

REFUTING MONOPHYSITISM

- **The creed of Chalcedon** states that: Christ is one person who is the word of God. who is divine in his own nature and hypostatically united human nature to Himself in the incarnation.
- Dioscoros, First session of the Council of Chalcedon: "I accept 'from two natures', but i do not accept 'two'..."

MONOPHYSITE CHRISTOLOGY OF SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH: Letter 18 states that to speak of two natures after the union is to deny the union (which means becoming one) and to speak of a division, since "duality is division". For him the two particular hypostasis, His self-subsistent Divine hypostasis and non-self-subsistent human hypostasis came into union to form a composite self-subsistent divine-human hypostasis.

REJECTION OF TWO WILLS AND TWO ENERGIES BY MONOPHYSITES: Dioscoros written to Juvenal of Jerusalem at Chalcedon, he said: "Cursed to be anyone who assumes in the Messiah two properties and two activities". By Severus of Antioch (Letter 1) he said " for it anathematizes those who divide the one son who was hypostatically united to the flesh in two natures and the operations and properties of the same two natures" .. (Letter 26 to John the hegumenos): "But when God performed divine-human (theandric) activity in our eyes it cannot be understood other than as rejection of every duality" ... Damian of Alexandria also agree with both.

THE FEATURE OF MONOPHYSITE: Just like how the body and the soul are united and become human nature, the divinity and humanity are united into one nature which is Christ. As such there is nothing in Christ is "dual" in reality, since his being, activity, will, etc are all divine-human. The human will is not free but rather a "instrument" of the divine will and activity. In other words there is only the divine will,nature, and activity because there is only one person.

THE BIBLE ON CHRIST'S TWO WILLS: John 6:38, Philip 2:8, Matthew 26:39, James 1:13.

LEONTIUS OF JERUSALEM ARGUMENT AGAINST THE MONOPHYSITE: IS CHRIST CREATED OR UNCREATED? - If Christ is one nature and there is no duality in Christ, then one would have to ask whether he is created or uncreated. If he is created,he is not God, if he is uncreated then he is not man. If he is both then he is in two natures since One/Will/Activity cannot be created and uncreated at the same time. As for how many of these are , you would have to say there are at least two. You have to confess that they are substances and you speak of two substances because of the difference in Christ.

CHRISTIC NATURE ARGUMENT: The Monophysite position ends up reducing its

If Christ has to be one nature because he is one person then does that not mean that the Trinity would have to be three natures and also three wills, energies and properties because there are three persons in the Trinity? ... This made them to the conclusion of being tritheists (which believe that God has three natures) like the Monophysites called John Ascoutzanges and John Philoponus. Johannes Zachhuber says in his book "The Rise of Christian Theology and the end of Ancient Metaphysics" - Because of this conclusion of the existence of tritheists in the miaphsyte community was enough to trigger mass conversions to the Chalcedonian Church.

PATRISTIC QUOTES FOR TWO NATURES:

St. Paul Philip 2:5-11: "who being in the form [nature] of God did not consider it robbery to be equal with God but made himself of no reputation, taking the form [nature] of bondservant and coming in the likeness of men. And being found in the appearance as a man."

St. Gregory of Nyssa Against Eunomius book 5: "It is not the Human nature that raises up Lazarus nor is it the power that cannot suffer that weeps for him when he lies in the grave: the tear proceeds from the man the life from the true

ST GREGORY OF NYSSA (LETTER 32): "For we do not say that he is one nature in his divinity and flesh butbut he has twofold existence and is susceptible to passion in the one and not subject to it in the other."

"Partook of both created and uncreated nature, mortal and immortal, circumscribed and uncircumscribed"

"Christ then existing in two natures (Greek: Xristos Duo Iparkon fuseon) "

ST. HILARY OF POITIERS - ON THE HOLY TRINITY BOOK 9:_".....Death is attributed to the man and the quickening of the flesh to the God, though he who dies and he who raises the dead to life are not two but one person?see his divine nature in the power to raise again and recognize in his death the dispensation of his manhood. And although either function is performed by its proper nature, yet remember that he who died and raised to life was one Christ Jesus."

"Himself one person, both man and God. For he being of two natures united for that Mediatorship, is full reality of each nature."

ST. MELITO OF SARDEIS ON PASCHA: "For he was born a son and led as a lamb and slaughtered as a sheep and buried as a man, and rose from the dead as God, being God by his nature and a man."

ST. CYRIL THE STRICT "MIAPHYSITE"?

St. Cyril is known for saying that Christ is "one nature of God the word enfleshed". There are Orthodox interpretations of this statement.

The one nature is the Divinity of Christ “enfleshed” with human nature.

