Studia Theologica Debrecinensis

A Debreceni Református Hittudományi Egyetem teológiai szakfolyóirata

2010/2.

Theological Journal of the Debrecen Reformed Theological University

Theologische Zeitschrift der Reformierten Theologischen Universität Debrecen

Felelős szerkesztő és kiadó/Editor-in-Chief:
Fazakas Sándor rektor

ISSN 2060-3096

Szerkesztőség címe/Editorial Office:
H–4044 Debrecen, Kálvin tér 16.
Tel.: +36-52/516-820 • Fax: +36-52/516-822
E-mail: rektori@drhe.hu • Web: http://www.drhe.hu

A borítón: xxx

A szöveget gondozta:
Peres Imre, Fazakas Sándor, Gaál Izabella

Technikai szerkesztés:
Miklósiné Szabó Monika

Készítette:
Kapitális Kft.

Felelős vezető:
Kapusi József

TARTALOM

István Pásztori-Kupán

The one veneration belonging to the One Son: The union of worship as the criterion of teaching "the One and the same" during the Monophysite controversy

Az egy Fiúnak kijáró egyetlen imádat, mint „az egy és ugyanazon Fiúról" szóló tanítás ismérve a monofizitizmus körüli vitában.

Összefoglalás

Jelen írás igyekszik feltárni a kalcedoni dogmában meghatározott krisztológiai modell (egy Személy – két természet) és a Fiú imádásának módja közötti liturgiai és tanbeli kapcsolatot. Amint az a rendelkezésre álló bizonyítékok alapján kiderül, az efézusi-kalcedoni korban Krisztus imádásának módját is a személyi egységhez kötötték. Mindenki egyetértett abban, hogy Krisztust egyetlen imádás illeti, nem kettő. Annak ellenére, hogy főleg az alexandriai tábor egyes képviselői igyekeztek ezt az egyetlen imádást Krisztus egy természetéhez, ti. a Kürillosz-féle μία φύσις-hez kötni, a Kalcedoni Hitvallás tanúsága szerint végül az antiochiai álláspont győzedelmeskedett: Krisztus egyetlen imádása az ő egyetlen Személyéhez kapcsolódik, miközben isteni és emberi természete csorbítatlanul megmarad.

One of the greatest challenges of the Nestorian and Monophysite controversies in the fifth century was to find an acceptable dogmatic formula, which could encompass both the reality of the single person of Christ, the Word made man, and the simultaneous existence of his two natures: his full divinity and complete humanity respectively. The primary and secondary literature connected with this issue could almost fill a library. In the present paper we set out to investigate not as much the well-researched doctrinal aspect of this dispute, but rather the relationship between specific acts of worship and their dogmatic relevance vis-à-vis one's orthodoxy as it appears in the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus, Cyril of Alexandria as well as a few of their predecessors and contemporaries.

Our first question is, then, the following: do cultic activities like veneration, adoration or praise offered to Jesus Christ bear any relevance upon one's belief regarding who our Lord really is? Does the liturgy itself somehow influence or reveal the worshipper's doctrinal attitude towards "the One person" and "the two natures"? Having investigated the available primary evidence, I incline to affirm that such a connection exists, and it is even emphasised by the theologians of the time, both in their polemical writings and in their instructive tracts or correspondence.

Studia Theologica Debrecinensis
2010. III. évfolyam 2. szám – 77–94. old.

The idea of a union of worship in Cyril and Theodoret

Following the death of Theodore of Mopsuestia in 428 and the subsequent outbreak of the Nestorian controversy in 430, the otherwise withdrawn and gentle bishop, Theodoret of Cyrus became the leading figure of the Antiochene system of thought[1] mostly by necessity. Although he is chiefly known for his refutation of Cyril of Alexandria's famous *Twelve Anathemas*, Theodoret's positive contribution towards the development of Christological thinking before the synod of Ephesus (431) should not be neglected. One of these was undoubtedly his two-part treatise *On the Holy and Vivifying Trinity* and *On the Inhumanation of the Lord*, written shortly before the second ecumenical council, which survived under the name of Cyril of Alexandria.[2]

As the heir of the teachings of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret conceives the one Person of Christ as an unconfused union of the two natures, without the diminishing of either. The most important aspect of this picture is the correct expression of the union's mode, i.e. a real e[nwsij, which preserves the completeness (τὸ τέλειον) of both natures. As our author writes:

> It can be seen more clearly from the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, that on the one hand the divine nature and the human are different one from another according to their operations [ταῖς ἐνεργείαις μὲν διῃρημένας], yet on the other hand are united in the person [τῷ προσώπῳ δὲ συνημμένας] and show the One Son [καὶ τὸν ἕνα ὑποδεικνύσας Υἱόν].[3]

The difference between διη ρημένας and συνημμένας underlies the idea of an unmingled union: although the ἐνέργειαι are different, the "being together", i.e. the union is real, since it happens on the level of the one πρόσωπον. The author repeatedly uses "One Son" to whom the single worship belongs:

> But how can God, denominated with the article [ὁ θεός], whose throne stands forever and ever, be anointed [χρισθείη] by God? How could He receive kingdom by election [χειροτονητήν], when He [already] owns the kingdom by nature [φυσικὴν ἔχων βασιλείαν]? […] So then again we will understand, that the One whose throne is for ever and ever is God, the eternal One [τὸν ἀεὶ ὄντα], whereas the latter [τὸν δὲ ὕστερον] being later anointed for his hatred towards sin and his love for righteousness is that which was assumed from us [τὸ ἐξ ἡμῶν ληφθέν], which [τό] is of David and of Abraham, which has fellows and exceeds them by anointment, possessing in itself [ἐν ἑαυτῷ][4] all the gifts of the most Holy Spirit. Hence, let us worship the one Son in both natures [ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ δὲ φύσει τὸν ἕνα Υἱὸν προσκυνήσωμεν].[5]

1 Following A. M. Schor's valid affirmations, one may indeed consider to speak of the Antiochene tradition as a "network" rather than a "school". See Schor, Theodoret on the "School of Antioch".

