

**Julius-Maximilians Universität  
Katholisch- Theologische Fakultät  
Lehrstuhl für Alte Kirchengeschichte, christliche Archäologie und  
Patrologie**

# **A Search of the Roots of Syro-Malabar Church in Kerala**

(A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology at the Cath. - Theol. Faculty of the Julius - Maximilians - University, Würzburg)

**Submitted  
By  
George Joseph Nedumparambil  
Würzburg, 2013**

**Julius-Maximilians Universität  
Katholisch- Theologische Fakultät  
Lehrstuhl für Alte Kirchengeschichte, christliche Archäologie und  
Patrologie**

# **A Search of the Roots of Syro-Malabar Church in Kerala**

(A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Theology at the Cath. - Theol. Faculty of the Julius - Maximilians - University, Würzburg)

**Guide: Prof. Dr. Franz Dünzl**

**Submitted by  
George Joseph Nedumparambil  
Würzburg, 2013**

## **A word of Gratitude**

I would like to thank everyone who helped me to materialize my doctorate study.

First and foremost I thank the good Lord who held me fit mentally, intellectually and physically to finish this work.

I thank my Professor and guide Prof. Dr. Franz Dünzl for the enormous help he rendered me. I am really privileged to do this work with Dr. Dünzl. As he is the professor of Church History, Patristic Science, and Christian Archaeology it was a great benefit for my studies as he could orient me well in the field of my research. The patience with which he read my draft and the amount of time he spent for me is magnificent and a model. The understanding and encouragement he gave me, in disheartened and dispirited moments, is brother-like. I also thank Prof. Dr. Gerhard Droesser, the second assessor of the work, who appraised my work and gave scholarly and scientific corrections.

I thank my former Provincial P. Dr. Jacob Chamakalayil who promoted me to Doctorate Studies. I also thank sincerely the present Provincial P. Dr. Mathew Paikada who always supported and encouraged me to move forward. I remember P. Dr. Joseph Mathew Angadiyil also with a heart full of gratitude with whom I could discuss my topic.

I also thank the ex-Provincial of Bayern Capuchin Province for extending the opportunity and welcoming me to the Bayern Capuchin Province to do my studies in the University of Würzburg. In the same way I thank the present Provincial P. Christophorus Goedereis of the united German Province. I thank the community members of Würzburg. In a special way I remember both P. Johannes and P. Rainer, the holy presence in the community, for the support and encouragement they gave me.

As my work is a search of the roots of Syro-Malabar Church in Kerala I dedicate this work to all the people who are misunderstood, maltreated and persecuted for not mistakes of theirs exactly like this Church which was misunderstood as Nestorian, and who was also misunderstood and maltreated in the history of the Church.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	II
------------------------	----

Contents.....	III
---------------	-----

### Introduction

1. Introduction .....	01
-----------------------	----

### I. Nestorius and Nestorian Christology

1. The Person of Nestorius .....	09
2. The Hellenistic Background of the Antiochian School.....	12
3. The Causes that Lead to the Suppression of Nestorius .....	14
4. The Doctrinal Controversy .....	17
5. Nestorius' Metaphysical and Christological Presuppositions.....	22
6. The Prosopic Union.....	27
7. The Concept <i>Communicatio Idiomatum</i> .....	37
8. The Political Reason for the Conflict.....	44
9. The Influence of Ancient Goddess Devotion and the Title Theotokos.....	47
10. The History of Nestorius - Question and Modern Study .....	58

### II. Cyril of Alexandria and his Christology

1. The Person of Cyril of Alexandria .....	67
2. The Beginning and Development of Christianity in Egypt.....	76
3. The Alexandrian School against the Antiochian School .....	80
4. The History of the Egyptian Church in the 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> Century .....	89
5. The Christology of Cyril .....	96
A. The Term φύσις in Cyril .....	97
B. A Study of the Formula: μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη .....	110
C. μία φύσις Formula: A Gateway to Ecumenical Consultation.....	112

### III. Life and Theology of Theodoret of Cyrus

1. The life of Theodoret.....	116
2. Theodoret and Nestorius .....	119
3. Theodoret's Works .....	122
4. Theodoret's Refutation of Cyril's Twelve Anathemas .....	124
5. Theodoret's Work <i>Eranistes</i> .....	140
6. Theodoret's Christology.....	152
A. Doctrine of God and man .....	152
B. The Immutability of the Divine Nature (Dialogue I).....	165

## IV

C. The Unconfused Union of the Two Natures (Dialogue II) .....	177
D. The Impassibility of the Divine Nature (Dialogue III) .....	185
7. Reunion Formula of Theodoret .....	189
8. Concluding Remarks .....	193

### **IV. Syro-Malabar Church and Nestorian Connections** **(A Search into the relations of Syro-Malabar Church)**

1. The Various Rites and Churches in India .....	198
A. Latin Church .....	201
B. Malankara Church .....	202
2. A Short Sketch of Kerala .....	204
A. The Land of Spices .....	204
B. Synchronization of Religions in Kerala .....	211
3. SMC: A Study from a Historical Perspective .....	214
A. The First Phase of the SMC .....	240
B. The Second Phase of the SMC .....	247
C. The Third Phase of the SMC .....	258
4. A Critical Analysis of the Syro-Malabar Liturgy .....	271
A. The Structure and the Historical background of the AM and Sharar III .....	272
B. General Observations of the Reconstruction Attempts .....	276
C. Relation between Birkat Hamazon and AM .....	277
D. Cup of Elijah and AM .....	280
E. Didache and AM .....	281
F. Stages of Formation .....	282
i. The First Stratum .....	282
ii. The Second Stratum .....	283
a. The Addition of Isaian Qaddysh: In the First Section .....	283
b. Various Other Modifications .....	284
iii. The Third Stratum .....	285
a. AM and Last Supper .....	286
b. Consequence of the Interpolation .....	287
c. AM and the Maronite Version .....	288
d. Urgent Request for an Anaphora .....	288
G. Theological Content of AM .....	291
i. Theology of the AM from a Trinitarian Perspective .....	292
ii. Christology of AM .....	293
iii. Pneumatological Dimension of the AM .....	297
iv. Mother of God and AM .....	299
H. The Christology of Seleucia-Ctesiphon .....	301
I. Analysis of the Anaphora with the Aid of the Bible .....	305
i. Validity of AM from a Biblical Point of View .....	305
ii. The Catholic Perspective on the Validity and Orthodoxy of AM .....	311
a. Mixed Reactions .....	313
b. Modern Critical Analysis of AM .....	316
c. Critical Evaluation of the Anaphora AM .....	321

J. The Malabar Church .....	323
i. Malabar Liturgy and Related Problems .....	325
ii. Malabar Liturgy and Recent Developments .....	337
<b>V. Concluding Remarks</b> .....	340
<b>VI. List of Abbreviations</b> .....	352
<b>VII. Bibliography</b> .....	354

## Introduction

Our attempt in this work is basically to make a search into the veracity of the accusation namely whether the Syro-Malabar Church is Nestorian or not. The thrust for such a search is stimulated by the disparagement which this Church had to carry for years. In order to accomplish this task we will study various church fathers, certain liturgical aspects and the history of the SMC which comprises the nascent period and the time period in which SMC is supposed to have adopted this Nestorian element. Thus the scope of our study is not only from patristic point of view rather it covers also the liturgical and church historical aspects. The SMC was accused to be Nestorian at first only when it came in contact with the European colonizing forces that is to say from the 15<sup>th</sup> century onwards. She was mainly accused by the missionaries who came with the colonizers. The missionaries, those who came to India along with the colonizers, thought that everything must be in conformity with the Latin faith. It might have happened perhaps due to the ignorance of the differences in the celebration and the presence of various other rites extant in the Catholic Church. It is an unbelievable fact that quite a good number of Catholics are unaware of the fact that there are 21 Oriental churches in the Catholic Church. Thus together with these Churches and the Latin Church they form into one unit and the Catholic Church is an encompassing of 22 churches. So without knowing this basic fact many accuse other churches which do not exhibit uniformity in liturgy with that of the Latin Church, or the way of celebrating the holy Mass, that they are non-catholic or practising something heretical. The same consideration might have happened in the case of the SMC too. Thus ignorance along with a craving for power and dominance over the SMC has prompted them to criticize her as heretic. In our study we will consider how far is it true to say that SMC is Nestorian or is it true to say that there existed a strong bond between the SMC and the Nestorian Church. In our attempt to do it we will go back to the nascence of the church of SMC in Kerala and its affinities with other churches. This study is also motivated to look into the details, whether the church in Kerala, which is said to have received its faith from St. Thomas the Apostle, later, went to the wrong side in her following of Christ.

As we approach this study in an objective way, our starting point is to start with the person of Nestorius himself. First and foremost if we fix our objective, so to say, that Malabar Church is not Nestorian, then perhaps the aim of our study may be very much limited and merely subjective. Hence let us do it very objectively with an intention to accept either result with an open hand. If we want to do properly such an objective study, namely a research into the above accusation, it is a must to start with the person of Nestorius himself as the Malabar Church was accused as Nestorian. Even though an objective study was not possible up to 16<sup>th</sup> century on the person of Nestorius today it is made possible through the effort of various scholars. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century there took place a new turn for the scientific study of catholic theology initiated by J. Garnier through his incomplete edition of *Marius Mercator*. Simultaneously started scientific research on the teaching of Nestorius and for the first time in the history of the Christian Church she started asking an audacious question: Was Nestorius a Nestorian? This gave momentum to the researches which were to be conducted in the following centuries. Towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early period of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries there were quite a few scholars interested in the teaching of

Nestorius. There interest was fructified by the discovery and the publication of the book *Liber Heraclidis*,<sup>1</sup> latest work written by Nestorius, and the studies conducted on the person of Nestorius and his teaching. Thereafter from the Catholic side also many eminent scholars occupied themselves with the study and research on the teaching of Nestorius. Thus both catholic and other evangelical churches' contributions to the field of Nestorius' teaching gave much insight into his teaching and thus free him of the age old criticism. Many of them hold the view that Nestorius is not a Nestorian. Basing on the modern interpretations on the text [*Liber Heraclidis*] conducted in different languages we are also able to habituate ourselves with the true teaching of Nestorius. The finding of this study conducted by so many scholars is an eye opener to truth seeking Christians and thus we may be compelled to give up our conservative and traditional beliefs. This study makes it clear one thing for certain and gives us the conviction that the condemnation of the teaching of Nestorius was a catastrophe in the history of the Universal Church. R. Seeberg, in his *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* clearly expresses that "Nestorius offered a presentation of the Antiochian Christology which is the clearest, simplest, and nearest to the Church's understanding that we possess. There is nothing heretical in his thought ... None of the great heretics of the history of dogma bears this name as undeservedly as Nestorius."<sup>2</sup> As he was an Antiochian he tried to clearly present the Christological mysteries basing on the pure Aristotelian line. Antiochians depended upon Aristotle to make clear the divine truths. "Their rationalism, seen particularly in their mode of Scriptural exegesis, their ethical interest, and, above all, their interest in man as a free agent - in these ways is their standpoint akin to that of the *Peripatetics* and, at the same time different from that of the theologians of Alexandria, whose place is in the platonic tradition."<sup>3</sup> The Antiochians approach the Christological problem from a different standpoint than that of the Alexandrians. If the Alexandrians can be called Christian Platonists Antiochians who are brought up in the Syrian doctrinal tradition can be called Christian Aristotelians. When the Alexandrians lay their stress on the first principle, that is, Christ is one Person, God himself, the Antiochians lay stress upon the second principle that is, the doctrine of the reality of the Lord's manhood to the full extent, and do not hesitate to apply the principle of its individuality.

Up to this above mentioned century no one had given sufficient importance to the line of thought which the Antiochians held. If earlier sufficient considerations were given to this neglected side much of the controversies and fight could have been avoided which took place in the name of mere terminologies. The Hellenistic terms which were christianized by the Antiochian side as was not well understood till this above given period so also the same is true with the Alexandrians too. And above all the use of the term *prosopon* with two different connotations by Nestorius has made him nothing other than the holder of a wrong teaching and a heresiarch in the eyes of the opposite group namely Alexandrians and before the Christian world. But from the 17<sup>th</sup> and the consequent centuries scholars were able to define what the implied meanings of these two different connotations are. In the words of my guide and theologian Prof. Dr. Franz Dünzl if Nestorian is not to be considered any more in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. below fn. 50.

<sup>2</sup>Cited from A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, London 1964, 504 referring to R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* II, 3, Leipzig 1923, 219.

<sup>3</sup>R.V. Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies: A study in the Christological thought of the schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the early history of Christian Doctrine*, London 1940, 109.



so called traditional sense a Nestorian, why should one fear to be recognized as a Nestorian, is the general consensus today among scholars regarding the person and teaching of Nestorius. These views of the modern scholars gave added momentum to the process of freeing him from the age old heresy and give strength to probe into the veracity of the relationship which SMC is said to have with the Nestorians. In addition we will also verify objectively the veracity of the accusation, that SMC shares some of the elements of Nestorian Church and their liturgy. Thus in the first chapter we will strictly limit ourselves to the study of the life and teaching of Nestorius basing on his *Liber Heraclidis*.

At the same time if want to do justice to the study of Nestorius it is a *sine qua non* a study on Cyril of Alexandria who was the opponent of the Constantinople's Patriarch and who accused Nestorius saying that he teaches the doctrine of two sons in the Person of Christ. In order to know whether Cyril was right in accusing Nestorius or stamping him as a heresiarch we may have to deal with the next eminent person from the Patristic era. Thus we will dedicate the second chapter to acquaint ourselves with the person and teaching of Cyril of Alexandria and his arguments against Nestorius. In making Nestorius a heretic one cannot acquit Cyril from his particular role. Simultaneously when the whole Catholic Church venerates Cyril as a saint and reveres him as a champion of faith in the 4<sup>th</sup> century he had his own limitations. It is not surprising for us to hear that all saints have their own weaknesses and all sinners have their own plus factors. Cyril was also not an exception to it and perhaps a bit more weaknesses and cupidity we find in the person of Cyril for power. At the same time one will be surprised to see the contributions he made to the universal Church. As we have already mentioned about the bent of Nestorius so also it may be good to know about the school to which Cyril of Alexandria belonged. The Alexandrians depended upon the Platonic philosophy and thus they are known as the Platonists. R.V. Sellers observes that "if the Church has her Christian Platonists, she has also her Christian Aristotelians."<sup>4</sup> When the Antiochians give stress to realism the Alexandrians stress on the idealism. If we want to understand this point clearly we must go into the details of the thrust of each Christology. Alexandrine Christology and its exponents living in a Greek world may betray signs of the influence of the thought and religion of Hellenism but their Christological thought and teaching are essentially Christian although it seems unsatisfactory. According to their Christological principles first Christ is one Person, God Himself, who has become man for man's salvation, and second, that in Him are the two elements of Godhead and manhood, these remaining real in their union in this one person. It is upon first of these principles Alexandrians lay particular stress in order to resist the teaching of Nestorian doctrine. It is easily discernible for anyone of us to observe the difference in both schools, in their outlook and thrust, teachings and definitions. Thus it is quite natural for the difference which we find and come across in these two schools when these two different schools with two different mentalities, understandings and philosophies try to interpret the same truth employing two different sets of terminologies. Today when we look back at these schools, equipped with this information and knowledge, we may be able to observe the difficulty they had in swallowing the same truth presented differently although we may be able to understand them in a better way with the new tools of researches and methodologies.

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

Contemporarily many modern scholars, for example Theologians like Loon, Grillmeier etc., consider Cyril as a dyophysite exactly like Nestorius. Modern scholarship informs us that both Cyril and Nestorius were heading towards the same principle namely δύο φύσεις - ἕν πρόσωπον. Unfortunately both sides could not understand it that both of them were trying to reach the same truth and instead tried to tackle the other. If we are right in concluding that there is no fundamental difference between the Christological teaching of the Alexandrians and that of the Antiochians, one would naturally ask then why it was that the two parties could not see that both of them were striving after the same cardinal principle. Only answer is that, that from the second half of the third century the spirit of warfare ruled over the two schools of thought, and in consequence, it was not a common understanding which was sought after, but the defeat of the enemy. It was a tragedy in and for the Church and which should not have happened. In the words of Sellers “the Antiochian theologians, though they approach the Christological problems from another angle, are in reality at one with their opponents in maintaining the same root principles - a conclusion, which, if it is right, means that the downfall of the Antiochian school is to be regarded as one of the tragedies in the history of the Early Church.”<sup>5</sup> Presently it is clear, that both these Schools exercised a great influence in the formulation of the definition of theology and growth of the Church. They should be considered as the two different sides of the same coin.

The struggle which arose in the name of the Person of Christ between the Constantinople Patriarch and the Alexandrian Patriarch in the first sense was not a theological fight for upholding a doctrine rather it was merely political, terminological and personal. Thus through the first and second chapters we will make an attempt to acquaint ourselves with these various problems which they faced and in particular in the second chapter we will dedicate our energy to study the person of Cyril and his contributions to Catholicism. It is said of Cyril that he was a perfect model of his uncle Theophilus. When the fear of losing control in the region haunted him due to the supremacy handed over by the Emperor to the Constantinople Church and newly erected Capital, he could not sit quiet. As Nestorius had terminological problems in his teaching so also had Cyril. The teaching of Cyril is also not free of accusations. Some modern scholars accuse him for holding φύσις as always synonymous with πρόσωπον. Some accuse him as an upholder and father of *monophysitism* exactly like the opposite namely *dyophysitism* with which Nestorius is accused. Along with it Cyril sensed a threat in the appointment of Nestorius as the Patriarch of Constantinople. Due to certain treacherous affairs which Cyril had played, he feared whether the new Patriarch of Constantinople would be appointed a judge over him. If we get into the problems involved in the theotokos title we may be able to understand the undercurrent in which both of them argued and defended. Cyril finds in Nestorius a true heretic when he denies the title theotokos to mother Mary. Exactly in the same way Nestorius doubts whether Cyril has the right knowledge of the goddess concept which was prevalent in the Egyptian Culture and to which people had a great affinity. Nestorius fears that some of the goddess figures reappear through the veneration given to Mother Mary by the Egyptian church, headed by Cyril the Patriarch. In our study, we will also deal with this troubling theme in the first chapter itself.

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 108.

Although we deal separately Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria in the first and second chapters respectively we may not be able to get a clear picture regarding the veracity of the teaching as both of them are right in their own way. Therefore it necessitates us to rely upon someone else to get clarity on the topic which we discuss. As both Nestorius and Cyril had not the perfect mastery of the terminologies and ideas which they borrowed from the Hellenistic world in order to illumine the person of Christ, we may refer to an Antiochian Church father, named, Theodoret of Cyrus who had perfect mastery of the terminologies of the Hellenistic world. He knew at once the origin of the terminologies in the theology of both Nestorius and Cyril and its various implications. Therefore in the third chapter we will also take up the teaching of Theodoret of Cyrus who throws more clarity to the Christological crisis and problem which pierced the church of the time. His contribution was a great breakthrough in the field of Christology and a great consolation to the burning church although his life was in great danger. He was a highly respected bishop in the Christian world but unfortunately due to the vicious politics of the time he also had almost the same fate like that of Nestorius although later he was rehabilitated. As he was an Antiochian and knew well the teaching of Nestorius, he could defend him in various councils and in turn which targeted his life. Many of the authors, whom we have taken into consideration while dealing with Theodoret, are of the opinion that if he were not known as a friend of Nestorius, he would have been one of the most eminent bishops of that century. His friendship with Nestorius became a threat for him. But still he was not ready to sacrifice the bond he had with Nestorius in order to save his life and become famous. Although in the Chalcedonian council held from 8 October 451 Theodoret's fate was decided, he was not ready to give up his principles and faith in Christ. In the eighth session of this council Theodoret had to defend his faith, mostly against Nestorius, in the midst of a riotous and unprincipled churchmen. Theodoret was more in favour of the teaching of Nestorius than that of Cyril of Alexandria. Theodoret could not approve the teaching of Cyril completely as in his view it contained the elements of Apollinarism.

Thus in order to have a better grasp of the problem and to remove the terminological difficulties from the teachings of both Nestorius and Cyril we may depend upon the teaching of Theodoret. Thus in the third chapter we will take up, first and foremost, the refutation of Theodoret against the twelve anathemas of Cyril. To know Theodoret and his theological terminology the study of his work called *Eranistes*<sup>6</sup> is very important. Thus the third chapter will be a voyage through the 12 anathemas of Cyril and response to it by Theodoret along with the treatment of his work *Eranistes*. The work *Eranistes* is in the form of a dialogue between two persons, namely between the Orthodox and the Eranistes, through which Theodoret tries to expound and ascertain what he thinks right about the person of Christ. As the word *Eranistes* indicates, the person who represents him, it is a person similar to a beggar who collects ideas from everywhere and anywhere possible and spreads it as his own. Thus he is the patron of all unfinished, patch-worked and wrong theology. Theodoret is one whom we cannot avoid in our study as he is so instrumental in bringing about peace in the church through his most famous Formula of Reunion and who made a great advancement in the development of Christology, although it is not yet fully developed. At the request of Patriarch John of Antioch the famed Theodoret makes a

---

<sup>6</sup>Cf. below fn. 689.

compendium of Christology. It was a concealed fact that Theodoret was the author of this Formula. Even Cyril quotes this formula and later falls in line with the teaching of Theodoret. It is an undeniable fact that Theodoret was really a master brain to solve the problem of the church of that time. If we go through the words of the great Pope Leo who addressed Theodoret personally we will understand the value of his Reunion Formula and the person. Pope Leo finds space in his 120<sup>th</sup> Letter written to Theodoret on 11 June 453 to congratulate the Bishop of Cyrus for the joint victory at Chalcedon and he reassures him that the Apostolic See holds him free of heresy and requests his further co-operation by writing periodic reports from the East. At the end of this third chapter therefore we will cull out all the important elements from the *Eranistes* and try to form a précis of his teaching and which in turn will help us to understand the problems of both Nestorius and Cyril and give us much clarity to the Christological disputes.

Now having attained a holistic picture of the 4<sup>th</sup> century and the Christological crisis we may move further to the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter which is the kernel of our study. Instead of simply saying that SMC is not Nestorian we dare to make a probe into the element that how far this Church is Nestorian or how the title 'Nestorian' does fit or does not fit to this church. If we want to know this church thoroughly it is a must to get into its roots. Therefore we have started with the genesis of this Church. Although it is not our primary concern to prove whether St. Thomas the Apostle came to Kerala, we have tried to produce some available sources in establishing the fact. Along with it, we have tried to give a geographical picture of the land where the Church was planted, nurtured and grown. As the Kerala Church has a history of different phases we have tried to deal them separately in different segments. Along with it we have tried to make a study of the Addai and Mari Anaphora which is considered by many scholars as the portal for the SMC to be accused as a Nestorian Church. It must be also a necessity in our study to evaluate it from various points of views. In this endeavour we will make a comparative study of it with other possible and similar liturgical prayers related to Judaism and early Christian forms of prayers along with acquainting ourselves with the structure of the anaphora. We will also study it by going through the present day scholarly impression on it from a biblical, liturgical, and catholic notion along with an evaluation of the Addai and Mari anaphora from Christological, Trinitarian, and Pneumatological view. It may be also proper to consider, though not in detail, a view of it on mother Mary and theotokos. In our study we have also taken into account two documents from the Catholic side, which have checked the validity of the Assyrian Church and the legitimacy of the Addai and Mari anaphora as it does not have an Institution narrative. Vatican and modern scholars agree unanimously that the Assyrian Church is apostolic, ancient and authentic so also Addai and Mari anaphora. The words of famous Syriac scholar S. Brock help us to understand the importance of the anaphora along with the need of respect which is to be shown to other churches. He tells that "from a historical point of view to name a church Nestorian is totally misleading and incorrect - quite apart from being highly offensive and a breach of ecumenical good manners."<sup>7</sup> From this comment of S. Brock and the studies conducted by Vatican and scholars, we are equipped with sufficient proofs to prove otherwise. From these evaluations and appreciations from scholars and Vatican we are also able to deduce logically that SMC is not Nestorian rather it is a misnomer. Thus

---

<sup>7</sup>S. P. Brock, The Nestorian Church: A Lamentable Misnomer, in: BJRL 78 (1996), 25.

we have bound up all those findings in the 4<sup>th</sup> namely in the concluding chapter with a conclusion.

Besides this, it is also the ambition and desire of every Christian to bring about unity and respect between churches and thus we join hands to make a tiny attempt to enhance the unity among various denominations of the Christian folk. Such a thought and inspiration gave the thrust to make such a study and which in turn ease a bit the tension which exists between the churches and thus make an atmosphere conducive to dialogue and understanding. Moreover, such an attempt is motivated by four different reasons. First and foremost the love of God which must be the guiding force in our endeavour to reach the goal namely Christ. It is a wound in the hearts of millions of Christians that in the name of Christ they condemn and repudiate each other. Thus we become mocker ourselves and a great scandal to the whole world. It is a deep wound created in the minds of Christians, started years before and it takes time to heal the wound but still it is our duty to eliminate the misunderstandings which led to the rupture of church into various fractions. Guided by the Christian motive force, that is Christ's unconditional love, one must be able to accommodate the other. The second reason for such a thought is due to join hand in collaboration with all the ecumenical efforts which are conducted by all the heads of the church and thus the unity of the Churches. Thus it is also a tiny attempt to light a small lamp with the already lighted lamp of ecumenism by Popes John XXIII and John Paul II and their followers. It is good to remember the words of our late Pope John Paul II, who during his visit to Jerusalem said, that we all are brothers and sisters. If so how much more we all are brothers and sisters who believe in the same Christ and eat and drink the same body and blood of Christ. Therefore it is a growing necessity that we all become one in the name of Christ. It needs a lot of understanding, removal of misunderstanding and acceptance of each other. It is an attempt to bring about unity among denominations and thus integrity in the universal Church. Actually we all are one and we must try for that. It is the mind of Christ that we all be one (Jn 10, 16). Thirdly it is an attempt to understand the Person of Christ through the writings of various church fathers esp., through the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus and make a re-search into the writings of Nestorius and Cyril in order to better understand the background in which and how they interpreted the person of Christ and thus remove the misunderstandings which caused breakage in the Antiochian and Alexandrian Church. Fourthly and finally such a study is conducted with a personal motive namely to extricate and liberate the SMC, as far as possible, from the misunderstandings caused by the uncharitable interpretations and thus bring all the churches a bit closer to the spirit of God and love of Christ.

Presently when we look back to the event which disrupted the Antiochian Church, one may be able to say that the Council of Ephesus (431) instead of marking the beginnings of a process which ended in the disruption of the Syrian school of theology, should have stood as the place where two ways met - and should have utilized to the benefit of the Christian Church. Thus in these modern days, we should be prepared to make use of the contribution of the Alexandrine theologians as well as that of the theologians of the school of Antioch, since, the contributions from both sides are being complementary and not contradictory and as both are necessary in the interest of sound Christological thought. No one can deny the truth that due to the missionary Spirit of Antiochians the Church of Christ was brought to various parts of

our Continent. This was beneficial also to the Assyrian Church of the East and as a result to the Syro-Malabar Church in Kerala. This same vigour and enthusiasm must be brought back once again to the church by joining hands. Divided we perish and joined we grow strong. This unity and joining hands will be a propeller which propels the action of the Catholic Church initiated by Christ and continued by His Apostles.

In our study we are able to conclude saying that SMC is one of the ancient, authentic and apostolic churches in the Universal Catholic Church fully blown to serve the humanity, depending upon the various facts namely the documents and drafts which are produced by Vatican, from the study conducted on the basis of Bible and all the possible and available historical documents. Although she had to pass through a land of thorns and disheartening experiences, today she is raised to the level of a Major Archiepiscopal church guided by Major Archbishop and Cardinal Mar George Alencherry.

## Chapter I

### Nestorius and Nestorian Christology

#### 1. The Person of Nestorius

Nestorius<sup>8</sup> was born at Germanicia, in Syria and died in the Thebaid, in Egypt, ca. 451. When he was living as a priest and monk in the monastery of Euprepus outside the city of Antioch, he was called unexpectedly to the see of Constantinople by Emperor Theodosius II<sup>9</sup> to be the Patriarch of Constantinople in succession to Sisinnius,<sup>10</sup> like a second Chrysostom.<sup>11</sup> A graphic picture is given in the Emperor's address to Dalmatius<sup>12</sup> recorded by Nestorius, of the difficulties which were experienced in finding a bishop who would be acceptable.<sup>13</sup> This graphic picture

---

<sup>8</sup>Nestorius, who was the Patriarch of Constantinople (428-431), taught the unity of the person of Christ and who was seen outwardly as only one πρόσωπον (one Terminology which was used to mean the undivided outward appearance of the Person Jesus Christ) and in whom the two natures of Jesus are accrued. Nestorius was a theologian of the Antiochian profile. He was very much impressed by the teachings of the great teachers of Antiochian school like Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. As a monk and priest he animated a Closter in the neighbourhood of Antiochia until he was called by Theodosius II to take up the Patriarchate of Constantinople (cf. A. Amato, Nestorius, Nestorianismus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 745-749).

<sup>9</sup>Roman Emperor (402-408) (sole Augustus in the East), who is considered as religious and always concerned about the welfare of the church although he could not enjoy complete freedom in matters of the church as he was always controlled by many advisers especially by his sister Pulcheria (since 414 Augusta) and his wife Eudokia (since 421 Augusta). During his life time he performed certain important activities for the Church like calling councils in order to save it from various heretics and pagans and from Attila the Hun [448/450] (cf. A. Lippold, Theodosius II., in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1422).

<sup>10</sup>He was a Patriarch from Constantinople and a candidate supported by laity against Philip of Side and Proclus. About his term of office only very little is known. He was not able to stop the appointment of Proclus as the bishop of Cyzicus (cf. F. Winkelmann, Sisinnios Patriarchen v. Konstantinopel, S.I., in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 635).

<sup>11</sup>John Chrysostom (St., Feast 13 Sept.), Patriarch of Constantinople, 349/350 and learned Antiochian, died in 14. 9. 407. He was known for his sermons (gold-mouthed), was educated in the Hellenistic school, perhaps a student of Libanios the great Greek Rhetorician, followed the Stoic-School Tradition and also made use of the art of Diatribe. As bishop of Constantinople he insisted upon the inner reform of all clergy, monks, religious women and widows. He called all church men and women to a faultless life and all the faithful to an exceptional life style fitting to Christians. He established hospice for the poor, strange and sick. He also functioned as a pastor in the capital city for the mercenary soldier. In the year 400/401 he obtained the absolution of six Simonist bishops. He functioned also as the admonisher of the increasingly unbearable Eudokia. He was suspected of Origenismus and in the synod of Oak he was condemned and deposed in his absence. At a later period the condemnation continued by the Emperor and he was sent in Exile to Kucusus in Asia Minor. He was very zealous in his life that he had to face condemnation in his life. Finally he was deported to Pityus near the black sea. On the way to there he died. His last words were in confirmation to his life and preaching: Let God be glorified in everything. Amen (cf. P. Klasvogt, Johannes Chrysostomus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 889-892).

<sup>12</sup>Dalmatius was a monk who never went outside of his monastery for forty-eight years and was one of the archimandrites in Constantinople (cf. T. E. Gregory, Vox populi: Violence and Popular Involvement in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A. D., Ohio 1979, 110).

<sup>13</sup>It may be good here to cite the words of the Emperor Theodosius II himself addressed to Dalmatius to know more about the person of Nestorius and the context in which he was selected as the Patriarch of Constantinople: "the emperor said to him (Dalmatius): I find no evil in this man [i.e. Nestorius], nor any cause deserving of deposition. I testify to thee and to all men that I am innocent. For I have no love for this man through any human inclination that I should act thus and be criticized and condemned as one who withstands God and arrogates to himself the rights of the priests. Never did I insist upon his ordination that punishment and vengeance should be exacted (of me) because of his election, but through the concurrence of you all I of necessity introduced this man, though he was much beloved in his own country and his own people. You were the cause of this and not I. Thee thyself, Dalmatius, I begged to undertake this office, and I besought thee with

clearly shows how Nestorius was forced to come to Antioch and take the see. He had a high reputation for eloquence, and the popularity of St. Chrysostom's memory among the people of the imperial city might have influenced the Emperor's choice of another priest from Antioch<sup>14</sup> to be the court bishop. He was consecrated in April, 428, and seems to have made an excellent impression. From his teachings and biblical exegesis, his insistence on the recognition of the full manhood of our Lord, and his desire to make the doctrine of the Church intelligible to men's minds, we can conclude that he belongs to the school of Antioch or to the Antiochian's theological lineage and point of view. He was always busy fighting heresies in his life. Within a few days after his consecration Nestorius had destroyed an Arian chapel, and he persuaded Theodosius to issue a severe edict against heresy in the following month. At the reception given to him by the Emperor he said to him, "Give me, Emperor, the world free from heretics, and I will give thee heaven in return."<sup>15</sup> Within a week after his consecration as bishop he acquired the nickname 'Incendiary' or 'Firebrand' as he seemed to have pulled down and burnt down so many of the churches belonged to Arian groups though this accusation seems to be unjust. But the energy with which he combated the laxity of life and errors of thought gave him so many enemies. He seized the churches of the Macedonians<sup>16</sup> in the Hellespont, and took measures against

---

any words not to refuse the ministry of God. But thou didst refuse, and didst beg of me in turn saying: 'Compel me not for I am an ignorant man.' And another also of the monks, a man who was thought to be somewhat and was well esteemed for his religiousness, did I entreat, and he also refused as not knowing how to conduct this ministry because he was unlearned. Then you said: 'Constantinople requires a bishop who for his words and his conduct shall be agreeable to all, who shall be a teacher in the church and a mouth to everyone in all things.' But when you refused for these reasons, did I do aught by my own authority? Did I not again beg of you to choose one of this character? Did I not implore of the clergy of Constantinople to choose one who was fitting? Did I not speak these same things to the bishops, saying: 'It is yours to choose and to make a bishop'? And you also I implored in like manner. Did I not leave the matter in your hand all this time, being patient in order that you should choose quietly, lest through haste some mistake should be made as to him who should be chosen? But did you choose and I not receive your choice? Dost thou wish me to say something against you? Shall I speak of their violence and bribery and presents, and their promises and oaths, and how they sought to turn the whole affair into a sale. Which of these men did you wish to be bishop? But I pass on: which choice did you wish should be made? Was it to be thyself, or that other of whom others chose, bringing damaging charges against him. You could not agree upon one man; but whom the people agreed upon you would not accept. I read before you what the people said of each one that was selected. What then ought I to have done that I did not do? You, the monks, did not agree with the clergy, the clergy were not of one mind, the bishops were divided, and the people in like manner disagreed. Each was contending for a different man. Yet not even so did I assume to myself the authority, but I left the choice to you. But when you were all at a loss you came to me and deputed me to choose whom I would. And even then I scarcely consented, though you all begged of me. Now I considered that it was not right to appoint any one from here, lest he should have to contend against enmity and opposition, for every one hated, and was hated by, the others, as though each were covetous of the office; so I sought to find a foreigner who should be a clear speaker and of good morals. And I was told that Nestorius of Antioch was such a one. Him I sent for and took, thereby causing sorrow to his whole city, and I brought him hither for your advantage - since this I held to be of more importance than that of the others. But when he was appointed this was not your estimate of him" (cited from J. F. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching: a fresh examination of the evidence*, Cambridge 1969, 6-8 referring to Nestorius, *Bazaar of Heraclidis*, 279-281).

<sup>14</sup>The Capital city of Syria with the surname ἡ ἐπὶ Δάφνῃ was founded in the year 300 B. C., by Seleukos I Nikator and it was named after his father. As Syria became the Roman province in the year 64 B. C., it was chosen as the place of administration and emperor's office. Antioch played a major role in the beginnings of Christianity [Acts 11, 19] (cf. F. W. Norris, *Antiochien am Orontes*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 767).

<sup>15</sup>Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, 8.

<sup>16</sup>Macedonios was bishop of Constantinople before 364; from theol. point of view he followed the thought pattern of Basilios of Ancyra who taught that the Son is similar to the οὐσία of Father. Later M. became the founder of the teaching of Pneumatomachy and his followers were named Macedonians after his name (cf. T. Böhm, *Makedonios*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 1223-1224).



the Quartodecimans<sup>17</sup> who remained in Asia Minor. He also attacked the Novatians,<sup>18</sup> in spite of the good reputation of their bishop. However he did not expel the Pelagian<sup>19</sup> refugees from the West, being not well acquainted with their condemnation ten years earlier. He twice wrote to Pope Celestine I for information on the subject but received no reply. Nestorius taught that Christ had two complete natures, one human and the other divine. In an age when popular piety<sup>20</sup> looked upon Christ as God and gave little thought to his manhood, Nestorius' emphasis upon the Lord's humanity was not well received.

If we refer the thought pattern of the people who tried to interpret Christ or His natures we understand the intention and importance of the teaching of Nestorius and other genuine patriarchs of the Church. Let us have recourse to certain thoughts which were propagated before Nestorius' and his contemporaries' time. From the below given citation we may get an idea about what sort of concepts and ideas proliferated by various schools from the second century and later on regarding the person of Christ. "Cerinthus,<sup>21</sup> the Gnostic teacher of Asia Minor, taught that 'Christ descended upon' the human Jesus at his baptism and then was 'separated again from Jesus' and did not suffer in Jesus' passion."<sup>22</sup> By this statement his humanity was flatly denied. Saturninus of Syria<sup>23</sup> and Basilides<sup>24</sup> of Alexandria taught "that the Christ merely

---

<sup>17</sup>The terminology Q. comes from the lat. transl. quartodecimani (5 cent.) a heretic concept τεσσαρεσκαίδεκαῖται (ca. 375). The term began diminishing as the minority, who used it for the date of the feast of Easter, was put under control. The problem began when a minority, who were in connection with the Jews, started celebrating the Easter in accordance with a Jewish date i.e., 14<sup>th</sup> day of the First Moon month of Nisan (quartadecima luna) without regard for weekday and without having recourse to the law of the church (cf. R. Kany, Quartodezimaner, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 762).

<sup>18</sup>The Roman priest Novatian held a rigorist position against Pope Cornelius and became the anti-Pope after the Decius persecution. He was the first Roman theologian (251) and writer who used Latin language. N. taught the unpaired divinity of the Son even in His incarnation (cf. H.-J. Vogt, Novatian, Novatianismus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 938-939).

<sup>19</sup>Pelagius was a layman and teacher and a leading personality of Pelagianism. On 30. 04. 418 we see a rescript from the Roman court chamber in Ravenna and from the African Plenary council from Carthago dating 01. 05. 418 in the new canons stating that Pelagius, Caelestius and his supporters as excommunicated. He taught that everyone has the power to live in conformity with God and good to do without special grace. He condemned the idea of original sin as taught by Augustine and stressed the moral ability of men not to sin (cf. O. Wermelinger und G. Greshake, Pelagius und Pelagianismus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 5-9).

<sup>20</sup>But Nestorius is also criticized by various authors for the lack of certain sensitivity to popular piety (cf. J. Binns, Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314-631, Oxford 1994, 4).

<sup>21</sup>Cerynthus was a gnostic. According to Church Fathers he was a heresiarch of the 1 cent. in Egypt. He was a skilled scholar and taught Jewish Gnosticism in Asia Minor. He taught that the visible world and heavens were not made by the Supreme Being, but by a lesser power (Demiurge) distinct from him. According to him Jesus is the Son of Joseph and Mary but upright, intelligent, and wiser than all others. Christ may have remained untouched by the suffering as he was spirit (cf. J. Frickel, Kerinthos, Kerinthianer, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 1402-1403).

<sup>22</sup>A. J. Hultgren, The Rise of Normative Christianity, Minneapolis 1994, 91.

<sup>23</sup>Saturninus, who was a Gnostic leader like Basilides, was the pupil of Menander. Menander in turn was the pupil of Simon Magus. It is most probable that Simon was a Gnostic before he was a Christian (if he should be classified as a Christian at all, as Acts 8, 9-13 would lead one to conclude) in Syria; Menander can be considered a link between pre-Christian Gnosticism and Christian Gnosticism (cf. *ibid.*, 88).

<sup>24</sup>Basilides was a leading Gnostic presumably during the time of Emperors Hadrian (117-138 A. D.) and Antoninus Pius (138-161 A. D.) in Alexandria. We hear about the school established by his son Isidore named after his father's name, even in the 4<sup>th</sup> cent in Lower Egypt. From the fathers of the church we hear that he was a Gnostic and both of them searched after the source of badness and the accountability of man to it. They followed an Alexandrian tradition (cf. W. A. Löhr, Basilides, Gnostiker, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 2, Freiburg 1994, 59).

appeared to be a man.”<sup>25</sup> Basilides claimed that Simon of Cyrene was crucified in place of the incorporeal Christ. “According to Hippolytus<sup>26</sup> and Irenaeus,<sup>27</sup> the Italian Valentinians<sup>28</sup> claimed that the Logos entered the physical body of Jesus at his baptism, but departed prior to his suffering and death. On the other hand, the Oriental Valentinians claimed that ‘the body of the Saviour was spiritual,’ not fleshly.”<sup>29</sup> These citations taken from Hultgren show us clearly what serious threat the fathers of the church had to face in their time. In all probability we can think that such ideas lingered even up to the time of Nestorius or even beyond. Against such heresies and tendencies prevalent, which taught that Christ’s human nature was only apparent, Nestorius had to fight against and affirm that Christ was both God and human. As Marcian<sup>30</sup> (450-57 A. D.) became the new emperor of the east, he called a council to meet at Nicaea in 451. It is interesting to note that the Council which in fact met at Chalcedon and which was considerably influenced by the ‘Tome of Leo,’<sup>31</sup> a clear and precise statement of the Latin Church’s theological views, described ‘Christ as perfect in Godhead ... perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man,’ was the same idea, for which Nestorius had argued for.<sup>32</sup>

## 2. The Hellenistic Background of the Antiochian School

Founded by the Seleucid kings, and the third city of the Roman Empire, Antioch was a centre of Greek culture, famed for letters and arts. But at the same time due to its geographical position, it became also a centre of Semitic life and thought. So one can

<sup>25</sup>Cited from Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity*, 91 referring to Irenaeus (The Christology of Saturninus is summarized by Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1. 24. 1; and that of Basilides by Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1. 24. 4).

<sup>26</sup>Hippolytus of Rome (St., Feast 13 August), was the last Greek Church writer in the West (cf. C. Scholten, *Hippolyt v. Rom*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 147-149).

<sup>27</sup>Irenaeus, Eirenaïos, (St., Feast 28 June), was bishop of Lyon. In his principal work *Adversus Haereses* which runs into five volumes, he combats a number of heresies (titled as “Gnosis”) like Valentinians, Marcionites, Encratites, and Ebionites (cf. F. Dünzl, Irenaeus (Eirenaïos), in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 583-585).

<sup>28</sup>Valentinus was a gifted rhetorician and literary Christian theologian of the 2nd century. He is commonly considered as the founder of the group which is named after him called ‘Valentinian Gnosis.’ According to the information from the Fragments he taught that the human beings were created imperfect or deficient by the angels (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* II, 36, 2; IV, 89, 6-90, 1), whereas the universe seems to be well arranged (*Hipp. ref.* VI, 37, 7). According to him the fallen mankind is renewed to its initial stage by the cleaning of the heart of human being (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* II, 114, 3-6) through the mediation of the Son who makes the revelation of ‘the only good Father’ (Mt 19, 17) possible (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* VI, 52, 4). V. represented a confusing christology although not a purely docetic (III, 59, 3) Christology. Famous follower of this heresy is Heracleon who was a faithful follower of the traits of Valentinianism (cf. C. Marksches, *Valentinos, Valentinianismus*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 10, Freiburg 2001, 518).

<sup>29</sup>Cited from Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity*, 91 referring to Hippolytus, *Refutation of all Heresies*, 6, 30; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1. 7. 2.

<sup>30</sup>Marcian (Marcianus, Markianos) byz. Emperor (450-457) started his career as an Army officer and *domestikos* under Theodosius II., and later became his successor. He through the marriage with the sister of Theodosius II., namely Pulcheria was also accepted in the West from 451. He went radically against all the pagan cults. He convoked the council of Chalcedon and supported the teaching of two natures. He also used military forces against Monophysites who were well established with the support of Robber Synod of Ephesus (449) and which was also supported by Eutychians. (He deposed the Patriarch Dioscorus of Alexandria) (cf. J. Koder, *Markianos*, byz. Kaiser, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 1391).

<sup>31</sup>It is a famous letter of Pope Leo (Leo I. the Great, St., Feast 10 Nov., Greek Church 18 Febr.), to the Patriarch Flavian of Constantinople comprised of his position regarding Christology 13. 06. 449 (*Tomus ad Flavianum*) (cf. H. Arens, *Leo, Pápste*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 821).

<sup>32</sup>Cf. W. S. McCullough, *A Short History of Syriac Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, Chicago 1902, 48.

assume that throughout the history of the Christian Church there were upholders of two different doctrinal traditions, at Antioch, namely, the Greek and the Syrian.

In the beginning of the fourth century, the coming of Lucian<sup>33</sup> to Antioch influenced the development of Alexandrine doctrine, as expounded by Cyril, and it found a home for itself especially in the monasteries of Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia. At the same time we find also exponents for the Syrian tradition. While the Lucianists were upholding the teaching which had its origin at Alexandria, Paul of Samosata<sup>34</sup> and Eustathius of Antioch<sup>35</sup> were upholding a different school of thought, namely Antiochian. If we want to understand the outlook of Antiochians we must get into the world of Antiochians. During the first five centuries of the Christian era there flourished in Northern Syria, and beyond to the East, a type of Greek culture which possessed a strong Aristotelian bias - and we find clear indications of its effect on Christian thought in this region. For example, Malchion the Sophist,<sup>36</sup> in seeking to express his doctrine concerning the Lord's 'Person' preferred the term '*ousia*'<sup>37</sup> understood in the sense of Aristotle's '*primary ousia*.'<sup>38</sup> So we find also among the upholders of the Syrian doctrinal tradition people who are altogether conversant with a Greek Culture on Aristotelian lines. "Their rationalism, seen particularly in their mode of Scriptural exegesis, their ethical interest, and, above all, their interest in man as a free agent - in these ways is their standpoint akin to that of the *Peripatetics* and, at the same time different from that of the theologians of Alexandria, whose place is in the platonic tradition."<sup>39</sup> On the contrary we find the theologians of Alexandria who lay stress on the Platonic tradition. "For these [Antiochians] are not idealists, but realists,

<sup>33</sup>Lucian was the teacher of Arius, Asterius, the first Arian writer, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, and Athanasius of Anazarba. He was a man of deep learning and an ascetic, held in the highest honour by his pupils, and his death (7<sup>th</sup> January 312), as one of the last victims in the persecution begun by Diocletian, won for his memory universal esteem. He did not regard Christ as essentially one with the eternal God, clinging to the conception of a perfect human development (προκοπή) as the means by which he reached divinity, and he seems to have distinguished between the Word or Son in Christ (the offspring of the Father's will) and the immanent Logos the reason of God (cf. Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon, London 1962, 110).

<sup>34</sup>Paul of Samosata was a controversial bishop of Antioch. Paul became bishop of Antioch in 260 and was deposed later in 268 by a synod comprised of seventy bishops, priests and deacons for his monarchianist teachings. For him Jesus was seen not as God-become-man but as man-become-God. For him 'the Son of God' is not one who came from heaven. Early credentials add that he considered Christ as a κοινός, nam., ψιλός άνθρωπος. Although he survived the first synod in the year ca. 264 the second one ca. 268 excommunicated him (cf. R. Hanig, Paulos v. Samosata, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 1527).

<sup>35</sup>Eustathius who was archbishop of Antioch and who is said to be great and praise worthy in the holy synod of Nicea fought against the Arians (cf. L. Abramowski and A. E. Goodman, A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts, No.19, Vol II: Introduction, Translation Indexes, London 1972, 75).

<sup>36</sup>Malchion of Antioch was priest and head of a Rhetoric school in Antioch according to Eus. H. E. 7, 29f. It seems that he was instrumental in disclosing the errors of Paul of Samosata in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Council of Antioch held in the year 268 (cf. T. Böhm, Malchion, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 1237).

<sup>37</sup>Here the term is used in the Aristotelian concept of '*primary ousia*.' In Aristotle '*primary ousia*' is meant as that which causes a thing 'to be' 'what it is.' According to him "without '*primary ousiai*,' which are the inhabitants of this world *par excellence* there would be no room for accidental modes of being. All things other than primary ousia are either said of the *primary ousiai* as their substrates or present in them as substrates. This is clear from an examination of cases. For example, "being an animal is said of being a man and therefore also of the individual man; for were it said of none of the individual men it would not be said of man at all. Again colour is in body and therefore also in an individual body; for were it not in some individual body it would not be in body at all. Thus all the other things are either said of the *primary ousiai* as substrates or in them as substrates. So if the *primary ousiai* did not exist it would be impossible for any of the other things to exist" (L. M. de Rijk, Aristotle: The Metaphysics: Semantics in Aristotle's strategy of argument, Leiden 2002, 391).

<sup>38</sup>Cf. Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies, 109.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid.

taking as their basis the historical and empirical; to these the particular rather than the general makes its appeal; theirs is not so much the metaphysical as the ethical point of view. So it is that we can say that if the Church has her Christian Platonists, she has also her Christian Aristotelians.”<sup>40</sup>

### 3. The Causes that Lead to the Suppression of Nestorius

We may best begin by considering the tension between the Antiochian and Alexandrian Church. In 428 when Nestorius became the patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril<sup>41</sup> was already patriarch of Alexandria since 412. When we read the book of I. P. Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, we come across the problem that existed between the two churches, namely Antiochian and Alexandrian. “The matter of dispute begins as regards the adequacy of the title (Theotokos) applied to the Virgin Mary although both wanted to affirm the belief in the oneness of Christ. Nestorius denied the term due to the reason of making Mary another goddess, if the term ‘God-bearer’ applied ontologically.”<sup>42</sup> The term suggested by Nestorius, namely, Theotokos and anthropotokos (God-bearer and man-bearer) simultaneously, or simply Christotokos (Christ-bearer) was misunderstood by Cyril and his followers and the term used by Cyril and followers (i.e., Theotokos) was misunderstood by Nestorius and his group. “The conflict between them was not primarily theological in character, but largely personal, ecclesiastico-political, and terminological.”<sup>43</sup> The accusation against Nestorius was started by Cyril due to the acceptance of a few excommunicated Pelagians into the church. “The Alexandrian patriarch was very cautious in approaching the Pope and made him aware that Nestorius had accepted a few excommunicated Pelagians into his court. The reaction was cleverly calculated: the Pope took Cyril’s side.”<sup>44</sup> In the case of Nestorius lot of official prejudice together with personal displeasure, from the part of Rome, played a major role. Without knowing the age old rivalry between the Antiochian and the Alexandrian church, Rome took side with the Alexandrians. For example, the mystical tendency followed by the Alexandrian school was in contrast with the practical and historical method followed by the Antiochian school. Another hidden interest of Alexandrian church was to play the dominant role in the East which Rome aspired to play in the whole of Christendom.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>Cyril of Alexandria (St., Feast 27 June) who died in 27. 07. 444 was bishop of Alexandria since 412 as the successor of his uncle Theophilus, whom he had accompanied to the synod of Oak. It seems that he was influenced very much by Athanasius in the theological outlook. In his early days he combated the Arians in Athanasian style and besides he made use allegory extensively. He has written so many explanatory notes on O.T and the gospel of John. His Easter Letters of 421 reveal clearly his Christological view (PG 77, 571f); He accused Nestorius for his Christological view and for the denial of the title Theotokos to Mary. After 435 he turns against the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia which was condemned in the Council of Ephesus due to the diffusion of it with zeal by the supporters of Nestorius who held the same Christology (cf. H.-J. Vogt, *Cyrill v. Alexandrien*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 2, Freiburg 1994, 1368- 1370).

<sup>42</sup>I. P. Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus* (The Early Church Fathers), New York 2006, 8.

<sup>43</sup>M.V. Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, *DOP* 16 (1962), 120.

<sup>44</sup>Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 7.

<sup>45</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, 9.

Cyril had worked at Alexandria in close association with Theophilus,<sup>46</sup> his uncle, who tormented and deposed John Chrysostom, and the fierce and domineering spirit of his uncle lived in him.<sup>47</sup> The following quote clarifies how fervently the spirit of fighting and animosity of his uncle survived in Cyril. “Theophilus, Cyril’s uncle and predecessor as bishop of Alexandria, to satisfy a personal animosity against John Chrysostom, had fomented the scandalous attack on him and which resulted in his deposition from the bishopric of Constantinople.”<sup>48</sup> We find a similar behavior in the person of Cyril. Let us use Bethune-Baker’s book as an explanatory vehicle here. He points out that

“History repeats itself. A painful family likeness can be traced in all controversies about religion: we see in them all the same zeal for the truth as each side understands it, the same inability in all the disputants to conceive the possibility that they may be mistaken, the same mixture of the highest with the lower aims and motives. And in many ways Cyril’s treatment of Nestorius recalls the attack of Theophilus on Chrysostom. Without in the first instance addressing enquiries or protests to Nestorius himself, he circulated reports of the erroneous teaching of the bishop of Constantinople, and by letters to the Emperor’s sister and other ladies and officials of the court - and handsome presents such as are customary in the East, whether they be regarded as bribes or not - had won over to his side many of the most influential of the Emperor’s advisers. The bribery then and later (for whatever Cyril’s apologists may say, no one who reads the letter of Cyril’s archdeacon and chancellor to the patriarch, who was appointed in place of Nestorius after the council,<sup>49</sup> can doubt that it was bribery) was on so extensive a scale that the archdeacon declares the expenditure had reduced the clergy and Church of Alexandria to poverty. Cyril, moreover, had sent to the capital a large body of Egyptian bishops and monks, who appeared as a kind of guard set over against Nestorius to terrorize him, so that Nestorius could say that they had actually seized his church. ‘I’ he says, addressing Cyril (*Bazaar of Heraclidis*<sup>50</sup>, 106), ‘who was

<sup>46</sup>Theophilus (St., Feast in the Syr. church 17 Oct. and in the Copt. Church 15 Oct.), who was Patriarch of Alexandria was born ca. 345 and died in 412. He tried to get the leading role of Alexandria with self-confidence, quarrelling and without hesitation. He liked to control the whole of Eastern Church especially the new and emerging church of the East namely, Constantinople. He did not succeed in appointing his own candidate to the see of Constantinople and he tried to depose John Chrysostom which resulted in turmoil and he had to return to Egypt. Against his activities John Chrysostom appealed to Innocent I (cf. M. Fiedrowicz, Theophilus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1471-72).

<sup>47</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his Teaching, 10.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., 9.

<sup>49</sup>The letter of Epiphanius to Maximianus preserved in the Synodicon adversus tragoediam Irenaei, Ch. 203.

<sup>50</sup>This is a personal work of Nestorius, named, *Bazaar of Heraclidis of Damascus* (it is a Syriac Version, in MS found in the Patriarch’s library at Kochanes). We come to know about this work of Nestorius from Ebed Jesu, a learned Nestorian, who died in the early part of the fourteenth century. According to the translator the book was published under such a title for the sake of acceptability. The translator tells us that if otherwise titled, it would not have been accepted by everyone and would not have been taken as a true witness. The word *Bazaar* comes from Syriac Têgûrtâ, which means the ‘business of a merchant’ or ‘merchandise’ and the translator tells that the book is verily a têtgûrtâ, of spiritual knowledge. Its title, *Têtgûrtâ of Heraclidis of Damascus*, according to Bedjan and Nau corresponding in Greek to Πραγματεία Ἡρακλίδου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ, hence Treatise of Heraclidis-and not *Bazaar of Heraclidis* as Bethune-Baker translated according to Loofs, a German scholar. Also in the book of L. Abramowski, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius* she indicates that the Syriac translator translates it as a Treatise of Heraclidis. “Der Syrische Übersetzer des Liber Heraclidis nennt den Titel *Tractatus Heraclidis* in seinem Vorwort (cf. L. Abramowski, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius*, Louvain 1963, 7). We will come back once again to the task of a fresh investigation into the literary historical testimony to the *Liber Heraclidis* taken up by L. Abramowski. In her studies she found that the first apology viz. *Tragoedia* is directly associated with Irenaeus of Tyre. The fragments of this *Tragoedia* of Nestorius have been recently discovered in Irenaeus of Tyre, Euagrius the Scholastics, in cod. add. 12156 of the

patient with heretics', 'was to be scared and chased out; and thou, being bishop of Alexandria, didst take possession of the Church of Constantinople, a thing that no bishop in any city would put up with.'<sup>51</sup>

Apart from the theological differences there was also the inherited church-political antipathy that led Cyril to act against the patriarch of Constantinople. Thus to have Nestorius out of the way was almost a matter of survival for Cyril, since the emperor had previously appointed the patriarch of Constantinople to investigate the messy situation in Alexandria, including the sudden death of a few of Cyril's opponents, like Hypatia,<sup>52</sup> the female pagan philosopher.<sup>53</sup> As one of his recent editors states it, "it will always have been unwise, and sometimes even physically dangerous, to meet Cyril<sup>54</sup> as an opponent."<sup>55</sup> The last thing Cyril needed was to have Nestorius as his examiner. Therefore he wanted by all means a dispute with Constantinople's patriarch that the latter never be appointed as his investigator.

The matter of dispute begins as regards the inadequacy of the title ascribed to the Virgin Mary as we have already mentioned above. Today majority of theologians agree that if Cyril and Nestorius could have been compelled to discuss their differences calmly and to define their terms with precision, under the supervision of an impartial arbiter, the problems would not have been pushed to the other extreme and would not have become so worse as to separate both churches from one another. Being Archbishop of Constantinople (428-31) and champion of the theological tradition of the city of Antioch, in which he had begun his career, Nestorius resented the intervention of Cyril, the Archbishop of Alexandria (412-44), who had determined

British Museum and in Severus of Antioch. She came to such a conclusion from the fact that all the parallels of content [in the first analogy] style and language at no time touch on the dialogue at the beginning of the *Liber Heraclidis*. This discovery led her to a further literary critical investigation of the text. And as a result she found that the bulk of the book derives from Nestorius himself and at its conclusion the text underwent some interpolation as Loofs has already acknowledged it. According to L. Abramowski this interpolation must have taken place sometime between 451 and 470 somewhere in Constantinople. She names the writer of the introduction to the book of *Liber Heraclidis* as Ps. Nestorius. Along with this discovery the investigation of L. Abramowski was a thrust to the modern Scholarship to understand the person of Nestorius and her work was a divulging of the so-far hidden work of Nestorius (cf. A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 502). Heraclidis was a certain man, who lived in Damascus. Therefore the title of the book is *Bazaar of Heraclidis of Damascus*. The Greek word was probably ἐμπόριον (θησαυρός would have been rendered Gazzâ). 'Mart' or 'store' or 'magazine,' suggests themselves as renderings, but *Bazaar* is perhaps the best available translation to represent the title. According to M. V. Anastos this is one of the theological treatises from the profoundest and most brilliant theologian of the fifth century. He tells that although this theological treatise is frustrating, wearisome and painful due to its repetitiousness, it offers the subtlest and most penetrating study of the mystery of the incarnation in the whole of patristic literature (cf. Anastos, *Nestorius was Orthodox*, 123).

<sup>51</sup>Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching*, 10-11.

<sup>52</sup>Ἰπατία, was a Neo-Platonist, pagan Philosopher and natural scientist, born most probably in 355-360 in Alexandria and died in the year 415 in March; distinguished pagan teacher; she was killed by fanatic Christians. It is debatable whether her death was supported by Cyril of Alexandria. It has been argued by historians that the myth of St. Catherine of Alexandria had been modelled on the life of Hypatia of Alexandria. Her murder became a cause for Christian and non-Christian authors to write a number of works against Christianity (cf. H. Brakmann, *Hypatia*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 369).

<sup>53</sup>Cf. Socrates H. E. 7, 15 (cf. K. G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Los Angeles 1982, 98; N. Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria: The Early Church Fathers*, London 2000, 9).

<sup>54</sup>When Eusebius, the later bishop of Dorylaeum pressed charges against Nestorius in Alexandria and Rome litigious Cyril made use of this dogmatic opportunity to strengthen his authority (cf. H. Karpp, *Textbuch zur altkirchlichen Christologie: Theologie und Oikonomia*, Neukirchener Studienbücher - Band 9, Rheinberg 1972, 115); Loofs indicates that "it was tragic that there was a Cyril who was capable of turning the mistrust of Nestorius which previously existed in Rome into enmity" (F. Loofs, *Nestorius and his place in the history of Christian doctrine*, New York 1975, 45).

<sup>55</sup>L. R Wickham, *Introduction in Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters*, Oxford 1983, xvii.

to humble the clergy of the capital city and gain dominion over the entire Eastern Church.<sup>56</sup> The facts above mentioned are not to blame anyone for the past misdeeds or to highlight and worsen the situation but to better understand the controversy and clearly recognize the facts and make a call for mutual understanding and acceptance. A lot of falsities have occurred in the past. But we cannot punish the present generation for the mistakes of the past. Therefore it is a cry of the present generation to come together under one Lord and Savior.

M. V. Anastos claims that Nestorius was never guilty of the dogmatic errors accused on him. "Some contend, in a variety of ways, that Nestorius has been misrepresented or misunderstood and never was guilty of the dogmatic lapses that have been attributed to him."<sup>57</sup> We may refer to what McEnerney says on this point: "Some argue that the action of the Council of Ephesus in 431 was ambiguous and cannot be regarded as a valid ecumenical condemnation of Nestorius. They point out, also, that the Letter of Cyril (the Third) most damaging to Nestorius was not approved by the Church until 553."<sup>58</sup>

#### 4. The Doctrinal Controversy

It seems that both Nestorius and Cyril were at fault in the grasp of the term they claimed to have held. Nestorius was very sincere in his attempt to interpret the person of Christ, namely, the oneness of Christ. But he was condemned at Chalcedon<sup>59</sup> [as also in 431 at Ephesus by the Third Ecumenical Council] for dividing Christ into two separate persons. On the other hand, Cyril, who was enthusiastically acclaimed at both Ephesus and Chalcedon, formulated a Christology which was in direct conflict with that of 451. He repeatedly affirms Christ to have been both divine and human, God and man. But his critics say that, in his advocacy of the 'hypostatic union' and Apollinarian<sup>60</sup> Christological formula, μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη ['the one incarnate nature of God the Word'], which he mistakenly took to be Athanasian<sup>61</sup>

<sup>56</sup>Cf. Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 120.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., 123.

<sup>58</sup>Cited from Anastos, Nestorius was Orthodox, 123 referring to ACO I, I, I, 33-42; I, 2, 45-51; I, 3, 26-35 (PG 77, 105); he states that the action of the Council of Ephesus cannot be considered valid. According to ACO I, 2, 51. 34, the third letter of Cyril was merely incorporated into the *Acta*. All these references given above show clearly that how everything was precisely calculated against Nestorius. There is no record regarding the acceptance of the letter written by Cyril against Nestorius as acclaimed or approved at Ephesus. If we refer to the words of Bishop Hypatius of Ephesus we understand that the conference held in Constantinople in 532 points out clearly that the Council of Chalcedon had expressly withheld approval from Cyril's Twelve Anathemas which forms an appendix to the Third Letter. ([see the Third letter of Cyril to Nestorius] cf. J. I. McEnerney, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters 1-50, The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, Washington 1985, 80).

<sup>59</sup>Gr. Χαλκηδών ancient form Καλκηδών, today Kadiköy, City in the Asia Minor, Bithynia lies in the eastern shore of Bosphorus opposite to Constantinople. Here took place the council of 451. Theokritos is the first notable bishop from this region (end 2/ beg. 3. cent.) (cf. W. Breuning, *Chalkedon*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 2, Freiburg 1994, 999-1002).

<sup>60</sup>Apollinarius, who was bishop of Laodicea, was born ca. 315 in Laodicea as the son of the homonymous grammar teacher and priest from Alexandria. He was a lector in 335; in 346 the family of Apollinarius gave shelter to Athanasius of Alexandria on his return from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Exile. A. was excommunicated by the Arian Bp. George of Laodicea for his teaching. He taught that the Logos, or the divine nature in Christ, took the place of the rational human soul or mind of Christ and that the body of Christ was spiritualized and glorified form of humanity. It took time to understand it as a heretical teaching. In the year 387 Apollinarism was officially banned. He remained a faithful friend of Athanasius (cf. C. Kannengiesser, *Apol(l)inarios, Bf. v. Laodicea*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 826-827).

<sup>61</sup>Athanasius the Great, (St., Feast 2 Mai), was Archbishop of Alexandria (since 8. 6. 328) and primate of Catholic Church in Egypt, Libya and in Pentapolis. As a deacon and personal secretary he accompanied his Bp.

in origin, he lost sight of Christ's human nature. In the appraisal of both Cyril and Nestorius, the case for each rests mainly upon their understanding and use of a single word, to which they assigned contradictory meanings. The decisive term for Nestorius was *πρόσωπον* (person), which he used in two different senses, and for Cyril it was *φύσις* (nature) with which he also had similar difficulty. It can be said generally that "the Antiochian theologians, though they approach the Christological problems from another angle, are in reality at one with their opponents in maintaining the same root principles - a conclusion, which, if it is right, means that the downfall of the Antiochian school is to be regarded as one of the tragedies in the history of the Early Church."<sup>62</sup> In the introduction of the book *Two Ancient Christologies* Sellers shares the view that

"although the Antiochians appear to establish their doctrine on a dualistic conception of God and man, it seems clear that, as we look beneath the surface and concentrate rather upon what they were meaning to say than upon what, in the heat of controversy, they actually said, it is found that these, too, though from their own point of view, were upholding, and seeking to explain, the Christian affirmation that Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is Θεοῦ Υἱός and Σωτήρ - and what is more, that in their teaching on the reality of the Lord's human consciousness they supply what is lacking in the system of the Alexandrians, as these start from the same affirmation. As is claimed in this work, if we are to see old things in a new light, we must turn to our treasure, and out of it brings forth together both these ancient Christologies, since the one without the other cannot be deemed wholly satisfactory."<sup>63</sup>

The following reflection, raised by Nestorius will help us to have a clear idea about this issue. He argued that Mary cannot carelessly be termed *Theotokos*<sup>64</sup> rather she should be titled *theotokos* and *anthropotokos* [God-bearer and man-bearer] simultaneously, the former being interpreted attributively (on account of the union of manhood and Godhead within Christ) and not ontologically; or simply *Christotokos* [Christ-bearer], comprising both terms in one. Although this argument seemed reasonable, Cyril always doubted that his opponent did not truly believe in the divinity of Jesus but was a crypto-Arian.

---

Alexander in May 325 to take part in the Nicene Council. His career as bishop lasted almost 45 years. He embodied the catholic position during the Constantine epoch. He became very famous due to his mindset and efficient work as a bishop. He defended the Church with an unshakeable courage against the encroachments and attacks of various emperors during his time of administration. He also defended the confession of the creed of Nicea faithfully from its false upholders namely from various Arian bishops. Therefore he was sent in exile for almost five times (335-37, 339-346, 356-362, 362-363, and 365-366 under emperors Constantine, Constantius [2 times], Julian and Valens respectively). He could also renew the basic tenets of Christian theology in an orthodox way in which we may also observe the influence of Origen during the first half of his life. His concentration lies mainly to give a new footing to the theological research. He held that not only was the Son of God consubstantial with the Father, but so was the Holy Spirit, which had a great deal of influence in the development of later doctrines regarding the Trinity. The reputation which he enjoyed in the Alexandrian Church during his life time gave way to a number of writings in his name to spread. Therefore today it becomes difficult for us to differentiate between the genuine works which were written originally by him (cf. C. Kannengiesser, Athanasius der Große, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 1126-30).

<sup>62</sup>Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 108.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid.*, viii.

<sup>64</sup>God-bearer (Gr. θεοτόκος, Lat. Dei genitrix/genetrix, Deipara) is the basic title developed and identified through the Christological clarification of 3rd and 4th cent., to the Mother of Jesus and in which one will see the legitimation of Mariology and Marian devotion (cf. W. Beinert, Gottesgebälerin, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 4, Freiburg 2000, 915).



The main difference, however, was in the Christological model and the terminology used by both of them. Once again let us come to the school of thought they were influenced by. Nestorius was formed in the school of Antioch under his masters Diodore<sup>65</sup> and Theodore.<sup>66</sup> They held a Christology that is *Logos-anthropos* (Word-man) Christology, which firmly held that the divine Word did not become merely flesh but human, thus the rational soul was a part of the assumed human nature. Cyril also held that a rational soul had been assumed, but he could not allot anything to this soul and therefore did not grant it any soteriological significance, speaking in the manner of his Alexandrian predecessors, employing a *Logos-sarx* (Word-flesh) Christology, which really irritated the Antiochians.

Most of the terms used by these two schools of thought had already been applied in the theological tradition, although not always in the same manner. The four main terms which were used by the two opponents were the following:

- *ousia* (essence; in most Latin and English translations rendered as ‘*substantia*’, i.e., ‘substance’)
- *physis* (nature)
- *hypostasis* (which means more or less a ‘personal reality’, although its meaning varied even within the works of the same author)
- *prosopon* (face, countenance, person)

“The first two expressions were used to denote what was common for the three Persons of the Trinity and for the two realities which came together in Christ respectively. The second two terms explained the individual properties of the divine persons, while in Christology *prosopon* was the key term to denote the oneness of the Person of Christ.”<sup>67</sup> So while using these terms both Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius used one for the other. Here one must note that the term *hypostasis*<sup>68</sup> was not part of the Christological vocabulary of orthodox theologians before the Nestorian controversy, rather only of Apollinarius of Laodicea. The phrase ‘*hypostasis of ousia*’ (Heb 11, 1) - according to Prestige - may be translated as ‘substantial objectivity.’

“*Hypostasis* in the course of time gathered a sense of ‘genuineness’, or ‘reality’, i.e., positive, ‘concrete and distinct existence, first of all in the abstract, and later in

---

<sup>65</sup>Diodore, Bp. of Tarsus, was a distinguished ancient theologian and Exegete. Born in Antioch and died in Tarsus in the year 390. He was a student of Silvanus of Tarsus and Eusebius of Emesa in Athens. After the death of Valens he became the bishop of Tarsus (378) and played a significant role in the Council of Constantinople (381). During the Nestorian disputes he was suspected as a Nestorian and a forerunner of Nestorius (cf. C. Kannengiesser, Diodoros Bf. v. Tarsos, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 238).

<sup>66</sup>Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, was a gr. ecclesiastical author, born at Antioch ca. 350, and from 392 - 428 led as bishop in Mopsuestia. He was also a student of Greek-speaking teacher of rhetoric Libanius like John Chrysostom. It seems that the concern of Julian of Eclanum and other Pelagians to combat was taken up by Diodore (cf. F. Thome, Theodoros Bf.v. Mopsuestia, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1414-1415).

<sup>67</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 9.

<sup>68</sup>The expression hypostasis in itself is a correlative substantive of *hyphistemi*, i.e., ‘to stand’, ‘set’ or ‘place under.’ In classical Greek, in the material sense it means ‘foundation,’ ‘sediment,’ ‘ground work,’ or even ‘substantial nature’. It also means ‘substance,’ ‘reality,’ something ‘underlying’ a specific phenomenon or essence. In the New Testament it occurs three times in the sense of ‘confidence’ (2 Cor 9, 4; 11, 17, Heb 3, 14), once in the sense of ‘reality’ or ‘assurance’ (Heb 11, 1) and only once with a meaning the Church more or less began to assign to it (Heb 1, 3). Its application in theology is therefore caused by Heb 1, 3 and at first it becomes the synonym of *ousia*, in Epiphanius and his contemporary anti-Arian theologians. As opposed to *ousia*, in which the emphasis is upon the single object disclosed by means of internal analysis, hypostasis draws attention to the externally concrete independence, i.e. the relation to other objects. The primary theological sense of the word was also subject to continuous development (ibid., 58).

the particular individual.<sup>69</sup> Its use becomes more and more common by the time of the Cappadocians,<sup>70</sup> meaning largely ‘objective individual existence.’ *Hypostasis* gradually gains the meaning of ‘individual’ in Clement,<sup>71</sup> Origen,<sup>72</sup> Athanasius and Basil.<sup>73</sup>

As G. L. Prestige puts it,

“Instances could be multiplied, but those which have been quoted are sufficient to show what the word *hypostasis* really means when it comes to be applied to the *prosopa* of the triad. It implies that the three presentations possess a concrete and independent objectivity, in confutation both of the Sabellian<sup>74</sup> type of heresy, which regarded them all merely as different names, and of the unitarian type of heresy, which regarded the second and third of them as abstract qualities possessed by the first or impersonal influences exerted by His volition.”<sup>75</sup>

These terms were applied both in theologia and *oikonomia*<sup>76</sup> as the teaching about God’s being and the Trinity and as the teaching about the sense and mode of the incarnation, i.e., what we might call soteriology and Christology.<sup>77</sup> Thus, if in the

<sup>69</sup>Cf. G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, London 1952, 174.

<sup>70</sup>Cappadocians: From 1850 by three Cpns. are meant besides Basil of Ceasarea, his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa and so also somewhat elder and school comrade of Basil, viz., Gregory of Nazianzus (cf. K. Koschorke, *Kappadokier*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 1219).

<sup>71</sup>Clement of Alexandria (Titus Flavius Clemens) was a Christian author, ca. 150 Athen (?) †215 (?). Only very little is passed down to us about his life with certainty. He travelled far and wide besides in Alexandria. During the persecution of 202/203 by Septimus Severus he left the city and it seems that he did not return any more to the city. He sought refuge during this time with Alexander then bishop (possibly in Flaviada) in Cappadocia. His works are: *Protreptikos* (Protr.; Exhortations) which is a work to the pagans to show the unworthiness of the pagan gods and show in its place the true philosophy, namely the Christianity, as the one through which the Logos bestowed us the way to salvation. In his *Paidagogos* (paed.; Tutor/ Educator) he tells that Christ the Logos-Tutor, leads the souls of the Christians to a better life and through his education the sins are forgiven, and through the punitive measures mankind is brought to the saving grace. In his theology he shares the basic idea that the Creator-God is ever gracious (Strom. V, 2, 16, 5), who through His Logos created the world and bestowed the mankind with freedom of self-determination (VII, 7, 42, 3f.). Yet God helps everyone through His Son that the mankind reaches the goal in their life that is, Salvation and everlasting life through the mediation of Christ (cf. E. Früchtel, *Klemens v. Alexandrien*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 126-127).

<sup>72</sup>Origen was a significant Theologian, Church Father and Christian author, who was born in Alexandria ca. 185, and died in Tyros ca. 254 (?). He had his initial education from his father who died as a martyr. It seems that he studied many portions of the bible by heart that later he could cite many of them from his memory. His presentation of the dogmatic theology we find in his main work *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* - *De principiis*. He was invited to preach in Palestine and was ordained a priest by Bp. of Caesarea and thereafter worked in Alexandria. Later he settled in Caesarea, where he preached over almost all books of the Bible; he had a number of famous students and very many of his works were written as he was here (cf. H.-J. Vogt, *Origenes*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 1131-1135).

<sup>73</sup>Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 58.

<sup>74</sup>Sabellius: The presumable origin of Sabellius to have come from Libya is a hypothetical issue. He taught that God was indivisible, with Father, Son and Holy Spirit being three modes or manifestations of one divine Person. He held that the One God successively revealed Himself to man throughout time as Father in Creation, the Son in Redemption and the Spirit in Sanctification and Regeneration (cf. C. Kannengiesser, *Sabellius*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 1407-1408).

<sup>75</sup>Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, 177.

<sup>76</sup>Divine Economy: The gr. *οἰκονομία* is translated in Latin with *oconomia*, *dispositio* or *dispensation*. The related terms to it are *ordinatio*, *ordo rerum* and *ordo temporum*. This concept was made use in the early period of patristic era for the providential (Clem. Alex. *Strom* I. 52, 3) understanding of cosmic dimensions, adopted from the philosophical background, and later on with emphasis to the plan of salvation initiated by God through Jesus Christ (Ign. Eph. 20, 1) (cf. A. Kallis, *Ökonomie*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 1014-1016).

<sup>77</sup>The term *oikonomia* is frequently used by the Antiochians in various contexts: either it can mean God’s intervention in a special way to save mankind or the very act of incarnation itself or it can refer to the theological discipline referring to the incarnation, its mode and purpose (i.e., Christology and Soteriology together), or - at times - they refer to the person of the incarnate.

Trinity there was only one *ousia* and one φύσις, in Christ there were two *ousiai* and two φύσεις. When in the Trinity there were three hypostaseis and three *prosopa*, in Christ there was only one *prosopon* [the term *hypostasis* was not being used in orthodox Christology before Cyril].<sup>78</sup> Besides this, the term referring to the union of the Word with the manhood in Christ constituted a matter of dispute. Thus terms (other than *henosis* [union]) used by Antiochians, namely, *synapheia* [conjunction], *asynchutos henosis* [unmingled union, the synonym of *synapheia*], *koinonia* [community, togetherness], *enoikesis* [indwelling], *symploke* [combination, connection] etc., were not accepted by Cyril.

An additional confusion was created because of the ignorance due to the understanding of the terms of secular philosophy. As a result of this the two opponents namely, Cyril and Nestorius did not particularly care about the ancient history or nuances of these terms and employed them rather carelessly.<sup>79</sup> Citing one example may give us more clarity to this problem. For example Nestorius used the term *prosopon* both in the singular and plural in his description of the union, whereas Cyril often equated *physis* with *hypostasis* and spoke repeatedly of a ‘physical’ as well as a ‘hypostatic’ union, which conferred ambiguity to his formulae. Having applied the term *physis* both in the sense of ‘nature’ and ‘person,’ Cyril’s terminology became inconsistent. The additional problem with Cyril was that as he was an admirer of Athanasius and as he wanted to follow him closely, he kept on quoting the Apollinarian forgeries as coming from Athanasius, and made these formulas the cornerstones of his Christological interpretation. One such famous interpretation is ‘one incarnate nature of the God-Word’ (μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη), by which he intended to mean the one entity of the God-man Christ, the Word of God. The definition however, came from Apollinaris, and not Athanasius, a fact Cyril would not accept even though repeatedly warned about it by his opponents.<sup>80</sup> This is a fact that we come across when we read the bishop of Cyrus’s *Refutation of Cyril’s Twelve Anathemas or Chapters*. The trained critical mind of Theodoret of Cyrus could find the heretical flavour in the teaching or understanding of Cyril. This issue we will discuss later in the forthcoming chapter on Theodoret of Cyrus. E. Venables rightly observes that the teaching of Cyril “hardly escaped falling into the opposite<sup>81</sup> error.”<sup>82</sup> The language and terminology of Cyril was strongly Apollinarian, and the anathemas formulated against Nestorius were far from being a peerless summary of Cyrilline orthodoxy, requiring further explanation in order to be accepted. Theodoret of Cyrus finds a number of - mostly verbal - inconsistencies in the arguments of Cyril of Alexandria. As L. Abramowski points out, “these Anathemas, which were formulated against Nestorius, were one of the greatest misfortunes of the history of doctrine.”<sup>83</sup> And F. Loofs wrote that if Nestorius would have been bishop and flourishing in the time of the council of Chalcedon, he would possibly have become a pillar of orthodoxy.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>78</sup>Cf. Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 9.

<sup>79</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 10.

<sup>80</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>81</sup>By the term ‘opposite’ here is meant that he fell into the monophysitic error.

<sup>82</sup>Cited from Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 10 referring to E. Venables, Theodoretus, in: DCB IV, Minnesota 2001, 908.

<sup>83</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to a personal discussion conducted by Kupán with L. Abramowski.

<sup>84</sup>Cf. Loofs, Nestorius and his place in the History of Christian Doctrine, 21.

## 5. Nestorius' Metaphysical and Christological Presuppositions

As we have already seen Nestorius' Christology appears to be diametrically opposed to that of Cyril's Christology. But if we want to understand and evaluate his Christology it is necessary to carefully look at the terminologies he used.

In the first book of the *Bazaar*, and frequently thereafter, Nestorius denounces the Jews, the Manichaens,<sup>85</sup> the Arians,<sup>86</sup> the Sabellians, and the Apollinarians. Besides he expressly condemns Paul of Samosata and the notion that there were two sons. He based his theological doctrine on the hypothesis that every independently existing object, thing, animal, or person, including man and God the Logos, has a substance or essence (*ousia*) of its own, as the indispensable underlying factor, from which it derives life or existence. "To express any kind of real existence two terms were in common use among Greek thinkers, viz. *ousia* and *hypostasis*: the former the noun of the verb 'to be' ('being'), the latter the noun of a verb of similar sense 'to subsist' or 'to exist' (subsistence, or existence)."<sup>87</sup> More fundamentally

"The *ousia*, which is invisible, is what the object is in itself, in its inmost being, apart from being perceived. Each *ousia* in turn, Nestorius thought, has a distinctive nature (*physis*), i.e., the totality of qualities, features, attributes, and peculiarities (both positive and negative) which give it its individual stamp or character. Every nature is founded upon its own *ousia*; there is no nature without an *ousia*; and no *ousia* without a nature. Thus *ousia* and nature are correlative terms each of which implies and requires the other."<sup>88</sup>

Following Nestorius, we should recognize that

"neither the *ousia* nor the nature is fully present or effective without a third equally indispensable element namely the *prosopon*. None of the three can be separated from the other two, nor can the *ousia* and the nature be recognized externally apart from the *prosopon* which reveals them. No ordinary entity or individual being has more than one each of these three components, nor does any one of the three have more than one each of the other two."<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup>Mani, the founder of Manichaeism was born in 216 in Asuristan (Babylonia) and died in 276 in Gundeshapur (under the Sassanid Empire). He was the founder of a gnostic teaching. According to him there are two principles; they are light and darkness, good and bad, Spirit and matter. These were primordially and radically separated from one another (cf. H.-J. Klimkeit, *Mani, Manichäismus*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 1265- 1269).

<sup>86</sup>Arius (250 or 256-336 A. D.) was a Christian presbyter in the Baucalis church in Alexandria. Because of his heretical teaching he was condemned and displaced by Alexander the local bishop. He taught that there was a time when the Son was not (ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐχ ἦν). The Son is neither like the Father as it regards his essence (μέρος ὁμοούσιον), nor is by nature either the Father's true Word, or true Wisdom, but indeed one of his works and creatures. The Word of God was not from eternity, but was made out of nothing; for that the ever-existing God made him who did not previously exist, out of nothing. According to him the Son existed as an independent subject (ὑπόστασις) although he depends upon the Will of the Father for his existence. He argued if the Father begat the Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of existence: and from this it is evident, that there was a time when the Son was not. According to his teaching as Christ is a creation of God before all times the H. Spirit is also a creation of God the Father. A. considered the Holy Spirit to be a person or a high angel, and which had a beginning as a creature. To clear the commotion created by his teaching a council was convoked in 325 called the Nicene Council in which it was defined that the Son was with the Father from eternity (Homoousios) and later the council of Constantinople in 381 defined H. Spirit as divine and sharing the same Godhead with the Father and the Son (cf. R. D. Williams, *Arius, Arianismus*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 981-989).

<sup>87</sup>Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching*, 47.

<sup>88</sup>Anastos, *Nestorius was orthodox*, 125.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, 126.

This metaphysical structure, which may have been influenced in part by Stoicism most probably via the Cappadocian fathers,<sup>90</sup> has influenced Nestorius to reach at the fundamental presupposition that the substance of God the Word and that of the manhood of Christ were both complete in themselves. They were ‘whole’ natures, because the human could have become man by the creative power of nature, without union with the divinity, and the latter was altogether independent of the former. Therefore Nestorius rejects Cyril’s comparison of the union of God and man in Christ with that of body and soul in man. According to Nestorius this coming together of body and soul in man is due to constraint and by an act of divine creation, whereas God and man in Christ joined in a union that was voluntary on the part of both participants. He elucidates it saying that when body and soul are united, each is complemented by the other, since “the body has need of the soul that it may live, for it lives not of itself, and the soul has need of the body that it may perceive.”<sup>91</sup>

Nestorius’ definition of *ousia* and *physis* lay at the foundation of his Christological doctrine that neither God the Word nor the human nature of Christ was combined with the other in its own nature or *ousia*. They were mutually exclusive, or “alien to one another,”<sup>92</sup> so that neither anyone of them could have served as the basis of union for the other. Hence according to him the union of both *ousiai* and *physeis* is not possible except through a third medium, called the *prosopon*. He held that this was the only ‘vehicle of union’<sup>93</sup> that was capable of preserving the properties of the two *ousiai* and natures of Christ inviolate. It was very essential for him, since otherwise Christ could not have been both perfect God and perfect man. He claims that natures (or *ousiai*) cannot be combined or changed in any way without serious damage<sup>94</sup> to one or the other. So this unsuitability of the two natures as centers for the union heads him towards the doctrine of the *prosopic* union. According to him if anyone of the natures was the cause for the union, it would have led one of the natures to be absorbed by the other, or the result of their combination would have brought about another third nature and that would have been totally different from both of them.

According to Nestorius, “if God should take flesh into his own *ousia*, he would not truly become man because he is not of the nature of men.”<sup>95</sup> Still worse, since the Godhead is characterized by lack of body or flesh, if God were to admit flesh or body into his *ousia*, he would cease to be God.<sup>96</sup> Similarly, if Christ’s manhood were to take God into its *ousia*, there would be no incarnation of God,<sup>97</sup> but rather the annihilation of the human nature, the deification of man, and the addition of alien

---

<sup>90</sup>Cf. A. Grillmeier, *Das Scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlich-dogmatischer und theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht*, in: *Schol.* 36 (1961), 321-56 would trace the Stoic elements in Nestorius’ metaphysics to the Cappadocians (see also E. Ivánka, *Hellenisches und Christliches im frühbyzantinischen Geistesleben*, Vienna 1948, 84; R. Armou, *Nestorianisme et néoplatonisme*, in: *Gr.* 17 (1936), 116-31).

<sup>91</sup>Cited from Anastos, *Nestorius was orthodox*, 126 referring to *Bazaar*, 304, 161 (on the union between the divine and human as voluntary; see *ibid.*, 37f., 47, 85, 90 f., 163, 179, 182, 184, 304 for Cyril’s comparison of the incarnation to the union of body and soul in man [PG 77, 225B]).

<sup>92</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 126 referring to *Bazaar*, 298.

<sup>93</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 23, 53, 89, 143, 145, 17, 147, 157-59, 160, 166, 170, 174, 189-91, 196, 206, 214-16, 219-20, 231, 240, 246, 262, 299, 308, 310, 313, 319-20; 33, 37-39.

<sup>94</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 27, 6-8, 28-36.

<sup>95</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 127 referring to *Bazaar*, 20-23.

<sup>96</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 14.

<sup>97</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 23-26.

matter to the Trinity.<sup>98</sup> He argues that if this *prosopic* union were not possible, the original *ousia* would have been changed and ceased to be what they had been formerly. And thus it would negate the principle that Christ was fully human and divine. He articulates this principle also in dealing with Moses' miracle of changing the water of the Nile into blood. In this case, he is of the opinion that the Nile had become blood in *ousia* for the Egyptians, but had been changed back into water for the Hebrews when they used it.<sup>99</sup> Therefore he concludes that the uncreated God, the Word, who is eternal, cannot be transformed into that which is created (body), nor can the human body of Christ be changed into the *ousia* of God, the Word. "On these premises he rejects Cyril's formula of a 'natural union' or 'hypostatic union' in Christ, both of which, according to him involved a mixture and confusion of natures or *hypostases*, and consequently an impairment of their integrity that would have been fatal to both the divine and human natures of Christ."<sup>100</sup>

Now one may detect subtle differences in the shades of meaning in these two terms used viz., *ousia* and *hypostasis*, although in practical use they were synonymous. Their equivalents in Latin were *essentia* (or *entia* means an existing or real thing, an entity = comes from the singular form *ens* which is the present participle of *esse* 'to be') and *substantia*, 'essence' (or entity) and 'substance.' But the equivalents of *ousia* were never assimilated in the Latin language; *substantia* alone was taken into use, and 'substance' is thus the English representative of the original sense of both the Greek terms.<sup>101</sup>

Nestorius knew very well what he was doing when he insisted on the recognition of the 'substances' as well as the 'natures' in the Person of our Lord. In order to express the conception 'substance' he employed both *ousia* and *hypostasis*, the latter more frequently than the former. The Syriac translator simply transliterated *ousia*, except in a few cases in which the Being of God Himself (rather than the Godhead<sup>102</sup>) is meant; and in these he used a Syriac word (*îthûthâ*) which was commonly employed of Divine beings. But *hypostasis* he always rendered by a native Syriac term (*q'nômâ*).<sup>103</sup>

Also for nature he employs another Syriac word namely, (*k'yânâ*). In speaking of two Substances in the Person of our Lord Nestorius was employing an expression which had been recognized in ecclesiastical usage from the time of Melito<sup>104</sup> in the East and Tertullian<sup>105</sup> in the West.<sup>106</sup> Tertullian used the phrase "more often to the

<sup>98</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>99</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 18.

<sup>100</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 27. 6-8, 28-36.

<sup>101</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 48.

<sup>102</sup>The exponents of catholic faith would use the genuine English words 'Godhead' and 'manhood' rather than 'Divinity' and 'humanity' of our Lord in order to avoid the grave risk of confusing two distinct realities, because they may have some attributes in common.

<sup>103</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 49.

<sup>104</sup>Melito (Syria) Bp., of Sardis, near Smyrna in western Anatolia, Lydia (now in Turkey), was an Apologist, before 190. From his work *περὶ πάσχα*, in the Bodmer papyri on Passover, only fragments survive. M. was a Quartodeciman observing Easter on the Jewish Passover date of 14 Nisan (Eusebius H. E. 5, 24). He was precipitously criticized for his antisemitic attitude which was aimed partially due to his enmity to Judaism. His homily on Passover and the passion of Christ first appears to many as raving anti-Judaism. His exegetical works are also to an extent criticized as giving emphasis to such a thought of anti-Judaism (cf. S. G. Hall, Meliton Bf v. Sardeis, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 86-87).

<sup>105</sup>Tertullian (Quintus Septimius Florens T.), who was born ca. 160 and died ca. 220, from Carthage in the Roman Province of Africa, was the first important Latin Christian author and theologian to produce an

‘Three,’ without adding any noun, than to ‘three Persons.’”<sup>107</sup> According to Prestige, Tertullian would have taken the term from Greek ‘*prosopon*,’ which simply means ‘individual’ and he insisted that although they are not inseparable they are distinct.<sup>108</sup> The phrase that ‘two substances in the person of our Lord’ does not mean anything other than the technical expression of the Christian faith in the Godhead and manhood of the Lord. Therefore, “in treating *ousia* and *hypostasis* as synonyms, Nestorius was simply carrying on the old traditional use of the words, reflected in the Creed of Nicaea,<sup>109</sup> in which the two terms are placed side by side, and the assertion of Athanasius in one of his writings *hypostasis* is *ousia*.”<sup>110</sup> Athanasius was influenced by the Greek terminologies. “For the Greeks both the words *hypostasis*, which was the strict expression for a distinct ‘object’, and *ousia* or ‘substance,’ mean very much the same.”<sup>111</sup>

Thus the terminological difficulties related to these words have its influence up to our times. Bethune-Baker has tried to bring out its nuances when translated from Greek to Syriac and again from it to English.

“In the citations of Nestorius (whose works are very often in Syriac language) it must be understood that ‘person’ represents the Syriac *paršôpâ* or the Greek *πρόσωπον*. In English translations from the Greek, *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* are rendered alike either ‘being’ or ‘substance’; in the Syriac translation of the *Bazaar of Heraclidis*, in which *οὐσία* is simply transliterated, the transliteration *ousia* is preserved, while *hypostasis* or ‘substance’ represents *q’nômâ*. The Greek *φύσις* and the Syriac *k’yânâ* are translated ‘nature,’ though ‘physical’ is often used for the adjectival forms in accordance with the common theological usage. The idiomatic Syriac rendering of *ὁμοούσιος* means literally ‘the son of the nature of,’ and as there is no doubt about the original term, it is either transliterated ‘homousios’ or translated by ‘consubstantial’ or some equivalent phrase.”<sup>112</sup>

But in the latter half of the fourth century some of the Greek theologians had given a new and artificial sense to the word *hypostasis* in order to better express the Christian conception of Trinity in unity in connection with the Being of God. The word had been narrowed down from its wider meaning ‘substance’ to the conception of the particular

extensive corpus of Latin Christian literature. He has been called ‘the father of Latin Christianity’ and the ‘founder of Western theology’. The passionate writer T. shows an extraordinary originality and individuality in his writings (cf. A. Fürst, Tertullian[us], in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1344-1348).

<sup>106</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 51.

<sup>107</sup>G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics: Six Studies in Dogmatic Faith with Prologue and Epilogue*, London 1977, 84.

<sup>108</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>109</sup>Nicaea, ecumenical Council, 325: The NC (Nicaen-Constantinople [also ‘the long Credo’]) is regarded as an important bond of unity in liturgy between the oriental and occidental Christendom. As the Apostolic Credo so also the NC is structured in the Trinitarian form (cf. D. Sattler, *Nicaeno-Konstantinopolitanisches Glaubensbekenntnis*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 798-800). The Nicene Council made it clear that Christ is fully God against the teaching of Arius who taught that Christ is not fully God. It also made clear that Christ is truly human and truly divine against the teaching of Apollinarius who taught that Jesus was a combination of the divine Logos Spirit, a sensitive soul and a human body basing on the platonic tripartite view of human nature. He denied a human spirit to Jesus. Thus affirmation of two independent substances (not as the heresiarchs understood) in Christ was the only possible way of affirming both divinity and humanity in Christ.

<sup>110</sup>Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 50; (Athanasius preferred to regard hypostasis as a synonym of ousia. In his work *Ep.ad Afros* 4 we read, “And hypostasis is ousia and it has no other meaning except Being itself (ὡτὸ τὸ ὄν) ... for hypostasis and ousia are existence (ὑπαρξις)” (R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy*. 318-381, New York 1988, 445).

<sup>111</sup>Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, 88.

<sup>112</sup>Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 54.

‘modes of existence’ of the one God which constituted God a Trinity. By the time of Nestorius, this use of the term had probably won wide acceptance in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity. We hear it from his own work that he was familiar or recognizes such usage.<sup>113</sup> But it must be doubted whether this conventional sense had employed universally and exclusively with regard to the modes of existence implied by the three names Father, Son and Holy Spirit or to the Christological problem in relation to the Godhead and manhood of Christ. Further it makes clear that Cyril’s own use of the term *hypostasis* (and its adjectival form *hypostatic*) is not certainly consistent but it had been established at a later period. For example Marius Mercator in translating Cyril renders it sometimes by *substantia* (substance) and sometimes by *subsistentia* (subsistence) as if he felt some shade of difference in its significance in different connections and he never renders it by the natural Latin equivalent of its Trinitarian usage, namely, *persona* (person).<sup>114</sup> It must be noted that this word ‘person’ of ours cannot possibly bear the same sense when we apply it to the three Persons of Trinity as it has when we speak of the Person of the incarnate Word, both God and man. With regard to the use of the term *hypostasis* both Cyril and Nestorius had used synonymously the term *ousia* in Christological context. We can conclude that “it may be this shade of difference, akin to that between the general and the particular, made it possible to agree to speak of the one *ousia* and the three *hypostases* of God that underlies Nestorius’ use of *ousia* as well as *hypostasis* in speaking of the Godhead and the manhood of Christ.”<sup>115</sup> It seems appropriate to treat two different sets of thought patterns here, namely that of Cyril and Nestorius.

“The word *hypostasis* did mean to Cyril exactly person, as it certainly did not to Nestorius. To express the idea of personality Nestorius always uses *prosopon* (which the Syriac translator transliterates *parsopa*) - a word which has the same history as the Latin *persona*; meaning originally an actor’s mask, or face, - the part which an actor played, the *dramatis persona* - role or function in life in general - the character or aspect in which someone is conceived - and so someone regarded in a particular relation, a person.”<sup>116</sup>

It has been observed by Bethune-Baker that

“Latin theologians used the phrase *tres personae* of the Trinity and *una persona* of Christ, though more often they seem to have avoided the word and to have been content to speak of ‘Three’ (*tres*) and ‘One’ (*unus*). Whereas for the Greek theologians the word *prosopon* was tainted due to the Sabellian use of it to express the conception of One God assuming different roles and playing the part now of Father, now of Son, and now of Holy Spirit; therefore they had no unequivocal term to use in this connection (of the doctrine of the Trinity) until the conventional distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis* was established. But though they avoided the term *prosopon* in stating the doctrine of the Trinity, they do not seem to have shrunk from using it of the incarnate Son in connection with the doctrine of the Incarnation. And when Nestorius insisted that he believed our Lord Jesus Christ, in His Godhead and His manhood, to be ‘one *prosopon*,’ it was not that they suspected the term *prosopon* of any hidden heretical meaning, but they did not believe that he really believed what he said that he believed. They too, were quite ready to use the term to express the ‘Person’ of the Lord, and even in the Chalcedonian definition

<sup>113</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 50 in reference to *Bazaar*, 39.

<sup>114</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 51.

<sup>115</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>116</sup>*Ibid.*



‘one person’ is joined with ‘one *hypostasis*,’ preceding it to define the sense in which ‘*hypostasis*’ was then used, just as at an earlier time in the Nicene anathema *ousia* and *hypostasis* were used together as synonyms.”<sup>117</sup>

In fact, the problem lies in the understanding of the terminology.

“For Cyril the supreme realities were persons and to Nestorius things. Nestorius can find fault with Cyril when he speaks of a ‘nature’ when the *ousia* which the ‘nature’ presupposes is wanting; but Cyril meant the ‘nature’ to be as real as the *ousia*. As far as precision of terminology goes, Nestorius is more definite than Cyril. Cyril does not seem to have had a clear conception of the difference between the terms ‘substance,’ ‘nature,’ and ‘person.’”<sup>118</sup>

Finally the below given quotations from J. van den Dries, who justifies the notion of Nestorius, may give us clarity to the lack of understanding from the part of Cyril.

“If the notional meaning of the word ‘φύσις,’ when used by Nestorius, was that of a person, Cyril had every right to object to the Nestorian formula: ‘δύο φύσεις,’ precisely as such, for it would thus be equivalent to ‘two persons.’ Cyril’s own formula: ‘μία φύσις,’ chosen precisely to refute Nestorius, would then indicate a single personality.”<sup>119</sup>

J. van den Dries continues asking, “if, on the contrary, the notional meaning of the term ‘φύσις,’ in the writings of Nestorius, were that of an impersonal substance in opposition to ‘πρόσωπον’ why did Cyril object to the formula: ‘δύο φύσεις’?”<sup>120</sup> He continues saying that moreover, “if Cyril opposed to the Nestorian formula: ‘δύο φύσεις’ his own ‘μία φύσις,’ also in the Nestorian sense of an impersonal substantial reality, it would be very difficult to defend Cyril against the accusation of Monophysitic<sup>121</sup> teaching.”<sup>122</sup>

## 6. The Prosopic Union

In order to bring clarity to what we have discussed above let us have a further look into the *prosopic* union about which Nestorius speaks. “When he says that God the Word became man, he means that the manhood of Jesus formed a distinct *ousia* alongside the *ousia* of God, and that the two were joined together in the *prosopon*.”<sup>123</sup>

<sup>117</sup>Ibid., 52.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., 53.

<sup>119</sup>J. van den Dries, The formula of Saint Cyril of Alexandria: ΜΙΑ ΦΥΣΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ ΣΕΣΑΡΚΩΜΕΝΗ, Diss., Roma 1937, 92.

<sup>120</sup>Ibid., 93.

<sup>121</sup>Monophysism teaches that after the union of Christ’s Godhead with Manhood it shows or manifests itself only in one Nature (griech: μόνος, sole/only; φύσις, Nature). Historically it has the opponent in the two natures’ teaching of the Council of Chalcedon (‘one Person or Hypostase in two Natures’). Monophysites (Mph.) confess the Mia - Physis - Formula (μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη, flesh became nature of God-Logos). Today M., are namely the Coptic, Jacobites (West Syrians), Armenians and Ethiopians (old oriental Churches; Oriental - orthodox Churches). The name was in use or employed first from the end of the sixth cent. (Lat. Monophysitas); from the 7 cent., the Greek term μονοφυσίτης was used by Anastasios Sinaites with a heretical flavor. By M. is also meant eutychians. It is the concept or perception (mixing of Godhead and manhood in Christ without any consubstantiality with us: Eutyches) in which generally they do not see an autonomous connection between the divine and the human rather the divine dominates the human or is absorbed by the divine nature (cf. T. Hainthaler, Monophysitismus, Monophysiten, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 418-421).

<sup>122</sup>Dries, The formula of Saint Cyril of Alexandria, 93.

<sup>123</sup>Cited from Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 127 referring to *Bazaar*, 1, 1, 27, 29, 18, 20, 21, 22,15; 55,166, 210, 233, 236, 247.

And Nestorius never suggested that there were two persons in Christ as his enemies accused, and hence four (a quaternity) in what tradition called a Trinity. Very often we hear in his works the affirmation of the unity of natures in the person of Christ, for he explains that, “no else than he was in the bosom of his Father came and became flesh and dwelt among us; and he is in the bosom of his Father and with us, in that he is what the Father is, and he has expounded unto us what is in the bosom of his Father ...”<sup>124</sup> Again we hear him pronouncing his faith in conformity with the Creed of 451, “in one Christ two natures without confusion. By one nature on the one hand, that [by that] of the divinity, he was born of God the Father; by the other, on the other hand, that [by that] of the humanity, [he was born] of the holy virgin.”<sup>125</sup> These various citations from his work show very clearly that he firmly believed that there is of the divinity and of the humanity one Christ and one Lord and one Son ... and that there both exists and is named one Christ, the two of them [i.e., the natures] being united, he was born of the Father in the divinity, and of the holy virgin in the humanity, for there was a union of the two natures.<sup>126</sup>

We hear him very often speaking about the union of the two natures<sup>127</sup> in the one *prosopon* of Jesus Christ, and he clearly denies that it should be explained as a union of *prosopa*.<sup>128</sup> Although we find a contradictory note on this comment of Nestorius we will be able to explain it lucid when we understand his thought and mind properly. What he says is that the human Jesus “received his *prosopon* as something created, in such wise as not originally to be man but at the same time Man-God by the incarnation [ἐνανθρώπησις] of God ...”<sup>129</sup> From his explanation we understand that he makes a subtle description of the oneness of Jesus Christ, and it is clear from his writings that “Nestorius conceived the Man-God to have been the divine Logos, plus what would have become the separate individual man Jesus, if the Logos had not been united with him from the moment of conception. For the child born of the Virgin was at no time, Nestorius states, a separate man but “at the same time Man-God.”<sup>130</sup> What all this comes to is that

“He [i.e., the Man-God] indeed was the Maker of all, the law giver ... the glory, the honour and the power; he was also the second man [the ‘New Adam,’ as in Romans 5, 14, 1 Cor 15, 22 and 45, i.e., Jesus] with qualities complete and whole, so that God was his *prosopon* while he was in God. Nestorius repeatedly emphasizes that in Jesus Christ God and man were one and he argues that the ‘child [the human Jesus] and the Lord of the Child [the divine Logos] are the same.”<sup>131</sup>

<sup>124</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 128 referring to *Bazaar*, 50, 53, 192.

<sup>125</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 296.

<sup>126</sup>Cf. F. Nau, *Le Livre d’Héraclide de Damas*, Paris 1910, 262 in reference to *Bazaar*, 295: what Nestorius meant is very clearly expressed in the translation of F. Nau: “Il y a et on reconnaît un seul Christ, les deux (natures) étant unies, lequel est né du Père selon la divinité et de la Vierge sainte selon l’humanité, car il y a eu union des deux natures.”

<sup>127</sup>Cf. Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 128 in reference to *Bazaar*, 58, 79, 89, 143, 148, 156, 161, 163, 172, 182, 295, 300-302, 308, 310, 314.

<sup>128</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 156, 172, 224.

<sup>129</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 1, 1, 64; 92, 1, 237, 304. Although Nestorius frequently refers to what seems to be the *assumptus homo*, the texts cited show that he understood by the ‘man assumed’ nothing more than the human nature of Christ.

<sup>130</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>131</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 230; (“he who judges and is judged is the judge ... Who is it who has accepted the offering for all men, when it is he who accepts and he who is offered?”) 200; (“he who descended is the same whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world”) 207; (“the taker’ and the ‘taken’ are one, not two) 233. Nestorius denies the idea strongly that there were in Christ ‘one and another’ (masculine) 200-201,

Further in his works referring to Nestorius Anastos writes that,

“we say not one and another, for there is one *prosopon* of both natures, by which Nestorius gives sanction to the orthodox doctrine that the divine and human in Jesus Christ should not be taken to be masculine in gender, ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος, or ἕτερος καὶ ἕτερος or *alius* and *alius*, as of two separate persons, but neuter, ἄλλο and ἄλλο or *aliud* and *aliud*, of the two separate ‘things,’ i.e., natures of *usiai*, which were united in Jesus Christ.”<sup>132</sup>

It is very clear from this text that what he “refers to is one Person [ἐν πρόσωπον], to whom both the sufferings and the honour are to be ascribed.”<sup>133</sup> If his critics had the patience to listen to him properly at what he intended or what he wanted to say, they would not have ended up in condemning him as a heretic. He had always denied “that there were two Sons or Lords or Christs.”<sup>134</sup> If they had understood him properly they would not have accused him of having propagated the theory of a separate man, the *assumptus homo*, who lived by the side of the Logos during the incarnation - and therefore amounted to a second Son and ‘a fourth member of the Trinity’. But in order to do justice to both sides, we will also go through the objections that have been raised against Nestorius by Cyril of Alexandria.

Although Nestorius describes the union as taking place in the *prosopon*, which he defines innumerable times,<sup>135</sup> he also sometimes speaks of two *prosopa* (that of the divine nature and that of the human) and occasionally also to a “union of the *prosopa*.”<sup>136</sup> Although we said above that he never admits the union of two *prosopa* in Jesus sometimes we find also this term being employed to explain the union in Jesus. Therefore first and foremost it must be clarified. It must be admitted that this sort of application makes it difficult to understand him. This might be the kernel problem the Alexandrians found in his interpretation. Perhaps by the below given explanation we may be able to reach certain clarity to his thought and what he really intended. Even though at times he speaks of two *prosopa*, immediately he explains in the same context, that the latter, [i.e., two *prosopa*] ‘took place for the *prosopon*’ and that there was only ‘one *prosopon* of the two natures.’ Such explanations in no way compromise the unity or oneness of Jesus Christ as we find in him two different senses implied to the word *prosopon*. Let us name these two implications by sense A and sense B. According to this sense A, *prosopon* - i.e., what may be called the natural or external *prosopon*, means the exterior aspect or appearance of a thing, not opposed to its genuine character. According to Nestorius there is no external *prosopon* which lacks an *ousia* and a nature of its own. When we apply this sense to the two natures in Jesus Christ it indicates clearly, that each nature had not a separate, independent existence (as a person), as his critics accused him, but that each had a substantive reality, recognizable in its distinctive qualities, which remained undiminished after the union. Therefore *prosopon* in sense A is not to be understood as a separate independent being rather another aspect of *physis* or *ousia*, to which it is inextricably bound. According

---

209, 224, 237 (On the orthodox affirmation of the same principle: cf. E. Weigl, *Christologie vom Tode des Athanasius bis zum Ausbruch des nestorianischen Streites*, 373-429, in: *MSHTh* 4 (1925), 45, 47, 57, 108, 112, 152; J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian doctrines*, London 1960, 297; Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 72).

<sup>132</sup>Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 129.

<sup>133</sup>Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 72.

<sup>134</sup>Cited from Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 129 referring to *Bazaar*, 47-50, 146, 160, 189-91, 196, 209, 215, 224, 227, 237, 295-302, 314, 317.

<sup>135</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 58 (this is one of the texts and we can find several of them).

<sup>136</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 218-20, 163, 246, 252, 261, 302, 309.

to the sense B, *prosopon* is an approximate equivalent of our word ‘person’ and occurs in the *Bazaar of Heraclidis* as the designation for Jesus Christ, “the common *prosopon* of the two natures.”<sup>137</sup>

If we take into consideration this understanding of Nestorius we may dare to say that he does not teach the union of two *prosopa* as above mentioned instead we may have to say that he meant to teach the union of two natures in the same *prosopon* that is the one person of Christ comprised of two natures. Let us look into the way how Nestorius applied these definitions to the union. Man is known by the human *prosopon*, taken in sense A, which is by the schema [outward form] of the body and by the likeness. Every individual man is identified and distinguished from his fellow human being by the physical characteristics of his appearance. These constitute his *prosopon* [sense A]. But the *prosopon* [sense A] of God, who is invisible, is recognized in a different way - by his glorious name and by the fact that he is acknowledged to be God. To be precise the *prosopon* of the divine nature [sense A] was God the Logos himself.<sup>138</sup> On the basis of these definitions, Nestorius claims that, a transfer of attributes [*communicatio idiomatum*]<sup>139</sup> took place due to this union. God the Logos [understood as the *prosopon* in sense A of the divine nature] became the *prosopon* of Jesus Christ’s human nature. As a consequence of the union, the Logos united with his divine nature the body and appearance [i.e., the *prosopon* in sense A of the human nature]. It may be made clear by quoting one of his own favorite expressions, viz., “the divinity makes use of the *prosopon* of the humanity, and the humanity of that of the divinity.”<sup>140</sup> According to his explanation this unity was not a loosely connected union of two natures but intimately connected, but not identical, with the two natures themselves, fulfilled the functions assigned to them. According to Nestorius they were the characteristic or visible elements by which the divine and human natures were made perceptible respectively to the observer in all of their aspects. Therefore he was able to explain the union of the two natures in the one *prosopon* [sense B] of Jesus Christ, the incarnate divine Logos, in terms of their external revelation through their *prosopa* [sense A]. He holds that the two *prosopa* [sense A] served as a means of *communicatio idiomatum*. But in no respect did they connote a division or bifurcation into two separate persons. Hence he speaks that we speak of one *prosopon* [sense B] in both of them. Therefore Anastos referring to Nestorius says that “God appears whole, since his nature is not damaged in aught owing to the union; and thus too, man [is] whole, falling short of naught of the activity and of the sufferings of his own nature owing to the union.”<sup>141</sup>

Another criticism which can be raised against Nestorius, when we read the last sentence, is that the union of God and man in Jesus Christ, the one common *prosopon*

<sup>137</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 130 referring to *Bazaar*, 319, 58, 148, 166, 170, 220.

<sup>138</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 1, 1, 64.

<sup>139</sup>The *Communicatio idiomatum* is based on the oneness of the person subsisting in two natures of Jesus Christ. Hence it can be used as long as both the subject and the predicate of a sentence stand for the person of Jesus Christ or present a common subject of predication. It means that He who subsists in the Divine nature and possesses certain Divine properties (Attribute, Idiomatica) is the same as He Who subsists in the human nature and possesses certain human properties. This problem was handled by the Chalcedonian Council in 451 A. D. and gave it final and definitive clarification basing on the text prepared by Pope Leo the great named as *Tomus Leo* before 449: *agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est* (cf. G. L. Müller, *Idiomenkommunikation*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 403-406).

<sup>140</sup>Cited from Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 130 referring to *Bazaar*, 58, 207, 220, 240.

<sup>141</sup>*Ibid.*, 131 (The same idea is also found in Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 51).

[in sense B], which unites the two *ousiai* and natures, was in any way illusory or met with a diminution of the fullness and perfection of either the divine or the human nature. All the more if we have recourse to his work this criticism or doubt can be eliminated. Nestorius speaks of Jesus Christ that “He is truly God, ... in naught falling short of the nature of the Father; and we confess that the man is truly man, completely in his nature, in naught falling short of the nature of men, neither in body nor in soul nor in intelligence ...”<sup>142</sup> He summarizes that “God indeed remained God and was made man, and man remained man and was made God; for they took the *prosopon* of one another, and not the natures.”<sup>143</sup> It must be noted that always Nestorius held the faith of the Creed of 325. He identifies the one Lord Jesus Christ, as the only-begotten Son of God, that is, from the *ousia* of God the Father.

“God from God and Light of Light, Very God of Very God, born and not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all that is in heaven and in earth was made, with the same one Lord Jesus Christ, who on account of us men and on account of our salvation came down and was made flesh of the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary, who also made man ..., suffered and rose on the third day and ascended into heaven and will come to judge the living and the dead - he who is ‘consubstantial with the Father’ and ‘consubstantial with the mother,’ one Lord Jesus Christ.”<sup>144</sup>

This is further clear for us if we read his first sermon.<sup>145</sup> In the book of Camelot we read thus:

“Um seines Trägers willen verehere ich den Getragenen, um des Verborgenen willen bete ich den Sichtbaren an. Der unsichtbare Gott ist untrennbar von dem, der sichtbar ist; deshalb trenne ich auch nicht die Ehre und Würde dessen, der ungetrennt ist. Ich trenne die Naturen, aber ich vereinige die Anbetung ... Wir wollen bekennen, dass er zweifach ist und ihn als einen anbeten. Er ist zweifach in den Naturen, aber einer wegen der Einheit.”<sup>146</sup>

Nestorius always remained within the confines of orthodox theology even in describing the difference between the two natures in Christ. He explained that the *prosopon* of the human nature [sense A] was the visible manhood of Jesus, not merely his outward physical features, rather signified the whole of his human individuality, with all the qualities that go to make up a perfect man. Whereas the divine nature of the eternal God the Word, who has neither physical form nor shape, was fully present in the common *prosopon* [sense B] Jesus Christ, manifested himself behind the cloak of flesh through his *prosopon* [sense A] by the exertion of divine power. He used such a language in order to emphasize the immateriality of God and to explain how the divine Logos could be united with the humanity of Jesus without any objectionable duality of person. He relies upon these terminologies in order to make clear the otherwise indefinable *prosopon* of God the Logos, and not as mere external power or spirit, but truly the divine, eternal Logos, who descended from heaven and was joined with the human nature in the womb of the Virgin. According to Nestorius, therefore, “Jesus Christ was the divine Logos incarnate, the Son of God in the flesh, the Lord

---

<sup>142</sup>Ibid.

<sup>143</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 233, 220, 144.

<sup>144</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 50, 53, 192.

<sup>145</sup>Cf. P.-T. Camelot, *Ephesus und Chalcedon*, Mainz 1963, 32 in reference to ACO I, I, I, 35-37.

<sup>146</sup>Ibid.

whom his disciples knew as a man but recognized to be God.”<sup>147</sup> In order to affirm this unity he makes it clear that it was the Logos who both ‘gave’ his *prosopon* [sense A] to the human nature and ‘took’ that of the human [sense A] for his own. He states that “the human will of Christ was always obedient to the divine, that there was never any conflict or division between the two.”<sup>148</sup> When the Chalcedonian Symbol merely affirms the oneness of the *prosopon* or *hypostasis* and denies that it was divided into two Nestorius is far more explicit than his contemporaries and expounds the incarnation so fully and affirms the oneness and unity of Jesus Christ. Perhaps one may be led to condemn him as a heretic as he never differentiates the ‘common *prosopon*’ of Jesus Christ from the two *prosopa* [sense A], except by his constant emphasis upon its oneness or indivisibility and upon its having been the vehicle of the union of the two natures or “the common *prosopon* of the two natures.”<sup>149</sup> His deep commitment to the unity of Christ is demonstrated also by his acceptance of the Cyrillian idea of the hypostatic union, provided *hypostasis* is defined as a synonym for *prosopon* and not for *ousia*.<sup>150</sup> On this basis he could even endorse the Cappadocian Trinitarian formula, one *ousia* in three *hypostases*, although he himself preferred to speak of one *ousia* in three *prosopa*.<sup>151</sup> Cyril of Alexandria criticizes Nestorius saying that he had an inadequate conception of the union of the two natures in Christ, and separated the one from the other spatially. Cyril attacks him for saying, “I separate the natures but unite the adoration,”<sup>152</sup> as if Nestorius meant that, notwithstanding the absence of a real union of the natures, the separate man Jesus deserved to be worshipped because of his close association with the Logos. The verb ‘separate’ [χωρίζω], which Cyril finds offensive, was banned at Chalcedon. But Nestorius makes it clear that he meant only to the distinction between the two natures by the word ‘separate,’ since one was divine and the other human and not to any physical or spatial separation as Cyril misconceived. “Nestorius never made a division in Jesus Christ between the Logos and the man Jesus. Nor did he say that there were two adorations as if the divine Logos and the human nature of Jesus formed separate persons, and each received worship of his own.”<sup>153</sup> On the contrary, like the *prosopon* of Jesus Christ, adoration was also singular in number, that is to say, the human nature being adored together with the divine.

The intention of Nestorius was to solve the problem of the misuse of the *communicatio idiomatum*. We know that in the history of the church due to the misuse of the *communicatio idiomatum*, especially in Arian and Apollinarian Christology, it had caused a lot of confusion regarding the nature of Christ.<sup>154</sup> Even at the time of Nestorius, the question has still not been solved, and as a whole the Christological

---

<sup>147</sup>Cited from Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 132 referring to *Bazaar*, 60, 191, 193, 196-8, 200-1, 237: On the Logos’ ‘giving and taking’ so to say the initiative is always from the Logos.

<sup>148</sup>Ibid.

<sup>149</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 128 referring to *Bazaar*, 58, 79, 89, 143, 148, 156, 161, 163, 172, 182, 295, 300-302, 308, 310, 314, 319.

<sup>150</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 133 in reference to *Bazaar*, 156, 208, 218.

<sup>151</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 247.

<sup>152</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 196, 202, 207, 227, 237, 311, 314.

<sup>153</sup>Ibid.

<sup>154</sup>Nestorius detected the heresy of Arius and Apollinarius even among the priests and certain laity but not among the monks in Constantinople itself (cf. C. Fraise-Coué, *Die Theologische Diskussion zur Zeit Theodosius’ II.: Nestorius*, in: N. Brox, u. a., Hg., *Die Geschichte des Christentums. Religion - Politik - Kultur*, Dt. Ausgabe. Bd. 2. *Das Entstehen der einen Christenheit (250-430)*, Freiburg 1996, 578).

problem [viz., the distinction of the unity and the duality of Christ] was in need of further clarification.<sup>155</sup> Therefore his intention was always genuine and he tried to protect the union of natures in the same person Christ. Nestorius was concerned with preserving the theological insistence upon two natures in the Messiah, Godhead and manhood, without confusing them or suggesting a change in their properties. This view was that of the Antiochian School of Theology. “*Non dixi alterum filium aut alterum deum verbum; sed dixi deum verbum natura et templum naturaliter aliud, filium coniunctione unum.*”<sup>156</sup> In these words Nestorius repudiates the teaching of two sons with which he was so often charged: “For ‘Son’ is to him in fact just one of the names which express the united natures.”<sup>157</sup> In asserting his belief in the unity of the Sonship in Christ he writes one of the best pages of his Christology: “Even before the incarnation the God-Logos was Son and God and together with the Father, but in the last times he took the form of a servant; but as already previously he was a Son both in name and in nature, he cannot be called a separate Son after taking this form, otherwise we would be decreeing two sons.”<sup>158</sup> If we really try to understand his intention in the interpretation, we can come to the conclusion that it is to provide a clear distinction of the natures in the face of the heretical tendencies of his time, whether real or real supposedly so, that he gave such an explanation. Grillmeier referring to the fragments of Nestorius, “*Nestoriana*” (collected by F. Loofs) holds that Nestorius even has command of the password of traditional Christological understanding which occurs over and over again in the Chalcedonian Definition the εἶς καὶ ὁ αὐτός:

“(c) ... one and the same which is seen in the uncreated and in the created nature. (e) Therefore he who is recognized as one Christ in two natures, the divine and the human, the visible and the invisible, will hold the future judgment ... (f) For the oneness of the Son is not damaged by the distinction of the natures. But in the same way as the perishable body is one thing and the immortal soul is another, yet both go to make up one man, so too (one is made up) from the mortal and the immortal, from the perishable and from the imperishable, from that which is subject to a beginning and from the nature which has no beginning. That means that I confess God the Logos one πρόσωπον of the Son.”<sup>159</sup>

And F. Loofs has clarified further the view of Nestorius’ by studying his book *Liber Heraclidis*.

“You start in your account with the creator of the natures and not with the πρόσωπον of the union. It is not the Logos who has become twofold; it is the one Lord Jesus Christ who is twofold in his natures. In him are seen all the characteristics of the God-Logos, who has a nature eternal and unable to suffer and die, and also all those of the manhood, that is a nature mortal, created and able to suffer, and lastly those of the union and the incarnation.”<sup>160</sup>

Cyril’s group accuses Nestorius as teaching the idea of two persons in Christ and therefore a denial of the true unity of God and man in Christ. But as Nestorius in fact sees the difference or distinction in Christ only on the level of the natures, he cannot

<sup>155</sup>Cf. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 376.

<sup>156</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 379 referring to *Nestoriana*, 308, 8-11, Sermon of 430.

<sup>157</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Nestoriana*, 275: 1-9, 283, 299: 19-21, ... naturae duplices, sed filius singularis; 335, 25-27; 336, 1-4, 17-24.

<sup>158</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Nestoriana*, 275, 1-5.

<sup>159</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 380 referring to *Nestoriana*, 330, 31.

<sup>160</sup>Loofs, *Nestorius and his place in the history of Christian Doctrine*, 79-80.

be accused of teaching such a doctrine of two persons in the strict sense, at least, not as he himself intends it.

So in the works of Nestorius we find an inkling or an indication regarding the true unity of subject in Christ. According to him the designation ‘Son’ already refers to the pre-existent Logos who takes flesh in the Incarnation. The name ‘Son’ permits no division. For him the distinction lies on the side of the natures. “Although he is not very clear about the ontological primacy of the *hypostasis* or person of the Logos, he is seriously concerned to maintain the traditional unity in Christ. For this reason he opposes the expression ‘ἀνθρωποτόκος’ from the moment he takes office as bishop.”<sup>161</sup> He does not advocate the idea that Christ is a ‘mere man’ (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος).<sup>162</sup> He is not teaching the commingling of two natures in one as he is very often accused by his adversaries instead he is rejecting the amalgamation of it into one. When we hear him speaking in some places as the ‘*hypostasis* of the human nature’ of Christ, Nestorius means only to stress its concrete, unconfused reality.<sup>163</sup> According to him the two natures of Christ are joined in συνάφεια, which rests on the unity of the πρόσωπον. So even Nestorius congratulates Cyril on the promising insight through which he has come to the distinction of the natures into the divine and the human and their conjunction in one *prosopon* (εἰς ἑνὸς προσώπου συνάφειαν).<sup>164</sup> Hence according to him after the distinction we have the conjunction of the two natures (φύσεις διπλαῖ), the *synapheia* or *coniunctio*.

When we analyze the word *prosopon* in Nestorius we may have to consider the context in which he speaks of it. According to Nestorius each nature has its own *prosopon*, its own characteristics, its own appearances, through which it is characterized in its individuality. For Nestorius the *prosopon* is the last point in the analysis of a concrete nature. The later metaphysical definition of the concept of person goes beyond ‘individuality’ to look for the decisive element of the concept of the person in the καθ’ ἑαυτὸ εἶναι, the incommunicabilis absoluta, of a complete rational nature. Chalcedon opened the way to this by its practical distinction between nature and *hypostasis*. Even in Chalcedon we still do not have a definition of the term person. Within his own terminology and conceptuality, Cyril found his way to the idea of the ultimate unity of subject in Christ, but he did this without being able to grasp the concept of person as such. Now in that Nestorius stands by the ‘individuality’ of the natures and stresses this to an extra-ordinary degree, he obstructs the way to a speculative solution of the Christological problem as far as one is possible at all. Nestorius’ concept of *prosopon* is largely determined by the Bible and then, above all, by the approach made by the Cappadocians in distinguishing nature from *hypostasis* in trinitarian theology. This point is further clarified by his *Liber Heraclidis*. Nestorius is fond of the expressions found in Philippians 2, 5-8 namely, the ‘form of God’ and the ‘form of a servant.’ Nestorius begins with the idea of ‘countenance’ in order to make his idea of *prosopon* comprehensible. In this, the

<sup>161</sup>Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition, 379.

<sup>162</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 379 in reference to *Nestoriana*, 182; 248: 19, 249: 4, 259: 16-17, 299, 354 (against Paul of Samosata); Socrates, H. E. 7, 32, 8 also defends Nestorius; ‘But I read his writings and I will say the truth; he did not hold the same opinions as Paul of Samosata and Photinus nor did he at all regard the Lord as a mere man, only he abhorred the term θεοτόκος as a bugbear.’

<sup>163</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 382 in reference to *Nestoriana*, 369, 3-12.

<sup>164</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Nestoriana*, 176, 15-17.



whole is to be seen as the appearance of the divine in human form. The countenance represents Christ. But in the countenance there are two eyes, the divine and the human nature unconfused:

“Christ is indivisible in that he is Christ, but he is twofold in that he is both God and man; he is one in his Sonship, but he is twofold in that which takes and that which is taken. In the πρόσωπον of the Son he is an individual, but, as in the case of two eyes, he is separate in the natures of manhood and Godhead. For we do not acknowledge two Christs or two Sons or Only-Begottens or Lords, not one Son and another Son, not a first Only-Begotten and a new Only-Begotten, not a first and a second Christ, but one and the same, who has been seen in created and uncreated nature.”<sup>165</sup>

According to him the two natures have one Lordship (αὐθεντία) and one power (δύναμις) or might (δυναστεία) and one *prosopon* in the one dignity (ἄξια) and in the same honour (τιμὴ).<sup>166</sup> Throughout his whole career, in his whole life, Nestorius takes pains to explain this unity of *prosopon* in itself and as the exclusive basis of unity in Christ.

We may be right in thinking that the problem lies in the lack of understanding, from the part of Cyril of Alexandria, about the terminologies used by Nestorius. The term *prosopon* with its double connotation developed by Nestorius in the period between 429 and 436 was not comprehensible to others. Besides this, Rome also could not follow his thought pattern properly. It is remarked by Grillmeier in his book, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, that Pope Celestine was not able to answer back immediately due to the lack of translators of Greek original. This delay of the letter has also caused the conflict to intensify. The lack of understanding of the language in which the whole transactions were made and a leniency towards Cyril of Alexandria made all the more the case of Nestorius very difficult.<sup>167</sup> We may doubt why one Patriarch should write to the head of the Church of Rome about the development of issues in the other part of the church. It was to fulfill the wish and desire of the Bishop of Rome, namely, Celestine. “For Caelestine’s demand was that the council be unanimous rested on his belief that the doctrine of apostolic succession implied a catholic faith that consisted in a continuous trajectory of orthodox views.”<sup>168</sup> Therefore we can assume in every way that Nestorius had the intention to convince Rome that his belief was that of Nicaea and the same as the belief of the Bishop of Rome. Secondly it was also a brotherly wish of Nestorius to acquaint himself with East and West regarding Christological ideas. In his letter to Pope Celestine he addresses himself as “*Fraternas nobis invicem.*”<sup>169</sup> Another reason for the action against Nestorius from Rome was due to a misunderstanding caused by Cyril by the Latin translation of the so called teachings of Nestorius and the passionate feelings of Cyril of Alexandria. Therefore Rome cannot be criticized in this matter as she was simulated or deceived by the Patriarch of Alexandria. Together with these “Pope Celestine had insufficient knowledge of the true situation and the intentions of the

<sup>165</sup>Cited from Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 385 referring to *Nestoriana*, 280, 5-16.

<sup>166</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Nestoriana* 196, 15-17.

<sup>167</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 393.

<sup>168</sup>S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The making of a saint and of a heretic*, New York 2004, 174.

<sup>169</sup>Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 392.

Patriarch of Constantinople.”<sup>170</sup> So the case of Nestorius is treated in a purely defensive and conservative way. Celestine and the Synod of Rome were unable to realize adequately the Christological problems raised by Nestorius. So they also do not recognize the necessity of giving a theological basis to the *communicatio idiomatum* and of creating a formula which expresses simultaneously both the unity and the difference in Christ.<sup>171</sup> Celestine does not give a very detailed picture either of the teaching of Nestorius or of his own attitude. He says that the Bishop of Constantinople teaches the division of the two natures. “Now he makes Christ a mere man, now he lets him dwell in communion with God.”<sup>172</sup> By the same author again we find quoting that “let Nestorius explain that this, [virgin birth] *virgineus partus*, has given to the world not a *solitarium hominem*, [mere man] but the true Son of God, who thus assures our salvation.”<sup>173</sup>

Here let us also discuss the accusation raised against Nestorius as the propagator of a ‘union of wills’ of both divine and human as a moral union. It is not factual to say that he propagated the theory of union of wills. Instead “he insists that the union in Christ was not merely ‘moral’ but truly metaphysical.”<sup>174</sup> According to him the divine and human wills in Christ were in complete harmony with each other supported by the Logos will. He never meant the obliteration or absorption of one will by the other by the harmony or union of these wills. He held that there were two wills, but they made identical decisions. To make it further clear, “the human will despite its independence of the divine will, was always actively and deliberately obedient to it, through every trial and vicissitude.”<sup>175</sup> But he held that without a perfect human nature Christ would not have been a model for humanity and assurance of immortality for all mankind. This concept is basic to his soteriology. According to him the unity of Christ’s personality never experienced dissension or discord since the human will always followed the divine.

The Italian scholar L. Scipioni in his book *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso* speaks very clearly about the position of Nestorius:

“Nestorius as a man completely imbued in the Pauline idea of the ‘second Adam’ as global expression of the *oikonomia*. The consideration of the *oikonomia* is totally influenced by the idea that *natus Christus vitam terrenam in caelestem conversationem transferre dignatus est*. Thus the consideration about Christ is dominated by the antithesis Adam - Christ as expressed in Romans 5, 12 f.; in the same way that through Adam alone sin and death appeared in the world, so through Christ alone we have the justification which is life for all men.”<sup>176</sup>

Nestorius explains it without minimizing the idea of Christ’s divinity. If we understand further the situation into which he was brought we will understand it clearly. When he came to Constantinople as the Patriarch of that city there he found a complex form of Arianism and Apollinarianism which seemed to restate the idea of the *Logos treptos* or *Logos ktisma*, a kind of superangelic spirit subject to a cosmic

<sup>170</sup>Ibid., 371.

<sup>171</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 398.

<sup>172</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to ACO I, 2, 15, 2.

<sup>173</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to ACO I, 2, 21, 4.

<sup>174</sup>Anastos, Nestorius was Orthodox, 134.

<sup>175</sup>Ibid.

<sup>176</sup>L. Scipioni, *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso: Storia dogma critica*, Milano 1974, 425 (He gives the summary in English in this book).

*descensus* in a human body but of divine nature. According to these heretics, the Lord took the form of a servant but did not himself become the servant. Therefore

“Nestorius used all his energies to vindicate Christ’s true humanity, a humanity, moreover, that allows us to attribute to Christ all the marks of authentic human protagonist, according to the Pauline and Irenaeian idea *per hominem mors et per hominem resurrectio mortuorum*. Thus Nestorius adapts all the *oikonomia* to the logic that requires the salvation of man by means of man and which leads to a deep meditation of Christ as Priest and Mediator, taken from 1 Tim 2, 5 and the tight exegesis of the Letter to the Hebrews.”<sup>177</sup>

According to Scipioni many things were at play in misinterpreting Nestorius or making him a heretic.

“nel caso particolare della controversia nestoriana, essi tendono talmente a fondersi, da rendere in gran parte irricognoscibile il movimento di pensiero senza la luce esplicita dei contesti storici, anche i più contingenti, quali certe situazioni ambientali, sociologiche e politiche, che hanno giocato un ruolo indiscutibile nel particolare modo di formularsi di determinate proposizioni o di esaltarsi di alcuni dati aspetti dottrinali.”<sup>178</sup>

## 7. The Concept *Communicatio Idiomatum*

Basing on the previous analysis we can free Nestorius from the heresy of Nestorianism and we can assume that he taught a theology unobjectionable to that of Chalcedonian criteria. Before we enter into the issue proper we may consider the orthodox position on the natures of Christ. According to the approved view these natures are united without confusion, change, separation, or division, and retain all their properties, which in the union of God and man are distinct from each other but not separate.<sup>179</sup> “The difference between the natures had given rise to two appellations of Jesus Christ, who, on account of his divine nature, is Son of God (the divine Logos) and also, at the same time, by virtue of his human nature, the Son of man (Jesus).”<sup>180</sup> The Orthodox position is that although there are two natures in Jesus Christ the reference is always to the one and the same person Jesus Christ, even if the designation varies.

“Therefore it is possible to ascribe all the experiences of Jesus Christ in respect of his divine nature to the Son of man, and those which Jesus Christ underwent because of human nature to the Son of God. Hence, it was theologically permissible to teach that the Son of God underwent death, to which the divine nature was not subject, and that the ‘Son of man’ received worship, which is accorded only to God.”<sup>181</sup>

Nestorius also shared the same thought. Nestorius was in no way intended to question the Godhead of our Lord. Whereas what he was anxious to maintain was the correct interpretation of the doctrine of the relation between the natures in the Person of the Incarnate Son of God, the doctrine commonly known by the term *communicatio idiomatum*. He held that

<sup>177</sup>Ibid., 426.

<sup>178</sup>Ibid., 14.

<sup>179</sup>Cf. Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 124, 135 (The text of the Creed of 451 is to be found in ACO 2, 1, 2, 129).

<sup>180</sup>Ibid., 135.

<sup>181</sup>Ibid.

“while maintaining that all experiences, whether of Godhead or of manhood, are rightly predicated of the one Person Jesus Christ, whether He be styled Son of God or Son of man, - yet forbids us to ascribe human experiences to the Godhead or Divine experiences to the manhood; the special properties of either nature belong to it and to it alone, though the Person who is both God and man is the subject of them all. All Catholic teachers have always repudiated the idea that God in His own being was capable of human affections (πάθη).”<sup>182</sup>

The Antiochians in general interpret the Nicene Creed in order to avoid any ‘confusion’ of the Godhead and manhood of Jesus Christ - “that from *And in one Lord Jesus Christ* down to *Who for us men, and for our salvation came down ...*, the Fathers at Nicaea were speaking of the Logos in His divine nature, and that at this point they begin to speak of the Economy - of the Logos as He has become man, that is.”<sup>183</sup> So the Antiochians insisted that

“the Fathers at Nicaea distinguished between what in their statement refers to the Logos in His divine nature and what to the Economy, the former holding that the latter make the dividing-line at ‘He came down from heaven and was incarnate,’ and, they maintain, this distinction must be upheld in order to avoid any interpretation of the Creed which might rob the two natures of their reality in the union.”<sup>184</sup>

Nestorius himself quotes the words of the Fathers of Nicaea so,

“for until His incarnation, they (the Fathers of Nicaea) taught us everything in terms of God the Word, and after He was made flesh they speak of this union which (proceeded) from the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, of the birth and the flesh ..., the sufferings and the death and the resurrection and the ascension, ... in order that we might suppose that the union was without confusion and further without change of *ousia* and of nature or mixture or natural composition ...”<sup>185</sup>

In his interpretation Nestorius is totally faithful and upholds the truth of the Gospel and the Nicene Fathers. Nestorius writes in *Liber Heraclidis*:

“God the Logos was made man that He might therein make the humanity the likeness of God, and that He might therein renew (the likeness of God) in the nature of the humanity; and thereupon He renewed His material elements, and showed Him (to be) without sin in the observance of the commandments, as though He alone sufficed for renewing him who had originally fallen by the transgression of the observance of the commandments. Otherwise, He gave Himself for him to observe them because he sufficed not to keep himself without sin ... For this reason He took the likeness of a servant which was without sin in its creation in such wise as even in the observance of the commandments to receive a name which is more excellent than all names, and so that whatsoever came into being through the renewal of His material elements might be confirmed by observances and by prudence; for which reason also the renewal of the material elements took place through the Incarnation by means of which He might contend against defeat.”<sup>186</sup>

Again in the same work Nestorius asserts that “because in fact He took this (likeness) in order to abolish the guilt of the first man, and in order to give to his nature the former image which he had lost through his guilt, rightly He took that which had proved itself guilty and had been made captive and had been subjected to

<sup>182</sup>Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 81.

<sup>183</sup>Cited from Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies, 126 referring to the Nicene statement.

<sup>184</sup>Ibid., 206.

<sup>185</sup>Cited from ibid. referring to *Bazaar*, 142, 171.

<sup>186</sup>Cited from ibid., 128-129 referring to *Bazaar*, 212, 213.

servitude, with all the bonds of scorn and contempt.”<sup>187</sup> Without doubt we can say that Antiochians always tried to interpret that it was man’s fall which has rendered the incarnation necessary, and that their Christology is indeed “soteriologically determined.”<sup>188</sup> That is to say, “if man is to be redeemed, there must come into the world a man who in his perfect obedience to the will of God will be the Man, the Second Adam, the first fruits of a renewed humanity and a renewed creation.”<sup>189</sup> Nestorius affirms always clearly in his work *Liber Heraclidis* that it is to renew the divine image in man which was his at first that the Logos took man’s fallen nature upon Him. For example speaking of the indwelling of the Logos in the Man, Theodore of Mopsuestia<sup>190</sup> affirms in a well known passage in his *De Incarnatione* that he is not so mad as to say that in Him God dwelt as He dwelt in apostles and in righteous men. On the contrary, “in Him towards whom He showed His good pleasure He dwelt as in a Son (ὡς ἐν υἱῷ) – that is to say, He united the Man assumed entirely to Himself, and fitted Him to share with Him in all the honour which He, the Indweller, who is Son by nature, possesses.”<sup>191</sup> It seems clear that he means One who possesses the divine indwelling a *prima statim plasmatione*,<sup>192</sup> One who is never separated from the Logos who assumed Him, and One who shares in all the honour which belongs to the Son by nature. In a word, he is thinking of the Man as the Son of Man, the Second Adam, the One who, according to the foreknowledge of God, has been chosen by Him to be His Agent as He comes to inaugurate the new *katastasis*.<sup>193</sup> It must be noted that

“neither the Council of Chalcedon nor Bishop Leo of Rome was less ambiguous or more positive about this doctrine than Nestorius. Like them he says that we name the man God indeed on account of the union of the divinity but man in nature; yet similarly once more also God the Word is God indeed in nature, but we call God man by reason of the union of the *prosopon* of the humanity.”<sup>194</sup>

<sup>187</sup>Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 129; Let us also refer to the first sermon of Nestorius on ‘*Theotokos*’: “*Et non hoc solum Christianis praedicandum, quia incommutabilis est Deus Christus, sed et benignus, formam servi accipiens et quod subsistebat existens ... suscipere autem humanum genus per hominem et reconciliare Adam multa justitiae circumpectio est*” (cited from *ibid.*, 129 referring to *Sermo ix, Nestoriana*, 254).

<sup>188</sup>*Ibid.*, 129; (Harnack is of the opinion that the Christology of the Antiochians is not soteriologically determined; but of course the Antiochians are indeed interested in soteriology although their thought is not fully developed).

<sup>189</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>190</sup>Theodore is one of the great theologians of the Antiochian School and perhaps one of the teachers of Nestorius and the main representative of Nestorianism who was interested in affirming the fullness of the humanity of Christ (cf. D. Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ: Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of Saint Maximus the Confessor*, New York 2004, 17). The Antiochian tradition was formed and maintained by the great teacher Diodorus of Tarsus (†394) and his more famous pupil Theodore, who in turn, was the teacher of Nestorius. Theodore was born at Antioch, of distinguished parentage, ca. 350. He was a pupil of the famous sophist Libanius (also a native of Antioch), in whose school he began his lifelong friendship with another famous pupil of Libanius, viz. John Chrysostom. In early youth he was caught by the prevailing enthusiasm for monasticism, and went from the feet of Libanius to the ascetic and studious life of the cloister; but his ardour soon cooled, and he returned to the prospect of office and honours in public life, and even wished for marriage. Chrysostom succeeded in dissuading him from such a change of purpose, and at the age of thirty-three his ordination took place [ca. 383] (cf. J. F. Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the time of the Council of Chalcedon*, London 1962, 256).

<sup>191</sup>Cited from Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 133 referring to *De Incarnatione* vii.

<sup>192</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *C. Apoll.* iii, Frag. 2.

<sup>193</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 133.

<sup>194</sup>Cited from Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 135 referring to the words of Nestorius.

Nestorius also quotes Athanasius to the same effect: “Now that the Word has become man and has made the properties of the flesh his own, the same are no longer imputed to the body because the Word has come to be in it.”<sup>195</sup> Therefore, he is able to come to the conclusion like Athanasius, that in the union the Logos acquired the characteristics of man, and the human in Christ, in turn, those of God. Nestorius specifically agrees with the orthodox who assign the properties of the humanity to the divinity and those of the divinity to the humanity, and this is said of the one and that of the other, as concerning natures whole and united, united indeed without confusion and making use of the *prosopa* of one another. But he makes it clear that such an exchange was not effected between the two natures but rather between God the Logos and the human in Christ through their *prosopa*. His formula runs so in his work *Liber Heraclidis* “the divinity makes use of the *prosopon* of the humanity and the humanity that of the divinity.”<sup>196</sup> According to M. V. Anastos this formula must be ranked high among the patristic attempts to define this central mystery of the incarnation.

Nestorius interprets in such a way that he is able to safeguard the divinity and integrity of the divine nature of the Logos. Thus he is able to attach Jesus Christ’s human experiences and agony, which God the Word assumed<sup>197</sup> not to the divine nature, but to the human *prosopon* [sense A] which the Logos ‘used.’ Hence in the kenosis [the emptying by which God humiliated himself and took on human form: Philippians 2, 6-11], the Logos endured “death upon the cross, in that he made use of the *prosopon* of him who died and was crucified as his own *prosopon*, and [i.e., as a consequence] in his own *prosopon* he made use of the things which appertained unto him who died and was crucified and was exalted.”<sup>198</sup> Thus “he does not question the validity of the traditional affirmations like ‘God suffered’ and ‘God died,’ if correctly understood as applying to the human *prosopon* the divine Logos took, not to his [divine] nature.”<sup>199</sup> Hence he is able to speak of Logos as “impassible in a passible body and truly ... came to be in the body and was not distinguished from the body.”<sup>200</sup> Basically Cyril was also in agreement with Nestorius on this point. For example, in his *Second letter to Nestorius* which received ecumenical endorsement at the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, Cyril declared that the Logos, though begotten of the Father before the ages and in no need of a second birth, is said (λέγεται) to have been born in the flesh (σαρκικῶς) because he had united himself with human nature. So Cyril continues saying that Virgin Mary, in this sense, cannot be regarded as the Mother of the divine Nature, since she gave birth only to the flesh to which the Logos was joined in hypostatic union.<sup>201</sup> The words of Cyril from his second letter to Nestorius run so:

“For this reason, even though he existed and was begotten of the Father from before all ages, he is also said to have been begotten from a woman according to the flesh. This does not mean that his divine nature received the beginning of its existence in the holy virgin or that it necessarily needed a second generation for its own sake

<sup>195</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 221.

<sup>196</sup>*Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>197</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Bazaar*, 174.

<sup>198</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 138 referring to *Bazaar*, 58 (Nestorius’ analysis on this point was accepted by Cyril and the Council of Chalcedon).

<sup>199</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Bazaar*, 70.

<sup>200</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 136 referring to *Bazaar*, 237.

<sup>201</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 137 [for the text of Cyril’s Second letter to Nestorius], in reference to ACO I, I, I, 25. 23-28 (PG 77, 44).

after its generation from the Father. It is completely foolish and stupid to say that He who exists before all ages and is coeternal with the Father stood in need of a second beginning of existence. Nonetheless, because the Word hypostatically united human reality to himself, ‘for us and for our salvation’, and came forth of a woman, this is why he is said to have been begotten in a fleshly manner. The Word did not subsequently descend upon an ordinary man previously born of the holy virgin, but he is made one from his mother’s womb, and thus is said to have undergone a fleshly birth in so far as he appropriated to himself the birth of his own flesh.”<sup>202</sup>

In this sense Cyril concurs that in no way Virgin Mary is the mother or source of God the Word himself or his divine nature and thus in no wise be regarded as *Theotokos*, since she gave birth to the flesh to which the Logos was joined in hypostatic union. “By this process of reasoning, Cyril evolved a formula, according to which the Logos submitted to birth, suffering, and death in the flesh (σαρκί) or according to the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα).”<sup>203</sup> In the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius he says that

“we understand that there is One Christ Jesus, the Only begotten Son, honored together with his flesh in God, born from God the Father, suffered in the flesh, for our sake, in accordance with the scripture [1 Pet 4, 1] even though he is impassible in his own nature. In the crucified body he impassibly appropriated the suffering of his own flesh and ‘by the grace of God he tasted death on behalf of all.’ [Heb 2, 9]. He surrendered his own body to death even though by nature he is life and is himself the Resurrection [Jn 11, 25]. He trampled upon death with unspeakable power so that he might, in his own flesh, become the ‘first-born from the dead’ [Col 1, 18] and the ‘first fruits of those who have fallen asleep’ [1Cor 15, 20] and might lead the way for human nature to return to incorruptibility. This is why ‘by the grace of God he tasted death on behalf of all,’ as I have just said, despoiling Hell and coming back to life on the third day. And so, even if it is said that the resurrection of the dead came about through a man [1 Cor 15, 21], nonetheless we understand this as meaning the Word of God became man and the dominion of death was destroyed by him.”<sup>204</sup>

In the same letter No. 8 he tells that “they do not divide out the sayings of our Saviour in the Gospels as if to two *hypostases* or *prosopa*. The one and only Christ is not twofold even though he is understood as compounded out of two different elements in an indivisible unity, just as a man is understood as consisting of soul and body and yet is not twofold but rather is one from out of both.”<sup>205</sup>

His explanation with regard to the Word’s relation to passibility is greatly reasonable, and it resembles closely to what Nestorius has to say on this subject.<sup>206</sup> On the contrary Nestorius accuses Cyril of Manichean error of reducing Christ’s flesh to an illusion. “But Nestorius’ criticism, however unjustified, proves once again that he thoroughly understood the *communicatio idiomatum* and realized that there could

<sup>202</sup>Cited from J. A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts*, New York 1994, 263-264 referring to Cyril’s second letter to Nestorius.

<sup>203</sup>Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 137.

<sup>204</sup>Cited from McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 270 referring to ACO I, I, I, 33-42 (PG 77, 105-21).

<sup>205</sup>*Ibid.*, 271.

<sup>206</sup>ἐνὶ τοιαροῦν προσώπῳ τὰς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις πάσας ἀναθετέον φωνάς, ὑποστάσει μὲν τῆ τοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη. Κύριος γὰρ εἷς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς. Therefore, all the words of the Gospels must be ascribed to one ‘πρόσωπον,’ to the one ‘ὑπόστασις’ of the Word made Flesh, for the Lord Jesus Christ is one according to the Scriptures.

have been no true union of the divine Logos and the human nature in Jesus Christ unless the qualities of the one were deemed applicable to the other and *vice versa*.<sup>207</sup>

If we look into the point where both Nestorius and Cyril stress this disagreement concerning the subject of the God-man's career and experience, the fundamental difference between them in interpreting the results of the *communicatio idiomatum*, it can be easily noticed. According to Nestorius, Cyril preferred to begin with the divine Logos (the maker of the natures), and habitually speaks of the Logos as saying, doing, suffering, dying and rising from the dead, and Nestorius associates all these activities with 'the *prosopon* [sense B] of the union' (the Jesus Christ of the Gospels). It should be noted here that the Symbol of Chalcedon follows the same pattern and qualifies the terrestrial generation of Jesus Christ exactly as Nestorius does, stating that he was born of Mary the Virgin *Theotokos*, according to the manhood.<sup>208</sup> Therefore the modern research says that the line which separates both Cyril and Nestorius on this concept is either very thin or nonexistent. Both agreed that the qualities of the two natures were referable to one person, Jesus Christ. Cyril's characteristic notion that 'the Logos suffered in the flesh is theologically the exact equivalent of Nestorius' dogma that the Logos suffered in the *prosopon* of the manhood which he took for his own.<sup>209</sup> In the works of L. Abramowski, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts* (vol. II) she clearly presents the idea of Nestorius regarding this issue: "For whoever says that he, the Son, who is equal to the Father, became not equal, that is, man, and thus suffered, and does not rather say that he took a man, and when he suffered, he was conjoined to him in the union, while he remained impassible - denies the truth."<sup>210</sup> As Cyril condemned Nestorius, for his insistence that the human experiences should in a strict sense be attributed to Jesus Christ, or to his human nature (or, as he preferred to put it, to the human *prosopon* [sense A] which the Logos appropriated for himself), rather than to the divine nature of the Logos, are by no means to be regarded as idiosyncrasies of Nestorianism.<sup>211</sup> If we go through the letter of Cyril written to John of Antioch we find that Cyril in his stance is very close to the Antiochian school. This change of mind from the part of Cyril has eased the process of signing in the Union Code which was arrived by both parties in 433. Let us go through the following quotation which is taken from a letter from Cyril to John of Antioch No. 5

"The same one is consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood, for there was a union of the two natures, and this is why we confess One Christ, One Son, and One Lord ... As for the evangelical and apostolic sayings about the Lord, we are aware that the theologians take some as common, as referring to one *prosopon*, but distinguish others as referring to two natures; that they interpret the God-befitting ones in accordance with the Godhead of the Christ, and the humble ones in accordance with the manhood."<sup>212</sup>

<sup>207</sup>Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 137.

<sup>208</sup>Cf. The text of the Creed of 451 is to be found in ACO 2, I, 2, 129.

<sup>209</sup>Cf. Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 139.

<sup>210</sup>Cited from L. Abramowski, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts*, Vol. II., Cambridge 1972 referring to the Twelve Theses of Nestorius in answer to Cyril's anathema, 4, 128.

<sup>211</sup>Cf. Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 139.

<sup>212</sup>Cited from McGuckin, St. Cyril of Alexandria, 344-45 referring to ACO I, I, 4, 17-20 (PG 77, 177): "τὰς δὲ εὐαγγελικὰς καὶ ἀποστολικὰς περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνάς, ἴσμεν τοὺς θεολόγους ἄνδρας, τὰς μὲν κοινοποιοῦντας, ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς προσώπου, τὰς δὲ διαιροῦντας, ὡς ἐπὶ δύο φύσεων καὶ τὰς μὲν θεοπρεπεῖς κατὰ τὴν θεότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὰς δὲ ταπεινὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα παραδιδόντας" (Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 139).



When we read the below given quotation of Cyril written to John of Antioch we are reminded of the similar qualifications in the teachings of Nestorius.<sup>213</sup> For Cyril expresses his idea by quoting the words of St. Peter saying, “Christ has suffered for us in the flesh, and not in the nature of the ineffable deity (1 Pet 4, 1).”<sup>214</sup> From these quotations it is crystal clear that both of them are actually heading towards the same point without understanding each other. In the letter of Cyril written to John of Antioch he portrays exactly what Nestorius want to teach.

“According to the pure and blameless faith which came down to us from the beginning, one Son and Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God the Father made man and incarnate according to the confession of the holy Fathers so that the same one is and is said to be divine from God the Father as his Word and by nature to proceed from his substance, as is from the seed of David according to the flesh, that is, from Mary the holy Mother of God.”<sup>215</sup>

Of course this change of mind from the part of Cyril was not with the intention of bringing peace within the Eastern Church but purely to win a sweeping victory over the Antiochians. When we come across the so-called ‘union document’ [Unionsakte] arrived at between Cyril and John of Antioch, it clearly tells us about the hidden intentions of Cyril. And from this below given quotation it is clear it was not because that Nestorius taught something wrong or heretical that Cyril always opposed him but because of the fear of the loss of position by the new upcoming church.

“Die Übereinkunft von 433 war zunächst nur zwischen den Häuptern der beiden Parteien, Cyrill von Alexandrien und Johannes von Antiochien, getroffen worden. Nun blieb die Aufgabe, sie in die Wirklichkeit umzusetzen, eine Aufgabe die umso heikler war, als Johannes - ganz wie Cyrill - verkündete, daß er in dieser Angelegenheit seine Lehrauffassung nicht geändert habe. Diese taktischen Beteuerungen, die in erster Linie dazu bestimmt waren, die Zögernden und Widerständigen zum Anschluß zu bewegen, waren im übrigen gewiß nicht ganz frei von versteckten Absichten: der Verlockung, unter der Gunst der Verhältnisse die gemachten Zugeständnisse zurückzunehmen oder der Hoffnung, auf diese Weise die errungenen Positionen zu festigen.”<sup>216</sup>

Nestorius is neither a Gnostic nor a Manichaen as many criticize. The Gnostics held that “Jesus passed through Mary but had not been formed in her.”<sup>217</sup> Nestorius never shared this idea of Gnostics in his life. Also it is not correct to say that he was primarily concerned with the human nature of Jesus. Of course, he laid great stress upon the manhood of Christ but never denied or neglected the divine nature of Christ.

“Indeed his theory that neither of the two *ousiai* could be mixed with the other or combined with it in its own *ousia* was intended, among other things, to preserve the impassibility of the divine nature. Actually, Nestorius’ Christology is not characterized by preoccupation with either one of the two natures to the exclusion

<sup>213</sup>“the Only-begotten Son of God created and was created; the Son of God suffered and suffered not, the same but not in the same (*ousia*); for (some) of these things are in the nature of the divinity and (others) of them in the nature of the humanity. He suffered all human things in the humanity and all divine things in the divinity ...” (cited from *ibid.*, 136 referring to *Bazaar*, 165, 170, 179, 191, 193, 221).

<sup>214</sup>Cited from McGuckin, St. Cyril of Alexandria, 347 referring to Cyril’s letter to John of Antioch, 9.

<sup>215</sup>Cited from J. McEnerney, St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters 51-110, Washington 1985, 62 referring to Letter 67, 3 of Cyril to John of Antioch.

<sup>216</sup>Fraisse-Coué, Der Streit um die Lehre und seine Auswirkung im Osten und im Westen, in: N. Brox, u. a., Hg., Die Geschichte des Christentums: Dt. Ausgabe. Bd. 3. Der Lateinische Westen und der Byzantinische Osten (431-642), Freiburg 2001, 7.

