**The Council of Chalcedon 451l**

**And Pope Dioscorus the Lamp of Orthodoxy**

**Introduction**

This book was originally a research paper prepared in response to a request of the Anglican Church, to be presented in the annual International Official Dialogue between the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Anglican Church. I presented it in the meeting held on October 23-28, 2017 at Dublin, Ireland.

We previously published a book titled "*The Third Ecumenical Council in Ephesus 431 AD and the Doctrinal Controversies during the Fourth and Fifth Centuries Regarding the Person and Nature of Christ*". It reports the Nestorian conflict since its beginning, with a detailed record of the events and minutes of the sessions of the Council of Ephesus 431 AD, including explanations of the Great St. Cyril in response to Nestorianism; followed by the victorious conclusion of the council for orthodoxy and the condemnation of Nestorius. This book in your hands, is a historical summary of the events taking place during the era which followed the Council of Ephesus 431 AD, the exile of Nestorius and until the Council of Chalcedon. It includes the appearance of the Eutychian heresy, the convening of the Council of Constantinople 448 AD presided over by Patriarch Flavian, and the Council of Ephesus 499 AD summoned by the Emperor Thedosius who determined it should be presided by Pope Dioscorus with Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Caesarea as assistants. Following with the events which concern us in the Council of Chalcedon 451 AD, and its conclusion resulting in a major schism. Several attempts of unity from both sides occurred after Chalcedon: we shed light on the text of the *Henoticon*, the Council of Ephesus 475 AD of the non-Chalcedonian side, in which the heresy of Eutyches and Nestorius were condemned, Chalcedon rejected, and from the Chalcedonian side the Council of Constantinople 553 AD. The Chalcedonians call the Council of 553 Nea-Chalcedon, since it tried to get closer to the teachings of St. Cyril, condemned the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa who attacked the teachings of St. Cyril of Alexandria. Finally, we provided examples of some anathemas from both sides.

In all these historical events we highlighted the position of the Church of Alexandria by explaining its firm belief regarding the mystery of the divine incarnation and the person of God the Word as stated by St. Pope Cyril the Great, Pillar of Faith, and St. Pope Dioscorus, rightly entitled in our church: the Lamp of Orthodoxy.

The great St. Pope Dioscorus was insulted and accused with many false accusations in the ominous Council of Chalcedon 451 AD, which this book aims to clarify with scientific evidence from most prominent historical references, most of which are by foreign authors. As a result of some administrative charges against Pope Dioscorus, he was deposed from his See, exiled to the island of Gangra, where he ended his life defending the faith that he had received from his fathers.

##### Unfortunately, to this day, the same false accusations made by the enemies of true faith against the faith of the Church of Alexandria and against Pope Dioscorus are being echoed in Chalcedonian writings. Regretfully, we find some sons of our church today ignorantly quoting these western Chalcedonian authors. Even the Coptic Encyclopedia published in English, edited and supervised by Dr. Aziz Suriel aided by numerous western foreign writers mentioned the same false accusations. Therefore, we found it our duty to defend the Alexandrine theology and the Alexandrine saintly fathers: the teachers of the universe.

##### May the blessings of St. Cyril the Great, Pillar of Faith (24), and St. Dioscorus, the Lamp of Orthodoxy (25) embrace our sound church along with the prayers of His Holiness Pope Anba Tawadros II (118) successor of St. Mark and Saints Cyril and Dioscorus.
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**The Council of Chalcedon**

The Council of Chalcedon was called by Empress Pulcheria and by Emperor Marcian[[1]](#footnote-1) (450-457). Held at Chalcedon across the Bosporus from the capital Constantinople, the council opened with perhaps 500 bishops in attendance on 8 October 451, in the basilica of St. Euphemia.[[2]](#footnote-2) Its sixteenth and last session took place on 1 November 451. Although Chalcedon was designed as a council of reconciliation, its results caused much future unrest in the Eastern provinces, occasioning deep divisions that have not been healed to the present day.”[[3]](#footnote-3) “From the political point of view, the Council of Chalcedon was a failure.”[[4]](#footnote-4) From the ecclesiastic point of view “a grievous schism, which remains unhealed to this day.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

**An Overview of the Events Which Led to Chalcedon:**

##### The Reunion of 433 AD

Nestorius was sent to the Monastery of Euprepius and in the year 435 was exiled to Petra in Arabia then to the wilderness of Egypt where he died in the year 449 AD. [[6]](#footnote-6)

The removal of Nestorius did not solve the problem. Communion between the parties being now broken, the emperor himself exerted his influence to re-establish peace. His efforts produced the expected results and in 433 John of Antioch sent Paul of Emesa to Alexandria with a profession of faith (i.e. a written document containing a confession of the faith of John), which Cyril accepted and sent back to Antioch his famous letter which brought reunion. This incorporated a passage from John's confession, stressing the unity of Christ's person and the unconfused continuance of Godhead and manhood in Him.[[7]](#footnote-7)

**A State of Tension**[[8]](#footnote-8)

The reunion of 433 did not really succeed in bringing about perfect unity between the two sides. The Alexandrines (i.e. the group that supported Saint Cyril) felt that Cyril had offered too many concessions to the Antiochenes. As for the Antiochenes, some of them felt aggravated and unsatisfied with the exclusion of Nestorius and his condemnation.

Yet Cyril was powerful and influential enough so as to contain his adherents. He sent many letters to his friends such as Acacius, Bishop of Melitene (present day Malatia), and Valerian, Bishop of Iconium, explaining that the reconciliation with John of Antioch is not in contradiction neither with his previous interpretation of the dogma in his letters to Nestorius, nor with the doctrines of the council of Ephesus.

As for the Antiochenes, they were not all in agreement on the question of a rapprochement or a reunion. Although men like John of Antioch and Acacius, Bishop of Beroea (present day Aleppo), accepted the reunion and continued to remain loyal to the terms of the agreement reached in 433, there were others on the Antiochene side who were unwilling to comply with the Antiochene patriarch. This latter group consisted of persons holding to two positions. On the one hand, there were the Cilicians who were opposed to Cyril and the reunion, and on the other there were persons like Theodoret of Cyrus who would not accept the condemnation of Nestorius.

The Emperor now intervened and many of those bishops and clerics yielded. Yet fifteen recalcitrant had to be deposed. In 435 Theodoret accepted the reunion, without condemning Nestorius. An able controversialist, the Bishop of Cyrus played a significant role in the conflict following the reunion.

**The Reunion Interpreted Differently** [[9]](#footnote-9)

The tension between the two sides was aggravated by the fact that the reunion itself was not taken by them in an agreed sense. The Alexandrines, on their part, regarded it as an incident which led the Antiochenes to accept the council of 431 unconditionally. Cyril himself had taken it only in this sense, and he made that point clear to the men on his side who asked him about it.[[10]](#footnote-10) This Cyrilline view, was ably asserted by Severus of Antioch in the sixth century.[[11]](#footnote-11) The Alexandrines could offer sufficient justification for this position. Did not the Antiochenes, for instance, agree to the concordat withdrawing all their three objections to the council of Ephesus? Did they not also communicate with Cyril of Alexandria without making him formally give up the anathemas?