2 See Pásztori-Kupán, Theodoret of Cyrus, 109–171.

3 Theodoret, De incarnatione Domini, in: Migne, Patrologia Graeca, 75, 1456 (hereafter: PG).

4 Following the rationale of the preceding sentences I translated ἐν ἑαυτῷ with "in itself".

5 Theodoret, De incarnatione Domini, in: PG 75, 1456.

The last sentences of the passage are not easily translatable into English in order to reflect Theodoret's formulation accurately. In the same manner as in his other writings, the author speaks of the assumed humanity taken on by the Word out of David and Abraham as a "what", granting it the title of "person", i.e. of "who", only from the moment of its union with the Logos. The pre-existence of a separate human person as opposed to the person of the Word preceding the union does not seem to possess any substantial support within Theodoret's oeuvre, although he refers to the assumed manhood in concrete terms after the union has been effected. As he himself will assert in Ch. 34 [32] of the same treatise:

> We both recognise the nature of the God-Word and acknowledge the essence of the form of the servant; nevertheless, we worship either nature as one Son [ἑκατέραν δὲ φύσιν ὡς ἕνα προσκυνοῦμεν Υἱόν].[6]

The duality of persons is in both cases refuted by the unity of worship. This is what during our private consultations Prof. Luise Abramowski came to label as the Antiochene "liturgical" or "cultic" **πρόσωπον**, or even "the one worship of the one **πρόσωπον**", emphasising that the confession of a true personal union can be accepted as valid if it is supported by a union of worship, since the liturgical act is one of the most fundamental and the least changing features of any ecclesiastical tradition. To this I would like to add the observation that in both the above cases Theodoret speaks of a worship belonging to both natures [ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ δὲ φύσει] as to "the One Son" [τὸν ἕνα Υἱόν], admitting, as it were, the prevalence of the Word within the one veneration. weight of this 'one veneration' during the Nestorian controversy already is also shown by Cyril, the chief representative of the Alexandrian tradition in his eighth anathema against Nestorius:

Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι δεῖν τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ καὶ συνδοξάζεσθαι καὶ συγχρηματίζειν θεὸν ὡς ἕτερον ἑτέρῳ τὸ γὰρ συν ἀεὶ προστιθέμενον τοῦτο νοεῖν ἀναγκάσει καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον μιᾷ προσκυνήσει τιμᾷ τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ καὶ μίαν αὐτῷ τὴν δοξολογίαν ἀνάπτει, καθὸ γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ λόγος, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.	If anyone has the temerity to say that the assumed man should be worshipped along with 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.[7]

In the quoted text we may observe that Cyril expressly refuses to speak of the one worship of Christ as being some "co-worshipping" or "worshipping along" of an assumed man with God the Word. Instead, he emphatically claims that Em-

6 Theodoret, De incarnatione Domini, in: PG 75, 1472. Concerning the problem of chapter numbering within this treatise see Pásztori-Kupán, An unnoticed title.

7 Schwartz, Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum I, 1, 1, 41 (hereafter: ACO).

manuel has to be honoured with a single act of worship. As it is obvious from the textual environment, the single worship belonging to Christ is a proof that one proclaims only one Son and not two sons: a divine and a human. Theodoret in fact agrees substantially with Cyril's eighth anathema despite his counter-statement, which is rather concerned to speak of the same One whilst preserving the properties of each nature:

> As I have often said, the doxology which we offer to the Master Christ is one [μίαν […] τὴν δοξολογίαν προσφέρομεν], and we confess the same [τὸν αὐτόν] to be at once God and man, as the method of the union [ὁ τῆς ἑνώσεως λόγος] has taught us; but we shall not shrink from speaking of the properties [τὰς ἰδιότητας] of the natures. For the God-Word did not accept a change into flesh [τὴν εἰς σάρκα τροπήν], nor yet again did the man [ὁ ἄνθρωπος] lose what [ὅ] he was and undergo transformation [μετεβλήθη] into the nature of God. Therefore, maintaining [λέγοντες] the properties [τὰ ἴδια] of each nature, we worship the Master Christ.[8]

Theodoret recognised the Son as the divine Word and the Son of Man as being "one and the same" (εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτός) after the union, without division (χωρισμός) in his early years already in Ch. 12 of his *Expositio rectae fidei*.[9] The importance of Theodoret's "union of worship" of the one πρόσωπον cannot be ignored, the more so since the idea is present in four of his replies to Cyril's anathemas. The first three occurrences are noteworthy also because they appear before the reply to the eighth anathema, which is the only one related indeed to the question of worship.[10] Whilst being concerned with the Cyrilline "hypostatic union" in *Anathema* 2, Theodoret concludes:

> Therefore the union according to hypostasis, which I think they put before us instead of mixture [ἀντὶ κράσεως], is superfluous. It is quite sufficient to declare the union [τὴν ἕνωσιν], which both shows [δείκνυσιν] the properties of the natures [τὰς τῶν φύσεων ἰδιότητας] and teaches [us] to worship the one Christ [καὶ τὸν ἕνα προσκυνεῖν διδάσκει Χριστόν].[11]

The emphasis upon this "union of worship" due to the One Christ is not an empty or negligible formula, but rather the counterpart of the equal worship given to the three ὑποστάσεις of the Trinity. We encounter this idea in a Trinitarian sense within the *Confession of Athanasius*:

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Μονογενῆ Λόγον, σοφίαν, Υἱὸν […] τὴν ἀληθινὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἰσότιμον καὶ ἰσόδοξον.	We worship the one Only-Begotten Word, Wisdom and Son, […] the true image of the Father, equally venerated and glorified.[12]

8 ACO I, 1, 6, 132.

9 See PG 6, 1229–1232. Cf. de Otto, Iustini Opera, 48.

10 Beside his reply to Anathema 8, the idea of the single worship returns in the answer to the first, second and fifth anathema. See below.

11 ACO I, 1, 6, 115.

12 Hahn, Bibliothek der Symbole, 265. It is important to note that this is the authentic confession of Athanasius, consequently, it is not identical with Symbolum Quicunque.