The nature is one in the sense of his indivisibility

The one nature is not the “essence” of Christ in the sense of a Christic nature, rather “Hypostasis”.

St. Cyril of Alexandria says “Thus, there is only one nature (physis) of the word or hypostasis if you like and that is the word himself.”

Moreover as historical scholarship shows, the “one nature” statements St. Cyril used whom he thought were statements from various different fathers were in actually Apollinarian forgeries. This showcases that the miaphysite formula used by the Copts and Syriacs today in its theology is influenced more from Apollinarius than from St. Cyril. [Leitzman in his book “Apollinarius of Laodicea” points out].

St. Cyril, Glaphyra on the Pentateuch (Volume 69, Page 576): “He orders two small living, clean birds to be taken”, he says “so that you might understand from winged creatures the man from heaven at once man and God, in two natures, in as much as he came to be in the separate definition that belongs to each.”

other Letters of St. Cyril of Alexandria

Letter 17: “he was allowing the nature like ours to move according to its own laws, while at the same time preserving the purity of the divinity.”

Oratio Ad Augustas, 37:20-21: “often, with regard to one person the appereance of our speech introduces two persons”. => This is important passage in the sense of St. Leo when he speak about two forms of Christ in his tome. The meaning of this passage is that although Christ is one, one can speak of there being two grammatical persons. [for example if I said that my soul thirst for heavenly water to drink. What I done here is that I treat my soul as a person because my soul is a grammatical person but it does not mean that it is ontological person. All ontological persons is grammatical persons but all grammatical persons is not ontological persons].

Thesaurus Chapter 12: “If he who is in the form of God took the form that is consubstantial to us because it belongs to us and the son is the form of God, then he is consubstantial to God whose form he is.

Thesaurus Chapter 24: “Some things he says as man and some as God, for he has authority in both natures”

2nd Letter to Nestorius: “there is of both one Christ and one Son, for the difference of the natures is not taken away by the union”

2nd Letter to Succensus: “God did not himself suffer [bodily things] in his own nature but suffered rather in his earthly nature.”

Letter 39 to John of Antioch: “.....of the same substance with his Father according to his Divinity and of the same substance with us according to his humanity.....For we know the theologians make some things of the Evangelicals and Apostolic teaching about the Lord common as pertaining to the one person and other things they divide as the two natures and attribute the worthy ones to God on account of the Divinity of Christ and the lowly ones accounted of his humanity.

Scholia on the Incarnation, Chapter 13: “while recognizing the difference of the natures and preserving them each other without confusion”

St. Vincent of Lerins - Commonitorium (died 445, before Chalcedon): “For he would not slow that there are in Christ two substances, one Divine, the other human, one from the Father and the other from the Mother.”

St. Gregory the Theologian - Oration 30: “Thus everyone must see that he knows as God and knows not as Man, if one may separate the visible from which is discerned by thought alone. For the absolute and unconditioned use of the Name “The Son” in this passage without the addition of whose Son gives us this thought that we are to understand the ignorance in the most reverent sense, by attributing it to the Manhood and not to the Godhead.” => This refutes the objection of orientals because they say “There is no the continuity of the two natures after the union”. Well St. Gregory doesn’t agree with you since in his oration.30, he literally accepted the continuation of the two natures.

St. Ambrose of Milan - Exposition of the Christian Faith, Book 2, Chapter 7: “ Let us not suppose that he was crucified in his Glory. It is because he who is God is also Man, God by virtue of his Divinity and by taking upon him of the flesh, the Man Christ Jesus, that the Lord of Glory is said to have been crucified ; For possessing both natures, that is, the Human and the Divine, he endured the passion in his humanity”. He also says in the same book “In Each there speaks One and the same Son of God, for Each nature is present in him; yet while it is the same person who speaks, he speaks not always in the same manner.....As God he speaks the things of God because he is the word; as man he speaks the things of Man because he speaks in my Nature.” => St. Ambrose here explicitly accept the continuation of two natures. If however continuation of two natures is nestorianism then by your logic, St. Ambrose of Milan is Nestorian. Sorry but I respect St. Ambrose more than.