Though the legitimacy of this Alexandrine defence cannot be gainsaid, Theodoret of Cyrus and his supporters were not willing to grant it. Theodoret, on his part, proceeded on the assumption that the reunion of 433 had cancelled all decisions of the council of 431 which they did not positively endorse. Accordingly, they exerted all their abilities to build up a strong [i.e. extremist] Antiochene theology on the foundation of the Formulary of Reunion [according to their own understanding] and to appoint men in key positions to propagate this theology. This they hoped to achieve by admitting the Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius as a document of the faith, in addition to the Formulary itself. In so owning the second letter, the Antiochenes may well have interpreted the phrase *hypostatic union* which it contained as a synonym for *prosopic* *union* (union between persons)though Cyril had rejected this phrase in that letter. In their effort to develop their theology it was felt that they should admit and declare Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia as their theological masters. The works of these two were published and even a defense of the men was brought out by Theodoret himself. As soon as this was produced, it was **refuted by Pope Cyril**. The Antiochene extremists did also raise men in important Sees from among their supporters. Ibas of Edessa was one of such persons, and he was made bishop of Edessa in 435. The Antiochene side also could offer a justification for their activities. They could argue, for instance, that they were unable to make sense of the Alexandrine phrases like ***hypostatic union, one hypostasis, and one incarnate nature of God the Word,***except to see in them an Apollinarian meaning, and that they had not accepted the anathemas of Cyril.[[12]](#footnote-12)

**The Standpoint of Saint Cyril**

In this period Pope Saint Cyril sensed that there was an attempt by the bishops who were impressed by, or adhered to, Nestorius and his teachings, to bring back Nestorianism to the East, in the areas surrounding the Antiochene See. He thus wrote to John of Antioch, the Antiochene Synod, Acacius Bishop of Melitene, the clerics and Lampon the Priest, and Emperor Theodosius, warning them against the Nestorian tidal-wave which was trying to creep behind the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus, the theological masters of Nestorius. He then wrote to Bishop Proclus of Constantinople, and to Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, in reply to a letter which the latter had sent to him, praising him for his stand against the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Nestorian undercurrent in the East.

From the Letter of Saint Cyril to Emperor Theodosius we quote the following:

*“There was a certain Theodore and before him Diodore the bishop, the latter of Tarsus, the former of Mopsuestia. These were the fathers of the blasphemy of Nestorius. In books which they composed they made use of a crude madness against Christ, the Saviour of us all, because they did not understand his mystery. Therefore, Nestorius desired to introduce their teachings into our midst and he was deposed by God.*

*However, while some bishops of the East anathematised his teachings, in another way they now introduce these very teachings again when they admire the teachings which are Theodore's and say that he thought correctly and in agreement with our Fathers, I mean, Athanasius, Gregory and Basil. But they are lying against holy men. Whatever they (these holy men) wrote, they are the opposite to the wicked opinions of Theodore and Nestorius. Therefore, since I have learned that they may bring certain matters concerning these men even to your pious ears, I ask that you preserve your souls entirely intact and clean of the impieties of Theodore and Diodore.”*[[13]](#footnote-13)

At an earlier date, St. Cyril had written a letter to the clergy and Lampon the priest in which he states:

“*When I was staying in [the city] of Aelia[[14]](#footnote-14) a certain**one of the noble men serving as a soldier in the palace brought to me a large letter of many lines, sealed, saying**that he received it from the orthodox in Antioch. The signatures on it were of many clerics, monks and lay persons. They accused the bishops of the East that, although they kept silent about the name of Nestorius, of course, and were pretending to abhor him, they were leaping over to the books of Theodore concerning the Incarnation, in which are lying ready far more dangerous blasphemies than those of Nestorius. He was the father of the evil teaching of Nestorius, and because he voiced the teachings of Nestorius, the impious man is in the company in which he now is. I wrote to the most pious Bishop of Antioch that no one should preach in church the impious teachings of Theodore.*

*When the most pious deacon and archimandrite, Maximus, arrived in Alexandria, he cried out much against them saying that the orthodox have no place there, nor freedom to speak the dogmas of the true faith.”[[15]](#footnote-15)*

**Change of Leadership[[16]](#footnote-16)**

So long as Pope Cyril of Alexandria and Patriarch John of Antioch were alive there was peace between the two sides. But Patriarch John died (departed) in 442, and Pope Cyril followed him in 444.

**Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, began to attempt spreading the Nestorian teachings in the East and, in 447, he published his book *Eranistes,* a book intended to distort and ridicule the teaching of the Alexandrine fathers, and especially the great Saint Cyril**. This aroused so much opposition, that on 18 April 448, an imperial edict was published, proscribing Nestorius, his writings, and his supporters, and Theodoret himself was ordered to remain confined to his See of Cyrus. Also Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, aroused a great deal of reaction because of his letter to Maris, Bishop of Ardaschir in Persia, against the teachings of Saint Cyril the great.

**The Heresy of Eutyches**

In reaction to the Nestorian activity in the East, an extreme teaching emerged in defense of the belief in the ‘one incarnate nature of God the Word’, which Saint Cyril the great had professed and taught, through Eutyches, the abbot of the Monastery of Job in Constantinople.

Eutyches, a friend of Pope Cyril, claimed to have received from the great Alexandrine theologian a copy of the decisions of the Council of Ephesus 431 and to have cherished it ever since. He was an indefatigable supporter of the Alexandrine cause at the capital. As the abbot of the monastery of Job in the seventh quarter of the city, he had directed more than three hundred monks for over thirty years. Through his godson and nephew Chrysaphius, the grand chamberlain of the emperor, he had direct access to the court. At a time when the ecclesiastical atmosphere in the East had been viciated by the rivalry between the Alexandrine and the Antiochene sides, Eutyches' undue zeal for the former may well have elicited opposition from the latter, and thus added to further tension.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Eutyches started defending the faith of the one nature but then fell into the heresy attributed to him, i.e. the humanity (of Christ) dissolved in the divinity as a drop of vinegar would dissolve in the ocean; or, in other words, that the two natures had been intermixed into one nature. From here came the appellation *‘*monophysites’ *(*monofusi,thj)because the phrase ‘moni physis’ *(*monh, fu,sij)means 'only nature' and not 'one nature', which *is* ‘mia physis’ *(*mi,a fu,sij)*.*

Eusebius Bishop of Dorylaeum, visited Eutyches[[18]](#footnote-18) in his monastery at Constantinople many times and found out that the faith he maintains was unorthodox, for he believed that the two natures were intermixed into one.

**The Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 AD**

In this Synod (8-22 November 448) presided over by Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, and attended by 32 bishops, Eutyches was condemned, deposed and excommunicated upon a libel that Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, presented against him, and also the testimonies of Presbyter John and Deacon Andrew, whom the Synod had sent to summon Eutyches, because he insisted that the flesh which our Lord Jesus Christ took from the Virgin Mary was not ‘consubstantial with us’ and he hesitated in clarifying his point of view when he attended the Synod. He submitted a written confession of faith and requested that it be read but the document was neither received nor read. Flavian asked him to read it but he refused to read himself.[[19]](#footnote-19)

In this context it would be worth mentioning some extracts of the minutes of this synod which justifies the position of Pope Dioscorus towards Eutyches at the Council of Ephesus 449:

Eusebius of Dorylaeum asked Eutyches: “*Dost thou confess the existence ek[[20]](#footnote-20) duo fusewn (of two natures) even after the incarnation, and that Christ is of one nature with us after the flesh, or not.*” Eutyches answered: “*I confess that His (the Son’s) bodily presence is from the body of the holy Virgin, and that he became perfect man for our salvation*.”[[21]](#footnote-21) “*I say not that the body of man has become the body of God, but I speak of a human body of God, and say that the Lord was made flesh of the virgin. If you wish me to add further that His body is of one substance with ours, then I do this*.”[[22]](#footnote-22)

When Eutyches was asked if Christ was of two natures or not, Eutyches answered: “*I confess that before the union (of the Godhead and manhood) He was of two natures, but after the union I confess only one nature.*”[[23]](#footnote-23)

“The Patrician Florentius, however, shut him up within narrower limits by the question: “*Dost thou confess two natures in Christ, and His unity of substance with us*?” and when Eutyches replied: “*I read the writings of S. Cyril and S. Athanasius: before the union they speak of two natures, but after the union only of one.*” He asked still more precisely: “*Dost thou confess two natures even after the union? If not, then wilt thou be condemned.*” “*If thou dost not acknowledge two natures after the union also, then thou acceptest a mingling and confusion (of the natures).”* Florentius cried out*: He who does not say of two natures, and who does not acknowledge two natures has not the right faith*”.[[24]](#footnote-24)

For the first time, the following statement was, affirmed: that Christ the Lord **'was** ***in* two natures after the union'**[[25]](#footnote-25).

