

*Decrees of the
Ecumenical Councils*

Volume One
Nicaea I to Lateran V

EDITED BY
Norman P. Tanner S.J.

ORIGINAL TEXT ESTABLISHED BY
G. Alberigo, J.A. Dossetti, P-P. Joannou,
C. Leonardi, and P. Prodi,
in consultation with H. Jedin

Sheed & Ward
and
Georgetown University Press
1990

Constantinople II

553

INTRODUCTION

The emperor Justinian and Pope Vigilius decided to summon this council after the latter withdrew his "Judgment" condemning the "Three Chapters" of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret and Ibas. This "Judgment" had been issued on 11 April 548 but the bishops of the west and especially of Africa unanimously opposed it. The council was summoned by Justinian to Constantinople, although Vigilius would have preferred to convene it in Sicily or Italy so that western bishops might be present. It assembled on 5 May 553 in the great hall attached to Hagia Sophia cathedral.

Since the Roman pontiff refused to take part in the council, because Justinian had summoned bishops in equal numbers from each of the five patriarchal sees, so that there would be many more eastern than western bishops present¹, Eutychius, patriarch of Constantinople, presided. The decrees of the council were signed by 160 bishops, of whom 8 were Africans.

On 14 May 553 Pope Vigilius issued his "Constitution", which was signed by 16 bishops (9 from Italy, 2 from Africa, 2 from Illyricum and 3 from Asia Minor). This rejected sixty propositions of Theodore of Mopsuestia, but spared his personal memory² and refused to condemn either Theodoret or Ibas since, on the testimony of the council of Chalcedon, all suspicion of heresy against them had been removed. Nevertheless, the council in its 8th session on 2 June 553 again condemned the "Three Chapters", for the same reasons as Justinian had done so, in a judgment which concludes with 14 anathemas³.

After carefully considering the matter for six months, Vigilius, weighing up the persecutions of Justinian against his clergy and having sent a letter to Eutychius of Constantinople⁴, approved the council, thus changing his mind "after the example of Augustine". Furthermore he anathematized Theodore and condemned his writings and those of Theodoret and Ibas. On 23 February 554, in a second "Constitution", he tried to reconcile the recent condemnation with what had been decreed at the council of Chalcedon⁵.

The council did not debate ecclesiastical discipline nor did it issue disciplinary canons. Our edition does not include the text of the anathemas against Origen

¹ See L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VI^e siècle*, Paris 1925, 210.

² See synod of Constantinople in 394: "It seems unjust to harm a dead person", H-L 2, 99 note.

³ The text given below has been taken from Mansi 9, 368-388. As regards the acts of the council, there are a few fragments in Greek but otherwise only the Latin text survives (the first critical edition was made by S. Balutius, *Nova collectio conciliorum*, Paris 1683, 1475-1581).

⁴ Msi 9, 413-432. ⁵ Msi 9, 457-488.

since recent studies have shown that these anathemas cannot be attributed to this council⁶.

For the 14 anathemas (pp. 114–122) the translation is from the Greek text, since this is the more authoritative version.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H-L 3, 1–156; Percival 297–323; RE 5 (1898) 21–23; DThC 3 (1908) 1231–1259, 15 (1950) 1880–1884; DHGE 3 (1956) 757–760; LThK 6 (21961) 495–497; NCE 4 (1967) 238–240; HC 2 (1980) 450–457; H. Noris, *Dissertatio historica de synodo quinta*, Opera, ed. Ballerini, I Verona 1729, 550–820; id., *Defensio*, ibid. IV, 385 ff.; J. Garnier, *Dissertatio de synodo V*, PG 84, 455–548; R. Devreesse, *Le V^e concile et l'œcuménicité byzantine*, Miscellanea Giov. Mercati, III Rome 1946, 1–15; C. Moeller, *Le V^e concile œcuménique et le magistère ordinaire au VI^e siècle*, Rev. des Sciences phil. et théol. 34 (1951) 413–423; L. Stan, *Impăratul Iustinian, sinodului V ecumenic și papalitatea*, Studii Teologice 2/5 (1953) 347–364; I.G. Coman, *Problemele dogmatice ale sinodului V ecumenic*, ibid. 312–346; M. Sesan, *Le V^e concile œcuménique* Byzantinoslavica 15 (1954) 240–255; H.M. Diepen, *Douze dialogues de christologie ancienne*, Rome 1960, 127–133 and 181–204; W. de Vries, *Das zweite Konzil von Konstantinopel (553) und das Lehramt von Papst und Kirche*, Orient. Christ. Per. 38 (1972) 331–366; F.X. Murphy and P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, Histoire des conciles 3, Paris 1974.

⁶ Grumel 245; F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert und das 5. allgemeine Konzil*, Münster 1899, 90; DThC 11 (1932) 1576–1588; F.X. Murphy and P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, Paris 1974, 108–109; see D 203–211.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

[Sententia adversus „tria Capitula“¹]

Magno Deo et salvatore nostro Iesu Christo, secundum parabolam in evangelis dictam, pro uniuscuiusque viribus talenta distribuite, et operam eorum opportuno tempore exigente, si is qui creditum sibi unum talentum sine diminutione servavit, eo quod non operatus est, et amplifi- 5
cavit hoc quod sibi creditum est, condemnatur², quanto maiori et horribili iudicio subiaceat, qui non solum de ipso neglexerit, sed etiam aliis scandali et perturbationis causam praeberit? cum sit omnibus fidelibus manifestum, quod quando de fide ratio moveatur, non solum impius condemnatur, sed etiam ille qui potest quidem prohibere impietatem, 10
negligit vero aliorum correptionem. Et nos igitur, quibus regere ecclesiam Domini creditum est³, timentes maledictionem, quae imminet his qui negligenter opera Domini faciunt⁴, festinamus bonum fidei semen purum conservare ab impietatis zizaniis, quae ab inimico inseminantur⁵. Quo- 15
niam igitur videbamus quod Nestorii sequaces conati sunt per Theodorum impium, qui Mopsuestiae fuit episcopus, et impia eius conscripta, et insuper per ea quae impie Theodoritus conscripsit, et per epistolam sceleratam, quae ab Iba dicitur ad Marim Persam scripta esse, suam impietatem Dei ecclesiae applicare, ideo ad eorum quae movebantur correctionem surreximus, et pro Dei voluntate, et iussione piissimi imperatoris vocati ad hanc regiam urbem convenimus. 20

Et quia contingit Vigilium religiosissimum, in hac regia urbe degentem, omnibus interesse quae his tribus capitulis annotata sunt, et tam sine scriptis, quam in scripturis ea saepius condemnasse, postea tamen et 25
consensit in scriptis in concilio convenire, et disceptare una nobiscum de his tribus capitulis, ut definitio communiter ab omnibus nobis praebeatur fidei rectae conveniens; piissimus imperator secundum quod inter nos placuit, tam ipsum quam nos hortatus est communiter convenire, eo quod sacerdotes decet communibus quaestionibus finem communem 30
imponere. Unde necessario petivimus ipsius reverentiam scriptas suas promissiones adimplere; nec enim iustum esse amplius scandalum pro tribus istis capitulis crescere, et Dei ecclesiam conturbari. Et pro his ad memoriam eius perduximus magna illa apostolorum exempla, et patrum

¹ Huius sententiae principium tantum graece exaratum nobis extat (Msi 9, 368), quod sequitur:

Τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις παραβολὴν, πρὸς τὴν ἐκάστου δύναμιν τὰ τάλαντα διανεμάντος καὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν ταύτην ἐν καιρῷ τῷ δέοντι ἀπαιτοῦντος, εἰ ὁ πιστευθεὶς τὸ ἐν τάλαντον καὶ φυλάξας ἀμείωτον, ἐφ' ᾧ οὐκ εἰργάσατο, καὶ ἐπλεόνασε τὸ πιστευθὲν καταδικάζεται, πῶσω μείζονι καὶ φοβερώ κρῖματι ὑπόκειται ὁ μὴ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀμελήσας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτέροις σκανδάλου καὶ ταραχῆς γενόμενος αἴτιος, προδήλου πᾶσι τοῖς εὐσεβέσι καθεστῶτος, ὡς ἦνικα περὶ πίστεως ὁ λόγος κινεῖται, οὐ μόνον ὡς ἀσεβῆς κατακρίνεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς θυνάμενος μὲν κωλύσαι τὴν ἀσέβειαν, ἀμελήσας δὲ περὶ τὴν τῶν ἐτέρων διόρθωσιν. Καὶ ἡμεῖς τοίνυν ποιμαίνειν πιστευθέντες τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου, εὐλαβοῦμενοι τὴν κατὰ τὴν ἀπειλουμένην τοῖς ἀμείωτος τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου ποιοῦσαι, σπουδῆν ποιούμεθα τὸ καλὸν τῆς πίστεως σπέρμα διαφυλάξαι καθαρὸν ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἐπισπειρομένων τῆς ἀσεβείας ζιζανίων.

² Cf. Mt 25, 14-30. ³ Cf. Ac 20, 28. ⁴ Cf. Ir 48, 10. ⁵ Cf. Mt 13, 36-43.

[Sentence against the “Three Chapters”¹]

Our great God and saviour Jesus Christ, as we are told in the parable in the gospel, gives talents to each one according to his ability, and at the proper time asks for an account of what has been done by each one. If the person to whom only one talent has been given is condemned because he has not worked and increased it, but has only preserved it without diminishment², how much more serious and more frightening must be the condemnation to which the person is subjected who not only fails to look after himself but scandalizes others and is a cause of offence to them? It is clear to all believers that when a problem about the faith comes up it is not only the heretical person who is condemned but also the person who is in a position to correct the heresy of others and fails to do so. To those of us to whom the task has been given of governing the church of the Lord³, there comes a fear of the condemnation which threatens those who neglect to do the Lord's work⁴. We hurry to take care of the good seed of faith, protecting it from the weeds of heresy which have been planted by the enemy⁵. We observed that the pupils of Nestorius were trying to bring their heresy into the church of God by means of the heretical Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, and his books as also by the writings of the heretical Theodoret and the disgraceful letter which is alleged to have been sent by Ibas to Mari the Persian. Our observations prompted us to correct what was happening. We assembled in this imperial city, summoned here by the will of God and the command of the most religious emperor.

The most religious Vigilium happened to be present in this imperial city and took part in all the criticisms against the three chapters. He had frequently condemned them by word of mouth and in his writings. Later he gave a written agreement to take part in our council and to study with us the three chapters so that we could all issue an appropriate definition of the true faith. The most pious emperor, prompted by what was acceptable to us, encouraged a meeting between Vigilium and ourselves because it is proper that the priesthood should impose a common conclusion to matters of common concern. Consequently we asked his reverence to carry out his written undertakings. It did not seem right that the scandal over these three chapters should continue and that the church of God should be further disturbed. In order to persuade him, we reminded him of the great example left us by the apostles and of the traditions of the fathers. Even

¹ Only the beginning of this “Sentence” survives in Greek (Msi 9, 368). The translation is the same as for the Latin: “Our great God ... planted by the enemy” (line 14).

² See Mt 25, 14-30. ³ See Ac 20, 28. ⁴ See Jer 48, 10. ⁵ See Mt 13, 36-43.

traditiones. Licet enim sancti Spiritus gratia et circa singulos apostolos abundaret, ut non indigeret alieno consilio ad ea quae agenda erant; non tamen aliter voluerunt de eo quod movebatur, si oporteret gentes circumcidi, definire, priusquam communiter congregati divinarum scripturarum testimoniis unusquisque sua dicta confirmaverunt.

Unde communiter de eo sententiam protulerunt, ad gentes scribentes: *Visum est Spiritui sancto et nobis, nihil aliud imponere vobis oneris, praeterquam necessaria, ut abstinere ab immolatis simulacrorum, et sanguine, et suffocato, et fornicatione*¹.

Sed et sancti patres, qui per tempora in sanctis quatuor conciliis convenerunt, antiquis exemplis utentes, communiter de exortis haeresibus et quaestionibus disposuerunt, certo constituto, quod in communibus disceptationibus cum proponuntur quae ex utraque parte discutienda sunt, veritatis lumen tenebras expellit mendacii.

Nec enim potest in communibus de fide disceptationibus aliter veritas manifestari, cum unusquisque proximi adiutorio indiget, sicut in proverbii dicit Salomon: *Frater fratri adiutorium praestans: exaltabitur sicut civitas munita: valet vero sicut regnum fundatum*². Et iterum in Ecclesiaste dicit: *Optimi duo quam unus, quibus est merces bona in labore ipsorum*³. Sed etiam ipse Dominus dicit: *Amen dico vobis, si duo ex vobis convenerint super terram, de omni re quamcumque petierint, contiget illis a Patre meo qui in caelis est. Ubi cumque enim fuerint duo aut tres collecti in nomine meo, ego cum eis sum in medio ipsorum*⁴. Cum autem saepius et a nobis omnibus invitatus, et insuper gloriosissimis iudiciis missis ad ipsum a piissimo imperatore, promisit per seipsum de iisdem tribus capitulis sententiam proferre: huiusmodi responso audito, Apostoli nos admonitiones in corde habentes, quod unusquisque pro se rationem reddet Deo⁵, timentes autem et iudicium imminens eis qui vel unum ex minimis scandalizant⁶, quanto magis imperatorem ita christianissimum, et populos et ecclesias totas; et quod dictum a Deo ad Paulum: *Ne timeas, sed loquere, et ne taceas, quoniam ego sum tecum, et nemo poterit nocere tibi*⁷: congregati ante omnia compendiose confessi sumus fidem illam tenere, quam dominus noster Iesus Christus verus Deus tradidit sanctis suis apostolis, et per eos sanctis ecclesiis, et qui post illos fuerunt sancti patres et doctores ecclesiae creditis sibi populis tradiderunt. Tenere autem et servare et praedicare sanctis ecclesiis confessi sumus hanc fidei confessionem, quam latius exposuerunt trecenti decem et octo sancti patres Nicaeae congregati, qui sanctum mathema sive symbolum tradiderunt: insuper autem et centum quinquaginta in Constantinopoli collecti exposuerunt, qui eandem fidei confessionem secuti sunt, et eam explanaverunt: et ducentorum sanctorum patrum prius Ephesi collectorum pro eadem fidem consensum: et quae a sexcentis triginta Chalcedone congregatis definita sunt pro una eademque fide quam et ipsi secuti praedicaverunt. Eos autem qui pro tempore condemnati vel anathematizati a catholica ecclesia et praedictis quatuor conciliis sunt,

¹ Ac 15, 28-29. ² Pro 18, 19. ³ Ec 4, 9. ⁴ Mt 18, 19-20.

⁵ Rm 14, 12. ⁶ Cf. Mt 18, 6. ⁷ Ac 18, 9-10.

though the grace of the holy Spirit was abundant in each of the apostles, so that none of them required the advice of another in order to do his work, nevertheless they were loathe to come to a decision on the issue of the circumcision of gentiles until they had met together to test their various opinions against the witness of the holy scriptures.

In this way they unanimously reached the conclusion which they wrote to the gentiles: *It has seemed good to the holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from unchastity*¹.

The holy fathers, who have gathered at intervals in the four holy councils, have followed the examples of antiquity. They dealt with heresies and current problems by debate in common, since it was established as certain that when the disputed question is set out by each side in communal discussions, the light of truth drives out the shadows of lying.

The truth cannot be made clear in any other way when there are debates about questions of faith, since everyone requires the assistance of his neighbour. As Solomon says in his proverbs: *A brother who helps a brother shall be exalted like a strong city; he shall be as strong as a well-established kingdom*². Again in Ecclesiastes he says: *Two are better than one, for they have a good reward for their toil*³. And the Lord himself says: *Amen I say to you, if two of you agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven. For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them*⁴. Vigilius was frequently invited by us all, and most distinguished judges were sent to him by the most pious emperor. Eventually he promised to give judgment personally on the three chapters. When we heard this promise, we remembered the warning of the Apostle that *each of us shall give an account of himself to God*⁵. We were afraid of the condemnation which threatens those who scandalize one of the least important⁶, and of the much more serious one which threatens those who scandalize so very christian an emperor, the people and all the churches. We also remembered what was said by God to Paul: *Do not be afraid, but speak, and do not be silent; for I am with you, and nobody shall be able to harm you*⁷. When we met together, therefore, we first of all briefly made a confession of the faith which our lord Jesus Christ, true God, handed down to his holy apostles and by means of them to the holy churches, the same faith which those who afterwards were holy fathers and doctors handed down to the people entrusted to them. We confessed that we believe, protect and preach to the holy churches that confession of faith which was set out at greater length by the 318 holy fathers who met in council at Nicaea and handed down the holy doctrine or creed. The 150 who met in council at Constantinople also set out the same faith and made a confession of it and explained it. The 200 holy fathers who met in the first council of Ephesus agreed to the same faith. We follow also the definitions of the 630 who met in council at Chalcedon, regarding the same faith which they both followed and preached. We confessed that we held to be condemned and anathematized all those who had been previously condemned

¹ Ac 15, 28-29. ² Pro 18, 19. ³ Ec 4, 9. ⁴ Mt 18, 19-20.