St. John Cassian, Book 1, chapter 5-6 - Against Nestorius: “we must hold that there is one person of the flesh and the word: so as faithfully and without any doubt to believe that One and the same son of God, who can never be divided, Existing in two natures”

St. Augustine- Sermon 80: “He is Man and God; the One Christ is Man and God; as one man is soul and body: but God and man are not two persons. In Christ indeed that are Two substances, God and Man but One Person”

ORTHODOX CHRISTOLOGY

- The two natures are united in the hypostasis of the word of God, who is Jesus Christ.
- Christ’s hypostasis is not the product of the union but the foundation of the union.
- Since Christ is fully man and fully God, Christ has faculties proper to both natures. As such he has two wills and two energies.
- Since nature and hypostasis are distinct and since hypostasis is not a faculty of nature but the foundation of the existence of nature and its properties in a unique mode, it does not follow that Christ has to have human hypostasis.
- Because these two natures are hypothetically united to him he is two natures not in the sense of being strictly identical, for hypostasis and nature are distinct, Saint Basil affirms in letter 38. But it is his divinity and his humanity that are particularized in this one person he is identified with them. Hypostasis is not merely reduced to particularized nature but is rather distinct from what nature is. Hence God is one nature and three hypostasis, the two natures are hypostatic united whereas the persons in the trinity are united by essence. when we say the trinity is united by essence we don't mean that three essence united to make up one essence but rather three persons united by their same essence, likewise when we speak of a hypostatic union we don't mean a union of hypostasis but rather a union of essences or forms or substances.

- We distinguish the natures of Christ not concretely for there are not concrete things to distinguish. For Nestorius this is possible for him he believes that Christ has two concrete things to distinguish but we distinguish them in thought as St. Cyril and the Cappadocians and Chalcedons argued. When we say distinction in thought we do not deny a real distinction that occurs in the mind. Dr David Bradshaw points out that this is in the mind of pre-Chalcedonian idea used to distinguish the persons in the Trinity.
- The formula of St. Cyril "One incarnate nature of the word" = this formula is accepted as orthodox (the 5th Ecumenical Council) affirmed it. However we have to know that this formula is originally an Apollinarian formula, it is not a patristic formula, the first father to use this is St. Cyril and that's because he assumed it was the Father's when in reality both in the academy of that day scholarship and scholarship of today we now understand that these are forgeries. See Leitzman in his book "Apollinarius" points out. For Apollinarius this formula means that the divine nature is in the flesh with body but not with the soul. [This is the debate between St. Gregory of Nyssa and Apollinarius]. Severus in letter 10 states that distinction between united things of different kinds are not separated like body and soul but distinction of the same kind of the same essence do not necessarily have to be divided. If you apply this to the Trinity they are separate (see his letters 19, 22, 23 and 62) - explicitly states the hypostasis in the Trinity are separate. If you look the Severan system we understand why he comes to this conclusion because when you have multiplicity (when you number one, two, three) separation necessarily always included, they (Monophysites) reject duality or two natures.
- Severus also contradicts himself whether Christ has one substance or two, when dealing with Sergius who says Christ is one ousia, he corrected Sergius but when John the Grammarian said in two substances Severus said that's Nestorianism. For Monophysites union of essence and union of hypostasis is the same thing. The problem with this is that if hypostasis is merely a concretized essence, if we apply to this the Trinity has three hypostases aren't there also three concretized essences?

- We Chalcedonian says the natures are particulars and we distinguish particulars nature from hypostasis. For example St. Cyril use the term "like nature" or " he (Christ) moved the nature like ours", he used this because the nature is particularized. If it's particularized hypostasis then when he moved the nature he also moved as hypostasis. So when he moved his humanity (suffering) he moved this as standing away hypostasis. This won't be a nestorian then by that logic since hypostasis is concretized essence for Monophysites and Severus?
- If the distinguishing of the two natures only "en theoria" but not as reality: why are we introducing illusion in Christ when we just say what the reality is? When we Chalcedonians say will is a faculty of essences and it is two wills but we don't mean by saying that there is two sources of willing. Duality is abolished in the sense of Christ's person and in the sense of separation but not all senses because distinction is duality (example -hypostasis of the trinity).
- Humanity is one thing and divinity another, and it's two things= two things is duality. Monophysites argues that distinction and division is the same thing. So for them the distinct natures of Christ are divided so they should be only one nature. Again if we apply this to the trinity the three persons are divided because they are distinct. This doesn't make any sense and this is not how the Cappadocian fathers confessed and it is not patristic at all. Monophysites defend this argument citing St. Basil saying "Indivisibly divided" - St. Basil is not saying here that distinction entails division rather in terms of difference of the three persons without separation.

When we Chalcedonians use the word “mingle” for the natures= we meant by saying **COMMUNICATO IDIOMATUM** (latin) - in english "Exchange of properties" = the two natures communicates each others they interpenetrate one another. For example when we say God walked, God ate, we don't ascribe eating and walking to the divine nature but rather to the one Christ who has two natures that ate and walk. Hypostasis is the coming together of natures. For example the body and soul does not produce a new hypostasis of its own but the hypostasis where the body and the soul comes together in union (same with the natures).