After the discussions Eutyches was condemned and his condemnation was signed by 30 bishops and 23 archimandrites.[[26]](#footnote-26)

The Synod in adopting its decision concerning Eutyches… no mention was made of the Letter (of Cyril) with the anathemas nor of the anathemas themselves. This shows that, in spite of the repeated reference to the Council of Ephesus and to the teaching of Cyril, the synod accepted only the Antiochene view of the reunion of 433. It is this very position that the Alexandrines had all along been resisting with great determination.[[27]](#footnote-27)

Many troubles and a very tense situation prevailed in Constantinople.

Eutyches raised an appeal against the Home Synod to the emperor, who then wrote to Pope Dioscorus of Alexandria summoning him to preside over a council to be held on the first of August 449 at Ephesus, and required of Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, and Thalassius, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, to be co-presidents with him. An imperial mandate was sent to Dioscorus asking him to permit Barsumas, an archimandrite from Syria on the Alexandrine side, to participate in the council.[[28]](#footnote-28)

On the other hand, “Leo prepared his doctrinal letter, the *Tome*, and sent it to Constantinople on 13 June 449… Leo’s plan was not to work for the reconciliation of the parties, but to offer a theological statement for the east to accept, irrespective of its past tradition”[[29]](#footnote-29)

**The Standpoint of the Alexandrine Church**

The historian Hefele wrote: “The Nestorian heresy was now properly condemned, but new religious doubts had soon arisen.”[[30]](#footnote-30) Pope Dioscorus sensed the danger of the spread of the ideas of Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa, in the East; those ideas that attack the doctrines of Pope Cyril of Alexandria. He also feared the spread of the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius, in many areas in the East. He knew that Eutyches complained that he had presented a profession of faith along with a writ of appeal to the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 AD, and it had not been received from him.[[31]](#footnote-31) Pope Dioscorus feared that Eutyches might have been condemned for his adherence to the teachings of the great Saint Cyril about the one incarnate nature of God the Word. The Home Synod of Constantinople (448) had demanded from Eutyches to anathematize all who do not say ‘in two natures after the union’, but he refused and said, “*if I anathematize, woe unto me that I condemn my fathers* (as Saint Cyril the great).”[[32]](#footnote-32)

Having Eutyches’ (deceptive) written confession, that he rejected those who say, ‘*that the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ had come down from heaven’*… ‘*For he who is the Word of God came down from heaven without flesh and was made flesh from the very flesh of the Virgin unchangeably and inconvertibly, in a way he himself knew and willed. And he who is always perfect God before the ages was also made perfect man in the end of days for us and for our salvation*.’[[33]](#footnote-33) Pope Dioscorus sensed that Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, had joined the Nestorian trend present in the East when Eutyches was demanded by the Home Synod of Constantinople (448) to anathematize all who do not confess two natures after the union. The truth was that Pope Dioscorus sought to fight Nestorianism by rejecting the phrase “two natures after the union”, and Bishop Eusebius was urging Patriarch Flavian to fight Eutychianism by asserting the phrase “two natures after the union”. Hence the misunderstanding occurred between the two sides, and had later developed into the Chalcedonian dispute. Pope Dioscorus was not Eutychian, this is why the Council of Chalcedon did not condemn him for any erroneous belief on his part, as Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople and president of the Council at its meeting of the 22 October 451 had stated.[[34]](#footnote-34)

**The Second Council of Ephesus 449 AD**

The first session was held on 8 August 449, attended by 160 bishops (in Sirmond. Appendix Codicis Theodos. P. 113),[[35]](#footnote-35) presided by Pope Dioscorus, in the presence of Bishop Julius the representative of the Pope of Rome, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, and Flavian Patriarch of Constantinople.

After examining the proceedings of the First Council of Ephesus in 431 and the Synod of Constantinople in 448, and reading a written confession of the Orthodox faith which Eutyches had (deceitfully) submitted to this Council, and after hearing deliberations from those who were present, the Council decreed its condemnation and deposition of Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, acquitted Eutyches and restored him to his clerical post. [[36]](#footnote-36)

“The Council of 449 took up in subsequent session the cases of **Ibas of Edessa**, Daniel of Carrhae, Irenaeus of Tyre, Aquilinius of Byblus, Sophronius of Constantina, **Theodoret of Cyrus** and Domnus of Antioch… All these men were **excommunicated on the charge that they were adherents of Nestorianism**.[[37]](#footnote-37)

It also proclaimed that Diodorus of Tarsus was a Nestorian.[[38]](#footnote-38)

The letter of Pope Leo 1st, which is known as *the Tome of Leo,* was not read. Pope “**Dioscorus alone suggested the reading of the letter**. Even then no other person asked for it. It was thoroughly a conciliar action. Dioscorus himself made this point at Chalcedon.”[[39]](#footnote-39) “What has happened is clear’, said Dioscorus; ‘**I asked twice for the reading of the writing of the most revered bishop of Rome’**”[[40]](#footnote-40) V.C. Samuel points to the fact that “the document (*Tome of Leo*) had been given wide publicity in the east from about the middle of June 449, and that its contents had been known to the delegates to the council of 449 even before they had met. They had, in fact, learned that it was an able defence of the ‘two natures after the union’.”[[41]](#footnote-41) He adds, “We have stronger evidence.. to venture the conjecture that the council of 449 did not read the Tome out of respect for the see of Rome. For if it were read there without an imperial backing, the result would not have been.. an acceptance of either the document or its theology, but a more serious condemnation. In all probability, Dioscorus and the leading men at the council were trying their best not to declare the incumbent of the first major see in Christendom a heretic.”[[42]](#footnote-42)The above undoubtedly defends Pope Dioscorus from the accusation brought up against him in Chalcedon.

We would like to add that perhaps Pope Dioscorus intended to discuss with Pope Leo, the successor of St. Celestine who was St. Cyril’s partisan, some phrases and expressions included in his *Tome* that need more precision or addition. Maybe he intended to pay him a visit to Rome in order to discuss the subject with him.

Regarding the council’s decision on Eutyches, “Dioscorus, induced the assembled bishops to give their solemn approval to the declaration of faith which Eutyches had made at Constantinople… **Dioscorus requested that they should individually declare their view as to whether Eutyches was orthodox**, and what was to be decreed concerning him; and there were now **no fewer than 114 votes given**, declaring the doctrine of Eutyches to be orthodox, and demanding his restitutions as abbot and priest.”[[43]](#footnote-43)

Regarding the decision against Flavian and the synod of Constantinople Hefele mentions the following: “After the reading was finished (Acts of Ephesus 431, the Nicene creed, a quantity of patristic and other passages, writings of Nestorius in proof that he was heretic), Dioscurus said: ‘You have now heard that the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who teaches otherwise than the Nicene Creed, or makes alterations in it, and raises new or further questions. **Everyone must now give his opinion in writing** as to whether those who, in their theological inquiries go beyond the Nicene Creed, are to be punished or not. It is clear that he wanted to use this to make an attack upon Flavian and the Synod of Constantinople, since they, going beyond the Synod of Nicaea, had wished to introduce the expression ‘two natures’. Several bishops, Thalassius of Caesarea first, declared immediately that whoever went beyond the Nicene Creed was not to be received as a Catholic. Others simply affirmed their assent to the faith of Nicaea and Ephesus.. this was done by the Roman legate.”[[44]](#footnote-44) “Juvenal of Jerusalem, Somnus of Antioch and Thalassius at their head, declared Flavian and Eusebius guilty, **a hundred of them voting**… **At the close,** **the 135 bishops who were present subscribed**.”[[45]](#footnote-45) The above proves that Pope Dioscorus was innocent of the charge raised against him in Chalcedon historically know as ‘the blank papers’.