A similar emphasis upon this one veneration and one worship can be found also in Gregory Nazianzen's *Oratio* 41 *on Pentecost*:

Πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας […] δι οὗ Πατὴρ γινώσκεται, καὶ Υἱὸς δοξάζεται, καὶ παρ ὧν μόνων γινώσκεται, μία σύνταξις, λατρεία μία, προσκύνησις, δύναμις, τελειότης, ἁγιασμός.	Spirit of adoption […] through whom the Father is known and the Son is glorified, and beside whom alone is known, one order, one veneration, one worship, power, perfection, holiness.[13]

At the end of Ch. 8 of Theodoret's *De Trinitate*, the Word receives the same worship with the Father from the believers: τὴν μετὰ Πατρὸς παρὰ τῶν εὐγνωμόνων προσκύνησιν δέχεται.[14] This is one of Theodoret's ways to show that the Word "is eternally together with the Father" (ἀεὶ τῷ Πατρὶ σύνεστι).[15] The union of worship as a picture of the unity within the Trinity is expressed also by the repeated use of the formula "we, the worshippers of the Triad" in Ch. 4 and Ch. 15 of *De Trinitate*.[16]

Similarly, the worship – the least changing aspect of church life – concerning Jesus Christ is not a simple liturgical, but also a Christological issue. That is why Theodoret emphasises the "union of worship" against what he thinks involves a mixture in Cyril's fifth anathema. The Son is the Person and the manhood is the object:

> Thus, while we use the label "sharing" [τῷ τῆς κοινωνίας ὀνόματι χρώμενοι], we worship both Him who took and that which was taken as one Son [ὡς ἕνα μὲν Υἱὸν προσκυνοῦμεν τὸν λαβόντα καὶ τὸ ληφθέν]. Nevertheless, we acknowledge [γνωρίζομεν] the distinction [τὴν διαφοράν] of the natures.[17]

It may be argued that this single worship of the One Son in both natures is one of the most decisive factors in Theodoret's mind as to determine who is teaching "two Sons". The idea reappears both in his works and in his correspondence. His little tract entitled *That even after the inhumanation our Lord Jesus Christ is one Son* was written in 448, shortly after the *Eranistes* (447).[18] It contains Theodoret's apology against the charge of teaching 'two Sons'. At its very beginning we read:

13 PG 36, 441.

14 See PG 75, 1157. Cf. with Gregory of Nyssa's following statement: διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρ ἡμῶν μία προσκύνησις καὶ δοξολογία τοῖς τρισὶν ὡς ἑνὶ θεῷ. See Gregory of Nyssa, De creatione hominis sermo primus, in: Jaeger et al. (ed.), Gregorii Nysseni opera, Suppl., 8a.

15 PG 75, 1157. Theodoret's answer to the first anathema contains the very same idea: ὁ θεὸς Λόγος τῷ Πατρὶ συνὼν καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς γνωριζόμενός τε καὶ προσκυνούμενος, in: ACO I, 1, 6, 109.

16 Cf. with Theodoret's Letter 126 to Aphtonius etc.: οἱ τῆς ἀϊδίου Τριάδος προσκυνηταί, in: Sources Chrétiennes, 111, 98 (hereafter: SC).

17 ACO I, 1, 6, 126.

18 The little tract entitled ὅτι καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν εἷς Υἱὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός was published as an appendix to Letter 151 to the monks of the East (which had been written in 431–432) in PG 83, 1433–1440. Marcel Richard proved that the tract is a later composition, subsequent to the Eranistes. See Richard, "Un écrit de Théodoret".

Those who gather slanders against us claim that we divide our one Lord Jesus Christ into two sons. Nevertheless, we are so far from conceiving such things that we charge with impiety [all] those who even dare to say so.[19] Since we have been taught by the divine Scripture to worship one Son [ἕνα Υἱὸν προσκυνεῖν], our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, the God-Word made human.[20]

In fact, the entire defence of the author's orthodoxy within the aforementioned tract is based upon this recurrent idea of the union of worship, which a little later he combines with the perfection of the natures:

We therefore worship the Son, but we contemplate in Him each nature in its perfection [ἑκατέραν δὲ φύσιν τελείαν ἐν αὐτῷ θεωροῦμεν], both that which took on and that which was taken; the one of God and the other of David. For this reason He is named [ὀνομάζεται] both Son of the living God and Son of David, thus either nature receiving its proper title [ἑκατέρας φύσεως τὴν ἁρμόττουσαν ἐλκούσης προσηγορίαν].[21]

It is superfluous to repeat the issues already discussed. Nevertheless, a very representative occurrence in the same tract ought to be observed, since there the author connects his concept of Christological union with specific acts of worship:

The slanderers who assert that we venerate [πρεσβεύειν] two sons [are refuted by] the flagrant testimony of the facts [βοᾷ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡ μαρτυρία]. Since for all those who come to the all-holy Baptism we teach the faith laid forth at Nicaea. And when we celebrate the mystery of rebirth [τὸ τῆς παλιγγενεσί ας ἐπιτελοῦντες μυστήριον] we baptise those who believe in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, pronouncing each name by itself [ἑνικῶς ἑκάστην προσηγορίαν προσφέροντες]. And when we are performing divine service in the churches it is our custom to glorify the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit: not sons, but Son. If then we proclaim two sons, which [of the two] is glorified by us and which one remains unhonoured [ἀγέραστος]? For we have not quite reached such [a level of] insanity as to assert two sons, yet not to honour one of them with any respect. It is clear from this, therefore, that the slander is [slander], since we worship one Only-begotten Son, the God-Word made man.[22]

19 Anathema 6 of Ambrose quoted with approval by Theodoret (as written by Damasus) in his Ecclesiastical History reads: ἀναθεματίζομεν καὶ τοὺς δύο Υἱοὺς εἶναι διισχυριζομένους, ἕνα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἄλλον μετὰ τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας ἀνάληψιν. See Theodoret, Historia ecclesiastica in: Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 44, 298.

20 PG 83, 1433.

21 PG 83, 1436.

22 PG 83, 1437. The same liturgical defence of Theodoret's orthodoxy returns almost word by word in his Letter 146 to the monks of Constantinople written in the first half of 451. See SC 111, 178.

One veneration = One Person?

We can safely conclude from the above that the issue at stake for the Bishop of Cyrus concerning a true confession of the One Christ as the single subject of ultimate attributions is the unambiguous single worship. He invokes this argument repeatedly in his correspondence, often bound together with the idea of the reality of both natures and the *communicatio onomaton*, i.e. the ontological communication of names.[23] I shall quote some of the most relevant ones mentioning their time of composition, yet without adding further comments and letting the passages speak for themselves:[24]

> In this way [i.e. because of the unmingled union] I declare that the same Master Christ both suffers and destroys suffering; on one hand, He suffers according to the visible [κατὰ τὸ ὁρώμενον],[25] and destroys suffering as touching the ineffably indwelling Godhead. This is proved clearly also by the narrative of the holy gospels, from where we learn that whilst lying in a manger and wrapped in swaddling clothes, He was announced by a star, worshipped [προσεκυνεῖτο] by magi and hymned [ὑμνεῖτο] by angels.[26] […] For He who was born of her [i.e. Mary] is not revered on her account [δι αὐτὴν σεβάσμιος], but rather she is honoured [καλλύνεται] with the greatest titles on account of Him Who was born of her.[27]
>
> Although you have not yet met me, I think that your excellency is aware of the open calumnies that have been published against me, for you have often heard me preaching in church, when I have proclaimed the One Lord Jesus, and have pointed out both the properties [ἴδια] of the Godhead and of the manhood; for we do not divide [διαιροῦμεν] the One Son into two, but, worshipping [προσκυνοῦντες] the Only-begotten, point out the distinction [τὸ διάφορον] between flesh and Godhead.[28]
>
> Know then, O holy and godly sir that no one has ever at any time heard us preaching two sons; in fact this doctrine seems to me abominable and impious, for there is one Lord Jesus Christ through whom all things are. Him I acknowl-

23 For a detailed discussion of the communicatio idiomatum versus communicatio onomaton in Theodoret's thought see Pásztori-Kupán, Theodoret's Double Treatise, 139–150.

