

# ARAM

PERIODICAL

MELKITE CHRISTIANITY &  
THE ARAMAEANS B.C.:

HISTORY, LITERATURE &  
ARCHAEOLOGY



VOLUME 31

2019

# مجلة تراث



VI-46 - M (2)  
AN 88 95  
B 489 372

# ARAM PERIODICAL

MELKITE CHRISTIANITY &  
THE ARAMAEANS B.C.:

HISTORY, LITERATURE &  
ARCHAEOLOGY



VOLUME 31

2019

ARAM is a peer-reviewed periodical published by the ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies

**Address:**

ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies  
The Oriental Institute  
The University of Oxford  
Pusey Lane  
Oxford OX1 2LE – UK  
Tel: +44 (0)1865 514041  
Email: [aram@orinst.ox.ac.uk](mailto:aram@orinst.ox.ac.uk)  
[www.aramsociety.org](http://www.aramsociety.org)

**Editor:**

Dr. Shafiq Abouzayd  
The Oriental Institute  
The University of Oxford  
Pusey Lane  
Oxford OX1 2LE – UK  
Mobile: +44 (0)7977 495150  
[shafiq.abouzayd@orinst.ox.ac.uk](mailto:shafiq.abouzayd@orinst.ox.ac.uk)

**Articles:**

Articles for publication to be sent to ARAM at the above address.

**Subscription:**

New subscriptions to be sent to ARAM at the above address.

**Book Orders:**

Order from the link: [www.aramsociety.org](http://www.aramsociety.org)  
or directly from the publisher: <https://www.lulu.com/spotlight/ARAM120>

ISSN: 0959-4213

© 2019 ARAM SOCIETY FOR SYRO-MESOPOTAMIAN STUDIES

All rights reserved. No parts of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, without prior permission of the publisher.

**ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies:  
Forty Fifth International Conference**

**Melkite Christianity  
(The Patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, and  
Jerusalem)**



The Oriental Institute  
Oxford University  
12-14 July 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 31, Number 1 (2019): Melkite Christianity (ARAM Conference 2017)

ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies:  
Forty Seventh International Conference

The Aramaeans B.C.:  
History, Literature, and Archaeology



The Oriental Institute  
Oxford University  
09-10 July 2018

**Dr. Sebastian Brock** (University of Oxford)  
“PALIMPSEST CANONS IN THE SINAI, NEW FINDS SYR. 3.” .....PP. 1-6

**Mr. Joseph Glynias** (PhD student at Princeton University)  
“SYRIAC MELKITE MONASTICISM AT MOUNT SINAI IN THE 13<sup>TH</sup> AND 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES.” .....PP. 7-33

**Dr. Daniel Galadza** (University of Vienna) & **Mr. Alex C.J. Neroth van Vogelpoel** (Notre Dame University)  
“MULTILINGUALISM IN THE DIVINE LITURGY OF ST JOHN CHRYSOSTOM AMONG THE MELKITES (8<sup>TH</sup> – 13<sup>TH</sup> C.)” ..... PP 35-50

**Dr. Bishara Ebeid** (Pontifical Oriental Institute - Rome)  
“THE MELKITE -CHALCEDONIAN READING OF HISTORY: THE CASE OF EUTYCHIUS OF ALEXANDRIA AND HIS ANNALS.” .....PP. 51-83

**Dr. Pierre Moukarzel** (Lebanese University, Beirut)  
“THE MELKITE PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM DURING THE MAMLUK PERIOD.” .....PP. 85-104

**Dr. Scott Ables** (University of Oxford).  
“WAS THE REESTABLISHMENT OF THE JERUSALEM PATRIARCHATE A ‘PROTO-MELKITE’ GAMBIT ORCHESTRATED BY JOHN OF DAMASCUS—*QUID PRO QUO*: CATHEDRAL FOR PATRIARCHATE?” .....PP. 105-117

**Dr. Ioana Feodorov** (Institute for South-East European Studies of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest.)  
“THE ARABIC VERSION OF DEMETRIUS CANTEMIR’S *DIVAN* AND THE WIDE RANGE OF ITS READERSHIP.” .....PP. 119-128

**Dr. Nestor Kavvadas** (University of Siegen, Germany)  
“THE FIRST BLAST: THE JERUSALEM FILIOQUE CONFLICT OF 807 AND ITS POLITICS.” .....PP. 129-136

**Dr. Željko Paša** (Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome)  
“ĪSŪ‘YAHB II OF ĠADĀLĀ’S CONFESSION OF THE FAITH BEFORE HERACLIVS IN 630 : STUDY, CRITICAL EDITION, AND TRANSLATION” ..... PP. 137-164

**Dr. Mariusz Burdajewicz and Prof. Dr. Jolanta Mlynarczyk** (University of Warsaw)  
“SOME FACTS ABOUT THE NORTH-WEST CHURCH IN HIPPOS (ARAMAIC: SISITA, ARABIC SŪSIYAH) ON THE SEA OF GALILEE, SIXTH TO MID-EIGHTH CENTURIES).” .....PP. 165-194

**Dr. Ravit Linn, Dr. Emma Maayan, Dr. Yotam Tepper, Dr. Guy Bar-Oz**, (University of Haifa)  
“STUDY OF THE EARLY TRANSFIGURATION WALL PAINTING IN SHIVTA, ISRAEL.” .....PP. 195-206

**Michael Zellmann-Rohrer** (University of Oxford)  
“A CHRISTIAN EPITAPH FROM FOURTH-CENTURY PALAESTINA TERTIA.” .....PP. 207-209

**Dr. Souad Slim** (Balamand University)  
“THE MANUSCRIPT ‘MULUK AL ROUM’ BETWEEN HISTORY AND LEGEND: *“الدر المنظوم في أخبار ملوك الروم”* .....PP. 211-219  
THE MANUSCRIPT ‘MULUKS AL ROUM’ BETWEEN HISTORY AND LEGEND

**Dr. Naila Takieddine Kaidbey** (American University of Beirut)  
“MELKITES IN DAMASCUS ACCORDING TO MIKHAIL BREIK’S *TARIKH AL-SHAM*.” .....PP. 221-232

**Dr. Lucy-Anne Hunt** (Manchester Metropolitan University)  
"MELKITE ARTISTIC CONTRIBUTION DURING THE CRUSADES' PERIOD."  
.....PP. 233-316

**Volume 31, Number 2 (2019):** The Aramaeans B.C.: History, Literature, and Archaeology  
(ARAM Conference 2018)

- Prof. K. Lawson Younger, Jr.** (Trinity International University – Divinity School, USA)  
"GODS AT THE GATES: A STUDY OF THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE DEITIES  
REPRESENTED AT THE GATES OF ANCIENT SAM'AL (ZINCIRLI) WITH POSSIBLE  
HISTORICAL IMPLICATIONS.".....PP. 317-348
- Prof. Theodore J. Lewis** (John Hopkins University)  
"BAR-RAKIB'S LEGITIMATION AND THE PROBLEM OF A MISSING CORPSE: THE  
END OF THE PANAMUWA INSCRIPTION IN THE LIGHT OF THE KATUMUWA  
INSCRIPTION.".....PP. 349-374
- Prof. Giuseppe Petrantoni** (University of Enna, Kore, Italy)  
"RECONSIDERING THE ARAMAIC INSCRIPTION OF BAHADIRLI. A PILGRIMAGE  
FOR THE GODDESS KUBABA?" .....PP. 375-379
- Prof. Rüdiger Schmitt** (University of Münster, Germany)  
"THE ARAMEAN INFLUENCE ON IRON II C JUDEAN RELIGION."  
.....PP. 381-393
- Dr. Lisa J. Cleath** (George Fox University, USA)  
"COLONIAL IDENTITY IN THE JEDANIAH 'ARCHIVES' AT ELEPHANTINE."  
.....PP. 395-408
- Dr. Haim Perlmutter** (Bar-Ilan University, Israel)  
"THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE IN EARLY RABBINIC LITERATURE (70-250 CE): A  
COMPLEX POSITION." .....PP. 409-419
- Prof. Ben Zion Rosenfeld** (Bar Ilan University)  
"JOSEPHUS ON THE ARAMEANS." .....PP. 421-437
- Prof. Daniel Bodi** (Sorbonne Université University of Paris 4)  
"THE 8TH CENTURY BCE BATTLE ACCOUNT OF THE ARAMEAN DEFEAT AT  
SUHU AND ITS BEARING ON THE YAHWEH WAR ACCOUNTS AND ON  
EZEKIEL'S *HAPAX LEGOMENA* - PHILOLOGICAL AND COMPARATIVE STUDY."  
.....PP. 439-465
- Prof. Minna Silver** (Mardin University)  
"AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON EARLY ARAMEANS AND THEIR  
KINGDOMS." .....PP. 467-498
- Dr. Krzysztof Jakubiak** (University of Warsaw)  
"THE GREAT TEMENOS OF HATRA CULT PRACTICES FROM THE SMALL CITY  
TEMPLES PERSPECTIVES.".....PP. 499-512

**Miscellaneous**

- Carol Ferris** (Marylhurst University, USA)  
"THE CELESTIAL PATHS OF SUMER AND ANCIENT CHINA." .....PP. 513-536
- Adi Erlich** (University of Haifa)  
"AMOS KLONER, 1940-2019." .....PP. 537-564

**Aram Newsletter**

**Newsletter** .....PP. 565-569

- 1998–2001) [French original, *Histoire des patriarchats melkites (Alexandrie, Antioche, Jerusalem) depuis le schisme monophysite du sixième siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (1910–1911)].
- Mateos, Juan, “‘Sedre’ et prières connexes dans quelques anciennes collections”, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 28 (1962), 239–287.
- Meester, P. de, ‘Grecques (liturgies)’, in Fernand Cabrol and Henri Leclercq, eds, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie Chrétienne et de liturgie* (Paris, 1924), vol. 6/2, coll. 1607–1608.
- Nasrallah, Joseph, ‘La liturgie des Patriarchats melchites de 969 à 1300’, *Oriens Christianus*, 71 (1987), 156–181.
- Nikolopoulos, Panagiotis G., ed., *Tà véa eúrĥmata toŧ Sinvā* (Athens, 1998).
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios, ed., ‘Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας’, in *Ανάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμητικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1894), 1–254.
- Philothée du Sināi, *Nouveaux Manuscrits Syriaques du Sināi* (Athens, 2008).
- Sakkellion, I., *Πατριακὴ Βιβλιοθήκη ἤτοι ἀναγραφή τῶν ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νήσον Πάτιμον* (Athens, 1890).
- Sauget, Joseph-Marie, ‘Nouveaux fragments de rouleaux liturgiques byzantino-melkites en syriaque’, *Le Muséon. Revue d'études orientales*, 88 (1975), 5–30.
- Scher, Addāi, ‘Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques du Musée Borgia aujourd'hui à la Bibliothèque Vaticane’, *Journal Asiatique*, series 10, 13 (1909), 249–287, <<https://archive.org/details/ScherNoticeSurLesManuscritsSyriaquesDuMuseeBorgiaAujourd'huiALaBibliothequeVaticane>> accessed 15 March 2018.
- Taft, Robert F., *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville/MN, 1992).
- *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 5: *The Precommunion Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 261 (Rome, 2000).
- *The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of the Gifts and other Pre-Anaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 200 (4<sup>th</sup> edn, Rome, 2004).
- *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 6: *The Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 281 (Rome, 2008).
- Tannous, Jack, and Johnson, Scott F., eds, *syri.ac: An annotated bibliography of Syriac resources online*, <<http://syri.ac/>> accessed 13 February 2018.
- Thekeparampil, Jacob, ‘Prayers after Incense’, *Parole de l'Orient* 6–7 (1975–1976), 325–40.
- ‘Weihsymbolik in den syrischen Gebeten des Mittelalters und bei pseudo-Dionysius’, in *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter: internationales Kolloquium, Eichstätt 1981*, eds Margot Schmidt and Carl-Friedrich Geyer, *Eichstätter Beiträge*, Bd. 4 (Regensburg: Pustet, 1982), 131–145.
- Treiger, Alexander, ‘Unpublished Texts from the Arab Orthodox Tradition (1): On the Origin of the Term “Melkite” and On the Destruction of the Maryamiyya Cathedral in Damascus’, *Chronos: Revue d'Histoire de l'Université de Balamand*, 29 (2014), 7–37.
- Velkovska, E., and Parenti, S., eds, *Евхологий Барберини гр. 336. Издание текста, предисловие и примечания*, tr. S. Golovanov (Omsk, 2011).
- ‘Worship in the Syriac Orthodox Church’, *Syriac Orthodox Resources*, <<http://sor.cua.edu/Worship/index.html>> accessed 6 July 2017.

MELKITE-CHALCEDONIAN READING OF HISTORY:  
THE CASE OF EUTYCHIUS OF ALEXANDRIA AND HIS ANNALS<sup>1</sup>

BISHARA EBEID  
(Pontificium Institutum Orientale, Roma)

**Abstract**

The Melkite Christianity of the patriarchates of Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch, for centuries, considered its orthodoxy to be the faith of the first six ecumenical councils. Even if the disputation on the icons is mentioned in their treatises and doctrines, especially in apologetic works with Muslims, the seventh council was not considered ecumenical. In my paper I aim to analyze the presentation of these six councils according to one Melkite historical work: the *Annals* of Eutychius of Alexandria. This work is one of the first historical works we know written in Arabic by a Christian. I will examine how this author presents the councils in their historical context, how he reads and presents the doctrine of each council, and how he describes the heresies and heretics that led to its convocation. I will analyze Eutychius' historical exposition of Melkite-Chalcedonian dogma and to try to answer these two questions:

- (1) How does he read the doctrines of the councils?
- (2) How does he present the faith through his particular Melkite and Chalcedonian reading?

INTRODUCTION

The Melkite Christianity of the patriarchates of Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch, for centuries, considered its orthodoxy to be the faith of the first six ecumenical councils.<sup>2</sup> Even if the disputation on the icons is mentioned in their treatises and doctrines, especially in apologetic works with Muslims, the seventh council was not considered ecumenical. Their reading of these councils and their context is a particular one, which I call Melkite-Chalcedonian, because the doctrines of all six ecumenical councils are seen through a Chalcedonian lens, and given a Chalcedonian interpretation. I aim, then, in this paper, to analyze these six councils as they are presented in one Melkite historical work: the *Annals* of Eutychius of Alexandria, which is one of the first chronicles (10<sup>th</sup> century) written in Arabic by a Christian.

I will examine how Eutychius presents the councils in their historical context, how he reads the doctrine of each council, the faith of orthodox fathers, and the heresies that led to the convocation of the councils. In other words, I will analyze the historical expositions of Melkite dogma according to Eutychius so I can show the special way he (1) uses his sources; (2) chooses the information from them; and (3) presents his own narration. I have previously

<sup>1</sup> My paper, given at the Aram Forty-Sixth International Conference: Melkite Christianity, 1<sup>st</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries, had the title “The Melkite Orthodoxy: The Six Ecumenical Councils according to Eutychius of Alexandria’s *Annals* and Agapius of Mabbug’s *Universal History*”. In the conference I presented and analyzed the narrations of both Melkite authors until the Council of Chalcedon. In this paper presented here, I chose just one of the authors, Eutychius of Alexandria, focusing on his historical analysis and doctrinal description of the six Ecumenical Councils.

<sup>2</sup> Cfr. Griffith, S., ‘Melkites, Jacobites and the Christological Controversies in Arabic in Third/Ninth Century Syria’, in D. Thomas, ed., *Syrian Christians under Islam: the First Thousand Years*, (Leiden- Boston- Köln, 2001), 9–55, here 47; see also footnote 157 on the same page.

analyzed elsewhere the language and the terminology used by Eutychius in his description of these doctrines<sup>3</sup>; therefore such analysis will not be applied to this paper.

S. Griffith has already illustrated the role of the six ecumenical councils in the writings of *Theodore Abū Qurrah*, highlighting these characteristics of his theology: written in Arabic, in an Islamic milieu, to Muslims and other non Melkites, i.e. Nestorians and Miaphysites,<sup>4</sup> with catechetical, polemic and apologetic dimensions/purposes. Griffith tried to demonstrate the same thing in Eutychius' *Annals*. According to him, these same characteristics and purposes formed the basis of Eutychius' historiography, defining his Melkite patrimony in his *Annals*.<sup>5</sup> Griffith's analysis was limited to underlining these characteristics without giving detailed examples. My aim with this paper, then, is to analyze Eutychius' exposition of the six ecumenical councils in his *Annals*, showing how he, with a special Melkite-Chalcedonian reading and interpretation of the history of the Church and its dogma, could realize what S. Griffith correctly characterized the "self-definition of a Melkite profile". Thus, I will define this profile the "orthodoxy of the Melkite and Chalcedonian Church" according to Melkite historiographical works as the *Annals* of Eutychius.

#### EUTYCHIUS AND HIS ANNALS

We do not have very much information on the life of *Sa'īd Ibn Baṭṭīq*, known as Eutychius of Alexandria;<sup>6</sup> what we know about him comes mainly from the *Annals* itself. He tells us that he was a physician. This profession was very important to him—he always added it to his name as a title-adjective, *Sa'īd Ibn Baṭṭīq* the physician (*al-mutaṭabbib*). He says he was born in *al-Fuṣṭāṭ miṣr* (inside the actual city of Cairo) in 877,<sup>7</sup> and elected Melkite patriarch of Alexandria on the 7<sup>th</sup> of February, 933, when he was 60 years old.<sup>8</sup> At his enthronement he chose the Greek name *Ευτύχιος*, which is a translation of his Arabic name *Sa'īd* (in English could be translated into Felix). The fact that he mentions the Greek name is significant because it indicates the relationship of his Church with its origins, i.e. the Melkite and Chalcedonian confession.<sup>9</sup> During his patriarchate, Egypt was controlled by the independent governors, the Tulunids and

<sup>3</sup> See the third chapter of my dissertation: Ebeid, B., *La Cristologia delle grandi confessioni cristiane dell'Oriente nel X e XI secolo. Studio comparativo delle polemiche del melchita Sa'īd Ibn Baṭṭīq e le risposte del copto Sawirus Ibn al-Muqaffa' e del nestoriano Elia di Nisibi*. Dissertatione ad Doctoratum, Pontifical Orientale Institut (Rome, 2014). This dissertation is published as Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh. La Cristologia delle grandi confessioni cristiane dell'Oriente nel X e XI secolo*, (Rome, 2018). For the third chapter see pages 101-157 of the publication.

<sup>4</sup> Cfr. Griffith, S., 'Muslims and Church Councils. The Apology of Theodore Abū Qurrah', *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993), 720-290.

<sup>5</sup> Cfr. Idem, 'Apologetics and Historiography in the Annals of Eutychios of Alexandria: Christian Self-Definition in the World of Islam', in H. Teule, ed., *Studies on the Christian Arabic Heritage. In honour of Father Prof. Dr. Samir Khalil Samir S. J.*, Eastern Christian Studies, 5 (Leuven, 2004), 65-89, here 80-88.

<sup>6</sup> Cfr. Graf, G., *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, vol. ii: *Die Schriftsteller bis zur mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts*, Studi e Testi, 133 (Vatican City, 1947), 32-33. See also Ebeid, B., 'Sa'īd Ibn Baṭṭīq, the Theologian. New Considerations on his Historical Work, "The Annals"', *Parole d'Orient* 42 (2016), 165-190, here 167-168.