**Emperor Theodosius II confirmed the decrees of the Council of Ephesus 449, and published a law condemning Nestorius. He “had deposed Flavian, Eusebius, Domnus, Theodoret, and some others on account of their being entangled in the Nestorian heresy**.”[[46]](#footnote-46)

At that time, “the Bishop of Dorylaeum and.. also Theodoret himself made their personal appearance before the pope. In this way a powerful coalition was organized against the council of 449 with Rome as its centre of operation.” “The fact should be admitted that a special alliance was formed between Leo and Theodoret, and that the latter had not yet endorsed the condemnation of Nestorius.”[[47]](#footnote-47)

**The Council of Chalcedon 451**

Pope Leo 1st did not accept the results of the Second Council of Ephesus 449, he “immediately held a.. Western Synod and.. rejected all that had been done at the.. Synod.. with the addition that **Leo had pronounced an anathema upon Dioscorus** and Eutyches and had sent a solemn announcement of it to the Clergy, Senate, and Laity of Constantinople”.[[48]](#footnote-48) Leo “immediately wrote, on 13th October 449, to the Emperor Theodosius II, saying,.. that until a greater Synod of Bishops from all parts of the world could be held, he should be pleased to allow everything to remain in the status which existed before the recently-held Synod at Ephesus.”[[49]](#footnote-49) Moreover, Leo earnestly entreated the Latin Emperor Valentinian III, his mother (aunt of Theodosius) and wife (daughter of Theodosius), for their kind intercession with the Emperor Theodosius. Three letters were addressed to the Emperor of the East, in which, “while maintaining the high dignity of the Roman see, they entreat him to commit the existing controversy to the sentence of the Pope, to whom Falavian had appealed, and to a new Council to be held in Italy. The Emperor Theodosius answered, about Easter 450, with a refusal, saying that **everything had been settled at Ephesus** **with complete liberty and entirely in accordance with the truth, and that Flavian had been justly deposed on account of innovations in the faith**.”[[50]](#footnote-50) **Theodosius added that “Leo’s story was not the truth concerning the council** (see ACO. II, I, pp 7-8).[[51]](#footnote-51)

“Leo wrote to Anatolius, asking him to delete the names of Dioscorus, Juvenal and Eustathius of Berytus from the diptychs, thereby **excommunicating them on his own authority**.”[[52]](#footnote-52) Moreover, “It was reported that he had **restored Theodoret of Cyrus who had been excommunicated by the council of 449** to the episcopate even before he was received back into the fellowship of the Church by the council of 451”.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Here, we note that in the then established tradition of the church, Leo had not right to reject the decisions of a synod convened by the Emperor, he had no right to restore Theodoret of Cyrus nor to excommunicate Dioscorus, Juvenal and Eustathius. Thus, the following question is rightly posed: Why did the council of Chalcedon accuse Pope Dioscorus for anathematizing Leo’s *Tome* and not accuse Leo for all he did against ecclesiastic tradition?

Meanwhile, Emperor Theodosius fell off the back of his horse and this led to his death on 28 July 450. His sister Pulcheria stepped forth, assumed authority, married Marcian, one of the most distinguished generals and statesmen of the time, on condition that she should not be disturbed in her vow of perpetual virginity, and declared him Emperor on the 28thof August of that same year.[[54]](#footnote-54) “The Emperor Valentinian gave his assent to that which have been done.”[[55]](#footnote-55)

Now, “The Emperors were anti-Alexandrine and anti-Cyrilline, and they were definitely keen to bring down Alexandria, from the hegemony which it enjoyed in the east and to set up Constantinople in its place.”[[56]](#footnote-56) Their aim was to “rein in the Egyptian church (and its tradition so deeply indebted to Cyril of Alexandria), which had hitherto been highly dominant.”[[57]](#footnote-57)

With Pope Leo, Marcian entered into friendly correspondence.. In his first letter (to Leo).. he declares that he is favourable to the holding of the **synod suggested by Leo** for the extirpation of heresy and the restoration of peace.[[58]](#footnote-58)

**The Emperor had ordered the recall of those bishops who had been exiled with Flavian on account of the faith**. Their episcopal sees should, however, not be restored to them until the close of the Synod about to be held.[[59]](#footnote-59)

On 15 May 451, an imperial edict was issued summoning for a general council to be held at Nicaea. By the 1st of September, the bishops had arrived in Nicaea, but then they were ordered to proceed to Chalcedon, which was near to Constantinople. About five hundred delegates assembled in the great church of Saint Euphemia, and the first session of the council was held on 8 October 451 AD.[[60]](#footnote-60)

Seeking to reach the Emperors’ goal of bringing down Alexandria can be easily detected from the very beginning of the first session. “The bishops assembled found themselves confronted by an imperial commission consisting of no less than eighteen high officials of state led by the patrician and *magister militum*, Anatolius… who occupied seats before the apse, faced the great assembly of bishops. On their left (the place of honour) were the representatives of Leo of Rome... On the right of the commissioners sat Dioscorus of Alexandria...”[[61]](#footnote-61) “No sooner had the first session (8 October) opened than Paschanius, chief of the papal legates, arose to declare that he and his fellow-delegates from Rome had been commissioned by Leo to see that Dioscorus was not allowed to sit in the Council, and that, unless their protests were heard, they would depart.”[[62]](#footnote-62) “They ordered Dioscorus to leave his place and to sit in the middle.”[[63]](#footnote-63) “The first session on October 8 was taken up by demands from the commissioner for the deposition of Dioscorus.”[[64]](#footnote-64)

And, at the beginning of the first session the officials said: “Let the most devout Theodoret enter and take part in the council, since the most holy Archbishop **Leo has restored his see to him**, and since the most divine and pious emperor has decreed his attendance at the holy council.”[[65]](#footnote-65) “The commissioners and senators gave command that Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus should be introduced into the synod because Archbishop Leo of Rome had reinstated him in his bishopric, and the Emperor had commanded his presence.”[[66]](#footnote-66) “When Theodoret entered “the bishops of Egypt, Illyricum, and Palestine exclaimed: ‘*Have mercy, the faith is being destroyed. The canons exclude him. Drive him out. Drive out the teacher of Nestorius*.”[[67]](#footnote-67) “Dioscurus cried: “***Theodoret anathematized the holy Cyril****; shall Cyril now be cast out*?”[[68]](#footnote-68)

A series of documents were read… “Dioscurus then spoke and asked why he alone should be held responsible for the deposition of Flavian, of Eusebius of Dorylaeum, and others, since, according to the Acts which had been read, Bishops Juvenal and Thalassius had been nominated by the Emperor as judges at the same time with him, and the whole Synod had consented to the decrees, and had subscribed them?”[[69]](#footnote-69)

In the same session, other false nondoctrinal accusations against Pope Dioscorus were presented:

(1) At the Council of Ephesus 449 the attendants were forced to subscribe a blank paper; to which the Egyptians remarked scornfully; ‘*A true Christian does not allow himself to be frightened*!’ and Dioscorus said, ‘*If they did not agree, they ought not to have signed, for it concerned the faith in which nothing should be surrendered.*”[[70]](#footnote-70)