<sup>217</sup>J. E. Stealy and R. A. Kraft, Edessa, in: W. Bauer, ed., Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, Philadelphia 1979, 31.

or detriment of the other, but rather by uncompromising insistence upon the union of both of them in Christ, in their full totality, and unimpaired. He was the dyophysite *par excellence*, and, more than any other theologian, except possibly Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 466), his friend and ally, devoted his energies to demonstrating that Jesus Christ was equally and in full measure both God and man, both human and divine. No one else championed this principle more vigorously than he, or was more forceful in denouncing the slightest deviation from it. In view of the great merit of his theological ideas, it is all the more regrettable that he was not able to present them more skillfully. The obscurity and prolixity of his style are major defects, from which he cannot be exculpated, and explain in part why he failed to hold the favor of Emperor Theodosius II (408-50), and spent the last years of his life (from 431- ca. 451) in agonizing exile.”<sup>218</sup>

## 8. The Political Reason for the Conflict

Here it is advantageous to speak of the political scenario between 425 A. D. and 435 A. D. in Egypt and in Constantinople in order to have a better understanding of the occurrences which took place in these churches. As Nestorius took charge as the Patriarch of the Antiochian Church, he found it very difficult to exercise as the head of the church there, due to the presence of Proklos<sup>219</sup> and Philip<sup>220</sup> who had wished to become the Patriarch of Constantinople at the death of Sisinnius. But Theodosius II in order to avoid further commotion in the empire selected Nestorius, the Antiochian priest as the Patriarch.

“Als Sisinnius starb (Dezember 427), wurden Proklos und Philipp wieder von ihren Freunden vorgeschlagen; diesmal wollte der Kaiser dem Streit ein gründliches Ende bereiten und holte den antiochenischen Presbyter Nestorius (10. April 428). Ihm und den Presbytern, die er aus Antiochien mitbrachte, stand der Konstantinopler Klerus von Anfang an feindlich gegenüber; seine beiden Konkurrenten ließen ihren Streit fallen und beteiligten sich beide an der Fronde gegen den Eindringling, der sich nicht scheute, auf der Kanzel dem hauptstädtischen Klerus vorzuwerfen, daß er das Volk nicht zum rechten Glauben zu erziehen verstehe.”<sup>221</sup>

We are familiar with the severe conflict between Nestorius and Cyril which broke out even before the commencement of the Council. The conflict is most often perceived to be a theological dispute, which it no doubt was, but many ignore the political situation and deal only with perceptions and theological schools of thought. In other words, we can say the thrust was laid upon the differences existing between

<sup>218</sup>Anastos, Nestorius was orthodox, 140.

<sup>219</sup>Proclus (St., Feast 24 Nov.), became secretary to Archbishop Atticus of Constantinople (406-425) who ordained him deacon and priest. Atticus' successor Sisinnius I (426-427) consecrated him Bishop of Cyzicus, but as the people refused to receive him there he remained at Constantinople; in the year 427 and 431 he tried a hand in becoming the Patriarch of Constantinople but in vain. Later when Archbishop Maximianus (431-434) died on Great and Holy Thursday, Proclus was immediately enthroned (434-446) by the permission of the Emperor Theodosius II and by bishops gathered at Constantinople. He appears to have been wise, moderate, and conciliatory, desirous. The writings of Proclus consist chiefly of 37 *Homilies* and *epistles* (cf. K.-H. Uthemann, Proklos-Patriarch v. Konstantinopel, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 617-618).

<sup>220</sup>Philip of Side (he is named after his birthplace in Pamphylien) was a priest by the middle of the 5<sup>th</sup> cent., in Constantinople, and he was a friend of John Chrysostom (Ep. 213). He campaigned three times to become the Patriarch of Constantinople [426, 428, 431] (cf. N. M. Borgengässer, Philippos v. Side, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 238).

<sup>221</sup>E. Schwartz, Konzilstudien: I. Cassian und Nestorius II. Über echte und unechte Schriften des Bischofs Proklos von Konstantinopel, Straßburg 1914, 19.

Alexandrian and Antiochian interpretation of Christology. But that makes only half of the problem. Therefore here we would like to speak a little about the political situation.

The resentment between the Eastern Roman Empire centered in Constantinople and the Western Roman Empire centered in Rome was experienced in theology (i. e., in the east, the interpretation of the Apocalypse of Daniel as bringing in the millennial kingdom with Constantinople as Capital), the establishment of rival apostolic lines of succession, and the development of the concept of primacy.<sup>222</sup> The movement of the capital from Rome to Constantinople [New Rome] on the Bosphorus by Constantine was an act of political strategy in order to save the Roman Empire. This created a split in the thinking of many in the Christian community, creating jealousy between Old Rome and New Rome. Constantine further exacerbated the tension between East and West by proclaiming himself as the ‘Proto-Apostolos’ meaning ‘first of the apostles,’ placing his tomb in the middle of the cenotaph of the Twelve Apostles in Constantinople.<sup>223</sup> This posed a threat to the claim of primacy in Rome and of course a threat to the Alexandrian Church for the second position after Rome. This would also mean that the new Rome, viz. Constantinople would be prime in honour after the old Rome, which means for Alexandria in turn a submission to the newly erected capital.

“Die zweite ökumenische Konzil (Konstantinopel 381) bedeutete mit seinem Kanon 3 für den Bischofssitz von Konstantinopel einen wichtigen Fortschritt, da es dem Bischof dieser Stadt einen Ehrenrang einräumte – den zweiten nach dem Alten Rom. Diese Entscheidung wurde damit begründet, daß Konstantinopel das ‘Neue Rom’ sei, doch wurde seine Jurisdiktion nicht näher festgelegt.”<sup>224</sup>

One is able to see the political advantage which could be gained by Pope Celestine siding with Cyril and vice versa against Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, of new Rome. Together with it, the evidence seems to suggest that there was an Antiochian community within Egypt before the Council of Ephesus and Nestorian sympathizers after the Council who were obstinate against the authority of Cyril. Thus the continued presence of monastic communities which credit their founding to a Nestorian called Isaac of Nineveh and which was sizeable in number would give *raison d’être* for Cyril’s actions. So Cyril sought means by which he could lessen or eliminate their influence. Besides, the enthusiasm of Nestorius<sup>225</sup> was also not looked upon too kindly. Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, during the Council of Ephesus specifically opposed Nestorius for pursuing these heretics into Ephesian ecclesiastical areas. Ephesus had suffered financially as an ecclesiastical center because of the importance of Constantinople.<sup>226</sup>

Relations between the Sees of Alexandria and Constantinople were not always strained. We will also find some evidences for good tie between both these Sees

<sup>222</sup>The Christian community, of course, was originally united, constituting one political organism, the Roman Empire, and one undivided church. But already in the first centuries of the Byzantine era, even before the foundation of Constantinople as the ‘new Rome’ in 330, certain differences - linguistic, cultural, and to a lesser extent religious - can be discerned between the Greek and Latin halves of Christendom (cf. D. J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom In Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History, Oxford 1966, 1).

<sup>223</sup>Cf. H. W. Haussig, *A History of Byzantine Civilization* (trans. J. M. Hussey), London 1966, 112.

<sup>224</sup>B. Flusin, *Organisation und Spirituelles Leben in der Reichskirche (5.-6. Jahrhundert)*, in: N. Brox, u. a., Hg., *Die Geschichte des Christentums: Dt. Ausgabe. Bd. 3. Der Lateinische Westen und der Byzantinische Osten*, (431-642), Freiburg 2005, 547.

<sup>225</sup>Cf. T. E. Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 84.

<sup>226</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 102.

although we find sufficient tug of war always between both Sees.<sup>227</sup> The conflict which took place between John of Chrysostom and Theophilus cannot be overlooked. “The rivalry between Antioch and Alexandria and also more recently between Constantinople and Alexandria was a major factor in Theophilus’ earlier attack on John Chrysostom.”<sup>228</sup> During the early period of Nestorius’s rule, he sought to establish a yearly festival at Constantinople in honour of John Chrysostom and tried to get Cyril’s consent to place John’s name in the Alexandrian diptychs. This occurred as late as 429 A. D. A letter from Nestorius to Cyril around 429 even refers to their mutual, previous ‘friendly relations,’ when Cyril was trying to dissuade Nestorius of his position on the use of the word ‘*theotokos*.’<sup>229</sup>

But on the whole from the way Cyril acts towards Nestorius we can conclude that he was a shrewd politician. He sought the support of the Roman Church and Pope Celestine threw his support behind the bishop of Alexandria. Of course, we would say that Nestorius also should have been prudent. Instead, he was too much self-confident about his own position and wrote rather airy letters to Rome explaining his position and requesting to be told the reason why certain prominent Pelagians who had been condemned as heretics ten or more years earlier at Rome and were refugees now at Constantinople must not be received into communion. These letters constituted fatal mistakes as he was under suspicion as a heretic and Rome considered him as one who showed a reprehensible tendency to question the doctrinal decisions of the Roman see in the case of other heretics.<sup>230</sup> A Roman synod was held in August 430 at which the teachings of Nestorius were condemned. Cyril held his own synod in Alexandria<sup>231</sup> that same year to rally supporters. The lot of Nestorius was a hard one. He had been handed over by the Pope to the tender mercies of his rival, Cyril; he had been summoned to accept within ten days under pain of deposition, not a papal definition, but a series of anathemas drawn up at Alexandria under the influence of Apollinarian forgeries. And after that period due to the commotion and inquietude between the two churches, emperor Theodosius decided to call a general council.

“Theodosius berief am 19. November 430, zehn Tage vor dem Empfang der alexandrinischen Abgesandten durch Nestorius, feierlich in Ephesus für Pfingsten des Jahres 431 (7. Juni) ein Konzil ein, zu dem die Metropolitanbischöfe mit einer kleinen Anzahl ihrer Suffragane eingeladen waren, um die eingetretene Unruhe zu beseitigen.”<sup>232</sup>

<sup>227</sup>Prior to the Council of Chalcedon, there existed no theological differences between the Church of Alexandria and the Churches of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem (cf. O. F. A. Meinardus, *Two Thousand Years of Coptic Christianity*, New York 1999, 52).

<sup>228</sup>W. C. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity from its origin to 451 C.C.*, Vol. 2, New York 1990, 192.

<sup>229</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 193.

<sup>230</sup>Cf. *Prestige, Fathers and Heretics*, 127.

<sup>231</sup>When Cyril shrewdly sent copies of one of the letters in which he clearly outlined his theological argument, to Aleppo and Antioch, Jerusalem and Rome, all branches of the Church were drawn into the controversy. Cyril summoned a local synod in Alexandria, which resulted in twelve anathemas against the principal tenets of Nestorius. Nestorius countered with twelve anathemas against Cyril’s pronouncements. It was a deadlock. Emperor Theodosius II. consequently summoned the first Council of Ephesus in 431 to settle the matter. Nestorius failed to appear. He was declared a heretic *in absentia*, excommunicated, and exiled to Kharga Oasis at Antioch (cf. J. Kamil, *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs: The Coptic Orthodox Church*, New York 2002, 182).

<sup>232</sup>Fraisse-Coué, *Die Theologische Diskussion zur Zeit Theodosius’ II.: Nestorius*. (Sechstes Kapitel), in: N. Brox, u. a., Hg., *Die Geschichte des Christentums. Religion - Politik - Kultur. Dt. Ausgabe. Bd. 2. Das Entstehen der einen Christenheit (250-430)*, Freiburg 1996, 590.

After the condemnation of Nestorius, the emperor, after much delay and hesitation, ratified its finding. It was confirmed by Pope Sixtus III.<sup>233</sup> As the whole council had not condemned him, but only a portion which had not awaited the arrival of the bishops from Antioch, Nestorius refused to recognize the jurisdiction of this incomplete number, and had consequently refused to appear or put in any defense. Nestorius disapproved the ratification and the confirmation of this Council and retired to his monastery at Antioch with dignity and apparent relief. His friends, John of Antioch and his party, at the wish of the Emperor, at the beginning of 433, joined hands with Cyril. The bishops who were suspected of being favorable to Nestorius were deposed. An edict of Theodosius II, 30 July 435, condemned his writings to be burnt. A few years later Nestorius was dragged from his retirement and banished to the Great Oasis in Egypt. He was at one time carried off by the Nubians (not the Blemmyes) in a raid, and was restored to the Thebaid with his hand and one rib broken. He gave himself up to the governor in order not to be accused of having fled. “After looking under the surface, it would seem that the schism that resulted from Chalcedon,<sup>234</sup> like the others that would follow centuries later in the Reformation, were largely political in nature, and not the result of true religious differences.”<sup>235</sup>

## 9. The Influence of Ancient Goddess Devotion and the Title *Theotokos*

Our study would be incomplete if we disregard concepts like goddess devotion, ‘*magna mater*’ etc., which were very important in the Ancient world and in the early church and consequently its connections with the title *Theotokos*. As this title caused a great deal of strife and struggle between both Patriarchs [Cyril and Nestorius] we may deal with it also in detail. First of all let us exhume the roots of the goddess devotion in the ancient world which may bring us to the prehistoric culture. A. L. Barstow finds that “one goddess with many roles in the prehistoric period. Although she was associated with many things, the goddess was primarily a symbol of fertility, as well as a source of material and spiritual power. The prehistoric goddess was depicted as faceless, without feet, unclothed, often large-breasted, sometimes pregnant, nursing a child or exposing her genitals.”<sup>236</sup>

---

<sup>233</sup>Sixtus III ([St., Feast 28 March] [31. 7. 432-19. 8. 440]) was a Roman. As a Roman priest he was considered at first as an ally of Pelagians. But when Zosimus published (418) his *Tractoria*, he publicly anathematized Pelagianism and made his rejection of it clear to its arch adversary Augustine. He was prominent among the Roman clergy and in correspondence with St. Augustine (Ep.191, 194). In the Nestorian struggle he endeavoured to restore peace in collaboration with Emperor Theodosius II (408-450). He insisted that John and others were only needed to accept the decisions of Ephesus and disavow Nestorius to be restored to communion. The unification formula of 433 drafted by Antiochians, which was accepted by Cyril, gave him great satisfaction. For the reconciliatory measures between the Patriarchs John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria he played a major role. He was succeeded by the first doctor of the Latin Church Leo I (cf. G. Schwaiger, Sixtus III, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 644).

<sup>234</sup>The controversial Council of Chalcedon which took place in 451 is regarded as a turning point in the ecclesiastical history. It caused the division into what are today labeled as ‘Chalcedonian’ and ‘non-Chalcedonian’ churches. Theological discussions became confused by misunderstandings, and the lack of knowledge of Greek by the Latin Church. The whole issue was charged because when, at the fifth session, the creed of Chalcedon affirmed ‘the equal parts of the human and divine Christ in one body, one being,’ far from ending the controversy rapidly boiled over (cf. Kamil, *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs*, 190).

<sup>235</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>236</sup>C. Olson, Introduction, in: C. Olson, ed., *The Book of the Goddess: Past and Present, and Introduction to her Religion*, Illinois 1983, 2.

The geography and climatic conditions of Mesopotamia heavily influenced the perceptions of the nature of divinities and of divine-human relations. Often subject to violent extremes of weather, that threatened the food supply, such as the scorching winds, torrential rains, recurrent drought, devastating floods, people thought it all caused due to the cosmic conflicts among divinities. “Thus the early religious literature of Mesopotamia reflects the rather fatalistic comprehension that humans were created almost as an afterthought by goddesses and gods in order to serve them in menial fashion, to feed and clothe them.”<sup>237</sup> So people thought that if they did some performances of rituals and sacrifices, divinities could be sufficiently reconciled or appeased to ensure an adequate food supply, avert natural and social disasters. They also felt that any pestilence or sickness which disturbed them was the cause of personal sin or by the failure to observe prescribed rituals for the propitiation of deities. People were accustomed to conceive divinity in anthropomorphic terms. Further, irrespective of whether a female or a male, deity was credited with the creation of the universe - in Mesopotamia, and they believed that the creator was usually female - it was most often the sexual union of goddesses and gods that organized the universe.

We find that everywhere goddesses were labeled as mother goddesses. For example, in S. N. Kramer’s account of the Sumerian myth about ‘The creation of Man,’ it is the goddess Ninmah who fashions human beings out of the earth: “Ninmah takes some clay which is over the abyss and fashions six different types of individuals, while (the god) Enki<sup>238</sup> decrees their fate and gives them bread to eat. In Hebrew scripture, Yahweh too makes Adam out of clay, and thus he is known as the Creator. But instead of calling Ninmah a creator, she is referred to as a mother goddess.”<sup>239</sup> In Hindu religion also we find this sort of thought pattern. According to Hindus the concept Brahman<sup>240</sup> or sacred power may be thought of as essential life energy, whereas *śrī*<sup>241</sup> is the quality of how that life force is manifested in the world and acquired a specific identity as a goddess. Complementary to the concept of *śrī* the concept of Brahman is transformed into the idea of the impersonal soul of the universe.

“Before the goddess *Śrī* appeared in Indic literature, the concept of majesty remained an abstract notion. Linked with auspiciousness, it was something highly sought after in the prayers and propitiations of the Vedas, the earliest texts of Indian civilization, and it was called *śrī*. *Śrī* can be translated as majesty, prosperity,

<sup>237</sup>J. Ochshorn, *Ishtar and Her Cult*, in: C. Olson, ed., *The Book of the Goddess*, 17.

<sup>238</sup>He is the Lord of the Earth and a god in Sumerian mythology; patron god of the city of Eridu and later the influence of his cult spread throughout Mesopotamia and to the Canaanites, Hittites and Hurrians (cf. BE 6, Mannheim 1988).

<sup>239</sup>B. Moon and E. Benard, (ed.), *Goddesses who rule*, New York 2000, 5.

<sup>240</sup>In Veda Brahman was the name given to the spiritual power. Since it is eternal and infinite, it comprises the only truth. For this reason ‘truth is one’ and all is Brahman. It means the power to grow, expand and self-altering process. In Upanishad Brahman is considered as the Absolute, the ground of all existence and from whom the universe emerged. He was defined as the infinite Being, infinite Consciousness, and infinite Bliss (Sat-chid-ananda: Truth-consciousness-Bliss) (cf. H. P. Müller, *Brahman*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 2, Freiburg 1994, 627-628).

<sup>241</sup>Sri Lakshmi is the female goddess of India associated with wealth and prosperity (both material and spiritual), light, wisdom, fortune, generosity, courage and fertility. She is the embodiment of beauty, grace and charm. From epic time she is the wife of Lord Vishnu. Her Emblem is lotus (because of this she has a byname Kamala and Padma). In art she is portrayed as the one who sits or stands on a blossoming Lotus with a lotus flower in her hand and at other times she is also portrayed with other attributes like fruit and pot in her hands. She is also named as Gajalakshmi (cf. BE 13, Mannheim 1990, 11).

fullness, auspiciousness, abundance, loveliness, illustriousness, and well-being. In the splendor that is śrī, lies the power to eradicate debility, to illuminate darkness, to flood a hollow and meaningless void with light, fluidity, and consciousness. Śrī is radiance - the bright sparkling of the sun and the cool luminescence of the moon. Śrī is the luxurious bounty of the earth. Śrī is the force of creativity and the impetus behind a flourishing creation.”<sup>242</sup>

To quote Benard again

“In much the same way the goddess Lakṣmī makes her first appearance in the Vedas as an impersonal concept. Whereas this term later developed into a separate, or rather, an additional identity as the goddess called Lakṣmī. Śrī and Lakṣmī seem originally to have been two independent goddesses, but as their personalities and mythologies developed, the two were conflated into one goddess with a singular identity.”<sup>243</sup>

After having dealt with the Mesopotamian and Indian goddess’ concept let us look into a belief which was very prevalent in the Egyptian world.

“The myth of Osiris, Isis and Horus is one of the most poignant and probably the most well-known of ancient Egypt. Surviving in oral tradition and variably recounted over the centuries, it has come down to us in many versions and with many contradictions. It is appropriate to describe it as reflected in Christianity for several reasons. First, because the institutions of family ideals found its earliest expression in the Pharaohs myth. Second, because it provides evidence of the early worship of relics. And finally because the tales of Isis’ devotion to her son Horus whom she brought up secretly in the marshes of the Delta parallel Mary’s protection of the Christ child in Egypt.”<sup>244</sup>

Let us consider more in detail about the Egyptian goddess Isis who is immediately connected with our topic. “Isis,<sup>245</sup> like Demeter in Greece, is a goddess of mysteries. Her cult spread as far as Rome. Isis is the goddess of earth and moon. She is the sister-wife of Osiris and plays the most significant role in his resurrection.”<sup>246</sup> We have a picturized explanation of this myth in the below given quotation.

“Seth the brother of Osiris who married Nephthys<sup>247</sup> was jealous of Osiris’ good fortune. It seems that he had set his eyes on Isis, whose beauty and sexuality were so enchanting to him that he changed himself into a bull and, not being able to catch her, ejaculated. Since Seth was obviously not able to steal Osiris’ wife he schemed to steal his kingdom. Therefore during the great banquet for deities, Seth offered a wonderful coffin as a gift to whomever would fit in it. Since earlier he had paid the servants to take Osiris’ measurements secretly, there was no doubt for whom this coffin was designed. And the story proceeds as Osiris trying the coffin

<sup>242</sup>Moon and Bernard, Goddesses who rule, 133.

<sup>243</sup>Ibid., 135.

<sup>244</sup>Kamil, Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs, 14.

<sup>245</sup>Isis and Osiris, are Egyptian couple gods (Götterpaar), and Parents of Horus. Osiris’ sister-wife is worshipped as the goddess of magic and the faithful caring wife and mother who helps Horus to achieve the throne, who was deprived and persecuted by Seth the tormentor. The picture of Isis with the child on her breast is an iconographic model for the mother lactating. In the Roman time she was the most worshipped Egyptian goddess. Osiris is the god of dying and again resurgent nature (cf. H. Brunner, Isis u. Osiris, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 620).

<sup>246</sup>D. A. Leeming, The World of Myth, New York 1990, 97.

<sup>247</sup>Egyptian Nebet-hut: is an Egyptian goddess, helper of her sister Isis who with her sister for the deceased Osiris mourned. She is presented in the Egyptian hieroglyphs (Housewife) as ‚Lady of the House’ wearing a headdress in the shape of a house and basket and in one hand a papyrus stalk and the other sign of life (cf. BE 15, Mannheim 1991, 438).

which fits him like an old shoe. Promptly Seth sealed it and threw it into the waters of the Nile with the king of the earth still inside. Osiris drowned and with his passing away, the concept of death was born. Isis, the great magician and devoted wife, was looking for his body to resurrect him. Knowing this Seth snatched the body again and to prevent the magic of Isis, he cut it into many pieces which he then spread it all over Egypt. Thus the worship of Osiris spread all over Egypt. But Isis did not give up. With the help of her sister, Nephthys, she was able to retrieve almost all the parts of her husband's scattered body. Miraculously, or rather with the help of her great magic, Isis was able to restore Osiris, enough to conceive a child, Horus, with him. Although through his death Osiris lost his earthly kingdom, through his resurrection he claimed the kingdom of the Nether World."<sup>248</sup>

In addition Isis, one of the most powerful goddesses of Egypt, was a personification or an embodiment of the throne of Egypt. Isis was worshipped as the mother-goddess because she was perceived as the symbolic mother of the Egyptian pharaoh.<sup>249</sup> At this point we ought to quote P. Berger: "Among the Egyptians (and later among the Greeks and Romans), Isis was worshipped as the great divine mother of all nature. The most ancient Egyptian documents reveal that she was identified as the goddess from whom all becoming arose."<sup>250</sup> She was also considered as the deity of the earth, or rather of the soil fructified by the Nile. Tradition held that the sowing of wheat, barley and flax was among the skills Isis taught to humankind, and she was consequently known as the woman of bread, beer, and green fields. She was considered responsible for the rebirth of vegetation and the prosperity of Egypt. By the time of Herodotus her personality grew more and more potent and she became the primary goddess incontestable. During the Ptolemaic and Roman times she was conceived as the universal power, or, as she is evoked in Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*, "the mother of Nature, the mistress of all the elements, the first offspring of time, highest of deities, queen of the Underworld, foremost among the gods of Heaven, in whose divine appearance all gods and goddesses are fused."<sup>251</sup> There are evidence for the co-existence of pagan and Christian customs and traditions.

"For centuries, pagan and Christian festivals existed side by side, and even after Emperor Theodosius took measures to terminate all forms of Pharaonic (pagan) worship and ritual in the fourth century, only in the reign of Justinian (527- 65) was the Graeco-Roman temple of the goddess Isis on Philae, south of Aswan, officially closed. By that time Egypt's most beloved goddess was closely associated with the Holy Virgin."<sup>252</sup>

In order to understand the socio-political environment in which Christianity spread, it is necessary to stress "the Egyptian society which was traditionally characterized by a high level of cultural integration and religious tolerance ... Christianity shared many aspects with the mystery cults of Egypt and the Hellenistic world, especially the central mystery concerning the resurrection of the body and the afterlife."<sup>253</sup>

---

<sup>248</sup>E. Wasilewska, *Creation Stories of the Middle East*, Philadelphia 2000, 100.

<sup>249</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 99.

<sup>250</sup>P. Berger, *The Goddess Obscured: Transformation of the Grain Protectress from Goddess to Saint*, Boston 1985, 14.

<sup>251</sup>Berger, *The Goddess Obscured*, 15.

<sup>252</sup>Kamil, *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs*, 14.

<sup>253</sup>*Ibid.*, 67.



This concept viz. the Isis cult with which the Egyptian Christianity was well-knit, was also known to Nestorius. He thought that when Cyril of Alexandria mentioned about Mother Goddess that he was referring to one of the ancient goddesses prevalent in Egypt. It seems appropriate to give a quotation from Kamil.

“When Emperor Theodosius prohibited the placing of wreaths, the crown of justification - made of olive leaves, blue lotus flowers and corn flowers (as found on the forehead of King Tutankhamun’s first mummiform coffin and on anthropoid coffins of Late Period) - on statues, and burning incense before them, soon enough floral decorations were laid and candles lit before icons of saints and martyrs. The Eastern Roman Church of Constantinople may at first have looked askance (skeptical) at such acts, which rang strongly of paganism, and, indeed, to the Old Testament commandment against the making graven images. But in Egypt, a Byzantine province with its long tradition of religious themes inscribed or painted on walls, icons were eventually legitimized as ‘teaching devices’ necessary to an understanding of the faith. The fifteenth - century Arab historian El-Maqrizi remembered that Cyril of Alexandria authorized such paintings in all the churches of Alexandria and later, in the year 420, issued another decree permitting them in the other churches of Egypt as well. Such major feasts as the Nativity, Flight into Egypt, Baptism, Passion and Crucifixion of Christ, and his Resurrection and Ascension became subjects of the ‘histories’ icons for public veneration. Devotional icons of Christ himself, the Virgin Mary and Child and the saints proliferated in private.”<sup>254</sup>

Together with this Isis cult let us also familiarize ourselves with a “goddess called Cybele, a deity known as Magna Mater or the Great Mother whose worship was introduced into Rome from Asia Minor in 204 B. C.”<sup>255</sup> In Gaul the cult of mother goddess can be traced back as far as the Neolithic period. As Celts moved into Western Europe they inherited the belief of Neolithic systems, elements that included the belief in a mother goddess, protectress of vegetation. Later as Roman influence took hold in Celtic regions, the Celts began to fashion their mother goddess images in stone and in other permanent materials. Therefore from the period of Roman invasion images of the mother goddess appeared throughout Gaul and Germania as well as in the British Isles.<sup>256</sup> It is interesting to note that sometimes two or more goddesses were grouped together and at other times the figure was alone. So these mother goddess figures were syncretized with Demeter, Tellus/Ceres, and the Great Mother Cybele and some of them were used as household goddesses, occupying niches in domestic shrines and others as the focal point of a community procession or ceremonial.<sup>257</sup>

As the agricultural practices began to supersede, so to say, gathering as a means of obtaining plant food, the Earth Mother gradually lost importance or developed into the Corn Mother, the Great Goddess, whose concern is planting and harvesting. “Demeter, who supplanted Gaia in importance in Greece, is the best known of the Great Goddesses, but she has counterparts in such figures as the Roman Ceres, the many-breasted Artemis at Ephesus, Cybele, the *Magna Mater* of Phrygia, the Devi in her various forms in India, Isis in Egypt, and Inanna-Ishtar in Mesopotamia.”<sup>258</sup>

---

<sup>254</sup>Ibid., 163.

<sup>255</sup>Berger, *The Goddess Obscured*, 27.

<sup>256</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 29.

<sup>257</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 30.

<sup>258</sup>Leeming, *The World of Myth*, 134.

The goddess images in the ancient world paved a great annoyance to the Christian religion as it tried to connect to Mother Mary. And it was deplorable that these images impeded extensively in all the areas where the Gospel was preached. We know that the Jews and later the Muslims refused to represent God in a human form due to its incapability of representing an infinite by a finite or perfect by an imperfect. Actually, in earliest times Christianity also tolerated only the image of fish, Greek name [ἰχθύς], representing Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior, in an esoteric sense of the fish as the creature of the earliest origin, and thus capable of signifying ‘creator god.’<sup>259</sup> As Christianity was not able to obstruct all the pressure from outside in stopping the adoption of certain images of the ancient world, it incorporated some of them by baptizing it. “By the third century C. E., the system of beliefs of the cult of the Magna Mater had evolved from its original nature worship into a sophisticated system of spiritual beliefs that represented to contemporary Christians a major competitive religious ideology.”<sup>260</sup> In the words of Markale

“It is only in about the fourth century when, unable to eliminate the too-pervasive representational images around the first churches, there would be an attempt to recover certain ones and attribute entirely Christian overtones to them. This was the case with the Virgin Mary, and surely we must acknowledge that the image of the Mother of God owes much to Cybele, with equal regard to form as to context.”<sup>261</sup>

According to legendary tradition solidly maintained throughout the centuries, it is Saint Luke the Evangelist who painted the first portrait of the Virgin.<sup>262</sup> According to history the first images in which Mary appears are in the churches of Syria and the Near East. From there, they migrated to the West, following the trade routes and arriving into the Celtic regions. Immediately after the Council of Ephesus Pope Sixtus III (432-440) transformed an ancient Roman structure into an official sanctuary to Mary, the Santa Maria Maggiore basilica. Thereafter we find the tendencies in France also to dedicate all the churches and cathedrals to Virgin Mary.<sup>263</sup> In this context we must be also aware what happened in the Egyptian Church.

“Although King Theodosius the emperor outlawed all the paganism and closed all the temples during his reign in 379 the Egyptians saw in Mary and her divine son, their own beloved Isis and her son Horus. There is no doubt that the Holy virgin holds as prominent a place in the Coptic Church of today, as did the goddess Isis in the temple at Philae. Each was a mother figure who protected her son from those who wished him ill. Just as Pharaonic priests shuffled their way out of the sacred sanctuary of the temple of Isis on Philae during the spring and autumn festivals in her honour, so does Bishop Mikhail and his white-robed deacons at Durunka bear the icon of the Holy Virgin to carry in procession before adoring pilgrims. Theotokos, (mother of God) occupies a special place in the hearts of Copts. Since pagan worship was only outlawed in the fourth century, perhaps the switch in devotion from Isis to Mary was never consciously made, at least not on the popular level.”<sup>264</sup>

<sup>259</sup>Cf. J. Markale, *The Great Goddess: Reverence of the Divine Feminine from the Paleolithic to the Present*, (trans. J. Gladding), Vermont 1999, 108.

<sup>260</sup>M. R. Salzman, *Magna Mater: Great Mother of the Roman Empire*, in: C. Olson, ed., *The Book of the Goddess*, 60.

<sup>261</sup>Markale, *The Great Goddess*, 108.

<sup>262</sup>Cf. Markale, *The Great Goddess*, 110.

<sup>263</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 111.

<sup>264</sup>Kamil, *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs*, 18.

Therefore Nestorius defended against the idea of ‘*Theotokos*’ which was taught by an Egyptian Patriarch, namely, Cyril of Alexandria. It is not a surprise that Nestorius suspects in his formula of *Theotokos* also some cultic nuances. Some of Nestorius’ critics claim that his unwillingness to designate Mary the Virgin as *Theotokos* without qualification indicates that he failed to grasp fully well the implications of the *communicatio idiomatum* (ἀντίδοσις τῶν ἰδιωμάτων or ὀνομάτων). Another interesting element to note is that the conflict over the *Theotokos* title was not originated by Nestorius.<sup>265</sup> As he took charge of Constantinople as the Patriarch, there came to him members of two factions, some calling Mary ‘Mother of God,’ the others insisting on ‘Mother of Man.’ Both these groups expected a fair hearing from the new Patriarch. Instead of their title and in order to pacify these two groups Nestorius gave them the new title ‘*Christotokos*,’ Mother of Christ.<sup>266</sup> One of the parties found that the new title was nothing other than a slur against Mary. This party was helped when Anastasius, the new bishop’s [i.e., Nestorius’] domestic chaplain, declared in a sermon in the Great Church: “Let no one call Mary *Theotokos*. She was a human being, and it is impossible that God was born of a human.”<sup>267</sup> And Nestorius did not withhold his support from Anastasius due to the fact that in large part he found an excessive worship and near-deification of Mary in the title ‘*Theotokos*.’<sup>268</sup>

And all the more the criticism of Nestorius against Pulcheria,<sup>269</sup> the empress, worsened the situation. The Patriarch was aware of the vow of chastity she made and at the same time having adulterous sexual relations with numerous men.<sup>270</sup> Therefore he stopped honoring Pulcheria as the bride of Christ in his prayers for the imperial house. Nestorius also refused to continue Sisinnius’<sup>271</sup> practice of entertaining Pulcheria and her women after Sunday communion for dinner in the Episcopal palace.<sup>272</sup> Along with it he effaced Pulcheria’s portrait above the altar of the Great Church and removed her robe from the holy table, where it had served as an altar-covering during communion. Another dramatic confrontation between Pulcheria and Nestorius took place during an Easter Sunday, five days after Nestorius was ordained bishop of Constantinople. As it was customary Pulcheria appeared at the gate of the sanctuary of the Great Church, expecting to take communion within the presence of

<sup>265</sup>Cf. Fraisse-Coué, Die Theologische Diskussion zur Zeit Theodosius’ II.: Nestorius, in: N. Brox, u. a., Hg., Die Geschichte des Christentums. Religion - Politik - Kultur. Dt. Ausgabe. Bd. 2. Das Entstehen der einen Christenheit (250-430), Freiburg 1996, 578.

<sup>266</sup>Cf. Loofs, Nestorius and his place in the history of Christian Doctrine, 28-31 (in reference to PG 83, 436).

<sup>267</sup>Cited from Holum, Theodosian Emperresses, 154 referring to Soc.7, 32. 1-2 (ACO I, I, 1, 110; 7, 96).

<sup>268</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 154.

<sup>269</sup>Aelia P. Augusta (St., feast 10 Sept.) byz. Empress was born on 19. 1. 399 in Constantinople as the daughter of Emperor Arcadius and Eudoxia and died in the year 453 July. Together with her sisters Arcadia and Eudoxia she made a vow of virginity and gifted a major share of their wealth for the social purposes. In the Christological dispute she dedicated much of her time over the title *Theotokos* and she fought against Nestorius and worked with Cyril of Alexandria. Together with Leo I. she prepared the ground for the Council of Chalcedon and in all probability she is said to have attended 6 sessions of the council (cf. E. Grünbeck, Pulcheria, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 742).

<sup>270</sup>Cf. Holum, Theodosian Emperresses, 153.

<sup>271</sup>Sisinnius († 24 December 427) was the Patriarch of Constantinople from 426 to 427 (Socr. H. E. 7, 26, 4). He was preceded by Atticus and succeeded by Nestorius. He was a priest loved very much by the people of the city due to his virtues and thus people proposed him as the candidate to the see of Patriarchate against Philip of Side and Proclus [Socr. H. E. 7, 26, 2] (cf. F. Winkelmann, Sisinnios, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 635).

<sup>272</sup>Cf. Fraisse-Coué, Die Theologische Diskussion zur Zeit Theodosius’ II.: Nestorius, in: N. Brox, u. a., Hg., Die Geschichte des Christentums. Religion - Politik - Kultur. Dt. Ausgabe. Bd. 2. Das Entstehen der einen Christenheit (250-430), Freiburg 1996, 589.

the priests and her brother, the emperor. The archdeacon Peter informed Nestorius of her custom and immediately the bishop hurried in order to stop her from entering the Holy of Holies. The reason for the unworthiness of Pulcheria, according to Nestorius, was her adulterous sexual relations. And later the feast conducted in the Great Church of Constantinople, where Proclus<sup>273</sup> delivered a panegyric on the Virgin Mary *Theotokos*, must be seen against the background of Pulcheria's quarrel with Nestorius and her rising anger over his attacks on the title *Theotokos*.<sup>274</sup> It was not motivated by a right theological perception. The historical side of it was that she was able to win the *voces populi* to her advantage against her enemy Nestorius.

By the end of 428, or at latest in the early part of 429, Nestorius preached the first of his famous sermons against the word *Theotokos*, and detailed his Antiochian doctrine of the Incarnation. The first to raise his voice against it was Eusebius,<sup>275</sup> a layman, afterwards Bishop of Dorylaeum and the accuser of Eutyches.<sup>276</sup> Two priests of the city, Philip and Proclus, who had both been unsuccessful candidates for the patriarchate, preached against Nestorius. Philip, known as Sidetes, from Side,<sup>277</sup> his birthplace, author of a vast and discursive history now lost, accused the patriarch of heresy. Proclus (who was to succeed later in his candidature) preached a flowery, but perfectly orthodox sermon, yet extant, to which Nestorius replied in an extempore discourse, which also we possess. All this naturally caused great excitement at Constantinople, especially among the clergy, who were clearly not well disposed towards the stranger from Antioch.

Although today we are very clear that Mary the mother of Jesus is not a goddess but rather a holy being placed in the church more than any other saints, in those days when Christianity took its form, Mary was also considered as a counterpart of these various goddesses existed in various parts of the world especially to Egyptian goddess Isis. "It was Isis who provided much of the iconography, as well as the popular piety, that fueled the Christian cult of Mary that began to arise in Egypt in the third century A. D."<sup>278</sup> E. A. Matter in the edited book *The book of the Goddess* notes that

"Mary certainly fits neatly into the protective and sustaining role of ancient Near-Eastern fertility goddesses; her devotees may also have borrowed trappings from classical goddesses to clothe the Christian queen of heaven. This was to be expected in cities such as Ephesus, where fervor for the local Diana of the Ephesians gave way very quickly to equally deep devotion to Mary."<sup>279</sup>

<sup>273</sup>Although Proclus was ordained bishop of Cyzicus by Sisinnius, he was not able to enter his see because of the local clergy and populace who elevated their own candidate (cf. Holum, *Theodosian Emperors*, 155).

<sup>274</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 156.

<sup>275</sup>Eusebius Bp. of Dorylaeum (Phrygia: now Turkey) was a layman of high rank, rhetor, and lawyer in Constantinople. He began publicly to speak against the newly elected Patriarch of Constantinople, viz., Nestorius in 430 when he started, [according to Eusebius], interpreting falsely the title 'Theotokos' (God-bearer). He took part in the Chalcedonian council and later in the year 448 was made bishop of Dorylaeum (cf. Kannengiesser, *Eusebius Bp. v. Dorylaion*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 1010).

<sup>276</sup>He was a Monophysite monk, 370/378 in Constantinople. He was zealous fighter against Nestorianism. He was accused as a Monophysite by Eusebius of Dorylaeum. Later he was condemned as heretic and displaced from his position by Flavian the patriarch of Constantinople (cf. Hainthaler, *Monophysitismus, Monophysiten*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 418-423).

<sup>277</sup>It lies in the east of Antalya, Turkey. This ancient city was established on the Mediterranean coast of southwestern Turkey. It is believed to be founded by the Greek settler Attalos II the King, developed during the Roman time as one of the important harbours and as an important commercial town of Pamphylia (cf. BE 20, Mannheim 1993, 238).

<sup>278</sup>R. R. Ruether, *Woman guides: Readings toward a Feminist Theology*, Boston 1985, 5.

<sup>279</sup>E. A. Matter, *The Virgin Mary: A Goddess?* in: C. Olson, *The Book of the Goddess*, 91.

We read in the work of Leeming that

“in her Christian form - that of the Madonna - she has lost the dark side, just as the old Hebrew Yahweh - whose treatment of Job and of Abraham and Isaac, for example, is at least morally questionable - gives way in Christianity to a God who contains no evil. If the Christian Madonna is a Great Mother unblemished by evil, however, the Great Goddess of the East remains realistically ambiguous.”<sup>280</sup>

Markale is certainly right when he suggests that “in fact it was impossible to erase the image of the Great Goddess of so many names, crystallized in this epoch under the two principle ones of Isis and Cybele.”<sup>281</sup> Markale goes on to say that it was not by mere chance the doctrinal position on *Theotokos* was decided in Ephesus, since this city had been dedicated to the worship of the Great Goddess since early antiquity. Once again he asserts that “by the same token, there have been serious attempts to find the house that the Virgin Mary supposedly inhabited - in the company of the apostle John - in that very same city. Where can the Mother of God be better honored than in the citadel of the ancient goddess of the Near East?”<sup>282</sup> We cannot be astonished by the solemn acceptance of the *Theotokos* dogma during the famous council of Ephesus.

We state this theory which was prevalent in the formulation of Christianity not to disapprove anything related to the devotion to the Virgin Mary but to affirm that Nestorius who was also familiar with the Egyptian cult practices wanted to denounce in any way making Virgin Mary another goddess, prevalent in Egyptian cultic religion, through the term *Theotokos*. Let us look into a dialogue which took place between Campbell and Moyers in the book *The Power of Myth*: Moyers raises the doubt to Campbell asking whether the Christian fathers took the image of Isis? In answer to this Campbell replies: “Definitely. They say so themselves. Read the text where it is declared that those forms which were merely mythological forms in the past are now actual and incarnate in our Savior.”<sup>283</sup> And further Moyers asks whether it was for the first time that Mary was proclaimed to be the mother of God when the council of Ephesus met in the year 431 after the death of Christ. Campbell answers his question with a negation and puts it this way

“the argument had been going on in the Church for some time. But the place where this decision was made, at Ephesus, happened at that time to be the greatest temple city in the Roman Empire of the Goddess Artemis, or Diana. And there is a story that when the council was in session, arguing this point, the people of Ephesus formed picket lines and shouted in praise of Mary, ‘The Goddess, the Goddess, of course she’s the Goddess.’”<sup>284</sup>

Besides in the article of Schwartz he makes it clear that, to the question of the emperor, Nestorius answers that *Theotokos* is not a word to be quarreled upon as it is not a dogmatic thesis to be proved as it was customarily used as a cult word. From the below given quotation two things are clear that the focal point of Nestorius was not to prove whether Mary was *Theotokos* rather he wanted to prove that Christ is fully human and divine and secondly that the Alexandrians assumed the title *Theotokos* as a cult word.

“Dagegen wurde dem Patriarchen [Nestorius] gefährlich der Streit, der bald nach seiner Inthronisation über die Frage ausbrach, ob es zulässig sei, die Jungfrau Maria

<sup>280</sup>Leeming, *The World of Myth*, 134-135.

<sup>281</sup>Markale, *The Great Goddess*, 107.

<sup>282</sup>*Ibid.*, 106.

<sup>283</sup>J. Campbell, *The Power of Myth*, New York 1988, 179.

<sup>284</sup>*Ibid.*, 180.

θεοτόκος, ‚Gottbegebäerin‘ zu nennen. Auch in diesem Falle bot nicht eine Lehre als Ganzes, keine dogmatische These den Anstoß zum Streit, sondern ein Kultwort.<sup>285</sup>

It has been observed by Giebel what had been done by Cyril himself in Alexandria. “Es war Patriarch Kyrillos von Alexandrien gewesen, als Anführer der ägyptischen Kleriker, der es auf dem Konzil durchsetzte, dass Maria künftig als die Gottesgebäerin galt. Er hatte zuvor, worauf R. Merkelbach hinweist, ein Heilzentrum der Isis ‚umgewidmet‘, in dem er die Stätte einem christlichen Märtyrer weihte.”<sup>286</sup> This action of Cyril tells us very clearly that at the time of his episcopate also Isis cult was prevalent in Alexandria and it was a constant threat to Christianity. Nestorius tells very clearly that he has nothing against calling Mary Theotokos but it must be done with care: “Er erklärt, daß er nichts dagegen habe, wenn einer in Einfalt oder in besonderer Freude den Thetokos-Namen gebrauche. Nur macht die Jungfrau nicht zur Göttin! warnt er.”<sup>287</sup> In the book of L. Langener *Isis lactans - Maria lactans* we find innumerable examples how Isis lactans later became Maria lactans.

“Unter den ptolemäischen [305-30 v. Chr.] und römischen Kaisern ist das Epitheton ‚von Isis geliebt‘ häufig. Wie der im der Koptischen Museum Kairo, erfaßte Silberring<sup>288</sup> beweist, war der Isiskult in Ägypten noch bis in das 4.-5. Jh. n. Chr. hinein lebendig, wie auch die späte Schließung des Isistempels in Philae im Jahre 540 n. Chr. beweist ... Die Isisverehrung ist seit dem 2. Jh. v. Chr. in den Hafenstädten Campaniens nachweisbar, in denen ägyptische Geschäfts- und Seeleute lebten.”<sup>289</sup>

Langener offers numerous examples of the same phenomenon

“Als archäologische Zeugen für die Anrufung Mariens als Gottesgebäerin in Ägypten sind die Grabstele des Priesters und Urkundenschreibers Marinos aus dem 4.-5. Jh., das Holzapaneel der Mu‘allaqa-Kirche aus dem 5.-6. Jh. und das Holzbrett Würzburg Isis-Thermuthis lactans aus dem 8. Jh. zu nennen ... Neben der Bezeichnung Mariens als Gottesgebäerin belegen die konvertierenden Ägypter daher Maria auch analog mit dem Titel Gottesmutter.”<sup>290</sup>

All these various studies show us that in Alexandria there was a time when people held the concept of mother goddess or *Theotokos* as equivalent to Isis. And from the above given quotation it is clear that Alexandrian faithful worshipped Isis as their mother goddess. So in this situation it was necessary for Cyril of Alexandria, the then Patriarch, and Alexandrian Church to find a substitute-figure in the person of Mary, the mother of God.

Wie die Zusammenstellung von Übereinstimmungen und Unterschieden (auch unter Berücksichtigung der profanen Belege gezeigt hat), greifen die sakralen Belege der Isis - und Maria lactans auf die Vorbilder zurück, die sich bereits seit dem Alten Reich im profanen Bereich ausgeprägt vorfinden. Das bedeutet also, daß die Ikonologie der Maria lactans nicht durch schriftliche Belege, sondern direkt

<sup>285</sup>Schwartz, Zur Vorgeschichte des ephesinischen Konzils, in: HZ 112/3 (1914), 249.

<sup>286</sup>M. Giebel, Nur für Eingeweihte - Die Mysterienkulte in der griechisch-römischen Welt, Isis, Zeus und Christus, in: Welt und Umwelt der Bibel, Archäologie - Kunst - Geschichte 3 (2002), 21.

<sup>287</sup>Cited from L. Langener, *Isis lactans - Maria lactans: Untersuchungen zur koptischen Ikonographie*, Altenberge 1996, 131-32 referring to *Nestoriana*, Fragment 3, S. 353, Z. 18.

<sup>288</sup>Koptisches Museum, Kairo: The silver ring seems to have originated from 4-5 cent. A. D. Besides this jewelry, it contained also other items of jewelry namely a gold coin with the portrait of Emperor Valens from 364-378 A. D. (cf. Langener, *Isis lactans - Maria lactans*, 261).

<sup>289</sup>*Ibid.*, 96-97.

<sup>290</sup>*Ibid.*, 279.

durch die ägyptische Ikonographie angeregt wurde ... Die Lactatio Jesu orientiert sich direkt an den zahlreichen Belegen der Lactatio Horus, die auch in den Belegen der von Göttinnen gestillten Pharaonen wieder aufgegriffen wird. Demonstrierten einerseits die von Göttinnen gestillten Pharaonen auf diese Weise ihren Anspruch als Göttersohn, demonstrierte Jesus andererseits so seinen Anspruch als Menschensohn.<sup>291</sup>

Langener observed:

„Die Darstellung der thronenden Maria, flankiert von Assistenzfiguren, scheint von byzantinischen Königshof-Szenen beeinflusst worden zu sein ... Es zeigt eine thronende Herrscherin unter einem Baldachin, umgeben von Höflingen, die unterschiedliche Funktionen ausüben ... Über der Thronbank schweben nun die beiden Engel zu beiden Seiten Mariens, wobei sie mit den inneren angehobenen Flügeln eine Art Baldachin über ihrem Haupt bilden. Diese sehr ungewöhnliche Art der Auszeichnung Mariens ist anscheinend nur im Bereich der koptischen Kunst anzutreffen ...<sup>292</sup>

These various quotations above cited compel us to reach the conclusion that in the Alexandrian Church people found in Mary their ancient Isis and adored her. Therefore it was necessary for Cyril to stop people visiting the temples of Isis immediately after the holy services by substituting the Mother of God in place of Isis. Roman church has always made it clear that she is not to be worshipped like her Son who is the second person in the Trinity but rather to be venerated.

Here it may give us some more clarity on this issue if we go through the words of E. A. Matter who says that “no religion is defined by theologians alone, the practice of the pious often takes its own course, and can sometimes be strong enough to draw theological theory after it. This is the case with devotion to Mary; in no other realm of Christian theology does theory so closely, and it may even be said, so unwillingly, follow practice.”<sup>293</sup> And today we know the Fathers of the church reworked at the cult practices of the ancient image of the goddess and there reemerged the cult of the *Theotokos*, the Mother of God, which the council of Ephesus will finally decide to make official in 431.

“It was perfectly normal to present to the new Christians this serene and welcoming image of a mother who, not being in the least bit a goddess, was no less the Mother of God ... Moreover, it was necessary, because the first Christian zealots, as much in Europe as on the coasts of Asia, felt no discomfort at all leaving a church where they had attended Mass to rush off to a temple dedicated to one goddess or another.”<sup>294</sup>

In Egypt existed even three hundred years after the arrival of Christianity also customs of annual festival offering sacrifices to various gods.

“When Alexander (313-326/28A.D) became the Coptic Patriarch he decided to destroy that idol [in the temple of Caesar which was built by Cleopatra, stood a large copper idol called Mercury] but the people of Alexandria revolted against his decision saying, ‘we have been accustomed to celebrating the idol’s festival. Twelve patriarchs have sat on that throne and not one of them dared to make us abandon that custom.’<sup>295</sup>

---

<sup>291</sup>Ibid., 273.

<sup>292</sup>Ibid., 177.

<sup>293</sup>Matter, *The Virgin Mary: A Goddess?*, 81.

<sup>294</sup>Markale, *The Great Goddess*, 106-107.

<sup>295</sup>J. Tagher, *Christians in Muslim Egypt: An Historical Study of the Relations between Copts and Muslims from 640 to 1922*, Altenberge 1998, 1 (in the preface the author tells that he is neither a Muslim nor a Copt whereas a

We have dealt with this topic at length due to the reason of its importance at least for Nestorius. The life of the Patriarch of Constantinople was brought to naught by his adjacent Patriarch by giving undue importance to this term and through a misinterpretation of what the other has not even dreamed of. Cyril has found in the refusal of Nestorius to call Mary Theotokos a serious threat to Christianity. But today we know that Nestorius' thrust was to free Mother Mary of cultism and popular pietism. What we have discussed above is not to mislead anyone regarding the devotion to Our Lady rather in order to make clear one of the problems which both Cyril and Nestorius faced immediately in their life. This is the context in which Nestorius and Cyril lived. Therefore it is not surprising to think that Nestorius had ever doubted whether Cyril or the Egyptian people have a true understanding of Virgin Mary, the mother of God, whose title he compelled him to accept, namely *Theotokos*.

### 10. The History of Nestorius – Question and Modern Study

At the time of the Council of Ephesus, the Church did not possess a theological method which would make possible a scientific judgment on the kerygma of Nestorius. There was neither the ability nor the inclination to investigate the Patriarch's [Nestorius] basic ideas and concepts. And unfortunately the condemnation of Nestorius which was expressed at Ephesus has ever been confirmed from time to time by various popes.

“By pope Hormisdas in his *Libellus professionis fidei* of 517; by the Second and Third Councils of Constantinople in 533 and 680/1; by the Lateran Council under Martin I in 649; by Eugenius IV in the Decree for the Jacobites (4. II. 1441 *stilo Florentino*); by Benedict XIV in the constitution *Nuper ad nos* of 1743; in most recent times by the Ephesus Encyclical of Pope Pius XI, *Lux Veritatis* (AAS 1931, 493-517); and finally by the Chalcedon Encyclical of Pope Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex Christus* (AAS 1951, 625-44). These documents deliberately however contain no scholarly discussion of the teaching of Nestorius.”<sup>296</sup>

Only in the seventeenth century a new basis for scholarship was laid by J. Garnier in his incomplete edition of *Marius Mercator* (two volumes, Paris 1673).<sup>297</sup> Baluzius re-edited *Marius Mercator* in 1684. At the same time began also criticism of the traditional verdict on Nestorius. For the first time the question was asked:

“‘Was Nestorius a Nestorian?’ In the works of J. Bruguier of Lille, a Calvinist, who published a book anonymously in Frankfurt in 1645 we find an attempt to prove Nestorius orthodox and Cyril heretic. (*Disputatio de supposito, in qua plurima hactenus inaudita de Nestorio tamquam orthodoxo et de Cyrillo Alexandrino aliisque episcopis Ephesi in Synodum coactis tamquam haereticis demonstrantur ...*).”<sup>298</sup>

According to C. W. F. Walch [Author of the book: *Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzereien, Spaltungen und Religionstreitigkeiten*, Leipzig 1770] both Nestorius and Cyril teach rightly, but both should have tempered their language. In this period the catholic authors maintained a negative attitude. Towards the end of the

---

historian. Therefore we can assume that it is not a prejudiced comment that he makes rather a historical fact, VII).

<sup>296</sup>Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 496.

<sup>297</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>298</sup>*Ibid.*, 497.



nineteenth and the early period of the twentieth century we come across a new phase in the study of Nestorius that is, with the discovery and publication of the so-called *Liber Heraclidis*.<sup>299</sup> P. Bedjan arranged an edition of the whole Syriac text *Nestorius, Le Livre d'Heraclide de Damas* by using one primary and two secondary transcripts. F. Nau provided a French translation for the same with the help of P. Bedjan and M. Briere. We have an English translation for *The Bazaar of Heraclidis*, newly translated from the Syriac and edited with an Introduction, with Notes and Appendices by G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson (Oxford 1925). The study conducted on this work has brought about new awareness and perceptions in relations to the theology of Nestorius.

Supplementary to this in the twentieth century a few scholars took up the task of making the ideas of Nestorius clear and freeing him of the age-old criticism raised against him. They are on the way towards filling this gap and are performing an ecumenical task now vigorously inculcated by the Second Vatican Council. For example great scholars like H. Chadwick, *Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy*, in: JThS NS 2 (1951), 145-64; L. I. Scipioni, in his work *Ricerche sulla cristologia del Libro di Eraclide di Nestorio, La formulazione teologica e il suo contesto filosofico*, (Paradosis 11), Freiburg, 1956; A. Grillmeier, *Das Scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlich-dogmatischer und theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht*, in: Schol 36 (1961), 321-56; M. V. Anastos, *Nestorius was orthodox*, in: DOP 16 (1962), 119-40; and L. Abramowski, *Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius* (CSCO 242), Louvain, 1963, all try to throw light upon what Nestorius meant and thought and bring the churches closer to one another. E. Schwartz, L. Abramowski, F. Loofs, P. Bedjan, F. Nau, J. B. Bethune-Baker, M. V. Anastos, A. Grillmeier are some of the scholars of 20<sup>th</sup> century who attempted to study Nestorius and bring clarity to what he meant and believed. The study made by these various scholars has enlivened the ecumenical process. In the manifold studies made by Bethune-Baker he tries to rehabilitate Nestorius. In these studies we find that Catholic scholarship too begins to adopt a milder approach to the Nestorius-question. E. Amann, a catholic scholar, in his article *Nestorius*, in: DTC XI. I, 76-157, with great care seeks to explain the positive and the negative, the psychological and doctrinal elements in Nestorius' case. Thereafter we find further expansion with regard to the study of Nestorius from the catholic side in the person of L. I. Scipioni, and similarly from the Orthodox side in the person of M. V. Anastos, through their above mentioned works respectively.<sup>300</sup> In the study of Scipioni, he tries to emphasize on Nestorius' insistence on the unity of Christ, 'the firm and undiscussed starting point of his Christology,' Nestorius' anti-Apollinarism, an account of the philosophical background of his doctrine and "the unity of *prosopon* in Nestorius which does not lie in the moral rather in the metaphysical realm."<sup>301</sup> Of course, there are also opponents today to these various studies and theories held. For example M. Jugie finds a firm starting point for his criticism of Nestorius in the later dogmatic concepts such as person and *hypostasis*, and finds in his writings an explicit doctrine of two persons and

---

<sup>299</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>300</sup>Cf. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 501.

<sup>301</sup>*Ibid.*, 502.

two *hypostases*.<sup>302</sup> But it is comforting that from time to time various popes and heads of other denominations were able to sit around a table and speak heart to heart.

“Hatte bereits Paul VI. durch seine Begegnung mit dem Ökum. Patriarchen Athenagoras I. (1964 in Jerusalem, 1967 in Konstantinopel) u. mit dem Ebf. v. Canterbury, M. Ramsey (1966 in Rom), so wie in zahlr. Verlautbarungen den ökum. Gedanken vorangetrieben, so erweist sich Johannes Paul II. in erklärter Treue zu Geist u. Buchstaben des Konzils als echter Anwalt für die Einigung der Christen.”<sup>303</sup>

It is also worth mentioning that after the Council Catholic church has taken various initiatives in order to bring about this unity among the various denominations of the churches. All these initiatives express the mind of the Church that we are one and all of us must envision together the day in which all of us are united in the spirit of Christ and thus come together and effectively proclaim the message of Christ. It is a happy note that the church realized that breaking from one another, or to say, from our own brothers is not the will of Christ. And she realized that Christ had not created churches but only one Church and thus she aims at this unity.

“Das Vorwort stellt in seinem ersten Teil das traurige Dekret zur fest, daß die Christen gegen den Willen des Herrn gespalten sind, der nur eine einige und einzige Kirche gegründet hat. Im Sinne der Erklärung des früheren „Heiligen Offiziums“ vom 20. Dezember 1949 ist diese Bewegung dem Wirken der Gnade des Heiligen Geistes zugeschrieben, und das Wollen der Ökumenischen Bewegung wird unter Verwendung der Basisformel des Weltkirchenrates (Neu Delhi 1961) korrekt wiedergegeben.”<sup>304</sup>

According to the eminent catholic theologian Grillmeier the study conducted by L. Abramowski on *Liber Heraclidis* prepares the basis for a balanced judgment on Nestorius and the Nestorius question.<sup>305</sup> In Anglican theology most writers have concurred with the verdict of J. F. Bethune-Baker, who freed Nestorius from his heresy, and in particular R.V. Sellers: “from all this it seems clear that Nestorius hardly deserves the title ‘Nestorian,’ and that this is a legitimate conclusion is borne out by statements of his which show that for him Jesus Christ is very God incarnate.”<sup>306</sup> According to G. L. Prestige

“the unorthodoxy of Nestorius was not a positive fact but a negative impotence; like his master Theodore, he could not bring within the framework of a single clearly conceived personality the two natures of Christ which he distinguished with so admirable a realism. The orthodoxy of Nestorius was positive: with his peculiarities of presentation once for all eliminated, the substance of his doctrine was accepted as the faith of Christendom at the Council of Chalcedon in 451.”<sup>307</sup>

Of course there are inadequacies in his interpretation some of which we have already seen and the rest we will see in the next chapter when we discuss the issues and problems together with the works of Cyril of Alexandria. For F. Loofs also Nestorius is orthodox by the standard of the Council of Chalcedon but not by the

<sup>302</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to the works of M. Jugie, *Nestorius e la controversa nestoriana*, Paris 1912; *Theologia dogmatica Christiana orientalis*, Tome V, Paris 1935, 76-211; *id.*, *Nestorio e Nestorianismo*, in: *EC* 8 (1952), 1780- 84, etc. are some of the works which strongly find reasons against what we have said earlier.

<sup>303</sup>A. Klein, *Ökumene*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 1017-1024.

<sup>304</sup>K. Rahner and H. Vorgrimler, *Kleines Konzilskompendium: Sämtliche Texte des Zweiten Vatikanums*, Freiburg 1966, 218.

<sup>305</sup>Cf. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 502.

<sup>306</sup>Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 164.

<sup>307</sup>Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, 143.

standard of the Second (553) and the Third (680/1) Councils of Constantinople. He claims that in his teachings Nestorius stands in a better and more complete tradition than Cyril. R. Seeberg in his *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* II, 3 clearly expresses that “Nestorius offered a presentation of the Antiochian Christology which is the clearest, simplest, and nearest to the Church’s understanding that we possess. There is nothing ‘heretical’ in his thought. ... None of the great ‘heretics’ of the history of dogma bears this name as undeservedly as Nestorius.”<sup>308</sup>

The Catholic Church was always hopeful to heal the age-old wounds which were created in the names of minor terminological differences. The starting point of such a movement was taken up by a visionary Pope Pius XI. Later both Popes John XXIII and John Paul II have expressed their great desire for unity among churches. The desire of Giuseppe Roncalli, later Pope John XXIII, is very clear regarding his view on Christian unity from a letter written to a young man from the Orthodox Church as he made an apostolic visit to Sofia in the year 1926. He says that Catholics and Orthodox are not enemies but brothers. We have the same faith; we share the same sacraments, and especially the Eucharist. We are divided by some disagreements concerning the divine constitution of the Church of Jesus Christ. The persons who were the cause of these disagreements have been dead for centuries. Let us abandon the old disputes and, each in his own domain, let us work to make our brothers good, by giving them good example. Later on, though travelling along different paths, we shall achieve union among the churches to form together the true unique Church of our Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>309</sup> This kind of talk from various popes made clear the catholic attitude and approach. Along with it we find also various initiatives from the part of eastern churches. Let us also refer to some of such moves being initiated between the church of West and East.

Both sides [the church of West and East] would wish to remove the barrier without vitiating their traditional theology. It is clear from the words of Rabban Bar Sauma<sup>310</sup> of 13<sup>th</sup> century that the Church of the East is not adequately regarded by West. He expresses that, “zu uns im Osten ist kein Gesandter des Papstes gekommen. Die heiligen Apostel, die ich nannte, haben uns bekehrt, und bis zur Stunde folgen wir dem, was sie uns aufgetragen haben.”<sup>311</sup> In these words we find the feeling of forlornness that the Church of the East underwent from the counterparts of the Church especially from the Catholic wing. It may not have taken place purposefully, as we have always said, rather may be due to distance, language and misunderstandings. Therefore it took years for both sides to establish good relation with each other. We find the initial move for this was started by Mar Dinkha the Patriarch of the Assyrian Church of the East, when he first came to Vatican in 1978, for the installation of Pope John Paul II. Thereafter there took place a number of coming together and meetings. We may note the year 1984 from November 7-9 as the first official visit in which both

<sup>308</sup>Cited from Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 504 referring to R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* II, 3 (210-242), Leipzig 1923, 219.

<sup>309</sup>Cf. P. F. Ruelius, *Wenn der Papst um Vergebung bittet: alle “mea culpa” Johannes Paul II an der Wende zum dritten Jahrtausend*, Innsbruck 1999, 28.

<sup>310</sup>Bar Sauma was born in Peking in a rich family which practiced the Nestorian faith. At the age of 23 he became a monk and achieved greater respect and prestige as an anchorite and teacher (cf. E. A. W., *Budge, The Monks of Kublai Khan: Emperor of China*, London 1928, 17).

<sup>311</sup>P. Jenkins, *Das Goldene Zeitalter des Christentums: Die vergessene Geschichte der größten Weltreligion*, Freiburg 2010, 65.

heads came together in Vatican and initiated a process of theological dialogue.<sup>312</sup> Followed by this meeting there took place further almost five meetings and as a culmination in the last meeting both heads signed a draft for unity between the churches. The fifth synod of the Patriarchate of Mar Dinkha IV held in Sydney in the year 1994 in July decided to sign the Declaration unanimously. Later in the same year on 11 November the meeting held between Mar Dinkha IV and John Paul II became a well known historic meeting in which both of them signed a draft on Common Christological Declaration.<sup>313</sup> Besides they decided and signed in the same to put up a Mixed Committee for the theological dialogue precisely with the motive to overcome the obstacles towards visible unity. Thus in the year 1995 in November there took place the first official meeting of this official committee in Rome followed by it in Beirut in 1996 in October.

The Christological Declaration which they arrived at, pay witness to the Nicene Creed and to the only begotten Son who became man for our salvation. “The Word of God, second Person of the Holy Trinity, became incarnate by the power of the Holy Spirit in assuming from the holy Virgin Mary a body animated by a rational soul, with which he was indissolubly united from the moment of his conception.”<sup>314</sup> This declaration gave emphasis to the ‘rational soul’ in Jesus with a particular purpose. It was used in order to overcome the difficulty caused by the Cyril’s formula namely, *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη* which apparently denies a rational soul to the person of Christ, and which he adopted from an Apollinaristic forgery. Thus in the common declaration between the two churches they made use of the term ‘rational soul’ and which became the standard formula in the orthodox theology. Thus the Christological Declaration proclaims,

“therefore our Lord Jesus Christ is true man, perfect in his divinity and perfect in his humanity, consubstantial with the Father and consubstantial with us in all things but sin. His divinity and his humanity are united in one person, without confusion or change, without division or separation. In him has been preserved the difference of the natures of divinity and humanity, with all their properties, faculties and operations.”<sup>315</sup>

The formula which is known as the ‘Formula of Union’ (433) and which is authored by Theodoret of Cyrus and was sent to Cyril of Alexandria at the request of John of Antioch had also almost the same wordings. The statement of the common Christological Declaration about the difference, properties, faculties and operations of the two natures in the one Christ lead us back to the *Tome of Leo* and to Theodoret of Cyrus the Antiochian. This same meeting also solves amicably the age old problem of theotokos-title. In this meeting both churches decided upon the use of both formulas prevalent in both churches. Thus both titles ‘Mother of God’ and ‘Mother of Christ’ were recognized as the legitimate and right expressions of the same faith and they said that both sides respect the preferences of each Church in her liturgical life and piety. Both sides were ready in the Christological Declaration to approve the possibility of

<sup>312</sup>Cf. New Impetus to Mutual Relations, in: The Messenger 11 (1995), 20-22; Information Service of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, N. 88, 1995/I, 1-6; D. W. Winkler, The Current Theological Dialogue with the Assyrian Church of the East, in: OCA 256 (1998), 169.

<sup>313</sup>Cf. Common Christological Declaration between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East, in: OR 12 (1994), 1.

<sup>314</sup>Winkler, The Current Theological Dialogue with the Assyrian Church of the East, 170.

<sup>315</sup>Ibid.

different terminologies regarding the incomprehensibility of the *Mysterium Christi* and thus a solution to an age-old quarrel. Therefore instead of holding firmly only one title as the only standardized terminology, liturgy, piety they gave thrust and emphasis to a common understanding of our faith. Thus one must acknowledge that the Common Declaration was extracted from the Formula of Union (433) of which Theodoret is responsible and which was sent to Cyril of Alexandria. Let us go through the draft which they draw regarding the common faith:

“We believe that our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, is God the Son Incarnate perfect in his divinity and perfect in his humanity. His divinity was not separated from his humanity for a single moment, not for the twinkling of an eye. His humanity is one with his divinity without commixtion, without confusion, without division, without separation. We in our common faith in the one Lord Jesus Christ regard his mystery inexhaustible and ineffable and for the human mind never fully comprehensible and expressible.”<sup>316</sup>

In this ‘union code’ which they arrived, both Churches recognized that the Christology of the other was not only orthodox, but actually the same Christology, expressed in different terms. Both Churches upheld the validity of others’ terms for Mary, stating, that we both recognize the legitimacy and rightness of these expressions of the same faith and we both respect the preference of each Church in her liturgical life and piety. This trend and a renewed interest in the West towards the thought and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius and Bawai the Great,<sup>317</sup> as well as other theologians of the Antiochian School of Theology, may continue to help improve understanding and enhance dialogue. Due to these various efforts taken by both sides [East and West] there emerged also opportunity among the eastern Churches to sit around a table. The difficulty for certain Eastern churches to come together and sit around was the breakage with the Roman Church. Once this breakage is healed it was possible for the Eastern Churches which were in communion with Rome to hold talks with other Eastern Churches which was not in communion with the Western Church up to now.

Many unwanted conflicts and tensions have taken place in the Catholic Church in the name of Christ and basing on trivial terminologies and personal antagonism. If the words of K. Rahner are taken seriously the breakage of 431/451 in the church could have been avoided. According to him all the technical concepts and formulas and the philosophoumena are not an end in themselves. They have a service to perform for the faith of Church. They are intended to preserve the Christ of the Gospels and the Apostolic Age for the faith of posterity. In all the Christological formulas of the ancient Church there is a manifest concern not to allow the total demand made on men’s faith by the person of Jesus to be weakened by pseudo-solutions. Therefore according to him all these concepts or formulas try to prove the Church’s desire for an ever more profound *intellectus fidei*, which is an en route to the resolution of the

---

<sup>316</sup>Ibid., 172.

<sup>317</sup>Mar Bawai the great was a prolific author who exercised a profound influence on the Church of the East, and his treatise ‘on the Union’ (of the two natures in Christ) is one of the major statements on Christology that we have from the Church of the East in this period (cf. S. Brock, *Studies in Syriac Christianity: History, Literature and Theology*, Variorum, XII, Hampshire 1992, 128); Abramowski also speaks vastly about Mar Bawai in her work *A Nestorian collection of Christological Texts*. According to tradition he is the author of almost 83 dogmatic books. He teaches that anyone who does not declare and confess two natures preserving their properties, which are their *hypostases*, in one *prosopon* of Christ, the Son of God, is foreign to the church and denies the truth (cf. Abramowski, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts*, 123-125).

*Mysterium Christi*. He tells very clearly that none of the formulas once framed, should be given up. Yet not one of them can claim to be the Church's last word on the divine revelation. Even Chalcedon according to him, is not an end but a beginning.

“Work by the theologians and teachers of the Church bearing on a reality and a truth revealed by God always ends in an exact formulation. That is natural and necessary. For only in this way it is possible to draw a line of demarcation, excluding heresy and misunderstanding of the divine truth, which can be observed in everyday religious practice. But if the formula is thus an end, the result and the victory which bring about simplicity, clarity, the possibility of teaching and doctrinal certainty, then in this victory everything depends on the end also being seen as a beginning.”<sup>318</sup>

The thrust of his thought [K. Rahner] must guide the Church in her effort to understand the *Mysterium Christi*. It must be continually thought through afresh. It is Christ's promise that His Spirit will guide the church more and more profoundly into all truth (Jn 16, 13).

“R. Bultmann has made us painfully aware of the difficulty of relating the original message of Christ to the modern mentality, and has energetically sought a remedy for this state of affairs ... Pope John XXIII, in his opening address to the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, made a similar appeal to that made by R. Bultmann. But Pope John called for a synthesis. The Church is to speak the language of the modern age, but in such a way that the substance of tradition is preserved. But he does concede that linguistic garb, conceptual representation and the content of the message of revelation are not the same thing.”<sup>319</sup>

In reality, Nestorius and Cyril, Dyophysites, Chalcedonians, and Monophysites, are much nearer together than they themselves know. All the more F. Nau sees in the letters of Nestorius recognition of the orthodoxy with Chalcedon.

“Pour vous - dit Nestorius à ses disciples et, par eux, à ceux aussi qui s'associent maintenant au concile et à son enseignement - regardez comme saints nos coréligionnaires les docteurs Flavien et Léon; il leur demande encore ‘de prier pour qu'un parce que là, comme il le dit, ses doctrines devaient être confirmées; il prévoyait en effet que le concile qui se réunirait confirmerait ses doctrines avec celles de Léon et de Flavien; ce qui a eu lieu. Ce concile a relevé les doctrines de Nestorius et a confirmé toutes ses (théories), comme le montrent clairement les paroles qu'il a mises dans sa profession de foi, car il a dit aussi deux natures comme Nestorius, et que chacune d'elles avait ses propriétés, c'est-à-dire Dieu les prodiges et l'homme les souffrances; or il est évident que deux natures qui ont leurs opérations propres sont aussi des *hypostases* et pas seulement des *prosôpons*, ...”<sup>320</sup>

Cyril on the other hand, suffers just as much as Nestorius in the straits of the Christological problem. According to F. Nau Nestorius is the more modern theologian, but he does not have the same religious force as his counterpart, who thinks in more archaic terms. However, we can conclude, although his methodology was not fully correct, Nestorius too, played a very important role in the theological developments in the history of the Church. Hence we can draw the conclusion that he was in full agreement with the Church from the fact that the Second Apologia that is the *Liber Heraclidis* and ‘the Letter to the inhabitants of Constantinople’ written after

<sup>318</sup>Cited from Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 493 referring to K. Rahner, ‘Chalcedon - Ende oder Anfang?’: *Chalcedon III* (3-49), 3.

<sup>319</sup>Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 494.

<sup>320</sup>Nau, *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, 373.

the ‘Robber Synod’ of 449 show agreement with the Christology of Flavian<sup>321</sup> of Constantinople and of the Tome<sup>322</sup> of Leo I to Flavian. The misunderstanding which existed between both Cyril and Nestorius has led to all these problems:

“For Nestorius, the ‘natural’ or ‘hypostatic’ union envisaged by Cyril appeared to destroy the separateness of the natures, while Cyril perceived Nestorius’ doctrine as teaching that two persons were artificially linked together. Indicative of the differences found among modern commentators on the issue, Kelly emphasizes the differences of the two positions, noting that Cyril found a compromise with moderate Antiochianism possible, while Sellers states, that so far as fundamentals are concerned, there is no difference between the Christological teaching of the Antiochians, and that of the Alexandrians, though, when set beside that raised by the latter, the Antiochian doctrinal structure must appear crude and unfinished.”<sup>323</sup>

Socrates, the church-historian, as early as about 440 defended, with the impartiality which distinguished him, his contemporary Nestorius against the grave misrepresentation to which his doctrine was exposed. Loofs in his book tells that Nestorius prepared the concept of two natures, co-existing in Christ, clearer than anyone else in the Antiochian school. “Deutlicher noch als bei den älteren Antiochenern sieht man bei Nestorius, daß die antiochenische Christologie, soweit dies nach dem Nicaenum möglich war, an vor-apologetische Traditionen anknüpfte.”<sup>324</sup> Nestorius is one of the important personalities who was misunderstood and misinterpreted very much by others in relation to the Church and her teachings and suffered a lot for his convictions and interpretations. Although he had to suffer a lot till his death, it seems to be clear, that he died an Orthodox and a true believer in Jesus, the redeemer. It took many generations of councils and commentaries in order to sort out this problem in the West, which was ultimately decided in favour of Nestorius’ opponents, but only partially. In the end, much of Nestorius’ view prevailed. Today the Christological expressions used by most Christian denominations and of course, catholic theology, reflect that of Nestorius: The Messiah was perfect God and perfect man, without confusion or change, division or separation.

R. C. Chesnut is of the opinion that Nestorius’ basic Christology presents to the twentieth century a far better place to begin to structure a Christology in modern terms than his more successful opponents, for it takes into account the actual reality of the functioning humanity of Christ, as a genuine human being with no tricks up his sleeve. Nestorius’ criticism of Cyril that Cyril starts in the wrong place when he begins with the identity of the Word, rather than with the reality of Christ, is absolutely correct for us, if we insist that our Christology must make sense, not just with an internal

---

<sup>321</sup>He was the Patriarch of Constantinople from 446 – 49. Without taking into consideration the favour Eutyches enjoyed in the Court Flavian had condemned him at the Synod of 448. Although he was supported by Leo I. (Tomus ad Flavianum) he was deposed by the ‘Robber Synod’ (449) conducted by Dioscoros. He was later rehabilitated by the council of Chalcedon (451) together with his Christological formula which he prepared. He died on his way in exile to Hypaepa, Lydia (cf. H.-J. Sieben, Flavian Patriarch v. Konstantinopel, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 1315-1316).

<sup>322</sup>Upon hearing Eutyches, Leo realized that what the abbot called Nestorianism was orthodoxy at Rome; suppressed at Ephesus, the Tome was approved at Chalcedon, and is thus the representative of Western theology in the official documents of the Ecumenical Councils. [From this it is clear that Nestorius also shared the same doctrine as Pope Leo and which was in line with the Nicene and Ephesian councils] (cf. E. R. Hardy, The Formula of Union of 433, in: J. Baillie, et al., ed., Christology of the Later Fathers [LCC 3], Philadelphia 1954, 359).

<sup>323</sup>Griggs, Early Egyptian Christianity, 193.

<sup>324</sup>Loofs, Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte, 1, Halle-Saale 1951, 229.

consistency of its own, but with a sense that fits with the world we live in.<sup>325</sup> In the words of Drijvers “the Chalcedonian Definition of Faith, with its dogma of two natures, perfect Manhood and complete Divinity, united in one *prosopon*, seems to agree with the central notions of classical Antiochian Christology as developed by Theodore of Mopsuestia.”<sup>326</sup> Bathrellos rightly claims that “the exponents of Nestorianism raised questions and suggested answers which are of significance for the Christology of all times.”<sup>327</sup> The theologians of the school of Antioch were always interested in affirming the fullness of the humanity of Christ. Finally the words of Babai the Great would help us to understand why Nestorius or early fathers used at one point the formula ‘one *q’nomâ* from two natures’ (i.e. the Syrian Orthodox position):

“Babai explains that it was because they were countering Arius, Eunomius<sup>328</sup> and Apollinarius who denied that Christ was either complete God or complete Man. Babai goes on to say that these fathers sometimes used *q’nomâ* [transliterated] and *parsopa* [person, *prosopon*] interchangeably ‘just as happens now, so they say, in Roman territory’; such usage, however is to be avoided, according to Babai, in order to counter theopaschite<sup>329</sup> teaching.”<sup>330</sup>

<sup>325</sup>Cf. R. C. Chesnut, *The Two Prosopa in Nestorius’ Bazaar of Heraclidis*, in: JThS 29 (1978), 409.

<sup>326</sup>H. J. W. Drijvers, *Antiochene Christology, After Chalcedon*, in: OLA 19 (1985), 99.

<sup>327</sup>Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ*, 16.

<sup>328</sup>Eunomius, the most important exponent of anomeans who are also sometimes accordingly called Eunomians, was born ca. 330 in Dacora/Caesarea or Oltiseris/Korniaspa and died after 392, at the latest 395 in Dacora/Caesarea. He received his primary education from his father a farmer, who worked as a Tachygraph and educator. Later he studied in Constantinople in the year 356/357. He studied theology at Alexandria under Aetius and served him also as his secretary. Latest from 358 he was active in church politics. In 358 he was ordained a deacon by the Anomoean Bp. Eudoxius of Antioch. Later in 360 for a short time he became the bishop of Cyzicus. He taught that the begotten Son and unbegotten Father are dissimilar in their ousia (ἀνόμοιος), and held that the Unbegotten God is an absolutely simple being; an act of generation would involve a contradiction of His essence by introducing duality into the Godhead. He said that the Son is in all things unlike the Father, as well in will as in substance. There could be no essential resemblance between Father and Son but at most a moral resemblance. The Son does not share in the incommunicable Divine Essence (ousia) but he does partake in the communicable Divine creative power (energeia) and it is that partaking which constitutes the Son’s Divinity and establishes Him as regards creation, in the position of Creator. E. intensified without regard the question on God’s knowledge and Son’s incarnation influenced by the (neo) platonic position. His position regarding theology and conceptual doctrine are Arian (cf. F. X. Risch, *Eunomios*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 989-90).

<sup>329</sup>Theopaschism (from Gk., θεός, God and πάσχειν, to suffer; literally it meant ‘suffering of God’) is originally not theological but Christological terminology. (One of the Trinity suffered). Therefore it does not discuss upon the question of the suffering of God rather it is a discussion on the full manhood of the Son (in the sense of *idiomatum communicatio*). The theopaschite formula *,unus ex trinitate passus est in carne’* which we find in the 6th cent., goes back originally to Proclus of Constantinople (ca. 440) and an expansion of it through the activities of the Monophysite Peter of Walker in the Trishagions. Already from the second cent., Th. was unobjectionably employed (phrases like ‘God’s blood,’ ‘crucified God’ etc.). Tertullian speaks against Marcion who spoke of God without a proper implication to the passibility of God *‘etiam mortuum deum credere’* (adv. Marc. II, 16 u. 27). This heresy lies in the acknowledgement of the suffering of divine Son in the flesh [Athanasius: *Epistula ad Epictetum*, 10] (cf. R. Faber, *Theopaschismus*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1464-65).

<sup>330</sup>Brock, *Studies in Syriac Christianity*, XII. 131.



## Chapter II

### Cyril of Alexandria and his Christology

#### 1. The Person of Cyril of Alexandria<sup>331</sup>

“Cyril was born in 378 (378-444) in the small town of Theodosiou in Lower Egypt which was his father’s hometown. His mother came from Memphis.”<sup>332</sup> Memphis was at that time a stronghold of polytheism. We do not know much of the family of his father. But his maternal grandparents were Christians. His grandparents from the maternal side died comparatively young leaving an adolescent son, Theophilus and a daughter. Immediately after the birth of Cyril’s mother, there in her native town Memphis, broke out a resurgence of paganism under the emperor Julian in 362-63. Therefore the young Theophilus, his uncle, who was then sixteen or seventeen, left Memphis for Alexandria, taking his little sister with him.<sup>333</sup> There he enrolled himself in the catechumenate and came to the special care and attention of Athanasius. Athanasius baptized both Theophilus and his little sister and took them to his care. Athanasius did all what he could for Theophilus to complete his studies and his sister was entrusted to the care of the community of virgins, till she was given in marriage to Cyril’s father. As Theophilus was able to complete his studies very successfully and as a highly intelligent Christian and with no family ties, he dedicated his life to the clerical state and started his life as a secretary to Athanasius for almost three years. When Athanasius died in the year 373 Peter II was appointed as his successor in his place because Theophilus was too young although he was climbing the ladder of position and ecclesiastical status because of his enthusiasm, ability and intelligence. In about 375 he was ordained deacon and began to teach publicly. Rufinus,<sup>334</sup> who spent six years at Alexandria studying at the catechetical school under

---

<sup>331</sup>The Egyptian metropolis is situated at the mouth of the Nile River. Alexander the Great laid out Alexandria sometime in 332-331 B. C. Strategically, the city had connections to all points on the Mediterranean and through the Red Sea to the regions of Southeast Asia. Alexandria had two harbors, east and west, that made it an excellent port. Alexandria was the home of many cults. Sources make it clear that numerous Hellenistic gods were worshiped there, and various syncretistic religions also had their place (cf. F. W. Norris, *Alexandria*, in: E. Ferguson, ed., *EEC*, New York <sup>2</sup>1990, 20-21.

<sup>332</sup>N. Russel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, New York 2000, 4.

<sup>333</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>334</sup>Rufinus of Aquileia (or also called R. Tyrannius), Latin Monk, historian, and theologian was born ca. 345 in the Roman city of Concordia near Aquileia in Italy. He was in Rome from ca. 359 and there he studied grammar and rhetoric. It seems that he had studied with Jerome and later in 368 was attracted to ascetic life perhaps by his connection with the later bishop of Aquileia called Chromatius, a native of Aquileia, and was baptized at Aquileia at ca. 371. In 372 he travelled to eastern Mediterranean. He stayed in Alexandria from 373-380 and trained himself under the famous teacher of the Catechetical School of Alexandria namely Didymus the Blind and thus got acquainted with the Origenist theology. Later he came in contact with the Nitrian monks and Melania a rich Roman widow in Jerusalem with whom he already had good relations in Italy. Thus with her support he was able to establish a monastery in Jerusalem. In the year 390 he was ordained at Jerusalem to priesthood by Bishop John of Jerusalem (who was also a Nitrian monk) with whom he stood in defense of the teaching of Origen in 393. The Origenist controversy broke out again when R. depicted the translated works (Pamph. *Apol.*; *Orig. princ* [398]) of Origen as orthodox during his return to Rome and he held that the heretical elements in the works of Origen were due to interpolations. After the conquest of Rome in 410 he went to Sicily and engaged himself in the translation of the homilies of Origen and died there. Most of the voluminous work of Origen in Greek is made available to the Latin readers through the translation of R. whereas due to the parallel translation of Jerome of the same many of them are lost. Among his friends are counted Paulinus of Nola and Gaudentius of Brescia (cf. S. Heid, *Rufinus v. Aquileia*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 1350).

Didymus the Blind,<sup>335</sup> was impressed by the lecture given by Theophilus in the same school. At the age of forty as an archdeacon of Alexandria he was considered as well positioned church man to take over the episcopate. So he succeeded to the throne of St. Mark on 20 July 385.

At this time Cyril was only seven years old. Cyril's uncle supervised his education. Therefore he had a thorough grounding in reading and writing and arithmetic at primary school. To do his secondary education he might have gone to a grammarian, a *grammatikos*. In this period he came across the classic works of Homer, Euripides, Menander and Demosthenes, as it was part of a *grammatikos* study, together with a superficial treatment of mathematics, music and astronomy. From his writings we can understand that he was in all probability trained under a rhetor. For "he writes an elaborate Attic Greek remarkable for its revival of obsolete words and its many neologisms, yet precise and well suited to his purposes. He is also a master of the rhetorician's techniques of controversy."<sup>336</sup> We are not very sure whether he pursued formal philosophical studies. It is generally accepted that Cyril was not a philosopher. But on the other hand it has been established that Cyril had a good knowledge of Aristotelian and Porphyrian<sup>337</sup> logic. Cyril of Alexandria had knowledge of the technical Aristotelian terms and the relationship between substance and accidents and he made use extensively of syllogistic reasoning. Besides he was also acquainted with the exegetical methods of Platonism though he distanced himself from a philosophical culture due to its nature of defending paganism. In later life he became an anti-Hellenist saying that Hellenic learning is vain and pointless and in his own words we hear that, "it requires much effort for no reward."<sup>338</sup> Later on he depends upon Christian authors and holy and orthodox fathers like Didymus the Blind, Gregory of Nazianzus,<sup>339</sup> Basil of Caesarea<sup>340</sup> and above all Athanasius and echoes of

---

<sup>335</sup>Didymus the blind who was born in 313, died in 398. Despite his early blindness he secured such a great erudition that Athanasius appointed him as the head of the Catechetical School in Alexandria. He was a reputed exegete. Jerome, Rufinus of Aquileia, Palladius and Ammonios were his students. Together with Origen his works were also anathematized for the first time in particular in the Synod of Constantinople (543) and the second Council (553) of Constantinople and through the Lateran Synod (649) followed by that most of his works were also got destroyed. However the papyrus codices of 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> century found in the region of Toura in Egypt (south of Cairo) in 1941 gave further insights into the writings and thinking of him. He fought against the heresies of the time. According to Jerome he agreed fully with the catholic teaching on Trinity. He taught that in Christ both the divinity and humanity are indissolubly united. As a man He was capable to sin and could undergo the primary stages of affections but He decided against them. According to him man is a composite union of soul, body and spirit. Following the Apocatastasis (restoration) teaching of Origen he also held that the soul was preexistent with God. Hence to return to God and to regain its original stage the soul has to disengage from the bond of the body. He also held that the souls of holy people in contrast, as an example, were incorporated due to its aspiration for perfection (cf. B. Kramer, Didymus der Blinde, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 212-213).

<sup>336</sup>Russel, Cyril of Alexandria, 4.

<sup>337</sup>Porphyry, a Neo-Platonist, was born ca. 234 in Tyros in Lebanon and died between ca. 302 and 305; he was a student of Plotinus and was his biographer and editor. Porphyry has summarized a compendium of the metaphysics of his master Plotinus and he is considered as the author of the commentary on Plato's Parmenides. The commentary employs a notion of the One as an ineffable first principle. In his work he deals with the concept of God and his teaching on soul plays a significant role in his system of thought. According to him the soul is an intelligible entity that is directly engaged with the sensible realm. He teaches that intelligible entities are incorporeal and without extension. He was a severe critic of Christianity. For the early Latin Church theology his teaching was significant (cf. M. Enders, Porphyrios, Neuplatoniker, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 429).

<sup>338</sup>Russel, Cyril of Alexandria, 5.

<sup>339</sup>Gregory of Nazianz Jr., who is also known as Gregory the theologian, ([St., Feast 2 Jan.], in the Eastern Church earlier on 9 May), was Bp. of Sasima, Bp. of Constantinople (380-381) and died in 390. Gregory the Sr., (his father) and Nonna (his mother) raised G. in Christian faith. He studied in Caesarea (Cappadocia), Caesarea (Palestine), Alexandria and in Athens. In Jerusalem in 348/349 G. heard the sermons of Cyril of Jerusalem.

their writings are found throughout in his writings. But very rarely he mentions the secular authors whom he studied and nourished in his early education.

The first definite date on which we find Cyril with his uncle Theophilus is 403. In this year he accompanied his uncle to the Synod of Oak,<sup>341</sup> the council that deposed John Chrysostom.<sup>342</sup> By this time in all probability we can say that he might have been a lector and a secretary to his uncle as Theophilus had been to Athanasius. By the time when his uncle died on 15 October 412, Cyril was already powerful as he had almost nine years' of experience at the centre of power. Cyril was of course a man of iron will and a consummate ecclesiastical politician. According to Russel "he was a theologian of the first rank and a biblical commentator whose insights are still illuminating today."<sup>343</sup> According to L. R. Wickham he was the main architect of patristic Christology.<sup>344</sup> We come across also many negative comments about Cyril. For it is said many of his successful endeavors are abased due to his nefarious actions.

"Cyril (bishop 412-444) was a better man in comparison to his uncle but also suffered from the climate of power. In 415, a mob attacked Hypatia, a gifted Neoplatonist philosopher, killed her, and dragged her body through the streets of the city. Her death went unpunished. Cyril turned his own attention to rooting out

Socrates the Church historian tells that he was a student of Libanios at Antioch (H. E. 4, 26). After his studies he endorsed himself in Athens as a teacher of rhetoric; his schoolmates were Basil of Caesarea and Julian the emperor. Being attracted to the ascetic-monastic ideal of Basil he left Greece between the period of 354 and 363 and joined Basil although he had to return to Cappadocia at the compulsion of Basil to assist his father in church administration. G. represented the homoousios of Nicea. Besides he was more pragmatic than Basil in the exegetical explanations although he was not so speculative like Gregory of Nyssa regarding the terminological questions (cf. B. Coulie, *Gregor v. Nazianz. d. J.*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 4, Freiburg 1995, 1004-1007).

<sup>340</sup>Basil of Caesarea or the Great (St., Feast 14 June) is famous through his collection of letters. The commemorative Speech made by his senior friend Gregory of Nazianz in 381 (Or. 43); so also the Panegyric of Gregory of Nyssa one of his younger brothers (Or. Bas. PG 46, 787-818) and of Ephrem the Syrian one of his contemporaries contain lot of biographical elements about him. The famous Libanios does not avoid praising the special talents of Basil in public. As a listener in the Constantinople Synod 381 he came in contact with the Arian quarrels. In order to decree his understanding on Nicene Homousios, he had sought the help of the reputed teacher and Exegete Apollinarius of Laodicea. He made all possible efforts to clear out the inner breakage of the Antiochian Church faced by writing letters to Athanasius of Alexandria and Damasus of Rome. At his death in 1. 1. 379 man could see the reversal of the true Nicene faith due to his efforts (cf. C. Kannengiesser, *Basilios v. Caesarea*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 2, Freiburg 1994, 67-69).

<sup>341</sup>The first significant year in the life of Cyril is namely 403 A. D. in which he accompanied his uncle Theophilus, whom he succeeded as the Bishop of Alexandria in 412, to the 'Synod of the Oak' in which John Chrysostom was deposed from his see (cf. R. Voderholzer, *Cyril v. Alexandrien*, in: M. Heim, Hg., *Theologen, Ketzer, Heilige: Kleines Personenlexikon zur Kirchengeschichte*, München 2001, 98).

<sup>342</sup>John Chrysostom (St., feast 13 Sept.), was Patriarch of Constantinople, born 349/350 in Antioch, and died on 14. 9. 407. He was a celebrated preacher. He did his education in the pagan Hellenistic culture. He was educated perhaps under Libanios and became acquainted with the Stoic-tradition and diatribe. In the commotions of Antiochian schisms he distanced himself both from the wrong teachings of Arians and from the radical Nicene circle. He received his Christian education from his mother Anthusa and received baptism from Bp. Meletius and joined the company of faithful in 367/68. Later as Bishop in Constantinople John insisted upon and brought about the inner reform namely of the clerics, monks, virgins and widows. He appealed all the faithful in his diocese for a moderate, inculpable and impeccable life style. He erected hospices for the poor, stranger and sick. Due to the admonitions and reformations John became so unbearable that he gained so many enemies; the powerful empress Eudoxia was his enemy. His advocacy for Origenism suspected him to be an Origenist and in the so-called Oak synod in 403 in his absence he was condemned and deposed. Although the first exile was lifted the emperor decided to send him irrevocably to Kucusus in Asia Minor in 404. J. remained in his apostolic zeal unbowed. Thus in the next deportation he was deposed to Pityus on the Black Sea. On the way to this place he died. The last words which he uttered namely 'God be glorified for everything, Amen' clearly express the life style and fundamental tone which he upheld in his preaching and teaching (cf. P. Klasvogt, *Johannes Chrysostomus*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 889-892).

<sup>343</sup>Russel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, vii.

<sup>344</sup>Cf. L. R. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria*, in: E. Ferguson, ed., *EEC*, New York <sup>2</sup>1990, 249.

the unfaithful within. Like his uncle, who had worked for John Chrysostom's dismissal at Constantinople, Cyril set his hand against the Constantinopolitan Bishop Nestorius. The main issues concerned political power and Christology."<sup>345</sup>

He was a controversial figure from the fifth to the present century due to his particular behaviour. He was also a power greedy like his uncle Theophilus. One of the contemporaries of his time addressed his uncle Theophilus as the 'Egyptian Pharaoh' as he had caused enough of disturbances to the secular authorities. So the contemporaries of Cyril's time supported the candidature of the archdeacon, Timothy in his place, fearing whether he would continue the policies of his uncle.

"Socrates reports that Cyril's election to the Alexandrian patriarchate was challenged by the archdeacon Timothy, who gathered a crowd of local supporters eager to install him on the Episcopal throne. Several days of violence and fighting erupted. He continues saying that the two parties vying for Episcopal office became so heated that Abundantius (the commander of troops in Egypt) intervened with the aid of soldiers and fought in favour of Cyril."<sup>346</sup>

Like his uncle, Cyril also gained upper hand through the members of the guild of hospital porters, who later served him as a private militia in the election to patriarchy.<sup>347</sup> After three days of rioting, Cyril's faction attained predominance over the situation. "So he succeeded his uncle as bishop of Alexandria in 412 after a bloody and contested election."<sup>348</sup> On 18<sup>th</sup> October 412 Cyril was installed on the throne of St. Mark. He was the patriarch of Alexandria for 32 years succeeding his uncle Theophilus from 412 to 444 A. D. He together with his uncle Theophilus guided the eastern Roman world for almost 59 years. It is natural to think that he followed the policy of his uncle. Immediately after the enthronement of Cyril, as all his contemporaries feared, he played exactly the role of his uncle. According to Socrates,<sup>349</sup> Cyril always exceeded his authority by interfering in matters of secular administration other than that of ecclesiastical functions. According to the same Church historian, this nature of Cyril constituted an abuse of Episcopal power that readily explained his most rebellious acts. According to L. R. Wickham Cyril did a set of activities as he took up the office. First of all he started applying pressure on pagans, heretics and Jews; secondly he started cultivating a close alliance with Rome; then resisting the expansion of the Episcopal authority of Constantinople; and finally, retaining the support of the monks.<sup>350</sup> Like his uncle he also knew the art of mobilizing popular forces to his particular aims and of course he knew well to

<sup>345</sup>F. W. Norris, Alexandria, 22.

<sup>346</sup>Cited from S. Wessel, Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a saint and of a Heretic, London 2004, 15-16 referring to Socrates, H. E. 7, 7.

<sup>347</sup>Cf. Russel, Cyril of Alexandria, 6.

<sup>348</sup>Wickham, Cyril of Alexandria, 249.

<sup>349</sup>Socrates Scholasticus is a church historian. He was born in Constantinople after 380 and died after 439 in the same place (H. E. 24, 9). He was trained in the pagan school conducted by the Grammarians Helladios and Ammonios who in 391 fled from Alexandria and came to Constantinople due to a revolt (V, 16, 9); it is not improbable that he was a cleric and belonged to the moderate Novatians. His H. E. (church history) deals with a period between 305 and 439 (VII, 48, 8). We may presume that it was written before 450 as Theodosius II yet lived as he wrote the history (VII, 22, 1). His style of writing is simple but refined. His main concern was the peace and the unity of the Church which was being endangered by the inner strife and aggressiveness which existed between the bishops. Therefore he placed the emperor as the founder and donor of peace over the bishops. He criticized both Nestorius and John Chrysostom. He is not interested in Monasticism. He is interested in the faith of Nicea and the teaching of Origen although there is no much depth in his theological teaching (cf. F. Winkelmann, Sokrates Scholastikos, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 699-700).

<sup>350</sup>Cf. Wickham, Cyril of Alexandria, 249.

manipulate ecclesiastical politics to his advantage. He did not follow the resentment of the former Patriarch namely the antipathy for anthropomorphite<sup>351</sup> views, theological opportunism, and cynical approach. However in Cyril's own time he was regarded as 'his uncle's nephew' and in the later Coptic tradition as 'the new Theophilus.'<sup>352</sup> This title is highlighted as the most fitting one for Cyril by the famous historian Socrates if we go through the narrative given by him about the election of Cyril to episcopate and the aftermath. He continues saying that Cyril wielded even greater power than Theophilus as he had a finger in every pie, even in the secular administration.<sup>353</sup> According to Socrates, the Church historian, Cyril was elected bishop of Alexandria at the age of 34 on 17 October 412. We learn from Socrates<sup>354</sup> that Cyril's first action as bishop was to push out the Novatianists<sup>355</sup> and to seize their churches and property.<sup>356</sup> We do not know the exact reason of this action against the Novatianists' group. Immediately after taking charge of the patriarchate Cyril appointed priests throughout the various churches in his diocese. Thus he tried to win the Novatians to his side which otherwise would have created a menace for Cyril as they had claimed moral superiority than Cyril and a constant insidious threat to his leadership throughout Egypt. Besides, Cyril considered himself as the sole authority in Alexandria according to the earlier promulgated Canon 6 of the Council of Nicaea, which declared that the bishop of Alexandria exercised authority over all the churches of Egypt. Therefore in all probability we can think that he turned against the Novatians with the view that he

---

<sup>351</sup>Anthropomorphism I. Biblical: Anthropomorphism means any attribution of human characteristics to designate God with eyes, ears, hands, legs, inner feelings, heart, back side etc., and God stands up, goes, sits, sleeps, arouses, comes etc., according to the same designation God loves, gets angry, laughs, regrets, forgives, jealous etc (cf. J. Schreiner, Anthropomorphismus. I. Biblisch, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 734-735); II. Systematic-theological: We should speak of God as theologians. We are at the same time only finite beings and therefore cannot fully know and talk about God. We should do both, namely 'speak and hold' that we should but cannot fully know God which must lead us to give Him the highest glory and honour. Anthropomorphic talk is one in which God makes himself recognizable to us through the spoken words. As the human being is an image of God, and as Christ is a true and genuine human being and as God became true man in Him, the anthropomorphic terminology can legitimately represent the image of God in this self-manifestation. A. sees Christ no longer as an expiatory supplication before God, but precisely suited to the mystery of God as the image of God. A. at the same time is in place and a means to talk in a human manner about the humanness of men (cf. H. W. Schütte, Anthropomorphismus. II. Systematisch-theologisch, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 735-737).

<sup>352</sup>Cf. Wessel, Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy, 49 in reference to John Nikiu, Chronicle 84, 102 (John was Egyptian bishop and church historian of the late seventh century and who gives us a narrative account for the period prior to the Nestorian Affair.

<sup>353</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 16; besides we find the following citation from Socrates, H. E. 7, 7: "ἡ ἐπίσκοπὴ Ἀλεξανδρείας πέρα τῆς ἱερατικῆς τάξεως καταδυναστεύειν τῶν πραγμάτων ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν." 'The bishopric of Alexandria exceeded the sacerdotal limit and took command of secular affairs.'

<sup>354</sup>This dislike of Socrates for Cyril comes out very clearly in depicting the council of Ephesus so negatively saying that he transformed the lengthy ecumenical proceedings into little more than a petty factional dispute between two contentious parties denouncing each other (cf. Urbainczyk, Socrates of Constantinople, 22).

<sup>355</sup>Novatianists were a rigorist sect, taking their name from Novatian, a third-century Roman priest who objected to the reception of the lapsed on easy terms. Socrates was sympathetic towards them, that is why he has noticed what has happened to this minority and what might otherwise have been an unremarkable act. According to Socrates only the Novatians held Christological beliefs consistent with the *homoousian* (same essence) Creed of Nicaea, and they were the only group that was permitted to assemble within the Imperial City (cf. Russel, Cyril of Alexandria, 7 in reference to Socrates H. E. 7, 11).

<sup>356</sup>Cf. Wessel, Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy, 18 in reference to Socrates, H. E. 7, 7: ... "Cyril, then, immediately closed the Novatian churches in Alexandria, took all their consecrated treasures, and took from their bishop, Theopemptus, all that he had. Celestine did the same in Rome as Cyril. Celestine always had a disregard for the well-settled boundaries of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the point of transgressing secular boundaries even at the cost of closing the Novatian Churches" (cf. also Urbainczyk, Socrates of Constantinople, 16, 22).

was interested in the unity of the church of Egypt and to control it. There is also a counter argument that he did everything against Novatians due to their support given to Timothy, the archdeacon, who stood against Cyril in the Episcopal election. But Urbainczyk is of the view that he had the formerly mentioned intention as the major concern.<sup>357</sup>

He attacked next the Jews. The Jewish community used to gather in the theatre for theatrical shows, which the Jews liked to attend as part of their Sabbath recreation. Once it happened that Jews came together to hear Orestes, the prefect of Alexandria, who produced a prescript against Jews<sup>358</sup> by which the prefect wanted to control the Jews as their public meeting became a source of public disorder. On that occasion there came some members of the bishop's party to take note of the proceedings. Among them there was a primary school master called Hierax, who was a supporter of Cyril and an admirer of his sermons. He was considered as a trouble-maker always in the meetings and shows of Jews. Some of the Jews reported his presence to the prefect and immediately he was arrested interrogated and tortured. When Cyril was informed of this action he summoned the Jewish leaders and threatened them with retaliation if they took any aggressive measure against the Christians. It seems once the Jews set fire to one of the Christian churches. Seeing this, Christians fled to the place to save the building but there the Christians were ambushed and Jews killed a number of them. Cyril kept his word as he promised the Jews. "At day break he made a tour of the Jewish quarter in person at the head of large crowd and seized the synagogues and Jews were driven out of their homes and their property plundered by the mob."<sup>359</sup> It seems that this riot was caused as a power politics played between Orestes the prefect and Bishop Cyril. In order to bring the Prefect to reconciliation and obedience, Cyril once tried to make him kiss the book of the Gospels, but he rejected. Instead Orestes, though a Christian, leaned more heavily on pagan advisers to retaliate the overbearing authority of the Christian bishop. So the rift between bishop and prefect deepened. This resulted in different modes of attack from the part of Cyril. In the first he called monks from Nitria to fight against the prefect. There came to the city almost five hundred of them "deciding to fight on behalf of Cyril"<sup>360</sup>; Orestes remonstrated with them but stones began to fly, one of them striking him on the head and covering his face with blood. It seems Ammonius, a monk, was responsible for this attack. He was arrested and interrogated so severely that he died. Again both Cyril and Prefect started sending reports to the emperor saying that both were right in their own way. Cyril also attempted a propaganda victory by exposing Ammonius' body in a church and declaring him a martyr. But the peace-loving Christian population saw this as a cheap attempt to put further pressure on the Prefect.

The second incident which happened was the attack on Hypatia, a Hellenistic philosopher, with the support of Cyril.<sup>361</sup> A Christian mob led by a cleric, a lector

<sup>357</sup>Cf. Urbainczyk, Socrates of Constantinople, 20.

<sup>358</sup>Socrates finds fault with the Jew though he did not appreciate Cyril's reign. "Socrates chided and ridiculed the Jews because they did not keep the Sabbath as they were supposed to. He put the blame for the disturbance primarily on the Jews, because in his view, they loved to frequent dancing exhibitions (ὄρχηστράς). They should have been in the synagogues hearing the law, said Socrates" (R. L. Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology*, London 1971, 56-57).

<sup>359</sup>Cited from Russel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, 7 referring to Socrates H. E. 7, 13.

<sup>360</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 8 referring to Socrates H. E. 7, 14.

<sup>361</sup>According to Russel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, 208, fn. 45, Cyril might have played an indirect role in the killing of Hypatia. Because her influence with the prefect (Orestes) was clearly intolerable to Cyril and he must have

called Peter, attacked Hypatia and drove her through the city.<sup>362</sup> She was brought to the Caesareum,<sup>363</sup> the former temple of the imperial cult and which was now the cathedral, stripped and stoned to death. Her body was then hacked to pieces and burned. Modern studies represent Hypatia's death as the result of a struggle between two Christian factions, the moderate Orestes, supported by Hypatia, and the more rigid Cyril.<sup>364</sup> After this incident all people surrounded the patriarch Cyril and named him 'the new Theophilus,' for he had destroyed the last remains of idolatry in the city.<sup>365</sup> Her death took place in March 415. In the following year the imperial government responded with an edict reprimanding the bishop indirectly for exceeding his authority. There after we hear no further difficulties as Cyril facing during his episcopate with the Prefect of Alexandria.

We can understand the nature and character of Cyril from the letter written by someone (it seems to be Theodoret of Cyrus<sup>366</sup>) to a friend after the death of Cyril which we find in the book of G. L Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*:

“At last with a final struggle the villain has passed away ... Observing that his malice increased daily and injured the body of the Church, the Governor of our souls has lopped him off like a canker ... His departure delights the survivors, but possibly disheartens the dead; there is some fear that under the provocation of his company they may send him back again to us ... Care must therefore be taken to order the guild of undertakers to place a very big and heavy stone on his grave to stop him coming back here ... I am glad and rejoice to see the fellowship of the Church delivered from such a contagion; but I am saddened and sorry as I reflect

---

regarded her elimination with satisfaction. And all the more it must be noted that the murder took place in the cathedral next to Cyril's residence. Moreover, the leader of the mob was a minor cleric who knew well the mind of the Bishop on this matter. But Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 6, fn. 20, treats the problem in a balanced and prudent way. He argues that this murder of Hypatia can in no way be motivated by Cyril; although Kingsley in his work *Hypatia*, (1968) (which is quoted by Loon), sees Cyril as a scoundrel; he does not say that Cyril plotted the murder of Hypatia, rather he finds mistake with Cyril as he refused to hand over Peter the Reader and his associates - the perpetrators - to the lawful authority of the prefect. He says that at the least it was not his motive, though it was a means by which the archbishop tried to reach his goal. In another instance Loon asserts that Cyril was not the culprit of this action. Although Socrates, the contemporary of Cyril and church historian, expresses his dislike for Cyril due to his vehement action against the Novatians, he never tells that Cyril was the murderer. When John of Nikiu refers to a multitude in torturing and killing Hypatia, the neo-Platonist philosopher Damascius involves Cyril personally. But it should be borne in mind that Socrates (ca. 380-450) was a contemporary of these events, while Damascius (ca. 460-540) and John of Nikiu (ca. 690) wrote at a later date. And all the more Socrates was not particularly positive about Cyril of Alexandria, since he was sympathetic towards the Novatianists (cf. H. van Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, Leiden 2009, 2, 6).

<sup>362</sup>Cf. Russel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, 9.

<sup>363</sup>Caesareum was a huge complex of colonnaded buildings on an eminence overlooking the harbor, which had originally been built as a temple to the deified Caesar. Later it had been re-dedicated to St. Michael. Cyril conducted the affairs of the Alexandrian Church in this building until his death. Besides his office it housed also a library, secretariat and other administrative offices under the supervision of the archdeacon (cf. *ibid.*, 10).

<sup>364</sup>Cf. M. Dzielska, *Hypatia of Alexandria*, Cambridge 1995, xi, 157.

<sup>365</sup>Cf. Russel, *Cyril of Alexandria*, 9 in reference to John of Nikiu, *Chronicle* 84, 103.

<sup>366</sup>Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrus (Kyrrhos), was born ca. 393 at Antioch, and died ca. 460. Th. comes from a rich Christian family, received a splendid school education and grew from childhood in relation to the church. In the year 423 he was appointed bishop of Cyrus and then on dedicated his life and energy at first mainly in combating the numerous heathens and heretics in Cyrus. In the council of Ephesus (431) he belonged to John of Antioch and objected along with John the condemnation of Nestorius (cf. A. Viciano, *Theodoretos, Bf. v. Kyros*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1401-1404).

that the wretched man never took rest from his misdeeds, but died designing greater and worse.”<sup>367</sup>

It is unbelievable to hear such an obituary from a famous and saintly man like Theodoret. In Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, we read that “from his own time to the present day, Cyril of Alexandria has been described as a saint by some and as a villain by others. No doubt, evidence can be forwarded for either judgment. Like all of us, he had a light side and a shadow side.”<sup>368</sup> Again in the same book we read in detail more about his personality that “Cyril of Alexandria has at times been depicted as a potentate with a lust for power, who did not shy away from bribery, intimidation and even murder, to reach his goals”<sup>369</sup> and which we may say as the reason for many of the casualties which took place in the Church of Alexandria and in the neighbouring churches. When some regard him as a ruthless, power-seeking individual who orchestrated what happened from behind the scenes, some consider him as a young bishop who did not know yet how to keep his more fanatic followers under control.

Although he had so many negative elements there were also a number of good elements in him and that may be the reason why many consider him as a very capable person and saintly figure. Today we cannot disregard the contributions he made to the church. In the words of Pope Benedict XVI Cyril of Alexandria is the “Hüter der Genauigkeit.”<sup>370</sup> C. A. Beeley mentions regarding the importance of Cyril in the following words: “Cyril of Alexandria’s reputation as the chief architect of patristic Christology can hardly be overstated. For centuries, scholars and church leaders, particularly in the West, have regarded Cyril as the veritable founder of Christological orthodoxy.”<sup>371</sup> It is through the ideological conflict of the time the church came to a more precise terminology. Therefore his role as a corrective force is in no way to be doubted. “His writings however, convey a genuine concern for his flock and for the orthodoxy of their faith.”<sup>372</sup> Although he had been engaged in power struggles, he was also very much concerned about the orthodoxy of faith. “So during the first years (or possibly already before 412), Cyril composed the *Thesaurus* against Arianism. And he used to write Festal Letters, in order to inform the faithful regarding the dates of Lent, Easter and Pentecost, and which contained teachings and exhortations appropriate for the time.”<sup>373</sup> And he wrote a number of commentaries. He criticized the Jews living in Alexandria for their impiety, disobedience and for honouring the letter above the spirit. From the start of his episcopate Cyril started writing commentaries to biblical books, initiating with the Old Testament. *De adoratione*, a typological<sup>374</sup> exegesis,

<sup>367</sup>These sentences are attributed to him (cited from. G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, London 1977, 150 referring to Theodoret of Cyrus, Ep. 180 [PG 83, 1489 C- 1491 A]).

<sup>368</sup>Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 2.

<sup>369</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>370</sup>Benedikt XVI, *Die Kirchenväter - frühe Lehrer der Christenheit*, Regensburg 2008, 123.

<sup>371</sup>C. A. Beeley, *Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory Nazianzen: Tradition and Complexity in Patristic Christology*, in: *JECS* 17 (2009), 381.

<sup>372</sup>Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 4.

<sup>373</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>374</sup>Typology: I. Notion: The Greek concept of τύπος can mean pattern, lay, cast, form, exemplar. Typos is that which represents or that which is specially coined or formative or an exemplar. Although the theory of the biblical-theological term began in the period of early Church it was developed during the protestant time namely in the 18<sup>th</sup> cent. By it meant from today’s point of view corresponding forms, data or designs which can be applied to the historical conditions or to the different phases of salvation history. II: Biblical-theological: Typology concerns by its various approaches to find relationships between the OT and NT passages. Types play



from the Pentateuch, may have been his first commentary. The *Glaphyra* is a complementary commentary on Pentateuch passages. He wrote commentaries on Isaiah and on the twelve Minor Prophets. All these books and fragments of Cyril cover above four volumes of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*. In his Festal letter No. 8 we see the first warning against a two-Sons Christology. Cyril continued his fight further against Arianism through his seven Dialogues on the Trinity perhaps written between a period of 420 and 425. The same tenor of fight we find in his *Thesaurus*. In the second half of the year 420 he started with the New Testament commentary on the Gospel of John. This work contains quite some anti-Arian polemics while his main thrust is to denounce the separation of Christ into two Sons. Some commentaries are also extant to us today from the commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew and on several of the epistles, and a series of homilies on the Gospel of Luke. Some of them are written before the outset of Nestorian controversy and some later. We come across in almost three volumes of the *Patrologia Graeca*, mainly with New Testament commentaries from Cyril of Alexandria and among them mainly the commentary on John.<sup>375</sup> These all show how earnest he was in his life and how dedicated he was to foster the faith of his people. "Cyril was the chief representative of the Alexandrian tradition in the fifth century and the standard-bearer of the opposition to Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople and voice of the Antiochian tradition."<sup>376</sup> Nestorius was the chief opponent of Cyril due to his teaching. There after Cyril's whole life is dedicated to this conflict. "The outbreak of the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius brought Cyril's exegetical work to an end."<sup>377</sup> From this below given quotation it is clear that Cyril's whole life was dedicated against the heresy of Nestorius.

"Cyril and Nestorius exchanged a number of letters on these matters but no settlement could be reached. As a result Cyril, encouraged by Pope Celestine, called a synod in Alexandria and there the Egyptian bishops condemned the teaching of Nestorius. Out of this synod came Cyril's third letter to Nestorius including the notorious twelve anathemas condemning Nestorius' teaching. During this period Cyril also composed a major refutation of Nestorius in five books, the *Adversus Nestorium*, and in this work he discussed the position represented in the collection of Nestorius's sermons."<sup>378</sup>

We may refer to what Moreschini says on this point

"Die wichtigste Phase seiner bischöflichen Tätigkeit war die des Kampfes gegen Nestorius, der am 10. April 428 zum Patriarchen von Konstantinopel gewählt worden war. Dieser entwickelte die Thesen der Antiochener weiter, die, um die Integrität der menschlichen Natur Christi zu bewahren, die Unterscheidung zwischen dem göttlichen Sohn und dem Menschen Jesus betonten ... Cyril attackierte diese Position sofort ... Er suchte die Unterstützung des Kaisers Theodosius II ... Größere Zustimmung erhielt Cyrill von Papst Coelestin I, der

---

an important role in biblical theology in order to search the meaning of certain pericopes or passages in the Bible. Words, happenings, persons and institutions of the OT were 'Types' considered having corresponding counterpart in the NT (cf. C. Dohmen and E. Dirscherl, *Typologie. Begriff*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 10, Freiburg 2001, 321-323).

<sup>375</sup>Cf. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 7.

<sup>376</sup>Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, 201.

<sup>377</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>378</sup>*Ibid.*, 202.

Nestorius in einer Synode im August 430 verurteilte und den Bischof von Alexandrien zu seinem Bevollmächtigten gegen Nestorius ernannte.”<sup>379</sup>

According to Cyril Nestorius and his teaching posed a serious threat to the faith of the Church because it undermined the personal unity of Christ. It is through this conflict between both churches, namely Antiochian and Alexandrian, Cyril became very famous as the one who taught the right teaching of the Church and as a consequence Nestorius had to undergo severe tribulations in his life. Most of Nestorius’ writings have been lost and the remaining fragments do not present a totally satisfying picture of his views. A recently discovered work of Nestorius, called *Bazaar of Heraclidis*, gives us a glimpse into his ideas. From this work we are able to understand, which we have discussed in the first chapter, that Nestorius wanted to give emphasis to the manhood of Christ, which at least for him seems to be ignored by the Alexandrian Church. Whereas the Alexandrian Church represented by Cyril wanted to give thrust upon the Godhood of Christ, and which came in sharp conflict with each other. “The Christology of Cyril had the unity of Christ as its guiding principle. Cyril insisted that Christ is identical to God the Logos incarnate. The personal agent of our salvation was not a man standing in whatever relationship to God the Logos, but God the Logos incarnate himself.”<sup>380</sup> As we have seen at length in the first chapter the views and teachings of Nestorius we will concentrate mainly on Cyril of Alexandria and his teaching in this chapter. Before we get into the teachings of Cyril let us start with the church of Alexandria and its environment where Cyril exercised his power.

## 2. The Beginning and Development of Christianity in Egypt<sup>381</sup>

It is very difficult to appraise an exact date for the founding of Christian movement in Egypt due to the obscurity caused by legends. This obscurity does not arise due to the lack of materials but because of the lack of hint or chronicles which point to a definite time when Egyptian Christianity was founded and the religion’s earliest development along the Nile.<sup>382</sup> One can with certainty say that during the first century and first half of the second century, the spread of Christianity in Alexandria and in Egypt had not been considerable.

“According to traditional position taken by commentators Christianity was spread first to Alexandria as a ‘Greek-speaking’ religion and only considerably later was taken to the native population in their local languages. Greek was the scriptural language of Jews in Egypt, and although there is some evidence that they had utilized Aramaic centuries before Greek became a predominant language in Egypt.”<sup>383</sup>

<sup>379</sup>C. Moreschini und E. Norelli, *Handbuch der Antiken Christlichen Literatur* (Aus dem Italienischen übersetzt von S. F. Elisabeth und A. Haberkamm), München 2007, 551-52.

<sup>380</sup>D. Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ: Person, Nature and Will in the Christology of Saint Maximus the Confessor*, New York 2004, 24.

<sup>381</sup>“Egypt is a desert with a ribbon of inhabited land bordering the Nile. Irrigation farming is necessary to nourish the dry soil and to encourage the collection of silt. The productivity of the state is dependent on the proper maintenance of the irrigation system. And the proper maintenance of the irrigation system is dependent on the dominant class being able to control the means of production” (H. A. Green, *The Socio-Economic Background of Christianity in Egypt Part II: The Environment of Early Christianity in Egypt*, in: B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring, ed., *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, Philadelphia 1986, 102).

<sup>382</sup>Cf. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 13.

<sup>383</sup>*Ibid.*, 15.

But no meaningful estimate can be made concerning the number of Christians in the Mediterranean world who remained independent of Jerusalem or other major Christian centers. We can say in all probability that Christian groups sprang up in many lands, which were not united either ecclesiastically or doctrinally, with the Jerusalem church or as its satellites. Egypt with its large Jewish population may well have been spawn ground for a number of such groups along the length of the Nile. In the book *Early Egyptian Christianity*, we come across a reference “that there is a general consensus that Christianity had to be taken to Egypt by approximately 50 C. E.”<sup>384</sup> Also Egyptian Christianity claims some biblical references regarding the flight of the holy family to Egypt. It is perceived that it was at the time when Gaius Turranius was Prefect of the Roman Province of Egypt, according to the Evangelist St. Matthew, the Holy Family fled to the Land of the Nile. They would have crossed the narrow isthmus of al-Qantara, nowadays a small village at the Suez Canal, and following the ancient caravan-route from Judea to Egypt they might have entered the fertile province of Goshen.<sup>385</sup> For a large number of Copts, the coming of the Holy Family to the Land of the Pharaohs is an annual event of jubilation, which is commemorated in their *Synaxar*<sup>386</sup> and celebrated in many communities.<sup>387</sup> Any attempt to link this experience to the founding of Christianity in Egypt is at best fanciful and imaginative. In recent times also we encounter such legends associated with the visit of the holy family, although they are not founded upon any historical evidence than the Infancy Narratives which were invented from the second century onward. Again in bible in Acts 19, 1-7 we read that Paul had to rebaptize<sup>388</sup> some in Ephesus who came from Alexandria (Acts 18, 24) who had been taught by Apollos because they had not been correctly taught. From the summary of this passage one can assume that Christianity reached Egypt (at least Alexandria) at quite an early date. Another passage of the New Testament which perhaps has a reference to the Christianity of Egypt is 1 Pet 5, 13 “Ἀσπάζεταιται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτῇ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου (the congregation at Babylon, chosen together with you, and my son, Mark, send you greetings).”<sup>389</sup> From this above given reference we may assume that Markus was in Alexandria. Along with this biblical references we find also two other sources for the existence of Christianity in Egypt, namely, “the biblical and non-biblical Christian manuscripts found at many sites along the Nile, both of Old and New Testament texts; and the other regarding the vexing question of Gnosticism and Gnostic sources relating to the first two centuries.”<sup>390</sup> We may summarize “from this evidence of the Christian biblical papyri found in Egypt that in all probability Christianity arrived in Egypt

---

<sup>384</sup>Ibid., 17.

<sup>385</sup>Gosen, Goshen (hebr.), in the Vulgate Gessen is an area in Egyptian countryside [Gen 46,28-29, 34] (cf. BE 8, Mannheim 1989, 682).

<sup>386</sup>The Alexandrian martyrology, or Coptic Synaxarion, is evolved from a local martyrology toward a more general calendar, only to return later to its local tradition. The Coptic Church considers its patriarchs to be saints, and ninety-seven of the 116 patriarchs are commemorated in the Coptic Synaxarion (cf. O. Meinardus, *Two Thousand Years of Coptic Christianity*, New York 1999, 285).

<sup>387</sup>Cf. Meinardus, *The Coptic Church in Egypt*, in: A. J. Arberry, ed., *Religion in the Middle East: Three Religions in Concord and Conflict*, Vol. I., Judaism and Christianity, London 1969, 423.

<sup>388</sup>Cf. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 17; One of the explanations for this ‘rebaptism’ is that though Apollos taught ‘accurately’ or correctly but inadequately and that although Apollos was a Christian teacher he taught independent of the ecclesiastical or ‘apostolic’ Christianity.

<sup>389</sup>Ibid.

<sup>390</sup>Ibid., 23.

before the end of the first century, and further that Christianity was not confined geographically to the Alexandrian region.”<sup>391</sup>

Although today some consensus can be found regarding the date of arrival of Christianity in Egypt, some difficulty persists yet to be solved regarding what sort or kind of Christianity first attested there. It seems that “Alexandrian Christianity was rather syncretistic.”<sup>392</sup> Hadrian, who was Roman Emperor from 117-138, saw Christians giving worship to Serapis<sup>393</sup> addressing themselves as bishops of Christ and devoting themselves to Serapis.<sup>394</sup> It seems Alexandrians prostrated themselves before Serapis or Christ impartially. Whether it is Christ or Serapis, it was immaterial for them.

“Copts are Egyptian Christians. The word derives from the ancient Hikaptah (house of the ka or spirit of Ptah, the temple of one of the great gods of ancient Egypt) via Greek ‘Aigyptios’ and the Arabic ‘Qibt’ to the English ‘Copt.’ The Arabs called Egypt ‘dar al-Qibt’ (home of the Copts). In modern usage the term ‘Coptic’ refers to Egyptian Christianity (the Coptic Orthodox Church), the liturgy associated with that Church, and the art forms adopted by it. The Coptic language is the ancient Egyptian vernacular written in the Greek alphabet, with the addition of seven extra characters derived from demotic, the last stage of hieroglyphics. After Greek, it was the principal language of ‘late antique Egypt,’ and later it was eclipsed by Arabic.”<sup>395</sup>

But from the reign of Commodus<sup>396</sup> in 180, it seems that Christianity was rather well established in Alexandria, purifying itself of its Gnostic doctrines and paganistic

<sup>391</sup>Ibid., 28.

<sup>392</sup>Meinardus, *Two Thousand Years of Coptic Christianity*, 143.

<sup>393</sup>Sarapis (Gk. Σάραπις) or Serapis (Gk. Σέρραπις) was a Graeco-Egyptian god. S. was adopted by Ptolemy I. of Egypt and depicted with Greek features as a bearded man similar to the Greek god Zeus but with attributes derived from other Greek gods as a means to unify the Greeks and Egyptians in his realm. Therefore the god was depicted as Greek in appearance, but with Egyptian trappings. It was named Aser-hapi (i.e., Osiris-Apis), which became Serapis, and was said to be Osiris in full (the religious symbol of lying bull). The name S. seems to have been derived from Osiris Apis, the deceased form of the Apis bull worshipped at Memphis. S. continued to increase in popularity during the Roman period, often replacing Osiris as the consort of Isis in non-Egyptian temples. In Egypt he is the god of Hades and solar God corresponding and placing in par with Dionysos-Osiris and Zeus (Jupiter, Helios). In the Roman Empire he is known as a saviour-god, and had a new bloom in 2-3 cent., after Christ (cf. D. Kessler, *Sarapis*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 70).

<sup>394</sup>Cf. Meinardus, *Two Thousand Years of Coptic Christianity*, 143.

<sup>395</sup>J. Kamil, *Christianity in the land of Pharaohs: The Coptic Orthodox Church*, New York 2002, 1.

<sup>396</sup>Commodus (Lucius Aurelius C.), Roman Emperor (180-192), was born on 31. 8. 161. He was the son of Marcus Aurelius. He ruled as co-emperor with his father Marcus Aurelius from ca. 177 until his father's death in 180. Marcus Aurelius granted C. the rank of imperator and in the middle of 177 the title Augustus giving his son the same status as his own and formally sharing power. The reign of C. was comparatively peaceful in comparison with the reign of his father Marc. Aur. But it was marked by political strife and the increasingly arbitrary and capricious behavior of the emperor himself. Despite his notoriety, and considering the importance of his reign, C. years in power are not well chronicled. The principal surviving literary sources are of Dio Cassius (a contemporary and first-hand observer), Herodian and the *Historia Augusta* (untrustworthy for its character as they are embedded with elements of fiction with biography). He had only little interest in the business of administration and tended throughout his reign to leave the practical running of the state to a succession of favourites. This dissatisfaction with the state of affairs later led to a series of conspiracies and attempted coups. This provoked C. to take charge of affairs, which he did in an increasingly dictatorial manner. He enjoyed megalomania thus he called himself ‘the Roman Hercules.’ In his identification with Hercules one can see an attempt to solidify his claim as new founder of Rome, which he now called the *Colonia Lucia Annia Commodiana*. This was legitimized by his direct link to Hercules, son of father Jupiter (*Iupiter exsuperatorius; Hercules Commodianus*). Thus he decreed that he should be worshipped as Hercules Romanus. Together with it he adjured the old roman gods with new attributes and adopted gods from the East namely Cybele and Serapis as *conservatrices Augustii*. During his reign several plots were made on Commodus' life and finally he died on 31. 12. 192 during a casualty which took place during a palace revolution. Christian authors of the time see his reign

traces.<sup>397</sup> From the time of Septimius Severus (193-211),<sup>398</sup> growth of Christianity was rapid and started to make its own history. At the same period we see the founding of the so-called Catechetical School of Alexandria where the famous three celebrated scholars of this school originate namely Pantaenus,<sup>399</sup> Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. Concerning the place where the early Christians gathered for their worship we read so:

“The most important of the early Christian holy places in Alexandria was undoubtedly Boukolou, where according to the Acts of Mark, the earliest Christians had their place of worship and where the saint met his death and was buried. Here was the church in which Arius served as a presbyter in the early fourth century. Epiphanius refers to it as the ‘church of Baukalis.’<sup>400</sup> In the first century this area was the main Jewish neighbourhood, described in glowing terms by Josephus. This Jewish quarter was presumably destroyed during the time of the rebellion under Trajan (115-17),<sup>401</sup> and in the fourth century the area in question probably lay well outside the main part of the city.”<sup>402</sup>

The below given quotation speaks very clearly about the circumstances in which the Alexandrian Church flourished:

“There are many places in Egypt known to have a long history of sanctity from pagan through Christian and Islamic times. Until the beginning of Constantine’s declaration that Christianity as the official religion in 313, Church in Egypt had to

as a period of peacetime that the Christian mission could flourish [Iren. Haer. 4, 46, 3; Eus. H. E. 5, 21, 1] (cf. K. Rosen, Commodus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 2, Freiburg 1994, 1276-1277).

<sup>397</sup>Cf. Meinardus, Two Thousand Years of Coptic Christianity, 143.

<sup>398</sup>Septimius Severus (Lucius Septimius), Roman Emperor (193-211), was born on 1. 4. 145 at Leptis Magna in Tripolitania and died on 4. 2. 211 at Eburacum (York); in 185 he married Julia Domna, in 186 a son was born to him named Septimius Bassianus (Caracalla). After the assassination of Commodus and Pertinax, Severus was upraised as Emperor by his troops on 9. 4. 193 against Didius Julianus in Rome and Pescennius Niger in Antiochia. He could assert himself against the rivals and become the sole ruler in April 194. After solidifying his rule over the western provinces, Severus waged another small and successful war in the east against the Parthian Empire in which the capital Ctesiphon was captured towards the end of 197 A. D. Thereafter Mesopotamia was once more annexed as a province of the Roman Empire. He ruled with an iron hand. According to the apocryphal tradition (Hist. Aug. vita Sev. 17, 1), S. had prohibited conversion to Judaism and Christianity (cf. K. Rosen, Septimius, Severus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 475).

<sup>399</sup>Pantaenus who was in Alexandria is said to be the head of the ‘school of the faithful.’ But this information cannot be verified. It is certain that P. was the teacher of Clement of Alexandria and influenced Origen. He is presumed to be a stoic philosopher who was converted to the Christian faith. He seems to be born either in Sicilia or in Athens and came down to Alexandria and started a private philosophic school which intensively concerned with the theological questions (cf. W. M. Gessel, Pantainos, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 1316).

<sup>400</sup>B. A. Pearson opines that it may be a corruption or variant of the word Boukolos, which means ‘cowherd.’ Thus the place of the ‘boukolos’ could mean something like ‘cow pasture,’ boukolia (cf. B. A. Pearson, Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some observations, in: B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring, ed., The Roots of Egyptian Christianity, Philadelphia 1986, 153).

<sup>401</sup>Trajan (Marcus Ulpius Traianus), was Roman Emperor from 98-117. He was born on 18. 9. 53 into a non-patrician family in the province of Hispania Baetica and died on 7. 8. 117 in the city of Selinus (Zilizien). He was the son of Marcus Ulpius Traianus. But he was adopted by the Roman Emperor Nerva in October 97 who conferred upon him the title Caesar and appointed him as the successor in agreement with a part of the Senate. As Nerva died on 28. 1. 98 he was succeeded by his adopted son without incident and he was frequently designated as the first provincial emperor who was a non-native Italian acknowledged as the *optimus princeps*. He is known after two wars in history namely the Dacian (101-102; 105-107) and the Parthian (113-117) wars. During his time the empire extended and got new provinces namely the provinces of Arabia (106), Dacia (107), Armenia (113), Assyria and Mesopotamia (115). He was toyed between 115-117 with jewish-rebellion in the whole of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Cyprus and Cyrene. He died on his way back to Rome from the Parthian war in 117 (cf. K. Rosen, Trajan, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 10, Freiburg 2001, 163).

<sup>402</sup>Pearson, Earliest Christianity in Egypt, 153.

encounter many obstacles in the course of her existence. But once this officiality for Christianity came there started the flourishing of Christianity. Pharaonic temples were converted into churches and monasteries, their pagan images plastered over and repainted with saints propagating many churches were changed into mosques.”<sup>403</sup>

Kamil, in her book, *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs* tells us how Christianity flourished in Egypt where there had been an established religion which lasted almost for more than 3000 years.<sup>404</sup> From the fourth century onward, Egyptian Christianity was characterized by her emphasis on the ascetic life, and the erection of so many monasteries, and which grew more numerous as time went on. According to the information “in the fifth and sixth centuries there were no less than six hundred of them, all built like dedicated to the worship of the emperors.”<sup>405</sup> With regard to the language used in Egypt was all depended upon the conquest of the country.

“Following the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great, Greek became the official language and remained so until well after the Arab conquest in 640. Greek was the official language spoken in the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria, and it was the medium of communication among the patriarchs and bishops of the early church. It remained the official language until the days of the governor ‘Abd Allah ibn Marwan (705-709) who tried to use Arabic in public affairs.”<sup>406</sup>

L. MacCoull shares the view that a strange paradox hangs over the field of Coptic studies. Most of the articles in many volumes of assorted studies are on Constantinople, Syria, Armenia, Gaul, North Africa, and Palestine. Egypt is left off the map, or mentioned only in passing.<sup>407</sup> So is also with the Egyptian contributions. Although Monasticism has long been recognized as Egypt’s great contribution to the Christian world, there has been a notable lack of interest on the Egyptian (Coptic) Church. By default it is suggested that Egyptians played no part in the scholarly, scientific or intellectual life of Alexandria; and as a result they played no part in the growth and development of orthodox Christianity.<sup>408</sup> It is not true to say that they did not contribute anything to the Church rather their contribution to the Church was enormous.

### 3. The Alexandrian School against the Antiochian School

Under this title let us consider the major differences and the contrasts of Alexandrian and Antiochian School. We can understand the importance of Alexandria only in relation to the place of this metropolis in Hellenistic culture and in relation to the social and political life of the Roman Empire. “One of the three poles of Greek speaking culture (with Athens and Antioch), it was the primary centre of philology, philosophy and theology.”<sup>409</sup> Greek speaking Hebrew culture was also born and developed here, producing the Septuagint and the work of Philo. Today we know that Alexandria was socially and politically a perfect Greek Island purposely so created inside the territory of the old Egyptian Empire in order to control the exploitation of its

<sup>403</sup>Kamil, *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs*, xvii.

<sup>404</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 2.

<sup>405</sup>Meinardus, *Two Thousand Years of Coptic Christianity*, 145.

<sup>406</sup>*Ibid.*, 283.

<sup>407</sup>Cf. Kamil, *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs*, 4 in reference to MacCoull, 1993, I, 8.

<sup>408</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 5.

<sup>409</sup>T. Orlandi, *Alexandria*, in: *EncEc 1*, Cambridge 1992, 22.

agricultural and commercial riches to the full. From the historical point of view it was inherited by Roman government and as such it sheltered a strong Jewish colony. So we can assume in every way that Alexandria was rich with varied and complex relations. On the one side “in the theological school of Alexandria dominated the philosophy of Plato<sup>410</sup> and its main exponents were Clement, Origen and Didymus the Blind and thus following closely Greek culture and on the other we find also traces of monasticism and whose main exponents were Anthony,<sup>411</sup> Pachomius<sup>412</sup> and their followers.”<sup>413</sup> We hear of the first conflict taking place in the Egyptian Church at the time of Peter the bishop of Egypt (300-311), when he went in hiding due to the persecution of Diocletian and Maximian.<sup>414</sup> On this occasion Melitius,<sup>415</sup> the bishop of

---

<sup>410</sup>Plato was born in 428/427 B. C. and died in 348/347 B. C. in Athens. He was a Classical Greek Philosopher, mathematician, student of Socrates, writer of philosophical dialogues, and founder of the Academy in Athens. His thinking exhibits in dialogue forms (Dialogical). His thought is comprised of an Idea-Hypothesis. According to his principle of idea it refers typically to the belief that the material world as it seems to us is not the real world but only an image or copy of the real world. The world which appears to our senses is in some way defective and filled with error. According to him there is something else which is more real and perfect. One such entity is forms or ideas (ιδέα) as they are eternal, and changeless. Among the most important of these abstract objects are goodness, beauty, equality, bigness, likeness, unity, being, sameness, difference, change, and changelessness. He held that knowledge is always proportionate to the realm from which it is gained. That is to say if one derives one’s account of something experientially, because the world of sense is in flux, the views therein attained will be mere opinions. And opinions are characterized by a lack of necessity and stability. On the other hand if one derives one’s account of something by way of the non-sensible forms, because these forms are unchanging, the account derived from them [(Phaed 78 B ff., rep 475 E ff., Tim. 51 B ff)] will be the highest and most fundamental kind of reality (the theory of forms or theory of ideas). It is only in this sense that Plato uses the term ‘knowledge’ (cf. J. Szaif, Platon, Platonismus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 349-353).

<sup>411</sup>Anthony (Antony the Great, Anthony of Egypt, Anthony the Abbot, Anthony of the Desert, Anthony of Thebes, Abba Antonius) (St., Feast 17 Jan.), was Abbot, and great anchorite. A. was born in 252 in Middle Egypt (according to Sozomenos in Coma, today’s Ceman) as the son of affluent parents. At the age of 18 his parents died entrusting to his care the unmarried sister. Once as he heard the Bible being read in the Church specially a passage from the Gospel of Mt 19, 21 and later another passage Mt 6, 34 he made up his mind to renounce all what he had and to dedicate himself to an ascetic life. He entrusted his sister to Christian virgins who were also leading an ascetic life. He led a life of total renunciation and started to lead a life of asceticism in the neighbourhood of his home town where lived a number of ascetics. After that he shut himself up in an abandoned defensive fortification in the desert where he had to fight with the demons and later from there he moved to a mountain (Kolzim, the Mar Antonios), not very far from Red sea, where he ascended to greater perfection (cf. G. J. M. Bartelink, Antonios, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 786-788).

<sup>412</sup>Pachomius (copt. P-achom) from Tabennese (St., Feast 9, 14 Mai and varied feast days one find in different church calendars), founder of Christian cenobitic monasticism, was born ca. 290 in Latopolis (Upper Egypt) and died on 9. 5. 346 or 347 in Pbow. As he was twenty he was swept up against his will in Roman army recruitment, a common occurrence during the turmoil and civil wars of the period. As he saw the love of local Christians who brought food and comforts to the inmates of Thebes he was attracted to Christianity and converted and was baptized (314). He then came into contact with a number of well known ascetics and decided to pursue that path. He sought out the hermit Palaemon and came to be his follower. Later leaving this village he founded the first Christian cenobitic community in Tabennese between 320-325 in accordance with the ideal picture of the Jerusalem ancient community which is portrayed in Acts 4, 32-37 (with one heart, one soul and possessions in common). Before his death there were already nine monasteries of his order (Koinonia) for men, and two for women, one of which was guided by his sister called Maria (cf. T. Baumeister, Pachomios, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1993, 1254-1255).

<sup>413</sup>T. Orlandi, Alexandria, 22.

<sup>414</sup>Maximianus (Marcus Aurelius Valerius M.; Surname: Herculus as Pendant to Jovius of Diokletians from 286), a Roman Emperor from 286-305, was born ca. 250 in the Roman colony of Poetovio (modern Ptuj, in Slovenia). Although he belonged to lower grade by birth he ascended it and became comrade in arms to Diocletian and later in 285 he was raised to Caesar and in 286 to Augustus. He led number of wars against the Bagaudae in Gaul (285) and the Germanic tribes along the Rhine frontier (from 286) so also in Afrika (from 297) and conquered Carausius (295) his rival leader fighting long conquests together with Constantius Chlorus (cf. G. Wirth, Maximianus, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 1506-07).

Lycopolis acted for some time in his place as his substitute without his permission. Peter condemned Melitius and from then on began the schism in the Egyptian Church which gave much trouble to Athanasius and which lasted up to 7<sup>th</sup> cent. The great 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> cent. Patriarchs namely, Athanasius, Theophilus and Cyril conducted an active ecclesiastical policy towards the other imperial metropolises, dominating the ecumenical councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus. This predominance of Alexandria was brought to decline by the defeat of Dioscorus<sup>416</sup> at the council of Chalcedon. Later on “the Egyptian Church had to submit to the sending of ‘Chalcedonian’ bishops appointed by the emperor of Constantinople and supported by the army.”<sup>417</sup>

Another important field which we have to take into account when considering the Alexandrian Church is its heritages of culture. At present it is assumed that a Judeo-Christian culture, though less strong than in Asia, influenced Alexandria. Together with this culture the predominance of 2<sup>nd</sup> cent., Gnostics compels us to theorize that they also contributed to the formulation of an Egyptian culture, “professing more philosophically elaborate doctrines with their culturally syncretistic tendencies harmonized with the intellectual liveliness of the Alexandrian religious milieu and the different stimuli acting on it like Greek philosophy, Judaeo-Hellenism, oriental religions, and apocalyptic literature.”<sup>418</sup> Gnosticism was taken seriously by well-educated, intellectually more ambitious members of Christian society and people of higher social status. And their contact and collaboration (the contact between the orthodox and heterodox [Gnostic] Christians) were a matter of daily reality.<sup>419</sup> From the 2<sup>nd</sup> cent., onwards we find that the predominance of the Gnostics was challenged with the coming of famous orthodox Christians like Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen. The aim of Clement and Origen (though we do not know anything concrete about Pantaenus) was to oppose the cultural predominance of Gnostics among educated Christians, and for this purpose they began to elaborate and examine the data offered by scripture and tradition, making systematic use of the instruments provided by Greek

---

<sup>415</sup>Melitius was bishop of Lycopolis at the time of Diocletian and Galerius. The details of his life are not clear as there are conflicting accounts of it. According to one version he was imprisoned for his Christian belief during the persecution under Diocletian. He is known as the founder of Melitianism (ca. 305), one of the several schismatic sects in the early Church which was concerned about the ease with which lapsed Christians reentered the church. The supporters that Melitius drew around him included a number of bishops, at least some of whom he personally ordained, and the objections against him were that he ordained people in regions where he lacked authority. He was excommunicated as he was found a disturber of the peace of the Church by Bp. Peter of Alexandria who was the official bishop of Alexandria. But Melitius had led his Church further calling it the name of the Church of the Martyrs inherently objecting to the reacceptance of people by other bishops who chose to avoid the risk of martyrdom. The council of Nicea (325) tried to reintegrate all the Melitian bishops (meanwhile more than 30) under certain restrictions by bringing them under the suzerainty of Alexandrian bishop. The offer to keep only the title of bishop to Meletius was not accepted and he died in 327. The election of Bishop Athanasius in 328 intensified again the conflict (cf. F. Dünzl, *Melitios, Bf. v. Lykopolis*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 86).

<sup>416</sup>Dioscorus I, who was the Patriarch of Alexandria (444-451), died on 4. 9. 454 in Gangra (Exile). As the successor of Cyril of Alexandria he tried to set up and bring back the leading role of the Alexandrian Church and tried to freeze the updated Christology of the Formulary of reunion of 433 by overdoing it and through the so called ‘Robber synod’ of 449 deposed Flavian of Constantinople together with other Diophysites and rehabilitated Eutyches. He was deposed in Chalcedon due to breach of law of the Church and due to his move against Pope Leo (cf. H.-J. Sieben, *Dioskoros*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 249-250).

<sup>417</sup>Orlandi, *Alexandria*, 22.

<sup>418</sup>*Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>419</sup>Cf. M. Simonetti, *Alexandria, II. School*, in: *EncEc* 1, Cambridge 1992, 23 in reference to Eusebius, *H. E.* 6, 2, 13-14.



secular culture, rhetoric, philology, and philosophy. For this they employed platonic spiritualism rigorously than by certain Asiatic Christianity. “Origen in particular adopted the distinction, typical of Platonism, between two levels of reality, the sensible one a faint copy and image of the intelligible, as a criterion by which to interpret every aspect of Christian reality. Clement made the division of Christians into ‘simple and perfect.’”<sup>420</sup> Currently one can say without doubt that these ideas and principles developed and explored by Origen and Clement constituted the foundation of the Christian learning<sup>421</sup> in Alexandrian Church and diminished the danger of Gnostic threat to the Alexandrian Church and paved the way for Christianity to penetrate deep into the educated pagan minds and make it acceptable. As Origen depended heavily upon Platonic philosophy he had to face severe and unfavourable reactions from the local church for his intellectual commitments and later he had to face condemnation which ended up in the expulsion to Caesarea in Palestine (ca. 232). Although his teaching had faced with severe reactions the followers of Origen namely Heraclas,<sup>422</sup> Dionysius,<sup>423</sup> Achillas,<sup>424</sup> Serapion<sup>425</sup> and Peter<sup>426</sup> followed the cultural

---

<sup>420</sup>Ibid. (According to Origen the simple, the beginner adhered to the lower, sensible level of reality, while the perfect aspired to the higher, intelligible, spiritual level, according to the correlation: simple/perfect = Christ man/Christ God = literal/spiritual (allegorical interpretation of Scripture).

<sup>421</sup>Systematic allegorical interpretation of Scripture, Logos-theology and trinitarian doctrine of the three hypostases, depreciation of Christ’s humanity in comparison with his divinity, dualistic Platonic anthropology, spiritualized eschatology etc.

<sup>422</sup>Heraclas (St., Feast 14 Juli [Rom], 1 Dec. [Copt.]), was Bp. of Alexandria from 231/232-247/248. He was a convert to Christianity by Origen as he attended the School of Alexandria as a student. Later as a member and academician he guided the Catechumen School of Alexandria from 217. As a bishop he preceded Dionysius and carried forward the running of the catechetical school and supported the expulsion of Origen (cf. W. A. Bienert, Heraklas, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 4, Freiburg 1995, 1429).

<sup>423</sup>Dionysius of Alexandria (St., Feast 17 Nov.), generally known as ‘the great,’ was one of the significant bishops, born at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. He was not from a Christian family but later due to a vision got converted to Christianity. He died at an advanced age in 264/265. He was highly educated esp. in the field of philosophy and rhetoric by Origen and possibly baptized by Demetrius. In the year 231/232 he took over the position of the leader of the Catechetical school from Heraclas (who was also his teacher) and followed him later as bishop (247/248). In the fight against the resumption of the fallen ones (‘Lapsi’) during the time of persecution he allowed the possibility of return with proper penitence and fought against the rigorism of Novatian and for the unity of the Church. D. emphasized the divine Trias (Trinity), but at the same time realized the Homousie of the Son with the Father as orthodox (cf. W. A. Bienert, Dionysios v. Alexandrien, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 241-242).

<sup>424</sup>Achillas (St., Feast 7 Nov.), was bishop of Alexandria (from Jan. [?] to June [?] 312). His episcopate lasted less than a year. According to Eus. H. E. 7, 32 he had previously headed the Catechetical School of Alexandria. The information that he had taken Arius back to the Church and ordained him a priest, emerged in the 5<sup>th</sup> century (Soz. H. E. 1, 15; Gel. Cyz. H. E. 2, 1, 14), is based most probably on a confusion with a homonymous friend of Arius. Even if the Coptic Church mentions him as their Patriarch (PO 1, 401), he is not revered by her as holy (cf. H. R. Seeliger, Achillas, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 113).

<sup>425</sup>Serapion of Thmuis (St., Feast 21 March), was born ca. 300 and died after 370. Since 337 he came in personal contact with Antony the Great. In the year 336/337 S. fought against the Melitians, the adherents of Melitius of Lycopolis, on behalf of Athanasius the Great. He carried out the enforcement of 40 day Lenten Season (Quadragesima). After the flight of Athanasius in 356 he represented him in the defense of Arianism and was the defender of the divinity of the Holy Spirit (cf. K. Fitschen, Serapion v. Thmuis, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 478-79).

<sup>426</sup>Petros was bishop of Alexandria and martyr (Feast 25 Nov.). He died on 25 Nov. 311 in Alexandria. He was designated as the successor of Bp. Theonas ca. 300. He escaped by fleeing from the Diocletian persecution (306-311). His mild position of accepting the fallen ones (Lapsi) back to the church gave an occasion for the schism to break out which was initiated by Melitius of Lycopolis. He returned after the Edict of Toleration of Galerius to Alexandria and died during the persecution of Maximinus Daja (cf. A. M. Ritter, Petros, Bf. v. Alexandrien: P. I., in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 103-104).

approach<sup>427</sup> of Origen and later that became the official policy of the Church of Alexandria. Later Athanasius in regard to the monarchian<sup>428</sup> approach of the Nicene Creed (325) abandoned the three *hypostases* in the name of a more unitarian and egalitarian concept of the Trinity. According to M. Simonetti, the Alexandrian Christology by its subordination of Christ's humanity to his divinity better explained the unity of the theandric composition than that of the man/God bipolarity of Antiochene Christology and met the needs of the popular piety better.<sup>429</sup> But later we find also the development of this teaching into monophysitism<sup>430</sup> as the polemic degenerated it.

Another important peculiarity of Alexandria was that it was the cradle of syncretic religion. Together with the importance of the Episcopal see we find also intense activity in the field of religious building. We read innumerable examples in the works of Socrates and Sozomen, or Theodoret of Cyrus,<sup>431</sup> or in local chronicles that of John Nikiu<sup>432</sup> up to the period of Arab invasion; the Annals of Eutychius<sup>433</sup> contain a mass of information on the city's monuments. Under Patriarch Alexander (312-28) the temple of Saturn was converted into the church of St. Michael. He also

---

<sup>427</sup>Though they followed the same teaching of Origen they abandoned his doctrinal discussions of the pre-existence of the soul and the spiritual resurrection.

<sup>428</sup>By this term Tertullian (*adv. Prax.* 10, 1) indicates Praxeas ([P. introduced the monarchian heresy to Rome and then to Carthage]. P. may be taken as a nickname [mischief-maker, swindler]) (cf. M. Simonetti, Praxeas, in: *EncEc* 2, 706); and the patripassians, as heretical assertors of divine monarchy (= monotheism). Modern scholars prefer to apply the term also to the other branch of such heretics, the adoptianists (modern name ([Lat. adoptiani] is v. late) for the monarchians who made Christ a mere man and who was adopted by Him as Son of God for His merits. Theodotus of Byzantium ('the Tanner') taught at Rome (late 2<sup>nd</sup> cent.) that Jesus was a man born of the Virgin by the Father's will, who lived like other men, only more piously. At his baptism in the Jordan the dove descended on him to symbolize the divine spirit with which he was gifted, called the "higher Christ" (cf. Simonetti, Adoptianists, in: *EncEc* 1, 11). Here it is meant to specify a faith in a single God, which was characteristic of the Christian religion in contrast to the pagan polytheism. And this monotheistic faith had to be reconciled with faith in the divinity of Christ, the Son of God; and theological reflection on this point led in the 2<sup>nd</sup> cent., to the elaboration of the 'Logos-theology' (cf. Simonetti, Monarchians, in: *EncEc* 1, 566).

<sup>429</sup>Cf. Simonetti, Alexandria, II. School, in: *EncEc* 1, 23.

<sup>430</sup>Monophysitism, Monophysites, etymologically the term M. is the teaching which stated Christ as comprised of only one nature after the unification of divinity and humanity (Gr. *μόνος*, single, only; *φύσις*, Nature). Historically the opponents of the Two-Nature teaching, namely the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon („One Person or Hypostase in two Natures“) were called Monophysites (Mph.) which generally admit only the *Mia-Physis-Formula* (*μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*), one incarnated Nature of God-Logos (cf. T. Hainthaler, Monophysitismus, Monophysiten, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 418-421).

<sup>431</sup>From among the 232 Letters of Theodoret the 113<sup>th</sup> which is written to Pope Leo is remarkable; added to it are the 36 Letters of him which contained the acts the Council (cf. A. Viciano, Theodoretos, Bf. v. Kyros, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1401-1404).

<sup>432</sup>John of Nikiu was a Coptic Egyptian bishop (in the Nile Delta in Lower Egypt), who was also later appointed as the general administrator of the monasteries of Egypt. He died ca. 700. J. is the author of a world chronicle written according to the Byzantine-Syrian pattern. The last part of it gives an account of the Muslim conquest of Egypt (639/642) and it is valued as a reliable source (cf. P. Nagel, Johannes Bf. v. Nikiu, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 941).

<sup>433</sup>Eutychius of Alexandria, who was the author of a world history in Arabic, was the Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria from 933 to 940. He was born on 10. 9. 877 at Fustat (Cairo), and died on 12. 5. 940 at Alexandria. He attended the Muslim School, the traditional school or school of Traditionarier. His writings include his chronicle (Arabic: 'Row of Jewels') otherwise known by its Latin title, *Eutychii Annales*. Its original is attainable in the Alexandrian version in *Cod. Sin. Arab.* 582. Later it was appreciably revised (the Antiochian version and later a Lat. translation by Wilhelm of Tyrus). E. spent much of his life as a medical practitioner and at the age of 60 he became the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria probably due to the influence of the Muslim rulers. His administration lasted only 5 years and 3 months (cf. M. Breydy, Eutychios v. Alexandrien, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 1024).

restored the church of Theonas,<sup>434</sup> the then Episcopal church dedicated to the Virgin, whose function was later transferred to the Great Church that rose on the *Caesareum* or *Sebasteum* in the 4<sup>th</sup> cent. which was destroyed several times. During the reign of Constantius a Mithraeum was turned into a church. We find the intensification of this activity after the edict of Theodosius in 391. The principle Christian foundations were made mainly in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> cc., during the period of patriarchs called Theophilus (395-412), Cyril (412-44), and Dioscorus (444-51).<sup>435</sup> But after the council of Chalcedon, primacy over the East passed to the church of Constantinople and unfortunately the Egyptian Church rejected Chalcedonian dogma and officially embraced monophysitism and the Coptic and Melchite churches came into being.<sup>436</sup> It is unfortunate to note that after this period during the Muslim invasion of 638 many churches became mosques and that which resisted faced with terrible destruction.

In this context it may be good to speak also of the importance of Antioch in general. "Antioch, the capital of West Syria or Coele-Syria, was fertile and commercial, with sumptuous buildings, baths, theatres, hippodromes and library. In the 4<sup>th</sup> cent. it had eight pagan temples."<sup>437</sup> The supremacy of Antioch was not mainly politico-administrative but moral and cultural. The people of Antioch were cosmopolitan but spiritually and culturally Greek. Though Greek was their official language, Syriac was their popular language. The society was divided into rich, poor and middle class. It was again divided between big landowners, small shopkeepers, artisans, beggars and slaves. The people of Antioch were volatile and restless.<sup>438</sup> The Hellenist Judaeo-Christians from Jerusalem coming from Cyprus and Cyrenaica preached the gospel and converted many to Christianity. This was the place where at first the disciples were called Christians. Like in Alexandria, Antioch also had to undergo severe persecutions. But the Antiochian Church was faithful and suffered unto last and survived the crisis of the persecutions even those of Diocletian and Licinius<sup>439</sup> and recovered through the favour of Constantine (306-337). It seems that at the start of Diocletian's persecution (303), Syrian prisons were everywhere full of bishops, presbyters, deacons, lectors and exorcists. In the year 390 we hear from John Chrysostom, from his work,<sup>440</sup> that Antioch was wholly Christian with few pagans and a strong Jewish community.<sup>441</sup> After the Constantine peace formula there came up many church buildings inclusive of the splendid Great Cathedral Church, began by

---

<sup>434</sup>Theonas was in succession to Dionysius and Maximus bishop in Alexandria. During this period (281/282-300) the priests Achillas and Pierius (called „Origenes iunio“) spread the teaching tradition of Origen in this town. The local importance which Th. had in the town makes clear from the Church in Alexandria which was dedicated to his name (cf. W. A. Bienert, Theonas, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1463).