⁵ Rm 14, 12. ⁶ See Mt 18, 6. ⁷ Ac 18, 9-10.

confessi sumus condemnatos et anathematizatos habere. Cumque haec ita confessi sumus, initium fecimus examinationis trium capitulorum, et proposuimus prius de Theodoro Mopsuesteno: et cum in medio prolatae sunt blasphemiae codicibus insertae, mirati sumus Dei in his patientiam, quod non divino igni statim incensa est lingua et mens quae haec eructavit: et nunquam concessimus procedere lectorem praedictarum blasphemiarum, pro sola memoria illarum indignationem Dei timentes, (utpote unaquaque blasphemia magnitudine impietatis antecedentem superante, et mentem auditoribus funditus permovente) nisi eos qui talibus blasphemiiis gloriantur videremus indigere confusione, per manifestationem earum eis inferenda: ut nos omnes zelo blasphemiarum contra Deum expositarum incensi et in medio lectionis et post ipsam inclamationes et anathematismos contra Theodorum ut viventem et praesentem faceremus. Propitius sis, Domine, dicentes, nec daemones ausi sunt talia contra te loqui.

O intolerabilem linguam illam! o pravitatem viri! o altam illam manum, quam extendit contra creatorem suum. Scripturas scire miser ille pollicitus, non meminit Oseae prophetae dicentis: *Vae illis, quoniam exilierunt a me: famosi facti sunt, quia impii fuerunt in me, iniqua locuti sunt adversum me, et adversum me excogitantes, locuti sunt pessima. Ideo cadent in framea propter improbitatem linguae suae. Hic contemptus eorum in sinu eorum: quia transierunt testamentum meum, et adversus legem meam impie egerunt*¹. Iste Theodorus impius merito subiicitur. Prophetias enim, quae de Christo sunt, reiciens, festinavit dispensationis pro nostra salute magnum mysterium, quantum ad se pertinet, reprobare: fabulas tantummodo ad risum propositas gentibus divina eloquia, multis modis conatus ostendere, et contempsit tam alias propheticas pronuntiationes contra impios factas, et quod dixit divinus Habacuc de his qui mendaciter docent: *Vae qui adaequat proximum sibi eversione turbata, et inebriant eum, ut inspiciat speluncas eorum*²: id est, tenebrosas et omnino a luce alienas doctrinas eorum.

Et quid oportet multa dicere? Liceat volentibus codices impii Theodori prae manibus accipere, vel quae ex impiis codicibus eius, gestis apud nos habitis inserta sunt, impia capitula, et invenire nimiam insaniam, et nefanda illa quae dixit. Ulterius enim procedere, et iterum memoria repetere nefanda illa veremur. Recitata nobis sunt et quaedam a sanctis patribus contra illum, et omnes haereticos superantem eius insaniam conscripta, et insuper historiae, et leges imperiales, illius impietatem ab initio divulgantes et quoniam post haec omnia impietatis illius defensores, iniuriis contra creatorem suum dictis gloriantes, dicebant non oportere eum post mortem anathematizare, licet cognosceremus ecclesiasticam de impiis traditionem, quod et post mortem haeretici anathematizantur; tamen necessarium putavimus et de hoc perscrutari, et fertur in gestis, quomodo diversi haeretici et post mortem anathematizati sunt: et per multa manifestatum est apud nos, quod qui haec dicunt, nullam curam Dei iudicatorum faciunt, nec apostolicarum pronuntiationum, nec patrum traditionum. Libenter utique interrogemus eos, quid dicant de

¹ Os 7, 13-16; 8, 1. ² Hab 2, 15.

and anathematized by the catholic church and by the aforesaid four councils. When we had made this confession in this way, we made a start on the examination of the three chapters. First, we considered Theodore of Mopsuestia. When all the blasphemies in his works were exposed, we were astonished at God's patience, that the tongue and mind which had formed such blasphemies were not straightaway burned up by divine fire. We would not even have allowed the official reader of these blasphemies to continue, such was our fear of the anger of God at even a rehearsal of them (since each blasphemy was worse than the one before in the extent of its heresy and shook to their foundation the minds of their listeners), if it had not been the case that those who revelled in these blasphemies seemed to us to require the humiliation which their exposure would bring upon them. All of us, angered by the blasphemies against God, burst into attacks and anathemas against Theodore, during and after the reading, as if he had been living and present there. We said: Lord, be favourable to us; not even the demons themselves have dared to speak such things against you.

O his intolerable tongue! O the wickedness of the man! O the proud hand he raised against his creator! This disgraceful man, who had made a promise to understand the scriptures, did not remember the words of the prophet Hosea: *Woe to them, for they have strayed from me! They have become notorious because of their impiety towards me. They spoke evil things about me, and after they had considered them, they spoke even worse things against me. They will fall into a trap because of the depravity of their tongues. Their contempt will be turned inwards on themselves, because they have broken my covenant and acted impiously against my law*¹. The impious Theodore deserves to come under these curses. He dismissed the prophecies about Christ and he vilified, as far as he could, the great mystery of the arrangements that have been made for our salvation. In many ways he tried to demonstrate that the divine word was nothing but fables composed for the amusement of the gentiles. He ridiculed the other condemnations of the impious made by the prophets, especially the one in which holy Habakkuk says of those who teach false doctrines: *Woe to him who makes his neighbours drink of the cup of his wrath, and makes them drunk, to gaze on their caverns*². This refers to their teachings which are full of darkness and quite separate from the light.

Why ought we to add anything more? Anyone who wishes can consult the volumes of the heretical Theodore or the heretical chapters from his heretical books which have been included in our acts. Anyone can see his unbelievable folly and the disgraceful utterances made by him. We fear to continue and to rehearse again those shameful things. The writings of the holy fathers against him were also read out to us. We heard what had been written against his folly, which was more than all the other heretics, and the historical records and imperial laws which set out his heresy from its beginning. Despite all this, those who defended his heresy, delighting in the insults offered by him to his creator, declared that it was improper to anathematize him after his death. Although we were aware of the ecclesiastical tradition concerning heretics, that they are anathematized even after death, we deemed it necessary to go into this matter as well and it can be found in the acts how several heretics were anathematized after they were dead. In many ways it has become clear to us that those who put forward this argument have no concern for God's judgments, nor for the pronouncements of the apostles, nor for the traditions of the fathers. We would

¹ Hos 7, 13-16; 8, 1. ² Hab 2, 15.

Domino, dicente de seipso: *Qui crediderit in eum, non iudicatur: qui autem non crediderit in eum, iam iudicatus est, quia non crediderit in nomine unigeniti Filii Dei*¹. Et Apostolo clamante: *Licet nos aut angelus de caelo evangelizaverit, praeterquam quod accepistis, anathema sit. Sicut praediximus, et nunc iterum dico: Si quis vobis evangelizaverit, praeterquam quod accepistis, anathema sit*². Domino enim, quod iam iudicatus est, dicente, et Apostolo etiam angelos, si docerent praeter quod evangelizati sumus, anathematizante, quomodo praesumunt dicere, qui omnia audent, de vivis tantummodo haec dicta esse? Aut ignorant, magis autem scientes ignorare confingunt, quod iudicium anathematis nihil aliud est nisi separatio a Deo? Quod impius licet non verbo ab aliquo suscepisset, tamen anathema re ipsa sibi infert, per suam impietatem semetipsum a vera vita separans. Quid autem dicunt et ad Apostolum iterum dicentem: *Haereticum hominem post unam et secundam correctionem evita; sciens quoniam perversus est huiusmodi homo, et peccat, et est a semetipso damnatus*³? Quibus consonantia sanctae memoriae Cyrillus in libris quos contra Theodorum scripsit ita dicit: „Evitandi sunt illi, qui tam pessimis culpis detinentur, sive in vivis sunt, sive non. A nocente enim semper refugere necessarium est, et non ad personam magis respicere, sed ad hoc quod Deo placet.”⁴ Et iterum idem sanctae memoriae Cyrillus, scribens ad Ioannem episcopum Antiochiae, et congregatam ibi synodum, de Theodoro utpote una cum Nestorio anathematizato, ita dicit: „Erat igitur necessarium, claram propterea ducere festivitatem, expulsa certe omni voce a quocumque dicta, quae consonat Nestorii blasphemias. Processit enim adversus omnes qui eadem sapiunt, vel sapuerunt aliquando, quod absolute nos et vestra sanctitas dixit: „Anathematizamus illos qui dicunt filios duos, et duos Christos. Unus enim, ut dictum est, praedicatur a nobis et vobis Christus et Filius et Dominus, unigenitus ut homo, secundum vocem sapientissimi Pauli”⁵. Sed etiam in epistola ad Alexandrum et Martinianum, et Ioannem, et Paregorium, et Maximum presbyteros et patres monachorum, et eos qui cum ipsis erant solitariam vitam exercentes, ita dicit: „Iam quidem et sancta synodus Ephesi secundum Dei voluntatem congregata, contra nestorianam perfidiam iusta et subtili prolata sententia, et aliorum vaniloquia, qui vel postea futuri sunt, vel iam fuerunt, eadem illi sapientes, et dicere vel scribere tale aliquid praesumentes, una cum ipso condemnavit, aequalem condemnationem eis imponens. Consequens enim erat, uno semel pro suis tam profanis vaniloquiis condemnato, non contra unum tantum venire, sed (ut ita dicam) contra omnem eorum haeresim, sive calumniam quam fecerunt contra pia ecclesiae dogmata, duos colentes filios, et dividentes individuum, et anthropolatriae crimen inferentes caelo et terrae. Adorat enim nobiscum supernorum spirituum sancta multitudo unum dominum Iesum Christum.”⁶ Sed etiam Augustini religiosae memoriae, qui inter Africanos episcopos splenduit, diversae epistolae recitatae sunt⁷, significantes quod oportet haereticos et post mortem anathematizari.

¹ Io 3, 18. ² Gal 1, 8. ³ Tt 3, 10-11. ⁴ PG 76, 1442. ⁵ Cf. 1 Cor 8, 6; 1 Tm 2, 5. ⁶ PG 77, 334. ⁷ PG 77, 294-295. ⁸ In collatione V, cf. Msi 9, 260-261.

willingly question them concerning what they would say about the Lord, who said of himself: *He who believes in him is not condemned; he who does not believe in him is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God*¹. And about that claim of the Apostle: *Even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to what you have received, let him be accursed. As we said earlier, I repeat once more: If anyone preaches to you a gospel contrary to what you have received, let him be accursed*². Since the Lord declares that the person is judged already, and the Apostle curses even the angels if they instruct in anything different from what we have preached, how is it possible even for the most presumptuous to assert that these condemnations apply only to those who are still alive? Are they unaware, or rather pretending to be unaware, that to be judged anathematized is just the same as to be separated from God? The heretic, even though he has not been condemned formally by any individual, in reality brings anathema on himself, having cut himself off from the way of truth by his heresy. What reply can such people make to the Apostle when he writes: *As for someone who is factious, after admonishing him once or twice, have nothing more to do with him, knowing that such a person is perverted and sinful; he is self-condemned*³.

It was in the spirit of this text that Cyril of holy memory, in the books which he wrote against Theodore, declared as follows: “Whether or not they are alive, we ought to keep clear of those who are in the grip of such dreadful errors. It is necessary always to avoid what is harmful, and not to be worried about public opinion but rather to consider what is pleasing to God”⁴. The same Cyril of holy memory, writing to bishop John of Antioch and to the synod which met there, about Theodore who was condemned with Nestorius, says, “It was necessary that a brilliant festival should be kept since all those who had expressed opinions in accordance with Nestorius had been rejected, whoever they were. Action was taken against all those who believed, or had at any time believed, in these mistaken views. This is exactly what we and your holiness pronounced: ‘We anathematize those who assert that there exist two sons and two Christs. He who is preached by you and us is, as was said, the single Christ, both Son and Lord, the only-begotten as man, as learned Paul⁵ says’”⁶. Moreover in his letter to the priests and fathers of monks, Alexander, Martinian, John, Paregorious and Maximus, and to those who were living as solitaries along with them, he says: “The holy synod of Ephesus, meeting in accordance with the will of God, has pronounced sentence against the heresy of Nestorius and has condemned according to justice and with accuracy both Nestorius himself and all those who might later, in inane fashion, adopt the same opinions as he held, and those who had previously adhered to the same opinions and who were bold enough to put them in writing, placing upon them all an equal condemnation. It was quite logical that when a condemnation was issued against one person for such stupidity in what he said, then that condemnation should apply not only to that person alone but also, so to speak, against all those who spread the heresies and untruths. They express these falsehoods against the true dogmas of the church, offering worship to two sons, trying to divide what cannot be divided, and introducing to both heaven and earth the offence of the worship of man. But the sacred band of heavenly spirits worship along with us only one lord Jesus Christ”⁷. Moreover, several letters of Augustine of sacred memory, who was particularly outstanding among the African bishops, were read⁸ in which he

¹ Jn 3, 18. ² Gal 1, 8. ³ Tt 3, 10-11. ⁴ PG 76, 1442. ⁵ See 1 Cor 8, 6; 1 Tm 2, 5. ⁶ PG 77, 334. ⁷ PG 77, 294-295. ⁸ In the 5th session, see Msi 9, 260-261.

Talem autem ecclesiasticam traditionem, et alii Africani reverendissimi episcopi servaverunt: sed et Romana sancta ecclesia quosdam episcopos et post mortem anathematizavit, licet pro fide in vita sua non essent accusati: et utrumque apud nos habita gesta significant. Sed quoniam evidentissime veritatem impugnantes Theodori et ipsius impietatis discipuli, quaedam verba sanctae memoriae Cyrilli et Procli proferre conantur, quasi pro Theodoro scripta, opportunum est propositis aptare verba prophetae dicentis: *Quia rectae sunt viae Domini, et iusti ambulant in eis: impii autem infirmabuntur in eis*¹. Nam et isti male excipientes ea quae bene et opportune a sanctis istis patribus scripta sunt, et excusantes excusationes in peccatis², haec verba proferunt. Apparent enim patres non liberantes anathemate Theodorum, sed dispensative talibus quibusdam utentes verbis propter defensores Nestorii et eius impietatis, ut ab huiusmodi errore eos abstrahentes, ad perfectum deducerent, et docerent non solum discipulum impietatis Nestorium addicere, sed etiam doctorem eius Theodorum. Itaque et in ipsis dispensationis verbis suam patres intentionem ostendunt de eo quod oportet anathematizari Theodorum, sicut per plurima in gestis apud nos habitis demonstratum est ex his quae ad condemnationem Theodori et eius impietatis Cyrillus et Proclus sanctae memoriae scripserunt. Et talem dispensationem in divina scriptura est invenire: ad hoc et Paulus apostolus in principio praedicationis fecisse ostenditur, propter eos qui ex Hebraeis erant, Timotheum circumcidens, ut per hanc dispensationem et condescensionem ad perfectum eos deduceret³. Unde postea interdicens circumcisionem, ad Galatas ita scripsit: *Ecce ego Paulus dico vobis, quod si circumcidamini, Christus vobis nihil prodest*⁴. Invenimus autem et illud quod solent haeretici facere, et a Theodori defensoribus factum. Quaedam enim ex his quae sancti patres scripserunt, circumcidentes, quaedam vero falsa ex semetipsis componentes et confingentes, Cyrilli sanctae memoriae epistola conabantur, quasi ex testimonio patrum, praedictum impium Theodorum anathemate liberare: in quibus ex ipsis veritas demonstrata est, his quidem quae circumcisa erant, per sequentiam anteriorum et posteriorum perlectis, mendacio autem falsitatis per collationem eorum quae vera erant, per omnia convicto. In omnibus autem istis, qui talia vana loquuntur, secundum quod scriptum est, *confidunt falsis, et loquuntur vana: quia concipiunt dolorem, et pariunt iniquitatem, telam araneae texentes*⁵. His ita de Theodoro et eius impietate discussis, pauca et ex his quae impie a Theodorito conscripta sunt contra rectam fidem, et duodecim capitula sancti Cyrilli, et contra Ephesinam primam synodum, nec non quaedam ad defensionem Theodori et Nestorii impiorum ab eo conscripta, ad satisfactionem legentium in gestis apud nos confectis recitari et inseri perspeximus; ut sciant omnes, quod iuste isti eiiciuntur et anathematizantur. Tertio loco epistola, quam dicitur Ibas ad Marim Persam scripsisse, ad examinationem proposita, necessarium esse perspeximus et eam recitari. Statim igitur ex ipsa lectione impietas et inserta omnibus manifesta est. Et oporteret quidam, usque ad