(2) The Tome of Leo was not read; to which “Pope Dioscurus asserted that he had himself twice called out that this letter should be read.”[[71]](#footnote-71)

(3) “Dioscurus had driven away the notaries of the other bishops and had everything taken down by his own notaries; Dioscurus could, indeed, prove that not he alone, but also Juvenal, Thalassius, and the bishop of Corinth had notaries (each of these one).”[[72]](#footnote-72)

(4) Eusebius of Dorylaeun complained that “he had not been allowed at Ephesus to proceed with his accusation against Eutyches; and Dioscorus, Juvenal and Thalassius, when questioned by the commissioner on this point… said that it was not they but the Emperor and his representative Elpidius, who had ordered this exclusion.. Dioscurus exclaimed: ‘*How can you blame me for having violated the canons by yielding to the demand of Elpidius, since you violate them yourselves by the admission of Theodoret*.’[[73]](#footnote-73)

Pope Dioscorus was questioned about the teaching of Eutyches whom the Second Council of Ephesus in 449 AD had exonerated. He said: ‘*If Eutyches holds notions disallowed by the doctrines of the Church, he deserves not only punishment but even fire. But my concern is for the catholic and apostolic faith, not for any man whomsoever*.’[[74]](#footnote-74)

“Dioscorus had asserted that nothing should be added to, or taken from, the faith as it had been defined at Nicaea and confirmed at Ephesus (431) (Mansi, p. 621f).”[[75]](#footnote-75) Observing Canon 7 of the Council of Ephesus 431 AD which states that: “*The holy council decreed that no one is permitted to produce, to edit, or to compose another faith than that set out by the holy fathers gathered in Nicaea with the Holy Spirit. As for those who would dare to compose another faith, present it, or propose it to those who might want to be converted to the knowledge of the truth these persons, if they are bishops or clerics, with be set aside*…”[[76]](#footnote-76)

He also stated: “*I accept the phrase* ***from two natures after the union***.”[[77]](#footnote-77) “I accept the expression, ‘Christ is of two natures (ek duo) but not, ‘there are two natures’ (to duo ou decomai).” “After the union there are no longer two natures.”[[78]](#footnote-78) Thus in his affirmation of the one incarnate nature of God the Word he wanted to prove the indivisibility of the two natures after the union, and in his acceptance of the phrase 'from two natures after the union' he wanted to confirm what Saint Cyril had affirmed, i.e. the continuity of the existence of two natures in the union*,* without intermixture or confusion.

“Later on when the rest of the Ephesine Acts were read, the Council heard how Dioscorus had asked the bishops individually to express their view concerning the orthodoxy of Eutyches, and how a hundred and fourteen had voted that he should continue ‘as heretofore’ as presbyter and archimandrite.[[79]](#footnote-79) “Flavian, he maintained, had been justly deposed because he had spoken of ‘two natures after the union’.[[80]](#footnote-80) He affirmed: ‘*I have passages from the Fathers, Athanasius, Gregory and Cyril, to the effect that after the Incarnation there are not two natures, but one incarnate nature of the divine Logos. If I am to be expelled the Fathers will be expelled with me. I am defending their doctrine; I do not deviate from then at all’* (Mansi, vi. 684).”[[81]](#footnote-81)

“In the meantime, night had come… The imperial commissioners and senators spoke and said: ‘…As, however, it has now been shown by the reading of the Acts and by the avowal of many bishops who confess that they have fell into error at Ephesus, that Flavian and others were unjustly deposed, it seems right that, if it so pleases the Emperor, the same punishment should be inflicted upon the heads of the previous synod… Upon this the Orientals and others demanded **only the deposition of Dioscurus**.”[[82]](#footnote-82)

“During the first session of the council of Chalcedon the empress commanded to smite St. Dioscorus on his mouth, and to pluck out the hair of his beard. He took the hair and the teeth that were knocked out and sent them to Alexandria saying, ‘This is the fruit of faith.’”[[83]](#footnote-83)

**On the second session** held on 10 October “there were men to raise objection to three passages of the *Tome*,[[84]](#footnote-84) and one delegate (Atticus of Nicopolis, a town in Illyricum) asked for time to compare it with the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius and the anathemas”... “The second session was thus against the interests of Rome, and the legates of the western see with their associates in the east may well have sought to do away with its defects.. A five-day recess was announced by the commissioners.”[[85]](#footnote-85)

“Before the expiry of the appointed interval of five days, the **third general session** was held on the 13th of October in the same church. It is nowhere intimated that the imperial commissioners and the senators were present.. The number of bishops who were present at this session was also smaller, as those who were friendly to Dioscurus did not appear… Aetius (notary) stated that the session had been announced to Dioscurus, as to all the other bishops, by two deacons, and he had answered them that ‘**he would willingly appear, but his guards prevented him.**”[[86]](#footnote-86)

“Arendt says (S. 279): “The absence of the senate seems astonishing; but it is not so in fact, for the chief work of the session was, as is clear from the contents of the Acts, the definite pronouncing of the judgement on Dioscurus. The reasons involved were half ecclesiastical, half political.”[[87]](#footnote-87)

“The assembly concluded that Dioscorus deserved deposition.. Following the legates, Anatolius of Constantinople and a hundred and ninety-one men voted agreeing to the deposition of the Alexandrine Patriarch. The verdict was transmitted to **Dioscorus in his prison**...”[[88]](#footnote-88)

“The document, which was directly handed to Dioscurus, is as follows: “The holy and great and Ecumenical Synod… To Dioscurus.. Learn that, on account of despising the divine canons, on account of thy disobedience to the Synod, since, besides thine other offences, thou didst not respond to their threefold invitation, thou wast, on the 13th of October, deposed by the holy Ecumenical Synod from the episcopal office, and deprived of all spiritual functions.”[[89]](#footnote-89)

The assembly now wrote a number of letters.. A public notice was also given to say that the Alexandrine pope had been deposed. **The reason stated in these writings against him is not heresy but violation of canons**.”[[90]](#footnote-90)

“To the Emperor Valentinian III and Marcian, they sent a copy of the minutes with a letter, in which the reasons for the deposition of Dioscurus (that he had suppressed the letter of Leo, had received Eutyches into communion, had ill-treated Eusebius of Dorylaeum, had excommunicated the Pope, and had not obeyed the Synod) were briefly given, and the hope expressed that the Emperors would approve of what had been done.”[[91]](#footnote-91)

Pope Dioscorus of Alexandria was humiliated, deposed (not because of any erroneous belief)[[92]](#footnote-92) and exiled to Gangra[[93]](#footnote-93) till his death.

The Council of Chalcedon approved the synodical letters of the great Saint Cyril of Alexandria and *the Tome of Leo* after revising it on the twelve anathematisms of Saint Cyril.[[94]](#footnote-94) The *Tome* “clashed to a real degree with Cyril’s unwavering insistence that any talk of ‘two natures’ after the union demonstrated lack of belief in that union. In resisting Leo, many bishops, not just the Egyptians, felt they were defending the tradition of Ephesus 431.”[[95]](#footnote-95) “After much backroom maneuvring a plan was presented to the fifth session of October 22 that drew up a new synthesis of elements from Cyril’s writings as well as selected excerpts from Leo, all supplied with an explanatory gloss that read them in a Cyrilline manner.”[[96]](#footnote-96)

The final Council’s sentences were: to excommunicate, condemn and depose Eutyches, to annul most of the decisions of the Second Council of Ephesus 449, to depose Pope Dioscorus of Alexandria for administrative and legal reasons,[[97]](#footnote-97) and to restore Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, and Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, after they both agreed to anathematize Nestorius and his teachings. However, the Council did not judge the writings of Theodoret and Ibas which are against the teaching of the great Saint Cyril, neither did it judge Theodore of Mopsuestia, the theological master of Nestorius, or his teachings.