24 I have largely followed the translations of Blomfield Jackson. See Jackson, Theodoret.

25 Cf. Theodoret's Commentary on Romans 8,29 written in 436–438: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀόρατος ἡ θεία φύσις, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ὁρατόν, ὡς ἐν εἰκόνι τινὶ διὰ τοῦ σώματος προσκυνεῖται, in: PG 82, 141.

26 See his Commentary on Hebrews 1,6: Πῶς δὲ Πρωτότοκος ὁ Μονογενής; εἰ δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι προσεκύνησαν, πρὸ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως ταύτην αὐτῷ τιμὴν οὐ προσέφερον; […] ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν ὡς θεός, καὶ ἦλθεν ὡς ἄνθρωπος. Οὕτω καὶ Μονογενής ἐστιν ὡς θεός, καὶ Πρωτότοκος ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. Οὕτως ἀεὶ τὸ σέβας παρὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐδέχετο· ἦν γὰρ ἀεὶ θεός· προσεκύνησαν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπον, in: PG 82, 685.

27 Letter 151 written in 431–432, in: SC 429, 114–116 and 122.

28 Letter 99 to Claudianus written in Nov. 448, in: SC 111, 16. See also the following passage from Eranistes: ἕνα μὲν Υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ οἶδα καὶ προσκυνῶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· τῆς δὲ θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τὴν διαφορὰν ἐδιδάχθην. Ettlinger, Eranistes, 135.

edge both as eternal God and as man in the end of days, and I give Him one worship as Only-begotten. I was taught, however, the distinction [τὸ διάφορον] between flesh and Godhead, for the union is unmingled [ἀσύγχυτος γὰρ ἡ ἕνωσις]. […] For, even after the incarnation, we worship one Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ [καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἕνα προσκυνοῦμεν Υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν], and call as impious all who hold otherwise.[29]

And though the distinction [τὸ διάφορον] of the natures is equally recognised, the One Son ought to be worshipped [τὸν ἕνα χρὴ προσκυνεῖν Υἱόν], and the same ought to be recognised as Son of God and Son of man, form of God and form of the servant, Son of David and Lord of David, seed of Abraham and creator of Abraham. The union [ἕνωσις] causes the names to be common [κοινὰ ποιεῖ τὰ ὀνόματα], but the community of the names does not confound [οὐ συγχεῖ] the natures.[30] Since it is clear for the sound-minded that some [names] are appropriate as to God and others as to man. In this way both the passible and the impassible are befitting [ἁρμόττει] for the Master Christ, since on one hand He suffered according to the humanity [κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπειον], whilst on the other hand He remained impassible as God [ὡς θεός].[31]

Once for all, fighting against each heresy, we command [all] to worship the One Son [τὸν ἕνα προσκυνεῖν παρρεγγυῶμεν Υἱόν]. […] If, according to these calumnies, we venerate two sons, which one do we glorify and which one do we leave unworshipped [ἀπροσκύνητον καταλείπομεν]? Since it were the most extreme insanity to believe that there are two sons, yet to give the doxology to one alone [ἑνὶ δὲ μόνῳ].[32]

It is said that […] after certain presbyters had offered prayer, and concluded it in the wonted manner, while some said "For to You belongs glory and to Your Christ and to the Holy Spirit" and others "Through grace and loving kindness of Your Christ, with whom belongs glory to You with Your Holy Spirit", the very wise archdeacon prohibited the use of the expression, "the Christ" and said that the "Only-begotten" ought to be glorified. If this is true, it were impossible to exceed the impiety. For he either divides the one Lord Jesus Christ into two sons and regards the only begotten Son as lawful and natural, but the Christ as adopted and spurious, and consequently unworthy for being honoured in doxology; or else he is endeavouring to support the heresy which has now burst in on us with the riot of wild revelry. […] Copious additional evidence may be found whereby it may be learnt without difficulty that our Lord Jesus Christ is no other person than the Son who completes the Trinity. […] Let no one then foolishly

29 Letter 104 to Flavian, patriarch of Alexandria, written in Dec. 448, in: SC 111, 24–26 and 28.

30 See Theodoret's Commentary on Ephesians 1,20–22: τὸ δὲ τὴν ληφθεῖσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν φύσιν τῆς αὐτῆς τῷ λαβόντι μετέχειν τιμῆς, ὥστε μηδεμίαν φαίνεσθαι διαφορὰν προσκυνή σεως, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ὁρωμένης φύσεως τὴν ἀόρατον προσκυνεῖσθαι θεότητα, τοῦτο παντὸς ἐπέκεινα θαύματος, in: PG 82, 517.

31 Letter 131 to Bishop Timotheus written in the middle of the year 450, in: SC 111, 116–118.

32 Letter 146 to the monks of Constantinople written in the first half of 451, in: SC 111, 178.

suppose that the Christ is any other than the only begotten Son. […] One point, however, I cannot endure to omit. He is alleged to have said that there are many Christs but one Son. Into this error I suppose he fell through ignorance. For if he had read the divine Scripture, he would have known that the title of the Son has also been bestowed by our bountiful Lord on many. […] If then, because the name [τὸ ὄνομα] of the Christ is common, we neither should glorify the Christ as God, nor worship Him as Son, since this name has also been bestowed upon many. And why do I say the Son? The very name [προσηγορία] of God itself has been received by many as given [to them] by God. […] "I have said you are gods" [Psalm 82, 6]. […] But this common use of titles [τὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων ὁμώνυμον] does not offend those who are instructed in piety. […] Thus, though many are named fathers, we worship One Father, the Father before the ages, the One who gave this title [τὴν ἐπίκλησιν] to men, according to the words of the Apostle [Ephesians 3, 14–15]. Let us not then, because others are called christs, rob ourselves of the worship of our Lord Jesus Christ. For just as though many are called gods and fathers, there is One God over all and Father before the ages; and though many are called sons, there is One true and natural Son [εἷς ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ φύσει Υἱός]; and though many are labelled spirits there is One All-Holy Spirit; in the same fashion, though many are called christs there is One Lord Jesus Christ by Whom all things are. And very properly does the Church cling to this name [ἐξήρτηται τοῦ ὀνόματος]; for she has heard Paul, escorter of the Bride [τοῦ νυμφοστόλου], exclaiming "I have espoused you to one husband that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ".[33]