<sup>435</sup>Cf. Simonetti, Alexandria, II. School, 24.

<sup>436</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>437</sup>O. Pasquato, Antioch, 47.

<sup>438</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>439</sup>Licinius I (Gaius Valerius Licinianus Licinius Augustus), who was born ca. 265, was a Roman Emperor and was in the rank of an Augustus (308-324). He was murdered in Thessalonica ca. 325. Although he belonged to a lower ancestry he climbed the position through his access to the military (like the other Emperor's from almost 260); contemporary and friend of Emperor Galerius who in the year 308 (conference in Carnuntum) elevated him to the rank of Augustus. L. favoured Jupiter Conservator as the patron god (from 315/316 on the back side of his coins the figure of Jupiter was preferred). Up to the winning of the eastern empire he was pragmatist, and applied religion-politics holding the Milan declaration (313) and there after he acknowledged Jupiter as Protector and Guarantee god exactly like Constantine who held the Christian God as his protector God (cf. G. Gottlieb, Licinius, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 906-907).

<sup>440</sup>Cf. Adv. Jud.1, 4; PG 48, 849.

<sup>441</sup>Cf. Pasquato, Antioch, 47 in reference to Theodoret, H. E. 3, 9-12; PG 82, 1101-1108.

Constantine and finished by Constantius II (337-61) and dedicated in the presence of the many bishops of the council ‘in *Encaeniis*’ (341)<sup>442</sup> where John Chrysostom regularly preached. We learn from the 6<sup>th</sup> Canon of the Council of Nicaea (325) that Antioch enjoyed privileges together with Alexandria, Rome and Jerusalem. This also will hint at the idea that Antiochian Church was one of the super metropolitans from the 4<sup>th</sup> Century. But in the year 381 “canon 3 of Constantinople gave primacy of honour after Rome to Constantinople, ‘New Rome’, and the same council confirmed the Nicene privileges of Antioch, that is, main see of the ‘diocese’ of the East. But Boniface I (418-422) formulated the subordination of Antioch and Alexandria to Rome (Ep. 14, 1).”<sup>443</sup> It is one of the marked features of Church history that the relation between Rome and other Patriarchates were always one of tension and power-play.

“It is from Antioch we receive first the systematic collection of current canon law (canonical collection) now entitled *Collectio LXXVIII capitum*. The first ‘Nomocanon’ (or ‘of the fifty titles’) containing imperial-ecclesiastical law seems to have been composed here in the late 5<sup>th</sup> cent.”<sup>444</sup> It is unfortunate in the history of the Antiochian Church that the patriarchate weakened by internal dissensions, fell under Arab rule in 637, followed by Jerusalem (638), and Alexandria (642).<sup>445</sup> In Antioch flourished monasticism in the 4<sup>th</sup> cent. which in all probability might have come from autonomous Syrian eremitism that underwent post-Constantinian Egyptian influence. At the time of the council of Chalcedon (451) the patriarchate of Antioch had 130 episcopal sees. During this time Antioch evangelized the East Syrian Arab nomads. “Evangelization spread from Syria to N. India with the religious help of the S. Indian (Malabar) communities.”<sup>446</sup> Unfortunately Byzantine Syria fell under Islam in 636.

As in the Alexandrian Church, in Antioch also they had so many heretical teachers. In the year 268 almost 70 bishops gathered in order to judge the case of local bishop Paul of Samosata<sup>447</sup> who was accused of heresy and immorality. Having failed all the previous attempts, the accusation was entrusted to the priest Malchion<sup>448</sup> who convicted Paul of Monarchianism<sup>449</sup> condemned him and deposed. Again in the year 324- (early) 325 Alexander of Alexandria’s condemnation of the Arians was

<sup>442</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Theodoret, H. E. 3, 8; PG 82, 1099.

<sup>443</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>444</sup>*Ibid.*, 48.

<sup>445</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>446</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>447</sup>Paul of Samosata, contested bishop of Antioch, born in Samosata, died after 272. He became the bishop of Antioch ca. 260. His teaching and administration (namely as *dukenarios*, elevating himself to a high throne etc..) probably might have provoked enmity with him. The first Synod (ca. 264) he survived, the second (ca. 268) excommunicated him and appointed a successor to him. For P. Christ is someone from below and the Son of God is not someone who came from heaven above. Early attestation shows that for him Christ was only a *κοινὸς* namely *ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος* (Pamph apol. 5; Eus H. E. 7, 27-30). His teaching is a form of Monarchianism which emphasized the oneness of God. He taught that Jesus was born a mere man, but that at his baptism he was infused with the divine Logos or word of God. Jesus was seen not as God-become-man but as man-become God. From the supporters of P. there arose a group called Paulicians of whom the 19th canon of Nicene council (325) deals with (cf. R. Hanig, *Paulos v. Samosata*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 7, Freiburg 1998, 1527-28).

<sup>448</sup>Malchion of Antioch is a saint (Feast 28 Oct.). The only source for his life is Eusebius (H. E. 7, 29, 1f., 7, 30, 1-71) and dependent on him, Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 71). M. who was a presbyter and head of a school of rhetoric at Antioch was much esteemed for his purity of faith. At the 2<sup>nd</sup> council of Antioch (268) he exposed the errors of Paul of Samosata and was one of the authors of the *Letters*, written in the council’s name, to bishops Dionysius of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria (cf. A. De Nicola, *Malchion of Antioch*, in: *EncEc* 1, 518).

<sup>449</sup>Cf. above fn. 428.

confirmed by the ecumenical council at Ancyra<sup>450</sup> (later transferred to Nicaea). In the year 432 John of Antioch “convened the bishops favourable to Nestorius, hoping for reconciliation. The attempt to subscribe at least one of the six propositions (not heretical, but misunderstanding Nestorius’s position as legitimate) failed, and the bishops who signed Nestorius’s deposition resumed communion with Rome and the East (433).”<sup>451</sup> Later in the year 508-509

“at an illegal council, Flavian II of Antioch<sup>452</sup> signed the equivocal text of the Henoticon<sup>453</sup> which approved the councils of Nicea (325), Constantinople (381), and Ephesus (431) but did not mention Chalcedon (451); the council condemned the works of Diodore of Tarsus<sup>454</sup> and Theodore of Mopsuestia<sup>455</sup> and drew up four propositions (attributed to Acacius<sup>456</sup>) apparently conflicting with Chalcedon.”<sup>457</sup>

These are some of them mentioned in order to get to know the problems they had also in the Antiochian Church. Regarding the liturgical celebrations the Christian community of Antioch celebrated its liturgy in Greek<sup>458</sup> in apostolic times. Although the liturgy of John Chrysostom is not composed by him, the Antiochian influences entered the Byzantine Church through him. St. Mark is said to have introduced the Antiochian rite into Egypt (= Alexandrian rite). “From Jerusalem, to which the

---

<sup>450</sup> Ἀγκυρα is the metropolis of Galatia (diocesis Pontica) today’s Ankara. Christianity had rapidly progressed in this region (cf. D. Stiernon, Ancyra, in: *EncEc* 1, 37).

<sup>451</sup> Pasquato, Antioch, 49.

<sup>452</sup> Flavian, was the Patriarch of Constantinople from 446-449. Despite the favour which Eutyches found with the Emperor Flavian condemned Eutyches for his monophysitism at the Synod of 448 in which he was in the leading role. Flavian was deposed by the Robber Synod (449) which was guided by Patriarch Dioscorus although Flavian found protection and patronage by Pope Leo I (Tomus ad Flavianum). He died possibly on his way to exile. Later he was rehabilitated in Chalcedon [451] (cf. H.-J. Sieben, Flavian Patriarch v. Konstantinopel, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 1315).

<sup>453</sup> Edict Henoticon (482) is an unhappy and unsuccessful law edicted by emperor Zeno in order to conciliate Catholics and Monophysites. The reason for it was the assertion of Peter Mongus (Monophysite) as the Patriarch of Alexandria. Peter Mongus accepted it, explaining that it virtually condemned Chalcedon and thereby secured his place as Patriarch of Alexandria. The H. became very significant in the church politics during the time of Emperor Anastasius I (491-518) and it led to many needless and unnecessary polarization and schism in the Church (cf. G. Bausenhart, Henotikon, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 4, Freiburg 1995, 1426).

<sup>454</sup> Diodor(us), bishop of Tarsus, who was a highly distinguished ancient Christian Theologian, exegete from the Antiochian Church, seems to have died before ca. 394 in Tarsus. Actually he is considered as the founder of the Antiochian exegetical school. Theodore of Mopsuestia and John Chrysostom are counted among his prominent students. He played a significant role in the council of Constantinople (381). During the Nestorian disputes he came under suspicion as the precursor of Nestorius. Cyril of Alexandria charged him with strong accusations. Finally through the condemnation of the so-called ‘Three Chapter dispute’ (Dreikapitelstreit) his memory was cursed during the time of Emperor Justinian (544) and hence only a few of his writings are available to us from among his numerous works (cf. C. Kannengiesser, Diodoros, Bf. v. Tarsos, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 238).

<sup>455</sup> Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, Gk. church author, was born ca. 350 in Antioch and died in 428 in Mopusestia. Th. ascribes all sufferings to the humanity in Christ which he sharply distinguishes from the affliction incapable nature of Logos. He defends the divinity of the Holy Spirit (vs. the Macedonian, Pneumatomachi). In order to defend and preserve the divinity of the Logos he applied certain passages from the gospel of John (Jn 12, 31f; 14, 13, 17, 11) as belonging to the divinity of Logos and certain to the humanity of the human Jesus. This emphasis might have given the impression of two subjects although he never divided them; he always emphasized and held theoretically the unity of the Saviour (cf. F. Thome and H.-J. Vogt, Theodore, Bf. v. Mopsuestia, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 1414).

<sup>456</sup> Acacius of Melitene, was bishop before 430, and died before 449. In the Christological conflicts he was a staunch supporter of Cyril of Alexandria in the Council of Ephesus (431) and a determined opponent of Nestorius. After 433 he tried together with Rabbula of Edessa, whom he supported to become the bishop of Edessa in the year 412, to influence the Armenian Episcopate in an anti-nestorian manner (cf. W. A. Löhr, Akakios v. Melitene, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 286).

<sup>457</sup> Pasquato, Antioch, 49.

<sup>458</sup> Cf. Acts 11, 19-30; Epp. of Ignatius.

Antiochian Liturgy owes much, the liturgy of St. James spread to the patriarchate of Antioch later to be included in the Byzantine rite.”<sup>459</sup> From 451 (Council of Chalcedon) to 7<sup>th</sup> cent. with the separation of the monophysites, a dissident patriarchate was set up at Antioch. But both the Monophysites and the Syrian Catholics used the Antiochian rite. As Constantinople became supreme in the East, the Byzantine rite came to be used more whereas the Antiochene rite was used only by the Syrian Jacobites.<sup>460</sup> At the same time there arose the Melchite rite<sup>461</sup> which was closely related to the Byzantine Empire, and imitated the Syriac poetry of St. Ephrem and the rhythmical Greek homilies. The so-called Syro-occidental (Antiochian) rite is opposed to the Syro-oriental rite, which made itself independent of Antioch and coincides with the regions of Chaldaea<sup>462</sup> and Mesopotamia.<sup>463</sup> “The Indian Malankara rite is derived from the Syro-occidental; and the Malabar rite from the Syro-oriental.”<sup>464</sup>

The major exegetes and theologians of the so-called school of Antioch were Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrus who were active in the 4<sup>th</sup> and end of 5<sup>th</sup> cent. Lucian,<sup>465</sup> who belonged to this school, and who followed a literalist approach in his exegetical interpretation, came in contrast with the Alexandrian allegorism. Antiochian exegetes, who tended towards literalism, were thoroughly criticizing the systematic allegorism of Alexandria. Antiochians considered Alexandrian allegorism excessive and arbitrary. Diodore, Theodore and even Chrysostom are considered to be rigid literalists. Theodoret allowed more to a typological reading of the OT. Antiochians accused Cyril of Alexandria and Alexandrian Exegetes as they were falling back on a mixture of literalism and allegorism which distorted the organic unity of Origen’s and Didymus’s exegesis.<sup>466</sup> “Auch beim Kommentar zu den Evangelien lässt Cyrill immer die wörtliche Bedeutung der jeweiligen Texte zu, auf der (auch hier nicht systematisch) die

<sup>459</sup>Pasquato, Antioch, 50.

<sup>460</sup>Anti-Chalcedonian hierarchy was developed by Jacob Baradaeus (created bishop 542/43 at the request of the Ghassanid emir Aretas and the wish of the empress Theodora) who managed to consecrate innumerable priests and at least 27 bishops, who gave rise, in the area of the patriarchate of Antioch, to Syro-Occidental or, from its founder’s name, Jacobite Church (cf. S. J. Voicu, Jacobite Church, in: EncEc 1, 428).

<sup>461</sup>From a Syriac word meaning emperor’s men’; name traditionally given in the Syrian area by their ‘monophysite’ opponents to those Christians who accepted the Christological definition of Chalcedon (451) and remained in communion with the patriarch of Antioch appointed by Constantinople. Their dependence on the imperial see led to their gradual Byzantinization and almost total abandonment of the Syro-Antiochian rite. At present the term exclusively designates the Byzantine-rite communities which were united with Rome in the 17<sup>th</sup> cent. resident in the area of the Antiochian Patriarchate or dependent on it (cf. S. J. Voicu, Melchites, in: EncEc 1, 550).

<sup>462</sup>Chaldaea [k-], Gk. Chaldaia [c], the land of the Chaldaens, a part of South Babylon; in Greek-Roman sources it is used as a name for Babylon (cf. BE 4, Mannheim 1987, 402).

<sup>463</sup>Mesopotamia [Gk. (land) between two rivers]. The land of the two rivers, with a big landscape lies in the area of middle and lower Euphrates and Tigris, in Syria and in Iraq. M. is (beside Kurdistan) actually the habitat of Iraq - primarily M. was only a region between Euphrates and Tigris north of the city of Baghdad. Today the name is also used in relation to south subsequently Babylonia and also the cultural land east of Tigris. In this sense M. is a historical land embracing the great regions of Assyria and Babylonia of the ancient Orient (cf. BE 14, Mannheim 1991, 499).

<sup>464</sup>Pasquato, Antioch, 50.

<sup>465</sup>Lucian of Antioch, Martyr (Feast 7 Jan.), was born ca. 250 at Samosata (?), and died on 7. 1. 312 in Nicomedia. He is known for his asceticism and theological learning. L. was brought to Nicomedia during the time of persecution of Maximinus Daza and he was interrogated for his faith; he had to undergo many tortures and finally suffer Martyrium on 7. 1. 312 (Eus. H. E. 8, 13, 2; 9, 6). The idea that he held an Apologia may be a Topos (cf. T. Böhm, Lukianos v. Antiochien, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 1116).

<sup>466</sup>Cf. Simonetti, Alexandria, II. School, 23.

Allegorie aufbaut.<sup>467</sup> In theology they followed the anti-arian trinitarian doctrine of Nicea as elaborated by Basil of Caesarea, and the Antiochian Christology is opposed to that of Alexandrian,<sup>468</sup> which had to face the thorough criticism of Cyril of Alexandria. According to Cyril the Antiochians taught a defective Christology, in which Christ's humanity was exalted so high as to consider it another person alongside the Logos, with the risk of compromising Christ's unity.

#### 4. The History of the Egyptian Church in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> century

One of the major threats we find in the Egyptian Church was that of Melitian<sup>469</sup> - Peter<sup>470</sup> schism. It started during the persecution of Diocletian. During this time both Melitius bishop of Lycopolis and Peter bishop of Alexandria were arrested and were sent into prison. There occurred a quarrel between both of them regarding the readmission of the *lapsi* who were fallen in faith during this persecution. This quarrel took place not on a doctrinal position rather on the mode of admitting people those who have fallen. "Peter favoured a more lenient process for admitting those who had sacrificed to pagan gods, but Melitius held a more rigid position for harsher requirements."<sup>471</sup> This became a very heated issue in the prison that Peter drew a curtain across the middle of the cell so as to avoid looking at Melitius.<sup>472</sup> At the same time we come across the famous person Arius<sup>473</sup> through his teaching. During Achillas' episcopacy Arius delivered his so-called heretical discourse on the nature of Christ. But neither Achillas nor Alexander (bishop of Alexandria 312-328), took action against Arius rather both continued in good terms with Arius. "Alexander had

<sup>467</sup>Moreschini, *Handbuch der Antiken Christlichen Literatur*, 552.

<sup>468</sup>It subdued Christ's humanity to His divinity and which in later years became the cause of Monophysitism.

<sup>469</sup>Melitian Schism was the consequence of the last persecution, which lasted in Egypt from 303-312 with alternate phases of repression and tolerance. While the persecution was still going on and Peter Bishop of Alexandria was still imprisoned with other bishops, Melitius made himself the spokesman of rigorist tendencies towards *lapsi*, in opposition to Peter's moderation. When Melitius began to ordain bishops in sees left vacant by the imprisonment or absence of their holders the schism entered the Egyptian church. Peter temporarily free before his reimprisonment and martyrdom, took harsh measures against the schismatics, who organized themselves into a church of their own, determined and numerous. The Schism continued under Peter's successors Achillas and Alexander. The council of Nicea (325) took bland measures towards the schismatics. Melitius kept his dignity on condition that he made no further ordinations; other bishops, priests and deacons kept their dignities after a fresh laying on of hands by Alexander. But on Alexander's death (328) the Melitians sought to obstruct Athanasius' election and the struggle became violent. They were successful in condemning Athanasius at the council of Tyre in 335 but Athanasius emerged as the champion of the Egyptian Church and of orthodoxy against the Arians and the imperial authority, and later on these all weakened the positions of the Melitians and they rapidly lost vitality and importance (cf. M. Simonetti, *Melitius of Lycopolis, Melitian Schism*, in: *EncEc* 1, 551).

<sup>470</sup>Peter I of Alexandria was being elected bishop of Alexandria in 300, after having directed the *didaskaleion*. He was imprisoned during the great persecution and freed ca. 306 and was again rearrested and was beheaded ca. 311. During the years of persecution he had to cope with Meletius of Lycopolis who, not sharing P.'s moderation towards *lapsi* who wished to return to the church, replaced imprisoned bishops with adherents of his own ideas. P. had Meletius condemned and deposed by a council held in the interval between his two imprisonments, thus beginning the Meletian Schism (cf. M. Simonetti, *Peter I of Alexandria*, in: *EncEc* 1, 677).

<sup>471</sup>Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 117.

<sup>472</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>473</sup>Cf. above fn. 86: Arius [ca. 255 - ca. 336] was apparently a Libyan by birth, and later a student of Lucian of Antioch. He was a presbyter at Baucalis in Alexandria during the episcopacy of Peter. Sozomen (the church historian) alone suggests that he had an early connection with the Melitians. During the time of Alexander he was held in high repute due to his considerable capabilities in philosophy. He was excommunicated by Peter (cf. *ibid.*, 135).

taken action against him only when he was forced to do so by the reports and criticism of others either by Melitius<sup>474</sup> or those who heard these doctrines being taught.”<sup>475</sup> If Meletianism caused only an inner schism and was a local problem Arianism played a greater impact on the history of Christianity in general and it brought its teaching to all the major eastern cities of the Roman Empire.<sup>476</sup>

Athanasius who was against the teaching of Arius, had to face exiles several times in his life. Once as he was in exile the eastern bishops nominated Gregory, a Cappadocian, to become the bishop of Alexandria in Athanasius’ absence. During this time we see a letter reaching the Alexandrian Church from the Roman Church asking why they have done so without the prior permission of Roman Church and this letter of Julius,<sup>477</sup> the Roman pope, defending Athanasius and anti-Arians, create commotion in the Eastern Church in Alexandria:

“Διὰ τί δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων Ἐκκλησίας μάλιστα οὐκ ἐγράφετο ἡμῖν; Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν, πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὀρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια; ... ἃ γὰρ παρειλήφαμεν παρὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ταῦτα καὶ ὑμῖν δηλῶ.”

“And why especially concerning the Church of the Alexandrians was nothing written to us? Or are you unaware that this was the custom, to write first to us, and then for a just decision to be determined from this place? ... For what we have received from the blessed Apostle Peter, this I also signify to you.”<sup>478</sup>

As a reaction to the letter of Pope Julius sent to admonish the eastern bishops from Rome “nearly 100 eastern bishops met at Antioch in 341, and formulated a new creed of faith (omitting *homoousios*, but in other respects being similar to the Nicene Creed), and declared that it was unheard of for eastern bishops to be judged by western bishops.”<sup>479</sup> Later Constans,<sup>480</sup> ruler of the entire West who was a supporter of Athanasius, called a Council in Sardica in 342/343 with the hope of replacing him to the see. Constantius although favoured Arians, there were bishops from the Origenist fraction in the council who did not want the enthronement of Athanasius.

<sup>474</sup>Cf. Epiphanius, Panarion, 2. 68, 4; T. Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, Cambridge 1981, 204 raises doubt regarding the person who complained against him: “several clerics (among whom, it was later alleged, Melitius took a leading role) objected to Arius’ teaching and complained to the bishop.” The words ‘later alleged’ leave room for the reader to choose whatever he wishes in the matter.

<sup>475</sup>Cited from Griggs, Early Egyptian Christianity, 120 referring to Sozomen, H. E. 1, 15.

<sup>476</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 133 (according to Socrates, “the evil which began in the Church at Alexandria ran throughout all Egypt, Libya and the upper Thebes; and at length diffused itself over the rest of the provinces and cities” (cited from *ibid.*, 136 referring to Socrates, H. E. 1, 6).

<sup>477</sup>Julius I was Pope from 6. 2. 337 - 12. 4. 352 (St., Feast 12 Apr.). The most important source about him is a Synodal letter written to the leading bishops of the antiochian Synod (341). The consequence of it was a schism between Rome and the Eastern Churches. Julius’ actions culminated in the practice of Rome becoming the sentinel to verify the debatable arguments with the aim to control the synods in the universal Church (cf. W. M. Gessel, Julius, Pápste; Julius I, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 1083).

<sup>478</sup>Cited from Griggs, Early Egyptian Christianity, 143 referring to Athanasius, Apol. contra Arianos, 35.

<sup>479</sup>Cited from J. Stevenson, and W. H. C. Friend, ed., Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church, A. D. 337- 461, London 1966, 11-15 referring to Socrates, H. E. 2, 10, 4-8.

<sup>480</sup>Constans, Flavius Julius Constans Augustus was a Roman Emperor from 337-350. He was born ca. 323, and was murdered on 18. 1. 350 in South Gaul. He was the son of Constantine the Great and Fausta. As the co-emperor with his brother Constantine II and Constantius II he ruled over Italy, Africa and Illyria. After the death of his brother Constantine II in 340, who fell during the time of war with him, Constans ruled the whole West. In the church disputes he represented the mainstream of the Western Church’s faith namely of the Roman Empire against Arians and Donatists. The usurper Magnentius assassinated him on his flight either to Italy or Spain (cf. BE 4, Mannheim 1987, 668).



“The result was a deadlock and the eastern bishops withdrew to the East and excommunicated Athanasius, Julius of Rome and all who supported Athanasius’ return to communion. The western bishops in turn excommunicated Gregory, the Anatolian chosen by the Arians to replace Athanasius in 339, and the split continued until Gregory’s death in June 345.”<sup>481</sup>

Athanasius was finally allowed to come back to Alexandria due to the pressure and pursuance Constans employed on his brother with threats of war. And he was able to spend almost 10 years as the sole authority there. And it seems those were the years of golden decade of Athanasius. As Constantius was preoccupied with the Persian war and due to the threat from Constans his brother with attack if Athanasius were disturbed gave added impetus to Athanasius to strengthen the Church of Egypt. But as soon as Constans died (350) Constantius sought the help of local troops led by Syrianus accompanied by the Egyptian Prefect Maximus and invaded later the Church of Theonas on 8<sup>th</sup> February 356, with the hope of capturing the bishop. But he escaped to the desert monasteries through the help of local supporters. The military then placed a certain George of Cappadocia to the bishopric throne. But George could not win to his side his enemies and even his supporters due to his oppressive administration and within one year he had to leave the place in order to save his life and later when he returned to Alexandria he was murdered by a mob at the death of Constantius. These are some of the internal breakage we find in the Alexandrian Church and the problem of Alexandrian Church was mainly political than a doctrinal one.

We have so many instances from the Alexandrian church supporting this view. Cyril of Alexandria supporting anyone who attacks Nestorius makes it clear that he did everything with a political agenda. In the Synod called to repudiate Nestorianism Shenoute,<sup>482</sup> a monk<sup>483</sup> who is almost cantankerous and cranky like Cyril, attacked Nestorius, who in turn rebuked the monk and asked: “What is your business in the presence of this synod? For to be sure you are neither a bishop nor an archimandrite nor even an administrator, but you are a monk.”<sup>484</sup> Immediately after this comment by Nestorius, Cyril laid hands on Shenoute’s head, kissed him, gave him the tokens of authority, and made him archimandrite on the spot. It is marked by Griggs “that Cyril’s association with Shenoute is based primarily upon the usefulness of the monastic power in the bishop’s programs.”<sup>485</sup> Again in the words of Griggs, he makes further comments on the personality of Cyril saying, that “Cyril who was autocratic and overbearing in the Church, needed to cultivate a good relationship with his equally autocratic and violent counterpart in the burgeoning monastic system.”<sup>486</sup> We find in the banishment and punishment imposed upon Chrysostom and later on Nestorius was

---

<sup>481</sup>Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 144.

<sup>482</sup>A Monk in Alexandria, who entered the White Monastery south of Achmim, became the head of the monastery in 388. Soon he produced rules for the monks to follow which were stricter than those of Pachomius; (for example one monk who was beaten by Shenoute for breaking a regulation is said to have died, and another entered a self-imposed exile away from the monastery for breaking the rule, Shenoute grabbed another by the hair of head, struck him a blow in the face and dragged the unfortunate victim to the Nile and baptized him two times). He was also anti-Nestorian and Cyril asked him to accompany the bishop’s entourage to the Council of Ephesus in 431.

<sup>483</sup>The strength of the monastic movement was too great for a bishop to ignore, and the monk’s friendship and allegiance were always courted by bishops. One cannot state with certainty how many monks were there in Egypt by the end of the fourth century (cf. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 189).

<sup>484</sup>*Ibid.*, 199.

<sup>485</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>486</sup>*Ibid.*, 201.

not merely basing on a doctrinal principle rather it was well calculated against the Constantinople Church which became the new Rome. Whoever came to the see of Constantinople as its head became an offender in the eyes of Alexandrian patriarchs, who were looking upon the Alexandrian Church to place in the second position. In order to hit the target Cyril played different techniques. It is interesting to note also the list of gifts sent by Cyril to the court of Constantinople including ivory *cathedrae*,<sup>487</sup> numerous *vela*, and ivory objects.<sup>488</sup> “Theophilus’ action against the Origenist monks in Egypt was tacitly upheld, and the incident provided an opportunity to interfere in the affairs of the diocese at Constantinople, which at the time was the major obstacle in the way of enhancing the declining prestige of the Alexandrian diocese.”<sup>489</sup> Young rightly observes that Cyril was consumed with the mission to the point that he “was blinded to the doubtful morality of the means whereby his ends were achieved.”<sup>490</sup> Socrates opines “that the particular behavior of Cyril is not due to the differences in theology rather it is from the envy of the bishop of Constantinople, for he jealously guarded the autonomy of his own diocese, as well as trying to interfere in the operations of bishops elsewhere.”<sup>491</sup> From all these above given citations we may conclude that it was a blow to the Alexandrian Church to have an Antiochian Nestorius on the Episcopal throne at Constantinople, since Alexandria and Antioch were long-standing rivals in the east. The bishops of Alexandria always desired to have weak bishops at Constantinople. “The development of absolute power in the episcopate, combined with growing jealousy toward other bishops, especially at Constantinople, made a break with Catholicism.”<sup>492</sup>

This hidden motive of Alexandrians becomes clearer when Dioscorus takes up the office of Patriarchate as the successor of Cyril of Alexandria. The more serious attacks on the catholic unity hit when Dioscorus the Patriarch took charge of the Patriarchate immediately after the death of Cyril in 444 A. D. While Frend describes him as an enigma,<sup>493</sup> Baus states that he was “one of the most questionable figures of the century in the eastern episcopate.”<sup>494</sup> Dioscorus was also faithful in following the footsteps of Cyril as a villain. Both Cyril and Dioscorus are characterized as those who “strove to make themselves the masters of Egypt and the leaders of the Church of the East ... in as much as they aimed at making Egypt a sort of independent ecclesiastical state.”<sup>495</sup> Like Cyril Dioscorus also needed help and wanted to keep the growing power of Constantinople at bay. Therefore he sent Poseidonius as a legate to Leo of Rome to announce his consecration and further cement ties between those two Christian centers. According to Griggs “Leo was also interested in holding in check

<sup>487</sup>The chair with back and arms, named *Cathedra*, was in everyday use in antiquity, but had particular functions and significance for Christians (cf. V. Saxer, *Cathedra*, in: *EncEc* 1, 153).

<sup>488</sup>Cf. M. F. Castelfranchi, *Alexandria. IV. Archaeology*, in: *EncEc* 1, 24.

<sup>489</sup>Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 189.

<sup>490</sup>F. M. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A guide to the Literature and its Background*, Philadelphia 1983, 244.

<sup>491</sup>Cited from Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 197 referring to Socrates, *H. E.* 7, 34: Socrates notes that when Nestorius saw that the contention was leading toward disunity he cried out, “let Mary be called *theotokos*, if you will, and let all disputing cease.” But Socrates observes that nobody paid any attention to this belated attempt toward reconciliation from Nestorius.

<sup>492</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>493</sup>Cf. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, 763.

<sup>494</sup>K. Baus, et al., *The Imperial Church from Constantine to the early middle Ages*, in: H. Jedin and J. Dolan, ed., *History of the Church*, Vol. II, (trans. Biggs, A.), London 1980, 111.

<sup>495</sup>A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Vol. IV (trans. Buchanan, N.), New York 1961, 190-191.

the power of the 'New Rome' and responded favourably to Dioscorus' prestige."<sup>496</sup> R. V. Sellers notes that "unlike Cyril, Dioscorus directed his attack, not against the see of Constantinople, but against that of Antioch."<sup>497</sup> At the same time we find also the presence of famous Eutyches<sup>498</sup> in Constantinople, who was supported by Chrysaphius.<sup>499</sup> It seems Eutyches ruled over and was venerated by a large monastery of 300 monks and he was even powerful together with Chrysaphius to formulate the Imperial Court policy on religious matters. During this time Flavian was the bishop of Constantinople who was disliked by Chrysaphius due to his refusal to send a eulogion of gold at his consecration. Although he did not enjoy the 'goodwill' of Chrysaphius he managed to call a 'Home Synod' in November 448 in which Eutyches was deposed from his priestly status due to his decline in accepting the Antiochian two-nature formula of Christology. Immediately after this in the same year Flavian sent a letter to Leo mentioning about the teaching of Eutyches which articulated traces of Apollinarism and also that of a Valentinian Gnosticism. Leo though at first denounced the complaints raised against Eutyches the famous monk, changed his mind and even supported the decisions of the Home-Synod. In revenge to this Eutyches who enjoyed great sympathy at the Court through Chrysaphius, the adviser and confidant of the Emperor, managed to call a Council on 1 August 449 at Ephesus. Eutyches was not only successful in calling a council but he was also capable of getting appointed Dioscorus as the president of the meetings. Through this decision, which through the medium of an Alexandrian to take, the Alexandrian episcopate was reasserting the leading role in the Church. Almost 135 bishops took part in this council who were rock-solid supporters of Eutyches and Dioscorus. And as a result again the history repeated as it was always with the Antiochian Church. The Council deposed both Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylaeum<sup>500</sup> and declared Eutyches as orthodox. Like Cyril Dioscorus also took up the presidency of this Council with well planned schedule. During the time of the council "when he called for a vote of the bishops, and as some were hesitating, Dioscorus had the church doors opened and soldiers, noisy monks and a shouting mob streamed in."<sup>501</sup> The council which was called by Leo as Latrocinium, or Robber Council deposed Theodoret of Cyrus, Domnus of

---

<sup>496</sup>Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 202.

<sup>497</sup>R.V. Sellers, *Chalcedon*, 33.

<sup>498</sup>Eutyches was a Monophysite monk, born at Constantinople in ca. 378 and died after 454. He was a priest and archimandrite ca. 410; He fought fervently against Nestorianism, above all through his godchild and chief chamberlain Chrysaphios exercising great influence on the Church politics of the court. In 447/448 Theodoret of Cyrus in his work *Eranistes* suspects him of Apollinarism. We come to know his christological position from the Synod of 448 (Constantinople). He declares in it that "I confess that our Lord was in two natures before the union whereas after the union I confess only one single nature" (ACO 2/1, 1, 143). E. was not a monk who averted the world as he presented himself rather he was a purposeful even cleverly acting church politician (cf. H.-J. Sieben, *Eutyches, Monophysit*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 1024).

<sup>499</sup>The most influential man in the Emperor's court had been the Grand Chamberlain (cf. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 203).

<sup>500</sup>Eusebius bishop of Dorylaeum (Phrygia, now Turkey), was a layman of high rank, rhetorician and advocate in Constantinople. In the year 430 he began to confront publicly the newly appointed Patriarch Nestorius and accused him as exhibiting a false teaching regarding the Marian title 'Theotokos' (Godbearer). As bishop of Dorylaeum Eusebius complained against Eutyches in 448 as the latter started diffusing a biased interpretation of Cyril's writing with the meaning of Monophysitism. Once the Eutychians had the upper hand they forbade him to speak in the Robber Synod of 449 and forced his deposition. From prison he fled to Rome. He took part in the Council of Chalcedon and there he was again commissioned as the bishop of Dorylaeum (cf. C. Kannengiesser, *Eusebios Bf. v. Dorylaion*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 1010).

<sup>501</sup>Baus, *The Imperial Church from Constantine to the Early Middle Ages*, 214.

Antioch,<sup>502</sup> Ibas of Edessa<sup>503</sup> and others sympathetic to them. And in place of the deposed Flavian, the bishop of Constantinople, Dioscorus appointed his own deacon and representative Anatolius<sup>504</sup> in the capital. Leo had been alienated from Alexandria, and in the letter of Eutyches to the Roman bishop in 448 he (Eutyches) referred Dioscorus as the leader and chief of the holy synod of Ephesus and not Leo. The letter which was written by Leo to Flavian, which had denounced the Alexandrian Christology and the teaching of Eutyches in order to influence the deliberations of the Council, was not read purposefully in this council or rather Dioscorus pushed the item very cleverly to the very end in the matter of agenda for discussion. All these were great blows to the Church of Constantinople and Catholicism.

Rome also started developing disaffection towards Alexandria as it was not ready to correct its extreme position on 'One-Nature' Christology and the brutal tactics of the so-called Robber Council in 449.<sup>505</sup> "The alienated bishop of Rome took the initiative against Alexandrian Dioscorus and sent seven letters protesting the proceedings of the Council to Pulcheria, Anastasius of Thessalonica, the monks at Constantinople, Flavian, Julian of Cos, Theodosius, and the clergy of Constantinople."<sup>506</sup> After these letters, written by Leo, there took place a sweeping change in the attitude of Rome toward Alexandria and started isolating the Egyptian Church from a major source of power and support. We find in the primeval history things getting changed immediately after the death of Emperor Theodosius II who fell from his horse and died. As Marcian was enthroned as the new Emperor, he put Chrysaphius to death and he wanted to overthrow the old regime. The bishops who were banished by Dioscorus were recalled, and at the suggestion of Anatolius on 23

<sup>502</sup>“Domnus II. Bp. of Antioch was a friend of Theodoret. He, who was nephew of John Bp. of Antioch, was brought up under Euthymius the famous anchorite of Palestine. He was ordained deacon by Juvenal of Jerusalem on his visit to the Laura of Euthymus in 429 A. D. He obtained such popularity at Antioch that on the death of his uncle, in 441 A. D., he was appointed his successor, and at once ranked as the chief bishop of the Eastern world. Later he was charged of approving a Nestorian sermon preached before him at Antioch by Theodoret on the death of Cyril and some of the expressions in letters written by him to Dioscorus condemning the perplexed and obscure character of Cyril’s anathemas. He was the only bishop then deposed and banished who was not reinstated after the council of Chalcedon” (H. Wace, Domnus II, in: DCB, London 1999, 499).

<sup>503</sup>Ibas (Hibā), who died on 28. 10. 457 was bishop of Edessa (ca. 435-457) and was born in Syria. At first he was a teacher in the Edessan School. Due to the translation of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia from Greek to Syriac he was known as ‘the translator.’ He took part together with the Edessen Bp. Rabbula in the Council of Ephesus (431) and there after due to his advocacy of Theodore of Mopsuestia he had to leave Edessa. After the death of his bishop Rabbula, Ibas was elected as his successor in 435. He was accused of Nestorianism in the Robber Synod in 449 and deposed but through the Chalcedon Council of 451 he was rehabilitated and restituted. In the so - called Three Capital quarrel his writings were condemned as heretic by Emperor Justinian I and the Council of Constantinople of 553 (cf. W. Schwaigert, Ibas (Hiba), Bf. v. Edessa, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 5, Freiburg 1996, 382).

<sup>504</sup>Anatolius (St., Feast 3 July), Patriarch of Constantinople (Nov/Dez. 449 - 3.7.458) was born at Alexandria in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century. He was known as an apocrisiarius representative of Cyril with the emperor at Constantinople. Under Cyril of Alexandria he was deacon and perhaps later Cyril might have ordained him to priesthood. Due to the instigation and operation of Dioscorus against Flavian, Anatolius was appointed Patriarch of Constantinople Church (after some hesitation accepted by Leo I) during the lifetime of Flavian. As he was suspected of Eutychianism he condemned the teaching of Eutyches and Nestorius publicly. In conjunction with Pope Leo he requested Emperor Marcian to summon a general council against Dioscorus and the Eutychians. In the council of Chalcedon [451] he represented the Christology of Cyril against Nestorius. In this council of Chalcedon Anatolius presided in association with the Roman Legates and objected to the new Creed Formula in connection with Tomus Leonis. After this council as Anatolius surpassed his authority Pope Leo complained against him (cf. K.-H. Uthemann, Anatolios, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 606).

<sup>505</sup>Cf. W. H. Friend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge 1972, 43.

<sup>506</sup>Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 205 (cf. E. Schwartz, *ACO II. 4*, Berlin 1922-1929, 19-27, for Leo’s Epp. 44, 45, 47-51).

May 451 the Emperor called for a general council to be held in Nicea that September.<sup>507</sup> Although Leo did not want to call a Council in the east due to his fear that Constantinople would acquire much power, Marcian was not ready to hear.<sup>508</sup> As his wish was not taken into account Leo wanted the Emperor to postpone the council to another date. But Leo's both attempts were unsuccessful as the Emperor decided otherwise. They all were compelled to take part in the council. It is interesting to note that Dioscorus arrived early at Chalcedon with 17 bishops from Egypt and excommunicated Leo of Rome accusing that his famous *Tome* is contaminated with Nestorian heresy and most of the bishops gathered there did not accept Theodoret and repudiated his 'Nestorian' theology. But the Emperor and his court had decided to allow Theodoret of Cyrus to participate in the Council. Contrary to the expectation of many present there, the second session of the Council decided to reformulate the belief concerning the nature of Christ. The Creeds of the earlier Councils of Nicea and Constantinople, and two of Cyril's letters and Leo's *Tome* were read and all of them were readily approved with acclamation. Still the Emperor insisted in drafting a new creed, as there was no alternative to unity and peace. Although the bishops present resisted, the Emperor triumphed. A committee of 23 bishops was appointed to draw up a creed. Within three days they reformulated the new Creed. This Creed had the phrase ἐκ δύο φύσεων of two natures rather than ἐν δύο φύσεσιν in two natures relating to Christ. Dioscorus could only accept 'of' [ἐκ] rather than 'in' [ἐν] natures. But the Western Legates threatened to leave if it was not changed. The creed was reworded with 'in' as the Romans wished and Dioscorus was excluded. Therefore the creed runs so: "... in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation ..."<sup>509</sup> Finally Dioscorus was charged with contumacy as he had excommunicated Leo. The bishops those who were deposed earlier by Dioscorus in the first session at Chalcedon, were separated from Dioscorus, and bishops those who accepted Leo's *Tome* were restored to the true communion. Dioscorus was sent in exile first to Cyzicus, then to Heraclea, and finally to Gangra,<sup>510</sup> where he died on 4<sup>th</sup> September, 454.<sup>511</sup>

As we understand from the history that the effect of the Council of Chalcedon unified for the moment most of Christianity, but the obstinate monophysites were cut off from the church and the position so far held by Alexandria as the most favoured Catholic see of the East had been effectively and officially replaced by Constantinople. When we go through the words of Sellers we get the right impression of these patriarchs of Alexandria: "Theophilus, Cyril and Dioscorus had governed Eastern Christendom like 'second pharaohs' but at Chalcedon the pretensions of the Alexandrians see came to an end."<sup>512</sup> Canon 28 of the Council ratified the Council of Constantinople Canon 3, establishing Constantinople as an equal in all ways to Rome,

<sup>507</sup>Cf. R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and doctrinal survey*, London 1961, 98.

<sup>508</sup>Cf. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 206.

<sup>509</sup>The text is cited by Frend, *Rise of Christianity*, 771.

<sup>510</sup>Gangra was the capital of the Roman province of Paphlagonia, today Cankiri, north east of Ankara, Turkey. A titular see in the province of Paphlagonia; in the native tongue the word signifies goat, and even now large numbers of goats are seen in this region. It belonged originally to Galatia, and was then the capital of King Dejotarus, the adversary of Mithridates, and the friend of the Romans. Later the city became the metropolis of Paphlagonia (cf. J. van Paassen, *Gangra*, in: *CathEnc* 6, 1967, 279).

<sup>511</sup>Cf. Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 208.

<sup>512</sup>Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon*, 125.

being second only in ecclesiastical matters. In the words of J. B. Bury we find the right assessment of a process which had begun much earlier:

“Politically, the Council was a decisive triumph for Constantinople and a final blow to the pretensions of the see of Alexandria. Marcian completed what Theodosius the Great had begun. Three successive Patriarchs, Theophilus, Cyril and Dioscorus, had aimed at attaining the supreme position in Eastern Christendom and at ruling Egypt like kings. Alexandria could never again claim to lead the Church in theology. But the defeat of Alexandria was accompanied by an exaltation of Byzantium which was far from acceptable to Rome.”<sup>513</sup>

Griggs observes rightly in his work that,

“one can see how the Council of Chalcedon and its aftermath saw the separation of Egyptian Christianity from Catholic Christianity. This separation was the natural result of an alienation stemming in large part from the founding and development of Constantinople as the Eastern Capital of the Roman Empire. Alexandria, which had played the leading role in ecclesiastical and theological affairs for the eastern portion of the Empire for approximately three centuries, was relegated to an unaccustomed subservient status. The new and dominant role of the eastern imperial capital as stated in the Canons of both the Councils of Constantinople in 381 and Chalcedon in 451 struck unacceptable blows to the prestige of the Alexandrian Patriarchs.”<sup>514</sup>

In the centuries following after Chalcedon driven together by external forces as well as internal similarities, the Egyptian Church took a new form resulting in a national Egyptian Christian Coptic Church. The events which took place in the Egyptian Church and later to the formation of a national Church, may lead one to the idea that it was not for the right theological motive that all these fights and conflicts were conducted rather merely for the establishment of a stronger church above the new Rome namely Constantinople and thus playing a pivotal role in the whole of Christendom in the East.

## 5. The Christology of Cyril

Under this title we will give more emphasis to Cyrillian Christology and we will try to understand where he actually differentiates himself in his interpretation with Nestorius. Theodoret of Cyrus said that “Cyril was wrong to condemn all those who divided in two the sayings of the Gospels. Theodoret affirmed the necessity of division, ascribing to God those sayings appropriate to divinity, and to man the humble words and deeds of the servant.”<sup>515</sup> Our attempt in this section is to understand the Christology of Cyril and the problems, if at all there are some, in his interpretation. While discussing the short-comings of Nestorius we said that it will be discussed later in the forth coming chapter on Cyril of Alexandria. The fault of Nestorius was that he could not fully express his mind; and his style is diffuse, for example, his *Bazaar of Heraclidis* is immensely repetitive, it is diffuse and meandering, whose logical development are often tedious to trace. Also his use of the word  $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\omega\pi\alpha$  with two different connotations [which we have named as sense A and sense B] might have added flame to all what he said and taught. These may be said as some deficiencies in

<sup>513</sup>J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene: 395 a. d. to 800 a. d.*, New York 1958, 357.

<sup>514</sup>Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity*, 215.

<sup>515</sup>Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy*, 221.

the teaching of Nestorius and our difficulty to understand him. Cyril accuses him saying that he propagates the theory of two sons in Christ. According to modern scholarship Nestorius taught a theory of only one son, insisting both confessions, namely divine and human, as equally necessary for the redemption effected by the incarnation to have any real significance.<sup>516</sup> Let us have a look into the veracity of the accusation raised by Cyril and at the same time let us look into the terminologies coined by Cyril.

### A. The Term φύσις in Cyril

The word φύσις<sup>517</sup> and other derivatives of the verb φύειν can have various meanings. Most commonly φύσις is closely related to οὐσία. Both terms are found side by side in the works of Cyril namely in his ‘Thesaurus.’ So let us treat the meaning of it in this work. Cyril tells in the above mentioned work that, “things, of which the formula is the same, are of the same species and necessarily like each other naturally (ἀλλήλοις εὐοικότα φυσικῶς); and they are of the same substance.”<sup>518</sup> And he tells in the continuing passage that things that are naturally (φυσικῶς) in equality with each other are also consubstantial.<sup>519</sup> In many places where the relationship between a substance and its characteristics are discussed we see the terms φύσις and οὐσία are to some extent as interchangeably used. If we go through Cyril’s writings on the Trinity, we find the concepts φύσις and οὐσία used as closely related notions. Therefore we come across the ontological problem in his application, so to say, where it should have been applied as a secondary substance becomes a primary substance and vice versa. In order to get some clarity it may be good to refer to some works of scholars who have made a study on the application of the term φύσις in the works of Cyril of Alexandria. First of all let us take into account the dissertation of J. Lebon titled, the ‘Severian<sup>520</sup> Monophysites.’<sup>521</sup> In this work he claims that the major ‘Monophysite theologian of the fifth and sixth centuries, Severus of Antioch (465-538) followed Cyril of Alexandria’s Christology, and he expressed the terms used by Cyril

<sup>516</sup>Cf. McGuckin, *Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy*, 130.

<sup>517</sup>φύσις, (ὄ), ἡ gen. φύσεως, has different shades of meaning, namely 1. origin, the natural form or constitution of a person or thing as the result of growth 2. outward form, appearance 3. constitution, temperament etc. 4. form, stature, powers character etc. (cf. H. G. Liddel and R. Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*, London 1968, 876).

<sup>518</sup>Cited from Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 143 referring to Cyril of Alexandria, *Thesaurus*, 109 A.

<sup>519</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 143 in reference to Cyril, *Thesaurus*, 144 A.

<sup>520</sup>Severus of Antioch founder of Monophysites hierarchy in Antioch, Patriarch of Antioch (512-518), (St., Feast 8 Febr.), and teacher of the Jacobite Church was born ca. 465 in Sozopolis in Pisidia (modern day Turkey) and died in Chois on 8. 2. 538 in Egypt. S. wanted to defend the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria saying that in the incarnated God-Logos there existed only one single nature. He considered the concept φύσις as a concrete, subsisting, individual being, comparable to the concept ὑπόστασις. The adherents of S. teaching and theology are known as the Severians Monophysites are divided into two groups, namely, Real Monophysites and Verbal Monophysites. Severus who was the Patriarch of Antioch (512-518) was a verbal Monophysite (cf. T. Böhm, *Severos v. Antiochien*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 9, Freiburg 2000, 502).

<sup>521</sup>Cf. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 17 in reference to J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien: Étude historique, littéraire et théologique sur la résistance monophysite au concile de Chalcédoine jusqu’à la constitution de l’Eglise jacobite*, Louvain 1909.

himself and Cyril's understanding of the term. Thus Lebon argues that "Cyril's understanding of the terms was the same as that of these anti-Chalcedonians."<sup>522</sup>

In Cyril's Christological language the words, φύσις, ὑπόστασις, and πρόσωπον are always used as synonymous and they allocate an individual being, subsisting separately from other beings. Lebon observes that Cyril's Christological language φύσις is always synonymous with πρόσωπον. Cyril argues that there is only one φύσις of the incarnate Christ, and he argues one can speak of two φύσεις only in thought. Therefore Cyril could never accept dyophysite language, since 'two natures' for him implied two separate persons. Let us also make a study of the work of M. Jugie who wrote an article<sup>523</sup> a few years later. In his article he criticizes Lebon's finding saying that Cyril never meant in his terminology one for the other. According to Jugie the archbishop of Alexandria had used the term φύσις for Christ's human nature. So his finding is that by this term φύσις Cyril might not have meant 'person,' but an understanding closer to οὐσία. In his work he tells that Cyril considers Christ's human nature not as abstract rather as real, concrete which Cyril also calls ὑπόστασις.<sup>524</sup> Jugie argues in his article saying that Cyril would never call Christ's humanity a πρόσωπον, as it indicates to him a separate existence, an individual and a person. Consequently Jugie arrives at the conclusion that Lebon's argument, that Cyril's use of φύσις is always synonymous with πρόσωπον, is not correct. Thus Jugie opines that for Cyril the term φύσις is nothing other than Christ's human nature. Hence he concludes saying that in these instances the word cannot mean 'person.' But according to Jugie also there are illustrations where the word φύσις is separated from other φύσεις. Jugie finds that Cyril was never opposed to the idea of distinguishing two natures in Christ, but he opposed it to the point of 'dividing them' which may cause two separate persons. But Jugie justifies Cyril saying that there is no harm in his speaking of a concrete human φύσις as long as it is clear that this human φύσις never existed separately from the Logos. He tells us that by employing in this way the word φύσις is not synonymous with πρόσωπον. For Cyril the real distinction of two concrete φύσεις is not a great problem as long as they are not divided into two separate πρόσωπα. These are the two positions we find in the early twentieth century regarding the teaching of Cyril. Today there are several scholars who side by any one of these positions.

It may be proper for us to discuss the view of J. van den Dries' dissertation on the μία φύσις formula. He shares in general the idea of Jugie who told that for Cyril the term φύσις is not synonymous with πρόσωπον, but an impersonal substantial reality.<sup>525</sup> Dries argues that Cyril accepts the distinction of the two natures in Christ, but rejects their separation. According to Loon Dries is more precise than Jugie in his argument and conclusions. For Dries says, "The φύσις is a φύσις - πρόσωπον, not because φύσις signifies 'person', but because this φύσις is the nature of a Person, the Person of the Word."<sup>526</sup> A modern scholar finds that the monophysites (today's Copts

<sup>522</sup>Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 17.

<sup>523</sup>Cf. M. Jugie, *La terminologie christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie*, in: *EOr* 15 (1912), 25.

<sup>524</sup>Cf. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 17.

<sup>525</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>526</sup>Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 132.



and some other quite large Middle Eastern groups) held that Jesus had only one *physis*.<sup>527</sup> In the words of R. Cross, Cyril held that “the assumed human nature as something like a *proprium* of the Word - what the medievals would later call a necessary accident.”<sup>528</sup> R. A. Norris in his work, *Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria*, writes that “Alexandrian christologies are regularly labeled monophysite.”<sup>529</sup> Grillmeier later writes in an article that Lebon has shown with masterly lucidity that the Severians are nothing else but consistent Cyrillians.<sup>530</sup> And he clearly affirms that the pre-Chalcedonians purely held the Alexandrian-Cyrillian terminology and theology. But the intention of Grillmeier is not to denounce the statement rather to stress the orthodoxy of the Miaphysites.<sup>531</sup> If we want to understand Grillmeier we may have to refer back to his later written works, namely, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* (1979), which goes hand in hand with the previous written book of 1951 and in which he speaks in support of the Miaphysites and not in full agreement with Lebon’s interpretation.<sup>532</sup> It may be in place to refer to two unofficial ecumenical consultations<sup>533</sup> which took place between the theologians of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, who adhere to the definition of Chalcedon,<sup>534</sup> and the Oriental Orthodox Churches, the heirs of Miaphysites or Monophysites. The Greek Orthodox theologian J. N. Karmiris, who gave an interpretation of Cyril’s terminologies, says that both families are indebted to Cyril for their christological formula, and he came to the decision to follow the findings of Lebon. So accordingly he holds that “the terms ‘nature,’ ‘*hypostasis*’ and ‘person’ were equated at that time [the time of Cyril and Nestorius] since they were regarded as synonymous and identical.”<sup>535</sup> Another scholar called, J. S. Romanides, a Greek Orthodox theologian, who made a thorough study of the works of Cyril, wrote that “for Cyril φύσις means a concrete individual acting as subject in its own right.”<sup>536</sup> He said that although in Cyril’s Christology the terms φύσις, ὑπόστασις, and πρόσωπον are considered synonymous Cyril does not speak of two πρόσωπα before the union.<sup>537</sup> At the same time he observes that terms like φύσις and οὐσία are being employed as synonymous

<sup>527</sup>Cf. R. Swinburne, *Was Jesus God*, Oxford 2008, 47.

<sup>528</sup>R. Cross, *The Metaphysics of the Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus*, Oxford 2002, 29.

<sup>529</sup>R. A. Norris, *Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria*, in: E. A. Livingstone, ed., *StPatr* 13, 116, Berlin 1975, 255.

<sup>530</sup>Cf. A. Grillmeier, *Der Neu-Chalcedonismus. Um die Berechtigung eines neuen Kapitels in der Dogmengeschichte*, in: *HJ* 77 (1958), 151-66.

<sup>531</sup>Loon in his work prefers the term ‘Miaphysites’ than ‘Monophysites’. As originally the term ‘Monophysites’ was a polemical title for the non-Chalcedonians given by their opponents and they never liked to accept this name as fitting to them nowadays scholars refer to them as ‘Miaphysites’ as the counterpart to ‘dyophysite.’

<sup>532</sup>Grillmeier writes in his book that “die Menschennatur Christi ist ein αὐτοκίνητον, ein Prinzip der Selbstbewegung, eine Physis.” [The nature of man in Christ is a self-governing principle] (A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Band 1. *Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon* (451), Freiburg 1979, 666).

<sup>533</sup>Cf. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 237.

<sup>534</sup>Therefore, following the holy fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body; of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood (Council of Chalcedon, 451 A. D).

<sup>535</sup>Cited from Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 238 referring to J. N. Karmiris, *The Problem of the Unification of the Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East with the Orthodox on the Basis of Cyril’s Formula ‘Mia Physis tou Theou Logou Sesarkomene,’* in: *GOTR* 10/2 (1964-65), 31.

<sup>536</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 239 referring to J. S. Romanides, *St. Cyril’s ‘One Physis or Hypostasis of God the Logos Incarnate’ and Chalcedon*, in: *GOTR* 10/2 (1964-65), 82-102.

<sup>537</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 238.

in the Alexandrian bishops's view on trinitarian theology. Romanides detects that Cyril's terminology compels one to think of an idea of two *hypostases* or *prosopa*. Hence Cyril allows, according to Romanides, a distinction of the two natures after the union "in contemplation only."<sup>538</sup>

A few years later there took place an official consultation between representatives of the two above said families of churches from 1985 to 1993. In which though there are no direct interpretation of Cyril's Christology, they gave emphasis to the teaching of Lebon who said that the two natures of Christ are distinguished "in thought alone" ('τῆ θεωρίᾳ μόνῃ').<sup>539</sup> This argument is substantiated by J. McGuckin. According to him in the concept of Cyril

"the human nature is, not conceived as an independently acting dynamic (a distinct human person who self-activates) but as the manner of action of an independent and omnipotent power - that of the Logos; and to the Logos alone can be attributed the authorship of, and responsibility for, all its actions ... There can only be one creative subject, one personal reality, in the incarnate Lord; and that subject is the divine Logos who has made a human nature of his own."<sup>540</sup>

Cyril constantly reminds his hearers that one must not speak of the Logos as 'Gymnos' (i.e., Naked, in his divine characteristics), but as 'Sesarkomene' (enfleshed). In the words of Cyril "the subject is unchanged, the divine Logos, but that subject now expresses the characteristics of his divinely powerful condition in and through the medium of a passible and fragile condition."<sup>541</sup> Cyril prefers to call this economy a kenosis or self-emptying, in line with the epistle of St. Paul to Philipians 2, 6-11. Bishop of Alexandria continues saying that this economy or transaction that constitutes the incarnation is nothing less than a wonderful transformation of human nature. "This transformation which happens 'naturally' in Christ because the divinity has appropriated a human nature to itself, makes the flesh of Christ 'Life-giving,' replete with all the glory and majesty of the Godhead."<sup>542</sup> To indicate the unity of Christ McGuckin prefers the phrase 'single subject' or 'single subjectivity'<sup>543</sup> by which Cyril tries to explain the incarnate Lord as one who could make a free and untrammled exchange of attributes. If we read further the work of McGuckin, we come across the idea of the word φύσις as signifying the reality of the union. Hence he reaches the conclusion of one reality to be affirmed. By using the formula Cyril is attributing the person of the Word as the single subject of the incarnation event. He continues saying that both are referring to individual and real personal subjectivity that is to a metaphysical person. In this sense, he holds φύσις as synonymous with ὑπόστασις.<sup>544</sup> McGuckin tells that Cyril was also capable of using *physis* to connote natural quality. But McGuckin also realizes in Cyril the mistake of using "φύσις in its antique sense as concrete reality, suggesting 'individual subject' whereas the Antiochians consistently read it in the technical Aristotelian sense of 'physically constituted nature' or defining natural qualities."<sup>545</sup> In order to make it further clear

<sup>538</sup>Ibid., 239.

<sup>539</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 49 referring to Joint-Commission of the Theological Dialogue, in: GOTR 36 (1991), 186.

<sup>540</sup>McGuckin, Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy, 186.

<sup>541</sup>Ibid.

<sup>542</sup>Ibid., 187.

<sup>543</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 186, 191, 208, 211, 219, 224.

<sup>544</sup>Cf. Loon, The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria, 241.

<sup>545</sup>McGuckin, Cyril of Alexandria, 209.

we may say that when Cyril asserted the full humanity of Christ he was not associated by the logic of his semantic. “For Cyril the fully human Christ was not a human person, but a divine person who had chosen to live in the human condition.”<sup>546</sup> He is radically insistent on the single subjectivity of the divine Word. In this sense for Cyril φύσις of concrete personal individuand is synonymous with *hypostasis*.

Together with these authors above mentioned let us also take into account some more authors of this century who have tried a hand in interpreting Cyril’s Christology in terms of ‘models’ or ‘themes’ or ‘viewpoints.’ Let us first consider the idea presented by R. A. Norris. According to him the archbishop’s Christological writings contain two ‘models’ or ‘themes’ against the earlier classification of his theology in terms of Logos-Flesh against Logos-Man dichotomy. “Cyril’s point depends upon the distinction between the substantive and attributive uses of words, and upon the fact that the traditional phraseology to which he appeals always assigns the role of a substantive to terms like ‘Word’ and ‘Son of God.’”<sup>547</sup> The first of which can be called the ‘subject-attribute’ or ‘kenotic model.’ This model is related to two scriptural passages which were so central to Cyril namely, John 1, 14 and Phil 2, 5-8 and to the Nicene Creed. When he analyzed these three texts he reached at the conclusion that those three texts have in common the divine Son who is the subject, to whom the incarnation is added as a predicate: (1) it is the ‘Word’ who ‘was made flesh’; (2) it is ‘he who was in the form of God’ who ‘emptied himself, taking the form of a slave’; and (3) it is the ‘Son of God, the Only-Begotten, born from the Father’ who ‘came down and was made flesh and became man.’ Norris calls this grammatical and logical structure which Cyril adopts in order to express his Christological position as a ‘linguistic model’ or a model of predication.<sup>548</sup> So in many ways Cyril makes it clear that the Son remains the same when he becomes man and thus enters upon a new condition of existence. Cyril teaches us that the humanity is ‘appropriated’ by the Word, and it now ‘belongs’ to him or their numerical unity is caused by appropriation.<sup>549</sup> Besides this, Norris recognizes a second ‘composition’ theme other than the subject-attribute model. What is characteristic of this terminology is that “it pictures the Person of Christ as the result of the ‘putting together’ or ‘composition’ of two different realities.”<sup>550</sup> Concepts which are associated with this are σύνθεσις, συνδρομή, συμβάσις and ἔνωσις.<sup>551</sup> Cyril describes the incarnation as the “ineffable concurrence into union of two unequal and unlike natures.”<sup>552</sup> And a number of times he expresses that Christ is ‘one out of both (εἷς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν).’ From this study Norris holds the opinion that Cyril was not able to express very clearly the physical terminology. According to Cyril although Christ is composed of two things, his person is not constituted by the union. His personal unity is as it were extended to embrace the humanity. To this theme also belongs the analogy of soul and body.<sup>553</sup> Norris notes further that when this analogy is employed by Cyril to elucidate the μία

<sup>546</sup>Ibid., 210.

<sup>547</sup>Norris, *Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria*, 260.

<sup>548</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 268.

<sup>549</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 264.

<sup>550</sup>Ibid., 261.

<sup>551</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>552</sup>Cited from J. I. McEnerney, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters 1-50*, Washington D.C. 1987, 190 referring to ACO I. 5. 221, 9f; First Letter to Succensus, Ep. 45, 6; ACO I. I. 6, 153, 17.

<sup>553</sup>Cf. Norris, *Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria*, 267.

φύσις formula, the word φύσις gets a ‘slightly different meaning.’ Therefore Norris concludes saying that Cyril was not able to reach the goal in what he wanted to do by this composition. “So that what he intends by speaking of the integrity of Christ’s human nature never becomes clear in terms of a model of ‘composition.’”<sup>554</sup> According to Norris Cyril’s primary model is a linguistic one, while the composition theme works with physical models, which are of a different order.

We may consider the notion of R. M. Siddals on Cyril’s Christology. She tells in the fourth chapter of her dissertation that she agrees with the subject-attribute model of Norris but likes to express the same concept with different terminology although she notes that “Norris failed to distinguish fully between Cyril’s analysis of Christological predicates (a linguistic exercise) and his formation of a model illustrating the ontology of Jesus Christ (an exercise of metaphysics).”<sup>555</sup> Therefore according to R. M. Siddals Norris’ notion of the ‘linguistic model’ is rather misleading. According to her Cyril always distinguished between the two, namely Logos and man, although this is not very clear. She takes the words of Cyril himself to clear this point. Cyril, in his basic model, interprets the sentence ‘the Word became flesh’ in the same way as ‘a man became a carpenter’. According to the evaluation of Siddals, this phrase, namely, ‘A man became a carpenter’ has a number of logical corollaries. “(a) The man is now properly called ‘carpenter’ because he has become a carpenter. (b) he does not cease to be a man when he becomes a carpenter. (c) This individual is now both a man and a carpenter at once. (d) The man who has become a carpenter is still one single individual.”<sup>556</sup> So according to Cyril this way of interpretation or application is true in Christology too. According to him the Word is properly called ‘man’ because that is what he has become: a) “Ἄνθρωπος ὠνόμασται καίτοι κατὰ φύσιν ὑπάρχων Θεὸς ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος ... ἐν προσλήψει γεγωνῶς τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἀνθρωπότητος.”<sup>557</sup> b) he asserts saying that God does not cease to be God when he becomes man; “οὐ γὰρ ὅτι γέγονε καθ’ ἡμᾶς, τὸ εἶναι Θεὸς ἀπολέσει, πόθεν.”<sup>558</sup> c) this individual is now both God and man at once: “ἔστιν ὁ αὐτὸς Θεὸς τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπος.”<sup>559</sup> d) and having become flesh, the Word is still one single individual: “ὑποστάσει μιᾷ τῆ τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη.”<sup>560</sup> According to Siddals this phrase together with the intricate phrase of Cyril namely, μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη has provoked endless debate.

Let us also see what T. G. Weinandy has to say on this issue. First of all he opposes Norris’ idea of presenting Cyril’s Christology in terms of two different models which causes conceptual chaos. Weinandy tells on the contrary that Cyril does not divide or distinguish the two in an unambiguous manner. Christ is one ontological being or entity according to the first truth<sup>561</sup> expressed by the soul/body analogy. And

<sup>554</sup>Ibid., 265.

<sup>555</sup>Siddals, *Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria*, 358.

<sup>556</sup>Ibid., 357.

<sup>557</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 357-358 referring to Hespel, *Florilège*, fr. 97.

<sup>558</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 358 referring to ACO I. I. 6, 60, 39f.

<sup>559</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to ACO I. I. 6, 123, 16.

<sup>560</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to ACO I. I. 7, 44, 12.

<sup>561</sup>Cf. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 209 in reference to T. Weinandy, *Cyril and the Mystery of the Incarnation*, in: T. Weinandy, and D. A. Keating, Hg., *The Theology of Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*, London 2003, 23-54: in this work Weinandy distinguishes between first truth and second truth of the existence of Christ. For him the first truth is that Christ is one ontological person and by which he

“the second truth, related to Norris’s subject - attribute ‘model’, is that this one existing reality is the same as the divine Son of God, now existing as incarnate; it is the person of the Word existing as incarnate.”<sup>562</sup> Weinandy shares the idea that Norris was right in regarding the subject-attribute model as of primary importance but when he considered it as merely a linguistic tool he missed the metaphysical interpretation of Christ’s ontological constitution in the work of Cyril. So Weinandy stresses this idea more strongly than Siddals saying that the comparison of soul and body signifies that divinity and humanity are united in the Word, and not how they are united. According to him the word φύσις stands for separate reality though the usage of the word φύσις is ambiguous in Cyril as he speaks of soul and body, and of divinity and humanity, as φύσις in the sense of quiddity.<sup>563</sup> So in the μία φύσις formula of Cyril Weinandy finds the first truth; and he adds that the terms used by Cyril namely ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον are used as one ontological reality as the person of the Word existing as incarnate expressed. These two terms normally he translates as ‘subject’ and ‘person’ and regards them as synonymous. “For Cyril the one entity of Christ (*physis*) is none other than the one divine person/subject (*prosopon/hypostasis*) of the Son existing as incarnate.”<sup>564</sup> This understanding of Weinandy had been held by Dries saying that “the word ‘φύσις’ in the formula means ‘person’ the ‘subject’ the ‘individual.’ This same meaning is attributed to the terms ‘ὑπόστασις’ and ‘πρόσωπον’”<sup>565</sup> This way of commingling might have caused the difficulty to understand Cyril also. The opinions from several scholars underline the above said - factor. According to Harnack the Christological teaching of Cyril has occasioned only frustration in modern students. According to Harnack it has happened due to his method of writing or explaining as to “point now in one direction and now in another.”<sup>566</sup> Harnack expresses that what Cyril intended is clear to us but this turns out to be nothing more than “religious thought of Greek piety.”<sup>567</sup> According to Norris “Cyril gives the impression of having employed a number of inconsistent, or at least unrelated, ideas with view to defending or explaining particular facets of a position which in fact never emerges as a whole in a clear doctrinal formulation.”<sup>568</sup>

Let us also discuss here Cyril’s dislike for the term φύσις for the humanity of Christ. We can give an explanation for his dislike only as far as it coincides with the word ‘σεσαρκωμένη.’ First of all in this phrase the humanity of the Word is expressed by the term ‘σάρξ.’ According to Cyril the use of the word ‘σάρξ,’ which He assumed, was not in all respects a nature in the same sense as οὐσία or φύσις out of which it was taken rather it was only an addition or supplement to what He was already and not a being complete in itself and therefore in that act of assuming, He

---

stresses the unity of natures in the same person Christ and the second truth is that the incarnate Word is one separate reality, so to say, two natures of Christ are stressed.

<sup>562</sup>Ibid., 210.

<sup>563</sup>Cf. ibid: it is another term for essence of an object, literally it means ‘whatness’ or ‘what it is.’ The term derives from the Latin word ‘*quidditas*’ which was used by the medieval scholastics as a literal translation of the equivalent term in Aristotle’s Greek.

<sup>564</sup>Weinandy, Cyril and the Mystery of the Incarnation, 39.

<sup>565</sup>Dries, The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria, 12.

<sup>566</sup>Cited from Norris, Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria, 256 referring to A. Harnack, History of Dogma, Vol. IV, 175, n. 1.

<sup>567</sup>Ibid.

<sup>568</sup>Ibid.

changed in its qualities.<sup>569</sup> Besides we find that Cyril's dislike in calling the Word's humanity an 'οὐσία' was due to the risk of two beings or personalities. Together with this he also had difficulty in applying it to humanity as the word 'φύσις' for a human 'φύσις' implied a contamination with human passions and excesses. In the gospel of John we come across the formula: 'ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο' which was used by all the fathers as a compendium of Christology. Of course Cyril also used this formula with reverence to put heretics to shame and together with it he used also another gospel formula 'νάός' which is the expression of the human nature of the Word Incarnate. "Like the word 'σὰρξ', so the word 'νάός' signifies in Cyrillian Christology the complete human nature comprising all the properties of our own human nature, except the moral imperfections."<sup>570</sup> We find very often phrases like 'the flesh animated by a rational soul' in the works of Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>571</sup> As the expression 'Word Incarnate' articulates the complete humanity, so also the word 'σὰρξ' in Cyril's terminology. Why then Cyril does not use the word φύσις but the words 'σὰρξ' and 'νάός' in its place? Cyril tells it is one thing to express, that the Word has become man, and another to say that God has dwelt in man. But if someone wants to avoid Apollinarism, one has to admit that Christ suffered also in His rational soul together with His flesh. As a natural flow of this argument we can say logically that there are two 'φύσεις' in the Word made Flesh, for the flesh and the rational soul constitute the nature, common to us all.<sup>572</sup> Although like all the fathers Cyril also stressed the twofold 'φύσις,' after the union he had further difficulty with the understanding of Nestorius and party. Even though the Nestorian party namely Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia combated Apollinarism, according to Cyril the Nestorians are still to be opposed. For according to Cyril's understanding the Nestorian Party taught two separate persons in Christ against the teaching of Alexandrian understanding namely "one 'φύσις' after the union but made flesh."<sup>573</sup> In answer to the question of Succensus,<sup>574</sup> bishop of Diocaesarea in Isauria, that whether one 'φύσις' or two 'φύσεις' in Christ, Cyril answers that two 'φύσεις' have united in Christ without any fusion; Christ is therefore, 'ἐκ δύο φύσεων.'<sup>575</sup>

If we want to understand the mind of Cyril we may refer to the answer given by Cyril to Succensus. First of all let us deal with the objections of Succensus and proceed to the answer given by Cyril. He after having known the position of the Alexandrians that we say 'one φύσις after the union, but made flesh,' Succensus raises further objections to Cyril. If we teach that there is only one φύσις in Christ, does it mean that Christ must have suffered in that 'φύσις' that is, the 'φύσις' of the divinity?

<sup>569</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 52 in reference to in: J. H. Newman, *On St. Cyril's Formula: "μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη"* (Tracts [1858] Theological and Ecclesiastical 4), London 1924, 316.

<sup>570</sup>Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 53.

<sup>571</sup>Cf. J. I. McEnerney, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, Letters 1-50, Letter 45. 5*, Washington D. C. 1987, 192 in reference to Ep. ad. Succensum (PG 77, 240 B); Ep. ad. Monachos (PG 77, 17 C).

<sup>572</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 55.

<sup>573</sup>Ibid.

<sup>574</sup>Succensus (Succensus), was bishop of Diocaesarea in Isauria, ca. 431 (Gams), to whom Cyril of Alexandria addressed two celebrated letters on the Incarnate Word in reply to his requests for a statement of his belief on the one Incarnate Nature [Cyril. Alex. Epp. 38, 39] (cf. W. Smith and H. Wace, DCB IV, London 2005, 744).

<sup>575</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 54-55.

The second objection which he poses comes as a natural outflow of the first one that is regarding the fusion and annihilation of the human nature. In the third instance he finds as a result of this annihilation an apparent neglect of the consubstantiality of the Word with us. And finally by the objection he tries to resist the view of Nestorians saying that if Christ has suffered for us according to the flesh (σαρκί), then one merely articulates that Christ is said to have suffered for us in our nature (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῆ ἡμετέρᾳ φύσει).<sup>576</sup> From this various questions and objections raised by Succensus, Cyril answers saying that one cannot say Christ suffered merely in His flesh rather one must acknowledge that he suffered in His rational soul together with His flesh. This conclusion leads us to think logically to the concept of two ‘φύσεις’ in the Word made Flesh, for the flesh and the rational soul constitute the human nature, common to us all. Cyril adds further to his explanation given to the bishop of Isauria that we are accustomed to distinguish all things, not by a mental process only, rather segregate one from the other completely. He makes it clear that “in this human ‘φύσις’ the ‘φύσις’ of the soul and the body are distinguished the one from the other merely by a mental process, not divided one from the other in reality for then there would be two men.”<sup>577</sup> He proceeds saying that likewise we do not divide the ‘φύσις’ of the manhood (ἀνθρωπότητος) and of the Godhead (θεότητος) in Christ, but acknowledge their unity. He states the reason for us to hold this position namely that ‘Christ suffered according to the flesh’ due to the authentication of the same expression found in Holy Scripture. As the Holy Scripture does not try to divide the person Christ meticulously, Cyril holds that we also have to fall in line with the interpretation of the bible. According to Cyril Nestorius also tried to say the truth but with misplaced accuracy, namely, the phrase ‘Christ suffered according to the flesh.’ Cyril does not deny the term used by Nestorius ‘διαίρεσις’ but he tells that Nestorius used it with misplaced accuracy. One of the reasons why Cyril hesitated to use it is due to the misinterpretation which the Nestorians fixed to this phrase ‘ἡ φύσις τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος’. He says that by the word ‘διαίρεσις τῶν φύσεων’ Nestorians attach one meaning and we fix another meaning to it. Thus due to the fear of being misunderstood Cyril avoids the words which were used by Nestorians. Cyril tells that the use of the word ‘διαίρεσις’ has made it very clear that the Nestorians consider the human φύσις of the Word made Flesh to be as any other human φύσις.<sup>578</sup>

Let us make it further clear by saying that to divide the divine and the human ‘φύσεις’ in Christ is equivalent to saying that His human ‘φύσις’ is like any other human ‘φύσις’, i. e., a person. Thus Cyril hesitates to use it due to the misplacement of the term by Nestorius. Nestorius sees in the text, namely, ‘God sent His Son, made of a woman, made under the law’<sup>579</sup> twofold φύσις<sup>580</sup> according to Cyril. Cyril’s explanation varies from that of Nestorius. He teaches that the Word was sent because He became man. So according to Cyril it is enough to say that the Word was subject to law, in order to indicate His human nature. He finds threat in the interpretation of

<sup>576</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 55.

<sup>577</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>578</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 56.

<sup>579</sup>Cf. Gal 4, 4.

<sup>580</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 56 in reference to *Adv. Nestorium*, Book I, ch. 3 (PG 76, 73-75); ACO I. I. 6, 37-38.

Nestorians that Christ was subject to the law according to the ‘φύσις ἀνθρωπότητος.’ Modern scholars wonder at Cyril’s objection to the apparently orthodox formula of Nestorians: ‘δύο φύσεις ἐν πρόσωπον.’ It seems nothing more than an inexplicable action for many of us who read Cyril. Therefore today the modern scholars have come to the conclusion that Cyril’s reading of the Nestorian formula may run so: two persons and one ‘πρόσωπον.’ Currently there are two views regarding this Antiochian formula. One group of scholars holds that Nestorius meant by the term φύσις an impersonal notion; others hold that Nestorius also used that term to express the notion of personality. And to a latter group of scholars both the Cyrillian and Nestorian<sup>581</sup> consideration of the formula were one and the same: two persons and one ‘πρόσωπον.’<sup>582</sup> Though Cyril tried to preserve the distinction between the two natures which became so important in the definition of Chalcedon, we must also remember that he is also not fully free of his Apollinarian connection: μία φύσις.<sup>583</sup> In order to defend him against this Apollinarian lineage he makes it clear by saying that Christ is not soulless as some have said, but rather He is animated with a rational soul. But Grillmeier has rightly said that “it would have been the right thing for Cyril to give up the ‘Apollinarian’ language of the μία φύσις formula once and for all. Had he done this, without doubt the further development of Christological dogma would have been preserved from much confusion.”<sup>584</sup> Today all agree on one thing that Cyril’s rejection of the Nestorian formula was purely based upon terminological grounds. To be precise “he refrained from the use of the term φύσις is to keep clear of anything which might seem to favour the Nestorian division of the φύσεις.”<sup>585</sup>

Having seen Cyril’s dislike for the term φύσις for the humanity of Christ we may also consider some of his concepts which Cyril made use in his 17<sup>th</sup> letter<sup>586</sup> which is generally considered as his first letter relating to the Nestorian controversy although there are no explicit references to Nestorius. It is strange to note that concepts like οὐσία, ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον and their equivalents hardly appear in the Festal letter 17. Loon holds that Cyril uses only in two places such concepts and neither they are of any significance in his Christology.<sup>587</sup> Once in his Letter 17. 2. 67 he tells the Son

---

<sup>581</sup>For Nestorius Christ to be really human there must be a full human nature including a soul; and in order to be divine, there must be an inseparable union with the Word. However if the Word is to avoid those things which must not be attributed to divinity namely, birth, suffering, and death, the distinctness or separateness of the two natures even after the union must be emphasized. From the Alexandrian perspective, it seems that Nestorius teaches a weak union in Christ as if there are two persons. Although the Alexandrians misunderstood him Nestorius was orthodox in his comprehension. He taught and was firmly convinced of the union of the divine and human natures in the single Son, Christ: “I did not say that the Son was one (person) and God the Word another; I said that God the Word by nature one and the temple by nature another, one Son by conjunction” (Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 454).

<sup>582</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 85.

<sup>583</sup>According to Apollinarius Christ had no human soul; instead the human soul was replaced by the Word (cf. B. O. McDermott, *Word Become Flesh: Dimensions of Christology*, [New Theology Studies 9], Minnesota 1993, 199).

<sup>584</sup>Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 476.

<sup>585</sup>Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 153.

<sup>586</sup>Cf. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 291 in reference to PG 77, 768 -789: this letter is considered to be written at the end of 428 and generally regarded as his first work in the Nestorian Controversy. Although the name Nestorius and θεοτόκος do not appear in this letter, this is wholly dedicated to Christology and to the affirmation that the incarnate Word is one, not two Sons, and therefore Mary may be called the mother (μήτηρ) of God.

<sup>587</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 293.



is said to be coexistent (συνυφεστηκώς) with His eternal Father.<sup>588</sup> And somewhere else the word πρόσωπον comes in a scriptural quotation, and there it means ‘face.’<sup>589</sup> On the contrary we find frequently the utilization of the word φύσις and related terms in this festal letter. Therefore we will limit ourselves to the treatment of two concepts namely φύσις and ἴδιος. First Cyril makes use of κατὰ φύσιν and φύσει, in order to make clear that the Word, Christ is ‘God by nature,’<sup>590</sup> and the Word is ‘out of God by nature.’<sup>591</sup> Here he tells that no one shall see the God who is by nature and live.<sup>592</sup> He makes a reference to the secondary substance which is handed down from the Father to the Son. Although he makes a reference to the natural properties that are attached to the divine substance, he does not refer to Christ’s separate existence.<sup>593</sup> In order to make this idea clear Cyril depends upon the example of fragrant lily.<sup>594</sup> According to him the flower is a corporeal entity and a substance which exists in its own right. And for him fragrance is the inherent feature of a flower and without which a flower can never exist. Each, flower and fragrance, is different in most fundamental way. He concludes saying that flower has the nature of a substance and fragrance has the nature of an inherent quality.<sup>595</sup>

So he applies this difference to illuminate the difference between natures of humanity and divinity in Emmanuel. He continues articulating that even if the fragrance is felt from afar also, it cannot be in any way separated from the lily. Therefore he makes a conclusion stating that fragrance is other, and yet not other.<sup>596</sup> As a result of this contact there it forms between the lily and fragrance an ‘inseparable otherness’ ‘ἀμέριστος ἑτερότης’ and as a logical conclusion Cyril states that our separation or distinction between the two is purely ‘theoretical.’<sup>597</sup> Therefore in the explanations of Cyril he finds it very difficult to specify this ‘difference’ exactly, as he has grasped the oneness displayed by this single, fragrant lily. This same idea we find in the writings of Loon,

“If we move to contexts in which both the divine and the human elements in the incarnation are mentioned in relation to or in comparison with each other, then we find one instance of a dyophysite consideration, although the word φύσις is

<sup>588</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Festal letter, 17. 2. 67.

<sup>589</sup>Cf. Ex 33, 20: ‘No one shall see God’s face and live.’ Loon observes that for the lack of technical terminology in this letter may be due to the presence of less educated clergy and monks than fellow-bishops and theologians.

<sup>590</sup>Cf. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 294 in reference to Festal Letter 17. 2. 130; 3. 54; 3. 61; 4. 64; 4. 81.

<sup>591</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Festal Letter 17. 2. 65 - 66; 2. 91-92; 3. 128.

<sup>592</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Festal Letter 17. 3. 81- 83 (Ex 33, 20).

<sup>593</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>594</sup>Cyril’s most favourite examples to explain the term ‘nature’ in the treatment of ‘inherent factors’ and of things that are radiated from substances are fragrant scent from a flower, heat from fire, or sweetness from honey. “He distinguishes between two distinct sets of phenomena. First there are those things that exist in their own stability, that are what they are hypostatically, as self-existent substances, for example a man, horse, the sun, honey, fire and a flower. And secondly, there are those things which are not self-existent and only ever exist within other things, for example colour, wisdom, heat, sweetness and fragrance. These things cannot exist on their own, says Cyril, but are always inherent features within something else” (Siddals, *Oneness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, in: E. A. Livingstone, ed., *StPatr* 18. 1, Oxford 1985, 208).

<sup>595</sup>*Ibid.*, 209.

<sup>596</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to PG 931e - 932a (concerning aromatic herbs).

<sup>597</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Dialogues sur le Trinité* 453bc (concerning the sun and its ray).

employed in the singular: the nature of the things that have concurred into unity is thought to be different.”<sup>598</sup>

It may be proper to give an example which he used to explain the adoption of humanity by the divine Word: “just as the fire became bearable for the bush, so the majesty of the divinity for the nature like ours.”<sup>599</sup> This numerical oneness is an explicit concern in his works. For this type of an explanation Nestorius criticizes him as a person who teaches or stands only for this numerical oneness. Instead Cyril turns to the notion of oneness given by the category of relation: “there is a kind of uniting relation that binds together the man and Word into oneness or union.”<sup>600</sup> According to Siddals it was the mistake of Cyril to interpret the whole of Christology in the light of a single analogy.<sup>601</sup> It is also surprising for us to note that in his work Cyril makes use of the verb ‘to mingle’ to the union of the Word’s nature with blood and flesh, after the distinction he makes in *On the Incarnation* between a coming together of the natures and a mingling of their properties. It must be recognized that he does not form a *tertium quid* as a result of this union. In other words we can say in Cyril the divine nature and divine natural properties of the Word after the union also remains unchanged and unimpaired.<sup>602</sup> In somewhere else he speaks of this unity so: “therefore, as far as our understanding and our words are concerned, divinity and humanity could not come together into a natural unity (ἐνότητα φυσικῆν) and yet, they did come together in Christ and Emmanuel is one out of both.”<sup>603</sup> This is an expression found several times in the work of Cyril. In his *Commentary on John*<sup>604</sup> he compares the spiritual unity of the believers as an image of the natural unity of the three divine *hypostases*.<sup>605</sup> Again Cyril calls the natural properties of two individual men, Paul and Peter, ‘bound into a natural unity.’<sup>606</sup> In all these examples which he recites before the Nestorian controversy we find that ‘natural unity’ is brought about by a common nature.<sup>607</sup> But in his Christology Cyril understands “by ‘natural unity’ the coming together of two primary substances into a unity which is so tight that it results in a new primary substance.”<sup>608</sup> According to him “although the two original substances already had their being it may be said that this new substance has a beginning of being because of the union.”<sup>609</sup> A few months later we will find in his *Festal Letter 17* applying this concept of ‘natural unity’ to the accord of body and soul in a man i.e., the coming together of two substances or natures which does not bring

<sup>598</sup>Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 294.

<sup>599</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Festal Letter 3*. 120-122: τῆ καθ’ ἡμῶν φύσει.

<sup>600</sup>Siddals, *Oneness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 207.

<sup>601</sup>*Cf. ibid.*

<sup>602</sup>*Cf. Loon The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 296. It is clear from *Jo. XI. 9*, vol. 2, 697. 20-23 that Cyril does not use the verb ἀνακίρνῶν (and its equivalents) which means ‘to mix’ in the sense of the disciples being mingled (ἀνακίρναμένους) in soul and spirit and in the bond of peace and mutual love.

<sup>603</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Festal Letter 3*. 123-126.

<sup>604</sup>*Cf. ibid.*, 297 in reference to *Jo. XI. 5*, Vol. 2, 668. 15 (952 e); *XI. 6*, Vol. 2, 675. 1 f (957b).

<sup>605</sup>*Cf. ibid.* in reference to *Jo. XI. 9*, Vol. 2, 697. 20-26 (972ab); *XI. 11*, Vol. 2, 731. 25-29 (996b), 734 (997e - 998b). We find also reference to the ‘natural union (φυσικῆς ἐνώσεως)’ of believers in Cyril due to their partaking of the one body of Christ; they are σύσσωμοι.

<sup>606</sup>*Cf. ibid.* in reference to *Jo. IX. 1*, Vol. 2, 451. 15-19 (798a).

<sup>607</sup>But it must be noted that in his *Festal Letter 17* this ‘natural unity’ which is applied to the elements in Christ is not that of a common nature, as he finds the elements different in nature.

<sup>608</sup>Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 297.

<sup>609</sup>*Ibid.*, 298.

about a change in a substance or nature due to a separable accident.<sup>610</sup> Let us put together his assumptions regarding this ‘natural unity’ into two ideas:

“First of all both elements out of which a new entity is formed belong to the (Aristotelian) category of substance. It is not the unity of one substance and an accident. Secondly, the new entity really is a unity, one single being, a separate reality. It is not merely a matter of an external relationship between the two elements. But although the resulting entity belongs to the category of substance, this does not imply that it is one exemplar of a corresponding secondary substance. The incarnate Word is unique.”<sup>611</sup>

According to Loon, a modern scholar, many of Cyril’s explanations regarding the status of human element before the incarnation remain unanswered. According to the same author he tells that from the writings of Cyril one can arrive at the idea that Cyril regards the human nature as really existing as the element that comes together with the Word, and as a result of this union the Word also exists as an individual man.<sup>612</sup>

Let us also try to understand the concept ἴδιος’ in Cyril. The word ἴδιος and its equivalents present a familiar picture. Cyril uses one for the other namely sometimes it indicates what is proper to a being by nature: the Word’s own transcendence or majesty,<sup>613</sup> our nature’s own laws,<sup>614</sup> the Son’s own honours,<sup>615</sup> and at other times he uses it as for the natural relationship between Father and Son: his own Son,<sup>616</sup> his own Father.<sup>617</sup> In the study conducted by Siddal she tries to explain the notion of Cyril on ἴδιον.<sup>618</sup> She tells that in the works of Cyril the term ἴδιον has a range of meanings. But the most precise meaning given to it by Cyril is that “a natural property that is constitutive of the substance and nature of subject in which it resides: it must exist within this subject in order to make this subject what it is; the subject cannot exist without it.”<sup>619</sup> Cyril gives the example of lily and fire. According to him if fragrance is removed from lily, then it is no more. So also there is an indispensable co-existence between fire and heat as in lily and fragrance. And he calls this indispensable co-existence as συνύπαρξις συμφύια.<sup>620</sup> So according to this analogy Cyril states that both substance and property are one by nature, and the same in substance due to their indispensable co-existence although substance and natural property may be radically different in definition. And this is the precise notion of oneness or union Cyril aspires to secure for his Christology.<sup>621</sup> Let us put it so saying that “because of the incarnation one has become the property of the other and an inseparable, indispensable union or oneness has been established, of that kind which cannot be exterminated without

---

<sup>610</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>611</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>612</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>613</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 299 in reference to Festal Letter, 2. 86-87; 3. 63.

<sup>614</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Festal Letter 2. 127-128.

<sup>615</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Festal Letter 4. 35.

<sup>616</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Festal Letter 2. 81-82.

<sup>617</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Festal Letter 2. 91.

<sup>618</sup>The term ἴδιον is noun and ἴδιος is adjective.

<sup>619</sup>Cited from Siddals, *Oneness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 209 referring to PG 75, 445 b., ACO I. I. 6.

<sup>620</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Joannis evangelium, 29 a.

<sup>621</sup>Cf. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy*, 221: this is precisely the accusation Nestorius raises against Cyril saying that his thoughts are merely Apollinarism or Arianism as he ascribed all fleshly passions to the divinity and divine immutability to the humanity thus blended the human nature with the deity.

destroying the subject.”<sup>622</sup> J. J. O’Keefe agrees with the accusation that “Cyril’s understanding of divine suffering strikes closer to home.”<sup>623</sup> Thus the explanation of Cyril compels us to conclude that the Logos also undergoes suffering.

## B. A Study of the Formula: ‘μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη’

As this phrase μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη brought Cyril a lot of accusations from many corners we may consider it in its entirety. Cyril’s main allegation against Nestorius was that he divided Christ into two separate persons. Therefore his preoccupation was to unite what Nestorius divided. So we will find this concern of Cyril all throughout after the emergence of this problem. Therefore he uses his tooth and nail against the ‘so called heresy’ taught by Nestorius. After having quoted a number of examples from the Gospels related to the doctrine of the ‘*communicatio idiomatum*’ Cyril tries to prove that the dogma of the oneness of person of ‘the Word made Flesh’ that is one Son and Lord and Jesus Christ, not dividing the man and God. But this phrase in general has received enormous criticism due to its Apollinarian source which Cyril made use without knowing. Cyril has made use of such a formula in order to insist upon the immutability of the Word when joined to flesh. Cyril makes clear that if the Word did not undergo a change, when He took to Himself the human nature, then it follows that the Word ‘ἄσαρκος’ is identical with the Word ‘ἔνσαρκος.’ According to Cyril “the φύσις of the Word did not undergo any change, when it assumed the flesh, therefore the φύσις of the Word ἔνσαρκος is identical with the φύσις of the Word ἄσαρκος.”<sup>624</sup> By the use of this formula μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη Cyril tries to inculcate the immutability of the φύσις of the Word. He continues saying that He is immutable and He is not subject to any change,<sup>625</sup> and always the same (ὁ αὐτὸς ἀεὶ ὢν).<sup>626</sup>

In the letter of Cyril written to Acacius after using the formula he shares by saying that when we say that the Word God has become man and flesh, let no so much as a suspicion of change enter your mind (for He remains what He was), because we acknowledge only a union altogether devoid of a fusion.<sup>627</sup> Let us see then how he was criticized as the staunch supporter of Monophysitism. In the teaching of Cyril the word μία which is the feminine form of the word ‘εἷς’ was interpreted in different ways. Here we must be aware that so many non-catholic scholars interpreted μία with a Monophysitic colouring. According to these scholars the word μία suggests a unity of composition between elements which complete one another and give rise to a new thing. So according to this explanation the phrase μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη may mean either as a result of the union of two incomplete substantial realities, or an outcome of the union between one complete substantial reality (the flesh animated by Word) and

<sup>622</sup>Siddals, *Oneness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 209.

<sup>623</sup>J. J. O’Keefe, *Kenosis or Impassibility: Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus on the Problem of Divine Pathos*, in: E. A. Livingstone, ed., *StPatr* 32, Leuven 1997, 361.

<sup>624</sup>Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 151.

<sup>625</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to PG 77, 180 BC; ACO I. I. 4, 19.

<sup>626</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>627</sup>Cf. McEnerney, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters 1-50*, 40. 11, 159 (especially from paragraph No. 11 emphasis is very explicitly expressed).

another incomplete substantial reality.<sup>628</sup> Thus a new third substantial reality seems to originate by the use of this phrase at least for some interpreters. Therefore the modern scholars especially among the non-catholic side argued that this μία would give rise to a third substantial reality as it is a compound, the Word incarnate. Despite this meaning given by a few scholars of non-catholic side, the scholars from both catholic and non-catholic side admit upon the Dyophysitic character of Cyril's Christology. As we have above mentioned some of the scholars hold that this word μία indicates only a numerical unity and as such signifies one of the two φύσεις in the Word Incarnate, namely the divine nature and others hold it as a compound and thus a unity of composition. To make it further clear "the latter scholars hold the word μία as the part of the predicate (ἡ φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη μία ἐστίν) and the former as part of the subject (ἡ μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη ἐστίν)."<sup>629</sup> These are some of the problems also to interpret Cyril rightly.

Let us also try to grasp the significance of the term σεσαρκωμένη in the teaching of Cyril. According to Eulogius Alexandrinus,<sup>630</sup> it can be explained in three different ways: First it might mean the same as to have the figure and the form of flesh for example we can say just as metal is said to have the form of a statue. Secondly it might mean that one nature has been formed, and the nature of the Word having been transformed into the flesh as it were made of flesh. Finally that the one nature of the Word, after the Incarnation, must be considered to be with the flesh in such a way that itself and the flesh, which was assumed, is preserved from change or transformation.<sup>631</sup> Therefore the word σεσαρκωμένη can mean a real, complete and integral human nature, a body substantially united to a rational soul. In the teachings of Cyril he considers that this real integral human nature was truly united to the divinity and this union in no way interfered with the integrity of the two natures.

We may further ask then why did Cyril choose a particular form of a participle in order to signify the human nature? Here the question is not that why did Cyril favour σώρξ rather why did he prefer the form of a participle. As we have already mentioned above Cyril wished to keep himself free from the error of Nestorianism, namely the Nestorian division of the φύσεις by making use of this particular participle form namely σεσαρκωμένη. From the grammatical point of view also the form σεσαρκωμένη is preferred which agrees with the term φύσις or ὑπόστασις; at other times the forms 'σεσαρκωμένου' or ἐνανθρωπήσαντος are also adopted due to its grammatical agreement with the word Λόγου, Υἱοῦ, etc. Different theologians of different times tried to explain the use of this participle in Cyril. For example, Petavius says that by employing this participle form Cyril wishes to affirm the 'one nature of the Word' rather than the humanity. According to St. Thomas Aquinas Cyril

<sup>628</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 132.

<sup>629</sup>*Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>630</sup>Eulogius (St., Feast 13 Febr. [in East] and 13 Sept. [in West], [Chalcedon]), was Patriarch of Alexandria (580), and died in the year 607/608. He was a monk and priest in Antioch who communicated with Pope Gregory the Great and fought against the Monophysites and the Novatians (cf. H. R. Drobner, *Eulogios*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 989). Eulogius combated Monophysites and other heretics. A letter from his friend Gregory the Great (Ep. 8, 30) suggests that he supported the mission to Britain (cf. F. W. Norris, *Eulogius of Alexandria*, in: *EEC*, 325).

<sup>631</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 152 in reference to Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, Lib. IV. c. VIII, par.10 (PG 103, 1025 BC).

prefers to give the first place to the nature of the Word, though two natures were united by a mutual bond in the Incarnation, the first place is taken by the divinity, to which the humanity is related as an addendum as it were, and as an accident to its substance.<sup>632</sup> Or again the quotation of Vigilius of Thapsus<sup>633</sup> against Eutyches taken from his 4<sup>th</sup> book runs so: The Word indeed possesses another; he, who is less powerful and inferior, is said to be possessed.<sup>634</sup> Therefore by these words is expressed the conjunction, the relation of that nature, which alone is superior, the divine nature, to the other nature; “the union of the human nature is not explicitly mentioned, but follows from the other and must be understood.”<sup>635</sup> Therefore, none other than this participle form could forcibly express the non-division or the union of the elements according to Cyril. This formula of Cyril also met with so many criticisms and accusations.

### C. The μία φύσις Formula: A Gateway to Ecumenical Consultation

Today the μία φύσις formula of Cyril seems to be a good starting point between the theologians of Eastern Orthodox Church<sup>636</sup> and the miaphysitic Oriental Orthodox Churches.<sup>637</sup> While the former accepted only the dyophysitic definition of Chalcedon and the latter only the μία φύσις formula a way out was not possible. Therefore the new interpretation given to the μία φύσις formula of the miaphysitic Oriental Orthodox Church by the Eastern Orthodox Church made it possible to come together

<sup>632</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 153 in reference to Thomas, *Opuscula*, 2, c. 201; Petavius, *De Trinitate*, Lib. III. c. III. § 12.

<sup>633</sup>Vigilius was bishop of Thapsus in the African Province Byzacena. He took part in the conference convoked at Carthage in 484 by the Vandal-King Huneric and was exiled by this King with his colleagues (*Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Africae*, Prov. Byzac. 109 [CSEL 7,127]). It is conjectured that he fled to Constantinople. He was the author of several anti-heretics and certain anti-Arian works. Some among his numerous works are: *Contra Arianos*, *Sabellianos et Photinianus dialogus*; *Adversus Eutychetem*. Perhaps he is also the author of Ps. Augustinus *Contra Felicianum Arianum de unitate trinitatis*; two other anti-Arian works are lost (cf. M. Stark, Vigilius, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 10, Freiburg 2001, 788).

<sup>634</sup>Cf. Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 153 in reference to Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, Lib. IV. c. VIII. par. 6. *Verbum quippe habet; habetur autem caro* (PL 62, 121 A).

<sup>635</sup>Cited from *ibid* referring to Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, Lib IV. c. VIII. par. 6.

<sup>636</sup>The Orthodox Church, also officially called the Orthodox Catholic Church and commonly referred as the Eastern Orthodox Church, is the dominant Christian denomination in Greece, Romania, and the majority of Slavic countries, including Russia. It considers itself to be the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church established by Jesus Christ and his Apostles almost 2,000 years ago. Orthodox is the second largest Christian communion in the world, with an estimated 300 million adherents. The primary disputes that led to the split between the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Church centered on Rome's deviation from the original conclusions of the seven ecumenical councils, such as claim to universal papal supremacy. Another particular conflict is known as the Filioque Controversy. It had been added by the Roman Church in order to emphasize the divinity of Christ. They recognize all the seven councils before the 10<sup>th</sup> century (cf. W. Doniger, ed., *Eastern Orthodoxy*, in: *Merriam-Webster's Encyclopedia of World Religions*, Springfield 1999, 309).

<sup>637</sup>The Miaphysite Oriental orthodox churches are those that recognize only three ecumenical councils, namely, the First Council of Nicaea, the First Council of Constantinople and the First Council of Ephesus. They rejected the dogmatic definitions of the Council of Chalcedon (451). Hence these oriental Orthodox Churches are also called Old Oriental Churches or Non-Chalcedonian Churches. These churches are generally not in communion with Eastern Orthodox Churches but they are in dialogue for a return to unity. Oriental Orthodox churches are distinct from those that are collectively referred to as the Eastern Orthodox Church. The Oriental Orthodox communion comprises six groups: Coptic Orthodox, Ethiopian Orthodox, Eritrean Orthodox, Syriac Orthodox, Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church (India) and the Armenian Apostolic Churches. These six churches, while being in communion with one another, are hierarchically independent (cf. D. L. Donald, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology*, Colledgeville 1990, 342).

and discuss the matter and to accommodate the μία φύσις formula. Thus the unofficial consultation between both these Churches which was conducted in 1964 decided to abide by the new decision.<sup>638</sup> As the miaphysitic Oriental Orthodox Church considered μία φύσις formula as the heart of their Christology, this new interpretation given to this formula by the Eastern Orthodox Church was the only remedy to come closer to each other. Through the centuries different attempt had been made to find a common consensus. During the consultation several theologians presented papers and gave their views on Cyril's Christology in general and about the μία φύσις formula in particular. Let us try to deal with one of such papers. J. A. McGuckin in his book *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy*, states that by his insistence on the single subjectivity of Christ, Cyril introduced a new, Christian anthropology, besides the Semitic, Platonic and Aristotelian anthropologies.<sup>639</sup> According to McGuckin Cyril's person is not limited to those psychic experiences rather he is able to transcend the nature so to say the human nature is able to transcend itself and reach another realm. McGuckin terms this transcendence as "'divinization' or 'divine transfiguration' and 'an ever deepening communion with God's transforming grace.'"<sup>640</sup> According to this new concept, the new definition given by Cyril to person, he [person] is one "who has potential to transcend."<sup>641</sup> According to this argument we can say Cyril does not "reduce the notion of person to those psychic experiences or to brain act or intellectual states."<sup>642</sup> And according to McGuckin "Cyril bases his personhood not on psychic or intellectual states, rather on the basis of the act of divine power which first creates man."<sup>643</sup> By this Cyril meant that man's ontological stability utterly depended upon the human person's spiritual relation to the creative Word.

When this understanding of Cyril is reapplied to the realm of christological anthropology "it brings about a new and thoroughly christianized sense of the doctrine of personhood and one that is to suffuse the consciousness of the whole Byzantine oecumene for centuries to come."<sup>644</sup> When McGuckin discusses upon the term μία φύσις he comes to similar conclusions regarding the word φύσις. The word "φύσις signifies the reality of the union. There is only reality to be affirmed henceforth."<sup>645</sup> Therefore McGuckin asserts that "this concrete reality (φύσις) is what stands before the Christian observer; it is a single concrete reality enfleshed before us: μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη."<sup>646</sup> In this way, he says, Cyril is characterising the person of the Word as the single subject of the incarnation event and hence in this latter sense, φύσις is synonymous with ὑπόστασις. The British theologian holds that "both [φύσις and ὑπόστασις] refer to individual and real personal subjectivity."<sup>647</sup> To bring it to further

<sup>638</sup>Cf. Loon, *Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 237.

<sup>639</sup>Cf. McGuckin, *St Cyril of Alexandria*, 224.

<sup>640</sup>McGuckin, trans., *St. Cyril of Alexandria: On the Unity of Christ*, New York 2001, 42.

<sup>641</sup>McGuckin, *St Cyril of Alexandria*, 225.

<sup>642</sup>McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: On the Unity of Christ*, 41.

<sup>643</sup>McGuckin, *St Cyril of Alexandria*, 206.

<sup>644</sup>*Ibid.*, 207.

<sup>645</sup>Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 241.

<sup>646</sup>McGuckin, *St Cyril of Alexandria*, 208 (according to the same author Cyril's phrase meant something different from the phrase of Apollinarist scheme: For Cyril's phrase meant one enfleshed nature of the Word (Mia physis tou theou Logou Sesarkomene); On the contrary for Apollinarists it meant One Nature of God the Word Who is made flesh (Mia physis tou Theou Logou Sesarkomenou).

<sup>647</sup>Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 241.

transparency we can say that he does not want to teach the theory of two persons at all. His basic understanding of φύσις is of an independent subject. Therefore a proper understanding does not deny that the two natures endure within the one Christ, but it only denies that they endure separately; it is “only possible to speak of two natures after the union in a theoretical or deductive sense.”<sup>648</sup> So according to McGuckin Cyril’s Christology emphasizes Christ as an individual and not “merely generic or non-hypostatic.”<sup>649</sup> He continues saying in his work that Cyril allows the use of φύσεις merely as far as it is used in contemplation only. But with regard to the use of this phrase ‘in contemplation only’ McGuckin also is not very clear what Cyril actually means by it. For in McGuckin’s work we find that it is in different ways utilized sometimes as applied to the natures themselves or at other times as applied to their distinction.<sup>650</sup>

Today also we do not find a consensus among the theologians regarding the key terms in Cyril of Alexandria’s christological writings. It appears that scholars like Jugie, van den Dries and Grillmeier are of the view that Cyril did not concede to the Orientals regarding the use of two φύσεις, but that it was part of his own christological vocabulary. Scholar like Lebon considers Cyril’s φύσις as a separate reality or even an ontological person. A third group of scholars go beyond this conception of Lebon and tell that ὑπόστασις alone, or both ὑπόστασις and φύσις in the μία formulas as indicating a bearer of natures or a metaphysical person, at a different metaphysical level than the φύσεις.<sup>651</sup> Today the view of Grillmeier and scholars have wider acceptance than anyone, that is to say, that Cyril’s basic outlook is dyophysite, while the miaphysite formula can be found in his writings from before the reunion with the Antiochians only three times. Therefore as we considered earlier μία φύσις formula cannot be taken as the starting point of Cyril’s Christology. All the more if ‘in contemplation only’ and miaphysite formula of Cyril are given emphasis it may be considered by the Western Churches as running the danger of not giving full weight to Christ’s perfect humanity and it may bring about again the rupture of churches. So if ecumenical process should go on, the dyophysite christology must be the starting point which means, not ‘in contemplation only’ to the natures rather the ‘two nature formula’ which expresses rightly the full humanity of Christ, should be accommodated. Modern scholars have found that Cyril of Alexandria cannot be accused as a miaphysite theologian rather he is a dyophysite. For example he speaks hardly of ‘one nature’ of the incarnate Word before the reunion with the Antiochians.<sup>652</sup> Let us see how Cyril interpreted φύσις. In his work it has three main senses. First of all “it may refer to a common nature, to the reality which is shared by individuals which are consubstantial. Secondly to an individual nature which combines individual existence with essence; and finally to all the individual belonging

---

<sup>648</sup>Ibid., 242; Cyril accepts “the theory of dyophysis as a concession to the Antiochians which he felt was quite compatible with the general run of his theology ... He only admitted the diaphysite position only if the Antiochians are particular to use them” (McGuckin, *St Cyril of Alexandria*, 228).

<sup>649</sup>McGuckin, *St Cyril of Alexandria*, 216.

<sup>650</sup>McGuckin is also not very clear about its application, that is to say, whether it is to be applied to the ‘φύσεις alone’ ‘in contemplation only’ or even ‘their distinction’ is to be held ‘in contemplation only.’

<sup>651</sup>Cf. Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 248.

<sup>652</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 578.



to a common nature combined.”<sup>653</sup> And again in his trinitarian writings the word φύσις which Cyril has adopted from the Cappadocians points to the divine common nature, and sometimes the Godhead as such. According to Loon, Cyril’s Christological texts were at times incorrectly regarded as miaphysite. He holds “that expressions like ‘natural union’ and ‘natural unity’ are dyophysite in that they denote the coming together of two natures, two entities that belong to the Aristotelian category of substance.”<sup>654</sup> He tells that in the teaching of Cyril they do not become one nature, but rather two natures which are combined into one separate reality. Further he states that Cyril never holds φύσις and ὑπόστασις as synonyms<sup>655</sup> as both of them mean different things in the teachings of Cyril namely, φύσις conveys the notion of existence and essence and ὑπόστασις attach the meaning of real existence. “When the Word is said to have been united with His flesh according to *hypostasis* (καθ’ ὑπόστασιν), and when He is called ‘one *hypostasis*,’ this indicates that the Logos together with His humanity is one separate reality, one entity.”<sup>656</sup> According to Loon the notion ‘in contemplation only’ Cyril applies not to the natures of Christ rather it is to their division. We find also Cyril speaking sometimes of the incarnate Word ‘as God’ and at other times ‘as man.’ The main and only reason for this emphasis we find in his teaching for the unity of Christ’s person is soteriological.<sup>657</sup>

As a conclusion we can say that more than insisting upon the μία φύσις formula, the dyophysite teachings of Cyril must be insisted [which he actually meant according to Loon, a protestant theologian] then not only peace and ecumenical process can be enlivened and fostered between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches rather it may bring all these churches closer to the concept what Christ actually is and to the catholic churches and may avoid a rupture between churches. Above all we may say that both Cyril and Nestorius were heading towards the same principle namely ‘δύο φύσεις ἐν πρόσωπον.’

---

<sup>653</sup>Ibid.

<sup>654</sup>Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, 579.

<sup>655</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>656</sup>Ibid.

<sup>657</sup>For he tells that Christ is the boundary between divine and the human natures and when we come in contact with the divine nature we become partakers of the divine nature. As He is God, humanity, in particular the soul, receives a stability in him which makes that it does not sin, and the Spirit does not leave it again; and this stability is transferred to those who believe in him ... It is because he is also God that his death can be a ransom for our lives (cf. *ibid.*, 580).

## Chapter III

### Life and Theology of Theodoret of Cyrus

If we consider the work of Nestorius as thesis and Cyril as anti-thesis we may have to come to a synthesis. We find this synthesis in the person of Theodoret of Cyrus an Antiochian. He is considered to be a mature theologian who contributed much to the clarification of Christology. He is respected as a major figure of the fifth century. In the words of Duchesne Theodoret's significance is well manifested in the world in which he lived. "Theodoret, especially since the death of Cyril, was the greatest authority in theology in the Greek Orient ... Such a man represented merely in himself an ecclesiastical power: he was, for the Orient, a kind of Augustine."<sup>658</sup> He lived during the tumultuous decades of the third and fourth ecumenical councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451). He had to witness so many issues like doctrinal conflicts and disputes during his lifetime due to the attempts from various sides to find a proper interpretation for the nature of Christ and due to church politics. His *Religious History*<sup>659</sup> is a key text in order to understand not only his life but the issues the Church underwent in this period. It is said of Theodoret that he shaped the events of the Church of his time crucially as an actor and as an observer. But as he was not an astute politician, whom fifth century politics required, he had to pay with his life for his sincerity and theological contributions. In this chapter we will be discussing his contributions in order to understand both Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria and thus to have a true understanding of Christology. Before we get into his theology we may get acquainted with the person of Theodoret. We will acquaint ourselves with his theology through a process of analyzing the twelve anathemas of Cyril and its refutation by Theodoret and also his work *Eranistes* and its contents.

#### 1. The life of Theodoret

Theodoret of Cyrus was born in the year ca. 393 in Antioch. His birth reminds us of the biblical stories of Samson and Samuel. Although his mother married at the age of seventeen she remained barren till she gave birth to Theodoret. She started leading a more austere and ascetic life than she lived before due to the advice of a hermit called Peter of Galata<sup>660</sup> who cured her diseased eye. She had to wait almost seven years further to hear the glad tidings of the birth of a son in her life by a holy man called Macedonius. The condition he placed before the future parents was to dedicate their 'would-be born' child to the service of God. Having accepted this condition, the mother conceived, although she had to undergo a threatened pregnancy. As per the prophecy she gave birth to a son in the year 393 through the intercession of

<sup>658</sup>L. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3: The Fifth Century, London 1909, 273-274.

<sup>659</sup>*Religious History* is a series of lives of Syrian holy men whom Theodoret had known as he was young in Antioch or when he was bishop in Cyrus (cf. T. Urbainczyk, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus: The bishop and the holy man*, America 2002, 4).

<sup>660</sup>Peter was a hermit in Ankara (Galatia) in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. According to tradition while returning from Palestinian pilgrimage he entered into an anchoretic grave-chamber found on the mountain in Silpios of Antioch (Syria). Through his intercession it seems there took place many wonders. Theodoret was familiar with him as a boy as Peter was a friend of his parents. It seems that he died in 430 (cf. O. Volk, *Petros Galata*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 123-24).

the holy man. The parents named the child Theodoret, ‘the gift of God’ as he was born through the intervention of God as in the case of Samuel and Samson.<sup>661</sup> As he was interested in religious matters he used to frequent the monks from his childhood and they instructed him to dedicate his life as a fulfillment of his parental offering. We have a record of the difficulty of his birth recalled by him as he remembers the words of holy Macedonius addressed to him:

“You were born, my child, with much toil: I spent many nights begging this alone of God, that your parents should earn the name they received after your birth. So live a life worthy of this toil. Before you were born, you were offered up in promise. Offerings to God are revered by all, and not to be touched by the multitude: so it is fitting that you do not admit the base impulses of the soul, but perform, speak and desire those things alone that serve God, the giver of the laws of virtue.”<sup>662</sup>

He took to himself this offering of his parents to God as a blessing upon himself and dedicated himself to God from his early age. Therefore at the age of 23 when his parents died he made up his mind to distribute his inheritance among the poor and to live a very modest life which even later as a bishop he continued in his life. We note about this decisive years of spiritual formation through his letters written to various persons. One such example can be quoted from a letter written to Taurus the Patrician that “I received the apostolic nourishment from my mother’s breast and the creed laid down at Nicea by the holy and blessed Fathers.”<sup>663</sup> So having decided to live for God he started very early to get a thorough knowledge of Bible and an acquaintance with the teachings of the earlier fathers of the Church and theologians. He could speak besides his mother tongue Syriac, Greek and Hebrew. It is enough to read his work, namely, the *Cure of Greek Maladies*<sup>664</sup> to know his erudition. In this work he uses more than one hundred pagan philosophers together with poets and historians in about 340 passages.<sup>665</sup> Being well aware of various classical literatures he knew immediately where did it come from and in what way this idea could be used in Christian theology. This knowledge and acquaintance with secular philosophy and classical literatures caused him also a lot of trouble as his opponents employed the same terms with different connotations.

Regarding his baptism we can say that in all probability he had received his baptism as an adult.<sup>666</sup> This is only an assumption from his preaching. He presents a sequence of things which happened in his life. “For thus I have been made a disciple from the beginning, thus I have believed; thus I was baptized; thus I have preached, thus I have baptized, thus I continue to teach.”<sup>667</sup> From his childhood onwards he was privileged to listen to the golden-mouthed preacher John Chrysostom. Without doubt one can say this listening and later in his life reading the writings of John Chrysostom

<sup>661</sup>Cf. Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 3.

<sup>662</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 3-4 referring to Theodoret of Cyrus, HR.

<sup>663</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 4 referring to SC 98, 234.

<sup>664</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 85-86: Theodoret’s apologetical work ‘A Cure of Greek Maladies’ (*Hellenikon therapeutike pathematon*, or *Graecarum affectionum curatio*), is one of the best answers to pagan philosophy, which manifests a clear expression to his eloquence and argumentation. According to him this was the only effective way to present a valid Christian answer to Greek philosophy. This work must have been written before 449 A. D.

<sup>665</sup>Cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology III: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicea to the Council of Chalcedon*, Texas 1983, 544.

<sup>666</sup>Cf. D. F. Wright, *At what Ages Were People Baptized in the Early Centuries? A Quest for Statistics*, in: E. A. Livingstone, ed., *StPatr 30*, Leuven 1997, 392 (this work tells us that he was baptized as an adult).

<sup>667</sup>Cited from Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 4 referring to Theodoret’s Letter 143.

must have surely influenced in shaping a solid theological background. As a culmination to his spiritual life he decides after the death of his parents to dedicate himself totally to the service of God by entering into a form of monastic life in Nicerte, three miles from Apamea and about seventy-five miles from Antioch. In this monastery he led a life of asceticism for almost seven years. Thereafter he was made a bishop against his will in a solitary town, in the province of Euphratensis. He tells that those seven years of his monastic life were the most peaceful time in his life although further as a bishop he could lead a serene life for seven more years. Thereafter broke out the so called Nestorian controversy which consumed all his peaceful time and life. As a bishop in Cyrus his life was successful as he could do a lot for the uneducated laity by educating them the right teaching of the Church against the heretical teaching which swarmed the church of the time along with bringing about a lot of social developments. His character was such that he could bring back many schismatics to the right faith and to the body of the Church. Theodoret was an exception to the contemporary churchmen of his time. For example Nestorius and Cyril both used military forces to make their opponents obey their commands and if not they obliterated them. Instead “Theodoret was an upright man and a very sympathetic character. Pious, modest, a natural lover of silence and peace, and devoted to his people ...”<sup>668</sup> Among the social activities as a bishop he introduced skilled craftsmen and medical personnel to take care of his people. Although Cyrthastica was a fertile land it seems its people were unbearably overtaxed. Therefore Theodoret intervened in favour of the people and implored the officials to reduce their overburdened taxes. He also beautified the city, built canal, public bridges, baths, and porticos from the revenues of his see.<sup>669</sup> He was also a renowned preacher like John Chrysostom and his sermons were received with applause in Antioch where he was very often invited to give sermons to the people.<sup>670</sup> If we want to know how peaceful and philanthropic he was it is enough to go through this below given quotation taken from the Letter 81 to the Consul Nomus.<sup>671</sup>

“Even before my conception my parents promised to devote me to God; from my swaddling-bands they devoted me according to their promise and educated me accordingly; the time before my episcopate I spent in a monastery and then was unwillingly consecrated bishop. I lived for twenty-five years in such a way that I was never summoned to trial by any one nor ever brought accusation against any. Not one of the pious clergy who were under me ever frequented a court. In so many years I never took an obol<sup>672</sup> or a garment from anyone. Not one belonging to my household ever received a loaf or an egg. I could not endure the thought of possessing anything save the rags I wore. From the revenues of my see I erected public porticoes; I built two large bridges; I looked after the public baths. On finding that the city was not watered by the river running by it, I built the conduit, and supplied the dry town with water. But not to mention these matters I led eight

<sup>668</sup>J. Tixeront, *A Handbook of Patrology*, London 1939, 206.

<sup>669</sup>Cf. Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 5.

<sup>670</sup>Cf. *ibid.* (we can read about it in Letters 83, 147).

<sup>671</sup>Nomus was an influential officer of Theodosius II, *Magister Officiorum* in 443, *Consul* in 445 and *Patrician* in 449. A friend of Dioscorus he opposed Theodoret and was instrumental in procuring the decree which confined the bishop to his diocese in 449 (cf. J. A. H. Martin, et al., ed., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Vol. 2, Cambridge 1992, 785).

<sup>672</sup>Cf. Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 222: it is a Greek word (*obolos*) which was used both for weight (= 0. 57 grams) and for an Athenian coin (worth 1/6<sup>th</sup> part of a drachma).

villages of Marcionites,<sup>673</sup> with their neighbourhood, into the way of truth; another full of Eunomians and another of Arians I brought to the light of divine knowledge, and, by God's grace, not a tare of heresy was left among us. All this I did not effect with impunity; many times I shed my blood; I was often stoned by them and brought to the very gates of death. But I am a fool in my boasting, yet my words are spoken of necessity, not of consent."<sup>674</sup>

He was ordained a bishop in the year 423 to which he refers in various letters.<sup>675</sup> In all probability we can say that he might have become the bishop of Cyrus at the age of thirty in 423.

## 2. Theodoret and Nestorius

As Theodoret was an Antiochian he was a bosom friend of Nestorius and both of them were known for their oratory. "Theodore of Mopsuestia was his master in exegesis and Nestorius was his fellow student"<sup>676</sup> in the monastic school where he received his training. The contemporaries of Theodoret namely Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius were appointed to the see of Alexandria and Constantinople as patriarchs in the years 412 and 428 respectively. Later Theodoret was also drawn to the conflict of the Eastern Church as he was a perfect theologian or better to say as a peace loving and perfect church man. But unfortunately for this he had to pay a lot with his life. Theodoret started involving in the debate and issue directly only from 430. Exactly to say he started taking part in the issue when John of Antioch received the letters of Pope Celestine and Cyril concerning Nestorius' condemnation from the West and from Cyril's party. The reception of the excommunicated pelagians was informed by Cyril to Rome with a translated Latin text in such a way that West would only dispel Nestorius. As a response to this letter written by Cyril to Celestine he orders the excommunication of Nestorius. When the letter reached Antioch, communicating the excommunication of Nestorius, Theodoret was also there with other bishops of the province for the ordination of Macarius, the new bishop of Laodicea.<sup>677</sup> Theodoret's intention of saving the whole Christendom from the confusion in the name of one word, namely *theotokos*, got expression in the decision to write a letter to his friend Nestorius in John of Antioch's<sup>678</sup> name in a very temperate tone attempting to persuade him to accept the title *theotokos*. Theodoret knew that if they relinquished the use of this word they were going to be the losers as Celestine bishop of Rome also sided with Cyril along with the antipathy between two churches and politics.

---

<sup>673</sup>Marcion of Sinope (ca. 85-160) was a theologian in early Christianity. Later due to his conflict with the bishops of Rome he was eventually excommunicated (Tert. adv. Marc. I, 19. 2). Thereupon he established his own Church which soon got wide-spread (Ius. 1 apol. 58, 2:26, 5). He held Jesus to be the son of the heavenly Father but understood incarnation in a docetic manner that Jesus' body was only an imitation of a material body. He also held that Jesus paid the debt of sin through his crucifixion, and freeing the entire humanity to inherit eternal life [Tert. Adv. Marc. I, 19, 1] (cf. B. Aland, Markion, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 6, Freiburg 1997, 1392).

<sup>674</sup>Cited from Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 5-6 referring to SC 98, 196-197.

<sup>675</sup>In Epistle 80 and 81 written in 448 he says that he has been bishop for twenty-five years. In Epistle 113 and 116 written in 449 he says that he was the bishop of Cyrus for twenty-six years (cf. Urbainczyk, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, 11).

<sup>676</sup>Tixeront, A Handbook of Patrology, 205.

<sup>677</sup>Cf. Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 7-8.

<sup>678</sup>John of Antioch was bishop of Antioch from 429-441 A. D. and led a group of moderate Eastern bishops during the Nestorian controversy. In the struggle of Nestorius with Cyril of Alexandria first he gave support to Nestorius (cf. Loon, The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria, 8).

But as Theodoret saw the anathemas written by Cyril against Nestorius he was shocked as he found elements of Apollinarism in it. Then and there Theodoret changed his mind and joined the party of John of Antioch opposed to Cyril. He refused first of all to subscribe to the 'Union' of 433, although the creed of this 'Union' was his own work, but joined it later in 435 when it had been formally declared that Nestorius would not be condemned.<sup>679</sup> Together with this we must also hold in mind the problems of both patriarchs namely Nestorius and Cyril. The problem between both Nestorius and Cyril was that they used many terms from secular philosophy without caring the nuances of these various words which they have. For example as the term *prosopon* was used by Nestorius both in the singular and plural in his description of the union, so also Cyril frequently likened *physis* and *hypostasis* and articulated of a physical as well as a hypostatic union which bestowed vagueness to his formulae. Besides, due to the passionate liking of Cyril for the ideas of Athanasius he made use also Apollinarian forgeries, which for him, seems to have originated from Athanasius. Hence it becomes important for us a study of Theodoret and his theology as he was both a theologian and a person who was in acquaintance with the nuances of the ancient philosophical terms. But during his life time he was also very much misunderstood regarding his theological position as he was a friend of Nestorius and an Antiochian. He was also charged, convicted and deposed in the same way as Nestorius without a trial without any chance to defend himself. He also had a lot of bitter experiences in his life as many Antiochian fathers had. As we have already shared it is always hazardous to have Cyril as an opponent. For in Theodoret's own words he says:

“And those were unquestionably wrong who gave both their ears to my calumniators and would not keep one for me. Even to murderers, and to them that despoil other men's beds, an opportunity is given of defending themselves, and they do not receive sentence till they have been convicted in their own presence, or have made confession of the truth of the charges on which they are indicated. But a high priest who has held the office of bishop for 25 years after passing his previous life in a monastery, who has never troubled a tribunal, nor yet on any single occasion been prosecuted by any man, is treated as a mere plaything of calumny, without being allowed even the common privilege of grave-robbers of being questioned as to the truth of the accusations brought against them.”<sup>680</sup>

The content of this letter shows very clearly how terribly he had to undergo the unlawful accusations and charges. Immediately after the death of Theodosius II (29 July 450) Pulcheria, his sister and Marcian made their accession to the throne. Their rule was of course in favour of the orthodox party. Theodoret's fate was decided in the Chalcedonian council held from 8 October 451. In this council Dioscorus was deposed on disciplinary grounds and the bishops who were excommunicated by the *Latrocinium*<sup>681</sup> (449) were rehabilitated. In the eighth session of this council Theodoret had to defend his faith mostly against Nestorius in the midst of a riotous and unprincipled churchmen. Knowing all the repercussions and not willing to tear the church once again and to save the church once again from a hardly explainable dogma

<sup>679</sup>Cf. Tixeront, A Handbook of Patrology, 206.

<sup>680</sup>Cited from Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 22 referring to SC 98, 190 (Letter 80 to the prefect Eutrechius; NPNF III, 276).

<sup>681</sup>*Latrocinium* in ecclesiastical Latin means 'rebel' or hostile council. It literally means robber council and was used as a term of abuse to suggest such a council as not canonical.

Theodoret made the difficult decision in his life to anathematize his friend Nestorius. Otherwise his lot would have been the same as of Nestorius who was in his absence two years before anathematized at the Cyrillian Council of 431. We know from the history that although some of the bishops insisted nothing to add further with the Nicene Creed in accordance with the Cyril's Ephesian Council at the emperor's request a *Definition* was formulated, a definition which is formulated upon Theodoret's *Formula*:

“Therefore, following the holy Fathers we all teach with one voice that our Lord Jesus Christ is to be confessed as one and the same Son, the same one (to be) perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, the same one (to be) very God and very man (consisting) of a reasonable soul and body, coessential with the Father according to Godhead and coessential with us according to manhood; (being) in all things like us, sin excepted; on the one hand begotten of the Father before the ages according to Godhead; on the other hand, in the last days for us and for our salvation the same one (to be) born of the Virgin Mary, the God-bearer (*theotokos*) according to manhood. This one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten is recognized in two natures (*en duo physesis*), unconfusedly (*asynchutos*) immutably (*atreptos*), indivisibly (*adiairetos*), inseparably (*achoristos*) (united), and that the difference (*diaphora*) of the natures was by no means removed through the union (*henosis*), but rather the property (*idiotes*) of each nature being preserved and joined together in one Person (*prosopon*) and one *hypostasis*, not separated or divided into two persons (*duo prosopa*), but one and the same Son and Only-begotten, God-Word, Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets from the beginning (had spoken) about him, and as the Lord Jesus Christ himself had instructed us, and as the Creed of the Fathers handed down to us.”<sup>682</sup>

Although he had to share the same disaster of his companion Nestorius one thing we can conclude regarding this formula of Theodoret from the 120<sup>th</sup> Letter of Leo written to Theodoret on 11 June 453, that it was very pivotal in bringing about clarification to the formula which was till then under the sway of clouds. In this letter Leo finds space to congratulate the Bishop of Cyrus for the joint victory at Chalcedon and he reassures him that the Apostolic See holds him free of heresy and requests his further co-operation by writing periodic reports from the east. We know only very little about Theodoret's life after Chalcedon. Even the year of his death is yet a matter of dispute. In the patristic studies various authors vary with regard to the date of his death. For example Tillemont is of the opinion that he did not survive the year 453; on the other hand Gennadius suggests 457-458 as a preferable year of his death; according to Canivet he died before 466. Honigmann is certain that he died in the year 466; whereas Azéma is for 460 as the most possible year of his death.<sup>683</sup> However after his death the Monophysite bishop Philoxenus of Mabbugh<sup>684</sup> removed his name

<sup>682</sup>Cited from Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 22 referring to ACO II, I, 2, 129-30.

<sup>683</sup>Cf. E. Honigmann, Theodoret of Cyrrihus and Basil of Seleucia (the Time of Their Deaths), in: idem, Patristic Studies (Studi e testi 173), Città del Vaticano 1953, 180.

<sup>684</sup>Philoxenos (Syriac, Aksenaya) was bishop of Mabbugh (Hierapolis, today's Manbij) in Syria in the year 485. He was one of the best Syriac prose writers and vehement champion of the Anti-Chalcedonian doctrine at the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> and beginning of 6<sup>th</sup> centuries. He was an opponent of Chalcedonian council in 451. He attracted soon the attention by his strenuous advocacy of Non-Chalcedonian doctrine and on the expulsion of Calandio in 485 (and of Flavian in 512) he was ordained bishop of Mabbog by his non-Chalcedonian successor Peter the Fuller. He was exiled first to Paphlagonia and later to Philippopolis by Justinus I who was the emperor of the East-Roman empire from 518-527. Philoxenos died on 10. 12. 523 (cf. J. Martikainen, Philoxenos, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 262).

from the diptychs at Cyrus and Sergius II restored it.<sup>685</sup> And later in the fifth ecumenical council which was held under the Emperor Justinian in Constantinople (553) Theodoret was condemned although he did not undo all that was reached upon in Chalcedon. This council condemned all what Theodoret wrote against true faith and against St. Cyril in its Canon 13. We must keep in mind that all these condemnations meted against the three Antiochians were to keep the Monophysite opponents of Chalcedon in reconciliation. Before we come to the Christology of Theodoret let us treat in the forthcoming sections his notions in supporting Antiochian Christology rather than that taught by Cyril or Alexandrian version. We will do it by making a study of the twelve anathemas which Cyril brought against Nestorius and the answer given to it by Theodoret.

### 3. Theodoret's Works

Before we come to the evaluation of the twelve Anathemas of Cyril and its refutation and his work *Eranistes* we may make an ephemeral study of his works. Theodoret was one of the best orator and writer of his time. His commentaries are "excellent in substance and form, precision and clearness."<sup>686</sup> The works of Theodoret are comprised of exegetical, apologetical, dogmatic-polemical, historical writings, discourses and letters. His exegetical writings are encompassed of a series of detached explanations of the complex passages of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four Books of Kings, and the Books of Paralipomena, written in catechetical form towards the end of his life.<sup>687</sup> Later in the year 425 he wrote a continuous commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, a commentary on the Psalms between the period of 433-445, a third commentary on the minor and major Prophets (among which the commentary on Daniel was written in 426) and subsequently a fourth commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul during the period between 431-434. Another set of his writings are known as Apologetical writings. It is said that he was the last and most perfect author of apology produced by the Greek Church. He wrote his *Graecarum Affectionum curatio* (The Art of Treating Greek Distempers), in 12 books, between the period of 429 and 437. In this work he tries to show the difference between heathen and Christian teachings and aims at showing the truth which Christianity aims at. Besides this are also added to the apologetical works the 12 discourses *On God's Providence*. This is believed to be delivered at Antioch before 431. His treatise against the Persian magicians has been lost but we have a fragment of the work, named *Against the Jews*. The third sort of his writings can be titled under Dogmatico-Polemical writings. His famous polemical work is his repudiations to the anathemas written in 430 in answer to Cyril of Alexandria. The next work was *Pentalogium de Incarnatione* probably composed in the year 432, of which we have only Greek and Latin fragments. In this work also Cyril's theology is attacked. Then he wrote two works namely, *On the Holy and Vivifying Trinity* and *On the Incarnation of the Lord*, between 431 and 435 and both are wrongly considered among the works of Cyril of Alexandria. The next and the final treatise he wrote was the *Eranistes* (The Beggar), in 4 books (447). In this work he tries to invalidate the arguments of Eutychians [Alexandrians] and strives to

<sup>685</sup>Cf. P. Canivet, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, in: NCE 14, Washington 1967, 20.

<sup>686</sup>Tixeront, A Handbook of Patrology, 206.

<sup>687</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 207.



establish that the Word remained unchanged in the Incarnation (ἄτρεπτος), without mixture (ἀσύγχυτος) and impassible (ἀπαθής). The fourth book can be considered as a summary of the foregoing argument. The genuineness of other letters namely the *Letter to Sporacius* or *Libellus contra Nestorium* cannot be proved beyond doubt. If we discuss also about his historical works, Discourses and letters, we may be having a complete grasp of his various writings. He wrote almost three historical works. The first among them is the *A Church History* which seems to be written in the year 450 in 5 books, which hints at what have taken place between the periods of 323-428. In this work he made use of all the available historians namely, Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen and probably Rufinus. Secondly under this title falls *A Religious History*. This is a series of short sketches of the renowned ascetics of the East probably written in the year 440. He concludes this work with a short treatise *On Divine and Holy Charity*. Finally he writes *A Short History of the Heresies (Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium)*, in 5 books written in 453. The passage which we find towards the end of Book IV, hinting at Nestorius, may be an interpolation. In Book V he makes an explication of the orthodox doctrine. Besides these he wrote a number of discourses and letters. Today almost 230 letters are extant to us which are of utmost importance for us due to its historical and dogmatic value, and as they divulge the capacity, talent and character of the author namely, Theodoret, the bishop of Cyrus.<sup>688</sup>

Even if his writings are many in number we may be dealing only with the response of Theodoret to the 12 Anathemas of Cyril and his *Eranistes*<sup>689</sup> as it is very important for our study to understand his Christological thoughts. His theology was developed as a response to the particular situations which he faced and as an heir to a certain theological tradition. Today there is a general consensus regarding the date of composition of *Eranistes* as 447 or 448. We are not very sure of the role of *Eranistes* as Theodoret does not clearly mention about the object of his criticism. Another difficulty in arriving at his intention in writing *Eranistes* is that his enemy [thematic] Cyril had already died in the year 444 and Nestorius had been definitively exiled in 436 and the commotions surrounding the Ephesian council was also subsided. Then we may raise the question in that case for what or what was the motive behind writing this work. In all probability we can say this is a work to refute the false teaching of Eutyches, the new threat, who was supported by Dioscorus, the successor to Cyril in Alexandria. It is interesting to note that although Eutyches was condemned by a synod at Constantinople in 448, in the year 449 a synod at Ephesus again restored him and condemned Flavian of Constantinople, deposed Theodoret,<sup>690</sup> Ibas of Edessa and Domnus of Antioch. This is the irony we find in the life of great fathers who tried to teach the orthodox teaching of the church. Theodoret of Cyrus was also not exempted from this cruel irony in life although he was rehabilitated in Chalcedon. The work which we take up here is very important for us to understand his personal thought. It

<sup>688</sup>Cf. Tixeront, *A Handbook of Patrology*, 206-208.

<sup>689</sup>Cf. G. H. Ettliger, *Theodoret of Cyrus: Eranistes*, Oxford 1975, 3: *Eranistes* represents the high point in Theodoret's opposition to Cyril and is perhaps the most original work to stem from Syria in the fifth century; (cf. Ettliger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 5: the name 'Eranistes' is often translated as 'beggar,' but the Patristic Greek Lexicon's translation of it as 'collector' is closer to Theodoret's own explanation. He says that those whom *Eranistes* represents gather together [ἐρανισάμενοι] various opinions and weave them together into a many-faceted theory just as one might sew scraps of old cloth together).

<sup>690</sup>Cf. Ettliger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 4: Theodoret had to confine to the city of Cyrus in 448 by an imperial decree on the ground that he was convening synods everywhere and disturbing the peace.

is strikingly important for us also to understand the two nature doctrine about the person of Christ. So after having dealt with the twelve Anathemas and its refutations we will be getting into the study of Eranistes.

#### 4. Theodoret's Refutation of Cyril's Twelve Anathemas

Cyril's third letter was cataclysm to Nestorius. It is said so purely because of its contents. It contained almost twelve anathemas directed against the patriarch of Constantinople. In this section we will be dealing with all these anathemas with a refutation given by the Bishop of Cyrus. First of all we must keep in mind as we go through them that these twelve anathemas were made by an Alexandrian Patriarch who was always in opposition to the Antiochians. They were formulated in such a way or the language was such that they [the Antiochians] would never sign them. Through this anathemas Cyril could realize his entire church-political program. At this juncture in the year 430 Theodoret of Cyrus counters the anathemas of Cyril written against Nestorius at John of Antioch's request. Theodoret finds in the idea of Cyril nothing other than a disguised Apollinarism. According to Theodoret Cyril's equation of *hypostasis* with *physis* in Christ, as well as the mode of speaking continuously of *Logos-sarx* Christology, is nothing other than the subtlest heresies concerning the Person of the Saviour.

“If in Trinitarian doctrine Arius was wrong in equating *hypostasis* with *ousia* (which led him to assert that three *hypostases* meant three essences, i.e., excluding the ‘coessentiality’ of Father and Son), then Apollinarius (and consequently Cyril) had to be corrected in his Christological equation of *hypostasis* with *physis*, a correction which was ultimately carried out by the *Chalcedonian* Definition itself.”<sup>691</sup>

In this sense we understand how important was the contribution of Theodoret of Cyrus in understanding the Person of Christ and his refutation against Cyril's anathemas. The anathemas were not included in the Chalcedonian documents even if later in 553 they became the measure of orthodoxy, and Theodoret's refutation was banned as part of the Three Chapters by Justinian's council.<sup>692</sup> We do not want to belittle the contribution given by Cyril. His interest was only to protect the unity of Christ as a single subject of predication which at least for him seems to be denied by the Antiochian party. And Theodoret's Christology when taken in comparison with the Christologies of Cyril and Nestorius, it is complementary to the extent that it emphasizes upon the difference between the two natures as well as the positive recognition of a human soul in Christ. Let us consider each of the anathemas and its refutations.<sup>693</sup>

---

<sup>691</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 172.

<sup>692</sup>The Three-Chapter (*tria kephalaia*) Controversy is a by-product of the attempt to reconcile the Non-Chalcedonian Christians of the Middle East with Eastern Orthodoxy. In this Council it was decided to condemn (1) the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; (2) certain writings of Theodoret of Cyrus; (3) the letter of Ibas to Maris (cf. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 421).

<sup>693</sup>I have depended upon Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus for the clarification of anathemas and its refutations.

## A. The First Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone does not acknowledge Emmanuel to be truly God and therefore the holy Virgin to be *Theotokos* (for she gave birth according to the flesh to the Word of God made flesh), let him be anathema.”<sup>694</sup> “Ἐἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν τὸν ἐμμανουήλ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον γεγέννηκε γὰρ σαρκικῶς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ λόγον, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>695</sup>

### a. The Reply from Theodoret

Through this Anathema what Cyril tries to assert is that “Mary is theotokos as she who gave birth to God, in that she gave birth according to the flesh to the Word of God become flesh.”<sup>696</sup> Cyril emphasized that the human nature born of Mary was united with the Logos in one being or person (in one *hypostasis*).<sup>697</sup> In answer to this anathema Theodoret starts with discussing the nature of the flesh of Christ. According to him the God-Word was neither made flesh by nature, nor was turned into flesh. For him the divine cannot undergo any change as it is immutable and invariable. He quotes several scriptural quotations for this. For David said: “But you are the same, and your years shall not fail.”<sup>698</sup> We hear the same from the letter to the Hebrews that “Thou remainest, thy years shall not fail. Christ is the same in himself, the same yesterday, and today and forever.”<sup>699</sup> The same is said of Jesus before years through the prophet: “I am, I am and I do not change.”<sup>700</sup> This text seems to be paraphrased by Theodoret and conjoins with Exod 3, 14. So from the various scriptural passages he comes to the conclusion that it is impossible for the Son, who is divine, immutable and invariable, to change or alter. He proceeds further by asking the question then how can one interpret the mystery of incarnation? He depends upon John 1, 14 to explain this mystery. The phrase does not mean that the God-Word became flesh by changing, rather took on flesh and dwelt among us according to the scriptures. He finds also similar expression in Paul in his Epistles: “have within yourselves the same disposition of mind as was in Christ Jesus, for he was by nature in the very form of God, yet he did not regard the existence in equality with God as something to be snatched at, but he emptied himself, and took the very form of a slave, and became like men.”<sup>701</sup> With the help of these passages he makes clear that God did not change into the form of a servant but took to himself the form of a servant all the same remaining divine and immutable. So it is clear from the letter of St. Paul that the Word did not become flesh rather it assumed flesh. According to this interpretation the Word had not the beginning of His existence in Virgin Mary but rather God formed a temple for Himself in the womb of virgin and together with that he was fashioned, conceived, formed and

<sup>694</sup>Cited from Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 173 referring to ACO I, I, 6, 108-46 (cf. Russell, Cyril of Alexandria, 178-89).

<sup>695</sup>A. C. Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides: a Christology Compatible with the Third Letter and Anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria, Diss., Los Angeles 1983, 54.

<sup>696</sup>Ibid.

<sup>697</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 57 in reference to Cyril of Alexandria, Ep. ad John of Antioch.

<sup>698</sup>Ps. 102, 27 in LXX.

<sup>699</sup>Heb 1, 12.

<sup>700</sup>Mal 3, 6.

<sup>701</sup>Phil 2, 5-7.

begotten. This is precisely the reason why Virgin Mary becomes the ‘God-bearer’ (theotokos), because she did not give birth naturally to God, but to man united to the God who had fashioned him. For he argues that “if the one fashioned in the Virgin’s womb was not man but the God-Word, then the God-Word is a creature of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>702</sup> For we read in Matthew’s Gospel and Luke’s Gospel that Maria conceived the Son of God through the power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>703</sup> But we believe that the Son was uncreated like the Father and the Spirit and coessential and co-eternal with the Father, therefore, he is not something fashioned by, or a creature of the Spirit. Therefore we have to admit that it is not the God-Word rather the form of the servant was naturally fashioned, formed, conceived and begotten. This indwelling of the form of the servant in no way took away or diminished the form of God, but it dwelt in it as a temple holding the indwelling God, according to Paul. For in Him all the fullness of the Godhead was pleased to dwell bodily.<sup>704</sup> Therefore both titles are necessary namely ‘man-bearer’ (*anthropotokos*) and ‘God-bearer’ (*theotokos*) respectively when we speak of Virgin Mary. The former being applied to her as fashioning, forming and conception whereas the latter to the union between both. Hence the child who is born is Emmanuel, ‘God with us’ according to the words of the gospels. Consequently we can say that the child is Emmanuel in so far as it has assumed God and Virgin is God-bearer in so far as she makes it possible for the Word to unite or to assume the form of the servant. Hence he tells that we should not envisage that God-Word was turned into flesh rather it was the form of God which took the form of the servant.

## B. The Second Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone does not acknowledge that the Word of God the Father to be united hypostatically with the flesh and to be one Christ together with his own flesh, that is, the same subject as at once both God and man, let him be anathema.”<sup>705</sup> “Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ σαρκὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἠνωσθαι τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγον, ἕνα τε εἶναι Χριστὸν μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός, τὸν αὐτὸν δηλώνοντι θεόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>706</sup>

### b. The Reply from Theodoret

Cyril tries to assert through the second and third anathemas that “Christ is one independent being or person, himself both God and man, and that Christ is not to be divided into two independent beings or persons after the union.”<sup>707</sup> According to Theodoret and the Antiochian school Cyril advocates a sort of mixture in the person of Christ by applying the term hypostatically united with flesh. This in no way Theodoret can comply with for he finds in the interpretation of Cyril a mixture of flesh and Godhead according to *hypostasis*. He tells that we shall contradict him with all zeal and shall refute the blasphemy.<sup>708</sup> According to Theodoret a mixture is

<sup>702</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 174.

<sup>703</sup>Cf. Mt 1, 20; Lk 1, 35.

<sup>704</sup>Cf. Col 1, 19; 2, 9.

<sup>705</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 174.

<sup>706</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 75.

<sup>707</sup>Ibid., 78.

<sup>708</sup>Cf. Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 175.

necessarily followed by confusion and admission of confusion destroys the property of each nature. He continues saying that things which are blended do not remain any more the same. He tries to substantiate this point with the help of scripture. In the gospel of John Jesus tells the Jews to “destroy this temple and in three days I shall raise it up.”<sup>709</sup> His argument follows that if a mixture had taken place Jesus could not have been able to say to destroy ‘this temple’ which could have been logically then superfluous.<sup>710</sup> If a mixture had taken place in Jesus His vocabulary would have been something else. We can formulate it so: “destroy me and in three days I shall be raised.”<sup>711</sup> According to Theodoret all must acknowledge the union in the Person Christ together with the properties of natures. Without doubt he teaches that one must worship this one Christ rather than saying that God the Word to be united hypostatically with the flesh and to be one Christ together with his own flesh.

### C. The Third Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone, with regard to the one Christ, divides (*diairei*) the *hypostases* after the union, connecting them only by a conjunction in terms of rank or supreme authority, and not rather by a combination in terms of natural union, let him be anathema.”<sup>712</sup> “Εἴ τις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς χριστοῦ διαιρεῖ τὰς ὑποστάσεις μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, μόνη συνάπτων αὐτὰς συναφείᾳ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν αὐθεντίαν ἢ δυναστείαν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον συνόδῳ τῇ καθ’ ἔνωσιν φυσικὴν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>713</sup>

#### c. The Reply from Theodoret

Even though Cyril recognizes two natures in Christ this is not very clear for us. Daly comments that

“Cyril might yet be suspected of saying that although Christ was formed of two natures before the union, the divinity and the humanity were so united as to become only one nature after the union (... οὐ γὰρ ἔστι διπλοῦς ὁ εἷς καὶ μόνος Χριστός, κἂν ἐκ δύο νοῆται καὶ διαφόρων πραγμάτων εἰς ἐνότητα τὴν ἀμέριστον συνενηνεγμένος).”<sup>714</sup>

Theodoret finds it as an ambiguous and rarefied statement from the Patriarch of Alexandria. He tells that the irrationality of what Cyril says is clear to the pious. The bishop of Cyrus asks for whom it is not discernible that the conjunction (*synapheia*) and concurrence (*synodos*) are not different in any respect? “Concurrence is a concurrence of separated parts; and conjunction is a conjunction of the disconnected parts.”<sup>715</sup> Theodoret criticizes Cyril saying that he made synonyms into opposite. Theodoret explains it in this way saying that “one must not conjoin the *hypostases* by conjunction, but by concurrence (*synodos*), moreover, a natural concurrence (*synodos*

<sup>709</sup>Jn 2, 19.

<sup>710</sup>He tells that if Jesus was a product of mixture no more could he be God or no more could he be a temple. Therefore His claim is superfluous.

<sup>711</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 175.

<sup>712</sup>Ibid.

<sup>713</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 75.

<sup>714</sup>Ibid., 81.

<sup>715</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 176.

*physichē*).<sup>716</sup> He makes it clear that it should be so in Christ as nature is a matter of necessity and not of will. He clarifies this argument with the help of so many examples from day to day life. He tells that we are naturally hungry and it is due to necessity and not intentionally. We are either naturally thirsty, or we sleep naturally, or breathe the air naturally etc. All this takes place in us according to the category of the involuntary. It is reasonable to think that if it does not take place in any one of us naturally or out of necessity it would mean the end of life or rather someone is approaching the end of life. To make it further clear, if the power to hunger lingered only in the realm of intention or will, paupers would have ceased begging. Here with the support of these various examples Theodoret clarifies that the union (*henōsis*) of the form of God and of the form of the servant was natural (*physichē*). He tells that “the God-Word was conjoined to the form of the servant under the constraint of some necessity and the lawgiver of all is found to be a follower of the laws of necessity.”<sup>717</sup> But in the epistle of Paul he tells that Christ ‘emptied himself taking the form of a servant.’ In this citation of St. Paul we find something contrary to what Theodoret just said above, that is to say, the phrase ‘emptied himself’ contains also the act of voluntariness. Therefore the bishop of Cyrus argues if Christ was only united by intent and will to the nature assumed from us the addition of the ‘natural’ is then superfluous. Theodoret tells that separation is inherent in the word union. The perception of union presupposes separation.<sup>718</sup> He argues if there was no separation between these natures in Christ it would have been unfounded to speak of a union. Therefore the bishop of Cyrus asks then how could he [Cyril] say that one should not separate the *hypostases* or natures? Theodoret holds for certain that on the one hand the *hypostasis* of the God-Word was perfect before the ages, and on the other hand the form of the servant assumed by Him was too perfect. Therefore he uses *hypostases* and not *hypostasis*. As these perfect natures came together (*synelthon*) into the same (one) he is of the view that it is pious on the one hand to confess similarly one Person (*prosōpon*) and one Son and Christ and on the other to talk about the united *hypostases*<sup>719</sup> or natures as a consequence. He asks is it not reasonable to find the distinctive properties of the natures of the assuming God and the assumed man? In our everyday experiences we are prone to divide the same man into mortal body and immortal soul still what we mean by it is the only man, the single being. For example in the epistle of Paul we have so many instances of this terminology: “even though our outward man is wasted away, yet this inward man is renewed.”<sup>720</sup> Yet in another place he tells that “he rejoices in the law of God according to the inward man,”<sup>721</sup> and again somewhere else he tells that “the Christ may dwell in the inner man.”<sup>722</sup> So if blessed

---

<sup>716</sup>Ibid.

<sup>717</sup>Ibid.

<sup>718</sup>The term *diairesis* and the verb *diaireo* (division, separation; to divide, to separate) are used by Theodoret to express a clear distinction between the two natures of Christ against the Cyril’s confused way of speaking. Cyril used and condemned the same verb: ‘if anyone divides (*diairei*) the hypostases’ etc. Theodoret gives clarity by using another word, i.e., *diakrino* and *diakrisis* (to distinguish, distinction). The probable reason for using *diairesis* is to answer Cyril’s criticism in a terminological sense.

<sup>719</sup>Here is the only place in his entire theological system where Theodoret admits two hypostases in Christ as an answer to Cyril’s third anathema. It is not to indicate that there are two persons in Christ rather to make clear both natures were perfect and complete in itself.

<sup>720</sup>2 Cor 4, 16.

<sup>721</sup>Rom 7, 22.

<sup>722</sup>Eph 3, 16-17.

Paul does not find anything wrong in the division of what is adjoined of the synchronous natures in man how can someone else accuse us, he asks, with impiety when we speak of two complete and distinct natures of the eternal God and of the man assumed at the end of days?

#### D. The Fourth Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone takes the terms used in the Gospels and apostolic writings, whether referred to Christ by the saints, or applied to himself by himself, and allocates them to two *prosōpa* or *hypostases*, attributing some to a man conceived of as separate from the Word of God and some, as more appropriate to God, only to the Word of God the Father, let him be anathema.”<sup>723</sup> “Εἴ τις προσώποις δυσὶν ἤγουν ὑποστάσει τὰς τε ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς καὶ ἀποστολικοῖς συγγράμμασι διανέμει φωνάς, ἢ ἐπὶ Χριστῷ παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων λεγομένας, ἢ παρ’ αὐτοῦ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τὰς μὲν ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ παρὰ τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ Λόγον ἰδικῶς νοουμένῳ προσάπτει, τὰς δὲ ὡς θεοπρεπεῖς μόνῳ τῷ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγῳ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>724</sup>

#### d. The Reply from Theodoret

It is an anathema almost similar to what we have discussed above. Although he condemns people who apply certain element [wisdom, knowledge] to divinity and certain [hunger, thirst, ignorance, fatigue etc.] to humanity he himself is found at times employing what he has negated. Cyril says that “certain of the statements are to be ascribed to the divine *physis*, by which Christ is the same thing that the Father is on account of an identity of *ousia*.”<sup>725</sup> Bit sarcastically Theodoret directs the question back to the author himself requesting him to instruct people then how to refute the blasphemy of heretics, namely Arius, Eunomius and the rest of the heresiarchs. He asks further how could Cyril, the exact teacher of the divine dogmas, then explain and refute the blasphemy of heretics, while attributing to the God-Word what was uttered humbly and suitably by the form of the servant.<sup>726</sup> In order to understand better the arguments of Theodoret we will consider all the scriptural quotations which he makes use to clarify this concept. For we hear so many utterances from the mouth of Jesus, Arius argued, which go against his divinity. For example “my God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”,<sup>727</sup> further we read in the Bible: “Father, if possible, let this cup pass from me,”<sup>728</sup> or “Father, save me from this hour,”<sup>729</sup> or “no one knows that hour, not even the Son of Man.”<sup>730</sup> All these passages, literally speaking, are a deprivation to the divinity of Jesus. Although he was Son of God he expresses ignorance. Therefore Theodoret asks to whom shall we relate his hunger and the thirst? To whom can we apply the fatigue and the sleep? To whom can one attribute

<sup>723</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 176.

<sup>724</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 92.

<sup>725</sup>Ibid., 93.

<sup>726</sup>Cf. Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 176.

<sup>727</sup>Mt 27, 46.

<sup>728</sup>Mt 26, 39.

<sup>729</sup>Jn 12, 27.

<sup>730</sup>Mt 24, 36.

the ignorance and the fear? The bishop of Cyrus asks how could then he be entitled as Wisdom when He contains ignorance? Or was Jesus lying by saying “all that belonged to the Father belonged to him also”<sup>731</sup> yet did not possess the knowledge of the Father. Jesus says “only the Father knows that day.”<sup>732</sup> Does such an argument lead not to blasphemy when Jesus knows the exact day on which that would happen and still he hides it? One can conclude from this saying of Jesus either the truth lies, or it cannot be called truth. On the contrary we are certain as truth can never lie, and the God-Word is not ignorant of the day which he himself made and he himself appointed, in which he intends to judge the world, so also he has the knowledge of the Father, since He is (the Father’s) unchanged image. Consequently Theodoret comes to the conclusion that all imperfections namely, hunger, thirst, ignorance, fatigue, sleep, and weaknesses belong to the form of the servant. So he asks through his letter to Cyril otherwise how could it be logical for the God-Word to say to the Father, “Father, if possible, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless, not as I will but as you will?”<sup>733</sup> According to the Antiochian bishop if not taken as he expressed above these all seems to be absurdities and forthcoming conclusions can also be absurdities. For it would lead one to think that the mind of the Father and of the Son are not of the same; for the Father wishes one thing and the Son wishes something else. Following this pattern, he tells, that we have to accredit in Jesus greater ignorance. For the Son does not know whether this cup can or cannot pass [from him]. But he continues saying to indict Christ as ignorant is great impiety and blasphemy.

But our experience from the bible is quite contrary. This same Son, who tells, that he does not know the hour and day and who is thirsty and hungry knew well the mystery of *oikonomia*. For we read in the bible that the Son had foretold to the holy apostles all what had to take place and through whom and in what hour. The Son tells “behold, we go up to Jerusalem and the Son of Man shall be handed over into the hands of the Gentiles to mock and flog and to crucify him and on the third day he will rise again.”<sup>734</sup> The Antiochian bishop of Cyrus asks otherwise how is it possible for the Son to rebuke Peter when he said that should not happen to him. He tells him very strongly to get behind him.<sup>735</sup> It indicates very clearly that the Son knew exactly what was going to happen. Again Theodoret goes to the Old Testament and finds references to the knowledge of the Son. He asks is it not absurd for Abraham, many generations ago, to have seen his day and to rejoice and for all the prophets like Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Zechariah and a number of other prophets who all envisaged the suffering and death of the Son and however only for the Son that was unclear what was going to happen for the sake of the salvation of the world? So he concludes the words of ignorance and related imperfections are not of the God-Word as Arius taught but of the form of the servant. He finds the reason for the servant-Jesus to fear death because death was not yet destroyed and the God-Word had given room for fear that the nature which had been received may be evident and that which was foretold by Abraham and David may not seem only apparently or only in will or intention. Therefore the bishop of Cyrus asks us humbly to admit to attach to the form of the servant what was from

---

<sup>731</sup>Jn 16, 15.

<sup>732</sup>Mt 24, 36.

<sup>733</sup>Mt 26, 39.

<sup>734</sup>Mt 20, 18-19.