¹ Os 14, 10. ² Cf. Ps 140, 4. ³ Cf. Ac 16, 1-3. ⁴ Gal 5, 2. ⁵ Is 59, 4-5.

indicates that it is correct to condemn heretics even after their death. Other most reverend bishops of Africa have also observed this church custom; moreover the holy church of Rome has issued anathemas against certain bishops even after they were dead, although they had not been accused on matters of faith while they were alive; the acts of our deliberations bear witness to both these cases. Since the followers of Theodore and his heresy, who are plainly opposed to the truth, have tried to adduce some sections of the writings of Cyril and Proclus of holy memory, as though these were in favour of Theodore, it is appropriate to apply to these attempts the observation of the prophet when he writes: *The ways of the Lord are right, and the upright walk in them, but transgressors stumble in them*¹. These followers have wilfully misunderstood what the holy fathers wrote, even though it was true and appropriate; they have quoted these writings, dissembling excuses for their own iniquities². It seems that the fathers did not lift the anathema against Theodore but rather used the language of concession in order to lead away from their mistake those who offered some defence of Nestorius and his heresy; their aim was to lead them to perfection and to instruct them that not only was Nestorius, the disciple of heresy, condemned but also his teacher Theodore. The fathers indicate their intention in this matter despite the conciliatory forms used: Theodore was to be anathematized. This has been very clearly shown to be the case by us in our acts from the works of Cyril and Proclus of blessed memory in respect of the condemnation of Theodore and his heresy. This conciliatory attitude is also to be found in the holy scriptures. The apostle Paul employed this tactic at the start of his ministry when he was dealing with those who had been Jews; he circumcised Timothy so that by this conciliation and concession he might lead them to perfection³. Afterwards, however, he ruled against circumcision, writing on the subject to the Galatians: *Now I Paul say to you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no advantage to you*⁴. We found that the defenders of Theodore have done exactly what the heretics were accustomed to do. They have tried to lift the anathema on the said heretical Theodore by omitting some of the things which the holy fathers had written, by including certain confusing falsehoods of their own, and by quoting a letter of Cyril of blessed memory, as if all this were the evidence of the fathers. The passages which they quoted made the truth absolutely clear once the omitted sections were put back in their proper place. The falsehoods were quite apparent when the true writings were collated. In this matter those who issued these empty statements are those who, in the words of scripture, *rely on lies, they make empty pleas; they conceive mischief and bring forth iniquity, they weave the spider's web*⁵.

After we had investigated in this way Theodore and his heresy, we took the trouble to quote and include in our acts a few of Theodoret's heretical writings against true faith, against the twelve chapters of holy Cyril and against the first synod of Ephesus. We also included some of Theodoret's writings on the side of the heretical Theodore and Nestorius so that it would be made clear, to the satisfaction of anyone reading our acts, that these opinions had been properly rejected and anathematized.

Thirdly, the letter which is alleged to have been written by Ibas to Mari the Persian was brought under scrutiny and we discovered that it too ought to be officially read out. When the letter was read out, its heretical character was

¹ Hos 14, 10. ² See Ps 140, 4. ³ See Ac 16, 1-3. ⁴ Gal 5, 2. ⁵ Is 59, 4-5.

hoc quaestione facta, condemnationem et anathematismum praedictorum trium capitulorum facere: sed quia Theodori et Nestorii impiorum defensores alio modo machinabantur confirmare eorum personas et impietatem et dicebant istam impiam epistolam, quae laudat et defendit Theodorum et Nestorium, et eorum impietatem, susceptam esse a sancto Chalcedonensi concilio; necessarium esse putavimus per omnia ostendere, liberam esse sanctam synodum ab impietate quae in epistola continetur, eo quod qui talia dicunt non favore sancti concilii hoc faciunt, sed ut per eius nomen suam impietatem confirmarent. Et ostendebatur in gestis quod et anterioribus temporibus accusatus est Ibas propter eandem impietatem, quae et in epistola continetur, primo quidem apud Proclum sanctae memoriae episcopum Constantinopolitanum, postea vero apud Theodosium pia recordationis, et Flavianum, qui post Proclum episcopus ordinatus est, qui et causae examinationem delegaverunt Photio episcopo Tyri, et Eustathio episcopo Berytorum civitatis. Postea vero inculpatus idem Ibas ab episcopatu deiectus est. His ita subsecutis, quomodo praesumunt aliqui dicere istam impiam epistolam susceptam esse a sancto Chalcedonensi concilio, eamque per omnia secutum esse sanctum Chalcedonense concilium? Tamen ne quaecumque remaneret occasio eis qui tales calumnias applicant sancto Chalcedonensi concilio, recitari perspeximus ea quae apud sanctas synodus, Ephesinam primam et Chalcedonensem, pro epistolis sanctae memoriae Cyrilli, et religiosae memoriae papae antiquioris Romae Leonis mota sunt. Et cum ex his accepissemus, quod non aliter oportet suscipi quae ab aliquo scribuntur, nisi prius rectae fidei sanctorum patrum consonare demonstrantur; interlocuti sumus recitari et definitionem, quae de fide exposita est a sancto Chalcedonensi concilio, ut conferantur quae in epistola, et quae in definitione continentur. Quo facto demonstratum et contrariam per omnia epistolam esse his quae in definitione continentur. Nam definitio quidem consonat his quae iudicata sunt pro una eademque fide tam a trecentis decem et octo sanctis patribus, quam a centum quinquaginta, et his qui prius Ephesi convenerunt: impia autem epistola illa continet quae Theodorus et Nestorius haeretici blasphemaverunt, et defendit eos, et doctores sibi adscribit; sanctos autem patres haeticos vocat. Et illud autem omnibus facimus manifestum, quod nec patres interlocutionum unius vel secundi, quibus utuntur Theodori et Nestorii sequaces praeterire sustinimus, sed et istis, et aliis omnibus interlocutionibus in medio prolatis, et his quae eis continentur consideratis, invenimus quod non aliter passi sunt praedictum Iban. suscipere, priusquam exegissent eum Nestorium et impia eius dogmata, quae in epistola vindicantur, anathematizare. Et hoc fecerunt tam alii religiosi episcopi praedicti sancti concilii, quam illi duo, quorum interlocutionibus quidam uti conantur. Hoc enim et in Theodorito observaverunt, et exegerunt eum anathematizare ea pro quibus accusabatur. Si igitur Iban non alio modo suscipere sustinuissent, nisi impietatem, quae in epistola continetur, condemnasset, et subscripsisset definitioni quae pro fide a sancto concilio data est, quomodo conantur dicere, susceptam esse impiam epistolam ab eodem sancto concilio? *Quae enim, ut vere dicamus, participat*

immediately apparent to everyone. Until this time there had been some dispute as to whether the aforesaid three chapters ought to be condemned and anathematized. Since the supporters of the heretics Theodore and Nestorius were conspiring to strengthen in another way the case of these men and their heresy, and were alleging that this heretical letter, which approves and defends Theodore and Nestorius, had been accepted by the holy council of Chalcedon, it was therefore necessary for us to demonstrate that that holy synod was unaffected by the heresy which is present in that letter, and that clearly those who make such allegations are doing so not with the assistance of the holy council but so as to give some support to their own heresy by associating it with the name of Chalcedon. It was demonstrated in our acts that Ibas was previously accused of the same heresy which is contained in this letter. This accusation was levelled first by Proclus of holy memory, bishop of Constantinople, and afterwards by Theodosius of blessed memory and Flavian, the bishop there after Proclus, both of whom gave the task of examining the whole matter to Photius, bishop of Tyre, and to Eustathius, bishop of the city of Beirut. When Ibas was later found to be blameworthy, he was deposed from the episcopate. This being the state of affairs, how could anyone be so bold as to allege that that heretical letter was accepted by the holy council of Chalcedon or that the holy council of Chalcedon agreed with it in its entirety? So as to prevent those who misrepresent the holy council of Chalcedon in this way from having any further opportunity to do so, we instructed that there should be a formal reading of the official pronouncements of the holy synods, namely the first of Ephesus and that of Chalcedon, on the subject of the letters of Cyril of holy memory and of Leo of blessed memory, formerly pope of older Rome. We gathered from these authorities that nothing which has been written by anyone ought to be accepted unless it has been shown conclusively that it is in accord with the true faith of the holy fathers. Therefore we broke off from our deliberations so as to reiterate in a formal declaration the definition of faith which was promulgated by the holy council of Chalcedon. We compared what was written in the letter with this official statement. When this comparison was made, it was quite apparent that the contents of the letter were quite contradictory to those of the definition of faith. The definition was in accord with the unique, permanent faith set out by the 318 holy fathers, and by the 150, and by those who gathered for the first council at Ephesus. The heretical letter, on the other hand, included the blasphemies of the heretical Theodore and Nestorius and even gave support to them and describes them as doctors, while it condemns the holy fathers as heretics. We make it quite clear to everyone that we do not intend to omit what the fathers had to say in the first and second investigations, which are adduced by the supporters of Theodore and Nestorius in support of their case. Rather these statements and all the others were formally read out and what they contained was submitted to official scrutiny, and we found that they had not allowed the said Ibas to be accepted until they had obliged him to anathematize Nestorius and his heretical doctrines which were affirmed in that letter. This was the view not only of the two bishops whose interventions some have tried to misapply but also of the other religious bishops of that holy council. They also acted thus in the case of Theodoret and insisted that he anathematize those opinions about which he was accused. If they would permit the acceptance of Ibas only if he condemned the heresy which was to be found in his letter, and on condition that he subscribed to a definition of faith set out by the council, how can an attempt be made to allege that this heretical letter was accepted by the same holy council? We are rightly told: *What partnership*

*tio est iustitiae et iniquitatis? et quae societas est luci cum tenebris? quae autem conventio est Christi cum Belial? aut quae pars est fidei cum infideli? quae autem est commixtio templo Dei cum idolis?*¹

Repetitis igitur omnibus quae apud nos acta sunt, iterum confitemur, quod suscipimus sanctas quatuor synodos, id est, Nicaenam, Constantinopolitanam, Ephesinam primam, et Chalcedonensem, et quae pro una eademque fide definierunt, praedicavimus et praedicamus. Eos autem qui haec non suscipiunt, alienos catholicae ecclesiae iudicamus. Condemnamus autem et anathematizamus una cum omnibus aliis haereticis qui condemnati et anathematizati sunt a praedictis sanctis quatuor conciliis, et a sancta catholica et apostolica ecclesia, et Theodorum qui Mopsuestiae episcopus fuit, et impia eius conscripta, et quae impie Theodoritus conscripsit contra rectam fidem, et contra duodecim capitula sancti Cyrilli, et contra Ephesinam primam synodum, et quae ad defensionem Theodori et Nestorii ab eo scripta sunt. Super haec anathematizamus et impiam epistolam, quam dicitur Ibas ad Marim Persam scripsisse, quae denegat Deum Verbum de sancta Dei genitrice et semper virgine Maria incarnatum, hominem factum esse; et sanctae memoriae Cyrillum, qui recte docuit, tamquam haereticum, et similiter Apollinario scribentem, criminatur; et inculpat quidem Ephesinam primam synodum, tamquam sine examinatione et quaestione Nestorio ab ea deposito, et duodecim sancti Cyrilli capitula impia et contraria rectae fidei vocat; defendit autem Theodorum et Nestorium, et impia eorum dogmata et conscripta. Praedicta igitur tria capitula anathematizamus, id est, Theodorum impium Mopsuestenum cum nefandis eius conscriptis, et quae impie Theodoritus conscripsit, et impiam epistolam, quae dicitur Ibae, et defensores eorum, et qui scripserunt vel scribunt ad defensionem eorum, vel recta ea dicere praesumunt, vel omnino impietatem eorum nomine sanctorum patrum, aut sancti Chalcedonensis concilii defenderunt, aut defendere conantur.

His ita cum omni subtilitate dispositis, in memoria tenentes promissiones de sancta ecclesia factas, et qui dixit, quod *portae inferi non praevalent adversus eam*², id est, haereticorum mortiferae linguae; recordantes autem et quae per Oseam de ea prophetata sunt, in quibus dicit: *Et sponsabo te mihi in fide, et cognosces Dominum*³; haereticorum quidem effrenatas linguas, et eorum impiissima conscripta, et eosdem ipsos haereticos, qui usque ad mortem in sua impietate permanserunt, patri mendacii diabolo⁴ connumerantes, illis dicemus: *Ecce omnes vos ignem accenditis, et convalescere facitis flammam ignis: ambulabitis in lumine ignis vestri, et per flammam accenditis*⁵. Nos autem mandatum habentes, per doctrinam rectam exhortari populum⁶, et loqui in cor Ierusalem⁷, id est, Dei ecclesiam, merito seminare quidem in iustitia⁸ festinamus, vindemiantes fructum vitae, et illuminantes nobisipsis lumen scientiae, ex divinis scripturis, et patrum doctrina, necessarium esse putavimus capitulis comprehendere et praedicationem veritatis, et haereticorum, necnon eorum impietatis condemnationem.

¹ 2 Cor 6, 14-16. ² Mt 16, 18. ³ Os 2, 20. ⁴ Cf. Io 4, 44.

⁵ Is 50, 11. ⁶ Cf. Tt 1, 9. ⁷ Cf. Is 40, 2. ⁸ Cf. Os 10, 12.

*has righteousness with iniquity? Or what fellowship has light with darkness? What accord has Christ with Belial? Or what has a believer in common with an unbeliever? What participation has the temple of God with idols?*¹

Now that we have given the details of what our council has achieved, we repeat our formal confession that we accept the four holy synods, that is, of Nicaea, of Constantinople, the first of Ephesus, and of Chalcedon. Our teaching is and has been all that they have defined concerning the one faith. We consider those who do not respect these things as foreign to the catholic church. Furthermore, we condemn and anathematize, along with all other heretics who have been condemned and anathematized by the same four holy councils and by the holy, catholic and apostolic church, Theodore, formerly bishop of Mopsuestia, and his heretical writings, and also what Theodoret heretically wrote against the true faith, against the twelve chapters of holy Cyril and against the first synod of Ephesus, and we condemn also what he wrote defending Theodore and Nestorius. Additionally, we anathematize the heretical letter which Ibas is alleged to have written to Mari the Persian. This letter denies that God the Word was made incarnate of the ever virgin Mary, the holy mother of God, and that he was made man. It also condemns as a heretic Cyril of holy memory, who taught the truth, and suggests that he held the same opinions as Apollinarius. The letter condemns the first synod of Ephesus for deposing Nestorius without proper process and investigation. It calls the twelve chapters of holy Cyril heretical and contrary to the orthodox faith, while it supports Theodore and Nestorius and their heretical teachings and writings. Consequently we anathematize the aforesaid three chapters, that is, the heretical Theodore of Mopsuestia along with his detestable writings, and the heretical writings of Theodoret, and the heretical letter which Ibas is alleged to have written. We anathematize the supporters of these works and those who write or have written in defence of them, or who are bold enough to claim that they are orthodox, or who have defended or tried to defend their heresy in the names of holy fathers or of the holy council of Chalcedon.

These matters having been treated with thorough-going exactness, we bear in mind what was promised about the holy church and him who said that *the gates of hell will not prevail against it*² (by these we understand the death-dealing tongues of heretics); we also bear in mind what was prophesied about the church by Hosea when he said, *I shall betroth you to me in faithfulness and you shall know the Lord*³; and we count along with the devil, the father of lies⁴, the uncontrolled tongues of heretics and their heretical writings, together with the heretics themselves who have persisted in their heresy even to death. So we declare to them: *Behold all you who kindle a fire, who set brands alight! Walk by the light of your fire, and by the brands which you have kindled!*⁵ Since we are under command to encourage the people with orthodox teaching⁶ and to speak to the heart of Jerusalem⁷, that is the church of God, we very properly hurry to sow in righteousness⁸ and to reap the fruit of life. In doing this we are lighting for ourselves the lamp of knowledge from the scriptures and the teachings of the fathers. It has therefore seemed necessary to us to sum up in certain statements both our declarations of the truth and our condemnations of heretics and their heretical teachings.