The evidence gathered here at some length is quite conclusive. In Theodoret's understanding, from the time of the composition of *De incarnatione* (430–431) until the months leading to Chalcedon (451), one's Christological orthodoxy is measurable by the following question: "whom do you worship?" Although τὸ διά φορον of the natures cannot be ignored, this does not impair by any means the ἀσύγχυτος ἕνωσις within the ἕν πρόσωπον, who is the One and the same Son, Word and Master Christ and who should be worshipped with a single veneration. The Antiochene equation, then, would be that the "one veneration" belongs and is bound to the "one person": μία προσκύνησις = ἕν πρόσωπον. In order to determine whether this equation held also in the works of the contemporary Alexandrian or earlier theologians, or whether it was an exclusive peculiarity of the Bishop of Cyrus in the Ephesian-Chalcedonian period, we need to take a glance at the issue within a wider perspective.

33 Letter 147 to John the oeconomus written in 451, in: SC 111, 201–220.

Earlier testimonies concerning the unity of worship

One of the earlier testimonies concerning the matter is the *Creed* ascribed to either a Nicene or Antiochene council against Paul of Samosata (preserved in the Ephesian Acts of 431), which confesses "our Lord Jesus Christ" in the following manner:

Οὕτως ὅλον προσκυνητὸν καὶ μετὰ τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλ οὐχὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα προσκυνητόν, ὅλον προσκυνοῦντα καὶ μετὰ τῆς θεό τητος, ἀλλ οὐχὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα προσκυνοῦντα.	Thus, He is worshipped entirely even together with his body, yet not worshipped according to the body; he is entirely worshipped also with the Godhead, but not worshipped according to the Godhead.[34]

Some analysts dispute the Antiochene provenance of this creed, suspecting that it may have come from the school of Apollinaris.[35] I have some doubts concerning this, since the keyword for the humanity is σῶμα and not σάρξ as we shall see below by Apollinaris, nevertheless, this is a further hint that the union of worship may indeed have been a major issue for the Alexandrian party also. Here is what Athanasius writes in his *Commentary on Psalm* 99, 5 (LXX: Ps. 98, 5):

Ὁ ὑψηλὸς ὡς Θεὸς καὶ ὑπὸ πόδας ἔχων πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν γέγονεν ἀτρέπτως ἄνθρωπος. Τοῦτον οὖν, φησὶ, τὸν γενόμενον ἀτρέπτως ἄνθρωπον ὑψοῦτε, προσκυνοῦντες αὐτὸν μιᾷ προσκυνήσει μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός.	The One exalted as God and having the whole creation under His feet became man without change. Then, he says, you should exalt this one, who was made man without change, worshipping him with one veneration together with his own flesh.[36]

Apart from the double emphasis upon the "unchanged" manner of God's becoming man, we encounter here a recurrent Alexandrian expression concerning the single worship "of the Word together with His own flesh".[37] Apollinaris' famous confession Περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου – held by Cyril as coming from Athanasius – apart from the phrase of "one incarnate nature" adopted by Cyril reads:

34 Hahn, Bibliothek, 182. Cf. ACO I, 1, 5, 6.
35 See Hahn, Bibliothek, 182, note 42.
36 PG 27, 421.
37 Cf. with the Confession of the Apollinarian Bishop Jobius: προσκυνούμενον δὲ καὶ δοξαζόμενον μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός. See Hahn, Bibliothek, 285.

οὐ δύο φύσεις τὸν ἕνα υἱόν, μίαν προσκυνητήν καὶ μίαν ἀπροσκύνητον, ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην καὶ προσκυνουμένην μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ μιᾷ προσκυνήσει […] ἢ εἴ τις […] ἀπροσκύνητον [λέγει] τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν σάρκα ὡς ἀνθρώπου καὶ μὴ προσκυνητὴν ὡς κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ σάρκα, τοῦτον ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἁγία καὶ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

[We do not confess] the one Son as two natures, one venerated and one lacking veneration, but one nature incarnate and worshipped of the God-Word together with his flesh with one veneration […] and if anyone says that the flesh of our Lord is lacking veneration as being the flesh of man, and not worshipped as the flesh of the Lord and God, is anathematised by the Catholic Church.[38]

It appears that the "one worship" belonging to the one Christ was not of secondary importance for Alexandrian theologians, although Apollinaris introduces a "natural union" deriving from this union of worship, which the other party – and the whole church indeed – did not approve, whilst still maintaining the one veneration. Apollinaris endorses it emphatically in his *Detailed Confession*, i.e. in ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις, asserting of the Son of God made man:

ἓν πρόσωπον, καὶ μίαν τὴν προσκύνησιν τοῦ Λόγου καὶ τῆς σαρκός, ἣν ἀνέλαβεν· καὶ ἀναθεματίζομεν τοὺς διαφόρους προσκυνήσεις ποιοῦντας, μίαν θεϊκὴν καὶ μίαν ἀνθρωπίνην, καὶ προσκυνοῦντας τὸν ἐκ Μαρίας ἄνθρωπον ὡς ἕτερον ὄντα παρὰ τὸν ἐκ θεοῦ θεόν […] οὐδὲ γὰρ τεσσάρα προσκυνεῖν λέγομεν, θεὸν καὶ Υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Διὸ καὶ ἀναθεματίζομεν τοὺς οὕτως ἀσεβοῦντας, τοὺς ἄνθρωπον ἐν τῇ θείᾳ δοξολογίᾳ τιθέντας.