<sup>7</sup> He declares this by saying that he was born in the eighth year of the caliphate of *al-Mu'tamid*, cfr. Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini, *Annales*, vol. ii, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 51, Scriptorum Arabici, 7, L. Cheikho, ed. (Beirut-Paris-Leipzig, 1909), 69:

«وفي ثمان سنين من خلافة المعتمد ولد سعيد ابن بطريق المتطبيب»

<sup>8</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. ii, 70:

«وبعد ستين سنة من مولده صير بطريقاً على الإسكندرية وسمي انبا إفتيشيوس»

See also Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. ii, 86:

«في اول سنة من خلافته (القاهر بالله) صير سعيد ابن بطريق المتطبيب من اهل فسطاط مصر بطريقاً على الاسكندرية وسمي انبا إفتيشيوس»

<sup>9</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. ii, 88:

«إفتيشيوس الملكي المذهب الذي صار بطريقاً على مدينة الاسكندرية»

the Ikhshidids.<sup>10</sup> As S. Griffith notes, Eutychius is not famous because he was a Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, but rather because he was a Christian author who wrote in the Arabic language.<sup>11</sup>

In fact, he was the first Melkite of Egypt to write in Arabic. It is said that he wrote theological works besides the *Annals*,<sup>12</sup> but in this paper we will focus only on this historical chronicle. It is a fundamental source of ecclesiastical history, of the general history of his time, and of theology. The importance of the *Annals* can be seen even in its use by Muslim historians, such as *al-Mas'ūdī*, as a source of Byzantine<sup>13</sup> secular and ecclesiastical history. Elsewhere I have discussed the authenticity of this work and its attribution, as whole work, to Eutychius himself.<sup>14</sup> In this paper I will examine the *Annals* in its complete form, edited by L. Cheikho, considering it a work of the Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, Eutychius. The historical work of the patriarch belongs to a genre of "universal history" which begins from the time of creation and continues until the time of the author himself. My analysis will be in chronological order of the ecumenical councils, from Nicaea (325) to Constantinople III (680-681).

#### THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA (325 A.D.)

According to Eutychius, Arius was in Alexandria at the time of Peter (patriarch) of Alexandria, when he started to teach his heretical doctrine, for which Peter excommunicated him.<sup>15</sup> Eutychius tells us that Peter had a dream in which Christ's tunic was divided; Peter asked the Lord who had divided his tunic and He replied that it was Arius.<sup>16</sup> Such mention of the dream, although not based on historical accounts we know of, nonetheless realizes perfectly the main goal of Eutychius, i.e. reading the doctrine with Chalcedonian and Melkite eyes. Saying that Christ's tunic is divided alludes, according to my understanding, to Nestorianism. We know that the Chalcedonians as well as the Miaphysites considered Nestorius a follower of Arius.<sup>17</sup> Eutychius, then, by such mention of the dream, follows his tradition and presents it in his own way.

Our Alexandrian patriarch author Eutychius goes on to tell us that after the death of Peter, Arius asked mercy from *Asīlā* (he means Archelaous), the successor of Peter, who forgave him and ordained him a priest. Later still, when Alexander in turn succeeded Archelaous on the seat of Alexandria, Arius proclaimed again his heretic doctrine, for which Alexander started a polemic against him.<sup>18</sup> Eutychius then recounts a second excommunication of Arius, by Alexander,<sup>19</sup> without mentioning the synod convoked by him in Alexandria in 319/320 that

<sup>10</sup> On the dynasty of the Tulunids see Elli, A., *Storia della Chiesa Copta*. vol. ii: *L'Egitto arabo e musulmano. Il miracolo d'una sopravvivenza cristiana in terra d'Islam*, Studia Orientalia Christiana. Monographiae, 13 (Cairo – Jerusalem, 2003), 6-65; while on that of the Ikhshidids see *ibid*, 66-67.

<sup>11</sup> Cfr. Griffith, S., 'Eutychios of Alexandria on the Emperor Theophilus and Iconoclasm in Byzantium: A Tenth Century Moment in Christian Apologetics in Arabic', *Byzantion* 52 (1982), 154-190, here 154.

<sup>12</sup> For the works attributed to him and the discussion on this issue, see Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 92-100, 202-215; see also *idem*, 'Sa'īd Ibn Baṭṭīq', 165-190.

<sup>13</sup> Cfr. El-Cheikh, N., 'Arab Christian contributions to Muslim historiography on Byzantium', *Bulletin of the Royal Institute for Inter-Faith Studies* 1 (1999), 45-60, here 48-54.

<sup>14</sup> Cfr. Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 202-215; see also *idem*, 'Sa'īd Ibn Baṭṭīq'.

<sup>15</sup> Cfr. Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini, *Annales*, vol. i, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 50, Scriptorum Arabici, 6, L. Cheikho, ed. (Beirut-Paris-Leipzig, 1905), 116-117.

<sup>16</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 117:

«فاني رأيت المسيح في النوم مشقوق الثوب فقلت له يا سيدي من شق ثوبك فقال لي اريوس»

<sup>17</sup> Cfr. Wessel, S., *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, 2004), 297.

<sup>18</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 124.

<sup>19</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 124:



excommunicated Arius. He also mentions that Alexander excommunicated a fellow bishop, Melitius of *Asyūt*.<sup>20</sup> Historians today believe that Melitius of Lycopolis in Thebais was the one who ordained Arius a priest, not Archelaous as Eutyhchius asserts,<sup>21</sup> and that Melitius was affiliated in some way with the Arians. Thus, I believe that the bishop whom Eutyhchius calls Melitius of *Asyūt* was actually Melitius of Lycopolis, who created a schismatic sect in Egypt, known as the Melitians.<sup>22</sup> He was condemned first by Peter,<sup>23</sup> then by Alexander, along with Arius in the synod of Alexandria in 319/320.<sup>24</sup> Eutyhchius seems to be alluding to this synod without actually referencing it.

Eutyhchius goes on to say that Arius went to the emperor Constantine to ask for help, bringing with him two supportive bishops, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Caesarea.<sup>25</sup> He also tells us that a debate between Arius and Alexander was held in front of Constantine. It is known that Arius sent a letter to Alexander of Alexandria, after being excommunicated and having taken refuge towards Eusebius of Caesarea,<sup>26</sup> in which he presented his doctrine. We also know Alexander's response to Arius, but we do not know of any debate between them, especially in front of Constantine the Great. It seems to me that Eutyhchius, by mentioning this dispute in front of the emperor, is extrapolating beyond the fact that Constantine in the year 324 wrote a letter to both Arius, who probably had returned to Alexandria, and Alexander, sent with the delegation of Hosius of Cordoba, to Alexandria with the desire of reconciling the two parties.<sup>27</sup>

Eutyhchius' work reveals some other information about Arius' doctrine. At the beginning of his narration on Arius, Eutyhchius says that he taught that God is only the Father, whereas the Son is created, and that there was a time in which the Father existed and the Son did not.<sup>28</sup> This, in fact, is the doctrine Arius proclaimed at the beginning of the controversy.<sup>29</sup> Eutyhchius,

«وان الاسكندرس بطريك الاسكندرية منع اريوس من الدخول للكنيسة ولعنه وقال: ان اريوس ملعون لان بطرس البطريرك قال لنا قبل ان يستشهد ان الله لعن اريوس فلا تقبلوه ولا تدخلوه معكم في الكنيسة»

<sup>20</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 124:

«وكان على مدينة اسبوط من عمل مصر اسقف يقال له مليطيوس يرى رأي اريوس فلعنه الاسكندرس البطريرك»

<sup>21</sup> Cfr. Friend, W., *The Rise of Christianity* (London, 1984), 493.

<sup>22</sup> Cfr. Cross, F., and Livingstone, E., eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (3rd edn, Oxford-New York, 1997), 1067-1068.

<sup>23</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 1067-1068.

<sup>24</sup> Cfr. Labbé, Ph., and Cossart, G., Josse, G., eds., *Sacrosancta concilia ad regiam editionem exacta quae nunc quarta parte prodit auctior*, vol. I (Paris, 1671), 1491-1494.

<sup>25</sup> Cfr. Eutyhchii, *Annales*, vol. i, 124-125. Eutyhchius actually misnames both men: He says that Eunomius, rather than Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Eusebius of *Filā* were the bishop supporters of Arius. Although it could possibly be a mistake made by the copyists, I elsewhere discussed the two names and tried to explain why Eutyhchius, if it was his mistake, refers to them this way, cfr. Ebeid, B., 'La figura di Costantino nella storiografia melchita araba primitiva: Un Costantino diverso?', in M. Pampaloni and B. Ebeid, eds., *Costantino e l'Oriente. L'impero, i suoi confini e le sue estensioni, Atti del convegno di studi promosso dal PIO in occasione della ricorrenza costantiniana (313-2013) Roma 18 aprile 2013*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 300 (Rome, 2016), 341-400, here 367, 371 and 375.

<sup>26</sup> Cfr. Simonetti, M., *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, 11 (Rome, 1975), 31.

<sup>27</sup> Cfr. The Newman, J., *The Arians of the Fourth Century. Their Doctrine, Temper and Conduct Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the church between A.D. 325 and A.D. 381*, (2ed edn, London, 1854; repr. 2015), 130-132; see also Ebeid, B., 'La figura', 367-371 and 392-394. For the letter see Simonetti, M., *Studi sull'Arianesimo*, Verba Seniorum Collana di Testi e Studi Patristici, 5 (Rome, 1965), 88-109, where the author analyzes the letter of Arius sent to Alexander of Alexandria, while in pp. 110-134 there is an analysis of the letter of Alexander written as reaction to the Arian doctrine.

<sup>28</sup> Cfr. Eutyhchii, *Annales*, vol. i, 116:

«ان الأب وحده الله والابن مخلوق مصنوع. وقد كان الأب اذ لم يكن الابن»

<sup>29</sup> In fact, this affirmation is found in Arius' letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, in which he explains his doctrine, for which he was persecuted by Alexander of Alexandria, cfr. Simonetti, M., ed., *Il Cristo*, vol. ii: *Testi teologici e spirituali in Lingua Greca dal IV al VII Secolo*, (5th edn, Milano, 2003), 72-73. For the Arian question, see *idem*, *Studi sull'Arianesimo*, 32-37 and 88-109, where the author presents in a very clear way the Arian doctrine on the created character of the Logos.

however, anachronistically presents Arius' doctrine in Islamic language.<sup>30</sup> In my opinion, Eutyhchius had in mind the *Mu'tazilites* and their doctrine regarding the word of God, the Quran, as created. For this reason, he has Alexander asking Arius if it is more desirable to worship a creature or the uncreated God,<sup>31</sup> with Arius answering that it is a must to worship the uncreated.<sup>32</sup> Eutyhchius then, writing in an Islamic environment, certainly has in mind the accusations made by Muslims against Christians,<sup>33</sup> so he tries to give his readers the idea that before the Muslims, the heretic Arius and his followers had the same doctrine, or something similar to it. Therefore, he makes Alexander to affirm that for Christians both the Father and the Son, who is the real Word of God, are uncreated, and thus are to be worshiped.<sup>34</sup> This is what we call a Melkite reading of faith, an expression of the Christian faith using the linguistic codex used at the author's time. In fact, the term *muḥḍaṭ* (created) was first used in Arabic-Islamic philosophy by the school of *mu'tazilah*.<sup>35</sup> By it they wanted to describe the created character of the Quran. Applying this term to the thought of Arius, Eutyhchius makes his readers note the similarities between the doctrine of *mu'tazilah* and Arianism. In fact, just like Arius,<sup>36</sup> the *mu'tazilah* taught that the Quran, the word of God, has an eternal character, but remains a creature of God.<sup>37</sup> The key difference, however, must be noted: for Arius the Word is identified with the Son of God, but for the *mu'tazilah* such doctrine is rejected.

Eutyhchius reports that Constantine the Great convoked a council in Nicaea to resolve the problem. The problem was not just Arius—he tells that at that time, there were many heretical doctrines, including those of Sabelius, and of Marcion, as well as Paul of Samosata.<sup>38</sup> The council had to deal with all these heresies. Eutyhchius provides some names of bishops who participated at the council of Nicaea: Alexander of Alexandria, who was the president of the council, Eustathius (*Astār*) of Antiochia, Macarius of Jerusalem; *Biqtur* (Victor) and Vicentius representing Silvestrus, the bishop of Rome.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Cfr. Eutyhchii, *Annales*, vol. i, 125:

«أقول أن الابن اذ لم يكن الابن ثم انه أحدث الابن فكان كلمة الله الأ أنه مُحدث مخلوق ثم فوض الابن الى الابن الذي يسمى كلمة الامر فكان هو خالق السموات والارض وما بينهما كما قال في انجيله المقدس اذ يقول: قد أعطيت كل سلطان على السموات والارض. فكان هو الخالق لهما بما اعطي من ذلك. ثم ان تلك الكلمة تجسدت فيما بعد من مريم العذراء ومن روح القدس فصار ذلك مسيحا واحداً. فالمسيح اذا معنيين كلمة وجسد الأ انهما جميعاً مخلوقان.»

<sup>31</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 125:

«اخبرنا ايها اوجب علينا عندك عبادة من خلقنا او عبادة من لم يخلقنا.»

<sup>32</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 125:

«فان كان خلقنا الابن كما وصفت وكان الابن مخلوقاً. فعبادة الابن المخلوق اذا اوجب من عبادة الابن الذي ليس بمخلوق بل تصير عبادة الابن الخالق كفر وعبادة الابن المخلوق ايماناً وذلك من اقبح القبيح.»

<sup>33</sup> I mean here the denial of the divine character of the Logos and the consequences of that doctrine. Moreover, it is well known that at the beginning of the Arabic conquest, many Christians, like John Damascene, considered Islam as a Christological heresy with many common points with Arianism, cfr. Goddard, H., *A History of Christian-Muslim Relation* (Edinburg, 2000), 4; for the opinion of John of Damascus see Sahas, D., *John of Damascus on Islam. Christian Heresiology and the Intellectual Background to Earliest Christian-Muslim Relations*, The History of Christian-Muslim Relations, 34 (Leiden, 2017).

<sup>34</sup> Cfr. Eutyhchii, *Annales*, vol. i, 125:

«فان كان خلقنا الابن كما وصفت وكان الابن مخلوقاً. فعبادة الابن المخلوق اذا اوجب من عبادة الابن الذي ليس بمخلوق بل تصير عبادة الابن الخالق كفر وعبادة الابن المخلوق ايماناً وذلك من اقبح القبيح.»

<sup>35</sup> Cfr. Wolfson, H., *The Philosophy of the Kalam* (Cambridge-Massachusetts-London, 1976), 291-303.

<sup>36</sup> Cfr. Dünzl, F., *A Brief History of the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Early Church*, tr. J. Bowden (New York, 2007), 43-45; see also Arius' letter to Alexander in Simonetti, M., ed., *Il Cristo*, vol. ii, 76-79.

<sup>37</sup> Cfr. Wolfson, H., *The Philosophy*, 264.

<sup>38</sup> Cfr. Eutyhchii, *Annales*, vol. i, 126.

<sup>39</sup> Cfr. Eutyhchii, *Annales*, vol. i, 127:

«كان رئيس المجمع والمقدم فيه الاسكندرس بطريك الاسكندرية واسطبات بطريك انطاكية ومقاريوس اسقف بيت المقدس. ووجه سليسترس بطريك رومية من عنده قسيسين اسم احدهما بقطر والآخر فيكتيوس.»

The names he mentions are found in all lists of Nicaea, cfr. Gelzer, H., and Hilgenfeld, H., and Cuntz, O., eds., *Patrum Nicaenorum. Nomina Latine Graece Coptice Syriace Arabice Armeniace*, (Leipzig, 1898); see also Davis, L., *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): their History and Theology*, Theology and Life, 21 (repr., Colledgeville, 1990), 56.

Eutychius has the name of the Pope of Rome correct, but he is wrong on one of the priests representing him at Nicaea. He calls Vito by the name *Biqtur* (Victor).<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, the Arabic form he uses for Eustathius of Antioch, *Astāt*, leads me to hypothesize that Eutychius had a Syriac source, since the name Eustathius in Syriac ܐܘܨܬܐܘܨܐܘܨܐܘܨܐܘܨܐܘܨܐ<sup>41</sup> is closer to the Arabic form *Astāt*. Another fact that reveals his sources is his use of the Arabo-Islamic name of Jerusalem, *bayt al-maqdis*.<sup>42</sup> Such use reveals not just a different approach to the reading of history, but also the degree of arabization of the Melkites in Eutychius' area, Palestine and Egypt, at his time. In fact, it has been demonstrated<sup>43</sup> that the Melkite community of Palestine, where I maintain Eutychius received his theological formation,<sup>44</sup> was arabized quicker than other Christian communities in the Islamic empire;<sup>45</sup> this is evident in the Arabic language used in the *Annals*.<sup>46</sup>

Besides the Greek and the probable Syriac historical sources, it is apparent that he also had in hand apocryphal sources and legends that he either read as separate works, or were included in the historical sources he used. One of such legend books is that regarding Silvestrus of Rome, the *Acta Silvestri*, found in the East in different versions. Eutychius uses some information from it, but not every detail;<sup>46</sup> for instance, he does not follow the legend regarding the baptism of Constantine by Silvestrus. All this should help us understand how Eutychius, as a historian, chose his information and historical details, and how he elaborated them so at the end he was able to present them in his own way.

We should now reflect on the information regarding the presidency of the council. It is known that Hosius of Cordoba was the president of the council of Nicaea,<sup>47</sup> not Alexander, as Eutychius states. Why does he transmit such misinformation? Does he follow a mistake found in his sources, or does he want to obscure the role of Hosius, and instead exalt that of Alexander? In my opinion, the second option is more probable. We know that Eusebius of Caesarea and Sozomen were among the sources Eutychius follows,<sup>48</sup> and both of them correctly name the presidency of the bishop of Cordoba at Nicaea. I believe Eutychius manipulates this information for the following reasons: First of all, Hosius was not a great theologian, and he did not have direct contact with Arius, as had Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria. Secondly, Alexander was a predecessor of Eutychius himself in the seat of Alexandria. Eutychius wants to

<sup>40</sup> Such a mistake could be by the copyist, but I am convinced that Eutychius confuses the names Vito and (Pope) Victor, as we shall see further.

<sup>41</sup> This element could also support my hypothesis that Eutychius sojourned in the monasteries of Jerusalem and knew the *Loca Sancta*. This hypothesis was used to show the authenticity of the book of demonstration attributed to him, see Ebeid, B., 'Sa'id Ibn Baṭriq'.

<sup>42</sup> Cfr. Levy-Rubin, M., 'Arabization versus Islamization in the Palestinian Melkite community during the early Muslim period', in A. Kofsky and G. Stroumsa, eds., *Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land. First Fifteenth Centuries CE* (Jerusalem, 1998), 149-162.

<sup>43</sup> Cfr. Ebeid, B., 'Sa'id Ibn Baṭriq'.