¹ 2 Cor 6, 14-16. ² Mt 16, 18. ³ Hos 2, 20. ⁴ See Jn 4, 44.
⁵ Is 50, 11. ⁶ See Tt 1, 9. ⁷ See Is 40, 2. ⁸ See Hos 10, 12.

Ἀναθεματισμοὶ κατὰ τῶν τριῶν
κεφαλαίων

Anathematismi adversus „tria Capitula“

α'

I

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ πατρός καὶ υἱοῦ
καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος μίαν φύσιν, ἦτοι
5 οὐσίαν, μίαν τε δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν,
τριάδα ὁμοούσιον, μίαν θεότητα ἐν
τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν, ἤγουν προσώ-
ποις, προσκυνουμένην, ὁ τοιοῦτος
ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Si quis non confitetur Patris et Filii
et Spiritus sancti unam naturam sive
substantiam, et unam virtutem et
potestatem, trinitatem consubstan-
tialem, unam deitatem in tribus sub-
sistentiis sive personis adorandam,
talīs a. s.

10 Εἰς γὰρ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ
πάντα, καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χρι-
στός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα
ἁγίον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα¹.

Unus enim Deus et Pater, ex quo
omnia, et unus dominus Iesus Chri-
stus, per quem omnia, et unus Spi-
ritus sanctus, in quo omnia¹.

β'

II

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου
εἶναι τὰς δύο γεννήσεις, τὴν τε πρὸ
αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀχρόνως καὶ
ἄσωμάτως, τὴν τε ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν
ἡμερῶν² τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατελθόντος ἐκ
τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντος ἐκ τῆς
20 ἁγίας ἐνδόξου θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρ-
θένου Μαρίας, καὶ γεννηθέντος ἐξ
αὐτῆς, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Si quis non confitetur Dei Verbi du-
as esse natiuitates, unam quidem
ante saecula ex Patre sine tempore
incorporaliter, alteram vero in ulti-
mis diebus² eiusdem ipsius qui de
caelis descendit, et incarnatus de
sancta gloriosa Dei genitrice et sem-
per virgine Maria, natus est ex ipsa,
talīs a. s.

γ'

III

Εἴ τις λέγει ἄλλον εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν
θαυματουργήσαντα, καὶ ἄλλον τὸν
25 Χριστὸν τὸν παθόντα, ἢ τὸν θεὸν
λόγον συνεῖναι λέγει τῷ Χριστῷ
γενομένῳ ἐκ γυναικός, ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ
εἶναι ὡς ἄλλον ἐν ἄλλῳ· ἀλλ' οὐχ ἓνα
καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν
30 Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, σαρκω-
θέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, καὶ τοῦ
αὐτοῦ τὰ τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ πάθη,
ἅπερ ἐκουσίως ὑπέμεινε σαρκί, ὁ τοι-
οῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Si quis dicit alium esse Deum Ver-
bum qui miracula fecit, et alium
Christum qui passus est, vel Deum
Verbum cum Christo esse nascente
de muliere, vel in ipso esse ut alte-
rum in altero, et non unum eun-
demque dominum nostrum Iesum
Christum, Dei Verbum incarnatum
et hominem factum, et eiusdem ip-
sius miracula, et passiones quas vo-
luntarie carne sustinuit, talīs a. s.

δ'

IV

Εἴ τις λέγει κατὰ χάριν ἢ κατ' ἐνέρ-
γειαν ἢ κατ' ἰσοτιμίαν ἢ κατὰ ἀβθεν-

Si quis dicit secundum gratiam vel
secundum operationem vel secun-

¹ Cf. 1 Cor 8, 6. ² Cf. Heb 1, 2.

Anathemas against the "Three Chapters"

1

If anyone will not confess that the Father, Son and holy Spirit have one nature or substance, that they have one power and authority, that there is a consubstantial Trinity, one Deity to be adored in three subsistences or persons: let him be anathema.

There is only one God and Father, from whom all things come, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things are, and one holy Spirit, in whom all things are¹.

2

If anyone will not confess that the Word of God has two natiivities, that which is before all ages from the Father, outside time and without a body, and secondly that nativity of these latter days² when the Word of God came down from the heavens and was made flesh of holy and glorious Mary, mother of God and ever-virgin, and was born from her: let him be anathema.

3

If anyone declares that the [Word] of God who works miracles is not identical with the Christ who suffered, or alleges that God the Word was with the Christ who was born of woman, or was in him in the way that one might be in another, but that our lord Jesus Christ was not one and the same, the Word of God incarnate and made man, and that the miracles and the sufferings which he voluntarily underwent in the flesh were not of the same person: let him be anathema.

4

If anyone declares that it was only in respect of grace, or of principle of action, or of dignity or in respect of equality of honour, or in respect of authority, or of

¹ See 1 Cor 8, 6.

² See Heb 1, 2.

τιαν ἢ ἀναφορὰν ἢ σχέσιν ἢ δύναμιν, τὴν ἔνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι· ἢ κατὰ εὐδοκίαν, ὡς ἀρεσθέντος τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐ καὶ καλῶς δόξαι αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ, καθὼς Θεόδωρος μαινόμενος λέγει· ἢ κατὰ ὁμωμυμίαν, καθ' ἣν οἱ Nestorianοὶ τὸν θεὸν λόγον Ἰησοῦν^α καὶ Χριστὸν καλοῦντες, καὶ τὸν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον κεχωρισμένως Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ὀνομάζοντες, καὶ δύο πρόσωπα προφανῶς λέγοντες, κατὰ μόνην τὴν προσγορίαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀξίαν καὶ προσκύνησιν καὶ ἐν πρόσωπον καὶ ἓνα Χριστὸν ὑποκρίνονται λέγειν· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν ἔνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς σάρκα ἐμψυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ καὶ νοερᾷ κατὰ σύνθεσιν, ἢ γοῦν καθ' ὑπόστασιν γεγενῆσθαι, καθὼς οἱ ἄγιοι πατέρες ἐδίδαξαν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν, ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, εἷς τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Πολυτρόπως γὰρ νοουμένης τῆς ἐνώσεως, οἱ μὲν τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ Ἀπολλιναρίου καὶ Εὐτυχοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ ἀφανισμῷ τῶν συνελθόντων προκείμενοι^β τὴν κατὰ σύγχυσιν τὴν ἔνωσιν πρεσβεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὰ Θεοδώρου καὶ Nestorίου φρονοῦντες, τῇ διαίρεσει χαίροντες, σχετικὴν τὴν ἔνωσιν ἐπεισάγουσιν· ἢ μέντοι ἁγία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησία ἐκατέρας αἰρέσεως τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἀποβαλλομένη, τὴν ἔνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὴν σάρκα κατὰ σύνθεσιν ὁμολογεῖ, ἢπερ ἔστι καθ' ὑπόστασιν. Ἡ γὰρ κατὰ σύνθεσιν ἔνωσις ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν μυστηρίου, οὐ μόνον ἀσύγχυτα τὰ συνελθόντα διαφυλάττει, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ διαίρεσιν ἐπιδέχεται.

^α υἱὸν v. l. Msi ^β lege προσκείμενοι ^γ omittit τὴν ^α confitentur Msi

dum dignitatem vel secundum aequalitatem honoris vel secundum auctoritatem aut relationem aut affectionem aut virtutem, unionem Dei Verbi ad hominem factam esse, vel secundum bonam voluntatem, quasi quod placuit Deo Verbo homo, eo quod bene visum est ei de ipso, sicut Theodorus dicit; vel secundum homonymiam per quam nestoriani Deum Verbum Filium et Christum vocantes, et hominem separatim Christum et Filium nominantes, et duas personas evidenter dicentes, per solam nominationem et honorem et dignitatem et adorationem, unam personam, unum Filium et unum Christum confingunt dicere: sed non confitentur unitatem Dei Verbi ad carnem animatam anima rationabili et intellectuali, secundum compositionem sive secundum subsistentiam factam esse, sicut sancti patres docuerunt, et ideo unam eius subsistentiam compositam, qui est dominus noster Iesus Christus, unus de sancta Trinitate, talis a. s.

Cum enim multis modis unitas intelligitur, qui impietatem Apollinarii et Eutychetis sequuntur, interemptionem eorum quae convenerunt colentes, unionem secundum confusionem dicunt; Theodori autem et Nestorii sequaces, divisione gaudentes, affectualem unitatem introducunt. Sancta Dei ecclesia, utriusque perfidiae impietatem reiiciens, unionem Dei Verbi ad carnem secundum compositionem confitentur, quod est secundum subsistentiam. Unitio enim per compositionem in mysterio Christi non solum inconfuse ea quae convenerunt conservat, sed nec divisionem suscipit.

some relation, or of some affection or power that there was a unity made between the Word of God and the man; or if anyone alleges that it is in respect of good will, as if God the Word was pleased with the man, because he was well and properly disposed to God, as Theodore claims in his madness; or if anyone says that this union is only a sort of synonymity, as the Nestorians allege, who call the Word of God Jesus^a and Christ, and even designate the human separately by the names "Christ" and "Son", discussing quite obviously two different persons, and only pretending to speak of one person and one Christ when the reference is to his title, honour, dignity or adoration; finally if anyone does not accept the teaching of the holy fathers that the union occurred of the Word of God with human flesh which is possessed by a rational and intellectual soul, and that this union is by synthesis or by person, and that therefore there is only one person, namely the lord Jesus Christ, one member of the holy Trinity: let him be anathema.

The notion of "union" can be understood in many different ways. The supporters of the wickedness of Apollinarius and Eutyches have asserted that the union is produced by a confusing of the uniting elements, as they advocate the disappearance of the elements that unite. Those who follow Theodore and Nestorius, rejoicing in the division, have brought in a union which is only by affection. The holy church of God, rejecting the wickedness of both sorts of heresy, states her belief in a union between the Word of God and human flesh which is by synthesis, that is by a union of subsistence. In the mystery of Christ the union of synthesis not only conserves without confusing the elements that come together but also allows no division.

^a Son variant reading in Msi.

ε'

Εἰ τις τὴν μίαν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ κυρίου
 ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οὕτως ἐκλαμ-
 βάνει, ὡς ἐπιδεχομένην πολλῶν ὑπο-
 στάσεων σημασίαν καὶ διὰ τούτου
 5 εἰσάγειν ἐπιχειρεῖ ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ Χρι-
 στὸν μυστηρίου δύο ὑποστάσεις, ἦτοι
 δύο πρόσωπα, καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ
 εἰσαγομένων δύο προσώπων ἐν πρό-
 σωπον λέγει κατὰ ἀξίαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ
 10 προσκύνησιν, καθάπερ Θεόδωρος καὶ
 Νεστόριος μαινόμενοι συνεγράψαντο,
 καὶ συκοφαντεῖ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν Καλχη-
 δόνη σύνοδον, ὡς κατὰ ταύτην τὴν
 ἀσεβῆ ἔννοιαν χρησαμένην τῷ τῆς μιᾶς
 15 ὑποστάσεως ῥήματι· ἀλλὰ μὴ ὁμο-
 λογεῖ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον σαρκὶ καθ'
 ὑπόστασιν ἐνωθῆναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο
 μίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν, ἦτοι ἐν
 πρόσωπον· οὕτως τε καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν
 20 ἐν Καλχηδόνη σύνοδον μίαν ὑπόστασιν
 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμο-
 λογεῖσαι, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Οὔτε γὰρ προσθήκην προσώπου,
 25 ἤγουν ὑποστάσεως, ἐπεδέξατο ἡ ἁγία
 τριάς, καὶ σαρκωθέντος τοῦ ἐνὸς τῆς
 ἁγίας τριάδος θεοῦ λόγου.

ς'

Εἰ τις καταχρηστικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐκ
 ἀληθῶς θεοτόκον λέγει τὴν ἁγίαν
 30 ἐνδοξον ἀειπάρθενον Μαρίαν, ἢ κατὰ
 ἀναφοράν, ὡς ἀνθρώπου ψιλοῦ γεν-
 νηθέντος, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου
 σαρκωθέντος καὶ τῆς ἐξ αὐτῆς,
 ἀναφερομένης δὲ κατ' ἐκείνους τῆς^α
 35 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου γεννήσεως ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν
 λόγον, ὡς συνόντα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ
 γενομένῳ· καὶ συκοφαντεῖ τὴν ἁγίαν
 ἐν Καλχηδόνη σύνοδον, ὡς κατὰ ταύ-
 την τὴν ἀσεβῆ ἐπινοηθεῖσαν παρὰ
 40 Θεοδώρου ἔννοιαν, θεοτόκον τὴν παρ-
 θένον εἰποῦσαν· ἢ εἰ τις ἀνθρωποτόκον
 αὐτὴν καλεῖ ἢ χριστοτόκον, ὡς τοῦ

^α omittit τῆς

V

Si quis unam subsistentiam domini
 nostri Iesu Christi sic intelligit, tan-
 quam suscipientem plurimarum sub-
 sistentiarum significationem, et per
 hoc introducere conatur in mysterio
 Christi duas subsistentias, seu duas
 personas, et duarum personarum
 quas introducit, unam personam
 dicit secundum dignitatem et ho-
 norem et adorationem, sicut Theo-
 dorus et Nestorius insanientes con-
 scripserunt et calumniantur sanctam
 Chalcedonensem synodum tanquam
 secundum istum impium intellec-
 tum, unius subsistentiae utentem
 vocabulo, sed non confitetur Dei
 Verbum carni secundum subsistentiam
 unitum esse et propter hoc
 unam eius subsistentiam seu unam
 personam, et sic et sanctum Chalce-
 donense concilium unam subsistentiam
 domini nostri Iesu Christi con-
 fessum esse, talis a. s.

Nec enim adiectionem personae
 vel subsistentiae suscepit sancta
 Trinitas ex incarnato uno de sancta
 Trinitate Deo Verbo.

VI

Si quis abusive et non vere Dei geni-
 tricem dicit sanctam gloriosam sem-
 per virginem Mariam, vel secundum
 relationem, quasi homine puro
 nato, sed non Deo Verbo incarnato
 et nato ex ipsa, referenda autem,
 sicut illi dicunt, hominis nativitate
 ad Deum Verbum, eo quod cum
 homine erat nascente, et calumni-
 atur sanctam Chalcedonensem syn-
 odum, tanquam secundum istum im-
 pium intellectum, quem Theodorus
 execrandus adinvenit, Dei genitri-
 cem Virginem dicentem, vel qui
 hominis genitricem vocat, aut Chri-

5

If anyone understands by the single subsistence of our lord Jesus Christ that it covers the meaning of many subsistences, and by this argument tries to introduce into the mystery of Christ two subsistences or two persons, and having brought in two persons then talks of one person only in respect of dignity, honour or adoration, as both Theodore and Nestorius have written in their madness; if anyone falsely represents the holy synod of Chalcedon, making out that it accepted this heretical view by its terminology of "one subsistence", and if he does not acknowledge that the Word of God is united with human flesh by subsistence, and that on account of this there is only one subsistence or one person, and that the holy synod of Chalcedon thus made a formal statement of belief in the single subsistence of our lord Jesus Christ: let him be anathema.

There has been no addition of person or subsistence to the holy Trinity even after one of its members, God the Word, becoming human flesh.