<sup>735</sup>Cf. Mt 16, 23.



the lowly or humble nature uttered. He reminds us that we may be also contaminated otherwise with the blasphemy of Arius and Eunomius.

### E. The Fifth Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone has the boldness to say that Christ is a divinely inspired<sup>736</sup> man instead of saying that he is truly God, since he is by nature a single Son, in that the Word became flesh and shared in flesh and blood like us<sup>737</sup> let him be anathema.”<sup>738</sup>  
 “Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν θεοφόρον ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστόν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, ὡς Υἱὸν ἓνα καὶ φύσει, καθὸ γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ Λόγος καὶ κεκοινώνηκε παραπλησίως ἡμῖν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>739</sup>

#### e. The Reply from Theodoret

Through this anathema Cyril accuses Nestorius with the central fault as teaching the idea that Christ is not one person but two.<sup>740</sup> To this abomination of Cyril Theodoret responds saying that no one is keen to attribute to God-Word a change (*tropē*) to flesh on the contrary we advocate everyone to believe that God-Word partook in flesh and blood. The bishop of Cyrus says that if someone teaches contrary to what we have above mentioned we consider it as impiety also. And he demonstrates saying that the argument of Cyril is wrong to the extent that if the Word was changed into flesh, then he did not partake with us in flesh and blood. Nonetheless if God-Word joined in flesh and blood, then it should be something different from flesh and blood. And we believe that flesh is not same as God-Word. So if the flesh is different from God-Word, then one can conclude that Word did not change into flesh. Theodoret continues saying that as they acknowledge the distinction (*diaphora*) of the natures in Christ so also they worship both him who took (*ton labonta*) and that which was taken (*to lēphthen*). This partaking of God-Word with flesh, says the bishop of Cyrus, was an element of *koinōnia*. And he adds saying that they follow in line with the holy fathers, one among whom is the Cappadocian great Basil,<sup>741</sup> in naming God-Word as ‘God-bearing man’ (*theophoros anthrōpos*). He makes clear the background in which the Antiochians consider him as God-bearing man. It is not because He shares some divine grace rather he possesses all the Godhead of the Son united. He grounds his argument on the epistle of St. Paul: “see to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deceit, according to human tradition, according to the elements of the universe, and according to Christ, for in him dwells the whole fullness of the Godhead bodily.”<sup>742</sup>

<sup>736</sup> The translation of the Greek adjective θεοφόρον as ‘divinely inspired’ is not the correct rendering.

<sup>737</sup> Cf. Heb 2, 14.

<sup>738</sup> Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 179.

<sup>739</sup> Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 99.

<sup>740</sup> Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>741</sup> Cf. Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 179 in reference to Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* 5, 12 in SC 17; in one of his works addressed to Amphilochius on Holy Spirit, and in his explanation of Psalm fifty-nine PG 29, 424 B; 468 A.

<sup>742</sup> Col 2, 8-9.

## F. The Sixth Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone says that the Word of God is Christ’s God or Master, instead of acknowledging the same Christ as simultaneously God and man, since according to the Scriptures the Word became flesh,<sup>743</sup> let him be anathema.”<sup>744</sup> “Εἴ τις λέγει θεὸν ἢ Δεσπότην εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγον, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖ θεόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ὡς γεγονότος σαρκὸς τοῦ Λόγου κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>745</sup>

### f. The Reply from Theodoret

Main accusation of Cyril on Nestorius bases on the idea that he makes the Logos the Lord of Christ although Cyril himself finds this dominion over the humanity of Christ.<sup>746</sup> The response of Theodoret to this anathema of Cyril is in the form of a number of quotations from Old Testament and New Testament alike. He starts his answer by quoting St. Paul. Paul appends the word ‘form of a servant’<sup>747</sup> to that which was assumed by the God-Word. But after the union of God-Word with the form of a servant or flesh the name ‘servitude’ does not fit any more. Therefore, Theodoret argues, in the letter of St. Paul he uses the word son deliberately and not servant for those who believe in Him. “You are no longer a servant but a son.”<sup>748</sup> The Lord himself said to his disciples “I shall no more call you servants but friends.”<sup>749</sup> Theodoret is of the view that by the servitude of Christ not only we are freed from the first-fruits of our nature, but we are also privileged to the benefit of adoption and freed from the servitude. And he concludes saying that we confess even the form of the servant as ‘God’ as God’s form being united with it freed us also eternally from servitude, our first nature. He disagrees with Cyril’s anathema saying that even the prophets also found in infant Jesus, in the form of the servant, an Emmanuel<sup>750</sup> and the child which was born was called “angel of great counsel, wonderful adviser, powerful God, mighty, prince of peace and Father of the coming age.”<sup>751</sup> The same prophet who entitled the child Jesus with the above expressions also describes him as servant, the one from the seed of Abraham: “You are my servant, Israel, and in you I shall be glorified.”<sup>752</sup> Theodoret finds so many quotations of the same sort from the OT. “Thus says the Lord who formed me from the womb (to be) his servant.”<sup>753</sup> And the same prophet utters “behold, I have given you for a covenant of nations, for a light to the Gentiles that you may be the salvation to the end of the earth.”<sup>754</sup> Thus the bishop of Cyrus tells in lucid terms that that which was formed in the womb was not

<sup>743</sup>Cf. Jn 1, 14.

<sup>744</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 180.

<sup>745</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 104.

<sup>746</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>747</sup>Cf. Phil 2, 7.

<sup>748</sup>Gal 4, 7.

<sup>749</sup>Jn 15, 15.

<sup>750</sup>Cf. Is 7, 14.

<sup>751</sup>Is 9, 6.

<sup>752</sup>Is 49, 3.

<sup>753</sup>Is 49, 5.

<sup>754</sup>Is 49, 6.

the God-Word but the form of the servant. And of course, one must be clear that God-Word was not made flesh but rather it assumed flesh with a rational soul.

### G. The Seventh Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone says that Jesus is a man controlled by the Word of God and that the glory of the Only-begotten is to be attributed to another existing apart from him, let him be anathema.”<sup>755</sup> “Εἴ τις, φησίν, ὡς ἄνθρωπον, ἐνεργῆσθαι παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς εὐδοξίαν περιῆφθαι, ὡς ἑτέρῳ παρ’ αὐτὸν ὑπάρχοντι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>756</sup>

#### g. The Reply from Theodoret

Although this anathema remains somewhat isolated one can find a connection with the ninth one. Cyril’s purpose in formulating this Anathema was “to exclude a duality of persons in Christ.”<sup>757</sup> To this anathema Theodoret replies with an interrogation asking if the nature of the human being is mortal, and this mortal body which was destroyed by Jews<sup>758</sup> could it raise by its own power the temple in which the God-Word dwelt and which carried it into heaven and how is that form of the servant glorified if not anything else other than the form of God? Theodoret clarifies saying that being mortal by nature the mortal body was made immortal by its union with the God-Word. He tells Christ’s mortal body received what it did not have with this unification. So one can say it was glorified by the One who has given it. He quotes the words of St. Paul in support of his argument. For we read in Ephesians that “according to the working of his mighty power which he accomplished in Christ when he raised him from the dead.”<sup>759</sup>

### H. The Eighth Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone has the audacity to say that the assumed man should be worshipped along with the God the Word and should be glorified and called God along with him as if they were two different entities (for the addition of the expression ‘along with’ will always necessarily imply this interpretation) instead of honouring Emmanuel with a single act of worship and ascribing to him a single act of praise in view of the Word having become flesh, let him be anathema.”<sup>760</sup> “Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι δεῖν τῷ θεῷ Λόγῳ καὶ συνδοξάζεσθαι καὶ συγχεματίζειν θεόν, ὡς ἕτερον ἐν ἑτέρῳ τὸ γὰρ Σύν ἀεὶ προστιθέμενον τοῦτο νοεῖν ἀναγκάσει καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον μιᾷ πορσκυνήσει τινᾷ τὸν Ἐμμανουήλ, καὶ μίαν αὐτῷ τὴν δοξολογίαν ἀναπέμπει, καθὼς γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ Λόγος, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>761</sup>

<sup>755</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 181.

<sup>756</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 115.

<sup>757</sup>Ibid.

<sup>758</sup>Cf. Jn 2, 19.

<sup>759</sup>Eph 1, 19-20.

<sup>760</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 181.

<sup>761</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 118.

## h. The Reply from Theodoret

Here Cyril seems to be distressed due to the division of Christ into two persons, due to the use of the phrase ‘a man assumed.’ Instead “he wants Emmanuel to be honoured with a single adoration and with a single doxology.”<sup>762</sup> To this accusation namely the use of ‘along with’ Theodoret answers saying that they hold the doxology of the catholic teaching firm. Theodoret tells that they [Antiochians] also confess the same One to be at once God and man as it is held in the doxology. But at the same time we should not deny the fact that the term ‘union,’ points out clearly that it is a union of two natures namely Godhood and manhood in the person Christ. However he makes it clear telling that although they speak of this ‘oneness’ in the person of Christ they cannot decline from speaking about the distinctive properties of the natures. Once again he brings clarity to his thought saying that by the acceptance of these two natures into oneself, the God-Word never accepted the change into flesh, and the man did not lose what he had been and was transformed into the nature of God. He clarifies without doubt that even if they uphold the properties of each nature, it in no way curtails them from worshipping the Ruler Christ.

## I. The Ninth Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone says that one Lord Jesus Christ has been glorified by the Spirit, in the sense that Christ used the power that came through the Spirit as something alien to himself and received from him the power to operate against unclean spirits and work miracles in human beings, instead of saying that the Spirit by which he also performed the miracles is his own, let him be anathema.”<sup>763</sup> “Εἴ τις φησὶ τὸν ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν δεδοξάσθαι παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὡς ἀλλοτρία δυνάμει τῆ δι’ αὐτοῦ χρώμενον, καὶ παρ’ αὐτοῦ λαβόντα τὸ ἐνεργεῖν δύνασθαι κατὰ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, καὶ τὸ πληροῦν εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὰς θεοσημίας, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα φησὶ, δι’ οὗ καὶ ἐνήργηκε τὰς θεοσημίας, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>764</sup>

## i. The Reply from Theodoret

As Cyril sees in the seventh Anathema here also he widens a bit more about the power and energy of Christ. He tries to teach that “Christ is one person who is divine as well human and supplies his own power and glory; and even though he also works through the Holy Spirit, it is his own Holy Spirit which he employs.”<sup>765</sup> First of all in answer to this accusation Theodoret depends upon Cyril’s own words where Cyril declared that “Christ possesses the Holy Spirit as his own, as rooted in him in a substantial manner (οὐσιωδῶς ἐμπεφυκός), and this is how he worked miracles.”<sup>766</sup> Besides, in reply to this accusation of Cyril Theodoret relies upon sarcasm. So he starts refuting not only Cyril’s anathematization and those who hold pious opinions but

<sup>762</sup>Ibid.

<sup>763</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 182.

<sup>764</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 127.

<sup>765</sup>Ibid., 128.

<sup>766</sup>G. C. Berthold, Cyril of Alexandria and the Filioque, in: E. A. Livingstone, ed., StPatr 19, Leuven 1989, 144.

also refutes who were heralds of the truth namely, the authors of the gospels, holy apostles and even the archangel Gabriel. Thereafter he presents bizarrely a number of quotations from the scripture to answer the accusation of Cyril. He responds to Cyril saying that we must start, against this allegation which Cyril advanced, accusing the archangel Gabriel. For it is the Archangel who announced the good news to Mary even before her conception and who taught Joseph after the conception.<sup>767</sup> To the question which Mary raised, “How shall this happen to me, since I do not know the man?”<sup>768</sup> his answer was that the Holy Spirit would come upon her and the power of the Highest would overshadow her; therefore also the One who is to be born will be called the Son of God.<sup>769</sup> The same archangel also strengthened doubting-Joseph to accept Mary saying that the one who is born of her is of the Holy Spirit.<sup>770</sup> Next Theodoret accuses sarcastically the evangelist who announced the good tidings of the birth of Jesus. For we read in the gospel of Matthew that she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit.<sup>771</sup> He also does not leave Peter from his criticism. For in the words of Peter to the Jews he finds apostasy according to the mind of Cyril. For preaching to the Jews Peter said that Jesus of Nazareth, whom God had anointed with the Holy Spirit.<sup>772</sup> He did not leave also the prophet Isaiah from his criticism who had foretold the work of Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus: “a rod will come forth out of the stem of Jesse, and a blossom will come up from his roots; and the Spirit of God will rest upon him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and piety; the spirit of the fear of God will fill him.”<sup>773</sup> And somewhere later also we read in the works of Isaiah that, “behold my servant [*paīs*] whom I have chosen, my beloved one, in whom my soul has rejoiced, I shall put my spirit upon him: he will bring judgment to the Gentiles.”<sup>774</sup> And in the next phase he does not forget to criticize the Lord himself with sarcasm who announces that “the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, and he has anointed me to preach the good news to the poor ...”<sup>775</sup> And in many discourses with the Jews Jesus tells them that if he casted out the demons with the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God has certainly come upon them.<sup>776</sup> According to the argument of Cyril one should not leave John the Baptist also from criticism who says: upon whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining, he is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.<sup>777</sup> So according to Theodoret no one should be exempted from the accusation according to the teaching of Cyril who says that the Holy Spirit is in Christ even Christ. For Christ announces in many places the working of the Holy Spirit in his life. He says to the Jews that the Spirit of the Lord is upon him, because he has anointed him. Theodoret tells that we could confess with Cyril if he taught the idea that “the Spirit of the Son was his own if he spoke of the Spirit as being of the same nature and proceeding from

---

<sup>767</sup>Cf. Mt 1, 20-22.

<sup>768</sup>Lk 1, 34.

<sup>769</sup>Cf. Lk 1, 35.

<sup>770</sup>Cf. Mt 1, 20.

<sup>771</sup>Cf. Mt 1, 18.

<sup>772</sup>Cf. Acts 10, 38.

<sup>773</sup>Is 11, 1-2.

<sup>774</sup>Is 42, 1.

<sup>775</sup>Lk 4, 21.

<sup>776</sup>Cf. Mt 12, 28.

<sup>777</sup>Cf. Jn 1, 33.

the Father and shall receive the expression as pious.”<sup>778</sup> But on the contrary if he teaches that the Spirit is out of the Son, or the Spirit has His origin through the Son Theodoret tells that they will strongly condemn this idea as blasphemous and impious. For he holds the idea shared by the Lord himself saying that the Spirit proceeds from the Father’ (Jn 15, 26) and the idea shared by Paul that “we have received not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of the Father.”<sup>779</sup> So through these sarcastic attacks starting from Archangel Gabriel and ending with Christ he tries to answer the question of Cyril and clarifies very clearly that he together with his colleagues in Antioch share the same and the true teaching of the Catholic faith and the church.

## J. The Tenth Anathema of Cyril

“Divine Scripture says that Christ became high priest and apostle of our confession<sup>780</sup> and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering to God the Father.<sup>781</sup> Therefore if anyone says that it was not the Word of God himself who became our high priest and apostle when he became incarnate and a man like ourselves, but someone different from him who was a separate man born of a woman, or if someone says that he made the offering for himself too instead of for us alone (for he who knew no sin had no need of an offering), let him be anathema.”<sup>782</sup> “Ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἀπόστολον τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν γεγενῆσθαι Χριστὸν ἢ θεία λέγει γραφή, προσκεκόμικε δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας τῷ θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ. εἴ τις τοίνυν ἀρχιερέα φησὶ καὶ ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν γενέσθαι, οὐκ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ Λόγον, ὅτε γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἀλλ’ ὡς ἕτερον παρ’ αὐτὸν ἰδικῶς ἄνθρωπον ἐκ γυναικός ἢ εἴ τις λέγει καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ προσενεγκεῖν αὐτὸν τὴν προσφορὰν καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ μόνων ἡμῶν οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐδεήθη προσφορᾶς ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ἁμαρτίαν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>783</sup>

### j. The Reply from Theodoret

The reasons for this Anathema, according to Cyril, are twofold. The first of them is the constant repetition of the accusation of Cyril against Nestorius as the one who divided Christ into two persons. Therefore Cyril makes an attempt in the first to identify the high priest with the one Christ, the Logos made flesh or made man like us. Secondly he also wants to reject the idea taught by Nestorius that Christ offered his sacrifice not only on our behalf, but also on behalf of himself.<sup>784</sup> Theodoret tries to respond with a few quotations from both Old and New Testaments to this accusation of Cyril. He is convinced of one fact that this nature of the Word-God has in no way changed into a nature of the flesh, rather it has assumed the human nature and set this above the common [i.e., human] high priests. He clarifies it with the help of bible quotation from the letter to the Hebrews. It is explained very clearly there that “every

<sup>778</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 183.

<sup>779</sup>1 Cor 2, 12.

<sup>780</sup>Cf. Heb 3, 1.

<sup>781</sup>Cf. Eph 5, 2.

<sup>782</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 183.

<sup>783</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 133.

<sup>784</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 134.

high priest chosen from among men is put in charge of things pertaining to God on their behalf, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. He is able to deal gently with the ignorant and wayward, since he himself is subject to weakness; and because of this he must offer sacrifice for his own sins as well as for those of the people.”<sup>785</sup> And the same letter to the Hebrews a little later compares the high priest Christ with Aaron saying that “as was Aaron, so also was the Christ.”<sup>786</sup> According to Theodoret the author of the letter to the Hebrews tells in order to show the weakness of the assumed nature that

“in the days of his flesh, Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries and tears, to the one who was able to save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverence; although he was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation for all who obey him, having been nominated by God a high priest according to the order of Melchizedek.”<sup>787</sup>

In reference to this quotation Theodoret raises so many reasonable questions against the argument of Cyril of Alexandria. He asks then who is the one made perfect by the labours of virtue, not being perfect by nature? Or who is the one who learnt obedience by trial mentioned in the same epistle and he asks further that was he ignorant of this before the trial? Again Theodoret raises doubts regarding the life of Jesus, in answer to the questions advanced by the Patriarch of Alexandria, namely, who lived with reverence and at the same time carried his supplications with loud cries and tears in order to save himself from that hour and yet not being able to save him, but imploring the Father to save him and begging to free him from death? He quotes Isaiah saying “for he has wiped away the tears from all faces,”<sup>788</sup> and asks further is it not this Word-God who was immortal, impassible, the bodiless, and the one who gave good cheer and released everyone from the tears, underwent suffering, tears and cries? He asks further to Cyril what an explanation we can give for the strong crying and tears of Christ who is not able to save himself at the moment of death and entreating a release from his death? He finds a number of quotations from the Old Testament in order to validate his points. For in the Psalm we read “I remembered God and rejoiced.”<sup>789</sup> There the prophet asks who crowns those who live in reverence, who knows all before their origin, and who has all that which belongs to the Father and who is the unchanged image of his Begetter, who reveals the Father through him? This same person whom the prophet sees as the perfection of all righteousness beseeches John the Baptist telling: “let it be so now, for thus it is not befitting for us to fulfill all righteousness.”<sup>790</sup> Theodoret shares with us saying that the complete manhood of Jesus took the designation of the high priesthood of Melchizedek, though it was besieged by the frailty of nature, though not the almighty God-Word. The bishop of Cyrus tries to explain this idea with the help of a quotation taken from the epistle to the Hebrews. There we read that “we do not have a high priest who is unable to

---

<sup>785</sup>Heb 5, 1-3.

<sup>786</sup>Heb 5, 4-5.

<sup>787</sup>Heb 5, 7-10.

<sup>788</sup>Is 25, 8.

<sup>789</sup>Ps 77, 4: (LXX: Ps 76, 4).

<sup>790</sup>Mt 3, 15.

sympathize with our weakness, but one who in every respect has been tempted in the same way as we are, yet without sin.”<sup>791</sup>

He tries to explain this idea in this way that the nature was taken from us for our sake and the same nature which was taken from us experienced our sufferings without partaking in sin. To confirm this idea he employs the idea given in the epistle to the Hebrews. There it is said that “consider the apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus, who was faithful to the one who created him in the same way as Moses was faithful in all God’s house.”<sup>792</sup> Although this is the case he expresses that anyone who holds the right doctrine would not call the God-Word, which was unmade and uncreated and who is co-eternal with the Father, a creature [*poiēma*]. On the other hand Jesus the incarnated will be considered by all as man assumed of us. Finally he says that it was not the God-Word who was designed to be our high priest but rather it was the one from the seed of David, and being one of us except in sin, He became our high priest and victim, and became a ransom for all of us before God pleading for every one of us. In the same breath Theodoret instructs us not to skip the idea that the man Jesus in himself had the God-Word from God, united and conjoined to him inseparably.

#### K. The Eleventh Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone does not acknowledge that the Lord’s flesh is life-giving and belongs to the Word of God the Father himself, but says it belongs to someone else who is joined to him on the basis of rank or simply possesses a divine indwelling, instead of saying it is life-giving, as we have said, because it became the personal property of the Word who is able to endow all things with life, let him be anathema.”<sup>793</sup> “Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου σάρκα ζωοποιὸν εἶναι καὶ ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγου, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἑτέρου τινὸς παρ’ αὐτόν, συνημμένου μὲν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν ὡς μόνην θείαν ἐνοίκησιν ἐσχηκότος, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ζωοποιόν, ὡς ἔφημεν, ὅτι γέγονεν ἰδία τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ τὰ πάντα ζωογονεῖν ἰσχύοντος, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>794</sup>

#### k. The Reply from Theodoret

The motive behind this Anathema of Cyril is soteriological. He wants to correct Nestorius through this anathema that the division of Christ into two persons may cause the difficulty of presenting the flesh of Christ as life-giving in the Eucharistic meal. Cyril finds it categorical to assert the personal unity of Christ in order to correct Nestorius by saying that the flesh of Christ is not something adjoined loosely to the Logos and thus he is able to conclude that the flesh as life-giving and as Word’s own.<sup>795</sup> To this accusation Theodoret raises a doubt about Cyril’s orthodoxy. For Cyril always uses in his teaching the term ‘flesh’ for the complete manhood of Jesus. In this teaching of Cyril Theodoret finds twofold problems. First of all Cyril never makes mention of a rational flesh anywhere in his teaching which was assumed by the God-Word and secondly the assumed man about whom he refers is not perfect. Instead he

<sup>791</sup>Heb 4, 15.

<sup>792</sup>Heb 3, 1-2.

<sup>793</sup>Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 185.

<sup>794</sup>Daly, Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides, 153.

<sup>795</sup>Cf. *ibid.*



uses merely ‘flesh’ everywhere for the assumed nature of Jesus. The bishop of Cyrus finds trends of Apollinarism in Cyril’s teaching. According to Cyril “Father and Son both form μία φύσις without qualification. Cyril is fond of speaking of Christ as μία φύσις.”<sup>796</sup> Further a stronger accusation comes to Cyril from the man of Cyrus. For he says after introducing the notion of ‘mixture’ (*krasis*) Cyril turns away from it to some other ideas. There he plainly proclaims that the flesh of the Lord to be soulless (*apsychon*). Also from the anathema which he brought against Nestorius ‘if anyone does not acknowledge that the Lord’s flesh belongs to the Word of God the Father himself, but that it belongs to someone else beside him, let him be anathema,’ it is clear that he teaches the idea of ‘flesh’ without a soul and a ‘flesh’ imperfect. From all these it is obvious for Theodoret that Cyril does not confess the God-Word to have assumed a soul, but merely flesh, and the assumed Word Himself being in the place of the soul in the flesh. But Theodoret makes it clear for the Antiochian side that they teach only “the ensouled (*empsychon*) and rational (*logike*) flesh of the Lord to be life-giving (*zōopoion*) through the life-giving Godhead united to it.”<sup>797</sup> Theodoret observes that in the clarifications given by Cyril to this notion, although unintentionally, he professes the same idea held by the Antiochians namely the difference between the two natures, that is, ‘flesh’ and ‘God-Word’ and labeling it ‘his own flesh.’ And finally the bishop of Cyrus makes it clear that by assuming the human by the God-Word, it was not changed into the nature of flesh, rather the assumed nature was made into his own flesh, and thus both together became life-giving, so to say, by their union.

## L. The Twelfth Anathema of Cyril

“If anyone does not acknowledge that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, and was crucified in the flesh, and experienced death in the flesh, and became the first-born from the dead, seeing that as God he is both life and life-giving, let him be anathema.”<sup>798</sup> “Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον παθόντα σαρκὶ καὶ ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ καὶ θανάτου γευσάμενον σαρκί, γεγονότα τε πρωτότοκον ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καθὸ ζωὴ ἐστὶ καὶ ζωοποιὸς ὡς θεός, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”<sup>799</sup>

### 1. The Reply from Theodoret

To this final anathema Theodoret once again repeat the above given argument [cf. the 4<sup>th</sup> and the 7<sup>th</sup> Anathemas] to reply to the often repeated anathema of Cyril. Here Cyril tries to deal with the theme suffering, crucifixion, death and resurrection of Christ. It is interestingly an accusation raised by Nestorius against Cyril saying “that Cyril conceived of the Incarnation as some sort of corruption of the divine nature so that flesh, by becoming incorporated in one way or another into the *ousia* of God the Word, renders the divinity passible.”<sup>800</sup> Theodoret agrees with Cyril in saying that the impassible cannot undergo passions rather only the passible ones. This does not mean

<sup>796</sup>A. Louth, *The Use of the term idios in Alexandrian Theology from Alexander to Cyril*, in: E. A. Livingstone, ed., *StPatr* 19, Leuven 1989, 201.

<sup>797</sup>Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 186.

<sup>798</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>799</sup>Daly, *Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides*, 161.

<sup>800</sup>*Ibid.*

that God-Word was not with the passible form. He was always with it found together. Hence only the form of servant in Christ suffered and not the God-Word. But God-Word in allowing the servant form to suffer for the sake of the salvation of mankind it has not alienated the servant form but took part in its suffering. Hence Theodoret tells that it was not the God who suffered but the form of manhood which was taken from us by the God-Word. He supports this idea with the words of Prophet Isaiah where we read so: “being a man in pain and acquainted with the bearing of sickness.”<sup>801</sup> Again to clarify the same thought Theodoret quotes the words of John the evangelist which is uttered by Jesus to the Jews: “Why do you seek to kill me, a man who had told you the truth?”<sup>802</sup> So he tells it is not the life giving God-Word which is killed rather it is the mortal nature of Jesus which is put down to death. If we interpret this way, we can understand and construe the citation taken from John: “destroy this temple, and in three days I shall raise it up.”<sup>803</sup> Hence Theodoret concludes saying that it was the seed of David on the one hand destroyed, and on the other hand the life-giving principle God-Word which in Jesus was, raised the mortal body of Christ which was destroyed. The interpretation of Theodoret is also not fully perfect as sometimes he misunderstands certain terminologies of Cyril. Still one may say Theodoret’s contribution is a great thrust in the process of a perfect Christology.

### 5. Theodoret’s Work *Eranistes*

Theodoret’s best-known and largest work on Christology, the *Eranistes*, was written ca. 447, though it could have been begun the year before and possibly not completed until 448.<sup>804</sup> The work *Eranistes* contains three separate discussions, in dialogue form, between two personages termed as Orthodoxos and Eranistes. The word Eranistes means a beggar or collector. The term ἐρανιστής signifies “a member or contributor to a ἔρανος which was a meal, feast, or a permanent association apparently religious in character.”<sup>805</sup> In classical Greek Eranistes signifies a contributor to the feast of a supper club. In Gemoll version it means “Geldbeiträge einsammeln, von jem., behilflich sein.”<sup>806</sup> The literal sense of the verb ἐραρίζω is to ‘collect by way of contribution’ or ‘to collect for oneself’ and to gather, acquire, earn beg or borrow.<sup>807</sup> In this work it refers to the person who has collected ideas from many heresies in order to produce a motley or hotchpotch collection of theological errors like a beggar who collects different types of food from different people to replete his hunger. Theodoret explains the name as follows in one of the passage. He tells as we are accustomed to suppose, the word προσαίτης (beggar) means as the one who is fed by many in pity, and χρηματιστής (business man or money-getter) as the one who is able to collect money.<sup>808</sup> Thus it can be applied to anyone who collects anything from somebody. The whole title of the work is called *Eranistes seu*

<sup>801</sup>Is 53, 3.

<sup>802</sup>Jn 8, 40.

<sup>803</sup>Jn 2, 19.

<sup>804</sup>Cf. Quasten, *Patrology III*, 547.

<sup>805</sup>J. L. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus According to his Eranistes*, Diss., Illinois 1972, 233 (I have depended mostly upon Stewardson for the interpretation and clarifications).

<sup>806</sup>W. Gemoll und K. Vretska, *Griechisch - deutsches Schul - und Handwörterbuch*, München 2006, 342.

<sup>807</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 233.

<sup>808</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

Polymorphus<sup>809</sup> due to its raggle-taggle nature which the Eranistes represents. So the title gives us an indication regarding the sort of a person. It is someone like a beggar who moves around in garments joined together with different patches. As his tunic gives us an idea of multi-coloured or patched so also Eranistes' dialogue with Orthodoxos imparts the idea of someone who teaches a multi-coloured or multi-formed teaching as it does not intend to convey anything particular. The person who represents Eranistes collects from many sources and tries to make a theological position as true and the original. From this explanation it is very clear that Theodoret wants to explicitly show this beggar as a person who does not hesitate to take scraps and left-overs from any one whenever and wherever it is possible. On the contrary to this particular behavior of Eranistes Orthodoxos represents the teaching of Theodoret. Eranistes may be considered in this work as a representative for all the diverse heretical doctrines held by the adversaries of Theodoret. At the end of the dialogue we witness to the defeat of Eranistes and Orthodoxos is able to assert the right theology on the nature of Christ. All throughout the work the Orthodoxos has dominance and takes the upper hand in the dialogue. It is written in the form of mutual questioning and answering. It is also noted well that the aggressive stratagem on Eranistes' part is employed that the Orthodoxos get every opportunity to expound his ideas fully well. In this work each dialogue ends with the acceptance of the truth by Eranistes demonstrated by Orthodoxos. Throughout the dialogue Orthodoxos tries to correct and educate Eranistes on various points of doctrine basing on Scripture and fathers. The work exhibits a strong dialectical skill on the part of the author. The author makes a careful analysis and pursues such a logical argument that Eranistes has to agree with the natural conclusion which the Orthodoxos has in his mind. This rationalistic trait is one of the characteristics of the Antiochian theological school. The work starts with a prologue in which Theodoret specifies his plans, namely, to disapprove the various heresies with which he is opposed. In order to disapprove the various heresies and establish the specific truth regarding the Christian faith he adopts a new method of dialogue.<sup>810</sup> And each dialogue is supplemented by a florilegium of citations from the writings of earlier ecclesiastical writers and fathers and Theodoret even makes use of the citations from the opponent fathers of the Church. He inserts also seven excerpts on John 1, 14 in the first dialogue before the formal florilegium. The whole work is ended with an appendix, which is divided into three sections corresponding to the three dialogues. Each part is consisted of a brief statement summarising the main arguments of Orthodoxos. This can be said as the appraisal of the major arguments of the dialogue and is entitled *Demonstrationes per syllogismos*.<sup>811</sup>

It may be also useful for us to know who are represented as Eranistes in this work. For the sake of having a full grasp of Theodoret's theology we may have to look into what or whom he is trying to refute. Among the scholars there are different opinions regarding the personages of *Eranistes*. We have already given above a hint about the meaning of the term Eranistes as the one who collects or makes a motley collection of theological errors. Theodoret wants to communicate that his opponent in the dialogue is a person who collects doctrines from this and that heresy and

---

<sup>809</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>810</sup>Theodoret indicates that he is using a rather different method than the classical authors who also employed the dialogue method.

<sup>811</sup>Cf. P. B. Clayton, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus: Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*, Oxford 2007, 217 (PG 83, 40).

propagates like a heterogeneous-inconsistent theological doctrine. We also have hinted at the nature of the beggar. From that it is clear, this is a hint at a person who collects materials from the so-called heresies prevalent in the Christian world and exhibits something like the patchwork in a beggar's tunic exhibiting many forms (polymorphus) and many colours. Besides, in this writing Theodoret also mentions about such kind of people in his Ep. 151. There he characterizes these sorts of heresies as πολυσχεδῆ ... Βλασφημίαν ('a manifold blasphemy'), and the πολλή καὶ ποικίλη ... ἡ πλάνη ('the manifold and varied or many-coloured error.')<sup>812</sup> In the work of Hippolytus (3<sup>rd</sup> Century) also we come across such reference to people who collect materials from others as beggars. Regarding the Sethian Gnostics<sup>813</sup> Hippolytus informs us that

“Purloining their theories from the wise men among the Greeks, they have patched together their own system out of shreds of opinion taken from Musaeus, Linus, and Orpheus ... For from philosophers the heresiarchs deriving starting points, (and) like cobblers patching together, according to their own particular interpretation, the blunders of the ancients, have advanced them as novelties to those that are capable of being deceived ...”<sup>814</sup>

Theodoret finds various old heresies in the person who is in the place of Eranistes. First of all Eranistes tries to assert that Lord Christ is God alone like the Gnostics Simon and Cerdo and Marcion and others. Followed by this group the Bishop of Cyrus finds traits of Valentinus and Bardesanes in the person of Eranistes who taught that the birth of Christ was a παραδοική (through a passage) and Christ did not take anything from the Virgin. In the third heresy he finds perhaps the most important one, that is, the Apollinarian heresy which taught that Christ's humanity and divinity were formed into one nature. And finally Theodoret also observes traces of Arius' and Eunomius' heresy who tried to connect the passion of Christ with the divinity of Christ. Thus his title of the work fits well as it is a conglomeration of so many heresies. Having identified so many heresies we may be able to circumscribe to Theodoret's perspective, to the particular time, in which these persons lived and thus orientate ourselves well to find out who would be the probable person he is intending to.

We have said above that in his argument he never corners out any person as the target of this work. But from the context and time in which he writes we can come to certain conjectures. From the reading of the text we may be able to point to certain historical persons as possible models of the heretic [beggar-Eranistes]. One of such probable assumptions may compel us to come to Eutyches. The scholars arrive at such a conclusion due to the reason of the historical circumstances in which *Eranistes* was composed. In this period Eutyches was the main opponent of Theodoret. Added to it the accusations which are raised in this work have similarities to the falsities taught by Eutyches. Eutyches, like Eranistes, is resolute to speak of one nature in Christ. As

<sup>812</sup>Cf. W. Telfer, ed., Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa, (LCC 4), London 1955, 295, 298, 300.

<sup>813</sup>Sethian Gnosticism is a form of Gnosticism which had its roots in a form of Jewish speculation on the figure and function of Sophia, figure of the divine Wisdom featured in the Bible. Its followers regarded themselves as the spiritual seed of the biblical Seth, third son of Adam and Eve, and at the same time understood Seth as the name of a spiritual entity or aeon who brought redeeming knowledge to humanity and was closely related to another such entity - the Christ entity (cf. P. Wilberg, From new age to new Gnosis: The contemporary significance of a new Gnostic Spirituality, Eastbourne 2003, 6).

<sup>814</sup>Cited from Telfer, Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa, 300-301 referring to Hippolytus, On Peratae and Sethians.

Eranistes expressed his special interest to speak of Christ according to the higher [divine] nature so also there seems a realm of affinity in Eutyches to the beggar. We find also in the works of Eutyches that Christ's humanity was swallowed up by divinity. He believed that the divinity remained and the humanity was swallowed up by it.<sup>815</sup> The teaching of Eranistes also manifests tenets of Eutyches. Eutyches taught that Christ's body was not consubstantial with the bodies of other men but was the body of God, so to say, not the body of a man but 'human.' This may be one of the reasons why the scholars identified him as the probable one close to Eutyches. Nevertheless we cannot push aside also the idea of Dioscorus being considered as the opponent of Theodoret being presented in Eranistes. Although the later theologians from both sides viz., Eutychians and Monophysites did not accept each other the modern theologians find some relationship in their teaching as both of them were stalwart supporters of Cyril's one nature theology. Although Dioscorus did not compromise the humanity of Christ as Eutyches did, still Theodoret considers Dioscorus also as having trodden the same path.<sup>816</sup> Thus along with Eutyches Dioscorus also may fit in well in this work of Theodoret. According to some modern theologians someone else also is meant besides these two by Theodoret. It is no one else other than Cyril of Alexandria according to Mazzarino.<sup>817</sup> He argues that Cyril is the true antagonist meant by the bishop of Cyrus. It seems that Theodoret has an anti-Cyrrillian mentality from the outset of the problems. Therefore, according to this scholar, Theodoret not only comes against Cyril with his attack upon the anathemas early in his career favouring Nestorius but also much later in his *Eranistes*. This below given observation also underlines this above expressed thought. It is said that even though this work does not name an opponent, the opposing party [the Alexandrians] would probably realize its general application to their theology.<sup>818</sup> G. Ettliger is also of the same opinion: "The entire dialogue takes place between two debaters, Orthodoxos, who represents Theodoret's Christology, and Eranistes, who probably does not represent any particular historical individual but rather, in a general way, the Alexandrine Christology of Cyril, Dioscorus, and Eutyches - as Theodoret perceives it."<sup>819</sup>

Another important thing we have to discuss here is the use of the opponent's florilegium. The reason why Theodoret makes use quotations from his enemies is not a proof for his love for the opponents or that he is in agreement with the Alexandrian but it is a method through which he intends to win the enemies to his side.<sup>820</sup> Mazzarino finds a lot of similarities between the *Reprehensio*<sup>821</sup> and the *Eranistes*.<sup>822</sup>

<sup>815</sup>Cf. R. Arnou, Nestorianisme et Néoplatonisme, L'unité du Christ et l'union des Intelligibles, in: Gr. 17 (1936), 122.

<sup>816</sup>Cf. Steward, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus According to his Eranistes, 237.

<sup>817</sup>Cf. ibid. in reference to C. da Mazzarino, La dottrina de Teodoreto di Ciro sull' unione ipostatica delle due nature in Cristo, Roma 1941.

<sup>818</sup>Cf. H. Bacht, Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (431-519), in: A. Grillmeier und H. Bacht, Hg., Das Konzil von Chalkedon, Bd. 2, Entscheidung um Chalkedon, Würzburg 1953, 204, 205, 286-288.

<sup>819</sup>G. Ettliger, Theodoret of Cyrus: Eranistes, Critical Text and Prolegomena, Oxford 1975, 3-4.

<sup>820</sup>Cf. Arnou, Nestorianisme et Neoplatonisme, 127.

<sup>821</sup>Theodoret was called upon to represent the two-nature Christology of the Antiochians against the Alexandrian interpretation. Theodoret's response took the form of a tract entitled *Reprehensio duodecim capitum seu anathema anathematismorum Cyrilli* (431), in which he stressed the biblical foundation for the fullness of the two natures of Christ and argued that Cyril's formula implicated the divine Christ in the passion and suffering of

In the former work viz., *Reprehensio*, Mazzarino points out that Theodoret accused Cyril for not apportioning immutability to the divine Word. This same accusation reappears in *Eranistes* too. Together with it he finds another added reason to say that this is a work against Cyril. In this work it is the concern of the author to speak against the one who denied the assumption of a human soul in Christ together with the duality of natures. According to this scholar it is an indictment against Cyril of Alexandria. In both works of Theodoret we find a concern of the bishop of Cyrus to refute the attribution of suffering to the nature which cannot suffer. Therefore Theodoret surmises that the person who speaks in such a tone may be disfiguring Christ with the understanding of Apollinarism. Thus in this latest work of Theodoret also we find the argumentation, plan, and presuppositions as exactly as in the earlier polemic against Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>823</sup> Another reason for finding him as the opponent mentioned here is due to the reason of his criticism against the allusion of Christ's flesh as taken exactly like Cyril. Eranistes criticizes the phrase that Christ took flesh instead he prefers like Cyril the Johannine formula 'that the Word was made flesh.'<sup>824</sup> Bishop Theodoret notes in his work that his adversary articulates something as if the Word of God undergoes a change into flesh. Here the scholar Mazzarino notes that in this work we find similar phrases of condemnation as that of counter-anathemas that were produced earlier against Cyril.<sup>825</sup> In his analysis this scholar finds so many elements which are same as the teaching of Cyril coming from the mouth of Eranistes. For example according to Theodoret, the opponent in *Eranistes* [the opponent of Orthodoxos] "accepts like Cyril the idea that the incarnation involved the assumption of both a human body and a rational soul."<sup>826</sup> Again the author of this work inserts the predilected phrases of Cyril into the mouth of his opponent in *Eranistes*: μία φύσις and ἐκ δύο φύσεων. Although the opponent uses these phrases he is not ready to teach that there was only one nature in Christ or that the two natures were mixed as in Cyril's teaching. Again the same scholar finds a strong argument to say that the allusion is to Cyril in the work due to its objection like Cyril who objects the Antiochian norm of distinguishing between the properties of the natures of Christ on the grounds that it divides Christ into two Sons.<sup>827</sup> Finally he tells that both Cyril and the opponent in *Eranistes* employ the same categories to impute suffering to the divine Word 'by means of the flesh.' From all these findings he concludes that the ideal adversary in *Eranistes* is Cyril and not anyone else.<sup>828</sup> In the Encyclopedia of Early Christianity we are informed that "*Eranistes* was a thinly veiled attack on Cyril's Christology, which Theodoret viewed as Apollinarian and intrinsically Monophysite."<sup>829</sup> We cannot say for certain that who is best suited among Eutyches, Dioscorus and Cyril to the heretic opponent of Eranistes. According to Mazzarino though all the three are equally substantial in his finding he finds more affinity to

---

the Crucifixion (cf. F. N. Magill, and C. J. Moose, Dictionary of World Biography: The Ancient World, Vol. 1, California 2005, 1140).

<sup>822</sup>Cf. Steward, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus According to his Eranistes, 238.

<sup>823</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>824</sup>Cf. Jn 1, 14.

<sup>825</sup>Cf. Steward, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus According to his Eranistes, 238.

<sup>826</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>827</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 239 in reference to PG 83, 221 C-D, 224 A-B; The entire work, including the Demonstrationes, is found in PG 83, 27 A-336 B).

<sup>828</sup>Cf. W. J. Burghardt, The image of God in Man According to Cyril of Alexandria, in: SCA 14 (1957), 18.

<sup>829</sup>Ettlinger, Theodoret of Cyrus, in: E. Ferguson, ed., EEC, New York 1990, 890.

Cyril's theology.<sup>830</sup> Yet we have a problem in this supposition. Although Mazzarino presents Cyril as the most fitting person meant by Theodoret as the opponent, the historical evidence tells us that already by this time Theodoret had stopped all confrontation with Cyril after the commotions regarding Diodore and Theodore in 438. Besides when the *Eranistes* was composed Cyril was already dead before several years. Thus he must have also an immediate historical person as the object in his *Eranistes*. Most scholars agree that it would be Eutyches or Dioscorus. Bardenhewer utilizes terms while hinting at Eutyches and Dioscorus as "at least inexact."<sup>831</sup> There are also another group of scholars who do not point at any particular individual in *Eranistes* rather they point to a general theological persuasion of a monophysitic type.<sup>832</sup> Thus as a conclusion to this argument we may be able to say that *Eranistes* stands for all those who share the conservative theology of Cyril's twelve anathemas and almost the similar theologies of Eutyches, Dioscorus and all those who joined their piety and belief.

Another evaluation of the study also may support what we have already arrived at. Saltet gives us solid information regarding the hint in *Eranistes*. He tells that the basic structure of the florilegium of *Eranistes* which is employed in 447 gives us ample proof about the problem which he fought against sixteen years before. When we look at things which happened in 431 [sixteen years back] in retrospect we understand that Theodoret made use of the florilegium to begin with the refutation of the twelve anathemas of Cyril which remained the quintessence of heretical Christology.<sup>833</sup> Another proof which helps us to identify the opponent in *Eranistes* with Cyril and his teaching is the Ep. 151<sup>834</sup> which was addressed to the monks of Euphratesia, Osroene, Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia, a letter which was condemned at the Robber Council in 449.<sup>835</sup> In this epistle written by Theodoret we find sharp criticism against the twelve anathemas of Cyril and the bishop of Cyrus likens the errors contained in the anathemas of Cyril to various heresiarchs and false teachers namely, Apollinarius, Arius, Eunomius, Valentinus, Marcion, Mani and to Bardesanes. Added to it we find assail in the prologue of *Eranistes* against ideas similar to that of the twelve anathemas. Besides, in his *Reprehensio* against the Twelve Anathemas, Theodoret mentions also the names of Apollinarius, [in his reply to the eleventh anathema] Arius and Eunomius [in reply to the fourth anathema]. If we turn our attention to the prologue of *Eranistes* we find reference to all the polemical works in accretion with a few new viz., Marcion, Valentinus, Apollinarius, Arius, Eunomius, Simon (added), Cerdo (added), and Bardesanes.<sup>836</sup> In some other passages of *Eranistes* we find references to the names of Valentinus and Marcion along with that of Mani. Theodoret gives sufficient space in this work also against the faults of Arius and Eunomius.<sup>837</sup> Hence the title *Eranistes* fits appropriately to this work of

<sup>830</sup>Cf. Steward, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus According to his Eranistes*, 239.

<sup>831</sup>Cited from Steward, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus According to his Eranistes*, 240 referring to O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Bd. IV, Freiburg <sup>2</sup>1924, 229-230.

<sup>832</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>833</sup>L. Saltet, *Les sources de l'Eranistes de Théodoret*, in: *RHE* 6 (1905), 290.

<sup>834</sup>Cf. Steward, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus According to his Eranistes*, 241: this letter seems to be addressed to the monks late in the year 431 or early 432.

<sup>835</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>836</sup>Cf. C. E. Raven, *Apollinarism*, Cambridge 1923, 182-183.

<sup>837</sup>Cf. Steward, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus According to his Eranistes*, 242 in reference to PG 83, 224 A-D.

Theodoret as it is actually a presentation of heterogeneous heretics and composite theological errors. And here there is a final note to orient ourselves regarding who would be the probable opponent in *Eranistes*. In his prologue Theodoret uses plural ‘they’ in the place of the representative of all the Christological heresies. He uses it again and again in the work. Thus we can say with certainty that it is not a hint at a historical person rather a hint at various persons who spread errors and hold erroneous theological systems. Hence we may be right in saying as a conclusion that it is headed against the Monophysite camp namely, Cyril the stalwart adherer, Eutyches, Dioscorus and their allies. According to O’Keefe “*Eranistes* probably represents Theodoret’s response to Eutyches and the growing chorus of more strident monophysite voices emerging in the years leading up to the council of Chalcedon.”<sup>838</sup>

Although we are not going to deal with a word by word production of the text but only the Christological understanding of Theodoret in this chapter let us have a look at the schema of this work:

Prologue: 61. 1- 62. 32<sup>839</sup> (on Jn1, 14; it deals with the topic ‘Word became flesh’).

Dialogue I (Ἄτρειπτος): 63.1- 3. 2 (it discusses on the immutability of the natures).<sup>840</sup>

Florilegium<sup>841</sup> 1:

Part 1 (on John I, 14): 91. 22 - 94. 29 (passim).

Part 2 (main section): 95. 25 -109.4, 109. 25 - 110.25.

Dialogue II (Ἀσύγχυτος): 112.1-188.4 (it discusses on the theme of a union which does not confuse both natures into one).<sup>842</sup>

Florilegium 2: 153. 12 -183. 27, 184. 9 - 187.16.

Dialogue III (Ἀπαθής): 189. 1 - 253.14 (it discusses on the impassibility of the Word’s divinity).<sup>843</sup>

Florilegium 3: 229. 19 - 246.32, 247.19 - 248. 30, 249.18 - 252. 26.

Appendix: 254. 1- 265. 4.

In the first dialogue Theodoret tries to deal with the immutability of Christ’s divine nature. For he tells that as the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit are one in essence so their essence is also immutable. He argues that “if the trinity shares one essence which is immutable, then the only begotten Son is also immutable, since he is one person of the trinity. If he is immutable, then he became flesh without changing in

<sup>838</sup>O’Keefe, *Kenosis or Impassibility*, 362.

<sup>839</sup>Cf. Ettliger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 6: the specification 61.1 means page 61, line 1.

<sup>840</sup>Cf. Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 219.

<sup>841</sup>A major development of florilegia in theological argumentation begins in the fifth century. These are quotations from the fathers to confirm a specific doctrine. The basic test of orthodoxy at this period was conformity with the teaching of the Nicene fathers. Cyril of Alexandria made extensive use of such dogmatic patristic florilegia in the controversy with Nestorius. In the *Eranistes* Theodoret too quotes bishops, referring to them as fathers and teachers who have guided the churches and enriched them with truth. But it is important to note that against Cyril Theodoret quotes citations even from heretical authors namely Apollinaris in all three florilegia and Eusebius of Emesa (Eusebius’ theology though not Arian, has some Arian traits in it) (cf. Hanson, *The search for the Christian doctrine of God*, 390). The purely dogmatic aim of citing them on one’s own behalf, and not in order to reject or refute them, is peculiar to *Eranistes*. Theodoret claims if his opponents are not convinced by his arguments or by the orthodox fathers quoted, they will perhaps be persuaded when they see that their own dogmatic ancestors taught the same doctrine as himself (cf. Ettliger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 26); “besides the sources of these three florilegia provide insight into the structure and purpose of the *Eranistes*” (Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 218).

<sup>842</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 217.

<sup>843</sup>Cf. *ibid.*



any way; rather he assumed flesh, and was therefore said to have become flesh.”<sup>844</sup> In the second dialogue he tries to prove that although both divine and human natures are united in such a way, that in no way they curtail the identity or individual reality of each other.

“Those who believe that one nature resulted from the union of the divinity and the humanity destroy by this teaching the individual properties of both natures; and the destruction of these results in a denial of both natures. For mixing the realities that were united prevents us from considering the flesh as flesh, and God as God. But if there was a clear difference between the realities united even after the union, there was no mixture; a union without mixture took place. If one admits this, then Christ the Lord is not one nature, but one Son, who shows both natures without mixture.”<sup>845</sup>

In the third dialogue he tries to prove the impassibility of the divine nature of the incarnate Word of God, and thus a subsequent rejection of the passion and death on the cross of the Godhead.<sup>846</sup> “If Christ is both God and man, as Holy Scripture teaches and the blessed fathers always preached, then he suffered as man, but remained impassible as God.”<sup>847</sup>

Like Nestorius Theodoret also was misunderstood as a proponent of two sons in Jesus Christ. It is said that

“Neither Theodoret nor Eutyches ever actually held the extreme beliefs which were attributed to them. But the disastrous misunderstandings which occurred were rendered almost inevitable by the lack of clarity in theological language and by the failure of both sides to listen to their opponents with the desire of comprehending the true meaning of their words.”<sup>848</sup>

Let us refer one more quotation from Theodoret’s letters written to Renatus and Leo in 449 seeking their support for his orthodox teaching to understand whether as accused he teaches two sons or one Son with two natures:

“Confident in your justice I shall accept your decisions, whatever they may be, and shall claim to be judged by my writings. More than thirty books have I written ... I have followed in the steps of the apostles, proclaiming ... that the Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ was perfect, perfect manhood taken for our salvation ... I do not know one Son of man and another Son of God, but one and the same, Son of God and God begotten of God, and Son of man through the form of the servant ... These and like doctrines I continue to teach ...”<sup>849</sup>

Again to Leo he writes: “I have in my possession what I wrote twenty years ago; what I wrote eighteen, fifteen, twelve, years ago ... From these it is not difficult to ascertain whether I have adhered to the right rule of faith.”<sup>850</sup> Although some modern scholars accuse Theodoret for change of mind regarding his teaching after the council of Ephesus M. Richard takes seriously the profession of consistency on Theodoret’s

<sup>844</sup>Cited from Ettliger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 6 referring to Appendix 254. 2-7; here Theodoret gives a summary of Dialogue I.

<sup>845</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 7 referring to Appendix 257. 10-17; here Theodoret gives the summary of Dialogue II.

<sup>846</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>847</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Appendix 264. 15-17; here Theodoret gives the summary of Dialogue III.

<sup>848</sup>*Ibid.*, 7-8.

<sup>849</sup>Cited from Stewardson, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 171 referring to Ep. 116, ‘To the Presbyter Renatus.’

<sup>850</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Ep 113, ‘To Leo, Bishop of Rome.’

part.<sup>851</sup> A few of the present scholars found reason to criticize Theodoret basing on the argument that he used concrete terms for the two natures prior to 432. But later in his writings these distinctions do not occur any more. But “M. Richard theorizes on the basis of Oratio X of *De Providentia* written between 433 and 437 Theodoret had decided to forego such concrete expressions.”<sup>852</sup> According to the same author, he analyzes it as only a change in terminology or style but not ‘a profound modification’ of his thought. Hence he never intended a division of two ‘Sons’ in Christ as some accuse him. Some say that only after Cyril of Alexandria’s accusation he modified his formula. This is not true. This criticism of Cyril made Theodoret aware of the inapprehensive terminologies that the language caused. Therefore he made an attempt to rectify them. But it in no way means that he modified the thought pattern as he never taught the theory of two ‘Sons’ in Christ. One of the reasons why he was so criticized as one who taught the theory of two Sons in Jesus may be due to his support given to Nestorius. When he heard the news that John of Antioch had anathematized Nestorius he writes a letter to Alexander of Hierapolis in 431<sup>853</sup>:

“When I read the letter addressed to the emperor, I was much distressed, because I know perfectly well that the writer of the letter, being of the same opinions, has unwisely and impiously condemned one who has never held or taught anything contrary to sound doctrine. But the form of the anathema, though it be more likely than his assent to the condemnation to grieve a reader, nevertheless has given me some ground of comfort in that it laid down not in wide general terms, but with some qualification. For he has not said, ‘We anathematize his doctrine’ but ‘whatever he has either said or held other than is warranted by the doctrine of the apostles.’”<sup>854</sup>

It could be further made clear by his letter to Andreas of Samosata<sup>855</sup>:

“He (Cyril) required further subscription to the condemnation which has been passed, and that the doctrine of the holy bishop Nestorius be anathematized. Your holiness well knows that if anyone anathematizes, without distinction, the doctrine of that most holy and venerable bishop, it is just the same as though he seemed to anathematize true religion. We must then, if we are compelled, anathematize those who call Christ mere man, or who divide our one Lord Jesus Christ into two sons and deny His divinity ...”<sup>856</sup>

Hence certain things are clear for us from these letters that Nestorius did not teach the idea of two Sons, and the teachings of Theodoret and the Antiochian Christology were more lucid than the Alexandrians although some terms of Nestorius and Theodoret were inapprehensible to the Alexandrians. As we have said above that this support

<sup>851</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to M. Richard, Notes sur l’évolution doctrinale de Theodoret in: RSPHTh 25 (1936), 459-481.

<sup>852</sup>*Ibid.*; (and this hypothesis is substantiated by the work *Eranistes* written a few years later).

<sup>853</sup>Alexander Bp. of Hierapolis (Mabbug) 5<sup>th</sup> cent., was one of the decisive figures who remained with Nestorius in the Ephesian Council of 431. He criticized and fought against the Christology of Cyril as monophysite as his 12 anathemas manifested elements of monophysitism. Besides his hostility to Cyril was such that he disapproved any attempt of union (of 433) between John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria (basing on the Union Formula of Theodoret). Despite his old age he was exiled and died in the year 434/435 (cf. W. A. Bienert, *Alexandros*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 364).

<sup>854</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 178 referring to Ep. 175 (PG 83, 1488).

<sup>855</sup>Andreas Bp. of Samosata (today’s Samsat) was a companion of Theodoret of Cyrus in his fight against the 12 Anathemas of Cyril. He was in reconciliation with the majority of the eastern bishops. He helped in dispersing the Chalcedonian terminologies like ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον (cf. L. R. Wickham, *Andreas, Bp. v. Samosata*, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 633).

<sup>856</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 178 referring to Ep. 177 (PG 83, 1489-1490).

and friendship he gave to Nestorius may be the cause of accusation against Theodoret too.

It is said that no other single work of the bishop of Cyrus shows his constancy in theological matters than his *Eranistes seu Polymorphus*. So therefore a study of his *Eranistes* will help us to understand his mind and to get to his Christology. It may be good to make a mention of the peculiarities of this work in advance before we get into this work: (1) the florilegium<sup>857</sup> of patristic quotes in the work, (2) the anonymity of the heretical opponent in the dialogues. (It may be important for us to note that why he does not attack the person directly rather under the disguise of Eranistes. It may be due to the life-threatening situation he had during this time. In any way attacking these heretics in guise may be the best way to exhibit his doctrinal position regarding Christ's nature), (3) the use of quotes<sup>858</sup> from opponents and omission of material from allies, and (4) the use of certain language uncharacteristic of earlier works.<sup>859</sup> His *Eranistes* tries to explain mainly three topics, namely, 'the Word became flesh,' the unconfused union of the two natures and finally the impassibility of the divine nature. To this Theodoret has also added his own favourite theme, namely, the immutability of the divine nature with his own proof texts. In this work [*Eranistes*] he makes use of the same plan of argumentation which he employed against Monophysitism in which he found the same error as that in Cyril's anathemas. Today many scholars are of the view that this organic relationship between his earlier and later works substantiates further the view of a basic consistency in his Christology throughout his life. It is also interesting to note that he never mentions anyone by name in this work as his opponent. It can be argued that it is not only against Eutyches or Dioscorus or Cyril rather this work is written to teach the right Christological position aiming at an entire group of people who do not have the right notion of Christology. We know from history that Eutyches, Dioscorus or even Cyril was teaching a particular Christology which was never acceptable to Theodoret. It may raise some curiosity in us that then why he quotes Cyril and Apollinarius and not Diodore and Theodore. It can be said as a technique of debate to make his opponent to accept what he wants to say. If he quotes his own pioneers namely Diodore and Theodore his opponents may not receive them wholeheartedly. Another probable reason we can presume regarding it as that by the time of composition of *Eranistes*, the Alexandrian 'monophysite' party was in power, and the theologians of this group despised the names of Diodore and Theodore. Therefore he considered the bias view of his opponents in order to make his theological argumentation more convincing.

Another serious problem also we may have to discuss here is the change of theological terminology. In this treatise [with the exception of the florilegium] lacks the concrete terminology with respect to the natures (especially the human nature) in Christ. Instead he innovates some new terms in this treatise. The first term he makes use of is *hypostasis* and he considers it as equivalent to *prosopon*. In his earlier life, he had considered the term *hypostasis* in Christology as same as *physis*. Theodoret had no difficulty in accepting the Chalcedonian definition: “ἐκ δύο φύσεων ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν, ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει καὶ ἐνὶ προσώπῳ.”<sup>860</sup>

<sup>857</sup>Florilegia are found in four sections divided between the three dialogues in the work.

<sup>858</sup>Quotes are used as proof-texts for the position advanced in each section.

<sup>859</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 179.

<sup>860</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 186 referring to ACO I. I. 114, 9.

Soon after the composition of his work *Eranistes*, the word *hypostasis* attained a greater legality in the Christological context through Flavian's profession of faith from the trial of Eutyches. Although Theodoret had no difficulty in accepting the Chalcedonian formula, he understood the term ὑπόστασις as a synonym for πρόσωπον in the phrase εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν. We are able to gather this information from Syriac fragments from Theodoret's letter to John of Aegeae,<sup>861</sup> which is the last epistolary evidence from him. In this letter written to John he clearly mentions that the *hypostasis* is not from two natures as he had considered the *hypostasis* as equal to *physis*. He expresses clearly that the *hypostasis* is in two natures. It is not to be misunderstood as a natural or substantial union of the two [viz., divinity and humanity] with its concomitant confusion of the two as John had misunderstood after reading the Chalcedonian definition. Theodoret makes clear that it is not to be considered as a composite *hypostasis* in the sense of a person. As Theodoret repeats this same point several times in his work there may not be any more difficulty regarding its meaning. It may be good to remember that Theodoret also appealed to Nestorius' thought when he explained the meaning of the term *hypostasis* in the Chalcedonian Definition. This indicates very clearly that he obtained his Christological language from the classical Trinitarian language advocated by Nestorius and the Cappadocians (we may refer for example to the Epistle to Cleodnius<sup>862</sup> by Gregory of Nazianzus who identified Nestorius' and Cappadocian's *hypostasis* and *prosopon*). They confessed one God in one nature and three *hypostases*, and logically applied to the person of Christ as with two natures and one *hypostasis*. "... confessant en Dieu une nature et trois *hypostases*, il était logique de reconnaître dans le Christ deux natures et une hypostase. En ceci il fait office de précurseur: ce texte sera, en effet, comme le pivot de la théologie chalcédonienne à partir du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle."<sup>863</sup> It seems that this understanding of *hypostasis* and *prosopon* as equivalent terms may have influenced the terms of Christology. This basic understanding is one of the chief features of dyophysite Christology known as 'Neo-Chalcedonianism' which grew up after 451. Both Theodoret and Nestorius are indebted to the Cappadocian Fathers for their concept of God. What was new in Theodoret was its application. Both Nestorius and Theodoret applied the trinitarian term *hypostasis* with the same general sense of *prosopon* to the Christological formula.<sup>864</sup> Although Theodoret had not accepted the idea that *hypostasis* was synonym for *prosopon* in relation to Christ in his *Eranistes*, he interpreted it as equivalent as employed in the trinitarian dogma in the Chalcedonian definition. We have evidence for it in the third dialogue of *Eranistes* where he shares the idea of a 'natural union' of soul and body and the distinction between this and the union of natures in Christ.<sup>865</sup> In his epistle to Dioscorus (Ep. 83) written between the periods of his *Eranistes* and the 'Robber Council' he makes it very

<sup>861</sup>John of Aegeae was a Nestorian opponent in the Council (cf. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 490).

<sup>862</sup>Cleodnius was the priest in charge of the Church at Nazianzus after Gregory had given up the charge, and before the consecration of Bishop Eulalius. The Epistle about which we referred dates back to 383-384. Gregory had left the area to seek a Spa cure and heard from Cleodnius that Apollinarist dissidents had targeted his Church in his absence. This local problem stimulated him to write what subsequently became (along with Athanasius' letter to Epictetus) a classic patristic refutation of the Apollinarist Christology. Cyril's use of the text is quite evident at several key points (cf. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, 390).

<sup>863</sup>M. Richard, *La lettre de Théodoret à Jean d'Égées*, in: *RSPT* 30 (1941-42), 419-420.

<sup>864</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus* 189 in reference to the Cappadocian formula in Theodoret's *Eranistes* (PG 83, 36A).

<sup>865</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 192 in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 237).

clear that there is no room for doubt in his teaching. He, like the Alexandrians, teaches in accordance with the Nicene Creed and considers mother Mary as Theotokos and condemns those who do not accept it. Together with it he asserts that those who teach the idea of two sons are considered to be in error. Of course, in this letter he speaks highly of Cyril and Theophilus and at the same time he defends his theology as orthodox. In all probability we can consider this tone of praise as an intention to gratify the Alexandrian inquisitor, namely, Dioscorus. How can we reconcile this idea of condemning and approving at the same time? For he speaks in high esteem of Nestorius: “But to what has been done unjustly and illegally against your holiness, not even if one were to cut off both my hands would I ever assent ...”<sup>866</sup> Sometimes we may get confused that how he can at the same time please both parties [Cyril and Nestorius]. From this variation in his teaching we may say that his Christology has no consistency. But if we go through the political scenario of the time it may not be true. He holds always the same position. According to a few modern scholars (for example Richard) it was only an element of opportunism, that is, of political calculation in order to avoid offending Cyril’s forces. But some other scholars who consider Theodoret as a saint tell that he was not an opportunist. It may be also good to hear two citations from two different authors. Perry writes an editorial comment on the condemnation of Theodoret in the Robber Council as in the following words:

“Thus we see condemned by the sentences of the Bishops, and by the unanimous vote, of the synod, without hearing even on that point of Doctrine in which we may reasonably consider him to be not faultless, a man of the purest and most innocent life, as well as possessed of the grandest virtues that can adorn humanity, a Bishop whose saintly memory alone of all the Chiefs tried is stainless, and whose deeds place him in the very van of the noblest representative personages that figure so differently during the frightfully disquieting and unhappy epoch of the fifth period of the Church”<sup>867</sup>

Let us also make a reference to the comment of E. Venables who says something very similar about the bishop of Cyrus. “There is on the whole no name in ecclesiastical history which more commands at once our admiration, our respect, and our affection, than that of the Blessed Theodoret.”<sup>868</sup> Even Harnack (who is considered as critical-minded) shares this opinion regarding Theodoret in the following words: “man who in my opinion was the most truth-loving and the least guided by consideration of policy of the Fathers of that period and as the brave and indefatigable Theodoret.”<sup>869</sup> Therefore we cannot conclude saying that he was an opportunist. But we may say that sometimes he speaks according to the tone of his enemies in order to establish what he believed to be theological truth and the condition of peace in the Church. For he writes to Irenaeus of Tyre in the following words: “my object is not to make my words and deeds fit the pleasure of this man or that man, but to edify the church of God, and please her bridegroom and Lord.”<sup>870</sup> In order to verify the veracity of these quotations above cited we may refer to the words of the bishop of Cyrus himself written to Pope Leo I: “I care not for honour and glory. I care only for

<sup>866</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 200 referring to Ep. 172 of 432/433.

<sup>867</sup>S. G. F. Perry, *The Second Synod of Ephesus*, (together with certain extracts relating to it, from Syriac MSS., preserved in the British Museum), Dartford 1881, (last edited in 2010), 258.

<sup>868</sup>Venable, *Theodoretus*, in: DCB, 958.

<sup>869</sup>A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Vol. IV, 197-98.

<sup>870</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 206 referring to Ep. 16.

the scandal that has been caused, in that many of the simpler folk, and especially those who I have rescued from various heresies, cleaving to the authority of my judges and quite unable to understand the exact truth of doctrine will perhaps suppose me guilty of heresy.”<sup>871</sup> So in no way we can accuse him saying that he was an opportunist rather he tried to reconcile with the opposite groups in so far as he could maintaining his own view points and principles. This idea may be further cemented by his famous work *Eranistes* in which he tries to teach the right Christology.

“It is clear from the structure of the work itself that Theodoret is still attacking Cyril’s Twelve Anathemas, that his basic concern is to refute any notion of a union which arises out of confusing the divine and human natures into one nature, for this leads to the predication of passibility and thus creaturely status to the Only-Begotten Son, the Word of God.”<sup>872</sup>

Let us get into the content of this work in its detail. We have already said that this work of Theodoret is in the form of a dialogue which contains three sections. Let us get into these various dialogues to get to know his Christology. We will deal with them section by section.

## 6. Theodoret’s Christology

First of all it is necessary to clarify certain things regarding Theodoret’s Christology. From his own time up to today there are different opinions regarding the acceptability of his teaching. It can be said as due to the twofold evaluation of Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Some analyze it as a Cyrillian Council and some others speak of the victory of the Antiochian School. As we cannot judge anyone of the ancient school with our standards of today so also cannot say that it was either the victory of Cyril or victory of Theodoret. Both views are essential for the right interpretation of Christology. Hence here our intention is only to discuss the importance of the theology of Theodoret in the light of his *Eranistes* as his contributions brought clarity to certain terminologies and skip great danger in the Christology.

### A. Doctrine of God and man

We have already said that both Cyril and Nestorius were arguing for the same thing. For what Cyril taught and said that is “the Logos suffered in the flesh is theologically the exact equivalent of Nestorius’ dogma that the Logos suffered in the *prosopon* of the manhood which he took for his own.”<sup>873</sup> It is said that this dyophysite idea of Nestorius, that is, Jesus Christ is equally and in full measure both God and man, both human and divine, was strongly held by Theodoret.<sup>874</sup> As both of them belong to the Antiochian school of theology they gave stress not to the metaphysical union of Christ but to the soteriological element with full emphasis on both divine and human. In turn this attitude has given room for real humanity in Christ. Even Grillmeier tells that if we check the letter of Cyril to Succensus, which we have already discussed in the second chapter, we find very clearly the vulnerability of Cyril

<sup>871</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Ep. 113.

<sup>872</sup>Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 220.

<sup>873</sup>Anastos, *Nestorius was Orthodox*, 139.

<sup>874</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 140.

to Apollinarianism.<sup>875</sup> O’Keefe informs us “that even few scholars would still agree with the notion that Cyril was a secret Apollinarian.”<sup>876</sup> He tells that Cyril was aware of the criticism raised by Antiochians against him as theopaschite. The Antiochians feared in the formula of Cyril that the eradication of the human nature in Jesus, or presenting a Jesus without a complete human nature in Him, would leave the divinity to absorb the suffering of Jesus. This danger the Antiochians found in the argument of Cyril, a danger of eliminating incarnation, its meaning and thus soteriology. Although repeatedly Cyril denied any validity to the charges that he secretly espoused Apollinarian views his doctrine of the idea of divine suffering strikes closer to home.<sup>877</sup> For Cyril such a distinction is a foolish idea. He tells after incarnation although we recognize two natures in Christ such distinctions fade to insignificance. He stresses that such a division remains in the theoretical level (ἐν ψιλαῖς διελόντες ἐννοίαις) and by a subtle speculation (ἐν ἰσχυραῖς θεωρίαις) or rather we accept the distinction only in our mental intuitions (νοῦς φαντασίας).<sup>878</sup> Hence he categorically speaks that when we encounter Christ, we encounter a single subject, the Word made flesh. Therefore he concludes saying that “we do not rule out the legitimacy of saying that he suffered.”<sup>879</sup> We find the argument of Cyril also as exceedingly logical in its basic tenets.

We may further ask then who is at mistake. Is it Cyril or Nestorius or Theodoret? In order to answer this question first we may have to have recourse to Antiochian understanding of God and man and creation. The basic principle the Antiochian school held regarding the Creator and His creation as ontologically distinct from each other. Theodoret was also not an exception to it. We can say that Theodoret held the realities namely God and the entire created order (both material and spiritual) as ‘infinite qualitative distinction’ (a phrase for which we are indebted to Kierkegaard). He finds a striking difference between God and man. When we read the phrase in his work we understand his perception regarding the difference between both of them: “the difference is boundless and is such as of a gnat to the whole visible and invisible creation ... for this very thing is more and greater by far - the difference between the nature of the flesh and divinity.”<sup>880</sup> In his work *Eranistes* he brings out the inadequacy of physical analogies to express the right notion regarding God and creation. Thus he tells that the quantitative comparison in no way helps one to fully understand the qualitative distinction which he likes to express. So this difficulty he expresses with the help of a scriptural quotation from the book of Isaiah chapter 40: For He is God, and they are men. And the distance between God and man is the greatest. The mortal and perishable (ones) are compared to grass and the flower. But he is omnipotent.<sup>881</sup> This citation quoted by an Antiochian gives the idea that they consider realities as self-standing independent realities. Thus we must also keep in our mind that their entire Christology is also interpreted from this view point. The

<sup>875</sup>Cf. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 472-478.

<sup>876</sup>O’Keefe, *Kenosis or Impassibility*, 360.

<sup>877</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 361.

<sup>878</sup>Cf. L. R. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria, Select Letters*, Oxford 1983, 92. 14-16 (the specification 92. 14-16 means page 92, paragraph 14-16).

<sup>879</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 86. 24-25.

<sup>880</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 249 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 40 A-B).

<sup>881</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 250.

Antiochian Christology is characterized as dyophysite as they categorize reality into two permanently different natures. We may look into how Theodoret treats this issue in his attempt to maintain the ontological separation between God and man or the entire creation. If we follow the perception of the Antiochians strictly we may come across a difficulty in finding a substantial union of the two irreducible natures of Christ into one. For such a union would corrode the differentiating elements of both divinity and humanity. Such an explanation would make God a less God and man anything other than a mere man. Therefore the first attempt of Theodoret is to base his arguments somewhere else in order to explain better this union between divinity and humanity in Christ and make it acceptable to believers and non-believers equally. So he intended that his interpretation should in no way dampen the unity of Christ and disfigure the humanity which Christ holds into himself. His main concern was that without obliterating the thought pattern of the Antiochian school's Christology, viz., *finitum non capax infiniti* (the finite has no capacity for the infinite) to explain the God-man nature of Christ. Due to the linguistic limitations he may have a tolerable difficulty in establishing the truth of the existence of two realities in the God-man, Jesus Christ. But how is it possible for this school to ascertain the soteriological dimension without emphasizing a true manhood in Christ. Thus we find from a soteriological-incarnational point of view manhood of Christ was the central element in Antiochian Christology. If we refer the book of Sellers *Two Ancient Christologies* we come across a series of quotations which compel the Antiochians for such an advocacy of manhood in Christ. Let us have recourse to a few quotations from the same author:

“it was needful for the divinity to renew the humanity and for the humanity to be renewed and to take the very image [of him] who created it but not His own *ousia*; and it was needful that it should observe prudently the conduct of the man who had fallen, because especially for that was it created, to conduct itself according to the law which is in the nature of men and to preserve the very image of the Creator by the observance of the commandments without fault ...”<sup>882</sup>

Another similar quotation from Theodore of Mopsuestia the teacher of Antiochian school runs so: “the Lord in assuming flesh and soul strove through each to win each-mortifying sin in the flesh, and subduing its lusts, and training the soul to overcome its passions and to restrain the lusts of the flesh.”<sup>883</sup> In the teaching of the classical Antiochian precursor Eustathius<sup>884</sup> we hear that the Man of Christ fits us for the way of heaven because He is the *bonorum principium immutabile*: “Quando igitur ait: Creavit me initium viarum suarum operibus suis claro demonstrat argumento bonorum principium immutabile nobis exstitisse hominem Christum, quoniam aptat nos ad viam caelorum.”<sup>885</sup> These all quotations show how important for the Antiochians the Man

<sup>882</sup>Cited from Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 139 referring to Bazaar, 214.

<sup>883</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *De Incarn.* XV, Frag. 3.

<sup>884</sup>Eustace or Eustathius (St., Feast 16 July), was born in Side in Pamphylia. In the beginning he was Bishop of Beroea (modern Aleppo) and later Patriarch of Antioch in 324. It seems he enjoyed the love and esteem of the people. He was a learned theologian and was also distinguished by his broad knowledge in secular sciences. From the emergence of Arianism he took side with Alexander of Alexandria. According to Roey it is very difficult to fix his teaching or what he aims at. He tells that people saw in his teaching a successor of Paul of Samosata and predecessor of Nestorius. In his teaching he allows only one hypostase in the Godhead and he recognizes the personal difference of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Against the Arians he insisted the existence of divinity and humanity to the integral person Christ with a human soul (cf. A. von Roey, *Eustathios v. Antiochien*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3, Freiburg 1995, 1014-1015).

<sup>885</sup>Cited from Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 132 referring to Eustathius, *Discourse on Proverbs* 8, 22.



in Christ is for the redemption of man. Thus their philosophical leniency, that is, realism rather than idealism, gives them ample problems in order to interpret this most complicated truth regarding Christ. Let us say that they took the historical and empirical as the basis of their thought pattern. In the words of Prestige we hear this difficulty experienced by Antiochians:

“the real theological bond between all the Antiochenes was their clear perception of the full and genuine human experience which the incarnate Son historically underwent; they shrank in horror from the idea that He was not in all respects as truly kin to us as He was kin to God; they emphasised the Gospel evidence of His human consciousness and moral growth, and would not have it thought that His human life was merely the illusory exhibition on earth of an action which in sphere and method was exclusively celestial. It might be said that they pinned His human nature down to this earth to which, in a true and vital sense, it belonged.”<sup>886</sup>

So their Aristotelian bias compelled them to consider everything as historical and empirical even the mode of Scriptural exegesis, their ethical interest and above all their interest in man as a free agent and they appealed to the particular and not to the general. The concern of the Antiochians is not to lose the perfect manhood while establishing Christ as perfect God. Theodoret is particular to show that in the incarnation God remained God and did not turn into a human nature or a *tertium quid*. But how is it possible to explain such a difficult fact for people who come under the Aristotelian category of thought. In order to get rid of this great difficulty we may have to get into the idea how Antiochians consider the incarnation of Jesus Christ.

Antiochians never teach that in Jesus Christ an ordinary man has been conjoined with the Logos in a moral relationship “rather in Jesus Christ the Logos, through uniting to Himself real manhood, has Himself become man - a position which implies the complete denial of the conception that God and man are essentially ‘other.’”<sup>887</sup> Theodoret considers ontological duality in the Person of Christ as the starting point basing on an historical, empirical view of human nature. So to say he does not strictly follow an empirical estimate of human nature, rather a metaphysical one. In other words “the concern with the complete manhood of Christ is dictated by his metaphysics.”<sup>888</sup> According to him each side of the ontological spectrum implies its opposite. So in his system of thought both the categories of humanity and divinity became the objects of special concern. But we find an apprehension with the doctrine of God. He avows always one and the same thing that God cannot change. How does he affirm and establish this great truth?

Although Antiochians want to affirm the natures of the incarnated One as fully God and Man, at the same time we find that in their vocabulary there were divergences. Nestorius “based his theological system on the hypothesis that every independently existing object, thing, animal, or person, including man and God the Logos, has a substance or essence (*ousia*) of its own, as the indispensable underlying factor, from which it derives life or existence.”<sup>889</sup> But he did not insist it to the point that there existed two subjects or persons in Christ. What he preached or taught was misunderstood. He tells very clearly that these two natures are united in the third indispensable element namely *prosopon*. None of these three can be separated from

<sup>886</sup>Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, 133.

<sup>887</sup>Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 112.

<sup>888</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 252.

<sup>889</sup>Anastos, *Nestorius was Orthodox*, 125.

the other two, nor can the *ousia* and the nature be recognized externally apart from the *prosopon*, which reveals them. Nestorius tries to establish this fundamental truth based on metaphysical structure that the divine nature and the human nature in Christ were complete in themselves, influenced partly by Stoicism via the Cappadocian fathers. He found *prosopon* as the only vehicle of union which could safeguard the properties of the two *ousiai* and the natures of Christ inviolate. This explanation was necessary for him otherwise according to him Christ would not have been both perfect God and perfect man. And he was accused as teaching the theory of two Sons in Christ. “Both Nestorius and Theodoret were alike convinced that Cyril’s language implied a fusion of the deity and the humanity into a hybrid compound, neither wholly divine nor wholly human, under pressure of a ‘physical’ or ‘natural’ law of mechanical combination entirely opposed to all conceptions of personal or voluntary action.”<sup>890</sup>

Let us examine here how the mature theologian of Antioch [Theodoret] overcomes this difficulty and makes both sides meet together. Before we come to the issue proper let us also refer to a precursor of Theodoret, called Eustace or Eustathius of Antioch, contents of whose teaching we find in the fragments in the three dialogues entitled *Eranistes*. Eustathius maintains the reality of human soul of Christ against the teaching of Arius who taught that Christ’s sufferings were endured in His heavenly character.<sup>891</sup> Eustace teaches further that the humiliations which Jesus underwent belong to Him specifically as son of Mary. “He distinguishes firmly between ‘Him who anoints’ and ‘Him who is anointed,’ the former is ‘God by nature’ begotten of God’, the latter is beautified by exquisite construction, from the Godhead that dwelt in him’, but his virtue is not innate, but ‘acquired’ the fruit of moral effort.”<sup>892</sup> So also Eustace confers upon Christ’s manhood manifold titles. He addresses Him as the shrine of God the Son (Jn 2, 19), or His ‘tabernacle’ (Jn 1, 14), or His ‘house’ (Prov 9, 1), or again he simply calls him the human instrument for the purpose of redemption and frequently he calls him ‘the man.’<sup>893</sup> Sometimes Eustace refers to his manhood simply as ‘the body.’ He makes use of the language of his own time in order to express both manhood and godhead of the person Jesus. He used this language of the time not basing on any doctrinal bias rather he wanted to express the human experience of the Redeemer as a real experience and not an artifice or fantasy, and at the same time as an experience of God. On the other hand “Eustace asserts that the divine Word in His own nature continued in the bosom of the Father; the divine Wisdom did not cease to contain the whole creation; being immaterial and invisible, He did not in His heavenly character sustain the nails and the tomb.”<sup>894</sup> But he referred all the actions of Jesus to the single person of God, the Son. He affirms tirelessly the unity of Christ’s person. He asserts that the divine nature in no way was debased or diminished because of the Incarnation. Without any doubt Eustace, who is also known as the father of Antiochian school of Christology, expresses the sum total of Antiochian Christology in the words that “there is only one Christ and He is both a single person and a single object of perception. But those who have the eyes to see can perceive in Him two distinct depths of reality.”<sup>895</sup> Theodoret was also worried that

<sup>890</sup>Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, 157.

<sup>891</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 134.

<sup>892</sup>*Ibid.*; cf. Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 122-23.

<sup>893</sup>Cf. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, 134.

<sup>894</sup>*Ibid.*, 135.

<sup>895</sup>*Ibid.*, 136.

any compromise in the language referring to the divinity of the Son would lead inevitably back to Arianism. His problem in the work *Eranistes* or the problem of Orthodoxos was how to reconcile this humanity and divinity in the person without allowing one to take over the other. He was fully aware that his language should in no way be similar to that of Arius or Apollinarius. In *Eranistes* he gives a just hearing to the monophysitic position of Eranistes where the opponent [Eranistes] holds that humanity is overtaken by divinity. Therefore, without doubt, Orthodoxos holds that only the uncompromising insistence on the two-nature formula will help one to overcome this problem of Arianism or Monophysitism and any sort of confusion regarding the natures in Christ. Arius also first focused on the doctrine of God viz., the nature of the Logos. But it soon got widened to contain the Christological issue. Thereafter Arius defended a Word-flesh Christology with emphasis on presenting Logos as a creature rather than portraying Logos as being the same substance with the Father. In his theological explanations the Logos replaced the human soul in Christ. By ascribing all the limitations and weakness which he found in human Christ to the Logos-subject, he could easily prove that the Logos was less than God. So also Apollinarius confused both natures [divine and human] of Christ without any qualifications.

Theodoret tried to overcome this difficulty by giving emphasis to both divine and human natures in Christ. In his explanation he uses the phrase *παραπέτασμα* ‘curtain’ in order to clarify how both natures co-exist or co-dwell in the same person. He likens Christ’s flesh as a kind of curtain. Orthodoxos is indebted for this word to the Letter to the Hebrews where Christ’s flesh is likened to the curtain of the Holy of Holies in the temple.<sup>896</sup> He argues basing on the Epistle that Christ’s flesh is an entry-point for all human to the heavenly sanctuary. Regarding his concept on the doctrine of human nature, he takes it as a composite (*σύνθετος*) being consisting of body and soul.<sup>897</sup> According to him in the union of the body and the soul both remain unadulterated. He explains it with the apparent example of soul not needing food, rest, or anything related to physical needs and the body which lives by obtaining its vital force (*τὴν ζωτικὴν δυνάμιν*) or vital energy (*τὴν ζωτικὴν ... ἐνέργειαν*) from the soul. Without receiving this energy or force which soul gives to the body it cannot exist rather it undergoes corruption. But Orthodoxos reminds us not to confuse between the sphere of the soul and body as Eranistes confused and considered that the needs of the body namely thirst, hunger etc., belonged to the soul. In answer to this confusion of Eranistes Theodoret begins to express his notion regarding these two spheres in the person. According to him the properties of body and soul are definitively distinct. Those which belong to the soul are *τὸ λογικόν, τὸ ἀπλοῦν, τὸ ἀθάνατον, τὸ ἀόρατον* (the rational, the simplex, the immortal and the invisible). And the properties of the body are *τὸ σύνθετον, τὸ ὀρατόν, τὸ θνητόν* (the compound, the visible and the mortal).<sup>898</sup> He makes clear that no one can separate these two elements as they are so essential to man. He is referred as a rational and at the same time a mortal being. By this meticulous explanation he does not try to detach the soul from the body or to annihilate the natural union existing between them. He differentiates one from the

<sup>896</sup>Cf. Heb 6, 20; 10, 20.

<sup>897</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 262 in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 109 C-D).

<sup>898</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 263 in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes*, III (PG 83, 145, 109).

other or between the properties of soul and body basing on the principle of ‘by the reason alone’ (τῷ λόγῳ μόνῳ). This can be compared to a theoretical or conceptual distinction between two entities rather than an actual separation. This sort of a conceptual distinction we find in a letter (which is preserved only in Syriac) from Andreas of Samosata (who was the friend of Theodoret in combating heresies) to Rabbula of Edessa.<sup>899</sup> According to Abramowski it is an Aristotelian idea took over by Alexander of Aphrodisias<sup>900</sup> in a work titled *De Anima*. Here we come across the reference to a theoretical distinction made by Alexander between form and matter, body and soul. Theodoret took this understanding of soul and body as two unconfused entities formulating one individual within Christological context in *Eranistes*. He expresses the purpose of employing such an anthropological formula: “just as we do not then divide (διαροῦμεν), but call the same one both rational and mortal, thus also it is fitting to do with Christ and to apply to him both the divinity and humanity.”<sup>901</sup> Thus he was able to establish an unconfused union and interaction between soul and body. He developed this sort of anthropology only in relation to his Christology.

Theodoret was influenced by his contemporary Nemesius<sup>902</sup> to arrive at such thoughts. It would be beneficial for us to understand the concepts in Nemesius. He tells that the intelligible such as the soul cannot change in the process of uniting with something. According to his teaching the union of soul with body can in no way cause any change. Like Theodoret Nemesius also “uses the union of body and soul as an analogy for the union of God and man in Christ.”<sup>903</sup> It may be useful for us to know the source of this thought in Nemesius. Two modern scholars namely Telfer and Arnou have made a study on the origin of this thought. According to Telfer Nemesius’ position is a mid-way between Plato and Aristotle and Nemesius rejects categorically the trichotomist anthropology of Apollinarius which he finds as coming from

---

<sup>899</sup>Rabbūlā of Edessa was a Syrian church historian, lived in the middle of 4<sup>th</sup> century. Although his father was a pagan priest his mother was a devoted Christian. He was also a pagan like his father until some time after his marriage. As a part of his decision first he travelled to Jerusalem and got baptized in Jordan and then renounced his children and wife and entered into the rigorous practice of Christian asceticism. He spent some years in the desert as a rigorous ascetic. From there he was elected as the bishop of Edessa in 412. As a bishop he was marked by extraordinary energy by the continued asceticism of his personal life, by his magnificent provision for all the poor and sufferer in the diocese, by his care for discipline among the clergy and monks who were under his authority and latterly by the fierce determination with which he combated all heresies. In his fight against Nestorianism he defended the 12 anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria. Later he closed all the schools of Persians and banished Ibas who was a propagator and exegete of Antiochian theology and he burned all the books written by Theodore of Mopsuestia. He died in the year 436 in Edessa (cf. G. G. Blum, Rabbūlā v. Edessa, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8, Freiburg 1999, 789).

<sup>900</sup>Alexander was a Peripatetic philosopher and the most celebrated of the Ancient Greek commentators on the writings of Aristotle in 200 A. D. He held that the undeveloped reason in man is material and inseparable from the body and therefore mortal. He argued strongly against the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. He held that the active intellect through whose agency the potential intellect in man becomes actual with God. According to him providence is a power that emanates from the heavens to the sublunar region, and is responsible for the generation and destruction of earthly things, without any direct involvement in the lives of individuals (cf. M. Schramm, Alexander of Aphrodisias, in: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 360).

<sup>901</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 264 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 145 C-D).

<sup>902</sup>Nemesius was a bishop of Emesa (close to the southern border of Syria Secunda) at the end of the fourth century. Nemesius belongs to the same thought-world of the Antiochians. He like Theodoret depended upon many similar sources. Later these two authors (Theodoret and Nemesius) attracted the attention of Maximus the Confessor in the 7<sup>th</sup> and John Damascene in the 8<sup>th</sup> cent., and through them influenced the Middle Ages, both in Byzantium and the West (cf. A. Louth, John Chrysostom and the Antiochene School to Theodoret of Cyrhus, in: F. Margaret, ed., *The Cambridge history of early Christian literature*, Cambridge 2004, 351).

<sup>903</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 265.

Plotinus.<sup>904</sup> Arnou finds Nemesius' source of anthropology in Neo-platonism.<sup>905</sup> According to the neo-platonic teaching the doctrine concerning the relationship of intelligible and material realities are very rigidly retained. In the teaching of Porphyry and Plotinus both of them considered the material bodies as something that which is characterized by spatial location, division, and juxtaposition of objects. It means all bodies are exterior to each other. They find the difference in intelligible bodies from the material bodies as not located by place. Plotinus' famous phrase runs so: "each has all in itself and sees all in each other. All is everywhere. All is all. Each is all."<sup>906</sup> He finds the sole distinction of intelligibles as one which is not the other. But still they penetrate each other. So according to their teaching all realities which belong to this field will not undergo any change at all even if it is in union with other realities. Whereas the material objects when they come in union with other objects, it may undergo change. Plotinus concludes saying that the relation of the soul to the body is such a union. The intelligible substances remain without confusion and corruption.<sup>907</sup> This relationship of soul and body in Plotinus, made use by Nemesius, is also employed by Theodoret of Cyrus. According to Nemesius soul is a transforming presence which penetrates the body. It can be considered, according to him, as an animator without being confused with it. Nemesius tries to explain this further with the help of an example taken from Plotinus which is also found in the work of Theodoret titled *Expositio rectae fidei*. Nemesius makes use of the example of the rays of sun which runs through the air but not becoming part of it.<sup>908</sup> Theodoret also makes use this simile in order to better explain the unconfused nature of divinity and humanity in the individual person in Christ. Nemesius finds a difficulty in applying this language in spatial and non-spatial realities so to say in a soul which is localized in a body. Therefore he realizes that only a metaphorical language can be of any help in better explaining the relationship between soul and body. Thus he relies upon Porphyry to make his mind clear. In Porphyry we find the idea of relation. To speak of a soul in a body can be expressed only with the terms 'in relation' (ἐν σχέσει) to it. He uses other terminologies in order to express the nature of their relation. He employs terms like σχέσις (relation), ῥοπή (inclination) or διάθεσις (disposition). These terminologies do not hint at a physical or local nature of the soul. Although Theodoret makes use of these terminologies he does not employ the Neoplatonic term σχέσις to explain the union between God and man in Christ. We can say that this is one of the most distinguishing factors between Theodoret and Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. But at the same time he follows his Antiochian predecessors to uphold the idea of man as a composite of soul and body. He was also cautious not to fall in line with Apollinarian trichotomistic anthropology. Apollinarius believed that "man is comprised of three parts viz., a body, the vital soul (ψυχῆς τῆς ζωτικῆς) and the rational soul (λογικῆς) which he calls mind (νοῦς)."<sup>909</sup> Theodoret discards this idea of Apollinarius and teaches that man has only one soul basing on Scripture. Basing on

<sup>904</sup>Cf. Telfer, Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa, 224-227.

<sup>905</sup>Cf. R. Arnou, Nestorianisme et Neoplatonisme, l'unité du Christ et l'union des Intelligibles, in: Gr. 17 (1936), 118-119.

<sup>906</sup>Cited from Stewardson, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 266 referring to Plotinus, Enn.V, lib. VIII, 4.

<sup>907</sup>Cf. Arnou, Nestorianisme et Neoplatonisme, 119-120.

<sup>908</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 120-121.

<sup>909</sup>Stewardson, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 268.

several biblical passages he teaches that the divine Logos could not have taken a human nature consisting of a non-rational (ἄλογον) soul and flesh (σάρξ). Theodoret could not in any way approve this theory of Apollinarius as his Jesus does not have a complete human nature as He is lacking His rational faculty. Theodoret tries to overcome this difficulty by emphasizing ‘complete human nature’ (φύσιν ἀνθρωπεῖαν τελείαν) with body and rational soul.<sup>910</sup> But we can also observe in his teaching that Theodoret never pushes this idea to the level of separating one from the other [body and soul] and obliterating one by the other. According to the bishop of Cyrus this separation takes place only in death. He finds the reason for this alteration with the basic human predicament in sin. For him death is the punishment for man’s sin.<sup>911</sup> In Theodoret’s view original sin is not something inherited by mankind like in St. Augustine. For him it is mortality and not sin itself that is passed on from Adam to the ensuing generations. According to Theodoret “sin is not of nature but of evil choice: Ἡ ἀμαρτία γὰρ οὐ τῆς φύσεως ἀλλὰ τῆς κακῆς προαιρέσεως.”<sup>912</sup> So we may be able to say in accordance with Theodoret “that death came to the world not as an account of the sin of the forefather but on account of one’s own sin that each one receives the limit of death.”<sup>913</sup> Thus the personal responsibility of each one of us is well maintained in the theory of death. Besides, he stresses the idea that sin does belong neither to the human body nor to the soul. This theory would help the bishop of Cyrus to fit well the idea of complete manhood with body and soul joined to the Logos. Gross observes that this concept fits well with his entire Christology, for God can unite Himself with a complete human being without taking over sin.<sup>914</sup> Apollinarius wanted to eliminate the human mind from the person of Christ due to its leniency towards sin. Apollinarius tells that human mind is necessarily sinful. This dualistic contention of human nature is well put in the mouth of Eranistes and he [Eranistes] condemns the body as the cause of all punishment. According to him only the body was punished. Eranistes discusses upon how the whole body was perverted and came to destruction. It was through the means of body man looked at the tree evilly and stretched out its hands and stripped off the forbidden fruit.<sup>915</sup> He narrates how the entire body got suffused and degenerated with this forbidden food. On the contrary Orthodoxos despicably answers that Eranistes has given the procedure of physical digestion rather than anything theological. When again pressed by Orthodoxos Eranistes starts expressing his mind in the following words: “The body partakes of life from the soul on the one hand, but on the other furnishes to the soul the penal possession of sin ... Through the eyes it makes it see evilly, through the ears it makes it hear unprofitable sounds, and through the tongue utter injurious words, and through all the other parts act ill.”<sup>916</sup> Here Eranistes is moved by the Aristotelian category of thinking of the soul and body as mover and the moved and falls in line with Apollinarius’ thinking. The fundamental character of this thought is that there cannot be two movers in Christ. One must lose the fundamental character in order to co-exist according to this

<sup>910</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 269 in reference to Theodoret, Eranistes (PG 83, 102, 233).

<sup>911</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Theodoret, Eranistes (PG 83, 221, 224).

<sup>912</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Theodoret, Eranistes ([PG 83, 325] [cf. Rom 5, 12]).

<sup>913</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 270 referring to Theodoret, Eranistes (PG 83, 100).

<sup>914</sup>Cf. J. Gross, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas*, Bd. II, Basel 1963, 188.

<sup>915</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 270.

<sup>916</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 271 referring to Theodoret, Eranistes (PG 83, 224).

principle. But Orthodoxos proves against the argument of Eranistes and establishes that without the help of the life giving soul nothing is possible with this given body. He shares that

“without the soul, the body lies breathless, voiceless, and motionless. And the eye sees neither wrongly nor rightly, nor do the ears receive the sound of voices. The hands do not move nor do the feet walk. But it is like an instrument deprived of music. How then could you say that only the body sinned, since it is not able to breathe at all without the soul.”<sup>917</sup>

Thus Orthodoxos leads his opponent who upholds the Apollinaristic view to the right assumption that soul and body both are responsible for obedience or transgression. According to this theory of Orthodoxos it is the soul who takes the initiative in conducting an action as it contains the power of reason even before the body acts. Accordingly he brings forth the logical conclusion: “if the mind sketches the virtue or the vice, then it gives form to it ... If then it sins with the body, or rather initiates the sin - for it was entrusted with driving and guiding the animal (nature) - why then when it shares in sin does it not share in the punishment?”<sup>918</sup> Through this affirmation Theodoret wants once again to affirm that sin does not belong either to the body or to the soul. Thus after having asserted that neither any one of the natures (body and soul) is to be degraded Orthodoxos proceeds to the punishment. For the author of *Eranistes* the term ‘flesh’ (σάρξ) in Scripture does not bear any negative connotations when referring to human nature. It is not inferior to the soul in the language of Scripture. Orthodoxos is of the view that the mortal body is punished by death for the sins committed while the immortal that is the soul will be delivered with body to Gehenna. He is of the opinion that “it will not suffer by dying but ‘by being punished in life’ (in the life to come).”<sup>919</sup> He continues discussing the state of the body after death. He shares the view that human existence does not cease with the dissolution of the body-soul union in death. Although our body is subject to death, he teaches that it is not definitively condemned to death and eternal punishment. For all of us will have a resurrection of the body and a reunification of the body with the immortal soul. Theodoret makes use of the examples of Ezekiel’s vision (Ez 37, 7) and the resurrection of Lazarus for a confirmation of these statements. He realizes the intervention of the Lord by which all the mortal bodies will be reconstituted and reanimated by the return of the soul’s to their bodies. And the resurrection of our bodies will be textured after that of Christ. In a climax of the dialogue Orthodoxos directs Eranistes to affirm: “For this reason the only-begotten Son of God became man and suffered and took the trial of death - in order that he might destroy death. Therefore, having risen, he proclaims by his own resurrection the resurrection of all men.”<sup>920</sup> Thus Theodoret makes clear the terminology of St. Paul viz., the ‘first fruits’ (ἀπαρχή) which is used to indicate Christ’s resurrection and in turn indicate the resurrection of all the faithful who are to be resurrected after Him.<sup>921</sup> Although the term stands for the first-fruits of the harvest or flock which were offered to God here

<sup>917</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 224).

<sup>918</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 272 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 225).

<sup>919</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 225).

<sup>920</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 273 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 260, 273).

<sup>921</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* ([PG 83, 72, 261] [1 Cor 15, 20, 23]).

for Theodoret it is the first or the best or a representative of the whole humanity.<sup>922</sup> Thus metaphorically the author is able to apply resurrection of the body to the whole body of faithful. The only difference the author of *Eranistes* finds in the resurrection of Christ and ours is that “Christ’s body did not undergo corruption (διαφθοράν) and remaining undefiled (ἀκήρατον), it recovered its soul after three days.”<sup>923</sup>

Although it is not directly involved in our issue let us also discuss the nature of the resurrected body for the completion of the topic which we have already begun. We may ask further whether the resurrected body is different from the empirical body. According to the bishop of Cyrus the nature of the body of Christ remained the same after the resurrection and did not undergo any change and was not made into another substance. Theodoret of Cyrus answered so in response to the argument *Eranistes* brought forth. *Eranistes* held that the resurrected body of Christ became divine only after the resurrection.<sup>924</sup> To this objection Orthodoxos replies with instances from the Gospels. In various places in the Gospel the risen Christ is described as tangible and visible as He was before death. After the resurrection also it remained as body with flesh and bones, hands and feet. So it remained, he states, as body after the resurrection.<sup>925</sup> Theodoret tells that the limitations (περιγραφήν) of the body lingered even after the resurrection. He tells that the body retained ‘the boundaries of its nature’ (τῶν ὄρων τῆς φύσεως), and ‘its circumscribed nature’ (περιγεγραμμένην φύσιν).<sup>926</sup> He arrives at this conclusion regarding the state of the resurrected body from the Gospels. To the question of the nature of change the bodies of Christ and his followers underwent he answers that they became ‘incorruptible’ (ἄφθαρτα) and ‘immortal’ (ἀθάνατα).<sup>927</sup> He employs also another terminology in order to express the nature of Christ’s body namely, ‘impassible’ (ἀπαθέξ),<sup>928</sup> which we will be discussing under the next title. He seems to have depended upon the epistle of St. Paul 1 Corinthians 15, 53 for the first two terms namely, incorruptibility and immortality which refer to the common resurrection. He makes use also of other texts of St. Paul, other than Gospels, namely, 1Cor 15, 43-44 and 1 Thes 1, 17 in order to establish the fact of resurrection. According to the author of *Eranistes* our resurrected bodies also enjoy immortality and incorruptibility (ἀθανασίας καὶ ἀφθαρσίας) and our souls have impassibility and immutability (ἀπαθείας καὶ ἀτρεπτότητος).<sup>929</sup> In Ep. 145<sup>930</sup> which was published a few years after *Eranistes* he gives added distinctiveness to the resurrected bodies like light (κούφα) and airy (μετάρσια). Once they transform with these characteristics they can move easily through the air which according to him is the cause of Jesus’ passing through the closed doors. Together with all these characteristics he also adds another differentiating element to the resurrected body

<sup>922</sup>Cf. W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago 1967, 80.

<sup>923</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 273 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 273).

<sup>924</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 164).

<sup>925</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 274 in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 328).

<sup>926</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 273 in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 164, 328).

<sup>927</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 274 in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 161, 164).

<sup>928</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 161, 164).

<sup>929</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 274 in reference to Ep. 145, ‘To the monks of Constantinople.’

<sup>930</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 287.



namely glory (δόξα). According to bishop of Cyrus even in the possession of this characteristic Christ's body continued to be a body, yet filled with divine glory. Basing on the epistle of St. Paul, Phil 3, 20-21, where the apostle expresses the idea that our lowly bodies will also be transformed into the likeness of glorified body of Christ, Theodoret expresses that the bodies of the saints will also be conformed to the one of Christ.<sup>931</sup> Again to the question of Eranistes whether we are equal to Christ's risen body, Orthodoxos replies, relying upon the epistle of St. Paul to Romans 8, 17 where it is said that 'if we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified (συνδοξασθῶμεν) with him,' that on the one hand they will partake of its incorruption and immortality and on the other its glory.<sup>932</sup> According to Orthodoxos among the resurrected bodies, the resurrected body of Christ holds a kind of paramount importance. Orthodoxos gives this preeminence to Christ's resurrected body due to the reason of its masterly function. He uses the typical Antiochian word for the 'role of Christ' as master 'δεσπότης,' which illumines the other resurrected bodies. By this prominent role played by the 'chief body' Orthodoxos is able to find a similarity between the resurrected nature of Christ and the nature of believers. According to him this illumination by Christ's body brings sameness to the resurrected body of believers namely, immortality, incorruptibility, impassibility, immutability, lightness, ethereal quality and glory.<sup>933</sup> To the question of the opponent in *Eranistes* whether Christ's body and other bodies are equal Orthodoxos answers that Christ's body is distinct from the body of others in the following words:

“But in quantity (τῆ ποσότητι) the difference to be found is great, and it is as great as (the difference) between the sun and the stars, or rather between master and slaves, and between the one giving light and the one receiving light. Nevertheless, he has given a share of his own names to his servants, and since he is called light, he called the saints 'light' (Mt 5, 14). Therefore, according to quality (or kind) and not according to quantity (κατὰ τὸ ποιὸν, [ποιὸς, ἄ, ὄν = of a certain nature, kind or quality; ποιότης, ητος, ἦ = quality; ποσός, ἦ, ὄν= a certain quantity or magnitude; ποσότης, ητος, ἦ= quantity<sup>934</sup>] τοῖσιν, οὐ κατὰ τὸ ποσόν), the bodies of the saints will be conformed to the Lord's body.”<sup>935</sup>

Thus we can arrive at the conclusion that it is not a quantitative change that takes place rather it is a qualitative change which takes place. Elsewhere he employs the term divine (θεῖον) for Christ's glorified body.<sup>936</sup> If we understand Theodoret's terminologies properly we can say that it is not to be taken in the literal sense. For in the same Epistle after several lines he refuses to admit the idea that the body was changed into the divine nature.<sup>937</sup> While discussing the nature of the resurrected body Eranistes raises another issue namely the eating of food by Christ's resurrected body.

<sup>931</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 165).

<sup>932</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 165).

<sup>933</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 287: Stewardson hesitates to assert whether the author of *Eranistes* had assigned the attributes of impassibility and immutability to the body as well as the soul as he does not find an entire philosophy expressed in Ep. 145.

<sup>934</sup>Cf. Liddell-Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1431, 1453.

<sup>935</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 276 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, col. 165 B-C).

<sup>936</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 277 in reference to Ep. 145.

<sup>937</sup>Cf. *ibid.*; H. Wace and P. Schaff, *The Ecclesiastical History, Dialogues and Letters of Theodoret*, (trans. J. Blomfield), Oxford 1892, observes that the divinity here is meant not divinity rather 'His glory,' namely the glory that which has come to the body).

He concludes saying referring to this eating of Jesus after the resurrection that one of the options must be accepted as the logical outcome of it; “either he partook because he needed, or else, needing not, He seemed to eat, and did not really partake of the food.”<sup>938</sup> Together with it the opponent raises another problem by asking whether the resurrected body of Christ in any way became inferior to other bodies due to its manifestation of all the marks of earthly sufferings on his body and engagement in normal physical activities such as eating after the resurrection. To this Orthodoxos responds saying that Christ was not in need of food, since his body had become immortal. Orthodoxos finds the reason of eating bread by the resurrected Christ as to prove the resurrection real. For Orthodoxos shares his view regarding the eating of the risen Lord: “for since eating is a property of those living during this life the Lord necessarily taught the resurrection of the flesh by eating and drinking to those who do not recognize that it is real.”<sup>939</sup> In order to substantiate this incident of resurrection as most real he narrates the instances of the raising of both Jairus’ daughter and Lazarus for both of them took food immediately after coming to life. But immediately after this to the question of Eranistes whether other resurrected bodies also consumed food like the Lord, he adds that “these things which were accomplished by the Saviour through a certain plan (οἰκονομίᾳ) are not a rule and standard of nature, since he also managed (ᾠκονόμησεν) other things which will not happen to those brought back to life.”<sup>940</sup> According to Orthodoxos the risen body although had certain signs of his earthly life, it is no more lame, blind, or disfigured in any way.<sup>941</sup> Thus he comes to the conclusion that all the risen bodies have the same fundamental nature or essence like Christ’s risen body although Christ’s body differs in degree from others’ with certain unique traits which is pre-designed for the plan of salvation. But again Eranistes comes with the complicating question to Orthodoxos. Eranistes argues that if the resurrected body had adopted the forms of incorruptibility, impassibility, immortality as Orthodoxos had characterized it then it has been changed into another nature. Perhaps this can be considered as the crucial question posed by Eranistes towards Theodoret’s theological outlook. But to this question raised by Eranistes, Orthodoxos replies with much insistence that the nature remains even though corruptibility is changed into incorruptibility and mortality into immortality by participation.<sup>942</sup> In order to clarify this argument he uses the analogy of healthy and sick body. According to him there is no difference between a healthy body and sick body as both of them partake in the same essence. Both healthy and sick are called ‘body’ in our normal language.<sup>943</sup> He differentiates between essence or substance and accident or contingent attribute. According to the author of *Eranistes* while the body is considered as ‘essence’ or ‘substance’ (οὐσία) sickness and health are considered to be ‘accident’ or ‘contingent attribute’ (συμβεβηκός). He clarifies further saying that “both corruptibility and mortality are called accident, not of the essence, for they happen and cease to be.”<sup>944</sup> But to this question of Eranistes also Theodoret remains

<sup>938</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 277 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 160).

<sup>939</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 278 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83,160).

<sup>940</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 161).

<sup>941</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 161); Ep 145.

<sup>942</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>943</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 279 in reference to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 161).

<sup>944</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 278 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 161).

consistent to his earlier thought. According to the teaching of bishop of Cyrus the soul possesses certain traits by nature in common with God viz., rationality, simplicity, immortality and invisibility. But to the question whether he assigns additional attributes to the risen human nature, which also properly belong to God, he denies categorically with a ‘no.’ Theodoret finds differentiating elements between the resurrected human nature and the divine nature. While he considers God as uncreated, inconceivable and uncircumscribed, then for him the resurrected human nature is still a created reality and circumscribed nature in many ways. Let us once again go to the citation in order to understand his impressions regarding these two natures: “God is decisively immortal. He is immortal by nature and not by participation (οὐσία γὰρ ἀθάνατος, οὐ μετουσία). He does not have the resurrection as having received it from another. But to the angels and others of whom you have just spoken, he has given immortality.”<sup>945</sup> He expresses the status of two natures in the following words. “God the Word is immortal by nature, but the flesh is mortal by nature. But after the passion it became immortal by participation with the Word.”<sup>946</sup> Therefore without doubt and embarrassment one can say that his teaching is lucid clear. He tells that immortality belongs to God by nature whereas we are given it by way of participation (μετουσία). He considers immortality of men as a gift of God.<sup>947</sup> It may be due to this distinction which he is able to maintain in the person of Christ that he is also termed as a dyophysite or as the one who proposes the two-nature scheme of Christology. Having looked into his attempt in clarifying the concepts like God and man we are well placed to get into the next theme namely the immutability of the divine nature.

### B. The Immutability of the Divine Nature (Dialogue I)

The three dialogues which we find in the work *Eranistes* are written to combat various heresies. These dialogues speak of the immutability, the union of God and man in Christ without confusion or mixture and impassibility. Theodoret asserts assiduously the teaching of the Nicene Council through this work. While his first two theses are an attempt against the works of Gnostic heresiarchs who obliterate the true human nature of Christ the third thesis is against Apollinarism and his cohorts whose teaching led to the confusion and therefore to the abridgement of both natures. The fourth thesis mentioned is an attack on the Arian-Eunomian attribution of suffering to the ‘divinity’ of Christ.<sup>948</sup> All the Antiochian fathers were preoccupied with the fourth century heresy, namely that of Arius who championed a ‘Word-flesh Christology’ in order to support his teaching of the Logos [Son] as a ‘creature.’ So Theodoret took it to himself as his duty to combat these theories and maintain the true concepts regarding Christ. Arius could make intelligible to his hearers everything that is said in the bible by attributing human weaknesses of Christ directly to the Logos-subject and consequently proving that the Logos was a creature. In order to fight this heresy of Arius the Antiochian fathers developed the Word-Man type of Christology, insisting that the Logos was truly God dwelling in a complete human being constituted of body and soul. Thus they (Antiochians) claimed that they were the true defenders of the

<sup>945</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 280 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 268, 332).

<sup>946</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 288 referring to Theodoret, *Eranistes* (PG 83, 332 C).

<sup>947</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 280.

<sup>948</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 289.

Nicene view of God. By this Word-Man type of Christology they held that the incarnate Logos remained ὁμοούσιος with the Father retaining its essential nature of immutability and impassibility. But together with it they taught that in order to maintain its nature, it must be kept distinct from Christ's human nature.<sup>949</sup> In the expressions of Theodoret especially in his work *Eranistes* this Antiochian thought is very strongly held. In the summary of the first Dialogue in the *Demonstrationes*, he comes against the Arian heresy saying that God the Word cannot be changed into flesh by becoming incarnate.

The first dialogue “entitled, Ἄτρεπτος opens with a statement defining God as one being and nature in three hypostaseis and *prosopa*. Since all three are homoousios each to the other, all share in divine immutability.”<sup>950</sup> Theodoret's view of God is based on an inextricable blend of biblical and Hellenistic concepts. Orthodoxos occupies himself in the first dialogue with the divine names or the various definitions of terms applied to God. He tries to illustrate the trinitarian dogma. According to him the Holy Trinity is μία φύσις and which means what is (τὸ ὄν). He continues discussing on the meaning of ὑπόστασις and οὐσία. According to the Hellenistic understanding ὑπόστασις is a synonym for οὐσία. But the fathers regarded ὑπόστασις as something different from οὐσία in order to state how God can be one in three and which corresponds to the difference between τὸ ἴδιον (the particular) and τὸ κοῖνον (the general or common), between τὸ ἄτομον (individual) and τὸ εἶδος (species) or τὸ γένος (genus).<sup>951</sup> After clarifying terms like ‘animal,’ ‘species of animal,’ ‘man’ and ‘specific men’ he proceeds to give a definition to trinity.

“Therefore whatever is said concerning the divine nature is common to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit - such as ‘God,’ ‘Lord,’ ‘Creator,’ ‘almighty,’ and one that resembles these ... Whatever is indicative of the *hypostases* is not at all common to the Holy Trinity, but is of this *hypostasis* to which it is appropriate. Such names as Father and Unbegotten are characteristic of the Father, and again the names Son, Only-Begotten, and God the Word do not indicate the Father or the Holy Spirit, but the Son. And the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete are indicative of the *hypostasis* of the Spirit.”<sup>952</sup>

Having stated that the trinity shares one *ousia* in three hypostaseis he proceeds to the nature of Christ and the theme of immutability. It is said of the Antiochians that all of them were tied together by a theological bond namely with “the clear perception of the full and genuine human experience which the incarnate Son historically underwent.”<sup>953</sup> According to Theodoret the union which takes place in Christ is only in relation to two terms, namely the ‘taking’ and the ‘dwelling,’ within the Logos. In his work when he uses the verbs like ἐνανθρωπέω or σαρκόω they are made use with these connotations. According to the author of *Eranistes* if we accept the idea that God the Word changed into flesh in incarnation, it may lead us to the conclusion that the Logos ceases to be ὁμοούσιος with the Father or the One who begot him. Orthodoxos in *Eranistes* argues that if we teach that the Son, the second *hypostasis* of the one divine *ousia*, is mutable

<sup>949</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 290.

<sup>950</sup>Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 220.

<sup>951</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 221.

<sup>952</sup>R. V. Sellers, *Pseudo-Justin's Expositio rectae fidei: A Work of Theodoret of Cyrus*, in: *JThS* 46 (1945), 148-149.

<sup>953</sup>Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics*, 133.

then we fall into the same error of Arians.<sup>954</sup> Hence for Theodoret any change applied to the second person of the Trinity would call forth again the blasphemy of Arius and Eunomius. For they taught the Son is another substance different from the Father (ἕτεροοῦσιον).<sup>955</sup>

So in order to establish the theory of the immutability of the Word-God he starts with a consideration of the difference between ‘being’ and ‘becoming.’ Theodoret leads Eranistes to the concept what is meant by the term ‘flesh’ in John 1, 14. Here he occupies himself with the question “how the Only-Begotten Word can be said to have become flesh and remain immutable.”<sup>956</sup> According to Theodoret it means a perfect human nature with body and soul. In Dialogue III he makes an attempt at the end of the dialogue by appealing to the Creed of Nicea to persuade his obstinate enemy that suffering cannot be attributed to the divine nature of Christ. And he forces him to predicate human qualities of the human nature of Christ and divine qualities of the divine. To this again Eranistes refute relying upon the words of the Nicene Fathers: “the teaching of the faith which was agreed upon by the Fathers in Nicea says the Only-begotten himself, the true God, of the same substance with the Father, suffered and was crucified.”<sup>957</sup> Orthodoxos clarifies the reason for such a reference by fathers. He observes that the Nicene fathers used at first phrases like ‘became flesh’ and ‘became man’ before they added ‘suffered’ and ‘was crucified.’ Orthodoxos himself checks the intention of the Nicene fathers and comes to the conclusion that they used it with the intention of alluding suffering back to the nature that was capable of suffering. For Theodoret it is an absurdity to say that “the immutable, unchangeable divinity can change by becoming what it is not.”<sup>958</sup> Immediately after this Orthodoxos notes that this does not mean that there are two persons in the person of Christ. Theodoret brings clarity to what he intends to teach us. He asks further to Eranistes “whether he would attribute the phrase ‘from the (same) substance of the Father’ to the divinity or ‘to the nature from the seed of David.’”<sup>959</sup> Eranistes answers without doubt – ‘to the divinity.’ Again Orthodoxos presses him to express his impression on the phrase ‘true God from true God.’ To this question also Eranistes gives the answer as belonging to the divinity. Upon this answer Orthodoxos recapitulates his interpretation of the Nicene Creed:

“Thus when we hear about the passion and the cross, it is necessary to recognize the nature which received the passion and not to connect it (the passion) with the impassible but with that one which was assumed for the sake of this (passion). That the most worthy Fathers confessed the divine nature to be impassible but joined the passion with the flesh, the end of the faith (the creed) witnesses. And it runs like this: ‘And those who say, there once was when he was not, and before he was begotten, he was not, and that he came into being (ἐγένετο) from non-being, or who suppose that the Son of God is from a certain other *hypostasis* or essence, mutable or changeable, these the holy catholic and apostolic church anathematizes.’ See then what penalties they threatened against those who join the passion to the divine nature.”<sup>960</sup>

<sup>954</sup>Cf. Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 220.

<sup>955</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 290.

<sup>956</sup>Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 220.

<sup>957</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 292.

<sup>958</sup>Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 220.

<sup>959</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 292.

<sup>960</sup>*Ibid.*, 293.

Thus with this above given illustration he makes clear through his work *Eranistes* that he affirms the basic faith of Nicea and his opponents are propagating something against the true faith of the Church. Theodoret depends upon the theology of the Nicene Fathers to decimate the theopaschite tendencies. This is the pinnacle of his argument. We may speculate why Theodoret criticizes Eranistes who does not promote an Arian doctrine of God instead who tries to maintain like Cyril and Apollinaris one divine subject in Christ which is absolutely unified to the human nature and to this divine subject everything is predicated. According to Orthodoxos by attributing human weaknesses to the Godhead Eranistes arrives at a logical contradiction of impassibility and immutability. Besides, Theodoret finds enough reason to criticize the Arian tendencies in Eranistes, namely the idea of an incarnate God who is less than God, although Eranistes recognizes God's impassible and unchangeable nature. So categorically the bishop of Cyrus asserts that the only way to surmount this predicament is to acknowledge 'double predication,' namely, attributing traits that belong to the divinity of Christ and others to that of humanity.<sup>961</sup> But still Eranistes is of the view that Orthodoxos divides Christ into two 'sons.' We find further interesting dialogue taking place between Orthodoxos and Eranistes in response to this 'two-sons' theory. It may be of great help to consider some of the following dialogue taking place between them to understand the anti-Arian preoccupation of Orthodoxos.

“For me it is equally unholy to divide the one son into two and to deny the duality of the natures. Tell me the truth. If someone of the parties of Arius or Eunomius would attempt to belittle the Son when conversing with you and to describe him as less than and inferior to the Father, saying those things which they are accustomed to saying and quoting from the Holy Scripture: ‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me,’ and ‘Now my soul is troubled,’ and other such passages. How would you solve his problems? And would you show that the Son is not diminished by these expressions?”<sup>962</sup>

To this question of Orthodoxos Eranistes reasonably answers avoiding the Arian problem that sometimes the “Scriptures speak ‘theologically’ and at other times ‘economically,’ that is inversely how the Son of God expressed the weaknesses of the flesh at one time but the greatness of the divinity at another.”<sup>963</sup> Again to reach at his estimated answer Orthodoxos goes on compelling him to speak in clear terms. In order to bring out the falsity which Eranistes holds Orthodoxos compels him with further questions. “But if he (the Arian or Eunomian) were to say in answer: ‘And he did not take a soul but only a body, and the divinity united with the body instead of a soul and took on all the things (properties) of the soul,’ with what words would you put an end to his opposition?”<sup>964</sup> To this Eranistes tries to answer with the help of the Scriptures saying that the Logos took both a body and a human soul and he affirms additionally that the soul was rational against the Apollinarian hypothesis. He tries to establish that the soul was rational with the help of the Gospel passages viz., Lk 2, 40 and 2, 52 where we read that the child grew and became strong, filled with wisdom, and the favour of God was upon him. And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and

---

<sup>961</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>962</sup>*Ibid.*, 294.

<sup>963</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>964</sup>*Ibid.*

in favour with God and man.<sup>965</sup> According to Arians and Eunomians the ‘Spirit’ was divinity itself which Jesus committed into the hands of the Father before His last breath; whereas Theodoret claims this spirit of Jesus to be His human soul. Now Orthodoxos is in a position to give the final blow to his opponent as Eranistes formulated his arguments to the satisfaction of Orthodoxos which is also anti-Arian and anti-Apollinarian. Let us come to that logical argument of Theodoret from his quotation:

“But that union and notorious mixture and confusion, you have broken apart mentally not only into two but into three (parts). And you have shown not only the difference of the divinity and the humanity, but have divided the same humanity in two. You show that the soul is one thing and the body another, so no longer two natures (according to your statement) but three natures of our Saviour Jesus Christ are to be recognized.”<sup>966</sup>

This quotation from Theodoret demonstrates not only his dialectical skill but also his theological conviction. He holds that at the face of Arian threat one must constantly and consistently distinguish between the natures and those aspects related to the life of Christ. He observes in the argument of Eranistes the annihilation of natures as he fails to distinguish the natures. Therefore, Theodoret proceeds to prove the need of recognizing two natures in Christ and at the same breath he informs his opponent that he does not divide the two natures in such a way to form two sons in Christ. Instead he finds that his opponent argues to establish three natures in Christ.

Now Theodoret turns to Gospel for further explanation. As a famous Antiochian exegete Theodoret bases all his arguments upon exegetical foundation. In the first dialogue he gives us the initial Scriptural foundation for the entire work. He starts with Jn 1, 14 - ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. This was part of the theme of original florilegium of 431 and later incorporated into *Eranistes*. How does one understand this phrase: ‘the Word became flesh?’ According to him the word flesh does not mean only something external to the Person, rather he understands it as the entire human nature following the biblical language. He tries further to explain the word ‘became.’ Has he used this word ‘became’ in the sense of ‘changed into’ flesh? Here Theodoret is very clear regarding the word meaning and he tells that it does not refer in any way to a change. Therefore we see him giving two options to Eranistes namely, one that is right and the other wrong. He asks Eranistes about his understanding of this change. He asks him whether the phrase ‘became flesh - is considered by him as ‘took flesh’ or ‘was changed into flesh’ (τὸ σάρκα λαβεῖν ἢ τὸ εἰς σάρκα τραπήναι).<sup>967</sup> To these options given by Orthodoxos Eranistes responds with somewhat different answer saying that “He who underwent the change into flesh became flesh, and as I already said, as he knows. And we know that with him all things are possible.”<sup>968</sup> In order to substantiate the point which he holds he cites several supernatural instances like change of the Nile into blood, the change of sea into dry land at creation, and filling the desert with water etc. To this response Orthodoxos again tries to convince him saying that if he became flesh by mutation, then he is no more as he was before. After having checked so many instances of physical unions Orthodoxos postulates that “the

---

<sup>965</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>966</sup>*Ibid.*, 295.

<sup>967</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 296.

<sup>968</sup>*Ibid.*, 296-297.

Word did not ‘become’ but rather ‘took’ human nature and wore it in the economy of the Incarnation.”<sup>969</sup> Eranistes replies to this clarification of Theodoret that it is the teaching of two Sons. In answer to this accusation of Eranistes Theodoret once again makes a study of the attributes of divinity and humanity. Here the dialogue opens with an analysis of *ousia*, *hypostasis*, and *prosopon* in God.<sup>970</sup> Before considering this issue aforesaid he makes sure both he and Eranistes believe that God is of one *ousia* alike Father and Only-Begotten Son and the Holy Spirit.<sup>971</sup> We understand from these repeated interrogations addressed to Eranistes that this topic is one of the main concerns of Theodoret all throughout this work. Having received a positive answer to the question he proceeds further to know Eranistes’ mind clear. He asks what is his understanding of *hypostasis* i.e., whether he considers *hypostasis* anything other than *ousia*. To this Eranistes with the help of Fathers ascertains that “in Christian thought a distinction is made between *ousia* and *hypostasis* for the purpose of stating how God can be one in three, that corresponds to the difference between ‘the common and the particular, the species and the individual.’”<sup>972</sup> And further Eranistes continues telling that the particularizing characteristics or properties namely - the *idia* - of unbegottenness, begottenness, and proceeding, are the ways in which God is three namely, the three hypostaseis. Thus each *hypostasis* or individual has its own *prosopon* which according to Eranistes is incorporeal and not visible or perceptible to human senses.<sup>973</sup> After having made clear Eranistes’ understanding of these terms Orthodoxos advances with his understanding of *hypostasis* and *ousia*. Even though *prosopon* is his favourite term for individuation Orthodoxos employs here the traditional Trinitarian terminology which refers to the three hypostaseis as individuations of God’s *ousia*. Thus for him *hypostasis* and individuality mean the same. According to this understanding whatever is predicated of the divine *physis* is common to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit. According to this logic of Orthodoxos he is able to assert that some terms are common to the Holy Trinity and some peculiar to each *hypostasis*. And finally he compels Eranistes to profess whether the term ‘immutable’ is common to the *ousia* or peculiar to the *hypostasis*. To this Eranistes has no other alternative other than conceding to the idea that ‘immutable’ is common to the *ousia*. If then the term ‘immutable’ applies to the *ousia* of the Holy Trinity, the Only-Begotten Son is also immutable without doubt argues Orthodoxos. This recognition of the term by Eranistes gives the first and basic triumph to Theodoret.

Then he proceeds to the other problems in the argument of Eranistes that, “if God has truly changed into flesh, He cannot be called God anymore.”<sup>974</sup> To this argument of Orthodoxos Eranistes finds again his inconsistent argument stating that “I have said many times that he became flesh not according to change, but remaining what he was, he became what he was not.”<sup>975</sup> To this somewhat confusing statement of Eranistes, Orthodoxos tries to bring him to the only option for a clear understanding of Jn 1, 14: “unless he became flesh by taking flesh, he became flesh by change (Εἰ μὴ γὰρ σὰρκα

<sup>969</sup>Clayton, Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 220.

<sup>970</sup>Cf. Ettliger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 63-65.

<sup>971</sup>Cf. Clayton, Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 221.

<sup>972</sup>Ibid.

<sup>973</sup>Cf. ibid.

<sup>974</sup>Stewardson, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 297.

<sup>975</sup>Ibid.



λαβῶν ἐγένετο σὰρξ, τραπείς ἐγένετο σὰρξ).<sup>976</sup> As Eranistes is adamant not to accept the notion of ‘taking’ after the elucidations adopted by Orthodoxos, instead adhering only to his literal wording of the text, Orthodoxos initiates a new exploration of the Scriptural interpretation in order to convince him. He proceeds to clarify what he meant by the phrase ‘the Word became flesh.’ For Theodoret ‘the Word became flesh’ is same as ‘Word taking flesh.’ So if we want to understand this ‘taking’ according to Theodoret we may have to rely upon a number of exegeses. He depends upon various passages in the Bible to understand the terminology ‘taking’ namely Jn 1, 14, Hebrews 2, 16 and Philippians 2, 7. Let us take each of these texts one by one. In the epistle to the Hebrews we read “for truly he did not take (ἐπιλαμβάνεται) from angels, but he took (ἐπιλαμβάνεται) from the seed of Abraham.”<sup>977</sup> First Orthodoxos takes up the issue of clarifying what is meant by ‘the seed of Abraham.’ He utilizes the term ‘the seed of Abraham’ to signify the complete humanity of Christ. According to Eranistes “what is proper to Abraham is proper to the seed of Abraham (i.e. Christ) except for sin, for ‘Christ did not sin.’”<sup>978</sup> Thus Orthodoxos is able to convince him that Christ like Abraham had a rational soul and body or a full human *physis*. But the word human *physis* raises again in him the doubt that when someone predicates a ‘human *physis*’ of Christ is it not to put forward the theory of ‘two sons.’<sup>979</sup> So in answer to this doubt raised by Eranistes Orthodoxos says clearly that the assumed humanity may be called Son of God only by virtue of the *prosopic* union. Thus Clayton tells “the assumed humanity or human being of Theodoret’s *prosopic* union is not a son of God in his own right and certainly not the Son of God, who is the Word.”<sup>980</sup> Thereafter he turns immediately to his favourite terminology ‘the Word took (ἔλαβεν) flesh.’<sup>981</sup> In explaining it he tries to find a relation between the epistle to Philippians text 2, 7 with the Johannine passage: he emptied himself taking (λαβῶν) the form of a servant.<sup>982</sup> Together with the theme of ‘taking’ found in Philippians, utilizing the text of John, he establishes that the form of God and the form of humanity there referred mean nothing other than the real and full divine and human *physis* in the Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>983</sup> Thereafter Orthodoxos makes an attempt to bring Eranistes to his key term namely ‘taking.’ He finds sufficient proof for his incarnational language in the Gospels namely God taking the human Jesus into relationship with Himself. Let us put it this way: “God is explained as the one who assumed or took and the humanity is the one who was assumed or taken.”<sup>984</sup> So instead of the classical doctrine of Alexandrians viz., ‘Logos became flesh,’ Theodoret coins the new Antiochian term i.e., ‘He took flesh.’ According to the Antiochian Theodoret the word ‘became’ can be interpreted only as ‘according to appearance’ ... And by appearance the Antiochians do not mean that “the Logos did not take real flesh, but that He did not ‘become flesh.’”<sup>985</sup> By this statement the Antiochians do not deny the reality of the

---

<sup>976</sup>Ibid.

<sup>977</sup>Ibid., 298.

<sup>978</sup>Ettlinger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 69.

<sup>979</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>980</sup>Clayton, Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 225.

<sup>981</sup>Cf. Stewardson, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 298.

<sup>982</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>983</sup>Cf. Clayton, Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 226.

<sup>984</sup>Stewardson, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 298.

<sup>985</sup>Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies, 182.

Incarnation rather they would resist the notion that in the incarnation the Logos was deprived of His divine nature.<sup>986</sup> Now it becomes easier for Orthodoxos to connect this idea with the idea of Jn 1, 14. In Jn 1, 14 he finds the idea of God dwelling in the manhood of Christ. He argues that from the Johannine vocabulary his argument is made clear with the phrase “dwelt or tabernacled among (or in) us (ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν).”<sup>987</sup> Having cleared his notion regarding the nature of Logos in man Jesus, he proceeds with the help of other metaphors from the Bible to ascertain that ‘Logos took flesh’ namely: σκηνή (tent or tabernacle), ναός (temple), and ἁγία (sanctuary) and καταπέτασμα (curtain or screen). He understands the Gospel of John and the epistle to the Hebrews in such a way that “the humanity of Christ is symbolized as a temple or tabernacle in which the Divine resides.”<sup>988</sup> Besides relying upon a citation from Athanasius letter to Epictetus he adds that “it is not because he was turned into flesh, but because he took flesh on our behalf that he is said to have been made flesh.”<sup>989</sup> Let us also refer to a citation taken from his florilegium given by Flavianus of Antioch in order to authenticate his argument. “The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us; he is not turned into flesh, nor yet did he cease from being God, for this he was from all eternity and became flesh in the dispensation of the Incarnation after himself building his own temple, and taking up his abode in the passible offspring.”<sup>990</sup> Another interesting phrase of Apollinarius he uses in order to convince him of the immutability of the Word at this juncture: “not even Apollinarius was willing to say that the Word became flesh by a change of his divine *physis*, but rather that in the ‘synthesis’ of the Word and (mindless) flesh which is the incarnate Christ, the Word empties himself, ‘not by undergoing change, but by investiture.’”<sup>991</sup> With these various concepts made use from the Bible and some theologians he is able to ascertain for certain his or Antiochian formula of the distinction between divine and human natures. For he tells

“that which dwells in a tabernacle is other than the tabernacle which is dwelled in. But the evangelist called his flesh the tabernacle (σκηνήν) and said that God the Word dwelled in it (σκηνώσαι). For the Word, he says became flesh and dwelled in us. But indeed, we have been taught that he dwelled in flesh. For the evangelist himself in another place called his body a temple.”<sup>992</sup>

From this understanding of the incarnation as a dwelling in human nature he is able to interpret the phrase ἐν ἡμῖν (Jn 1, 14) as ‘in us,’ or ‘in human nature.’ To substantiate this argument he makes use of the quotations from Jn 2, 19 and 2, 21 where we read “destroy this temple (ναόν) and in three days I will raise it up ... he spoke of the temple of his body (τοῦ ναοῦ σώματος).”<sup>993</sup> He identifies the term σκηνή which is used in his Commentary on Hebrews (which is found in the eighth<sup>994</sup> and ninth<sup>995</sup>

<sup>986</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 183.

<sup>987</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 298.

<sup>988</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>989</sup>Cited from Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 227 referring to Athanasius letter to Epictetus.

<sup>990</sup>Cited from Ettlinger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 93 referring to *Florilegium I*: 4 (PG 83, 77).

<sup>991</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 107 referring to *Florilegium I*: 62-8 (PG 83, 100).

<sup>992</sup>Cited from Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 299 referring to PG 83, 320; the same idea is expressed in various texts: in PG 83,72 he juxtaposes the term σκηνώω with ναός and in PG 83, 321 he makes use of the idea of indwelling human nature.

<sup>993</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>994</sup>Cf. Heb 8, 2.

chapters of Hebrews) with the ἐσκήνωσεν in John 1, 14. He says that the term in Heb 9, 11 is a clear allusion to the body of Christ: “Ἐνταῦθα σκηνὴν ἀχειροποίητον τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν ἐκάλεσεν ἢ ἀνέλαβεν ὁ Δεσπότης χριστός.”<sup>996</sup> In the same way he finds also relationship of ἡ σκηνή with τὰ ἅγια.<sup>997</sup> When we get acquainted with the terminology of the Antiochians we understand that their reference to God dwelling in the ‘temple’ or in a ‘tabernacle’ is a common image for the incarnation.<sup>998</sup> It is worth commending the combination Theodoret finds between the terminologies ‘taking’ and ‘dwelling in’ in order to clarify the phrase in Jn 1, 14 ‘the Word became flesh.’ Theodoret exhorts everyone to consider the text of the gospel in its entirety. According to him the phrase ‘the Word became flesh’ is completed only with the next phrase namely, ‘and dwelt among us.’ He interprets this taking of flesh from us as a kind of temple and as a result he is said to have become flesh. Therefore in the interpretation of the bishop of Cyrus the divinity of Christ remained invariably unchanged.<sup>999</sup>

Let us also deal with some more terminologies which he employs in order to clarify his ideas on the immutability of the natures. He makes use of the term ‘curtain’ of the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>1000</sup> He prefers the word παραπέτασμα instead of καταπέτασμα. Theodoret holds that Christ’s visible nature namely, his humanity, is presented as a curtain. Orthodoxos observes that the author of Hebrews speaks figuratively of Christ’s flesh as the ‘curtain of the sanctuary’ or the ‘holy of holies.’ Theodoret explains that this curtain is nothing other than that which encloses God’s invisible nature and through which God manifests himself.<sup>1001</sup> This image of curtain leads him further to use the traditional term ‘clothing’ or ‘investing himself with’ human nature for the incarnation. He is indebted for such a term to the Old Testament prophecies in which we find the human nature as identified with a ‘robe’ or ‘garment.’<sup>1002</sup> At times we find him also using imagery like ‘divine nature being clad with human nature: “ἀνθρωπείαν περικείμενος φύσιν.”<sup>1003</sup> We may doubt whether such a term has a docetic meaning in his teaching. But Theodoret who knew very well the problems included in a docetic teaching, that is, excluding a human soul to the human nature, asserts without ceasing that the ‘flesh’ or human nature includes body and a rational soul.<sup>1004</sup> It may be helpful for us to get acquainted with another vocabulary which he uses for the incarnation or for the earthly Christ. The word ‘divine glory’ (δόξα) is employed by Theodoret for the incarnate Christ. This idea is very well clear from the text given below:

“For after he said, ‘the Word became flesh,’ he continued, ‘and dwelt among us’: that is, using the flesh taken from us as a kind of temple, he is to have become flesh. And teaching that he remained unchanged, he continued: ‘And we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.’ For

<sup>995</sup>Cf. Heb 9, 2-8, 11.

<sup>996</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 299.

<sup>997</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 328 (The loci in Hebrews are 8, 2; 9, 2; 9, 6; 9, 9-11).

<sup>998</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 300.

<sup>999</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1000</sup>Cf. Heb 10, 19-21.

<sup>1001</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 300.

<sup>1002</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 301.

<sup>1003</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1004</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

also having been invested with flesh, he showed his paternal nobility, and sent out rays (ἄκτινας) of divinity, and discharged the splendour (τὴν αἴγλην) of the Lordly power, revealing the hidden nature by his wonderful works.”<sup>1005</sup>

Again we may raise the doubt that by using ‘divine glory’ to the incarnated Christ which is one of the attributes of resurrection bodies of Christ and believers, has he fallen into the peril of docetism? We can say definitely it is not the case as he uses the term glory in resurrection narratives and incarnation narratives in different ways depending upon different sources. When he applies the term ‘glory’ to the resurrection bodies he depends upon the Pauline passages<sup>1006</sup> whereas when he speaks of ‘glory’ of the incarnate Christ he draws it from the imagery of the Johannine prologue. The author of *Eranistes* and *Graecarum affectionum curatio* repeats that there is nothing related to docetism or elements of it implied in his terminology. The quotation from the same author asserts once again without doubt that the two natures in Christ remain ever distinct. “We beheld, he says, ‘his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.’ For the covering of flesh did not dim the rays of his divinity, but also by putting this on, it was clear who he was and from whom he received his radiance.”<sup>1007</sup> The below given quotation may help us to affirm that there is nothing related to docetism in his teaching.

“For when he said, ‘the Word became flesh and dwelt in us,’ he added immediately, ‘and we beheld his glory ...’ But if, according to the ignorant, he underwent a change into flesh, he did not remain what he was. But if when he was concealed in the flesh, he sent out rays of his Father’s nobility, he has the nature which is certainly immutable, and it shines also in the body and sends out flashings of the invisible nature ... For the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it ... when he dwelled in us he did not dim the glory of his nature ... But if having become flesh, it was clear who he was, then he remained just who He was, and did not undergo the change into flesh.”<sup>1008</sup>

His concern is always evident in his work to hold both the true humanity of Christ and the inviolable nature of the incarnate Word. To cite one example for this caution let us see how he interprets the passage in Philippians 2, 5-8. In interpreting it he is cautious to remove any likelihood of a docetic conjecture from the phrase ‘born in the likeness of men,’ and ‘the form of a servant’ and ‘the form of God.’ He establishes that what was taken was not the ‘likeness of man’ but the ‘nature of man.’ According to him “the form of a servant is the nature of a servant just as the form of God is considered the nature of God.”<sup>1009</sup> We must also keep in mind at this occasion that although both Alexandrians and Antiochians made use of the letter to the Hebrews, today it is said that the Antiochian’s double predication seems to be more in line or in harmony than their opponent. R. A. Greer expresses the nature of Hebrews in the following words: “in the letter to the Hebrews perhaps more than anywhere else in the New Testament, we are given a double judgment concerning Christ’s person. He is the reflection of God’s glory, yet he was made like his brothers in all things.”<sup>1010</sup> As an Antiochian Theodoret was also very much influenced by the letter to the Hebrews due to its double application in redemption. Especially in *Eranistes* he appeals to this letter to

<sup>1005</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1006</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 302 in reference to Ep. 145 (Rom 8, 17, 30; 1 Cor 15, 40-43; Phil 3, 21).

<sup>1007</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1008</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1009</sup>Ibid., 303.

<sup>1010</sup>R. A. Greer, *Antiochene Exegesis of Hebrews*, Diss., Yale 1965, 343 (cf. 52-55, 142-143, 152-153 etc).

clarify the theme of redemption. Antiochians generally interpret Christ as one who truly takes part in the weaknesses of his fellow human beings with the exception of sin. They stressed always the same point that God who remained impassible gained man's redemption through his human nature.<sup>1011</sup>

Having seen a few texts from the New Testament let us also analyze some texts from the Old Testament to make his thought patterns clear. We can say that he utilizes the text purely from Christological point of view. His concern is the same as the New Testament writers, namely, to set up a rapport between Jesus and the history of Israel in the Old Testament. By finding such a rapport he is able to confirm once and forever his distinctive Christology. Thus his starting point is a scrutinizing of Old Testament prophecies and typological anticipations of Christ regarding Jesus' ancestry. Consequently he tries to find out the relation between Hebrews 2, 16, that is, 'from the seed of Abraham' with that of Old Testament. Depending upon a typological method he finds an argument for the true humanity of Christ, which according to him, is reflected in all the Old Testament passages. While he passes through various texts of OT he never loses sight of God's immutable nature in his applications. After having made his appeal to the nature of Christ taken from the seed of Abraham he comes to an Old Testament passage of Micah 5, 2 "Out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting."<sup>1012</sup> Depending upon this and various other texts in the OT Eranistes immediately suggests that it was God who was born in Bethlehem. But Orthodoxos corrects him saying not only God but also man. He gives further clarification to his thought saying "on the one hand, man as having come forth from Judah according to the flesh and having been born in Bethlehem, on the other, God as existing before the ages."<sup>1013</sup> Hence we can be sure that Theodoret is typical in his dualistic way of interpretation of the natures of the person of Christ. Let us also have recourse to one more Old Testament passage which is very important for us to understand his Christological view points, namely, Isaiah 11, 1-9. Here the king who is prophesied to come from the Davidic line and who is depicted with a long list of ideal characteristics is no one else other than Christ according to Theodoret, to whom he applies these various characteristics to His divine or human natures respectively.<sup>1014</sup> We find always such an application to two natures in Christ in the works of Theodoret. In Dialogue II Theodoret explains how the term 'Mediator' (μεσίτης) embraces both divinity and humanity. Against this argument of Theodoret Eranistes reminds him of the danger in considering 'mediator' as a Christological term as it contains only humanity. The reason behind this statement of Eranistes is that the same term is used also for Moses who was only a man. To this argument of Eranistes Orthodoxos makes the counter-argument saying that Moses was only a type (τύπος) for Christ and consequently did not hold all the elements of truth. Theodoret gives added clarification saying that he was only a type for Christ's human nature. In the words of Orthodoxos we have the clarification for this accusation raised by Eranistes. "That one (Moses) was a type of the truth. And the

<sup>1011</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 303 (PG 82, 244-245, 325; the other passages which the author of *Eranistes* refers in order to substantiate his argument are Heb 2, 11-13; 4, 15).

<sup>1012</sup>Ibid., 304.

<sup>1013</sup>Ibid., 305.

<sup>1014</sup>Cf. Theodoret von Kyros, *Kommentar zu Jesaja Mitteilungen des Septuaginta - Unternehmens*. 5 (trans. A. Möhle, Akademie der Wissenschaften), Göttingen 1932, 171.

type does not have all such (qualities) that the truth (has). On account of this, that one (Moses) was not God by nature, but still he was named God in order that he might fulfill the type.”<sup>1015</sup> After having cleared the doubts raised by Eranistes he advances to the explanation regarding the true nature of archetype. “The true archetype (ἀρχέτυπον) must be equally God and man.”<sup>1016</sup> Not being satisfied with the clarification given by the author of *Eranistes* the opponent still finds some counter-arguments. His doubt is very logical. He asks if Moses does not possess the characteristics of the archetype how can he be qualified as a type? To this question Theodoret tries to lead his opponent to admit the fact that the imperial images are truly images of the emperor. Employing the word εἰκών in place of τύπος but with the same meaning he expresses: “an image does not possess the vital and rational traits of the emperor himself.”<sup>1017</sup> To make clear his methodology that Old Testament types validate a dyophysite Christology even if they do not in the strict sense correlate with them, he depends upon one more figure namely Melchizedek. Melchizedek is a personality who appears often in the letter to the Hebrews. Using this personality Orthodoxos educates his foe about the contradictions included in the type (τύπος). He himself exposes the contradiction included in this type in order to convince his opponent. The contradiction is that “although Melchizedek was ‘begotten’ as a human being, his lack of parents allies him with the divine nature which has no parentage or point of beginning. The Lord Christ is the archetype of Melchizedek in those things exceeding the human nature.”<sup>1018</sup> Relying upon this personality Orthodoxos goes further with a question: “How can Melchizedek be a legitimate type of Christ’s divinity, if he is not truly divine himself?”<sup>1019</sup> To this question raised by Orthodoxos he himself finds the answer: “If he was truly without father and without mother, he was not the image but the truth. But since he does not have things by nature but according to the economy of Holy Scripture, he shows the type of truth.”<sup>1020</sup> He educates his foe with certain phrases like ‘image of God in man’ with the answer saying that there is a great disparity between the image and the archetypal reality-God.<sup>1021</sup> It may be useful for us to employ perhaps one more example from his Dialogue III regarding this issue namely how Old Testament types (τύποι) legitimately uphold his understanding of Christology. He makes use of the story of Abraham and Isaac. This discussion, which is taking place between Orthodoxos and Eranistes, may give us the idea regarding the contradiction between the two theologies these two schools are holding. Eranistes holds “Isaac as the type for the death and resurrection of ‘God the Word.’ According to him it was the divine voice which brought him back to life.”<sup>1022</sup> Let us also hearken to the idea given by Orthodoxos:

“But a ram was seen hanging from a tree and showing the image of the cross, it underwent the sacrifice instead of the boy. But if this is a type of the truth, and in the type the only-begotten son did not undergo the sacrifice, but a ram was substituted and laid on the altar, and it fulfilled the mystery of the sacrifice, why

<sup>1015</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 306.

<sup>1016</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1017</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1018</sup>Ibid., 307.

<sup>1019</sup>Ibid., 306-7.

<sup>1020</sup>Ibid., 307.

<sup>1021</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1022</sup>Ibid.

then do you not once assign the passion to the flesh and declare the impassibility of the divinity?"<sup>1023</sup>

From this definition of Theodoret he arrives at the conclusion that the distinction between natures implied in the OT type (or image) does not correspond accurately to the natures of Christ which remain different but not separate. "For we proclaim such a union of divinity and humanity as to understand one undivided person and to know the same (to be) God and man ..."<sup>1024</sup> Finally he also makes use of the example of two goats for the sacrifice in the OT. According to OT practice the one goat may be sacrificed and the other let go. Theodoret makes use of this example also to compare with the two natures of Christ, one which suffers and the other which remains impassible. But at the same moment he reminds his opponent not to be mistaken with these two goats as representing two πρόσωπα in Christ.<sup>1025</sup> Thus depending upon various examples taken both from N.T and O.T he establishes that the divine did not turn into flesh rather it took to itself the flesh and thus the divine remained immutable.

### C. The Unconfused Union of the Two Natures (Dialogue II)

After having established the immutability of the Word he tries to analyze the complex problem which Orthodoxos finds as essential and as a logical flow from the first. If the divine remained immutable how could there take place a union without the dissolution of the other? This question he discusses in the second dialogue and establishes that the union of the two physeis namely God and humanity in Christ is united in an unconfused way. He terms this unconfused union by the term ἀσύγχυτος.<sup>1026</sup> Here the author of *Eranistes* tries to prove that "the Word as divine *hypostasis* remains what he is, immutable God, and that he has assumed to himself in the Incarnation a real, full, actual humanity which remains what humanity is."<sup>1027</sup> His concern here in this dialogue is to assert the unadulterated humanity of Christ. According to him the union between both natures in no way takes away their distinctiveness and thus not confused into each other. He is certain that his humanity remained unalloyed throughout the ministry, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ. The word 'ἔνωσις'<sup>1028</sup> which is used by Theodoret in his *Eranistes* for union in Christ, does not indicate any change. Without doubt we can say his favourite term is ἔνωσις and not συνάφεια or σχέσις which were used by Nestorius. Theodoret does not go into the detail to find out that 'when' does the union of God and man take place. He finds the motive of this union as the love of God for man. We have ample proof for it in his *Eranistes*.<sup>1029</sup> As he acknowledged the term Theotokos in the early 430's it is no more an issue for him. He believes that at the time of Christ's conception there took place the divine-human union.

<sup>1023</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1024</sup>Ibid., 308.

<sup>1025</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1026</sup>Cf. Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 229.

<sup>1027</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1028</sup>Cf. Sellers, *Pseudo-Justin's Expositio rectae fidei*- a work of Theodoret of Cyrus, 152, 156: though he has other words like συνάφεια, and ἐνοίκησις indicating this unconfused union he prefers ἔνωσις. In his *Rephrehensio* Theodoret criticized Cyril for his attack upon Nestorius for the use of συνάφεια. In his *Exposition rectae fidei* his predilected term is ἔνωσις (κατ' ἄκραν ἔνωσιν).

<sup>1029</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 309.

Let us go into the detail how he understands this union implied in the phrase ‘the Word became flesh.’ He depends upon various analogies from nature to explain it. Let us deal with them one by one. First of all he observes that when there is a change of substance it accompanies with a change of name. For example when sand is heated to a particular degree it becomes glass. He instructs us that the sand which was formerly so called is no more known after its former name. In the second analogy he studies the grapes. When grapes are pressed it loses its first shape and the juice which comes out of it changes its name to wine. Again when this same wine is reserved for a few years it is no longer called wine but vinegar. In the third place he makes a study on rock. According to him the rock which is burned or broken up is not any longer rock but lime or gypsum.<sup>1030</sup> After having observed these changes from the natures he asserts categorically that such a change can in no way be applied to the union of manhood and divinity in Christ. He finds a reason against the application of such a union due to the reason of losing its former state. He says that no one can speak any more of God or of man, “for the change of name goes with the change of nature.”<sup>1031</sup> Another obstacle he finds in this application is the difference between the divinity and flesh. In the physical changes which are mentioned above there remains a certain level of kinship to the previous state of being even after their change to another substance. But he tells without doubt that in no way we can apply this sort of a change to the person of Christ due to their boundless difference. The two realms to which His natures belong are of a great and vast difference. Consequently “the change is too great for any kinship with His previous state of being to remain.”<sup>1032</sup> In the next phase he probes into the possibility of finding another category of analogies to apply to the union of divinity and flesh basing on the argument of Eranistes. The opponent of Theodoret argues that in Christ ‘the divinity remained but that the humanity was swallowed up by it.’ To this argument of Eranistes Orthodoxos asks him back how the ‘simple and uncompounded’ nature of divinity could join with the flesh of Jesus. In answer to it Eranistes finds so many analogies from the nature. According to him it has taken place exactly “like the sea receiving a drop of honey. For this drop is soon gone, being mixed with the water of the sea.”<sup>1033</sup> Orthodoxos cannot accept this argument as it contains lot of weakness due to its qualitative difference between God and creation. For Orthodoxos says that

“the sea and the drop of honey are different in quantity, though alike in quality (poioteti); the one is greatest, the other is least; the one is sweet and the other is bitter; but in all other respects you will find a very close relationship. The nature (*physis*) of both is moist, liquid and fluid. Both are created. Both are lifeless yet each alike is called a body. There is nothing then absurd in these cognate natures undergoing commixture (*krasin*), and in the one being made to disappear by the other. In the case before us, on the contrary, the difference is infinite, and so great that no figure of the reality can be found. I will, however, endeavour to point out to you several instances of substances which are mixed without being confounded, and remain unimpaired.”<sup>1034</sup>

---

<sup>1030</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1031</sup>*Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>1032</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1033</sup>*Ibid.*, 311.

<sup>1034</sup>Ettlinger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 143-44.



After having disposed and showed the inapplicability of such an analogy Orthodoxos proposes some other unions or mixtures which remain different even if mixed. One of such analogies is that of light which passes through atmosphere. He states that even if the light leaves at darkness, the atmosphere remains alone. And secondly there is the example of iron that is put in fire.<sup>1035</sup> Against this Eranistes argues that the iron could be completely changed into fire. But Orthodoxos reminds him of the fact although it seems as fire it is still considered by the blacksmith as iron and treats it as such on his anvil. In the words of Orthodoxos “then the conjunction with the fire did not spoil the nature of the iron. If then there is an unconfused mixture to be found in bodies, then it is clearly madness to conceive a confusion in the unmixed and unchangeable nature, and a disappearance of the nature which was assumed.”<sup>1036</sup> The favourite analogy of Theodoret, namely, the union of body and soul in man is also made use in order to explain the Christological union. He distinguishes between the difference of a ‘natural union’ which involves only created natures and the ‘union of divine and human natures’ in Christ which are qualitatively or categorically different. He uses still this simile due to its particularities. Although it takes place only on a natural level, its constituents remain intact while being firmly united.<sup>1037</sup> If we check thoroughly the analogy of fire and iron we understand that the thrust of Theodoret is placed upon the distinction between the natures in against the analogy of a drop of honey in the sea where both loses its identity. The Analogy of honey as Eranistes stated namely “Like the sea receiving a drop of honey, for straightway the drop, as it mingles with the ocean’s water, disappears,”<sup>1038</sup> finds Theodoret negative consequences in it. At the same time his concern is to convince his foe that the distinction between the natures in no way implies a disjunction of the natures joined together. Although Theodoret tries to convince him of the unconfused union Eranistes suspects always duality in Christ or two sons in his interpretation. His monophysitic faith in Christ is very clear for us from the conspicuously expressed statements: “Whoever contemplates two natures in Christ, divides the one Only-begotten into two sons.”<sup>1039</sup> Once again the bishop of Cyrus brings down his enemy with his logical conclusions which runs so: “Therefore, he who also says that Paul is of a soul and a body declares that the one is two Pauls.”<sup>1040</sup> To this conclusion of Theodoret Eranistes rejoins saying that the example was unfair. Thus Theodoret approves the unsuitability of his analogy applied here and proceeds to the famous statement “that the natural union of body and soul in Paul is different from the union of qualitatively different divine and human natures in Christ which is based upon approval, love and grace: τὸ ὅλον εὐδοκίας ἐστὶ, καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ χάριτος.”<sup>1041</sup> His analogy brings forth the most solid proof for the unconfused and intact union of both natures. His main concern all throughout his work is for the safeguarding of the integrity of the divine and human natures and yet maintaining the union between

<sup>1035</sup>Cf. *ibid* (cf. H. A. Wolfson, *The philosophy of the Church Fathers*, Vol. I: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation, Cambridge<sup>2</sup>1964, 372-386).

<sup>1036</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 312.

<sup>1037</sup>Cf. *ibid*.

<sup>1038</sup>Ettlinger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 143.

<sup>1039</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 313.

<sup>1040</sup>*Ibid*.

<sup>1041</sup>*Ibid*.

them.<sup>1042</sup> Not being satisfied with any of these answers given by Theodoret Eranistes asks further whether Jesus the Christ is to be called a human being or God. To this question of Eranistes Orthodoxos answers that He is both: “by neither name alone, but by both. For God the Word, having been incarnated, has been named Jesus Christ ... But before the incarnation he was named God, Son of God, Only-Begotten, Lord, divine Word, and Creator ... But after the Incarnation he was named Jesus Christ.”<sup>1043</sup>

Although his analogy of body-soul unity is superior to that of drop of honey in the sea and the time-worn image of heated iron, we have to admit also that it has its own limitations. M. Richard is of the view that a body-soul unity analogy is more akin to a Word-flesh Christological scheme similar to that of Apollinaris.<sup>1044</sup> Another limitation of his analogy of the body-soul from the anthropological view is that it is the soul who suffers whereas the divinity does not. Modern theologian like K. Barth is of the opinion that body-soul analogy is an insufficient phrase for the union in Christ. In his opinion it is something peculiar or unique that our common language is insufficient. He also points out that this analogy does not give clear evidence for the preponderance of the divinity and the dependence of the humanity upon it.<sup>1045</sup> According to Grillmeier this analogy of Theodoret is too symmetrically built a system that it is not clearly aligned or pointed to the *hypostasis* of the Logos.<sup>1046</sup> Theodoret is not ready to accept the argument of Eranistes that “Christ was of two natures, but I do not say that there are two natures.”<sup>1047</sup> Here it seems Theodoret misses the argument of Eranistes or the Alexandrian argument namely, the insistence upon the idea that “Christ is one *physis* is that he is one being, the one *hypostasis* of the Word, who has taken human life and existence and limitation up into his own life.”<sup>1048</sup> Even in the face of all these criticism we have to admit a fact that in Theodoret’s interpretation the divine nature is always predominant in the sense that this union is initiated by the love and grace of the divine nature. Even if we criticize it as a symmetrical or parallel Christological union, still we have to admit one fact in his Christology that in his interpretation Christ remains a true human being and God does not become part of the world. It may help us to understand when we study the question raised by Eranistes to Orthodoxos that what is the compelling or the motive force behind Theodoret’s use of both ‘human’ as well as ‘God’ after incarnation? He tells that he attributes a real and full human nature to the Lord Christ after the union signified by naming him ‘human’ as well as ‘God’ precisely with a motive that to refute the heresies called Gnosticism, Arianism, and Apollinarism.<sup>1049</sup>

It may not be complete in this section if we avoid the end product of this union in Theodoret. Does he teach a *tertium quid* like earlier heresiarchs or has he some uniqueness in presenting a new Christology from the union of God and man in Christ? We have already said that he was consistent in his terminologies. Here also he is

---

<sup>1042</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1043</sup>Ettlinger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 114.