<sup>44</sup> In other Arab-Christian sources, such as the historical work of the Melkite Agapius of Hierapolis, the name used for the holy city is an Arabic transliteration of the Hebrew ירושלים, cfr. Agapius Episcopus Mabbugensis, *Historia Universalis*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 65, Scriptorum Arabici, 10, L. Cheikho, ed. (Beirut-Paris, 1912), 289:

«ومقاريوس صاحب اورشليم»

See also *ibid*, 310:

«ويوملاوس صاحب اورشليم»

<sup>45</sup> One of the elements of the arabization that scholars note is the use of the Arabic names for persons and for places, cfr. Levy-Rubin, M., 'Arabization versus Islamization', 153, notable in Eutychius' *Annals*.

<sup>46</sup> Cfr. Ebeid, B., 'La figura', 362-367.

<sup>47</sup> Cfr. Newman, J., *The Arians*, 132.

<sup>48</sup> Cfr. Simonsohn, U., 'Sa'id ibn Baṭriq' in D. Thomas and A. Mallett, eds., *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. ii: 900-1050, The History of Christian-Muslim Relations, 14 (Leiden-Boston, 2010), 224-233, here 227-329.

exalt the role of the bishops of Alexandria in defending orthodoxy. This is a key point of his Melkite reading of history: As a successor of these bishops, his own role is to continue defending orthodoxy against all heresies. His polemics, then, against non-Chalcedonians or non-Christians, should be highly regarded by the members of his Church.

Returning to Eutychius' account, he affirms that Constantine actually sat in the middle of the bishops during the council, following their discussions, a fact which all scholars today accept.<sup>49</sup> Eutychius then tells us the results of the council: the fathers agreed to excommunicate Arius and his followers, including Eusebius of Nicomedia, and repudiate his doctrine as heresy. In order to define orthodox doctrine, they composed a *Creed*.<sup>50</sup> He does not mention any part of the *Creed*; he simply says that in it, the fathers affirmed that the Son is generated from the Father before time, that He is of the same nature as the Father, and that He is uncreated.<sup>51</sup> After this, Eutychius narrates that the fathers decided to consecrate Metrophanes a bishop for the see of Constantinople, and they agreed that Christian Easter should be celebrated the Sunday after the Jewish Passover.

For calculating the day of Easter, the fathers of Nicaea affirmed what was already written by Demetrius of Alexandria, Gaianus of Jerusalem, Maximus of Antioch, and *Biqtur* (Victor) of Rome.<sup>52</sup> (This last information resolves the problematic name of the first representative of the bishop of Rome—it seems that Eutychius confused Vito with Victor (Pope of Rome †199), calling both *Biqtur*). They decided that the date of Easter should be determined according to the calculations used by Alexandria and Rome.<sup>53</sup>

We must take note here that Eutychius, besides these two episcopal sees, mentioned also Jerusalem and Antioch. In my opinion, such addition is caused by his Melkite-Chalcedonian reading of history that permits him to apply the system of pentarchy, the five principal sees of the Christian world including also Constantinople, in the narrations of all six councils. It is known that even if the *pre-formulation* of pentarchy began during the 5<sup>th</sup> century, at the council of Chalcedon, it was not formulated and established until the 6<sup>th</sup> century, by the emperor Justinian.<sup>54</sup> Applying it retroactively to the narration of councils before this era demonstrates its importance for the Melkite community who lived with other Christian churches under Islamic rule. Emphasizing this system and applying it to all councils helped them show their unity with the rest of the Melkite-Chalcedonian Church outside of the Islamic Empire, i.e. in Constantinople and Rome. One might here see a similarity between the comprehension and use of pentarchy in Eutychius' historical narration of the councils, and the theological comprehension of the role of the bishop of Rome in the councils expressed by *Abū Qurrah* in his tract on orthodoxy and the councils.<sup>55</sup> Both try to express the unity between all Melkite thrones, inside and outside the Islamic empire.

<sup>49</sup> Cfr. Pohlsander, H., *The Emperor Constantine* (2ed edn, London-New York, 2004), 51-52; Jones, A., *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (4th edn, London, 1965), 156; Branes, T., *Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (4th edn, Malden-Oxford, 2014), 122; Ebeid, B., 'La figura', 372.

<sup>50</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 127:

«فاتفقوا على انشاء اريوس واصحابه ولعنوه ولكل من يقول بمقاتتهم. ووضعوا الامانة.»

<sup>51</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 127:

«وثبتوا ان الابن مولود من الاب قبل كل الدهور. وان الابن من طبيعة الاب غير مخلوق.»

<sup>52</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 127:

«وثبتوا ما وضعه ديمتريوس بطريرك الاسكندرية وغابياتوس اسقف بيت المقدس ومقسيموس بطريرك انطاكية وبطريرك رومية من حساب الصوم والفتح»

<sup>53</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 68.

<sup>54</sup> On the system of pentarchy, its origins and its function see Peri, V., 'La Pentarchia: istituzione ecclesiae (IV-VII Sec.) e teoria canonico-teologica', *Bisanzio. Roma e l'Italia nell'alto Medioevo. Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 34 (1988), 209-311; O'Connell, P., *The Ecclesiology of Saint Nicephorus I (758-828), Patriarch of Constantinople: Pentarchy and Primacy*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 194 (Rome, 1972), 29-36.

<sup>55</sup> Cfr. Griffith, S., 'Muslims and Church Councils', 290-293.

It is interesting to notice again the sources the patriarch has in hand to create his own narration: some details are really decisions of Nicaea, as the question regarding the Easter and its calendar,<sup>56</sup> or the condemnation of Arius and other heretical doctrines;<sup>57</sup> other details come from local traditions and legends, such as the nomination of Metrophanes as the bishop of Constantinople.<sup>58</sup> However, the condemnation of Eusebius of Nicomedia and his friends as reported by Eutychius<sup>59</sup> is not totally correct, since it is known that they were excommunicated only temporarily—they were given time by Constantine himself to re-think their doctrine and renounce Arianism.<sup>60</sup>

Eutychius, continuing his narration, refers to the attempts by which Arians tried to win again the favor of the emperor. Eusebius of Nicomedia and his friends went to Constantine and asked mercy, rejecting the doctrine of Arius and accepting the one of Nicaea. As a consequence, the emperor consecrated Eusebius patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>61</sup> It is clear that such information, as presented in the narration, is not totally correct. Eusebius of Nicomedia, in fact, had really asked mercy from Constantine and accepted Nicaea,<sup>62</sup> but he became the patriarch of Constantinople at the time of Constantine II, the son of Constantine the great.<sup>63</sup> Eutychius, makes this “mistake” since he follows his Melkite reading of history. For this reading, orthodoxy should win at end since it is defended by orthodox emperors. In this narration, Eusebius, after becoming patriarch of the capital, reveals again his heretic doctrine, and Constantine, the orthodox emperor and defender of orthodoxy, condemns him; the heretic Eusebius, consequently, dies condemned by Constantine himself.<sup>64</sup>

The post-Nicaean account of Eutychius is concentrated on the will of Constantine to convoke another synod to be held in Tyre with the scope to reconcile between the two groups. The feast of reconciliation should be in Jerusalem where the bishops would be invited to consecrate the holy places.<sup>65</sup> Elsewhere I discussed in detail this narration;<sup>66</sup> what interests me here is to highlight the appearance of Eunomius and his doctrine. As supporter and follower of Arius, Eunomius wanted to defend him. In the synod of Tyre, there occurred a dispute between him and Athanasius, who was already the successor of Alexander in Alexandria. Each of them tried to explain what exactly Arius meant by his doctrine.<sup>67</sup> It is known, in fact, that Eunomius wrote an apology and tried to defend the doctrine of Arius referring to the last statement of faith Arius had made to Constantine, i.e. his letter to the emperor after Nicaea.<sup>68</sup> It is not known to me, however, that such a conversation between Eunomius and Athanasius actually occurred. I think that Eutychius applies his Melkite reading of history and faith again.

As we saw in his presentation of the dispute between Arius and Alexander, when the bishop of Alexandria had to defeat Arius theologically, here again Eutychius invents another encounter,

<sup>56</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 68.

<sup>57</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 62-65.

<sup>58</sup> Cfr. Leadbetter, B., *Galerius and the Will of Diocletian* (London-New York, 2009), 14, see footnote 45 in the same page. See also Ebeid, B., ‘La figura’, 358-359.

<sup>59</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 130:

«فجاء اوسابيوس اسقف نيوميدية وصاحبه اللذان لعنهما الثلاثة وثمانية عشر مع اريوس...»

<sup>60</sup> Cfr. Jones, A., *Constantine*, 165.

<sup>61</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 130.

<sup>62</sup> Cfr. Dünzl, F., *A Brief History*, 60-62.

<sup>63</sup> Cfr. Amerise, M., *Il battesimo di Costantino il Grande. Storia di una scomoda eredità* (Stuttgart, 2005), 55.

<sup>64</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 312; Ebeid, B., ‘La figura’, 387.

<sup>65</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 130-131.

<sup>66</sup> Cfr. Ebeid, B., ‘La figura’, 382-388.

<sup>67</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 131-132.

<sup>68</sup> Cfr. Löhr, W., ‘Arius reconsidered (Part 1)’, in H. Brennecke and V. Drecoll and Ch. Marksches, eds., *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 9 (Berlin- New York, 2005), 524-560, here 131; see also Dünzl, F., *A Brief History*, 60-62.

this time between the successor of Alexander and the radical follower of Arius, and the conclusion of such dispute must be the victory of Athanasius. According to Eutychius, this victory was the reason that the supporters of Arius wanted to kill Athanasius. He, however, left Tyre and went to Jerusalem and sanctified the holy places. Constantine knew what happened and honored Athanasius, sending him back to Egypt, while excommunicating Eunomius and Eusebius, now of Constantinople.<sup>69</sup> I have elsewhere commented on the non-historicity of the information Eutychius furnishes us in his accounts. He bases his narrations on some historical nucleuses, but he inserts in them other information taken from legends and non historical works.<sup>70</sup>

Eutychius’ Melkite reading of faith is revealed also in the details of his account of this supposed dispute between Eunomius and Athanasius. One might be able to see beneath the dispute’s supposed quotations the thought of each man, since they show evidence of historical sources containing information about them—probably including, as W. Löhr notes, the historical work of Sozomen.<sup>71</sup> What we see again here are the reflections of a Christian author who lives among Muslims and knows their thought, especially the debate with the *Mu’tazilah* regarding the created character of the Quran, the word of God, as was previously noted in the dispute between Alexander and Arius. Affirmations such as “God has simply created things through His Word, but these, however, were not created by the Word”, attributed to Eunomius,<sup>72</sup> can be found in some Muslim thinkers.

More evidence of Eutychius’ Melkite reading can be found in the affirmations he attributes to Athanasius in this supposed debate. According to H. Wolfson, *Mu’tazilites* knew the doctrines of Sabelianism and Arianism, and therefore, they applied them to their doctrine on the attributes of God.<sup>73</sup> Topics like will and creation in God, necessity in God, freedom of Gods’ will etc., are found in dialogues with Muslims, especially the *mu’tazilah*, regarding the nature of God, His attributes, and the created/uncreated character of the Quran. Words such as *irādah* (will), *qadīm* (uncreated-eternal), *muḥḍat* (created) and *nāqīṣ* (imperfect) etc. are found in the opinion of Athanasius in the dispute as invented by Eutychius.<sup>74</sup> In fact, our Alexandrian patriarch author has Athanasius attributing to Arians doctrines that we find in the *mu’tazilah*, such as God creating through his word or through his will, and that both his word and His will are created.<sup>75</sup> This special Melkite reading of faith has a catechetical goal: (a) Islam is similar to heresies. (b) The doctrines of the different schools of Islam are similar to the famous heresies of

<sup>69</sup> Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 132.

<sup>70</sup> Cfr. Ebeid, B., ‘La figura’, 382-388.

<sup>71</sup> Cfr. Löhr, W., ‘Arius reconsidered (Part 1)’, 530.

<sup>72</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 131:

«ان اريوس لم يقول ان المسيح خلق الاشياء. ولكنه قال: به خلقت الاشياء لانه كلمة الله الذي بها خلق الله الاشياء بكلمته ولم تخلق الاشياء كلمته. وكما قال السيد المسيح في الانجيل: وكل به كان ومن دونه لم يكن شيء مما كان. وقال: به كانت الحياة والحياة هي نور البشر. وقال: في العالم كان والعالم به كون. فاخبر ان الاشياء كونت به ولم يخبر انها كونت له. فقال: هذه كانت مقالة اريوس ولكن الثلثمائة وثمانية عشر اسقفا تعذوا عليه واحرموه ظلماً وعدواناً.»

<sup>73</sup> Cfr. Wolfson, H., *The Philosophy*, 135-140.

<sup>74</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 131-132:

«اما اريوس لم يكذب عليه الثلثمائة وثمانية عشر اسقفاً ولا ظلموه لانه انما قال: ان الابن خلق الاشياء دون الاب فاذا كانت الاشياء انما خلقت بالابن دون ان يكون الاب لها خالقاً. فقد يجب ان لا يكون خلق منها شيئاً. وفي ذلك تكذيب لقوله في الانجيل: الاب يخلق وانا اخلق. وقال: لم اصنع عمل ابني فلا تصدقوني. وقال: كما ان الاب يخلق ويحيي من يشاء ويميته كذلك الابن يحيي من يشاء ويميته. يدل بذلك على انه يحيي ويميت ويخلق. وفي هذا تكذيب لمن زعم انه ليس بخالق. انما خلقت الاشياء به دون ان يكون خالقاً لها. واما قولك ان الاشياء كونت به فانها لما كونت لا نشك ان المسيح هو قال فكانت. ودل بقوله: اني افعل الخلق والحياة. فان قولك به كونت الاشياء انما هو راجع في المعنى انه كونها فكانت به مكونه. ولو لم يكن ذلك كذلك لتناقضنا لقولك. ... اما قول من قال من اصحاب اريوس ان الاب يريد الشيء فيكونه الابن والارادة للاب والتكوين للابن. فان ذلك يفسد ايضاً ان كان الابن عنده مخلوقاً فقد صار حظ المخلوق في الخلق اوفر من حظ الخالق فيه. وذلك ان هذا اراد وفعل ذلك اراد ولم يفعل. فهذا اوفر حظاً من ذلك في فعله. ولا بد من هذا ان يكون في فعله لما يريد ذلك بمنزلة كل فاعل من الخلق لما يريد الخالق منه ويكون حكمه كحكمه في الجبر والاختيار فان كان مجبوراً فلا شيء له في الفعل. وان كان مختاراً فجاز ان يطيع وجاز ان يعصى وجاز ان يثاب وجاز ان يعاقب. وذلك من القول الشنع. ... ان كان الخالق انما خلق خلقه بمخلوق فالمخلوق بلا شك غير الخالق. فقد زعمت ان الخالق يفعل بغيره والفاعل بغيره محتاج الى ذلك المتمم ليفعل به اذ كان لا يتم له فعل الا به. والمحتاج الى غيره منقوص والخالق يتعالى عن هذا.»

<sup>75</sup> Cfr. Wolfson, H., *The Philosophy*, 140-143.

the first centuries. (c) Therefore, Christians should listen to the new defender of orthodoxy, the successor of Alexander and Athanasius, the patriarch Eutychius himself, to be saved from heresy and heretics.

It is clear that after Nicaea and before Constantinople I, the conflict between Arians and anti-Arians was the main theological concern in eastern Christianity. This is also notable in Eutychius' narration. He also gives us some descriptions of the important persons who were involved in the post-Nicaea Trinitarian discussion, such as Macedon, the leader of Pneumatomachians, who refused to recognize in the Holy Spirit a divine person, considering him merely a created being.<sup>76</sup> According to Eutychius, it was the doctrine of Macedon, not Eunomius, that led to the convocation of the council of Constantinople I. As we will see, the decisions of the council of Constantinople I as presented by the author did not deal with Eunomius or with his doctrine.

#### THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE I (381 A.D.)

Eutychius gives us information regarding Apollinaris as well as Macedon in his description of the council of Constantinople I. According to him, when Theodosius the great became emperor, the doctrines of Arius and Macedon had become controversial, so he enjoined Timothy, patriarch of Alexandria, Miletius of Antioch, Damas of Rome and Cyril of Jerusalem, to bring their bishops to a council to be held in Constantinople. All came except Damas, patriarch of Rome, who sent a declaration of his faith. The bishops read the letter of Damas, then examined the doctrine of Macedon.<sup>77</sup>

Before we continue our reading of the council according to Eutychius' account, we should analyze the details he has already provided us. First of all, this time all the names of the bishops are correct.<sup>78</sup> Secondly, affirming that Theodosius convoked the council is also correct. To support the fact that the council was convoked by an emperor and that he was orthodox, which is an important element of his Melkite reading of the councils, he narrates one legend according to which the election of Theodosius as emperor was guided by Christ himself.<sup>79</sup> However, we also know that the emperor convoked the council for the eastern bishops, and, contrary to Eutychius' account, he did not invite Damas, Pope of Rome.<sup>80</sup> Again, Eutychius wants to show the unity of faith between the Melkite churches inside and outside Byzantium based on the system of pentarchy. Furthermore, we do not know also about any letter or declaration that Pope Damas sent to Theodosius and was read in the council. Eutychius, applying his particular Chalcedonian reading, probably, tries to see in Damas and his declaration a prefigure of Pope Leo and his Tome. In fact, we do know that Pope Damas wrote a tome "*Tomus Damasi*", and sent it to the bishop of Antioch, after the year 382, i.e. after the council, or as some scholars maintain in the year 378, i.e. before the council. It is also called *Confessio Fidei*<sup>81</sup> and probably,

<sup>76</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 144-145:

«وفي عشر سنين من ملكه صير مكذونيوس بطريركا على القسطنطينية وكان يقول ان روح القدس مخلوق.»

<sup>77</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 144-145:

«فكتب ثاودوسيوس الملك الى تيموثاوس بطرك الاسكندرية والى ملاطيوس بطرك انطاكية والى دامسيوس بطريرك رومية والى كيريلس اسقف بيت المقدس ان يشخصوا مع اساقفتهم الى مدينة القسطنطينية لينظروا في امانة النصرانية ويوضحونها للناس. فشخص البطاركة مع اساقفتهم الى القسطنطينية خلا دامسيوس بطريرك رومية فانه لم يشخص. الا انه كتب الى ثاودوسيوس الملك بالامانة الصحيحة وشرحها ووضحها. واجتمع في القسطنطينية مائة وخمسون اسقفا وكان المقدم في الجماعة تيموثاوس بطريرك الاسكندرية وملاطيوس بطريرك انطاكية وكيريلس اسقف بيت المقدس. فدفع اليهم ثاودوسيوس الملك كتاب دامسيوس بطريرك رومية الذي كتب فيه الامانة ووضحها. فقرأه ووضحوه ووقفوا على ما كتب في الامانة.»

<sup>78</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 119.

<sup>79</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 140-144.

<sup>80</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 118-119.

<sup>81</sup> On this document see Denzinger, H., and Hünermann, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum. Definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, tr. A. Lanzoni and G. Zaccherini (5th edn, Bologna, 1995), 92-93; for the text see *ibid.*, 92-96 (nn. 152-177).