6

If anyone declares that it can be only inexactly and not truly said that the holy and glorious ever-virgin Mary is the mother of God, or says that she is so only in some relative way, considering that she bore a mere man and that God the Word was not made into human flesh in her, holding rather that the nativity of a man from her was referred, as they say, to God the Word as he was with the man who came into being; if anyone misrepresents the holy synod of Chalcedon, alleging that it claimed that the virgin was the mother of God only according to that heretical understanding which the blasphemous Theodore put forward; or if anyone says that she is the mother of a man or the Christ-bearer, that is the mother of Christ, suggesting that Christ is not God; and does not formally

Χριστοῦ μὴ ὄντος θεοῦ· ἀλλὰ μὴ κυ-
ρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν θεοτόκον
αὐτὴν ὁμολογεῖ, διὰ τὸ τὸν πρὸ αἰώ-
νων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα θεὸν
λόγον ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐξ
αὐτῆς σαρκώθη, οὕτω τε εὐσεβῶς
καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν Καλχηδόνι σύνοδον
θεοτόκον αὐτὴν ὁμολογήσαι, ὁ τοιοῦ-
τος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ζ'

Εἴ τις ἐν δύο φύσει λέγων, μὴ ὡς ἐν
θεότητι καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι τὸν ἕνα
κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν γνωρί-
ζεσθαι ὁμολογεῖ, ἕνα διὰ τούτου
σημαίνῃ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν φύσεων,
ἐξ ὧν ἀσυγχύτως ἡ ἄφραστος ἔνωσις
γέγονεν, οὕτε τοῦ λόγου εἰς τὴν τῆς
σαρκὸς μεταποιηθέντος φύσιν, οὕτε
τῆς σαρκὸς πρὸς τὴν τοῦ λόγου φύσιν
μεταχωρησάσης, (μένει γὰρ ἐκότερον
ὑπερ ἑστὶ τῇ φύσει καὶ γενομένης τῆς
ἐνώσεως καθ' ὑπόστασιν) ἀλλ' ἐπὶ
διαίρεσει τῇ ἀνά μέρος τὴν τοιαύτην
λαμβάνει φωνὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν
μυστηρίου· ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν φύσεων
ὁμολογῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνὸς κυρίου
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου
σαρκωθέντος, μὴ τῇ θεωρίᾳ μόνῃ τὴν
διαφορὰν τούτων λαμβάνει, ἐξ ὧν καὶ
συνετέθη, οὐκ ἀναιρουμένην διὰ τὴν
ἔνωσιν, (εἰς γὰρ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν καὶ δι'
ἐνὸς ἀμφοτέρω) ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ κέ-
χρηται τῷ ἀριθμῷ, ὡς κευωρισμένως
καὶ ιδιούποστάτους ἔχει τὰς φύσεις,
ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

η'

Εἴ τις ἐκ δύο φύσεων, θεότητος καὶ
ἀνθρωπότητος ὁμολογῶν τὴν ἔνωσιν
γεγενῆσθαι, ἢ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ
λόγου σεσαρκωμένην λέγων, μὴ οὕτως
αὐτὰ λαμβάνῃ, καθάπερ καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι
πατέρες ἐδίδαξαν, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς θείας
φύσεως καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης τῆς
ἐνώσεως καθ' ὑπόστασιν γενομένης,

stotocon, id est Christi genitricem,
tanquam si Christus Deus non esset,
et non proprie et vere Dei genitri-
cem ipsam confitetur, eo quod ipse
qui ante saecula ex Patre natus est
Deus Verbum, in ultimis diebus ex
ipsa incarnatus et natus est, et sic
pie et sanctam Chalcedonensem
synodum Dei genitricem eam esse
confessam, talis a. s.

VII

Si quis in duabus naturis dicens,
non ut in deitate et humanitate
unum dominum nostrum Iesum
Christum cognosci confitetur, ut
per hoc significet differentiam natu-
rarum, in quibus inconfuse ineffa-
bilis unio facta est, neque Deo
Verbo in carnis naturam transmu-
tato, neque carne in verbi naturam
transducta, (manet enim utrumque
hoc quod est natura, etiam facta
unitate secundum subsistentiam)
sed pro divisione per partem, talem
excipit vocem in mysterio Christi,
vel numerum naturarum confitendo
in eodem domino nostro Iesu Chri-
sto Deo Verbo incarnato, non in-
tellectu tantummodo differentiam
excipit earum ex quibus et compo-
situs est, non interemptam propter
unitatem, (unus enim ex utroque et
per unum utraque) sed in hoc nu-
mero utitur, ut separatim unaqua-
que natura suam habente subsisten-
tiam, talis a. s.

VIII

Si quis ex duabus naturis deitatis et
humanitatis confitens unitatem fac-
tam esse, vel unam naturam Dei
Verbi incarnatam dicens, non sic ea
excipit, sicut patres docuerunt,
quod ex divina natura et humana,
unione secundum subsistentiam
facta, unus Christus effectus est,

confess that she is properly and truly the mother of God, because he who before
all ages was born of the Father, God the Word, has been made into human flesh
in these latter days and has been born to her, and it was in this religious
understanding that the holy synod of Chalcedon formally stated its belief that
she was the mother of God: let him be anathema.

7

If anyone, when speaking about the two natures, does not confess a belief in our
one lord Jesus Christ, understood in both his divinity and his humanity, so as by
this to signify a difference of natures of which an ineffable union has been made,
without confusion, in which neither the nature of the Word was changed into that
of the Word (each remained what it was by nature, even after the union, as this
had been made in respect of subsistence); and if anyone understands the two
natures in the mystery of Christ in the sense of a division into parts, or if he
expresses his belief in the plural natures in the same lord Jesus Christ, God the
Word made flesh, but does not consider the difference of those natures, of which
he is composed, to be only in the onlooker's mind, a difference which is not
compromised by the union (for he is one from both and the two exist through
the one) but uses the plurality to suggest that each nature is possessed separately
and has a subsistence of its own: let him be anathema.

8

If anyone confesses a belief that a union has been made out of the two natures,
divinity and humanity, or speaks about the one nature of God the Word made
flesh, but does not understand these things according to what the fathers have
taught, namely that from the divine and human natures a union was made
according to subsistence, and that one Christ was formed, and from these

εἰς Χριστὸς ἀπετελέσθη· ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν
τοιούτων φωνῶν μίαν φύσιν, ἤτοι
οὐσίαν, θεότητος καὶ σαρκὸς τοῦ
Χριστοῦ εἰσάγειν ἐπιχειρεῖ, ὁ τοιοῦ-
τος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

5 Καθ' ὑπόστασιν γὰρ λέγοντες τὸν
μονογενῆ λόγον ἠνώσθαι, οὐκ ἀνάχυσιν
τινα τὴν εἰς ἀλλήλους^α τῶν φύσεων
πεπραῆχθαί φαμεν, μενούσης δὲ μᾶλ-
10 λον ἑκατέρας ὅπερ ἔστιν, ἠνώσθαι
σαρκὶ νοοῦμεν τὸν λόγον· διὸ καὶ εἰς
ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός, θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος,
ὁ αὐτὸς ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν
θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν ὁ αὐτὸς
15 κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. Ἐπίσης γὰρ
καὶ τοὺς ἀνά μέρος διαιροῦντας, ἤτοι
τέμνοντας, καὶ τοὺς συγγέοντας τὸ
τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας μυστήριον τοῦ
Χριστοῦ, ἀποστρέφεται καὶ ἀναθεμα-
20 τίζει ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησία.

θ'

Εἴ τις προσκυνεῖσθαι ἐν δυοῖ φύσεσι
λέγει τὸν Χριστόν, ἐξ οὗ δύο προσκυ-
25 νήσεις εἰσάγονται, ἰδίᾳ τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ
καὶ ἰδίᾳ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· ἢ εἴ τις ἐπι-
ἀναιρέσει τῆς σαρκὸς ἢ ἐπι συγ-
χύσει τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρω-
πότητος, ἢ μίαν φύσιν, ἤγουν οὐσίαν,
30 τῶν συνελθόντων τερατευόμενος, οὐ-
τῶ προσκυνεῖ τὸν Χριστόν· ἀλλ' οὐχὶ
μιᾶ προσκυνήσει τὸν θεὸν λόγον σαρκω-
θέντα μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς
προσκυνεῖ, καθάπερ ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ-
35 κλησία παρέλαβεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ὁ τοιοῦ-
τος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ι'

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν ἑσταυρωμέ-
νον σαρκὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χρι-
στὸν εἶναι θεὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ κύριον
40 τῆς δόξης καὶ ἓνα τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος,
ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

^α lege ἀλλήλας

^α deest in Msi (= τῆς σαρκὸς)

sed ex talibus vocibus unam natu-
ram sive substantiam deitatis et car-
nis Christi introducere conatur, ta-
lis a. s.

Secundum subsistentiam enim di-
centes unigenitum Deum Verbum
carni unitum esse, non confusio-
nem aliquam naturarum in se invi-
cem factam esse dicimus, sed magis
permanente utraque hoc quod est,
unitum esse carni Deum Verbum
intelligimus. Propter quod et unus
est Christus, Deus et homo, idem
ipse consubstantialis Patri secundum
deitatem, et consubstantialis nobis
idem ipse secundum humanitatem.
Aequaliter enim et eos qui
per partem dividunt vel incidunt,
et eos qui confundunt divinae dis-
pensationis mysterium Christi, rei-
cit et anathematizat Dei ecclesia.

IX

Si quis in duabus naturis adorari di-
cit Christum, ex quo duas adoratio-
nes introducunt, separatim Deo
Verbo et separatim homini; vel si
quis ad interemptionem carnis^a vel
ad confusionem deitatis et humani-
tatis unam naturam sive substanti-
am eorum quae convenerunt intro-
ducens, sic Christum adorat, sed
non una adoratione Deum Verbum
incarnatum cum propria ipsius carne
adorat, sicut ab initio Dei ecclesiae
traditum est, talis a. s.

X

Si quis non confitetur dominum
nostrum Iesum Christum, qui cruci-
fixus est carne, Deum esse verum,
et Dominum gloriae, et unum de
sancta Trinitate, talis a. s.

expressions tries to introduce one nature or substance made of the deity and human flesh of Christ: let him be anathema.

In saying that it was in respect of subsistence that the only-begotten God the Word was united, we are not alleging that there was a confusion made of each of the natures into one another, but rather that each of the two remained what it was, and in this way we understand that the Word was united to human flesh. So there is only one Christ, God and man, the same being consubstantial with the Father in respect of his divinity, and also consubstantial with us in respect of our humanity. Both those who divide or split up the mystery of the divine dispensation of Christ and those who introduce into that mystery some confusion are equally rejected and anathematized by the church of God.

9

If anyone says that Christ is to be worshipped in his two natures, and by that wishes to introduce two adorations, a separate one for God the Word and another for the man; or if anyone, so as to remove the human flesh or to mix up the divinity and the humanity, monstrously invents one nature or substance brought together from the two, and so worships Christ, but not by a single adoration God the Word in human flesh along with his human flesh, as has been the tradition of the church from the beginning: let him be anathema.

10

If anyone does not confess his belief that our lord Jesus Christ, who was crucified in his human flesh, is truly God and the Lord of glory and one of the members of the holy Trinity: let him be anathema.

ια'

XI

Εἴ τις μὴ ἀναθεματίζει Ἄρειον, Εὐνόμιον, Μακεδόνιον, Ἀπολλινάριον, Νεστόριον, Εὐτυχεᾶ καὶ Ὀριγένην, μετὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτῶν συγγραμμάτων, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας αἰρετικούς, τοὺς κατακριθέντας καὶ ἀναθεματισθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῶν προειρημένων ἁγίων τεσσάρων συνόδων, καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια τῶν προειρημένων αἰρετικῶν φρονήσαντας ἢ φρονοῦντας, καὶ μέχρι τέλους τῆ οἰκείᾳ ἀσεβείᾳ ἐμμέναντας, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ιβ'

XII

Εἴ τις ἀντιποιεῖται Θεοδώρου τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς τοῦ Μοψουεστίας, τοῦ εἰπόντος ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν λόγον καὶ ἄλλον τὸν Χριστὸν, ὑπὸ παθῶν ψυχῆς καὶ τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐνοχλούμενον καὶ τῶν χειρόνων κατὰ μικρὸν χωριζόμενον, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ προκοπῆς ἔργων βελτιωθέντα καὶ ἐκ πολιτείας ἄμωμον καταστάντα, ὡς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον βαπτισθῆναι εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαβεῖν καὶ υἰοθεσίας ἀξιωθῆναι, καὶ κατ' ἰσότητα βασιλικῆς εἰκόνας εἰς πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου προσκυνεῖσθαι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἄτρεπτον ταῖς ἐννοίαις καὶ ἀναμάρτητον παντελῶς γενέσθαι. Καὶ πάλιν εἰρηκότος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβοῦς Θεοδώρου τὴν ἔνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν τοιαύτην γεγενῆσθαι, οἷαν ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπὶ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἔссονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν¹.

Καὶ πρὸς ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀναριθμήτοις αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαις τολμήσαντος εἰπεῖν ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἐμφυσή-

Si quis non anathematizat Arium, Eunomium, Macedonium, Apollinarium, Nestorium, Eutychem, Origenem cum impiis eorum conscriptis, et alios omnes haereticos, qui condemnati et anathematizati sunt a sancta catholica et apostolica ecclesia et a praedictis sanctis quatuor conciliis, et eos qui similia praedictis haereticis sapuerunt vel sapiunt, et usque ad mortem in sua impietate permanserunt vel permanent, talis a. s.

Si quis defendit impium Theodorum Mopsuestenum, qui dixit alium esse Deum Verbum, et alium Christum a passionibus animae et desiderii carnis molestias patientem, et a deterioribus paulatim recedentem et sic ex profectu operum melioratum et a conversatione immaculatum factum et tanquam purum hominem baptizatum esse in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, et per baptismum sancti Spiritus gratiam accepisse et filiationem meruisse et ad similitudinem imperialis imaginis in persona Dei Verbi adorari, et post resurrectionem immutabilem cogitationibus et irrepreccabilem omnino factum fuisse. Et iterum dixit impius Theodorus, talem factam esse unionem Dei Verbi ad Christum, qualem dixit Apostolus de viro et muliere: *Erunt duo in carne una*¹.

Et super alias innumerabiles blasphemias ausus est dicere, quos post resurrectionem, cum insufflasset Do-

11

If anyone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches and Origen, as well as their heretical books, and also all other heretics who have already been condemned and anathematized by the holy, catholic and apostolic church and by the four holy synods which have already been mentioned, and also all those who have thought or now think in the same way as the aforesaid heretics and who persist in their error even to death: let him be anathema.

12

If anyone defends the heretical Theodore of Mopsuestia, who said that God the Word is one, while quite another is Christ, who was troubled by the passions of the soul and the desires of human flesh, was gradually separated from that which is inferior, and became better by his progress in good works, and could not be faulted in his way of life, and as a mere man was baptized in the name of the Father and the Son and the holy Spirit, and through this baptism received the grace of the holy Spirit and came to deserve sonship and to be adored, in the way that one adores a statue of the emperor, as if he were God the Word, and that he became after his resurrection immutable in his thoughts and entirely without sin. Furthermore this heretical Theodore claimed that the union of God the Word to Christ is rather like that which, according to the teaching of the Apostle, is between a man and his wife: *The two shall become one*¹.

Among innumerable other blasphemies he dared to allege that, when after his resurrection the Lord breathed on his disciples and said, *Receive the holy*

¹ Eph 5, 31.¹ Eph 5, 31.

σας ὁ κύριος τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ εἰπὼν 'λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον'¹, οὐ δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἀλλὰ σχήματι μόνον ἐνεφύσησε· οὗτος δὲ καὶ τὴν ὁμολογίαν Θωμᾶ, τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ψηλαφῆσει τῶν χειρῶν καὶ τῆς πλευρᾶς τοῦ κυρίου μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, τὸ 'ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου'², εἶπε μὴ εἰρῆσθαι περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Θωμᾶ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ παραδόξου τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐκπλαγέντα τὸν Θωμᾶν, ὑμνήσαι τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν Χριστόν· τὸ δὲ χεῖρον, καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων γενομένη παρ' αὐτοῦ ἑρμηνείᾳ, συγκρίνων ὁ αὐτὸς Θεόδωρος τὸν Χριστὸν Πλάτωνι καὶ Μανιχαίῳ καὶ Ἐπικούρῳ καὶ Μαρκίῳ, λέγει ὅτι ὡσπερ ἐκείνων ἕκαστος, εὐράμενος οἰκεῖον δόγμα, τοὺς αὐτῶ μαθητεύσαντας πεποίηκε καλεῖσθαι πλατωνικούς καὶ μανιχαίους καὶ ἐπικουρείους καὶ μαρκιωνιστάς, τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εὐραμένου δόγμα, ἐξ αὐτοῦ χριστιανούς καλεῖσθαι.

Εἴ τις τοίνυν ἀντιποιεῖται τοῦ εἰρημένου ἀσεβεστάτου Θεοδώρου καὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, ἐν οἷς τὰς τε εἰρημένους καὶ ἄλλας ἀναριθμήτους βλασφημίας ἐξέχεε κατὰ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀναθεματίζει αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ ἀσεβῆ αὐτοῦ συγγράμματα, καὶ πάντας τοὺς δεχομένους ἢ καὶ ἐκδικοῦντας αὐτόν, ἢ λέγοντας ὀρθοδόξως αὐτὸν ἐκθέσθαι, καὶ τοὺς γράψαντας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια φρονοῦντας ἢ φρονήσαντας ὡποτε καὶ μέχρι τέλους ἐμμεῖναντας τῇ τοιαύτῃ αἰρέσει, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

¹ Io 20, 22. ² Io 20, 28.

minus discipulis et dixisset: *Accipite Spiritum sanctum*¹, non dedit eis Spiritum sanctum, sed figuratim tantummodo insufflavit. Iste enim et confessionem quam fecit Thomas cum palpasset manus et latus Domini post resurrectionem, dicens: *Dominus meus et Deus meus*², inquit non esse dictam a Thoma de Christo, (nec enim dicit Theodorus Deum esse Christum) sed ad miraculum resurrectionis stupefactum Thomam glorificasse Deum qui Christum resuscitavit. Et, quod peius est, etiam in interpretatione, quam in actus apostolorum scripsit Theodorus, similem fecit Christum Platoni et Manichaeo et Epicuro et Marcioni, dicens: Quod sicut illorum unusquisque ex dogmate quod invenit suos discipulos fecit vocari platonicos et manichaeos et epicureos et marcionistas, simili modo et cum Christus dogma invenisset, ex ipso christianos vocari.