<sup>1044</sup>Cf. M. Richard, L’introduction du mot ‘hypostase’ dans la théologie de l’incarnation, in: MSR 2 (1945), 262.

<sup>1045</sup>Cf. K. Barth, Die Kirchliche Dogmatik, Bd. IV/2, Die Lehre Von der Versöhnung, Zollikon-Zürich 1955, 56, 58-64.

<sup>1046</sup>Cf. A. Grillmeier, Die theologische und sprachliche Vorbereitung der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon, in: A. Grillmeier und H. Bacht, Hg., CGG, Bd. I, Würzburg 1951, 189.

<sup>1047</sup>Ettlinger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 134.

<sup>1048</sup>Cited from Clayton, Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 232 referring to the Alexandrian view on *physis*.

<sup>1049</sup>Cf. Ettlinger, Theodoret of Cyrus 117-118.

consistent in his work *Eranistes* with the term πρόσωπον for the person of Christ.<sup>1050</sup> He uses it consistently for a ‘person’ for a concrete historical individual. He uses this term for the person of Christ as the bearer of both divine and human attributes. He does not prefer to name this person either ‘one nature’ or simply ‘God’ according to his higher nature as Eranistes prefers.<sup>1051</sup> Together with this term ‘πρόσωπον’ he also prefers the term ‘Christ’ for Jesus, as it comprises the totality of his significance. “After the incarnation, God the Word is called Christ. Therefore, this name receives everything, all the properties of the divinity and all the properties of the humanity. But we recognize certain properties of this nature and certain properties of that nature.”<sup>1052</sup> A further clarification which he gives to the word Christ may help us to grasp its significance in his work: “the name ‘Christ’ in the case of our Lord and Saviour indicates the Word which became man. The (name) ‘Emmanuel,’ ‘God with us,’ indicates God and man. But the name ‘God’ the ‘Word,’ thus spoken, signifies the simple nature before the world, beyond time, incorporeal.”<sup>1053</sup> His notion of Christ is entirely different from that of Eranistes. Orthodoxos accuses Eranistes who holds that Christ is a *physis* out of two as a confusion or σύγχυσις, of deity and humanity into a third kind of being, or the swallowing up of the latter in the former.<sup>1054</sup> In answer to this false teaching of Eranistes we have the classical response from the part of Orthodoxos: “One Son of God I both know and adore, the Lord Jesus Christ; but I have been taught the difference between his deity and his humanity.”<sup>1055</sup> Let us also check a few more names in the usage of Theodoret in order to understand him better regarding the person of Christ. He uses terms like, ‘Lord,’ the ‘one Son,’ and the ‘Mediator.’<sup>1056</sup> He is not worried about the psychological unity of Christ. He does not get into an issue like how the two natures operate together in the mind of Christ. That was not a concern of 5<sup>th</sup> cent., in which he lived. Let us also consider further his thought regarding the divine and human attributes in Christ. Sometimes we find him using simply θεός and ἄνθρωπος for the two natures.<sup>1057</sup> We also see terms like θεότης and ἀνθρωπότης as being used very often by him.<sup>1058</sup> In some other passages we find also terms like τὰ θεῖα and τὰ ἀνθρώπινα for the two natures.<sup>1059</sup> In some other passages terms like τὴν θείαν φύσιν and φύσιν ἀνθρωπείαν τέλειαν are also used.<sup>1060</sup> Sometimes the word σάρξ, that is, the biblical designation for human nature is also used when he refers to the Scriptural passage containing the term.<sup>1061</sup> The use of ‘concrete terms’ do not occur any more in his *Eranistes* for humanity. In his earlier

<sup>1050</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 315 (PG 82, 148, 257, 260, 277 etc. are a few examples for Theodoret’s consistent use of it).

<sup>1051</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1052</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1053</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1054</sup>Cf. Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 232.

<sup>1055</sup>Ettlinger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 135.

<sup>1056</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 315 (PG 82, 273, 328, 121: the terms like ‘one Prosonon,’ ‘one Son,’ and ‘Christ’ Theodoret uses also in the third counter-anathema to Cyril of 431 A. D.).

<sup>1057</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 316 (PG 82, 233, 252, 261, 324, 333 [Except in the fourth PG 83, 324 C-D] Theodoret speaks always of Christ as the one who underwent suffering ὡς ἄνθρωπος and not ὡς θεός) (cf. G. Kittel und G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. I, Stuttgart 1969, 365-67).

<sup>1058</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 316; cf. G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961, 141-142.

<sup>1059</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 315.

<sup>1060</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1061</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

works written before 432 A. D., he employed terms like ‘the assumed man,’ ‘the visible man,’ and ‘the man taken from the race of David.’ These all terms were used with the intention of upholding or safeguarding the humanity of Christ from his enemies but which would also give an indication of humanity in Christ separated from the divinity.

It is observed by many theologians that *Eranistes* contains more abstract terminologies than concrete terms. The distinguishing factor between *Eranistes* and the earlier works of Theodoret is the use of abstract and concrete terms. In his earlier works he makes use of both concrete and abstract terms<sup>1062</sup> where as in *Eranistes* he utilizes only abstract terms. The use of abstract terms in no way must compel us to think that the human element in Christ is something abstract to the exclusion of an individual human being rather he gives adequate stress to both human and divine in Christ. Theodoret tries to express his thought above all in the categories of natures and essences. He is particular that the union in Christ must in no way confuse the two natures rather remaining as divine and human they must retain their unique characteristics. This is the reason why we find him attributing to each nature what it belongs. One may call this sort of an attribution as ‘double predication’ which is peculiar to Antiochian theologians. We must be cautious to think only in terms of one Christ with two categorically different sets of characteristics if we want to fall in line with the Antiochians. In this way Theodoret is able to uphold God’s unique impassible nature and thus do justice to the fullness of Christ’s human qualities. It may be helpful for us to check some of his quotations in order to get convinced of this idea:

“At one time he [the Lord] honours his mother as the one who bore him, at another time he rebukes her as Lord. At one time, he approves those who call him Son of David, at another he teaches those who do not know that he is not only son but Lord of David. On the one hand, he calls Nazareth and Capernaum his native country. On the other hand again he cries: ‘Before Abraham was, I am.’ And you will find the divine Scripture full of many of these things. And these things are not of one nature, but very clearly of two.”<sup>1063</sup>

Towards the end of the second dialogue namely on the unconfused union of the two natures we will come to the realization of a certain fact that while Orthodoxos shares a dyophysite Christology *Eranistes* exhibit one that is purely monophysitic. After revealing his belief in the incarnation Orthodoxos makes him speak out his notion of Christ. *Eranistes* shares his view of God as the One who is turned into flesh and flesh turned into God.<sup>1064</sup> In opposition to this affirmation of *Eranistes* Orthodoxos reveals his faith in Christ as in the following way that “the enfleshed *physis* of God the Word is other than the *physis* of the flesh, by assumption of which the divine *physis* of the Word was made flesh and became a human being.”<sup>1065</sup> From this citation as Orthodoxos is able to convince *Eranistes* that in the Incarnation the Word was not changed into flesh, he comes to the conclusion of this second dialogue:

“If then he was made flesh, not by mutation, but by taking flesh, and both the former and the latter qualities are appropriate to him as to God made flesh, as you

<sup>1062</sup>This is an idea given by I. Montalverne in his work, *Theodoretus Cyrensis doctrina antiquior de Verbo ‘inhumanato,’* in: *StAnt* 1 (1948), 80-83.

<sup>1063</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 318.

<sup>1064</sup>Cf. Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 233.

<sup>1065</sup>Ettlinger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 137.

said a moment ago, then the natures were not confounded, but remain unimpaired. As long as we hold this we shall perceive too the harmony of the Evangelists, for while one proclaims the divine attributes of the one Only-Begotten - the Lord Christ - the other sets forth his human qualities ... You will find the divine scripture full of similar passages, and they all point not to one *physis* but to two.”<sup>1066</sup>

Although he holds two natures in the person of Christ as entire, whole, real and functional and each retaining its own properties without any confusion and mingling, he highlights saying that Christ is one *prosopon*. In the explanation of these two natures participating in each other he depends upon Plotinus rather than Aristotle or Stoics. For in Theodoret's Greek text he makes use of the Greek word *krasis di'holon*.<sup>1067</sup> We have to go back to Aristotle in order to know the source of this word. In Aristotle we come across the theory of the union of soul and body in human beings as like the relationship between form and matter, the soul being the form of the body. In Aristotle we find two sets of relationship by mixture namely 'synthesis,' and 'krasis' or 'mixis.' According to him 'synthesis' is one in which very small parts of the material forming it are juxtaposed. For example it takes place when two sorts of grain are poured together. According to him although the mixture is inert, the two materials remain each what it was. In the next mixture, namely, *krasis*, the two substances are mixed together in such a way that they produce a *tertium quid*. In this mixture the weaker is absorbed into the stronger. Theodoret compares this mixture with that of Eranistes' comparison. The 'synthesis theory' of Aristotle was not acceptable to the Stoics as it juxtaposes two elements in the union side by side. For them by synthesis the union of the soul or pneuma with the body cannot be well explained. They also do not accept the '*krasis* theory' for according to them if it is applied to the union of soul and body it would suggest genuine and substantial change in the soul. Thus the Stoics postulated a new form of theory with two forms of mixture. The first mixture named σύγχυσις refers to the kind of mixture in which the constituent substances are changed into a new form of existence which cannot recur back to its initial existence. Aristotle's κρᾶσις can be brought back to its earlier existence even after this mixture whereas Stoics' σύγχυσις cannot. Stoics' second mixture is called *krasis di' holon*. This sort of a mixture was made use by the Stoics for the union of soul and body as it indicates a thorough interpenetration of the two constituent substances, without losing its properties.

In the work of Norris, a modern scholar he sets the objections of Plotinus even against this *krasis di'holon* of Stoics as it cannot be applied to the mixture of body and soul.<sup>1068</sup> According to Plotinus although this mixture may be applied to the sphere of corporeality, this cannot be applied to the sphere of the being [soul] which is incorporeal. Instead he makes clear what is meant by the same word namely *krasis di'holon* with a different application. The same application of the terminology we find also in *Eranistes* being employed by Theodoret in his argument against his opponent. According to Plotinus the best possible analogy which can be applied to the mixture of soul in the body is that of light in air. The advantage of this analogy is that it can be applied both in the Aristotelian sense of *krasis* or *mixis* as it is through and through

---

<sup>1066</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1067</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 144; cf. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 129-30.

<sup>1068</sup>Cf. R. A. Norris, *Manhood and Christ: a study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, Oxford 1963, 67-68.

mixed with it and yet remain unchanged. As in the way light is in the air, so the body is totally penetrated by soul, but not the soul by the body.<sup>1069</sup> According to Plotinus “soul remains transcendent of the body just as light and its source are transcendent of air and remain unchanged by their contact with it.”<sup>1070</sup> In the use of this terminology Plotinus differentiates himself from the terminology of Aristotle. For him the soul is not the form to the body as in Aristotelian sense. Plotinus finds the difficulty in adopting the interpretation of Aristotle as it would lead to the conclusion that soul is inseparable from its body and determinant of body’s mortality. On the other hand for Plotinus, “the soul may be described as a formal principle, inasmuch as it is the separate, active substance which begets form within a body.”<sup>1071</sup> So to say the soul will be present in the body exactly like the light which shines through it, and so exhilarates it as the body of that particular soul. This explanation helps us to overcome the difficulty that soul is enchained by the body and it makes clear that soul is not dependent on the body rather it can transcend the body. Secondly, Plotinus explains the soul’s presence in a body as the intention of a soul and not vice versa. It means the soul decides or wills to make it present to a body. According to Plotinus the individual souls are governed by νεῦσις towards the inferior or by an ἐπιστροφή towards the body which has need of their attention. Plotinus explains this concentration or attention which the body needs as ἔλλαμψις πρὸς τὸ κάτω: the illumination by which the soul penetrates and animates the body.<sup>1072</sup> Plotinus’ own words runs so: “penetrating it totally, transforming its character, while distinct from it and unaffected by it. The soul dominates and contains the body; it is in fact the active, governing element in the human composition, conferring life, but receiving from the body nothing in return.”<sup>1073</sup> Thus employing the concepts of Plotinus Theodoret is able to give the final blow to his opponent in *Eranistes* besides being able to overthrow the concepts held by Eranistes regarding the blending of two natures in Christ. Utilizing these principles of the neoplatonic world Orthodoxos is able to establish the theory of unconfused union of two realities in Christ against the monophysitic ideas of Eranistes. We can say that Theodoret is indebted for this terminology to Plotinus through Aristotle and Stoics school who held the idea of *krasis di’ holon*. The idea which Theodoret imbibed from Plotinus and christianized goes along with the same idea shared by Ambrose. “Those therefore that assert ... that the two *physeis* of the Christ become one *physis* by confusion and commixture, those that deny that our Lord Jesus Christ is two unconfounded (*asygchytous*) *physeis*, but one *prosopon*, as he is one Christ and one Son, all these the Catholic and Apostolic Church condemns.”<sup>1074</sup> Again Theodoret is making use of a citation from Cyril of Alexandria which was written to John of Antioch approving the 433 formula of union. It is interesting to note that the source of this citation is no one else other than Theodoret himself. Thus by quoting the words of Cyril he is simply citing himself here:

<sup>1069</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 71 in reference to Plotinus, *The Enneads* (P. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, ed., *Plotini Opera*, IV. 3, Paris 1951-9, 22).

<sup>1070</sup>Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 239.

<sup>1071</sup>Norris, *Manhood and Christ*, 72.

<sup>1072</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 73.

<sup>1073</sup>*Ibid.*, 75.

<sup>1074</sup>Cited from Ettliger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 163 referring to Ambrose, *De Incarnationis Dominicae Sacramento*, 6, 57 (CSEL, 79, 253).

“There is a union of two physeis and therefore we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. According to this conception of the unconfused union (tes asygchytou henoseos) we confess the holy Virgin as Mother of God because the Word of God has been made flesh and made human, and from the conception itself united to himself the temple assumed from her.”<sup>1075</sup>

Again he cites from Cyril’s commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews: “yet though the Only-Begotten Word of God is said to be united in *hypostasis* to flesh (henosthai sarki kath’ hypostasin), we deny there was any confusion (anachysin) of the physeis with one another, and declare each to remain what it is.”<sup>1076</sup> Thus through the words of Cyril Theodoret asserts that there was no confusion of deity and humanity into each other and once again tries to convince his enemy that the natures in Jesus remained without confusion [asygchyton] and without commingling. In this second florilegium he uses almost seventeen citations from Apollinaris and he closes his second argument with his citation to convince his enemy that even the arch-heretic himself admitted a distinction between the two physeis in Christ.<sup>1077</sup>

#### D. The Impassibility of the Divine Nature (Dialogue III)

Having established a union between divinity and humanity without confusion or mixture in the same person of Christ Theodoret proceeds to clear one more element through his *Eranistes* namely the impassibility [ἀπαθής] of Godhead in Christ. He sets forth this section, namely Dialogue III, to discuss this above mentioned element in Christ. Thus let us engage ourselves with this theme of Theodoret. In this dialogue Eranistes asks Orthodoxos who according to him suffered the passion?<sup>1078</sup> Orthodoxos answers that it is our Lord Jesus Christ who is of the same *ousia* as the one who begot him and a human being. Eranistes is happy to hear this answer from the mouth of Orthodoxos and he complements saying then that he meant God underwent the passion.<sup>1079</sup> Once again Theodoret answers in the negative and makes clear his ideas regarding the impassibility of the divine nature. Orthodoxos asserts that it was the body of the assumed human nature which experienced death, since the Word does not have a nature which is capable of passion. His logical argument follows that “if he had a *physis* capable of the passion, he would have suffered without the flesh; so the flesh becomes superfluous.”<sup>1080</sup> Theodoret holds that the flesh of Christ or human nature underwent the suffering against the theme of Eranistes that God the Word suffered in the flesh. Eranistes holds the famous Alexandrian phrase that “He is by nature immortal, but he became a man and suffered.”<sup>1081</sup> Eranistes, holding the opinion of Alexandrians, says that He underwent the passion impassibly. To this argument of Eranistes Theodoret answers this way: “And what man in his senses would ever put up with such ridiculous riddles? Who ever heard of an impassible passion ... The impassible has never undergone passion, and what has undergone

---

<sup>1075</sup>Ibid., 182.

<sup>1076</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1077</sup>Cf. Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 249.

<sup>1078</sup>Cf. Ettlenger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 189.

<sup>1079</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1080</sup>Ibid., 190.

<sup>1081</sup>Ettlenger, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 216.

passion could not possibly be impassible.”<sup>1082</sup> In order to defeat the falsities of Eranistes, namely, that divinity of Christ in flesh suffered, Theodoret attributes all sufferings and limitations to the human nature in Christ. He asserts that it was not God who was weary of travelling rather it was Christ’s human body that became weary (Jn 6, 6).<sup>1083</sup> According to Theodoret God cannot become weary as he has neither spatial limitation nor has any want in Him. And he educates the foe that “when Christ was nailed to the cross, it was the human nature that felt the pains of the nails and not the divinity.”<sup>1084</sup> In the same way he applies the death of Christ to the human nature alone, for according to him the divine nature cannot die.<sup>1085</sup> Again in his own words he states that it cannot be attributed properly to the divinity ‘the corpse of Jesus’ for he states God cannot taste death. This particular phrase points only to “a common custom of referring to a dead body by the whole person’s name.”<sup>1086</sup> Instead he paraphrases the suffering of the Incarnated in this way that “the body which suffered happened to be his body.”<sup>1087</sup> Even though he was preoccupied to attribute various characteristics in a parallel fashion to both divinity and humanity, many of his passages remind us to the importance he gives to humanity. To acquaint ourselves with this way of his writing let us refer some of his quotations here:

“We have learned that the Saviour Christ hungered and thirsted and we believe that this truly happened and did not seem to happen. But these are properties not of a bodiless nature but of a body. Then, the Lord Christ had a body, which received the sufferings of the nature before the resurrection and the divine apostle bears witness to these things. ‘For we do not have,’ he says, ‘a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but one who has been tempted in all ways in the same way, without sin.’ For sin is not of nature but of evil choice.”<sup>1088</sup>

Against the docetic teachers he explicates about the body of Christ in this way: “How was the flesh seen to possess nothing new after the birth, but showed the human character, preserved the proportions of the unborn child, was wrapped in swaddling clothes, and sucked the mother’s nipple?”<sup>1089</sup> Another important thing to note here in his application is that he does not attribute the human traits to the body as we find this sort of a tendency in the Word-flesh Christology.<sup>1090</sup> In Theodoret’s work Christ’s body has a soul. He seeks supports from the Scripture to substantiate his argument. He presents Christ as saying to Paul not to be afraid.<sup>1091</sup> But he finds contradictions in

---

<sup>1082</sup>J. M. Hallman, *Theodoret’s Eranistes and its Aftermath: The Demise of the Christology of Antioch*, in: P. Allen, et al., ed., *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, Vol. 2, Brisbane 1999, 343.

<sup>1083</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 318.

<sup>1084</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1085</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1086</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1087</sup>*Ibid.*, 319.

<sup>1088</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1089</sup>*Ibid.*, 332.

<sup>1090</sup>Cyril of Alexandria also followed strictly the Word-flesh Christology scheme of Athanasius. Athanasius understands the incarnation as a union between the Logos and human flesh without the presence of a human soul. For him the death of Christ was caused by the separation of the Logos (not the soul) from the body. Apollinaris likewise understood Christ’s death in terms of a separation of the divinity from flesh (cf. A. Grillmeier, *Der Gottessohn im Totenreich*, in: *ZKTh* 71 (1949), 40, 43-46). Liébaert states that Cyril had taken the basic ideas from Athanasius. He continues saying that although Cyril affirmed the existence of a human soul in Christ more clearly than Athanasius, it has no place in Cyril’s system. He states that one does not need a human soul in Cyril’s system in order to affirm that the incarnate Word was man (cf. J. Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique de Saint Cyrille d’Alexandrie avant le querelle nestorienne*, Lille 1951, 88-89, 143-145).

<sup>1091</sup>Cf. Acts 23, 11; 27, 24.



the bible as Christ himself is undergoing fear.<sup>1092</sup> In these two passages from the Scripture although we find contradictions Theodoret tells us that it was used with the purpose of instructing us about the genuine nature of the body.

“He is by nature both God and man. And as God he encourages who need courage. But as man, he receives encouragement by an angel, although the Divinity and the Spirit as an anointing. But neither the Divinity which was joined together with them nor the all-holy Spirit at that time supported body or soul, but this service was committed to an angel in order that they might show the weakness of the soul and body ...”<sup>1093</sup>

He asks further to his opponent in *Eranistes* “how did the properties of the natures remain unimpaired, and (how) did the soul struggle, and (how) did the body sweat, so as to secrete blood-like drops from the excess of fear?”<sup>1094</sup> A scholar finds in his writing that Theodoret attributes not only fears and struggles to the soul of Christ but even ignorance.<sup>1095</sup> We may be prone to think that his meticulous division splits the union in Christ into two separate beings. But as long as he does it or distinguishes it only ‘by the reason alone’ (τῷ λόγῳ μόνῳ)<sup>1096</sup> our answer must be ‘no’ to such kind of a doubt. His answer must be considered also as a response to Eranistes who holds that it is “God the Word who has died in the flesh.”<sup>1097</sup> Theodoret does not really divide between soul and body in man as long as he distinguishes the natures conceptually.<sup>1098</sup> It can be considered as a mental or rational act in the process of explanation. Let us listen to his own argument: “We do not, good fellow, divide the union, but we contemplate the properties of the natures (Οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς, ὧ̅ ἀγαθὲ, διαιροῦμεν τὴν ἔνωσιν, ἀλλὰ θεωροῦμεν τὰ τῶν φύσεων ἴδια).”<sup>1099</sup> Although he distinguishes in his work between the properties as rightly belonging to one or other nature there is no conflict between these distinctions but all are referred to the one person Christ. We know the reasons why he stresses so much the two natures in Christ. It is against the various tendencies of the time.

“It is fitting ... talking about the natures, to apply to each what suits it and to recognize certain properties of the divinity and certain ones of the humanity. But when we talk about the person, it is necessary to make the properties of the natures common, and to fit the former and latter (properties) to the Saviour Christ, and to call the same one both God and man. Son of God and Son of man, and son of David and Lord of David, and seed of Abraham and Maker of Abraham, and many others in like manner.”<sup>1100</sup>

He gives further explanation for the use of such language that “the union makes the names common and the properties (idia) of the natures became common (properties) of the person.”<sup>1101</sup> Thus he applies the term ‘Christ’ as belonging to all the characteristics

<sup>1092</sup>Cf. Lk 22, 44.

<sup>1093</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 318.

<sup>1094</sup>*Ibid.*, 320.

<sup>1095</sup>Cf. E. F. Schulte, *Entwicklung der Lehre vom menschlichen Wissen Christi bis zum Beginn der Scholastik* (FLDG 12), Paderborn 1915, 78-81.

<sup>1096</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 320.

<sup>1097</sup>Clayton, *Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 257.

<sup>1098</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 320.

<sup>1099</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1100</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 321.

<sup>1101</sup>*Ibid.*

of both natures. He is very clear about the union which takes place in Christ. According to him the properties in Christ are not joined substantially.<sup>1102</sup>

Perhaps one more issue we may have to deal here regarding ‘*communicatio idiomatum*.’ There are two opinions regarding his view on communication of properties. Some scholars are of the view that his Christology replicates this idea<sup>1103</sup> and some others are of the opposite view.<sup>1104</sup> Here we have to take into account the fact that all theologians are not unanimous in its application [*communicatio idiomatum*]. In the strict sense it means that all characteristics of one nature can be applied to another in Christ to the extinction of distinguishing them.<sup>1105</sup> After analyzing his work named *Eranistes* we cannot agree that Theodoret shared the idea of mixing all characteristics of one nature with the other. There is no doubt with regard to his application that is to the person of Christ constituted of two natures. In his own words “I follow [the Apostle] too, and believe that he was Lord of glory. For the body which was nailed to the wood was not that of any common man but of the Lord of glory. But we must acknowledge that the union makes the names common.”<sup>1106</sup> Hence it is clear for us that although he acknowledges this common name he denies the interchange of the properties of the natures. In his work we would never come across the idea that God suffered and died. Together with it he teaches that the assumed humanity had never preexisted. He argues that if he agreed such a substantial union which confused the natures in Christ he could never speak of the two realities in Christ namely, Godhead and manhood. He makes clear that in Christ only the names have become common and not the substance. Scholars like Mazzarino and McNamara have criticized his Christology for not attributing the natures to one unified person or subject in Christ.<sup>1107</sup> But such criticism ensues only from a Cyrillian type of orthodoxy which has its own profound inadequacies.<sup>1108</sup> Thus he tells explicitly that the Word remained impassible and immortal and did not experience the human passion and death of Christ as the subject of them.<sup>1109</sup> He asserts categorically that the subject of the passion and death is a human subject and human experience and not that of the Word. Accordingly at last Orthodoxos is able to convince Eranistes the folly he held. Thus the work *Eranistes* is concluded with the assertion that any one who confesses that the Word suffered the passion has fallen into Arianism.<sup>1110</sup> Theodoret’s Orthodoxos concludes his faith referring to Nicea in the only Son together with the bishops in the following words:

“When we are told of the passion and of the cross, we must recognize the *physis* which submitted to the passion; we must avoid attributing it to the impassible, and must attribute it to that *physis* which was assumed for the distinct purpose of suffering. The acknowledgment on the part of the most excellent Fathers that the divine *physis* was impassible and their attribution of the passion to the flesh is

<sup>1102</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1103</sup>Cf. Richard, Proclus de Constantinople et le theopashisme, 327-330; Richard, L’activite litteraire de Theodoret avant le concile d’Ephese, 90-91.

<sup>1104</sup>Cf. Mazzarino, La dottrina di Teodoreto, 170-172; cf. McNamara, Theodoret of Cyrus and the Unity of Person in Christ, in: ITQ 20 (1955), 321-328 (Although Theodoret shares this idea he has not expressed it in terms of *communicatio idiomatum*).

<sup>1105</sup>Cf. Mazzarino, La dottrina di Teodoreto, 171.

<sup>1106</sup>Ettlinger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 226.

<sup>1107</sup>Cf. Mazzarino, La dottrina di Teodoreto., 170-172; cf. McNamara, Theodoret of Cyrus and the Unity of Person in Christ, 321-328.

<sup>1108</sup>Cf. Stewardson, The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 322.

<sup>1109</sup>Cf. Clayton, Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus, 261.

<sup>1110</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 262.

provided by the conclusion to the creed, which runs, ‘But they who state there was a time when he was not, and before he was begotten he was not, and he was made out of the non-existent, or who allege that the Son of God was of another *hypostasis* or *ousia*, mutable or variable, these the holy catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes.’ See then what penalties are denounced against those who attribute the passion to the divine *physis*.<sup>1111</sup>

Theodoret concludes his work with three sets of ‘Demonstrations by Syllogisms.’ Each of the three corresponds to one of the dialogues and is named the same. Let us have a short look at the third demonstration in which he comes back again with his attack upon Arianism and Apollinarism: “They who maintain that God the Word suffered in the flesh should be asked the meaning of what they say, and should they have the hardihood to reply that when the body was pierced with nails the divine *physis* was sensible of pain, let them learn that the divine *physis* did not fill the part of the soul.”<sup>1112</sup> And finally we read the summing-up of his Christology in the last paragraph of the last demonstration (III, 16) so:

“When we say that the body or the flesh or the humanity suffered, we do not separate the divine *physis*, for as it was united to a *physis* that was hungry, thirsty, weary, even asleep and undergoing the passion, the divine *physis* itself is affected in its own way, so it was conjoined to it even when crucified, and permitted the completion of the passion, that by the passion it might destroy death; not indeed receiving pain from the passion, but making the passion its own, as of its own temple.”<sup>1113</sup>

Thus we can say two things with certainty about Theodoret of Cyrus that he was consistent all throughout in his argument against Arians, Eutychians and Apollinarians and secondly like the Antiochians he also held the dyophysite school of thought applying each particularities to the field to which it belongs. In this third dialogue he explicitly announces his faith in the impassible nature of the divinity. As a conclusion we may say that “the Christology of *Eranistes* is of a consistent dyophysite type which is grounded in Theodoret’s fundamental concept of God and His creation as two ontologically or qualitatively different natures.”<sup>1114</sup>

## 7. Reunion Formula of Theodoret

The council of Ephesus was one of the tragedies in the history of the Early Church in which we see both Antiochians and Alexandrians denouncing each other as heretics and denying any sort of reconciliation with each other. After this Council discord and disharmony prevailed in both Churches against each other. If both had had patience to listen to each other upon what they were trying to tell there would not have been such a tragedy in the history of the Church. So the Council of Ephesus can be counted as a serious calamity, a complete break-up affecting the well-being of the Church. This has brought about a deadlock in the Church. In the Epistles 165-170 we find Theodoret bemoaning regarding the action of Cyril and his party about their hesitance and antipathy to discuss the issues written in the Twelve Anathemas. He finds it as the main obstacle to reunion. In these letters he affirms that the theology

<sup>1111</sup>Ettliger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 228.

<sup>1112</sup>Ibid., 263.

<sup>1113</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 264-265 referring to *Eranistes* III, 16.

<sup>1114</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 336.

found in the Twelve Anathemas can be in no way admitted by the Antiochians.<sup>1115</sup> It may be good for us to have recourse to what Theodoret says in Ep. 170 addressed to Bishop Rufus of Thessalonica: “they have continued to fight for this impious heresy, and pay no attention to the counsels of the very pious emperor. On five separate occasions he has met us, and ordered them either to reject the Chapter of Cyril as contrary to Faith, or to be willing to do battle in their behalf ...”<sup>1116</sup> But later Cyril concurred to this Formula due to the reason of protecting his own interests - even if he had to contradict himself.<sup>1117</sup> Let us have a look into this Formula of Reunion.

“We confess, then, our Lord Jesus Christ, the unique Son of God, perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and body; begotten of the Father before [the] ages according to the Godhead, the same in the last days for us and for our salvation [born] of Mary the Virgin according to the manhood; the same consubstantial with the Father in Godhead, and consubstantial with us in manhood, for a union of two natures took place; therefore we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. According to this understanding of the unconfused union we confess the holy Virgin to be *theotokos*, because God the Word was made flesh and lived as man, and from the very conception united to himself the temple (The temple of his body, Jn 2, 21, a text which Nestorius had rather overworked) taken from her. As to the evangelical and apostolic phrases about the Lord, we know that theologians treat some in common, as of one person, and distinguish others, as of two natures, and interpret the God befitting ones in connection with the Godhead of Christ, and the humble ones of manhood.”<sup>1118</sup>

Cyril started doing as he wished even after agreeing with this Formula of reunion. Cyril and his party consecrated Maximian as archbishop of Constantinople on 25<sup>th</sup> October 431 as Nestorius’ successor and gave the final blow to the Antiochians. As Cyril’s purpose had been accomplished they pressed on the decree of Theodosius II, who was always manipulated by Cyril’s party as he was a weak-kneed and as he complied with the wishes of Cyrillian party. Although the emperor ordered Cyril and Memnon to remain under detention in Ephesus Cyril escaped and returned to Egypt before the imperial rescript arrived. As Cyril escaped and as it was difficult to arrest him in his ‘kingdom’ “the emperor decided to accept the fait accompli by giving official permission for his return to Egypt.”<sup>1119</sup> Thus besides the consecration of Maximian to the see of Constantinople the escape of Cyril was a reason for double defeat for the Antiochians. Together with these as agreed Cyril was not ready to agree with the condemnation of the Twelve Anathemas. Thus having felt as maltreated and cheated they [Antiochians] returned home with a spirit of bitterness and a deep breakage in the history of the Church. The time from October 431 to April 433 was a time of great difficulty for both Alexandrians and Antiochians. Both tried to fluster

---

<sup>1115</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 143 in reference to Ep. 165, addressed to some Eastern bishops (PG 83, 1465-1466); Ep. 169, addressed to Alexander of Hierapolis, (PG 83, 1473-1475): ‘I have even stated to our pious emperor with an oath that it is perfectly impossible for Cyril and Memnon to be reconciled with me, and that we can never communicate with anyone who has not previously repudiated the heretical chapters.’ In Ep. 165 he strongly warns that even if Cyril were to deny the Anathemas, Theodoret would not enter into communion with him. Ep. 167: addressed to the Emperor with petition contains the same complaint (PG 83, 1469-1471).

<sup>1116</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 25 referring to Ep. 170 (PG 83, 1475-1481).

<sup>1117</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 40.

<sup>1118</sup>E. R. Hardy, *The Formula of Union of 433*, in: J. Baillie, et al., ed., *Christology of the Later Fathers*, (LCC 3), Philadelphia 1954, 356.

<sup>1119</sup>Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, 255.

each other in their own various capacities. We find in this period more of synodal meetings, political maneuvering from both sides. As a result the Orientals had cut off their communion with the Cyrillians.

In the year 432 as both sides held so many council meetings and negotiations the imperial court tried to find some measures to bring together both sides to peace. In order to restore peace Theodosius II proposed a solution in 432 in April namely to accept the condemnation of Nestorius and the condemnation of Cyril's Twelve Anathemas. This objective of the imperial court was brought to both sides by the tribune Aristolaus.<sup>1120</sup> The only possible way he found was to urge the Orientals to abandon Nestorius and Cyril to withdraw his Anathemas. As a result of this plea from the part of the Emperor John of Antioch called together a Synod at Antioch, in which Acacius of Beroea,<sup>1121</sup> Andrew of Samosata, Theodoret and Alexander of Hierapolis were present. As asked by John of Antioch Theodoret drew up six propositions to this council. In these propositions the first clause was to recognize the Nicene Creed as the sole authority by all the parties. Secondly he stated that Athanasius' 'letter *ad* Epictetus (which was an exposition of that Creed) against the Apollinarians' must be acknowledged as the only legitimate explanation for the Nicene faith. So also they strongly asked to withdraw the twelve Anathemas against Nestorius.<sup>1122</sup> Cyril disavowed all these resolutions. Cyril was adamant not to withdraw what he has already written against Nestorius and he added if they agreed to the deposition of Nestorius, an understanding could be arrived at. John of Antioch immediately agreed to this idea proposed by Cyril. But persons like Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata who were convinced of the veracity of Nestorius' teaching denied this idea. In his letter to Alexander writes Theodoret: "I have already informed your holiness that if the doctrine of the very holy and venerable Bishop, my lord Nestorius, is condemned I will not communicate with those who do so" (Ep. 175).<sup>1123</sup> But still, as we have already said, Theodoret as a peace-loving bishop agreed with John of Antioch to begin the discussions with the Alexandrians hoping to restore peace in the Church. Thus they produced a document which is known as the Reunion Formula. It is presumably drawn up by Theodoret himself.<sup>1124</sup> A passage from his own letter 112 makes it clear that he himself or together with others drafted it:

“Καὶ γὰρ ἤδη καὶ πλειόνων ὡς ἔτυχε, ταῦτα βεβαιωσάντων, ἀντέστημεν ἐν Ἐφέσω, καὶ οὐ πρότερον ἐκοινωνήσαμεν τῶ ταῦτα γεγραφότι, ἕως τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν ἐκτεθεῖσι συνθέμενος, σύμφωνον αὐτοῖς διδασκαλίαν προσήρμοσεν, οὐδεμίαν

<sup>1120</sup>Cf. B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A. D. 461*, Vol. III: Church history - Primitive and early Church, ca. 30-600, Oxford 1922, 256; cf. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, 259.

<sup>1121</sup>Akakios of Beroia (Aleppo) was born ca. 322 in Syria. While still very young he became a monk in the famous community of solitaries. During the Arian troubles he had to suffer a lot for his courage and constancy. Eusebius of Samosata ordained him bishop of Beroia in 378 A. D. as a public recognition for the great services he rendered to the church during the time of Arian heresy. In 381 he took part in the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople. On the death of Meletius of Antioch he took part in Flavian's ordination to the See of Antioch by whom he was sent afterwards to the Pope in order to heal the schism between the churches of the West and Antioch. Thereafter he took part in the persecution against Chrysostom. And he defended Nestorius against Cyril when the former was charged with heresy. As an Antiochian he subscribed the profession of faith in two natures against Apollinaris. He is considered as one of the godparents of the Christological re-union formula of 433. Immediately after this event he died at the age of 116 (cf. W. A. Löhr, *Akakios v. Beroia*, in: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 1, Freiburg 1993, 285).

<sup>1122</sup>Cf. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*, 257.

<sup>1123</sup>Cited from Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 235 referring to Ep. 175.

<sup>1124</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐκείνων ποιησάμενος μνήμην. For when, as it happened, many had already confirmed them (the Anathemas), we opposed them in Ephesus, and we did not first enter into communion with him who wrote them until he agreed to the things set forth by us, and put his teaching in accord with ours, making no mention of those chapters.”<sup>1125</sup>

Cyril accepted it provided Nestorius is condemned and denounced from his see. Thus at last it became the mutually accepted formula of Reunion of Alexandria and Antioch. Finally there came the negotiations in the year 433 in April.<sup>1126</sup> The formula which they arrived at is considered as a mild statement of Antiochian Christology.<sup>1127</sup>

Beyond all doubt one can say that Theodoret was the chief spokesperson of the Orientals to the Emperor when he pleaded to present their causes. We have very vivid reports from Theodoret about the episodes that took place after Ephesus from his letters 165-170. Although Cyril accepted the ‘Formula of Reunion’<sup>1128</sup> as exactly as John had included in his letter to Cyril and which was formulated by Theodoret in accordance with the faith of the Antiochians and with stress on the two nature Christology Cyril looked out the way with his old tricks to escape condemnation of his Anathemas. As a consequence of the forbearance of Antiochians peace was restored between the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch. It clearly states that it was drafted by the Antiochians. “Cyril’s letter to John of Antioch is in effect a concordat of the two sees - it accepts as orthodox a statement prepared by the Antiochians that the union in Christ was a ‘union of natures and clears Cyril from charges of Apollinarism.”<sup>1129</sup>

The second revolt against the Antiochian Church starts as Dioscorus the successor of Cyril comes into the scene. Dioscorus is known as the ‘violent man’ in the Church history. He started fighting against the Formulary of Reunion.<sup>1130</sup> His main reason for the dislike of this Formula was due to its mention of ‘a union of two natures.’ He held that through this formula ‘Nestorianizers’ could hide and proclaim themselves sound in the faith. Theodoret also like Nestorius had to undergo severe persecution under the violent man of the Alexandrian school. He became one of the first victims of Dioscorus at the Robber Synod of 449 as he was recalled from the exile and was compelled to condemn the teaching of Nestorius and Nestorius himself publicly. Facing threat to his life he had to do the most abominable act before these cantankerous bishops. Thus when he left Chalcedon before him “blocked the door of the monastery and declined to have intercourse with his friends”<sup>1131</sup> and it brought an end to the school of Diodore and Theodore. But in 451 Dioscorus also was exiled for his ‘one nature’ Christology.

---

<sup>1125</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 142 (Stewardson informs us that it is difficult to say for certain whether he is the sole author of the Formula on the fact of the use of the first person plural ‘we’ as a polite form by Theodoret or as a reference to several men who collaborated on the Formula. A scholar like Jackson translates it as first person singular in the place of the author).

<sup>1126</sup>Cf. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A. D. 461*, 254, 261.

<sup>1127</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 250.

<sup>1128</sup>This Formula we find in various works of the authors like T. H. Bindley, *The Eumenical documents of the Faith*, (ed. F. W. Green), London <sup>4</sup>1950, 221; R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*, London 1953, 180.

<sup>1129</sup>Hardy, *The Formula of Union of 433*, 32.

<sup>1130</sup>Cf. Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 239.

<sup>1131</sup>Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon*, 242.

Today it is well known that Theodoret was the key figure in reformulating the Christological formula which was acceptable to both parties. It is said that in the controversy between Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria, he emerged as a leading figure, defending the two-nature Christology. It is assumed that the major documents which he formulated and later used by John of Antioch and with which Cyril also found agreement and which brought peace to the Church was composed by Theodoret.<sup>1132</sup> But we should not consider it as a success from the part of Antiochians rather as we have frequently said it is the merit of both schools of thought. By all means we have to approve the contributions made by Cyril in the field of Christology although his vicious politics to be disparaged.

## 8. Concluding Remarks

We have already seen in the previous chapters that both Cyril and Nestorius had problems in their understanding of the terms *hypostasis* and *ousia*. In the late fourth century, both *hypostasis* and *ousia* (essence) “both indicated to take the inevitable physical metaphor, the particular slab of material stuff which constitutes a given object.”<sup>1133</sup> Since they [*hypostasis* and *ousia*] express the essential substratum of something, viz., the vehicle of all qualities, and it can be translated by the word substance. It was Origen who tried at first to give some distinction between these two terms. Nevertheless the meaning of the terms remained basically synonymous during the period of the Council of Nicea.<sup>1134</sup> Later through the help of Cappadocian Fathers the two terms were redefined in relation to each other. “When God is spoken of as one *ousia* in three hypostaseis (Father, Son and Holy Spirit), the sense of this formula is: God regarded from the point of view of internal analysis, is one object; but that, regarded from the point of view of external presentation, He is three objects.”<sup>1135</sup> They considered each *hypostasis* whether of Fatherhood, of Sonship, or of Spirit is a ‘special property’ or ‘particular mode of existence’ of the one inclusive *ousia*.<sup>1136</sup> Turning to Cyril one easily understands that his use of the terms like ‘*hypostasis*’ and ‘nature’ are lacking consistency. Cyril thinks that the divine Logos has naturally His ‘*ὑπόστασις*’ or is an ‘*ὑπόστασις*.’ He thinks that ‘*ὑπόστασις*’ always remained one and the same before the incarnation and after having assumed the human nature. His problem lies in the field, as the Antiochians accuse him, that ‘*ὑπόστασις*’ takes a human body, soul and intellect as his own body, soul and intellect, thus the human nature not having an ‘*ὑπόστασις*.’ He argues [Cyril] that “after the incarnation because of the *ἔνωσις καθ’ ὑπόστασιν*’ it cannot be regarded apart from the *ὑπόστασις*’ of the Logos. That is to say, Cyril meant by it *ἐκ δύο φύσεων εἷς*.”<sup>1137</sup> According to Loofs, “the term *οὐσία* in Cyril could also be used in a generic sense and then received a meaning similar to kind or nature, but *ὑπόστασις* means only that which *οὐσία* could mean in addition to its other meaning, viz., a single and really

<sup>1132</sup>Cf. Ettliger, Theodoret of Cyrus, 890.

<sup>1133</sup>Prestige, God in Patristic Thought, 168.

<sup>1134</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 78.

<sup>1135</sup>Prestige, God in Patristic Thought, 168-169.

<sup>1136</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, Meaning of Homoousios in the Constantinopolitan Creed, Cambridge 1901, 81.

<sup>1137</sup>Loofs, Nestorius and his place, 72-73.

existing being, whether material or immaterial.”<sup>1138</sup> Cyril’s two phrases ἔνωσις φυσικὴ ‘natural union’ and ἔνωσις καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ‘hypostatic union’ according to Bethune-Baker and Loofs must be considered in the sense of substantial rather than in the sense of personal oneness.<sup>1139</sup> According to another scholar called Sellers the phrase ἔνωσις καθ’ ὑπόστασιν of Cyril means “a real concrete unity which is at the same time a union of the natural constituents.”<sup>1140</sup> He continues saying that it can be understood either in the sense of *substantia* or *physis* on the one hand or in the sense of *prosopon* on the other. Thus Cyril could easily speak of “one incarnate *hypostasis* of the Logos,” and of the coming together in Jesus Christ of ‘things or *hypostases*.”<sup>1141</sup> So is also with the term *physis* in Cyrillian Christology. “As the equivalent of *ousia*, *physis* could refer either to the particular or to the general ... The Alexandrine theologians employed ‘nature’ in the sense of an ‘individual existence’ (i. e., as the equivalent of *prosopon*) and in its generic sense.”<sup>1142</sup> Therefore Cyril could easily speak of “one incarnate nature of the divine Logos,” and at the same time speak of ‘the divine nature,’ ‘the nature of the Godhead,’ ‘our nature,’ ‘man’s nature,’ and ‘human nature.’”<sup>1143</sup> Loofs also observes the same that Cyril used *hypostasis* and *physis* indiscriminately so that each could be used for the κοινόν of the nature or for the individualized nature.<sup>1144</sup> Today many scholars speak of ‘hypostatic union’ as a ‘personal unity’ in order to rescue Cyril from the accusation of Monophysitism.<sup>1145</sup> But there are also scholars on the other side who hold it as highly unlikely. They strongly hold that when Cyril used *hypostasis* he meant exactly ‘person.’ A few of the modern theologians consider Cyril’s categories as physical rather than personal. Such is also the difficulty with the term ‘hypostatic union.’ It hints certainly something more than ‘personal union.’

Let us also make a fleeting assessment of the problem Nestorius had. The problem of Nestorius was also applicable to the Antiochian School. For them

“the key-word ‘φύσις’ or ‘nature’ meant the humanity or divinity conceived of as a concrete assemblage of characteristics or attributes. It is said that Cyril himself accepted this sense of the Word. But in the everyday usage he preferred concrete individual or independent existent. In this sense ‘φύσις’ approximated to, without being actually synonymous with, *hypostasis*.”<sup>1146</sup>

For the Antiochians *hypostasis* was virtually a synonym for both *ousia* and *physis*. *Ousia* and *physis* for them meant ‘that which exists’ and *hypostasis* meant ‘underlying existence’ and it has the same sense of Western theologians definition of ‘*substantia*.’ From this we can understand all these three Greek words stood for ‘being’ or ‘subsistence’ (τὸ ὄν, τὸ ὑφεστός).<sup>1147</sup> They are totally opposed to the idea of

<sup>1138</sup>Ibid., 71.

<sup>1139</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 174; cf. Loofs, Nestorius and his place, 70, 72.

<sup>1140</sup>Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies, 47.

<sup>1141</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1142</sup>Ibid., 49.

<sup>1143</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1144</sup>Cf. Loofs, Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche (TU 3, 1-2), Leipzig 1887, 43.

<sup>1145</sup>Cf. Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, 157; cf. K. Adam, The Christ of Faith (trans. J. Crick), New York 1962, 235-237, 241-243; cf. F. Ferrier, The Chalcedonian Faith and its Further Clarifications, in: R. Tapia, ed., The theology of Christ, Commentary, New York 1971, 159.

<sup>1146</sup>Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 318.

<sup>1147</sup>Cf. Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies, 180-181.



confusion or mixture. Antiochians meant that “the union of Godhead and manhood in the Person of Jesus Christ each element remains real, and the properties of each are left unimpaired.”<sup>1148</sup> So by saying that there are ‘two *ousiai*’ or ‘two natures’ in Jesus Christ they were heading towards the truth that Jesus is true man and true God. In order to enforce this truth they use the term ‘*hypostasis*.’ It is a term used to emphasize the fundamental idea ‘reality.’ In theology this word can be made use in the sense of ‘person’ as the equivalent of ‘*prosopon*,’ whereas in Christology as we have already indicated it can mean the ‘underlying existence.’ For Antiochians “the word ‘*prosopon*’ refers to the person of Jesus as an empirical entity, viewed from the exterior and leaves untouched the question of exactly how the deeper unity is established metaphysically.”<sup>1149</sup> Both schools use the same term with a different connotation, that is to say, Cyril applies *hypostasis* to the person of Christ, [though not very consistent]<sup>1150</sup> and Nestorius and Antiochians are accused as applying it to the two natures of Christ. Thus is the difficulty to understand both schools. Thus let us summarize the teaching of Antiochian school so: “the God-man is said to be begotten from the Father according to the divinity’ and from Mary the Virgin according to the humanity.’ He is *omoousion* with the Father according to divinity and *omoousion* with us according to the humanity.”<sup>1151</sup> Thus they can say that Jesus Christ is θεός τέλειος καὶ ἄνθρωπος τέλειος ‘perfect [here it is meant complete] God and perfect man.’ Against the concrete terms of Antiochians for the reality of humanity Cyril prefers abstract terms for the humanity of Christ.<sup>1152</sup> The preferred term of Antiochians namely, ἐξ αὐτῆς ληφθέντα ναόν (the temple taken from her [the Virgin]) which was very important in their teaching had also an added focus in the Christological struggle. The term ‘ναός’ ‘temple’ and the form of the verb ‘λαμβάνω’ (to take) which were made use by the Antiochians in order to signify the humanity of Christ were indispensable terms to Antiochian Christology. Another term namely, πρόσωπον which the Antiochians used was also very important in indicating the oneness of the person of Christ. This terminology helped them to attribute some sayings of Jesus to the united person and still some others to the two natures. So to say the sublime sayings of Jesus were predicated of the divine nature and the ‘lowly’ or ‘humble’ ones (ταπεινάς) to the human nature. Due to this predication they were able to negate the *communicatio idiomatum* which was very important for Cyril. According to Cyril there is only one subject, one nature in Christ to which all properties must be predicated equally.<sup>1153</sup> In Cyril’s own words: “now an incarnate (σεσαρκωμένη) nature or *hypostasis* is one (μία).”<sup>1154</sup> To assert it we have the famous statement from his twelfth anathema [which we have above mentioned] where he expresses that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, and was crucified in the flesh and tasted death in the flesh. And finally we observe the preference of Antiochians for πρόσωπον as the

<sup>1148</sup>Ibid., 181.

<sup>1149</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 380.

<sup>1150</sup>Cf. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching*, 53, 172; (also Cyril’s use of hypostastis, as equivalent to physis or ousia caused great difficulty to understand him (cf. Sellers, *Two ancient Christologies*, 49).

<sup>1151</sup>Stewardson, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*, 37.

<sup>1152</sup>Cf. Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique de Saint Cyrille d’Alexandrie avant la querelle Nestorienne*, 170-171, 182.

<sup>1153</sup>Cf. Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 89.

<sup>1154</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Ep. ad Jovianum (Sellers is of the view that these terminologies must have come from Apollinarius himself).

main term for the person of Christ against Cyril's inclination for the word ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν or of μία φύσις in Christ.<sup>1155</sup>

With Theodoret it gets greater precision. His theological outlook is also the same as the Antiochians. He is also a person who is consistent with the terms which he uses. His *Eranistes* is a classic example for this. Today it is seen as the fruit of his mature thinking on the nature of Christ and at the same time as against the eclectic monophysitic heresy which he faced in 431 and in 447 A. D. His basic concepts consist in the fact that God and his creation are two ontologically or qualitatively different natures. From this stand point he insists that there is no substantial union or fusion of divine and human natures in Christ. According to him both natures the divine and the human in Christ must be acknowledged as distinct from each other. But at the same time he persists upon the idea of union in one person or one Christ. Through his writings he upholds the natures of Christ in the single person Christ. He instituted a change in the understanding of *hypostasis*. He regards the word *hypostasis* as a synonym for *prosopon* according to the example of Trinitarian language. It is to his credit that employing the neoplatonic terms he was able to affirm once and for all that the human and the divine remained in the same person Christ unconfused and unamalgamated. Theodoret points out that "in adopting the simile of Isaac and the ram he means that there are two natures, and not two *hypostases* in Jesus Christ."<sup>1156</sup> When he interpreted *hypostasis* in this way it can mean substance or its equivalent. It is to Theodoret's credit that the term which he preferred namely ἕνωσις [a strong term for the oneness in Christ]<sup>1157</sup> was understood in neutral terms. Thus the Antiochian formula δυὸ φύσεων became a unity (ἕνωσις) was taken in order to express the two natures in Christ namely, divinity and humanity, avoiding Cyril's famous phrase: μιὰ φύσις and Nestorius term συνάρφεια for the oneness in Christ. So after having analyzed the *Eranistes* and the Formula of Reunion we may be able to say that it contains nothing contrary to the mainline of Antioch's theology and even to that of Nestorius.<sup>1158</sup> It is underlined by the sayings of Harnack and Seeberg that Cyril made substantial concession to the Formula of Reunion while Antiochians did not make so much concession.<sup>1159</sup> At the same time there are also scholars who say that it is difficult to ascertain whether Cyril made any considerable compromise due to his inconsistent position regarding the Reunion Formula. This quotation given by Bindley may help us to come to this inconsistency in Cyril. "There were, in fact, two Cyrils, one who spoke in informal, at times in unguarded language, as in the Anathemas, which never received oecumenical sanction and another in diplomatic language as in the Epistle ... (to John of Antioch)."<sup>1160</sup> He asks further which is the real Cyril theologically? This is our problem too to know Cyril for certain. According to many in favour of this comment by Bindley join him saying that Cyril's conservative

<sup>1155</sup>Cf. Seeberg, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 228-230.

<sup>1156</sup>Cited from Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies, 165 referring to Dial III, IV. pt. i. (ed. Schulze), 203.

<sup>1157</sup>Cf. Montalverne, Theodoret's doctrine anti-quior de Verbo 'Inhumanato,' 84-85.

<sup>1158</sup>Cf. Loofs, Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte, 2 (durchgesehene Aufl. Hg. von K. Aland), Tübingen 1959, 233.

<sup>1159</sup>Cf. Harnack, History of Dogma, Vol. IV (trans. N. Buchanan), New York 1961, 189; cf. Seeberg, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 240.

<sup>1160</sup>Bindley, The Ecumenical Documents of the Faith, 137; for the same judgment see also Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D. 461, 283; Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church, 281, 282.

theology was characterized by its insistence upon the unity of Christ.<sup>1161</sup> His radical supporters felt embarrassed to see that he sold out his theological convictions, for which he stood in his life, by accepting this Reunion Formula.<sup>1162</sup> This suppressed feeling of his radical followers got wild expression in the person of Dioscorus who tried to thrash out the Antiochian leaders through his Latrocinium of 449 A. D. This action of the Alexandrian school is also an added proof for us that the Formula of Reunion is modest Antiochian theology formulated by an Antiochian namely Theodoret. “Through this Formula Theodoret was virtually the instrument of bringing about the long-desired peace between the two contending sections of the Church.”<sup>1163</sup> The later tragedies which were played on the Antiochian Church still remain as a wound in the heart of many true Christians and through a genuine ecumenical talk conducted between all the churches they may also be led to the main stream of Catholicism. As there were difficulties to understand both Nestorius (due to the theory of two sons: chapter I) and Cyril (as the proponent of monophysitism: chapter II) and their terminologies the clarifications and contributions of Theodoret (chapter III) help us better understand both schools with their thrust and come close to a better Christology.

---

<sup>1161</sup>Cf. Liébaert, *La Doctrine Christologique de S. Cyrille d’Alexandrie*, 237-240.

<sup>1162</sup>Cf. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A. D. 461*, 264-265.

<sup>1163</sup>Venables, *Theodoretus*, 910.

## Chapter IV

### Syro-Malabar Church and Nestorian Connections

In this chapter, we probe into the alleged Nestorian connections of the Syro-Malabar Church.<sup>1164</sup> Although we are mainly interested to examine the relationship of SMC with the Nestorian Church in this chapter and whether SMC's liturgy is in any way related to the Nestorian tradition, before that we will go into the origin of the SMC and other churches which are extant in Indian sub-continent. It is not a stigma today to say that one belong to a Nestorian Church, as we have already established through the first and third chapters; a serious theologian cannot find anything different in the Nestorian Christology and theology other than what is found in the catholic theology. Although this is the fact we would like to explore the actuality of the so-called allegation made against the SMC in order to be faithful to the history of the SMC in its authenticity and to know whether it is a twisted historical fact. First and foremost we will do it by studying the various rites in India, the land of Kerala, origin and different phases of SMC. Then we will proceed to an exploration of the Addai and Mari anaphora<sup>1165</sup> used in the SMC, and also an analysis of SMC's liturgy in comparison with the Birkat Hamazon, Cup of Elijah, Didache, and Anaphora of Peter or Sharar III. We will also try to look into its various stages of formation along with an appraisal of its theological content. We will study the anaphora from a biblical point of view together with the modern catholic view of it.

#### 1. The Various Rites and Churches in India.

*Lumen Gentium*, the dogmatic constitution of the Church,<sup>1166</sup> expresses very clearly that the diversity found in the Church is not an opponent of unity, but as an indicator of the ability of the Gospel message to acclimatize itself, flourish and find expression in a multiplicity of forms. The Catholic churches of both East and West are living expressions of this diversity (Nr. 13). We come across a number of similar passages in *Lumen Gentium* in support of this factor. The one people of God is accordingly present in all the nations of the earth, since its citizens, belonging to all nations, are of a kingdom whose nature is not earthly but heavenly. All the faithful

---

<sup>1164</sup>Hereafter we will be using only SMC for Syro-Malabar Church. The prefix Syro - indicates the relationship this church had with the Chaldean Church (Syrian) and Malabar is the ancient name used for Kerala in general: a land of Mala (mountains) bar (kingdom, full etc); today Malabar is no more applied to the whole of Kerala but only to the northern part of Kerala. There are so many versions to the meaning of Kerala. Some scholars are of the opinion that it originated from the classical Tamil 'Cheralam' land of the Cheras or chera-alam, (declivity of a hill or a mountain slope/range). The state was anciently called Cheralam and Cherala Nadu. Another ground some find in the origin of the word Kerala as associated with the Chera Kingdom which was also known as 'Keralaputra' at the time of the edicts of Asoka (257 B.C.). And the language Malayalam may have come from mala (hill) and alam (dale) corresponding to the undulating physical feature of Kerala. Some find also connection between Kerala and coconut as Keralam means land where Kera (coconut) grows. Malayalam is the language spoken in Kerala which has its origin in both Tamil and Sanskrit. Westerners refer to this land very often as Malabar. Malabar is a partially Arabicized form of the same word (cf. A. M. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India: from the beginning up to the Middle of the Sixteenth Century [up to 1542], Vol. 1, Bangalore 1984, 15).

<sup>1165</sup>Addai and Mari anaphora will be referred hereafter with the short form AM.

<sup>1166</sup>Cf. K. Rahner und H. Vorgrimler, Kleines Konzils-kompodium, LG 13, Freiburg 1966, 137-139.

scattered throughout the world are in communion with each other in the Holy Spirit. The Church or people of God which establishes this kingdom does not take away anything from the temporal welfare of any people rather she fosters and takes to herself, in so far as they are good, the abilities, the resources and customs of peoples. In so taking them to herself she purifies, strengthens, and elevates them. Holding a rightful place in the communion of the Church there are also particular churches that retain their own traditions, without prejudice to the Chair of Peter which presides over the whole communion of love, and protects their legitimate variety while at the same time taking care that these differences do not hinder unity, but rather contribute to it.<sup>1167</sup> These citations of *Lumen Gentium* clearly teaches us that although there are so many churches in the world, they all try to promote the same cause, namely, the welfare of the people of God. India too has its share of various churches and rites. Christianity is the third largest religion found in India with around 24 million followers, constituting 2.3% of India's population among 80.5% Hindus, 13.4% Muslims, 1.8% Sikhs, 0.8% Buddhists, 0.4% Jains, 0.7% others and 0.1% unspecified (2001 census).<sup>1168</sup>

Although there are a number of Christian denominations in India the Roman Catholic Church is the prominent among them. Then there is the Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church the Malankara Jacobite Syrian Church and the Malankara Mar Thomas Syrian Church. From among the protestant denominations there are quite a few of them found in India namely, the Church of South India (CSI), the Church of North India (CNI), the Presbyterian Church of India, Baptists, Lutherans and other evangelical groups. Roman Catholics belong to three rites, namely, the Latin, Syro-Malabar and Syro-Malankara. The following table gives the statistics of the Ecclesiastical units of Catholics in India with Archdioceses and Dioceses.

<b>1.Ecclesiastical Units</b>	<b>Archdioceses 30</b>	<b>Dioceses 134</b>	<b>Total 164</b>
<b>2. Rite.</b>			
a)Latin	23	105	128
b) Syro-Malabar	5	23	28
c)Syro-Malankara	2	6	8

<sup>1167</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1168</sup>Cf. Census of India: Census Data 2001: India at a glance, Religious composition office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner, India Retrieved on 2008, 11-26.

<b>3. Bishops</b>			
a) Diocesan	30	125	155
b) Coadjutors	2	-	2
c) Auxiliaries	12	-	12
d) Apostolic Visitor	-	2	2
e) Retired	13	34	47
<b>4. Cardinals</b>	5	-	5

(24 August 2011)<sup>1169</sup>

The following table shows the numerical distribution of Christians in Kerala.

1. Syro-Malabar Catholics	3,000,000
2. Latin Catholics	1,700,000
3. Syro-Malankara Catholics	400,000
4. Syrian Orthodox Christians (Methrankashi)	1,100,000
5. Jacobite Syrian Orthodox Christians (Bava Kakshi)	1,000,000
6. Church of South India (CSI) and other protestants	700,000
7. Marthomites	500,000
8. Nestorians/Surais Christians of the Church of the East	100,000
9. ST. Thomas Evangelical and Others	10,000
10. Independent Jacobites (Thozhiyur)	9,000

1170

<sup>1169</sup><http://www.apostolicnunciatureindia.com/history.htm>. Date of Access: 05. 02. 2012. The Apostolic delegation to the East Indies was established in 1881 and included Ceylon (today: Sri Lanka) and was extended to Malaca (Malaysia) in 1889 and then to Burma (Myanmar) in 1920 and eventually included Goa in 1923. On 12 June 1948 this Delegation was raised by Pope Pius XII to the rank of an Internunciature and eventually became a Nunciature on 22 August 1967, during the pontificate of Pope Paul VI. Malaysia was detached in 1957 followed by Srinlanka in 1967, and Myanmar in 1973.

It is interesting to note that USA has 15 Christians for sq. km whereas India has 7.5 Christians per sq. km. In USA one will find 7 Catholics for sq. km. India has 5 Catholics for sq. km. Texas has 10 Catholics for sq. km whereas Kerala has 140 Catholics per sq. km. Together with it we may note that there are only 247 Hindus in India per sq. km. It shows clearly the growth of Christianity in Kerala which no other state in India can claim.<sup>1171</sup>

### A. The Latin Church

Although our study is mainly focused on the SMC which is the most ancient and most numerical here we will deal also with the Latin and Syro-Malankara churches. The Latin Church in India believed to have arrived in the 9<sup>th</sup> century on the coast of Quilon (Kollam). But the presence of Latin Christians was revived by the western missionaries only in the 13<sup>th</sup> century with the coming of Franciscans and Dominicans. The pioneers of revival were mainly Giovanni di Monte Corvino OFM, Jordan Catalani OP, Odorico di Pordenone OFM,<sup>1172</sup> and Giovanni di Marignolli OFM. Among these Giovanni di Monte had spent more than a year in Mylapore (1292-93) to know more in detail about the Thomas Christians [or also called Malabar Christians]. He has testified to the existence of Christian communities both in Mylapore<sup>1173</sup> and in Quilon.<sup>1174</sup> Pope John XXII erected the Diocese of Quilon on 9<sup>th</sup> August 1329 in recognition of the zealous work of Jordan Catalani and appointed him as the first Latin Bishop of Quilon. We find the next major revival of the Latin Christians with the coming of Portuguese traders in the 15<sup>th</sup> century with Christian missionaries. Their coming to India caused the opening of a new jurisdiction of the Portuguese Padroado<sup>1175</sup> in the missions. With their coming Cochin<sup>1176</sup> and Goa became the two main settlements of Portuguese in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Together with it Goa was erected as suffragan to Lisbon. Joao Alfonso de Albuquerque OFM who arrived in Goa in 1538 was made the first Latin Bishop of India. Thus by 1558 Goa became an Archdiocese with Cochin and Malaca as suffragans. Besides this, various other Christian communities were also established at Goa, Mylapore, Travancore, Madurai, Vasai<sup>1177</sup> and Mumbai. The Franciscan missionaries were the first among the missionaries to come to India followed by Jesuits. They went as far as Bengal, Agra, Delhi, Lahore and Tibet. St. Francis Xavier came to Goa in the year 1542, and he worked also in Cochin, Vasai and Mylapore. The coming of Dominicans revived further the missionary activity in India in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Augustinians from Persia arrived in 1572 to revive the missionary work. The Evangelization took a new impetus as the Jesuits missionaries were invited by Akbar the Moghul Emperor.

<sup>1170</sup>Cf. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christianity\\_in\\_India](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christianity_in_India). Date of Access: 20.10.2012.

<sup>1171</sup>Cf. [www.youtube.com/watch?v=oNs61tQE9oE&feature=related](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oNs61tQE9oE&feature=related). Date of Access: 05. 02. 2012 (in reference to Christianity in Kerala, part II, produced for cable channel 10 in Austin, Texas, as part of the 'In and Around Austin' Series). Date of access: 05. 02. 2012.

<sup>1172</sup>Odorico di Pordenone and Giovanni di Marignoli were papal Legate to the East, in the 14<sup>th</sup> century and on their return journey they stayed at Quilon for several months.

<sup>1173</sup>Mylapore is the place where St. Thomas is said to be pierced to death and buried.

<sup>1174</sup>Cf. <http://www.apostolicnunciatureindia.com/history.htm>. Date of Access: 05. 02. 2012.

<sup>1175</sup>Padroado literally means patronage. It was an arrangement between the Holy See and the kingdom of Portugal, affirmed by a series of treatise, by which the Vatican delegated to the kings of Spain and Portugal the administration of the local Churches (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Padroado>). Date of Access: 05. 02. 2012).

<sup>1176</sup>Cochin is the economic capital of Kerala and Goa is a state in South India.

<sup>1177</sup>Vasai-Virar is a city in Maharashtra state in western India. The Portuguese attacked the city in 1528 and captured it in 1532. It was used by the Portuguese as the centre of Portuguese India's Northern Province.

Although the Jesuits enjoyed only limited success until the reign of Shah Jahan, they could implant Christianity in areas like Agra, Delhi, Lahore, Patna, Jaipur and Nawar.

Latin Hierarchy was erected in the year 1886 on 1 September by Pope Leo XIII through the bull '*Humanae Salutis*' with 6 Metropolitan Archdioceses namely Agra, Bombay, Culcutta, Madras, Pondicherry and Verapoly and 10 dioceses: Allahabad, Cochin, Coimbatore, Hyderabad, Krishnanagar, Mysore, Pune, Quilon, Tiruchirapalli, and Visakhapatanam and Patna continued to function as Vicariates. With its erection, the Portuguese Padroado was suppressed. Later the Indian missionary bishops formed the Catholic Bishops' Conference of India (CBCI) in 1944. Pope John Paul II through his letter addressed to the Bishops of India on May 28<sup>th</sup> 1987 announced the determination of the Catholic Church that the bishops of each of the three Rites [Latin, Syro-Malabar and Syro-Malankara] has the right to establish their own Episcopal bodies according to their own ecclesiastical legislation. Thus today this Episcopal bodies are known according to their ecclesiastical legislation as CCBI (Conference of Catholic Bishops' of India), SMBS (Syro-Malabar Bishops' Synod), and SMBC (Syro-Malankara Bishops' Conference).<sup>1178</sup>

## B. The Syro-Malankara<sup>1179</sup> Church

Syro-Malankara Church was part of the SMC till the breakage which took place after the Koonankurishusatyam.<sup>1180</sup> Before we go directly into the Syro-Malankara Church it may be proper to speak a bit of the history of the context in which this new church was born. The St. Thomas Christian Community, founded in India (also called Syro-Malabar or Nasrani Christians) was further strengthened by a group of Christians who immigrated from Persia in 345 A. D. The coming of this group from Persia paved the way for the further strengthening of the presence of St. Thomas Christians establishing relationship with the churches in Persian Empire among whom some were founded by close disciples of St. Thomas. Thus from this particular moment of history both Indian Church and Persian Church were in close relationships.

This relation continued till 16<sup>th</sup> century until the coming of Portuguese. But from the 16<sup>th</sup> century something very disastrous started happening in the Indian church. Although the Portuguese were greeted by the native Indians right at the beginning as fellow brothers in the course of time Latin Portuguese Christians accused Indian Christians as Nestorians and started converting them with force. There came a point of breakage in the Syrian Church in the year 1653 which was till then able to enjoy unity. Enraged by the undue control of the Portuguese, one group from among these Thomas Christians decided to break away from the thump-rule of Portuguese. They formed themselves into a believing group called Malankara Church, an independent ecclesial community later establishing relationship with the ancient Christian Church

<sup>1178</sup>I have depended mostly on the internet site produced by the Catholic church of India for the accuracy of this documentation and the address of the site is given above in fn. 1174.

<sup>1179</sup>Malankara is the ancient name of the land between the mala (mountain) and the Kara (land). As Kerala is a land of mountains this name fits well to the people of the new Church.

<sup>1180</sup>Cf. E. Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India: A History of the Syro-Malabar Church from the earliest time to the present day*, Westminster 1957, 79: It was a pledge made by a group of Kerala people who belonged to the Thomas Christians on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> January 1653 against the Portuguese and Latin domination who tried to dominate the Thomas Christians. They tied a rope to the famous Coonan Cross and holding on it they swore that they would never fall under the domination of the new missionary group (known also as 'Coonen Cross Oath').



of Antioch. Though they broke away from the union of the Catholic Church they came back to the Roman Catholic Church in 1926 headed by the delegated Metropolitan Mar Ivanios. Pope Pius XI accepted the Malankara Church with their ancient and venerable traditions which they had initiated from the 4<sup>th</sup> century, along with the Liturgy of St. James and its relations with the west Syrian Church. Thus relationship with the Catholic Church was re-established in 1930. The immediate cause of its establishment was the split which took place due to the close connection of the Syrian Orthodox church to the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch concerning the extent to which the Patriarch would be given authority. Thus the fraction which gave full administrative powers to the Patriarch of Antioch became the Malankara Jacobite Syrian Church and the other fraction under the leadership of Mar Ivanios on 20<sup>th</sup> September 1930 founded the Syro-Malankara Catholic Church. Later in 1932 on June 11 Pope Pius XI through the Apostolic Constitution *Christo Pastorum Principi* established the Syro-Malankara hierarchy for the reunited community and erected the archieparchy of Trivandrum with the Eparchy of Thiruvalla as its suffragan. The Metropolitan Eparchy of Trivandrum was established in 1933 with Mar Ivanios enthroned as its first Metropolitan Archbishop and Thiruvalla in the same year with Jacob Theophilos as its first Bishop. In 1932 Mar Ivanios made his official visit to the Holy See of Rome and Pius XI invested him with the Sacred Pallium. The Metropolitan Eparchy of Trivandrum was inaugurated on May 11, 1933 and Mar Ivanios was the first Metropolitan. Today the Malankara Church which regained communion with the Catholic Church in Rome has 2 Archdioceses and 6 Dioceses with about 500 priests, 1200 Religious men and women and 400.000 faithful. According to the Pontifical Year book *Annuario Pontificio* of 2010, the Syro-Malankara Church has approximately 420081 members.<sup>1181</sup> Due to their lasting relationship with the Antiochian Church it has adopted the Antiochian Liturgy and canonical traditions which are rooted in the apostolic traditions of the early oriental Churches. Their Liturgy is shaped basing on the Anaphora of St. James, which was in use in the Church of Jerusalem. Pope John Paul II has raised the Syro-Malankara Metropolitan Church *sui iuris* to the rank of Major Archiepiscopal Church and Cyril Mar Baselios Malancharuvil to the dignity of Major Archbishop. The Syro-Malankara Church is presently a Major Archiepiscopal Church headed by Major Archbishop and Baselios Cleemis which follows yet today the Antiochian Rite, West Syrian in Character.<sup>1182</sup> On February 10, 2005 the Syro-Malankara Catholic Church was raised to the status of a Major Archiepiscopal Church by a papal document called *Ab ipso Sancto Thoma*. Besides, the Archbishop also was given the then existing title 'Catholicos' according to the Antiochian-Malankara tradition. When Mar Cyril Baselios died on 18 January 2007, Mar Baselios Cleemis was elected in his place through the first Episcopal Synod convoked from 7-10 February 2007 at Catholicate Centre, Pattom, Trivandrum and Pope Benedict XVI confirmed the election on 9<sup>th</sup> February.<sup>1183</sup> On 24<sup>th</sup> October 2012 Pope Benedict XVI named Major Archbishop Mar

<sup>1181</sup>Cf. R. Roberson, *The Eastern Catholic Churches*, 2010 in reference to *Annuario Pontificio* 2010.

<sup>1182</sup>"The West-Syrian or Syro-Antiochene Rite is the tradition of the Syrian Orthodox in the Patriarchate of Antioch and in India as well as of the Syrian and Malankarese Catholics. The Syriac-speaking Christians were organized into an independent Church under Jacob Baradai (d. 578), which is the reason why they are sometimes called 'Jacobites'" (R. Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office and its meaning for Today*, Minnesota 1986, 239-240).

<sup>1183</sup>Cf. <http://www.apostolicnunciatureindia.com/history.htm>. Date of access: 06. 02. 2012.

Baselios Cleemis head of the Syro-Malankara Church as Cardinal. He is the first Cardinal of the Syro-Malankara rite of the Catholic Church and at 53 he is the youngest Cardinal in the Catholic Church.<sup>1184</sup>

## 2. A Short Sketch of Kerala

### A. The Land of Spices

Before we start our study, a short survey of the history of Kerala is in place. We can collect a lot of informations from the megalithic monuments about the history of Kerala. “The region is however noted for its megalithic monuments which belong to the megalithic complex common to South India.”<sup>1185</sup> When some of the scholars date back this period to 700-400 B. C., some even assign a much earlier age and yet some others subscribe it to a later age. Kerala<sup>1186</sup> was well known to other parts of India from antiquity. We have evidence for it from the various works written in Sanskrit. The Aitareya Aranyaka is the earliest Sanskrit work which makes a mention of Kerala.<sup>1187</sup> We find references to Kerala in the Epics of India, namely, Ramayana and Mahabharata. Katyayana (4<sup>th</sup> Century B. C.) and Patangali (2<sup>nd</sup> Century B. C.) write about the geography of Kerala. Kautilaya’s Arthasastra and the Puranas also mention Kerala. From Kalidasa’s Raghuvamsa we come to know about the land of Kerala with which the Northerners were acquainted.<sup>1188</sup> A. Mattam gives us some information about the people who inhabited Kerala in the first centuries. “The people who inhabited South India, Tamilakam, at the time of the Apostle were mostly Dravidians. Many of the Dravidians had accepted Buddhism and Jainism. They had a common language and culture, basically Dravidian. The common language was Chen-Tamil.”<sup>1189</sup>

Kerala is not only known in India but it was also known to the world from ancient times. For example the Greek ambassador called Megasthenes in his *Indica*, Pliny (1<sup>st</sup> century A. D.) the anonymous author of the *Periplus* (1<sup>st</sup> century A. D.) and Ptolemy (2<sup>nd</sup> Century A. D.) are some of the most classical outstanding writers who mention Kerala.<sup>1190</sup> From these classical writers we can gather informations regarding the trade conducted by Kerala with Roman Empire and the Middle East through the ports of Muziris<sup>1191</sup> (Kodungalloor). At a later stage also we find so many writers making mention of Kerala in their writings. Later writers like Sulaiman (9<sup>th</sup> century),

---

Cf. <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/mar-baselios-cleemis-iscardinal/article4027832.ece?css=print>.  
Date of Access: 5.11.2012.

<sup>1185</sup>A. Sreedhara Menon, Cultural Heritage of Kerala, Madras 1978, 4.

<sup>1186</sup>According to P. Miller Kerala is a Jewel of India’s Malabar Coast and a national pacesetter in health, education and religious tolerance (cf. P. Miller, Kerala: Jewel of India’s Malabar Coast, in: National Geographic 173, 5 [1988], 592-617).

<sup>1187</sup>Cf. Sreedhara Menon, Cultural Heritage of Kerala, 4.

<sup>1188</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 5.

<sup>1189</sup>A. Mattam, Forgotten East, Mission, Liturgy and Spirituality of the Eastern Churches: A Study with Special Reference to the Church of St. Thomas Christians, Satna 2001, 152.

<sup>1190</sup>Cf. Miller, Kerala: Jewel of India’s Malabar Coast, 592-617.

<sup>1191</sup>Muziris Port was defunct due to the 14<sup>th</sup> century flood and today Cochin Port is employed. According to Archaeological studies the Muziris Port can be found today in a place called Pattanam in Kerala near Paravur thodu (Kodungalloor). (Agencies involved in Pattanam excavation are Archeological Survey of India, Janpath, NewDelhi; State Archaeology Department, Thiruvananthapuram; Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute Pune ... etc.).

Masudi (10<sup>th</sup> century), Al Kazwini (13<sup>th</sup> century), Marco Polo (13<sup>th</sup> century), John of Monte Corvino (13<sup>th</sup> century), Friar Jordanus of Severic (14<sup>th</sup> century), Ibn Batuta (14<sup>th</sup> century), Ma Huan (15<sup>th</sup> century), Nicolo Conti (15<sup>th</sup> Century), and Abdur Razzack (15<sup>th</sup> Century) are a few of them to mention here. Besides Muziris some other ports of Kerala mentioned in the antiquity were Tyndis, Barace (today it is identified with Purakkad, south of Alleppey, Alappuzha the Venice of East) and Nelcynda. Along with them we find a port named Balita mentioned by Periplus and another ancient port of Kerala which is identified with Vizhinjam, south of Trivandrum. So also the port which was called Naura is identified with modern Cannanore (Kannur).<sup>1192</sup>

We may infer from all these that Kerala was one of the most important areas in India due to its manifold attractions. One of them is that Kerala was a legendary land of spices. The spice trade of Kerala goes back to the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium B. C. Kerala produced spices like cinnamon, cardamom, pepper, cloves, ginger, nutmegs etc. Among these cinnamon and cardamom attracted the attention of world traders at first and later pepper or any other spices. Keralites made use these spices in their food items, for healing and for the propitiation of the gods. Traders from Babylon, Assyria and ancient Egypt all came to Kerala especially for its cinnamon as it was very essential for preserving the dead bodies of kings and for the manufacture of perfumes and holy oils. “With the discovery of the monsoon winds by Hippalus, the Egyptian navigator, in 45 A. D., the spice trade between Kerala and the West entered a decisive phase, the Egyptians also entering the field in right earnest.”<sup>1193</sup> Sreedhara Menon, a leading historian of India, claims that among the gifts offered by the Emperor to the bishop of Rome were cloves and pepper. He tells that when Alaric the king of Visigoths besieged the country, Bishop of Rome saved the city from destruction by offering to the king of Visigoths a ransom of 3000 pounds of pepper.<sup>1194</sup> It seems spices found its way from Kerala through Venice to Europe that merchants of Venice had acquired special tributes from all countries of Europe. We find West European countries all involving in this spice trade by the end of middle ages and the beginning of the Renaissance. Thus Portuguese came to India rivaling with the Arabs and followed by the Danes, the French and the English. According to Sreedhara Menon the spice trade ultimately led to the coming of the European powers and the British conquest and occupation of India.<sup>1195</sup> The Anjarakkandy Cinnamon Estate, in Cannanore (now Kannur) a district of Kerala and which is still operational and established by the East India Company after a big fight between the Pazhassi Raja and the British Army for control of the estate in 1767 is reputed to be Asia’s largest cinnamon estate.<sup>1196</sup> In the Old Testament, there are some references to a land from where spices were brought. King Solomon of Israel (1000 B. C) travelled<sup>1197</sup> with fleet of ships to a port called Omphir in the East manned by the Phoenicians. This port is located by some scholars as a port in Kerala coast.<sup>1198</sup>

Even before Solomon found his way to Kerala the long voyage to Kerala coast and other regions of the East was undertaken by the Arabs of the Oman and the

<sup>1192</sup>Cf. Sreedhara Menon, Cultural Heritage of Kerala, 9.

<sup>1193</sup>Ibid., 7.

<sup>1194</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1195</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 8.

<sup>1196</sup>Cf. <http://www.keralaregistration.gov.in/cms/history.php>. Date of Access: 06. 02. 2012.

<sup>1197</sup>Cf. Sreedhara Menon, Cultural Heritage of Kerala, 8.

<sup>1198</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

Persian Gulf and the first cinnamon from Kerala found its way to West Asia through the Arabs by sea.<sup>1199</sup> In all probability the modern Puvar which is found near south of Trivandrum is the Ophir mentioned in the Old Testament<sup>1200</sup> although today many historians prefer some other land as the so-called Ophir. But due to the explanations given by Bible the counter-arguments of these modern scholars seems to be not matching. For in 1 Kgs 22, 48 we read about King Jehoshaphat as building great ships to sail to Ophir for gold. But unfortunately they could not reach there as they were ruined on the way. It shows that this Ophir remained somewhere very far from Israel. For it is said in the Bible the journey took almost three years from Ophir to Ezion Geber<sup>1201</sup> which is near Elath on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom.<sup>1202</sup> From this we can conclude that the location of Ophir ought to lie somewhere very far, several thousand nautical miles from the port of Ezion Gerber. Today many historians are of the view that those ships ought to have passed through the Arabian Sea and sailed into the Indian Ocean. Therefore, it must be somewhere in the midst of the Indian Ocean. The archaeologists of our century made studies on thousands of cylindrical seals found in Mesopotamia from 2300 B. C. and 2000 B. C. as Ur seemed to be the key entry port into Mesopotamia. To their amazement many of them bore inscriptions in the Dravidian language which is used in the south of India; it must be the earliest form of Tamil written letters.<sup>1203</sup> According to the reports available Ur imported items like gold, silver, copper, exotic woods etc. from an area which seems to be located somewhere in the lower parts of the Indian sub-continent. It is believed that this area is no other place than Kerala which also used old Tamil up to the 8<sup>th</sup> century A. D. Another study made by Benhur, a Kerala Archeologist, states that Ophir is the present day Oman. According to him the descendents of Joktan's son Ophir were traders from Zopar, the main trading centre in Oman. They came to Indian ports and opened godowns to gather goods and took them to Ophir through the sea. Benhur states that the reason why some of the ports in India are called Ophir is due to their trading relation with Ophir in Oman. Hence "Sopara in Maharashtra, Beypore on the Malabar Coast and Poovar in Travancore happened to be known by Ophir names."<sup>1204</sup> So according to Benhur this is the reason for fixing many other lands as Ophir by so many historians and archaeologists. Although we can find the argument of Benhur as very consistent, we also come across some other studies conducted by some other scholars. Scholars like Pothan and Cherian argue that Ophir must be somewhere

"on the west Coast of India, thirty-six miles north of Bombay, and three miles north of Bassein called by the name of Nalla Sopara on the suburban section of the Western Railway. This has been identified by scholars with Ophir. Sopara<sup>1205</sup> was formerly the capital of the kingdom of Aparanta, stretching from Navsari, north of Bombay to Gokarnam, the sacred northern city of Kerala."<sup>1206</sup>

---

<sup>1199</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1200</sup>Cf. 1 Kgs 10, 11.

<sup>1201</sup>Cf. 1 Kgs 9, 26.

<sup>1202</sup>Cf. 1 Kgs 10, 22.

<sup>1203</sup>Cf. <http://hope-of-israel.org/ophir.htm>. Date of Access: 08. 02. 2012.

<sup>1204</sup>A. Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People: A Historical, Archaeological, Anthropological and Etymological Study of the Lost Tribes*, Calicut 2011, 59.

<sup>1205</sup>In the Septuagint or Greek version of the Bible made in Alexandria, the translators render Ophir as Sopheir, Souphir, Sophara (cf. S. G. Pothan, *The Syrian Christians of Kerala*, Bombay 1963, 7).

<sup>1206</sup>*Ibid.*; cf. C. V. Cheriyan, *A History of Christianity in Kerala: From the mission of St. Thomas to the arrival of Vasco da Gama A. D. 52-1498*, Kottayam 1973, 28.

We do not deny the fact that there is a disagreement among the scholars about the Ophir land. Some relations which we find between the words involved give some indication about the strong relation between Kerala and the world at large. With the help of this linguistic tie, some scholars strongly argue that Ophir mentioned in the Bible is not Oman but rather it is the old Tamilnadu itself.<sup>1207</sup> In this journey the seafarers bought gold, almug trees, gems, ivory, apes, spices, sandalwood and peacocks from Ophir. Besides, this journey demanded intense preparations as it was a hazardous voyage. In addition the voyage demanded special expertise, technical and professional knowledge and training in navigation. We know from the Old Testament that this difficulty of navigation and ships were overcome by Solomon with his friendship with Hiram the King of Tyre the Phoenician. Bible tells Hiram gave Solomon cedar and cypress logs according to all his desire (1 Kgs 5, 10). We read in 1 Kgs 10, 11 that Hiram's ships brought gold, brought great quantities of almug wood and precious stones from Ophir. Besides Hiram sent his servants with the fleet, seamen who knew the sea, to work with the servants of Solomon. And they went to Ophir, and acquired four hundred and twenty talents of gold from there, and brought it to King Solomon (1 Kgs 9, 27, 28). The name Ophir may have originated out of the transliteration from Hebrew into Greek and later into Latin and English. The word 'Ophir' is derived from the Greek word 'ophis' which means serpent and some think the word for serpent in Hebrew is also the same. Some claim that there is no phonetic similarity between the Hebrew word for serpent 'Nachash' or 'Saraph' (the Tamil word is Sarpam) with Ophir; it is the Hebrews and not the Greeks who called the place Ophir. The Tamil word 'Ovar' means painters, artists, sculptors, engineering technicians, artisans, and skilled workers in the construction trade. The country of the Ovar was also called 'Oviyar Nadu'<sup>1208</sup> the ancient land of Oviyar which is considered as present day Kerala. Later on this word 'Ovar' was corrupted by foreign sailors due to the twisting of their tongues and came to be called Ophir - the country of the Oviyar.

“A number of South Dravidian words, almost all of them geographic and dynasties names, occur in such Greco-Roman sources as Periplus maris Erythraei (circumnavigation of the Erythraean sea)<sup>1209</sup> of 89 A. D. and in the writing of Ptolemaeus of Naukratis of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Century A. D; it is probable that the Western language term for rice (compare Italian *riso*, Latin *oryza*, Greek *oryza*) and ginger (compare Italian *zenzero*, German *Ingwer*, Greek *zingiberis*) are cultural loans from Old Tamil, in which they are arici and inciver, [in Malayalam ari, and inchi], respectively.”<sup>1210</sup>

Besides these words of Tamil origin there were also words which were in circulation in early Mesopotamia taken from Tamil. For example the word 'Ur' which means settlement, town or community and there are many words with 'Ur' in the root, such as 'Uruk,' 'Nimrud' etc. We find so many similar words in the Hebrew Bible. The original words used for ivory - in Hebrew is *ibha* (in Tamil *ipam*), for apes-Hebrew - *kapi* (Tamil: *kapi*), ahalim - Hebrew *ahalim* (Tamil *aghil*),

<sup>1207</sup>Cf. *ibid*.

<sup>1208</sup>It is a port city in Tamilnadu meaning the land of the divine craftsmen.

<sup>1209</sup>According to Brown, “Pliny (23-79 A. D.), Ptolomey (100-160 A. D.), and the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea give a good deal of detailed information about the trading centers of Malabar” (L. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas: An Account of the Ancient Syrian Church of Malabar*, Cambridge 1982, 60).

<sup>1210</sup>NEB 4, New York 151901, 699.

and peacocks - Hebrew *tukeyium* (Tamil *tokai*) which seem to have arrived at Israeli port from Tamilnadu. Modern archaeologists say that these words were borrowed by the Hebrew mariners from Tamil inhabitants of the port area.<sup>1211</sup> The finding of gold from the basement of Sree Padmanabha Swami Shethram (Temple) very recently in 2011 underlines the above said factors that present day Kerala was also abundantly rich with gold, other stones and spices. Many of the European News Papers also gave this news with a big Caption. Berliner Morgenpost wrote:

“Ruhen im Hindu-Tempel weitere Milliarden Schätze? Bald wird ein weiteres Gewölbe eines indischen Hindu-Tempels geöffnet, in dem schon ein Milliarden Schatz entdeckt wurde. Und es gibt noch zwei bislang ungeöffnete Kammern ... Der Sree Padmanabhaswamy Tempel in Thiruvananthapuram in Südindien wird mit Spannung die Öffnung einer weiteren Kammer eines Hindutempels erwartet, in dem ein milliardenschwerer Schatz entdeckt wurde. In den bereits geöffneten Kammern wurden Goldmünzen, Edelsteine und Schmuck gefunden. Die insgesamt sechs Gewölbe waren mehr als 150 Jahren lang verschlossen ... Bislang galt der Thirupathy-Tempel im südlichen Bundesstaat Andhra Pradesh als reichste Kultstätte des Landes. Sein Vermögen wird auf 320 Milliarden Rupien geschätzt.”<sup>1212</sup>

On no account can any historian deny the fact of the presence of traders in Kerala from Greece, Rome, Arabia, China, and Portuguese from time immemorial. K. Shillington a modern historian notes that *Periplus* (The Voyage of the Indian Ocean) was a navigational guide written in Greek in the great Egyptian trading port of Alexandria around 100 A.D.<sup>1213</sup> The same work describes about the ports and trading centers from Southern India to the region reaching up to Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. Many historians see this book as a path-finder to the Greek navigators. A student of history must not skip the *Chart of Castorius*<sup>1214</sup> to know the importance of India and Kerala. In this Chart and in *Expositio totius mundi* India is considered as the end of the world: “Die Verfasser dieser beiden Quellen hielten Indien für das Ende der Welt.”<sup>1215</sup> The *Chart of Castorius* indicates that already in the 4<sup>th</sup> century the Persians could reach India in different ways: “Die Perser konnten folglich Indien auf mehreren, in verschiedenen Richtungen verlaufenden Wegen erreichen.”<sup>1216</sup> In connection with India the same map shows us that this way did not end in North India rather it led further to Muziris and Malabar Coast.

“Die verzweigten Karawanenstraßen nach dem Osten, zum fernen Antiochien und zu den äußersten Punkten, bis zu denen Alexander vordrang, d. h. zu den Mündungen von Ganges und Indus und zur Malabarküste, gehen von Ekbatana aus ... Der Iran verfügte also im 4. Jahrhundert über eine Karawanenstraße nach Indien,

<sup>1211</sup>Cf. Cheriyan, A History of Christianity in Kerala, 29; cf. R. Caldwell, Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages, London 1875, 91-92; T. Puthiyakunnel, Jewish Colonies of India Paved the way for St. Thomas, in: G. Menachery, ed., Thomapedia, Ollur 2000, 26.

<sup>1212</sup>Berliner Morgenpost, Deutschland July 4<sup>th</sup> 2011.

<sup>1213</sup>Cf. K. Shillington, History of Africa, London 1995, 122-124.

<sup>1214</sup>The map of Castorius or map of the world by Castorius, also known as Peutinger's Tabula which has reached us today, must have been fixed in 500 A. D. which according to most authorities seems to be copied from a larger original map of the first century A. D. although a few local corrections were made subsequently, for example, in the eighth and ninth centuries (cf. [http://cartographic-images.net/120\\_Peutinger\\_Table.html](http://cartographic-images.net/120_Peutinger_Table.html). Date of Access: 21. 10. 2012; for more details of the same cf. R. J. A. Talbert, Rome's World: the Peutinger Map Reconsidered, Cambridge 2010).

<sup>1215</sup>N. Pigulewskaja, Byzanz auf den Wegen nach Indien: Aus der Geschichte des byzantinischen Handels mit dem Orient vom 4. bis 6. Jahrhundert, Berlin 1969, 99.

<sup>1216</sup>Ibid., 98.

die durch das südliche Festland verlief und zu den Städten von Sindh und zur Malabarküste führte.”<sup>1217</sup>

People might have come to Kerala (Malabarküste) as it was and is famous for elephants and ivory. “... letzteres bezieht sich ohne Zweifel auf indische Exportwaren, wozu nach dem Warenregister auch Elefanten und Elfenbein gehörten.”<sup>1218</sup> Castorius mentions also about the presence of a Christian church of the Syrians. He indicates about it without even depending upon the *Periplus*. “Castorius hat hier also offenbar nicht den Periplus benutzt ... Der Augustustempel auf seiner Karte bestätigt indirect die Angaben des Periplus über das Aufblühen von Muziris ... Zweifellos bauten auch die Syrer ihre christlichen Tempel in den Kolonien, die sie an den indischen Küsten gründeten, in ähnlicher Weise und knüpften dabei an Traditionen an.”<sup>1219</sup> He also gives sufficient indications regarding the trade relations which took place between present day Kerala and the world. He tells this land of Kerala (Muziris and Malabarküste) lies between two lands: “zwischen dieser Stadt und dem Piratenland liegen auf der Karte des Castorius die Städte Tundis und Muziris, die auch der Periplus nennt. Es folgen Naura und Tyndis, die ersten Handelsplätze von Limyrike, und nach ihnen Muziris und Nelkynda, die jetzt den ersten Platz einnehmen.”<sup>1220</sup> It seems almost 120 ships travelled in a year from Egypt through the Red Sea to the Malabar Coast of India. Klimkiet is of the opinion that “one of these ships might have taken St. Thomas to India. He says that there was no technical difficulty in the way of Christianity reaching India in that period.”<sup>1221</sup> P. Jenkins informs us about the status of Kerala in the world trade: “Auf der anderen Seite verbanden antike Seerouten Mesopotamien und Indien, und reiche Funde römischer Waren in Südindien erinnern an den Seehandel mit Ägypten.”<sup>1222</sup>

Before the coming of the Persians we find the presence of Jews in Kerala. The Kerala history witnesses the presence of three types of Jews in Kerala. Though today they are known as Cochin Jews actually they did not come at first to Cochin. Their first settlement was a little north from Cochin in the town of Kodungallur (formerly Cranganore). They did not migrate to Kerala in a trip. They came at different times and settled in South India in Kodungallur. One of the historical versions tells that they came during the time of Solomon who had business relations with Kerala. There are also two other versions related to it. One of them says that those who came to Kerala were the Lost Tribes of Israel. The third version tells that they were people who fled the rule of Nebuchadnezzar in 587. Later on Jews from Spain arrived in Cochin. The Spanish Jews in Kerala lived separately from the veteran Jews and considered them as Indian proselytes to Judaism.<sup>1223</sup> These merchants who arrived from Jerusalem and settled in Kerala were successful people and contributed to the prosperity of Kerala too. The research of Benhur also underlines the presence of Jewish traders in Kerala: “The closeness of Marayur, where there exists a large number of Jewish graves and the Jewish settlement of Udumalpet to Pollachi, from where large hoards of Roman coins

---

<sup>1217</sup>Ibid., 97.

<sup>1218</sup>Ibid., 96.

<sup>1219</sup>Ibid., 95.

<sup>1220</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1221</sup>I. Grillman and H. Klimkiet, *Christians in Asia before 1500*, Michigan 1999, 159.

<sup>1222</sup>Jenkins, *Das Goldene Zeitalter des Christentums*, 74.

<sup>1223</sup>Cf. <http://adaniel.tripod.com/cochin.htm>. Date of Access: 08. 02. 2012.

have been recovered, goes to prove a strong Jewish presence in these areas.”<sup>1224</sup> From the study Benhur conducted on the tombs and dolmens in Marayur in Kerala and the similarities he found in the construction of the tombs found with the tombs of port-holes found in the Caucases, Jerusalem, North Africa and Europe compelled him to reach such a conclusion that already before Christ there was Jewish presence in Kerala.<sup>1225</sup> For the prominence Jews acquired in Kerala some scholars find the protection they obtained from the princes in Kerala. As a gratitude to their contribution to the kingdom, the ruler Sri Parkaran Iravi Vanmar gave to Joseph Rabban the head of the Jewish community the village of Anjuvannam and declared him as the Prince of this village. They had all the privilege like any other ruling families of the Indian Kingdoms. And they received princely rights written on a copper plate.<sup>1226</sup> As we have already mentioned, they were three groups in India. The biggest group is called ‘Meyuhassim’ (meaning ‘privilege’ in Hebrew) or Malabari Jews (Malabar is the name of the coast on which Kerala is situated). They consider themselves as the grandsons of the Jews who came to Kerala during the time of Solomon. The Second group is called ‘Pardesi’ (meaning ‘foreigner’ in some Indian languages). These second group seems to have come to Kerala from Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Iran, Spain and Germany. These two groups were merchants with slaves. Whereas the slaves who got converted to Judaism and later on released from their status as slaves and are called ‘Meshuhararim’ (‘released’ in Hebrew) form the third group.<sup>1227</sup> The Kerala people took pride in the fact that the kingdoms of Kerala were world famous and merchants from around the world frequently visited Kerala, since the times of King Solomon. The Jewish principality survived till the 16<sup>th</sup> century A. D., till when they were attacked by Moorish Arabs.<sup>1228</sup> This attack seems to have taken place due to the monopoly of Jewish merchants in some of the commodities. So as the Jews in Kerala were not having a real army they suddenly deserted their principality and pleaded the king of Cochin to give them shelter. The king received them in his kingdom and so was established the Jewish community of Cochin. Even to this day there exists in Kerala, in Cochin, the town called ‘Jew Town.’ The Cochin Jews were numbered almost 3000 in the 1940s. Today there are about 70 Jews in Cochin and their Synagogues remain as a proof for their presence in Cochin. India and especially Kerala was the only place in the world where Jews were never attacked. Today also there exist in Kerala a functioning synagogue<sup>1229</sup> and 7 other standing synagogues with many lost synagogues. Many of the Jews returned to Palestine due to the establishment of the new state Israel.

---

<sup>1224</sup>Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 195.

<sup>1225</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 160.

<sup>1226</sup>Cf. V. Kodickal, *Religions in Kerala*, in: G. Menacherry, *Thomapedia*, 182 (According to some the principalities were given to them already in 4<sup>th</sup> century A. D. and some say that it was given to them only much later in the 10<sup>th</sup> century A. D. According to Cochin [also known as Cochini] Jews they received the ‘princely rights’ written on copper plates (and therefore called Copper Plates) in the year 379 A. D. (This is certified by an Indian born Jew Aharon Daniel and who at present lives in Israel. He attended his schools in India and started researching more about India in 1990s’ as he started writing his bachelor degree in Social sciences).

<sup>1227</sup>Cf. A. Daniel, *Jews in India*, <http://adaniel.tripod.com/cochin.htm>, 1999-2000. Date of access: 08. 02. 2012.

<sup>1228</sup>The first Indian mosque is thought to have been built in 629 A. D. purportedly at the behest of Rama Varma Kulashekara, who is considered as the first Indian Muslim, during the lifetime of Muhammad (ca. 571-632) in Kodangallur, Kerala by Malik Bin Deenar (cf. W. Logan, *Malabar Manual*, New Delhi 1996, 195-96).

<sup>1229</sup>Cf. J. C. Barbara and D. Ruby, *Ruby of Cochin: An Indian Jewish Woman Remembers*, Jerusalem 1995; S. Weil, *India’s Jewish Heritage: Ritual, Art, and Life-Cycle*, Mumbai 2006.



The same success story of Jews is also true with regard to the Thomas Christians of Kerala. They were also successful people like the Jews in Kerala. John de Marignolli finds various reasons for the success of Thomas Christians. They were mostly hard-working farmers, and quite a few of them were also merchants and they were especially busy with cultivating, selling, exporting pepper and other such spices. He mentions that “the pepper-trade was handled by the Thomas Christians. As such they were also the masters of the public weighing office.”<sup>1230</sup>

Portuguese merchants who gained right in 1516 in India had lost their upper hand and had to leave in the year 1662 due to the stronger Dutch (Nederland) merchants. However the Dutch merchants also could not withstand the British traders who came to India and had to leave by 1795. Then it was the period of British traders up to 1947 till India was freed from the Colonial rule.

## B. Synchronization of Religions in Kerala

India is a land of tolerance. If not we would not have been able to tolerate so many religious differences in this sub-continent. It is rightly noted by one of the historians that tolerance is one of the reasons for the coming of Christianity to India and Kerala. According to him “the missionary nature of Christianity must have been the main reason for its reaching India so early. Jewish presence, trade routes to India, and the hospitable attitude of Indians would have facilitated the venture.”<sup>1231</sup> Today India hosts all the major religions of the world namely, Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Zoroastrianism etc. The same can be said about Kerala which is located on the Malabar Coast of south-west India and is bordered by Karnataka to the north and northeast, Tamilnadu to the south and southeast, and the Arabian Sea on the west. It seems Jainism was the first one to reach Kerala (321-297 B. C.). “Buddhism also must have been introduced in Kerala in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B. C. itself during the reign of Asoka.”<sup>1232</sup> It seems Buddhism played a pivotal role for the popularity of Ayurveda along with learning and literacy in Kerala.<sup>1233</sup> The Kerala state was created on 1 November 1956 by the States Reorganization Act by combining various Malayalam speaking regions. It spreads over an area of 15,005 sq. miles or 38, 863 sq. kms, with 30 million people, divided into 14 districts. This state in India has the highest literacy rate.<sup>1234</sup> This high rate of literacy is also may be due to a Hindu conception that Lakshmi<sup>1235</sup> will come only where there is saraswathi.<sup>1236</sup> Another reason for this may be that it is not an industrialized state in India. So if people want to have their livelihood they have to be educated. Besides all these, Kerala is the only place in the world where education and

<sup>1230</sup>E. R. Hambye, *Medieval Christianity in India*, in: S. K. Sharma and U. Sharma, *Cultural and Religious Heritage of India*, Vol. 4, New Delhi 2004, 98.

<sup>1231</sup>J. Valiamangalam, *Indian Christian Spirituality*, in: R. Sundararajan and B. Mukerji, ed., *Hindu Spirituality*, Vol. 2: Post classical and Modern, New Delhi 2003, 507.

<sup>1232</sup>Sreedhara Menon, *Kerala History and its Makers*, 33.

<sup>1233</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1234</sup>Cf. The Literacy-official website of Govt. of Kerala: <http://www.census2011.co.in/census/state/kerala.html>. Date of Access: 08. 02. 2012. It shows that in Kerala 96.02% males and 91.98% females are among the literate as per the 2011 Census. Sex Ratio of Kerala is 1084 i.e., for each 1000 male as per Census 2011.

<sup>1235</sup>Lakshmi is the goddess of Hinduism who stands for prosperity, wealth, purity, generosity and she is an embodiment of beauty, grace and charm.

<sup>1236</sup>In Hinduism Sarasvati is the goddess of knowledge, music, arts, science and technology.

medical care are completely free in the state run schools and hospitals. Bill McKibben in an article titled *What is true Development? The Kerala model* wrote that “after the latest in a long series of literacy campaigns, the United Nations in 1991 certified Kerala as 100percent literate. Your chances of having an informed conversation are at least as high in Kerala as in Kansas.”<sup>1237</sup> Shashi Tharoor<sup>1238</sup> wrote in a Hindu Column that “most districts in Kerala, following the introduction of the free and compulsory education by an elected communist government<sup>1239</sup> in 1957, have attained 100 percent literacy.”<sup>1240</sup>

In Kerala the atmosphere between the religions was always one of tolerance and amity. “The Vaishnavites<sup>1241</sup> and Saivites<sup>1242</sup> behaved towards one another as brothers and the Hindus as a whole treated the followers of other religions namely that of Jainism, Buddhism, Christianity etc., in a spirit of extreme friendliness.”<sup>1243</sup> It is noted by Dempsey that “Kerala’s Hindu and Christian communities have been living under the same roof for nearly two thousand years.”<sup>1244</sup> Christian church in Malabar has also taken elements from the Hindu tradition.

“A baptismal font in the SMC of Edappally has a frieze of lotus flowers below the rim and sits on four Asiatic lions at the base. This is unmistakably due to the influence of pre-Portuguese Hindu art. Another font at the Katutturutti Church also shows the Hindu influence in decoration. Stone lamp-posts of Hindu type are also seen in the Cennanur churchyard.”<sup>1245</sup>

Unfortunately there were times in the history of Kerala that there were contrasts between Hindus and Christians. Susas Bayly notes such a situation which happened in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Kerala. According to her “in contrast to the prevailing climate of interreligious cooperation in Kerala a nineteenth-century break down in relations between Syrian Christians and Hindus took place for which she credits British missionary-colonizers.”<sup>1246</sup> Whereas after the departure of British colonizers such an event is not heard narrating from anywhere. Today on the contrary there are so many places in Kerala where Hindus decorate their entrances with tender coconut leaves and light oil lamps (nilavilakku) or candles when the Christian procession passes by. In the same way Christians also light the way with lights when Hindu procession passes by. Muslim support of Hindu and Christian festivals and vice versa is not completely

<sup>1237</sup><http://www.ashanet.org/library/articles/kerala.199803.html>. Date of access: 08. 02. 2012. (B. McKibben is the author of so many books like *The End of Nature*, München 1989; *The Age of Missing Information*, München 1992; *Hope, Human and Wild*, Boston 1995).

<sup>1238</sup>Tharoor was an Indian Diplomat at the United Nations and author (of 12 books) from Kerala. He served as the UN under-secretary General for Communications and Public information between June 2002 and February 2007 during the term of Secretary-General Kofi Annan. He was the official candidate of India for the succession to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan in 2006 and came close second to Ban ki-Moon out of seven contenders in the race. At present he is a MP (Member of Indian Parliament) representing the capital of Kerala viz., Thiruvananthapuram constituency and minister in the central government.

<sup>1239</sup>It is in Kerala for the first time a Communist government came to power through ballot.

<sup>1240</sup>Shashi Tharoor, *The Hindu: India’s National Newspaper*, Sunday, May 13, 2007.

<sup>1241</sup>Vaishnavism is a form of Hinduism which gives its worship to god Vishnu or his associated avatars such as Rama and Krishna.

<sup>1242</sup>Saivism is a form of Hinduism which considers Shiva as a personal, many faceted manifestation of the attributeless supreme deity.

<sup>1243</sup>Sreedhara Menon, *Cultural heritage of Kerala*, 22.

<sup>1244</sup>C. G. Dempsey, *Rivalry, Reliance, and Resemblance: Siblings as Metaphor for Hindu-Christian Relations in Kerala State*, in: *AFS* 57 (1998), 53.

<sup>1245</sup>A. S. Atiya, *A History of Easter Christianity*, London 1968, 386.

<sup>1246</sup>Dempsey, *Rivalry, Reliance, and Resemblance*, 54.

unknown in Kerala although the more commonly exchanged traditions one find between Christians and Hindus. There are also traditions where the temple elephant is fed by the Christians [on the occasion of a temple festival] where as the Temple gives oil for the lamps (kedavilaku) lit in the Christian churches. We have some references for this Kerala unity among religions. The author of the Sanskrit poem Mooshakavamsa (11<sup>th</sup> century A. D.) shares this idea with the help of a proverb. He says that “just as the proverb goes that in the asramas of those great kings who attained the siddhis beasts naturally inimical to each other lived in harmony, so in the region of Kerala ruled by the Mooshaka kings religions with dreadfully opposed doctrines flourished side by side.”<sup>1247</sup> It is interesting to note that all the religious institutions of the Buddhists, the Jains, the Christians, the Jews and the Muslims were all called *pallies*. For Christians it means church. It is true to say that the Portuguese saw a Christianity very different from the Europeanized Christianity. The Christianity one found in Kerala was an Indianized one, which means to say that barely one could differentiate especially with festive ceremonies. For example the Chenda<sup>1248</sup> melam which gives flavour to the feasts of Kerala Churches is typical Hindu instrument so to say belong to the life of the Hindus in Kerala. Or again the Nagaswaram<sup>1249</sup> which one sees both in the Churches and temples alike comes from the Hindu tradition. The Muttikuda<sup>1250</sup> which the laity carries in the hand during procession, gives any one viewing it a never forgetting experience in one’s life, is also taken from the Hindu tradition. Even the famous and one of the toughest music to learn namely the Carnatic music which is purely south Indian in origin and invented by hindu priests, also has influenced the liturgical music of St. Thomas Christians. In the Christian marriage besides handing over the rings as in Western tradition the Syrian Christians also have blended Hindu customs like Thalikettu, or the minnukettu<sup>1251</sup> and giving the Manthrakody or in Hindu tradition it is the pudava kodukkal.<sup>1252</sup> The oil lamp (Nilavilakku) which is used in the Church and which is part of the Hindu tradition is also a proof for the purest blending of many elements from Hinduism. On the top of this oil lamp there is a Cross illustrating well the blending of both traditions. Also in connection with it we must appreciate the tolerance of the Hindu rulers from time immemorial showed to the Christians in India and especially to the Kerala Christians.

<sup>1247</sup>Cited from Sreedhara Menon, Cultural Heritage of Kerala, 22 referring to the poem Mooshakavamsa.

<sup>1248</sup>Chenda is a cylindrical percussion instrument used widely in the state of Kerala.

<sup>1249</sup>Also called Nadaswaram, is one of the most popular classical musical instruments and the world’s loudest non-brass acoustic instrument.

<sup>1250</sup>It is an umbrella with multifarious colours used as an accompaniment to Blessed Sacrament or to the statues of Saints or relics when taken in procession etc.

<sup>1251</sup>A Thali (Thali is the word mainly used by Hindus; Syrian Christians use the name Minnu for it) is worn by the brides of Kerala’s Syrian Christian community. The Thali or Minnu is engraved with the Holy Spirit as a distinguishing feature of the Syrian Christian Minnu. According to tradition the families of the bride and the bridegroom contribute a piece of gold and melt it with the help of the family goldsmith. It is a pendant with a cross, the symbol of Christianity, on a gold medallion shaped like a heart. The heart symbolizes the concept of love and the cross reflects that the relationship between a husband and wife should be in the image of the relationship between Jesus and his bride, the Church. During the wedding ceremony, the Minnu is held on and tied using a braided thread made with several threads taken from the Manthrakodi (Wedding Saree) and twisted together.

<sup>1252</sup>It is a combination of two words Manthra means ‘specially blessed’ and kodi means ‘new clothes.’ Placing the manthrakodi upon the bride’s head symbolizes Rebecca who took a veil and covered herself when she first saw Isaac. This was an act of humility, chastity and devotion to her lifelong partner united in marriage by God. The groom accepts the responsibility to care and cherish his bride (cf. N. M. Mathew, Malankara Mar Thoma Sabha Charitram, [History of the Marthoma Church], Vol. 1, Thiruvalla 2006, 25, 32, 33).

It was the Hindu rulers who allowed St. Thomas to land in Kerala and spread his religion even by donating lands and even by providing financial support to build the churches. Today Kerala is called God's own country. Though this title was given to various countries at different times at different levels, the Kerala people think it as more appropriate and fitting to Kerala basing on the legend<sup>1253</sup> that Kerala was a god-made land and on two other reasons namely the cohabitation of 60% Hindus with 20% Muslims and 20% Christians in such a harmony and thirdly as the natural varieties and beauty one finds in Kerala.<sup>1254</sup> It all shows that there existed in Kerala religious harmony and friendship in all walks of life.

### 3. SMC: A Study from a Historical Perspective

Although we focus mainly on the relationship of Addai-Mari liturgy and its relationship with Nestorianism and the Liturgy of SMC it may be proper to speak about the origin of the Kerala SMC and about Kerala Culture in brief. Today's Kerala state was known as Malabar in olden times. The word Syro-Malabar is a combination of two words as we see which come from 'Syrian' and 'Malabar.' This church came to be known so due to its relation with the Syrian Church in Persia and from the place of origin that is ancient Malabar.<sup>1255</sup> L. Arangassery gives us further details regarding the title: "The title Syro-Malabar by which this Apostolic Church which always remained faithful to the catholic faith is called is of recent origin, that is from the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It was used to distinguish the Thomas Christians under Latin Jurisdiction from the Syro-Chaldeans, the followers of Roccas and Mellus."<sup>1256</sup> Kerala people strongly believe that St. Thomas came to Kerala in A. D. 52 and laid personally the foundations of Christianity in the land and he died a martyr's death and is buried in Mylapore in the neighbourhood of Kerala. "Nach den literarischen und örtlichen Überlieferungen wurde die christliche Botschaft vom Apostel Thomas nach Malabar gebracht."<sup>1257</sup> In the words of Mgr. Francis Youssef Alichoran there are so many credentials to believe that St. Thomas founded the Church in Kerala: "la fondation de l'Eglise en Inde par l'apôtre Thomas s'appuie sur de nombreux témoignages et son martyre à Mylapore, sur la côté de Coromandel, en l'an 72, couronnait sa mission d'évangélisation dont le souvenir reste vivace, surtout dans le sud de l'Inde, sur les côtes orientale et occidentale (Malabar)."<sup>1258</sup> We have some definite documentation from 'Joseph the Indian' who travelled to Lisbon in the company of Cabral. On his arrival at Lisbon and later at Venice in Italy he reports about the tomb of St. Thomas in the following words:

"In the kingdom of Narsindo [that is, Vijayanagar] there is a church of St. Thomas. It is in Mylapore situated on a promontory in the sea in the Orissa gulf. It is as big as the Venetian Church of St. Zouane and Paulo. In this Church is placed the body of

<sup>1253</sup>Legend is that Parasuraman, one of the ten forms of god Vishnu, threw axe across the sea and the coastal lands emerged which later came to be known as Keralam.

<sup>1254</sup>The National Geographic traveler has selected Kerala as one of the 10 paradises of the world and one of the 50 places of life time destination.

<sup>1255</sup>Cf. G. Vavanikunnel, *Die eucharistische Katechese der Anaphora der Apostel Mar Addai und Mar Mari in der syro-malabarischen Kirche gestern und heute*, Würzburg 1976, 3.

<sup>1256</sup>L. Arangassery, *Ecclesial Dimensions of East Syrian Liturgy: An Introduction to Liturgical Ecclesiology*, Kottayam 1990, 4.

<sup>1257</sup>Vavanikunnel, *Die eucharistische Katechese der Anaphora der Apostel Mar Addai und Mar Mari*, 4.

<sup>1258</sup>F. Y. Alichoran, *Missel Chaldéen: L'ordre des Mystères avec les trios Anaphores*, Paris 1982, 277.

St. Thomas, who works many miracles, and both Christians and gentiles have great veneration for him.”<sup>1259</sup>

Cosmas Indicopleustes<sup>1260</sup> (550 A. D) who came across an Indian priest, who translated the letter of Romans from the Greek language to Syriac, witnesses about the presence of Christians in Malabar. He reports,

“in Taprobanê (Sri Lanka), einer Insel in Hinterindien, wo der Indische Ozean ist, gibt es eine Kirche von Christen mit Klerikern und eine Gruppe von Gläubigen ...; doch weiß ich nicht, ob es in den jenseits gelegenen Gegenden auch Christen gibt. Im Land namens Malê (Malabar), wo der Pfeffer wächst, gibt es auch eine Kirche, und an einem anderen Ort namens Calliana gibt es außerdem einen von Persien eingesetzten Bischof.”<sup>1261</sup>

Unfortunately with the coming of so many colonizing forces to India and especially to Kerala their culture and history was trampled and destroyed. This has made it all the more difficult to say exactly the history of the first few centuries. Therefore one of the historians notes that: “historisch unsichere Überlieferungen verehren den Apostel Thomas als Glaubensboten an der Malabarküste im Südwesten des indischen Subkontinents. Die Ursprünge dieser Tradition liegen im Dunkeln und waren für uns erst in europäischen Reiseberichten seit dem 13. Jahrhundert recht greifbar.”<sup>1262</sup> Though it is difficult to prove the coming of St. Thomas and his apostolic activity in Kerala, according to Gopal Panikkar, a Kerala historian, the tradition is a clear proof for the coming of St. Thomas to Kerala. “Anyhow, the tenacity with which the belief is still clung to by the entire Syrian community is something significant, which the counter theorists would find it rather hard to shake or explain.”<sup>1263</sup> Although the coming of Apostle Thomas remains in an unclear arena almost all the historians readily agree with the fact that there existed strong trade relationships and trade routes between Muziris and the whole world from the 1<sup>st</sup> century. “Dessen ungeachtet ist aber unbestritten, dass es in der Spätantike rege Handelsbeziehungen zwischen Südindien und der Mittelmeerwelt gegeben hat.”<sup>1264</sup> Therefore we find a selective avoidance and acceptance from the part of the historians about the same fact which is true to the people of Thomas Christians. It is rightly observed by J. Puthussery in his doctoral theses that “the difficulty of studying the early history of Christianity in Kerala is increased by the fact that such sources for the history of Christianity in the region down to the modern times were burned into ashes after the synod of Diamper in 1599.”<sup>1265</sup> In the words of Cardinal Tisserant, “in India the big *auto-da-fé* ordered at Diamper was responsible for the loss of many manuscripts. Their colophons would probably have disclosed many details about the local history of the Malabar

<sup>1259</sup>Cited from A. M. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, Vol. I: From the Beginning up to the Middle of the Sixteenth century, (up to 1542), Bangalore 1984, 403 referring to idem, The Arrival of the Portuguese in India and the Thomas Christians under Mar Jacob, 1498-1552, Bangalore 1967, 32.

<sup>1260</sup>He is a 6<sup>th</sup> century geographical writer. Because of his travels to India and Ceylon (ca. 530) he is called Indicopleustes or Indian voyager. He was gifted with a keen sense of observation and retentive memory (cf. F. de Sa, Cosmas Indicopleustes, in: NCE 4, Washington 1966, 359).

<sup>1261</sup>Cited from Jenkins, Das Goldene Zeitalter des Christentums, 89 referring to Mingana, Christianity in India, 6.

<sup>1262</sup>K. Pinggéra, Die Apostolische Kirche des Ostens der Assyrer, in: C. Lange und K. Pinggéra, Hg., Die Altorientalischen Kirchen: Glaube und Geschichte, Darmstadt <sup>2</sup>2011, 34.

<sup>1263</sup>T. K. Gopal Panikkar, Malabar and its Folk, New Delhi 1983, 218.

<sup>1264</sup>Pinggéra, Die Apostolische Kirche des Ostens der Assyrer, 34.

<sup>1265</sup>J. Puthussery, Maargamkali: Genre and group identity through the ages, in: IFL 1 (2001), 13.

Christians.”<sup>1266</sup> The same fact is also shared by many native historians. P. U. Lukose expresses explicitly how Christian missionaries manipulated strategically to safeguard their ‘colonial desires’ and to enlarge their frontiers without prompting resistance from the natives.<sup>1267</sup> In the place of the old history a new history was written and was propagated. Thus the Malabar Church has been left without any authoritative documentation for the history of its ancient past. Therefore Thomas Christians are forced to turn always to the Syrian or Greek sources or authors for any serious documentation. But as we know as [Syrians or Greeks] they had no particular interest in India we get only scattered and disconnected fragments of evidence.<sup>1268</sup>

Added with this difficulty it becomes all the more a great task due to the culture of the Easterners. The easterners were not in the habit of writing and keeping the history like the westerners who kept everything in record whereas the easterners had handed down everything in oral tradition. The history of the written tradition starts very late.<sup>1269</sup> Faith was transmitted orally from one generation to the next instead of depending upon certain written documents. Thus when this oral tradition is adulterated it makes all the more difficult for us to assert when and where St. Thomas started his mission. Some historians are earnest to prove it as a matter of simple pious belief. Many of them who are very earnest to prove otherwise were also ignorant about the native languages namely old Malayalam (Tamil) or Hindi or Sanskrit or Syriac and thus very much handicapped. They simply depended upon the colonizers or even the priests with vested interests. And they gave their own versions as they wanted. Therefore the Kerala history written by many foreigners regarding the coming of St. Thomas is in many ways a manipulation and twisting of the actual facts. At the same time we must recognize the value of Western historians who looked at things from merely an objective view point and wrote. We will refer to some of them here along with some proofs for the coming of St. Thomas to India. As our study is not going to the veracity of the coming of St. Thomas to India we are not going to deal with all the available proof but only a few of them.

First and foremost it is the living community of St. Thomas Christians in South India and their living tradition. As the Portuguese came to Kerala they came across so many such oral traditions. According to Maffei “the Malabar children are wont to sing

---

<sup>1266</sup>E. Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India: A History of the Syro-Malabar Church from the earliest time to the present day*, Maryland 1957, 24; (cf. J. B. Chabot, ‘L’autodafé des livres syriaques au Malabar’, in: *Florilegium ... Melchior de Vogüé*, Paris 1909, 613-23; it is also remarkable to note that the only Syro-Malabar manuscript previous to 1500 and known to us is the Vatic. Syr. 22).

<sup>1267</sup>Cf. Puthussery, *Maargamkali*, 13 in reference to P. U. Lukose, *Keralathile Suriyani Krithiyikalude Purathanappattukal* (the ancient songs of Suriyani Thomas Christians), Kottayam 1910.

<sup>1268</sup>Cf. K. J. John, *Christian Heritage of Kerala, Cochin* 1981, 1.

<sup>1269</sup>This is 100% true of India. The first history of India was written in the eleventh century by Alberuni, a Muslim Scholar who accompanied Mahmud of Ghazni’s invasion of northwest India. As R. C. Majumdar, doyen of Indian historians lamented in his work *Ancient India* 1968, that ‘one of the gravest defects of Indian culture, which defies rational explanation, is the aversion of Indians to writing history. They applied themselves to all conceivable branches of literature and excelled in many of them but they never seriously took to the writing of the history,’ with the result that ‘for a great deal of our knowledge of ancient Indian history we are indebted to foreigners.’ So to write about ancient India one has to consult Herodotus and the Greek writers who accompanied Alexander the Great’s campaign to India; Megasthenes, The Greek Historian who in ca. 300 B. C. was ambassador to the court of Chandragupta Maurya and collected material there for his work *Indica*; Ptolemy’s *Geographica*; and the Chinese travelers Faxian and Xuanzang” (cf. <http://www.Historytoday.com/mihir-bose/india%E2%80%99s=missing-historians>. Date of Access: 10. 02. 2012).

in folk songs the praises and the martyrdom of Thomas.”<sup>1270</sup> Thanks to the historical mind of Portuguese who recorded everything what they heard from the people of the place. After the discovery of the tomb in Mylapore in (1517) at the order of the Portuguese king the Portuguese had conducted an official inquiry among the people. This inquiry has brought to light most of the local traditions. Today it is accessible to us a collection of information in various documents collected by Portuguese.

From 1<sup>st</sup> century to this day one will observe the faith life of the St. Thomas Christians. The number of vocations from this community is also a proof for the commitment the parents give to their life of faith. From this Church recently on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2008 Pope Benedict XVI canonized a nun of the clarist congregation to the sainthood namely, St. Alphonsa from the eparchy of Palai, Kottayam. And this Church has 6 more blessed in the list: Blessed Kuriakose Chavara, from the archeparchy of Changanacherry, Founder of CMI - declared blessed by John Paul II at Kottayam India on 8<sup>th</sup> February 1986; Bl. Mariam Thressia, eparchy of Irinjalakuda declared blessed by Pope John Paul II in Rome on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2000; Bl. Thevarparambil Kunjachan, eparchy of Palai-declared blessed on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2006 at Ramapuram Palai by late Mar Varkey Vidayathil, the Major Archbishop of the Syro-Malabar Church, as the delegate of Pope Benedict XVI; Bl. Euphrasia Eluvathingal-eparchy of Irinjalakuda-declared Blessed on 3 December 2006 by Mar Varkey Vithayathil, at Ollur, Thrissur as the delegate of Pope Benedict XVI. Bishop Kurialassery, who is already ‘servant of God,’ and Puthenparambil Thommachan, who is also known as the Kerala Assisi, who are in process all belong to this church of Kerala. I suppose that there is no other Church in the world which has started congregations in the name of any apostle other than SMC. There are congregations known as MST<sup>1271</sup> (men congregation of St. Thomas) and DST<sup>1272</sup> (women congregation of St. Thomas) for the missionary activity of the Syro-Malabar Church founded by Bp. Sebastian Vayalil, the first bishop of eparchial diocese Palai taking St. Thomas the Apostle as the patron of the Congregation. It is enough to look into the statistics of vocation both to priesthood and religious life<sup>1273</sup> in order to know how vibrant and living her faith is. Once when the bishops from SMC were in Rome to participate in the Episcopal ordination of the apostolic administrator of the autonomous Church, Pope John Paul II asked the bishops from Kerala that ‘what is the secret of so many vocations there?’<sup>1274</sup> According to a Statistics (1995) from the Statistical Yearbook of the Church, the 16 million-member Indian Church comprises only 1.6% of the 989 million Catholics worldwide. Yet SMC accounts for 6% to 9% of the worldwide total of diocesan priests, religious priests, nuns, and seminarians giving India the highest vocation rating in the world. Again from among the 115,000 vocations in India 60% of vocation come from SMC. According to this survey there is a priest or 1 nun for every 50 Catholics

<sup>1270</sup>Cited from M. Mundadan, Sources for the History of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period, in: B. Puthur, ed., The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period, Cochin 2000, 34 referring to Maffei, J. Petrus, *Historia Indicarum Libri XVI* (Opera Omnia Latine Scripta, Vol.1), Bergamo 1747.

<sup>1271</sup>It is the Missionary society of St. Thomas whose Generalate is in Melampara near Palai in Kerala.

<sup>1272</sup>It is the Missionary Daughters of St. Thomas whose Generalate is in Palai in Kerala.

<sup>1273</sup>Diocesan and religious priests 9121; Religious brothers 6836; religious sisters 35000; seminarians 2607.

<sup>1274</sup>Cf. National Catholic Register, December 14, 1997, A Service of EWTN, America ([http://www.nregister.com/site/article/no\\_place\\_produces\\_vocations\\_like\\_syro\\_malabar\\_church/](http://www.nregister.com/site/article/no_place_produces_vocations_like_syro_malabar_church/). Date of Access: 10. 02. 2012).

in the Oriental Church and 78 seminarians for every 1 million Catholics.<sup>1275</sup> Cardinal Varkey Vidayathil the late Major Archbishop of SMC finds nothing other than the prayerful atmosphere in the homes and the deep faith of our people as responsible causes for this. Evening prayer conducted at homes generally from 7 to 8 p.m. with the saying of rosary and hymns and praying of psalms and novena and thereafter the common Supper with all the family members, the 90-minute long catechism classes every Sunday conducted by volunteer teachers is compulsory for every catholic student in the SMC. The SMC children take pride in completing the 12<sup>th</sup> class of Catechism and having the certificate with a high mark and which is also a requirement for admission in colleges conducted by any SMC Colleges under community quota in Kerala. We cannot say that these children come to the catechism school for this certificate if so in Gulf countries or in Chicago they would not have come happily and earnestly to the Catechism conducted by SMC. In all the 28 Dioceses of Syro-Malabar including Chicago the children visit this catechism regularly and enthusiastically. The influence of Catholic Schools and colleges, the good examples given by priests and religious, the stand Church takes on humanitarian and moral issues, very exemplary Christian family life ‘with no divorces’ and daily attendance of H. Mass and the high reputation of priests-religious in the Kerala society may be also nurturing factors of vocations in SMC. Perhaps one will not see in the world a youth force ever ready for the Church as in SMC and Charismatic Centers being frequented by millions every year. This has brought about an added flavour to the Christian life in Kerala. Thus a Church-oriented, prayer oriented life of the children, youth and aged, and the society’s high esteem for the consecrated life inspires the youth to dedicate themselves to the service of the Church. I myself have heard parents saying that: ‘if God has called my son or daughter for His service we will not hinder His ways.’ This is the general attitude of the SMC parents. They also play a major role in the growth of the Church. One will be able to say this kind of a culture is not easy to develop all over a night. It is the fruit of 2000 years of faithful living of Christian life founded by St. Thomas.

Secondly the presence of St. Thomas’ tomb in Mylapore is recognized by many from time immemorial. According to tradition it is believed that St. Thomas after preaching in Kerala and establishing 7 and half churches he moved to Malacca<sup>1276</sup> and China. From there he returned to India to Mylapur (today’s Madras) in A. D. 72. There he was pierced by a lance and martyred. All the traditions endorse that he died as a martyr in Mylapore with a lance. Today where he is said to be interred is a place known as St. Thomas Mount (it is situated in the neighbouring state of Kerala called Tamilnadu). We have many reports about its presence from various persons. Let us refer a few of them here. According to Mgr. Alichoran, “Le Tombeau de Saint Thomas existe toujours mais une partie de ses reliques a été transportée dans une église à Edesse en 393, lors d’une persécution contre le chrétiens don’t une part quitta alors la côte Est de l’Inde, pour rejoindre au Malabar la communauté occidentale.”<sup>1277</sup> We have the report about it from Marco Polo who visited the Malabar Coast in the year 1292 who came to Malabar in his return journey from China and came to Mylapore. “Der Leib des heiligen Thomas ist in dieser Provinz Malabar in einer

---

<sup>1275</sup>I have depended upon the National Catholic Register for this statistics which is given above in fn.1274 accessed on 10. 02. 2012.

<sup>1276</sup>Malacca is a place in Malaysia.

<sup>1277</sup>Alichoran, Missel Chaldéen, 277.



kleinen Stadt, die nicht viele Einwohner hat und wenige Kaufleute anzieht ... Die Christen, die dahin pilgern, nehmen Erde von der Todesstätte und geben sie Fieberkranken zu trinken, und durch die Kraft Gottes wird der Kranke gesund.”<sup>1278</sup>

There is also another record of the tomb from an Italian traveler called Nicolo Conti who visited Mylapore between the year 1420 and 1430: “Hier liegt der Leib des heiligen Thomas ehrenvoll begraben in einer sehr großen und schönen Kirche ...”<sup>1279</sup>

In the year 1533, at the order of the Portuguese king an official inquiry was conducted about the tomb of St. Thomas. From this visit of the Portuguese officials we have so many rich informations regarding the tomb of St. Thomas which are of great importance for us.

“1. A letter written by Manuel Gomes, one of the Portuguese visitors to the tomb in 1517: he wrote a letter from Mylapore itself; 2. the report of the inquiry of 1533; 3. a letter from the citizens of Mylapore (called San Tome at the time of the composition of the letter) to the Portuguese king in 1538; 4. a few letters of Miguel Vaz and Francis Xavier.<sup>1280</sup> Besides the information given by these people it is also enriched and supplemented with the descriptions given by writers like L. de Castanheda (1551), J. de Barros (1552-63), G. Correa (1560-63), F. d’Andrada (1540), G. Barzaeus (1553), Amador Correa (1564), M. N. Barreto (1567), Osorius (1571), F. de Dionysio (1578), A. de Monserrate (c. 1579), A. de Valignano (1583), G. P. Maffei (1588), Andre de Santa Maria (1598-99 and 1601), Lucena (1600), Roz<sup>1281</sup> (1601 and 1604), A. de Gouvea (1603), D. de Couto (1603-11). Together with it three other documents like the gift deed donating the Little Mount to some religious, letters of Ruy Vicente (1581), D. Leitao (1581), and A. Boves (1599).”<sup>1282</sup>

According to Mundadan, the Kerala church historian, “the documents of Portuguese are faithful records of what they saw and heard.”<sup>1283</sup> At the same time they have also some limitations. They noted down simply whatever they heard from three sources namely, the Malabar (what the Kerala people told them), the East-Syrian (information from East-Syrian people or books), and finally report from Mylapore ([the information they collected from people of Mylapore] [called also triple tradition]) near the tomb of St. Thomas. The words of East-Syrian bishop Abuna is a proof to the triple tradition who gave testimony in 1533 to the questionnaire prepared by the Portuguese. “He declared that what he attested was heard both in his own country and in Malabar.”<sup>1284</sup> Mundadan observes also another reason for the less frequent reference by the Portuguese in the first half of the sixteenth century on the tomb of St. Thomas. One of

<sup>1278</sup>A. Vâth, *Der Heilige Thomas, der Apostel Indiens*, Aachen 1925, 40; “The christians who perform this pilgrimage collect earth from the spot where he was slain, which is of a red colour, and reverentially carry it away with them; often employing it afterwards in the performance of miracles and giving it, when diluted with water, to the sick, by which many disorders are cured” (cited from Pothan, *The Syrian Christians of Kerala*, 38 referring to the *Travels of Marco Polo*, New York 1961).

<sup>1279</sup>Vâth, *Der Heilige Thomas*, 40 (cf. A. Kolencherry, *Qurbana: Gottesdienstordnung der Syro-Malabarischen Kirche*, [trans. idem], Forsthausgasse 1981, 5).

<sup>1280</sup>Gomes’ letter published in SRD I, 296-99. The report of the inquiry exists in two exemplars: one copied by Fr. Cyprian in the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century kept in the ARSJ Goa 31, 18-25, in which both the testimonies of the Abuna and D. Fernandes are given; another one which is copied by Bp. André, OFM., of the Cochin diocese in 1589/90, ARSJ, Goa, 49, 125-31 which adds some later events to the original (cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 37).

<sup>1281</sup>He was the first Portuguese Latin - Roman Catholic bishop over the Thomas Christians.

<sup>1282</sup>Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 37-38.

<sup>1283</sup>*Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>1284</sup>*Ibid.*

the reasons he finds for this inadequate reference was that the people interviewed were not directly involved in this matter rather people of Coromandel Coast<sup>1285</sup> where the Syro-Malabar tradition seems to be very faint. It means to say that the so-called Kerala people were not interviewed where St. Thomas worked. Dr. Mundadan observes that if such an interview were conducted in Kerala the proof regarding the tomb of St. Thomas and his activities would have been definite and certain. Another serious problem the same author finds in the interlocution or interviews conducted by the foreign missionaries is that of language. The foreigner missionaries were a bit handicapped due to the problem of language and as a result they could not penetrate much deep into the life, customs and records of the community. If they needed to know the whole details of it a thorough knowledge of either Malayalam the mother tongue of Keralites or Syriac their liturgical language should have been mastered. Tisserant writes about the missionaries who came to South India under the protection of Portuguese Padroado. "When they came in contact with Malabar and later on with Ethiopia, they arrived in the midst of Christian communities of which they knew absolutely nothing, neither language, liturgy, nor history."<sup>1286</sup> Except for a Portuguese missionary named Alvaro Penteado (1517) no one else seems to have made a trial to a deep penetration. Besides this Portuguese Missionary two other names also would be of great help for us to know who tried to penetrate deeply into the veracity of this tomb. It was no one else other than two Jesuits called Dionysio and Monserrate who had relatively a better knowledge of the language. But still their knowledge of the Syriac or Malayalam language was not adequate enough to scrutinize the liturgical and literary books of the people.<sup>1287</sup>

Mainly the Portuguese missionaries could collect information regarding the tomb of St. Thomas from three sources: (a) the oral tradition, (b) the songs, (c) the books which contained the apostolate, death etc., of the Apostle. The East-Syrian and Malabar tradition go hand in hand with regard to the apostolate in Kerala and the tomb of St. Thomas in Mylapore. For example a missionary called Diogo Fernandes who was one of the main witnesses of the inquiry of 1533 and who from 1517 spent many years in Mylapore records that his testimony was based on what he heard from the inhabitants of the locality namely the Brahmins as well as other honourable people.<sup>1288</sup> These got their information in turn from their ancient writings.<sup>1289</sup> According to Barros a missionary from Portuguese, those people who were witnesses in the inquiry included Muslims, Hindus and Christians. They all were unanimous about the content of the substance what they reported to Portuguese for they said 'we witness to what we heard from our forefathers and ancestors.'<sup>1290</sup> Besides these people who were interviewed belonged to the age group between 80 and 90. From the 7<sup>th</sup> century onwards the place where St. Thomas was buried was identified as Calamina or Qalimaya. Another scholar named B. Vadakkekara writes that when the Europeans

<sup>1285</sup>Today it is found along the coast of the Marina beach Chennai in Tamilnadu, India, neighbour state of Kerala.

<sup>1286</sup>Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India*, 29.

<sup>1287</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 39.

<sup>1288</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 40.

<sup>1289</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 41.

<sup>1290</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

came to India they were shown Calamina as the burial place of St. Thomas.<sup>1291</sup> In the 12-14<sup>th</sup> centuries we find references to places called Calamina or Myluph or Meilan. From these centuries onwards undoubtedly it is recognized as Mylapur. In the works of Ploeg we read so:

“According to the constant tradition of the Christians of St. Thomas, the principal field of action of the Apostle was the coast of ‘Malabar,’ Kerala, whereas he died as a martyr, according to the same tradition, near Mylapur, to the north of Madras, at a great distance from Kerala. If the localization of his martyrdom had been a piece of fiction, tradition would not have let him die far from the region where he is said to have exercised his principal apostolic activity and built seven churches. This seems to be a strong argument in favour of St. Thomas’ activity in S. India.”<sup>1292</sup>

The same tradition gives an account how those who were converted in Mylapore by St. Thomas had to leave the area due to the unhealthy situations and join the community in Malabar of the same faith. Later on people from Kerala frequented Mylapore to pay homage to the tomb of their Apostle. We can assume that there were Christians in Kerala before the Portuguese arrived in Kerala from the fact that the Portuguese themselves called the Christians found in Kerala during their power in Malabar (1679-1728) as Christians of St. Thomas. All the more “it may be also noted that there is no grave anywhere in India or outside other than at Mylapore claiming to be that of St. Thomas. No other country or people have claimed to have the Apostle’s remains in their midst.”<sup>1293</sup> Although the mention of Benhur regarding the remains causes a bit of inexactitude, it is enough to be taken as a reference to the grave of the Apostle. If we go through the work of Perumalil it becomes all the more clear where he says,

“there is no place in the world other than Mylapore which claims his tomb. Had this not been the fact, the St. Thomas Christians of Kerala who claim to be the spiritual children of St. Thomas would never have been going to far off Mylapore to pay their homage to their apostle whose remains lay buried there. Added to that, if it was not a fact the Persian and Babylonian churches who were controlling the South Indian churches till the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century would never have tolerated this claim of Mylapore and Kerala that the Apostle preached in Kerala and Mylapore and died and buried in Mylapore.”<sup>1294</sup>

The witness of Claudius Buchanan who was sent in 1806 by Marquis of Wellesley, Governor General of India, to conduct research among the old Christians of Kerala affirms the fact of the coming of St. Thomas. He tells that “I am satisfied that we have as good authority for believing that the Apostle Thomas died in India, as that the Apostle Peter died in Rome.”<sup>1295</sup> Another proof given by Perumalil shows that the same kind of brick found in the tomb of St. Thomas is also found in the Roman trading station. His finding is based on the archaeological Survey of India conducted in the year 1945. This survey excavated a Roman trading station at Arikamedu about 150 kms to the south of Mylapore on the sea coast. The survey proves that the trading station was built in the first century A. D., and continued to the middle of the second.

<sup>1291</sup>Besides the place called Calamina is found mentioned in Pseudo-Hippolytus, Pseudo-Dorotheus, Pseudo – Jerome, Pseudo-Sophronius, and Oecumenius [ca. 990 AD] (cf. B. Vadakkekara, *Origin of Christianity in India: A historiographical critique*, Delhi 2007, 257).

<sup>1292</sup>J. P. M. van der Ploeg, *The Syriac Manuscripts of the St. Thomas Christians* (Placid Lecture Series 3), Bangalore 1983, 2.

<sup>1293</sup>Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 198.

<sup>1294</sup>A.C. Perumalil, *The Apostles in India*, Bangalore 1971, 76.

<sup>1295</sup>Cited from Pothan, *The Syrian Christians of Kerala*, 32 referring to C. Buchanan, *Christian Researches in Asia*, London 1806.

It seems the oldest bricks found there are of about 50 A. D. and measure 14-15"x 8-8.5"x2.9"; and similar brick are not found anywhere after the first century. He holds that the bricks found in the tomb of the Apostle at Mylapore are also of the same and resemble those large bricks of Arikamedu and measure 15.5"x8"x3". He proceeds from this fact to assert that "the tomb was built in the first century itself not long after the death of the Apostle in 72 A. D."<sup>1296</sup>

We are also able to hear about the missionary activities of St. Thomas in Parthia from the non-East Syrian Fathers, especially church fathers from the Graeco-Roman world. In the works of Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, Jerome (4<sup>th</sup> century A. D.), we come across references about the Church established by St. Thomas in India. We hear in the words of Gregory of Nazianzus that "the apostles took real efforts to go to the respective places allotted to them that the Gospel might penetrate into all parts ... Peter indeed may have belonged to Judea; but what had Paul in common with the gentiles, Luke with Achaia, Andrew with Epirus, John with Ephesus, Thomas with India, Mark with Italy?"<sup>1297</sup> Again if we go through the writings of Ambrose of Milan, one of the great 4<sup>th</sup> century church fathers, we come across reference to the presence of St. Thomas in India. It seems Ambrose had a vast knowledge of India<sup>1298</sup> and its people. He speaks of the Gymnosophists<sup>1299</sup> of India, the Indian Ocean, Muziris (Cranganore) of Kerala, of the river Ganges etc. When he writes about St. Thomas he mentions about him only in connection with India for he tells that "even those kingdoms which were shut out by rugged mountains become accessible to them as India to Thomas, Persia to Matthew ..."<sup>1300</sup> Origen, the *Clementine Recognitions*, Eusebius of Caesaria, Rufinus of Aquileia and Socrates the church historian all hold the idea that Thomas worked in Parthia. Reference to Parthia should not be found as a contradiction as in those days the Parthian empire extended up to North India and thus it is a certification for the work of St. Thomas in India. Eusebius the Church historian relying upon Origen acknowledges the work of St. Thomas in India. He quotes from Origen telling that "when the holy apostles and disciples of our Saviour were scattered over all the world, Thomas, so the tradition has it, obtained as his portion Parthia ..."<sup>1301</sup> The Syrian Poet St. Ephrem refers to St. Thomas as follows: "Blessed art thou, like unto the solar ray from the great orb; thy grateful dawn India's painful darkness doth dispel. Thou the great lamp, one among the Twelve, with oil from the Cross replenished, India's dark night flooded with light ..."<sup>1302</sup> He also speaks about the

<sup>1296</sup>Perumalil, *The Apostles in India*, 76; (Today it is proved beyond doubt by the Archaeological Survey conducted by Indian archaeologists that the bricks of the tomb at Mylapore belonged to that of the first century (ca. 50 Arikamedu bricks). Arikamedu is not far from Mylapore (cf. Menacherry, *Thomapedia*, 5, 30; Wheeler, *Ancient India*, Bulletin of Archaeological Survey in India, New Delhi 1946, 32).

<sup>1297</sup>Cited from C.V. Cheriyan, *A History of Christianity in Kerala: from the Mission of St. Thomas to the arrival of Vasco da Gama A. D. 52-1498*, Kottayam 1973, 46 referring to Gregory Nazianzen, *Contra Arianos et de Seipso Oratio* 23.11; PG 36, 228 (cf. Perumalil, *The Apostles in India*, 56).

<sup>1298</sup>Cf. Cheriyan, *A History of Christianity in Kerala*, 47 in reference to PL 140, 1143, (for Ambrose's knowledge about India see also PL 17, 1131, 1133).

<sup>1299</sup>Gymnosophists are members of a Hindu sect and a type of philosophers practicing gymnosophy (especially nudism).

<sup>1300</sup>Cited from Cheriyan, *A History of Christianity in Kerala*, 47 referring to Ambrose *Epist. ad Simplicianum*, 34, 36 (PL 17, 1092-3).

<sup>1301</sup>Cited from P. Schaff, ed., *Christianity: Early Christian Literature (Fathers of the Church)*, New York 1890, 210 referring to Eusebius *Pamphilis: H. E. III*, 1.

<sup>1302</sup>Cited from A. E. Medlycott, *India and the Apostle Thomas: An Inquiry, with a critical Analysis of the Acta Thomae*, Atlanta 2005, 26 referring to Syrian breviary (XIII) taken from British Museum Add. MS 17141, folio 85 (this edition is a facsimile reprint of the original edition published by D. Nutt, London 1905).

ministry of St. Thomas: “Thomas preached to the Parthians, Medes and Persians, Hyrcanians, Bactrians and Margians, and was pierced with a pine spear at Calamene, the city of India, and was buried there.”<sup>1303</sup> In one of the Nisibine Hymn (42), St. Ephrem recalls that “St. Thomas the Apostle suffered martyrdom in India (strophe I). His body was buried in India (I). His bones were thence removed by a merchant to the city of Edessa (II-III), His power and influence were felt in both places (I-II).”<sup>1304</sup> It is to be specially noted that although Ephrem the Syrian who was in Edessa for almost 13 years he never claims that St. Thomas was martyred there but he asserts that Apostle’s body was brought from great India and venerated there.<sup>1305</sup> He indicates about the veneration people of India gave to Apostle Thomas: “und im 4. Jahrhundert deuten die Hymnen Efrems (†373) zu Ehren des Apostels Thomas auf christliche Gemeinden in Indien zu Lebzeiten des Dichters hin.”<sup>1306</sup> That is to say even the people of Edessa considered that St. Thomas remains’ was brought from India; that is why an immigrant like St. Ephrem thinks that it was brought from India. One of the great church fathers Jerome also refers to St. Thomas when he mentions about the works of the Apostles. He comments that “the Lord dwelt in all places; with Thomas in India, with Peter in Rome.”<sup>1307</sup> Gregory of Tours who lived in the 6<sup>th</sup> century (Nov 30, ca. 538-Nov.17, 594) in Gaul and later bishop of Tours also comments about the works of St. Thomas in India. He speaks of the martyrdom of Thomas as having taken place in India and he also knows the presence of a monastery there. In his words which he heard from a certain Theodore who was a monk,

“Thomas the Apostle according to the history seemed to have suffered in India. His holy remains (corpus), after a long interval of time, were removed to the city of Edessa in Syria and there interred. In that part of India where they first rested, stand a monastery, and a church of striking dimensions, elaborately adorned and designed. This Theodore who had been to the place narrated us.”<sup>1308</sup>

Isidore of Seville is also familiar with this tradition. He notes that “Thomas was martyred and buried in Calamina a city of India.”<sup>1309</sup> Cosmas Indicopleustes (India-voyager), the Alexandrine of 6<sup>th</sup> century, in his *Christian Topography* narrates what he has seen in his journey to Ethiopia, Srilanka and India between the periods of 520-25. We have reliable historical evidence from him although he does not mention about the Apostolate of Thomas. He mentions something very important for the history of the SMC.

“The Gospel has been preached throughout the world. This I state to be definite fact, from what I have seen and heard in the many places which I have visited. Even in Taprobane (Ceylone) ... there is a church of Christians, with clergy and a body of believers, but I do not know whether there are any Christians in the country beyond it. In the country called Male (Malabar), where the pepper grows, there is

<sup>1303</sup>C. B. Firth, *An Introduction to Indian Church History*, Bangalore 1961, 7.

<sup>1304</sup>Cited from Medlycott, *India and the Apostle Thomas*, 31 referring to the four Madrasas of Ephraem which establishes certain points as matters of history.

<sup>1305</sup>Cf. P. Varghese, *Die Syrischen Kirchen in Indien*, (Die Kirchen der Welt 13), Stuttgart 1974, 17-18).

<sup>1306</sup>C. D. G. Müller, *Geschichte der Orientalischen Nationalkirchen*, in: B. Moeller, Hg., *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte*, Göttingen 1981, 313.

<sup>1307</sup>Cited from A. Butler, *Butler’s Lives of the Saints*, Great Britain 2000, 20 referring to St. Jerome.

<sup>1308</sup>Cited from Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 56 referring to Gregory of Tours.

<sup>1309</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Isidore of Seville.

also a church, and at another place called Kalliana (Quilon) there is moreover a bishop, who is appointed from Persia.”<sup>1310</sup>

By the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> and beginning of 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries again we witness to the authentication from some sources like that of St. Gaudentius bishop of Brescia (387-410 A. D.), St. Paulinus bishop of Nola (353-431 A. D.), St. Bede the Venerable (673-735), Gregory of Tours (538-94), Isidore of Seville (636), St. John Chrysostom (347-407 A. D.), etc. All of them certify that St. Thomas the Apostle preached in India and Chrysostom claims to have known the burial place of St. Thomas.<sup>1311</sup> In the 13<sup>th</sup> century when Marco Polo visited Mylapore he made some remarks about the Indian Christians in his book *Il Millione*:

“It is a place where numerous pilgrims from both Christians and Saracens<sup>1312</sup> go in pilgrimage. For you must know that the Saracens of that country have great faith in St. Thomas; they say that he was a Saracen; they believe that he had been a great prophet and call him *avarium* which means ‘saint.’ The Christians who go there in pilgrimage carry away some earth from the place where the body of the saint was transfixed. This earth was used by them as an efficacious remedy for all kinds of diseases.”<sup>1313</sup>

It is true that both the Portuguese and Marco Polo found that along with Christians, Hindus and Muslims also went to the tomb; and both Christians and Muslims claimed the tomb as belonging to them. We do not find any problem with regard to Hindu devotion to this tomb. In fact, many Hindus revere and some even pray to the Christian God. They can easily adopt and accept one more God to their collection of gods. But the question is why the Muslims together with Christians also came to the tomb? One thing is sure that if it belonged to a Muslim sage, surely no Christian would ever have gone there and paid homage. We may rely upon the more plausible explanation given by Bishop L.W. Brown. According to him the ancestors of these Muslims might have been Christians and as such continued the habit of venerating the tomb. So he concludes saying that “the Muslims who venerated the tomb were carrying an old practice derived from their ancestors before the rise of Islam, and that these ancestors were, in fact, Christians.”<sup>1314</sup> We have evidence from a Muslim custodian of the tomb who gave witness to the Portuguese. He communicated to the Portuguese that although he did not belong to the Thomas Christians in Kerala all his forefathers belonged to the community of St. Thomas.<sup>1315</sup>

<sup>1310</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 99-100 referring to Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Christian Topography* (trans. J. W. McCrindle), London 1907.

<sup>1311</sup>Cf. Cherian, *A History of Christianity in Kerala*, 48.

<sup>1312</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 55: according to T. K. Joseph, a Kerala Syrian Christian and historian, it was not the tomb of St. Thomas due to the claim and homage paid by Saracens to the same tomb. According to him it was someone who was prevalent among the Muslims of India as a prophet. The only answer which can be given for this natural prejudice is the ignorance of the abundant Portuguese source materials like the Letter of M. Gomes (1517), the letter of the inhabitants of Mylapore (1538), Diego Fernandes (1533/50), the accounts of Barbosa, Barros, Correa and so on. It is true that both the Portuguese and Marco Polo all found that along with Christians, Hindus and Muslims also came to the tomb and both even went so far as to claim it to be their own.

<sup>1313</sup>Cited from Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 52-53 referring to Marco Polo.

<sup>1314</sup>L. W. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas: An account of the Ancient Syrian Church of Malabar*, Cambridge 1956, 56.

<sup>1315</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 57.

Let us take into account the apocryphal ‘Acts of (Judas) Thomas’<sup>1316</sup> for the work and activity of St. Thomas in Kerala. Although earlier historians and researchers had not taken it seriously as it was accused as apocryphal today no serious historian would say so. The modern study states that it has much to say in connection with historicity of the first and second century oral tradition. In former times it was pushed off due to its romantic and fable like-tradition. Today many scholars are of the opinion that this work is the earliest available record and detailed account about St. Thomas’ mission in India, an account from the Syrian Christianity. Besides the current researchers do not criticize it anymore as an unorthodox book rather they say it is an important book which belonged to an authentic tradition, which prevailed till the 4<sup>th</sup> century within the Syrian Christianity. They are of the view that it is neither fiction nor history but it is both. When they read through the lines of the text they understood that it contained truth and fiction which is narrated in a very lively form to reflect both theology of the East Syrian Christianity and the history of the origins of Christianity in India. “Even though this work has been acknowledged as apocryphal, Gnostic in origin, and romantic in style, several scholars find in it a historical nucleus which represents the second century tradition about the apostolate of St. Thomas in India.”<sup>1317</sup> Ratcliff goes beyond every other scholar and takes *Acts of Thomas* as a proof for certain leniency of the AM anaphora.<sup>1318</sup> If so how can we write off this work saying that it is merely apocryphal? Among the prominent Western Historians who deny any possibility of St. Thomas’ going to India or to any countries of East Asia are B. Peeters, Garbe, Winternitz, Harnack, Vallee-Pussin, Basnage, Tillemont La Croze, John Kays and James Hough.<sup>1319</sup> At the same time although a few of the scholars agree only with the North-west India as the land of activities and work of St. Thomas some scholars are not against the work in South India and North India basing on this apocryphal work and some patristic and medieval references. Together with this group of historians we may also refer to historians, natives of Kerala, who argue for a south Indian activity of St. Thomas, from the fact of the living tradition of the community of St. Thomas Christian (or Syrian Christians in Kerala) and the tomb of Mylapore in Chennai. Besides, these historians find the trade routes which are a historical fact, between Kerala and the rest of the world which paved the way for St. Thomas to take an easy route to Kerala where Jews were present.<sup>1320</sup>

Still there are so many difficulties to establish regarding the historicity of these facts. One of the difficulties when we take this work [*Acts of Thomas*] into account is regarding the place that whether the place mentioned in this work is North India or

---

<sup>1316</sup>Cf. Menachery, Thomapedia, 24; *Acts of Thomas* is one of the earliest kinds written towards the end of the second century or in the beginning of the third century. At present it has versions in Syriac, Greek, Latin, Armenian, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Coptic. Very recently it is also translated into English, French and German. The original seems to be in the Syriac language written by an Edessene author. It contains 13 Acts in 170 Chapters. As authors tried various inferences in various versions we find also some discrepancies in it.

<sup>1317</sup>Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 23.

<sup>1318</sup>Cf. Ratcliff, The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, in JThS 30 (1929), 31 refer below fn. 1754 for more details.

<sup>1319</sup>Cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 24.

<sup>1320</sup>There are also contrasting opinions to this view that the Jews came only in 72 A. D. following the destruction of Jerusalem Temple by Emperor Titus. But still southern historians from Kerala hold the view basing on Bible and many traditional elements that there were trade relationships between Keralites and Jews from the time of the reign of King Solomon from 10<sup>th</sup> century B. C. (cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 20). Today even without basing on Bible modern Archealogist Benhur has proved the Jewish presence from B. C. through his archaeological studies.