Eutychius is alluding to this document by mentioning the declaration of faith. Eutychius certainly is not referring here to the instructions Damas gave to his vicar, Acholius, bishop of Thessalonika, who took part in the council.<sup>82</sup>

Another detail that should be noted in Eutychius' account is the answer given to Macedon by Timothy of Alexandria, who declares the victory for orthodoxy.<sup>83</sup> Again we see how the bishop of Alexandria, in the narration of Eutychius, must play an important role in defending orthodoxy. For this reason he asserts that Timothy was president of the council, which was not in fact the case.<sup>84</sup> In his Melkite reading of history, this Egyptian element has a catechetical purpose. In addition, Timothy's answer is formulated through a Melkite doctrine which reflects the Arab Christian way of defending the faith in its Islamic milieu. Eutychius uses the doctrine of the triads related to the divine attributes to defend the divinity of the Spirit.<sup>85</sup> If God has life, i.e. the Spirit, His life should be eternal as He is, i.e. divine and uncreated; otherwise, if His life was created, this means that He was not always alive and the giver of life.<sup>86</sup>

Among the heretics that the council condemned were in fact Sabelius, for his Trinitarian doctrine, and Apollinaris, for his Christological doctrine.<sup>87</sup> What is interesting is that Eutychius attributes to the council the affirmation that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one nature, one substance and three hypostases, persons and properties.<sup>88</sup> It is in fact known that such clarification between substance and hypostasis; as well as the identification of, on the one hand, nature and substance, and on the other hypostasis, person and property, was made in some way by the Cappadocians.<sup>89</sup> Such doctrine, however, was not explicitly spelled out by the council of Constantinople as Eutychius maintains. This teaching needed time to be applied in the Christian metaphysical system, and in some way was accepted officially by the council of Chalcedon, which distinguished nature from hypostasis, and identified hypostasis with person.<sup>90</sup> Eutychius' reading is not just a Chalcedonian reading of Constantinople I, but also a Melkite reading, since Eutychius underlines the term property, which was important in the discussions with Muslims. Property was a synonymous of attribute, and the three properties in God were explained to Muslims through their doctrine on the divine attributes of God.<sup>91</sup> The interest of Eutychius, then, is to teach his readers orthodoxy as it later developed, and not as it was historically expressed by the council. Since the Trinitarian doctrine was accused by Muslims of being tritheism, he underlines the unity of the divine nature and essence, and the distinction among the divine

<sup>82</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 119-120.

<sup>83</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 145.

<sup>84</sup> It is known that this council was presided over by two bishops at different times. The first president was Gregory Nazianzus, who was promoted from bishop of Nazianzus to bishop of Constantinople, the capital and site of the council. However, there arose a controversy against him during the council, so he resigned both his new see and the presidency. The second president was his successor Nectarius, cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 119-120.

<sup>85</sup> On this use of triads in Arab-Christian Trinitarian doctrine see Haddad, R., *La Trinité divine chez les théologiens arabes 750-1050*, Beauchesne Religions, 15 (Paris, 1985), 208-233.

<sup>86</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 145:

«فقال تيموثاوس بطريرك الاسكندرية: ليس روح القدس عندنا بمعنى غير روح الله. وليس روح الله شيء غير حياته. فاذا قلنا ان روح القدس مخلوق فقد قلنا ان روح الله مخلوق. واذا قلنا ان روح الله مخلوق فقد قلنا ان حياته مخلوقة فقد زعمنا انه غير حي. واذا زعمنا انه غير حي فقد كفرنا به. ومن كفر به وجب عليه اللعن.»

<sup>87</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 145.

<sup>88</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 145-146:

«وثبتوا ان الاب والابن وروح القدس ثلثة اقانيم وثلثة وجوه وثلثة خواص ووحدة في تثليث وتثليث في وحدة كيان واحد في ثلثة اقانيم اله واحد جوهر واحد طبيعة واحدة.»

<sup>89</sup> In regards see Kariatlis, Ph., 'St Basil's Contribution to the Trinitarian Doctrine. A Synthesis of Greek *Paideia* and the Scriptural Worldview', *Phronema* 25 (2010), 57-83.

<sup>90</sup> Cfr. Grillmeier, A., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. i: *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon*, tr. J. Bowden (2nd edn, rev., London-Oxford, 1975), 549-550.

<sup>91</sup> Cfr. Wolfson, H., *The Philosophy*, 135-140. For the Arabic terminology used for the divine attributes, see *ibid.*, 128-129.

hypostases and their properties in language familiar also to Muslims. In this way, his Christian readers can use such doctrine to answer the accusations against them. In just this reading, in fact, we can see why he quotes here the part the fathers composed and added to the *Creed* of Nicaea, affirming the divinity of the Holy Spirit,<sup>92</sup> even though in his description of the council of Nicaea he does not quote any part of its *Creed*.

We also know that the third canon of Constantinople I, declaring the see of Constantinople to be second after that of Rome, elicited a negative reaction in the West. Eutychius presents this canon, however, according to his understanding of the pentarchy system.<sup>93</sup> In his narration however, he makes a historical "mistake." It was noted that in his description of Nicaea, he does not apply the term patriarch to the bishop of Jerusalem; however, in his narration of the council of Constantinople I, and, I believe, desiring to give canonicity to his use of the system of pentarchy, he says that the fathers of the council decided to give the title "patriarch" to the bishop of the Holy City Jerusalem,<sup>94</sup> which actually did not occur until the council of Chalcedon.<sup>95</sup>

#### THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS (431 A.D.)

The narration of the council of Ephesus begins with the controversy between Nestorius of Constantinople and Cyril of Alexandria. Eutychius gives a detailed description of this controversy, beginning with the doctrine of Nestorius: he proclaimed that Mary was not really the *Theotokos*, the Mother of God; he taught a duality of sons, the Son of God and the son of man; the first was born of the Father and the second of Mary; he maintained that in Christ the man was united with God according to love, and because of this union, and only according to grace, the man could be called God and Son of God; between the two sons there was an agreement in honor and in name; and Christ was like one of the prophets.<sup>96</sup>

In this description we can easily see the Melkite-Chalcedonian reading of faith applied by Eutychius to Nestorius' doctrine. Except for the rejection of the title 'Mother of God', title which Nestorius actually did not reject totally but preferred the one of 'Mother of Christ', Eutychius attributes to Nestorius the traditional Chalcedonian accusations against him. The nucleus of such accusations is the doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria against Nestorius, presented however, with a Melkite reading, i.e. attributing to Nestorius what Melkites attribute to the later Nestorian tradition. The duality of sons is a Cyrilian accusation against Nestorius, already expressed in his second letter to him.<sup>97</sup> We know, however, that although Nestorius<sup>98</sup> and later

Nestorians<sup>99</sup> rejected this characterization of their teaching, Chalcedonians and Miaphysites nonetheless continued to attribute this duality of sons to their doctrine.<sup>100</sup>

According to Eutychius, Nestorius taught a union according to love, but in describing his doctrine, Eutychius does not use any technical terms, such as hypostasis or person. However, we know that Nestorius did employ the following expressions to describe this union: "in one person" (εις ἐνὸς προσώπου); "conjunction" (συνάφειαν); "union according to will" (ἔνωσις κατὰ θέλησιν μόνην); and "union according to goodwill" (ἔνωσις κατ'εὐδοκίαν). He never called it a union according to the virtue of love, as Eutychius attributes to him. One might maintain that Eutychius is translating the Greek εὐδοκίαν as the virtue of love, which is a possibility. I think, however, that the Melkite reading should help us to understand why the patriarch of Alexandria makes this attribution. In later Syriac Nestorian texts we find the concept "union according to perfect love" (ܘܢܘܨܝܘܨ ܥܠܡܘܬܐ) used against the concept "union according to substance" (ܘܢܘܨܝܘܨ ܥܘܫܘܬܐ).<sup>101</sup> In addition, the fact that Eutychius does not mention in his description the technical term "person" that was important in Nestorius' Christology, supports my hypothesis regarding the Melkite reading. Elsewhere I showed that at the time of Eutychius, Nestorians did not use this term in their Christological works.<sup>102</sup> All this confirms that Eutychius is keen to inform his Melkite readers what is the doctrine of Nestorians of his own time, and not what exactly Nestorius himself taught, so they can understand the opinion of the Melkite Church regarding such doctrine. His Melkite reading of faith and history, then, is to express the contemporary through the past.

Having described the doctrine of Nestorius, Eutychius then recounts the reaction of Cyril of Alexandria: the doctrine of Nestorius reached Cyril; he wrote to Nestorius and showed him the error and the corruption of his doctrine, asking him to abandon it and to return to the orthodox truth; between them was an exchange of letters. Nestorius, however, did not change his mind. Consequently, Cyril wrote to John of Antioch, asking him to write to Nestorius to convince him to abandon his doctrine. John wrote to Nestorius and told him that if he did not return to the truth, he would be excommunicated. Nestorius, however, after lots of letters between him and John, did not change his teaching and beliefs. John informed Cyril about the result of his correspondence with Nestorius, whereupon Cyril wrote to Celestine of Rome, *Būflābyūs* of Jerusalem, and John of Antioch, convoking them to a council in Ephesus to examine the doctrine of Nestorius.<sup>103</sup> Eutychius alludes to the correspondences between Cyril and Nestorius, Cyril and the bishop of Rome, Cyril and John of Antioch, and finally John of Antioch and

<sup>92</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 145-146:

«Ὀρθωτοῦν ἂν ῥοῦχ ὁ ἅγιος χάλκῳ ἄλλο μὴ ἄλλο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται».

<sup>93</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 146:

«Ὁρθωτοῦν ῥοῦχ ὁ ἅγιος χάλκῳ ἄλλο μὴ ἄλλο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται».

<sup>94</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 146:

«Ὁρθωτοῦν ῥοῦχ ὁ ἅγιος χάλκῳ ἄλλο μὴ ἄλλο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται».

<sup>95</sup> Cfr. Price, R., and Gaddis, M., tr., *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, Translated Texts for Historians, 45, vol. ii (Liverpool, 2005), 244-249.

<sup>96</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 156:

«Ὁρθωτοῦν ῥοῦχ ὁ ἅγιος χάλκῳ ἄλλο μὴ ἄλλο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται».

<sup>97</sup> We read, in fact, the following: «ἐὰν δὲ τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἔνωσιν ἢ ὡς ἀνέφικτον ἢ ὡς ἀκαλλῆ παρατώμεθα, ἐμπύπτομεν εἰς δύο λέγειν υἱοὺς ... οὐ διαμετρήτων τοιγαροῦν εἰς υἱοὺς δύο τὸν ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν», Simonetti, M., ed., *Il Cristo*, vol. ii, 360.

<sup>98</sup> In his letter to Cyril, Nestorius affirms: «... ἵνα τῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς φύσεως ἐκατέρας κοινῶν τινῶν σημαντικῶν προκειμένων μήτε τὰ τῆς υἰότητος καὶ κυριότητος τέμνηται μήτε τὰ τῶν φύσεων ἐν τῷ τῆς υἰότητος μοναδικῷ συγχύσεως ἀνασμιμῶ κινδυνεύη», *ibid.*, 366.

<sup>99</sup> See for example Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/III: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604): the Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch from 451 to 600*, tr. M. Ehrhardt (Oxford, 2013), 599 and 612.

<sup>100</sup> See for example, *ibid.*, 72-75, 262-263, 346-353, 442, 450, 483, 412 and 517.

<sup>101</sup> Cfr. Narsai, *A Homily on our Lord's Birth from the Holy Virgin*, *Patrologia Orientalis*, 182 (40.1), F. McLeod, ed., tr., 36-69, here 62.

<sup>102</sup> Cfr. Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 612-620.

<sup>103</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 156-157:

«Ἐπιβλέψας ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλεῖται».

Nestorius, but his chronological ordering of these correspondences is not exact,<sup>104</sup> and the name of the bishop of Jerusalem is wrong, the bishop at that time being Juvenal.<sup>105</sup> Such elements, however, do not interest me as much as those that show Eutychius' special reading of history.

First of all, Eutychius, being Chalcedonian and neo-Chalcedonian<sup>106</sup>, tries to give a positive image of John and his role in the controversy. However, it is known that John of Antioch was on the side of Nestorius until the composition of the *formula of union* by the Easterners, through which reconciliation with Cyril was realized.<sup>107</sup> For Eutychius, Chalcedonian orthodoxy is the most important element in his Melkite reading of faith. Therefore, John, who was orthodox, could not be presented as a supporter of Nestorius. In addition, since, as we will see, for him the emperor Theodosius II was a heretic, he could not be the one who convoked the council.<sup>108</sup> The same reason was behind his omission of the fact that it was the idea of Nestorius to convoke a council, and that he asked the emperor to convoke it.<sup>109</sup> The hero of his narration, according to his Melkite reading, is the patriarch of Alexandria Cyril, the real defender of orthodoxy like his predecessors; therefore it was him who convoked the council.

Eutychius continues his narration, affirming that the council took place at Ephesus, presided over by Cyril. These facts are historically correct, but what is incorrect is the name of the bishop of Jerusalem, and his affirmation of the participation of Celestine of Rome.<sup>110</sup> Historically, Celestine sent representatives to the council with a letter that was read there.<sup>111</sup> Probably Eutychius alludes to this letter when he maintains that the Pope took part in the council. Again, his preoccupation is to always present the councils according to his understanding of the system of pentarchy. One, in fact, must take into consideration the accusation made by the followers of Nestorius against this council and its authority.<sup>112</sup> It is known that Cyril began the council with neither the delegation from the Pope, nor John of Antioch and his bishops.<sup>113</sup> To avoid such accusation, Eutychius, underlines the presence of the bishop of Rome besides the bishops of Alexandria and Jerusalem.

John of Antioch, according to the narration, promised the other bishops he would come, but arrived late. Cyril did not wait for him, and started the council with the bishops who were present. He invited Nestorius, who was actually in Ephesus at the time, to participate but he did not come. Cyril, Eutychius affirms, invited him three times, and Nestorius refused to participate.<sup>114</sup> This really happened,<sup>115</sup> and one of the sources confirming it is Nestorius

<sup>104</sup> See the chronology of events during the controversy between Nestorius and Cyril in Nestorius in *The Bazaar of Heracleides*, trs. G. Driver and L. Hodgson (Oxford, 1925), xvii-xviii.

<sup>105</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 181.

<sup>106</sup> That his Christology might be considered a Neo-Chalcedonian see Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 145-147, and the analysis I made for his Christology on pp. 161-202.

<sup>107</sup> Cfr. Simonetti, M., ed., *Il Cristo*, vol. ii, 384-385; Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 153 and 160-161.

<sup>108</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 153; Scipioni, L., *Nestorio e il Concilio di Efeso. Storia, Dogma, Critica*, Studia Patristica Mediolanensis, I (Milano, 1974), 180.

<sup>109</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 180-182.

<sup>110</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 157:

«فاجتمع في مدينة افسس مائتين اسقفا وكان المقدم في هذا المجمع كيرلس بطريرك الاسكندرية وكالستينوس بطريرك رومية وبوفلابيوس بطريرك بيت المقدس».

<sup>111</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 155.

<sup>112</sup> In this regard, one can read the opinion of Elias, the Nestorian Metropolitan of Nisibis (†1046), cfr. Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 427-440. See also how the theology of the councils by *Theodore Abū Qurrah* also had an apologetic and polemic dimension versus the Nestorians, cfr. Griffith, S., 'Muslims and Church Councils', 293-299.

<sup>113</sup> Cfr. Scipioni, L., *Nestorio*, 205-213.

<sup>114</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 157:

«ووعدهم يوحنا ان يحضر فلما تأخر عنهم ولم يحضر لم ينتظره كيرلس بطريرك الاسكندرية لكنه جمع من حضر من الاساقفة وبعث الى نسطور ان يحضر معهم وكان في افسس فامتنع نسطور من الحضور معهم فبعث اليه ثلاث فلما تأخر لم يحضر نظروا في مقاله فاجوبوا عليه اللعن».

<sup>115</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 154.

himself.<sup>116</sup> Eutychius portrays this as an act of disobedience by Nestorius. The bishops, the narration goes on to say, examined the doctrine of Nestorius and decided that he should be excommunicated and anathematized. They also established that the Virgin Mary is truly the mother of God, and that Christ is true God and true man, one hypostasis known in two natures.<sup>117</sup> Before commenting on his presentation of the faith of Ephesus, I think it is important first to read how Eutychius himself comments on the decision of the council. He says, directly after presenting the doctrine of Ephesus, that the oneness of the hypostasis stands in opposition to the concept of a union according to love, i.e., Nestorius' teaching that the union was an agreement between two persons. Thus, Eutychius presents this opposition as one of unity versus division. The right way to express this union, then, is to assert only one hypostasis in two natures.<sup>118</sup>

Again, it is clear that Eutychius reads the councils with a Chalcedonian and Melkite perspective and interpretation. It is known that the council of Ephesus did not produce a definition of faith. The council affirmed that orthodoxy is just the *Creed* of Nicaea; orthodox Christology is expressed according to the interpretation Cyril made of this *Creed* in his second letter to Nestorius.<sup>119</sup> While Eutychius' affirmation that the title *Theotokos* expresses the council's faith could be correctly considered a doctrine of Ephesus, his assertion that Christ is one hypostasis in two natures is impossible to attribute to this council—it is, in fact, the doctrine of Chalcedon. We see here a neo-Chalcedonian interpretation of Ephesus, i.e. the desire to see an agreement between the doctrine of Cyril and that of Chalcedon, inserted into this historical narration. Thus, the hypostatic union, expressed by Eutychius as the oneness of the hypostasis, is interpreted not just in opposition to a union according love, but also as one hypostasis in two natures.<sup>120</sup> This is, in fact, the doctrine of the neo-Chalcedonian theologians, to equate the hypostatic union professed by Cyril with the Chalcedonian expression "one hypostasis in two natures".<sup>121</sup>

Eutychius applies not only a neo-Chalcedonian, but also a Melkite reading, i.e. expressing the contemporary doctrine through the past, in his interpretation of the faith of Ephesus. He says that the union according to love is an "agreement of the two persons in Christ," and attributes such doctrine to Nestorius. Even if the nucleus of this doctrine can be found in Nestorius' *Liber Heraclides*,<sup>122</sup> we have no evidence that Melkites of Eutychius' time knew of this work. Nestorius' thought, was developed and interpreted through later Nestorian theologians such as Babai the great, who taught a duality of hypostases but the oneness of person in Christ.<sup>123</sup> Meanwhile, for the Melkite-Chalcedonian Eutychius, person and hypostasis, as metaphysical terms, are considered as synonymous, and therefore, he presents Nestorian doctrine using the

<sup>116</sup> Cfr. Scipioni, L., *Nestorio*, 215-216.

<sup>117</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 157:

«وثبتوا ان مريم العذراء والدة الله وان المسيح اله حق وانسان معروف بطبيعتين متوحد في الاقنوم».

<sup>118</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 157:

«وهذا هو خلاف المحبة لان نسطور انما كان يقول ان الاتحاد هو اتفاق الوجهين واما الاتحاد المستقيم فانما هو ان يكون اقنوماً بطبيعتين».

<sup>119</sup> Cfr. Grillmeier, A., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. i, 484-487.

<sup>120</sup> See my analysis in Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 122-124.

<sup>121</sup> On neo-Chalcedonism and its Christology, see Gleed, B., *The Development of the Term ἐνυπόστατος from Origen to John of Damascus*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae: Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language, 113 (Leiden – Boston, 2012); dell'Osso, C., *Cristo e Logos. Il Calcedonismo del VI secolo in Oriente*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, 118 (Rome, 2010).