In spite of the fact that the letter of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, to Maris, Bishop of Ardaschir in Persia, in which he attacked the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus 431, the teachings of the great Saint Cyril and his twelve anathematisms, was read out in the Council, the Council did not decree its condemnation.[[98]](#footnote-98) Moreover, “At the close of the Council, the bishops addressed to the Emperor an *allocutio* (formal speech, hortatory address) undoubtedly the work of Theodoret of Cyrus… There was appended to the *allocutio* a short collection of patristic texts- a few out of many which might have been adduced- which contained teaching in harmony with that in the Tome.”[[99]](#footnote-99)

The Council of Chalcedon set a definition for the faith, although its members had refused to do so in the beginning but under pressure from the legates of the Emperor they finally gave up. The first draft stated that Christ was “of two natures”, but the legates of the Emperor insisted that the text should include **“in two natures”**. After much resistance, on the basis that this phrase was included in the *Tome of Leo,* which the Council had already accepted and therefore there is no need to include it in the *definition* *of the faith*, at the endthe Council accepted this last phrase as both the legates of the Pope of Rome and the Emperor's commissioners insisted on it.

This led the group who rejected the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon to feel that there had been a kind of sympathy at the Council for the Nestorian side.

The fourteen Egyptian Bishops who attended the Council of Chalcedon agreed with the anathematisation of Eutyches but they refused to put their signatures to the decisions of the Council or to the *Tome of Leo*. “They pointed out that they could not subscribe to it without the concurrence of their archbishop… They could not do that unless they had with them their archbishop”.[[100]](#footnote-100)

The definitionof faith that was accepted by the Council was not Nestorian; since the Council had, in fact, stressed in all its decisions the anathematisation of both Nestorianism and Eutychism. However, the *definition* neither included the phrase *“hypostatic union”,* nor the phrase *“there can be no distinction between the two natures except in thought only”,* which are the important phrases in the teaching of the great Saint Cyril. There was also a statement that anathematized “whoever believed in two natures before the union, and one nature after the union”, by this they meant Eutyches and the doctrine of confusion between the two natures. It is well known that the Non-Chalcedonian side anathematizes whoever believes in “two natures before the union”, because this expression suggests the existence of the *humanity* before its union with the *divinity.* This party accepts the phrase “of two natures in the union” and also “of two natures after the union”. However, anathematising whoever says “of one nature after the union” needed clarification, what was meant was the doctrine of intermixture or confusion because this anathematism could be interpreted as against the teaching of Saint Cyril the great “one incarnate nature of the Word of God”, which is the teaching that the Non-Chalcedonian side held, and still holds and adheres to until today, along with its utter and full rejection to the idea of the intermixing and its affirmation of the continuance of the existence of the two natures in the union.

These issues of faith, Leo’s restoration of Theodoret of Cyrus against ecclesiastical norms and his excommunication of Pope Dioscorus before the council of Chalcedon, led Pope Dioscorus to rightly reject the Council of Chalcedon, and led many groups in the East -including the Egyptian people- to denounce this Council.

Big troubles took place in the East due to the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, and by the change of emperors, the situation changed.

**The Third Council of Ephesus 475 AD**

On 16 March 475, Pope Timothy II (Aelurus) was elected in Alexandria as a successor to Pope Dioscorus after his decease. In the days of Emperor Basilicus (475-476 A.D.), he was able to convene another general Council at Ephesus (some call this the Third Council of Ephesus) in 475. “Basiliscus published his *Encyclical*, declaring that ‘the *Tome* of Leo and all the things said and done at Chalcedon in innovation of the holy Symbol of the Three Hundred and Eighteen holy Fathers’ should everywhere be anathematized.”[[101]](#footnote-101) “The *Encyclical* of Basiliscus (Evagrius, *H.E*. iii. 4; *Chron. Z.M.* v. 2) was drafted by Timothy and Peter the Fuller, the Monophysite (Miaphysite) patriarch of Antioch.”[[102]](#footnote-102)

The Council of Ephesus 475 anathematized the teachings of Eutyches and the teachings of Nestorius and abrogated the Council of Chalcedon. Seven hundred Eastern bishops signed the decisions of this Council.[[103]](#footnote-103)

The standpoint of Pope Timothy showed, through this Council, that the Non-Chalcedonian side was not, essentially, Eutychian in faith, as the Chalcedonian side had frequently accused it. The historian Hefele wrote: “It is however, a mistake to suppose that this Synod had also confirmed Eutychianism. This would not have been done even by Timothy Aelurus, for, when the Eutychian monks came to him (Pope Timothy) and hoped for his support, he expressed himself decisively in opposition to the tenets to Eutychianism, saying that “the flesh of Christ (i.e. His humanity) was essentially the same as ours. (Mansi, *l.c*. p. 105).”[[104]](#footnote-104)

**Attempts for Reaching Unity**

Then, in the days of the Emperor Zeno, another attempt to restore the union took place on the basis of the *Henotikon,* a document issued by Emperor Zeno on 28 July 482. This was subscribed first by each of Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, Peter Mongus, Patriarch of Alexandria, in 484 by Peter the Fuller, who had then become Patriarch of Antioch, and Martyrius, Patriarch of Jerusalem. Yet Rome did not join in signing the document, and **Pope Felix III held a council and excommunicated Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople**. Also, strong opposition took place in Egypt and a group called the *Acephilists* (without head) was formed. Thus, the Henotikon or the union document was not able to maintain the union which began with the Patriarchs of the four Eastern Sees who accepted and signed it.[[105]](#footnote-105)

**The Henoticon 482 AD[[106]](#footnote-106)**

The Emperor Caesar Zeno, pious, victorious, triumphant, supreme, ever-worshipful Augustus, to the most reverend bishops and clergy, and to the monks and laity throughout Alexandria, Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis.