South India. In this work we find that the areas where St. Thomas worked is shown as two places namely with a southern Indian King and a northern one indicating southern area and northern area respectively. Although this is considered as a work full of imagination, today the students of history have taken certain points of it seriously. The Western historians give us much information regarding this work. In order to acquaint ourselves with this work let us recall the summary of the story narrated in it. When St. Thomas received the commission to go to the Far East India he pleaded the Lord to send him anywhere else other than India. But the Lord appeared to him in a dream and encouraged him saying ‘that He would be with him.’ Although he was still hesitant with the assurance received from the Lord, by an internal thrust he proceeded to India with a Jewish business man called Habban.<sup>1321</sup> He came with this man to the palace of Gudnaphar. The story proceeds further that the king entrusted St. Thomas a big amount of money to build a palace for him. St. Thomas instead of building a palace for the king distributed the money among the poor. The king was very angry upon hearing the way how St. Thomas spent the money and he sent both of them to the prison. But the tale takes a new turn and it has a happy ending. As the king’s brother Gad died and when brought back to life by St. Thomas he narrated the beauty of the palace which St. Thomas built in heaven. Hearing this incident the king released him from the prison and received baptism from St. Thomas.<sup>1322</sup> Earlier although majority of the western historians held that this palace, king called Gudnaphar and his brother Gad are all merely imaginative figures, today modern scholarship gives greater authenticity to these events which are narrated with much imagination. Regarding the king whom St. Thomas met in North India is identified by modern scholarship as a king in Parthia named king Gondophorus. We are able to collect a lot of informations regarding this king Gondophorus from the Takht-e-Bahi inscriptions recovered from Peshawar in Pakistan (now preserved in the Lahore Museum).<sup>1323</sup> According to this findings Gondophorus was a king who ruled the area between Afghanistan and the Punjab from sometime before Christ in B. C. upto 48 A. D. In order to substantiate this fact the same author presents a number of coins unearthed from the north-western parts of the sub-continent with the name of the king inscribed on it. From the inscriptions found from Takht-e-Bahi<sup>1324</sup> it is stated that “in the 26<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of the great Gondophorus king on the fifth day of the month of Vysakh in the 103<sup>rd</sup> year.”<sup>1325</sup> Although there is no record regarding the calendar utilized, the use of the Indian month Vysakh will bring us to the idea that Gondophorus ruled around the Vikram Samvat era which started in 58 B. C. So according to the calculation based on this Indian Calender the 103<sup>rd</sup> year of Vikram Samvat must correspond to a period ca. 45-46 A. D. It seems the king mentioned in the *Act of Thomas* namely Gondophorus must have died in the year 48 A. D., and two years later this kingdom also might have

---

<sup>1321</sup>The name of the country from where Habban came is illegible in the Syriac manuscript preserved in the British Museum as the manuscript is injured here. Two other manuscripts which are preserved in Berlin and the Cambridge University libraries omit this word. We do not get any idea about the land from either the Latin or the Greek text. However F. C. Burkitt suspects that the injured word is only the Syriac for ‘Hindustan’ (cf. Pothan, *The Syrian Christians of Kerala*, 11).

<sup>1322</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 25.

<sup>1323</sup>Cf. Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 189.

<sup>1324</sup>It is situated about 80 kilometers from Peshawar, has ruins of an ancient Buddhist monastery atop a hill. Takht-i-Bahi is an impressive Buddhist monastery in Pakistan. It is believed to date back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> century A. D.

<sup>1325</sup>Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 189.



collapsed. The modern scholarship tells that St. Thomas might have reached north India during this period.<sup>1326</sup>

We cannot completely ignore what Bishop Medlycott has observed from the descriptions of *Acta Thomas*. He says that “the climatic conditions specified by the *Acta Thomas* apply more to South India than to the Punjab, and that the court life of Gondoporus befits a maharaja’s household more than a Parthian royal palace.”<sup>1327</sup> Together with the King mentioned from North-India (Gudnaphorus) we come across also another King from South India (Mazdai) in the *Acts of Thomas* who ruled sometime in the first century A. D. in Kerala, in Coromandel, or even in the present day Mysore,<sup>1328</sup> who invited St. Thomas to his kingdom, namely the king of the Chera kingdom where Jews settled for the trade. Besides “for the early christianization of North India we do not possess any actual vestiges as we have for that of South India.”<sup>1329</sup> This missionary trip made by St. Thomas to Maliankara or Cranganore or Muziris or Kodungalloor brought Christianity to today’s Kerala. It is believed that he founded 7 and half a church in and around Maliankara (besides Maliankara other places are called Koovakayal, Niranam, Palayoor near Guruvayoor, Nilackal (Chayal), Kokkamangalm (Gokkamangalam), Kollam, Thiruvithancode (this is called a half church: arappally in Malayalam). It seems that he was not attached to one single place. He moved from place to place. Thus it seems after a stay of two and half years in Mailapuram he returned to Malabar via Malayattoor<sup>1330</sup> and visited the old places: Cranganore, Kottakayal, Kokkamangalam, Kollam, Niranam and Chayal. Thus even if the *Acts of Thomas* is considered as Apocryphal we cannot deny the truth it contains namely the living faith tradition of the Kerala Syrian Christians and the tomb<sup>1331</sup> of Mylapore<sup>1332</sup> venerated by thousands of people to this very day together with factors like the commercial links with India and Kerala, the ports of Roman Empire, the Jewish presence both in India and Kerala from the very early Christian era.<sup>1333</sup> With regard to the field of St. Thomas activity *The Act of Thomas* seems to point to North and South India as well. As we have said above the sources (oral tradition) of this work (*The Acts of Thomas*) are those which people handed down from generation to generation orally. Thus it has also paved the way for so many versions. Today it is approved that there are two sets of versions of it, one which is written by ante-Nicean writers who generally mention Parthia as his field of activity and post-Nicean writers who generally prefer India to Parthia. Thus it may be concluded that in the western

---

<sup>1326</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1327</sup>Cited from Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, 363 referring to Medlycott, *India and the Apostle Thomas*, 75-79.

<sup>1328</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *Origins of Christianity in India*, 17.

<sup>1329</sup>*Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>1330</sup>Today this is the biggest shrine in Kerala dedicated to St. Thomas. More information one can collect about this place and shrine from the 19<sup>th</sup> Centenary Souvenir on St. Thomas, Malayattoor 1972 written in Malayalam.

<sup>1331</sup>“Marco Polo who stayed on the Coromandel (south-east) coast of India at the end of the thirteenth century, probably in 1293, states that the place of tomb was unimportant from a commercial point of view, but was visited by both Christian and Muslim Pilgrims. They took away red earth from the neighbourhood of the tomb and used it, mixed with water, as a specific for fever ... Marco Polo then went down the east coast and up the west to Quilon, where he found a few Christians and Jews” (Brown, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas*, 82 referring to Yule, ed., *Book of Ser Marco Polo*, II, Ch. 18, London 1903, 353).

<sup>1332</sup>“The tomb of Mylapore at least from the 14<sup>th</sup> century onwards is definitely identified as the burial place of St. Thomas. The conclusion seems to be inevitable” (Mundadan, *Origins of Christianity in India*, in: S. K Sharma and U. Sharma, ed., *Cultural and Religious Heritage of India*, New Delhi 2004, 7).

<sup>1333</sup>Cf. Valiamangalam, *Indian Christian Spirituality*, 507.

tradition the apostolic field of St. Thomas can be either North India or South India.<sup>1334</sup> This may be also the logical reason why today no serious historian subscribes to the idea that Christianity in India had its origin out of the missionary activity of the East Syrian Church or of the Roman Catholic Church.

In addition we must keep in mind that these churches, i. e., either the East Syrian Church or Roman Church, do not make such unique claim that they were instrumental for the origin of the church in India. Thus no one can deny two monumental proofs for the coming of St. Thomas to India and especially to Kerala namely: “the community of St. Thomas Christians with their living tradition; and the tomb of Mylapore, which is definitely identified as the burial place of St. Thomas at least from the 14<sup>th</sup> century onwards.”<sup>1335</sup> Both churches [the East Syrian Church and the Roman Church] have always said that it is through the apostolic labours of St. Thomas the church in India was initiated. To this proofs we can add a number of other proofs too. Hence Atiya is of the view that “whatever the outcome of these arguments, [namely that of *Acta Thomas*] it is clear that Christianity was planted in Malabar at a very early date, certainly before the end of the second century, as testified by Pantaenus.”<sup>1336</sup>

According to A. Benhur St. Thomas must have been encouraged to visit the lost people of Israel in Gondophorus’ kingdom through the Jewish traders who used the North Indian trade route.<sup>1337</sup> This argument is further authenticated by today’s consensus that all the apostles went to different parts of the world in search of the dispersed Jewish people. The chief interest of Apostle Thomas’ visit might be nothing other than the presence of Jews in Parthia. The authenticity of this argument is further cemented with the finding of coins with the name of the king Gondophorus. Thus “the coins bearing the names of Gondophorus, the presence of Gondophorus in history and the deciphering of the ‘Takht-e-Bahi’ inscriptions have all been now accepted as incontrovertible historic records.”<sup>1338</sup> As per the historic records available to us we can rely upon the fact that St. Thomas converted a few in Parthia to his religion. A. Benhur alleges through the finding of the granite cross excavated from the Taxila<sup>1339</sup> region for the presence and preaching of St. Thomas in Parthia. He claims that the Taxila cross is also an indubitable proof for the presence of a Christian community in ancient north-western India. Today there is no doubt regarding the Jewish presence in North India from the various inscriptions in Greek and Aramaic from the Mauryan time. The Aramaic language and the Judaic traditions held by these people eased the way of the Apostle to these people. Besides, the Asoka rock inscriptions in Aramaic testify to the presence of Jews in India when the Apostle visited north-western

---

<sup>1334</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *Origins of Christianity in India*, 20.

<sup>1335</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1336</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1337</sup>Cf. Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 189.

<sup>1338</sup>Ibid., 190.

<sup>1339</sup>Cf. *ibid.*; Thomas seems to have reached Taksha shila (today wrongly said as Taxila) by the well-known sea route from Alexandria to the mouth of the Indus. As Taxila is known as the oldest university ever known in the history of the universe and as a cosmopolitan centre of Culture where students from all over the world arrived and where it was a custom to give ready hearing to teachers from strange countries St. Thomas might have found an easy way to the court of Gondophorus. Taxila is also famous after its famous teachers. Chanakyan who was a product of this university and one of the great personalities of India later taught mathematics, geography and science along with dharmic education in this university. His two books got international acknowledgement namely book on Arthasastra in 15 volumes (deals with monetary and fiscal policies, welfare and international relations, and war strategies) and Neethisastra (on ideal life Morality).

India.<sup>1340</sup> A. Dihle agrees to the fact that “Thomas travelled by boat and, being a disciple of our Lord, he started his voyage right from the harbor of Jerusalem.”<sup>1341</sup> Atiya also authenticates what Benhur says.

“... the historicity of the relations between that part of India and some of the countries of the Middle East is established in antiquity beyond doubt. Two trade routes to India were frequented by seagoing craft from Egypt by way of the Red Sea and from Mesopotamia by way of the Persian Gulf; ... moreover a small Jewish group of residents had existed in Malabar from a very early date, indicating this interchange between southern India and the Semites of Syria and Palestine.”<sup>1342</sup>

Yet we have problems to unravel. Then is it only a myth that he started seven and a half churches in South India, namely in Kerala? The people of Syro-Malabar Church hold that Apostle Thomas constituted churches in Kodungallur, Palayur, Parur, Kokkamangalam, Niranam, Nilackal, and Kollam. According to the modern historical records St. Thomas travelled farther from north-west India to the south-west India and reached there by A. D. 52. It is interesting to note that the so-called seven and a half churches seem to have established by St. Thomas are situated either in or near the settlements of Jews. We have documents about it from the 17<sup>th</sup> century delegate to India in the person of Pereya de Paiva who led a delegation of Jews from Amsterdam to Cochin in 1686 in his book *Noticias de Judees do Cochin*. According to him there were Jewish communities and their Synagogues in Cochin, Angicaymol (Ernakulam), Parur, Palayur, Chenot and Muttam and beyond the Malabar Coast Kalyan, Thana and Mylapore had Jewish settlers.<sup>1343</sup> Thus it may be realistic to think that “it was the existence of these Jewish colonies that prompted St. Thomas to come to South India to preach the Gospel.”<sup>1344</sup> It seems that he visited the Malabar Coast during the Sangam Period which extended from the last two centuries before Christ and three centuries of the Christian era. As Apostle Thomas came to know about a substantial number of Jewish population in the southern part of India namely Malabar Coast, from the Arab and Egyptian sailors who visited the Malabar Coast for trade, he might have started his next apostolic journey towards the south of India. Currently it is an established fact that there were almost 120 ships travelling every year to the Malabar Coast from Arabia. This journey was made possible through the discovery of the trade winds by Hippalus.<sup>1345</sup> St. Thomas might not have faced much difficulty in Malabar Coast as the Jews in South India also spoke Aramaic and followed all Jewish customs. “There are several documents proving that Aramaic (Chaldaic) was a very familiar language in the whole of India and especially in the West coast of it, Kerala. If Emperor Asoka had to proclaim his edicts also in Aramaic, it is evident that there were a considerable

<sup>1340</sup>Cf. Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 190.

<sup>1341</sup>A. Dihle, *Early Christianity in India*, in: T. W. Hillard et al., ed., *Early Christianity, Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Bd. 2, Cambridge 1998, 311.

<sup>1342</sup>Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, 360 (cf. L. W. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas: An account of the Ancient Syrian Church of Malabar*, Cambridge 1956, 62; he refers to a tradition that a Jewish colony settled in the first cent. in the Periyar Valley, in Quilon, and in Muziris, receiving fourth-century privileges with the Christians, as recorded on copper plates; cf. E. M. Philip, *The Indian Church of St. Thomas*, Kottayam 1950, 20-21 mentions a place called Jews' Hill near the Palayar Church where a Jewish synagogue had been in existence before).

<sup>1343</sup>Cf. A. Mattam, *Inculturation of the Liturgy in the Indian Context*, Kottayam, 1991, 85 in reference to Mosseh Pereyra De Paiva, *The Cochin Synagogue, 400<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Souvenir*, Cochin 1968.

<sup>1344</sup>*Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>1345</sup>It was Hippalus who discovered the wind in 45 A. D. which would lead ships from Greece and Europe to Kerala Malabar Coast. Thereafter it is known after him (cf. Menon, *Cultural Heritage of India*, 7).

number of his subjects who could read only that language.”<sup>1346</sup> Besides this, “historians have almost proved that there were Jewish traders in the Malabar Coast from the 10<sup>th</sup> century B.C.”<sup>1347</sup> T. Puthiakunnel who made a research into the possibility of the existence of Jewish colonies of India came to the conclusion that the presence of the Jewish traders paved the way for St. Thomas to come to Kerala and his findings fall in line with the findings of Benhur.<sup>1348</sup> It seems first he travelled to Muziris present day Kodangallur in Kerala (Cranganore) and from there to all major Jewish settlements in Kerala.<sup>1349</sup> During the time of his visit this southern part of India which was known as Tamil country (Tamizhagam)<sup>1350</sup> was then under three different kingdoms of ‘Moventhans’- the Cheras, the Cholas and the Pandyas. The coming together of these three kingdoms was to resist the onslaught of the Mauryan Empire and especially the rule of Asoka’s grandson called Sampraty who reigned from 224 B. C. to 215 B. C. During his time “the Jews came to Tamil country along with the Mauryans<sup>1351</sup> and the Kassites<sup>1352</sup> of northern India who brought along with them Buddhism, Jainism, the Paali language as well as the Gangetic civilization.”<sup>1353</sup> The Tamilians used to call these immigrants from the north as Kongans and Vadukas. Thus people who belonged to Jewish religion or people those who were converted from Judaism to Christianity were also called as Vadukas. This word ‘Vadukas’ does not mean anything other than to distinguish people from south and north. The southerners were called ‘Thekkumbagar’ who came to Kerala under the leadership of Kinayi Thomman and remain as ‘pure blooded’ up to this day and the people who came from North is called ‘Vadakkumbhagar’ or ‘Vadukas’ or ‘Vadukans’. If we make a search into the relation between the word Kosanputtur and Coimbatore, a student of history will understand that it was in connection with the Kassite from the North, who were no one else other than the Jews. Coimbatore is the present day city in Tamilnadu which lies close to Kerala.

But as they [Vadakkumbhagar] came to south India there were already other rulers. From the Asoka inscriptions of Brahmagiri in Chitradurga we are able to establish the fact that it was the Cheras who ruled the area before the Kongans came to dominate the Coimbatore area in 300 B. C. At present we are sure of the historical fact that during the time of Sampraty the Coimbatore based Jews who had trade contact with the Mauryans played the major role in the trade along the Southern Trade Route.<sup>1354</sup> We have proof for all this various historical facts namely from inscriptions which are preserved in British Museum and Lahore Museum. Pliny records that “the best Beryl (emerald) stones in the world, which looked ‘as green as sea water’ were obtained from India.”<sup>1355</sup> Presently it is clear to any student of history where in India

<sup>1346</sup>J. Marshall, Guide to Taxilla, Delhi 1936, 78-79 and xxiii (a).

<sup>1347</sup>V. Pathikulangara, Chaldeo-Indian Heritage, in: Denha Services 39 (1995), 117.

<sup>1348</sup>Cf. T. Puthiakunnel, Jewish Colonies of India paved the way for St. Thomas, in: J. Vellian and A. Raes, ed., The Malabar Church. Symposium in honour of Rev. P. J. Podipara (OrChrA 186), Rome 1970, 187.

<sup>1349</sup>It is a historical fact that there were Jews in all these places where he started the Church (cf. *ibid.*, 191).

<sup>1350</sup>Even today’s Kerala formed part of the larger unit Tamizhakam (Tamiland) which lay beyond the Western Ghats (cf. T. K. Krishna Menon, History of Kerala, Vol. 3, New Delhi 1984, 32).

<sup>1351</sup>The Kassites and the Mauryans were also called Kongans and they came from the Gangetic basin (cf. Benhur, The Jewish Background of Indian People, 193).

<sup>1352</sup>Coimbatore was known earlier as Kosanputtur; Kosan being the Tamil form of Kassite (cf. *ibid.*).

<sup>1353</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1354</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1355</sup>*Ibid.*

these stones were available. It was nowhere other than Padiyur in Kongunad, almost 10 km away from Kankayam in Coimbatore district in the north-west direction. Hence Kongunad had drawn to itself all the Jews who were involved in stone (emerald) work whose value they knew well. It seems the Jews who had quarried the sapphire gems from the Bamiyan Hills in Afghanistan were the same who came to Padiyur in search of emeralds from South India. In the year 1930 people who made excavations in the suburb of Mambalam (half an hour to the north of the Little Mount) found out a coin of the Roman Emperor Augustus dated 14 A. D. which brings us back to the first century. Later a series of finding of the Roman coins took place. The number of Roman coins which were recovered from Padiyur gives us ample proof that it was an international trade centre. From places like Pollachi, Udumalpet, Karur, Vellalur etc. hoards and hoards of Roman coins of first century A. D. were exhumed. We can say for certain that it was the Jews who conducted this business from the fact of finding Roman coins and Karsh coins used by the Mauryas, unearthed from the graves of Jews by so many famous archeologists from India and from abroad<sup>1356</sup> in Coimbatore.<sup>1357</sup>

The modern research is once again underpinned with the information we collect from the map of Castorius that Malabar was an important trade centre from B. C. “An der indischen Westküste [which is Malabar] wurden zahlreiche römische und frühbyzantinische Münzen gefunden. Sie sind ein lebendiges Zeugnis für die Handelsbeziehungen und für die Angaben in den Quellen.”<sup>1358</sup> Today it is assessed that the Jewish traders collected the produce of the forest from Wayanad and Marayur<sup>1359</sup> especially sandal wood and precious stones from Coimbatore and through the Muziris Port (Kodaungallur) delivered it to the traders from Rome and Arabia. In the words of Pliny, “good authorities declare that Arabia does not produce so large a quantity of perfume in a year’s output as was burned by the Emperor Nero in a day at the obsequies of his consort Poppaea.”<sup>1360</sup> It is a clear indication that Rome had also transported enormous amount of incense and perfumes or sandalwood from south India. Even a Hindu historian who hails from Kerala state asserts basing on all these findings that “trade relations existed between Kerala and the Mediterranean countries and there seems to be nothing improbable in the St. Thomas tradition.”<sup>1361</sup> Sir Mortimer Wheeler in his study has found that there existed a trade route between Coimbatore [Tamilnadu] and Kodungallur [Muziris, Kerala] via Palakkad [in Kerala].<sup>1362</sup> Although due to the 13<sup>th</sup> century flood Muziris or today’s Kodungallur lost its prominence [today Cochin Port is the most famous in Kerala] and it is supposed that it was the main route through which St. Thomas might have come. So

<sup>1356</sup>The Roman coins recovered in South India indicate five distinct phases in the Roman trade with the South between 40 B. C. and 2<sup>nd</sup> Century A. D. According to M. Wheeler eleven hoards of Roman coins of the first century A. D. were recovered from Coimbatore district (cf. M. Wheeler, *Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers*, New York 1955, 143). From Karur, from the capital of ‘Cherabotras’ (Kerala Puthras), in 1806, 1856 and 1878 three hoards of Roman coins were recovered. From Pollachi in Coimbatore two hoards one in 1800 another in 1810. From Vellalur in the same district two very large hoards (522 coins in 1842 and 544 in 1891) were recovered (cf. E. H. Warmington, *Commerce between Roman Empire and India*, New Delhi 1995, 284).

<sup>1357</sup>Cf. Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 194.

<sup>1358</sup>Pigulewskaja, *Byzanz auf den Wegen nach Indien*, 95.

<sup>1359</sup>Today both these places belong to Kerala. Wayanadu is situated in the north-east and Marayur (Marayoor) is situated in the south of Kerala. Marayur is also famous for its sandal wood perhaps one of the most famous sandalwood forest.

<sup>1360</sup>Pliny, *Natural history*, Vol. 4 (trans. H. Rackham), London 1938-1963, 61.

<sup>1361</sup>Sreedhra Menon, *Cultural Heritage of India*, 17.

<sup>1362</sup>Cf. Wheeler, *Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers*, 144.

A. Benhur who made so many archaeological studies in all these places asserts that it is a historical possibility that St. Thomas visited all Jewish settlements in Kerala.<sup>1363</sup> He adds that it is not improbable that St. Thomas visited also Coimbatore as there were Jews present there gathering the goods, what the Romans and other dealers from other parts of the world needed. After having conducted so many studies on Marayur dolmens A. Benhur is of the estimation that there were several hundreds of Jews present in these areas as it was and is the place where the superior quality of sandalwood was and is available. P. Varghese also supports the theory of A. Benhur:

“Es ist nicht undenkbar, daß im 1. Jahrhundert in Indien eine jüdische Gemeinde existierte. Bei den indischen Juden gibt es seine Überlieferung, nach der eine Gruppe von jüdischen Ansiedlern im 2. oder 3. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert nach Indien kam. Nach der Thomas-Überlieferung besuchte der Apostel die jüdische Synagoge in Kodungallur (Muziris) und traten etwa 40 Juden zum Christentum über. Man hat auch vermutet, daß Habban, der palästinische Kaufmann, der Thomas nach Indien brachte, selbst ein bekehrter Jude war.”<sup>1364</sup>

According to historical tradition when the Cheras took hold of Kongunadu, the Jewish traders collaborated with the Cheras. The Jews who lived in these areas were superior to the natives in their foreign connection, language skills and in the art of know-how to do things. As they started paying tribute to the Chera rulers they also secured the protection from the rulers. Besides, Kerala rulers were very happy with the presence of Jews as they were successful traders and who contributed much to the development of Kerala. As a token of gratitude various Kings rewarded them with various copper plates<sup>1365</sup> granting the community special privileges. “The Jewish leader Joseph Rabban was granted the rank of prince over the Jews of Cochin, given the rulership of tax and revenue of a pocket principality in Anjuvannam, near Cranganore, and rights to seventy-two ‘free houses.’”<sup>1366</sup> The Hindu king gave permission to Jews in perpetuity (or in the poetical language, ‘as long as the world and moon exist’) to live freely, build synagogues, and own property without conditions attached.<sup>1367</sup> Thus Jews settled around the trade centres of Chera rulers, namely Karur (the Capital of Chera Country), Thakidur (Salem), Airamalai (Anamudi), Muziris (Kodungalloor) and Thondi (Calicut) as provincial administrative centres.<sup>1368</sup> Later Chera rulers shifted their administrative set-up to the west coast namely to Muziris with a view to smoothen their trade through sea-routes. According to Benhur’s excavation the so called places, where St. Thomas seemed to have come namely Kodungallur, Kollam, Niranam, Nilackal(Chayal), Kokkamangalam, Kottakkayal (Paravoor), Palayoor (Chattukulangara) and Thiruvithancode Arappally [the half church], had Jewish presence as it was all situated near the Coasts of South India, Kerala. Pliny mentions that, “the district from which pepper is conveyed to Becare in

<sup>1363</sup>Cf. Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 195 (he has come to such a conclusion after having made several excavations and research in various Dolmens, Rock-cut cave and urns and utensils, pit-circles and port-hole dolmens used by Jews in various states in India).

<sup>1364</sup>Varghese, *Die Syrischen Kirchen in Indien*, 17.

<sup>1365</sup>The copper plate granted to the Jews is preserved in their synagogue at Cochin. The facsimile of these plates are available today to us from various books. We have recourse to it in the book of Pothan, *Syrian Christians of Kerala*, 32-33.

<sup>1366</sup>K. Blady, *Jewish Communities in Exotic Places*, New Jersey 2000, 115.

<sup>1367</sup>Cf. J. Massey, *Roots of Dalit History: Christianity, theology and Spirituality*, New Delhi <sup>3</sup>1996, 28.

<sup>1368</sup>Cf. Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 196.

canoes made of hollowed tree-trunks is called Cottonara.”<sup>1369</sup> Here the reference goes obviously to places like Kuttanad<sup>1370</sup> and Kottayam where even today pepper and all sorts of spices are produced and known as a dream land of green spices and a land of latex, letters and lakes respectively.

Thus from the above mentioned factors we may suppose that St. Thomas visited South India. It is believed that when St. Thomas came to Tamil country it was controlled by Cheras, Cholas, Pandyas and the Pallavas. As St. Thomas heard of a group of Jews in South India from the North Indian traders of Jewish origin he came in search of this people of Israel. He had not much difficulty to go through the coastal towns of Kodungallur, Palayur, Parur and Kollam and the riverside towns of Kokkamangalam (on the Periyar river), Niranam and Nilackal (on the Pamba river) converting some Jews to Christianity as the Jews all spoke Aramaic. So his journey in Kerala was always through the trade paths of the Jews till he was martyred by the Pattars at Mylapore in 72 A. D. The story of his martyrdom is narrated by some as the cause of aggravation. The Pattars (Brahmins) who were on the way to temple happened to meet St. Thomas and they invited him to join them to worship their gods. Hearing this invitation St. Thomas destroyed furiously their idols and the temple used by the Pattars. In retaliation to this they looked for a convenient occasion to kill him and he was lanced to death by these infuriated Pattars.

According to Benhur, the above mentioned scholar, it was not Nampoothiris<sup>1371</sup> that St. Thomas converted rather it was the Jews. He holds that there was a conscious effort from the part of the later Christians to speak of it due to the status and fame this high caste Nampoothiris in society had.<sup>1372</sup> Basing on various studies conducted by J. Vellian and V. Pathikulangara they conclude that the Church in India, namely, SMC was a synthesis of Jewish and Dravidian, i.e., Semitic and Indian Cultures.<sup>1373</sup> But in the study conducted by A. Benhur he found a similarity between two populations existed in Kerala namely between the Jews and the Scythian Brahmins. Both of them looked alike in their physical attributes, attire and lifestyle thus according to him those who were converted to Christianity from Judaism were taken to be Brahmins and thus Nampoothiris.<sup>1374</sup> To substantiate this theory he depends upon the story of ‘poonool.’ According to him both Brahmins and Jews alike wore sacred thread. Up to this day the Jewish Christians of Mahabaleswar (Maharashtra) wear sacred thread (‘poonool’) on their mane. The Jewish Christians also wore it up to the Diampore synod in 1599. It holds also true to the fact that there are Orthodox Jews in the United States still wearing threads like the Brahmins of India.<sup>1375</sup> There was also a custom of Jews using the names of Brahmins or Indians in Palayur. In the research conducted A. Benhur found that the patriarch of Shankarapuri family was a Mahadevan, a typical Hindu

<sup>1369</sup>Pliny, Natural History, Vol. 2 (trans. H. Rackham), Cambridge 1942, 419.

<sup>1370</sup>Here one should not get confused with today’s Kuttanadu which is called the Venice of East, namely the backwaters tourist Spot. Instead today’s Idukki District is mentioned here as Kuttanad.

<sup>1371</sup>The Brahmanans of Kerala are known as Namboothiris. Historical evidences as well as their own traditions suggest that they came from North India and settled down in Kerala, migrating along the West Coast (cf. <http://www.namboothiri.com/articles/history.htm>. Date of Access: 14. 10. 2012).

<sup>1372</sup>Cf. Benhur, The Jewish Background of Indian People, 199.

<sup>1373</sup>Cf. J. Vellian and V. Pathikulangara, The Eucharistic Liturgy of the Chaldeo-Indian Church, in: J. Madey, ed., The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East, Paderborn 1982, 249.

<sup>1374</sup>Cf. Benhur, The Jewish Background of Indian People, 198.

<sup>1375</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 199.

name in Kerala.<sup>1376</sup> Thus he finds lot of similarities between Christians and Nampoothiris of Kerala. But according to him this does not mean that the earlier Christians were Nampoorthiris. Perhaps there was a conscious effort at a later period to associate with the Nampoothiris of Kerala as they were already an affluent group in Kerala. V. Nagam Ayya states in the Travancore State Manual (1906) that the Kerala Christians were Nampoorthiris basing on this conscious effort from the part of the Christians. A. Benhur finds a number of reasons for such kind of assertions:

“the custom of giving gold and honey to the new born, tying black thread on the 28<sup>th</sup> day of the baby’s birth, celebratory observance of the baby’s first grain feeding, keeping a tuft of hair on the shaven pate of the male, ceremonial initiation of children into learning, patrilineal inheritance, wearing of studs on the earlobes of men, the women wearing the unique ‘chatta’ blouse and long ‘kachamuri’ waist cloth and using the century palm frond umbrella when going out, observance of untouchability, child marriage,’ annual memorial feasting for the dead, preparing the nuptial thread to tie the ‘thali’ (mangalasutra) at marriage with the yarn taken from the dress given to the bride (mantrakodi) ceremonially at marriage etc., have been cited among such practices.”<sup>1377</sup>

Thus the identification and similarity found among the Thomas Christians pushed to the conclusion that today’s Thomas Christians are converts from Nampoorthiris. But according to the latest studies there were already people with sacred thread, ear studs, and tuft of hair on the shaven pate (kuduma) in and around Kodungalloor when St. Thomas arrived. It is assumed beyond doubt that they were Pathans from Afghanistan. But people considered them as Nampoorthiris like the Brahmins, Bhattas, Bhattathiris, Iyers and Ayyankars who also wore sacred thread. The new study reveals that they were not Nampoorthiris rather Jews or Pathans. But there is a strong view in Kerala that the first St. Thomas Christians were Brahmins. In the works of Hambye he finds it more fitting to be Brahmins than Jews due to two reasons. First among them, is the presence of a church in the region called shapakkad and its compound stand on the remnants of a Hindu temple, with its tank, sacred well, and sculptures.<sup>1378</sup> Second is the documentation ‘Nagargarandhavaryola’ which a Brahmin family holds called Kalathu mana. In this above mentioned document it is stated that “Kali Year 3153 (52 A. D.) the foreigner Thomas Sanyasi (priest) came to our village (graman) preached there causing pollution.”<sup>1379</sup> The new version is that as St. Thomas preached in Chavakkadu there were resisting Jewish families and who retained their age old faith and renounced the new religion preached by St. Thomas. So they fell out of the converted four families and moved out of the land abhorring that

---

<sup>1376</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1377</sup>*Ibid.*, 199-200.

<sup>1378</sup>The water tank and temple have a special legendary story connected to it. It was customary for the Orthodox Brahmins to perform five Yajnas (Panchayajnas = it means worship, prayer or sacrificial ritual) every day. One of these was Pithruyajna. Once it happened when they were performing this yajna St. Thomas happened to see this practice of throwing water upward. He asked them what it all meant. They said the reason for throwing the water upward. But the Apostle said if your god was pleased with the water thrown upward it should have remained in the air. The Brahmins argued with him basing on the theory of gravity. Then he argued that his God would make them see accepting this water thrown upward. Then the Apostle prayerfully cast a handful of water high up in the air from the tank. The water came down only at the bidding of the Apostle. Many Brahmins seeing this instance believed in the God of St. Thomas. But yet some others left cursing the village and thus later this village is known as Shapakkad (cf. Cherian, *A History of Christianity in Kerala*, 39).

<sup>1379</sup>Cited from G. Moraes, *A History of Christianity in India*, from early times to St. Francis Xavier: A. D. 52-1542, Bombay 1964, 40 referring to Hambye, *St. Thomas and India in: CleM 16* (1952), 370-371.



the land is a 'shapakkad' (accursed land) where the converts live. Today this land is known as Chavakkad<sup>1380</sup> (Chowghat) in Kerala. Later these people who left the area saying that it is an accursed land, who were Pathans and later known to be Pattars (today high caste in Kerala), went to Mylapore, near Madras (Chennai), on the banks of Adayar River. According to the contemporary study St. Thomas went in search of this Jewish group namely the Pathans (Pattar), who fell out from Kodungalloor to live with the already settled Pathans who are supposed to be from Afghanistan and settled in Mylapore. We hear something similar in the work of F. Day that "it is by no means improbable, that the Jews who came to Malabar, divided themselves into two parties, one of which became Christians whose ancestors were formally converted to the Christian faith by the Apostle Thomas, and the other retained their ancient faith."<sup>1381</sup> Along with it, this study presumes that St. Thomas was killed by a Pathan who found St. Thomas as a troublemaker to follow their faith and religion. The researcher holds that the Pattars or Pathans found in Mylapore were in all likelihood Israelites from north-west India. In addition, A. Benhur asserts the existence of Jews on the trade route at Alathur, Thiruvilwamala, Ariyannur, Kandanassery, Kattakambal, Iyyal and Porkalam in Thrissur District from the various studies conducted on the remnants of Jews like dolmens, hood-stones, cap-stones, laterite cave chambers and terracotta urns etc. He concluded that the Megalithic sites of Jews have been found as far as Pathanamthitta<sup>1382</sup> in the South and Wayanad in the north, besides the Coimbatore areas. The ancient burial chambers found in the Ranni and Konni areas as well as Nilackal belong to the Pathans who reached Pathanamthitta from Marayur in Idukki. From Pathanamthitta some Jews again moved to Niranam and Kollam. We can in all probability think that these Jews who adopted the new religion from St. Thomas might have set up churches at Niranam and Kollam.<sup>1383</sup>

The Hindu leaders of India are also convinced of the coming of St. Thomas to India. Dr. Rajendra Prasad (first president of India 1952-62) tells that "remember St. Thomas came to India when many of the countries of Europe had not yet become Christian, and so, those Indians who trace their Christianity to him have a longer history and a higher ancestry than that of Christians of many of the European countries. And it is really a matter of pride to us that it so happened."<sup>1384</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru who was the first prime minister of Independent India speaks that "you may be surprised to learn that Christianity came to India long before it went to England or Western Europe and even when in Rome it was a despised and proscribed sect. Within 100 years or so of the death of Jesus, Christian missionaries came to South India by sea ..."<sup>1385</sup> Dr. S. Radhakrishnan (1888-1975), the famous Indian philosopher and president of India (1962-1967), who is also known as the bridge-builder between India and the West due to his extensive knowledge of the Western philosophical and literary traditions, says that

<sup>1380</sup>Today's Chavakkad is a municipality in Thrissur District, and famous for its beach and fishing.

<sup>1381</sup>F. Day, *Land of the Perumals*, Madras 1863, 214.

<sup>1382</sup>The word Pathanamthitta comes from two words Pathans meaning a domain of the Pathans (Pattars) and 'Thitta' which means 'thinai' region in Tamil.

<sup>1383</sup>Cf. Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 202.

<sup>1384</sup>Cited from Pothen, *The Syrian Christians of Kerala*, 1 referring to the speech of Rajendra Prasad given on 18<sup>th</sup> December 1955 on St. Thomas Day celebrations in New Delhi.

<sup>1385</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 3 referring to Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, 1934.

“Christianity has flourished in India from the beginning of the Christian era. The Syrian Christians of Malabar believe that their form of Christianity is Apostolic derived directly from the Apostle Thomas. They contend that their version of the Christian faith is distinctive and independent of the forms established by St. Peter and St. Paul in the West. What is obvious is that there have been Christians in the West Coast of India from very early times. They were treated with great respect by the Hindus, whose princes built for them churches.”<sup>1386</sup>

This observation made by three eminent and educated Hindu leaders of Indian society is also shared by a vast majority of Indians regarding the coming of St. Thomas. Being this is the assumption and belief, people of Kerala started communicating it orally to each other about it after the martyrdom of St. Thomas even before the coming of the Syrian fathers who came to guide the Kerala church which was without much structure. This oral tradition of Kerala Jews actually became the nucleus of the so-called Apocryphal work called *Acts of Thomas*. People who came to Kerala, to Kodungalloor, heard from the people of Kerala about the influx of new religion and life, missionary activity and martyrdom of St. Thomas. Thus this oral tradition, when from Malabar Coast reached in other places, where the written tradition was prevalent, they put them into letters. Thus we come across at first a Syriac version<sup>1387</sup> of this oral tradition with the title *Acts of (Judas) Thomas*, by a Syrian Bardesanesa and native of Edessa in Mesopotamia<sup>1388</sup> which in its complete form, preserved in the British Museum, followed by Greek, Latin, Armenian and Ethiopic and Arabic versions.

With regard to the date of composition historians are of varied suppositions. When F. C. Burkitt places it before the middle of the third century<sup>1389</sup> Dr. Wright prefers a date not later than the fourth century<sup>1390</sup> and Thurston assigns to it an earlier date of 220.<sup>1391</sup> Some of the historians argue that the western tradition was not a single tradition but it was comprised of two traditions namely, that which is originated in Edessa, and in Alexandria.<sup>1392</sup> Thus we may assume that it was written down in the form of history of a church basing on what they heard from the natives. So it may be too much audacious to conclude that St. Thomas came only up to North India or never visited South India in the face of a standing claim from the Kerala people along with the presence of the tomb of St. Thomas which no other church claims to have, and a very strong living tradition of faith than any of the North Indian Church.

It may be good to look into a modern scholar's view regarding the Folklores which were extant in Kerala. All the local traditions of Kerala hold the reminiscences of St. Thomas' visit to south India and about his missionary activity and martyrdom. J. Puthussery who is a researcher of cultural theory, Culture studies, Ethnography and history of folklore theories and method and who at present works in Hyderabad University Centre for folk Culture Studies, studied about the various folklores in Kerala. He establishes in his thesis *Maargamkali: Genre and group identity through*

<sup>1386</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to S. Radhakrishnan, *East and West in Religion*, 1958.

<sup>1387</sup>Some historians are of the view that the Greek version was written first and later followed by Syriac and others.

<sup>1388</sup>Cf. Pothan, *The Syrian Christians of Kerala*, 9.

<sup>1389</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 10 in reference to F. C. Burkitt, *Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 1899.

<sup>1390</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to W. Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, London 1871.

<sup>1391</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1392</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *Origins of Christianity in India*, (1<sup>st</sup> - 6<sup>th</sup> century), in: H. C. Perumalil and E. R. Hambye, ed., *Christianity in India: A History in Ecumenical Perspective*, Alleppey 1972, 18.

*the Ages*<sup>1393</sup> that there were Christians in Kerala before the coming of Portuguese. He depended upon traditional songs like Veeradyan Pattu,<sup>1394</sup> Maargam Kali Pattu, Kerala Wedding Song, Rabban (Ramban) Pattu and others for the proof of existence of Christianity in Kerala before the coming of Portuguese. This oral tradition is very important in order to know the coming, activities, and martyrdom of St. Thomas in South India. It may be too adventurous to deny the nucleus and thrust of the historicity narrated in these Odes sang from generation to generation in Kerala. They transmitted the history of their origin through ‘Ramban Pattu (song),’ ‘Margam Kali Pattu,’ ‘Veeradian Pattu,’ ‘Panham Pattu’ etc. Together with the historical transmission of SMC’s origin these various songs were employed by St. Thomas Christians to transmit their faith orally to the next generation which they received from St. Thomas. However presently we cannot trace farther back than the 17<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries for this tradition. The 16<sup>th</sup> century works of Portuguese missionaries throw sufficient light into the Church of Malabar who employed these Odes. From their letters, reports, depositions, and well-composed histories we are able to come to the conclusion that they depended heavily upon these songs or Pattukal [songs]. The inquisitive mind of Portuguese or Europeans, who collected all such traditions prevalent in the Malabar Christian community, helped the Malabar Christians to retain their faith. Thus “they are today the richest, and perhaps, the earliest written sources of the Indian tradition on the apostolate and tomb of St. Thomas.”<sup>1395</sup>

Another astounding factor which indicates about the coming of St. Thomas is the recognition of it by Hindus. In a country like India, where the vast majority are Hindus (83%), believed about the coming of St. Thomas and commemorated the 1900<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his martyrdom in Mylapore by issuing stamps (in 1964 and 1972) in honour of him and in honour of the minority group namely, St. Thomas Christians who form less than 2% of the total population of India by a group of leaders headed by Hindus. Besides, no other country claims that St. Thomas was martyred in their land. The only martyrdom which St. Thomas faced was in the neighbourhood of Kerala called Mylapore and this is the strong conviction not only of Christians but also the followers of other religions too. According to the tradition of Kerala Thomas Christians’ “Apostle St. Thomas suffered martyrdom on the Little Mount of Madras and was buried in Mylapore, which is now a suburb of Madras; and on the Great Mount where St. Thomas used to pray.”<sup>1396</sup> Although his remainings were brought to

<sup>1393</sup>Cf. Puthussery, Maargamkali, 13.

<sup>1394</sup>Pattu is a Malayalam word used for song. Veeradyan Pattu was sung by Hindu singers as well. Rabban (Ramban) Pattu seems to be written by Thomas Ramban Maliekal, ‘the 48<sup>th</sup> priest of this family whose compound at Niranam can still be seen today. Again Margam Kali Pattu (margam kooduka in Malayalam means to join the way) is believed to be composed to accompany some sacred dance. Possibly this song is a Christian imitation of the Yathrakali i.e. the journey song of the nampoothiris (Malabar Brahmins). The content of these folk songs was about the coming of St. Thomas to Kerala, India. It narrates that he came to Maliankara near Cranganore or Muziris the Capital of the Cheras in 52 A. D. founded seven and a half churches at Cranganore, Quilon, Niranam where members of four Brahmin families – Pattamukku, Thayyil, Mangi and Madattalam-accepted faith from him, Nilakkal, a prosperous trade centre, Korkkamangalam, a centre of nampoothiris (or Brahmins, the highest caste), Kottakkavu (Paravoor) by converting a temple (as per tradition), Palayur, a Brahmin centre and Jew market, by transforming a temple, and Tiruvitamkod and converted a number of native upper caste people including Brahmins and Jews into Christianity. He also ordained priests from four nampoothiri families-Pakalomattom, Sankarapuri, Kalli and Kaliankal (cf. S. K. Muraleedharan, Colonial Literary Historiography: A Case Study from Kerala, Hyderabad 2010, 327-334).

<sup>1395</sup>Mundadan, Origins of Christianity in India, 18.

<sup>1396</sup>G. Schurhammer, The Tomb of Mailapur, in: G. Menacherry, ed., The Thomapedia, Madras 2000, 5.

Edessa by a business man the veneration people give to his tomb in Mylapore is a proof that he was martyred in the neighbourhood of Chennai.

There are also so many opposite views to what is said above. It may be good to recount a few of them here. In the words of Brown St. Thomas was the Apostle of Parthia. He tells that the Apostle Thomas was widely known in many Eastern lands as their apostle.<sup>1397</sup> Whereas according to Dihle there was already a tomb of the Apostle Thomas at Edessa and at first it was believed that St. Thomas had a natural death. The story about the transfer of the martyred Apostle's relics from India to Edessa is known only by the middle of the fourth century.<sup>1398</sup> So against this argument it may be good to remember "that even the East Syrian Church does not claim St. Thomas as its Apostle."<sup>1399</sup> They claim that "it is Addai one of the 72 disciples of Jesus, and his disciple Mari who are the founders of their Church."<sup>1400</sup> Even if this above said problem is solved again Dihle finds certain inconsistency in the presence of a tomb in Mylapore. Dihle holds that in India there are two places where the tomb of St. Thomas is found.<sup>1401</sup> Not a single serious historian from the land [neither Hindu, nor Christian nor Muslim], has raised so far such an argument regarding where the tomb lies. Even if there are so many counter arguments no one seems to be agreeing with each other. Dihle in his work asserts that St. Thomas is the Apostle of Edessa. "The name of Thomas was closely attached to Christian beginnings at Edessa."<sup>1402</sup> The great poet Ephrem the Syrian who lived in Edessa almost in the third century admits that the body of St. Thomas was brought from India. So if Ephrem is so sure about it who lived almost in the near by centuries and who lived in the same land how can a person like Dihle who never visited nor lived in that country and lived very much remote both geographically and temporally so to say who lived only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century deny such a saying of a person like Ephrem regarding the bringing of the relics of Apostle from India? All the more his study is based on certain books almost from 20 years back. After that so many relevant studies were made on the presence of St. Thomas in Kerala and St. Thomas missionary activity. Thus the latest one we find in the chain of research is that which is conducted in the year 2011 by A. Benhur. He went around the whole of India and especially in Kerala and made a thorough study on the dolmens and utensils found in various places in India. He asserts from these studies conducted that there was Jewish presence in Kerala from B. C. and trade relationships with Kerala. He clearly asserts in his study that "the Jews and the Pahlagonians (Pahlavas) entered Tamil country through the same trade corridor only. But at Coimbatore they split and went their separate ways."<sup>1403</sup> Consequently he has proved very recently and concretely than any earlier historians about the coming of St. Thomas to Kerala. So when we have a very recent source regarding the trade relations, habitations and proofs for the presence of St. Thomas in Kerala based on the archaeological studies why should we depend upon an old conservative and bookish knowledge? This finding is again authenticated by the findings of A. Mattam who

<sup>1397</sup>Cf. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas*, 66.

<sup>1398</sup>Cf. A. Dihle, *Neues zur Thomas-Tradition*, in: *JAC* 6 (1963), 57.

<sup>1399</sup>C. Illickamury, *Response*, in: B. Puthur, ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*, Cochin 2000, 106.

<sup>1400</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1401</sup>Cf. Dihle, *Early Christianity in India*, 312.

<sup>1402</sup>*Ibid.*, 311.

<sup>1403</sup>Benhur, *The Jewish Background of Indian People*, 123.

says: “that there were Jewish colonies in India before the beginning of the Christian era. Their presence paved the way for Apostle Thomas to come to this country. There are several references to show that there was a large settlement of Jews at Muziris (Kodungallur), at least from the sixth century B. C.”<sup>1404</sup>

It is commonsensical to ask further that if someone is convinced of the work of an Apostle in his own home town and country why should they deny his work in their native land and attribute it to some other country saying that the Apostle Thomas was a missionary in North India and Malabar. It is a matter of pride and esteem to claim that an Apostle came to our own country rather than saying that the Apostle was in some other country. In the claim of Ephrem he gave thrust not ‘to pride of claiming’ rather ‘to actuality’ and truthfulness. This simple question is still to be answered by modern historians who are eager to deny the existence of the missionary activity of St. Thomas in India. Some historians are of the view that all the Apostles left for the West after the resurrection but still no Western land has produced so far any evidence for the presence of such a great Apostle called St. Thomas somewhere in the West. If he had been somewhere in the West it is by all means improbable to think that his body was brought from there to Edessa. The reason for these various assumptions raised by historians may be due to the absence of a solid written history. A. Dihle is not sure of the missionary work of St. Thomas in Malabar although he admits that he came to North India.<sup>1405</sup> But he is aware of the importance of India and especially of Kerala by making mention of it. He claims that even “Roman trade-post has been excavated at Arikamedu on the coromandel Coast. Lucian in the second century, even mentions some sort of tourism to India.”<sup>1406</sup> Although he strongly holds that it is North India where St. Thomas was active present day scholars are of the view that the boundary of the North-west India reached up to the borders of Kerala. G. Every is of the view that along with other famous trading centres Malabar was also well known.

“Indian Christians have reason to be aware of this [namely diffusion of civilisation] because of the close connection between the earliest Indian Christian communities and Syrian merchants trading between the near and the far east, between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf on one side and Malabar, Ceylon and Mylapore on the other, and also because of the role of commerce in all modern relationships between India and West since the Portuguese arrived, with the Dutch and then the English at their heels.”<sup>1407</sup>

Due to the absence of a written history of India or Malabar it is beyond our capacity to prove. The lack of a written document should not immediately drive one to the idea that nothing historically has taken place in India or in Malabar, but it is as we have said above has happened due to the attitude of the people not to note everything systematically. An absence of a written record in no way justifies the saying that there was nothing of an apostolate or living tradition ever existed in the country. If that is the case many things which we believe as having taken place about other churches also must be denied or again what we profess as our faith from the Bible must also be denied. For example the apocryphal Bibles which speak about the infancy of Jesus in a very flowery language must be denied but at the same time can one deny the fact of a person called Christ? It was the Church which made certain books Apocryphal and

<sup>1404</sup>Mattam, *Forgotten East, Mission, Liturgy and Spirituality of the Eastern Churches*, 148.

<sup>1405</sup>Cf. Dihle, *Early Christianity in India*, 305.

<sup>1406</sup>*Ibid.*, 306.

<sup>1407</sup>G. Every, *Understanding Eastern Christianity*, Bangalore 1978, xxiv.

certain others canonical. Thus any division between apocryphal and canonical is only a man-made division in order to give gravity to what is written in it. But that does not mean what is said in the Apocryphal is to be completely ignored or denied.

Arnobius of Sicca<sup>1408</sup> asserts and not merely assumes that already in the year 300 there were Christians in India.<sup>1409</sup> Although he does not mention about the coming of St. Thomas to India and Kerala one thing we can say that there were Christians in India before the coming of the Syrians. If there were no Christians in India it would not have been possible for Arnobius to hear this news of the presence of Christians in India. Among the nations mentioned by Arnobius for its faith India holds the first place. “Thus among the countries of the rising sun India holds the first place for Arnobius, while among the countries of the setting sun Rome, ‘the mistress’ dominates and so Rome is mentioned in the last place.”<sup>1410</sup> We would like to conclude saying that one cannot utterly write off the coming of St. Thomas to Kerala from the above given proofs and evidences, and his missionary activity and martyrdom in Mylapoor is not entirely implausible. As it is not going to be the motto of our study to prove the veracity and the historicity of St. Thomas’ arrival to India we are not going to do it elaborately here but at the same no one can push off the idea saying that it is an unreal and incredible element.

#### A. The First Phase of SMC (A. D. 52 - 4<sup>th</sup> cent)

Having seen the background and origin of the SMC, let us also make a short survey of the various phases she went through. We will begin our surveillance from the first to the 4<sup>th</sup> century, the pre-Persian period. As the patristic period did not give much thrust to an ecclesiology in the nascent periods of the Church, our task becomes very difficult to have a perfect view of the Church of that period. It is not because that the Church in their time was less important that they gave less attention to it rather the outlook on it was entirely different. “The Patristic period gave us an ecclesiology in the communion of faith and sacramental life, founded on the ontology of the grace of the sacraments.”<sup>1411</sup> Therefore if one searches for a modern ecclesiology in the writings of the fathers of the Church one may be disappointed. They viewed the theology of Church as a community of faith. Thus ecclesiology is for them basically something that which lies in the liturgical and symbolical aspects. Thus one finds a unified, interconnected, wholistic view of the world, man and God in the concepts of the fathers of the Church. Hence theology achieved a cosmic and spiritual dimension in the teachings of the fathers although this horizon was lost sight of in the later centuries especially in the middle ages. In this regard it may be good to take into

---

<sup>1408</sup> Arnobius of Sicca was a North African Christian Apologist who wrote during the Great Persecution (303-311; died in 330). He was a convert from paganism and his most famous work is *Adversus Gentes* (AG) in which he criticized severely his previous faith (paganism) with the same vigour with which he had previously opposed Christianity. In this work AG he wrote, that the Indians like many other peoples, had abandoned paganism and accepted Christianity (cf. G. Nedungatt, *Quest for the Historical Thomas Apostle of India: A Re-reading of the Evidence*, Bangalore 2008, 149).

<sup>1409</sup> Cf. Nedungatt, *Quest for the Historical Thomas Apostle of India*, 148.

<sup>1410</sup> *Ibid.*, 150.

<sup>1411</sup> M. Vellanickal, *Sources of Theology of the Syro-Malabar Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*, in: B. Puthur, ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*, 98.

account a citation from the instructions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches:

“The Eastern rites trace their origins to the Alexandrian, Antiochian, Armenian, Chaldean and Constantinopolitan traditions. These churches have jealously retained the symbolic Biblical theology, explained at great length by the Fathers ... These Churches boast of a spirituality drawing directly from the Sacred Scripture and consequently, a theology less subjected to strictly rational categories.”<sup>1412</sup>

Our starting point to know the first phase of the SMC will be based on this citation and what is said above. What Walter Kasper said namely, “Theology is the reflected memory of the Church”<sup>1413</sup> is very true with regard to the SMC. The SMC bases for her theology on the sources of faith namely Scripture, Tradition, Liturgy, Fathers, Spirituality and Discipline. A church experiences and manifests her faith traditions in her prayer (*lex Orandi*), faith (*lex credendi*), and in her particular life-style (*lex vivendi*). These three expressions constitute her faith traditions. Y. Congar has beautifully expressed this idea what is mentioned above: “The Church has invested the whole of its faith in its prayer and though fervor does not create truth, yet the liturgy contains, offers and expresses in its own way all the mysteries, only certain aspects of which have been formulated by our theological understanding and in dogmas.”<sup>1414</sup>

The SMC has also, as in line with the above said expressions of the early church, given expression to her life of faith by adhering so strongly to the ‘Thomamargam’<sup>1415</sup> or the Law of Thomas. It is meant that the ecclesial life of SMC is encompassed of their liturgy, theology, spirituality and discipline in its entirety. The Thomamargam could be entitled as the faith of the SMC in the initial period of her inception. If we want to comprise the biblical, liturgical and patristic sources and sources related to the spirituality and discipline of the Thomas Christians it can be done in one word namely, ‘Thomamargam’ and which is the source of the theology of the SMC before the pre-Persian period. At the same time we may hypothesize that SMC had not a written theology in this period but the above mentioned Thomamargam. We can say basing on this hypothesis that the people’s faith experience was the theology of this church during this particular period. To be precise, the theology of the people of these first centuries was that which

“they expressed in the way they worshipped (liturgy), the way they lived their Christian life (spirituality), the way they understood themselves as the community of Christ (ecclesiology), the way they regulated their life together (discipline), and the way they related themselves to people of other faiths (theology of non-Christian religions) and to society in general.”<sup>1416</sup>

This theology which was lived by the SMC in the first centuries was termed as *Thomayude Margavum vazhipadum*, which has been anglicized as the “Law of Thomas by Westerners.”<sup>1417</sup> By which we would like to distinguish the SMC not only from the pre-Portuguese period but also from the pre-Persian period. In this pre-Persian period SMC had no written documents or sources, as the theology of the

<sup>1412</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 99 referring to Instruction: For applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, Vatican 1996, 11.

<sup>1413</sup>Cited from Vellanickal, Sources of Theology of the Syro-Malabar Church in the Pre-Diamper Period, 103 referring to W. Kasper, *Theology and Church*, New York 1989, 6-7.

<sup>1414</sup>Y. Congar, *Tradition and Traditions*, London 1966, 335.

<sup>1415</sup>By the word it is meant through the path or way or law of Thomas.

<sup>1416</sup>Illickamury, Response, 109.

<sup>1417</sup>*Ibid.*

Thomas Christians, other than the traditions, way of life, and certain characteristics, which has come upon the SMC from the local customs and traditions of their own Christian life.

Let us go deep into her functioning in these centuries by adverting to the various aspects of its functioning. We may regard first the service of the hierarchy and presbyters. It is hypothesized that the model St. Thomas followed in Kerala was something different from what other apostles followed elsewhere with regard to the organization of the hierarchy of bishops (leading Presbyter), presbyters and deacons. It is believed that St. Thomas constituted the organization of the community in Malabar in line with the spirit of Gospel and according to the manner of Indian genius. Malabar Church was constituted of the *pallyogam*<sup>1418</sup> either after the model of *manram* of the Buddhists or of the traditional village assembly of the Dravidians.<sup>1419</sup> According to G. Nedungatt this yogam of SMC is patterned after the Jewish Sanhedrin.

“The Sanhedrin supplied the model to the first Christian Churches of apostolic foundation, which were governed by presbyteral councils before the episcopal system (‘Single bishop’) of church governance emerged during the second century in some places, and later spread elsewhere. In Malabar yogam could have constituted an almost perfect replica of the Sanhedrin (ref. Num 11, 16).”<sup>1420</sup>

There was no such strict hierarchy of the offices extant in the SMC as we see today. “All presbyters in SMC were equal, and the senior by age took the leadership to co-ordinate the ministry. The heads of the families were all members of the *pallyogam*, an expression of communion of a sharing community.”<sup>1421</sup> Thus the *pallyogam* was a system of discipline which is comprised of the presbyters and the heads of the families, presided over by the senior presbyter. “They decided all disciplinary matters regarding the local community.”<sup>1422</sup> Besides this *pallyogam* there were also other *yogams* to carry out the functions pertaining to the local community. The so-called Bishops and presbyters in Malabar followed the simple model of celebrating the Eucharist after the model given in the Acts of the Apostles (2, 42- 46; 20, 7; 1 Cor 10, 16). We can presume in all probability they came together in loving fellowship and listened to the readings from the Holy Scriptures and their explanations. With regard to the breaking of the bread also it must be in its simplest form. They might have started with prayers of praising and thanking God, singing psalms and hymns following the manner of the synagogue service<sup>1423</sup> and after the example of Jesus.<sup>1424</sup>

We may also suppose that from this period on up to the Portuguese Period

<sup>1418</sup>It is the local assembly consisted of the heads of the Christian families and the clergy of the *edavaka* (parish). This assembly seems to owe its origin to the traditional village assembly of the Dravidians known as Manram, which was the responsible and authoritative body at the village level consisting of the heads of the families. They assembled under the leadership of the local parish clergy. It can also mean a communion of elders from the village (cf. Koodapuzha, Response to Sources for the history of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period by M. Mundadan, in: B. Puthur, ed., The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period, 53).

<sup>1419</sup>Cf. Illickamury, Response, 110.

<sup>1420</sup>Nedungatt, Quest for the Historical Thomas Apostle of India, 151; cf. Nedungatt, Yogam and Bishops in the Thomaschristian Church, in: JSTC 16 (2005), 78.

<sup>1421</sup>J. Powathil, Identity and Dignity of the Syro-Malabar Church, in: J. Porunnedom, ed., Acts of the Synod of Bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church, Cochin 1996, 72.

<sup>1422</sup>Illickamury, Respose, 114.

<sup>1423</sup>Cf. L. Bouyer, Life and Liturgy, London 1956, 28.

<sup>1424</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 27-29.



Malabar Christians might have started using Rice bread and wine pressed of wine or of coconut palm for the celebration of the Eucharist. This might be also another added reason why the Portuguese supposed that it was a Nestorian element adopted by the Malabar Church. If it was a Nestorian element surely one should have found it in the Persian Church too. But as they came from a land where wine and wheat were available they might not have used bread and wine in their liturgy made out of the produce of Kerala. These products are only the produce of Kerala as rice and coconut trees are plentiful in Kerala. Thus it was only due to the unavailability of wine and wheat bread in Kerala, as they do not grow in Kerala, they had to rely upon the product of the state. Jesus also took product from his own native country and beyond all he wanted to communicate the message of fellowship and communion rather than anything else through the celebration of it. It also gives us added indication that Kerala Church had its indigenous forms of celebration before the coming of the Persians even though later it adopted the liturgy of Addai-Mari from the middle of the fourth century. Although the Malabar Church adopted the liturgy of Addai-Mari the Persian prelates never imposed upon the Malabar church the use of wheat bread and wine as “SMC was not an integral part of the East Syrian Church.”<sup>1425</sup> This is the reason why even in the 16<sup>th</sup> century Portuguese happened to see the Malabar priests using these above said items in their liturgy.

Let it be taken for granted that they came together and prayed without any fixed formulas or fixed ceremonies and gestures. We may be right in saying that even determined gestures and actions were quite foreign to St. Thomas or to Jesus. We can suppose that the St. Thomas Christians also might have celebrated the Eucharist as the other churches elsewhere giving thrust to the focal point of the Eucharist. Different from other churches the Malabar presbyters or celebrants wore no special dress either during the celebration or out door. “The bishops and the presbyters were elderly married men, who lived a good Christian life and they resided in their own homes.”<sup>1426</sup> We can also imagine that the celebration of the Eucharist might have been conducted in private homes as the churches founded by St. Thomas are referred as communities rather than church buildings. At a later stage they might have built churches which they called ‘palli’<sup>1427</sup> following the terminology of Buddhists. It may be true to say that the Thomas Christians did not have a developed liturgy of the Eucharist in the first centuries. What they had in this period was a very simple form based on the New Testament with no pre-determined formulas of prayer and gestures.<sup>1428</sup> We have all reason to think that they had a very remote form of celebration, a form very much distanced from the modern Eucharistic celebration which is based on a sort of cultic sacrifice in the manner of the sacrifices of the gentiles and Jews. They had also celebrated the Eucharist without any of the paraphernalias, which had been later borrowed from the imperial court like veil, censer, incense, candle sticks, genuflection etc., rather very much in line with the thinking of Jesus who said to do it ‘in memory of me’ and thus they were ‘proclaiming the Lord’s death until he comes.’ Thus one

<sup>1425</sup>Podipara, *The Hierarchy of the Syro-Malabar Church*, Alleppey 1976, 35.

<sup>1426</sup>Illickamury, *Response*, 111.

<sup>1427</sup>The word ‘Palli’ comes from the Buddhist era meaning the place where the Buddhist monks gathered together. Later this word is adjusted and accommodated to Malayalam language and is commonly used to mention Churches and Mosques. It is interesting to note that there are a number of places in Kerala which ends with ‘Palli’ reminding us of the ancient Buddhist centers.

<sup>1428</sup>Cf. Illickamury, *Response*, 111.

may observe that the earlier celebration of the Thomas Christians was one which remained closer to the original intention of the Lord.<sup>1429</sup> Today we know that even the concept of priest (*hiereus, sacerdos*) was developed in Rome and Persian Empires in the same mode of pagan and Jewish priests in the wake of a cultic misunderstanding of the Eucharist. Thus slowly there emerged a hierarchy of inferior, superior, supreme *sacerdos*. All the more we do not find terms like *hiereus* and *sacerdos* in the NT. Instead we find terms in NT alluding to service namely, overseers (*episcopos*), elders (*presbyteroi*), ministers (*diakonoi*) etc. The term *jathicku karthavian* which the Thomas Christians used was perhaps in equal rank with who was later called 'archdeacon'. Without doubt one thing is sure that one could notice a great difference between the dress code of the Malabar priests and the priests from elsewhere. While the Persian and Roman priests and bishops who had adopted the dress of the nobility instead of the ordinary wear, and costly, golden paraphernalias for the liturgical celebrations, the Thomas Christian priests remained with their ordinary dress both during the celebration and outside.

In the pre-Persian period it seems that some thing took place in order to curtail the succession of the priesthood among the Thomas Christians. It is a very oft-repeated hypothesis that a calamity which took place among these Christians in Malabar has caused the extinction of their priesthood. Therefore Malabar church needed some outside help to restore this situation and which was done by the Persian Church from the middle of the fourth century. But unfortunately no one is able to say what that calamity was and when it happened. Some believe that "bishops and priests of the line founded by St. Thomas continued for many centuries and generations. The redactor of the Rabban Song<sup>1430</sup> himself claims to be the 48<sup>th</sup> priest of one of those lines. Even in recent years there were priests who claimed to be a successor of one of those lines."<sup>1431</sup> Together with this calamity which is said to have happened in the Malabar Church, there is also another hypothesis for the establishment of the new relationship with the Persian Church, which took place in the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> century. It seems Mar Joseph, bishop of Urha<sup>1432</sup> (Edessa) dreamt the pathetic situation of Thomas Christians who were languishing and struggling without bishops and priests. Thus he was instrumental for the coming of Thomas of Cana a merchant to Malabar. Mar Joseph approached the Catholicos of Seleucia-Ctesiphon and narrated the frightening dream he had about the SMC and was able to convince him of the situation of Malabar Church.<sup>1433</sup> From then on always the Persian Church started supplying personnel to the Malabar Church although they did not ordain any native bishop or priest. Famed theologian like C. Illickamury muses whether the *Jathikku Karthavian*

---

<sup>1429</sup>Cf. *ibid*.

<sup>1430</sup>Ramban Pattu or song belongs to that genre which narrates orally from generation to generation the arrival of St. Thomas in the port of Cranganore by sea, conversion of their ancestors to the faith, ordination of priests, erection of crosses, foundation of churches and reception of the crown of martyrdom in Mylapore. It is assumed that these were written down by a disciple of St. Thomas and re-written in modern language by Thomas Ramban Maliekal, the 48<sup>th</sup> priest of the same family whose compound in Niranam can be seen even today (cf. V. Vithayathil, *Mission and life of St. Thomas in India*, in: G. Menachery, ed., *The Thomapedia*, 3).

<sup>1431</sup>M. Mundadan, *Traditions of St. Thomas Christians*, Bangalore 1970, 63.

<sup>1432</sup>Urha and Edessa point to the same place; the place called Urha is the Armenian translation of Edessa, in Syriac it is called Urhay and the city was located in ancient Mesopotamia (cf. <http://forums.catholic.com/showthread.php?t=685577>. Date of Access: 20. 10. 2012; cf. Cheriyan, *A History of Christianity in Kerala*, 76).

<sup>1433</sup>Cf. Cheriyan, *A History of Christianity in Kerala*, 76-77.

of Thomas Christians who was the spiritual and temporal leader of the Thomas Christians was equal in role and function as the Catholicos of the East Syrian Church. He raises also the doubt that whether the priesthood of Thomas Christians became less significant after the arrival of the Persian bishops and priests with their more developed liturgies.<sup>1434</sup> He also supposes that this Persian Church had only supplied the SMC with personnel. His assumptions and doubts are proper according to me as many of the traditions of this church are not brought from Persia rather that which belong to the land of Kerala. Ceremonies like ‘appammuri service’ [the breaking of the bread] on Maundy Thursday and the Eucharistic celebration with rice bread and palm wine (or coconut juice), which the Portuguese missionaries also witnessed, are beyond doubt go back to the remnants of the Eucharistic celebration of Thomas Christians. Again a lot of Hindu traditions have been adopted and incorporated into our liturgy as part of inculturation. Tying of *Thali* and the giving of *Manthrakodi* at marriage have become part of Christian celebration. Various modes of festal celebrations have lot of elements from Hindu Culture. Even some of the instruments which are played in the church music and procession are also adopted from the Hindu culture. “In all those the Indian Church had taken their own stand without considering the differences that they would make from the practices of the Persian Church.”<sup>1435</sup> A departure from the elements which were considered holy by the Oriental East Syrian Church would not have been easily tolerated in the East Syriac Eucharistic celebration if SMC was part and parcel of that Church. Thus as a presumption we would say that in line with the eminent church historian of Kerala P. Podipara that the Persian priests and bishops had not considered the SMC as an integral part of their church although not output. If not, this inculturation or adoption of many elements from the land would have been terribly difficult. From two points of view it asserts that Thomas Christians existed prior to the coming of Persians. First if the Persians would have founded the Church in India there would not have been needed further adoption of elements from local culture as East Syrian liturgy is self-sufficient. Secondly if the East Syrians were instrumental for a Church in India they would not have allowed any foreign element to their Liturgy. Thus these two factors underline again for the foundation of the Malabar Church somewhere else.

Another peculiar feature of Thomas Christians during this period [pre-Persian] and later is their understanding of ecumenism and hospitality. They received fellow Christians from anywhere irrespective of their confessional leanings. They took pride in welcoming and venerating the foreign bishops or metrans and allowed them to take part in the spiritual affairs of their Church,<sup>1436</sup> whatever their creed or belief might be. Their relation with the non-Christian religions especially with Hindus and later with Muslims became a guide line even before Vatican II and even a world model about which all outsiders wonder at who come to Kerala.<sup>1437</sup> Kerala is an exception in India for the peaceful co-existence between religions up to this day. When one hear about the persecutions of Christians elsewhere in India for eg. Bihar, Orissa etc., none will hear such an incident taking place in Kerala. This peaceful co-existence was made

---

<sup>1434</sup>Cf. Illickamury, Response, 113.

<sup>1435</sup>P. Chittilapilly, Keynote Address, in: B. Puthur, ed., The Life and nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period, 19.

<sup>1436</sup>Cf. Brown, The Indian Christians of St. Thomas, 289.

<sup>1437</sup>Cf. M. Mundadan, Indian Christians: Search for Identity and Struggle for Autonomy, Bangalore 1984, 27-28.

possible through such an attitude of the forefathers of the Kerala SMC in the pre-Persian time itself.

Another feature of the pre-Persian period is characterized by the Indian system of leading a retired life of prayer and penance after the 'Grahasthashram'<sup>1438</sup> (Grahasthashram means family life with worldly bondage). Even after the coming of the East Syrians who were known for their typical institution of monasticism the Thomas Christians were not influenced much by their monastic form of life. Neither the Persians nor the Portuguese could completely withstand the traditions prevalent among the Thomas Christians especially through songs like *Margam kali pattu* (The song of the Way) or *Rabban Pattu* etc. All the more either the Portuguese or anyone else could not deny the family history each of these families carry with them. "A number of families are said to have palm-leaf documents in their private archives, which they think, contain all the details of their origin."<sup>1439</sup> P. Podipara the veteran historian of the Thomas Christian helps us to understand the family traditions of Thomas Christians:

"Again the Christian families of one locality in Malabar, which traditionally trace their origin from the Apostle, do not contradict the same traditional claims of other families found in the same or other localities of Malabar. The tenacity with which these family traditions have been held and the fact that they existed certainly before the coming of the Portuguese, make it difficult to discredit them completely. The Thomas Christians give great honour to these families and for many centuries the prelacy and priesthood was confined to some of them. Some of the most important of these families are Pakalomattam, Sankarapuri, Kalli, Kalikav, Koykkam, Madeipur, Muttodal, Nedumpally, Panakkamattam, Kottakali etc. Certain of these families have succession of priests and each of the priests regards himself as the 50<sup>th</sup> or the 61<sup>st</sup> and so on, of his family, counting from the first, who is believed to have been ordained by St. Thomas."<sup>1440</sup>

All the more I have never come across any contradictions among Christian historians regarding this above said factor. This is further concreted by the latest historian and archaeologist A. Benhur. He has advanced further in his research than anyone and found all most all the family roots to which all belonged. For example when he explains the Kaliyankal family he explains Pulimood, Nilavunthara, (in Kavalam), Thengumpally (Bharanaganam), Tharappel (Kizhapparayar) Mannamplackal (Chirakkadave), Pattani (Kuravilangadu, Kalpatta), Plathottam (Pravithanam, Aruvithura) etc., as belonging to this family stem only.<sup>1441</sup> Like this he has categorised all the present day families of Syro-Malabar church into one or other family root. It is astonishing to know that none of the family stem overlaps the other one. Thus all Thomas Christians have a history of their own beginning from the 1<sup>st</sup> century, not clashing with any other family history but complementing.

Besides this, the presence of scattered communities of Christians and the community of Mylapore are noted by a few birds of passage from West. Pantaenus of Alexandria who died in 200 A. D. seems to have visited India. St. Jerome, in his *De viris illustribus* 36, tells that Pantaenus visited India and preached Christ to the Brahmans and philosophers there. Theophilus the Indian apparently a native of

<sup>1438</sup>Cf. Vadakkekara, Origin of India's St. Thomas Christians, 422.

<sup>1439</sup>Mundadan, Sources for the History of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period, 31.

<sup>1440</sup>Ibid., 32.

<sup>1441</sup>Cf. Benhur, The Jewish Background of Indian People, 225-229.

Maldives and who was a delegate of Emperor Constantius visited India in 354. We hear of a monk called Theodore who visited India and reported to Gregory of Tours about the 'House' or Monastery of St. Thomas in India.<sup>1442</sup> G. Punnakkottil's words give us a clue about the early years of Thomas Christians:

“Our Church survived all these centuries without much of formal academic theology. It is really a wonder that our microscopic Church survived in this vast ocean of believers of other religions. We did not have a profound Theology or Philosophy to support our faith. Compared to the great philosophic systems of our country we were intellectually babes with our simple faith. But we managed to keep our faith. Although we did not have formal academic Philosophy and Theology, nor theological faculties and schools, yet we had Theology. It was a Theology of life.”<sup>1443</sup>

These words of G. Punnakkottil is a pace setter to know the early years of Thomas Christians. Let us sum up this first phase of the SMC with the citation given by a renowned church historian of India: “they [Thomas Christians] had been leading a life at the core of which was an identity consciousness which, if not expressed in clear-cut formulas, was implicit in their attitude towards their traditions, their social, socio-religious and religious customs and practices and their theological outlook.”<sup>1444</sup> This all can be summarized in one word namely the *Thomamargam* as the driving force of the first four centuries which guided Thomas Christians. Thus it is rightly observed by P. Podipara in his saying that one of the “the peculiar characteristics of the individuality of the Malabar Church was entirely Indo-Oriental.”<sup>1445</sup>

## B. The Second Phase of SMC (4 - 15<sup>th</sup> cent.)

The second phase of SMC starts with the coming of a group of Christians under the leadership of Thomas of Cana from Chaldea in the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> Century. It is believed that the second phase begins in the year 345 A. D. Historians present varied reasons for this coming. When some historians say that it was at the request of Malabarians that bishops came to Malabar some others are of the view that it was due to the persecution in Persia or with a motive of trade. We have evidence for the persecution the Persian Church underwent during this period. “vor allem unter Shapur II (309-379) kam es zwischen 339 und 379 zu blutigen Christenverfolgungen, die sich auch in den Schriften eines Zeitzeugen, des syrisch-aramäisch schreibenden Theologen Aphrahat (†um 350), genannt der ‚Persische Weise‘, widerspiegeln.”<sup>1446</sup> We have already mentioned about the dream which Mar Joseph had regarding the situations of Thomas Christians of Kerala.<sup>1447</sup> We may hypothesize that this dream or any of the above said factors might have become the key elements for the Easterners to come to Kerala. Thomas of Cana is believed to have come from Persia. As we know from the records the Persian church was also dependent upon the Antiochian Church as many other churches for its beginning.

<sup>1442</sup>Cf. Mundadan, Sources for the History of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period, 37.

<sup>1443</sup>G. Punnakkottil, Concluding Message-III, in: B. Puthur, ed., The Life and nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period, 25.

<sup>1444</sup>Mundadan, Indian Christians, 28.

<sup>1445</sup>P. Podipara, The Malabar Christians, Alleppey 1972, 3.

<sup>1446</sup>D. W. Winkler, Zeitalter der Sassaniden (bis 653), in: W. Baum and D. W. Winkler, Hg., Die Apostolische Kirche des Ostens, Klagenfurt 2000, 16.

<sup>1447</sup>See above fn. 1433 and below fn. 1476.

“Many of the Eastern Churches trace their origins to Antioch: the churches of Persia, and subsequently the churches of India and even Mongolia and China; the Syrian and the Maronite churches; the Melkite churches of Syria and Palestine; and the Armenian and Georgian churches by way of Cappadocia (a daughter church of Antioch) ... In comparison with this Church the church of European church of Rome was numerically smaller. Unfortunately the current status of Antioch, today a small town known as Antakya in present day Turkey, does not reveal the former greatness of a city which was so crucial to the evolution of Eastern Christianity.”<sup>1448</sup>

It seems Thomas of Cana (also known as Kinayi Thomman), a merchant from Bes Husaye, migrated into Cranganore (Kodungalloor) with 4 priests, several deacons and almost 400 Christians.<sup>1449</sup> A few centuries later there came to Kerala two holy men called Sapor and Prot (9/10<sup>th</sup> centuries). It is nothing improbable to have connection with Persia in those days as India and Muziris had commercial and cultural relations with Persia from early centuries onwards. And basing on this we may be able to say that those trade routes which led to the Indian subcontinent facilitated the activities of the missionaries of the East-Syrian Church also. Thus with the coming of Thomas of Cana<sup>1450</sup> and this group of Christians from Persia (Chaldea or Babylon) the SMC was strengthened, reinvigorated and reconstituted. Their coming really boosted the Christian life of Thomas Christians. There was a crisis period in the life of Thomas Christians during the Brahmin penetration time. “The Brahmin penetration and domination in Malabar took place between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries.”<sup>1451</sup> It seems these people were able to wipe away the Buddhists and Jains from the map of Malabar through their influence on the local rulers. It would have happened to the Thomas Christians too. But fortunately there came the saviours in the persons of Thomas of Cana and his companions. As the Persians were good at trade and the rulers wanted their services, they were able to win the respect of the rulers and became one of the favoured groups. This coming of Persians in a way made possible further the existence of Thomas Christians in Kerala. People of Malabar and SMC were very happy to receive them as fellow Christians especially as they were at danger of extinction. Besides, they received them happily due to the identification of their liturgical language with that Jesus spoke<sup>1452</sup> although modern scholarship varies from this opinion.<sup>1453</sup> The Thomas Christians received them and showed them their hospitality without taking into account their confessional leanings and allowed them to celebrate in their Churches and gladly took part in their celebrations. In those days as

<sup>1448</sup>J. D. Faris, *The Eastern Catholic Churches: Constitution and Governance According to the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, New York 1992, 4.

<sup>1449</sup>Cf. J. Kollamparambil, *Sources of the Hierarchical Structure of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*, in: B. Puthur, ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*, 165.

<sup>1450</sup>Some call him simply an Armenian merchant’ (which is a misunderstanding by the Portuguese) without giving him a name. Others call him Thomé of Canane from the country of Canane (Abuna), Thomé Cana (Correa) Quinai Thomé (Dionysio), Mar Thomé (Monserrate and Gouvea) Thomé Cananeo (Ros). The Malayalam form is generally Canai Thomman. ‘Cana’ attached to the name of this merchant/traveller/ pilgrim is commonly considered ‘Cana’ (or modern Qanah’) of Palestine (cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 90).

<sup>1451</sup>Illickamury, *Response*, 113.

<sup>1452</sup>Cf. L. K. Ananthkrishna Ayyar, *Anthropology of the Syrian Christians*, Ernakulam 1926, 17-18; Vadakkekara, *Origin of India’s Thomas Christians*, 401.

<sup>1453</sup>Cf. S. Moscati, et al., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages: Phonology and Morphology* (ed. S. Moscati), Wiesbaden 1964, 11-12.

people were not worried about the liturgical differences the Thomas Christians might have taken their arrival as a possibility to bolster the celebration of *Thomamargam* as they considered the Persians also as Christians.

During this period Thomas of Cana transformed the waste land namely Cranganore, into a Christian city. Alvaro Penteadó, a Franciscan missionary, seems to be the first one to report about Thomas of Cana and his relations with the Indian Christian community.<sup>1454</sup> It seems Thomas of Cana who was much advanced in age and who came to Cranganore had two sons. He came to Malabar Coast with the hope of settling there. Therefore he bought a piece of unoccupied land with all its income, with property rights of both land and water within the bounds of this land.<sup>1455</sup> Thus he was able to settle there with all property right. The Persian people who came under the leadership of Thomas of Cana in the 4<sup>th</sup> century remain up to this day as a separate group in the same family of SMC belonging to the Catholic Church with separate Dioceses. And the number of the faithful and the distinction and the tradition these two groups hold up to this day clearly tell the seeker of truth that Thomas Christians were the former ones to have received faith in the land and the Persian Christians are second in the land as Christians (in Kerala/ South India) although they had received the faith in their land from the disciples of St. Thomas namely Addai and Mari. The coming of Kinai Thomman was a blessing to the Malabar people as they supplied the Thomas Christians with bishops, priests and physical support. The Thomas Christians were in great need for the support due to the above mentioned factors. As the Malabar Church did not have three bishops<sup>1456</sup> at that time she was not in a position to ordain bishops. For the First Ecumenical Council of Nicea (325) prescribed that for the ordination of a bishop at least three bishops should be present (can. 4).<sup>1457</sup> Thus they could solve the problem which the Malabar Church faced by sending a bishop ordained in Persia. But this does not mean that the SMC lost her independence which she had from its origin. The historian Nedungatt is of the view that “this hierarchical dependence, however, was no umbilical chord signaling the birth of the Indian Church from the Persian Church, as not a few Western writers have seen it, but just a canonical link forged to ensure the validity of episcopal succession in India.”<sup>1458</sup> This is the reason why the historian P. Podipara found reason to say that “the Church of the Thomas Christians was neither an integral part nor an out-put of the Church of Mesopotamia, and that the relations of the former with the latter were for practical but not for doctrinal purposes.”<sup>1459</sup> It is believed that “once in 80 or 100 years the Bishops would come from East Syria.”<sup>1460</sup> For the services they rendered to the Malabar Church they were always paid handsomely by the Thomas Christians.<sup>1461</sup>

It may be proper here to speak a bit about the Chaldean Church with which today's Thomas Christians had a lasting connection. The Chaldean Church is one which exists and existed in the Persian Empire. We know from the history that the

<sup>1454</sup>Cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity, 91.

<sup>1455</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1456</sup>SMC had no bishops in this period.

<sup>1457</sup>Cf. Nedungatt, Quest for the Historical Thomas Apostle of India, 152.

<sup>1458</sup>*Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>1459</sup>P. Podipara, St. Thomas Christian Encyclopedia of India, Vol. 2, Trichur 1973, 109.

<sup>1460</sup>Cited from M. Mundadan, Traditions of St. Thomas Christians, Bangalore 1970, 140 referring to the testimony of Penteadó.

<sup>1461</sup>Cf. Vadakkekara, Origin of India's Thomas Christians, 418.

Persian Empire was a great rival of the Roman Empire. The Persian Church which lay in the region of present Iran and Iraq were all under the dominion of Persian Empire. In the past this region was successively ruled by the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Chaldeans, and the Persians. Thus the Church originated in this area was named after the Empire where it sprouted namely Assyrian or Babylonian or Chaldean or Persian Church. Besides it was also known as the Church of Mesopotamia (Euphrates-Tigris Valley). The people of Persia were also well-known at that time as successful traders. In spite of the invasion by the Persians in the 6<sup>th</sup> B. C., the language spoken by the people remained Chaldean or Aramaic (East Syrian). Therefore the merchants and missionaries who came to Malabar from these areas were generally known in Malabar as 'Arameans' and their country as 'Aramea' against 'Armenians' and 'Armenia' with which the Portuguese confused.<sup>1462</sup> The 'Persian Cross' which is venerated on Big Mount (Madras) and its imitations in various places in Malabar are a standing proof for the relation between Persia and Malabar.<sup>1463</sup> For example such Crosses which are known as St. Thomas Crosses are conserved at Alangat, Kadamattam (Jacobite), Kottayam Valiapalli (Jacobite), and Muttuchira (catholic). Below we find a model of the ancient Persian Cross.



The Persian Cross<sup>1464</sup>

There are so many accounts related to their coming to Kerala. When in Rome Christianity became the state religion the repercussions came to different parts of the world. As a result the Persian Emperors started doubting the loyalty of the Christian people living in the Persian kingdom. The people of Persia enjoyed religious freedom and tolerance as long as the Roman Kingdom had persecuted the Christians. But once Christianity became the most favoured religion or later state religion the situation of the Christians in Persia got worsened. At the time of Shapur II we find a royal decree being issued against Christians with variety of indictments on which Christians seemed at odds with the state and with Zoroastrian Values:

“The Christians destroy our holy teachings, and teach men to serve one God, and not to honour the sun or fire. They teach them, too, to defile water by their ablutions, to refrain from marriage and procreation of children, and to refuse to go out to war with the Shahenshah. They have no scruple about the slaughter and eating of animals, they bury the corpses of men in the earth, and attribute the origin of snakes and creeping thing to a good God. They despise many servants of the King, and teach witchcraft.”<sup>1465</sup>

<sup>1462</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *Origins of Christianity in India*, in: Perumalil, *Christianity in India*, 25.

<sup>1463</sup>Cf. P. Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, (OIRS 104), Kottayam 1986, 51.

<sup>1464</sup>Cf. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:MarThomaSleevea.png>. Date of access: 15.10.2012.

<sup>1465</sup>Cited from R. C. Foltz, *Religions of the Silk Road: Overland Trade and Cultural Exchange from Antiquity to the 15<sup>th</sup> century*, New York 1999, 66 referring to Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum* 2: 351.



The letter from Constantine, written in the year 315 A. D., to Shapur II beseeching protection and favour for the Christians caused acrimony and rage against the Christians in the Persian empire. From then on the King started suspecting the leaning and patriotic spirit of Christians. This suspicion of the King was the impetus for the following persecution which took place in Persia. Then onwards the Persian Christians underwent several severe persecutions in the Empire. Shapur II (309-379) decided to eliminate the Christians through the easiest method namely persecution and in which many Christians lost their lives. Although after this persecution the Christians were able to enjoy a limited freedom for quite a short period under Jasdgard I (399-420 A. D.), again under Bahram V (420-424 A. D.), and under his son Jasdgard II (445-48) the persecution returned vigorously in the fifth century.<sup>1466</sup> At the end of this persecution the Church had to surrender to the *modus Vivendi* which the Sassanids suggested. Thus, although with reluctance, the Church of Persia had to agree with the emperor severing itself from the main stream of Church and bringing itself to a centrifugal national church. This has paved the way for a separate Persian Church more or less independent of the Antiochian Church which was situated in the Roman Empire. The Synod of Markabta Tayyayye<sup>1467</sup> (424 A. D.), which made the first attempt towards independence was completed by the Synod of Seleucia-Ctesiphon<sup>1468</sup> (486 A. D.).<sup>1469</sup> There were many who looked upon these two issues as schism<sup>1470</sup> and as the acceptance of Nestorian heresy respectively. If we accuse these people for the disjoining from the main stream of Church as schism or leniency towards Nestorian heresy we may not do justice to the history. Against this accusation there are sufficient proofs. Let us refer one among them. “The Western Fathers themselves grant them the right to consecrate their own metropolitan. And in this letter by the end of 8<sup>th</sup> century they included Pope Caius of Rome also among the fathers who had signed the above mentioned letter.”<sup>1471</sup> It was not for dividing the mother Church or for adopting something wrong they did such an action rather it was a matter of existence. Through this movement the Christian Church was able to enjoy freedom under the Sassanid rulers of Persia. We see at the same time in the 5<sup>th</sup> century the Persian Church started developing its own theology, canon law, liturgy and so on and so forth. The next disaster which the Persian Christians underwent was the Mohammedan occupation. Although this occupation was not ruinous to the Church she was reduced from her earlier status. Many Christians could not withstand this situation. In this dark history of the Persian Christians due to the Sassanids and later the Mohammedan persecution so many Christians fled to the eastern parts of the

---

<sup>1466</sup>Cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 84.

<sup>1467</sup>It was in this synod that the Catholicos Mar Dadishu I who formally proclaimed the Church of the East independent of Antioch. Besides the metropolitans and bishops present at the synod raised the status of Mar Dadishu to that of Patriarch.

<sup>1468</sup>The Church of Seleucia-Ctesiphon takes its name from the twin cities of Seleucia and Ctesiphon situated on either side of the river Tigris. The Persian Church is also known in other names like Babylonian Church, Assyrian Church and the Seleucian Church. In addition due to its connection with the forerunners of Nestorianism this church is also known as Nestorian Church (cf. Menacherry, Thomapedia, 30).

<sup>1469</sup>Cf. Menacherry, Thomapedia, 30.

<sup>1470</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1471</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to J. A., Assemani, *De Catholicis seu Patriarchis Chaldaeorum et Nestorianorum Commentarium historio-canonicum*, Romae 1775, 18.

Persian Empire. We have so many evidences of such kinds of emigrations taking place in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1472</sup>

It seems “under Mar Timothy, the Great (780-823), the missionary activities expanded and peoples in central Asia with their kings accepted Christianity.”<sup>1473</sup> It is believed that the monks who found the persecution as really unbearable left the area with merchants even to distant lands traversing even to farther lands like Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, India etc.<sup>1474</sup> It is said that in these centuries and the following centuries “the route from Persia to India was covered with monasteries that created new communication line and enlivened the interchange in the spiritual life between these areas.”<sup>1475</sup> Thus we may not be hoodwinked if we think that this kind of a persecution in their home land might have caused them to flee their native place and come to Kerala. There are also other stories ubiquitous in Kerala regarding their coming. One of the local sources which we have from a priest called Mathew is narrated in the following way. After the death of St. Thomas the Apostle there was a time when there was no preacher and leader for the Malabar Church. This situation continued for 93 years. At this time there appeared a Magician called Manikkabashar (Manikkavachakar). He went to Mylapore and seduced many Christians from their faith through his magic which he played before them. Some lost faith and some others resisted and joined the Malabar Christians who were loyal to their faith which they received from St. Thomas. It is estimated that almost 160 families lived there without priests and leaders. During this period divisions also emerged among them. Due to the internal and external calamities and various other troubles many lost their faith. This chaotic situation and the plight of the Malabar Christians were seen by the Metropolitan of Edessa in a dream or vision and reported to the Catholicos of the East. The latter sent immediately messengers to all the Churches, under his jurisdiction. Right away there gathered a big crowd enquiring about the matter. The Catholicos of the East told them about the vision which the Edessan Metropolitan had. Hearing of this certain vision Thomas of Jerusalem told him that he has also heard about Malabar and India from strangers. At once the Catholicos ordered him to visit Malabar and report back. He set for Malabar Coast and landed in Maliankara and as it was narrated by the Metropolitan of Edessa he also heard the uproar from the people of Malabar personally. He came back to his land and reported to Catholicos what he saw and experienced in Malabar community. The Catholicos felt the need of sending sufficient number of spiritual heads to the church which was in need. He sent the Metropolitan who had the vision with 4 priests, several deacons, men and women and children from Jerusalem, Bagdad and Niniveh under the leadership of Thomas of Cana. And they landed at Maliankara in 345 A. D.<sup>1476</sup>

As they reached Kerala they were received by the native Malabar Christians and they went together to meet the King of Malabar. The King hearing upon the wishes of this new group who came from Persia gave them as much land as they wanted. The King was also pleased to give them “royal honours and inscribed the grant and

<sup>1472</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 89.

<sup>1473</sup>A. Thekkudan, *Sources of Spirituality of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*, in: B. Puthur, ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church*, 139.

<sup>1474</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1475</sup>A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient: A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East*, Vol. I (CSCO 184), Leuven 1960, 313; (cf. Thekkudan, *Sources of Spirituality*, 139-140).

<sup>1476</sup>See above fn. 1433; cf. Mundadan, *Origins of Christianity in India*, in: Perumalil, *Christianity in India*, 26-27.

honours on copper plates.”<sup>1477</sup> This easy access and permission from the king might be due to the former Malabar Christian presence in his kingdom and who must have been successful traders and must have contributed much to the Chera kingdom. This would be substantiated by the remark of Kerala historian Menon who says that “the Christians of the age were prominent in trade and commerce and they received several privileges and favours from the native rulers.”<sup>1478</sup> The same is noted by John de Marignolli quoted by Hambye who tells that the pepper-trade was handled by the Thomas Christians and they were the masters of the public weighing office.<sup>1479</sup> The Thomas Christians besides being self-reliant and independent, they also enjoyed the status of petty rajas of Kerala. This status together with their military tradition<sup>1480</sup> made possible to find special favour by the royal family named Villarvattam at Udayamperur (Diamper). It is presumed that due to the special privilege which the Thomas Christians enjoyed, the royal family took up the protection of Thomas Christians. Later when this royal family was extinct the King of Cochin shouldered the responsibility.<sup>1481</sup> Thomas Christians had a high standing in the society at par with that of higher Hindu castes, namely Brahmins and if not to the Nairs. The Thomas Christians always enjoyed a higher status even above the Jews and the Muslims who came at a later period. This is the reason why the Christians were also called Mapilas (great sons) or Perumals (chieftains) etc.<sup>1482</sup> Such an influential group of Christians had no difficulty to find favour with the king for the fellow Christians from Persia. Consequently with the approval this group put up their first church in Cranganore, in the land called Kuramakulur.<sup>1483</sup> It may be proper also to refer to another traditional belief. There was a time of lethargy experienced by the Malabar Church due to lack of personnel to guide her. At this particular juncture Kinai-Thomas sensed the need of the Malabar Christians returned to his native place and fetched a bishop and two priests of laudable manners who had mastery in the Syriac and Chaldean languages and much erudition. Due to their zealous activities they were able to bring back the old fervour and enthusiasm of the Malabar Church. Hence the Malabar Church is indebted to these three personnel who came with Kinai Thomas to do the rescue operations. Then onwards due to the scarcity of native bishops, the Babylon bishops governed the churches of Malabar.<sup>1484</sup> We can assume from that time onwards the Syrian fathers used to come to Kerala at the order of the Catholicos of the East who was responsible for the entire East. So the Syrian Fathers gave assistance to the Indian Church and in particular to the Malabar Church from the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> Century to the 16<sup>th</sup> century till the coming of the Portuguese Missionaries. Malabar church was very happy to have this connection for its governance although they had exercised their political power and influence. Thomas of Cana is considered as the link between the church of Malabar and the Chaldean Church.

---

<sup>1477</sup>Mundadan, *Origins of Christianity in India*, in: Perumalil, *Christianity in India*, 27.

<sup>1478</sup>Sreedhara Menon, *Cultural heritage of Kerala*, 18.

<sup>1479</sup>Cf. Hambye, *Medieval Christianity in India*, in: Perumalil, *Christianity in India*, 34-35.

<sup>1480</sup>It is supposed that the Christian soldiers serving the Vijayanagar emperors in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries had come from Kerala, and belonged to the Thomas Christian community (cf. *ibid.*, 35).

<sup>1481</sup>Cf. Hambye, *Medieval Christianity in India*, in: Perumalil, *Christianity in India*, 35.

<sup>1482</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1483</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *Origins of Christianity in India*, in: Perumalil, *Christianity in India*, 27.

<sup>1484</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 94-95.

In the words of Monserrate, a Jesuit priest,<sup>1485</sup> we have further information regarding the relationship that fostered between the Syrian and Malabar church in the past. He informs us that “it was consequent on the arrival of Thomas of Cana that the Christians of Malabar accepted the rites and ceremonies of the Syrian Church, because Thomas always managed to get Syrian bishops for Malabar where they were held in great esteem.”<sup>1486</sup> Another historical proof we have for this relation from the pen of Gelasius from the 5<sup>th</sup> century. According to the list of bishops who attended the Nicene Council of 325 there was a bishop named John from Persia. According to this above mentioned historian Gelasius this particular bishop ‘John’ was the bishop of the whole of Persia and Greater India.<sup>1487</sup> Besides these also, we have so many other proofs for the coming of Bishops from Persia to India. In the Chronicle of Seert<sup>1488</sup> we come across a bishop called David of Basra<sup>1489</sup> who seems to have left his Episcopal see and travelled to India between 250 and 300 A. D., and who was instrumental for many conversions in India.<sup>1490</sup> The stories of Bishop David of Basra and Bishop John are pointers to the relation that existed between Indian Church and Persian Church.<sup>1491</sup> Although we can find a number of such evidences let us treat at least one more of that sort. Cosmas Indicopleustes who visited India between 520-525 (6<sup>th</sup> century traveller) explains in his *Christian Topography* about the Christian presence in Socotra and their clergy who were ordained in Persia; about Ceylon and its Church with Persian settlers and with a priest ordained in Persia, a deacon, and minor clergy; about Male (Malabar Coast) and Kalliana and the bishop who was ordained in Persia and the presence of a Christian community there.<sup>1492</sup> This historical book is a definite indication to the hierarchical backing the Indian Church received from the Persian Church. From that time onwards the hierarchical relations between the Indian Church and the Persian Church were one of undeniable fact through the centuries up to the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Although the person in charge of India is addressed in the Vatican Mss. of 1301 as Metropolitan and Director of the Holy Church in India his official title was ‘Metropolitan and Door of (all) India.’<sup>1493</sup> As the same Catholicate was responsible for Ceylon, the Maldives and Socotra, together with the scattered communities of Malaysia-Indonesia we may suppose that all of them might have depended upon the Indian Metropolitan whose see was in Kodungalloor (Cranganore).<sup>1494</sup> One may also rightly say that this second phase became very crucial as it gifted the Malabar Church with the Liturgy namely that of Addai-Mari.

Let us also discuss under this second phase, although not in detail, the coming of two prominent personalities. It may be unjust from our part if we do not mention two bishops named Sapor and Prot who came to Malabar church and played an important

<sup>1485</sup>He was one of the writers who makes reference to the confusion regarding the first origin of a few Christians whether it was from St. Thomas the Apostle or from Thomas of Cana (cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 90).

<sup>1486</sup>Mundadan, Origins of Christianity in India, in: Perumalil, Christianity in India, 28.

<sup>1487</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1488</sup>It is an important East-Syrian document of the 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> century (cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 78).

<sup>1489</sup>He is considered as one of the eminent doctors of the Persian Church.

<sup>1490</sup>Cf. W. G. Young, Handbook of Source-Materials for Students of Church History, Delhi 1999, 29.

<sup>1491</sup>Cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 78.

<sup>1492</sup>Cf. Mundadan, Origins of Christianity in India, in: Perumalil, Christianity in India, 29.

<sup>1493</sup>Cf. E. R. Hambye, Medieval Christianity in India: The Eastern Church, in: Perumalil, Christianity in India, 33.

<sup>1494</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

role. After the coming of Thomas of Cana also there were many missionary expeditions conducted to India. The earliest report regarding their coming is from the testimony of Chaldean Abuna in 1533.<sup>1495</sup> He reports that in the 9<sup>th</sup> century two saintly brothers, natives of Armenia came to Quilon (Kollam). From there they proceeded to Cranganore (Kodungalloor) and again from there to Ceylon.<sup>1496</sup> We hear from Bp. Abuna about the presence of a church constructed by these brothers in Quilon.<sup>1497</sup> It is believed that all these journeys were conducted only at the order of the Catholicos of the East. All these show well the relationship that existed between the Syrian bishops and Malabar Community from the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> century. Today historians agree unanimously beyond doubt that it was Thomas of Cana and these two brothers who were instrumental in bringing the Indian (Malabar) Church to the Persian church and to a direct and intimate relation with each other.<sup>1498</sup>

Currently majority of the historians except one called Barbosa are of the view that it was the East Syrians themselves, whether merchants or pilgrims or missionaries, who had taken the initiative to sow the seeds of Persian relations with the Malabar Church of Kerala.<sup>1499</sup> With these two missionary expeditions there established a strong rapport between both churches along with a shift of name from Thomas Christians to Syrian Christians as they started using the East-Syrian or Chaldaean rite. The SMC is rightly identified by P. Podipara as “Hindu or Indian in Culture, Christian in religion and Syro-Oriental in worship.”<sup>1500</sup> Accordingly today the members of this church are locally known as Surianis or SMC or Thomas Christians or Roman Catholics or Syrian Catholics (RCSC). “It must have been the Dutch authorities of Cochin, who in the second half of the seventeenth century first qualified them as Syrian Christians in order to distinguish them from those who had been evangelized by the Portuguese missionaries.”<sup>1501</sup> The term Syriac Christians should not mislead one to consider these people as immigrants rather it is based only on the language they used for their worship. If we go through the ecclesiastical documents from Vatican, from the beginning of the twentieth century, we come across the same tautology for Thomas Christians namely ‘Syrians’ or ‘Soriani.’<sup>1502</sup> This church is also termed as Chaldeans. The term Chaldean today include all the groups including the Nestorians with the false supposition that the whole denominations which came under them and those churches which used Syriac as its liturgical language, had accepted Nestorianism. This may be the reason why this Syrian Church of Thomas Christians was also termed Nestorian or its liturgy Nestorian.<sup>1503</sup> It has become part of a

<sup>1495</sup>Mar Jacob Abuna (Mar Yacob), bishop of the Malabar SMC from 1504-1553, was ordained and appointed bishop of the SMC by the Patriarch of the Church of the East (cf. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas*, 16-17).

<sup>1496</sup>In various versions we find different names to these brothers. Abuna calls them Xaor and Aproito, Correa modified and called them Apreto and Thor. For Gouvea they are Mar Xabro and Mar Aprrott, whereas in the works of Ros we find Saper and Aprot. In a local document we find the name noted as Mar Saper and Mar Parut. We have adopted the name Sapor and Prot following Mundadan (cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 103).

<sup>1497</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 104.

<sup>1498</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 106.

<sup>1499</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1500</sup>Podipara, *The Malabar Christians*, 27.

<sup>1501</sup>Vadakkera, *Origin of Christianity in India*, 40.

<sup>1502</sup>Cf. Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India*, 1.

<sup>1503</sup>Here we use the term Nestorian in its primary understanding not in its theological rather in the geographical sense (cf. Brown, *Indian Christians of St. Thomas*, 70). Very often people forget that the term ‘Nestorian’ was

tendency that as soon as people hear the word ‘Chaldean’ they are prone to think and connect it with ‘Nestorianism.’ Although the members of the Seleucian-Ctesiphon church who lived outside the Roman Empire and who were not in touch with these controversies were also called Nestorians. The Seleucians-Ctesiphons, like Nestorius himself who was misunderstood, were also accused as Nestorians, although they professed the unity of Christ in two natures: “Christ in two *kyane* and in two *qnome* is one *parsopa*.”<sup>1504</sup> All the more the so-called East Syrians<sup>1505</sup> were out of touch with the Christological controversies that took place in the Roman Empire. This is evident from the designation others have given them namely ‘East Syrians’ which is different from the West-Syrian or Antiochian. Although this is the reality today to this designation ‘Chaldean,’ whether historical or geographical, ‘Nestorianism’ is misleadingly and inseparably joined. This might be one of the reasons why Malabar Church which is also termed as ‘Chaldean’ is misunderstood as Nestorian. Malabar Church along with the acceptance of the missionaries from East Syria, she adopted also their liturgy. The reason for the acceptance of such a liturgy was the lack of one in the SMC. But we cannot say that “all the services of this rite were performed in Malabar in their integrity.”<sup>1506</sup> As it was in the manuscript form an integral performance was not possible. But people were passionately attached to this rite. People found this liturgy as something higher and praise-worthy than the one with which they were familiar with. It is to our surprise that “even today the Chaldeans and Nestorians, the representatives of the ancient Seleucian Church, say when they consecrate their Patriarch that they do so by the permission of the Holy Fathers of the West.”<sup>1507</sup> Thus if they acknowledge the authority of Rome how can we accuse them saying that they are Nestorian or out of the Church? Today we can say without doubt that the coming of Thomas of Cana from Persia reinforced and increased the strength of the Kerala Church and St. Thomas Christians. But at the same time we may observe that they [Thomas Christians and Kottayam Christians] are not similar. If one look into the Church traditions of the Kottayam Diocese or Knanaya Church especially into the marriage customs one can easily find the differences of customs between both Thomas Christians and Kottayam Christians who live and lived for centuries together in the same state. Or again the system of endogamy which is a custom practiced today in Kerala only among this group i.e., the Knanaya who came from Persia and this

---

often used in order to indicate a geographical differentiation rather than a theological conviction. In the words of the Italian author Shammon, “La denominazione ‘chiesa caldea’ fu ufficialmente usata la prima volta dal Papa Eugenio IV nella sua dichiarazione del 7 agosto 1455, in cui ordinava di chiamare caldei tutti quei nestoriani che passavano al cattolicesimo. Ciò successe in seguito al passaggio della comunità nestoriana di Cipro al cattolicesimo sotto la guida del suo vescovo Timoteo di Tarso, il quale cominciava la sua professione di fede con la parola ‘Io Timoteo, vescovo dei Caldei di Cipro.’ The denomination ‘Chaldean Church’ came into official use for the first time when Pope Eugene IV ordered on 7 August 1455 that the ‘Nestorians’ passed over to Catholicism be called Chaldeans” (cited from Vadakkekara, *Origin of Christianity in India*, 42-43 referring to D. Shammon, *La Chiesa assiro-caldea*, in: J. Metzler, ed., *Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide memoria rerum*, Romae 1972, 355); or again such kind of tones in the letter of Sulaqa addressed to the Pope in 1552, ‘Nos servi humiles peccatores nestoriani.’ Sulaqa was the patriarch of India’s St. Thomas Christians also. These all indicate clearly that the term later on used to distinguish between Catholics and Nestorians. In 1581 Mar Elias requested Rome to forbid referring to his Church as ‘Nestorian’ (cf. Vadakkekara, *Origin of Christianity in India*, 54 in reference to *Genuinae Relationes* 13, 97).

<sup>1504</sup>Menacherry, Thomapedia, 30.

<sup>1505</sup>The term East Syrian applies to both Chaldean and Assyrian churches belonging to two great ancient nations.

<sup>1506</sup>P. Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church* (OIRS 104), Kottayam 1986, 140.

<sup>1507</sup>Koodapuzha, *Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the Saint Thomas Christians*, Kottayam 1982, 38.

custom not shared by Thomas Christians of earlier origin is again an indication that they are not the same although they are brothers and sisters in faith.

Later the Eparchy of Kottayam was erected exclusively for the Southist [Knanaya: which is derivative from kinai] Catholics in 1911. When these Christians are known as Southist [Thekkumbhagar: people from the south] the Thomas Christians were distinguished from them as Northist [Vadakumbhagar: people from the north]. The Knanaya<sup>1508</sup> Community traces its origin from a group of Jewish-Christian emigrants from Southern Mesopotamia, who came to the South Indian port of Cranganore (Kodungalloor) in 345 A. D., formed themselves into an endogamous community. Those who came from there consisted of almost 400 persons belonging to 72 families headed by Thomas of Kinai. Among them there was a bishop called Mar Yousef Uraha, 4 priests and several deacons. From the history of the coming of Thomas of Cana and two bishops-brothers we can conclude that smaller or larger colonies of East-Syrian or Persian Christians came to India and settled down in Kerala. The Christianity with which one comes across before the Portuguese time is one that which is made up of south Indians and a few foreigners. The South Indians probably belonged to the Dravidians who had not yet developed the caste conscience i. e., to say till the Aryanization of South India. We may also assume that some of the converted Christians belonged to Brahmins<sup>1509</sup> and some to Jews. We can suppose that the original Christians were engorged by the addition of the immigrants either from Mylapore or Coromandel. But it may be hazardous to say when it has actually happened. One may be able to say that this growth process might have taken place either in the early centuries or during later times, and possibly not once but at different and several times. Finally even if the relationship of Indian Church with Persian church might have helped to develop a strong Christian tradition it had also caused difficulties by not creating a sense of the need of the Indian Christian culture, especially in the areas of theology, liturgy, church law, customs etc. Although this is the fact we remain sometimes dwindled due to lack of solid proofs. As we have said above in majority of cases we have to depend upon local tradition. The local tradition on which we depend for proofs does not exhibit always a chronological consciousness or again the tendency to exaggerate things makes all the more difficult the study of the origin of the Malabar Christians. So also the records which we have from Portuguese missionaries cannot be considered as first class proofs as they suffer from subjectivity and sometimes as they depend heavily upon hypothesis. All these problems which lie in our study give us sufficient hurdles to overcome. Thus it is almost impossible to get a very precise idea of the origin of the community or communities of India. Although for the St. Thomas Apostolate there is the western tradition to supplement or some local tradition in certain cases, one find only very meager evidences regarding the original community or communities existed there from time to time. Although this is the situation we cannot at the same time easily deny the local tradition which is very strong and which agrees upon one thing invariably that is about the origin of the Church in India, viz., in the east and west coast of South India from the preaching of St. Thomas and the existence of one such community in Mylapore on the Coromandel Coast.

---

<sup>1508</sup>Knanaya literally means, 'Kinai' people or 'Kanai' people.

<sup>1509</sup>Although the Aryans came to Kerala before the Christian era, their domination took place only at a later stage in Kerala (cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 115).

### C. The Third Phase of SMC (15<sup>th</sup> cent. - 1896)

Under the third phase we will discuss the coming of Portuguese to India and the aftermath which took place in the Syro-Malabar Church. This phase starts with the coming of the Portuguese under the leadership of Vasco da Gama to Calicut in 1498 and it extends up to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This period is considered as the Dark Age in the history of Christianity in Kerala.<sup>1510</sup> Before the coming of Portuguese to Indian Malabar Church, SMC had intimate relation with the Persian Church. Kerala Christians did not bother about the details of the faith of the bishops who came from Persia to help them rather they bothered only about the preservation of the apostolic succession of its priesthood.<sup>1511</sup> Cosmas Indicopleustes (522 A. D.), notes what he has seen with his own eyes namely about the Church in Male (Malabar), where the pepper grows and about the clergy who are ordained in Persia and sent from there to minister among the multitude of Christians in Malabar.<sup>1512</sup> This reference is a clear indication to the existence of some relation between the Church of Kerala and Persia. The five carved stone crosses discovered in South India may also give us ample attestation regarding the relationship between the Indian Church and the Persian Church.<sup>1513</sup>

With the rise of the mendicant religious orders like that of the Franciscans and the Dominicans a new enthusiasm and vitality came into the Church namely the original apostolic spirit of the Christian Community. When the Franciscans considered missionary activity as their serious concern they made heroic attempts for the conversion of North African Moors and Saracens (Muslims) and later they conducted more organized missionary enterprises in the Asian countries stretching from Palestine to the farthest Orient. They were supported by the Dominicans in these missionary activities of proselytism and the proclamation of the Word of God. In this phase of history John of Monte Corvino came to India, the First European missionary, a Franciscan monk who afterwards became the Archbishop of Cambalec in Cathay, accompanied by a Dominican called Nicolas Pistoia at the request of Pope Nicholas IV as a missionary to China. On their way to China they came to India and stayed there almost thirteen months. Friar John went about preaching Christ. The Franciscan friar was very much taken up by the simplicity and friendliness of Indians. He baptized a few in and around Mylapore. Having impressed about the Indian people he wanted to appoint the Dominican as in charge of these few whom he baptized. But all of a sudden the Dominican friar fell ill and died. Friar John having reached Peking in 1306 he notes something regarding the Malabar Christians in the letter which he wrote: "There are few Christians and Jews and they are of very little weight. The people persecute much the Christians and all who bear the Christian name."<sup>1514</sup> After the missionary trip of Friar John we hear of another missionary trip taking place under the leadership of a French Dominican friar named Jordan of Severac along with a few Dominicans and Franciscans reaching the Bombay Coast in the year 1323 A. D. In

<sup>1510</sup>Cf. Cheriyan, A History of Christianity in Kerala, 95.

<sup>1511</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 99.

<sup>1512</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 93.

<sup>1513</sup>Two of these Crosses have been preserved in the Valiyapalli, Kottayam, one at the traditional site of the martyrdom of St. Thomas in Madras, viz., Mylapore, another one is preserved in Orthodox Church at Kadamattom and the fifth one is in Muttuchira Roman Catholic Church (cf. *ibid.*, 120-21).

<sup>1514</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 123 referring to G. T. Mackenzie, History of Christianity in Travancore, British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, Trivandrum 1901, 145.



Bombay Coast the companions of Jordan were martyred by Mohammadans. But friar Jordan was able to escape the situation and returned to Europe. He was later ordained bishop of Quilon by Pope John XXII at Avignon in the year 1328 A. D., and is the author of the book *Mirabilia Descripta*. Immediately after his ordination he proceeds to Quilon as the Bishop with two letters of the Pope, which are given in *Oriens Christianus*,<sup>1515</sup> one of which is addressed to the Christians of Molephatam<sup>1516</sup> and the other is to the Nazarean Christians at Quilon. Later he was also stoned to death by the Mohammedans who saw him converting so many to Christianity. The first tension we find in Kerala in Quilon seems to have taken place when friar Jordan tried to introduce the Latin rite instead of the then existing rite. According to the Kerala historian P. Podipara, the quarrel between the Quilon Nazareans and friar Jordan might have been the basis for the mention of heresy and schism in the letter of Pope John XXII.<sup>1517</sup> For the Pope writes

“... what we consider even more deeply with constant care, what we thirst for more vehemently, what we beg with fervent prayers in the ardour of solid charity, is that among all those whom the water of baptism has regenerated the division of schism may cease, the clouds of errors may not darken the brightness of faith, and the imitation of a detestable sundering and the falsity of a sullied faith may not blind the mental eyes such as belief in Christ and worship ...”<sup>1518</sup>

According to G. Woodcock the difficulty friar Jordan had to face, was not from the local people but from the Arab traders. He observes that the local people also had to undergo maltreatment due to the acceptance of Latin rite. Arab traders left the natives in peace who did not embrace the Latin rite and on the contrary they killed some who received it.<sup>1519</sup> There is a view shared by some historians that the Church built during the time of friar Jordan was actually founded by Venetian traders who also had some footing in Quilon during this period.<sup>1520</sup> Today this Church or its memory is gone to oblivion. Another friar who visited India during his missionary trip to China was Odoric of Pordenone who visited also the place where the companions of friar Jordan were martyred in order to collect the bones of all martyrs to deposit it in Zaitun in China. On his way he also halted at the port of Quilon. We have a record from what he wrote some six years later about the people of Kerala and St. Thomas. He tells it took almost a ten days’ journey from Malabar to another part of India where St. Thomas the Apostle was buried and that “his church is filled with idols, and beside it are some fifteen houses of Nestorians; that is to say, Christians, but vile and pestilent heretics.”<sup>1521</sup> We come across another Franciscan friar called Maringoli who had very friendly relations with Malabar Christians and who visited Mylapore, although he named it Mirapolis, the tomb of St. Thomas in 1349 A. D. He stayed almost sixteen

<sup>1515</sup>*Oriens Christianus* is the technical Latin term for the scholarly study of the Christian Orient. In its examination of the cultures of the Christian East this study encompasses seven languages: Georgian, Armenian, Syriac, Christian Arabic, Ethiopic, Coptic and Old Nubian (cf. A. Guillaumont, *L’Orient chretien*, in: JA 261 [1973], 69).

<sup>1516</sup>Molephatam is an old name for Mylapore and in this letter Pope John XXII has used the term Nascarini a wrong form of the term Nazaranis. St. Thomas Christians were known as Nazaranis connected with the Nazarean Jesus (cf. Cheriyan, *A History of Christianity in Kerala*, 124).

<sup>1517</sup>Cf. P. Podipara, *The Thomas Christians*, London 1970, 116.

<sup>1518</sup>Cited from Cheriyan, *A History of Christianity*, 125 referring to the letter of Pope John XXII.

<sup>1519</sup>Cf. G. Woodcock, *Kerala: A Portrait of the Malabar Coast*, London 1967, 119.

<sup>1520</sup>Cf. C. B. Firth, *An Introduction to Indian Church History*, Bangalore 1961, 41.

<sup>1521</sup>Cited from A. E. Medlycot, *India and the Apostle Thomas: An Inquiry with a Critical Analysis of the Acta Thomae*, London 1905, 90-92.

months with the people of Quilon. He has recorded something about his stay in Kerala:

“On Palm Sunday, 1348, we arrived at a very noble city of India called Quilon, where the whole world’s pepper is produced. Now this pepper grows on a kind of vines which are planted just as in our vineyards. These vines produce clusters which at first are like those of the wild vine of a green colour and afterwards are almost like the bunches of our grapes, and they have in them a red wine which I have squeezed out on my plate as a condiment. When they have ripened they are left to dry on the tree and when shriveled by excessive heat the dry clusters are knocked off with a stick and caught upon linen cloths and so the harvest is gathered. These are things that I have seen with mine eyes and handled with my hands during the fourteen months I stayed there. And there is no roasting of the pepper as some others have falsely asserted, nor does it grow in forests but in regular gardens nor are the Saracens the proprietors but the Christians of St. Thomas. And these latter are the masters of the public weighing office (*qui habent stateram ponderis totius mundi*) from which I derived, as a perquisite of my office as Pope’s Legate, every month a hundred gold fanams and a thousand when I left.”<sup>1522</sup>

We have given a few quotations only to show that from the fourteenth century onwards there were already isolated events of both conversions and maltreatments and ties of good relationships in the history of Christianity in Kerala. The above mentioned letter which is written by Pope John XXII to friar Jordan may be interpreted as the first claim made by Pope to the jurisdiction in India over Kerala Christianity. In the fifteenth century, in 1439 Pope Eugenius IV writes a letter to a Kerala king named Raja Thomas: “To my most beloved son in Christ, Thomas, the illustrious Emperor of the Indians, health and apostolic benediction: - There often has reached us a constant rumour that Your Serenity and all who are subjects of your kingdom are true Christians.”<sup>1523</sup>

Although these are some isolated missionary trips during the 13<sup>th</sup> century we come across the major missionary expeditions to India by the close of the middle ages. The European explorers joined hands with missionaries and traders for new woods and new pastures. The history of the St. Thomas Christians was seriously changed by the coming of the Portuguese sailor Vasco da Gama who arrived at Calicut in 1498 A. D. In the history this is recorded as the serious penetration of European traders into the depth of Asia. Till the coming of the Portuguese missionaries the St. Thomas Church of Kerala had no serious and regular contact with West. All her contact was only with the East Syrian Patriarchate of Seleucia. Up to this moment the ecclesiastical head of Thomas Christians, who was also called ‘the Metropolitan and the Gate of all India,’ was appointed by the East Syrian Patriarch. Although the Metropolitan for the Indian Church was appointed by the East Syrian Patriarchate he had enjoyed autonomous status. Hence the Metropolitan was also at times referred as the Patriarch.<sup>1524</sup> Even though the title Patriarch was not in wide circulation, titles like ‘The Metropolitan and the Gate of All India,’ was generally in vogue with titles like ‘All India,’ ‘Door of India,’ ‘Of India,’ and ‘Head of India.’<sup>1525</sup> We have reference to the title of the

<sup>1522</sup>Cited from Cheriyan, A History of Christianity in Kerala, 128.

<sup>1523</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 132 referring to Mackenzie, History of Christianity in Travancore, 147.

<sup>1524</sup>Cf. G. Schurhammer, The Malabar Church and Rome during the Early Portuguese Period and Before, Trichinopoly 1934, 39.

<sup>1525</sup>Cf. Cheriyan, A History of Christianity in Kerala, 136.

Metropolitan of India in the Vatican Syriac Codex 22 written in the year 1301 A. D. by a Kerala Christian in Cranganore. In this Codex there is a reference to a certain Mar Jacob, a prelate of the Christians of Kerala, as the Metropolitan Bishop of the See of St. Thomas and of the Whole Church of the Christians of India.<sup>1526</sup> We have some information regarding the title from Fr. Campri who was in Kerala for several years and who has testified it in A. D. 1607.

“According to the information gathered from several Chaldean books and from well known facts, the bishopric of Serra (Kerala) was always an archbishopric, and is the most ancient in the whole of India. Its Archbishops and Prelates were always called ‘the Archbishop Metropolitan of the whole of Hendo (India) and of its confines ...’<sup>1527</sup>

These references all point to the relationship Malabar Church had with the Persian Church.

Although the occasional visits of few missionaries or travellers or pilgrims who passed through the country from time to time could not bring about much lasting influence, the arrival of the Portuguese Missionaries at the close of the 15<sup>th</sup> century brought India and the Indian Christians into an enduring contact with the Western Christendom and Latin Christianity. If North India was completely under the dominion of Muslim Rulers, South India was in the hands of Hindu dynasties when Portuguese came to India. At that time, few of the strong kingdoms in North India were Gujarat or Cambay, Delhi and Orissa. In the south the strong kingdoms were the independent states of the Deccan, the Kingdom of Vijayanagar, the independent and semi-independent and dependent principalities and kingdoms of Malabar.<sup>1528</sup> As the Portuguese came they could build up good relation with the rulers of Vijayanagar who were in the South. Because of the favourable situation the Portuguese could establish good relation with various rulers in the South and could commence well in the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century in different areas like Nagapattinam, Pulicat, and Mylapore which belonged to the Vijayanagar Empire.<sup>1529</sup> It seems at the time of the Portuguese invasion most Thomas Christians lived in the interior and mountainous regions. Hence they started distinguishing the Thomas Christians with a name ‘Serra’ (sierra = mountain) from the ‘new Christians’ who were converted to Christianity by Portuguese missionaries and who lived along the coast. At that time they noted down some of the main areas where Thomas Christians lived. They are Palyporam (South Pallipuram), Arretomto (Arthungal), Maleas (Malayatur), Turubuli (Thodupuzha), Maota (Muttam), Batimene (Wenmani), Porqua (Porakkad) or Chempakassery, Travancore, Pimenta (Vadakkenkur), Tecancute (Thekkenkur), Paru (South Parur), Cortute (South Kuthiathod), Cartute (Kaduthuruthy) and Angamali.<sup>1530</sup> It is believed that the Portuguese arrived in Cochin a few miles away from the most important ecclesiastical centre of that time namely Cranganore. As they came they could acquire support from the Kolathiris who ruled Cochin and who was not in good terms with the Samuthiris who ruled Calicut and with the support of the Kolathiris the Portuguese could spread to the whole of south India and rule the country for about a century and a

<sup>1526</sup>Cf. G. M. Moraes, A History of Christianity in India, from early times to St. Francis Xavier: A. D. 52-1542, Michigan 1964, 175 in reference to Anato, *De Synodi Diamperitance Natura Atque Decretis*, no. 1, 148.

<sup>1527</sup>Podipara, The Thomas Christians, 71.

<sup>1528</sup>Cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 223.

<sup>1529</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 220.

<sup>1530</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 233 in reference to N. Gonçalves, *Estes são as Rios*, 46.

half.<sup>1531</sup> At the time when they came it was the only place in India namely in Cranganore where they could find Christians.<sup>1532</sup> The major population the Portuguese found in Cranganore was the Christians and the Hindus. As the Portuguese arrived in Quilon the Christians of Malabar received them with great joy. In the words of Giovanni da Empoli

“When a few Portuguese landed in Quilon they were greeted by some 400 (in Italian Dictionary the number is 3000 including men and women) men waiting for them, and they were very much pleased to hear that the new-comers were Christians and they told the Portuguese that they themselves were Christians through the missionary work of St. Thomas the Apostle. Then they took them to their church.”<sup>1533</sup>

In all likelihood we may say that the Portuguese Missionaries were welcomed very solemnly and with enthusiasm in the churches of Thomas Christians. It seems a few of them celebrated Holy Mass at certain occasions and preached to them in their Churches. A certain Mathias of Kayamkulam, who was a Thomas Christian and a pepper merchant, was instrumental in bringing about the cordial relation between the Thomas Christians and the Portuguese. It seems he helped Vasco da Gama to load their ships with pepper in the year 1502. After loading the ship he writes a letter to the Portugal King Manuel in 1503 expressing that he did it not for any personal benefit but for the spiritual assistance he sent to Malabar Coast. In this letter he expresses his optimism that even if the old generation is not able to gain much from the teachers whom he had sent he expresses the hope that the later generation would surely profit from them.<sup>1534</sup> In gratitude to the help they received from the Portuguese king and missionaries they offered the best article in their Church, even the golden cross to the king of Portugal. As gratitude the Malabar Christians did not even hesitate to surrender the special judiciary powers they had enjoyed from time immemorial, an action upon which they later regretted.<sup>1535</sup> These all show the rapport of the Thomas Christians with the Portuguese missionaries who were considered as their own in faith.

Though this was the situation in the very beginning later as more and more missionaries arrived to the coast of Malabar it gave rise to conflicts and divisions. The initial warmth and relationship started slowly dwindling. The immediate reason for the conflict was the mentality of the Portuguese for they wanted to suppress all the local customs and the particular usages of the different rites. “... aus den anfänglichen, brüderlichen Beziehungen wurde im Laufe der Zeit die Unterwerfung der Thomas-Christen unter die Missionsbischöfe. Die Missionare und ihre Prälaten waren weder

---

<sup>1531</sup>Cf. V. C. Samuel, *The sprouting Church: An Introduction to Indian Church History* (A Translation of the Malayalam Book ‘Sabha Valarunnu’), Kottayam 1992, 106.

<sup>1532</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 260.

<sup>1533</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 277 referring to G. B. Ramusio, *Viaggio fatto nell’India per Giovanni da Empoli* fattore su la nave del Serenissimo Re di Portogallo per conto de Marchionni di Lisbona, 57. In this work he mentions about the places he visited: l’isola dell’Ascensione, il Brasile, il Capo di Buona Speranza, la costa Africana in quasi alla Somalia, la costa del Malabar. Empoli gives what he saw there in Malabar coast and the surprise at the presence of a community of Christians comprised of 3000 (“tremila poco più o meno”) including women and men and who are so-called Nestorians of St. Thomas and who were visited by Italian Franciscans. He indicates about the Church which he saw there. Though it looked almost like theirs its inside was very frugally decorated only with a Crucifix and some statues dedicated/titled after Virgin Mary. And these Christians were called Nazareni. This may be due to the Muslim presence. The Muslims started calling the Christians ‘Nazarenes’ (cf. Da Empoli, Giovanni, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Vol. 31, 1985; [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/Giovanni-da-empoli\\_Dizionario-Biografico](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/Giovanni-da-empoli_Dizionario-Biografico). Date of Access: 25. 04. 2012).

<sup>1534</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity*, 278.

<sup>1535</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 279.

fähig, die Liturgie der Thomas-Christen zu verstehen noch sie zu schätzen.”<sup>1536</sup> All the missionaries invariably intended to suppress the difference of the Thomas Christians and wanted to conform them to the Portuguese ways and usages which were same as Roman ways. Although the Thomas Christians were ready to adopt certain good elements which they brought from Europe they were never ready to give up their customs and practices or social and ecclesiastical practices with regard to faith. It was a difficult thing for the Thomas Christians to allow someone to uproot their age-old customs which they had considered sacred and followed for centuries. St. Thomas Christians may not remember happily the harm done to their church by a certain Franciscan friar called Alvaro Penteado. He had of course a lot of Franciscan zeal and enthusiasm in winning souls but lacked prudence and tact in dealing with these people. His activities were supported by the Portuguese missionaries by hide and seek politics. They relied upon various coercive measures, including the kidnapping of Syrian bishops, accusing the Syrian Church of heresy and imposing sea blockades to prevent the coming of prelates from the Eastern Patriarchs to Kerala. The problem originated as the missionaries started considering the Thomas Christians as the subjects of the king of Portugal. These missionaries might have been tempted to do so because of the support Thomas Christians gave to Vasco da Gama earlier when he came first to Kerala. But the support which they gave to him was a part of Indian hospitality and brotherliness and of course for the sympathy and help he offered to the Thomas Christians. It was not with the intention of undermining their church and teaching them a new way of life. When the Franciscan friar was discouraged by the chief priest of Cranganore to continue his activity among the Thomas Christians he appealed first to the Governor of Portuguese and later to the Portugal king. He wrote a long letter to the king explaining the origin, history, government, faith, worship, sacraments and ecclesiastical customs of Thomas Christians. His main intention of this communication was to conform them to the Latin Church. He complains in his letter about the respect these people [Malabar Christians] give to the priests from Armenia [the use of Armenia is an aberration of Aramaia]. In his letter he made so many suggestions to bring these people to obedience and to the teaching of the holy mother Church.<sup>1537</sup> He concludes his letter by pleading the king to rebuild the tomb of St. Thomas which is in a ruined state and to place some religious as its custodians and to find a benefice in Portugal for its maintenance.<sup>1538</sup> Even the Portuguese officials were not happy about the presence of this particular Franciscan friar among the St. Thomas Christians:

“Your Highness sent a Padre Alv. Penteado there [among the Christians of St. Thomas], who does not seem to me the right man, for he has a hard head and a very hot temper; and the people who are christians since the time of St. Thomas, are very little satisfied with him and this they told me already many times. Mind, he has been occupied for ten years already with that work and has not baptized a single one.”<sup>1539</sup>

<sup>1536</sup>J. Madey and G. Vavanikunnel, *Qurbana: Die göttliche Liturgie der Thomas - Christen ostsyrischer Überlieferung*, Paderborn 1922, II.

<sup>1537</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 295-296.

<sup>1538</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 295 in reference to A. Penteado, Letter ca. 1518 in SRD III, 550.

<sup>1539</sup>Cited from Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 306-307 referring to Sebastião Pires who was vicar general from 1521 till 1532 he writes this about Penteado in SRD II, 136-41.

Mar Jacob the East Syrian Metropolitan is also of the same opinion when he tells that “he did not take Father Alvaro Penteado there [to the Malabar Christians], for he did not dare to do so for fear of the people who were not very satisfied with him.”<sup>1540</sup> But at the same time there were also priests who considered Thomas Christians as belonging to the mother church. A Dominican priest called João de Caro, who was a faithful companion and friend of Mar Jacob, was in Malabar from 1504 until his death in 1552, worked in collaboration with the Thomas Christians and in favour of them.<sup>1541</sup> As remuneration to his friendliness the Thomas Christians helped the Portugal king in pepper trade. Although the Christians had to pay a lot for the direct pepper trade with Portugal they continued it as a service to the king of Portugal.<sup>1542</sup>

Mar Jacob and the Franciscans in Cochin had a very friendly and intimate tie. Even though the Franciscan friar Penteado tried at different occasions to hurt the feelings of Mar Jacob and Thomas Christians there were also many among the Franciscans with innate goodness and friendly approach. This approach of some of the Franciscans easily won the sympathies of the Thomas Christians. This relationship helped Mar Jacob to continue his ministry and reforms among the Thomas Christians. Nevertheless the intention of the missionaries from the West was always to latinize the Thomas Christians. With this intention of strengthening the latinization process they put a seminary or college at Cranganore in 1541. It was almost at the same time a latinized Thomas Christian priest, who did his priestly training in Portugal, named Matthew with the Portuguese surname Dias, came to the field and collaborated with the Portuguese missionaries and intensified the activity of latinization. It is said of him that he was a priest who was very much latinized in mind and attitude due to his formation in Portugal. The East Syrian bishops were tolerant at the activities of the native father who was trained in Portugal. But when he was obstructed by a St. Thomas Christian cleric in all probability he reported to the king of Portugal in the beginning of 1550:

“On this coast there are many St. Thomas Christians, over forty thousand souls, who formerly had the Patriarchs of Babylon as their prelates. In their name there came men from Babylon as Bishops, to instruct them in the Catholic faith, which they did, not without some errors. Among other things they ordained the natives, but without the permission to say mass. And now there are here two from the said Babylon, who first did everything after the manner of Babylon, until your Highness sent Fr. Alv. Penteado, who with much diligence and zeal brought the said two Babylonians to the obedience of the Holy Mother Church and obtained for them a salary from your Highness, and now they no longer do anything after the Babylonian custom and they are honest and obedient towards the Holy Mother Church. One however, of those ordained by one of Babylonians above mentioned, is going about teaching St. Thomas Christians the Babylonian customs without fear of God or of the Holy Mother Church, nor has he the permission of his Babylonian prelates, and he has already created much confusion amongst them.”<sup>1543</sup>

---

<sup>1540</sup>Ibid., 309.

<sup>1541</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 301.

<sup>1542</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 302-303: the direct pepper trade was also not liked by the men of Samorim, the Muslims and therefore the Thomas Christians who helped discarding the threat of Cochin Raj and Muslim had to undergo severe damages from both parties. They caused much damage to the houses and Churches of Thomas Christians. And they burned even a church of St. Thomas.

<sup>1543</sup>Cited from Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 320 referring to the letter of Mathew Dias which is published in the SRD IV, 477-481.

The Portuguese could alleviate themselves at the death of Mar Jacob in 1552.<sup>1544</sup> Although Mar Jacob was a meek and good person his presence was seen as a block to the smooth-latinization process of Portuguese missionaries.<sup>1545</sup> But their relief did not last long due to the presence of new bishops, sent from Persian Church by Patriarch Mar Ebed Jesus, called Mar Joseph in the year 1558, (1558-1569) accompanied by Mar Elias [bishop] and two Maltese Dominicans [Bishop Ambrose Butigeg and Father Antony Zahara]. Although the phase of Mar Jacob was one of peaceful time in the history, the time of Mar Joseph and then later the time of Mar Abraham was one of tumult. This was only a preview of what was to take place in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Though the disruptive activities by Portuguese started during the time of Mar Jacob it reached in its culmination when Portuguese authorities detained those who came from Chaldea under the leadership of Bishop Joseph. All the more Bishop Joseph was accused of heresy by the Portuguese and was taken to Rome although he was acquitted by the Roman authorities. All of a sudden Bishop Joseph died and in his place Mar Abraham (1569-1597) took the charge of the Malabar Church with the full approval of Catholic Patriarch of Chaldea and with the confirmation of Pope Pius IV.<sup>1546</sup> It is said that during his time the relation was proceeded with discord and reconciliations. It is during his time that the synod of Goa took place (in 1585) and Fr. Francis Roz who was a professor in the newly erected seminary and an expert in Syriac language, was put in charge to scrutinize the content of the books of Thomas Christians with the motive to eliminate the so-called Nestorian errors from it. He says in his dissertation that these Christians professed Roman Catholic Faith: “*Romanam fidem catholicam fuerint professi.*”<sup>1547</sup> But still he found errors in their books. Consecutively so many complaints were sent against the Thomas Christians and the Metropolitan. Although he admitted that the Thomas Christians had professed the same Catholic faith of Rome he was shrewd enough to find so many mistakes in their books with a political motive.

“Ohne die Sprache zu verstehen - oder sie verstanden sie falsch -, wagten sie es, die Liturgie der Thomas-Christen der Häresie anzuklagen. Infolgedessen wurde eine gründliche Latinisierung der Liturgie geplant, und auf der sog. ‘Synode’ von Diamper (Udayamperur) im Jahre 1599 und in den darauffolgenden Jahren wurden zahlreiche Änderungen eingeführt.”<sup>1548</sup>

Thus finally Rome decided in 1597, in the year in which Mar Abraham died, to send Dom Alexis de Meneses, Archbishop of Goa, to start a process of clarification. At the death of Mar Abraham Pope Clement VIII had authorized Archbishop Meneses to appoint a Vicar Apostolic for Angamaly. At the news of the death of Mar Abraham the Archdeacon George of the Cross took up the control of the Church in his own hands which Archbishop Meneses had to approve it reluctantly. At the same time

<sup>1544</sup>The date of his death is disputed. According to Fr. Lourenco de Goes (who was the Guardian of the Franciscan monastery in Cochin: 1528-1534; commissary in 1534- 1536; after this office also he was appointed Guardian in the same friary) he died sometime between 1543 and 1545. According to Soledade he died in the year of Christ 1544; but today it is assumed generally that he died in the year 1552 (cf. *ibid.*, 346 in reference to SRD II, 243-46).

<sup>1545</sup>His letters written in the year 1523 and 1530 clearly tell what difficulties he had in resisting the attempt of missionaries to oust him (cf. G. Shurhammer, *The Malabar Church and Rome during the Early Portuguese Period and Before*, Trichanopoly 1934, 10-19).

<sup>1546</sup>Cf. Menacherry, *Thomopedia*, 49.

<sup>1547</sup>Cited from Koodapuzha, *Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the Saint Thomas Christians*, 113 referring to Roz, *De erroribus Nestorianorum qui in hac India Orientali versantur*, 40; cf. below also fn. 1838.

<sup>1548</sup>Madey and Vavanikunnel, *Qurbana*, II.

Archbishop Meneses at the recommendations of Pope Clement VIII came to Malabar to make a visitation and ordained many to priesthood. But he exceeded the authority of Pope by making further arrangements to convoke a synod.<sup>1549</sup> This Synod gave official recognition to the latinising efforts of the Portuguese missionaries. Though the Archdeacon George of the Cross tried to stop him Archbishop Meneses applied pressure upon him and made him to give in. This synod which took place on June 20-26 1599, in the church of Diamper (Udayamperoor)<sup>1550</sup> severed capriciously all the connections of the Thomas Christians with the Chaldean Patriarch and Church. From then on, the power to rule over the Thomas Christians was given to the bishops under the Padroado.<sup>1551</sup> Through this Synod of Udayamperur the Church of Malabar was brought under the Portuguese administrative control ruled by Jesuits from 1599-1653.<sup>1552</sup> The accusations Meneses raised against the Kerala Christians that they were Nestorians was a deliberate attempt with a precise motive to bring them under the rule of Portuguese.<sup>1553</sup> Thereafter the native Archdeacon was compelled to take the orders from the Portuguese Jesuit's superiors. This made the situation very worse for the Thomas Christians.

Again problem arose when a certain Athalla (or Aithalaha) landed at Mylapore, who was sent by Pope Innocent X (in some versions we see it as Urban VIII), to be the Patriarch of India in 1652. According to E. M. Philip, a Kerala church Historian, "the members of the Church of Malabar believe that he was Patriarch Mar Ignatius of the Antiochian Syrian Church who had come down to deliver his Church that had suffered much under the yoke of Rome."<sup>1554</sup> Portuguese detained him under their custody doubting his credibility and before the Archdeacon and Thomas Christians do something the Portuguese packed him to Goa. So many rumours spread about this prelate. One of these was that he was accidentally drowned in the sea. It had taken place at a time when the relationship between two groups was not that astounding. The Thomas Christians who heard this unfortunate thing that happened to the prelate gathered together near the open-air cross (famous as 'Coonen Cross') at Mattacherry tied a long rope and holding the rope they swore (known as 'Coonen Cross Oath') that they would never be again under the Paulists, namely the Jesuits, and that they would never obey Archbishop Garzia.<sup>1555</sup> This revolt of 3<sup>rd</sup> January 1653 which took place as a culmination and expression of their bitter disappointment and which had been mounting up almost for a century, broke the community into two. By this revolt the Malabar Christians never meant anything against the Roman Church rather it was

---

<sup>1549</sup>Jonas Thaliath (J. Thaliath, *The Synod of Diamper*, in: OCA 152 [1958]), who made a study on the topic tells that the Synod of Diamper was invalid on various grounds namely that it was convoked without authority, conducted against the sacred canons, and was never approved by Rome. Thus he observes that it had no binding force as it was not a lawful synod because of the lack of authority on the part of those who convoked it, absence of intention on the part of those who attended it, lack of form in the manner of conducting it and lack of integrity in the text promulgated. The laws made by the prelates who ruled the Malabar Church concluded that Latin laws were universal and erroneously created the assumption that Latin in form and content were only lawful (cf. Koodapuzha, *Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the Saint Thomas Christians*, 113).

<sup>1550</sup>Synod of Diamper held at Udayamperur is a diocesan synod (council) that formally united the ancient Christian Church of the Malabar Coast (modern Kerala State), India with the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>1551</sup>Cf. above fn. 1177.

<sup>1552</sup>Cf. Samuel, *The Sprouting Church: An Introduction to Indian Church History*, 100.

<sup>1553</sup>Cf. N. K. Jose, *Syro-Malabar Kurbhanayude Charitram (The history of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana): A Study*, Vaikom 1987, 44.

<sup>1554</sup>E. M. Philip, *The Indian Church of St. Thomas, Cheeranchira 2002*, 147.

<sup>1555</sup>Cf. Menacherry, *Thomapedia*, 49.



against the attempt to convert the Thomas' tradition into Roman Catholicism and the suppressing mentality of Portuguese and Jesuit missionaries. If it were anything against the Roman primacy they would not have even written letters almost twenty one years prior to the Diamper Synod addressing the Pope as the Universal Pastor.<sup>1556</sup> In this letter written to the Pope they request him to ask their Patriarch to send bishops to India: "nosque item Patriarchae nostro litteris tuis commendatos facias, ut quinque ad nos mittat Episcopos."<sup>1557</sup> In the same letter they profess the universal role of the Pope: "Nam tu es Christianorum omnium Pater, ideo fac cum grege tuo et par est Regni tui acquisitioni et optime in Domino valeas."<sup>1558</sup>

We can recite a number of quotations from the fathers of the Chaldean Church approving the primacy of Rome and Pope. Narsai (ca. 399- ca. 503 A. D.),<sup>1559</sup> whom the Seleucians call 'the harp of the Holy Spirit' and the 'poet of Christianity writes:

"Simon preached among the Romans the New Gospel of the Divinity that put on flesh in order to confirm all; the fisher of fishes set out to fish the gentiles first; he cast the net and caught the Mother of cities. The head of the disciples caught the city of Primacy and kept her enclosed within the ramparts of faith ... Mark tended the seed that Kepa sowed in Rome."<sup>1560</sup>

One of the great teachers of this school Babai the Great in the 7<sup>th</sup> century says that "they (Monophysites) perished most miserably with those of their views through the one who holds the See of the great Peter, the wonderful Leo."<sup>1561</sup> In the words of great poet and Church Father St. Ephrem we hear the approval of the same when he says that St. Peter is the head and tongue of his brothers.<sup>1562</sup> This same sentiment of relation with Rome was also followed by the Thomas Christians of Kerala. But the Portuguese-led missionaries and forces wanted nothing other than the expurgation of their liturgy and complete control over the Church.

Following the rumour of the drowning of the prelate a few leaders assembled at Alangad on May 22 1653 swore on the Gospel that they would not obey Garcia S.J., and twelve priests imposed their hands on Archdeacon Thomas and made him Bishop. Some are of the view that all these actions were controlled by Mar Ahathallah who was later taken to Portugal and is believed to have died in Paris.<sup>1563</sup> The large majority accepted the leadership of pseudo-Metropolitan Thomas Parambil<sup>1564</sup> who assumed the name Mar Thomas I. Rome came to know the entire grievous elements took place in the corner of the world in Malabar and Pope Alexander VII asked the Italian Carmelites to reconcile the malcontents. The other group, who comprised of almost

<sup>1556</sup>Cf. Koodapuzha, Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the Saint Thomas Christians, 109.

<sup>1557</sup>Cited from ibid. referring to Archiv. Secreto Vat. Armad VII, Caps. V, N. 14.

<sup>1558</sup>Cited from ibid. referring to Archiv. Secreto Vat. Armad VII, Caps. V, N. 14.

<sup>1559</sup>Narsai was a prolific writer of the East Syrian tradition in the 5<sup>th</sup> century. He was an ardent follower of the Antiochian position in Christology and a long term director of the School of Edessa-Nisibis (cf. F. Kanichikattil, To Restore or to reform?, Bangalore 1992, 9).

<sup>1560</sup>Koodapuzha, Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the Saint Thomas Christians, 109.

<sup>1561</sup>Cited from ibid., 65 referring to Giamil, S., *Genuinae Relationes inter Sedem Apostolicam et Assyriorum Orientalium seu Chaldaeorum Ecclesiam*, Romae 1902, 26 who gives also both Syriac and its corresponding Latin: "Miserrime perierunt una cum suis asseclis mediante admirabili Leone (i.e. Romano Pontifice) qui Sedem Magni Petri obtinet."

<sup>1562</sup>Cf. ibid., 66.

<sup>1563</sup>Cf. Menacherry, Thomapedia, 49.

<sup>1564</sup>He is called Pseudo because he and his followers pretended to have the approbation of the Pope for their actions by the order of Ahathallah whose letter (a falsification) was read aloud. It is noted that not because of love for Rome his supporters left him but because they considered his orders as defective as he was not validly installed (cf. Samuel, The sprouting Church, 121).

400 families, and who did not want to separate from the Mother Church, namely from Rome, although at the same time they did not want to be ruled by Jesuit priests, were entrusted to the care of the Carmelite missionaries who were already in good terms with the Thomas Christians. From this time on there were three groups of people who were holding three different attitudes regarding the nature of its relationship. One of the groups desired to accept the Latin tradition and Rome's Supremacy. The second among them decided without approving the supremacy of Jesuit to accept Rome's leadership direct. And finally the third group desired to reject both Rome and Jesuit's supremacy.

As the Carmelite missionaries came to India as deputies of the Propaganda Congregation the new period began to be known as the Propaganda Period.<sup>1565</sup> Thus from 1659 to 1663 Joseph Sebastiani and from 1663-1687 Chandi Parambil led the Malabar Catholic Church. Carmelites with their tactful approach won to their side many who left the mother Church. The severed group, who continued under Mar Thomas I, without cooperating with the conciliation attempt, initiated by the Carmelite missionaries, still tried persistently for a bishop from the Middle East. Finally their plea was answered by the Jacobite Church of Antioch by sending a Metropolitan of Jerusalem called Mar Gregory in 1665 to help and guide them. Thus there emerged two parallel communities of Thomas Christians, one headed by Carmelite missionaries in communion with Rome and which did not sever even in moments of crisis, which is today's Syro-Malabar Church and the other in communion with the Church of Antioch which was outside Roman communion and who accepted the West Syrian theological and liturgical tradition of the Syriac Orthodox Church of Antioch known as the Jacobite or the present day Malankara Church.

Thus the arrival of Bishop Mar Gregory of the Syriac Orthodox Church marked the beginning of a Schism among the St. Thomas Christians. It was Mar Gregory who brought the Jacobite faith to the fraction of the Malabar Church. This was an unwanted and unhappy moment in the Thomas Church. Thus the Malabar church, which was one till the 17<sup>th</sup> century, came to be split into two bodies. Although those who separated and went away from the catholic side made repeated attempts to come back to the original church, such efforts were constantly thwarted by the Latin domination. Even though Kariattil Joseph, a Thomas priest, made strenuous effort to convince Rome about the desire of the Malankara group, Rome did not give him a cordial reception.<sup>1566</sup> Although Thomas Christians of Catholic side wanted to bring this fraction back to the catholic side which is severed from the same family it was not able to do it as it needed rightful permission from Rome to accept this group who went away from the original church.

Those who remained with the old Thomas Christians [Syro-Malabar Church] in course of time started addressing the people who severed themselves from the rule of Portuguese as Puthenkoottukar (Neo loyalists) and they addressed themselves as Pazhayakoottukar (Old loyalists). In this time SMC which was always in communion with Rome received as its new head Joseph Sebastiani whom Rome appointed as

---

<sup>1565</sup>It was initiated by Rome at the realization that the monopoly of Portuguese in missionary work is no more effective as the Portuguese power in Indian soil declined.

<sup>1566</sup>About his attempt and journey to Rome and later to Portugal is narrated in the Varthamanapusthakam, which is the first travelogue written in Malayalam by Thomas Paremmakkal the co-traveller of Kariattil; (cf. T. K. Paremmakkal, Varthamanappusthakam (trans. P. J. Podipara [OrChrA 190], Rome 1971, 96).

Titular Bishop and Administrator in 1659 who came to Malabar some years back in 1657. Meanwhile as part of the political turmoil Portuguese lost their control and Dutch took the control of the Fort of Cochin in 1663. Thus together with the Portuguese the Italian Vicar Apostolic was also asked to quit Malabar. There came a moment in this particular stage of history that no one other than an indigenous priest could continue in Malabar as Vicar Apostolic. Thus from among the Malabar Christians Alexander Parambil (westerners called him Alexander de Campo = a literal translation of Parambil) was consecrated by Sebastiani and was appointed as the first Vicar Apostolic of Malabar Church with the guidance and supervision of Rome. After the death of Mar Alexander (1687 A. D.) the seat remained vacant for some time due to the stringent measures taken by the Dutch by not allowing any foreign missionaries from Portuguese to take up the office. By the end of the same century [17<sup>th</sup> cent.], Rome became successful in negotiating with the Dutch to obtain permissions for Carmelites from Italy, Germany and Belgium to work actively in India. Consequently Rome appointed Angelo Francis as the new Vicar Apostolic of Malabar. But the Portuguese authorities did not accept this appointment by Rome and were unwilling to consecrate him. Thus the Portuguese authorities nominated their candidate to Cranganore. There were also titular differences applied to these persons appointed by Rome's Propaganda fide and Portuguese's Padroado. The head appointed by Propaganda bore the title Vicar Apostolic of Malabar and of Padroado bore the title Archbishop of Cranganore. The Archbishop of Cranganore had his residence in Puthenchira whereas the Vicar Apostolic nominated by Rome had his residence at Verapoly (which means true city in Cochin). In 1838 Pope Gregory XVI suppressed both Sees, namely, Cranganore and Cochin and brought all the faithful to one See namely that of Verapoly under the custody of the Vicar Apostolic of Malabar. The Portuguese were not ready to approve this action of Rome and were in virtual schism for some time known as the 'Padroado Schism.'<sup>1567</sup>

Later on when the Carmelites also adopted the same method of Latinization there emerged new trends of Schism. Among these Mellus (1874) deserve special mention as he was instrumental in separating again a small portion from the Syrian Christians (one fraction of the Thomas Christians) to divide and to create a small community in Trichur called the Surais who eventually submitted to the Patriarch of Chaldea (Nestorian), and who are outside the Roman Communion. Though it was a painful event it stirred Rome to study the actual problem of the Church of Malabar. It appointed two extraordinary visitors to study the situation and to suggest solutions to the problems. As an effect of this study conducted among the Syrian Christians in 1887 they were completely separated from the Verapoly Jurisdiction and placed under the newly constituted Apostolic Vicariates namely Trichur and Kottayam with Adolf Medlycot (an English Prelate) and Charles Lavignes (a French Prelate) as Vicars Apostolic precisely for the Malabar Church. Then onwards they are known as exclusively Syro Malabar Catholics in order to differentiate them from the Latin Rite Catholics in Kerala. Thereafter there took place so many reorganizations in the Syro Malabar Church.

---

<sup>1567</sup>Cf. A. Meersman, The catholic Church in India since the Mid-Nineteenth Century, in: S. K. Sharma and U. Sharma, ed., Cultural and Religious Heritage of India, 113; cf. A. Thazhath, The Juridical Sources of The Syro-Malabar Church, 202.

It was in 1896 a reorganization of Vicariates was made for the advantage of administration into Trichur [Thrissur], Ernakulam and Changanacherry [the Vicariate of Kottayam was renamed Changanacherry since this town had been the centre of Catholic activity], and John Menacherry, Aloysius Pazheparambil, and Mathew Makil three native prelates were appointed as Vicar Generals to them respectively. Mar Mathew Makil was later transferred to Kottayam in 1911 to the newly erected Vicariate which was set up specifically and exclusively for the Knanaya Southist Christians, about whom we have referred above as the people who came under the leadership of Kinayi [Cana or Qnai] Thomman, due to the constant and repeated requests from them. So Pope Pius X acknowledging the distinct and unique practices and identity of them established a separate apostolic Vicariate under the Syro Malabar Church exclusively for the Knanaya Christians named Knanaya Catholic Vicariate Apostolic of Kottayam headed by Bishop Mar Mathew Makil. Pius X erected the Vicariate Apostolic of Kottayam exclusively for the Southist Catholics on 29<sup>th</sup> August 1911 through an apostolic letter *Universi Christiani*. In the year 1923 when the Syro-Malabar hierarchy was reconstituted by the apostolic constitution *Romani Pontifices* the Vicariate Apostolic of Kottayam was raised to an eparchy along with the eparchies of Trichur, Changanacherry and the archeparchy of Ernakulam. Later in 2005 Kottayam eparchy was raised to a metropolitan archeparchy comprising not only the faithful in Kottayam district but all Southist Christians of Kerala, throughout India and Overseas. Currently this diocese is guided by Bishop Mar Mathew Moolakkattu and auxiliary bishop Jose Pandarassery respectively. Mar Makil who was then the Apostolic Vicar (Changanacherry) was replaced by Mar Thomas Kurialacherry as the Vicar Apostolic of Changanacherry and both were raised servants of God in 2009 and 2011 by Pope Benedict XVI respectively. In the year 1923 Holy See constituted the Syro-Malabar hierarchy in Ernakulam (Cochin) as its Metropolitan See. Changanacherry diocese was again divided into Changanacherry and Palai dioceses in 1950.

“Changanacherry was raised to the status of an Archdiocese on July 26, 1956 by Pope Pius XII constituting the second province in the Syro-Malabar Church and Kottayam and Pala became its suffragans. The Apostolic Constitution *Regnum Caelorum* of November 26, 1959 of Pope John XXIII gave effect to this decision of Pope Pius XII.”<sup>1568</sup>

In the year 1954 a new diocese of Tellicherry was set up for the Syrian Christians living in the north of Kerala [Malabar]. It was very gratifying to see the expansion of the jurisdiction of the Syro-Malabar Church in the year 1955 to the whole of Kerala and parts of Mysore and Tamilnadu. The appointment of Joseph Parekattil Archbishop of Ernakulam as Cardinal in 1969 came as a climax to all these developments. Vatican was also interested to study the presence of Syro-Malabar Christians in the state of Maharashtra. Thus Vatican appointed a Pontifical Commission to study the situation of Kalyan Malabar Catholics. Thus on May 19, 1988 Pope John Paul II made the announcement of the establishment of a new diocese, called the diocese of Kalyan, for the Syro-Malabar Christians of Bombay-Pune-Nasik regions, and appointed Mgr. Paul Chittilappilly as its first Bishop.<sup>1569</sup>

<sup>1568</sup><http://www.archdiocesechanganacherry.org/archdiocesechanganacherry-archdiocese.php?id=3>. Date of Access: 22.05.2012.

<sup>1569</sup>Cf. <http://www.cbcisite.com/Kalyan.htm>. Date of Access: 22.05.2012.

It was a great relief for the Thomas Christians for the great understanding showed by Pope Pius XI when he stated that latinization is no longer to be encouraged among eastern rite Catholics. He not only said but initiated a process of liturgical reform to bring back the unique identity of the oriental nature of the (Latinized) Syro-Malabar rite. Though it was initiated by Pope Pius XI the completely restored Eucharistic Liturgy basing on the original east Syrian sources was approved by Pius XII in 1957 and introduced in 1962. In the same year (1962) on July 3 the liturgy was celebrated for the first time in the vernacular in Malayalam, the mother tongue of Kerala. The curia of the Syro-Malabar Church started to function in March 1993 at the archbishop's house of Ernakulam-Angamaly. Soon after on 27<sup>th</sup> May 1995 it was shifted to the new premises at Mount St. Thomas near Kakkanad, Cochin. Mar George Alencherry is the first elected head of Syro-Malabar church. Thus today in Kerala the three main groups namely Syro-Malabar, Latin, and Syro-Malankara which belong to the Catholic Church have the majority of members (17.3 million members) in the Christian denominations. It is sorry to note here that there are yet a few million falling outside the catholic folk namely the Malabar Independent Syrian Church, Assyrian Church of the East whose Catholicos Patriarch named Mar Dinkha IV for the whole Universal Assyrian Church of the East consecrated on 17<sup>th</sup> October 1976 in England; on certain issues like the validity of the anaphora there is already mutual consensus between the Catholic Church and the Church of the East), Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church, the Malankara Jacobite Syrian Church, and the Malankara Mar Thomas Syrian Church, St. Thomas Evangelical Church, who all are the sons of St. Thomas the Apostle. Besides these groupings India witnessed the coming of so many Protestant and Pentecostal groups by the end of 18<sup>th</sup> and beginning of 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The major ones among them are Church of South India (CSI) which is a union of Presbyterian, Reformed, Congregational, Methodist, Anglican Congregations, and the Church of North India (CNI) which together constitute approximately almost 2.2 million members according to 2001 report and both of them are in full communion with the Anglican Church.<sup>1570</sup> In India there exist a few Pentecostal groups namely India Pentecostal Church of God (IPC), Brethren group which include Plymouth Brethren, Indian Brethren, Kerala Brethren etc. Thus as we have already mentioned this third phase of the Syro-Malabar Church is the dark period in the history of it due to its division into an assorted denominations. Having seen the third phase of the SMC and the various churches extant in India let us take up also a study and analysis of the anaphora of SMC. Before we do the analysis of the anaphora of SMC we may familiarize ourselves with the Addai-Mari anaphora<sup>1571</sup> in particular.