<sup>122</sup> See Chesnut, R., 'The Two Prosopa in Nestorius' Bazaar of Heracleides', *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978), 392-409; Scipioni, L., *Ricerche sulla cristologia del "Libro di Eraclide" di Nestorio. La formulazione teologica e il suo contesto filosofico* (Friburgo, 1956), 56-67; Anastos, M., 'Nestorius was orthodox', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962), 119-140.

<sup>123</sup> Cfr. Abramowski, L., 'Babai der Grosse. Christologische Probleme und ihre Lösungen', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 41(1975), 289-343.

term person (*wağh*); thus, he applies his own metaphysical system and understating of concepts to the doctrine of the Nestorians. In this way he distinguishes between the Nestorian "prosopic union" and the Chalcedonian "hypostatic union", applying hypostasis (and not person) to Chalcedonian Christology, while applying persons (and not hypostases) to Nestorian doctrine.

Eutyichius goes on to say that after the council presided by Cyril took these decisions, John of Antioch arrived in Ephesus. He became angry when he saw that the bishops had already excommunicated Nestorius. He claimed, according to the narration, that this excommunication was unjust. Then he gathered with Nestorius and other bishops who came with him, and they in turn excommunicated Cyril and Memnon, the bishop of Ephesus. When the party of Cyril saw what John and his bishops did, they left Ephesus, and from that moment, Eutyichius comments, there was an "upset" between the two factions.<sup>124</sup>

Again Eutyichius describes in his special Melkite and Chalcedonian way the events at Ephesus, particularly the council held by John of Antioch against Cyril and his council. He does not, however, mention the decision of the emperor Theodosius II to dissolve the divided council, instead suggesting a victory for the Cyrilian party.<sup>125</sup> Behind this omission we see Eutyichius' consideration of Theodosius II as a heretic, meaning that this heretic emperor is not the one who could recognize and decide which council was orthodox. For this reason, he says that the enmity between the Antiochians and Alexandrians started after the decisions made by John and his council, and not, as really happened, after Theodosius dissolved the council and consecrated a new bishop for Constantinople, in place of the deposed Nestorius.<sup>126</sup> Another point that should be noted is that Eutyichius does not use the word "schism" between Alexandria and Antioch, but rather "upset". In my opinion, the reason behind the use of this term is his preoccupation with preserving a positive image of John of Antioch.

Eutyichius then recounts the preoccupation of the emperor Theodosius II with the problem between the Easterns and the Egyptians, saying that he could not be at peace until he reconciled them. The Easterns, then, wrote a formula and sent it to Cyril with Paul of Emesa.<sup>127</sup> Eutyichius does not mention who the composer of this formula was, but for him the initiative came from the Easterns who wanted to realize the reconciliation desired by the emperor. Among scholars today we do not find agreement on the real composer of the formula.<sup>128</sup> It is clear, however, that this formula was the result of a discussion among the Eastern bishops, who tried to put together a single document that could be the basis for the reconciliation with Cyril and the Egyptians that was desired by the emperor.<sup>129</sup> Eutyichius is historically correct in saying that the formula was sent to Cyril by Paul of Emesa.<sup>130</sup> It is known also that Cyril accepted this document and considered it orthodox, and therefore he concelebrated with Paul.<sup>131</sup> Eutyichius confirms this fact, and also says that Cyril informed the other bishops about this formula, according to which: Easterns returned to orthodoxy; they do not agree anymore with Nestorius; and they

<sup>124</sup> Cfr. Eutyichii, *Annales*, vol. i, 157:

«فلما لعنوا نسطور قدم يوحنا بطريرك انطاكية فلما وجدهم قد لعنوه قبل حضوره غضب وقال: ظلمتم نسطور ولعنتموه باطلاً. وتعصب مع نسطور وجمع الاساقفة الذين كانوا معه فقطع كيرلس بطريرك الاسكندرية وقطع ميمس اسقف افسس. فلما رأوا اصحاب كيرلس قبح صنيع يوحنا وقع بينهم شرور وخرجوا من افسس وصار اصحاب كيرلس والمشرقيون حزبين فكان بينهم سجن.»

<sup>125</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 158-160; Scipioni, L., *Nestorio*, 240-246.

<sup>126</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 159-161.

<sup>127</sup> Cfr. Eutyichii, *Annales*, vol. i, 157:

«فلم يزل ثاودوسوس الملك حتى اصلىح بينهم فكتب المشرقيون صحيفة ... ووجهوا بالصحيفة مع بولص مطران حمص الى كيرلس بطريرك الاسكندرية.»

<sup>128</sup> Cfr. Simonetti, M., ed., *Il Cristo*, vol. ii, 384; Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 161.

<sup>129</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 161.

<sup>130</sup> Cfr. Scipioni, L., *Nestorio*, 258-259.

<sup>131</sup> Cfr. Stiernon, D., 'Paolo di Emesa', in *Nuovo Dizionario di Patristica e Antichità Cristiana*, vol. iii, 3854-3855.

excommunicated him.<sup>132</sup> It is clear that orthodoxy for Eutyichius means condemnation of Nestorius.

It is known, however, that the real formula does not mention any kind of condemnation of Nestorius, as Eutyichius maintains. The formula, in fact, contains two important elements: (1) a Christology expressed in Antiochene terms; and (2) an acceptance of the title *Theotokos* for Mary.<sup>133</sup> Furthermore, we know that Paul of Emesa, being in Alexandria, condemned Nestorius, and just after this condemnation Cyril accepted the formula and considered it orthodox.<sup>134</sup> John of Antioch, in fact, had already condemned Nestorius in a synod of his bishops, before sending Paul to Alexandria;<sup>135</sup> however, such condemnation was not included in the document sent to Cyril. Eutyichius, however, imposing a Chalcedonian interpretation on the formula, says that it contained a condemnation of Nestorius, thereby manipulating the historical details according to his particular reading of history and faith.

Such interpretation is clear also in his transmission of the doctrine of that same formula: the holy virgin gave birth to Jesus Christ, God and Lord; He is consubstantial with the Father according to divinity, and according to humanity He is consubstantial to men; and the assertion of two natures, one person and one hypostasis.<sup>136</sup> We know that the real formula, besides the acceptance of the term *Theotokos*,<sup>137</sup> affirms: (1) the two consubstantialities of Christ;<sup>138</sup> (2) the oneness of the person (*prosopon*) of Christ;<sup>139</sup> and (3) the duality of the natures.<sup>140</sup> There is no mention, however, of the term hypostasis, or that such term is a synonym of person, which was not defined officially, in Christological context, until Chalcedon.<sup>141</sup> A neo-Chalcedonian reading of the formula is clearly being applied to his historical narration. Eutyichius wants to portray Cyril, who accepted the formula, as Chalcedonian. Thus, Eutyichius presents the formula in Chalcedonian language, inserting into it the term hypostasis.

Eutyichius is aware also of the polemics Miaphysites made against the formula and its doctrine. He says that some persons claimed Cyril had rejected the formula, considering it not totally orthodox, since Cyril did not teach two natures and one person.<sup>142</sup> These two elements, in fact, were behind the rejection of the formula by some Egyptian bishops and other followers of Cyril.<sup>143</sup> These two elements were accepted and affirmed as orthodox by Chalcedon, but were the source of the rejection of Chalcedon by the Miaphysites, who considered it a betrayal of

<sup>132</sup> Cfr. Eutyichii, *Annales*, vol. i, 157-158:

«ونفذوا اللعن على نسطور ... وقرأها ووافقهم على ما فيها وجاوبهم على كتابهم ان امانتي على امانتكم التي في صحيفتكم. فعلى هذا كان اتفاق كيرلس والمشرقيون ... فكتب كيرلس نسخة صحيفة المشرقيون الى ايلاريوس اسقف مدينة قرنتية والى افلكيوس اسقف ملطية والى جماعة من الاساقفة يعلمهم ان المشرقيين قد رجعوا الى الايمان بالحق وانهم غير موافقين لنسطور.»

<sup>133</sup> Cfr. Simonetti, M., ed., *Il Cristo*, vol. ii, 384-385.

<sup>134</sup> Cfr. Stiernon, D., 'Paolo di Emesa', 3854-3855.

<sup>135</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 160-161.

<sup>136</sup> Cfr. Eutyichii, *Annales*, vol. i, 157:

«فكتب المشرقيون صحيفة فيها بان مريم القديسة العذراء ولدت الهنا وربنا يسوع المسيح الذي هو مع ابيه في الطبيعة ومع الناس في الناسوت في الطبيعة. واقروا بطبيعتين ووجه واحد واقنوم واحد.»

<sup>137</sup> We read in the formula the following: «... ὁμολογοῦμεν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον θεοτόκον», Simonetti, M., ed., *Il Cristo*, vol. ii, 386:

<sup>138</sup> We read in the formula the following: «... ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τον αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα», *ibid*, 386.

<sup>139</sup> We read in the formula the following: « τὰς δὲ εὐαγγελικὰς καὶ ἀποστολικὰς περὶ τοῦ κυρίου φωνὰς ἴσμεν τοῦς θεολόγους ἄνδρας τὰς μὲν κοινοποιοῦντας, ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς προσώπου, τὰς δὲ διαιροῦντας, ὡς ἐπὶ δύο φύσεων ... », *ibid*, 386.

<sup>140</sup> We read in the formula the following: «δύο γὰρ ἐνόησε γέγονε», *ibid*, 386.

<sup>141</sup> In fact, in the definition of Chalcedon we read: «εἰς ἓν πρόδοξον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν», Denzinger, H., and Hünermann, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 168 (n. 302).

<sup>142</sup> Cfr. Eutyichii, *Annales*, vol. i, 158:

«وقالوا قوم ان كيرلس لما قبل صحيفة المشرقيون بذاته فلم يقول طبيعتين ووجهها واحد وهم في ذلك كذابين.»

<sup>143</sup> Cfr. Sellers, R., *The Council of Chalcedon. A historical and doctrinal survey*, (London, 1953), 22-25

Cyril's doctrine.<sup>144</sup> Neo-Chalcedonians, however, referred always in their discussions with Miaphysites to the acceptance of this formula by Cyril, considering it an agreement with Chalcedon,<sup>145</sup> a point which Eutychius, as mentioned above, makes in his historical narration, with his particular reading.

#### THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON (451 A.D.)

According to our patriarch of Alexandria, there was a monk and doctor in Constantinople named Eutyches<sup>146</sup> who taught that the body of Christ was not consubstantial with our bodies, and that He, Christ, was of two natures before the Incarnation, and one nature after the Incarnation.<sup>147</sup> We know, in fact, that Eutyches was a monk in Constantinople,<sup>148</sup> but there is no evidence that he was a physician by profession. We know that his doctrine was full of confusions;<sup>149</sup> that he did not affirm the humanity in Christ as consubstantial to ours. The doctrine Eutychius attributes to him seems to be in fact what Eutyches affirmed in the synod of Constantinople in 448, convoked and presided over by Flavianus of Constantinople.<sup>150</sup>

Our Melkite patriarch of Alexandria is detailed regarding the reaction against Eutyches' doctrine. He informs us that Flavianus, patriarch of Constantinople, knew about the doctrine of Eutyches and invited him to have a debate.<sup>151</sup> I assume that Eutychius here alludes to the synod of 448, and to the discussions with Eutyches occurred during it.<sup>152</sup> He furnishes us with the dialogue between Flavianus and Eutyches. It seems that our author had at hand a source that included information about this synod of 448. Maybe this source included also the acts of this synod, or parts of them. What is interesting is that the quotation attributed to Eutyches is based on the saying attributed to him in the acts we possess from this synod:<sup>153</sup> affirming two natures means Nestorianism; Christ is of two natures before the Incarnation, while after Incarnation He is one nature and one hypostasis.<sup>154</sup>

The answer of Flavianus, however, even if it is based on his doctrine of the duality of natures in Christ, and double consubstantiality,<sup>155</sup> is presented through Eutychius' Melkite reading: affirming one nature in Christ makes ontological confusion between created beings and their

<sup>144</sup> See the analysis of *ibid*, 254-301.

<sup>145</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 286-270; see also Price, R., 'The Second Council of Constantinople (553) and the Malleable Past', in R. Price and M. Whitby, eds., *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils 400-700* (Liverpool, 2009), 117-132, here 121 and 124.

<sup>146</sup> To be noted that I preferred to use for the heretic Eutychius the form Eutyches so the reader might not confuse him with Eutychius himself, our author who had the same name and was also a doctor.

<sup>147</sup> Cfr. Eutychie, *Annales*, vol. i, 179:

«وكان في القسطنطينية رجل راهب طيب يقال له افيثيوس كان يقول ان جسد المسيح ليس هو مع اجسادنا في الطبيعة. وان المسيح قبل التجسد من طبيعتين وبعد التجسد طبيعة واحدة.»

<sup>148</sup> Cfr. Cross, F., and Livingstone, E., eds., *The Oxford Dictionary*, 577.

<sup>149</sup> On the Christology of Eutyches, see Varanic, V., 'The Christology of Eutyches at the Council of Constantinople 448', *Philothos* 8 (2008), 208-221.

<sup>150</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 216-220.

<sup>151</sup> Cfr. Eutychie, *Annales*, vol. i, 179:

«فوجه فلابيانوس بطريك القسطنطينية خلف افيثيوس فاحضره وجمع جمعا بالقسطنطينية وناظره.»

<sup>152</sup> For more details see Varanic, V., 'The Christology', 215-220.

<sup>153</sup> For more details see *ibid*.

<sup>154</sup> Cfr. Eutychie, *Annales*, vol. i, 179:

«ان قلنا ان المسيح طبيعتين فقد قلنا يقول نسطور ولكننا نقول ان المسيح طبيعة واحدة واقنوم واحد لانه من طبيعتين كانا قبل الاتحاد فلما وقع الجسد زالت عنه التثنية وصار طبيعة واحدة واقنوم واحد.»

<sup>155</sup> For more details on his doctrine see Simonetti, M., 'Flaviano di Costantinopoli', in *Nuovo Dizionario di Patristica e Antichità Cristiana*, vol. ii, 1980-1981; see also Frend, W., *The Rise of Christianity*, 765-766.

Creator. This means that it is possible to affirm things and their opposite as identical: the cold can be called hot and the dark as shining.<sup>156</sup>

I maintain that this answer is elaborated in such way as to reflect the Arab-Melkite rationality in answering either Muslims, or their opponents of other Christian confessions. Eutychius' elaboration of Flavianus' answer is, in fact, an answer/polemic against the Miaphysites of his time. This is why he, commenting the doctrine of Eutyches, affirms that this doctrine is also the one of Jacobites.<sup>157</sup> Furthermore, it is worth noting, as I demonstrated elsewhere,<sup>158</sup> that Eutychius uses his elaboration of Flavianus' answer in his polemic work against the Jacobites. Additionally, the use of Islamic, and particularly *mu'tazilah* language, is clear in his formulation of Flavianus' answer. He applies to the humanity of Christ the term *al-muḥdat*, the *mu'tazilah* technical term for temporal and created realities, while for His divinity he uses the term *al-qadīm*, the *mu'tazilah* technical term for the eternal and uncreated God.

The rest of Eutychius' narration agrees with what we know about the historical events that followed the condemnation of Eutyches at the synod of 448, except for what we noted earlier, his claim that he was a physician. Flavianus, according to the narration, could not exile Eutyches since he was a physician and people were in need of him; he did, however, excommunicate him. For this reason Eutyches went to the emperor Theodosius II and asked for his help. The emperor asked Dioscorus of Alexandria, Damianus of Antioch, Leo of Rome and *Būblābiyūs* of Jerusalem to resolve the problem.<sup>159</sup> The result was the convocation of another synod at Ephesus, presided over by Dioscorus. This synod affirmed the doctrine of Eutyches and excommunicated Flavianus and other bishops who followed him.<sup>160</sup> Eutychius is correct regarding the decisions of the synod of Ephesus of 449. Again, however, he gives an altogether different name to the bishop of Jerusalem, who at that time was Juvenal. The name of the patriarch of Antioch is almost correct, since Domnus, the actual name, and Damianus, the name given by Eutychius, are similar.<sup>161</sup> Eutychius' Melkite reading of history is noticeable in his account of this synod: the system of pentarchy is presented by the convocation of the five patriarchs, but given that the synod was non-orthodox, the one who convoked it was Theodosius II, who according to him was a heretic, and a follower of Eutyches' doctrine.

Continuing his historical narration, Eutychius says that some bishops did not agree with what happened in the synod of Ephesus presided over by Dioscorus, and after the death of Theodosius II, they went to Marcian, the successor of Theodosius II, and informed him about the injustice perpetrated at Ephesus by Dioscorus.<sup>162</sup> Consequently, the new emperor convoked

<sup>156</sup> Cfr. Eutychie, *Annales*, vol. i, 179-180:

«ان كان المسيح كما تزعم طبيعة واحدة فالطبيعة القديمة اذا هي محدثة وان كان القديم هو المحدث والذي لم يزل هو الذي لم يكون ولو جاز ان يكون القديم هو المحدث لكان القائم هو القاعد والحرار هو البارد والمظلم هو المضيء وما اشبه ذلك من المحالات التي لا يجوز الجمع بينهما في جزء واحد.»

<sup>157</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 179:

«وهذه مقالة اليعقوبية.»

<sup>158</sup> Cfr. Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 127, 198; *idem*, 'Sa'īd Ibn Baṭrīq', 176.

<sup>159</sup> Cfr. Eutychie, *Annales*, vol. i, 180:

«فابا ان يرجع عن مقالته فلعنه فلابيانوس بطريك القسطنطينية ولم ينفه عن القسطنطينية لانه كان طبيبا والناس يحتاجون اليه. وكان ثاودوسيوس الملك يرى رايه فاستعز اوتيشيوس الى ثاودوسيوس الملك وقال ان فلابيانوس قطعه ظلما. وسأل الملك ان يكتب الى جميع البطاركة ان يجتمعوا وينظروا في قصته فكتب الملك الى ديسقورس بطريك الاسكندرية والى دمنيس بطريك انطاكية والى لاون بطريك رومية والى بوبلابيوس بطريك بيت المقدس ان يشخصوا مع اساقفتهم لينظروا في قصة اوتيشيوس فاجتمعوا في مدينة افسس...»

<sup>160</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 180:

«وهذا هو المجمع الثاني في مدينة افسس وكان المقدم في هذا المجمع ديسقورس بطريك الاسكندرية ودمنيس بطريك انطاكية وبوبلابيوس بطريك بيت المقدس ووكلاء لاون بطريك رومية فنظروا في قصة اوتيشيوس مع اوصابيوس اسقف درلية وفلابيانوس بطريك القسطنطينية فثبت ديسقورس بطريك الاسكندرية مقالة اوتيشيوس وقطع فلابيانوس بطريك القسطنطينية وواسابيوس اسقف دلالية فانكر دمنيس بطريك انطاكية وبوبلابيوس بطريك بيت المقدس ومودرسطس اسقف انكرة وأسا اسقف الرها وجماعة من الاساقفة ووكلاء لاون بطريك رومية على ديسقورس بطريك الاسكندرية ما فعل وقبحوا رايه فقطعهم ديسقورس...»

<sup>161</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 176-177.