Si quis igitur defendit praedictum impium Theodorum et impia eius conscripta, in quibus tam praedictas, quam alias innumerabiles blasphemias effudit contra magnum Deum et salvatorem Iesum Christum, et non anathematizat eum et impia eius conscripta, et omnes qui suscipiunt vel defendunt eum et dicunt orthodoxe eum exposuisse, et qui scripserunt pro eo et eadem illi sapuerunt, vel scribunt pro eo vel impiis eius conscriptis, vel eos qui similia illi sapiunt vel aliquando sapuerunt et usque ad mortem permanserunt vel permanent in tali impietate, talis a. s.

*Spirit*¹, he was not truly giving them the holy Spirit, but he breathed on them only as a sign. Similarly he claimed that Thomas's profession of faith made when, after his resurrection, he touched the hands and side of the Lord, namely *My Lord and my God*², was not said about Christ, but that Thomas was in this way extolling God for raising up Christ and expressing his astonishment at the miracle of the resurrection. This Theodore makes a comparison which is even worse than this when, writing about the acts of the Apostles, he says that Christ was like Plato, Manichaeus, Epicurus and Marcion, alleging that just as each of these men arrived at his own teaching and then had his disciples called after him, Platonists, Manichaeans, Epicureans and Marcionites, so Christ found his teaching and then had disciples who were called Christians.

If anyone offers a defence for this more heretical Theodore, and his heretical books in which he throws up the aforesaid blasphemies and many other additional blasphemies against our great God and saviour Jesus Christ, and if anyone fails to anathematize him and his heretical books as well as all those who offer acceptance or defence to him, or who allege that his interpretation is correct, or who write on his behalf or on that of his heretical teachings, or who are or have been of the same way of thinking and persist until death in this error: let him be anathema.

¹ Jn 20, 22. ² Jn 20, 28.

ιγ'

Εἴ τις ἀντιποιεῖται τῶν ἀσεβῶν συγγραμμάτων Θεοδώρητου, τῶν κατὰ τῆς ἀληθοῦς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρώτης καὶ ἀγίας συνόδου καὶ τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Κυρίλλου καὶ τῶν δώδεκα αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίων, καὶ πάντων, ὃν συνεγράψατο ὑπὲρ Θεοδώρου καὶ Νεστορίου τῶν δυσσεβῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄλλων τῶν τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς προειρημένοις Θεοδώρῳ καὶ Νεστορίῳ φρονούντων καὶ δεχομένων αὐτούς καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ἀσεβείαν, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ἀσεβεῖς καλεῖ τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδασκάλους, τοὺς καθ' ὑπόστασιν τὴν ἔνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φρονούντας· καὶ εἴπερ οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει τὰ εἰρημένα ἀσεβῆ συγγράμματα καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις φρονήσαντας ἢ φρονούντας, καὶ πάντας δὲ τοὺς γράψαντας κατὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως, ἢ τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Κυρίλλου καὶ τῶν δώδεκα αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίων, καὶ ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἀσεβείᾳ τελευτήσαντας, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ιδ'

Εἴ τις ἀντιποιεῖται τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς λεγομένης παρὰ Ἰβᾶ γεγράφθαι πρὸς Μάρην τὸν Πέρσην, τῆς ἀρνούμενης μὲν τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας σαρκωθέντα, ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι· λεγούσης δὲ ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ αὐτῆς γεννηθῆναι, ὃν ναὸν ἀποκαλεῖ, ὡς ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν λόγον καὶ ἄλλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον· καὶ τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Κύριλλον τὴν ὀρθὴν τῶν χριστιανῶν πίστιν κηρύξαντα διαβαλλούσης ὡς αἰρετικὸν καὶ ὁμοίως Ἀπολλιναρίῳ τῷ δυσσεβεῖ γράψαντα· καὶ μεμφομένης τὴν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρώτην ἀγίαν σύνοδον, ὡς χωρὶς κρίσεως καὶ ζητήσεως Νεστόριον καθελούσαν· καὶ τὰ δώδεκα κεφάλαια τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Κυρίλλου ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἐναν-

XIII

Si quis defendit impia Theodoriti conscripta, quae contra rectam fidem et contra primam Ephesinam synodum et sanctum Cyrillum et duodecim eius capitula exposuit, et omnia quae conscripsit pro Theodoro et Nestorio impiis, et pro aliis qui eadem praedictis Theodoro et Nestorio sapuerunt, defendens eos et eorum impietatem, et propter hoc impios vocans doctores ecclesiae, qui unitatem secundum subsistentiam Dei Verbi ad carnem confitentur, et non anathematizat ea et eos qui similia sapuerunt vel sapiunt, insuper autem et omnes qui scripserunt contra rectam fidem et sanctum Cyrillum et duodecim eius capitula, et usque ad mortem in tali impietate permanserunt, talis a. s.

XIV

Si quis defendit epistolam, quam dicitur Ibas ad Marin Persam haereticum scripsisse, quae abnegat quidem Deum Verbum de sancta genitrice semper virgine Maria incarnatum, hominem factum esse, dicit autem purum hominem ex ipsa natum esse, quem templum vocat, ut alius sit Deus Verbum et alius homo; et sanctum Cyrillum, qui rectam fidem christianorum praedicavit, tanquam haereticum et similiter Apollinario haeretico scripsisse criminatur; et inculpat primam Ephesinam sanctam synodum tanquam sine examinatione et quaestione Nestorium condemnantem; et duodecim capitula sancti Cyrilli impia et contraria rectae fidei vocat

13

If anyone defends the heretical writings of Theodoret which were composed against the true faith, against the first holy synod of Ephesus and against holy Cyril and his Twelve Chapters, and also defends what Theodoret wrote to support the heretical Theodore and Nestorius and others who think in the same way as the aforesaid Theodore and Nestorius and accept them or their heresy; and if anyone, because of them, shall accuse of being heretical the doctors of the church who have stated their belief in the union according to subsistence of God the Word; and if anyone does not anathematize these heretical books and those who have thought or now think in this way, and all those who have written against the true faith or against holy Cyril and his twelve chapters, and who persist in such heresy until they die: let him be anathema.

14

If anyone defends the letter which Ibas is said to have written to Mari the Persian, which denies that God the Word, who became incarnate of Mary the holy mother of God and ever virgin, became man, but alleges that he was only a man born to her, whom it describes as a temple, as if God the Word was one and the man someone quite different; which condemns holy Cyril as if he were a heretic, when he gives the true teaching of Christians, and accuses holy Cyril of writing opinions like those of the heretical Apollinarius; which rebukes the first holy synod of Ephesus, alleging that it condemned Nestorius without going into the matter by a formal examination; which claims that the twelve chapters of holy Cyril are heretical and opposed to the true faith; and which defends

τία τῆ ὀρθῆ πίστει ἀποκαλεῖ ἢ αὐτὴ ἀσεβῆς ἐπιστολή, καὶ ἐκδικεῖ Θεόδωρον καὶ Νεστόριον καὶ τὰ ἀσεβῆ αὐτῶν δόγματα καὶ συγγράμματα.

Εἴ τις τοίνυν τῆς εἰρημένης ἐπιστολῆς ἀντιποιεῖται, καὶ μὴ ἀναθεματίζει αὐτὴν καὶ τοὺς ἀντιποιουμένους αὐτῆς καὶ λέγοντας αὐτὴν ὀρθὴν εἶναι ἢ μέρος αὐτῆς, καὶ γράψαντας καὶ γράφοντας ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἢ τῶν περιεχομένων αὐτῆ ἀσεβειῶν, καὶ τολμῶντας ταύτην ἐκδικεῖν ἢ τὰς περιεχομένας αὐτῆ ἀσεβείας ὀνόματι τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἢ τῆς ἁγίας ἐν Καλχηδόνι συνόδου, καὶ τοῦτοις μέχρι τέλους ἐμμείναντας, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Τούτων τοίνυν οὕτως ὁμολογηθέντων, ἀ καὶ παρελάβομεν ἐκ τῆς θείας γραφῆς καὶ τῆς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκαλίας καὶ τῶν ὀρισθέντων περὶ τῆς μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πίστεως παρὰ τῶν προειρημένων ἁγίων τεσσάρων συνόδων· γενομένης δὲ καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας, πρὸς γε καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐκδικησάντων ἢ ἐκδικούντων τὰ εἰρημένα τρία κεφάλαια, καὶ ἐναπομεινάντων ἢ ἀπομενόντων τῆ οἰκείᾳ πλάνῃ, κατακρίσεως· εἴ τις ἐπιχειρήσῃ ἐναντία τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν διατυπωθεῖσι παραδοῦναι ἢ διδάξαι ἢ γράψαι, εἴ μὲν ἐπίσκοπος εἴη ἢ ἐν κλήρῳ ἀναφερόμενος, ὁ τοιοῦτος, ἀλλότρια ἱερέων καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς καταστάσεως πράττων, γυμνωθήσεται τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἢ τοῦ κλήρου· εἴ δὲ μοναχὸς ἢ λαϊκός, ἀναθεματισθήσεται.

eadem impia epistola, et defendit Theodorum et Nestorium et impia eorum dogmata et conscripta.

Si quis igitur memoratam impiam epistolam defendit et non anathematizat eam et defensores eius et eos qui dicunt eam rectam esse vel partem eius, et eos qui scripserunt vel scribunt pro ea vel pro impietate quae in ea continetur, et praesumunt eam defendere, vel insertam ei impietatem nomine sanctorum patrum vel sancti Chalcedonensis concilii, et in his usque ad mortem permanent, talis a. s.

Cum igitur haec ita recte confessi sumus, quae tradita nobis sunt tam a divinis scripturis, quam a sanctorum patrum doctrina, et ab his quae definita sunt de una eademque fide a praedictis sanctis quattuor conciliis, facta autem a nobis et condemnatione contra haereticos et eorum impietatem, nec non etiam contra eos qui defenderunt vel defendunt praedicta impia tria capitula, et permanserunt in suo errore vel qui permanent: si quis conatus fuerit contra haec quae pie disposuimus, vel tradere vel docere vel scribere, si quidem episcopus vel clericus sit, iste tanquam aliena a sacerdotibus et statu ecclesiastico faciens, denuciabitur episcopatu vel clericatu; si autem monachus vel laicus sit, anathematizabitur.

Theodore and Nestorius and their heretical teachings and books.

If anyone defends the said letter and does not anathematize it and all those who offer a defence for it and allege that it or a part of it is correct, or if anyone defends those who have written or shall write in support of it or the heresies contained in it, or supports those who are bold enough to defend it or its heresies in the name of the holy fathers of the holy synod of Chalcedon, and persists in these errors until his death: let him be anathema.

Such then are the assertions we confess. We have received them from holy Scripture, from the teaching of the holy fathers, and from the definitions about the one and the same faith made by the aforesaid four holy synods. Moreover, condemnation has been passed by us against the heretics and their impiety, and also against those who have justified or shall justify the so-called "Three Chapters", and against those who have persisted or will persist in their own error. If anyone should attempt to hand on, or to teach by word or writing, anything contrary to what we have regulated, then if he is a bishop or somebody appointed to the clergy, in so far as he is acting contrary to what befits priests and the ecclesiastical status, let him be stripped of the rank of priest or cleric, and if he is a monk or lay person, let him be anathema.

Constantinople III

680-681

INTRODUCTION

To make an end of the Monothelite controversy, Emperor Constantine IV asked Pope Donus in 678 to send twelve bishops and four western Greek monastic superiors to represent the pope at an assembly of eastern and western theologians. Pope Agatho, who meanwhile had succeeded Donus, ordered consultation in the west on this important matter. Around Easter 680 a synod in Rome of 125 Italian bishops, with Pope Agatho presiding, assessed the replies of the regional synods of the west and composed a profession of faith in which Monothelitism was condemned. Legates of the pope took this profession to Constantinople, arriving at the beginning of September 680.¹

On 10 September 680 the emperor issued an edict to Patriarch George of Constantinople, ordering a council of bishops to be convoked. The council assembled on 7 November in the hall of the imperial palace in Constantinople. It immediately called itself an ecumenical council. There were 18 sessions, at the first eleven of which the emperor presided.

In the 8th session, on 7 March 681, the council adopted the teaching of Pope Agatho in condemnation of Monothelitism. Patriarch Macarius of Antioch was one of the few who refused his assent; he was deposed in the 12th session.

The doctrinal conclusions of the council were defined in the 17th session and promulgated in the 18th and last session on 16 September 681. The acts of the council, signed both by 174 fathers and finally by the emperor himself, were sent to Pope Leo II, who had succeeded Agatho, and he, when he had approved them, ordered them to be translated into Latin and to be signed by all the bishops of the west. Constantine IV, however, promulgated the decrees of the council in all parts of the empire by imperial edict. The council did not debate church discipline and did not establish any disciplinary canons.²

The Greek and Latin texts given below are taken from Labbe (= LC) 6, 1019–1028. The translation is from the Greek text, since this is the more authoritative version.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H-L 3, 472–538; Percival 325–353; RE 13 (1903) 409–411; DThC 3 (1908) 1259–1273, 7 (1922) 93–132, 10 (1923) 2307–2323; DHGE 13 (1956) 760–763; LThK 6 (2^e 1961) 496–497; NCE 4 (1967) 240–241; HC 2 (1980) 462–463; L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VI^e siècle*, Paris 1925, 391–485; F.X. Murphy and P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, *Histoire des conciles* 3, Paris 1974; P. Conte, *Il significato del primato papale nei padri del VI concilio ecumenico*, *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 15 (1977) 7–111.

¹ Msi 11, 286–315. On whether Pope Honorius should be condemned, see CSP appendix II, ch. V 25.

² Matters of church discipline, which the councils of Constantinople II and III did not touch, were taken up by the council of Trullo (sometimes called “Quinisext” or “Fifth-Sixth”) which was summoned by Emperor Justinian II in 692. This council issued 102 canons, which have been regarded as decrees of an ecumenical council in eastern canon law; their approval by the pope is disputed. A critical edition of these canons is to be found in CCO 98–241.