#### 4. A Critical Analysis of the Syro-Malabar Liturgy

Having seen the origin of the various churches and background in which it got split, one from the other, let us concentrate ourselves to the study of the liturgy of SMC. Our major concern in this section is to check the veracity of the criticism whether the liturgy of SMC is Nestorian in nature and thus to establish either possibilities. The liturgy which is known after the names of the blessed Apostles Mar Addai and Mar Mari is used only by the Church of the East, the Chaldean Church and

<sup>1570</sup>Cf. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christianity\\_in\\_India](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christianity_in_India) . Date of Access: 20.10. 2012.

<sup>1571</sup>Hereafter we will be using only AM for Addai-Mari Anaphora/Liturgy.

the SMC. Thus a study of the AM is also equally helpful to know the SMC more in detail which makes use of the same liturgy. It is considered as one of the most ancient anaphoras in the Christian liturgical tradition. According to Bouyer “the Liturgy of Hippolytus actually manifests relatively late origin. AM is an archaic formula of indispensable authenticity.”<sup>1572</sup> SMC uses the AM from that day on which she came in contact with the Persian Church until today. It is also called Assyro-Chaldean Rite. This liturgy which is used by the Church of the East as well as by the Chaldean and Malabar Catholics “is the ancient usage of the Mesopotamian Church in the Persian Empire, with its ecclesiastical center in the Catholicosate of Seleucia-Ctesiphon on the Tigris River, about fifty kilometers down river south of Baghdad in present day Iraq.”<sup>1573</sup> So before we get into the theology and Christology of this liturgy let us have a look at the structure and the historical background of this liturgy.

### A. The Structure and Historical Background of the AM and the Anaphora of Peter or Sharar III

The peculiarity of the Anaphora of AM is that it is a Eucharistic prayer that preserves the mark of the apostolic era, and reflects the same basic structure of *Birkat Hamazon*<sup>1574</sup> in its paschal context. Further this Anaphora is said to belong to a primordial era, to the era of the Eucharist of chapter 10 of the *Didache* as well as to the Paleoanaphora of the *Apostolic constitutions* VII, 25 and to the Eucharistic synaxis of Justin.<sup>1575</sup> This liturgy reveals an uninterrupted layer of the development of the Eucharistic euchology in the early liturgy. Some scholars have taken up a research of the text of the Anaphora of AM and tried to reconstruct a putative original version in comparison with the Maronite Anaphora of Peter III or Sharar (ca. 3<sup>rd</sup> century) which exhibits a similarity with that of AM and the marks of apostolic era. According to G. J. Cuming “although practically every section of the AM has been excised by one scholar or another still there is undoubtedly a close relationship between AM and the Maronite third anaphora of St. Peter, generally known as Sharar.”<sup>1576</sup> So in our endeavour to know the structure of the AM first and foremost we must make a structural comparison which it is said to have with other anaphoras and blessings extant. Hence let us engage ourselves in studying and going through the comparison<sup>1577</sup> of these texts and get to know these Anaphoras of antiquity. We will start our comparative study with AM and Sharar as both of them show lot of similarities.

<sup>1572</sup>L. Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayers* (trans. C. U. Quinn), Notre Dame 1968, 180.

<sup>1573</sup>Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West*, 225.

<sup>1574</sup>It is a Hebrew word *ברכה המוק* meaning ‘Blessing on Nourishment’ or in English it could be translated as ‘Grace after Meals.’

<sup>1575</sup>Cf. S. Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari: A Study of Structure and Historical Background*, in: B. Puthur, ed., *Studies on the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, Kochi 2004, 2 in reference to Justin, *Apologia* I, 65 and 67, 3-5.

<sup>1576</sup>G. J. Cuming, *The Shape of the Anaphora*, in: E. A. Livingstone, ed., *StPatr* 20, Leuven 1989, 337.

<sup>1577</sup>I have depended upon Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 3-15 for all the parallel text of AM anaphora with other anaphoras, early Jewish prayers and *Didache*.

The Anaphora of AM: Section I	Peter III or Sharar: Section I
<p>a) Worthy of glory from every mouth and thanksgiving from every tongue is the adorable and glorious Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, who created the world in his grace and its inhabitants in his compassion, has redeemed mankind in his mercy, and has effected great grace toward mortals.</p>	<p>a) Glory to you, the adorable and glorious Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who created the worlds by his grace and its inhabitants by his mercy, and has effected redemption toward mortals by his grace.</p>
<p>b) Your majesty, O Lord, a thousand thousand heavenly beings worship and myriad myriads of angels, hosts of spiritual beings, ministers of fire and spirit with cherubim and holy seraphim, glorify your name, crying out and glorifying:</p>	<p>b) Your majesty, O Lord, a thousand thousand heavenly angels worship and myriad myriads hosts ministers of fire and spirit glorify in fear. With the cherubim and seraphim, who from one to another bless and sanctify and cry out and say:</p>
<p>c) Holy, Holy, Holy, God almighty. Heaven and earth are full of His glories.</p>	<p><i>So that may we also, O Lord, through your grace and your compassion be made worthy to say with them three times:</i></p> <p>c) Holy, Holy, Holy...</p>
<p>cc) Hosanna in the highest. Hosanna to the Son of David.</p> <p>Blessed is he who has come and will come in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.</p>	<p>cc) Hosanna to the Son of David...</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Section II</b> <i>And with these heavenly powers</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Section II</b></p>
<p>d) We give thanks to you, O Lord, <i>even</i> we your lowly, weak and wretched servants, because you have effected in us a great grace which cannot be repaid, in that you put on our humanity so as to quicken us by your divinity. And lifted up our poor estate and righted our fall. You raised up our mortality and you forgave our debts. You justified our sinfulness and enlightened our understanding, and you, our Lord and God, vanquished our enemies and made triumphant the lowliness of our weak nature through the abounding compassion of your grace.</p>	<p>d) We give thanks to you, O Lord, we your sinful servants because you have effected in us your grace which cannot be repaid. You put on our humanity so as to quicken us by your divinity. You lifted up our poverty and righted our dejection and quickened our mortality, and you justified our sinfulness and you forgave our debts. And you enlightened our understanding and vanquished our enemies and made triumphant our lowliness</p>

<p>e) And For all your help and graces toward us, we raise to you glory, honor, thanksgiving and adoration, now and for ever and ever. Amen.</p>	<p>e) And For all your graces toward us, let us offer to you glory and honor in your holy Church before your propitiatory altar, now....</p>
<p>Section III</p>	<p>Section III</p>
<p>f) You, Lord, through your unspeakable mercies make a gracious remembrance of all the upright and just fathers who have pleased you, in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ,</p>	<p>f) You, O Lord, in your many mercies make a gracious remembrance for all the upright and just fathers in the commemoration of your body and your blood,</p>
<p>g) which we offer to you upon the pure and holy altar as you have taught us:</p>	<p>g) which we offer to you upon your living and holy altar, as you, our hope, have taught us in your holy and living gospel and have said: <i>I am the bread of life which came down from heaven so that mortals may have life in me. We make, O Lord, the memorial of your passion as you have taught us:</i> <i>in that night when you were delivered up to the crucifiers, you took bread... &lt;the Narrative&gt;</i></p>
<p>h) And grant us your tranquility and your peace all the days of the world, that all the inhabitants of the earth may know you, that you alone are the true God and Father, and that you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ, your beloved Son, and he, our Lord and our God, taught us through his life-giving gospel all the purity and holiness,</p>	<p>h) <i>We remember you, only-begotten of the Father ... make us ... that we may stand before you in purity and serve you in holiness... Yes, we beg you, only-begotten of the Father; through him peace has been proclaimed to us, Child of the Most High by whom the things above were reconciled with the things below, the good shepherd...</i></p>
<p>i) of the prophets, apostles, martyrs and confessors, bishops and priests and deacons, and of all the children of the holy catholic Church, who have been marked with the mark of holy baptism.</p>	<p>i) <i>We offer before you, O Lord, this oblation in memory of all the upright and just fathers, prophets and apostles, martyrs and confessors, [and of all our patriarchs, the Pope...] bishops and chorepiscopoi and periodeutai, priests and deacons and deaconesses, young men celibates and virgins, and all the children of the holy Church who are marked with the mark of saving baptism, and whom you have made participate in your holy body.</i></p>
<p>j) And we also, O Lord, your lowly, weak, and wretched servants who are gathered</p>	<p>j) <i>intercessions in Antiochian manner&gt;</i></p>



<p>together and stand before you at this time, have received by tradition the example (Tupsa) which is from you, while rejoicing, glorifying and magnifying, commemorating and praising and performing this great and dreadful mystery of the passion and death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.</p>	
<p>k) May he come, O Lord, your Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation of your servants and bless it and hallow it, that it may be to us O Lord for the pardon of debts, the forgiveness of sins, and a great hope of resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven with all who have been pleasing before you.</p>	<p>k) And may he come, O Lord, your living and Holy Spirit <i>and dwell</i> and rest upon this oblation of your servants, And may it be <i>for those who partake</i> for the pardon of debts and the forgiveness of sins and for a blessed resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven, forever.</p>
<p>l) And for all your wonderful economy for us, we give you thanks and glorify you unceasingly in your Church, redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ, with open mouths and uncovered faces, as we offer up praise, honor, thanksgiving and adoration, now and for ever and ever. Amen.</p>	<p>l) And for your glorious economy toward us we give you thanks, we your sinful servants redeemed by your innocent blood, with open mouth which give thanks in your holy Church before your propitiatory altar, now...</p>

We will make a comparative study of the anaphora basing on the text given above. I. Rahmani is of the opinion that there is no trace of a putative original Urtext available for AM other than what we possess today.<sup>1578</sup> On the contrary B. Spinks holds that for every paragraph in the Mar Esha'ya<sup>1579</sup> text [AM] has parallel with the Maronite anaphora with the sole exception of the Anamnesis. "If ... the text of Sharar must be taken seriously, then why is the Anamnesis missing? Its absence suggests the possibility that the Anamnesis is a later East Syrian addition to the original form of the anaphora."<sup>1580</sup> This means AM must have existed in all probability before the Anaphora of Peter III. If we go through this above given Anaphoras, one thing is clear that every paragraph in AM has a parallel in Peter III and not vice-versa. It clearly points to one fact that the Maronite reviser of the Anaphora had before him the text of AM (an earlier version) and which made it possible for the editor to redact a parallel text similar to that of AM especially which gives a resemblance to every paragraph. Thus depending upon our reason we state that AM existed before the Peter III anaphora and the Urtext of Peter III. Although this is the case we should not drive ourselves to the extent saying that AM never underwent a Mesopotamian reworking or

<sup>1578</sup>Cf. I. Rahmani, *Les Liturgies Orientales et occidentales*, Beyrouth 1929, 338, 352.

<sup>1579</sup>Mar Eshaya is a manuscript of the AM anaphora dating from the tenth or eleventh century. The publication of the oldest available manuscript took the study of AM to a new level. It is generally called after the Church in which Macomber found the Hudra that contained the anaphora (cf. S. B. Wilson, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, in: P. F. Bradshaw, et al., ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, Minnesota 1997, 24).

<sup>1580</sup>B, Spinks, *The Original Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles*, in: EL 91 (1977), 160.

brushing up. We have sufficient evidence for this reworking at the beginning of the section I (Paragraph a) perhaps by the reviser of Peter III himself. Thus we will go through a study of different editing which it is believed to have undergone from time to time.

### B. General Observations of the Reconstruction Attempts

The various scholars who tried to analyze the AM observe certain peculiarities with it. Some of them esp., Sanchez Caro and A. Gelston are of the opinion that AM had been produced as integral, as one piece, that is to say, it was produced at one time in its entirety. Another scholar called Macomber seems to be not agreeing with this opinion of the above said scholars. According to him except the Epiclesis all other elements were made at a stretch. J. Magne holds that it is a collection of preformulated hymns addressed to Christ. Basing on these two different hypotheses held by two different sets of scholars one may reach only at inconclusive results.<sup>1581</sup> Another scholar called Botte basing on paragraph (j) said that it is the anamnesis of sorts<sup>1582</sup> which gave incentive to some scholars like Macomber<sup>1583</sup> to search for the missing Institution Narrative in AM. After this study of Botte several scholars like Sanchez Caro and others tried to reformulate models with the inclusion of Last Supper. This kind of a study may destroy the unique nature of the Anaphora of AM due to its formulary character. A student of history may observe that AM was an anaphora which grew together with the development and growth of the Church of Mesopotamia. As it grew in an isolated situation and as the empire and culture was severed from other culture it was untouched by any other anaphoras or cultures. When all other churches both East and West can glory in the parallel growth of an anaphora according to the contemporary developments taking place in theology and liturgy through the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, the Church of the East has nothing to glory other than the AM anaphora to cope up with the existing situation of growth and development. Precisely due to this reason the Scholar and bishop Sarhad Jammo of the Chaldean Catholic Church is of the opinion that any attempt to reconstruct of a phantom original text of this Eucharistic Prayer may give us only futile effect and it may not be proper as it is not going to give any new element. He has reached this conclusion not from any personal assumptions but from the results of the scholarly studies made by the previous researchers.<sup>1584</sup> At the same time he agrees with the fact that one can find elements of various strata in it. According to Bouyer “it has become somewhat artificial due to its addition of elements that are visible from different times, at the price of splitting up a prayer or a series of prayers that are more ancient.”<sup>1585</sup> He is also of the opinion that AM is an undeniably continuous prayer provided these embellishments are removed. Before dealing with the various additions and strata of the anaphora AM, that was added to it at different phases of history, we will consider first of all the sources which might have influenced the formulation of AM. Modern study has proved that AM was influenced by various Jewish prayer formulas like

<sup>1581</sup>Cf. Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 7.

<sup>1582</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 7 in reference to B. Botte, *Problèmes de l’anaphore syrienne des apôtres Addai et Mari*, in: OS 65 (1965), 100-104.

<sup>1583</sup>Cf. W. Macomber, *The Maronite and Chaldean Versions of the Anaphora of the Apostles*, in: OCP 37 (1931), 77-79.

<sup>1584</sup>Cf. Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, iv.

<sup>1585</sup>Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*, 146.

*Berakah* and adopted much from sources like Didache etc. Thus in the next section we will try to get familiar with the sources which were instrumental in the formulation of AM.

### C. Relation between Birkat Hamazon<sup>1586</sup> and AM

Many scholars have conducted various studies in our century on *BH*. “It seems to be fairly generally agreed that the roots of Christian liturgy are to be found in Jewish liturgy; and most of these scholars<sup>1587</sup> would hold that in particular, the *berakah* type of prayer, and within that type the *BH*, is to be seen as the probable model for the Christian anaphora.”<sup>1588</sup> Cuming holds that “no other anaphora exactly reproduces the tripartite structure of the *BH*: blessing, thanksgiving, supplication”<sup>1589</sup> than the AM. Therefore it is a must in our study to know how deeply the Jewish blessing has affected the composition of AM. We will do it by a comparison of the correlation between these two. We will start our analysis with a comment from the famous scholar L. Ligier regarding his view for the search of the origin of the Eucharistic prayer. He states that one must begin from the *BH* in order to clear the passage from the Supper to the Eucharistic prayer of the Canon basing on two conditions namely considering first the prayer in its entirety and secondly taking into account the *BH* in its paschal context.<sup>1590</sup> At the same time so many studies were conducted to find the relation between *BH* and the earliest surviving formula of Eucharistic prayer found in chapter 10 of Didache. Today it is asserted beyond doubt that the Eucharistic prayer found in the Didache is closely related to the *BH*.<sup>1591</sup> It may be good for us to keep in mind the structure, content and style before dealing with any Eucharistic prayer.

Generally we find three different blessings spoken on the food by the Jewish teachers. The Jewish teachers when they spoke these three different blessings upon the food they had in their mind three different ideas. By the first blessing they meant to give the most fitting thanks to the creator and provider for the nourishment. Secondly, they spoke a blessing on the fertile land without which it would not have been possible to receive this food. This blessing is at the same time connected with the duty of mankind to express gratitude for the divine favour received, together with a revival of Jewish experience through the land starting from their exodus experience in which they were taken as slaves to Egypt and then back to freedom and again from

<sup>1586</sup>Here after it will be referred as *BH*.

<sup>1587</sup>So many scholars have been working on the origins of the anaphora in recent years, especially scholars like L. Ligier, G. Rouwhorst, B. Spinks, T. Talley, and H. Wegman (cf. L. Ligier, *The Origins of the Eucharistic prayer*, in: *StLi* 9 (1973), 161-85; G. Rouwhorst, *Bénédiction, action de grâces, supplication*, in: *QuLi* 4 (1980), 211-40; B. D. Spinks, *Beware the Liturgical Horses!* in: *Worship* 59 (1985), 211-19; T. J. Talley, *The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church according to Recent Research* in: K. W. Stevenson, ed., *Liturgy Reshaped*, London 1982, 48-64; T. J. Talley, *The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer*, in: *Worship* 58 (1984), 404-19; H. A. J. Wegman, *Généalogie hypothétique de la prière eucharistique*, in: *QuLi* 4 (1980), 263-78).

<sup>1588</sup>Cuming, *The Shape of the Anaphora*, 333.

<sup>1589</sup>*Ibid.*, 345.

<sup>1590</sup>Cf. L. Ligier, „De la Cene du Seigneur a l’Eucharistie,” *Assemblees du Seigneur*, Vol. 1 (serie 2), Paris 1968, 31-32.

<sup>1591</sup>Cf. Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 7; E. Mazza, *L’anafora eucaristica*, Roma 1991, 24-25; L. Finkelstein, *The Birkat Ha-Mazon*, in: *JQR* 19 (1928-1929), 211-262; M. Dibelius, *Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache*, in: *ZNW* 37 (1938), 32-41.

Moses to Law. Thus through this second blessing spoken on the land every Jew is brought to his personal redemption. Hence this blessing which is so interwoven with the land and the redemption bring home the concept of their freedom from slavery. And finally the third blessing spoken upon the food brings every Jew to his native land in particular from the whole world, praying for the preservation of the nation, unity of its people and for the protection of its central institutions. In the Babylonian Talmud one reads that the first blessing is one that is for “the One who nourishes, the second one the blessing for the land, and the third is for the One who will build Jerusalem.”<sup>1592</sup> It is said that the *Didache* 10, the mystical Eucharist of the *Apostolic Constitutions* VII, 25 and the Anaphora of AM all have come under the influence of this Jewish blessing. Thus it becomes clear for us how important a role *BH* has played in the earliest surviving formularies of the Christian Eucharist. The difference we find in the Christian Eucharistic prayers from the blessings of Jewish prayers is only in the transition of the blessings said from thanksgiving for the food to the creation and redemption. This transition can be easily seen from the *Didache* and AM: “You, Lord Almighty, have created everything by your Name, both food and beverage ... to us on the other hand you have graciously bestowed through your servant Jesus.”<sup>1593</sup> Whereas in the AM the blessing takes a new turn: “Glory to You, the adorable Name ... who created the world by his grace.”<sup>1594</sup> S. Y. Jammo finds two reasons for not having said the blessings upon the food as in Jewish blessings. First he observes that the community dinner was separated from the Eucharist in the early years and secondly the spiritual bread and wine they participated is no more considered as part of the plan of creation but as an apex of the redemptive work began in Jesus. From a second century apologetic Father of the Church namely Justin the Martyr we hear the same idea shared by S. Y. Jammo. Justin the Martyr informs us about the regular weekly assembly which gathered on the day called Sunday, of all Christians who live in town or country, and this gathering according to scholar Bradshaw took place in the morning and did not involve the consumption of a full meal.<sup>1595</sup> Bradshaw also shares as S. Y. Jammo that “the rite connected with the bread and cup certainly appears to be distinguished from any other eating and drinking here.”<sup>1596</sup>

As we are familiar with the background of the Eucharistic prayers of the early centuries let us deal with the relation of *BH* and AM in particular. Bouyer who studied about their relationship found a remarkable association between the two. This above mentioned author is quite sure that AM is the most ancient Christian Eucharistic composition to which we can have access today. He reached such a conclusion from the fact that it is a model which is reasonably different from the prayers of the patristic period. He observes that although the expressions of it are Christian, it is still moulded after the pattern of the Jewish prayers for the last cup of the meal.<sup>1597</sup> The study conducted by S.Y. Jammo gives us further indications regarding the origin of AM. In order to study the rapport between these two blessings (namely *BH* and AM) he

<sup>1592</sup>Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 9.

<sup>1593</sup>Cited from A. Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*, Minnesota 2003, 25 referring to *Didache* 10, 3.

<sup>1594</sup>Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 10.

<sup>1595</sup>Cf. P. F. Bradshaw, *Introduction: The Evolution of Early Anaphoras*, in: idem, ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, Minnesota 1997, 1 in reference to Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 67. 3.

<sup>1596</sup>*Ibid.*, 1.

<sup>1597</sup>Cf. Bouyer, *Eucharist*, 147.

extracted first of all three segments from the original text of AM which, according to him, did not belong to it from the very initial stage of the text. Those are namely the Sanctus, the Epiclesis and the expanded references to the Last Supper. Besides he falls in line with the findings of R. Taft who says that “there is more or less consensus that the most primitive original Eucharistic prayers were short, self-contained benedictions, without Sanctus, Institution Narrative or Epiclesis, comparable to the Jewish *BH*, *Didache* 10, and the *Papyrus Strasbourg* 254.”<sup>1598</sup> The argument is that if AM belonged to the same era and identified with the patterns of *BH* then we should be able to extort a remnant formula when we expurgate and which in turn must be analogous to *Didache* 10 and to the Mystic Eucharist of the *Apostolic Constitutions* VII, 25. The three fragments thus pulled out encompass:

- i. the Sanctus, its introduction, and the adjustments made for its insertion in the anaphora in the first section,
- ii. the paragraph containing the Epiclesis in the third section, and
- iii. the expansion of the references to the Last Supper in the third section, i.e., unequivocally relating the act of the Church to the Supper.”<sup>1599</sup>

Let us have a closer look at the three blessings from the *BH* and the related texts in AM with a new nuance.

<i>BH</i>	AM
<p>1) Blessed are you, Lord our God, king of the universe, for you nourish us and the whole world with goodness, grace, kindness, and mercy</p> <p>Blessed are you, Lord, for you nourish the universe</p>	<p>1) Glory to you the adorable and glorious Name (of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit) who created the world in his grace and its inhabitants in his compassion, has redeemed men in his mercy and has effected great grace toward mortals.</p>
<p>2) We give you thanks, Lord our God, for you have given us for our inheritance a desirable land, good and wide, the covenant and the law, life and food</p> <p>For all these things we give you thanks and</p>	<p>2) We give you thanks, Lord, we your lowly, weak, and wretched servants, because you have brought about in us a great grace which cannot be repaid. For you put on our humanity to give us life through your divinity, you extolled our lowly state, you raised our fall, you restored our immortality, you forgave our debts, you justified our sinfulness, you enlightened our intelligence. You, our Lord and God, conquered our enemies, and made triumphant our weak nature through the abundant mercy of your grace. And for all your help and graces toward us, we raise to</p>

<sup>1598</sup>R. Taft, The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora, in: OCP 57 (1991), 290.

<sup>1599</sup>Jammo, The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, 11.

bless your name for ever and beyond.	you praise, honor, thanksgiving and adoration, now and for ever and ever. Amen.
<p>3) Have mercy, Lord our God, on us your people Israel, and your city Jerusalem, on your sanctuary and your dwelling place on Zion the habitation of your glory, and the great and holy house over which your name is invoked. Restore the kingdom of the house of David to its place in our days, and speedily build Jerusalem.</p> <p>Blessed are you Lord for you build Jerusalem. Amen.</p>	<p>3) Lord, through your many mercies which cannot be told, do make, in the commemoration of your Christ, a gracious remembrance for all the pious and righteous fathers who were pleasing in your sight, the prophets, the apostles, the martyrs and confessors, the bishops, the priests and deacons, and all the sons who have been sealed with the living seal of holy baptism.</p> <p>And for all your wonderful plan for us, we give you thanks and glorify you unceasingly in your Church, redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ, with open mouths and uncovered faces, as we offer up praise, honor, thanksgiving and adoration, now and forever and ever. Amen.</p>

When we go through its clarification it may become clearer what we have tried to explain above. For clarity sake we will follow Nos.1, 2 and 3. In number 1 the Mesopotamian Christians start their Eucharist with a blessing for the creation and redemption against the Jewish tradition of saying blessing for the food. Followed by it in number 2 they set their eyes on the redemptive economy with obvious Christological content initiated in and through Christ whereas in *BH* it is for the desirable land. In number 3 although we find a similarity of structural pattern with that of *BH* the tenor in *AM* is that of commemoration. This commemoration is addressed to the Father who made possible the redemption through His Son: “Lord God, as we do the memorial of your Christ, remember us, your Church. The Lord Christ, in fact request his disciples toward the end of his blessing to: ‘Do this in memory of me.’”<sup>1600</sup>

#### D. Cup of Elijah and AM

The study of this Hallel<sup>1601</sup> text again reemphasizes the presence of Jewish influence in *AM*. Let us see the text i.e., the text of Cup of Elijah for its relation with the *AM*.

<sup>1600</sup>Jammo, The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, 13.

<sup>1601</sup> Hallel (Hebrew: הלל) is a Jewish prayer - a verbatim recitation from Psalms 113-118 which is used for praise and thanksgiving that is recited by observant Jews on Jewish holidays (cf. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hallel>. Date of Access: 21.10. 2012).

Easter Meal  The Last Chalice, of Elijah (Psalm 79, 6-7; 69, 25; Lam 3, 66)	AM
Pour out your wrath on nations that reject you, on kingdoms that do not call your name. For they have devoured Jacob, laid waste his home. Pour out your wrath upon them, let the fury of your anger overtake them, pursue them in wrath and destroy them from under your heavens.	And grant us your tranquility and your peace all the days of the world, that all the inhabitants of the earth may know you, that you alone are the true God and Father, and that you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ, your beloved Son, and he, our Lord and our God, taught us through his life-giving gospel all the purity and holiness.

Giraudo observes that the text which is given above is an added proof for scholar Jammo for the relation between AM and *BH* due to the presence of Hallel (Ps 113) which is called the Cup of Elijah in AM.<sup>1602</sup> If we go through the above given texts in both columns it is clear that the Mesopotamian anaphora bases for its text in the final text of the Judaic Passover meal although the Cup of Elijah is in the negative expressed. The language of the AM surpasses that of the Judaic text which invokes the wrath of God on the gentiles who do not call out His name and who battle against His people. Thus AM has changed its negative tone and curse into a positive nature and blessing. Hence AM intercedes and prays for peace for all people on earth and it prays for the conversion of all people to God and to Christ or through Christ. From the analysis Jammo comes to the conclusion that as Mesopotamian Eucharist is close to the Jewish Passover meal so also it is to the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples.

### E. Didache and AM

Let us also take into account the relationship which we find in the AM and in *Didache*<sup>10</sup>.

Didache	AM
Almighty Lord, you created all things for your Name's sake ...	Glory to you, the adorable Name (of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit) who created the world in his grace and its inhabitants in his compassion, has redeemed mankind in his mercy, and has effected great grace toward mortals.
We thank you, holy Father, for your holy name which you have made to dwell in our hearts ...	We give thanks to you, Lord ...,

<sup>1602</sup>Cf. C. Giraudo, *Eucaristia per la Chiesa: Prospettive teologiche sull'eucaristia a partire dalla 'lex orandi'*, Roma 1989, 159.



Lord, remember your Church ...	Make, Lord, a gracious remembrance for all the fathers ...
--------------------------------	--

The text of AM shows a great structural affinity with that of *Didache*. Thus it is reasonable to think that all these ancient and the first primary sources were made use as the formulary for the compilation of AM and instrumental for the particular vocabulary and theme of AM. Having seen the similarity between the various texts, let us proceed to the study of the original text of AM. If we remove various layers which it has adopted through the centuries we may be able to arrive at the crude text of AM.

## F. Stages of Formation

### i. The First Stratum

As we have seen the different thanksgiving prayers which might have influenced in the formulation of AM let us go step by step to the original text of AM by extracting from it the various elements which were added later to it. It is assessed that there were three stages of addition to the original of AM. While acknowledging the different expansion of the original content of the *BH* in each of the two formularies given above with that of AM we find also enough resemblance of structure and initial content between them. This will lead to the conclusion that “AM in its first and early stratum still preserves the basic pattern of eucharistic prayer similar to that of the *Didache*, the paleoanaphora of the *Apostolic Constitutions* VII, 25 and the anaphora of the *Apostolic Tradition* 4, 20 which are literary monuments of Christian euchology, and consequently close to its apostolic era.”<sup>1603</sup> This indicates to the fact that AM continued to be the vital liturgical expression of a living Church and is a very ancient and venerated anaphora from time immemorial updating itself with the theological and liturgical developments of the Church universal. Some of the scholars accused it as unstable and incoherent due to the lack of a proper addressee especially in the third section. But the study conducted by various scholars especially by excising and bringing back to its initial stratum they proved that it is quite coherent and continuous. According to the various studies conducted, it is clear that the first section is addressed to the divine Name, and later expanded to mean the Trinity whereas the second and third sections are addressed to Christ and the Father respectively. Although it is an unusual addressing it is sufficiently clear. There are also counter-arguments to it. Some scholars find such a return once again from Christ to Father as unusal. But those who are familiar with the Mesopotamian euchological pattern reflected in the most archaic hymn of the Assyro-Chaldean liturgy may not find much difficulty to accept this style found in the inception of every liturgical service. Thus the addressing starts with the Father, who is the Lord of the Universe, reaches Christ the Saviour: “To you Lord of the Universe, we give thanks. To you Jesus Christ, we give glory, because you are the one who will raise our bodies and save our souls.”<sup>1604</sup>

<sup>1603</sup>Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 15.

<sup>1604</sup>*Ibid.*, 17.



Thus after having removed the later added elements from the AM in the first stratum one is close to a masterpiece product of euchology, patterned after the structure of *BH* in its Passover context, and related to the Eucharist of *Didache* 10.

## ii. The Second Stratum

As we have already noted that the AM had also updated it according to the theological and liturgical developments taken place in the society so the next concern and search must be somewhere else for its additions. Although we have said that all other anaphoras other than AM underwent updating and actualization according to the liturgical and theological development of the catholic world it does not mean that AM had never undergone any such process. It does only mean to say that AM might not have undergone such a large addition and excision as it might have taken place with regard to other anaphoras. So in order to reach its purest form we may further take up the task of excision under this second stratum.

### a. The Addition of Isaian Qaddysh

So many scholars have engaged themselves with the origin of old elements in AM. A. Baumstark, a German scholar, gives us a great clue regarding the origin of benedictions in Christian Eucharist. According to him the second phase and background of this insertion into AM was the use of Isaiah 6, 3 Qedusha in Yoser and the 3<sup>rd</sup> Tefilla of the 18 Benedictions of Jewish Morning Prayer by the Jewish community. He argues that it was adopted or inserted into the Christian Eucharist only in the areas which lie close to the Jewish congregations.<sup>1605</sup> Bradshaw is also of the same opinion like Baumstark and proves it with the help of the absence of these benedictions in the anaphora of Apostolic Tradition<sup>1606</sup> which is believed to have originated in Rome or better known after Hippolytus of Rome (3<sup>rd</sup> cent.), and for the presence of these benedictions in the anaphora of Apostolic constitutions, VIII, 12, 27 (ca. 380) as it originated from the Syrian region, probably from Antioch.<sup>1607</sup> These findings give us ample evidence for the insertion of the heavenly hymn by a Mesopotamian Church into its Eucharist which lies in the neighbourhood of the Jewish Congregations. The Jews used these benedictions in their morning prayer. Hence it is believed that it found a smooth passage from the Jewish congregation to the Christian Eucharist as both were conducted in the morning. In the insertion process it was given an introduction with Your Majesty ... followed by the original primitive text without any modification i.e., Glory to You, the Name ... We have still remnants for the Qaddysh segment in both AM and Peter III.<sup>1608</sup> For example in both AM and Peter III Anaphoras section (a) the primitive element we find being addressed to the 'divine name' whereas in the (b) next section we find the introduction to the Qaddysh is 'My Lord' without exception. Today scholars agree upon the date of this insertion as a period earlier than ca. 340, a period which marked the beginning of forty years of

<sup>1605</sup>Cf. A. Baumstark, Trishagion and Qeduscha, in: JLW 3 (1923), 18-32.

<sup>1606</sup>Although it played a crucial role in the liturgical reforms of mainstream Christian bodies the absence of benedictions may compel us to think in terms of Baumstark (cf. P. F. Bradshaw, *Reconstructing early Christian worship*, London 2009, 47-51).

<sup>1607</sup>Cf. Bradshaw, *The search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, Oxford 2002, 85-87.

<sup>1608</sup>Cf. Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 18.

fierce persecution upon the Persian Church and as a result, the severance of the ecclesial ties linking Persian East and the Roman West.

### b. Various Other Modifications

Let us also make a study on the modifications that occurred to the opening sentence. One may ask why there was a shift from ‘Glory to you, the Name ...’ to ‘Worthy of glory from every mouth and of thanksgiving ....’ The only reason and answer which can be given for these later modifications is the thrust which is caused by the later new addition of a neotestamentarian Hosanna and Benedictus adopting from Ps. 118, 25-26 and Ezekiel 3, 12 besides Isaiah 6, 3. In all its probability it might have been forced to imitate the liturgy of St. James<sup>1609</sup> which was in proliferation and diffusion in Jerusalem and which gave thrust to the singing of hymn by a journeying Church. This thrust and finding of a new meaning might have given further impetus to new adjustment and modification in a new proper context of the Qaddysh. Consequently the influence of the new texts namely Ps 118 and Ez 3 together with Is 6, 3 must have paved the way for the modifications we find in the opening sentence. In order to get further clarity on this issue it is enough to go through the difference between the anaphora of AM and Peter III. It is clear for us that Hosanna-Benedictus is a later addition from the fact that both anaphoras “patch a new context into it in different, awkward and clearly artificial way.”<sup>1610</sup> For example when Peter III has interrupted the Isaian text by inserting ‘so that we may become worthy ...’ in order to form it into a cohesive text, AM modified by adding two sentences to it and acclimatized it to the present context namely, one at the beginning, ‘Worthy of glory from every mouth and of thanksgiving from every tongue, the adorable ... and the second sentence ‘with these heavenly hosts, even we, give you thanks.’ This addition must be a later one in all probability to the anaphora of AM.

According to the modern scholarship it must have taken place after the time of Narsai († 502). To be precise it took place through the mediation of Mar Aba who was sent by the hierarchy of the Church of the East to update the liturgy of the Church in agreement with the liturgical developments which took place in Western Christianity. Accordingly Mar Aba went to the Byzantine Metropoles in the year 530 A. D., and edited two additional anaphoras one in honour of Theodore the Interpreter (of Mopsuestia), and the other in honour of the Patriarch Nestorius.<sup>1611</sup> Consequently these two anaphoras which are structured in the form of the Liturgy of St. James have both the Sanctus with the addition of Hosanna-Benedictus. So we can assume that it might be Mar Aba himself who through a patchwork of the text added it to the so called Qaddysh of AM anaphora.<sup>1612</sup> Some scholars who were not aware of the distinctive character of these two segments (namely Qaddysh and Hosanna - Benedictus) of the Sanctus and the different instances of their insertion were misled in

<sup>1609</sup>The liturgy of St. James is considered as the oldest among the surviving liturgies developed for general use in the Church. Date of its origin is disputed among authorities as some hold for 60 A. D. close to the time of composition of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, some others hold fourth century for its officially recognized form (cf. J. D. Witvliet, *The Anaphora of St. James*, in: Paul F. Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, Collegeville 1997, 152-72).

<sup>1610</sup>Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 19.

<sup>1611</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 21.

<sup>1612</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 19.

their conclusion. Thus a scholar called Gelston who based his theory on Macomber's analysis reached to a different conclusion: "The most significant point indeed to emerge from a comparison of Section C (Qaddysh ... Hosanna ... Benedictus) with its counterpart in Sharar is the fact that both anaphoras contain the Sanctus, which creates a presumption in favour of its having belonged to the original common core."<sup>1613</sup> He arrived at such a conclusion precisely due to the lack of information regarding a later insertion. So if we get back once again, to the similarity of all the three liturgical prayers for the Qaddysh which is in section I.a i. e., for the veterotestamentarian Trisagion but without the neotestamentarian Hosanna-Benedictus pericope i.e., Section I.c., (Holy, Holy, Holy, God Almighty, heaven and earth are full of his glory; you are blessed forever. Amen) found in AM, Peter III and the anaphora in the Apostolic Constitutions VIII, we will understand clearly that the second element was inserted into it in a later period. Thus the argument raised by Gelston for a common core theory basing on Qaddysh ... Hosanna ... Benedictus is unsubstantiated. If we want to have further proof for the lack of concreteness in the argument of Gelston it is enough to go back once again to *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII (380 A. D.), where we do not find any trace of Hosanna-Benedictus scheme and at the same time which does not appear in the *Exposition of mysteries* which Narsai († 502) describes in his Memra 17.<sup>1614</sup> The absence of it in the works of Narsai reveals that it was written after the work of Narsai. Once this Hosanna-Benedictus pericope made its way from AM to Sharar or Peter III anaphora or to the Maronite tradition they made the needed adjustment to the original text and thus we have two differently patched anaphoras adjusted on its own to adapt to the needs of the times. This is the only logical reason and answer we can find and give for the different elements found in these two anaphoras in Section I: b, c and cc. But Section II remained almost intact without change from its inception. And finally in the third section the Euclesis of AM is in close bond with the Maranatha form of 1 Corinthians 16, 22 and *Didache* 10 where it is used only in relation to Eucharist. AM invokes Holy Spirit to turn the wine and blood of Christ into the food for the new life in the kingdom of heaven. If we check the manuscript of Peter III it remains very close to the text of AM. Although we detect two separate moments in history regarding the introduction of Isaian Qaddysh from that of Euclesis, we assume that they might have taken place during the second stratum namely before 340 A. D., in the development of AM anaphora. It must be acknowledged that although this second phase of addition took place during a vicious time of persecution, the Persian Church was faithful to hold the basic elements of church teaching and apostolic originality while adapting itself magnificently to the development of theology.

### iii. The Third Stratum

Let us also engage ourselves with the last insertion which has taken place in the text of AM. With this third stratum scholar Jammo means the final product and the accepted and well-known text of AM which we find in all the ancient manuscript

<sup>1613</sup>A. Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*, Oxford 1992, 88.

<sup>1614</sup>Cf. Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 21.

rituals edited critically by W. Macomber in 1964.<sup>1615</sup> According to S. Y. Jammo this is the end product of the Mesopotamian anaphora and according to him when half of the portion was excellently done half of it lacked its brilliance. In this third stratum, one can discern two instances of development. When the first of these treats with the formulation of an explicit connection between the Eucharistic act of the Church and Last Supper of the Lord the second deals with the addition of the Hosanna-Benedictus segment to the Sanctus in the first section of the anaphora and the textual adjustment that required.<sup>1616</sup> Thus the work of insertion which took place in the second stratum was perfected in the third phase. Under this title we will be studying only the first element namely the formulation of an explicit connection between the Eucharistic act of the Church and Last Supper of the Lord as we have already discussed the second one under the previous title.

#### a. AM and Last Supper

The third section namely the third stratum has puzzled and confused many scholars as it is the most complicated one. We find the reason for this complication as two-fold. Both these two-fold complications can be comprised into one apprehension: “to confirm and expand the connection between the act of the Church and the Last Supper i.e., to show that the Church is doing as Christ ordered her to do: not only to commemorate a historic Christ, but also to offer *hic et nunc* His sacrifice.”<sup>1617</sup> Thus the reviser has found an apt opportunity to insert the preferred words in Section 3 (paragraph: f) at the beginning where there is a mention of ‘commemoration of Christ and his Church,’ and thus by expanding the commemoration to embrace “the body and blood of your Christ which we offer to you upon your pure and holy altar as you have taught us”<sup>1618</sup> (paragraph: g). The reviser had no biblical or liturgical intention in his mind rather he wished to remember the Person of Christ in the Eucharist recalling the events of saving passion, death and resurrection. Yarnold observes that

“AM though without an Institution Narrative in the earliest MS, still has a prayer of thanksgiving commemorating the Lord’s incarnation and saving work, followed by a prayer for the dead ‘who were pleasing in their sight, in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ, which we offer to you on the pure and holy altar, as you taught us ...’”<sup>1619</sup>

Another difficulty we come across in the third section is the interpolation of the phrase, ‘taught us in his holy gospel all the purity and holiness’ (paragraph: h). This interpolation has given further difficulty to the reader to grasp the meaning and exactness of the sentences forth coming. The only possible justification we can give in this case is that the reviser does not wish to forego anything from the original commemorative pericope and thus he tries to patch the wedged segment and relocates it at the end of the following paragraph. The intention of the reviser is clear for us as he wants to introduce the next event Epiclesis by commemorating the act of the Church and the institution by Christ. Due to this recalling of the act of the Church and

<sup>1615</sup>Cf. W. Macomber, *The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, in: OCP 32 (1966), 335-71 (cf. Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 24).

<sup>1616</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 24.

<sup>1617</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1618</sup>*Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>1619</sup>E. Yarnold, *Anaphoras without Institution Narratives?*, in: E. A. Livingstone, *StPatr* 30, Leuven 1997, 401.

the institution by Christ from the past one may not observe any verb in the present tense.

### b. Consequence of the Interpolation

This patching procedure and the newly composed text of particular anamnesis have given ample problems regarding the diptychs segment and to the quasi-anamnesis. With regard to the diptychs they were cut off from the Memorial segment and patched into the following Supplication for Peace. This has caused the distortion of both paragraphs, from which they were cut off and to which they were intercalated. It has also caused the loss of original direction and consequently created sufficient confusion changing the addressee from the Father ('of your Christ') to the Son ('as you have taught us') and once again back to Father (refer Section III f, g, h). As we have already mentioned there were numerous studies conducted in this century on the problem of edition and the confusion. Thus through the excision of the later added texts, the scholars were able to lead us to the original text of the AM. Among them the scholar Jammo has helped us to understand this text without confusion and disorder in its original purity and has given us a fluent formulation of the original diptychs:

“Lord, in your manifold and ineffable mercies, make, in the commemoration of Your Christ, a gracious remembrance for all the upright and just fathers who did please you, the prophets and apostles, the martyrs and confessors, the bishops, the priests, and the deacons, and of all the children of the holy Catholic Church who have been signed with the sign of holy baptism.”<sup>1620</sup>

The second confusion with which we have to occupy is the problem of quasi-anamnesis which has taken place due to interpolation. The reason of the new addition, namely the new paragraph (j), is due to the inadequacy of the expression which the reviser had in his mind. Although his intention was to give a good connection to the act of the Church, to the prototype namely that which is originated from the Lord, it has created enough weaknesses due to his particular way of connecting it. Besides although it tried to serve as a linkage between the Last Supper and the Eucharist with genuine and brilliant eucharistical elements, it has failed to bring out the connection between both. Thus we find them as constructed with verbs without a clear order. Thus the reviser after stating the reception in the text, ‘by tradition the example (tupsa = form, model) which is from you,’ he tries to insert a few words like, ‘rejoicing, glorifying, magnifying, commemorating, praising, performing without any clear arrangement. This makes the text again unclear. Due to this adverbial use of the verb the reader gets confused whether the intention of the reviser is to connect the quasi-anamnesis with the following Eucharist or to initiate the Eucharist proper. If the reviser had intended to initiate the faithful to the Eucharist then he should have used the verb ‘(and) let come’ in the present tense with the exclusion of the word *waw* (= and) from the inception and thus making the verb ‘let come’ the principal verb of the sentence. Another serious problem we face in this insertion is to find out the addressee namely to whom it is addressed. As it makes a leap from the Father to the Son in the inception and again from the Son to the Father creates difficulty to grasp its sense (from Father to the Son: ‘... we gathered in your name ... have received the example which is from you’; again from Son to the Father: ‘performing the mystery of the passion ... of our

<sup>1620</sup>Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 26.

Lord Jesus Christ.’).<sup>1621</sup> Thus we may say that even if the reviser had a good intention of connecting various elements into one sentence it has given adequate uncertainty for the reader of the text. The only way to get over this difficulty is to know the intention and mind of the reviser.

### c. AM and the Maronite Version

Let us also take up the issues involved in the transmitted text from AM to Peter III or Sharar. Some scholars are of the view that both AM and Peter III have a common source, and to find this common source they suggest to get back to a very ancient period erstwhile to both these anaphoras. Some of them reached such a conclusion due to the presence of an Epiclesis in both texts. From these studies conducted by scholars, we may suppose that the common source had the epiclesis without the introductory prayer and the anaphora of the Apostles added to it at a later period by analogy with the other anaphoras of the same rite. But according to Raes if it was true the introductory prayer should have been a simple one like that of Theodore’s anaphora instead of the complex introductory prayer in AM.<sup>1622</sup> Following this logic he concluded saying that the editor of the Maronite Anaphora might have given up the introductory prayer (prayer of anamnesis) while introducing the Narrative and he might have thought that it was enough to prepare the epiclesis with a triple Kyrie eleison or a triple ‘Hear my prayer’ in the Antiochian way. Consequently according to this scholar it is not the presence of the introductory prayer in AM to be explained rather it is the absence of the introductory prayer in Peter III to be brought under study.<sup>1623</sup> If the Mesopotamian Fathers found it adequate to insert an explicit linkage with the Last Supper by composing a new paragraph for the anamnesis, the later Antiochian Fathers who were close to a theological and liturgical atmosphere of Antioch found it insufficient to express what was intended in an earlier epoch. As before them there remained a collection of anaphoras namely the AM of the Mesopotamian Fathers, various adopted anaphoras, and the rest of the Antiochian anaphoras with Institution Narrative within their text, they sensed the need to update the Mesopotamian anaphora with that of the common pattern of the western anaphora by the insertion of the Institution Narrative. Now the Maronite reviser retouched what had been touched upon by the Mesopotamian reviser with the Institution Narrative (cf. Section III. g). Such an insertion of the Institution Narrative made the anamnesis superfluous. Thus one does not find again an anamnesis in Maronite version. But this does not mean the anamnesis of AM is lacking in the Maronite anaphora rather it is replaced with the Institution Narrative. Hence this absence of an anamnesis in the Maronite version is a clear indication to the prior existence of the Mesopotamian anaphora namely, AM.

### d. Urgent Request for an Anaphora

We may ask further if there were anaphoras already existing with precisely and clearly conceived theological structures why and how did the formulation of such an

---

<sup>1621</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 27.

<sup>1622</sup>Cf. A. Raes, *The Enigma of the Chaldean and Malabar Anaphora of the Apostles*, in: J. Vellian, and A. Raes, ed., *The Malabar Church: Symposium in honour of Rev. Placid J. Podipara*, (OrChrA 186), Rome 1970, 6.

<sup>1623</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 7.

anaphora happen with so much confusion especially from a group of Mesopotamian fathers who knew well the structure of the Aramaic language? One of the probable answers we can give is that this anaphora most probably had been worked in hurriedness in response to an urgent request under pressure. To clarify this element of haste and pressure we may have to go back once again to the historical situation of the Persian Church of the 4<sup>th</sup> century. When the Western Church started enjoying the religious freedom, the Eastern Church started undergoing the existential struggle. The letter from Constantine to the emperor in the East made the situation very vulnerable instead of creating a positive atmosphere for the Christians of the East. The history tells us that the situation of the Christians turned from favourable situation to that of a prey. Although we do not hear any martyrdom till the end of the rule of Pagrasp, due to the contract he entered not to kill the Christians in the month of September and October, it was copious during the time of Shapur II. We hear a fierce attack on Christians until the death of Shapur II starting with the martyrdom of Mar Shim'on Bar Sabba'e († 341), Mar Shahdost († 343) and Mar Barba'Shmin († 346).

It took years to recuperate the loss of the Persian Church. The recuperation was started during the time of Tomarsa (363-371 A. D.), who was elected to the see of Seleucia. He started to rebuild the churches which were destroyed and strengthened the people who were broken. He was followed by Qayyoma (377-399 A. D.), and later by Mar Issac (399-410). From 399 the Mesopotamian Church enjoyed an amount of freedom and good-will. Once again the Persian Church was brought back to its full life through the precious blood of so many martyrs who were murdered and killed due to their faith. At the same time one should recall with gratitude the support and brotherliness shown by the Western Christianity to the Christians in the Persian Empire. The letter written by Constantine to Shapor regarding the protection of the Christians within his empire is an example for this support.<sup>1624</sup> During this time it was also an added benefit for the church of the East the role played by the schools of Nisibis and Edessa in fostering encounter and communion between western and the eastern Christianity. During this time the official Synod known as the Synod of Mar Issac (410 A.D) gave a formal recognition to the Bishop of Seleucia and the Catholicos of the East together with reorganization of ecclesiastic life in line with the western Church especially in matters concerning theological, liturgical and administrative. The ecclesiastical life of Persia was synchronized with that of West due to the letter written by the bishops of Syria and Upper Mesopotamia (who were known as the Western Fathers) to king Yazdagird (399-421 A. D.), on Sassanid throne which had contained the crucial steps to be taken to legislate certain laws for making the churches identical. When this letter was read to the king he commented that "East and West are but one authority in the dominion of my kingdom."<sup>1625</sup> According to scholars the announcement of the emperor was an acknowledgment of the western laws and principles as pertinent to the east too. King Yazdagird took the content of the letter of the Western Fathers optimistically and allowed the Christians to follow the directives which the Western fathers brought to them. Mar Marutha<sup>1626</sup> who was a

<sup>1624</sup>Cf. Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 29 in reference to Eusebius of Caesarea, *Life of Constantine*, IV, 9-13 (cf. PG 20, 1157-1161).

<sup>1625</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 30 referring to J. B. Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale* 19, 1902, 2-4.

<sup>1626</sup>We do not know much about Marutha's home or early life or when he became bishop. He appears to be of considerable culture, well versed in both Greek and Syriac, and with some pretension to be a doctor of medicine. He was used by the emperors Arcadius (395-408) and Theodosius II (408-50) as Constantinople's ambassador to

delegate of the Western Fathers and who carried this letter from the Syrian and Upper Mesopotamian Fathers to the king expresses the love and support he found with the king in the following words: “concerned himself with the restoration of the churches of Christ the Lord, and was assiduous that the laws, divine ordinances, upright and trustworthy canons which had been established in the West by our honoured fathers, the bishops, might also be established in the East, as an edifice of steadfastness and truth for the people of God.”<sup>1627</sup> Thus in the great synod which took place under the patronage of the king in the Cathedral of Seleucia on January 6<sup>th</sup> 410 almost after 85 years of the Nicene Council<sup>1628</sup> they formulated the following as the acts of the Synod:

- a. The Synod accepting the Nicene profession of faith included it in the acts of the Synod. It can be interpreted as a communion of faith with the church universal.
- b. The fathers of the synod after hearing the letter read by Mar Marutha brought from the West approved and signed it as a symbol of canonical unity.
- c. The thirteenth canon of the Synod, which designates the liturgical unity, approved the ordinances and canons which were appropriate to the liturgy and to the Holy Mysteries and to the glorious feasts of our Saviour.

We have a quotation from the Synodicon Orientale from the fathers of the Synod to substantiate the above said factors:

“The western liturgy which Is-haq and Marutha the bishops taught us and all of us saw them celebrating here in the church of Seleucia, henceforth we shall celebrate ourselves in like manner. The deacons in every city shall proclaim the proclamation like this, and the Scriptures shall be read thus, and the pure and holy oblation shall be offered upon one altar in all the churches, and the argument of that (d-haw)<sup>1629</sup> ancient memory shall no longer exist among us. The oblation shall no longer be offered from house to house.”<sup>1630</sup>

Thus with the coming of these bishops from the West, after almost a century of isolation, it gave the Church of the East a new thrust to update her theology, canon-law, and liturgy. The modern study claims that it had taken place not out of any force or threat or compulsion but as a personal willingness and decision from the Church of the East herself. From the above given quotation it is clear that both bishops had celebrated the so-called ‘westernized’<sup>1631</sup> liturgy in the Cathedral of Kokhe which should have included the anaphora of the West. It seems that when Mar Marutha suggested the modification of the text of AM there was resistance from the part of the bishops telling that their text belonged to one of ‘ancient memory.’ Still Mar Isaac was willing to update it after the manner proposed by Mar Marutha. Thus at last it was

---

the Persian king, Yazdagird I (399-421). Probably his first mission was in 399 to represent Arcadius at the accession of Yazdagird to the Persian throne, and his second in 408 to advise Yazdagird of the accession of Theodosius II ... How long the bishop remained in Persia on either occasion is uncertain. He played an active role in the reorganization of the Persian Church (cf. W. S. McCullough, *A Short History of Syriac Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, Chico 1982, 63).

<sup>1627</sup>Cited from Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 30 referring to Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale* 18, 19-22.

<sup>1628</sup>Cf. S. Brock, *Fire from Heaven: Studies in Syriac Theology and Liturgy*, Oxford 2006, 70.

<sup>1629</sup>The word to be translated here as ‘that’ or as ‘it is’ lacks clarity (... *that* ancient memory shall no longer exist among us). The Syriac pronoun ‘*Haw*’ may mean ‘that’ if we place the dot on the top of it and which is considered by Jammo as an error of the copyist and if on the contrary if the dot is placed under the pronoun then making the text to read ‘*Hu*’ meaning ‘it is’ and he considers it as clear as it gives more sense.

<sup>1630</sup>Cited from Jammo, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 31 referring to Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale* 27, 3-11.

<sup>1631</sup>By ‘westernized’ it is meant any indirect contact from the West through the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire (cf. Brock, *Fire from Heaven*, 75).



agreed by the bishops, to use a uniformly modified or so-called 'western' version of their anaphora. This modification took place in a hurried way under some pressure. As when Mar Marutha showed a copy of the modified version of the eastern Anaphora namely AM to the Maronite fathers they were taken up by it and decided to use it as part of their own liturgical patrimony. Later it seems that they modified it with the Institution Narrative. It does not mean that they were completely contented with the new insertion. Therefore again we find the insertions of Hosanna-Benedictus with its introduction and a bit later adding intercessions falling in line with the rest of their Antiochian Anaphoras.<sup>1632</sup>

From the above given observations made on the ancient manuscript we can arrive at certain conclusions regarding the AM that first and foremost it does not depend upon any putative or Urtext or Common Core for its origin. Consequently any attempt to reconstruct hypothetically the missing paragraph or segment would give only a falsification of the text. Secondly it is a Eucharistic prayer contemporary to the apostolic times basing on the same structure of *BH* in its paschal context. Besides the various strata developed in it at various moments in history give clear indication of the development of the Eucharistic euchology in the early liturgy. And above all the use of this Chaldean liturgy which belonged to the apostolic times is a proof to assert the apostolicity of all the churches which uses it still. The study of this anaphora gives a further incentive to make a return to the original stratum of this 'gemma orientale'<sup>1633</sup> [gem or Jewel] and which in turn may be of great help to make an exegetical study of the biblical narrative of Last Supper due to its rapport with the apostolic times and the Jewish formulas of banquet blessings. This is the reason why the Holy See has acknowledged the genuine value of this anaphora or Quddasha of AM. Thus we will make a short study of it from Pneumatological or Philological perspectives and make a consideration of the theological dimensions of the Anaphora of AM from a view basing on its Christology.

### G. Theological Content of AM

One of the important elements to note here is the significant characteristic of Eastern Christianity namely its unity between theology, spirituality and liturgical life. Thus it is impossible to discuss any theme of theology according to Eastern tradition where liturgy has no role. One can rightly say as a summary of Eastern tradition as *lex credendi - lex orandi - lex agendi*. Thus a separation of one from the other may not bring about the expected result. Shevchuk's quotation makes this idea clear when he tells "Liturgy as the communion and experience of Trinitarian life is the source and final test of all theological thought."<sup>1634</sup> Thus through the eastern liturgy which participates or makes possible the participation in the reality of the risen Christ gives rise to or become the source of theology.

<sup>1632</sup>Cf. Jammo, The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, 33.

<sup>1633</sup>Cf. C. Giraud, L'anafora degli Apostoli Addai e Mari: la 'gemma orientale' della Lex orandi, in: *Divinitas* 47 (2004), 107-24.

<sup>1634</sup>Cited from S. Athapilly, The Theological Dimensions of the Anaphora of AM, in: B. Puthur, ed., *Studies on The Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 102 referring to S. Shevchuk, The Identity of Eastern Theology and Denominational Issues, in: *Theologia Bogoslavie* Vol. I (2001), 49.

### i. Theology of AM from a Trinitarian Perspective

To study this and the following topics we have depended upon the Syro-Malabar Qurbana<sup>1635</sup> text which is in use today in Kerala in the Syro-Malabar Church.<sup>1636</sup> The second G'hanta<sup>1637</sup> is a striking prayer addressed to the Holy Trinity<sup>1638</sup> based on the formula of blessing taken from 2 Corinthians 13, 13. In this prayer the Church recalls the salvific presence of the Holy Trinity which is made obtainable and experiential through the second person in the Trinity. This formula of AM gives us a strong evidence of the mystery of the immanent Trinity which is made possible to us through Jesus Christ. The prayer which comes at the outset or just before the second G'hanta asks the people to set their minds on high due to two reasons namely to take part in the heavenly liturgy which takes place before God and to have a foretaste of the eschatological community. The congregation responds to the prayer of the celebrant with the response: 'Towards you, God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, O, glorious King' (in the Malayalam translation adorable king is used instead of glorious). The congregation, by recalling the string of faith shared by the Patriarchs, expresses that they also witness to a living and direct experience and encounter with God, as Patriarchs had, and give expression to the experience which they have by calling the Triune God, the Trinity. Like the angelic band, the congregation sings the hymn 'Sanctus' with three times 'holy.' According to Narsai the hymn with three times 'holy' is a verbal symbolism of the faith in the Triune God.<sup>1639</sup> In the singing of people namely, "one alone is holy, the Father, one alone is holy the Son, one alone is holy the Spirit"<sup>1640</sup> they acknowledge not only three Persons in the Godhead each Person being holy but also recognize the unity or oneness of the Divine nature. This acknowledgement of the people is accentuated by the prayer of supplication (kussapa) during the hymn 'Holy' spoken by the celebrant in a low voice namely, "Holy are you, God; you alone are the Father of truth from whom is all fatherhood in heaven and on earth. Holy are you, eternal Son, through whom all things were made. Holy are you, Holy Spirit, the Being by whom all things are sanctified."<sup>1641</sup> If we go through the 'Sanctus hymn' which is first intoned by the celebrant and then taken up by the congregation, we will understand that it is "comprised of the Pauline theology of the Fatherhood of the Father (Eph 3, 15), the Johannine as well as Pauline theology of

<sup>1635</sup>Qurbana in East Syriac means the holy offering or holy Sacrifice. The term refers to the Eucharist celebrated according to the East Syrian and West Syrian traditions of Syriac Christianity. The East Syriac word Qurbana is cognate with the Hebrew word Korban (קרבן). In Kerala the term Qurbana has become very prevalent that many denominations use it with the same meaning (cf. T. Kodiyan, Qurbana, Die Heilige Liturgie: katholischer Thomas-Christen, Innsbruck 1963, 3).

<sup>1636</sup>Cf. The Syro-Malabar Qurbana, The Order of Raza, Ernakulam-Thamarassery 1989.

<sup>1637</sup>While G'hanta (inclined, bowed, bent) refers to the posture, gehanta prayers are normally recited in a low tone and this is the hallmark of prayers of inclination from all liturgical traditions. G'hanta is four long prayers within the Eucharistic prayer of Addai and Mari. They are considered by many scholars to be the closest forms of prayer to the Jewish prayers over the meals. In the SMC Qurbana there are four G'hanta prayers recited one after another by the celebrating priest as the Eucharistic prayer and great thanksgiving. In the Syro-Malabar Qurbana the third G'hanta is consisted of the dominical words (cf. N. V. Russo, The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: Critique of the Critiques, Minnesota 2010, 40 in reference to R. P. Smith, A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, Oxford 1903, 62A).

<sup>1638</sup>Cf. The Syro-Malabar Qurbana, 46.

<sup>1639</sup>Cf. R. H. Connolly, Liturgical Homilies of Narsai: Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristical Literature, Vol. VIII/1, Cambridge 1909, 13.

<sup>1640</sup>The Syro-Malabar Qurbana, 53.

<sup>1641</sup>Ibid., 48.

creation through the Son (Jn 1, 3; Col 1, 15; Heb 1, 2) and the purification and sanctification as the property of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>1642</sup> The present Syro-Malabar Liturgy pursuant to the Anaphora of AM has four G’hanta prayers. The Anaphora according to the Mar Esa’ya Text begins with thanking God the Father in the first G’hanta for His magnificent graces bestowed upon the mankind. The celebrant takes the initiative to thank God in the following words: “Lord our God, we thank you for the abundant graces you have showered upon us. For, though we are sinful and weak, through your infinite mercy, you have made us worthy to be ministers of the sacred mysteries of the Body and Blood of Your Anointed One ...”<sup>1643</sup> This thanksgiving prayer which comes in the first part of the G’hanta shows clearly that it is addressed to the Father (‘Your Christ’) and at the same time recollects the Father’s act of sending the Son as His Christ. Thus in the first G’hanta the thrust is given to the initiative taken by the Father (Jn 3, 16-17) and it entails the pre-existence of the Son. There is also a reference to the Christian priesthood in this first prayer in line with Heb 5, 4. God in His infinite mercy calls and designates and makes someone worthy to be His priest. Thus priesthood is neither an office which one can take upon oneself nor a community can confer it to someone rather it is a call and ordination by God’s grace to be the ministers of the Body and Blood of Christ. In the same G’hanta the celebrant comes to the awareness together with the congregation that the Father has not only anointed (Acts 10, 38) and sent the Son (Jn 3, 16; Gal 4, 4) but has also given us the great gift of the celebration and administration of the sacraments, in which the believing community is entitled to celebrate the Christ event. In the words of liturgist our awareness of God’s gift is strengthened who tells that “the celebration of the Qurbana (Eucharist) in terms of the Mystery of Christ’s Body and Blood is here affirmed as the greatest gift and the embodiment of all God’s merciful deed to us.”<sup>1644</sup> Thus the celebrant together with the congregation not only commemorates, in the first G’hanta prayer, the initiative act of Father in sending the Son for the salvation of the mankind but also realizes it as the Father’s everlasting gift to the humanity. Thus AM realizes the Father as the initiator and ultimate author of both these gifts. This G’hanta is concluded with a doxology with praise and honour, worship and thanksgiving, indicating that for everything we are indebted to the Father. As this G’hanta focuses itself on praise and thanksgiving it clarifies well the meaning, nature and purpose of the word eucharistia.

## ii. Christology of AM

In our study it is very essential to know the approach and position of AM on the person of Christ. If the first and second G’hanta prayers are full of praise, honour, worship and thanksgiving oriented towards the Triune God and Holy Spirit respectively, the third one is an exclusive Christological text. The present text i.e., the third G’hanta is divided into two parts of which the first while focuses on the incarnation and the personality of Christ (ontological Christology) the second expounds on the upshot of His redemptive work (soteriology). While giving clarity to

<sup>1642</sup>Athapilly, *The Theological Dimensions of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 106.

<sup>1643</sup>The Syro-Malabar Qurbana, 42.

<sup>1644</sup>T. Elavanal, *The Memorial Celebration: A Theological Study of the Anaphora of the Apostles Mar Addai And Mari*, Alwaye 1989, 80.

the first part AM is abundantly rich with Scriptural quotations. It says the Word came down from the Father's bosom (Jn 1, 18) as His image (Col 1, 15; Heb 1, 3) emptying Himself at the Incarnation and became a servant (Phil 2, 6-8). For it prays in the following words:

“Together with the heavenly hosts we give you thanks. We glorify and bless God the Word, hidden offspring from your bosom. He is your own likeness and splendour and the Image of Your own Being. Setting aside His equality with You, He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant. Born of a woman He became a complete human being with a rational, intelligent, and immortal soul, and a mortal body. He subjected Himself to the law, in order to redeem those who were under the law. He left for us the memorial of our salvation, this redemptive mystery, which we now offer before you.”<sup>1645</sup>

This above given prayer gives us an idea of age old heresies which the Persian Church was combating and can know that AM is highly theological and Christological affirming both His divine and human natures. By affirming that He is rational AM is denouncing the heresy of Apollinarism which disfigured the human nature by placing the Logos in the place of the higher or rational part of the soul in Christ. Thus the 3<sup>rd</sup> G'hanta of AM as it combats against the monophysitic tendencies (only one simple nature in Christ) it fights also against the miaphysitic tendencies (held by Coptics as Jesus is both true man and true God and His two natures form into one composite nature 'φύσις' in Christ). Thus we can say the anaphora of AM has an explicit Christological position which is based on the Antiochian model of Logos-Anthropos (Word-Man) in against the extreme Alexandrian model of Logos-Sarx (Word-flesh) Christology. Consequently it tries to safeguard the integrity of the person of Christ in two natures. As a result the tone of AM's third G'hanta is in perfect harmony with the Chalcedonian council (451) which spoke against Apollinarism and affirmed that Christ is truly God and truly man composed of rational soul and body.

Syro-Malabar Qurbana text also affirms what is taught by the Chalcedonian Council of 451 namely Christ is perfect God (... we glorify and bless God the Word, hidden offspring from Your bosom) and He is perfect Man (He became a complete human being) with a rational, intelligent, and immortal soul, and a mortal body.<sup>1646</sup> Besides the phrase 'born of a Woman' in the 3<sup>rd</sup> G'hanta (Gal 4, 4) gives it added force in affirming the full humanity of Christ. The first part comes to a conclusion by making a mention of the mystery with the prayer 'we offer before you (the Father).'<sup>1647</sup> It is an indication that the sacrifice is offered to the Father through the Son. Thus the conclusion of the first part of the 3<sup>rd</sup> G'hanta is a clear assertion of the ontological nature of the second person of Trinity. The author of the third G'hanta in AM is very clear about the person and nature of Christ. From the various words which the author of it applies here, it is clear that he has a holistic perception of the person of Christ. He uses terms like God the Word, offspring from the Father's bosom, likeness, splendour and image of the Father, self-emptying (*kenosis*), likeness of servant, perfectly human with a rational soul and a mortal body. Therefore the author of this anaphora asserts without the slightest doubt that Jesus is both God and Man as in two-

<sup>1645</sup>The Syro-Malabar Qurbana, 49.

<sup>1646</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1647</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

stage Christology assumed by Ignatius of Antioch taken from Rom 1, 3f.<sup>1648</sup> After this section comes the Institution Narrative in the Syro-Malabar text, and thereafter the second part of the third G'hanta. The second part of the G'hanta concentrates on the redemptive work of Christ. Therefore this part of the anaphora belongs to the Christology that is purely functional (Soteriology) and which focuses on Christ as redeemer and the effects that His death, crucifixion and resurrection that has brought to us.

We may observe one particular thing regarding the terminology used by the Malayalee liturgist to distinguish between Jesus and Trinity. He has selected a familiar pronoun namely 'nee' (= you) and 'ninte' (= your) for Jesus Christ which the Keralites use only for so cordial a person, and has chosen a reverential plural form 'angu' (= deutsch Sie / Italian Lei/ French Vous) for the Trinity. This form is very consistent and we find it all throughout in the Malayalam Qurbana.<sup>1649</sup> It does not mean that Trinity is an unfamiliar concept to the Syro-Malabar Church but to emphasize the fact that in and through the Incarnation, God the Son has become one of us (Immanuel = God with us Mt 1, 23) one among us, a brother to every one of us and with us (Heb 2, 16-17; 4, 15). And it is through His initiative that we come to know the so far hidden God, His Father (Jn 1, 18). Therefore by calling him 'nee' the Syro-Malabar family acknowledges that He is so close and intimate to that family and one among the family members. All the more they find a reason for this affinity with the second Person of Trinity as He took initiative to familiarize the family members with His Father. In this second part the text realizes that it is through His incarnation (assumed our human nature) the effects of the redemptive work is made accessible to the mankind namely vivification and exaltation. Vivification and exaltation are the entry point through which the incarnated One deify us (the idea of *theosis*: Rom 8, 29; Heb 12, 10; 2 Cor 8, 9 etc.). It is a preferred theme of the Eastern Church to speak of deification as the very essence of salvation. In the works of Ephraim the Syrian and Aphrahat and many other church Fathers we come across this theme of deification. For in the works of Ephraim we hear him speaking that "He gave us divinity, we gave Him humanity."<sup>1650</sup> Aphrahat in his *Select Demonstrations* speak that "the Great and honourable name of Godhead He withheld not from His righteous ones."<sup>1651</sup> These texts are clear assertions about Christ as both God and Man. As God he could raise us to the level of God and by assuming He could exalt us from our sinful state of being. Through the prayers of the second part of the third G'hanta we come across the thrust of the redemptive work namely the healing aspect of salvation which is made accessible to the fallen mankind and which in the ultimate run brought us out from death of body and soul.

The third prayer of the anaphora of AM gives stress to a twofold elevation of mankind by Christ i.e., first through His incarnation and second through His expiatory death and resurrection. These two Christ-events are great moments of a double grace

<sup>1648</sup>Cf. Athapilly, *The Theological Dimensions of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 109 in reference to Ignatius of Antioch, *Letter to the Ephesians*, 7, 2.

<sup>1649</sup>Here we have quoted this interesting division not to introduce two adorations one belonging to the Humanity and the other to Divinity but only to show our familiarity with the Person of Christ.

<sup>1650</sup>Cited from S. Brock (trans.), *St. Ephrem the Syrian: Hymns on Paradise*, Crestwood 1990, 73 referring to St. Ephrem.

<sup>1651</sup>Aphrahat, *Select Demonstrations* 17: Of Christ the Son of God 5, 1051; <http://www.sacred-texts.com/chr/ecf/213/2130285.htm>. Date of Access: 30. 10. 2012.

for the fallen humanity. “Raising us who are fallen, vivification of our mortality, forgiveness of our sins and justification of our sinfulness are mentioned as the effects of Christ’s redemptive work.”<sup>1652</sup> According to AM not only Christ redeems us but he also enlightens us for He is true light (Jn 1, 9). The author of AM gives stress to the defeat of our enemies which is made possible through the victory of the Lord (Col 1, 13; 1 Cor 15, 54-57; Heb 2, 14-15). From here the anaphora proceeds to the realm of grace. For the celebrant prays: “O Lord, by Your Grace, you have made me worthy of your Body and Blood. So may I come before you with confidence on the day of judgement.”<sup>1653</sup> This is also an indication that the Lord is the right Judge (Acts 10, 42) and thus affirms that He is on par with God. For Bible teaches that God is the Judge (Ps 7, 8, 11; 9, 7; 50, 6; Is 43, 25). Although He is the right Judge He is also merciful. Thus the celebrant even though unworthy was made worthy to administer and receive the mysteries of Christ’s Body and Blood. This mercy of the Lord propels the celebrant to hope and pray with confidence to appear before him when he would come as the Judge. Consequently the liturgy which takes place now on earth is linked with the future eschatological salvation. The same hope reappears when the celebrant recites the prayer after having received the communion, “Let not O Lord, your Body be to me unto condemnation but unto the remission of debts and the forgiveness of sins.”<sup>1654</sup> Nevertheless AM manifests anxiety of the possibility of condemnation if not received the mysteries in a worthy manner (1 Cor 11, 27).

The various titles which we come across in the third G’hanta exhibits very clearly that Christ is God. Titles like Lord, the Judge, the image of God’s being, His equality with God and *kenosis* in the incarnation, establish without the least trace of doubt and affirm that He is God like the other persons of Trinity. There are also places in the third and fourth G’hanta where the term ‘God’ is used unambiguously and explicitly for Christ. The third G’hanta initiates its section with the address ‘we glorify and bless God the Word.’<sup>1655</sup> This addressing is an ample proof for a ‘Descending Christology’ which is a trade mark of the Alexandrian Christology. It says very clearly that Word was with God and the same Word who is God took the form of a human being in incarnation. This theology which represents from above is typical of Alexandrian theology. Thus we may hesitate what the Antiochian Liturgist wishes to communicate. It is clear from the above mentioned ‘phrase’ that he does not side with any particular Christological position rather he wants to teach the right Christology namely that Jesus is God the Word himself and he came to the world to save the humanity. In the concluding section we come across terms like ‘our Lord and our God’ the same terms employed by the founder of the Syro-Malabar Church (Jn 20, 28). Although the above mentioned phrase we miss in the Malayalam text in the third G’hanta (second part) we find it in the fourth G’hanta. Nevertheless we find the same expressions in both G’hantas in the English version of the Raza<sup>1656</sup> and in the Mar Esa’ya text. The anaphora of AM recognizes Jesus as the only unique mediator of salvation for the whole world. The prayer used in the anaphora besides explicitly acknowledging the uniqueness of Christ, it also upholds Christ as the only perfect and

<sup>1652</sup>Athapilly, The Theological Dimensions of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 110-11.

<sup>1653</sup>Syro-Malabar Qurbana, 53.

<sup>1654</sup>Ibid., 70.

<sup>1655</sup>Cf. Syro-Malabar Qurbana, 49.

<sup>1656</sup>It means the solemn celebration of the Holy Qurbana.

definitive revelation of the Father.<sup>1657</sup> It is also a favourite topic of the Anaphora of AM to acknowledge Christ as the only Son and God as the only Father.<sup>1658</sup> The requests which are uttered in the form of prayers and petitions exhibit clearly the concern of the anaphora that the world may know that it is the Father of Jesus Christ who is the true God. It can give us two conclusions namely that Jesus Christ has the true God as his Father and he is the Son of God. The second plea we hear from the AM anaphora is that ‘that the world may also know that God has sent him to bring salvation.’<sup>1659</sup> Thus the anaphora acknowledges him as the only unique and universal Saviour.

As a conclusion we may say that AM is a blend of both Antiochian and Alexandrian Christology which acknowledges and affirms that Christ is perfect human and Perfect God. Some scholars are of the opinion that the only possible explanation for such a composition and Christology is perhaps due to a previous origin. It might mean that the liturgy of AM belonged to a period prior to that of the Christological tensions of 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1660</sup> According to many scholars, AM is influenced mostly by the Jerusalem community which was Judeo-Christian and therefore it is patterned on the *BH* of Jewish Liturgy. T. Mannoramparambil detects three pericopes in AM analogous to the Jewish *BH*. G. Kombara is of the view that if someone is very particular, that is to say, that they cannot but to categorize the Syro-Malabar liturgy as belonging to a particular group, then they could incorporate into that of Alexandrian Christology.<sup>1661</sup> Today there is a general consensus that the prayers in AM are mostly addressed to the second person of Trinity. We cannot say for certain that it has happened as an after-effect of the Christological controversies of the fourth century. As many Scholars point the origin of AM either to early third century or even before it, we may have to search for its motive of addressing to Christ somewhere else. This Christocentrism may be due to its Judeo-Christian background, so to say, any one from the Judaism had to confess the faith in Christ. The sole condition for the reception of baptism and admittance in the Christian community was to admit Christ as their Saviour (Acts 2, 38; 8, 12, 16; 10, 48; 19, 5).<sup>1662</sup> This gives us more convincing avowal regarding its antiquity.

### iii. Pneumatological Dimension of the AM

As the Father and Son are acknowledged as God in the liturgy of AM so is also the Holy Spirit. In the second G’hanta the opening prayer begins with the acknowledgement of the Trinity: “Lord of all, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit! The adorable name of your most Blessed Trinity is worthy of honour from every mouth, thanksgiving from every tongue, and praise from every creature.”<sup>1663</sup> This is a clear indication that the Holy Spirit is also one of the Persons of the Trinity like the

<sup>1657</sup>Cf. Athapilly, *The Theological Dimensions of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 115.

<sup>1658</sup>Cf. *Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, 54.

<sup>1659</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1660</sup>Cf. G. Kombara, *Response to the Paper of Sebastian Athapilly*, in: B. Puthur, ed., *Studies on the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 134.

<sup>1661</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 136.

<sup>1662</sup>Cf. T. Elavanal, *The Pneumatology of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari Especially in its Epiclesis*, in: B. Puthur, ed., *Studies on the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 146.

<sup>1663</sup>*Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, 48.

other two members in the Holy Trinity. The idea of the Triune God is one of the most favoured themes of Eastern Church. We hear again of the Holy Spirit in the prayer of Epiclesis: “O My Lord, may your Holy Spirit come down or descend on this Qurbana.”<sup>1664</sup> We are not very sure whether it is addressed to the Son or to the Father or to both or to the Spirit Himself. We doubt of its addressee because of its causative nature. In this prayer we do not pray ‘to send’ the Holy Spirit rather we pray ‘to come down’ or ‘to descend.’ In all probability we can conclude that it is addressed to Christ as the pronoun ‘ninte’ (Deutsch: ‘dein’/ Italian: tuo/French: tu/ most cordial form used mostly only among friends) in Syro-Malabar Qurbana is always used for Christ and not for the Father. Thus it can be an indirect way of calling the Spirit to come down. All the more the implied theology is that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ.<sup>1665</sup> Thus we hear ideas like that in the light of the economy of salvation that Christ sends the Spirit (Jn 16, 7) or He pours out the Spirit, or as being promised by Christ comes the Spirit from the Father (Acts 2, 33) or receive Him from the Father (Joel 2, 28). The same idea comes in the Epistle of Tit 3, 6 that the Spirit is poured out through Jesus Christ send by the Father.

But the eastern theology has stressed and defended that Spirit is ultimately from the Father and who is ultimately the single source of the Holy Spirit. Thus in line with the eastern theology we hear referring to Father as the source of the Spirit in all the subsequent parts of the prayer in the Syro-Malabar text: “we will thank and glorify you unceasingly in your Church redeemed by the precious Blood of your Anointed One.”<sup>1666</sup> How can we reconcile these two different ideas that one not accepting the occidental interpretation of *filioque* and at the same time accepting the idea of Spirit coming from the Father. The Syro-Malabar Qurbana, especially its Credo, avoids saying that the Spirit comes from Christ due to its consideration of the three Persons *ad intra*, where as in the Epiclesis it appears as an element of the economy as well as of sanctifying activity as *ad extra*. Therefore it can be interpreted that in the Epiclesis the addressee is the Son. The prayer of Epiclesis found in the Malabar Qurbana upholds that the Holy Spirit was intimately related to the presence of Christ. According to Elavanal it may be due to an influence which came from the early Church in which they considered the Holy Spirit as the inseparable or almost as the Vicar of Christ.<sup>1667</sup> But we should not be hastening to conclude that the idea found in the anaphora is that Christ is Holy Spirit. We know that the Holy Spirit is the third person of the Trinity and Trinity is defined as “three co-equal and co-eternal hypostaseis or Persons sharing the one divine *ousia* or essence.”<sup>1668</sup>

Thus in our endeavour to find out who is the real addressee in this prayer we may be a bit handicapped to know for certain to what extent the Lord is invoked at the epiclesis (to send the Spirit) or his Spirit (to come down). P. Podipara argues that the recipient of the offering must be Christ as first of all the Anaphora is Judeo-Christian in origin and the aim of the author is to make understand the fellow Jewish brethren

<sup>1664</sup>Ibid., 54.

<sup>1665</sup>Cf. T. Mannoramparambil, The Anaphora of Addai and Mari (Malayalam), in: J. Kallarangatt, ed., Paurastya Devasastra Dharsanangal, Kottayam 1997, 347.

<sup>1666</sup>Syro-Malabar Qurbana, 55.

<sup>1667</sup>Cf. Elavanal, The Memorial Celebration, 166.

<sup>1668</sup>G. O’Collins, The Holy Trinity: The State of the Questions, in: S. Davis, et al., ed., The Trinity, Oxford 1999, 9.



that Christ is God.<sup>1669</sup> According to Narsai it can be considered as an invocation addressed to the Spirit Himself to come down and to dwell in the mysteries.<sup>1670</sup> Elevation gives the idea that it is not improper and not unfitting to identify the Spirit of Christ with the Holy Spirit as originally the invocation of the Spirit referred to the Logos.<sup>1671</sup> Some scholars are of the view that the prayer namely the request to dwell on the oblation and to bless and sanctify found in Epiclesis gives us the notion that it is addressed to the Holy Spirit. Besides the activities mentioned in the Epiclesis are those specially reserved to the Holy Spirit. Immediately after the Hymn of 'Holy' (Sanctus) there comes a direct mention of the activities of the three persons of the Trinity. There we find a direct mention of the activity of the Holy Spirit as sanctification.<sup>1672</sup> Another function of the Holy Spirit, in the prayer as belonging to the third person of the Holy Trinity, is the 'hope of resurrection from the dead.'<sup>1673</sup> This portion in the Syro-Malabar Qurbana is an indication to the Pauline theology of Spirit as the Spirit of Resurrection (Rom 8, 11; 1 Cor 6, 14). The four G'hantas of the anaphora of AM are enclosed with praise and thanksgiving in four sections. When the first part raises praise and thanksgiving to God the Father for all the gifts in general and for the priestly ministry in particular the second part is directed to the Triune God for the creation and for the continuing bestowal of grace on humanity. While the third is praise to the Son for His incarnation and redemption, the fourth is to each of the Divine Persons namely to the Father for regarding the world and sending His Son, to the Son for His salvific activities and to the Holy Spirit for the activities of sanctification and the realization of the resurrection of Jesus respectively.<sup>1674</sup> The anaphora of AM is a rich amalgamation of scripture and theology and on the whole it tries to depict all the basic and significant canons of the Catholic faith. Above all AM is a concomitant précis of trinitarian, theological, christological and pneumatological reflections.

#### iv. Mother of God and AM

It may be proper for us to make an exploration into the references on Virgin Mary our Mother in the anaphora of AM. The term 'Mother of God' bring us back to the fifth century commotions and controversies. The term 'Mother of God' does not appear in the original text of AM but later in the sixteenth century the aforesaid title was inserted into the Syro-Malabar text by Bishop Francis Roz the first Latin Bishop of Malabar who fixed the text of the Mass (1599-1624) through an act of interpolation.<sup>1675</sup> It is observed that in the original Esa'ya text there is no mention at all of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Although the Pre-Diamper text mentioned Mary, it only makes reference to 'Mother of Christ.'<sup>1676</sup> Thus the Portuguese-controlled Synod of Diamper suspecting this title namely 'Mother of Christ' to be an element of

<sup>1669</sup>Cf. P. Podipara, *The East Syriac Liturgy*, in: G. Vavanikunnel, ed., *A Study on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, Changanacherry 1976, 152.

<sup>1670</sup>Cf. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Hom. 17, 20 in reference to the homilies of Narsai.

<sup>1671</sup>Cf. Elavanal, *The Memorial Celebration*, 165.

<sup>1672</sup>Cf. *Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, 48.

<sup>1673</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 55.

<sup>1674</sup>Cf. V. Pathikulangara, *Resurrection, Life and Renewal: A Theological Study of the Liturgical Celebrations of the Great Saturday and the Sunday of Resurrection in the Chaldeo-Indian Church*, Bangalore 1982, 234.

<sup>1675</sup>Cf. Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 141.

<sup>1676</sup>Cf. Mannorampambal, *The Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 339.

Nestorianism altered it to ‘Mother of God.’<sup>1677</sup> But we cannot completely agree with this argument as Mary is presented in AM as one witnessing the redemption offered by her Son. Thus every time we come around the Eucharistic table in which we repeat the reminiscences of our redemption her presence is also acknowledged and admitted who was also present under the Cross at Calvary and who has also witnessed the redemption of mankind.<sup>1678</sup>

A personal note may be in place here to add that if in the early centuries the term ‘Mother of God’ were applied to Virgin Mary in India perhaps it might have caused to happen exactly what happened in the Egyptian Church. But it is fortunate that the term ‘Mother of God’ entered the Indian soil at a bit later period, at a mature period, when people could distinguish between who is ‘Mother of God’ and other goddesses in the Hindu culture and consequently the Indian Church could save the title from a degenerated ‘mother goddess’ concept. Today people understand very well that the term ‘Mother of God’ is not used in place of goddess concepts or at par with any ‘Hindu goddesses’ rather it is a valid application in order to safeguard the ontological unity in Christ namely the hypostatic union or an application based on the principles of *communicatio idiomatum*. As every church has its infancy stage in its growth in adapting perfectly to the faith so to say as it happened in the case of Egyptian Church so also Indian Church had its infancy and consequently it would have been precarious to adapt a title so early in an Indian church where more than hundreds of goddesses also exist along with our ‘Mother of God.’ The Divine Liturgy of the Indo-Chaldean Church gives us ample proof to its assumption. “Virgin Mary is venerated and praised several times everyday also in her ‘Liturgy of the Hours.’ Moreover, the Wednesdays throughout the year are fully set apart to extol the praises of the Bl. Mother ... She is acknowledged as perfect Virgin and Mother of our God and Lord.”<sup>1679</sup>

Along with this the Saturday devotion to Our Lady on which the church is packed with faithful is another indication how people respect and venerate her as the Mother of God and believe how effective her intercessions are. Thus my personal observation is that it was providential to incorporate this term a bit later to Indian theology. At the same time we must observe the fact that it was not to deny the title Mother of God to Virgin Mary that Syro-Malabar Church adopted that Es’aya text with the title Virgin Mary and the title Mother of Christ but it was, first only as an act of the acceptance of administration, and secondly because of the absence of such a heretical problem existing in the Syro-Malabar Church as somewhere else in the Catholic world. In no way this title has caused any problem to the Syro-Malabar Church from its inception to this very day. Thus we are compelled to say that it was not because of siding with a ‘so-called theological fallacy,’ according to Cyril of Alexandria and in our case according to Bishop Francis Roz, but because of the above reasons namely that of administration and lack of problems in the name of title. SMC believed from its inception that Mary is the mother of God and continue to hold the same faith. If we look into the history of the Syro-Malabar Church it was never divided in the name of this title but only in the name of Latin domination. The Kerala Church venerates (veneration/hyperdouleia) her as the mother of God but not adore

<sup>1677</sup>Cf. J. Thaliath, The Synod of Diamper, Bangalore 1999, 184.

<sup>1678</sup>Cf. T. Fabian, Keralathile Paurasthyasuriyanikkarude Qurbana, (The Qurbana of the east-Syrians of Kerala), Mannanam 1953, 225.

<sup>1679</sup>V. Pathikulangara, Indo-Chaldean Liturgy (OIRS 30), Kottayam 1979, 87.

(adoratio/latreia) her as goddess. Thus it is not totally unreasonable to think that the primitive Malabar Christians might have had a much respected place for Mother of God as they were familiar with her through the Bible. Otherwise she would not have made such a strong appearance later in the life of the Malabar Church. In addition although the Syro-Malabar Church has more than three hundred doctors in various ecclesiastical disciplines trained abroad and inland not even one has taught anything other than the faith of the Catholic Church rather all her priests, bishops and Cardinals have only strengthened the bond of unity among its neighbouring churches and with Rome through their teaching and preaching. No one will ever hear about the element of heresy originated in this Church either in the past or in the present as something originated in any other parts of the world.

Today the difference in name is not a serious concern of the Church as it was in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. In connection with it we ought to remember the agreement which had been arrived between Pope John Paul II and Catholicos Mar Dinkha in the year 1994 regarding the title.<sup>1680</sup> But it is always safe to use the title 'Mother of God' as it affirms and underlines the single divine *hypostasis* or person or forming into one ontological subject namely Christ with perfect unadulterated and unassumed natures. Hence whatever is attributed to the Son of God or God the Son is equally applicable to the counter parts.

#### H. The Christology of Seleucia-Ctesiphon.

Although we discussed already the concept of Christology in the anaphora of the Church of the East it may be proper to discuss whether the Christology of the Church of the East is the same as its anaphora. In our endeavour to know more about the Malabar Church it is a *sine qua non* to get to know the Seleucian Church and its Christology. Although we have already mentioned that the Malabar Church was directly under the Persian Church we cannot omit her indirect relationship with the Seleucian Church and later the direct contact. It was Timothy I who made a compromise with the Persian Church in 8<sup>th</sup> cent., and then on it came under the direct control of the Seleucian Church. Later in the same century (714-728) the Malabar Church was raised to the status of a Metropolitan church and Theodosius in the 9<sup>th</sup> century (852-855) gave this Indian church a kind of exemption demanding at the same time to keep the contact with it through the letter of communion and a collection for the maintenance of the Patriarchal house and both to be sent every sixth year.<sup>1681</sup> From then on the church of India was known as the 'Metropolitan and Gate of All India' and she held the 10<sup>th</sup> place among the other metropolitans which belonged to the Seleucian Church. Mar Jacob the then head of the Indian Church was addressed as the Metropolitan bishop of the See of St. Thomas and of the whole Church of the Christians of India.<sup>1682</sup> To get acquainted with the church of Seleucia, we may also

<sup>1680</sup>“Common Christological Declaration between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East” signed by Pope John Paul II and the Catholicos Mar Dinkha IV on November 11, 1994, in: AAS 87, 1995, 686.

<sup>1681</sup>Cf. G. T. Mackenzie, *Christianity in Travancore*, Trivandrum 1901, 5; Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 52 in reference to Lamy, ed., *Bar Hebraeus, Chronicon Eccl. II*, Louvain 1877, 172.

<sup>1682</sup>Cf. Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 52 in reference to *Vatican Syriac Codex 22* [*Vatican Syriac Codex 22* was written in 1301 A. D., at Cranganore in South India by a deacon named Scaria of Malabar who speaks of Mar Jacob as a Prelate of the Christians of Kerala and as the Metropolitan Bishop of the See of St. Thomas and of the Whole Church of the Christians of India] (cf. Cherian, *A history of Christianity*

make a mention of all the titles attributed to this Church. It is known as the Church of Seleucia or Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Church of the East, the Persian Church (i.e., of the Persian Empire including the Church of Persia proper), the Babylonian Church, the Assyrian Church or even the Nestorian Church as it fostered Nestorianism. The church has its origin from a disciple of Addai called Mari and Addai was sent to Edessa by St Thomas. They claim that their church was visited by St. Peter, St. Thomas and even St. Bartholomeus.<sup>1683</sup> Their liturgy, which is called either East Syrian or is also called Chaldean, had its origin in Edessa, which is said to be received from Addai the disciple of St. Thomas. This may be the only ancient liturgical centre outside the eastern *limes romanus*.

We have discussed above at length the reason which led to the separation from the Antiochian influence or the influence of the Western Fathers. Thus after this separation the head of this church came to be known as Catholicos or Catholicos-Patriarch or Patriarch. We cannot say for certain that when the head of this Church had assumed this title. In the synod of 486 held in Seleucia-Ctesiphon not only they proclaimed themselves as independent and autonomous but also they officially announced their head as Catholicos who had already been given the title ‘Catholicos’ and had been made independent and supreme. They had also adopted the antiochian dyophysite Christological formula of faith and the guidelines set forth by the theology of an antiochian, namely Theodore of Mopsuestia, who is also known as the master of East-Syrian theological school of Edessa-Nisibis. Through this formula they were able to distinguish themselves from the other Antiochian Church which is said to be Monophysite by this time and show its independence.<sup>1684</sup> Shortly this Church came in contact with John of Antioch, who was an Antiochian himself and a friend first of Nestorius and later an associate of Cyril of Alexandria, and became famous through the intermediary role played in the formulation of the Formula of Reunion of Theodoret of Cyrus.

Curtly the anti-Ephesians gained the sympathy of the Seleucian Church. Two personages like Narsai and Bar Souma are said to be instrumental in propagating Nestorianism or Theodorianism among the Seleucians in the 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>1685</sup> Thus the Seleucian Church professed the same faith in Christ as that of Antiochians namely “Christ is one *parsopa* Divine in two *kiane* and two *qnome*.”<sup>1686</sup> So also they believed Mary as the mother of God the Son, the Word. They confessed that “Mary conceived and brought forth Christ who is God the Son united to a man or vice versa.”<sup>1687</sup> They took this Son of God as eternally from God the Father and temporally from Mary. Hence she is Mother of God the Son. They strongly hold that the avoiding of the phrase ‘Mother of God’ is not part of joining the heresy of Nestorianism rather it is to distinguish Mary as not being the ‘Mother of Trinity or any Person of the Trinity.’<sup>1688</sup> We hear them saying that Jesus is the image of the Father born before all ages. They make use of the Theodorian terms when they speak of the person of Jesus that the

---

in Kerala, 137; cf. J. Hilarion, *The Sacraments of the Malabar Church before 1400 A.D.*, in: G. Menacherry, ed., *The Thomapedia*, 115).

<sup>1683</sup>Cf. Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 3.

<sup>1684</sup>Cf. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 85.

<sup>1685</sup>Cf. Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 36.

<sup>1686</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1687</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1688</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 37.

union in power and dignity or in love like that of a minister with his king or like that of husband and wife. Today we know that all these terms were applied by the Antiochian school not to set a limit to his Godhood rather to assert that he was fully Man along with the idea that He is fully God. In their affinity with this school they rejected the Ephesus council together with Cyril and instead venerated Nestorius, Theodore and Diodore. If we go back to the historical record we observe that all these things happened due to a misrepresentation of the historical fact to them. For example the content of Ephesus was not properly presented to them. From two reasons it is said that they remained out of information. First of all as they were isolated from the Roman world, especially from the European West they had no idea what actually made a council ecumenical and thus binding or especially when Papal supremacy was not centralized or again when Papal infallibility was not defined etc. Secondly they considered all the councils as topical, western or eastern, some of which they accepted or did not accepted or rejected.<sup>1689</sup> Consequently they did not accept the councils that followed Ephesus, though they did not reject them.

It may be proper here a treatment of their attitude and mentality towards the Roman Primacy. It was due to the persecution held by the Persian emperors that they had to sever themselves from the Western Antiochian rapport. Thereafter under the Caliphs of Persia they flourished admirably and “the Patriarch exercised jurisdiction in Assyria, Babylonia, Chaldea, Arabia, Cyprus, Media, Khorosan, Merve, both sides of the Persian Gulf, Persia proper, Turkistan, Socotra, China, India, Ceylon ...”<sup>1690</sup> It is noted that in the 15<sup>th</sup> century the Seleucian Church came in contact with the European West through the Crusaders. Although they believed in the divinely instituted primacy of St. Peter, as is clear from the official books such as Pontificals, Divine Office, and Canonical Collections, they came in direct contact with the Western Church and the Seat of St. Peter, only by the end of the Middle Ages. We have references to the position they took regarding the Western Church from the sermons of Narsai. Narsai sings in one of his sermons: “The mother of cities (Rome) approached the prince of the disciples, and he, as in the head fixed in her the eyes of faith.”<sup>1691</sup> This citation is a clear indication to the acknowledgement of the spiritual leadership and headship of Rome. If we refer to the Seleucian Divine Office we see there written: “Rome says the church is built forever, kings and powers shall not prevail against it.”<sup>1692</sup> Or again the Apology of Nestorius (*Tegurtha d’Heraclidis Darmasogaya*), with which the Seleucians were also familiar, speaks in high esteem of the Pope of Rome.<sup>1693</sup> All the more we have reference from Nestorius in the same about the excuse he makes for not having contacted the Pope due to the great prejudice. He says that Pope Celestine was deceived by the sneaky Cyril. We find a number of citations about the primacy of St. Peter in the canon of the Seleucian Church: “the ecumenical synod had decreed that in the whole world there should be four patriarchs ... whose head should be the Roman Patriarch, according to what has been established by the Apostles in their Constitutions ...”<sup>1694</sup> All these references give us the idea that the Seleucians had a strong respect

---

<sup>1689</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 38.

<sup>1690</sup>Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 39.

<sup>1691</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Narsai, *Sermo de Pentecoste*, D. 2.

<sup>1692</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1693</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1694</sup>Cited from Koodapuzha, *Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the Saint Thomas Christians*, 64 referring to *Codex syr. Propaganda Fide* 27, 6: “*Quatuor Patriarchae sint in universo Mundo, quorum Caput sit*

for the primacy of Rome. Otherwise they would not have gladly received the Nicene canons at least in the 7<sup>th</sup> century if not before.<sup>1695</sup> The Patriarchs from various periods namely Patriarch Iso'yahb III (7<sup>th</sup> cent.), Patriarch Timothy I (8<sup>th</sup> cent.), Canonist Elias Damasceno (9<sup>th</sup> cent.), Canonist Ebn-Attib (11<sup>th</sup> cent.), Canonist Abdisho' Sobensis (14<sup>th</sup> cent.), all are unanimous about their opinion: "just as a Patriarch has Juridical power over those who are under him, so the Roman Patriarch has power over all the other Patriarchs, because he holds the place of Simon Kepa in the whole Church."<sup>1696</sup>

When a family member was raised to the Patriarchate at the death of Patriarch Simon bar Mama in the 16<sup>th</sup> century (1551 A. D.) the Seleucians elected a person called Sulaqa and sent to Rome opposing the hereditary Patriarchal succession. In the letter which he carried along with him it is well noted that 'we Nestorians'<sup>1697</sup> and 'humble and sinful children' of the Pope, send Sulaqa to the Pope to be consecrated and made Patriarch. As he reached Rome he makes a profession of faith before Pope saying: "... the first (Council) held at Nicea ... wrote about the Roman Church that it is the seat of Peter, that it is the head of all the Churches ... this faith is being kept up among us ..."<sup>1698</sup> Immediately after introducing Sulaqa to the Pope for the Pallium Cardinal Maffei speaks: "these Nestorians seem to have kept rather the name of the heretic Nestorius than his heresies. For I see nothing in these men that are here which may have any leaning to that sect ..."<sup>1699</sup> All the more Sulaqa himself expresses the mentality of the Seleucian people saying that: "the Seleucians have laid it down that their Patriarch was to be consecrated in Rome if there were not among them at least three Metropolitans who could perform the consecration."<sup>1700</sup> This citation will also make clear that they were having genuine relation and were particular to have it received from Rome. From all these citations given above it is crystal clear, that the Seleucians never considered themselves as separate independent, cut off church from Rome. Thus Pope having heard his catholic faith consecrated him and sent him back to his patriarchy. "... er [Sulaqa] reiste über Jeusalem nach Rom, legte dort am 20. Februar 1553 vor Papst Julius III. das katholische Glaubensbekenntnis ab, wurde zum Patriarchen konsekriert und erhielt das Pallium. Der Papst schickte ihn mit zwei Dominikanern in den Orient zurück, die die Christen in römischen Glauben unterweisen sollten."<sup>1701</sup> Consequently from Sulaqa's time on the Seleucian Patriarchs were always in explicit communion with Rome and obtained confirmation and Pallium from the Pope.

---

*Romanus, juxta decretum quod Apostoli in suis Canonibus statuerunt;*" (cf. J. David, *Antiqua Syro-Chaldaica tradition circa Petri Apostoli Primatum ejusque successorum Romanorum Pontificum Divinum Primatum*, Romae 1870).

<sup>1695</sup>Cf. Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 38.

<sup>1696</sup>Ibid., 40.

<sup>1697</sup>As this term is being regularly used by many historians and theologians misappropriately it became a *sine qua non* for them to use this name to distinguish them from other denominations. It must be said that today the use of the term 'Nestorian' has become more geographical than doctrinal.

<sup>1698</sup>Cited from Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 41.

<sup>1699</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1700</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 42 referring to J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana in qua manuscriptos codices syriacos, Arabicos, Persicos, Turcicos, Hebraicos, Samaritanos, Armenicos, Aethiopicos, Graecos, Aegyptiacos, Ibericos et Malabaricos, ... Bibliothecae Vaticante addictos recensuit*, Vol II, Romae 1913-1928, 523-524.

<sup>1701</sup>W. Baum, *Zeitalter der Osmanen (15. Bis 19. Jahrhundert)*, in: W. Baum and D. W. Winkler, Hg., *Die Apostolische Kirche des Ostens: Geschichte der sogenannten Nestorianer*, Klagenfurt 2000, 101.

In connection with this it may be proper to speak of the Malabar Church in Kerala. Until the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Malabar was under Sulaqa who was later preceded by Abdisho'Aithalla and Denha Simon. Thus it was through them, Malabar Church was also able to profess the same faith of the Catholic Church explicitly and become part of it officially. Denha Simon who was condemned as heretic and schismatic during the time of Synod of Diamper in 1599 was in explicit communion with Rome and was one who got official confirmation and Pallium from Rome. Thus it is clear as daylight the motive behind all that has taken place in the Malabar Church namely for domination over the SMC and conformation of their Catholic faith to the Latin Liturgy and faith. If we follow the casualties that have happened in the SMC closely, one thing becomes clear that the motive of all the missionaries were not that genuine. Thus the accusation that the Christology of Persians contained errors of Nestorianism was only a misnomer although it is not perfect. It was with a motive to close their doors of entrance to the Malabar Church forever and establish the dominion of the Portuguese missionaries evermore.

## I. Analysis of the Anaphora with the Aid of the Bible

As we have a rather wholistic comprehension regarding the content of the AM let us also check how far it is catholic and in line with the true faith of the Church through a study based on Scripture, modern scholars and liturgists. In this section we may be discussing whether it can be a true anaphora without the institution narrative by analyzing it from the Synoptic-Pauline institutional narrative, through checking its validity from a Catholic perspective and in the light of various modern studies so far conducted and finally to the fact whether Syro-Malabar Qurbana is Nestorian or not. Thus let us divide this section into four, namely a study of the validity of the anaphora basing on Scripture, Catholic perspective, modern scholarship and finally to the target of looking into the aspect whether it can be properly called Nestorian and thus condemn the Syro-Malabar Church as Nestorian.

### i. Validity of AM from a Biblical Point of View

Let us start discussing the validity of AM from an analysis of the earlier sources of the church from the inception of the Church. As we find a close rapport between the mind of AM and St. John's narration of the last supper, let us start our research in connection with the 4<sup>th</sup> gospel. Among the gospels only in this 4<sup>th</sup> gospel we do not find any institution of the Eucharist within the narrative of the Last Supper (Joh, 13). The reasons various commentators give is that St. John has left it out deliberately assuming that the evangelist and every Christian of the time knew the account of the Institution of the Eucharist which really belonged with the Last Supper and consequently he opted not to repeat it instead replaced it with the feet washing. According to a modern scholar, P. F. Bradshaw, this argument is a bit limping as it does not treat the problem or issue seriously.<sup>1702</sup> According to this scholar no one other than the authors of Synoptic Gospels and St. Paul had an idea of such an incident which seems to have taken place on the night before Jesus died. And St. Paul does not

<sup>1702</sup>Cf. P. F. Bradshaw, Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper?, in: M. E. Johnson, ed., Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis, Minnesota 2010, 1.

even mention it in the context of a Passover meal as the Synoptics do. So if the argument claims that the author of the fourth Gospel did not know either such a tradition or avoided purposefully the suggestion of Jesus on bread and wine as his body and blood at the Last Supper, we may be doing injustice to the words of Jesus. Hence it compels us to make a search for the avoidance of it in the fourth gospel and a re-seeking for the right motive and explanation for it somewhere in the fourth Gospel. Such an illustration we find in the 6<sup>th</sup> chapter of St. John's Gospel where Jesus feeds the five thousand. The next day Jesus refers back to what had taken place telling that it was not Moses who gave them bread from heaven rather it was his Father who gave them the true bread from heaven. Jesus claims that the bread of God which comes down from heaven gives life to the world (Jn 6, 32-33). Followed by this statement we find a number of claims in the gospel of John made by Jesus. He tells that He is the bread of life ... He is the living bread that came down from heaven ... and the bread that He shall give for the life of the world is His flesh.<sup>1703</sup> Currently several Scholars are of the view that this last verse is an indication of the saying over the bread at the Last Supper. For example, a renowned scholar Brown argues that "it is possible to find the Johannine form of the words of institution."<sup>1704</sup> Some other set of scholars argue that this form could in one way or other be closer to the original as either Hebrew or Aramaic do not have a word for 'body' accordingly they assert that Jesus might have used in its place (body) the Aramaic equivalent namely 'flesh.' Even to this argument there are lots of oppositions as some scholars doubt whether this equivalent is part of the material or an interpolation by a later redactor.<sup>1705</sup> Some guess that this can be a later interpolation due to the fact that 'eating flesh and drinking blood' is a difficult concept to comprehend and an abomination for a Jew.<sup>1706</sup> Consequently Bradshaw asserts that it is a later accretion particularly in a Gentile environment and not formed part of the earlier Jewish stratum. Hence a few scholars hold that it is not in relation to the Last Supper context Jesus associated bread with his flesh rather it must be a primitive tradition which goes hand in hand with the feeding miracle. Thus we may check whether it is a peculiarity of St. John alone or anyone else was also familiar with the existence of a primitive tradition from among the early Christians.

One of the earliest sources namely *Didache* may help us to check this above said element as it is considered as old as the canonical Gospels themselves. The texts of *Didache* namely chapters 9 and 10 contain prayers for the use (*ad usum*) at a Eucharistic meal with concise directions.<sup>1707</sup> The language of *Didache* is precise regarding the elements used namely wine and bread although they do not describe it as either the body and blood or the flesh and blood of Christ. They are considered simply as the spiritual food and drink. Further the text referred here does not give any intimation of an association existing between the meal and the Last Supper or with Jesus' death in any way. In addition the text speaks of Jesus as bringing and giving life, knowledge and eternal life, premises those are also characteristic of the fourth

---

<sup>1703</sup>Cf. Jn 6, 48-51.

<sup>1704</sup>R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, i-xii, Anchor Bible Commentary, New York 1966, 285.

<sup>1705</sup>Cf. J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man*, Rome <sup>2</sup>1978, 93.

<sup>1706</sup>Cf. Bradshaw, *Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper?*, 3.

<sup>1707</sup>Cf. Bradshaw, *Yet Another Explanation of Didache 9-10*, in: *StLi 36* (2006), 124-28.



Gospel.<sup>1708</sup> The studies conducted on the texts of Didache reveal that the particular vocabulary, which it has used namely, ‘fragment,’ when speaking of the bread rather than the normal Greek word ‘loaf,’ has only connection with the various feeding stories referred in the Bible and not with the Last Supper narratives. In the writings of Ignatius of Antioch we find the word ‘Christ’s flesh’ instead of ‘body.’ Again in his letter to the Smyrnaeans 7, 1 he criticizes those who abstained from Eucharist and prayer telling that “they do not confess the Eucharist to be flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, which the Father by his goodness raised up.”<sup>1709</sup> It is found that his choice of the word ‘flesh’ instead of ‘body’ has only affinity with the Fourth Gospel and not with the Synoptics or Paul.

If we refer to the works of Justin the Martyr, who lived in the middle of the second century, namely *First Apology* 66, 2 we hear so:

“not as common bread or common drink do we receive these things; but just as our Saviour Jesus Christ, being incarnate through (the) word of God, took both flesh and blood for our salvation, so too we have been taught that the food over which thanks have been given through (a) word of prayer which is from him, from which our blood and flesh are fed by transformation, is both the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus.”<sup>1710</sup>

Justin also follows the same tradition of the fourth Gospel using ‘flesh’ instead of ‘body’ and more explicitly than Ignatius of Antioch. As we come across the word ‘body’ in the *First Apology* 66, 3 it can be assumed that Justin was also familiar with the Synoptics but does not seem to be using the words of Jesus. With regard to the cup of the Last Supper he uses the words of Jesus ‘Do this in my remembrance’ perhaps basing on the Gospel of Luke but for this also we do not have sufficient proof as belonging to Jesus’ own words. His version is ‘this cup is the new covenant in my blood ...’ Lk 22, 20 instead of ‘This is my blood’ Mt 26, 28. Here also we find certain contradiction as the manuscript version contains a longer version of the Last Supper narrative. In the manuscript tradition which contains the shorter version lacks the command to ‘do this in my remembrance.’ Today many scholars are of the view that it is not from the Gospels that Justin has drawn this saying rather he has depended upon some other sources. They hold that only with such an assumption they can rightly explain the lack of many features of Synoptic Last Supper in Justin’s writings.<sup>1711</sup> For they observe the lack of important Synoptic elements in the work of Justin namely, ‘the night before he died,’ ‘body given for you,’ ‘blood poured out for you,’ or there is no mention of the ‘breaking of the bread.’ The same omission can be noticed in his other chapters also although it is implied there (*First Apology* 65, 67). Nevertheless there is an area which goes hand in hand with the idea, where without the breaking of the bread but at the same time Jesus giving thanks over bread, namely the account of the miraculous feeding of the multitude with loaves and fishes in Jn 6. So we find more rapport in the work of Justin with that of John 6 than with the Synoptics and Paul. Thus we can affirm that he is more familiar with a Johannine version or makes use of a Johannine notion.

<sup>1708</sup>Cf. J. Betz, The Eucharist in the Didache, in: J. A. Draper, ed., The Didache in Modern Research, New York 1996, 244-75.

<sup>1709</sup>Cited from Bradshaw, Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper?, 4 referring to Ignatius of Antioch, letter to the Smyrnaeans, 7, 1.

<sup>1710</sup>Cited from ibid. referring to Justin the Martyr, First Apology, 66, 2.

<sup>1711</sup>Cf. Bradshaw, Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper?, 5.

Irenaeus, another Church father, also does not make mention of the Last Supper or of the imminent passion in the context of the Eucharistic sayings. He simply says that “He took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks, saying, ‘This is my body.’ And similarly the cup which is part of that creation to which we belong, he declared his blood ...”<sup>1712</sup> As in Justin one cannot find any trace of the breaking of the bread in Irenaeus too. Even if we do not find the mention of the word ‘flesh’ in him, the affinity which we find between Irenaeus and Justin compels us to search for their dependence somewhere else. This search will bring us to the catechetical tradition of the Eucharist from which they have drawn and which has come down independently of the Gospel texts and which do not have any link with the narrative of the Last Supper. At the same time Irenaeus seems to be familiar at least with one of the Synoptic text namely Matthean version which refers about the Last Supper. Conversely he makes use of it in an eschatological statement where one drinks in the kingdom and not explicitly to the Eucharist. Thus we find a similarity between both Justin and Irenaeus in presenting the Eucharistic body and blood of Jesus as nourishment for human flesh and which leads to the hope of resurrection to eternal life rather than that which was sacrificed for human salvation.

Irenaeus’ citation follows thus: “as the bread which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity.”<sup>1713</sup> He speaks thus with regard to the change which our body will have: “nourished from the body and blood of the Lord and nourished by the cup which is his blood, and receives increase from the bread which is his body.”<sup>1714</sup> Thus in the teaching of Irenaeus also we find more affinity with St. John than Synoptics or Acts. If we go through the Fathers of the Church from the 1<sup>st</sup> to the third centuries we find further the stress not on the paschal character of the Eucharist rather it is on the eschatological reality. Until the third century it would appear that the New Testament texts did not govern what was said and thought by Christians about the institution of the Eucharist. For example we can say even after the third century also the Liturgical formulae did not always conform to the narrative of the Last Supper documented in the Synoptic Gospels or St. Paul. Thus we observe parallel forms in the development of liturgical celebrations in various communities. For example the form in Justin Martyr differs from that of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus. The latter uses the formulae ‘taking bread, giving thanks to you he said’ without the use of conjunction and without any explicit reference to the supper or to the breaking of the bread. Again the results of the modern study informs us that the words of Jesus which we find in it ‘Take, eat, this is my body that will be broken for you’ is a mixture of Matthean (‘Take, eat this is my body’) and Pauline (1 Corinthians ‘This is my body that is broken for you’ from the manuscripts) element without the command to repeat the action. It is noted that the use of future tense, namely ‘will be given up for you’, which is although rarely used in early Christian circles as the words of Jesus, it appears in Cyprian’s quotation of 1 Cor 11, 24 and ‘will be broken’ and in the institution narrative of the

---

<sup>1712</sup>Cited from Bradshaw, Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper?, 6 referring to Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4. 17. 5.

<sup>1713</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 7 referring to Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, 4. 18. 5.

<sup>1714</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, 5. 2. 3.

Eucharistic prayer cited by Ambrose of Milan in the 4<sup>th</sup> century (*De sacramentis* 4, 21).<sup>1715</sup> Almost the same we can see with regard to the cup. The words over the cup namely ‘this is my blood that is shed for you, when you do this you do my remembrance’ has no parallel in any of the canonical accounts. The Pauline text does not give us any indication regarding whether Jesus distributed the bread and wine to his disciples. If we proceed further with our search into the later centuries we will have different experiences. For example in a document from the mid-fourth century that is the, *Sacramentary of Sarapion*<sup>1716</sup> we find the mention of ‘on the night when Jesus was betrayed, the Supper, and also the breaking of the bread,’ although it does not have a ‘blessing’ or ‘giving thanks’ said by Jesus. Modern research has testified it as the result of a compilation of two sources namely 1 Corinthians 11 and Matthew’s version. There are so many such instances to present as the background for the formulation of the liturgy of Eucharistic prayers. From the observations and studies it is clear that it was not the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper that became instrumental in shaping the formula of what we have today as ‘Jesus’saying’ concerning flesh and blood or body and blood and not even an oral tradition, rather it must be quite some independent tradition or traditions.<sup>1717</sup>

It would be beneficial the consideration of the long history of independent traditions of liturgy celebrated before any official written canonical traditions. We cannot completely discard the theory which states that in every region of the ancient Christian world, there existed traditions of the Last Supper prior to the books of the New Testament which later came to be written down. At the same time every tradition was not current in all regions and consequently the pre-existed tradition would have influenced and affected the writing of NT and thus is a proof for the varied accounts. The pictorial representations of the Eucharist found in the Roman catacombs hinting at the feeding miracle of Jesus and not to the Last Supper may be a good example to authenticate our argument.<sup>1718</sup> When St. Paul writes this account of the death of Jesus ‘on that night he was betrayed’ already there lapsed some twenty years after the death of Jesus. In his account he does not specify that the Supper was a Passover meal. All the more what St. Paul says as ‘received from the Lord’ cannot be considered as an imperative to celebrate Eucharist rather as contemporary Bible scholars argue that it must be some tradition from the Lord<sup>1719</sup> as St. Paul had no direct contact with Jesus (1 Cor 11, 23). Hence the only possibility for his assertion must be some other Christian source which St. Paul must have believed as a trust worthy version of what Jesus actually said and did or perhaps a revelation.

The further analysis of the three texts in the Synoptic Gospels makes clear the thrust of the evangelists. Their thrust lie basically in two fields namely first in the eschatological field and second in relation to the words said over the bread and the cup relating to Jesus’ body and blood. In order to clarify this above mentioned two strands we will rely upon a French scholar, X. Léon-Dufour, who dealt with this idea. According to him the two strands were handed down through two distinct literary

---

<sup>1715</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 9.

<sup>1716</sup>Cf. M. E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis* (OrChrA 249), Rome 1995, 219-33.

<sup>1717</sup>Cf. Bradshaw, *Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper?*, 10-11.

<sup>1718</sup>Cf. G. Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, London 1971, 42-43.

<sup>1719</sup>Cf. Gal 1, 12; 1 Cor 7, 10; cf. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, London 1968, 264-66.

genres although their collocation was made possible by the evangelists themselves. He held that the Eucharistic sayings of Jesus had been interpolated into an earlier narrative of Jesus' last Passover meal with his disciples. He was not the first one to share such a view.<sup>1720</sup> Léon-Dufour reached at such a conclusion through a thorough scrutiny of the Synoptic text. According to him there is an explicit example for this interpolation in the Markan version chapter 14 where the phrase 'as they were eating,' in verses 18 and 22, is repeated. This scholar finds the reason for the repetition of it one after another through an act of interpolation. So also the words which follow (14, 23-24) indicate a perfect interpolation where the disciples are said to have drunk from the cup even before Jesus construes its meaning to the disciples. The same is the case with Lucan version as an effect of interpolation. In Luke not only two cups are mentioned one after another (22, 17, 20) but also we find contradictions in the actions of Jesus. Thus the result of the study made by the above mentioned scholar makes clear that all these happened due to two different stratum. The study conducted by Léon-Dufour is unraveling two strands. His disentanglement of one element from the other brought him to the same hypothetical result namely two complete, logical, and dislocated pericopes one belonging to the Passover meal containing the eschatological statements by Jesus and the other the Eucharistic sayings later interpolated.<sup>1721</sup> Besides, his study gave him the conviction of the concern of the Evangelists. According to him, eschatology is not only the concern of both Mark and Luke but also an imminent betrayal. It is remarkable to note that the separated texts (two strands) make total sense without the body and blood sayings and thus he is convinced of the theory of a secondary insertion. This interpolation has resulted in the repetition of the coming of 'two cups' and the reason for the repeated appearance of various elements. Matthew has solved these difficulties which are found in both Mark and Luke by his editorial hand. So there are not four different versions of the Last Supper tradition containing the sayings of Jesus about body and blood, relying on the studies conducted by this scholar, but only one that is of St. Paul. Consequently Mark who hears from St. Paul is copied by Luke and Matthew in different degrees. This scholar also makes mention of Christian communities, that existed in the second half of the first century, and which did not combine these two strands namely the eschatological version and the Passover meal version.

These research and studies conducted, is an advanced impetus to the question of the origin of Eucharist. In the lives of the first Jewish-Christian sharing of meals was very common. In such meals they experienced the eschatological anticipation of God's kingdom. In passages like Mt 8, 11 and Lk 13, 29 there are references to the experience of the Israelite people participating in the heavenly banquet coming from the four corners of the world. There are also similar experiences from the same folk in their cry *Maranatha* (1 Cor 16, 22; Didache 10, 6; Rev 22, 20). Such coming together was a time of recollection for the new believers of Jesus conducting or hosting meals with tax collectors and sinners. Or again with much importance they remembered the event of miracle of the multiplication of bread. It is not anomalous for us to think that in such gatherings they would have related the bread with His flesh. It is also not improper to find some connection in the sharing of meal by rich and poor. If the *anawim* of Yahweh who had nothing other than bread might have connected this bread

<sup>1720</sup>Cf. R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, Oxford 1963, 265.

<sup>1721</sup>Cf. Bradshaw, *Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper?*, 14.

with His flesh, the bit affluent who conducted meal might have supplied wine also with bread and might have connected or thought of it as simply ‘spiritual food and drink’ as in *Didache* or with ‘body and blood’ of Jesus.<sup>1722</sup> In some Greek speaking areas it seems that they preferred the latter phrase namely ‘body and blood’ than merely food and drink. From the narrations of the Acts of the Apostles it can be presumed that it was not merely once in one year that they celebrated the Passover meal or something connected with the Last Supper rather as often as possible to recall the above mentioned elements in their life and thus to experience the warmth of the new brotherhood.

In a while we find associations of their supper, perhaps by St. Paul himself, with that of the Lord who conducted a meal with his disciples in the night before he died and taking it to the realm of connecting it with the sacrifice of his body and blood and to the new covenant that would be made through his death. Later on, this saying or connections given to it, had some influence not only in the churches founded by St. Paul but even beyond. Afterwards it must have reached St. Mark, the author of the first written Gospel, who was at that time in Rome occupying himself with the compilation of the gospel, might have inserted this new interpretation into his supper narrative, and thus making it a great stimulus to the Christians in Rome, who were undergoing intermittent persecution and who were at the face of constant threat of martyrdom, as a great consolation and strength to receive their spiritual bread and wine as the sacrificed body and blood of Jesus. Thus it can be supposed that this has taken place through the merging of these two traditions namely that of Passover and Eschatology. Although this amalgamation was not wide spread in early Christianity this started entering into her catechesis and liturgy of the churches with the dissemination of New Testament books. Thus in a slow and gradual way its emphasis was shifted from feeding to sacrifice. Thus it can be asserted that AM is one of the anaphoras which really upholds the mind of Jesus and which celebrates according to the true meaning of the gospel. As AM does not have an Institution Narrative, it indicates to the point that it is in line with the mind of gospel of St. John in which more thrust is to the feeding and to the eternal life than to sacrifice. Now having seen the historical settings, origin and the actual motif of the ‘Institution Narrative’ from a scriptural point of view let us evaluate AM from a catholic angle together with the scholar’s view upon it.

## ii. The Catholic Perspective on the Validity and Orthodoxy of AM

The major concern here is to check the orthodoxy of the AM and to know how far it goes in line with the catholic thought. So in order to do it first we will take up the document which speaks about AM and was published in the year 2001 from Vatican and subsequently to various scholars those who speak both for and against. According to R. Taft this document from Vatican is “the most remarkable magisterial document since Vatican II.”<sup>1723</sup>

It was in the year 2001 on October 26 Vatican issued a document titled, ‘*Orientamenti per l’ammissione all’Eucaristia fra la Chiesa caldea e la Chiesa assira*

<sup>1722</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 18.

<sup>1723</sup>R. F. Taft, Mass without the Consecration?: The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East promulgated 26 October 2001, in: *Worship* 77. 6 (2003), 483.

*dell'Oriente*, in *L'osservatore Romano* with an aim to promote Christian Unity. Till the publication of it there were accusations on AM as Nestorian and, as a natural outcome of it, accused all the churches which used AM also as Nestorian. But this document which has approved AM as apostolic by Vatican, has removed so many negative impressions and improper criticisms against it. Up to the twentieth century the Anaphora of AM was merely accused as Nestorian from afar. A special mention is needed here about theologians who initiated the study of this Anaphora. It was Cardinal Walter Kasper the president of the Pontifical Council for the promotion of Christian unity together with Cardinal Ignace Moussa I Daoud, the prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches and Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, the then prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith who is the emeritus Pope Benedict XVI, initiated such a study. They looked mainly into the problem of the validity of the Eucharist celebrated with the anaphora of AM by the Assyrian Church of the East. The reason for such an investigation was due to the absence of an institution narrative in the anaphora of AM. The problem becomes more complicated when we come to know about the presence of an institution narrative in the other two Anaphoras namely that of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. It is no longer a great problem as we understand that these both anaphoras had AM as their formulary and accordingly they could adopt to the needs of the growing Church. A. Gelston states in his work that "AM was one of the sources used in the composition of the other two (anaphora of Theodore and Nestorius) anaphoras."<sup>1724</sup> The Catholic Church, after a detailed study comprised of scholars, recognized the validity of the Assyrian Anaphora without its institution narrative<sup>1725</sup> even if the Catholic Church considers the words of institution so integral and indispensable to Eucharistic prayer. Our main concern here is to go through those various points which are considered as the measuring rod by the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith to consider AM as a valid anaphora even without an Institution Narrative and to clarify whether AM used by Malabar Church is also a rightful liturgy even though the Malabar Anaphora is no more a pure AM anaphora as it had been revised with the institution Narrative taken from the Maronite Anaphora with its introduction by Archbishop Menezes who revised the Malabar liturgy during the time of Diamper Synod and the G'hanta prayer before the Words of Institution which is taken from the Anaphora of Nestorius during the 1986's revision.<sup>1726</sup>

The Catholic Church has evaluated the AM mainly from three angles namely antiquity, apostolic succession and the presence of an institution narrative. The investigators came out with a positive conclusion regarding their findings. First of all, the theologians said that the Assyrian or the anaphora of the Church of the East could be recognized as valid as it is one of the most ancient anaphoras going back to a period of the early Church. Secondly the Catholic Church views the Assyrian Church as an apostolic Church and the Catholic Church recognizes it as a true particular Church. And finally regarding the institution narrative they said although it is not codified or

---

<sup>1724</sup>A. Gelston, *The Relationship of the Anaphoras of Theodore and Nestorius to that of Addai and Mari*, in: G. Karukaparambil, ed., *Tuvaik: Studies in Honour of Rev. Dr. J. Vellian*, Mangalam 1995, 25.

<sup>1725</sup>Cf. N.V. Russo, *The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: Critique of the Critiques*, in: M. E. Johnson, ed., *Issue in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in liturgical and theological analysis*, Minnesota 2010, 23.

<sup>1726</sup>Cf. F. Kanichikattil, *A Response: Pneumatology in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, in: B. Puthur, ed., *Studies on the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 177.

clustered into one particular section it is definitely present in the Anaphora of AM strewn in a euchological way namely integrated in consecutive prayers of thanksgiving, praise and intercession.<sup>1727</sup> Accordingly

“in the first place, the Anaphora of AM is one of the most ancient Anaphoras, dating back to the time of the very early Church; it was composed and used with the clear intention of celebrating the Eucharist in full continuity with the Last Supper and according to the intention of the Church; its validity was never officially contested, neither in the Christian East nor in the Christian West. Secondly the Catholic Church recognizes the Assyrian Church of the East as a true particular Church, built upon orthodox faith and apostolic succession. The Assyrian Church of the East has also preserved full Eucharistic faith in the presence of our Lord under the species of bread and wine and in the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. In the Assyrian Church of the East, though not in full communion with the Catholic Church, are thus to be found ‘true sacraments, and above all, by apostolic succession, the priesthood and the Eucharist,’ (Vatican II Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis redintegratio* § 15). Finally, the words of Eucharistic institution are indeed present in the Anaphora of AM, not in a coherent way and *ad litteram*, but rather in a dispersed euchological way, that is, integrated in successive prayers of thanksgiving, praise and intercession.”<sup>1728</sup>

Even if the first two points do not cause us much problems let us probe into the third point once again as it provoked at least some contradictory reactions. So we will do it as we go through both negative and positive arguments basing on it.

#### a. Mixed Reactions

The normal Catholics, like any one of us, found it very difficult to appreciate and accept the decision which overturned the centuries old clichés of Catholic manual theology concerning the Eucharistic consecration. But contrary to all displeasure expressed by a few scholars, Vatican had to officially recognize it (AM) as *traditional*, as it was found one of the most ancient anaphoras used in the age-old East Syrian Christendom of Mesopotamia from time immemorial, *apostolic* as it belonged to the apostolic era and fully *catholic* as it has the institution narrative in a virtual way namely it contains references to the Eucharistic institution, to the Last Supper, to the Body and Blood and sacrifice of Christ and to the oblation of the church and thus clearly demonstrating the intention of repeating it in obedience to the command of Jesus who said to ‘Do this in memory of me,’ as it was advised by a group of liturgists, scholars and experts (a team comprised of 26 scholars<sup>1729</sup>) after a long discussion and study.<sup>1730</sup> After evolving such a conclusion Vatican referring to this particular document which was drawn on May 23, 1998, went to the extent “permitting the Chaldean Catholics to receive Eucharist confectioned at an Assyrian liturgy using the

<sup>1727</sup>Cf. L'Osservatore Romano del 26/10/2001, 7; cf. C. Giraud, Recognition of the Orthodoxy of the Most Ancient Eucharistic Prayer, in: ETJ 11 (2007), 107.

<sup>1728</sup>The text of the Document is cited from R. F. Taft, Mass without the Consecration?: The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist Between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East Promulgated 26 October Rome 2001, 3.

<sup>1729</sup>Cf. Taft, Mass without the Consecration?, 2 (Taft, an eminent liturgist and scholar who received a document from Vatican, was also one among them who was asked officially to study the validity of the AM and assert whether it can be approved as an official anaphora).

<sup>1730</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 3.

Assyrian form of the anaphora of AM in the absence of ordained ministers.”<sup>1731</sup> This was later officially promulgated by the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity.<sup>1732</sup>

We will once again recede to the problem of the absence of institution narrative in AM. What did compel Vatican to approve it as purely Catholic even if it does not have an institution narrative? Even in the absence of it also the Supreme Magisterium of the Catholic Church has decided to give its due respect owing to five fold reasons. These five fold reasons according to Vatican must be respected. First she wants to show her respect and veneration for the traditional practices of the Churches of the Christian East. Secondly taking into account the antiquity of the anaphora of AM she gives it respect. Thirdly she wanted to venerate it as she obtained the scholarly consensus through the studies conducted by a group of scholars regarding the original form of the anaphora although it never contained the Words of Institution. Vatican found it as not a unique feature of AM rather several other early Eucharistic prayers which are not in use any longer also do not have dominical words. Fourthly Vatican was able to disinter from the references (AM = references to mystical Supper, example provided by Christ, to his Sacrifice, oblation of the Church etc.,) which it has, that AM explicitly and consciously bases its celebration in Christ’s institution of the Eucharist. The Church affirms that AM was composed and used with the clear intention of celebrating the Eucharist in full continuity with the Last Supper and according to the intention of the Church. And finally its connection with the institution which is backed by all the other East Syrian anaphoras (that of Theodore the Interpreter, Nestorius, tradition of the Malka in which a piece of Holy Leaven believed to have been given by Jesus to John) and thus linking the present celebration with all previous ones back to the Mystical Supper itself, gave an impetus to Vatican to acknowledge and venerate it.<sup>1733</sup> Following the various scholarly studies Pope John Paul II validated the findings of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on January 17, 2001 saying that the Assyrian form of AM can be considered valid.<sup>1734</sup>

Although this is the affirmation of Vatican regarding the validity of the AM there are scholars like J. Allen who consider this document as ““an obscure Assyrian Liturgical Agreement.””<sup>1735</sup> Some went to the extent criticizing Vatican saying “why must a document affecting a tiny minority of Eastern Christians become such a cause célèbre?”<sup>1736</sup> Vatican’s steps were coherent and Spirit-guided as it gave importance not to number of faithful, belonged to this particular Church, rather to the various other elements which we have already discussed. After this there appeared a flurry of opposition questioning the historical, ecumenical, and theological validity of this anaphora basing upon the decree issued by Vatican. B. Gherardini, a Monsignor and the director of *Divinitas*<sup>1737</sup> accused the celebration of the Eucharist without an institution narrative in the following words: Whosoever presumes to celebrate the

<sup>1731</sup>N. V. Russo, The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, in: M. E. Johnson, ed., Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis, 24.

<sup>1732</sup>Cf. [http://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/pontifical\\_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc\\_pc\\_chrstuni\\_doc\\_20011025\\_chiesa-caldea-assira\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20011025_chiesa-caldea-assira_en.html). Date of Access: 30. 10. 2012.

<sup>1733</sup>Cf. Russo, The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 24.

<sup>1734</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 26.

<sup>1735</sup>*Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>1736</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1737</sup>It is a theological Journal published by the Vatican press.



Eucharist by silencing or altering the words used by Christ at the moment of the institution, does not perform an act of homage to Christ, but rather its opposite.<sup>1738</sup> He was criticizing the anaphora of AM basing on the arguments of the Councils of Trent and Florence, which said, that without the dominical words ‘the sacrament does not exist’ and that ‘the celebrant consecrates the bread and the wine only with the words used by Christ and in no other way.’<sup>1739</sup> Against the same (AM) he seeks support from the Bible through the patristic sources and Thomas to Trent on which the teaching of Roman Catholic hylomorphic (matter and form) sacramental theology is based. According to Jungmann, if the argument of Gherardini is right it would lead to deranged conclusion that the Church or many part of it did not celebrate the Eucharist for the first three hundred years of her existence as many of them did not contain dominical words.<sup>1740</sup> To raise such a criticism against Gherardini Jungmann had based upon the Chapters of Didache 9 and 10. But some scholars are against such kind of criticisms saying those are a priori and circular saying that we do not know what the second century suburban Syrians meant by the εὐχαριστέω (ten times in twelve verses in Didache) and prayers over bread (τό κλάσμα fragment, morsel) and wine (τό ποτήριον, cup) if not celebrating the Supper.<sup>1741</sup> At the same time today many scholars hold that it is also wrong to assume that there existed purely defined monolithic Eucharistic traditions.

The words of Taft may be a great help in assessing the growth of liturgy and other sacraments: “the past is always instructive, but never normative. Our liturgies are authentic or valid not because they are identical to the ones celebrated in the tenth century, or the third, or the first, or some other golden age, but because they are in continuity with what has been handed on not as an inert treasure, but as a dynamic inner life.”<sup>1742</sup> Taft falls in line in his work with the idea shared by the ancient celebration of the Church. In ancient days the whole anaphora was considered consecratory against regarding one part of it or compartmentalising it. He argues from three reasons that the whole anaphora is valued consecratory. First of all it is due to the consensus arrived by the liturgical historians that the earliest anaphoras did not contain a recitation of the institution narrative, secondly the patristic commentators both Eastern and Western considered the whole anaphora consecratory unlike the later scholastic sacramental theology which compartmentalised the liturgy, and finally depending upon fathers like Ambrose, John Chrysostom, John of Damascus etc. who interpreted the efficacy of the words of institution as deriving from Christ’s having spoken them once for all and not from a priests subsequent liturgical repetition.<sup>1743</sup> Therefore today many liturgists and scholars do not seriously consider the above criticism of Gherardini, Santogrossi<sup>1744</sup> or even Lang<sup>1745</sup> who came out with sharp

<sup>1738</sup>Cf. B. Gherardini, *Le parole della Consecrazione eucaristica*, in: *Divinitas* (Nova Series) Numero Speciale (2004), 163.

<sup>1739</sup>Cf. J. A. Jungmann, *The Early Liturgy: To the Time of Gregory the Great*, Notre Dame 1959, 35-36.

<sup>1740</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1741</sup>Cf. Taft, *Mass Without the Consecration?*, 489.

<sup>1742</sup>Taft, *The Liturgical Year: Studies, Prospects, Reflections*, in: *Worship* 55 (1981), 2-3.

<sup>1743</sup>Cf. Russo, *The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 29-30.

<sup>1744</sup>Cf. A. Santogrossi, *Historical and Theological Argumentation in Favour of Anaphoras without Institution Narrative: A Critical Appraisal*, in: U. M. Lang, ed., *Die Anaphora von Addai und Mari: Studien zu Eucharistie und Einsetzungsworten*, Bonn 2007, 175-210.

criticism against the catholic decision saying that it undermines the traditional Roman Catholic Sacramental theology. Currently many catholic theologians respond to these detractors saying that their attempt is merely an attempt to paint the late medieval scholastic theology as the vertebrae of the unbroken tradition of both East and West which does not go hand in hand with the patristic evidences. And secondly they criticize them saying that it is erroneous to hold such a belief that the Roman Catholic scholastic theology and the Roman *Canon Missae* are the benchmark against which all forms of anaphoras must be vetted. Or again the modern scholarship comes out with the question against these critics asking that if they find the lack of institution narrative in AM as a defect then how they can interpret the lack of an epiclesis in the Roman Canon.<sup>1746</sup> Today for these defects in the anaphoras we can find reasonable answers namely one set of them was written being influenced by the Semitic forms of prayer and the other as being written prior to the pneumatological controversies of the late fourth century. Thus in the words of N. V. Russo the conclusion of Vatican regarding the acceptance of the anaphora of AM was not accidental but was deliberate and cognizant as she found the Church of East celebrated the Lord's Supper for nearly two millennia. Therefore according to him Rome was fully right in the valuation of this anaphora as valid along with recognizing its apostolicity, traditionality and authenticity. N. V. Russo tells even if detractors do not accept its validity basing on the principle of medieval sacramental theology Rome has to stand by her decision.<sup>1747</sup>

#### b. Modern Critical Analysis of AM

A Scholar called A. Raes tried to study the absence of the institution narrative from the view of AM's author. According to him the author of AM might have left it out as he was not interested in the recounting of the historical events of the life of Jesus instead he was interested only in an abstract enumeration of the benefits obtained through the Redemption. So this scholar conclude when the author of this anaphora has such an intention in his mind it would be difficult for him to make such an abrupt move to a concrete account of the Last Supper.<sup>1748</sup> E. Ratcliff an important scholar in this field also made study on the anaphora of AM. The outcome of his study is available to us, published by the end of 1920's, and important to know more details regarding it.<sup>1749</sup> He notices that AM was a "εὐχαριστία pure and simple and which could be compared to the Jewish *Berakah*."<sup>1750</sup> He tells that one should search for its initial stage of development somewhere between that of 'agape' and the 'mass.' It indicates that we must search for an intermediary between these two periods. Now having relied upon this idea Ratcliff started to eliminate certain elements which would not have probably belonged to the original version of AM. Basing on the two homilies

<sup>1745</sup>Cf. U. M. Lang, Eucharist without Institution Narrative? The Anaphora of Addai and Mari Revisited, in: idem, ed., *Die Anaphora von Addai und Mari. Studien zu Eucharistie und Einsetzungsworten*, Bonn 2007, 31-65.

<sup>1746</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 61.

<sup>1747</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 62 in reference to N. V. Russo, *The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: Critique of the Critiques*, 21-62.

<sup>1748</sup>Cf. Raes, *The Enigma of the Chaldean and Malabar Anaphora of the Apostles*, in: J. Vellian and A. Raes, ed., *The Malabar Church: Symposium in honour of Rev. P. J. Podipara (OrChrA 186)*, Roma 1970, 6-7.

<sup>1749</sup>Cf. E. C. Ratcliff, *The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion*, in: *JThS* 30 (1929), 23-32.

<sup>1750</sup>Wilson, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 21.

given by Narsai, namely XVII and XXI, as a gauge he started to search for the interpolations and the original text which initially belonged to the text of AM. In the 21<sup>st</sup> sermon Narsai writes: “He breaks the Bread and casts [it] into the Wine, and he signs and says: in the name of the Father and the Son and the Spirit, an equal nature. With the name of the Divinity, three *hypostases*, he completes his words; and as one dead he raises the mystery, as a symbol of the verity.”<sup>1751</sup> Basing on the Urmi Text<sup>1752</sup> printed in 1890 (Canterbury Press) he started further investigations and found that the intercessory prayers and Kussapa prayers in the Urmi Text were added to it at a later period perhaps during the expansion of the anaphora. Thus he started purging these two elements from the Urmi Text. The reason for the removal was that they did not go well or flow along with the surrounding material of the text. Again his observations compelled him to remove the Sanctus along with Epiclesis from the text due to the same reason mentioned above. Thus after the expurgation he summarized his findings regarding the original version of AM under threefold structure that belonged to the original version of AM:

- “a) an address of praise to the name of the Creator and Redeemer;
- b) A thanksgiving for what he has done for men;
- c) A solemn following of Christ’s example and a special commemoration of his redemptive death and resurrection for which again praise and thanks are offered to the divine name.”<sup>1753</sup>

According to the same scholar in the original anaphora the addressee is always Christ. He was led to such a conclusion from various facts. In his opinion one will be easily led to this idea as the phrase found in it i. e., ‘Worthy of praise from every mouth ...’ is a reminiscent of Phil 2, 9-11. Another reason for him to say so is from the fact that many post-anaphoral prayers were in like-manner addressed to Christ. Although these post-anaphoral prayers belonged to a later period he establishes this fact with the help of the East Syrian tradition and tendency basing on the *Syrian Acts of Thomas*. We have some evidences from *Acts of Thomas*, almost in four passages with prayer-forms of the Eucharist as celebrated by Thomas and addressed to Christ.<sup>1754</sup>

Unlike any other scholar H. Engberding’s starting point was a comparison of the text with the other two East Syrian anaphoras (Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius) and the anaphora of the Maronite Church (Sharar or Peter III) situated in Jordan and Israel.<sup>1755</sup> From his study he came to the conclusion that the Maronite anaphora was more ancient than AM and both these anaphoras depended upon a common source (which according to Bishop Jammo, whom we discussed above, is spuriousness), and this common source which was later subject to a Chaldean redaction, paved the way for the AM.<sup>1756</sup> From these findings he was able to arrive at certain conclusions regarding the G’hanta prayers, anamnesis and the institution narrative in AM. Unlike the opinions shared by Ratcliff this scholar shared the idea that the G’hanta prayers or intercessions were part of the original form of AM from the fact that it was present in

<sup>1751</sup>R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Cambridge 1909, 59 referring to Narsai, Homily XXI.

<sup>1752</sup>The Syriac text was first printed in 1890 by Archbishop of Canterbury’s mission at Urmi in Persia (cf. Mannorampambal, *The Anaphora and the Post Anaphora of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, 27).

<sup>1753</sup>Ratcliff, *The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 29.

<sup>1754</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 31.

<sup>1755</sup>Cf. H. Engberding, ‘Urgestalt,’ *Eigenart und Entwicklung eines altantiochenischen eucharistischen Hochgebetes*, in: OC 29 (1932), 32-48.

<sup>1756</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 46-7.

the Sharar or Peter III too. He is of the opinion that the paragraph which starts with the phrase ‘we also Lord ...’ is a reference to the presence of an anamnesis. He holds that this paragraph is a continuation of the previous G’hanta for the living. He came to such a conclusion basing on another anaphora namely that of Nestorius in which he observes the presence of prayers for the living with the phrase, ‘we also’ immediately after the prayers for the dead. But his theory cannot be taken seriously as he negated immediately what he held saying that this paragraph is not an anamnesis and it cannot in any way provide the basis for the location of an Institution narrative. And from these various findings he postulated that the narrative was not originally in Sharar.<sup>1757</sup> His argument is not very clear as we are not able to apprehend what he wants to communicate and a bit misleading as it seems a bit confusing as his suggestions would lead one to a twofold structure of AM centering one on praise and the other on petition.

For us the study of B. Botte is very significant and important. His article published in 1949, and the revised version of the same published in 1969, are very important and very influential on the study of AM.<sup>1758</sup> He was able to conclude that it was highly Semitic from the style of the prayer namely from its most common feature of parallelism. Many of the findings of Ratcliff are also acceptable to Botte. For example the findings of Ratcliff regarding the Sanctus, the intercession and the epiclesis are also acceptable to him nevertheless there are crucial areas in the study of Botte where he could not find a consensus with the former. In the first instance he does not agree with the addressee of the anaphora. Even if in the works of Ratcliff it is addressed to Christ Botte differs in his opinion saying that in the initial stage it was not addressed consistently to Christ.<sup>1759</sup> He has exhumed some serious problem in the addressing of AM. According to him it betrays a covert monarchianism as the addressee varies from Father to Son. The absence of both institution narrative and an epiclesis Botte considers as problematic. He also came to the central paragraph like many of his predecessors and found exactly like some of his predecessors, namely, the sentence without a main verb where the first sentence starting with ‘And we also Lord ...,’ and consequently it causes such a difficulty to grasp and translate. He holds that if a prior statement is necessarily adjoined to the second then it might have given some sense to the context. The last phrase which he found similar to that of the anamnesis of Theodore gave him the conviction that AM also might have contained an institution narrative exactly like the one found in the anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia. He finds the reason for the textual omission of the institution narrative due to the recital of it by the celebrant from memory.<sup>1760</sup> So he affirms in his study various proofs for the existence of an institution narrative in AM although it is not written down by the principle of ‘*disciplini arcani*.’<sup>1761</sup> This idea of *disciplini arcani* shared by Botte is supported by Lang saying that the church fathers like Tertullian, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose and Innocent all shared the conviction that certain doctrines and practices were not to be disclosed to the uninitiated. These observations by these both authors may be further authenticated by the silent recital of prayers by the celebrant in

<sup>1757</sup>Cf. Engberding, Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet der ostsyrischen Liturgie der Apostel Addaj und Mar(j), in: OC 41 (1957), 107-109.

<sup>1758</sup>Cf. B. Botte, L’anaphore chaldéenne des Apôtres, in: OCP 15 (1949), 259-76.

<sup>1759</sup>Cf. Wilson, The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, 23.

<sup>1760</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 24.

<sup>1761</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, A Response: Pneumatology in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 170.

East Syria with the intention that it may not be heard and learnt by laymen, women and children so that the divine words may not become ordinary and despised.<sup>1762</sup>

But this above given reason is not accepted by many scholars according to Gelston as many of them found the Church of the East as not so scrupulous to conserve the words of institution narrative.<sup>1763</sup> It seems the study of AM has taken a new shift when Macomber published a manuscript of the anaphora in 1966 dating from the tenth or eleventh century.<sup>1764</sup> The finding of this new manuscript boosted the researchers to excavate further, the nature of AM as earlier they were bit handicapped due to the absence of an adequate tool for analyzing the prayer from an earlier date. The two sets of manuscripts which they had at hand belonged to later periods namely the first set which (had two of them) was from 1500 and the second set which (had four of them) was from 1600 A. D. Today the text which was excavated by Macomber is generally known as the Mar Eshaya text culled out from the Hudra Text of Mar Eshaya Church at Mossul. The difference between this manuscript and the later manuscripts lie in the lack of certain silent prayers and intercessions. While the later manuscripts contained a number of such prayers Mar Eshaya Text had only simpler thanksgiving prayers. Macomber's study leads us to the information that Mar Eshaya Text did not contain originally the *cushapa* prayers which goes along with the findings of Ratcliff in 1928. Ratcliff held that such prayers were inserted into it at a later stage. Although the Eshaya Text contains the Sanctus it does not have the institution narrative as we find in later manuscripts [of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries]. Macomber also took up a comparative study of the Eshaya text of AM with that of Sharar.<sup>1765</sup> From this study he was able to cull out certain key ideas and which can be distilled as follows. He tried to learn more about both anaphoras from three levels. The first area which he concentrated was that of Preface, then the addressee of the anaphora and finally the institution narrative. His study brought him to the conclusion that the Preface which he analyzed has nothing corresponding to either of the two other Chaldean anaphoras. The second area of his interest gave him the unquestionable proof that the addressee in the Sharar/Peter III anaphora was invariably the Son whereas that of AM as we have above noted was sometimes the Son and sometimes the Father. This brought him to the conclusion that there existed an earlier stage in the development of AM. Regarding the institution narrative, namely the third issue, he found that the Sharar had preserved both the form and location (exactly at the first of two places of the third G'hanta of the Chaldean Version) of the narrative that was originally in AM although the Chaldean Version shows clear signs of interference.<sup>1766</sup> Thus from his study we are able to assume that AM was prior to Sharar or Peter III anaphora.

Let us also make a scrutiny of the study of B. Spinks who has devoted much to a thorough study of this anaphora. This study and analysis of Spinks can be considered

---

<sup>1762</sup>Cf. Lang, Eucharist without Institution Narrative?, 58-60 (cf. Russo, The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 38).

<sup>1763</sup>Cf. Russo, The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 38 in reference to Gelston, The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari, 74.

<sup>1764</sup>Cf. W. F. Macomber, The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, in: OCP 32 (1966), 335-36.

<sup>1765</sup>Cf. Macomber, The Maronite and Chaldean Versions of the Anaphora of the Apostles, in: OCP 37 (1971), 55-84.

<sup>1766</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 72.

very significant for a student of AM anaphora. His findings are available to us from various articles published recently and from an English translation of AM.<sup>1767</sup> In contrast to the conclusion reached by Ratcliff, namely, that the reconstruction of AM is based on two assumptions namely eucharistia and a natural form of this eucharistia to be one complete prayer characterized by a coherent sequence of thought, Spinks points out for its origin a bipartite structure. According to him AM reflects the prayer tradition of *Berakoth* (Benedictions) and basing on which the prayers were formulated.<sup>1768</sup> Spinks finds two such forms of *Berakoth*, namely of *Yotzer* [blessing of Creation] and the *Ahabah* [prayer for the state of Israel] which precede the *Shema*, as the basis for the tradition found in AM. According to him the same *Berakoth* stands behind AM and Sharar. The reason for the difference according to him is the intrusion of a redactor in these two anaphoras. He is certain in his findings that the redactor by inserting an institution narrative into AM, marking its position by means of an anamnesis, made it different from the Maronite/Sharar where the redactor placed the narrative in a different position based on the theme of commemoration. Thus he is able to find the hand of a redactor in its variations.

Finally let us also deal with a modern scholar named W. Ray who also occupied himself with the study of AM. He finds a ‘chiastic flow’<sup>1769</sup> in the structure of this particular anaphora. According to this scholar it has an A B C X A’ B’ C’ pattern. Such a parallel is used in AM in order to show its focus namely through the X. He finds first groups of parallels namely A-A in the opening and closing paragraphs with praise to God for His works of grace. For the second namely B-B parallelism he gives us the example from the third G’hanta where there is the mention of ‘fathers,’ ‘eucharist,’ ‘sons,’ ‘baptism’ etc. His search gives us further example for C-C parallels found in the phrases like ‘pure and holy’/‘purity and holiness’ and ‘taught us’ in the middle of the third G’hanta. And according to him the focus of prayer namely X is found in the beginning of paragraph seven where one finds a petition for peace and eternal life.

By going through these various studies we are able to know one thing for certain that it belonged to the apostolic era and at the same it is traditional and authentic and a source text for many other anaphoras. Besides the findings of Ray highlights once again the central theme of AM namely ‘peace and eternal life’ which is the explicit expression of what Jesus meant and the mind of the gospel of John. Thus the absence of an institution narrative in AM in no way hinders to express what Christ wanted to convey to us namely eternal life, and AM has faithfully handed down to us what Christ intended through the breaking of bread.

---

<sup>1767</sup>Cf. B. Spinks, *The Original Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles: A Suggestion in Light of the Maronite Sharar*, in: EL 91 (1977), 146-61; idem, *Addai and Mari and the Institution Narrative: The Tantalising Evidence of Gabriel Qatraya*, in: EL 98 (1984), 60-67; idem, *Addai and Mari-The Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students*, in: GLS 24 (1980), 28-49.

<sup>1768</sup>Cf. Wilson, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 26.

<sup>1769</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 27; by chiasmus is meant a series (a, b, c ...) and its inversion (... c, b, a) which is taken together as a combined unit. In Hebrew poetry such a unit is generally a parallel couplet, so that the combined (chiastic) unit would be a, b, c//c, b, a. The components of such a series are usually sub-units of the sentence, considered semantically or grammatically (cf. W. G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*, London 2007, 201).

### c. Critical Evaluation of the Anaphora AM

After having made an analysis of the AM, through the evaluations available to us from the various Liturgists and scholars both from catholic side and other denominations, we are in a position to critically evaluate it. The study of scholars has brought to light the absence of an institution narrative in the AM, which is the unique peculiarity of AM among all the other Eastern anaphoras which is used until today. Thus AM is the only anaphora among all the Eastern anaphoras lacking the narrative of the Last Supper with explicitly expressed dominical words which Christ said over bread and wine and gave to his disciples namely a sacred rite as a commemoration of his sacrifice and commanded them to repeat it after Him. Nevertheless none of them deny the Semitic nature of this prayer. The Semitic nature is clear from the profusion of parallelism. The speciality of this literary device is its musical effect which is in contrast to the linear progression and which creates its unity through a logical, thematic or narrative progression. In the former one namely the parallelistic literary device it allows a lot of freedom to move by means of subtle variations on a theme which finally reaches its crescendo and then again retreat to its point of departure. When this methodology is applied to the anaphora the poetic quality of the prayer is boosted and elevated. Another salient feature of this Semitic anaphora is its stress on the economy of salvation. This method will give added thrust to amplify the most important element in the text. For example when AM addresses God as simply 'Lord' Sharar addresses God with a number of descriptive epithets like 'Lord, God of Abraham, Saviour of Isaac, Strength of Israel' etc.<sup>1770</sup> The methodology of AM does not allow the prominent or the central element of the text to get obscured by the superfluity of secondary or tertiary matters of importance. Therefore this study throws light upon the addressee found in the opening doxology. If we return once again with this new insight to the various addressees found in the doxology it becomes clear why there is retrieval to Christ. Although it starts with the trinitarian phrase 'the adorable and glorious name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,' its immediate return to the form 'Lord,' or again to 'Christ' gives us clear indication that it is addressed to Christ as it can be clearly made out from the phrase 'as you taught us.' Let us also do a comparison of the important elements of both AM and Sharar. One of the differences we find between AM and Sharar in the first G'hanta is in the addressed. When the former uses always the third person singular the latter always uses the second person singular all throughout and consistently. In addition the presence of *Presanctus* and *Sanctus* exhibits the antique nature of both AM and Sharar due to its presence in both. But at the same time we cannot rule out the likelihood of its being added to the preexisting text. Even if that is the case, *Sanctus* in no way hinders the chiasmus of this section of the anaphora.

It may be good to go through the similarity found in the second G'hanta in both AM and Sharar. According to S. B. Wilson a common source is perceptible in the postsanctus of these anaphoras. Nevertheless he finds a few dissimilar elements in the phrasing of the two prayers. Among the Syriac words used (AM uses forty five; Sharar thirty one) almost twenty eight of them appear in both texts. Whereas when we go through the third G'hanta we find a lot of major differences between both of them. According to Wilson it has taken place due to the redaction which AM has undergone.

<sup>1770</sup>Cf. Wilson, *The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, 28.

The kernel of the ‘chiastic flow’ of scholar Ray, which we have mentioned above, is to be found in this G’hanta. If we look into the ‘Anamnesis’ we have a number of problematic material there. The problem lies in the lack of a main verb, except for the Mar Eshaya manuscript, and its lack of parallels in the Maronite text. For the lack of the main verb scholars of present day offer three probable explanations. First of all according to them one may look for the verb within the sentence as it stands now. Secondly it may be due to a corruption of the text and then dropped out. Thirdly one may look for it outside the sentence.<sup>1771</sup> How can we reconcile the first argument that one may look for the verb within as we have already said that it lacks a main verb? According to Macomber in Syriac language a participle may function as an indicative verb in the present tense.<sup>1772</sup> But he acknowledges the difficulty to cull out the participles as they are occupied by their use in a series of parallel relative clauses.<sup>1773</sup> Regarding the second point namely it has happened due to the textual corruption one cannot either prove or disprove it. The third possibility to look for the verb somewhere else may help us to clarify the issue involved in it. If we recede to the previous sections i.e., the previous G’hanta we come across a verb namely ‘know.’ Even if this verb offers us a satisfying solution to our problem it does not completely solve our problem as it is out of tune with the thrust of AM namely with the economic style. There are various other solutions proposed to solve this problem. One of these is to search for it in the now lost institution narrative supposing that there was one. J. Magne is of the estimation that the missing verb could be ‘give thanks’ from the concluding doxology.<sup>1774</sup> Let us also make an evaluation of the Epiclesis of AM. Our analysis of the Epiclesis of AM is made easy by the presence of some elements in Sharar. So if we compare both of them we will have an easy access to the core material contained in them. The words ‘bless and sanctify,’ which is an activity of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist of AM, can be found also in the anaphoras of Theodore and Nestorius. Due to the presence of them we can presuppose in all probability that there had been an interpolation to conform AM to the norms of the other two East Syrian Eucharistic prayers. Another element which has no parallel in Sharar is the expression ‘with all who have been pleasing in your sight.’ It may be also an interpolation from the East Syrian text. We can find a common aim and similar focus in emphasis for both Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus and that of AM namely the forgiveness of sins obtained through the participation in the Eucharist. Still another peculiar element is that the similarity of epiclesis found between Hippolytus and which is found in both AM and Sharar, which point to a common text, and to which AM and Sharar are indebted since later variations tend to be consecratory. It may be good to make an ephemeral mention of the doxology, the last part. The shared incipit reveals the common motif and resemblance they have. Mar Eshaya manuscript gives the reason for the praise as dispensation, i.e., in Syriac equivalent *oikonomia*, of God. So ultimately we can interpret the focus of the author as Christological to God’s saving actions. Once again through the helps rendered by various scholars we are able to ascertain that, although AM has undergone several interpolations as Mar Jammo in advance asserted, it has a focus namely that of eschatology. Even though AM is

<sup>1771</sup>Cf. Wilson, The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, 33.