<sup>162</sup> Cfr. Eutychie, *Annales*, vol. i, 181:



the council of Chalcedon. Firstly, it must be noted that Eutychius incorrectly mentions among those bishops the ones who historically have accepted the synod of Ephesus of 449, such as the bishop of Jerusalem. The reason behind this incorrect information is his Chalcedonian and Melkite reading of history: since the same bishops historically accepted the orthodox council of Chalcedon, according to his particular reading, they could not have also accepted the heretical synod of 449. Eutychius also, applying this particular reading of history, makes another "mistake": the bishops, in fact, did not wait till the death of Theodosius to inform the imperial court of the injustice they faced in Ephesus under Dioscorus, his excommunication of some of them, and his acceptance of Eutyches' doctrine.<sup>163</sup> I believe this error is explainable. According to Eutychius' Melkite reading, Theodosius II was a follower of Eutyches' doctrine and he could not help them, listen to them, or do anything to support orthodoxy such as convoking the council of Chalcedon. For the same reason he does not mention, as we saw above, that Theodosius II convoked the council of Ephesus in 431, while at the same time claiming that he was the one who convoked the non-orthodox synod of 449.

Eutychius says, then, that Marcian convoked Leo the Pope of Rome, Maximus of Antioch, and *Būblābiyūs* of Jerusalem, with their metropolitans and bishops, and all the bishops of Byzantium, asking them to come to Chalcedon to deal with the question of what happened at Ephesus in 449, and to examine the doctrine of Eutyches.<sup>164</sup> According to Eutychius' account, there were 630 bishops at Chalcedon, an exaggerated number. The president of the council was Anatolius of Constantinople. Pope Leo did not come, but he sent a letter, i.e. the *Tome*, with Boniface, a priest from Rome, who was counted as one of the 630 bishops. The letter was given first to the emperor Marcian, who sent it on with the same Boniface to the council.<sup>165</sup> It is clear that our Melkite patriarch author confused the letter sent to Marcian<sup>166</sup> with the one sent to Flavianus, which was really the famous *Tome*. Besides Maximus, the patriarch of Antioch, and *Būblābiyūs*, the patriarch of Jerusalem,<sup>167</sup> Eutychius mentions also the names of Stephan, bishop of Barbiya (probably Yavne), and John, the bishop of the Barbarians (probably some Arab tribes),<sup>168</sup> both of whom, he says, were disciples of St. Euthymius. Including the names of St. Euthymius' disciples, mentioning just one representative of the Pope, presbyter Boniface, considering the *Tome of Leo* as a letter sent to Marcian, and claiming a huge number of bishops—all of these features make me hypothesize that Eutychius based his narration on some indirect sources, such as the life of St. Euthymius.<sup>169</sup>

I maintain that the Melkite reading of history was behind his omission of Dioscorus of Alexandria at the council, since he was a friend of Theodosius II and an enemy of orthodoxy.

«فلما ملك مرقيان اجتمعوا الاساقفة من كل بلد وباركوا له في الملك واعلموه ما كان من ظلم المجمع الثاني الذي كان بافسس وما فعل ديسقورس بطريرك الاسكندرية وقطعه للبطاركة....»

<sup>163</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 178-180.

<sup>164</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 181:

«فامر مرقيان الملك ان يكتب الى لاون بطريرك رومية والى مقسيموس بطريرك انطاكية والى بوبلابيوس بطريرك بيت المقدس بان يشخصوا وتكون معهم مطارنتهم واساقفتهم وان يكتب الى الاساقفة الذي بارض الروم فيجتمعوا كلهم في مدينة خلقيدونية لينظروا ويفحصوا عن مقالة اوتيشيوس وما فعل ديسقورس بطريرك الاسكندرية من قبوله قول اوتيشيوس وقطعه للبطاركة الذين ماتوا وان يثبتوا الامانة على ما ثبتتها الثلاثة المجمع المقدسة.»

<sup>165</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 181-182:

«فاجتمع في مدينة خلقيدونية ستمائة وثلاثون اسقفاً وكان المقدم في الجماعة اناطوليوس بطريرك القسطنطينية ومقسيموس بطريرك انطاكية وبوبلابيوس بطريرك بيت المقدس. وكتب لاون بطريرك رومية الى مرقيان الملك بالامانة المستقيمة امانة الملكية ووجه بالكتاب مع قسيس من تلاميذه يقال له بونيفاتيوس فوجه الملك مرقيان بالكتاب مع القسيس بونيفاتيوس الى مدينة خلقيدونية الى الاساقفة المجمعين وحسبوا بونيفاتيوس القسيس في الستمائة والثلاثين وكان في المجمع تلاميذ لافثيميوس القديس اسقف بربيا ويوحنا اسقف البرير.»

<sup>166</sup> Cfr. Leo Magnus, *Epistola XC Ad Eudem Marcianum Augustum*, *Patrologia Latina*, 54, 932-934.

<sup>167</sup> Again it is notable that our author gives this strange name to Juvenal the patriarch of Jerusalem who took part at Chalcedon.

<sup>168</sup> See the opinion of Pirone, B., tr., *Eutichio Patriarca di Alessandria (877-940)*. *Gli Annali*, *Studia Orientalia Christiana Monographia*, 1 (Cairo, 1987), 268 footnote 24.

<sup>169</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 183.

The number that Eutychius gives for the bishops who attended the council is almost double what scholars today estimate, ca. 370.<sup>170</sup> In other sources, we have numbers between 500 and 520;<sup>171</sup> Eutychius, following his Melkite reading, gives this huge number in order to convince his readers that the council was the faith of all these bishops, and Miaphysites have no reason to accuse the council and its faith of being heretical, or trying to claim that it was merely the faith of the emperor and not the orthodox doctrine.<sup>172</sup>

The doctrine of Chalcedon according to Eutychius' narration is also particular: the bishops excommunicated Dioscorus and Eutyches; they established that the Lord Jesus Christ is God and man; they affirmed the double consubstantiality, and that Christ is one, but known in two natures, perfect in His divinity and perfect in His humanity.<sup>173</sup> He adds also that the fathers of the council affirmed what the councils of Nicaea and Constantinople had decided; they confirmed as true the third council, the one convoked the first time in Ephesus, with its doctrine; they condemned Nestorius, Dioscorus and whoever follows his doctrine; they, finally, exiled Dioscorus and condemned the synod convoked the second time in Ephesus.<sup>174</sup> It is true that Chalcedon had recognized the three councils as ecumenical; also the information regarding the excommunication of Dioscorus, Eutyches and Nestorius is true. We also know that Dioscorus was exiled after the council. The condemnation of the Ephesus council of 449 is also true; we know, in fact, that Chalcedon considered this synod as *latrocinium*, the "Robber Council" following its condemnation by Pope Leo.<sup>175</sup> Eutychius, in his narration, remarks also the doctrine of the third ecumenical council of Ephesus. Reading it carefully, we see that this is not really the faith of Ephesus, which did not produce an official profession of faith, as we said above, but it is, in fact, a doctrine very similar to the formula of union of the Easterns that Eutychius quoted before.<sup>176</sup> It is clear that we have again a neo-Chalcedonian reading of the doctrine of Chalcedon.

Regarding his citation of the faith of Chalcedon, he does not follow the order of the known definition of Chalcedon, and he does not mention the four adjectives used by it to describe the relationship between the two united natures: without confusion or mixture, and without division or separation: *ἀσπυγύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαρέτως* and *ἀχωρίστως*. It is not clear to me why he omits such a fundamental affirmation of Chalcedon. Probably he considers his presentation of the faith of Chalcedon enough, and believes that it expresses the doctrine of these four adjectives without mentioning them. He underlines, instead, the double consubstantiality; the two natures in Christ, and the oneness of his person and hypostasis. Thus, the duality of natures and consubstantiality mean without confusion or mixture; whereas the unity of natures, and oneness of person and hypostasis, mean without division or separation. This is also to be considered a neo-Chalcedonian and Melkite interpretation of Chalcedon.

<sup>170</sup> Cfr. Price, R., and Gaddis, M., tr., *The Acts*, vol. i, 43.

<sup>171</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*

<sup>172</sup> For the term Melkite, its origin and its application by Miaphysites to Chalcedonians, Griffith, S., 'Melkites, Jacobites', 12. Also the theology of the council according to the Melkite *Abū Qurra* has the same purpose, cfr. Griffith, S., 'Muslims and Church Councils', 293-299.

<sup>173</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 182:

«فلما اجتمعوا نظروا في فساد مقالة ديسقورس بطريرك الاسكندرية وما فعل من موافقته لمقالة اوتيشيوس فلحنوا اذ ذلك ديسقورس ولعنوا اوتيشيوس وثبتوا ان ربنا يسوع المسيح اله وانسان وهو في الكيان مع ابيه في اللاهوت وفي الكيان معنا في الناسوت يعرف بطبيعتين تاما بلاهوته وتاماً بناسوته مسيح واحد.»

<sup>174</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*

«وثبتوا قول المجمع الثالث الذين اجتمعوا في مدينة افسس اول مرة وهم مائتين اسقفاً على نسطور وقالوا ان مريم العذراء ولدت الها ربنا يسوع المسيح الذي هو مع ابيه في الطبيعة الالهية ومع الناس في الطبيعة النسانية وشهدوا ان المسيح طبيعتان واقنوم واحد ووجه واحد ولعنوا ديسقورس ومن يقول بمقالته وانفوه ولعنوا المجمع الثاني الذي كان بافسس.»

<sup>175</sup> Cfr. Price, R., and Gaddis, M., tr., *The Acts*, vol. i, 39, 87 and 106, see also footnote 54 in page 106.

<sup>176</sup> See my analysis and a comparisons of both texts in Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 130-132.

## THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE II (553 A.D.)

It is clear that Chalcedon failed to put an end to the Christological controversy which continued in the following years. It is known that both groups, Chalcedonians and Miaphysites, developed their own metaphysical systems through which they expressed their doctrine. This is not the place to deal with how Eutychius narrates all the events between the council of Chalcedon and the fifth ecumenical council.<sup>177</sup> It is, important, however, to note that he is more detailed in presenting the doctrines of the individual heretics, while orthodoxy is expressed by simply employing the doctrine of the ecumenical councils. For Eutychius, then, orthodoxy and the doctrine of ecumenical councils are identical.

For the post-Chalcedonian context, I would like to analyze his presentation of two important figures from the Miaphysite party, Severus of Antioch and Jacob Baradaeus, trying to reveal his particular reading of their doctrines.<sup>178</sup> According to Eutychius' narration on the reign of Anastasius I, Severus was living in Constantinople; he was follower of the doctrine of Dioscorus and Eutyches; and he was teaching that in Christ there was one nature, one hypostasis, and one will.<sup>179</sup> By telling us that Severus was in Constantinople, Eutychius is probably alluding to his sojourn at the capital,<sup>180</sup> putting it, however, during the reign of Anastasius I and not of Justinian I. Additionally, Eutychius claims that Severus followed the doctrines of Eutyches and Dioscorus. It is true that Severus was a follower of Cyril of Alexandria and his Christology, and also that he was in agreement with Dioscorus, but certainly not with Eutyches, whom he in fact condemned.<sup>181</sup> We have again a Chalcedonian reading of the history.

That Dioscorus and Severus could not agree with the doctrine of Eutyches is, in fact, why modern scholars distinguish between different groups inside the Monophysite current, calling the radicals "monophysites" and the moderates "miaphysites".<sup>182</sup> For the Chalcedonian and Melkite tradition, however, all of them belonged to the same theological current without distinction,<sup>183</sup> and Eutychius follows this tradition in his narration. We can see the same in his presentation of Severus' doctrine. It is correct that Severus taught one hypostasis and one nature

<sup>177</sup> For the narration of Eutychius see Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 183-205; while for a detailed study on this period see Maraval, P., 'La ricezione di Calcedonia nell'impero d'Oriente', in L. Pietri, ed., *Storia del cristianesimo. Religione, politica, cultura*, vol. iii: *Le Chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432-610)*, tr. E. Prinzivalli (Rome, 2002), 119-153; idem, 'La politica religiosa di Giustiniano', in L. Pietri, ed., *Storia del cristianesimo. Religione, politica, cultura*, vol. iii: *Le Chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432-610)*, tr. E. Prinzivalli (Rome, 2002), 373-406.

<sup>178</sup> On Severus and his Christology, see Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/II, 21-180; Chesnut, R., *Three Monophysite Christologies: Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Sarug* (London, 1976), 9-56; Samuel, V., *The Council of Chalcedon and the Christology of Severus of Antioch* (London, 1957); idem, 'The Christology of Severus of Antioch', *Abba Salama* 4 (1973), 126-190; idem, 'Further Studies in the Christology of Severus of Antioch', *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 58 (1976), 270-301; Perrone, L., 'Il "Dialogo contro gli aftartodoceti" di Leonzio di Bisanzio e Severo di Antiochia', *Cristianesimo nella storia* 1 (1980), 411-442.

<sup>179</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 193-194:

«وكان بالقسطنطينية رجل يقال له سويرس وكان يرى رأي ديسقورس واقتيشوس وكان يقول بطبيعة واحدة واقدم واحد ومشينة واحدة.»

<sup>180</sup> Cfr. Maraval, P., 'La politica', 387; see also Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/II, 344-349.

<sup>181</sup> Cfr. ibid., 154 and footnote 149 at p. 263; Chesnut, R., *Three Monophysite Christologies*, footnote 1 at p. 53.

<sup>182</sup> Cfr. Brock, S., 'Il dibattito cristologico del V e VI secolo nel contesto del dialogo teologico moderno', in E. Vergani and S. Chialà, eds., *Le Chiese sire tra IV e VI secolo. Dibattito dottrinale e ricerca spirituale. Atti del 2° incontro sull'Oriente cristiano di tradizione siriana Milano Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 28 marzo 2003* (Milano, 2005), 73-92, here 76-77.

<sup>183</sup> Cfr. Luisier, Ph., 'Il miaphisismo, un termine discutibile della storiografia recente. Problemi teologici ed ecumenici', *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 35 (2014), 297-307.

in Christ,<sup>184</sup> but we do not find in his works the teaching on the one will, as Eutychius attributes to him.<sup>185</sup> Rather, we find the doctrine on the one energy, although this doctrine did not occupy an important place in his thought.<sup>186</sup> Eutychius, then, reading Severus through the Chalcedonian metaphysical system, attributes to him the doctrine of monotheletism: teaching one nature, one hypostasis and one energy in Christ leads also to affirm one will in Him.

With the same approach, Eutychius reads and presents the doctrine of Jacob Baradaeus, the one, he affirms, for whom the Jacobites are named.<sup>187</sup> In the narration, Jacob was disciple of Severus;<sup>188</sup> he agreed with his doctrine, and that of Dioscorus, and that of Eutyches.<sup>189</sup> In addition, he taught that Christ was one nature from two natures and one substance from two substances, and one will.<sup>190</sup> The doctrine "one nature from two" was Severus' interpretation of the Cyrilian formula "μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη",<sup>191</sup> but Eutychius attributes it to his disciple Jacob. This is again an application of his Melkite reading. In fact, such interpretation became the official one of later Jacobites. He, consequently, attributes it to Jacob, who, according to him was their founder. The Chalcedonian-Melkite approach is also clear in the identification of the term "nature" with the term "substance". Severus rarely used the term substance in his Christology,<sup>192</sup> but the later Jacobite tradition used it synonymously with the term nature, in Christology as in Trinitarian theology.<sup>193</sup> This gives Eutychius license to make this same identification, and go even further in his presentation. For him, since the will is natural and since Jacobites affirm that Christ was of one nature, it was possible to attribute to them the doctrine of the one will.

What is strange and interesting in this presentation is that for Eutychius these doctrines were not the reason for the convocation of the fifth ecumenical council in Constantinople, nor does he mention that the desire of Justinian to realize a union between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians was behind the convocation of the council.<sup>194</sup> The main problems, according to the narration, that led to the council were the doctrine of Origen, and the doctrine of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodore of Cyr and Ibas of Edessa (the three chapters controversy). He claims that these were the main topics of the edicts the emperor Justinian issued before the council, as well as the topics discussed in the council itself.<sup>195</sup> For Eutychius, however, the content of these heresies is different from what we know.<sup>196</sup> (1) According to the narration, Origen was the bishop of Mabbug, was still alive in the time of Justinian, and supported the doctrine of metempsychosis, rejecting the doctrine on resurrection of bodies; (2) Ibas of Edessa, Theodore

<sup>184</sup> Cfr. Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/II, 146-147; Chesnut, R., *Three Monophysite Christologies*, 9-15.

<sup>185</sup> Cfr. ibid., 20-29.

<sup>186</sup> Cfr. Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/II, 162-167; Chesnut, R., *Three Monophysite Christologies*, 29-34.

<sup>187</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 195:

«فسموا التابعين لدين يعقوب والقائلين بمقالته يعقوبيين مشتق من اسم يعقوب.»

<sup>188</sup> Cfr. ibid:

«وكان لسويرس تلميذ يقال له يعقوب....»

<sup>189</sup> Cfr. ibid:

«موافق لقول سويرس وديوسقورس واوتيشوس الملائين.»

<sup>190</sup> Cfr. ibid:

«وكانت مقالته ان المسيح طبيعة واحدة من طبيعتين وجوهر من جوهرين ومشينة واحدة.»

<sup>191</sup> Cfr. Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/II, 153-162.

<sup>192</sup> Cfr. ibid., 54-61.

<sup>193</sup> Cfr. Haddad, R., *La Trinité*, 135-151.

<sup>194</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 225-240; Maraval, P., 'La politica', 385-404.

<sup>195</sup> Cfr. ibid.

<sup>196</sup> On the edicts against Origen and against the three Chapters see Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/II, 385-462.

of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret of Cyr maintained that the body of Christ was not real.<sup>197</sup> The appearance of these heretics was known by Justinian who convoked them to the capital to meet Eutychius of Constantinople, who after having discussed with them their opinions, he condemned them.<sup>198</sup>

Even if the doctrine of metempsychosis, attributed to Origen in the narration, can have its nucleus in the thought of Origen and, especially, in the thought of some Origenists,<sup>199</sup> I assume that Eutychius applies here a Melkite reading of history. It seems that in his time there appeared some Islamic thinkers who claimed the doctrine of metempsychosis through an Indian influence. Some *Mu'tazilah* followers, in fact, supported this doctrine, which later had a huge diffusion in Islamic Shiism.<sup>200</sup> What supports my hypothesis is the information that *al-Mas'ūdī*, a Muslim historian who died in Cairo in 956, and *al-Bayrūnī*, another Muslim historian who died in 1048, offer to us regarding the diffusion of the doctrine of metempsychosis among some Muslims scholars at their time, i.e. the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>201</sup> The second problem, according to our narration, in Origen's thought was the rejection of the idea of resurrection of bodies, which is a consequence and result of the doctrine on metempsychosis, and is related directly with the heretical doctrine attributed to Theodore, Theodoret and Ibas in the narration, i.e. the unreality of the body of Christ. Even if in the anathema against Origen we see the affirmation of the doctrine on the resurrection of the body,<sup>202</sup> I think we have here again a Melkite reading that seeks to express a contemporary doctrine of the author, basing it in an historic nucleus. In Islam, in fact, we can find a diversity of opinions regarding the resurrection of body.<sup>203</sup> Muslims who taught metempsychosis rejected, consequentially, the resurrection of body, claiming the reincarnation of human beings.