Ἐκθεσις πίστεως

Ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆς υἱός
 τε καὶ λόγος, ὁ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιος
 ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας γενόμενος ἄνθρω-
 5 πος, Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς ἡμῶν,
 ἐν εὐαγγελικαῖς διαπρυσίαις ἐκήρυξε
 φωναίς: ἔγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσ-
 μου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περι-
 10 πατήσῃ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔξει τὸ
 φῶς τῆς ζωῆς¹ καὶ πάλιν, ἑιρήνην
 τὴν ἐμὴν ἀφήμι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν
 ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν². Ταύτη τοι τῇ θεο-
 λέκτω τῆς εἰρήνης διδασκαλίᾳ θεο-
 σύφως ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς
 15 ὁδηγούμενος, ὁ τῆς μὲν ὀρθοδοξίας
 ὑπέρμαχος, τῆς δὲ κακοδοξίας ἀντί-
 μαχος, τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἁγίαν ταύτην
 καὶ οἰκουμενικὴν συναθροίσασ ὁμήγου-
 20 ριν, τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἅπαν ἦνωσε
 σύγκριμα. Ὅθεν ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἁγία
 καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος, τὴν ἀπό τι-
 νων καὶ ὡδε χρόνων τῆς δυσσεβείας
 πλάνην πόρρωθεν ἀπελάσασα, καὶ τῇ
 τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐγκρίτων πατέρων
 25 ἀπλανῶς εὐθείᾳ τρίβῳ κατακολουθή-
 σασα, ταῖς ἁγίαις καὶ οἰκουμενικαῖς
 πέντε συνόδοις ἐν ἅπασιν εὐσεβῶς συν-
 εφώνησε· φημὲν δὴ τῶν τριακοσίων
 δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόν-
 30 των ἁγίων πατέρων κατὰ τοῦ μανιῶ-
 δους Ἀρείου, καὶ τῇ μετ' αὐτὴν ἐν
 Κωνσταντινουπόλει τῶν ἑκατὸν πεν-
 τήκοντα θεοφόρων ἀνδρῶν κατὰ
 Μακεδονίου τοῦ πνευματομάχου καὶ
 35 Ἀπολλιναρίου τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς ὁμοίως
 καὶ τῇ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸ πρότερον κατὰ
 Νεστορίου τοῦ ἰουδαϊόφρονος συν-
 αγγεγερμένων διακοσίων θεσπεσίων ἀν-
 40 δρῶν, καὶ τῇ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι τῶν ἑξα-
 κοσίων τριάκοντα θεοπνεύστων πατέ-
 ρων κατὰ Εὐτυχοῦς καὶ Διοσκόρου
 τῶν θεοστυγῶν· πρὸς ταύταις καὶ τῇ
 τελευταίᾳ τούτων πέμπτῃ ἁγίᾳ συνό-
 δω, τῇ ἐνταῦθα συναθροισθείσῃ κατὰ

Terminus

Unigenitus Dei Patris Filius et Ver-
 bum qui per omnia similis nobis
 absque solo peccato factus est, ho-
 mo Christus verus Deus noster, per
 evangelicas voces flagranter prae-
 dicavit: *Ego sum lux mundi. Qui*
sequitur me non ambulabit in tenebris,
*sed habebit lumen vitae*¹. Et iterum:
Pacem meam relinquo vobis, pacem
*meam do vobis*². Hac proinde divini-
 tus edita pacis doctrina Deo in-
 struente, mansuetissimus noster im-
 perator institutus, propugnator qui-
 dem rectae fidei, expugnator vero
 pravae doctrinae, hoc sanctum uni-
 versale nostrum congregans colle-
 gium, totius ecclesiae adunavit
 compaginem. Unde hoc sanctum
 nostrum universale concilium impi-
 etatis errorem qui nunc usque a
 quibusdam temporibus factus est,
 procul abiiciens, sanctorum autem
 ac probabilium patrum inoffense
 recto tramite iter consecutum,
 sanctis et universalibus quinque
 synodis pie in omnibus consonuit;
 trecentorum, inquam, decem et
 octo sanctorum patrum, qui in
 Nicaeam convenerunt adversus A-
 rium furiosum: et ei, quae a cento
 et quinquaginta a Deo inspiratis
 viris post hanc apud Constantino-
 polim adversus Macedonium im-
 pugnatores Spiritus, et Apolinarem
 impium: similiter et ei, quae in
 Epheso prius adversus Nestorium
 iudaicae intelligentiae, congregata
 est ducentorum venerabilium vi-
 rorum: atque ei, quae in Chalcedone
 sexcentorum triginta Deo inspira-
 torum patrum adversum Eutychem
 et Dioscorum Deo odibiles: super
 has et ultimae harum quintae sanc-

¹ Io 8, 12. ² Io 14, 27.

Exposition of faith

The only Son and Word of God the Father, who became a man like us in all things but sin, Christ our true God, proclaimed clearly in the words of the gospel; *I am the light of the world; anyone who follows me shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light of life*¹, and again, *My peace I leave to you, my peace I give you*². Our most mild emperor, champion of right belief and adversary of wrong belief, guided in godly wisdom by this teaching of peace, spoken by God, has brought together this holy and universal assembly of ours and set at one the whole judgment of the church. Wherefore this holy and universal synod of ours, driving afar the error of impiety which endured for some time even till the present, following without deviation in a straight path after the holy and accepted fathers, has piously accorded in all things with the five holy and universal synods: that is to say, with the synod of 318 holy fathers who gathered at Nicaea against the madman Arius, and that which followed it at Constantinople of 150 God-led men against Macedonius, opponent of the Spirit, and the impious Apollinarius; similarly too, with the first at Ephesus of 200 godly men brought together against Nestorius, who thought as the Jews, and that at Chalcedon of 630 God-inspired fathers against Eutyches and Dioscorus, hateful to God; also, in addition to these, with the fifth holy synod, the

¹ Jn 8, 12. ² Jn 14, 27.

Θεοδώρου τοῦ Μοψουεστίας, Ὁριγένους, Διδύμου τε καὶ Εὐαγρίου, καὶ τῶν συγγραμμάτων Θεοδώρητου τῶν κατὰ τῶν δώδεκα κεφαλαίων τοῦ αἰοιδίου Κυρίλλου, καὶ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰβᾶ ἐπιστολῆς πρὸς Μάρην γεγράφθαι τὸν Πέρσην. Ἀκαινοτόμητα μὲν ἐν πᾶσι τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀνανεωσάμενη θεσπίσματα, τὰ βέβηλα δὲ τῆς δυσσεβείας ἐκδιώξασα δόγματα, καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῶν τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ πατέρων ἐκτεθέν, καὶ αὐθις παρὰ τῶν ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα θεοφρόνως βεβαιωθέν, ὅπερ καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ ἄγιοι σύνοδοι ἐπ' ἀναιρέσει πάσης ψυχοφθόρου αἰρέσεως ἀσπασίως ἐδέξαντο καὶ ἐπεκύρωσαν σύμβολον, καὶ ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄγία καὶ οἰκουμένη θεοπνεύστως ἐπεσφράγισε σύνοδος.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα θεὸν . . .¹

Ἡ ἅγια καὶ οἰκουμένη σύνοδος εἶπεν·

Ἦρκει μὲν εἰς ἐντελῆ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως ἐπίγνωσιν τε καὶ βεβαίωσιν τὸ εὐσεβὲς καὶ ὀρθόδοξον τοῦτο τῆς θείας χάριτος σύμβολον· ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐπαύσατο ἀρχῆθεν τῆς κακίας ὁ ἐφευρέτης, συνεργὸν τὸν ὄφιν εὐράμενος καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν ἰοβόλον τῆ ἀνθρωπιᾶ φύσει προσαγόμενος θάνατον, οὕτω καὶ νῦν ὄργανα πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν αὐτοῦ βούλησιν εὐρηκῶς ἐπιτήδεια, Θεοδώρον φαμεν τὸν γενόμενον τῆς Φαράν ἐπίσκοπον, Σέργιον, Πύρρον, Παῦλον, Πέτρον, τοὺς γενομένους προέδρους τῆς βασιλευούσης ταύτης πόλεως, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ὀνώριον τὸν γενόμενον πάπαν τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης², Κύρον τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκοπήσαντα, Μακάριον τε τὸν Ἀντιοχείας προσεχῶς γενόμενον πρόεδρον καὶ Στέφανον τὸν

tae synodo, quae hic congregata est adversus Theodorum Mopsuestenum, Origenem, Didymum et Evagrium, et scripta Theodoretī adversus duodecim capitula laudabilis Cyrilli, et epistolam quae dicitur Ibae ad Marim Persam scriptam, immutilatas quidem in omnibus pietatis renovans sanctiones, profanas vero impietatis expellens doctrinas: et id quod est a trecentis decem et octo patribus editum, et dehinc a centum et quinquaginta Deo instituentē confirmatum est, quod etiam ceterae sanctae synodi ad extinguendam omnem pestiferam haeresim alacriter susceperunt et confirmaverunt symbolum, et hoc nostrum sanctum et universale a Deo inspiratum consignavit concilium.

Credimus in unum Deum . . .¹

Sanctum et universale concilium dixit:

Sufficiebat quidem ad perfectam orthodoxae fidei cognitionem atque confirmationem pium atque orthodoxum hoc divinae gratiae symbolum. Sed quoniam non destitit ab exordio adinventor malitiae cooperatorem sibi serpentem inveniens, et per eum venenosam humanae naturae deferens mortem, ita et nunc organa ad propriam sui voluntatem apta reperiens, Theodorum dicimus qui fuerat episcopus Pharan, Sergium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, Petrum, qui fuerunt huius regiae urbis antistites, insuper et Honorium qui fuit papa antiquae Romae², et Cyrum qui Alexandriae tenuit episcopatum, Macarium quoque qui nuper fuerat Antiochiae praesul, et Stephanum eius discipulum, non cessavit per

latest of them, which was gathered here against Theodore of Mopsuestia, Origen, Didymus and Evagrius, and the writings of Theodoret against the twelve chapters of the renowned Cyril, and the letter said to have been written by Ibas to Mari the Persian. Reaffirming the divine tenets of piety in all respects unaltered, and banishing the profane teachings of impiety, this holy and universal synod of ours has also, in its turn, under God's inspiration, set its seal on the creed which was made out by the 318 fathers and confirmed again with godly prudence by the 150 and which the other holy synods too accepted gladly and ratified for the elimination of all soul-corrupting heresy.

We believe in one God . . .¹

The holy and universal synod said:

This pious and orthodox creed of the divine favour was enough for a complete knowledge of the orthodox faith and a complete assurance therein. But since, from the first, the contriver of evil did not rest, finding an accomplice in the serpent and through him bringing upon human nature the poisoned dart of death, so too now he has found instruments suited to his own purpose — namely Theodore, who was bishop of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, who were bishops of this imperial city, and further Honorius, who was pope of elder Rome², Cyrus, who held the see of Alexandria, and Macarius, who was recently bishop of Antioch, and his disciple Stephen — and has not been idle in raising

¹ Symbolum Nicaenum et deinde symbolum Constantinopolitanum (v. supra pp. 5, 24).

² Haec damnatio, cuius rationes actione decimatertia expressae erant (Kirch 1082-1084), magnam famam habuit et multas oppositiones suscitavit, cf. H-L 3/1, 502 et 515-538.

¹ The Nicene creed and then the creed of Constantinople (see above pp. 5 and 24).

² This condemnation, the reasons for which were given in the thirteenth session (Kirch 1082-1084), achieved great notoriety and aroused much opposition, see H-L 3/1, 502 and 515-538.

τούτου μαθητήν, οὐκ ἤργησε δι' αὐτῶν τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληρώματι τῆς πλάνης ἐπεχειρεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα, ἐνὸς θελήματος καὶ μιᾶς ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ τῶν δύο φύσεων τοῦ ἐνὸς τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν τῷ ὀρθοδόξῳ λαῷ καινοφώνως ἐνσπεύρας τὴν αἵρεσιν, τῇ Ἀπολλιναρίου, Σεβήρου καὶ Θεμιστίου τῶν δυσσεβῶν φρενοβλαβεῖ κακοδοξίᾳ συνάδουσαν, καὶ τὸ τέλειον τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνὸς κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἀνακεῖν διὰ τινος δολερᾶς ἐπινοίας σπουδάσασαν, ἀθέλητον ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἀνερέργητον τὴν νοερῶς ἐψυχωμένην αὐτοῦ σάρκα δυσσφήμως εἰσάγουσαν.

Ἐξήγειρε τοίνυν Χριστὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν τὸν πιστὸν βασιλέα, τὸν νέον Δαυὶδ, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καρδίαν¹ εὐρηκῶς² ὃς οὐκ ἔδωκε, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὕπνον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῖς βλεφάροις αὐτοῦ νυσταγμόν³, ἕως ὅτου διὰ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς θεοσυλλέκτου ταύτης καὶ ἱερᾶς ὀμηγύρεως τὸ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἡὔρε τέλειον κήρυγμα κατὰ γὰρ τὴν θεόλεκτον φωνήν, ὅπου εἰσὶ δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἐπὶ τῷ ἑμῷ ὀνόματι συνηγμένοι, ἐκεῖ εἰμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν³.

Ἦτις παρούσα ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμένη συνόδος πιστῶς δεξαμένη καὶ ὑπτίαις χερσὶν ἀσπασαμένη τὴν τε τοῦ ἀγιοτάτου καὶ μακαριωτάτου πάπα τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης Ἀγάθωνος γενομένην ἀναφορὰν πρὸς τὸν εὐσεβέστατον καὶ πιστότατον ἡμῶν βασιλέα Κωνσταντῖνον, τὴν ἀποβαλομένην ὀνομαστὶ τοὺς κηρύξαντας καὶ διδάξαντας, ὡς προδηλώται, ἐν θέλημα καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ὡσαύτως δὲ προσηκαμένη καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν

eos plenitudini ecclesiae erroris scandala suscitare, unius voluntatis et unius operationis in duabus naturis unius de sancta Trinitate, Christi veri Dei nostri, orthodoxae plebi novisione disseminando haeresim, consentaneam insanam ac malitiosae sectae impiorum Apollinaris, Severi atque Themistii; quae et perfectionem humanitatis unius eiusdemque domini Iesu Christi Dei nostri, molita est per quam dolosam adinventionem perimere, per hoc involuntariam et inoperatricem carnem eius, quae intellectualiter animata est, insaniter introducens.

Excitavit igitur Christus Deus noster fidelissimum imperatorem novum David, *virum secundum cor suum*¹ inveniens qui *non dedit*, iuxta quod scriptum est, *somnum oculis suis et palpebris suis dormitationem*², donec per hunc nostrum a Deo congregatum sacrumque conventum ipsam rectae fidei reperit perfectam praedicationem; secundum enim a Domino editam vocem, *ubi duo vel tres fuerint congregati in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum*³.

Quae praesens sancta et universalis synodus fideliter suscipiens et expansis manibus amplectens, tam suggestionem quae a sanctissimo ac beatissimo Agathone papa antiquae Romae facta est ad Constantinum piissimum atque fidelissimum nostrum imperatorem, quae nominatim abiecit eos, qui docuerunt vel praedicaverunt, sicut superius dictum est, unam voluntatem et unam operationem in incarnationis dispensatione domini nostri Iesu Christi veri Dei nostri; adaeque amplexa

¹ Ac 13, 22. ² Ps 131, 4. ³ Mt 18, 20.

through them obstacles of error against the full body of the church, sowing with novel speech among the orthodox people the heresy of a single will and a single principle of action in the two natures of the one member of the holy Trinity, Christ our true God, a heresy in harmony with the evil belief, ruinous to the mind, of the impious Apollinarius, Severus and Themistius, and one intent on removing the perfection of the becoming man of the same one lord Jesus Christ our God, through a certain guileful device, leading from there to the blasphemous conclusion that his rationally animate flesh is without a will and a principle of action.

Therefore Christ our God has stirred up the faithful emperor, the new David, finding in him *a man after his own heart*¹, who, as the scripture says, *did not allow his eyes sleep or his eyelids drowsing*² until through this holy assembly of ours, brought together by God, he found the perfect proclamation of right belief; for according to the God-spoken saying, *Where there are two or three gathered in my name, there am I in their midst*³.

This same holy and universal synod, here present, faithfully accepts and welcomes with open hands the report of Agatho, most holy and most blessed pope of elder Rome, that came to our most reverend and most faithful emperor Constantine, which rejected by name those who proclaimed and taught, as has been already explained, one will and one principle of action in the incarnate dispensation of Christ our true God; and likewise it approves as well the other

¹ Ac 13, 22. ² Ps 131, 4. ³ Mt 18, 20.

αὐτὸν ἀγιώτατον πάπαν ἱεράς συν-
 ὁδοῦ τῶν ἑκατὸν εἰκοσι πέντε θεοφι-
 λῶν ἐπισκόπων ἑτέραν συνοδικὴν
 ἀναφορὰν πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ θεόσοφον
 γαληνότητα, οἷά τε συμφωνούσας τῇ
 τε ἀγία ἐν Καλχηδόνι συνόδῳ καὶ τῷ
 τόμῳ τοῦ πανιέρου καὶ μακαριωτάτου
 πάπα τῆς αὐτῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης
 Λέοντος, τῷ σταλέντι πρὸς Φλαβιανὸν
 τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις, ὃν καὶ στήλην ὀρθοδο-
 ξίας ἡ τοιαύτη σύνοδος ἀπεκάλεσεν·
 ἔτι μὴν καὶ ταῖς συνοδικαῖς ἐπιστο-
 λαῖς ταῖς γραφεῖσιν παρὰ τοῦ μακα-
 ρίου Κυρίλλου κατὰ Νεστορίου τοῦ
 δυσσεβοῦς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τῆς ἀνατολῆς
 ἐπισκόπους.