<sup>1772</sup>Cf. Macomber, The Maronite and Chaldean Versions, 70, 4.

<sup>1773</sup>Cf. Wilson, The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, 34.

<sup>1774</sup>Cf. J. Magne, L’anaphore nestorienne dite d’Adée et Mari et l’anaphore maronite dite de Pierre III [Étude comparative], in: OCP 53 (1987), 145-7.



proved by the modern scholarship as containing institution narrative through a form of 'wholistic consecratory' it has retained its identity as Syrian without losing its 'eastern/Syrian originality.' Consequently it is close to the idea what Jesus wants to communicate through the celebration of Eucharist and which fall in line with the gospel of John especially ch. 6 and is one of the most authentic and purely catholic anaphoras.

## J. The Malabar Church

Having seen the structure and the stand point of Bible, Vatican and modern study on the anaphora of AM we will be able to go further to our study proper namely that of Malabar liturgy. Today only three principal communities celebrate the Chaldean mass, namely two Catholics and one non-Catholic; they are the Church of the Middle East, (catholic), the Malabar Church of Kerala (catholic), and the Assyrian church of the East.<sup>1775</sup> Here it may be proper to refer to an *Epistolarium* i.e., Vatican Syriac Codex 22 which speaks of the East Syrian (Seleucians) rite as the only one in use in Malabar.<sup>1776</sup> The Malabar Christians were passionately related to this anaphora. It may be due to the Syriac language, which is developed from Aramaic, which seems to have been spoken by Jesus or again by the founder of this Church namely St. Thomas himself, that they found an immediate affinity with their founders through this rite which was also in Syriac (Aramaic). Although Chaldeans and Assyrians seem to be two different titles it hints at one and the same Church, namely Church of the East. The so-called Chaldean Church of India (Syro-Malabar) no longer reports to the Patriarchal seat in Mesopotamia, since it was forcibly cut off from it in 1565 during the Portuguese invasion to India and which was executed at the order of Pope Pius IV. Lang notes that canons 109-10 of the Synod of Diamper (1599), was conducted with the clear intention of latinizing the Malabar rite.<sup>1777</sup> Along with this the dissertations of J. Thaliath and J. Kuzhinjalil have challenged the validity of the synod.<sup>1778</sup> After the so-called Synod of Diamper, the Syro-Malabar Church came into full communion with Vatican.

Previous to this period (16<sup>th</sup> century) the relation between Malabar Christians and Rome was very nominal due to distance and language. Before this period we do not find any Church official coming to visit the Malabar Church especially from the Roman church. Thus it depended upon the Persian Church for the administration which had also only nominal contact with Rome due to distance, language, and perpetual wars of Persian Empire with the Roman Empire and later with Islam. This is the background in which the SMC depended upon it. In the sixteenth century Portuguese invaders of India found on the aforesaid coast over 200,000 of these ancient Persian or Syriac Christians, who called themselves Christians of St. Thomas. They acknowledged their dependence on the Persian Church for a long time however, on account of the dangers of travel and continual wars, their intercourse with the

<sup>1775</sup>Cf. Macomber, A History of the Chaldean Mass, 81.

<sup>1776</sup>Cf. Podipara, The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church, 53 in reference to Vatican Syriac Codex 22.

<sup>1777</sup>Cf. Lang, Eucharist without Institution Narrative?, 31-33.

<sup>1778</sup>Cf. J. Thaliath, The Synod of Diamper, Rome 1958, 7-17; J. Kuzhinjalil, The disciplinary Legislation of the Synod of Diamper, Diss. Rome 1975; P. Pallath, The Synod of Diamper: Valid or Invalid?, in: G. Nedungatt, ed., The Synod of Diamper Revisited, Rome 2001, 199-226.

Persian Church was only intermittent. Most of the time, therefore, they were without bishops. Being this is the case the clergy of Goa tried to occupy them by a process of latinization, and the Jesuits' successors of St. Francis Xavier followed a similar policy, but with much moderation and practical sense. Although distance and language were always a great problem in the middle centuries there were attempts from the part of the Persians to establish good relations with Rome. Such a renewal of relations was taken place between Rome and the Chaldean Catholics. After this period we find Bishop Hormizd Elias, coming to India (1562) sent by the Pope and the Patriarch Abdisho, with two Dominican missionaries, among whom one was a bishop. Abdisho ordained a person called Joseph as the Bishop of Malabar whom the Portuguese seized at Goa and hence he was able to reach his mission only after two years. In the meantime, because of the urgency, a successor had been appointed to this see, named Bishop Abraham of Angamaly. This caused also some misunderstandings and disputes to which Pius IV put an end (1565) by dividing the Malabar territory. This step did not greatly relieve the anxieties of the United Chaldeans of Malabar. During this time Bishop Abraham complained to the Pope that the Jesuit Fathers and the Portuguese tried to withdraw him from the obedience to the Chaldean Patriarch and persuade him to demand the pallium directly from the Pope. At all means they [Jesuits and Portuguese] wanted to conform the Syro-Malabar Church completely to the Latin Rite. It is interesting to note that although they came to Kerala with the permission of Pope and Patriarch Portuguese missionaries were not ready to accept this relation which existed for years in the Malabar Church. Knowing the situation of Kerala, Pope Gregory XIII (1576) asked the Cochin King to ensure safety for Bishop Abraham that he may attend the Provincial Council at Goa of the Indies without fear of imprisonment. In 1599, Alexis Menezes, Archbishop of Goa, convoked the celebrated synod at Diamper and in which it was decided to unify the hierarchy and to correct the rituals, missals, and other liturgical books of the Malabar Christians in line with the Roman Liturgy. Due to the action of Menezes many Catholics left the Thomas Christians and joined the bishop who was sent by the Jacobite (Miaphysite) Patriarch (1603) to India, unmindful of his Monophysitism, with a view to the preservation of their liturgical (Syriac) language, although it was an unintelligible act from their part. It is said that the Thomas Christians of Kerala had 116 churches between 1661 and 1662. During the strife the Carmelites claimed eighty four churches and the rest namely thirty two separated from the main body of the Thomas Church. Later on they gave birth to the Syriac Orthodox (Jacobites and Orthodox), Thozhiyur, Mar Thoma (Reformed Syrians), and Syro-Malankara Catholics. The eighty four churches, namely the present day Syro-Malabar Church, owing to the Carmelite missionaries, who succeeded the Jesuits and numbering almost 250,000 who safeguarded the Catholic unity, have remained to the present day, loyal to the Holy See and submissive to the Latin hierarchy. At a later period there arrived the happy announcement of Pope, withdrawing them from the jurisdiction of the Latin bishops and appointing in their place three vicars Apostolic of their nation and rite. These were the native bishops appointed by Rome to administer the Dioceses of Trichur, Ernakulam and Changanachery, and were directly under the Propaganda fide (1897). SMC was always obedient to Rome and what Rome said even during the time of decontamination-process of her liturgy with a motive to Latinize it. The struggle between the Portuguese missionaries and the indigenous Christians and their

Mesopotamian prelates was one of jurisdictional nature and never one of theological nature. The people who were interested only in Latinization process were clever enough to brand this church from the very beginning as heretical especially as Nestorians and consequently later on it got fixed upon this church. This might have happened due to the ignorance of the difference between a schism and a heresy. When we look back to those days it becomes crystal clear the intention of the Portuguese namely they wanted to chase the Seleucian presence ultimately from the Indian soil or its tie with the Malabar Church and thus bring about a perfect latinization.

As a first attempt to the elimination-process and latinization the Franciscan missionaries got ordained the Malabar youths in the Latin (Roman) rite.<sup>1779</sup> When the Portuguese missionaries compelled the Malabarians to eat meat and drink wine in Lent, and begin Lent on Ash Wednesday only, and to use only unleavened bread in the celebration of Mass from which they excluded married priests, the Malabar people ran away with their bishops from Cranganore and other Portuguese settlements.<sup>1780</sup> There is the account of detention of two bishops named Mar Elias and Mar Joseph who were sent to Malabar by Abdisho' successor of Sulaqa along with two Dominicans who were Bishop Ambrose and Fr. Antoninus from Malta. Though Dominicans were given as companions to Sulaqa by the Pope as soon as they reached Malabar they were detained by Portuguese for almost 18 months. During this time Mar Elias and Joseph were taught to say holy Mass in Latin. Interestingly they were not allowed to go out without conforming to the fact that they would not exercise jurisdiction without the permission of the bishop of Goa whom the Portuguese considered as the bishop of Malabar and of the whole of India at a time when Pope had confirmed the jurisdiction of the Seleucian Patriarchs over India.<sup>1781</sup> The baptism given by Mar Jacob conferred in the East Syrian rite was not considered valid by the Portuguese. We may not be able to narrate all the abominations and cursedness exercised by the Portuguese on the bishops who came to Kerala as it is not the target of our study. Any way these all show that they were determined somehow to bring the Malabar church under the complete detention of the Latin hierarchy.

### i. Malabar Liturgy and Related Problems

Let us also discuss in brief the liturgical situations and problems when Portuguese missionaries came in contact with the Thomas Christians. SMC was not having a specifically defined liturgy other than the Thomamargam in her pre-Chaldean period. Perhaps we can apply the same international fact with regard to the SMC too namely there was no strict and defined anaphora for any rite for the liturgical celebration. So from the founding of the church till the 4<sup>th</sup> century the faithful gathered somewhere and their liturgy was mainly depended upon Bible. Fortescue is of the opinion that it is only after the fourth century there emerged a proper precise liturgical order.<sup>1782</sup> In this period also we may suppose that the Thomas Christians came together to praise and worship and make their pleas to God. This kind of gathering of the Thomas Christians may be made clear from an instance which is given

---

<sup>1779</sup>Cf. Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 57.

<sup>1780</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1781</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 58.

<sup>1782</sup>Cf. A. Fortescue, *The Mass: A Study of Roman Liturgy*, London 1950, 115.

below. We have reference to a wrong practice in Kerala as stated by Theophilus the Indian. This person, who is said to be sent by Emperor Constantine to Malabar in the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, states that “he corrected the abuse of the Indian Christians sitting at the time of reading the Gospel.”<sup>1783</sup> It indicates indirectly to the use of the native language (proto Dravidian Language together with Sanskrit). It seems from this time on people started listening to the Word of God standing. People continued this practice of hearing the Bible till the correction as part of a Hindu culture. We can suppose in all probability that before the coming of Easterners (Chaldeans), there in Kerala existed an Indian liturgy (this is not in connection with our present day liturgy) being suited to the Indian situation and culture. Nevertheless we cannot say that there existed an Indian liturgy and took shape anywhere in India in any of the Indian languages. Since we have discussed in detail about what is meant by Thomamargam we will come to the later developments regarding the liturgy.

The 4<sup>th</sup> century witnesses the coming of the Chaldeans. The earliest document which gives us some indication regarding the existence of the East Syrian Liturgy in Malabar is Vatican Syriac Codex No. 22 written in Cranganore in the year 1301.<sup>1784</sup> We can imagine in all probability that these prelates who came from Syria brought with them the East Syrian rites and books which later became the official liturgy of Kerala. But we cannot say that they introduced and implanted a perfect liturgy of Syria in Kerala which they celebrated in their native land. In the words of famous historian P. Podipara: “the prayers and formulas for all these acts of worship were those of the East Syrian Church of Mesopotamia and Persia and they were in Syriac ... But the contexts in which they were used were all Indianised or Malabarised with new Indo-Malabar Christianised rites added to them as sacramentals.”<sup>1785</sup> From that time onwards, in all probability, the AM was in use in SMC, the same which was in use in Seleucia. We may presume that this Liturgy of AM spread to Mesopotamia, Persia and India in its initial stage itself.<sup>1786</sup> The Thomas Christians were one among the four churches, namely ‘the Edessan,’ ‘the Chaldean’ (of Mesopotamia or Iraq) with Seleucia-Ctesiphon as its centre, and the ‘Persian’ (of Persia proper or Iran),<sup>1787</sup> who made use of this liturgy. But at the same time it must be acknowledged of the deep love of the Malabarians for the language spoken by the Syrians due to the reason of it being the same language spoken by Jesus: “Aramaic came to be called Syriac (after Syrus [?]) who ruled over Mesopotamia.”<sup>1788</sup> We have so many assertions from scholars about the language. “Syriac which was the dialect of Aramaic developed in Edessa, now Urfa in modern Turkey ... Syriac is the language that has been hallowed by the blessed lips of Christ.”<sup>1789</sup> Though the Portuguese missionaries intended to purify the rite of Thomas Christians they did not change its language knowing that it

<sup>1783</sup>Cited from G. Nedungatt, Spirituality of the Syro-Malabar Church, in: Star Documentation 13, Alwaye 1989, 34 and 36 referring to *Philostorgi Eccles. Hist.* Lib. III, in: Photium Bibliotheca, Mss. v. 65. c. 486.

<sup>1784</sup>Cf. Thazhath, The Quest for Identity, 18.

<sup>1785</sup>Podipara, The Thomas Christians and Adaptation, in: St. Thomas Christian Encyclopedia of India II, Thrissur 1973, 189.

<sup>1786</sup>Cf. Mattam, Inculturation of the Liturgy in the Indian Context, 117.

<sup>1787</sup>Cf. P. Podipara, The Rise and Decline of the Indian Church of the Thomas Christians (OIRS 3), Kottayam 1979, 5.

<sup>1788</sup>P. Smith, Theasaurus Syriacus, Vol. I, Oxonii 1879-1901, 389.

<sup>1789</sup>A. Baker, Syriac and the Origins of Monasticism, in: DR 86 (1968), Exeter; W. Cureton, Remains of a very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, London 1958, 75: “the language used by our saviour ... is so very similar and closely allied with the Syriac of the New Testament that the two may be considered identical.”

had a special sacredness for the Thomas Christians. Thus Syriac remained the liturgical language till the reform of 1962.<sup>1790</sup> We are informed by various historians that the Latin West at first came to the realization of the existence of the anaphora of AM only at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century while they came ashore to the East. By the time Portuguese arrived on the Malabar Coast in 1498 the East Syrian Liturgy was already well rooted there. It is true although many Thomas Christians did not know very well its language and source of its origin still they had a deep attachment to this liturgy.<sup>1791</sup> As SMC had no famed theologians or Fathers of the Church in the early centuries, who were able to form a liturgy or theology, she adopted the East Syrian Liturgy which was the only known Liturgy developed outside the Roman boundaries.<sup>1792</sup>

Some arguments for the adoption of this Liturgy from a remote land or the predilection for the language are given by Mannoramparambil. He holds that the Sumerian founders of Babylon were Dravidians.<sup>1793</sup> According to “the recent excavations most of the inhabitants of the Indus Valley belonged to a Mediterranean race which inhabited Egypt, Iran and Iraq and that they are Dravidians who migrated there from the Mediterranean regions. The Thomas Christians are also predominantly Dravidians.”<sup>1794</sup> Mannoramparambil bases his argument on the excavations recently made on Mehrgarh culture, near the Bollan Pass on the bank of the Bollan river, which is very similar to the Mesopotamian. Besides he substantiates his reasoning on the recent excavations “which suggested that Indus Valley civilization was extended to South India also.”<sup>1795</sup> More to the point, he finds a few other reasons for the love of this language and hence a special love for the liturgy in the same language. He tells that the commercial relations, linguistic presence (Aramaic inscriptions of Taxillas<sup>1796</sup>) are certain proofs that the Jews with their Syriac (Aramaic) language were very influential in India, the spiritual relations (the relics of St. Thomas was also venerated in Edessa), or hierarchical relations (the presence of East Syrian Bishops in Malabar from the 4<sup>th</sup> cent.), all contributed to the easy access of this remote Liturgy.<sup>1797</sup> To cement this idea, presented by Mannoramparambil, let us also take into account the idea researched by Mattam. In his research he found the existence of a composite language present in Kerala, namely a mixture of Arabic and Malayalam, in the south on the Malabar Coast due to the intermingling of the Arab settlers and the local population.<sup>1798</sup> In his study he found that there was a relation existing already in Kerala between the Jews, Syrian Christians and Arabs and together they enriched the

<sup>1790</sup>Cf. F. Kanichikattil, *To Restore or to Reform?*, 11.

<sup>1791</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 10-11.

<sup>1792</sup>Cf. T. Mannoramparambil, *The Anaphora and the Post-Anaphora of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, Kottayam 1984, 16.

<sup>1793</sup>K. Luke who is an eminent philologist and scripture scholar denies this linkage saying that the Sumerians are a people who came into existence around 3000 B. C. and disappeared from the scene of history around 2000 B. C. (cf. K. Luke, *Contacts Between India and Sumer*, in: *IThS* 29 [1992], 125); G. Mangatt is of the view that commercial contacts between Sumeria and North Western India, i.e. present regions of Afghanistan and Pakistan, are admitted by Scholars but linguistic, cultural, territorial and commercial linkage between Mesopotamia and Malabar in the Pre-Christian centuries seems quite questionable (cf. G. Mangatt, *The Thomas Christians and the Persian Church*, in: *VJThR* 52 [1988], 437-446).

<sup>1794</sup>Mannoramparambil, *The Anaphora and the Post-Anaphora of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, 17.

<sup>1795</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1796</sup>Cf. J. Marshall, *Guide to Taxilla*, Delhi 1936, 78-79; XXXIII; S. Burnet, *Aramaic Inscriptions from Taxilla*, in: *JAH* 28 (1915), 340, 342; N. Couley, *First Aramaic Inscriptions from Taxilla*, in: *JAH* 28 (1915), 342-347.

<sup>1797</sup>Cf. Mannoramparambil, *The Anaphora and the Post-Anaphora of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, 17-23.

<sup>1798</sup>Cf. Mattam, *Inculturation of the Liturgy in the Indian Context*, 50 in reference to P. K. Muhammad Kunju, *Muslims and Kerala Culture*, (Malayalam) Trichur 1982, 208-237.

language Malayalam. According to him this is the reason for the presence of “more than 5000 words of Semitic origin - Aramaic, Arabic and Persian - currently used in Malayalam language.”<sup>1799</sup>

Thus basing on various relations it seems that Malabar Church had accepted the liturgy which was in a predilected language freely and esteemed it as her own liturgy. This love for the liturgy made the sons of SMC to resist latinization process of Portuguese when they started to Latinize it. On the contrary the way the Chaldeans and Malabarians celebrated their liturgy in every way disturbed the Latin missionaries and had aroused enormous bewilderment and kept them standing astounded. They could not swallow the idea of celebrating a holy Mass (Qurbana) with an anaphora devoid of the Words of Institution.<sup>1800</sup> As any one of us would think today so they were also forced to think seeing the celebration of these people that they perform something very defective and thus started correcting the defect they found in the Liturgy of Malabarians by inserting the institution narrative. Connolly is perhaps the first one to compare the Syro-Malabar Liturgy with that of AM. In his study he realized that basically there is no difference between the liturgy used by Malabarians in Kerala with that of AM<sup>1801</sup> which is today considered as the ‘oldest’ and ‘the parent form’ and still remains in use among all the East Syrian anaphoras.<sup>1802</sup> According to him “all the changes made by Menezes in the Synod of Diamper were doctrinal in purpose and not in any way liturgical.”<sup>1803</sup> The revisers of the Malabar liturgy faithfully carried out their declared intention of preserving the old rite as far as possible: “utque antiques ritus, quantum patitur fidei sinceritas ac doctrinae puritas serventur.”<sup>1804</sup> But unfortunately we cannot get an old copy of the uncorrected text. We are able to have some source of information about it from the Acts of the Diamper Synod which had revised it in the year 1599. At the same time “there is a possibility of going back to the pre-Diamper text if we substitute the new phrases with what the revisers recorded as changes.”<sup>1805</sup> Connolly observed the basic difference between Malabar Liturgy and that of AM in the fact that when the former contained institution narrative the latter does not have it. In his study he raised the doubt regarding the revised Malabar rite as containing an institution narrative outside the anaphora. He came to this conclusion from the fact that the Synod of Diamper keeps silence on the insertion of an institution narrative as part of amendment. If then he concluded saying that it had only modified other parts as there was an institution narrative already existing in this Qurbana.<sup>1806</sup> His notion regarding the position of the institution narrative is, that it must be somewhere after the invocation of the Holy Spirit before the process of retouching by Menezes.<sup>1807</sup> But he is not sure of the author although he

<sup>1799</sup>Cited from Mattam, *Inculturation of the Liturgy in the Indian Context*, 51 referring to S. Mohiddin Shah, *Semitic Culture*, art. in: *Bhasha Poshini* (Malayalam), Kottayam 1979, 32-35.

<sup>1800</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, *A Response: Pneumatology in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 169.

<sup>1801</sup>Cf. R. H. Connolly, *The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy*, in: *JThS* 15 (1914), 396-425, 569-89.

<sup>1802</sup>Cf. Ratcliff, *The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 25.

<sup>1803</sup>Cited from Kanichikattil, *To Restore or to Reform?*, 11 referring to Connolly, *The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy*, in: *JThS* 15 (1914), 575-577.

<sup>1804</sup>Cited from Mannoramparambil, *The Anaphora and the Post Anaphora of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, 26 referring to A. de Gouvea, *Jornada do arcebispo de Goa, Coimbra 1606*; cf. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, Romae 1745, 293-334.

<sup>1805</sup>Ibid.

<sup>1806</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, *To Restore or to Reform?*, 11 in reference to Connolly, *The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy*, in: *JThS* 15 (1914), 583.

<sup>1807</sup>Cf. Connolly, *The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy*, 583.

tells that there was already an Institution Narrative extant in it before being revised by archbishop Menezes. A modern study says that ‘the words of institution’ was already in the Anaphora during the time of Synod. It is conjectured that Mar Joseph who was the Bishop in India during the 16<sup>th</sup> century was the author of the Institution narrative and not Archbishop Menezes.<sup>1808</sup> At the same time Connolly cautions us against any rash conclusion regarding the origin of an Institution Narrative as it may be unsafe due to the possibility of a lost narrative being restored by the Malabar Liturgy, which was originally found within AM.<sup>1809</sup>

Lang is also of the opinion that “the words of institution were already part of the Malabar liturgy before Diamper and belonged to an oral tradition that had not yet been fixed.”<sup>1810</sup> He notes that “Chaldean prelates who had been sent from Babylon out of ignorance had words added to or removed from the forma da Consagração at will. However, an archbishop, whom Gouvea credits with more theological erudition, introduced a fixed formula of consecration.”<sup>1811</sup> Although Lang gives us some hints about the presence of an institution narrative before the Diamper Synod he confesses that he is not able to produce a witness to the unrevised form of the Malabar rite before 1599. The reason for this may be due to the ‘high-handed interference by the Portuguese’ according to Macomber.<sup>1812</sup> The same we may hear from Ratcliff too. He made a study on the Latin translation of the Malabar Liturgy revised by Aleixo de Menezes in 1599 which was used in the Malabar liturgy. He noted two important things regarding the Malabar Liturgy. The first is the substantial agreement between the two namely Malabar Liturgy and MSS<sup>1813</sup> produced by Urmi Press of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s Mission to the Assyrian Christians for the Nestorian clergy in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Further study was conducted by R. H. Connolly on the same text. He compared the Diamper text with the text given by F. E. Brightman, who made an English translation based on the Urmi Syriac text, and found a convincing proof that the Malabar Liturgy is essentially the same as the East Syrian Liturgy of AM. He holds that the Malabar and East Syrian Liturgy of AM are one and the same.<sup>1814</sup> The second is the lack of an institution narrative in the MSS where as it is found in the Malabari form. He found it outside the anaphora which introduces the ceremony of fraction.<sup>1815</sup> The same Urmi text which was printed in 1890 was again studied by Ratcliff and he found that “most of the intercessory prayers and *Kussapa* prayers in the Urmi Text were later additions, which happened during the expansion of the anaphora.”<sup>1816</sup>

<sup>1808</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, A Response: Pneumatology in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 169 in reference to Connolly, The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy, 583.

<sup>1809</sup>Cf. S. B. Wilson, The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, in: P. F. Bradshaw, ed., Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers, Minnesota 1997, 21 in reference to Connolly, The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy, 593.

<sup>1810</sup>Lang, Eucharist without Institution Narrative?, 33.

<sup>1811</sup>Cited from Russo, The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 41 referring to A. de Gouvea, Iornada do Arcebispo de Goa Dom Frey Aleixo de Menezes Primaz da India Oriental, Coimbra 1606.

<sup>1812</sup>Cf. Macomber, History of the Chaldean Mass, in: Worship 51 (1977), 115.

<sup>1813</sup>Here the reference is to a 19<sup>th</sup> century manuscript. For a list of the manuscripts of the apostles Addai and Mari see Macomber, The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, in: OCP 32 (1966), 335-336. He gives 24 Mss., dating from 10/11 century (Mar Eshaya Hudra) till 16/17 century (Berlin 39).

<sup>1814</sup>Cf. Connolly, The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy, in: JThS 15 (1914), 425, 577.

<sup>1815</sup>Cf. Ratcliff, The Original form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 25.

<sup>1816</sup>Cited from Kanichikattil, A Response: Pneumatology in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 169 referring to Ratcliff, The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, 23-32.

Another important study on the SMQ (Syro-Malabar Qurbana) text was made by an eminent church historian and scholar P. Podipara. His starting point was from the conclusion arrived at by Connolly. He could observe great differences between the Syro-Malabar text printed in Rome in the year 1774 and the Menezian text. Hence he came to the conclusion that these two texts above mentioned may have two different origins. According to him the 1774 text, which was prevalent up to the reformed text in 1962, was Rozian and not Menezian.<sup>1817</sup> Presently a few church historians are of the view that it was Roz, who convened another Synod in 1603, was instrumental for the insertion of so many Latin elements and customs in the Church life of the Thomas Christians and into this SMQ text.<sup>1818</sup> We have information from Tisserant regarding the need of convoking another Synod to be conducted by Roz. “Cardinal Tisserant quotes Bishop Francis Roz, who requested Rome not to approve the decrees of the Synod of Diamper because it was not conducted in forma; on the contrary, Bishop Roz requested the approval of the Synod he conducted in 1603 at Angamaly.”<sup>1819</sup> P. Podipara holds that it was Mar Joseph, who was the Chaldean Metropolitan of the Thomas Christian community from 1556-1569, the author of the institution narrative. Thus he comes to the conclusion that the SMQ contained institution narrative even before the Diamper Synod.<sup>1820</sup> If we refer to the personal copy of Mar Joseph kept in Vat. Mss. (Vat. Syr. 66) library we will have to agree with what Podipara confirms. According to him the position of ‘the words of institution’, which was found on a separate sheet at the beginning of the text with a note, to be said after the fraction, was changed in the 1774 text to ‘before the fraction,’ might be the work of Mar Abraham, the last Chaldean Metropolitan of the Thomas Christians (1558-1597). So in agreement with this observation J. Madey also observes that it might have taken place possibly “already before the synod of Diamper, i.e., in the Synod of Angamaly, in 1583, which dealt with the Qurbana, in which the institution narrative was shifted to an earlier place, i.e., before the fraction.”<sup>1821</sup> The 1774 text underwent a new edition in Rome in 1844,<sup>1822</sup> 1928 and 1962 (Carmelite Missal, Mannanam) and in 1956 (Mar Thomas Sleeha Press, Alwaye).<sup>1823</sup> This could be considered as the fourth phase of the SMC in which a lot of foreign elements were incorporated into the SMQ. From our consideration of the SMQ text we can say that SMQ is also ancient and apostolic like the AM as it is one and the same. Although it underwent corrections from the part of the Portuguese missionaries we can say one thing for certain that it was not to rectify the Nestorian elements rather to incorporate only the Latin elements into it with which the Portuguese missionaries were familiar with. But here we must also acknowledge, as in the case of any other anaphoras so also SMQ text had its infancy stage and consequently underwent modifications with further additions and removal. But at the same time we must say that it never contained elements of heresy as Portuguese missionaries considered. If so how can the same anaphora can be considered as

<sup>1817</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, *To Restore or to Reform?*, 11 in reference to Podipara, *The Present Syro-Malabar Liturgy: Menezian or Rozian?*, in: OCP 23 (1957), 313-331.

<sup>1818</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, *To Restore or to Reform?*, 11.

<sup>1819</sup>Cited from A. Thazhath, *The Juridical Sources of The Syro-Malabar Church: A Historico-Juridical Study* (OIRSI 106), Kottayam 1987, 142-143 referring to Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India*, 66-67.

<sup>1820</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, *To Restore or to Reform?*, 12.

<sup>1821</sup>J. Madey, *The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East*, Kottayam 1982, 266.

<sup>1822</sup>Cf. J. P. M van der Ploeg, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the Church of the East*, in: *The Harp* 3. 1, 2 (1990), 88-89.

<sup>1823</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, *To Restore or to Reform?*, 12.



apostolic, ancient, authentic and catholic by Vatican after 2000 years. All the more if it contained any sort of heresy surely it would not have been used in SMC at least from the 16<sup>th</sup> century and which is today in direct communion with Rome. We can adopt either the finding approved by Vatican or rely upon the idea fostered by Portuguese missionaries. If we agree with the idea that it contained Nestorian heresy it is equal to say the findings of the commission, headed by Card. Walter Kasper and Ratzinger, is wrong. I personally feel to acknowledge the findings of these modern and well-equipped theologians and Pope rather than the prejudiced middle aged missionaries. Thus one must be able to say that SMQ text is also ancient, apostolic, authentic and catholic.

Along with the SMQ text Portuguese missionaries also commenced many Latin customs like Roman vestments with different colours for the liturgy of each day, the use of unfermented bread, auricular confession, images of Western saints. Together with it they also enforced priestly celibacy and Western type of Cassock and tonsure for priests. Confession before Holy Communion was made compulsory; the statues of Bl. Mary, St. Joseph and other saints were introduced along with the Latin liturgical calendar for all liturgical purposes. The East Syrian Calendar, which was in use in the Malabar Church up to the 16<sup>th</sup> century based on the East Syrian tradition with 7 seasons, was modified by Mar Jacob (1503-1547) due to Latin pressure and implemented it in the Malabar church by Bishop Roz.<sup>1824</sup> The repercussion of this was the breakage in the Church. A group eventually sought communion with the Jacobite Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1653 and from this time on start the history of the Syrian Orthodox (Jacobite) Church in India.<sup>1825</sup> At the same time it must be said although for a long period the East Syrian Church had guided the Thomas Christians no one from among the Thomas Christians was raised as the head or bishop of their community. Due to all these factors the 16<sup>th</sup> century was one of the devastating periods for SMC. It witnessed the Synod of Diamper (June 1599) and the nomination of a Latin Prelate called Fr. Francis Roz SJ in place of Mar Abraham of Angamale. Thus there came the end of an era of relation with the East Syrian Church and started a new era of direct relation with Rome. On December 20, 1599 the Metropolitan and Primatial see of Angamale was made diocesan and suffragan to Goa and the Padroado of the king of Portugal was extended over it on August 4, 1600.<sup>1826</sup> Roz was consecrated on January 25, 1601. The grief which the Thomas Christians underwent as they were severed from the relationship they had from the 4<sup>th</sup> century and the degradation of Angamale was unfathomable. As Roz began to reside in Cranganore, there broke about quarrels between Roz (SJ) and the bishop of Cochin (Franciscan) regarding the jurisdiction.<sup>1827</sup> All the same we have to admit that although Roz was one of the better figures among

---

<sup>1824</sup>Seven Seasons according to the East Syrian liturgical year are 1. the feast of Nativity-Epiphany with the Period of Nativity-Epiphany 2. the feast of Pascha with the period of Great Fast 3. the feast of Resurrection and Ascension with the period of Resurrection 4. the feast of Pentecost with the period of Sliba (Apostle) 5. the feast of the Cross with the period of Sliba (Cross) 6. the feast of Elia with the period of Elia and 7. the feast of the renewal of the dedication of the Great Church of Jerusalem with the period of *Hudat edta* (renewal of the Church). This calendar which was used by the Malabar Church was the less developed earlier system of Jerusalem Calendar. In the last century there started again the restoration process of this calendar introducing the proper parts of the Eucharist in Qurbana Taksa (text) of 1968 (cf. J. Moolan, Historical and Structural Evolution of Syro-Malabar Liturgical Year, in: MThR 2 [2009], 160).

<sup>1825</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, To Restore or to Reform?, 12.

<sup>1826</sup>Cf. Podipara, The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church, 71.

<sup>1827</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 72.

the Latin's he also had self-interest. Basically in the heart of heart he was also a latinizer. Roz got the S. Pallium on Jan 26, 1609, and then on the Portuguese started viewing the Cranganore (Angamale was the old name but the new name Cranganore was taken after the wish of Roz) as a Latin See. They could make it into a Latin see so easily or as they wished because it was also ruled by the Padroado, that is to say the ultimate control was in the hands of the Portuguese.<sup>1828</sup>

The response of Mar Abraham to Chaldean Patriarch, who asked an explanation on things that happened in the third provincial Council of Goa in 1585, will make clear how serious a threat the Portuguese could create in Kerala as he was compelled to put his signature to the decrees: "Mar Abraham answered that he did these things at the insistence of the Portuguese who were over his head as a hammer over an anvil."<sup>1829</sup> In the same century Roz started studying the theology of the East-Syrians and wrote a dissertation.<sup>1830</sup> So his main concern was to prove that the texts of the East Syrians contained many Nestorian errors. Thus he picked so many of them one after another against them. It may be good to have a look at the Nestorian errors which were in the book used by Thomas Christians. "1. five scriptural texts supposed to have been falsified by the Nestorians; 2. theological formulas supposed to be tainted with Nestorianism; 3. cult and liturgical praise of the chiefs of the Nestorians: Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestor."<sup>1831</sup> From his thesis we are able to assume that it contained also some moral errors and abuses.

"1. The books of Parseman (full of lies, fables and superstitions), is held in respect by the St. Thomas Christians; 2. they do not have the sacraments of Extreme Unction and Confirmation; nor the consecration of chrism or oil; 3. their Patriarch is said to have been severed from the obedience of the Roman Pontiff by divine intervention; 4. the Nestorian sectarians spoke admiringly about Nestor, (he himself heard it with his own ears); they gave public veneration to contemporaries of Nestor who were not ordinary people but famous bishops; 5. sacred orders were conferred and received simoniacally; 6. minor orders were conferred simultaneously; similarly subdiaconate, diaconate, and priesthood were given together without taking into consideration the times and seasons; 7. all ecclesiastics (except a few) and laymen were given to drinking; 8. they held that the 'faith' of St. Peter was different from that of St. Thomas."<sup>1832</sup>

Although Roz found many faults and tenets which revealed Nestorian tinge in the Syriac books and in their archbishop, the people of Kerala had not understood them and even priests did not understand them as they did not know much theology.<sup>1833</sup> In Malabar there were no theological schools during this time. "Whatever was presented to them by the Liturgy and the tradition was held to be the law of life."<sup>1834</sup> It might be perhaps true to say that the books of Malabarians which were brought down from Mesopotamia contained errors. But can someone condemn a church saying that their books contained errors due to a mistake not of theirs? "As long as Liturgy is not the ultimate criterion of the law of Faith, errors might creep in. But these unnoticed errors

<sup>1828</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1829</sup>Koodapuzha, Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the St. Thomas Christians, 135.

<sup>1830</sup>This dissertation is titled '*De Erroribus Nestorianorum qui in hac India Orientali versantur*' which is later published by I. Hausherr, 1928 (cf. Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 510).

<sup>1831</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1832</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1833</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 511.

<sup>1834</sup>Koodapuzha, Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the Saint Thomas Christians, 118.

do not make a Church heretical.”<sup>1835</sup> And above and beyond, the people of Kerala might not have understood actually the content of all the prayers uttered in Syriac. As we have mentioned above people had come always to the church to be in communion and to exercise the ‘Thomamargam’ although they did not understand everything that was read by the Syrian priests or native priests. At the same time there are a few yet today in Kerala who can very well speak or sing and remember the old Syriac Mass. They might have learned it or later deepened their knowledge of the language through the constant hearing and practice of the same language. But that is not the case with all the ordinary faithful. So without understanding everything that is read to them or made them hear how can we accuse them saying that they shared the Nestorian faith? Thus without a true approval and consent of the idea which is preached and prayed how can we say that the people of this Church shared heretical elements in their faith and tradition? Let us refer to the words of P. Podipara who is commenting on the words of Bishop Roz:

“Thomas Christians accepted the faith from St. Thomas and remained in it very firm till Dec. 7, 1601, [*Usque ad hoc tempus in fide constantissimi perstiterunt*] the day he wrote his letter though Prelates infected with heresy were set over them. This would mean that the Thomas Christians had never known any change in their ancient faith. Bishop Roz SJ seems to put in the true perspective the whole question regarding the faith of the Thomas Christians during the 16<sup>th</sup> and the pre-16<sup>th</sup> centuries.”<sup>1836</sup>

There are two opinions regarding the connection of Thomas Christians to the Syriac language and the comprehensibility of the Syriac language by priests and people of SMC. Paremmakkal Thomman Cathanar one who journeyed from Malabar to Rome via Lisbon and back with Mar Joseph Kariattil (1786) makes mention of the intense relation of Thomas Christians with the Syriac language. “From the time the Apostle St. Thomas was in our country and gave us the treasure of the holy faith, we have been, until today, without any break, performing our ecclesiastical ceremonies and practices in the Syriac rite. Your predecessors tried their best to change this ancient Syriac rite of ours. But they realized that they could not ...”<sup>1837</sup> In the words of Buchanan it is all the more clear: “Every priest read fluently from it. Their own bibles were transcriptions by hand. Archdeacon George was able to converse in Syriac as if it were his mother tongue.”<sup>1838</sup> Vadakkekara, Kerala church historian, finds the reason for the closure of a seminary in these words: “The seminary in Cranganore established by the Franciscans had to be wound up all too prematurely because its authorities had failed to gauge the supreme importance that Syriac had for the St. Thomas Christians.”<sup>1839</sup> Whereas historians like S. Neill contradicts it saying that “it is to be doubted, because even the priests knew just enough Syriac to read the prayers of the Qurbana.”<sup>1840</sup> Neill’s words should in no way deny the fact of their [Malabarians] affinity to this particular language.

Another mistake which Bishop Roz found with the Thomas Christians is the use of the scripture mutilated by the Nestorians. But the contemporary theologians do not

<sup>1835</sup>Ibid., 119.

<sup>1836</sup>Podipara, *The Thomas Christians*, 112.

<sup>1837</sup>Paremmakkal, *Varthamanappusthakam*, 247.

<sup>1838</sup>Cited from Koodapuzha, Response, in: Puthur, ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*, 57 referring to Buchanan, *Christian Researches in Asia*, London 1811, 118.

<sup>1839</sup>Vadakkekara, *Origin of India’s Thomas Christians*, 24-26.

<sup>1840</sup>S. Neill, *A History of Christianity in India, The beginnings to A. D. 1707*, Cambridge 1984, 198.

agree with the argument of Roz who accused Nestorians saying that they falsified even the scripture texts. If we want to know the ecclesial and theological position of the Thomas Christians it is enough to refer to a letter from the archdeacon George of the Cross which was written in 1624 to the Jesuit General. In this letter he describes the state of affairs in which a dissonance and disharmony broke out between Roz and Thomas Christians.

“The reason for the dissension was the printing of a book at the order of Archbishop Dom Frey Alexis de Meneses which based on the information from our prelate, attributes heresy by serious calumnies unjustly to this Church. Errors, perhaps, there might have been; but heresies, which have to be confirmed with pertinacity, no. And if this Church were infected with heresy, the Fathers of the Society and other Catholic religious would not have been admitted into it; (for this reason) one can see well the falsity of what they attributed to us. From this arose other unpleasant things; and this state of affairs continued for twenty years.”<sup>1841</sup>

Another practice of the SMC which was hated by the Portuguese missionaries was the reception of the Holy Communion under both species. They considered it as an ‘abominable error.’<sup>1842</sup> Historians say that this practice was continued in the SMC at least up to the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century and thus it kept up the apostolic practice all through the ages. A Malayalam book written by P. Podipara, titled ‘nammude Ritu (Our rite, 71) gives us the indication that this practice was prevalent in Thomas Church till 1581. They found another reason to accuse the SMC as Nestorian due to its use of rice cake and wine of palms instead of bread and wine in the holy Eucharist. It was in vogue due to two reasons. First of all Kerala is a land where one does not find any vineyards and as a result one can imagine the difficulty with regard to the acquisition of it. Besides Kerala is not a land where there is wheat cultivation. Due to the inaccessibility of wine from vine and bread made of wheat the people of Kerala started using rice cake and palm wine or coconut juice for the Eucharistic celebration. We presume that it was the coconut juice, which is sweet was used for the Qurbana and it might not be toddy as there is some reference to it. Even to this day it is considered by Christian faithful as offensive to drink ‘toddy’ especially by a priest in public or any alcoholic drink in public for any matter. Even the practicing Syro-Malabar Christians hold that drinking toddy as disgraceful. Thus when the 18<sup>th</sup> century traveller gives such a record it can be either a recordical mistake<sup>1843</sup> or a translational mistake. So ‘Kokosnuss Getränk/coconut juice’ ‘Palm wine’ or ‘toddy’ which was extracted from coconut or coconut trees and which was available in the land in plenteous was used for the celebration. Second reason for the use of it could be explained as a logical explanation. Thomas Christians might have been inspired by the tradition of Jesus. He made use of the ‘country product’ (wine and bread from wheat) and conducted it in a ‘meal concept.’ Following this example given by Jesus these Christians also might have given thrust to the ‘meal concept’. Thus to accuse the use of coconut juice and rice cake as Nestorian is something perhaps due to the lack of any other fault to find with. The Malabar Christians were also using juice of raisins for the Eucharist, a

<sup>1841</sup>Cited from Mundadan, History of Christianity in India, 511 referring to ARSJ, Goa-Malabar, 18, 72.

<sup>1842</sup>Cf. Madey, The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East, 258.

<sup>1843</sup>„La messa era puramente Nestoriana: Consagravarsi in vino di coco dagl’indiani chiamato ‘Tagaram’ od ‘Araacca.’ L’ostia era una pasta di farina di grano mescolata con olio e sale. Questa ostia si faceva discendere per un buco dall’alto sull’altare del Celebrante” (cited from Madey, The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East, 259 referring to P. da S. Bartolomeo, Viaggio alle Indie Orientali, 1796, 136).

custom adopted from Jacobites but the Nestorians were not using it.<sup>1844</sup> It is a bit dim-witted to say that toddy or coconut juice is another sign of Nestorianism as Persians were never using coconut juice or toddy or rice cakes for their celebration of the holy Mass.

It seems almost fifteen changes Roz made on the various titles found in the anaphora. For example simple titles like Jesus was amplified and modified into 'Jesus Christ Your Son Our Lord,' again the title Mother of Christ was turned into 'Mother of God,' in all the places where he found the title of Chaldean Patriarch he replaced it with Pope.<sup>1845</sup> As we have already said these changes were done with a view to doctrinal integrity. It also abolished the liturgical practice of naming the bread and wine in anticipation as the body and blood of Christ. It had to eliminate names like Diodore, Nestorius and Theodore from the commemoration. They also modified the Creed by adding the phrase like *Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero*, and the substitution of *filius essentiae Patris* with *consubstantialem Patris*. The Syriac word '*bare kjana*' which meant exactly the same as *homoousios* and which was transliterated as *heumasios* could not satisfy the mind of the Latin bishop as they had set their mind to conform the Creed to the Roman Missal.<sup>1846</sup> They also prohibited clerics to touch the sacred vessels below the rank of subdeacons following the Roman liturgical law of the time (can. 124), and prohibited the use of stole by those who were below the deacons (can. 126).<sup>1847</sup> They demanded that the bread and wine which is used in the holy Qurbana must be pure wheat bread and pure Portuguese wine respectively (can. 126).<sup>1848</sup> The Synod also stipulated the use of consecrated altar stones and chalices of valuable metal (Can. 129).<sup>1849</sup> By some other misunderstanding, Menezes ordered the proscription of the practice of dipping one piece of bread which was broken with the Blood in the chalice and moistening the other piece with the already moistened piece of bread. He detected sacrilegious and impious action of Nestorians in such a practice for according to him it seemed, they believed that the body of Christ did not contain the Blood. Thus in this action of the Malabar priests they found an action to infuse Blood into the Body (can. 122).<sup>1850</sup> This was not a Nestorian practice although we find similarity in action.<sup>1851</sup> If we go through the actions done by both groups we will understand the differences held by these groups:

“i. The Nestorians cross the blood (wine) with the broken part held in the right hand, whereas the Malabar Christians cross the other half of the bread in the patin with the piece in the right hand. ii. The Nestorians first cross the wine and then dip the bread into it; whereas the Malabar Priests first dip a piece of the bread into the wine and then cross the other half of the bread. iii. The Nestorians dip a third piece of the bread into the wine whereas the Syrians of Malabar dip the second piece with which the other half of the bread was crossed.”<sup>1852</sup>

<sup>1844</sup>Cf. P. T. Geevarghese, Were the Syrian Christians Nestorians?, in: K. Moolayil, ed., Four Historic Documents, Changanacherry 2002, 113.

<sup>1845</sup>Cf. Kanichikattil, To Restore or to Reform?, 11 in reference to Connolly, The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy, 575-577.

<sup>1846</sup>Cf. Madey, The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East, 263 in reference to *Mansi*, 1247 Canon 116.

<sup>1847</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 264 in reference to *Mansi*, 1251.

<sup>1848</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Mansi*, 1253.

<sup>1849</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Mansi*, 1255.

<sup>1850</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 264 in reference to *Mansi*, 1251.

<sup>1851</sup>Cf. Geevarghese, Were the Syrian Christians Nestorians?, 113.

<sup>1852</sup>Geevarghese, Were the Syrian Christians Nestorians?, 146-47.

Another modification they insisted regarding the institution narrative was with regard to the words of consecration. As they found an institution narrative already existing in the AM, the Synod in its observations stated that the institution narrative that is the *verba consecrationis* should be the same as in the Roman Missal.<sup>1853</sup> It is interesting to note that the Diamper text which was already revised by Mar Joseph had a lot of similarity with Roman Missal: 1. “on the day previous to his suffering”; 2. omission of ‘which is broken for you’; 3. ‘and raises the chalice a little above the altar’ 4. ‘the chalice of my blood.’<sup>1854</sup> At the same time we find also something different from the text of the Roman Missal: “1. in truth seen in the consecration of bread and wine; 2. the position of ‘and whenever you eat this bread and drink this chalice ...’; 3. ‘and this will be for you a pledge for ever.’<sup>1855</sup> The text of Mar Joseph has the peculiar expression of Eastern Rites at the inception of the words of Institution: “In the night in which he was to be betrayed.”<sup>1856</sup> The phrase ‘and this will be for you a pledge for ever’ has been avoided from the Diamper text and in its place Synod inserted the modified text namely “and this will be for us a pledge until the end of the world.”<sup>1857</sup> The epiclesis of the anaphora of AM does not mention whether it is through the work of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine are turned into the body and blood of Christ. Therefore the Diamper synod did not modify it. But at the same time the Diamper synod eliminated the expression: “the priest invokes the Spirit who comes down from heaven.”<sup>1858</sup> The synod had taken this hymn as an epicletic. We find in between this prayer the institution narrative. According to Botte this has happened due to an insertion. He observes that when the institution narrative was inserted the Epiclesis was pushed back, and this hymn which was epicletic, was separated from the Epicletical prayer. But today this hymn goes with the ceremony of prostration in the Raza.<sup>1859</sup> It is an irony that then on this liturgy was seen at least by some scholars as a hybrid comprised of East Syrian and Latin.

“Mahlhereusement les livres anciens furent détruits à la suite de synode de Goa (1585) et de Diamper (1599) qui imposèrent l’adoption de nombreux rites et formulaires latins empruntés pour une part au rite de Braga et de Coïmbre. C’est sous cette forme hybride que la liturgie a été célébrée jusqu’à ces récentes années dans l’Eglise syro-malabare catholique.”<sup>1860</sup>

Thus the modifications, which the Portuguese introduced into the holy Mass of Syro-Malabarians, have only caused it to become a hybrid product. The Church of Malabar, which was in communion with Rome through this Patriarchal Church of Persia, was also called Indo-Chaldean Church. The Malabarians who were one in faith and tradition were severed in 1664 when a few of them received West Syrian rite although all of them are known as St. Thomas Christians and Nazrani Mapilas. It was from the time of the Portuguese we find the term ‘Nestorians’ as being applied to Malabar Christians as a designation by Portuguese to the Malabarians. Along with the Seleucians the Malabarians also began to be known as Chaldeans and it was a natural

<sup>1853</sup>Cf. Madey, *The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East*, 265 in reference to *Mansi* 1244, can. 110.

<sup>1854</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>1855</sup>*Ibid.*, 265-266.

<sup>1856</sup>*Ibid.*, 266.

<sup>1857</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *Mansi*, 1244, can. 109.

<sup>1858</sup>Cited from *ibid.*, 267 referring to *Mansi*, 1248, can. 118.

<sup>1859</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Sacris Erudiri* 6, 1954, 63-64; Raza means the most solemn celebration of the Eucharist in the SMC.

<sup>1860</sup>I. H. Dalmis, *Les Liturgies D’orient: rites et symboles*, Paris 1980, 48.

phenomenon to address them also as Nestorians in line with the appellation applied to their Patriarchate. The term which was used to designate the Malabarians namely 'Nestorians' was not applied as a characteristic of the Malabar church.<sup>1861</sup> Today it is approved among many open and truth seeking historians that the term 'Nestorians' was a designation given to both Chaldean Church and Malabar Church not as a designation to show that they were heretic but only as a geographic designation. Besides it may be doubted whether the Portuguese missionaries had also the right comprehension of what is really 'Nestorianism.' From the above accusations raised by both bishops Roz and Menezes it is very clear that they were not well informed about the content of the heresy called Nestorianism. Though geographically it may fit to Church of Seleucia, in no way it fits to the Malabar Church as it is geographically also very far from the above mentioned area. After a long period being under the Chaldean bishops, namely from 4<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, and later under the Latin Rite Roman Catholic bishops from 1599, the Thomas Christians got their own dioceses from 1887. From that time onwards this church is known as Syro-Malabar Catholics a technical name in order to differentiate them from the Latin Rite Catholics in Kerala. The Church was again blessed in 1923 with a Hierarchy with Mar Augustine Kandathil as the first Metropolitan and Head of the Church. The words of Pope Pius XI were really a great consolation for the eastern Churches namely "Latinization was no longer to be encouraged among the Eastern Rite Catholics."<sup>1862</sup> Afterward by the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Pope Pius XII in 1957 approved her liturgy which is drawn from the East Syrian Sources. It was in 1962 on July 3<sup>rd</sup> she started to celebrate the Holy Mass in Malayalam the mother tongue of Kerala. From then on her faithful are able to celebrate the Divine Liturgy of AM, with the inserted Institution Narrative, in their own language.

## ii. Malabar Liturgy and Recent Developments

After a long attempt of latinization through the Portuguese, Rome has realized the authenticity and the traditional nature of SMC. In the words of Cardinal Beltrami the pain and tragedy the SMC underwent is explicitly expressed: "Quale dolorosa sorpresa per l'anima malabarica"<sup>1863</sup> (what a painful surprise to a Malabar soul). Another historian expresses the intentions of the Portuguese in Kerala in the following words: "thus the synod accomplished the desired target of the political Portuguese: to detach the Malabarians from the Chaldean Patriarch and to extend to these regions the influence of His Catholic Majesty (the Portuguese Crown!)."<sup>1864</sup> When again in Kerala in the year 1874 the Mellus schism broke out the Malabar Christians remained with Rome. In the year 1875 on Jan 27 Pope Pius IX "sent a brief *Per legentes* to the Christians of Malabar congratulating them on their resistance."<sup>1865</sup> It is praise worthy to observe her steadfast faith, tireless service of charity and missionary service to the

<sup>1861</sup>Cf. Koodapuzha, Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the Saint Thomas Christians, 145-156.

<sup>1862</sup>Cited from J. Vellian, The Synod of Diamper and the Liturgy, in: G. Nedugatt, ed., The Synod of Diamper Revisited, referring to G. Menacherry, The St. Thomas Christian Encyclopedia of India, Rome 2001, 173.

<sup>1863</sup>Cited from V. Pathikulangara, Chaldeo-Indian Liturgy I: Introduction, Kottayam 1992, 51 referring to G. Beltrami, La Chiesa Caldea nel Secolo dell'Unione, in: OC 29 [Num. 83] (1933), 126.

<sup>1864</sup>Pathikulangara, Chaldeo-Indian Liturgy, 51.

<sup>1865</sup>Tisserant, Eastern Christianity in India, 116.

whole world even in these painful experiences. Some of the Malabar priests are in high praise also of the relations SMC has with the Western Church.

“It is true that in some respects our rite lost some of its identity and Indian image and had to accept some rituals alien to our rite, because the then authorities of our Church, yielded to an ‘overlatinisation’ with the explicit and implied consent of Rome. But we should remember gratefully that it gave a new life to our church in many ways. We need not hide the fact that the present youthful vitality and the international prestige of our church are to some extent the outcome of our contact with the western church.”<sup>1866</sup>

And finally there came a time when Rome realized all her endeavours and genuineness. Thus Rome took initiative to put up the Syro-Malabar Vicariates Apostolic of Trichur and Kottayam in 1887 and named this Church as ‘The Syro-Malabar Church’ in order to distinguish them from the Latins, the rebels of the Mellus schism who were called the Syro-Chaldeans and from the non-Catholics like the Jacobites, the Marthomites, and the Anglicans.<sup>1867</sup> “After 300 years of latinisation under Portuguese Jurisdiction the Thomas Christians were liberated by the Holy See through a ritual separation of the Chaldeo-Malabar Church from the Latin Church in 1887 and the establishment of the independent hierarchy for Chaldeo-Malabar Church in 1923.”<sup>1868</sup> Thus atlast there came an era of self-governance for the SMC. This could be considered as the fifth phase of the SMC. Like any other anaphoras SMC’s anaphora also underwent so many restorations and modifications. Some of them we have already seen. The restorations which were applied in 1599<sup>1869</sup> and which the Diamper Synod approved underwent changes and modifications again in 1603,<sup>1870</sup> 1774<sup>1871</sup> and 1844.<sup>1872</sup> Thereafter there were many moves to update and modify her liturgy. After this period we find the earliest attempt of it in 1929 when the Malabar bishops through the Apostolic Delegate to India named Ladislaus Zaleski requested the permission to translate the Roman Pontifical from Latin to Syriac. This request was submitted to Rome to the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches. In the year 1934 on Dec. 1 after long discussion it was submitted to Pope Pius XI. Thanks to the awareness of the Pope who stoutly refused the process of approbation saying: “Latinism ought not to be encouraged among the Orientals; the Holy See does not wish to Latinize, but to catholicize. Half measures are neither fruitful nor generous.”<sup>1873</sup> Pope Pius XI himself took up the initiative to restore all the Oriental liturgies by setting up a permanent liturgical commission within the Congregation for

<sup>1866</sup>J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I see it* (trans. K. C. Chacko), Ernakulam 1987, 4.

<sup>1867</sup>Cf. A. Thazhath, *The Quest for Identity: The Syro-Malabar Church and its Rite*, Thrissur 1992, 3.

<sup>1868</sup>Arangassery, *Ecclesial Dimensions of East Syrian Liturgy*, 5.

<sup>1869</sup>Diamper Synod had made almost 40 modifications in the Syro-malabar Taksa (text) related to Karozuza (6) Hymns (7) Diacon’s proclamation (4) response of the people (1) the reading of the Gospel (1) Credo (1) in the prayers which is said by the celebrant before the anaphora (5) in the anaphora (4) final blessing (6) Again regarding the name of Jesus almost 15 additions and eliminations we come across. These all were made in order to conform to the right teaching of the Church and due to the fear that they exhibited some Nestorian elements (cf. N. K Jose, *Syro- Malababr Kurbanayude Charitram*, [in Malayalam, the history of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana], Kottayam 1987, 38).

<sup>1870</sup>In 1603 again with notable dissatisfaction Roz the first Latin Bishop of the Malabar Christians started modifying her liturgy as he found still certain elements to be changed according to him and due to the clinging of Kathanars (priests) to the old one. He also applied almost 30 modifications to it (cf. *ibid.*, 39-41).

<sup>1871</sup>Up to this time the Qurbana had no printed text rather only the manuscript. In this year it got printed. And the imprimatur is given by Rome to print it officially (cf. *ibid.*, 47).

<sup>1872</sup>This is another text seems to have printed in Rome with certain modifications.

<sup>1873</sup>Cited from Pathikulangara, *Chaldeo-Indian Liturgy*, 54.



the Eastern Church according to traditional usages.<sup>1874</sup> As a part of it Mgr. Tisserant came to Kerala in 1953 and met all the Bishops of SMC personally and enquired about the need of restoration. According to his suggestion a special commission was put up comprised of Frs. Placid, Cyril and Corolowski on March 10, 1954. Thus the fixed text of Syro-Malabar Liturgy was sent to Rome for approbation. Accordingly the text which was approved by Pope Pius XII published in three parts. (a) the first part contained three anaphoras (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> anaphoras were in Latin version) and the unchanged parts of the Qurbana, known as Taksa;<sup>1875</sup> (b) the second part of it contained rubrics and Ordo (known as Ordo)<sup>1876</sup> (c) the third part contained of supplementary prayers (known as supplementum).<sup>1877</sup> One among these three parts was approved by Pope Pius XI and the other parts were by Pope Pius XII in 1957. The bishops of SMC were asked to coordinate well the elements from these extracts and produce a wholistic text of the Qurbana. But instead they published a Qurbana text with the anaphora of AM with the Ordinary prayers in Syriac. Thereafter the Sacred Congregation through a decree named '*De Ritu Sacrificii Eucharistici instaurato*' highlighted certain practical elements which are to be taken into consideration at the celebration of the holy Mass. Thus the already translated and approved Malayalam text of 1960 came into use in 1962 on July 3<sup>rd</sup>. But even with this modification, the Syro-Malabar liturgy is not relieved of its initial impair namely latinization and westernization. Although the SMC is in perfect harmony with Rome it underwent time and again re-latinization. Later this modified text which was approved by Pius XII in 1957 and by John XXIII in 1959 became the source of the restored Qurbana of 1962 in the mother tongue of Kerala namely Malayalam. Later there were attempts to restore the lost elements in 1968 and 1981. But both these texts were not accepted by Vatican as they were not in conformity with the original form of the Qurbana. Thus in 1981 Vatican gave clear and binding directives to the SMB (Syro-Malabar bishops) through a decree titled Observations on the order of the Holy Mass of the Syro-Malabar Church 1981 issued on 1 March 1983.<sup>1878</sup> The SMB formulated the new text of Qurbana for approval and it got official recognition from Sacred Congregation on 19<sup>th</sup> December 1986. The same holy Mass was officially inaugurated by late Pope John Paul II on 8<sup>th</sup> February 1985 at Kottayam on the occasion of the raising Sr. Alphonsa and Fr. Chavara to the state of blessed. The Bishop's Conference of SMC decided to utilize this revised, modified and approved text unanimously. The present Qurbana of SMC has three forms namely Raza, Solemn and Simple forms varying from more solemn or less solemn with more singing and more prayers adapting and customizing to various occasions. Although it is through a long process of struggle she has come to her present Liturgy, she can be proud saying that some of the lost elements are brought back to its initial purity.

---

<sup>1874</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1875</sup>Cf. T. Mannoramparambil, Syro-Malabar Sabhayude Qurbana Oru Padanam, (A study on the Qurbana of SMC), Kottayam 1999, 28 in reference to *Ordo Quddase Liturgiarum juxta Ritum Ecclesiae Syrorum Orientalium Malabarensium*, Romae 1955, 59.

<sup>1876</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 29 in reference to *Ordo Celebrationis Quddasa juxta Usam Ecclesiae Syro Malabarensis*, Romae 1959.

<sup>1877</sup>Cf. *ibid.* in reference to *Supplementum Mysteriorum Sive Proprium de Tempore et de Sanctis juxta Usam Ecclesiae Syro-Malabarensis*, Romae 1960.

<sup>1878</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 30.

## Chapter V

### Concluding Remarks

After having dealt with all the pros and cons of the issue I would like to draw some review from our findings. We had been trying to find out the so-called relationship of SMC with Nestorianism. In order to find out her roots we went first through the various phases of the SMC along with an analysis of her Anaphora, she uses, namely from a structural, biblical, catholic, scholarly and modern view. From our study we are forced to conclude that SMC is one of the ancient and apostolic churches as her birth is of the ancient origin. This is all the more made clear by the analysis of the Anaphora which she uses up to this day. The analysis of the Bible based study compels us to think that the anaphora which she makes use has tried to incorporate the mind of Jesus and in accordance with the Church. The study conducted by Vatican also certifies that the Anaphora used by the Assyrian Church is ancient, apostolic and catholic. Thus the SMC which has received its anaphora from the Chaldean Church must also fall in line with this characterization. All the more if the Assyrian Church of the East is apostolic and its anaphora is ancient, apostolic and catholic, the SMC can all the more claim its apostolicity and catholicity as it never turned away from its true relationship with the Catholic Church. Majority of modern scholars agree with the findings of Vatican namely it is a genuine anaphora and not Nestorian. Thus the SMC which lie also in the Eastern kingdom has nothing in common with Nestorianism and therefore this accusation is nothing other than a misnomer.

We will make an effort to do a summing-up of what we had been trying to analyse through the various chapters. The modern scholarship has brought out the undercurrent of Nestorian-Cyrrillian conflict through the various works and analysis. It was not in the serious sense a first class theological fight for upholding a doctrine. It was merely a conflict based on the political, terminological and personal. Cyril felt the need of resisting and bringing back the power to the Church of Egypt as he sensed a threat from canon 6 of the Constantinople council which gave primacy of honour to Constantinople after Rome. Up to this moment Cyril was the unquestionable Patriarch of the region. So he realized that if Nestorius gets more power who came to the see of Constantinople as the Patriarch, he would be tackled for the many misdeeds which he had committed in the past. Thus he started a method of counter-attack. That was the vogue of the day. The enemies of the Church were always brought down by a mere accusation of heresy. Thus Nestorius became a prey to the trick which Cyril played. Thus all the heresies which were disseminated against him and made against him do not have any more validity and do not stand with proper legitimacy. Of course those accusations were based on unsolid grounds and it destroyed the life of the Patriarch of Constantinople who stood to ascertain and teach the humanity of Christ but unfortunately no one was there from the Alexandrian side to hearken to what Nestorius wanted to say. Today we are in a better position to understand Nestorius due to the scholarly works of so many theologians. They all are of the opinion that the position of Nestorius was much more helpful to explain the doctrine of the Church than that of Cyril. The discovery of the *Liber Heraclidis* by Nestorius was a great thrust to understand him better. Along with it his arguments got better acceptance when

Theodoret of Cyrus was able to make clearer what actually Nestorius meant and tried to hold through his further studies.

As an Antiochian Theodoret of Cyrus also fall in line with the Antiochian school but with more precision than anyone from the same school regarding the Christological position. This fact is all the more highlighted by the various studies we conducted in the first chapter and in which we have come to the conclusion that ‘Nestorius was never Nestorian.’ Baker asserts assiduously that “the teaching and terminology of Theodoret and Nestorius were well remembered as well as standard (‘standard’ they have always remained), the Creeds of the Councils of the Nestorian Church are perfectly orthodox. No trace of heresy has crept into them. I can find no trace of ‘Nestorianism’ in the Nestorian Church of that time.”<sup>1879</sup> M. Labourt affirms in his words when he says: “I cannot find evidence that ‘Nestorianism’ ever existed in any but this ‘singularly attenuated’ form. In other words, it was never more than a tendency.”<sup>1880</sup> Thus all the accusation which centuries after centuries showered upon Nestorius and his followers must be seen as a slander against him. In recuperation to what has taken place in the past and in realization of all that has been going on in the various Churches, Catholic Church has taken the initiative to bring all the sheep to her fold. Thus any church being accused as ‘Nestorian’ must be seen as not based on any principle rather clearing off a person and his companions from the history of the Church on baseless and cantankerous steps. Thus the churches which use the AM and which are criticized as Nestorian due to its leniency towards this liturgy is not based on any reality rather geographical appellation. At the same time we have to consider the enormous contribution Cyril made to the Church. Thus both Nestorius and Cyril are necessary for a better explanation of the present Christology. Hence for all the atrocities the Nestorians underwent for centuries there must be a sincere catholic move to foster warm and fraternal atmosphere in which all feel free to converse with one another. If we remain united the message of Christ goes deep into the hearts of people divided we spoil the mission of Christ which he has begun on this earth among us.

Another explanation we may put forward to free the Church of the East from the accusation that it is Nestorian lie on the fact that it was not founded by Nestorius rather by Apostles St. Peter, St. Thomas and St. Thaddeus etc. It is not due to the fear of accusation that we deny it as being grounded by Nestorius but in order to be faithful to the historical records and history. We came across the fact in our study that due to the geographical, linguistic and political reasons it remained always in detachment from other churches. Due to this above mentioned reasons the Church of the East could not take part in many of the Councils which were held during the first five centuries. The classical example we find for the alienation this Church underwent in the fact that this church came to know the binding decisions of Nicea only after eighty five years.<sup>1881</sup> So also it did not take part officially in synods like Nicea, Ephesus, Robber Synod, Chalcedon, and Constantinople. We know from history that the Ephesus Synod which was held in order to condemn Nestorius and the church guided by him, later the Robber Synod in which the Antiochian party was maltreated, and the Chalcedon Synod in which the Antiochian Christological position was taken up were unknown to this Church of the East. Geographically speaking also, the Church of the East is not in

<sup>1879</sup>Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, 200.

<sup>1880</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to M. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l’empire perse*, Paris 1904, 224-632.

<sup>1881</sup>Cf. Podipara, *The Canonical sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 38.

Constantinople and Constantinople is not in Persia. Consequently we may say with all certainty that Nestorius did not come up from the Church of the East but from the Antiochian Church and the problem related with him took place only when he was the patriarch of Constantinople. Then we may ask further how then this Church is termed Nestorian. The only mistake this Church of the East seems to have committed is that it did not accept the condemnation imposed upon Nestorius by the Ephesian Council of 431. This Church later favoured Nestorianism as they found nothing wrong in his two-nature (against Cyril's accusation of two-person Christology) Christology. Thereafter this Church is also termed as Nestorian Church. At the same time against this acceptance of Nestorians or Nestorianism a group of people gave up Nestorianism and they constituted the (catholic) Chaldean Church.<sup>1882</sup> The name Chaldean was taken up and applied to themselves by a handful of Malabarians who joined the Nestorian Church after 1907.<sup>1883</sup> Thus people those who belonged originally to this Church and later left to join the Nestorians when started applying the names to themselves it became a matter of confusion regarding whom to apply the title 'Nestorian' and 'whom to apply the title 'Chaldean.' Whereas not taking into account any of the above given facts, from that time onwards the Church of the West and the other Eastern churches lying in the Roman Empire when started applying the term 'Nestorian' to all the churches which were in connection with this Church of the East it became attached to them permanently in a confused way.<sup>1884</sup>

If we go back to the history we find how Nestorius was maltreated and banished and his supporters were severely persecuted in the Roman Empire. The shrewdness of Cyril hunted them like anything. Thus while fleeing from the Roman Empire in search of an asylum they came to the Persian Empire where they were received as both of the Churches found agreement basically in their doctrines. It occurred only almost after 30 years of the council of Ephesus that is to say after the death of Nestorius. This incident will compel us to the conclusion that it was not the Church of the East which followed Nestorius but it was Nestorius and his supporters followed the Church of the East. So basing on this incident if we term a church Nestorian we may have to name all the other churches Nestorian by the same reason which approve the Chalcedon definition in which the two-nature Christology came out victorious. In the words of Cardinal Muffei we hear like this that "the Chaldeans (the Church of the East) seem to have had the name of Nestorians without holding any Nestorian error."<sup>1885</sup> Another study conducted in our time asserts that the Persian Church professed Nestorianism only to save their life. "From the false and dangerous position only a profession of Nestorianism could save the Persian Church, because Christians at this time were more at enmity with each other for theological reasons than with the heathen, and the prevailing tendency in the Byzantine Church was then Monophysite."<sup>1886</sup> This citation compels us to think that after the persecution and period of threat they experienced in

<sup>1882</sup>Cf. Podipara, *The Thomas Christians*, 36.

<sup>1883</sup>Cf. idem, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 33.

<sup>1884</sup>„Die ostsyrischen Christen lehnten eine Verurteilung des Nestorius ab, weshalb sie von den innerhalb des Römischen Reiches gelegenen Kirchen westlicher wie auch östlicher Tradition über Jahrhunderte als 'Nestorianer' bezeichnet wurden“ (H. Meyer, et al., ed., *Dokumente wachsender Übereinstimmung: Sämtliche Berichte und Konsentexte interkonfessioneller Gespräche auf Weltebene*, Band III, Paderborn 2003, 594).

<sup>1885</sup>Cited from R. Vattakuzhy, *Church of the East Never Nestorian*, Trichur 1989, 77 referring to Cardinal Muffei.

<sup>1886</sup>Ratcliff, *The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 24.

their life, they must have in all way professed their own faith. I would like to call such a situation as practical adjustment. But in no way it goes deeper into the depth of faith life of the Persian Church. In the words of the above mentioned scholar, E. C. Ratcliff, this has only brought about some detachment with conservatism along with certain ideas, certain beliefs, certain practices, certain forms that have been inherited from the ancient Edessene past.<sup>1887</sup> It is to be observed that the author is cautious not to use ‘Nestorian past’ rather he uses the word ‘Edessene past.’

It is perhaps an interesting thing to note that Cyril too is a dyophysite. In our treatment of him in the second chapter we found that Cyril also wanted to uphold the two realities of Christ like Nestorius. Therefore whom to condemn or who to condemn is a puzzling question. Thus the idea which was held by Nestorius and Cyril namely ‘Christ is one Person in two natures’ was again re-emphasized with precise terminology in the Formula of Renunion by an Antiochian called Theodoret of Cyrus. Thus we can say with all certainties that these three figures namely Nestorius, Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus were pivotal in giving shape to the not yet fully developed Christology of the Church. So in the light of the new studies it must be a case of self-pride to say that one is a Nestorian than a blame who contributed much in the development of the right Christology and who initiated such a thought in the Christian world. After all both Cyril and Nestorius were trying to teach the same thing: “the Logos suffered in the flesh is theologically the exact equivalent of Nestorius’ dogma that the Logos suffered in the *prosopon* of the manhood which he took for his own.”<sup>1888</sup> When Cyril wanted to give upperhand or stress to the Logos in his explanation Nestorius wanted to emphasise the manhood of Christ. So if the fighting parties looked back and contemplated a little over the issue between the so-called ‘Nestorianism’ and ‘Cyrillianism’ they might have overcome with shame for the uselessness of their fight and tension. If we go through the citation of Seeberg we will understand how miserably Nestorius was punished who did a lot of good to the church: “None of the great ‘heretics’ of the history of dogma bears this name as undeservedly as Nestorius.”<sup>1889</sup> All the more how can we condemn a person whose crude form of Christology helped much and which gave further impetus to move forward in Christological field in Catholic theology. We may not be wrong to say that today the Christological expressions used by most Christian denominations and of course, catholic theology, reflect what originally Nestorius stressed or affirmed namely: The Messiah was perfect God and perfect man, without confusion or change, division or separation approving at the same time the loopholes in his teachings. Thus we may say that it was only a fight in the name of terminologies which were not properly understood what each side intended. Thus when we live in the 21<sup>st</sup> century it must be an ‘ought’ that one knows the background in which all these things, which should not have happened, occurred. Thus we could say that the contributions of both Nestorius and Cyril must be considered as two sides of the same coin further perfected in the Theodoretian mint and a great contribution to the universal Church in its search to understand the person of Christ. Today no serious historian would deny the fact that Nestorius was condemned not for the so-called heresy but for the prominence he and

---

<sup>1887</sup>Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>1888</sup>Anastos, Nestorius was Orthodox, 139.

<sup>1889</sup>Cited from Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition, 504 referring to R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* II. 3, Leipzig 1923, 219.

the new Patriarchate was acquiring. It is clear from the words of Theodoret how much he was respected among his own people: "I have already informed your holiness that if the doctrine of the very holy and venerable Bishop, my lord Nestorius, is condemned I will not communicate with those who do so"<sup>1890</sup> (Ep. 175). Thus if we accuse the Church of the East as Nestorian who has accepted the two-nature Christology of Nestorius who fought at the same time like Cyril for the right terminology it may be again a slam to churches which still respect his contributions to the universal Church.

"This Church (church of the East) was, to all intents and purposes, already independent from the other Churches, not only by lying outside the Roman Empire but also by having objected (not without some good reason<sup>1891</sup>) to the irregular procedure of the council of Ephesus of 431 AD."<sup>1892</sup> Stewart is of the opinion that "the Church of the East had nothing whatever to do with this controversy of which they were ignorant until long after it was over."<sup>1893</sup> This author reached at such a conclusion from the fact that both empires remained politically hostile and as a result what occurred in the Roman Empire was unknown to the people those who resided in the Persian Empire. All the more Persian Church had no much time or energy left to take part in a hair-splitting controversy or conflict of the West when they themselves were passing through the fire of persecution. This citation may help us to understand the situation in the Seleucia-Ctesiphon Church:

"For this Church, detachment, if not complete isolation, from the Byzantine church, was an extreme necessity; for the Persian Shah, often at war with the Byzantine emperor, and always suspicious of his intentions, naturally regarded his Christian subjects as supporters rather of his enemy than of himself on the ground of their common Christianity."<sup>1894</sup>

Besides the language of the Western world was Greek whereas Aramaic was the language of the Church of the East. We know for certain that almost all theological controversies in the West was conducted in Greek and as a result the church of the East found it difficult to understand all the delicate and complicated terminologies expressed in Greek.

"It is therefore no wonder that when the church of Edessa emerges into the clear light of history we find it characterized by features and an outlook that distinguish it from Greek Christianity and by a conservatism that is to be expected in the genuinely oriental, while at the same time it bears about it certain definite marks of kinship with the church of the Graeco-Roman world."<sup>1895</sup>

Our evaluation of the anaphora in the fourth chapter also gives us impetus to assert that it is not Nestorian. It can be said as the anaphora belongs to a period of antiquity that they received it from the Apostles and not from Nestorius. The liturgy which was used in Chaldea and Mesopotamia was opposed to the Syro-occidental rite. In India the latter one [Syro-occidental] is followed by the Syro-Malankara where as the Syro-Malabar follows the Syro-oriental which we find only in regions like Chaldea and Mesopotamia independent of Antioch and Nestorians. Thus we can say that the Liturgy of AM is not Nestorian rather it directly comes from the great disciples of the

<sup>1890</sup>Cited from Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies*, 235 referring to Theodoret of Cyrus, Ep. 175.

<sup>1891</sup>Cf. Brock, *The Nestorian Church: A Lamentable Misnomer*, 25.

<sup>1892</sup>J. Faultless, *The two recensions of the Prologue to John in Ibn al-Tayyib's Commentary on the Gospels*, in: D. Thomas, ed., *Christians at the Heart of Islamic Rule*, London 2003, 183.

<sup>1893</sup>J. Stewart, *Nestorian Missionary Enterprise*, Edinburgh 1928, 324.

<sup>1894</sup>Ratcliff, *The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 24.

<sup>1895</sup>Ibid.

Apostle Thomas namely Addai and Mari. It is an anaphora which has its base in *BH* of the Jewish liturgy like any of the ancient anaphoras. It is true in the beginning it did not have an institution narrative. But our study gave us sufficient proof from the observation made by Vatican and scholars that the institution narrative or the 'economy' is permeated all through the AM anaphora. Therefore we cannot condemn it saying that it does not have an institution narrative *ad litteram*. From this we may conclude that not having an institution narrative is also a proof for an anaphora to be very ancient and traditional,<sup>1896</sup> as it belonged to the nascent period of the growth of the Church. Hence we are driven to the conclusion that this Church is apostolic and not Nestorian. So also the Malabar Church is not Nestorian due to its dependence on the Church of the East only for the anaphora and the hierarchy as the Church of the East is not Nestorian. If we go through the growth of any liturgy in the Church we will understand that all the liturgies have undergone a process of addition as time demanded. So Malabar Liturgy is also not an exception to the modifications she made to her liturgy. From the analysis and comparison we made above (AM with *BH*, Sharar III, Didache and Cup of Elijah) it is clear that the AM belonged to the nascent period of the Church itself. AM has more affinity to Judaic prayer service which was instrumental in the formulation of the later liturgies and the anaphoras of the church. Accordingly we can say AM is a rudimentary form of the Christian liturgy. We could also make it clear by going through the various strata it underwent. If it were perfect in the very beginning there would not have been needed any further additions. But we have found as the theology and the liturgy of the church developed AM also tried to incorporate well with the thinking and thought-pattern of the Church in relation with the other Churches. Thus some omission or some addition, which are intentional in order to validate itself with the current liturgical practice of the time, can in no way make it heretical. If something found in it contrary to the teaching of the church, Vatican would not have agreed to it. Instead Vatican recognizes the christology of the Assyrian Church not only as orthodox but actually as the same christology expressed in different terms in the common christological draft arrived by both Dinkha IV and John Paul II in the year 1994.

Besides, it is interesting to note that this church was approved by Vatican as ancient, apostolic and authentic even though it uses the AM and which has in any way more (geographical) affinity to Nestorians than the SMC. If that is the case with the Assyrian Church which is congruent in faith with the Catholic Church and which was accepted and approved as an apostolic, ancient and authentic church with its old and unchanged AM liturgy, how can a sincere and truth seeking person accuse the SMC saying that it is Nestorian which has also used the same liturgy from 4<sup>th</sup> century upto the present day although it underwent modifications in Portuguese times and which remained catholic from the very beginning. And in the year 2001 we witness to the most remarkable magisterial document since Vatican II. This document which is the fruit of the study of the magisterial committee of the Catholic Church, in which Pope Benedict XVI was also a member, found that the Anaphora of the Assyrian Church namely AM is not only apostolic but it is ancient and at the same time authentic. And if this liturgy which is approved and acknowledged as apostolic, authentic and ancient of the Assyrian Church how the same liturgy which was used in SMC can be heretical and consequently Nestorian. Hence any accusation on SMC due to its use of the AM

---

<sup>1896</sup>Cf. Russo, *The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*, 37.

liturgy was either a geographical indicator or a purposeful calumny or at the same time ignorance from the part of the people who called it so or with a motive to defame and subordinate the church. Besides, this factor will once again lead us to the authenticity of the grievance raised by SMC for the injustice done to it that it was not because of the heretic elements it contained rather to subordinate the church to the Latin rule that all these corrections, eliminations and additions were made. If we make a sincere and reasonable search into the accusations made by the Portuguese one will understand that it was a calumny in order to exercise their power over the SMC. At the same time we do not condemn completely the Portuguese missionaries for finding fault with the SMC. As they found the names of the great theologians, who were considered great heretics in this times namely, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, in the liturgical books of the SMC and as they were quite aware of the teaching of the church they might have decided to bring the SMC under the proper guidance of the church of course with political power and much dominion. When we look back from the 21<sup>st</sup> century equipped with the various studies conducted on the person of Nestorius and his teaching and along with the ecumenical movement of the Church we understand what they did in the 16<sup>th</sup> and the following centuries was false and unacceptable. But one should not forget the idea that the Portuguese missionaries had no such tools available to check the veracity of the teaching of the so-called theologians [heretics] and their church. Thus we may say that with the announcement of the recognition of the Assyrian Church in the 20<sup>th</sup> century all other churches which are in relation to it either geographically, in an administrative level or theological level or those who have only adopted the liturgy are also apostolic, ancient and authentic and thus any such accusations are simply calumny and misnomer.

If the Church of the East had no connection with the Nestorian Church how can it be true to say that SMC of Kerala is Nestorian? On the contrary the Syro-Malabar Church which claims its origin earlier than the Church of the East is also apostolic and ancient. By using an earlier formed anaphora it safeguards yet today one of the richest traditions of the Church. Some accuse Malabar Church saying that it has lost its uniqueness by being docile to the Roman Church through the Portuguese missionaries. People of the other Churches in India accuse the Syro-Malabarians saying that, in the Coonan Cross incident (1654) when a group of Thomas Christians went away from the Church, a large portion of it surrendered to the powerful tyranny of Menezes, the Archbishop (1596) of Goa, the Pope's agent.<sup>1897</sup> This is precisely the reason why Pope John Paul II was not hesitant to speak in high praise about this Church. His words about the Malabar Church is a proof that she never went away from the true path of Catholicism: "It is to the glory of this Church that it has not ever been severed from the communion with the Church of Rome in a continuity that the geographic distance has never been able to break."<sup>1898</sup> Francis Roz, the Latin-Spanish priest who was instrumental in correcting the Qurbana text and later who became bishop in India, writes about the Malabar people in the 16<sup>th</sup> century "that they professed Roman Catholic faith, although their books contained errors of Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius."<sup>1899</sup> Pope Pius XII remarked about the Malabar Church as "the one which

<sup>1897</sup>Cf. Vattakuzhy, Church of the East Never Nestorian, V.

<sup>1898</sup>Cited from A. Thazhath, The Quest for Identity: The Syro-Malabar Church and its rite, Thrissur 1992, 6 referring to Insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo II, III/2, Roma 1980, 513.

<sup>1899</sup>Cited from *ibid.* referring to *De erroribus Nestorianorum qui in hac India oriental versantur*, 15.



had always remained faithful to the Catholic Church in spite of all the humiliating experiences she had to endure. It is true that she had no opportunity for regular contacts with Rome until the advent of the Western Missionaries in India. But at the first opportunity her communion was spontaneous.”<sup>1900</sup> These citations are all crystal clear proof for the nature of SMC and to state that she was never Nestorian. We may reasonably suppose that if it were Nestorian how it would have been possible for Rome or Portuguese missionaries to exercise power over it. From the 15<sup>th</sup> century we have a very solid proof from Pope Eugene IV who wrote to the King of Kerala who was also known as the king of Thomas Christians, as by this time Thomas Christians were counted on par with the Sovereigns. For in 1439 Pope writes to the King of Kerala and sends it to him through convoys saying that “to my most beloved son in Christ, Thomas, the Illustrious of the Indians, health and the Apostolic Benediction. There often has reached us a constant rumour that Your Serenity and also all who are the subjects of your Kingdom are true Christians.”<sup>1901</sup>

Another thing to note about the accusation which is spoken against the Malabar Church is that it does not come from Rome rather from the Portuguese Padroado. It is also specially to be noted that Rome has never said anything against this Church in the history of SMC. Thus it seems Portuguese were more powerful than Rome and disobedient to Rome to admit the validity of this church. If we refer to the Padroado Schism, which is given above,<sup>1902</sup> it may become very clear. Their mentality was one of monopolizing and latinizing. They did not want to hear even the greatest head of the Catholic universal Church rather their pure motive was to bring them under their footstep. So today we must doubt whether Rome was even fearful to command to this missionary-sect to stop Latinizing. If we listen to the words of Pope Pius XI, Pope of a later period, it will be very clear for us. For he said: “Der Heilige Stuhl will nicht latinisieren, sondern katholisieren.”<sup>1903</sup> From time to time different Popes at different periods of history has clearly expressed the view on different rites with their impressions in celebrating it and how important other rites are : “so schrieb Papst Pius XI. - die Römische Kirche hat sie [die Riten] stets verehrt, sie ehrfurchtsvoll bewahrt und ihre Erhaltung gefordert, da sie in ihnen wie eine Königin in einem goldenen Kleid mit reichem Schmuck erscheint. Jeder Ritus ist ein kostbares Erbe der Kirche und trägt zum vollen Glanz katholischer Gottesverehrung bei.”<sup>1904</sup> But unfortunately the Portuguese missionaries did not have such an awareness which the later Popes expressed about the other rites. Thus Malabar Church became a prey due to the conceptions of these missionaries which today we consider as false and misleading with a motive to rule over. “The Goan Archbishop threatens the members [of Thomas Christians] with excommunication *latae sententiae* in case they do not follow his directives for [of] the Synod. He orders them by virtue of holy obedience.”<sup>1905</sup> Thus  
 “under Latin pressure the 16<sup>th</sup> century Chaldean Bishops governing the Malabar Church, especially Mar Jacob (1503-1547), Mar Joseph (†1569), and Mar Abraham (†1597) introduced Latin innovations into the Malabar Liturgy in use at that time.

<sup>1900</sup>P. Chittilapilly, Patriarchal Dignity for the Malabar Church, in: Thomapedia, 122.

<sup>1901</sup>Cited from Pothan, The Syrian Christians of Kerala, 32 referring to V. Nagam Aiya, The Travancore State Manual, Vol. II, 1906.

<sup>1902</sup>Cf. above fn.1567.

<sup>1903</sup>A. Kolencherry, Qurbana: Gottesdienstordnung der Syro-Malabarischen Kirche, Wien 1981, 8.

<sup>1904</sup>Madey and Vavanikunnel, Qurbana: Die Eucharistiefeyer der Thomaschristen Indiens, 12-13.

<sup>1905</sup>Koodapuzha, Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the St. Thomas Christians, 110.

Mar Jacob prepared a Syriac translation of the Latin absolution formula and modified the liturgical calendar. Mar Joseph modified the Pontifical, Missal and the Divine office.”<sup>1906</sup>

We have so many examples of such sort. In the Synod of Goa in 1585 Mar Abraham was asked to prepare a Syriac translation of the Latin Mass, Sacraments Sacramentals, Divine Office and Pontifical. To carry out this task Mar Roz, the first Latin Bishop of the Malabar Church from 1599-1624, was assigned. All these were done in the name of certain accusation against the Malabar Church namely ‘Nestorianism.’<sup>1907</sup> We also know that the major aim of the Portuguese was to control the SMC. The above said indication to threat may give rise to a natural and logical doubt that if Thomas Christians were not in communion with the Catholic Church how he could threaten them with excommunication and censure. We hear in the words of Roz who writes: “all have taken an oath that if His Holiness should send as their prelate, not their archdeacon but a Latin (Bishop) they would plead their case again with the Holy Father.”<sup>1908</sup> The phrase that ‘they would plead their case again with the Holy Father’ if it is not obedience and relation to the Holy Father how could we explain it? From all these above given citations it is apparent that the Thomas Christians always looked up to Papal authority for further clarity. But they were against the mentality of Portuguese missionaries of domination and suppression and not against any other doctrines and teachings of the Catholic Church. In the words of T. Kodiyan, “Die sogenannte ‘Synode von Diamper’ hat die Latinisierung völlig durchgesetzt ... und diese Synode hat 1599 unerlaubter- und ungültigerweise stattgefunden.”<sup>1909</sup> Even though this was the situation the people belonging to this church stood always for the true faith. This may be the reason even their so-called adversary bishops speak in high praise of this people about their faith. We may have recourse to the dissertation of Roz written in 1585/6 who worked among the Malabarians, preached in their churches, heard their confessions and taught in their seminary says in his thesis that

“the Malabarians (whom he calls Nestorians) ... professed the Roman Catholic faith, although their books contained Nestorian errors ... The Malabarians lived far away from the controversial zones ... in Malabar there were also books that contained clear passages in support of the Roman primacy ... Malabarians publicly preached the Blessed Virgin Mary as Mother of God and they left out the names of Nestorius and others when they recited the Divine office.”<sup>1910</sup>

In line with the words of Roz I must also add that the churches established in the name of Blessed Virgin Mary in Kerala in the Syro-Malabar Church is a standing proof that she approves her as θεοτόκος. If she [SMC] were Nestorian how could it have taken place there in Kerala? We must also take into account the situation in which Malabar Church sought the help of the Persian Church. It

<sup>1906</sup>J. Moolan, *The Period of Annunciation - Nativity in the East Syrian Calendar: Its Background and Place in the Liturgical Year*, Kottayam 1985, 2-3.

<sup>1907</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 3.

<sup>1908</sup>Cited from Koodapuzha, *Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the St. Thomas Christians*, 108 referring to ARSJ, Goa-Malabar 14, 357 (“... y todos estan juramentados que si Sd. Mandar prelado fuera de su arcediago, Latino que tornaran a replicar a su Sd.” This letter is dated December 23, 1597).

<sup>1909</sup>T. Kodiyan, ‘Qurbana,’ *Die Heilige Liturgie katholischer Thomas-Christen: Ostsyrischer Ritus in Indien*, Innsbruck 1963, 4.

<sup>1910</sup>Cited from Podipara, *The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 60 referring to *De Erroribus Nestorianorum qui in hac India orientali versantur*.

depended on the Persian Church for leadership. Although it is a church which is founded before the Persian Church, it had no hierarchical leadership up to 4<sup>th</sup> century. Thus it was for proper leadership it depended upon the Persian Church. As we have said she is also indebted to the Persian Church for the liturgy. This is hinted here not to obliterate its importance rather only to highlight the need of the Malabar Church. So as we have said previously about the Nestorian church that although it came to the Persian Church for its existence Persian church was not negatively influenced so also may be said about SMC that there was not a theological deformation taken place in SMC through her acquaintance and dependence on the Persian Church for the hierarchical aid. “Auf Grund ihrer hierarchischen Beziehung zur ostsyrischen Kirche übernahm die malabarische Kirche seit dem 5. Jahrhundert den ostsyrischen Ritus und die ostsyrische Liturgie.”<sup>1911</sup> It may be good to refer to the words of S. Brock regarding the status of the Church of the East:

“It is an utterly pernicious caricature, whose roots lie in a hostile historiographical tradition which has dominated virtually all textbooks of church history from antiquity down to the present day, with the result that the term ‘Nestorian Church’ has become the standard designation for the ancient oriental church which in the past called itself ‘The Church of the East’, but which today prefers a fuller title ‘The Assyrian Church of the East.’ Such a designation is not only discourteous to the modern members of this venerable church, but also both inappropriate and misleading.”<sup>1912</sup>

The same author finds again that “the association between the Church of the East and Nestorius is of a very tenuous nature, and to continue to call that Church ‘Nestorian’ is, from a historical point of view totally misleading and incorrect - quite apart from being highly offensive and a breach of ecumenical good manners.”<sup>1913</sup> P. Podipara sharply raises criticism against such uncharitable comments:

“European travelers and the Portuguese have made the whole world believe that the Thomas Christians were Nestorian heretics and schismatics, and that the archbishop of Goa, Dom. Meneses, converted them to the catholic church in 1599 through his visitation of their churches and through the synod he celebrated at Diamper ... The East Syrian Patriarch whom Dom. Meneses prevailed upon the Thomas Christians to condemn as a public heretic and schismatic, was none other than Mar Denha Simon who was in explicit communion with the Pope being also honoured with the sacred Pallium.”<sup>1914</sup>

This citation is sufficient and more than enough and crystal clear proof regarding the intention of the Latin-minded bishops. Before Nestorian followers came to the Edessan Church for security reason, Malabar Church had already relations with the same church for administration and hierarchical helps. How is it possible for a church to be influenced before it comes in contact with an accused element namely Nestorian? We mean to say that before Nestorianism started influencing the Persian Church, there had been already strong tie established between the Persian Church and the Malabar Church for hierarchical purpose. From the quotations, cited above taken from Roz, although it is clear that he could not find even a single mistake in the faith of the people, still he addresses her members as Nestorians because of the text of the

<sup>1911</sup>Vavanikunnel, Die eucharistische Katechese der Anaphora der Apostel Addai and Mari, 15.

<sup>1912</sup>Brock, The Nestorian Church: A Lamentable Misnomer, 23.

<sup>1913</sup>Ibid., 35.

<sup>1914</sup>Podipara, The Malabar Christians, 39-40.

Qurbana which mentions the name of Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Finally the words of famous Syriac Scholar S. Brock give us an idea to which school of thought the Syro-Malabar liturgy belongs.

”in contrast to the case with the Churches of Greek and Latin liturgical tradition, the Churches of Syriac liturgical tradition uniquely comprise three distinct Christological traditions, one Chalcedonian (represented by the Maronite, Syrian Catholic, Chaldean Catholic, Syro-Malabar and Syro-Malankara Churches), and two separate non-Chalcedonian ones (Syrian Orthodox, and Church of the East); they are also unique in the large number of Anaphoras that they preserve; this applies above all to the Syrian Orthodox tradition for which over seventy Anaphoras survive, although many of these are no longer in current use. Further Anaphoras are also known once to have existed, but are now no longer extant.”<sup>1915</sup>

Thus it is beyond doubt that SMC is also a church which approves and upholds all the important definitions of Chalcedon. The same scholar who is mentioned above attests very clearly in his analysis of the synodical statements and creeds of the Church of the East that “the Church of the East did not espouse or promote anything which was specifically Nestorian or make use of Nestorian terminology.”<sup>1916</sup> If this above citation is well founded how can we criticize other churches which relied upon it only for administrative help as Nestorian? F. C. Burkitt tells that “we cannot use the Malabar Rite as evidence for the Nestorian Rite in India earlier than the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, for there is nothing to suggest that the service books used by the new clergy were an old and unrevised form taken from surviving Malabari liturgical codices.”<sup>1917</sup> As part of a final point, the findings of Vatican itself regarding the anaphora of AM namely its official declaration of this anaphora as belonging to the ancient period and it is through and through apostolic, traditional and authentic, is all the more a proof for the riddance of all accusations so far showered lavishly upon all these Churches with out any regard for it. Thus as the root of accusation does not exist any more or uprooted we may claim that the Church of the East is never more Nestorian or in positive terms it is ancient, apostolic and catholic. The same can be applied equally to all the churches related to the Church of the East. Another observation regarding the anaphora of AM is that it originates from a period prior to 5<sup>th</sup> century. Thus again this is a proof to negate the so-called accusation regarding its Nestorian relations.<sup>1918</sup> This is a valid finding to deny all the accusations so far built up against the AM anaphora and against all the Churches which use it. AM stands out as an anaphora which tries to present a wholistic Christology and not one sided Christology.

We had been trying to assess whether the SMC is Nestorian or not. So in support of the evaluation we discussed many elements starting from the person of Nestorius, Cyril his opponent and Theodoret in the first three Chapters. Although Nestorius was considered a great heretic and condemned for the heresy which he taught, with the new understanding he is not considered as Nestorian and thus all the churches which follow

<sup>1915</sup><http://liturgia.it/addaicongress/interventi/Brock.pdf>. Date of access 18. 06. 2012.

<sup>1916</sup>Cited from B. D. Spinks, Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Institution Narrative in the East Syrian Anaphora, in: F. Young, et al., ed., *PatSt* 40 (2006), 110 referring to S.P. Brock, *The Christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the Fifth to Early Seventh Centuries: Preliminary Considerations and Materials*, in: G. D. Dragas, ed., *Askum-Thyateira, A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain*, London 1985, 125-42.

<sup>1917</sup>F. C. Burkitt, *The Old Malabar Liturgy*, in: *JThS* 29 (1928), 157; cf. Ratcliff, *The Original form of the Anaphora of Addai And Mari: A Suggestion*, in: *JThS* 30 (1928-29), 23-32.

<sup>1918</sup>Cf. above fn. 1662.

the line of Antiochian thought and two-nature Christology also cannot be condemned. However greater clarity is achieved through a study of Cyril of Alexandria on the person of Christ for the oneness of the person. Thus depending upon both of their contribution we can say that Christ is ἐν πρόσωπον ἐν δύο φύσεσιν. Although their contribution is great it had its discrepancies. Hence our study of Theodoret of Cyrus has thrown much light on the teaching of both Nestorius and Cyril and thus we are able to appreciate the two streams of thoughts namely Alexandrian headed by Cyril of Alexandria and the Antiochian headed by Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. Thus having a greater clarity in the field of Christology we were privileged to research further into the accusation on the SMC and its Qurbana text. In our work the focal point of search was to know the veracity of the accusation against SMC. In the first part of the fourth chapter we have tried to narrate the emergence of the SMC and in the second an analysis of the SMC anaphora namely AM. In order to check whether it is Nestorian we have taken up an evaluation of the anaphora of SMC from historical, ecclesiastical, theological, liturgical and biblical view. The study gave us a great thrust to free this Church from the age old accusation namely Nestorian. The study was an eye opener from two angles namely Nestorius cannot be considered anymore a Nestorian as people considered or condemned him from 5<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century and SMC and her liturgy is not Nestorian. At the same time the research gave an insight into the reasons for the accusation. The insertion of the names of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Diodore of Tarsus, and Nestorius who were considered as staunch heretics from 5<sup>th</sup> century upto 17/18<sup>th</sup> century could not be digested in the eyes of Portuguese catholic missionaries who applied force and political power to correct the erroneous faith along with avarice to domineer over the SMC. Thus to name any church as Nestorian along with the SMC and her anaphora can be considered as an illegitimate misappropriate misnomer and as S. Brock says it is highly offensive and a breach of good manners and calumny. Thus we may conclude saying that SMC was and is one of the most responsible Church which exercised her faith received from Christ through the Apostle of India namely from St. Thomas, and has cherished, nurtured, and heads towards higher perfection.

**List of Abbreviations:**

AAS	= Acta apostolicae Sedis
ACO	= Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum
AFS	= Asian Folklore Studies
AM	= Addai and Mari Anaphora
ARSJ	= Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu
BE	= Brockhaus Enzyklopädie
BH	= Birkat Hamazon
BJRL	= Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
CathEnc	= The Catholic Encyclopedia
CGG	= Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart
CLCAG	= Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum
CleM	= Clergy Monthly
CSCO	= Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
DCB	= Dictionary of Christian Biography
Diss.	= Dissertation for the Doctorate in partial fulfillment of the degree
DR	= The Downside Review
EC	= Enciclopedia Cattolica
EEC	= Encyclopedia of Early Christianity
EL	= Ephemerides liturgicae
EncEc	= Encyclopedia of the Early Church
EOr	= Echos d'Orient
ETJ	= Ephrem's Theological Journal
GÖK	= Geschichte der ökumenischen Konzilien
GOTR	= Greek Orthodox theological review
Gr.	= Gregorianum, Roma
H. E.	= Historia Ecclesiastica
HJ	= Historisches Jahrbuch
HKG (J)	= Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Hg. v. Hubert Jedin
HR	= Theodoret of Cyrus, Historia religiosa (A History of the Monks of Syria)
HSCP	= Harvard Studies in classical philology
HZ	= Historische Zeitschrift
IFL	= Indian Folklife
IIGC	= Illustrierte Geschichte des Christentums
IThS	= Indian Theological Studies
ITQ	= Irish Theological Quarterly
JA	= Journal asiatique
JAC	= Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JAH	= Journal of Asian History
JECS	= Journal of Early Christian Studies
JLW	= Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft
JQR	= Jewish Quarterly Review
JSTC	= Journal of St. Thomas Christians
JThS	= Journal of Theological Studies
KL	= Kirchengeschichtliches Lexikon
LCC	= Library of Christian Classics
LRC	= Liturgical Research Centre of the Syro-Malabar Church Mount St. Thomas, Kochi
MSHTh	= Münchener Studien zur historischen Theologie
MSR	= Mélanges de science religieuse
MThR	= Malabar Theological Review

NCE	= New Catholic Encyclopedia
NPNF	= A Select library of the Nicene and post-Nicene: Christian Fathers
NStB	= Neukirchner Studienbücher
OC	= Oriens Christianus
OCP	= Orientalia Christiana Periodica
OIRS	= Oriental Institute of Religious Studies
OLA	= Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OR	= L'Osservatore romano
OrChrA	= Orientalia Christiana analecta
OrChr(R)	= Orientalia Christiana. Roma
OS	= L'Orient Syrien
PatSt	= Patristic Studies
PG	= Patrologiae cursus completus. Accurante Jacques-Paul Migne. Series Graeca
PL	= Patrologiae cursus completus. Accurante Jacques-Paul Migne. Series Latina
QuLi	= Questions liturgiques
RevSR	= Revue des sciences religieuses
RHE	= Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique
RSPhTh	= Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques
SC	= Sources Chretiennes
SCA	= Studies in Christian Antiquity
Schol.	= Scholastik, Freiburg
SMC	= Syro-Malabar Church
SRD	= A. de Silva Rego, ed., Documentação para a Historia das Missões, India.
StAnt	= Studia Antoniana
StLi	= Studia liturgica
StPatr	= Studia Patristica
TU	= Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
VigChr	= Vigiliae Christianae
VJTR	= Vidyajyothi, Journal of Theological Reflection
ZKTh	= Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie
ZNW	= Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

## Bibliography

### I. Primary Literature

Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum (ed. E. Schwartz. Berlin 1914ff.).

Acts of Thomas (ed. A. F. J. Klijn. Leiden 1962).

Commentators and Commentaries on Aristotle's *Sophistici Elenchi*: A Study of Post-Aristotelian Ancient and Medieval writings on Fallacies Vol. 1. The Greek Tradition (ed. S. Ebbesen [CLCAG 8, 1]. Leiden 1981).

Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium (ed. J. B. Chabot et al. Paris 1933 ff.).

Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church, A. D. 337-461 (ed. J. Stevenson. and W. H. C. Frend. London 1966).

Cyril of Alexandria, *Select Letters* (ed. and trans. L. R. Wickham. Oxford 1983).

Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa (ed. W. Telfer [LCC 4]. London 1955).

Cyrille d'Alexandrie, *Dialogues sur la Trinité*. Vol. I. *Dialogues I et II* (ed. and trans. G. M. de Durant [SC 231]. Paris 1976).

Dokumente wachsender Übereinstimmung: Sämtliche Berichte und Konsentexte interkonfessioneller Gespräche auf Weltebene Bd. III. 1990-2001 (ed. H. Meyer. et al. Paderborn 2003).

The Ecumenical documents of the Faith (ed. T. H. Bindley. London <sup>4</sup>1950).

Eusebius, P., *Historia Ecclesiastica* (ed. P. Schaff. trans. A. C. McGiffert. New York 1890).

Justinian, I., *On the Person of Christ: The Christology of Emperor Justinian* (trans. P. W. Kenneth. New York 1991).

Kleines Konzilskompodium: Sämtliche Texte des Zweiten Vatikanums (ed. K. Rahner und H. Vorgrimler. Freiburg 1966).

Koptische Akten zum ephesinischen Konzil vom Jahre 431 (trans. W. Kraatz. Leipzig 1904).

Nestorius, *Bazaar of Heracleides* (trans. G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson. Oxford 1925).

Nestorius, *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (trans. F. Nau. Paris 1910).

Paremmakkal, T. K., *Varthamanappusthakam* (trans. P. J. Podipara [OrChrA 190]. Rome 1971).

Patrologia cursus completus: series Graeca (ed. J. P. Migne. Paris 1844ff).

Patrologia cursus completus: series Latina (ed. J. P. Migne. Paris 1857ff).



Pliny, Natural history. Vol. IV (trans. H. Rackham. London 1938).

Plotinus, The Enneads (ed. P. Henry and H. R. Schwyzer. Paris 1951-9).

Porphyry, Introduction (trans. J. Barnes. Oxford 2003).

-----, Isagoge (trans. E. W. Warren [Medieval Sources in translation 16]. Toronto 1975).

-----, On Aristotle's Categories (trans. S. K. Strange. New York 1992).

Socrates, Historia Ecclesiastica (ed. P. Schaff. New York 1886).

St. Cyril of Alexandria, Letters 1-50 (trans. J. I. McEnerney [The Fathers of the Church]. Washington D. C. 1987).

-----, On the Unity of Christ (trans. J. A. McGuckin. New York 2000).

Syro-Malabar Qurbana (Commission for Liturgy. Ernakulam 1962).

Theodoret of Cyrus, Eranistes: Critical Text and Prolegomena (ed. G. H. Ettlinger. Oxford 1975).

-----, Historia Ecclesiastica (ed. P. Schaff. New York 1892).

Theodoret von Kyros, Kommentar zu Jesaja (trans. A. Möhle. Akademie der Wissenschaften [Mitteilungen des Septuaginta - Unternehmens 5]. Göttingen 1932).

## II. Secondary Literature

Abramowski, L., A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts. Vol. II. London 1972.

-----, Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius (CSCO 242, Subs. 22). Leuven 1963, 1-73.

Accattoli, L., Wenn der Papst um Vergebung bittet: alle „*mea culpa*“ von Papst Johannes Paulus II an der Wende zum dritten Jahrtausend (übertr. Dt.: Ruelius, P.-F.). Innsbruck 1999.

Adam, K., The Christ of Faith (trans. Crick J.). New York 1962.

Aland, B., Markion. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 6. Freiburg 1997, 1392.

Alichoran, F. Y., Missel Chaldéen: L'ordre des Mystères avec les trois Anaphores. Paris 1982.

Ameringer, T. E., The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic On the Panegyric Sermons of St. John Chrysostom: A Study in Greek Rhetoric. Washington D. C. 1921.

Ananthakrishna Ayyar, L. K., Anthropology of the Syrian Christians. Ernakulam 1926.

Anastos, M. V., Nestorius was orthodox. In: DOP 16 (1962), 118-140.

Arangassery, L., *Ecclesial Dimensions of East Syrian Liturgy: An Introduction to Liturgical Ecclesiology*. Kottayam 1990.

Arnou, R., *Nestorianisme et Néoplatonisme: L'unité du Christ et l'union des Intelligibles*. In: Gr. 17 (1936), 116-131.

Atiya, A. S., *A History of Eastern Christianity*. London 1968.

Azéma, Y., *Sur la date de la mort de Théodore*. In: Pallas 31 (1984), 137-155.

Bacht, H., *Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (431-519)*. In: Grillmeier, A., und Bacht, H., Hg., *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*. Bd. 2. *Entscheidung um Chalkedon*. Würzburg 1953, 193-314.

Baker, D. A., *Syriac and the Origins of Monasticism*. In: DR 86 (1968), 342-353.

Barnes, T. D., *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge 1981.

Barrett, C. K., *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London 1968.

Bartelink, G. J. M., *Antonios*. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1. Freiburg 1993, 786-788.

Barth, K., *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*. Bd. IV. T. 2. *Die Lehre von der Versöhnung*. Zollikon-Zürich 1955.

Bathrellos, D., *The Byzantine Christ: Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of Saint Maximus the Confessor*. Oxford 2004.

Baum, W., *Zeitalter der Osmanen (15. bis 19. Jahrhundert)*. In: Wilhelm, B., und Dietmar, W., Hg., *Die Apostolische Kirche des Ostens: Geschichte der sogenannten Nestorianer*. Klagenfurt 2000, 101-118.

Baumeister, T., *Pachomios*. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7. Freiburg 1993, 1254-1255.

Baus, K., *The Imperial Church from Constantine to the Early Middle Ages*. In: Jedin, H., and Dolan, J., ed., *History of the Church*. Vol. II. (trans. Biggs, A.). London 1980.

Bausenhardt, G., *Henotikon*. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 4. Freiburg 1995, 1426.

Beeley, C. A., *Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory of Nazianzen: Tradition and Complexity in Patristic Christology*. In: JECS 17 (2009), 381-419.

Benard, E., and Beverly, M., ed., *Goddesses who rule*. Oxford 2000.

Benhur, A., *The Jewish Background of Indian People: A Historical, Archaeological, Anthropological, Etymological study of the Lost Tribes*. Calicut 2011.

Berger, P., *The Goddess Obscured: Transformation of the Grain Protectress from Goddess to Saint*. Boston 1985.

Berthold, G. C., Cyril of Alexandria and the Filioque. In: Livingstone, E. A., ed., *StPatr* 19. Leuven 1989, 143-147.

Bethune-Baker, J. F., *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the time of the Council of Chalcedon*. London 1962.

-----, *Meaning of Homoousios in the Constantinopolitan Creed*. Cambridge 1901.

-----, *Nestorius and his Teaching*. Cambridge 1969.

Betz, J., The Eucharist in the Didache. In: Draper, J. A., ed., *The Didache in Modern Research*. New York 1996, 244-275.

Bienert, W. A., Alexandros. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 1. Freiburg 1993, 360.

-----, Dionysios v. Alexandrien. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3. Freiburg 1995, 241-242.

-----, Heraklas. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 4. Freiburg 1995, 1429.

-----, Theonas. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 9. Freiburg 2000, 1463.

Binns, J., *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine*, 314-631. Oxford 1994.

Blady, K., *Jewish Communities in Exotic Places*. New Jersey 2000.

Blum, G. G., Rabbūlā v. Edessa. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 8. Freiburg 1999, 789.

Botte, B., *L'anaphore chaldéenne des Apôtres*. In: *OCP* 15 (1949), 259-276.

Boulnois, M. O., *Le Paradox trinitaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Herméneutique, analyses philosophiques et argumentation théologique* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, série Antiquité 143). Paris 1994.

Bouyer, L., *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (trans. Quinn, C. U.). Notre Dame 1968.

-----, *Life and Liturgy*. London 1956.

Bradshaw, P. F., Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper? In: Maxwell, E. J., ed., *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis*. Minnesota 2010, 1-20.

-----, *Reconstructing early Christian worship*. London 2009.

-----, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*. Oxford 2002.

Brauw, M. de, *The Parts of Speech: Rhetoric and Speeches*. In: Worthington, I., ed., *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford 2007.

Breydy, M., Eutybios v. Alexandrien. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3. Freiburg 1995, 1024.

Brock, S. P., *The Christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the Fifth to Early Seventh Centuries: Preliminary Considerations and Materials*. In: Dragas, G. D., ed., *Askum-Thyateira. A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain*. London 1985, 125-142.

-----, *Fire from Heaven: Studies in Syriac Theology and Liturgy*. Oxford 2006.

-----, *The Nestorian Church: A Lamentable Misnomer*. In: *BJRL* 78 (1996), 23-35.

-----, *Studies in Syriac Christianity: History, Literature and Theology*. Variorum. Hampshire 1992.

Brown, L. W., *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas: An Account of the Ancient Syrian Church of Malabar*. Cambridge 1956.

Brown, R. E., *The Gospel according to John, i-xii*. Anchor Bible Commentary. New York 1966.

Budge, E. A. W., *The Monks of Kublai Khan: Emperor of China*, London 1928.

Bultmann, R., *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Oxford 1963.

Burghardt, W. J., *The image of God in Man According to Cyril of Alexandria*. Washington 1957.

Burkitt, F. C., *The Old Malabar Liturgy*. In: *JThS* 29 (1928), 155-157.

Bury, J. B., *History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene: 395 a. d. to 800 a. d.* New York 1958.

Butler, A., *Butler's Lives of the Saints* (ed. Thurston, H. J.). Westminster 1984.

Camelot, P. T., *Ephesus und Chalcedon (GÖK 2)*. Mainz 1962.

Campbell, J. M., *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great*. Washington 1922.

Canivet, P., *Theodoret of Cyrhus*. In: *NCE* 14. New York 1967, 20-22.

Castelfranchi, M. F., *Alexandria. IV. Archaeology*. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 24.

*Census of India: Census Data 2001: India at a glance*, Religious composition office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner, India Retrieved on 2008, 11-26.

Chadwick, H., *Early Church*. Baltimore 1973.

Cherian, C. V., *A History of Christianity in Kerala: From the Mission of St. Thomas to the arrival of Vasco da Gama A. D. 52-1498*. Kottayam 1973.

Chesnut, R. C., The Two *Prosopa* in Nestorius' Bazaar of Heracleides. In: JThS 29 (1978), 392- 409.

Clayton, P. B., The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus: Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451). New York 2007.

Congar, Y., Tradition and Traditions. London 1966.

Connolly, R. H., Liturgical Homilies of Narsai (Texts and Studies Vol. VIII/1). Cambridge 1909.

-----, The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy. In: JThS 15 (1914), 396-425, 571-593.

Coulie, B., Gregor v. Nazianz. d. J. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 4. Freiburg 1995, 1004-1007.

Cross, R., The Metaphysics of the Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus. Oxford 2002.

Cuming, G. J., The Shape of the Anaphora. In: Livingstone, E. A., ed., StPatr 20. Leuven 1989, 333-345.

Cureton, W., Remains of a very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac. London 1958.

Dalmaï, I. H., Les Liturgies D'orient: rites et symbols. Paris 1980.

Daly, A. C., Nestorius in the Bazaar of Heracleides: a Christology Compatible with the Third Letter and Anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria. Diss. Los Angeles 1983.

Danielou, J., From Shadows to Reality: Studies in Biblical Typology of the Fathers (trans. Hibberd, D. W.). London 1961.

Day, F., Land of the Perumals. Madras 1863.

Dempsey, C. G., Rivalry, reliance, and resemblance: Siblings as metaphor for Hindu-Christian relations in Kerala State. In: AFS 57 (1998), 51-70.

Dihle, A., Early Christianity in India. In: Hillard, T. W., et al., ed., Ancient History in a Modern University. Vol. 2: Early Christianity, Late Antiquity and Beyond. Cambridge 1998, 305-316.

-----, Neues zur Thomas - Tradition. In: JAC 6 (1963), 54-70.

Dohmen, C., und Dirscherl, E., Typologie. Begriff. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 10. Freiburg 2001, 321-323.

Dries, J. van den, The Formula of St. Cyril of Alexandria: Μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη. Diss. Rome 1937.

Drijvers, H. J. W., Antiochene Christology, After Chalcedon. In: OLA 19 (1985), 99-113.

Duchesne, L., and Claude, J., *Early History of the Christian Church. Vol. III: The Fifth Century.* London 1909.

Dünzl, F., Melitios, Bf. v. Lykopolis. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7. Freiburg 1998, 86.

Dzielska, M., *Hypatia of Alexandria.* Cambridge 1995.

Elavanal, T., *The Pneumatology of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari especially in its Epiclesis.* In: Bosco, P., ed., *Studies on the Anaphora of Addai and Mari.* Kochi 2004, 146-167.

Enders, M., Porphyrios, Neuplatoniker. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8. Freiburg 1999, 429.

Engberding, H., *Urgestalt, Eigenart und Entwicklung eines altantiochenischen eucharistischen Hochgebetes.* In: OC 29 (1932), 32-48.

-----, *Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet der ostsyrischen Liturgie der Apostel Addaj und Mar(j).* In: OC 41 (1957), 102-124.

Ettlinger, G. H., *Theodoret of Cyrus.* In: EncEc 1. Cambridge 1992, 890.

Every, G., *Understanding Eastern Christianity,* Bangalore 1978.

Faris, J. D., *The Eastern Catholic Churches: Constitution and Governance According to the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches.* New York 1992.

Faultless, J., *The two recensions of the Prologue to John in Ibn al-Tayyib's Commentary on the Gospels.* In: D. R. Thomas, ed., *Christians at the Heart of Islamic Rule.* Leiden 2003, 177-198.

Ferrier, F., *The Chalcedonian Faith and its Further Clarifications.* In: Tapia, R., ed., *The Theology of Christ, Commentary.* New York 1971.

Firth, C. B., *An Introduction to Indian Church History.* Bangalore 1961.

Fitschen, K., Serapion v. Thmuis. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9. Freiburg 2000, 478-479.

Flusin, B., *Bischöfe und Patriarchen. Die Strukturen der Reichskirche.* In: Piétri, L., u. a., Hg., *Die Geschichte des Christentums. Religion - Politik - Kultur. Deutsche Ausgabe. Bd. 3. Der Lateinische Westen und der byzantinische Osten (431-642).* Freiburg 2001, 521-578.

Foltz, R. C., *Religions of the Silk Road: Overland Trade and Cultural Exchange from Antiquity to the 15<sup>th</sup> century.* New York 1999.

Fortescue, A., *The Mass: A Study of Roman Liturgy.* London <sup>9</sup>1950.

Fraisse-Coué, C., *Die Theologische Diskussion zur Zeit Theodosius' II.: Nestorius.* In: Piétri, L., u. a., Hg., *Die Geschichte des Christentums. Religion - Politik - Kultur. Deutsche Ausgabe. Bd. 2. Das Entstehen der einen Christenheit (250-430).* Freiburg 1996, 570-623.

-----, Von Ephesus nach Chalcedon. Der „trügerische Friede“ (433-451). In: Piétri, L., u. a., Hg., Die Geschichte des Christentums. Religion - Politik - Kultur. Deutsche Ausgabe. Bd. 3. Der Lateinische Westen und der byzantinische Osten (431-642). Freiburg 2001, 3-84.

Frend, W. H. C., *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia 1984.

-----, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. Cambridge 1972.

Geanakoplos, D. J., *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History. Oxford 1966.

Geevarghese, P. T., Were the Syrian Christians Nestorians?. In: Moolayil, K., ed., *Four Historic Documents*. Changanacherry 2002, 107-164.

Gelston, A., *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. Oxford 1992.

-----, The Relationship of the Anaphoras of Theodore and Nestorius to that of Addai and Mari. In: Karukaparambil, G., ed., *Tūvaik: Studies in Honour of Revd. Dr. Jacob Vellian*. Manganam 1995, 20-26.

Gessel, W. M., Pantainos. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 7. Freiburg 1998, 1316.

Ghellinck, J. de, Quelques appréciations de la dialectique et d'Aristote durant les conflits trinitaires du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle. In: *RHE* 26 (1940), 5-42.

Gherardini, B., Le parole della Consecrazione eucaristica. In: *Divinitas (Nova Series) Numero Speciale* (2004), 141-170.

Giebel, M., Nur für Eingeweihte - Die Mysterienkulte in der griechisch-römisch Welt, In: *Welt und Umwelt der Bibel. Archäologie - Kunst - Geschichte*. 3. Stuttgart 2002, 15-22.

Gill, M. L., *Aristotle on Substance: The Paradox of Unity*. New Jersey 1991.

Giraud, C., L'anafora degli Apostoli Addai e Mari: la 'gemma orientale' della Lex orandi. In: *Divinitas* 47 (2004), 107-124.

-----, *Eucaristia per la Chiesa: Prospettive teologiche sull'eucaristia a partire dalla 'lex orandi.'* Rome 1989.

-----, Recognition of the Orthodoxy of the Most Ancient Eucharistic Prayer. In: *ETJ* 11 (2007), 105-120.

Gopalapanikkar, T. K., *Malabar and its Folk*. New Delhi 1983.

Gottlieb, G., Licinius. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 6. Freiburg 1997, 906-907.

Greer, R. A., *Antiochene Exegesis of Hebrews*. Diss. Connecticut 1965.

Gregory, T. E., *Vox Populi: Popular opinion and violence in the religious controversies of the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D.* Ohio 1986.

- Griggs, C. W., *Early Egyptian Christianity from its Origins to 451 C.E.* New York 1991.
- Grillman, I., and Klimkiet, H., *Christians in Asia before 1500.* Michigan 1999.
- Grillmeier, A., *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451).* London 1964.
- , *Der Gottessohn im Totenreich.* In: ZKTh 71 (1949), 1-53.
- , *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche. Band 1. Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451).* Freiburg 1979.
- , *Der Neu-Chalkedonismus. Um die Berechtigung eines neuen Kapitels in der Dogmengeschichte.* In: HJ 77 (1958), 151-166.
- , *Das Scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlicher - dogmatischer und theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht.* In: Schol. 36 (1961), 321-356.
- , *Die theologische und sprachliche Vorbereitung der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon.* In: Grillmeier, A., und Bacht, H., Hg., CGG. Bd. I. Würzburg 1951, 5-202.
- Gross, J., *Entwicklungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas. Bd. II.* Basel 1963.
- Guillaumont, A., *L'Orient chretien.* In: JA 261 (1973), 69-81.
- Hainthaler, T., *Monophysitismus, Monophysiten.* In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7. Freiburg 1998, 418-421.
- Hallman, J. M., *Theodoret's Eranistes and its Aftermath: The Demise of the Christology of Antioch.* In: Allen, P., et al., ed., *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church. Vol. 2.* Brisbane 1999, 343-357.
- Hambye, E. R., *Medieval Christianity in India.* In: Suresh, K.S., and Usha S., ed., *Cultural and Religious Heritage of India. Vol. 4.* New Delhi 2004, 93-100.
- Hanig, R., *Paulos v. Samosata.* In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 7. Freiburg 1998, 1527-1528.
- Hanson, R. P. C., *The search for the Christian doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381.* New York 2005.
- Hantos, T., *Valerian.* In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 10. Freiburg 2001, 524-25.
- Hardy, E. R., *The Formula of Union of 433.* In: Baillie, J., et al., ed., *Christology of the Later Fathers (LCC 3).* Philadelphia 1954, 347-354.
- Harnack, A., *History of Dogma. Vol. IV (trans. Buchanan, N.).* New York 1961.
- Haussig, H. W., *A History of Byzantine Civilization (trans. Hussey, J. M.).* London 1966.
- Heid, S., *Rufinus v. Aquileia.* In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8. Freiburg 1999, 1350.



Hilarion, J., The Sacraments of the Malabar Church before 1400 A.D. In: Menacherry, G., ed., *The Thomapedia*. Ollur 2000, 114-117.

Holum, K. G., *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*. Los Angeles 1982.

Honigmann, E., Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Basil of Seleucia (the Time of Their Deaths). In: idem, *Patristic Studies (Studi e testi 173)*. Città del Vaticano 1953, 174-84.

Hultgren, A. J., *The Rise of Normative Christianity*. Minneapolis 1994.

Illickamury, C., Response to the Sources of Theology of the Syro-Malabar Church in the Pre-Diamper Period by Vellanickal M. In: Puthur, B., ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*. Cochin 2000, 105-120.

Iserloh, E., Die Geschichte der ökumenischen Bewegung. In: Jedin, H., Hg., *HKG (J) 7 (Die Weltkirche im 20. Jahrhundert)*. Freiburg 1979, 458-473.

Ivanka, E., *Hellenisches und christliches im frühbyzantinischen Geistleben*. Wien 1948.

Jammo, S., The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari: A Study of Structure and Historical Background. In: Puthur, B., ed., *Studies on the Anaphora of Addai and Mari*. Cochin 2004, 1-34.

John, K. J., ed., *Christian Heritage of Kerala*. Cochin 1981.

Johnson, M. E., *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis (OrChrA 249)*. Rome 1995.

Joint-Commission of the Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches. In: *GOTR 36 (1991)*, 183-188.

Jose, N. K., *Syro-Malabar Kurbanayude Charitram (The history of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana)*. Vaikom 1987.

Jugie, M., *Nestorius e la controversa Nestorienne*. Paris 1912.

-----, La terminologie christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie. In: *EOr 15 (1912)*, 12-27.

Jungmann, J. A., *The Early Liturgy: To the Time of Gregory the Great (trans. Brunner, F. A.)*. Notre Dame 1959.

Kamil, J., *Christianity in the Land of the Pharaohs: The Coptic Orthodox Church*. New York 2002.

Kanichikattil, F., *To Restore or to Reform?*. Bangalore 1992.

Kannengiesser, C., Athanasius. In: *LThK<sup>3</sup> 1*. Freiburg 1993, 1126-1130.

-----, Basilius v. Caesarea. In: *LThK<sup>3</sup> 2*. Freiburg 1994, 67-69.

Karmiris, J. N., The Problem of the Unification of the Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East with the Orthodox on the Basis of Cyril's Formula '*Mia Physis tou Theou Logou Sesarkomene.*' In: GOTR 10/2 (1964-1965), 61-74.

Karpp, H., Textbuch zur altkirchlichen Christologie: Theologie und *Oikonomia* (NStB 9). Rheinberg 1972.

Kelly, J. N. D., Early Christian doctrines. London <sup>2</sup>1960.

Kennedy, G. A., Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times. London 1999.

Kessler, D., Sarapis. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9. Freiburg 2000, 70.

Kidd, B. J., A History of the Church to A. D. 461. Vol. III. Church history - Primitive and early Church, ca. 30 - 600. Oxford 1922.

Kittel, G., und Friedrich, G., Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Bd. I. Stuttgart 1969.

Klasvogt, P., Johannes Chrysostomus. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 5. Freiburg 1996, 889-892.

Kodickal, V., Religions in Kerala. In: Menacherry, G., ed., Thomapedia. Madras 2000, 181-183.

Kodiyann, T., Qurbana, die Heilige Liturgie katholischer Thomas - Christen: Ostsyrischer Ritus in Indien. Innsbruck 1963.

Kolencherry, A., Qurbana: Gottesdienstordnung der Syro-Malabarischen Kirche. Wien 1981.

Kollamparambil, J., Sources of the Hierarchical Structure of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period. In: Puthur, B., ed., The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period. Cochin 2000, 161-181.

Kombara, G., Response to the Paper of Sebastian Athappilly. In: Puthur, B., ed., Studies on the Anaphora of Addai and Mari. Cochin 2004, 132-145.

Koodapuzha, X., Faith and Communion of the Indian Church of the St. Thomas Christians (OIRSI 52). Kottayam 1982.

Kramer, B., Didymus der Blinde. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 3. Freiburg 1995, 212-213.

Kupán, I. P., Theodoret of Cyrus (The Early Church Fathers). London 2006.

Kuzhinjalil, J., The disciplinary Legislation of the Synod of Diamper, Diss. Rome 1975.

Labelle, J. M., Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Témoin de la langue et de la pensée philosophiques au Ve siècle. In: RevSR 52 (1978), 135-158; 53 (1979), 23-24.

Lang, U. M., Eucharist without Institution Narrative? The Anaphora of Addai and Mari Revisited. In: idem, ed., *Die Anaphora von Addai und Mari. Studien zu Eucharistie und Einsetzungsworten*. Bonn 2007, 31-65.

Langener, L., *Isis lactans - Maria lactans: Untersuchungen zur koptischen Ikonographie*. Altenberge 1996.

Leclercq, J., et Hefele, H., *Histoire des conciles*. 2. I. Paris 1908.

Leeming, D. A., *The World of Myth*. New York 1990.

Liébaert, J., *La doctrine christologique de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant le querelle nestorienne*. Lille 1951.

-----, Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et la culture antique. In: MSR 12 (1955), 5-21.

Löhr, W. A., Akakios v. Beroia. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1. Freiburg 1993, 285.

Loofs, F., *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*. 1. Halle-Saale 1951.

-----, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*. 2 (durchgesehene Aufl. hrsg. von Aland, K.). Tübingen 1959.

-----, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche* (TU 3, 1-2). Leipzig 1887.

-----, *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius*. Halle-Saale 1905.

-----, *Nestorius and his place in the history of Christian Doctrine*. Cambridge 1914.

Loon, H. van, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*. Leiden 2009.

Louth, A., John Chrysostom and the Antiochene School to Theodoret of Cyrrhus. In: Young, F. M., et al., ed., *The Cambridge history of early Christian literature*. Cambridge 2004, 342-352.

-----, The Use of the term *idios* in Alexandrian Theology from Alexander to Cyril. In: Livingstone, E. A., ed., *StPatr* 19. Leuven 1989, 198-202.

Loux, M. J., Substance, Nature, and Immanence - Form in Aristotle's Constituent Ontology. In: Kanzian, C., and Legenhausen, M., ed., *Substance and Attribute: Western and Islamic Traditions in Dialogue*. Vol. 5. Frankfurt 2007, 145-162.

Lukose, P. U., *Keralathile Suriyani Kristhiyanikalude Purathanappattukal (the ancient songs of Suriyani Thomas Christians)*. Kottayam 1910.

Macomber, W. F., History of the Chaldean Mass. In: *Worship* 51 (1977), 107-120.

-----, The Maronite and Chaldean Versions of the Anaphora of the Apostles. In: OCP 37 (1971), 55-84.

-----, The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari. In: OCP 32 (1966), 335-342.

Madey, J., und Vavanikunnel, G., Qurbana: Die Eucharistiefeier der Thomaschristen Indiens. Paderborn 1968.

Madey, J., Marienlob aus dem Orient. Paderborn 1981.

-----, Qurbana: Die göttliche Liturgie der Thomas - Christen ostsyrischer Überlieferung. Paderborn 1922.

Mangatt, G., The Thomas Christians and the Persian Church. In: VJTR 52 (1988), 437-446.

Mannoramparambil, T., The Anaphora of Addai and Mari (Malayalam). In: Kallarangatt, J., ed., Paurastya Deivasastra Dharsanangal. Kottayam 1997, 320-351.

-----, The Anaphora and the Post-Anaphora of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana. Kottayam 1984.

Markale, J., The Great Goddess: Reverence of the Divine Feminine from the Paleolithic to the Present (trans. Gladding, J.). Vermont 1999.

Marshall, J., Guide to Taxilla. Delhi 1936.

Martikainen, J., Philoxenos. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 8. Freiburg 1999, 262-263.

Massey, J., Roots of Dalit History: Christianity, theology and Spirituality. New Delhi <sup>3</sup>1996.

Mathew, N. M., Malankara Mar Thoma Sabha Charitram (History of the Marthoma Church). Vol. 1. Thiruvalla 2006.

Mattam, A., Forgotten East, Mission, Liturgy and Spirituality of the Eastern Churches: A Study with Special Reference to the Church of St. Thomas Christians (ed. Maniyattu, P.). Satna 2001.

-----, Inculturation of the Liturgy in the Indian Context. Kottayam 1991.

Mazza, E., L'anafora eucaristica. Roma 1991.

Mazzarino, C. da, La dottrina di Teodoro di Ciro sull'unione ipostatica delle due nature in Cristo. Rom 1941.

McCullough, W. S., A Short History of Syriac Christianity to the Rise of Islam. Chico 1982.

McDermott, B. O., Word Become Flesh: Dimensions of Christology (New Theology Studies 9). Pennsylvania 1993.

McGuckin, J. A., St. Cyril of Alexandria. The Christological Controversy. Its History, Theology, and Texts. New York 1994.

McNamara, K., Theodoret of Cyrus and the Unity of Person in Christ. In: ITQ 22 (1955), 313-328.

Medlycot, A. E., India and the Apostle Thomas: An Inquiry with a critical Analysis of the Acta Thomae. Atlanta 2005.

Meersman, A., The Catholic Church in India since the Mid-Nineteenth Century. In: Suresh, K. S., and Usha, S., ed., Cultural and Religious Heritage of India. New Delhi 2004, 111-130.

Meinardus, O. F. A., The Coptic Church in Egypt. In: Arberry, A. J., ed., Religion in the Middle East: Three Religions in Concord and Conflict. London 1969.

-----, Two Thousand Years of Coptic Christianity. New York 1999.

Menacherry, G., ed., St. Thomas Christian Encyclopedia of India. Vol. 2. Trichur 1973.

-----, ed., The Thomapedia. Ollur 2000.

Menon, T. K. K., History of Kerala. Vol. 3. New Delhi 1984.

Milavec, A., The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary. Minnesota 2003.

Miller, P., Kerala: Jewel of India's Malabar Coast. In: National Geographic 173, 5 (1988), 592-617.

Moloney, J., The Johannine Son of Man. Rome <sup>2</sup>1978.

Montalverne, J., Theodreti Cyrensis doctrina antiquior de Verbo 'inhumanato.' Roma 1948.

Moolan, J., Historical and Structural Evolution of Syro-Malabar Liturgical Year. In: MThR 2 (2009), 160-174.

-----, The Period of Annunciation - Nativity in the East Syrian Calendar: Its Background and Place in the Liturgical Year. Kottayam 1985.

Moraes, G. M., A History of Christianity in India, from early times to St. Francis Xavier: A.D. 52-1542. Bombay 1964.

Moreschini, C., and Norelli, E., Handbuch der Antiken Christlichen Literatur (aus dem Italienischen übersetzt von Elisabeth, S. F. und Haberkamm, A.). München 2007.

Moscato, S., et al., An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages: Phonology and Morphology. Wiesbaden 1964.

Mundadan, A. M., History of Christianity in India. Vol. I. Bangalore 1984.

-----, Indian Christians: Search for Identity and Struggle for Autonomy. Bangalore 1984.

-----, Origins of Christianity in India. In: Perumalil, H. C., and Hambye, E. R., ed., Christianity in India: A History in Ecumenical Perspective. Alleppey 1972, 15-29.

-----, *Origins of Christianity in India*. In: Suresh K. S., and Usha S., ed., *Cultural and Religious Heritage of India*. New Delhi 2004, 1-16.

-----, *Sources for the History of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*. In: Puthur, B., ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*. Cochin 2000, 29-46.

-----, *Traditions of St. Thomas Christians*. Bangalore 1970.

Müller, C. D. G., *Geschichte der Orientalischen Nationalkirchen*. In: Moeller, B., Hg., *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte*. Göttingen 1981, 320-343.

Muraleedharan, S. K., *Colonial Literary Historiography: A Case Study from Kerala*. Hyderabad 2010.

Nagel, P., *Johannes, Bf. v. Nikiu*. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 5. Freiburg 1996, 941.

Nedungatt, G., *Quest for the Historical Thomas Apostle of India: A Re-reading of the Evidence*. Bangalore 2008.

-----, *Yogam and Bishops in the Thomaschristian Church*. In: *JSTC* 16 (2005), 63-97.

Neill, S., *A History of Christianity in India. The beginnings to AD 1707*. Cambridge 1984.

Newman, J. H., *On St. Cyril's Formula: "ΜΙΑ ΦΥΣΙΣ ΣΕΣΑΡΚΩΜΕΝΗ"*. In: *idem, Tracts (1858) Theological and Ecclesiastical*. London 1924, 329-382.

Nicola, A. de, *Malchion of Antioch*. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 518.

Norris, F. W., *Alexandria*. In: *EEC*. New York <sup>2</sup>1990, 20-23.

-----, *Eulogius of Alexandria*. In: *EEC*. New York <sup>2</sup>1990, 325.

Norris, R. A., *Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria*. In: Livingstone, E. A., ed., *StPatr* 13. Berlin 1975, 255-268.

-----, *Manhood and Christ: a study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Oxford 1963.

O'Collins, G., *The Holy Trinity: The State of the Questions*. In: Davis, S., et al., ed., *The Trinity*. New York 1999, 1-25.

O'Keefe, J. J., *Kenosis or Impassibility: Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus on the Problem of Divine Pathos*. In: Livingstone, E. A., ed., *StPatr* 32. Leuven 1997, 358-365.

Olson, C., *The Book of the Goddess: Past and Present, and Introduction to her Religion*. Illinois 1983.

Orlandi, T., *Alexandria*. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 22.

Paassen, J. van, *Gangra*. In: *CathEnc* 6. New York 1967, 279.

Pallath, P., The Synod of Diamper: Valid or Invalid?, in: G. Nedungatt, ed., The Synod of Diamper Revisited, Rome 2001, 199-226.

Parecattil, J., Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I see it (trans. Chacko, K. C.). Ernakulam 1987.

Pasquato, O., Antioch. In: EncEc 1. Cambridge 1992, 47.

Pathikulangara, V., Chaldeo - Indian Heritage. In: Denha Services 39 (1995), 101-120.

-----, Chaldeo - Indian Liturgy I: Introduction. Kottayam 1992.

-----, Indo-Chaldean Liturgy (OIRS 30). Kottayam 1979.

-----, Resurrection, Life and Renewal: A Theological Study of the Liturgical Celebrations of the Great Saturday and the Sunday of Resurrection in the Chaldeo-Indian Church. Bangalore 1982.

Pearson, B. A., and Goehring, J. E., ed., The Roots of Egyptian Christianity. Philadelphia 1986.

Perumalil, A. C., The Apostles in India. Bangalore 1971.

Perumalil, H. C., and Hambye, E. R., Christianity in India: A History in Ecumenical Perspective. Alleppey 1972.

Philip, E. M., The Indian Church of St. Thomas. Cheeranchira 2002.

Pigulewskaja, N., Byzanz auf den Wegen nach Indien: Aus der Geschichte des byzantinischen Handels mit dem Orient vom 4. bis 6. Jahrhundert. Berlin 1969.

Pinggéra, K., Die Apostolische Kirche des Ostens der Assyrer. In: Lange, C., und Pinggéra, K., Hg., Die Altorientalischen Kirchen: Glaube und Geschichte. Darmstadt 2011, 21-40.

Pliny, Natural History. Vol. 2 (trans. H. Rackham). Cambridge 1942.

Ploeg, J. P. M. van der, The Syriac Manuscripts of the St. Thomas Christians (Placid Lecture Series 3). Bangalore 1983.

Podipara, P. J., The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church (OIRS 104). Kottayam 1986.

-----, The Hierarchy of the Syro-Malabar Church. Alleppey 1976.

-----, The Malabar Christians. Alleppey 1972.

-----, The Rise and Decline of the Indian Church of the Thomas Christians (OIRS 31). Kottayam 1979.

-----, The Thomas Christians. London 1970.

Porter, S. E., *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B. C. - A. D. 400.* Leiden 1997.

Pothan, S. G., *The Syrian Christians of Kerala.* Bombay 1963.

Powathil, J., *Identity and Dignity of the Syro-Malabar Church.* In: Porunnedom, J., ed., *Acts of the Synod of Bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church.* Cochin 1996, 69-77.

Prestige, G. L., *Fathers and Heretics: Six Studies in Dogmatic Faith with Prologue and Epilogue.* London 1977.

-----, *God in Patristic Thought.* London 1952.

Puthiakunnel, T., *Jewish Colonies of India paved the way for St. Thomas.* In: Vellian, J., and Raes, A., ed., *The Malabar Church. Symposium in honour of Rev. P. J. Podipara (OrChrA 186).* Roma 1970, 187-191.

Puthussery, J., *Maargamkali: Genre and group identity through the ages.* In: *IFL* 1 (2001), 13-18.

Quasten, J., *Patrology. Vol. 3: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon.* Texas 1983.

Raes, A., *The Enigma of the Chaldean and Malabar Anaphora of the Apostles.* In: Vellian, J., and Raes, A., ed., *The Malabar Church: Symposium in honour of Rev. P. J. Podipara (OrChrA 186).* Roma 1970, 1- 8.

Rahmani, I., *Les Liturgies Orientales et occidentales.* Beyrouth 1929.

Rahner, K., und Vorgrimler, H., *Kleines Konzils-kompendium.* LG 13. Freiburg 1966.

Ratcliff, E. C., *The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion.* In: *JThS* 30 (1928), 23-32.

Raven, C. E., *Apollinarism.* Cambridge 1923.

Richard, M., *L'activité littéraire de Théodoret avant le concile d'Éphèse.* In: *RSPHTh* 24 (1935), 83-106.

-----, *L'introduction du mot 'hypostase' dans la théologie de l'incarnation.* In: *MSR* 2 (1945), 5-32, 243-270.

-----, *La lettre de Théodoret à Jean d'Égées.* In: *RSPT* 30 (1941-42), 415-433.

-----, *Proclus de Constantinople et le theopaschisme.* In: *RHE* 38 (1942), 303-331.

Ritter, A. M., *Petros, Bf. v. Alexandrien.* In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 8. Freiburg 1999, 103-104.

Roberson, R., *The Eastern Catholic Churches.* Annuario Pontificio 2010.

Rochie, H. E., ed., *Christology of the Later Fathers.* Philadelphia 1954.



- Roey, A. von, Eustathios v. Antiochien. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 3. Freiburg 1995, 1014-1015.
- Romanides, J. S., St. Cyril's 'One *Physis* or *Hypostasis* of God the Logos Incarnate' and Chalcedon. In: GOTR 10/2 (1964-65), 84-87.
- Rosen, K., Commodus. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 2. Freiburg 1994, 1276-1277.
- , Septimius Severus. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 9. Freiburg 2000, 475.
- , Trajan. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 10. Freiburg 2001, 163.
- Rucker, I., Das Dogma von der Persönlichkeit Christi und das Problem der Häresie des Nestorius. Günzburg 1934.
- Ruether, R. R., *Womanguides: Readings toward a Feminist Theology*. Boston 1985.
- Runia, D. T., Festugière Revisited: Aristotle in the Greek Patres. In: VigChr 43 (1989), 1-34.
- Russell, N., *Cyril of Alexandria (The Early Church Fathers)*. London 2000.
- Russo, N. V., The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: Critique of the Critiques. In: Maxwell, E. J., ed., *Issue in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in liturgical and theological analysis*. Minnesota 2010, 21-62.
- Rutherford, I., Inverting the Canon: Hermogenes on Literature. In: HSCP 94 (1992), 355-78.
- Sa, F. de, Cosmas Indicopleustes. In: NCE 4. Washington 1966, 359-360.
- Saltet, L., Les sources de l'Éranistes de Theodoret. In: RHE 6 (1905), 289-303, 513-536, 741-754.
- Samuel, V. C., *The Sprouting Church: An Introduction to Indian Church History*. (A Translation of the Malayalam Book 'Sabha Valarunnu'). Kottayam 1992.
- Santogrossi, A., Historical and Theological Argumentation in Favour of Anaphoras without Institution Narrative: A Critical Appraisal. In: Lang, U. M., Hg., *Die Anaphora von Addai und Mari: Studien zu Eucharistie und Einsetzungsworten*. Bonn 2007, 175-210.
- Saxer, V., *Cathedra*. In: EncEc 1. Cambridge 1992, 153.
- Schaff, P., ed., *Christianity: Early Christian Literature (Fathers of the Church)*. New York 1890.
- Schiappa, E., *The Beginnings of Rhetorical Theory in classical Greece*. London 1999.
- Scipioni, L., *Nestorio e il concilio di Efeso: Storia dogma critica*. Milano 1974.
- Schreiner, J., Anthropomorphismus. I. Biblisch. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1. Freiburg 1993, 734-735.
- Schütte, H. W., Anthropomorphismus. I. Systematisch-theologisch. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 1. Freiburg 1993, 735-737.

Schulte, E. F., *Entwicklung der Lehre vom menschlichen Wissen Christi bis zum Beginn der Scholastik* (FLDG 12). Paderborn 1915.

Schurhammer G., *The Malabar Church and Rome during the Early Portuguese Period and Before*. Trichinopoly 1934.

-----, *The Tomb of Mailapur*. In: Menacherry, G., ed., *The Thomapedia*. Ollur 2000, 5.

Schwaigert, W., *Ibas (Hiba), Bf. v. Edessa*. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 5. Freiburg 1996, 382.

Schwartz, E., *Cassian und Nestorius*. Konzilstudien I. Straßburg 1914.

-----, *Über echte und unechte Schriften des Bischofs Proklos von Konstantinopel*. Konzilstudien II. Straßburg 1914.

-----, *Zur Vorgeschichte des ephesinischen Konzils*. In: *HZ* 112/3 (1914), 237-263.

Seeberg, R., *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Die Dogmenbildung in der alten Kirche*. Bd. II. Darmstadt 1965.

Seeliger, H. R., *Achillas*. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 1. Freiburg 1993, 113.

Sellers, R. V., *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and doctrinal survey*. London 1961.

-----, *Pseudo-Justin's Expositio rectae fidei: A Work of Theodoret of Cyrus*. In: *JThS* 46 (1945), 145-159.

-----, *Two Ancient Christologies: A study in the Christological thought of the Schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the Early History of Christian Doctrine*. London 1940.

Shillington, K., *History of Africa*. London 1995.

Siddals, R. M., *Logic and Christology in Cyril of Alexandria*. In: *JThS* 38 (1987), 341-367.

-----, *Oneness and Difference in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*. In: Livingstone, E. A., ed., *StPatr* 18, 1. Michigan 1985, 207-211.

Sieben, H. J., *Dioskoros*. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3. Freiburg 1995, 249-250.

Simonetti, M., *Adoptianists*. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 11.

-----, *Alexandria: II. Schools*. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 23.

-----, *Melitius of Lycopolis. Melitian Schism*. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 551.

-----, *Monarchians*. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 566.

-----, *Peter I of Alexandria*. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 23-24.

-----, *Praxeas*. In: *EncEc* 2. Cambridge 1992, 706.

-----, Severus of Antioch. In: *EncEc* 2. Cambridge 1992, 808.

Smith, R., Logic. In: Barnes, J., ed., *The Cambridge companion to Aristotle*. Cambridge 1995, 27-65.

Spinks, B. D., The Original Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles. In: *EL* 91 (1977), 146-161.

-----, Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Institution Narrative in the East Syrian Anaphora. In: *PatSt* 40 (2006), 109-114.

Sreedhara Menon, A., *Cultural Heritage of Kerala*. Madras 1978.

-----, *Kerala History and its Makers*. Madras 1999.

Stead, G. C., *Divine Substance*. Oxford 1977.

-----, Rhetorical Method in Athanasius. In: *VigChr* 30 (1976), 121-37.

Steely, J. E., and Kraft, R. A., Edessa. In: Bauer, W., et al., ed., *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (trans. Kraft R. A., and Krodel, G.). Philadelphia 1979, 1- 43.

Steimer, B., Diokletian. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 3. Freiburg 1995, 239-241.

Stemberger, G., et al., *2000 Jahre Christentum. Illustrierte Kirchengeschichte in Farbe mit mehr als 1300 Farbbildern und Kirchengeschichtlichem Lexikon*. Lizenzausgabe. Salzburg 1983.

Stewardson, J. L., *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus according to his Eranistes*. Diss. Illinois 1972.

Stewart, J., *Nestorian Missionary Enterprise*. Edinburgh 1928.

Stiernon, D., Ancyra. In: *EncEc* 1. Cambridge 1992, 37.

Stump, E., *Dialectic and its place in the development of medieval logic*. Ithaca 1989.

Swinburne, R., *Was Jesus God?* Oxford 2008.

Szaif, J., Platon, Platonismus. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 8. Freiburg 1999, 349-353.

Taft, R. F., The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora. In: *OCP* 57 (1991), 281-308.

-----, The Liturgical Year: Studies, Prospects, Reflections. In: *Worship* 55 (1981), 2-23.

-----, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office and its meaning for Today*. Minnesota 1986.

Talbert, R. J. A., *Rome's World: the Peutinger Map Reconsidered*. Cambridge 2010.

Thaliath, J., *The Synod of Diamper*. Bangalore 1999.

Thazhath, A., *The Quest for Identity: The Syro-Malabar Church and its Rite*. Thrissur 1992.

Thekkudan, A., *Sources of Spirituality of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*. In: Puthur, B., ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church*. Cochin 2000, 121-154.

Tisserant, E., *Eastern Christianity in India: A History of the Syro-Malabar Church from the earliest time to the present day*. Westminster 1957.

Tixeront, J., *A Handbook of Patrology*. London 1939.

Urbainczyk, T., *Socrates of Constantinople: historian of church and state*. Michigan 1997.

-----, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus: The bishop and the holy man*. Michigan 2002.

Uthemann, K.-H., *Anatolios*. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 1. Freiburg 1993, 606.

Vadakkekara, B., *Origin of Christianity in India: a historiographical critique*. Delhi 1995.

Väth, A., *Der Heilige Thomas, der Apostel Indiens*. Aachen 1925.

Valiamangalam, J., *Indian Christian Spirituality*. In: Sundararajan, R., and Bithika, M., ed., *Hindu Spirituality*. Vol. 2: *Post classical and Modern*. New Delhi 2003, 520-523.

Varghese, P., *St. Thomas and Us. St. Thomas 19<sup>th</sup> centenary Souvenir*. Kottayam 1973.

-----, Hg., *Die Syrischen Kirchen in Indien (Die Kirchen der Welt 13)*. Stuttgart 1974.

Vattakuzhy, R., *Church of the East Never Nestorian*. Trichur 1989.

Vavanikunnel, G., *Die eucharistische Katechese der Anaphora der Apostel Mar Addai und Mar Mari in der syro-malabarischen Kirche gestern und heute (Das östliche Christentum N. F. 26)*. Würzburg 1976.

Vellanickal, M., *Sources of Theology of the Syro-Malabar Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*. In: Puthur, B., ed., *The Life and Nature of the St. Thomas Christian Church in the Pre-Diamper Period*. Cochin 2000, 96-104.

Vellian, J., and Pathikulanagara, V., *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the Chaldeo - Indian Church*. In: Madey, J., ed., *The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East*. Paderborn 1982, 239-272.

Vellian, J., *The Synod of Diamper and the Liturgy*. In: Menacherry, G., ed., *The St. Thomas Christian Encyclopedia of India*. Rome 2001, 34-35.

Venables, E., *Theodoretus*. In: *DCB* 4. London 1887, 1718-26.

Viciano, A., *Theodoretos, Bf. v. Kyros*. In: *LThK*<sup>3</sup> 9. Freiburg 2000, 1401-1404.

- Voderholzer, R., Cyril von Alexandrien. In: Heim, M., Hg., *Theologen, Ketzer, Heilige: Kleines Personenlexikon zur Kirchengeschichte*. München 2001, 98-100.
- Vööbus, A., *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient. A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East*. Vol. I. (CSCO 184). Louvain 1958.
- Voicu, S. J., Jacobite Church. In: *EncEc 1*. Cambridge 1992, 428.
- , Melchites. In: *EncEc 1*. Cambridge 1992, 550.
- Volk, O., Petros Galata. In: *LThK<sup>3</sup> 8*. Freiburg 1999, 123-24.
- Wace, H., Domnus II. In: *DCB*. London 1999, 499.
- Wainwright, G., *Eucharist and Eschatology*. London 1971.
- Warmington, E. H., *Commerce between Roman Empire and India*. New Delhi <sup>2</sup>1995.
- Wasilewska, E., *Creation Stories of the Middle East*. London 2000.
- Watson, W. G. E., *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*. London 2007.
- Weinandy, T., and Keating, D. A., ed., *The theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria: a critical appreciation*. London 2003.
- Wessel, S., *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a saint and of a Heretic*. Oxford 2004.
- Wheeler, M., *Ancient India: Bulletin of Archaeological Survey in India*. New Delhi 1946.
- , *Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers*. New York 1955.
- Whitmarsh, T., *Ancient Greek Literature*. Cambridge 2004.
- Wickham, L. R., Andreas, Bf. v. Samosata. In: *LThK<sup>3</sup> 1*. Freiburg 1993, 633.
- Wilberg, P., *From new age to new Gnosis: The contemporary significance of a new Gnostic Spirituality*. Eastbourne 2003.
- Wilken, R. L., *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology*. London 1971.
- William, L., *Malabar Manual*. New Delhi 1996.
- Wilson, S. B., The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari. In: Bradshaw, P. F., ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*. Minnesota 1997, 19-38.
- Winkelmann, F., Sokrates Scholastikos. In: *LThK<sup>3</sup> 9*. Freiburg 2000, 699-700.

Winkler, D. W., Zeitalter der Sassaniden (bis 653). In: Baum, W., and Winkler, D. W., Hg., Die Apostolische Kirche des Ostens: Geschichte der sogenannten Nestorianer. Klagenfurt 2000, 9-42.

Wirth, G., Decius. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 3. Freiburg 1995, 48-49.

-----, Maximianus. In: LThK<sup>3</sup> 6. Freiburg 1997, 1506-1507.

Witvliet, J. D., The Anaphora of St. James. In: Bradshaw, P. F., ed., Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers. Minnesota 1997, 153- 172.

Wolfson, H. A., The philosophy of the Church Fathers. Vol. I: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation. Cambridge <sup>2</sup>1964.

Woodcock, G., Kerala: A Portrait of the Malabar Coast. London 1967.

Wright, D. F., At what Ages Were People Baptized in the Early Centuries? A Quest for Statistics. In: Livingstone, E. A., ed., StPatr 30. Leuven 1997, 389-394.

Yarnold, E., Anaphoras without Institution Narratives?. In: Livingstone, E. A., ed., StPatr 30. Leuven 1997, 395-410.

Young, F. M., From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A guide to the Literature and its Background. Philadelphia 1983.

Young, W. G., Handbook of Source-Materials for Students of Church History. Delhi 1999.

### III. Dictionaries

Bauer, W., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. Chicago <sup>4</sup>1967.

Gemoll, W., und Vretska, K., Griechisch-deutsches Schul-und Handwörterbuch. München 1965.

Lampe, G. W. H., A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford 1961.

Liddel, H. G., and Scott R., ed., A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford 1968.

-----, An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford 1968.

Magill, F. N., and Moose, C. J., ed., Dictionary of World Biography. Vol. 1: The Ancient World. California 2005.

### IV. Internet sites:

<http://www.adaniel.tripod.com/cochin.htm>. Date of Access 08. 02. 2012.

- <http://www.apostolicnunciatureindia.com/history.htm>. Date of Access: 5. 02. 2012.
- <http://www.archdiocesechanganacherry.org/archdiocesechanganacherryarchdiocese.php?id=3>. Date of Access: 22.05. 2012.
- [http://www.cartographic-images.net/120\\_Peutinger\\_Table.html](http://www.cartographic-images.net/120_Peutinger_Table.html). Date of Access: 21.10. 2012.
- <http://www.cbcisite.com/Kalyan.htm>. Date of Access: 22.05.2012.
- <http://www.census2011.co.in/census/state/kerala.html>. Date of Access: 08. 02. 2012.
- <http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hallel>. Date of Access: 21.10. 2012.
- <http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Padroado>. Date of Access: 20. 10. 2012.
- <http://www.forums.catholic.com/showthread.php?t=685577>. Date of Access: 20.10. 2012.
- <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/marbaselioscleemisiscardinal/article4027832.ece?css=print>. Date of Access: 5. 11. 2012.
- <http://www.historytoday.com/mihir-bose/india%E2%80%99s=missing-historians>. Date of Access: 10. 02. 2012.
- <http://www.hope-of-israel.org/ophir.htm>. Date of Access: 08. 02. 2012.
- <http://www.keralaregistration.gov.in/cms/history.php>. Date of Access: 06. 02. 2012.
- <http://www.liturgia.it/addaicongress/interventi/Brock.pdf>. Date of access 18. 06. 2012.
- <http://www.namboothiri.com/articles/history.htm>. Date of Access: 14. 10. 2012.
- [http://www.nregister.com/site/article/no\\_place\\_produces\\_vocations\\_like\\_syro\\_malabar\\_church/](http://www.nregister.com/site/article/no_place_produces_vocations_like_syro_malabar_church/). Date of Access: 10. 02. 2012.
- <http://www.sacred-texts.com/chr/ecf/213/2130285.htm>. Date of Access: 30. 10. 2012.
- [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/Giovanni-da-empoli\\_Dizionario-Biografico](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/Giovanni-da-empoli_Dizionario-Biografico). Date of Access: 25. 04. 2012.
- [http://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/pontiufical\\_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc\\_pc\\_chrstuni\\_doc\\_20011025\\_chiesa-caldea-assira\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontiufical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20011025_chiesa-caldea-assira_en.html). Date of Access: 30. 10. 2012.
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oNs61tQE9oE&feature=related>; Date of Access: 05. 02. 2012.