Going back to the narration, we note a description of the dispute between Eutychius of Constantinople and the heretics convoked in the capital. We see also that the description of this dispute follows the model the author applies always in his accounts of the disputes between orthodox heroes and heretics, i.e. the disputes between Arius and Alexander, or Eutyches and Flavianus. As with the other accounts, this one also supports my hypothesis on the Melkite reading of doctrine applied by the patriarch of Alexandria. The dispute, in fact, is expressed with the logic and the language used by the Melkite and Arab Christian thinkers.<sup>204</sup>

Eutychius of Constantinople, the narration says, after having demonstrated the orthodox doctrine to the heretics, excommunicated them. Justinian however, desired an excommunication by a council, so he convoked the fifth ecumenical council in Constantinople.<sup>205</sup> Again for Eutychius, it is the orthodox emperor who convokes the ecumenical council. In fact, in his

<sup>197</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 205:

«وكان في عصر يوستينيانوس الملك اوريجناتوس اسقف منبج وكان يقول بالتناسخ وان ليس قيامة. وكان ايضا انيا اسقف الرها وتداوس اسقف المصيصة وثاودوريتوس اسقف مدينة انقرة. وكانوا هؤلاء الاساقفة يقولوا ان جسد سيدنا المسيح كان فانطاسيا اي خيالا غير حقيقة.»

<sup>198</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*

<sup>199</sup> Some anathemas, in fact, against Origen alludes to this doctrine see for example Denzinger, H., and Hünermann, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 231 (n. 403).

<sup>200</sup> Cfr. Gimaret, D., 'Tanāsukh', *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. x, 181-183.

<sup>201</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*

<sup>202</sup> Cfr. Denzinger, H., and Hünermann, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 231 (n. 407).

<sup>203</sup> See on regards see Smith, J., and Haddad, Y., *The Islamic Understanding of Death and Resurrection* (Oxford-New York, 2002).

<sup>204</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 205:

«فسمع بمقاتلهم الملك فوجه فاشخصهم الى القسطنطينية وجمع بينهم وبين اوتيشيوس بطريرك القسطنطينية فقال لهم البطرك: ان كان جسد سيدنا المسيح فانطاسيا كما زعمتم فيجب ان يكون فعله فانطاسيا وقوله فانطاسيا وكل جسد نعاينه لاحد الناس او فعل او قول فهو كذلك. وقال لاسقف منبج ان سيدنا المسيح قد قام من الموت واعلمنا ان كذلك يقومون الناس من الموت يوم الدينونة. وقال لنا في انجيله المقدس ان تأتي ساعة حتى ان كل من في القبور سمعوا بصوت ابن الله يحيوا فكيف تقولوا ان ليس قيامة. فاجوب عليهم الحرم واللعن.»

<sup>205</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*

«فامر الملك ان يكون لهم مجمعا ليلعنوا فيه.»

description of Justinian, he does not mention the known actions that could tarnish the emperor's image as defender of orthodoxy, like for example, preventing Pope Vigilius from returning to Rome before signing the decisions of the council, especially the condemnation of Theodore, Theodoret and Ibas, who, according to the Pope, were died in peace within the Church and their condemnation was unorthodox.

As we have seen before, Eutychius again presents the bishops according to the system of pentarchy. Thus, he says that Justinian invited Eutychius of Constantinople, Apollinaris of Alexandria, Domnus of Antioch, Eutychius of Jerusalem, and Vigilius of Rome; all came to the capital except the bishops of Rome and Jerusalem; the latter sent representatives while the first was not represented in the council.<sup>206</sup> This time, the given names for the five patriarchs are correct.<sup>207</sup> It is known also that the bishop of Jerusalem could not be present and that he really sent representatives to the council.<sup>208</sup> The narration however, is incorrect in asserting the absence of the bishop of Rome. We know that Vigilius was in Constantinople at the time of the council, but he refused to attend it because of the desire of the emperor to condemn persons who died in peace with the church,<sup>209</sup> as we mentioned above. I think that Eutychius maintains the Pope's absence because he does not want to talk about the condemnation of deceased persons; this also explains why, in his narration Origen, Theodore, Theodoret and Ibas were alive in that period. Beneath his hiding of details and manipulation of facts, we can understand his purpose: he does not want to admit to Muslims and non-Chalcedonians that the Pope, while in the capital, did not attend the council, and at first refused to accept the decision regarding the condemnation of deceased persons. Such embarrassing details, I think, could easily create accusations against the ecumenical character of the council and doubts regarding its orthodoxy. Therefore, I assume, Eutychius changes the historical facts, saying that the Pope did not come and did not sent any representative, but nonetheless accepted all its decisions. It is an account based on some real events, such as the final acceptance of the decisions by Pope Vigilius,<sup>210</sup> but presented according to a Melkite reading of history that permits the author to manipulate or hide some facts, or to present them with a particular way.

The bishops of the council, the narration continues, condemned the heretics and established: that the body of Christ is real; that He is one hypostasis, perfect God and perfect man, known in two natures, two wills and two operations. They also confirmed the doctrine of the previous four councils, they affirmed the resurrection of bodies, and that Christ will come with great glory to judge the living and the dead, as the 370 fathers of Nicaea had already asserted.<sup>211</sup> It is known that the fifth ecumenical council did not produce a profession of faith, but a sentence to which they appended a list of anathemas.<sup>212</sup> Eutychius refers to these anathemas regarding the condemnations of heretics, but the doctrine he describes and attributes to the council is not totally correct. We know that the council affirmed the duality of natures in Christ, the perfection of the divine and human natures in Him, and the oneness of the hypostasis and the person of

<sup>206</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 205-206:

«فكتب الملك الى الاربعة بطاركة فجمعهم لابوريناريوس بطريرك الاسكندرية والى دمنس بطريرك انطاكيا والى اوتيشيوس بطريرك بيت المقدس والى بنجيليوس بطريرك رومية وان يشخصوا الى القسطنطينية ليحضروا لعن هؤلاء الاساقفة فحضروا وكان في هذا المجمع اوتيشيوس بطريرك القسطنطينية ولم يحضر بطريرك بيت المقدس ولكنه وجه بوكلائه وكذلك بطريرك رومية لم يحضر ولا كان له وكيل الا انه قد وافقهم وقبل قولهم.»

<sup>207</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 240.

<sup>208</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*

<sup>209</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 242-243.

<sup>210</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 247-248.

<sup>211</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 206:

«فلعنوا هؤلاء الاساقفة ومن يقول بمقاتلهم وهم اوريجناتوس اسقف منبج وتداوس اسقف المصيصة وانيا اسقف الرها وثاودوريتوس اسقف انقرة. وثبتوا ان جسد سيدنا حقيقة لا خيال وانه اله تام وانسان تام معروف بطبيعتين ومشيئتين وفعلتين واقنوم واحد. وثبتوا قول المجمع الاربعة التي كانوا قبلهم وان الدنيا زائلة والقيامة لا بد ان تكون وان سيدنا المسيح يأتي بمجد عظيم فيدين الاحياء والاموات كما قالوا الثلثمائة والثمانمائة عشر.»

<sup>212</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 242-247.

Christ, as the patriarch of Alexandria affirms, identifying him with the eternal Logos.<sup>213</sup> However, the attribution of the doctrine on the two wills and two operations to this council is totally incorrect. Furthermore, in the anathemas of the council we do not find any mention of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, while, as said above, such doctrine is present in the emperor's edict against Origen. Eutychius, then, tries by his description of the decisions of the council to be in harmony with what he already had narrated before. If the doctrine of metempsychosis and the one of the resurrection of bodies were the heresies that the council had to deal with, this should be reflected in its decisions. If the Jacobites, already before the convocation of the council, taught one will in Christ, the council had to condemn this doctrine, teaching instead the orthodoxy, i.e. the doctrine of the two wills and two operations.

#### THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE III (680-681)

What led, in fact, to the convocation of the sixth ecumenical council was the heresy of monothelism and monoenergism (one will and one operation in Christ) expressed officially by the *Ekthesis*, a document composed by Sergius of Constantinople and issued by the emperor Heraclius.<sup>214</sup> In the narration of Eutychius, however, this heresy appeared already in the doctrine of Severus of Antioch and Jacob Baradaeus. In addition, he attributes to the fifth ecumenical council the doctrine of two wills and two operations in Christ, as the orthodox response to this heresy. The author, however, attributes again this doctrine to a monk named *Mārūn*.<sup>215</sup> Such information reveals once again the Melkite reading of history applied by Eutychius. Already, in fact, we find in the 9<sup>th</sup> century writing of *Theodore Abū Qurrah* that those who accepted the doctrine of Sergius and Heraclius, i.e. the heresy of monothelism and monoenergism, were the Maronites of his time.<sup>216</sup> Historically, *Mārūn*, if really existed, would have lived a century before, and the monks of his monastery would be those who accepted the doctrine of monothelism and monoenergism.<sup>217</sup> Eutychius, then, following his Melkite reading, attributes the heresy to the 4<sup>th</sup> century monk *Mārūn*, the founder of the Maronites, exactly as he attributes the later Jacobite doctrine to their founder, Jacob Baradaeus. According to the narration, *Mārūn* lived before Sergius and Heraclius. Therefore, Eutychius could claim that Heraclius was Maronite,<sup>218</sup> and those who accepted this doctrine were also Maronites.<sup>219</sup> This is, then, an application of his Melkite tradition to a historical narration, a method that permits the author to elaborate his information and to make some changes in the historical events through which he can realize his desire. It should be noted, in addition, that Eutychius mentions that there is one main difference between the doctrine of *Mārūn* and the one of Jacobites: for the first, Christ is known in two natures, while for Jacobites Christ has just one nature.

<sup>213</sup> Some of the anathemas of this council, in fact, condemn those who do not affirm hypostatic union, nor as a consequence one hypostasis and one person, nor that the two natures remain distinct and inseparable, cfr. Denzinger, H., and Hünermann, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 237-245 (n. 421-438); see also Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 242-247.

<sup>214</sup> For more details see *ibid*, 260-279; see also, Stiermon, D., 'Sergio', in *Nuovo Dizionario di Patristica e Antichità Cristiana*, vol. iii, 4862-4863.

<sup>215</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. i, 210.

<sup>216</sup> «وكان في عصر موريق الملك راهب يُقال له مارون وكان يقول ان سيدنا المسيح طبيعتين ومشينة واحدة وفعل واحد واقتوم واحد فافسد مقالة الناس»

<sup>217</sup> Cfr. Lamoreaux, J., tr., *Theodore Abū Qurrah*, Library of The Christian East, 1 (Provo, 2005), footnote 5 at p. 61 and pp. 74-75.

<sup>218</sup> Cfr. Cross, F., and Livingstone, E., eds., *The Oxford Dictionary*, 1040-1041.

<sup>219</sup> Cfr. Eutychii *Annales*, vol. ii, 12:

«ولما هرب صير بعده كورس بطريركا على الاسكندرية وكان ماروني على دين هرقل».

<sup>220</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 13:

«وفي خمس سنين من خلافته صير مقدونيوس بطريركا على انطاكية في مدينة القسطنطينية وكان مارونيا... وفي ست سنين من خلافة عمر بن الخطاب وهي سنة ثمانى عشرة من ملك هرقل صير سورس بطريركا على القسطنطينية وكان مارونيا».

Among those who reacted to this heresy Eutychius mentions Sophronius of Jerusalem and Pope John IV, providing some quotations from their works.<sup>220</sup> Regarding Maxim the confessor, he does not quote or mention in detail his doctrine, he simply alludes to his life and his role in this controversy.<sup>221</sup> For my study here I will analyze the doctrine attributed to Sophronius of Jerusalem to demonstrate how Eutychius' Melkite reading functions in its description. According to Sophronius, says Eutychius, if Christ has one will and one operation, he must have one nature, and this is the Jacobite doctrine; however, if we affirm two natures, we must affirm also two wills and two operations. It is impossible, he concludes, to claim that he who has two natures has one will and one operation.<sup>222</sup> Such a doctrine reveals, in fact, the Chalcedonian and the Melkite understanding of the relationship between nature and will; each nature has its own will and operation. Unfortunately, the original work of Sophronius written against monothelism did not survive,<sup>223</sup> therefore we cannot affirm if Eutychius bases his quotation on it or not. We can be sure, however, that the motivations Sophronius gives in the quotation made by Eutychius are in agreement with those he himself mentions in his synodical letter.<sup>224</sup> This leads us to maintain that Eutychius follows in his narration his Melkite tradition, presenting it in his particular way.

This is not the place to describe how Eutychius narrates all events that led to the convocation of the sixth ecumenical council. Rather, I wish to highlight the elements of his Melkite and Chalcedonian reading that we find in the narration of this council. He correctly mentions that it was Constantine IV who convoked the council.<sup>225</sup> The reason was his orthodox faith and his desire to defend it from the heresy of monothelism and monoenergism.<sup>226</sup> His information on the bishops who took part in the council is also correct,<sup>227</sup> presented again according to his comprehension of the system of pentarchy: the presidency was of the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, George; he mentions that the heretical patriarch of Antioch, Macarius, was present, and that he was condemned in the council and replaced by the orthodox Theophanes; in addition he informs us that both patriarchal seats of Alexandria and of Jerusalem were vacant and that the Pope of Rome sent a delegation to attend the council. He, however, names the Pope Agapius and not Agatho.<sup>228</sup>

<sup>220</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 12-13 and 28-30; see Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīh*, 137-141.

<sup>221</sup> Cfr. Eutychii *Annales*, vol. ii, 34.

<sup>222</sup> Cfr. *ibid*, 12:

«لو كان الأمر كما تزعم أنّ المسيح مشينة واحدة وفعل واحد فوجب ان يكون له طبيعة واحدة لا طبيعتين وذلك قول اليعقوبية بل نقول ان المسيح مشينتين وفعلين كما له طبيعتين لانه محال ان تكون مشينة واحدة لدى طبيعتين. لو كان ذا مشينة واحدة لكان ذا طبيعة واحدة فلما كان ذا طبيعتين فهو ذا مشينتين.»

<sup>223</sup> Cfr. Špidlík, T., 'Sofronio di Gerusalemme' in *Nuovo Dizionario di Patristica e Antichità Cristiana*, vol. iii, 5042-5043, here 5043.

<sup>224</sup> We read in his synodical letter the following: «... και εἰς Υἱὸς ἐγινώσκετο ὁ πᾶσαν ἐξ αὐτοῦ προφέρων ἐνέργειαν θεϊάν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπειον...», Sophronius of Jerusalem, *Epistola Synodica*, *Patrologia Graeca*, 87, 3147-3200, here 3176 C, and then he says: «... εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Υἱὸς καὶ Χριστὸς ἀδιάτμητος, ἐν δυσὶν ἀδιαρέτως γνωρισόμενος φύσει. καὶ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα τοῦ ἐνὸς Υἱοῦ διαβεβαιούμεθα, καὶ πᾶσας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς φωνὰς καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας πιστεύομεν. καὶ αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν εἰσι θεοπρεπεῖς, αἱ δὲ οὕτω πάλιν ἀνθρωποπρεπεῖς, αἱ δὲ μέσην τινὰ τάξιν ἐπέχουσιν, ὡς ἔχουσαι τὸ θεοπρεπὲς ἐν ταυτῷ καὶ ἀνθρώπινον», *ibid*, 3177 B. and then he explains saying: «Ταύτη δὲ φάμεν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τὴν κοινὴν καὶ θεανδρικὴν λεγομένην ἐνέργειαν, οὐ μίαν ὑπάρχουσαν, ἀλλ' ἑτερογενεῖν καὶ διάφορον...», *ibid*.

<sup>225</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 279-280.

<sup>226</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. ii, 31:

«وكان قسطنطين هذا الملك حسن العبادة»

See also *ibid*, 35:

«وجمع قسطنطين مائة وثمانية وستين اسقف... فبحسن معونة الله وشرف دعة قسطنطين الملك بقيت هذه القضية التي نفذت على اصحاب المشينة الواحدة وثبتوا اللعنة عليهم.»

<sup>227</sup> Cfr. Davis, L., *The First Seven*, 279-281.

<sup>228</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. ii, 34-35:

«فجمع اغابويوس من حضره من الاساقفة... وجه بهم مع رسل الملك فلما وصلوا الاساقفة الى القسطنطينية دخلوا الى قسطنطين الملك... فبحسن معونة الله وشرف دعة قسطنطين الملك بقيت هذه القضية التي نفذت على اصحاب المشينة الواحدة وثبتوا اللعنة عليهم وكان رئيس هذا المجمع السادس جرجيوس»

The fathers, the narration continues, after anathematizing the monothelites, established that the one of Trinity, the eternal Word and Son of God, who is consubstantial to the Father, is one hypostasis and one person, he is perfect God and perfect man; He is Jesus Christ the Lord known in two perfect natures, two operations and two natural wills, one hypostasis. They confirmed the doctrine of the council of Chalcedon: God the Son assumed a human body with a rational soul, without confusion, corruption, separation, or division. As one subject, Christ operated the things that belonged to divinity and the things that belonged to humanity. Each nature operated, however, in communion with the other nature. The duality of wills does not mean that one will was contrary to the other; neither does it mean confusion between the two wills or the two operations.<sup>229</sup>

Eutychius' description of the doctrine is based, in fact, on the decisions of the council,<sup>230</sup> but presented once again, according to his particular and special way.<sup>231</sup> The Chalcedonian reading of faith is revealed this time in his desire to affirm that the sixth council follows in its doctrine the faith of Chalcedon. The doctrine, then of the two wills and two operations is a consequence of the doctrine of two natures. It is the same mechanism as made by Sophronius. In fact, contrary to the actual council, which said that the basis for its doctrine was the *Tomus* of Leo,<sup>232</sup> Eutychius says that the fathers based their doctrine on the one of Sophronius of Jerusalem.<sup>233</sup> I think that this Chalcedonian reading is behind the appearance, at this time rather than at Chalcedon, of the four characters of the profession of Chalcedon: without confusion (*ἀσυγχύτως*), without corruption (*ἀτρέπτως*), without separation (*ἀδιαπέτως*) and without division (*ἀχωρίστως*).<sup>234</sup> According to the Melkite motivation, the wills and operations are natural, and since the natures are united without confusion or separation, the wills also exist without confusion or separation, not united but in communion and without contradiction.

Eutyches' mention of the neo-Chalcedonian expression "the one of Trinity", which played an essential role in neo-Chalcedonian Christology,<sup>235</sup> reveals his neo-Chalcedonian reading of the text. It is an expression that has a polemic finality against the addition to the trisagion<sup>236</sup> that miaphysites had made.<sup>237</sup> This in fact, confirms my hypothesis, that the neo-Chalcedonism was

بطريرك القسطنطينية وثاوفانس بطريرك انطاكية لانه في ذلك المجمع صير بطريركا لان مقاريوس الذي كان قبله لعن في هذا المجمع. فاما الاسكندرية وبيت المقدس فلم يكن فيها في ذلك الوقت بطريرك. وكان الكرسيين خاليين...»