One person and one veneration of the Word and of the flesh which he assumed; and we anathematise those who make different worships, one divine and one human, and worship the man [born] of Mary as being different from the God of God […] for we neither say that four should be worshipped: God, the Son of God, the man and the Holy Spirit. Thus we also anathematise those who blaspheme in this manner, putting the man into the divine doxology.[39]

This is arguably one of the main sources of the eighth Cyrilline anathema and constitutes the very charge Theodoret continued to fight against. Maintaining τὸ διάφορον of the natures (which Apollinaris did not admit of course, yet that is

38 Hahn, Bibliothek, 267–268. Cf. ACO I, 1, 7, 48–49. Caspari proved the authorship of Apollinaris in Caspari, Alte und Neue Quellen, I, 119. In his Προσφωνητικὸς ταῖς εὐσεβεστάταις δεσποίναις, Cyril quotes almost the entire text of Apollinaris' above Confession introducing it with the following formula: ἔφη τοίνυν ὁ τρισμακάριος ἀληθῶς καὶ διαβόητος εἰς εὐσέβειαν Ἀθανάσιος etc. See ACO I, 1, 5, 65.

39 Lietzmann, Apollinaris, 177–179. Cf. with the homily of Paul, Bishop of Emesa preserved in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (uttered in Alexandria in the presence of Cyril): διὰ τοῦτο Τριάδα, οὐ τετράδα προσκυνοῦμεν, Πατέρα καὶ ἕνα Υἱὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἀναθεματίζομεν δὲ τοὺς λέγοντας δύο υἱοὺς καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλομεν περιβόλων. ACO I, 1, 4, 10.

why he was heterodox), he simultaneously refused any διάφορον in the worship. As it appears in the recurrent Apollinarian (and later Cyrilline) formula of the "one incarnate nature of the God-Word", the Alexandrians following Apollinaris and Cyril tended to equate the "one worship" with the "one nature": μία προσκύνησις = μία φύσις. This became an increasingly important question during the Monophysite controversy, at the end of which the church finally had to choose not only between the "one Person" and the "one nature" of the Word made man, but also between the two equations: "μία προσκύνησις = ἕν πρόσωπον" over against "μία προσκύνησις = μία φύσις".

We shall return to the Alexandrian party contemporary to Theodoret, yet before that let us take a glance at his own tradition. Theodore of Mopsuestia, perhaps reacting to some extent to Apollinarian allegations, in his *Confession* writes about the "perfect human being" assumed by "the Master God-Word":

Παρὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως δέχεται προσκύνησιν, ὡς ἀχώριστον πρὸς τὴν θεὶαν φύσιν ἔχων τὴν συνάφειαν, ἀναφορᾷ θεοῦ καὶ ἐννοίᾳ πάσης αὐτῷ τῆς κτίσεως τὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονεμοῦσης. Καὶ οὔτε δύο φαμὲν υἱοὺς οὔτε δύο κυρίους, ἐπειδὴ εἷς θεὸς κατ οὐσίαν ὁ θεὸς Λόγος, ὁ Μονογενὴς Υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς, ᾧπερ οὗτος συνημμένος τε καὶ μετέχων θεότητος κοινωνεῖ τῆς Υἱοῦ προσηγορίας τε καὶ τιμῆς […] ὑπὲρ ὧν δὴ καὶ τὴν προσκύνησιν καὶ ἀναφορὰν θεοῦ παρὰ πάσης δέχεται τῆς κτίσεως.

He receives the veneration from the whole creation, as having an inseparable conjunction with the divine nature, imparting the veneration with God's offering and the praise of the whole creation towards him. And we neither speak of two sons, nor two lords, inasmuch as according to the essence the God-Word is one God, the Only-begotten Son of the Father, whence this one being united and participating in the Godhead shares the name as well as the reverence of the Son […] from which it is evident that he receives both the veneration and the praise of God from the whole creation.[40]

A more distilled, yet to some extent less technical expression of the same concept is found in John Chrysostom's treatise *De sancta Trinitate*, in which the famous Antiochene preacher brings the idea of the single worship closer to the Athanasian emphasis quoted above. As Chrysostom writes,

40 Hahn, Bibliothek, 303. Cf. ACO I, 1, 7, 98–99.

ὁρᾶτε μυστήριον. ἐπειδὴ ἤμελλε χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας τὴν ἡμετέραν σάρκα ἑνοῦν ἑαυτῷ εἰς μίαν προσκύνησιν, ἡ δὲ σάρξ ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ Ἀδάμ, ἐκ τῆς γῆς· κατὰ τοῦτο λέγει, Καὶ προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. ἡμεῖς τῇ γῇ οὐ προσκυνοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ Λόγῳ τῷ ἑνώσαντι ἑαυτῷ χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας τὴν ἐκ τῆς γῆς πλασθεῖσαν τοῦ Ἀδὰμ σάρκα.

Behold the mystery. That is why he approached our flesh without sin and united it to himself into one veneration. Yet our flesh is from Adam, from the earth. Against this he says, "worship at his footstool" [Psalm 99,5]. We do not worship the earth, but rather God the Word who united to himself without sin the flesh of Adam created from the earth.[41]

Based on the evidence presented above it is fair to assume that in both major theological traditions of Alexandria and Antioch respectively the idea of the single worship of the One Son incarnate was by no means of secondary importance vis-à-vis the personal union of Christ. Our concluding task is to investigate the impact of this "one veneration" upon the conflicting Christological models, which emerged during the Ephesian–Chalcedonian period.

Chalcedon and the ecumenical solution

Before the Council of Ephesus, Cyril was also one of the most vigorous defenders of the idea of a single veneration, notably bound to the union of the person. Apart from his eighth anathema, the idea reappears in his famous dogmatic letter to Nestorius:

οὕτω Χριστὸν ἕνα καὶ Κύριον ὁμολογήσομεν, οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνοῦντες τῷ Λόγῳ, ἵνα μὴ τιμῆς φαντασία παρεισκρίνηται διὰ τοῦ λέγειν τὸ σύν· ἀλλ ὡς ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν προσκυνοῦντες […] ὡς ἑνὸς καθ ἕνωσιν, μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός.

Thus we confess one Christ and Lord, not as if worshipping him along with the Word as man, so that no phantasm of veneration would be admitted by saying 'along with', but rather as worshipping the one and the same […] as one according to the union with his own flesh.[42]

Thus, a duality of subjects is refuted by the denial of a divided worship or a "common worship", i.e. "co-worship". Cyril's overall suspicion concerning the preposition σύν is a fairly well researched matter, especially concerning his mostly unfounded mistrust concerning the expression συνάφεια as describing an unmingled, yet

41 PG 48, 1096.
42 Cyril's Epistola dogmatica in Hahn, Bibliothek, 312. Cf. ACO I, 1, 1, 28.
43 Pásztori-Kupán, Theodoret's Double Treatise, 197–200. Pásztori-Kupán, Theodoret, 70–72. Cf. Abramowski, Συνάφεια.

real union in Christ.[43] At this point, however, we should remember how much weight he had laid upon the one worship as the proof of a true confession of the unity in Christ in his above quoted eighth anathema.