Being assured that the origin and constitution, the might and invincible defence of our sovereignty is the only right and true faith, which, through divine inspiration, the three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers assembled at Nicaea set forth, and the hundred and fifty holy Fathers who, in like manner met at Constantinople, confirmed; we night and day employ every means of prayer, of zealous pains, and of laws, that the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in every place may be multiplied, the incorruptible an immortal mother of our sceptre; and that the pious laity, continuing in peace and unanimity with respect to God, may, together with the bishops, highly beloved of God, the most pious clergy, the archimandrites and monks, offer up acceptably their supplications in behalf of our sovereignty. So long as our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who was incarnate and born of Mary, the Holy Virgin and Mother of God, approves and readily accepts our concordant glorification and service, the power of our enemies will be crushed and swept away, and peace with its blessing, kindly temperature, abundant produce, and whatever is beneficial to man, will be liberally bestowed. Since then the irreprehensible faith is the preserver both of ourselves and the Roman weal, petitions have been offered to us from pious archimandrites and hermits, and other venerable persons, imploring us with tears that unity should be procured for the churches, and the limbs should be knit together, which the enemy of all good has of old time been eagerly bent upon serving, under a consciousness that defeat will befall him whenever he assails the body while in and entire condition. For, since it happens that of the unnumbered generations which during the lapse of so many years time has withdrawn from life, some have departed deprived of the laver of regeneration, and others have been borne away on the inevitable journey of man, without having partaken in the divine Communion; and innumerable murders have also been perpetrated; and not only the earth, but the very air has been defiled by a multitude of blood-shedding; that this state of things might be transformed into good, who would not pray? For this reason we were anxious that you should be informed, that we and the churches in every quarter neither have held, nor do we or shall we hold, nor are we aware of persons who hold, any other symbol or lesson or definition of faith or creed that the before-mentioned holy symbol of the three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers, which the aforesaid hundred and fifty holy Fathers confirmed; and if any person does hold such, we deem him an alien; for we are confident that this symbol alone is, as we said, the preserver of our sovereignty and on their reception of this alone are all the people baptized when desirous of the saving illumination: which symbol all the holy Fathers assembled at Ephesus also followed, who further passed sentence of deposition on the impious Nestorius and those who subsequently held his sentiments: which Nestorius we also anathematize, together with Eutyches and all who entertain opinions contrary to those above-mentioned, receiving at the same time the twelve chapters of Cyril, of holy memory, formerly Archbishop of the holy Catholic church of the Alexandrians. We moreover, confess that the Only-begotten Son of God, Himself God, who truly assumed manhood, namely our Lord Jesus Christ, who in consubstantial with the Father in respect of the Godhead, and consubstantial with ourselves as respects the manhood; that He, having descended and become incarnate of the Holy Spirit and Mary, the Virgin and Mother of God, is one and not two; for we affirm that both His miracles, and the sufferings which He voluntarily endured in the flesh, are those of a single Person; for we do in no degree admit those who either make a division or confusion, or introduce a phantom; inasmuch as His truly sinless incarnation from the Mother of God did not produce an addition of a Son, because the Holy Trinity continued a Trinity even when one member of the Trinity, God the Word, became incarnate. Knowing then that neither the holy orthodox churches in all parts, nor the priests highly beloved of God who are at their head, not our own sovereignty, have allowed, or do allow, any other symbol or definition of faith than the before-mentioned holy lesson, we have united ourselves thereto without hesitation. And these things we write not as setting forth a new form of faith, but for your assurance; and every one who has held or holds any other opinion, either at the present or another time, **whether at Chalcedon or in any synod whatever, we anathematize**; and specially the before-mentioned Nestorius and Eutyches, and those who maintain their doctrines. Link yourselves, therefore, to the spiritual mother the Church, and in her enjoy the same communion with us, according to the aforesaid one and only definition of the faith, namely that of the three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers. For your all–holy Mother, the Church, waits to embrace you as true children, longs to hear your loved voice, so long withheld. Speed yourselves, therefore; for, by so doing, you will both draw towards yourselves the favour of our Master and Saviour and God, Jesus Christ, and be commended by our sovereignty.

**The Council of Constantinople 553 AD**

**V. C. Samuel explained in his book titled “*The Council of Chalcedon Re-examined*” the development that tried to heal the division caused by the Council of Chalcedon in the Council of Constantinople 553 AD named by many theologians as Nea-Chalcedon.**

Emperor Justinian (482-565) “convened the Council of Constantinople in 553, which came to be reckoned by as the fifth ecumenical council by the Chalcedonian body...

Three decisions of the council deserve notice:

1. The council of Chalcedon declared the fourth ecumenical council;
2. The condemnation of ‘the three chapters’;
3. The acceptance of fourteen anathemas…

The ‘three chapters’ referred to a condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia as a heretic, and of certain writings of Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa as opposed to the faith of the Church. Of these three men, Theodore is portrayed as a dangerous heretic. At Chalcedon the name of Theodore was not even mentioned seriously, but not so those of Theodoret and Ibas. The Council of 553 found fault with Theodoret because of what had been ‘impiously written’ by him ‘against the right faith and against the Twelve Chapters of St. Cyril and against the Frist Council of Ephesus’, and also because of ‘certain things written by him in defence of those impious ones Theodore and Nestorius.’ These writings of Theodoret, had all been published before the council of 451 and on the very ground of them he had been condemned by the second council of Ephesus in 449. However, it was in spite of this condemnation and despite these very writings that Leo of Rome had restored him to the episcopate and the imperial authority and sought to have him participate in the council of 451, without saying a word about these writings or about his defence of the man whom the council of 553 described as the most impious Theodore’...

The council of 553 judged that ‘the letter which is said to have been written by Ibas to Maris the Persian’ did, contain ‘the blasphemies of the heretics Theodore and Nestorius’ whom it defended and called doctors, while referring to the holy fathers as heretics. Ibas had been condemned on account of this letter and other charges by the council of 449. All these evidences had been presented to the council of Chalcedon, and after examining them the Roman legates gave their verdict that the evidence did not warrant an excommunication of the man, and that in spite of the letter Ibas was orthodox.”[[107]](#footnote-107)

**Briefly, the Council of Constantinople 553, took the decision to anathematize the person and the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the teacher of Nestorius, and to anathematize the writings of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, also the writings of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, against the teachings of the great Saint Cyril.**

**Furthermore, in its fourteen anathemas the Council of Constantinople in 553, tried to cure the Christological disputes caused by Chalcedon by using the phrases of Saint Cyril the great: *“hypostatic* *union”* and “*it is impossible to distinguish the two natures except by thought only*”, and by explaining the implication of rejecting those who believe in one nature on the basis of *intermixing.***

**Significant Anathemas**: [[108]](#footnote-108)

**IV**: “... The Holy Church of God, on the contrary, rejecting the impiety of both heresies (Nestorius & Eutyches), confesses the union of God the Word with the flesh by a combination, i.e. personally. For the **union according to hypostasis or according to combination**( synthesis kaq u`po,stasin h` ga.r kata. su,nqesin not only preserves, in regard to the mystery of Christ, that which has come together (the two natures) unconfused, but allows of no separation.”

**VII**: “If anyone, speaking of the two natures does not confess that he acknowledges in the Godhead and manhood the one Lord Jesus Christ, so that by this he signifies the difference of natures, of which the unspeakable **union** takes place **without confusion**... let him be anathema”.

**VIII**: “If anyone does not take the expressions, **of** **two natures**, the Godhead and the manhood, the union took place, or, the **one incarnate nature of the Word**, as the holy Fathers taught, that from the divine nature and the human, **hypostatic union e`nw,sewj kaq u`po,stasin** having taken place, one Christ was constituted, but endeavors, by such expressions, to bring in one nature or essence of the Godhead and manhood of Christ, let him be anathema. For, when we say that the only-begotten Word was hypostatically **kaq u`po,stasin** united, we do not say that a confusion of the natures with each other has taken place; but rather we think that, whilst each nature remains what it is, the Word has been united with the flesh..”

**Contemporary View of the Situation**

An agreement was reached between the Chalcedonian and the Non-Chalcedonian sides in the Orthodox dialogue at **Saint Bishoy's Monastery, Egypt** **in June 1989**, hosted by His Holiness Pope Shenouda III and under His Holiness’ supervision, and in **Chambesy, Switzerland** **in September 1990** hosted by the Orthodox centre that follows the Ecumenical Patriarch. Both sides agreed that the Word of God, Himself, became perfect man, through incarnation, is consubstantial to the Father according to His divinity, and consubstantial to us according to His humanity - without sin. Also, that the union of natures in Christ is a natural, hypostatic, real and perfect union without fusion or intermixing or change or separation. That it is not possible to distinguish between the natures except in thought alone. That the Virgin Mary is ‘Theotokos’ (qeoto,koj) with anathematising the teachings of both Nestorius and Eutyches and also the crypto-Nestorianism of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus. Our hope is that this agreement would be the basis of the union in Christological belief between the two parties.