<sup>229</sup> Cfr. *ibid.*, 35-36:

«قلنا فرغوا من لعن اصحاب المشيئة الواحدة جلسوا فصاحوا الامانة المستقيمة النقية التي بلا عيب. وقالوا اننا نؤمن بان الواحد من الثالوث الابن الوحيد الذي هو الكلمة الازلية الدائم المستوي مع الاب الاله في اقنوم واحد ووجه واحد يعرف تاما بناسوته تاما بلاهوته في الجوهر الذي هو ربنا يسوع المسيح بطبيعتين تامتين وفعالين ومشيئتين في اقنوم واحد وشهدوا كما شهد المجمع الخلقوني ان الاله الابن في آخر الازمنة اتخذ من العذراء السيدة مرتيم القديسة جسد انساني بنفس ناطقة عقلية وذلك برحمة الله تعالى. ولم يلحقه في ذلك اختلاط ولا فساد ولا فرقة ولا فصل ولكن هو واحد يعمل ما يشبه الانسان ان يعمل في طبيعته وما يشبه الاله ان يعمل في طبيعته الذي هو الابن الوحيد الكلمة الازلية المتجسدة التي صارت بالحقيقة لحما كما يقول الانجيل المقدس من غير ان تنتقل من مجدها الازلي وليس بمتغيرة لكنها بفعالين ومشيئتين وطبيعتين اله وانسان الذي بها يكمل قول الحق وكل واحدة من الطبيعتين تعمل مع شركة صاحبها بمشيئتين غير متضادتين ولا متضارعتين ليس لبعضهم بعض ولكن تبقى المشيئة الانسية في المشيئة الالهية القادرة على كل شيء.»

<sup>230</sup> For the decisions of the council see Denzinger, H., and Hünemann, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 314-319 (n. 553-559).

<sup>231</sup> See my comparative analysis in Ebeid, B., *La Tunica di al-Masīhī*, 142-147.

<sup>232</sup> The council, in fact, mentions the name of Leo, cfr. Denzinger, H., and Hünemann, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 314-315 (nn. 553 and 557).

<sup>233</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. ii, 37:

«واخرجوا امانة صفرونيوس بطريرك بيت المقدس وقبلوها واثبتوها...»

<sup>234</sup> If in the council of Chalcedonia these four characters appears one time, in the council of Constantinople III they appears four time; for the definition of Chalcedon and the use of these characters see DENZINGER, H., and HÜNEMANN, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 168, (n. 302); for their use in the definition of Constantinople III see *ibid.*, 314-317 (nn. 555-558).

<sup>235</sup> Cfr. Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/II, 317-318.

<sup>236</sup> We mean the addition of the phrase "who was crucified for us", added to the trisagion by the miaphysites giving it a Christological character and not considering it a Trinitarian hymn, as it was traditionally seen.

<sup>237</sup> See *ibid.*, 317-343.

not rejected in the sixth ecumenical council, as some scholars sustain.<sup>238</sup> The last element, which I believe is the most important one of Eutychius' Melkite reading, is his underlining that the fathers of the council affirmed the doctrine of the five preceding ecumenical councils.<sup>239</sup> Consequently, orthodoxy is to be considered the faith of the sixth ecumenical council, i.e. the doctrinal identity and profile of the Melkite Church and its orthodoxy, as I mentioned in the introduction to this study.

## CONCLUSION

Concluding my analysis, it has been demonstrated that Eutychius' presentation of the six ecumenical councils follows a particular reading of ecclesiastical history and doctrine. If the aim of his *Annals*, as S. Griffith claimed, is to express the identity and profile of his Church through historiography, with this paper it has been demonstrated that the particular reading of the history and doctrine followed by Eutychius, which I call a Melkite and Chalcedonian reading, is the reason behind the success of the *Annals* in presenting a Melkite profile, i.e. a self-definition of Chalcedonian identity in Arabic language.

Chalcedonian reading of history and faith means reading the Christian doctrine of councils and the development of doctrine according to the faith of Chalcedon. Such a reading allows the author to change some details in his narration, to add other details, to manipulate or to omit some facts, or to attribute doctrines of later periods to earlier. The rationale behind this approach and reading is the idea that orthodoxy in its totality is one, even if it was expressed gradually in time. Chalcedon is in the center of Eutychius' doctrine, so everything has to be related to it. The patriarch of Alexandria was not just a historian, he was also a neo-Chalcedonian theologian. This is clear in his presentation of the faith and its dogmas, and through his comments on it. For this reason his Chalcedonian reading, even if his work is historical, reveals an apologetic and polemic purpose against non-Chalcedonians: Nestorians, Miaphysites and Monothelites (Maronites). This Chalcedonian interpretation is clear in his narration on councils and their doctrines. It is not just his use of expressions and formulation of the neo-Chalcedonians, or the development of their doctrine, but also the desire to show an agreement between Cyril, the council of Ephesus, and Chalcedon. The result of such an approach was a unique and different narration of this historical period, one based on facts, but also on some elaborations and manipulations of details and information.

Melkite reading of history, however, is, according to my understanding, the instrument through which Eutychius tried to express the orthodox faith in Arabic language, using the Arab-Christian linguistic and philosophic codex. The new *lingua franca* was the language of apology and polemics used by Christians of the East against Muslims and against each other. Such Melkite reading, then, reveals Eutychius' understanding of Islam, and the relationship and similarities he finds between the new religion and the ancient Trinitarian heresies. Melkite reading means also expressing contemporary doctrine through the past and its controversies. This purpose permits the author to invent disputes between heretics and orthodox heroes that, indirectly bring to light the temporary discussions between Melkites and other confessions/religions. The same reading allows the author to attribute to the founders of the major Christian confessions, Nestorians (Nestorius), Miaphysites-Jacobites (Jacob Baradaeus), and Monothelites-Maronites (*Mārūn*), what their followers contemporary to Eutychius teach.

<sup>238</sup> Cfr. Carcione, F., 'La recezione ecclesiale del concilio di Calcedonia in Oriente tra V e VI secolo', *Studi e Ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano* 13 (1990) 47-66.

<sup>239</sup> Cfr. Eutychii, *Annales*, vol. ii, 37:

«هذه شهادة وامانة المجمع السادس المقدس وثبتوا ما ثبتوه الخمسة المجامع المقدسة التي كانت قبلهم.»

Furthermore, the linguistic and philosophic codex in which such reading is expressed is also interesting. Eutychius uses the Islamic language and philosophy, especially the one of the *Mu'tazilah*. Such use indicates, not just the degree of his arabization, but also his desire to use a language and philosophic argumentations common among Melkites, non-Melkite Christians, and Muslims. In this reading I underlined the importance of the use of *pentarchy* as an instrument through which Eutychius demonstrates the unity, on one hand, between all Chalcedonian churches inside and outside the Islamic empire, and on the other hand the catholicity and validity of the Melkite doctrine. The Melkite doctrinal identity, in fact, is based on the faith of the six ecumenical councils. Eutychius, in his presentation of these councils desired mainly to show: (1) to Muslims the importance, validity, and ecumenical character of these councils, since they express the orthodoxy of the whole Byzantine and Chalcedonian Church; and (2) to non-Melkites, the catholicity, orthodoxy, and authority of the decisions and doctrine of these councils, through, for example, affirming a huge number of bishops who attended and accepted them.

Eutychius, finally, tried to give an authority to his narration. The role of the bishops of Alexandria in the accounts on councils has an important place in his narration. This approach allowed him sometimes to add, omit, or manipulate facts regarding them. Presenting the bishops of Alexandria, in fact, as heroes of orthodoxy, is to be considered an indirect message to his readers: he also is patriarch of Alexandria, successor of all these great heroes; he is interested in defending orthodoxy against heresies, other Christian confessions, and other religions, exactly as his predecessors did; his narration, then, has authority and validity, and for this reason it must be read seriously and carefully by Melkite believers.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramowski, L., 'Babai der Grosse. Christologische Probleme und ihre Lösungen', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 41(1975), 289-343.
- Agapius Episcopus Mabbugensis, *Historia Universalis*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 65, Scriptorum Arabici, 10, L. Cheikho, ed. (Beirut-Paris, 1912).
- Amerise, M., *Il battesimo di Costantino il Grande. Storia di una scomoda eredità* (Stuttgart, 2005).
- Anastos, M., 'Nestorius was orthodox', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962), 119-140.
- Branes, T., *Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (4th edn, Malden-Oxford, 2014).
- Brock, S., 'Il dibattito cristologico del V e VI secolo nel contesto del dialogo teologico moderno', in E. Vergani and S. Chialà, eds., *Le Chiese sire tra IV e VI secolo. Dibattito dottrinale e ricerca spirituale. Atti del 2° incontro sull'Oriente cristiano di tradizione siriana Milano Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 28 marzo 2003* (Milano, 2005), 73-92.
- Carcione, F., 'La recezione ecclesiale del concilio di Calcedonia in Oriente tra V e VI secolo', *Studi e Ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano* 13 (1990) 47-66.
- Chesnut, R., *Three Monophysite Christologies. Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Sarug* (London, 1976).
- , 'The Two Prosopa in Nestorius' Bazaar of Heracleides', *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978), 392-409.
- Cross, F., and Livingstone, E., eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (3rd edn, Oxford-New York, 1997).
- Davis, L., *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): their History and Theology, Theology and Life*, 21 (repr., Collegeville, 1990).

- dell'Osso, C., *Cristo e Logos. Il Calcedonismo del VI secolo in Oriente*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, 118 (Rome, 2010).
- Denzinger, H., and Hünermann, P., eds., *Enchiridion Symbolorum. Definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, tr. A. Lanzoni and G. Zaccherini (5th edn, Bologna, 1995).
- Dünzl, F., *A Brief History of the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Early Church*, tr. J. Bowden (New York, 2007).
- Ebeid, B., *La Cristologia delle grandi confessioni cristiane dell'Oriente nel X e XI secolo. Studio comparativo delle polemiche del melchita Sa'īd 'Ibn Baṭrīq e le risposte del copto Sawirus 'Ibn al-Muqaffa' e del nestoriano Elia di Nisibi*. Dissertazione ad Doctoratum, Pontifical Orientale Institut (Rome, 2014).
- , 'La figura di Costantino nella storiografia melchita araba primitiva: Un Costantino diverso?', in M. Pampaloni and B. Ebeid, eds., *Costantino e l'Oriente. L'impero, i suoi confini e le sue estensioni, Atti del convegno di studi promosso dal PIO in occasione della ricorrenza costantiniana (313-2013) Roma 18 aprile 2013*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 300 (Rome, 2016), 341-400.
- , *La Tunica di al-Masīh. La Cristologia delle grandi confessioni cristiane dell'Oriente nel X e XI secolo*, (Rome, 2018).
- , 'Sa'īd Ibn Baṭrīq, the Theologian. New Considerations on his Historical Work, "The Annals"', *Parole d'Orient* 42 (2016), 165-190.
- El-Cheikh, N., 'Arab Christian contributions to Muslim historiography on Byzantium', *Bulletin of the Royal Institute for Inter-Faith Studies* 1 (1999), 45-60.
- Elli, A., *Storia della Chiesa Copta*, vol. ii: *L'Egitto arabo e musulmano. Il miracolo d'una sopravvivenza cristiana in terra d'Islam*, Studia Orientalia Christiana. Monographiae, 13 (Cairo – Jerusalem, 2003).
- Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini, *Annales*, vol. i, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 50, Scriptorum Arabici, 6, L. Cheikho, ed. (Beirut-Paris-Leipzig, 1905).
- , *Annales*, vol. ii, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 51, Scriptorum Arabici, 7, L. Cheikho, B. de Vaux Carra., H. Zayyat, eds. (Beirut-Paris-Leipzig, 1909).
- Frend, W., *The Rise of Christianity* (London, 1984).
- Gelzer, H., and Hilgenfeld, H., and Cuntz, O., eds., *Patrum Nicaenorum. Nomina Latine Graece Coptice Syriace Arabice Armeniace*, (Leipzig, 1898).
- Gimaret, D., 'Tanāsukh', *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. x, 181-183.
- Gleed, B., *The Development of the Term ἐννόστατος from Origen to John of Damascus*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language, 113 (Leiden – Boston, 2012).
- Goddard, H., *A History of Christian-Muslim Relation* (Edinburg, 2000).
- Graf, G., *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, vol. ii: *Die Schriftsteller bis zur mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts*, Studi e Testi, 133 (Vatican City, 1947).
- Griffith, S., 'Eutychios of Alexandria on the Emperor Theophilus and Iconoclasm in Byzantium: A Tenth Century Moment in Christian Apologetics in Arabic', *Byzantion* 52 (1982), 154-190.
- , 'Muslims and Church Councils. The Apology of Theodor Abū Qurra', *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993), 720-290.
- , 'Melkites, Jacobites and the Christological Controversies in Arabic in Third/Ninth Century Syria', in D. Thomas, ed., *Syrian Christians under Islam. The First Thousand Years* (Leiden-Boston-Köln, 2001), 9-55.
- , 'Apologetics and Historiography in the Annals of Eutychios of Alexandria: Christian Self-Definition in the World of Islam', in H. Teule, ed., *Studies on the*

- Christian Arabic Heritage. In honour of Father Prof. Dr. Samir Khalil Samir S. J.*, Eastern Christian Studies, 5 (Leuven, 2004), 65-89.
- Grillmeier, A., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. i: *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon*, tr. J. Bowden (2nd edn, rev., London-Oxford, 1975).
- and Hainthaler, Th., eds., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/II: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, tr. J. Cawte and P. Allen (London, 1995).
- , *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II/III: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604). The Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch from 451 to 600*, tr. M. Ehrhardt (Oxford, 2013).
- Haddad, R., *La Trinité divine chez les théologiens arabes 750-1050*, Beauchesne Religions, 15 (Paris, 1985).
- Jones, A., *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (4th edn, London, 1965).
- Kariatlis, Ph., 'St Basil's Contribution to the Trinitarian Doctrine. A Synthesis of Greek *Paideia* and the Scriptural Worldview', *Phronema* 25 (2010), 57-83.
- Labbé, Ph., and Cossart, G., Josse, G., eds., *Sacrosancta concilia ad regiam editionem exacta quae nunc quarta parte prodit auctior*, vol. I (Paris, 1671).
- Lamoreaux, J., tr., *Theodore Abū Qurrah*, Library of The Christian East, 1 (Provo, 2005).
- Leadbetter, B., *Galerius and the Will of Diocletian* (London-New York, 2009).
- Leo Magnus, *Epistola XC Ad Eudem Marcianum Augustum*, *Patrologia Latina*, 54, 932-934.
- Levy-Rubin, M., 'Arabization versus Islamisation in the Palestinian Melkite community during the early Muslim period', in A. Kofsky and G. Stroumsa, eds., *Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and conflicts in the Holy Land. First Fifteenth Centuries CE* (Jerusalem, 1998), 149-162.
- Löhr, W., 'Arius reconsidered (Part 1)', in H. Brennecke and V. Drecoll and Ch. Marksches, eds., *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 9 (Berlin- New York, 2005), 524-560.
- Luisier, Ph., 'Il *miafisismo*, un termine discutibile della storiografia recente. Problemi teologici ed ecumenici', *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 35 (2014), 297-307.
- Maraval, P., 'La politica religiosa di Giustiniano', in L. Pietri, ed., *Storia del cristianesimo. Religione, politica, cultura*, vol. iii: *Le Chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432-610)*, tr. E. Prinzivalli (Rome, 2002), 373-406.
- , 'La ricezione di Calcedonia nell'impero d'Oriente', in L. Pietri, ed., *Storia del cristianesimo. Religione, politica, cultura*, vol. iii: *Le Chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432-610)*, E. Prinzivalli (Rome, 2002), 119-153.
- Narsai, *A Homily on our Lord's Birth from the Holy Virgin*, *Patrologia Orientalis*, 182 (40.1), F. McLeod, ed. and tr., 36-69.
- Nestorius, *The Bazar of Heracleides*, trs. G. Driver and L. Hodgson (Oxford, 1925).
- Newman, J., *The Arians of the Fourth Century. Their Doctrine, Temper and Conduct Chiefly as Exhibited in the Councils of the church between A.D. 325 and A.D. 381* (2nd edn, London, 1854; repr. 2015).
- O'Connell, P., *The Ecclesiology of Saint Nicephorus I (758-828), Patriarch of Constantinople: Pentarchy and Primacy*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 194 (Rome, 1972).
- Peri, V., 'La Pentarchia: istituzione ecclesiae (IV-VII Sec.) e teoria canonico-teologica', *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto Medioevo, Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 34 (1988), 209-311.
- Perrone, L., 'Il "Dialogo contro gli aftartodoceti" di Leonzio di Bisanzio e Severo di Antiochia', *Cristianesimo nella storia* 1 (1980), 411-442.
- Pirone, B., tr., *Eutichio Patriarca di Alessandria (877-940). Gli Annali*, *Studia Orientalia Christiana Monographia*, 1 (Cairo, 1987).

- Pohlsander, H., *The Emperor Constantine* (2ed edn, London-New York, 2004).
- Price, R., 'The Second Council of Constantinople (553) and the Malleable Past', in R. Price and M. Whitby, eds., *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils 400-700* (Liverpool, 2009), 117-132.
- and Gaddis, M., tr., *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 45, 3 voll. (Liverpool, 2005).
- Sahas, D., *John of Damascus on Islam. Christian Heresiology and the Intellectual Background to Earliest Christian-Muslim Relations*, *The History of Christian-Muslim Relations*, 34 (Leiden, 2017).
- Samuel, V., 'Further Studies in the Christology of Severus of Antioch', *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 58 (1976), 270-301.
- Samuel, V., *The Council of Chalcedon and the Christology of Severus of Antioch* (London, 1957).
- , 'The Christology of Severus of Antioch', *Abba Salama* 4 (1973), 126-190.
- Scipioni, L., *Ricerche sulla cristologia del "Libro di Eraclide" di Nestorio. La formulazione teologica e il suo contesto filosofico* (Friburgo, 1956).
- , *Nestorio e Il Concilio di Efeso. Storia, Dogma, Critica*, *Studia Patristica Mediolanesia*, 1 (Milano, 1974).
- Sellers, R., *The Council of Chalcedon. A historical and doctrinal survey*, (London, 1953).
- Simonetti, M., *Studi sull'Arianesimo, Verba Seniorum Collana di Testi e Studi Patristici*, 5 (Rome, 1965).
- , *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, 11 (Rome, 1975).
- , ed., *Il Cristo*, vol. ii: *Testi teologici e spirituali in Lingua Greca dal IV al VII Secolo*, (5th edn, Milano, 2003).
- , 'Flaviano di Costantinopoli', in *Nuovo Dizionario di Patristica e Antichità Cristiana*, vol. ii, 1980-1981.
- Simonsohn, U., 'Sa'īd ibn Baṭrīq', in D. Thomas and A. Mallett, eds., *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. ii: *900-1050*, *The History of Christian-Muslim Relations*, 14 (Leiden-Boston, 2010), 224-233.
- Smith, J., and Haddad, Y., *The Islamic Understanding of Death and Resurrection* (Oxford-New York, 2002).
- Sophronius of Jerusalem, *Epistola Synodica*, *Patrologia Graeca*, 87, 3147-3200.
- Špidlík, T., 'Sofronio di Gerusalemme', in *Nuovo Dizionario di Patristica e Antichità Cristiana*, vol. iii, 5042-5043.
- Stiernon, D., 'Paolo di Emesa', in *Nuovo Dizionario di Patristica e Antichità Cristiana*, vol. iii, 3854-3855.
- , 'Sergio', in *Nuovo Dizionario di Patristica e Antichità Cristiana*, vol. iii, 4862-4863.
- Varanic, V., 'The Christology of Eutyches at the Council of Constantinople 448', *Philotheos* 8 (2008), 208-221.
- Wessel, S., *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*, *Oxford Early Christian Studies* (Oxford, 2004).
- Wolfson, H., *The Philosophy of the Kalam* (Cambridge-Massachusetts-London, 1976).