As shown by the evidence, although he did not share Cyril's worries concerning the preposition σύν as describing something composite and not truly one, Theodoret also emphasised the "one worship" as being προσκύνησις rather than συμπροσκύνησις. In his short reply to Anathema 8 he asserts μίαν τὴν δοξολογίαν προσφέρομεν explaining that this does not remove the natures' properties, which in their turn do not impair the union. Pope Leo I in his famous dogmatic epistle to Flavian, the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, martyred shortly after the Robber Synod of Ephesus (*Latrocinium Ephesinum* 449), touches upon the issue briefly, nonetheless clearly from the perspective of two natures:

Similis est rudimentis hominum, quem Herodes impie molitur occidere; sed Dominus est omnium, quem Magi gaudent suppliciter *adorare* […] Quem itaque sicut hominem diabolica tentat astutia, eidem sicut Deo angelica *famulantur* officia.	The one whom Herod impiously strived to kill, was like a human being at the earliest stage; yet it was the Lord of all whom the Magi rejoiced to adore suppliantly. […] Accordingly, the same one whom the devil craftily tempts as a man, the angels dutifully wait on as God.[44]

Without lengthening the gathering of evidence any further,[45] I would like to refer to one of the most interesting climaxes concerning the avowal of a single worship bound together with the confession concerning the existence of both natures. This is the case of Basil of Seleucia, who according to the Acts of Chalcedon, asserted:

Προσκυνῶ τὸν ἕνα Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Μονογενῆ, τὸν θεὸν Λόγον μετὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν καὶ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐν δύο φύσεσιν γνωριζόμενον.	I worship our one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Only-Begotten Son of God, the God-Word after the incarnation and inhumanation known in two natures.[46]

According to the minutes of the council a huge uproar followed this sentence from the side of the Egyptian and Eastern bishops, who repeatedly protested against "the separation of the indivisible": τὸν ἀμέριστον μηδεὶς χωριζέτω. Although Basil defended the union, he did not shrink to speak of the natures' properties and said:

44 See Leo, Tomus ad Flavianum 4, in: ACO II, 2, 1, 28–29.

45 For the importance of the unity of worship for both parties as a sign of teaching "One Son" during the Nestorian controversy cf. ACO I, 1, 1, 18, 23, 35, 37, 41, 53, 62–63; ACO I, 1, 2, 44, 48–49, 71, 92, 95, 101; ACO I, 1, 4, 25, 27; ACO I, 1, 5, 21–23, 31, 49, 64, 65; ACO I, 1, 6, 8, 20, 32, 46–54, 132; ACO I, 1, 7, 39, 48–50, 83, 93, 98–99, 108–109, 139; ACO I, 5, 1, 225, 230.

46 ACO II, 1, 1, 92–93.

ἀνάθεμα τῷ μερίζοντι, ἀνάθεμα τῷ διαιροῦντι τὰς φύσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν· ἀνάθεμα δὲ καὶ τῷ μὴ γνωρίζοντι τὸ ἰδίαζον τῶν φύσεων.

Anathema to the one who divides, anathema to the one who separates the natures after the union; yet anathema also to the one who does not recognise the property of the natures.[47]

It was an almost impossible situation, since the Egyptians labelled the "two natures" formula as outright Nestorian. We do not intend to follow the story any further, since that would divert us from our main theme, nevertheless, the fact that Basil's above assertion became ultimately the key phrase of the *Definition* is argued positively by modern scholarship. According to Sellers, the famous "in two natures" of the *Chalcedonense* may well have had its origin in Basil's earlier comment on the *Formula of Reunion*:

Προσκυνοῦμεν τὸν ἕνα Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν δύο φύσεσι γνωριζόμενον.

We worship our one Lord Jesus Christ recognised in two natures.[48]

André de Halleux, who is the author of probably the best analytic article so far on the *Chalcedonense*, also reaches the same substantial conclusion concerning the source of "la formule *basilienne*".[49] Basil had asserted this at the home synod at Constantinople in November 448, he was forced to retract it at the Latrocinium, only to revert to this statement again in Chalcedon.[50]

If one were to compare the above with Theodoret's assertion in Ch. 21 of *De incarnatione*, the resemblance is obvious, especially concerning the union of worship: ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ δὲ φύσει τὸν ἕνα Υἱὸν προσκυνήσωμεν.[51] In fact he restated it in a somewhat similar fashion at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which together with the anathema upon those teaching "two sons" and the confession of worshipping the One Son met the approval of the Eastern bishops also:

Θεοδώρητος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν· ἀνάθεμα τῷ λέγοντι δύο υἱούς· ἕνα γὰρ Υἱὸν προσκυνοῦμεν, τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Μονογενῆ.

The most venerable bishop Theodoret said: Anathema to the one who proclaims two sons; for we worship one Son, our Only-begotten Lord Jesus Christ.[52]

47 ACO II, 1, 1, 93.
48 ACO II, 1, 1, 117.
49 de Halleux, "La définition christologique à Chalcédoine", 467–70.
50 See Sellers, The Council of Chalcedon, 58, note 6; 67, note 4; 122; 215–216.
51 PG 75, 1456.
52 ACO II, 1, 1, 111. Concerning the issue of the worship not belonging to "two sons" see also Emperor Marcian's letters sent to Macarius (ACO II, 1, 3, 131–132) and to the synod of Palestine (ACO II, 1, 3, 133–135).

The alternative to this Antiochene position (i.e. to connect the one worship to the one person and not to the one nature) had been asserted previously at the same council by Bishop Logginos and Presbyter John respectively. We shall quote first the statement of Logginos :

Ὁ θεοφιλέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Λογγῖνος τῆς Χερσονησιτῶν πόλεως εἶπεν· […] εἰδὼς μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν τὴν ἐκ δύο φύσεων προσκυνεῖσθαι θεότητα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

The most God-loving Logginos, bishop of the city of Chersonese, said: […] I see that after the inhumanation the Godhead of the Only-Begotten Son of God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ is worshipped out of two natures.[53]

It is abundantly clear that Logginos, who in support of his affirmation also referred to the 318 fathers gathered in Nicea as well as to Cyril (who died in 444), made here a last attempt to canonise the equation "one worship = one nature". This is substantiated also by the fact that immediately after this declaration, Dioscorus of Alexandria, the leader of the Monophysite party and chief promoter of the *Latrocinium* (deposed by Chalcedon on disciplinary grounds), practically gave an ultimatum:

Διόσκορος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἶπεν· Τὸ ἐκ δύο δέχομαι· τὸ δύο οὐ δέχομαι.