Ἐπομένη τε ταῖς τε ἀγίαις καὶ
 οἰκουμενικαῖς πέντε συνόδοις, καὶ
 τοῖς ἀγίοις καὶ ἐκκρίτοις πατράσι,
 καὶ συμφώνως ὀρίζουσα ὁμολογεῖ
 τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν
 ἀληθινὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν, τὸν ἕνα τῆς
 ἀγίας, ὁμοουσίου καὶ ζωαρχικῆς
 τριάδος τέλειον ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον
 τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι· θεὸν
 ἀληθῶς καὶ ἀνθρωπὸν ἀληθῶς τὸν
 αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος·
 ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα
 καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ
 τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον
 ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας¹· τὸν πρὸ
 αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα
 κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ
 τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ
 διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ πνεύ-
 ματος ἀγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρ-
 θένου, τῆς κυρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν
 θεοτόκου, κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα·
 ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, υἱόν,
 κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν
 ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀχωρίστως,
 ἀδιαρέτως γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμοῦ
 τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης
 διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, σφωζομένης δὲ μάλλον

est et alteram synodalem suggestio-
 nem, quae missa est a sacro concilio
 quod est sub eodem sanctissimo
 papa centum viginti quinque
 Deo amabiliū episcoporum, ad
 eius a Deo instructam tranquillitatem,
 utpote consonantes sancto
 Chalcedonensi concilio et tomo
 sanctissimi ac beatissimi papae
 eiusdem antiquae Romae Leonis,
 qui directus est ad sanctum Flavianum,
 quem et columnam rectae fidei
 huiusmodi synodus appellavit; ad
 haec et synodicis epistolis, quae
 scriptae sunt a beato Cyrillo adversus
 impium Nestorium, et ad orientales
 episcopos.

Assecuti quoque sancta quinque
 universalia concilia et sanctos atque
 probabiles patres, consonanterque
 definiens confitetur, dominum nostrum
 Iesum Christum verum Deum nostrum,
 unum de sancta et consubstantiali et vitae
 originem praebente Trinitate, perfectum
 in deitate et perfectum eundem in
 humanitate, Deum vere et hominem
 vere, eundem ex anima rationali et corpore;
 consubstantialem Patri secundum
 deitatem, et consubstantialem nobis
 secundum humanitatem, per omnia
 similem nobis absque peccato¹, ante
 saecula quidem ex Patre genitum
 secundum deitatem, in ultimis diebus
 autem eundem propter nos et propter
 nostram salutem de Spiritu sancto et
 Maria virgine proprie et veraciter
 Dei genitrice secundum humanitatem,
 unum eundemque Christum Filium
 Dei unigenitum, in duabus naturis
 inconfuse, inconvertibiliter, inseparabiliter,
 indivise cognoscendum, nusquam
 extincta harum naturarum
 differentia propter unionem, salva-

synodal report to his God-taught serenity, from the synod of 125 bishops dear to God meeting under the same most holy pope, as according with the holy synod at Chalcedon and with the Tome of the all-holy and most blessed Leo, pope of the same elder Rome, which was sent to Flavian, who is among the saints, and which that synod called a pillar of right belief, and furthermore with the synodal letters written by the blessed Cyril against the impious Nestorius and to the bishops of the east.

Following the five holy and universal synods and the holy and accepted fathers, and defining in union, it professes our lord Jesus Christ our true God, one of the holy Trinity, which is of one same being and is the source of life, to be perfect in divinity and perfect in humanity, the same truly God and truly man, of a rational soul and a body; consubstantial with the Father as regards his divinity, and the same consubstantial with us as regards his humanity; like us in all respects except for sin¹; begotten before the ages from the Father as regards his divinity, and in the last days the same for us and for our salvation from the holy Spirit and the virgin Mary, who is properly and truly called mother of God, as regards his humanity; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, acknowledged in two natures which undergo no confusion, no change, no separation, no division; at no point was the difference between the natures taken away through the union, but rather the property of both natures is preserved

¹ Cf. Heb 4, 15.

¹ See Heb 4, 15.

τῆς ιδιότητος ἐκατέρας φύσεως, καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης· οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' 5 ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ, θεοῦ λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσεν, καὶ τὸ τῶν 10 ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον.

Καὶ δύο φυσικὰ θελήσεις ἦτοι θελήματα ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ δύο φυσικὰ ἐνεργείας ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, 15 ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγχύτως κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκαλίαν ὡσαύτως κηρύττομεν. Καὶ δύο μὲν φυσικὰ θελήματα οὐχ ὑπεναντία, μὴ γένοιτο, καθὼς οἱ ἄσεβεῖς ἔφησαν αἰρετικοί, 20 ἀλλ' ἐπόμενον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα καὶ μὴ ἀντιπίπτον ἢ ἀντιπαλαῖον, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ θελήματι· ἔδει γὰρ τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς 25 θέλημα κινήσθαι, ὑποταγῆναι δὲ τῷ θελήματι τῷ θεῷ, κατὰ τὸν πάνσοφον Ἀθανάσιον¹. ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ αὐτοῦ σὰρξ σὰρξ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου λέγεται καὶ ἔστιν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ φυσικὸν τῆς 30 σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ θέλημα ἴδιον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου λέγεται καὶ ἔστι, καθά φησιν αὐτός· ὅτι «καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός 35 με πατρός»². ἴδιον λέγων θέλημα αὐτοῦ τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ ἴδια αὐτοῦ γέγονεν· ὃν γὰρ τρόπον ἡ παναγία καὶ ἄμωμος ἐψυχωμένη αὐτοῦ σὰρξ θεωθεῖσα οὐκ ἀνηρέθη, 40 ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτῆς ὄρω τε καὶ λόγῳ διέμεινεν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα θεωθὲν οὐκ ἀνηρέθη, σέσωσται δὲ μᾶλλον, κατὰ τὸν θεολόγον Γρηγόριον λέγοντα·

taque magis proprietate utriusque naturae, et in unam personam et in unam subsistentiam concurrente, non in duas personas partitum vel divisum, sed unum eundemque unigenitum Filium Deum Verbum dominum Iesum Christum, iuxta quod olim prophetae de eo et ipse nos dominus Iesus Christus erudit, et sanctorum patrum nobis tradidit symbolum.

Et duas naturales voluntates in eo, et duas naturales operationes indivise, inconvertibiliter, inseparabiliter, inconfuse secundum sanctorum patrum doctrinam adaeque praedicamus; et duas naturales voluntates non contrarias, absit, iuxta quod impii asseruerunt haeretici, sed sequentem eius humanam voluntatem, et non resistantem vel reluctantem, sed potius subiectam divinae eius atque omnipotentis voluntati. Oportebat enim carnis voluntatem moveri, subiici vero voluntati divinae, iuxta sapientissimum Athanasium¹; sicut enim eius caro, caro Dei Verbi dicitur et est, ita et naturalis carnis eius voluntas propria Dei Verbi dicitur et est, sicut ipse ait: *Quia descendi de caelo, non ut faciam voluntatem meam, sed eius qui misit me Patris*², suam propriam dicens voluntatem, quae erat carnis eius. Quemadmodum enim sanctissima atque immaculata animata eius caro deificata non est perempta, sed in proprio sui statu et ratione permansit, ita et humana eius voluntas deificata, non est perempta, salvata est autem magis secundum deiloquum Gregorium dicentem: „Nam illius velle, quod in Salvatore intelligitur, non est contrarium Deo

¹ Athanasius, in illud „Nunc anima mea turbata est“ (tractatus deperditus) cf. PG 25, XXVII. ² Io 6, 38.

and comes together into a single subsistent being; he is not parted or divided into two persons, but is one and the same only-begotten Son, Word of God, lord Jesus Christ, just as the prophets taught from the beginning about him, and as Jesus the Christ himself instructed us, and as the creed of the holy fathers handed it down to us.

And we proclaim equally two natural volitions or wills in him and two natural principles of action which undergo no division, no change, no partition, no confusion, in accordance with the teaching of the holy fathers. And the two natural wills not in opposition, as the impious heretics said, far from it, but his human will following, and not resisting or struggling, rather in fact subject to his divine and all powerful will. For the will of the flesh had to be moved, and yet to be subjected to the divine will, according to the most wise Athanasius¹. For just as his flesh is said to be and is flesh of the Word of God, so too the natural will of his flesh is said to and does belong to the Word of God, just as he says himself: *I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of the Father who sent me*², calling his own will that of his flesh, since his flesh too became his own. For in the same way that his all holy and blameless animate flesh was not destroyed in being made divine but remained in its own limit and category, so his human will as well was not destroyed by being made divine, but rather was preserved, according to the theologian Gregory, who says: “For his willing,

¹ Athanasius on the text “now my spirit is troubled” (a lost tract), see PG 25, XXVII.

² Jn 6, 38.

‘ τὸ γὰρ ἐκεῖνον θέλειν τοῦ κατὰ τὸν σωτήρα νοουμένου οὐδὲ ὑπεναντίον θεῶ, θεωθὲν ὄλον. ¹ Δύο δὲ φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαίρετως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγγύτως ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τῷ ἀληθινῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν δοξάζομεν, τουτέστι θείαν ἐνεργείαν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνεργείαν, κατὰ τὸν θεηγόρον Λέοντα τρανέστατα φάσκοντα: ‘ ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ ἑκατέρα μορφή μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ὅπερ ἴδιον ἔσχηκε, τοῦ μὲν λόγου κατεργαζομένου τοῦτο, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου, τοῦ δὲ σώματος ἐκτελοῦντος ὅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ σώματος. ² Οὐ γὰρ δήπου μίαν δώσομεν φυσικὴν τὴν ἐνεργείαν θεοῦ καὶ ποιήματος, ἵνα μήτε τὸ ποιηθὲν εἰς τὴν θείαν ἀναγάγωμεν οὐσίαν, μήτε μὴν τῆς θείας φύσεως τὸ ἐξαίρετον εἰς τὸν τοῖς γεννητοῖς πρόποντα καταγάγωμεν τόπον: ἐνὸς γὰρ καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τὰ τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ πάθη γινώσκουμεν κατ’ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο τῶν ἐξ ὧν ἐστὶ φύσεων καὶ ἐν αἷς τὸ εἶναι ἔχει, ὡς ὁ θεσπέσιος ἔφησε Κύριλλος. Πάντοθεν γοῦν τὸ ἀσύγχυτον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον φυλάττοντες, συντόμῳ φωνῇ τὸ πᾶν ἐξαγγέλλομεν: ἓνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος καὶ μετὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν εἶναι πιστεύοντες, φαμὲν δύο αὐτοῦ τὰς φύσεις ἐν τῇ μιᾷ αὐτοῦ διαλαμπούσας ὑποστάσει, ἐν ἧ τὰ τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ παθήματα δι’ ὅλης αὐτοῦ τῆς οἰκονομικῆς ἀναστροφῆς οὐ κατὰ φαντασίαν, ἀλλὰ ἀληθῶς ἐπεδείξατο, τῆς φυσικῆς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μιᾷ ὑποστάσει διαφορᾶς γνωριζομένης τῷ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ἑκατέραν φύσιν θέλειν τε καὶ ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἴδια: καθ’ ὃν δὲ λόγον καὶ δύο φυσικὰ θελήματά τε καὶ ἐνεργείας δοξάζομεν πρὸς σωτηρίαν

deificatum totum. ¹ Duae vero naturales operationes indivise, inconvertibiliter, inconfuse, inseparabiliter in eodem domino nostro Iesu Christo vero Deo nostro asserimus, hoc est divinam operationem et humanam operationem, secundum divinum praedicatorum Leonem, apertissime asserentem: „Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est, Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est et carne exsequente quod carnis est. ² Nec enim profecto unam dabimus naturalem operationem Dei et creaturae, ut neque quod creatum est in divinam educamus essentiam, neque quod eximium est divinae naturae ad competentem creaturae locum deiiciamus. Unius enim eiusdemque tam miracula, quamque passiones cognoscimus secundum aliud et aliud earum ex quibus est naturarum et in quibus habet esse, sicut admirabilis inquit Cyrillus. Undique igitur inconfusum atque indivisum conservantes, brevi voce cuncta proferimus: unum sanctae Trinitatis, et post incarnationem dominum nostrum Iesum Christum verum Deum nostrum esse credentes, asserimus duas eius esse naturas in una eius radiantes subsistentia, in qua tam miracula quamque passiones per omnem sui dispensativam conversationem, non per phantasmiam, sed veraciter demonstravit, ob naturalem differentiam in eadem una subsistentia cognoscendam, dum cum alterius communione utraque natura indivise et inconfuse propria vellet atque operaretur; iuxta quam rationem et duas naturales voluntates et operationes con-

¹ Gregorius Naz., *Oratio XXX*, 12 (PG 36, 117).

² Leo I, *Tomus ad Flavianum* (Msi 5, 1375-1378).

when he is considered as saviour, is not in opposition to God, being made divine in its entirety.”¹ And we hold there to be two natural principles of action in the same Jesus Christ our lord and true God, which undergo no division, no change, no partition, no confusion, that is, a divine principle of action and a human principle of action, according to the godly-speaking Leo, who says most clearly: “For each form does in a communion with the other that activity which it possesses as its own, the Word working that which is the Word’s and the body accomplishing the things that are the body’s.”² For of course we will not grant the existence of only a single natural principle of action of both God and creature, lest we raise what is made to the level of divine being, or indeed reduce what is most specifically proper to the divine nature to a level befitting creatures; for we acknowledge that the miracles and the sufferings are of one and the same, according to one or the other of the two natures out of which he is and in which he has his being, as the admirable Cyril said. Therefore, protecting on all sides the “no confusion” and “no division”, we announce the whole in these brief words: Believing our lord Jesus Christ, even after his incarnation, to be one of the holy Trinity and our true God, we say that he has two natures shining forth in his one subsistence in which he demonstrated the miracles and the sufferings throughout his entire providential dwelling here, not in appearance but in truth, the difference of the natures being made known in the same one subsistence in that each nature wills and performs the things that are proper to it in a communion with the other; then in accord with this reasoning we hold that two natural

¹ Gregory of Nazianzen, *Oratio XXX* (*Oration 30*), 12 (PG 36, 117).

² Leo I, *Tomus ad Flavianum* (*Tome to Flavian*) (Msi 5, 1375-1378; see above p. 79).

τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου γένους καταλλήλως συντρέχοντα.

Τούτων τοίνυν μετὰ πάσης πανταχόθεν ἀκριβείας τε καὶ ἐμμελείας παρ' ἡμῶν διατυπωθέντων, ὀρίζομεν 5 ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν, ἢ γοῦν συγγράφειν ἢ συντιθέναι ἢ φρονεῖν ἢ διδάσκειν ἑτέρους· τοὺς δὲ τολμῶντας ἢ συντιθέναι πίστιν 10 ἑτέραν ἢ προκομίζειν ἢ διδάσκειν ἢ παραδιδόναι ἕτερον σύμβολον τοῖς ἐθέλουσιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξ ἑλληνισμοῦ ἢ ἐξ 15 ἰουδαϊσμοῦ ἢ γοῦν ἐξ αἰρέσεως οἰασοῦν, ἢ καινοφωνίαν, ἢ τοὶ λέξεως ἐφεύρουν πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν εἰσάγειν τῶν νυνὶ παρ' ἡμῶν διορισθέντων· 20 τούτους, εἰ μὲν ἐπίσκοποι εἴεν ἢ κληρικοί, ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ τοὺς κληρικούς τοῦ κλήρου· εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες εἴεν ἢ λαϊκοί, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτοῦς.

fitemur, ad salutem humani generis convenienter in eo concurrentes.

His igitur cum omni undique cautela atque diligentia a nobis formatis, definimus aliam fidem nulli licere proferre aut conscribere, componere aut sapere, vel etiam aliter docere. Qui vero praesumpserint fidem alteram componere vel proferre vel docere vel tradere aliud symbolum volentibus converti ad agnitionem veritatis ex gentilitate vel Iudaismo aut ex qualibet haeresi; aut qui novitatem vocis vel dictionis adinventionem ad subversionem eorum quae nunc a nobis determinata sunt introducere; hos si quidem episcopi fuerint aut clerici, alienos esse, episcopos quidem ab episcopatu, clericos vero a clero; sin autem monachi fuerint, vel laici, etiam anathematizari eos.

wills and principles of action meet in correspondence for the salvation of the human race.

So now that these points have been formulated by us with all precision in every respect and with all care, we definitely state that it is not allowable for anyone to produce another faith, that is, to write or to compose or to consider or to teach others; those who dare to compose another faith, or to support or to teach or to hand on another creed to those who wish to turn to knowledge of the truth, whether from Hellenism or Judaism or indeed from any heresy whatsoever, or to introduce novelty of speech, that is, invention of terms, so as to overturn what has now been defined by us, such persons, if they are bishops or clerics, are deprived of their episcopacy or clerical rank, and if they are monks or layfolk they are excommunicated.