**Examples of the Anathemas and Condemnations**

**against Chalcedon**

**St. Dioscorus of Alexandria Anathematizes Leo of Rome:**

Pope Dioscorus, “when on his way to Chalcedon, no sooner had he reached the Asiatic coast than he, with ten of his suffragans, boldly excommunicated Leo, being convinced that the *Tome* of this leader of the ‘dyophysites’ was clearly infected with the teaching of the accursed Nestorius. Though he well knew what lay in store for him, it was to be a fight to a finish, so far as the Bishop of Alexandria was concerned.”[[109]](#footnote-109)

“Leo had excommunicated Dioscorus exactly six months before the day when this charge was made against the latter. If therefore Dioscorus had done this, it was only a reciprocal action.”[[110]](#footnote-110)

**St. Dioscorus Anathematizes the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.):**

Even in exile, this ‘orthodox guardian of the faith’ was still ‘the valiant Dioscorus’, who remained convinced that the so-called Fathers at Chalcedon had forsaken the way of orthodoxy, and never ceased to anathematize ‘the Council of Oppressors’.[[111]](#footnote-111)

“The *Historia Dioscuri*, written by his disciple Theopistus (pub. and trans., F. Nau, *Journal Asiatique*, x (1903), I, pp. 1-108; 241-310), contains a series of six anathematisms against Chalcedon. J. Lebon, *Le Monophysisme sévérien*, pp. 86ff, suggests that, since these appear in the *Confession of faith of Jacobus Baradaeus* (pub. and trans., C.H. Cornhill, *Zeitschrift der deut, morgendl, Gesellschaft, t.* xxx. 1876) and are akin to the ten anathematisms against the Council to be found in the writings of Philoxenus (pub. E. A. W. Budge, *The Discourses of Philoxenus*, II pp. xcviii f; *E.T.*, pp. xxxiii ff), it is probable that Dioscorus composed the anathematisms which are contained in the work of Theopistus, and that they were used by the Monophysites, who required their opponents, on entering their communion, to condemn Chalcedon in this form. It seems likely, then, that, as Lebon argues, Dioscorus was responsible for a ‘formula type’, which was developed by the later Monophysites (Miaphysites).”[[112]](#footnote-112)

**Pope Timothy II (Aelurus) 26th :**

* A synod at Alexandria in 457 A.D. under his presidency, condemned the Council of Chalcedon.[[113]](#footnote-113)
* A synod in Alexandria 477 A.D. under his presidency condemned Chalcedon.[[114]](#footnote-114)
* In 458 A.D., Pope Leo of Rome “sent into the East an explanation of the doctrine of ‘two natures’ in his letter known as the ‘Second *Tome*’ [*Ep*. Clxv]; at least six of the nine chapters of this letter are almost identical with what Leo had said in his letter (*Ep*. cxxiv) to the Monks of Palestine.” The Emperor Leo “sent to Timothy Leo’s ‘Second *Tome*’, but the Monophysite (Miaphysites) roundly condemned the document on account of its ‘Nestorianism’ (*Chron. Z.M*. iv. 6), and was banished to Gangra and later to Cherson. See Evagrius, *H.E*. ii. 8-10. Liberatus, *Brev*. 15; *Chron. Z.M*. iv. 1-5.”[[115]](#footnote-115)
* Pope Timothy II of Alexandria, in his *Refutation of the Synod of Chalcedon*… (ed. Nau, *op. cit*., p. 226): “…the letter of Leo, which with good reason has been called a “tomos”, since it has divided the Church against herself.”[[116]](#footnote-116)

**The Third Council of Ephesus 475 Anathematizes Chalcedon:**

Held in Ephesus under the presidency of Pope Timothy of Alexandria (Aelurus) in the 475 or 477.[[117]](#footnote-117)

“Having reached Ephesus, he (Pope Timothy II of Alexandria) and Peter the Fuller assembled a large number of the bishops of Asia, and there anathematized Chalcedon, excommunicated Acacius and solemnly recognized the autonomy of Ephesus, restoring to Bishop Paul the former rights of the see. In their Petition to the Emperor (Evagrius, *H.E.* iii. 5), they say: ‘We have anathematized and do anathematize the *Tome* of Leo and the decrees of Chalcedon, which have been the cause of much blood-shedding and confusion, and tumult, and division and strifes in all the world. For we are satisfied with the doctrine and faith of the Apostles and the holy Fathers, the Three Hundred and Eighteen; to which also the illustrious Council of the One Hundred and Fifty in the royal city, and the two other holy Synods at Ephesus adhered, and which they confirmed.” [[118]](#footnote-118)

**Synod in Alexandrian 482 A.D. Condemns Chalcedon:**

This Synod was held in Alexandria in 482 A.D. under the presidency of St. Peter Mongus. It condemned the 4th Council*.[[119]](#footnote-119)*

**Synod in Antioch 485 A.D. Condemns Chalcedon:**

After the restoration of St. Peter the Fuller in 485 A.D. to his see at Antioch, he thereupon held a synod there the same year and condemned the 4th Council.[[120]](#footnote-120)

**A Council in Constantinople 498 A.D. Condemns Chalcedon:**

This Council was held “by order of the Emperor Anastasius I, in which Flavian, the second bishop of Antioch of that name, and Philoxenus of Hierapolis, took the lead: condemning the Council of Chalcedon and all who opposed the Monosphysite (Miaphysites) doctrine, or would not accept the interpolated clause “Who was crucified for us” in the Trisagion.”[[121]](#footnote-121)

**Examples of Anathemas and Condemnations**

**Against Non -Chalcedonians**

**The Council of Constantinople 680-681 AD**

In the definition of faith of the **Council of Constantinople 680-681 AD** Dioscorus is counted with heretics and named “**hated of God**”. Quoting this council’s words:

“in Ephesus of 200 venerable men convened against Nestorius the Judaizer; and that in Chalcedon of 630 God-inspired Fathers against Eutyches and **Dioscorus hated of God.”[[122]](#footnote-122)**

The same definition of faith mentions the following:

**“heresy similar to the mad and wicked doctrine of the impious** Apollinaris, **Severus**...”[[123]](#footnote-123)

In the Prosphoneticus to the Emperor they said about monothelites:

“Who have recently introduced the **detestable novelty** that in him there is but **one will and one operation,** **renewing the malignancy of** Arius, Apollinaris, Eutyches and **Severus**”[[124]](#footnote-124)

In the letter of the same council to Pope Agatho the following is mentioned:

“We justly subjected to the **anathema of heretics** those also who live in… the **impiety of these God-hated persons**, Apollinaris, **Severus**…”[[125]](#footnote-125)

The bishops of the same council also declared:

“**Anathema to all who teach one will and one energy in the incarnation of Christ**”[[126]](#footnote-126)

**The Catholic Council of Trullo (Quinisext Council) 692 AD**

In the Canons of the **Council of Trullo Pope** Dioscorus is again counted with heretics:

“Also **Nestorius and Dioscorus**, the former the protector and champion of division, the latter of the confusion ‘of Christ’s two natures’; who both, though from **opposite sides of impiety,** **fell into the same** **abyss of perdition and godlessness**.[[127]](#footnote-127)

**The Council of Nicaea 787 AD**

The bishops declared:

“**These condemned** Nestorius because he divided the one Son and Word of God into two sons, and on the other side, Arius, **Dioscorus**, Eutyches and **Severus** because they maintained a mingling of the two natures of the one Christ”[[128]](#footnote-128)

This council rejected the writings of Philoxenus of Mabbough and Severus of Antioch:

“Texts of… **Philoxenus of Maggough and Severus of Antioch were rejected as heretical**”[[129]](#footnote-129)

During the seventh session the assembled bishops shouted:

“**Anathema to** Anastasius, Constantine, and Nicetas, who one after the other, occupied the throne of Constantinople! They are: Arius II., Nestorius II., and **Dioscorus** II.”[[130]](#footnote-130)

In the letter of this synod to the Emperor, heretics among them Dioscorus were listed and condemned:

“the irreverent mingling of the natures devised by Eutyches and **Dioscorus, and the many-headed hydra which is their companion.**”[[131]](#footnote-131)
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