Dioscorus, the most venerable bishop of Alexandria said: I accept "out of two" [natures]; I do not accept the "two".[54]

In the ensuing dispute, it became abundantly clear that the two statements: "out of two natures" and "in two natures" respectively were mutually exclusive in the minds of the Chalcedonian fathers. Thus, if one stated ἐκ δύο φύσεων, it automatically meant that he denied ἐν δύο φύσεσιν after the union. The question of worship or veneration (προσκύνησις) differed accordingly. Consequently, it seemed for those who confessed "out of two natures" and who bound the "one worship" to the "one nature", that the other party did not venerate the One Son, but two sons with a συμπροσκύνησις, a practice against which Cyril used to warn his followers repeatedly. The obvious conclusion of ἐκ δύο φύσεων was uttered uncompromisingly by Dioscorus, who said: "after the union there are not two natures".[55]

After a short while, returning to the question of veneration, presbyter John came to strengthen the Alexandrian position with the following affirmation:

53 ACO II, 1, 1, 120.
54 ACO II, 1, 1, 120.
55 Μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἕνωσιν δύο φύσεις οὐκ εἰσίν. ACO II, 1, 1, 121.

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου, τουτέστιν μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μίαν φύσιν προσκυνεῖν καὶ ταύτην θεοῦ σαρκωθέντος καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος.

Nevertheless, after the inhumanation of the God-Word, i.e. after the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ one should worship one nature and this is the nature of the incarnate God made man.[56]

We may observe again the close resemblance with the Apollinarian line of thought: one worship → one nature. The evidence clearly shows that the Eutychians did not relinquish this formula.[57] One ought to observe the manner of reference to the "worship" within these statements in order to see how important this seemingly liturgical point became in the Christological debates during the Nestorian as well as the Monophysite controversies. It is useful to compare them with Basil's forced recantation at the *Latrocinium*:

Βασίλειος ἐπίσκοπος Σελευκείας Ἰσαυρίας εἶπεν· […] προσκυνῶ τὴν μίαν φύσιν τῆς θεότητος τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ἐνανθρωπήσαντος καὶ σεσαρκωμένου.

Basil, the bishop of Seleucia of Isauria said: […] I worship the one nature of the Godhead of the Only-begotten made man and incarnate.[58]

This statement forced upon Basil in 449 by the party of Dioscorus makes it obvious that concerning the worship belonging to the One Son of God Incarnate the issue at stake in the minds of the Eutychians was that this automatically determined the number of natures confessed after the union. The Apollinarian equation of "nature" with "person", i.e. φύσις with πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις inherited by Cyril as coming from Athanasius[59] permeated the Eutychian Christological thinking to the extent that a single veneration of the one Person having two natures even after the union became inconceivable.

As far as the testimony of the *Chalcedonian Definition* goes, it was decided that the μία προσκύνησις – which remained totally unchallenged through the entire period – is not bound to the μία φύσις formula, but belongs to the One Person of Christ. The Lord is thus worshipped with one veneration as a single πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις recognised not "out of two natures" (ἐκ δύο φύσεων), but rather "in two natures" (ἐν δύο φύσεσιν) after the union. Based on the available evidence it may be said that Theodoret of Cyrus and his companions, like Flavian of Constantinople or Ibas of Edessa, who clung to the Christology of "one Person – two natures" were in substantial agreement with this ecumenical conclusion.

56 ACO II, 1, 1, 124.
57 See ACO II, 1, 1, 159 and 161.
58 ACO II, 1, 1, 179.
59 See Apollinaris, De fide et incarnatione: "one nature, one hypostasis, one operation, one person" (μία φύσις, μία ὑπόστασις, μία ἐνέργεια, ἓν πρόσωπον). Lietzmann, Apollinaris, 198–199.

Bibliography

- Abramowski, Luise: "Συνάφεια und ἀσύγχυτος ἕνωσις als Bezeichnung für trinitarische und christologische Einheit", in: Abramowski, Luise,: *Drei christologische Untersuchungen*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1981, 63–109.
- Caspari, C. P., *Alte und Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel*, 3 Bände, Malling, Christiania, 1879.
- Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Berlin, Berlin–Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1969–.
- Ettlinger, Gerard H. (ed.): Theodoret of Cyrus, *Eranistes*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Hahn, G. Ludwig: *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der Alten Kirche*, III. Aufl., Breslau, E. Morgenstern, 1897.
- Halleux, André de, "La définition christologique à Chalcédoine", in: *Patrologie et œcuménisme*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensinum, 93, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 1990, 445–480.
- Jackson, Blomfield, *The Ecclesiastical History, Dialogues, and Letters of Theodoret*, in: Schaff, Philip – Wace, Henry (eds.), Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. III, Buffalo, NY, Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1892.
- Jaeger, W. et al. (ed.): *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, 9 vols + Suppl., Leiden, Brill, 1952–1996.
- Lietzmann, Hans, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen, Mohr, 1904.
- Migne, Jacques Paul: *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, 161 vols, Paris, 1857–1887)
- Otto, I. C. Th. de, (ed.), *Iustini Philosophi et Martyris Opera Quae Feruntur Omnia*, Corpus *Apologetarum* Christianorum Saeculi Secundi, 4, III. Aufl., Iena, Gust. Fischer, 1880.
- Pásztori-Kupán István: An unnoticed title in Theodoret of Cyrus' Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως, in: *The Journal of Theological Studies* 53 (2002), 102–111.
- Pásztori-Kupán István: *Theodoret of Cyrus*, The Early Church Fathers, London – New York, Routledge, 2006.
- Pásztori-Kupán István: *Theodoret of Cyrus's Double Treatise On the Trinity and On the Incarnation: The Antiochene Pathway to Chalcedon*, Kolozsvár/Cluj, The Transylvanian District of the Reformed Church in Romania, 2007.
- Richard, Marcel: "Un écrit de Théodoret sur l'unité du Christ après l'Incarnation", in: *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 24 (1935), 34–61.
- Sellers, R. V.: *The Council of Chalcedon, A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*, London, SPCK, 1961.
- Schor, Adam M.: Theodoret on the "School of Antioch": A Network Approach, in: *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15/4 (2007), 517–562.
- Schwartz, Eduard et al. (ed.): *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Berlin – Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter, 1914–1971.
- Sources Chrétiennes, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1942–.