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Abstract

The Melkite Christanity 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 Annales 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 try to answer these two questions: (1) How does he read the doctrines of the councils? (2) How does he present his 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. 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 Annales of Eutychius of Alexandria, which is one of the first chronicles (10th 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

1 My paper, given at the Abbas Forty-Sixth International Conference: Melkite Christianity, 1st – 10th Centuries, had the title "The Melkite Orthodoxy: The Six Ecumenical Councils according to Eutychius of Alexandria's Annales and Aquarius of Malabug's Universal History". In the conference I presented and analyzed the narratives 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.

analyzed elsewhere the language and the terminology used by Eutychius in his description of these doctrines; 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 Theodoret Aba 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, with catechetical, polemical 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.2 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' id Ibn Ba'triq, known as Eutychius of Alexandria.3 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' id Ibn Ba'triq the physician (al-mufattakhah). He says he was born in al-Fustat mi'jar (inside the actual city of Cairo) in 877,4 and elected Melkite patriarch of Alexandria on the 7th of February, 933, when he was 60 years old.5 At his enthronement he chose the Greek name Εὐτυχίους, which is a translation of his Arabic name Sa'id (in English could be translated into Felix). The fact that he mentions the Greek name is significant because it indicates the relation of his Church with its origins, i.e. the Melkite and Chalcedonian confession.6 During his patriarchate, Egypt was controlled by the independent governors, the Tulunids and


6 He declared this by saying that he was born in the eighth year of the caliphate of al-Ma'mun, ed. Eutychius Patriarches Alexandrini, Annals, vol. ii, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 51, Scriptores Arabici, 7, L. Chelichko, ed. (Beirut-Paris-Leipzig, 1909), 69.


13 See also Eutychius, Annals, vol. ii, 86: (Wenn ich eine Liste mit den Namen aller Geschichtsverfasser aufstellte, wie sollte ich sie anordnen?)


however, anachronistically presents Arian doctrine in Islamic language. In my opinion, Eutychius had in mind the Mu'tazilites and their doctrine regarding the word of God, the Qur'an, as created. For this reason, he has Alexander asking Arius if it is more desirable to worship a creature or the uncreated God. This, with Arius answering that it is must worship the uncreated. Eutychius then, writing in an Islamic environment, certainly has in mind the accusations made by Muslims against Christians, 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. This is what we call a Melkite reading of faith, an expression of the Christian faith using the linguistic code used at the author's time. In fact, the term mu'tazila (created) was first used in Arabic-Islamic philosophy by the school of mu'tazila. By it they wanted to describe the created character of the Qur'anic. Applying this term to the thought of Arius, Eutychius makes his readers note the similarities between the doctrine of mu'tazilah and Aristotelianism. In fact, just like Arius, the mu'tazila taught that the Qur'an, the word of God, has an eternal character, but remains a creature of God. The key fact is not just the word, however: must be noted: for Arius the Word is identified with the Son of God, but for the mu'tazila such doctrine is rejected.

Eutychius reports that Constantine the Great convened a council in Nicaea to resolve the problem. The problem was that Arius—he tells that at that time, there were many heretical doctrines, including those of Sabinus, and of Marcion, as well as Paul of Samosata. The council had to deal with all these heresies. Eutychius provides some names of bishops who participated at the council of Nicaea: Alexander of Alexandria, who was the president of the council, Eustathius (Athis) of Antiochia, Macarius of Jerusalem, Buitur (Victor) representing Silvesterus, the bishop of Rome.

**BISHARA IBBEED**

**55**
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 Viton by the name Bifatur (Victor). Furthermore, the Arabic form he uses for Eustathius of Antioch, Asfir, leads me to hypothesize that Eutychius had a Syriac source, since the name Eustathius in Syriac is ملصت (Mallath). This is closer to the Arabic form Astaf. Another fact that reveals his sources is his use of the Arabic-Islamic name of Jerusalem, باس في الأثر (Bayt al-maqdis). 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 that the Melkite community of Palestine, where I maintain Eutychius received his theological formation, was arabized quicker than other Christian communities in the Islamic empire; this is evident in the Arabic language used in the Annals.

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 clear books is that regarding Silvester of Rome, the Acta Silvestri, found in the East in different versions. Eutychius uses some information from it, but not every detail; for instance, he does not follow the legend regarding the baptism of Constantine by Silvester. 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, 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, 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 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 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 pontificates, then, against non-Melkite Christians or non-Melkites, 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. 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. 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. After this, Eutychius narrates that the fathers decided to consecrate Metropolitans 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, Gaius of Jerusalem, Maximus of Antioch, and Bifatur (Victor) of Rome. (This last information resolves the problematic name of the first representative of the bishop of Rome—it seems that Eutychius confused Viton with Victor (Pope of Rome 1199), calling both Bifatur). They decided that the date of Easter should be determined according to the calculations used by Alexandria and Rome.

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 3rd century, at the council of Chalcedon, it was not formulated and established until the 6th century, by the emperor Justinian. 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 Ḥabū Qurra in his tract on orthodoxy and the councils. Both try to express the unity between all Melkite thrones, inside and outside the Islamic empire.

---

40 Such a mistake could be due to the copyist, but I am convinced that Eutychius confuses the names Viton and Viton (Pope Victor, as we shall see further.
41 This element could also support my hypothesis that Eutychius soughed in the monasteries of Jerusalem and knew the Loca Sarrant. This hypothesis was used to show the authenticity of the book of demonstration attributed to him, see Eiben, B., ‘Sa’d ibn Bifatur.’
43 Cfr. Eiben, B., ‘Sa’d ibn Bifatur.’
44 In other Arab-Christian sources, such as the historical work of the Melkite Agapitos of Hieropolis, the name used for the holy city is an Arabic transliteration of the Hebrew ירושלים, cfr. Agapitos Episcopus Mathlegemenus, Historia Universialis, Corpus Scripturarum Christianorum Orientalium, 65, Scriptores Arabici, 16, L. Charpier, ed. (Beirut-Paris, 1912), 289:

See also Ibid., 310:

One of the elements of the arabization that scholars note is the use of the Arabic name for persons and for places, cfr. Ley-Rubin, M., ‘Arbitration versus Islamization,’ 153, notably in Eutychius’ Annals.
It is interesting to notice again the sources the patriarch has in hand to create his own narrative: some details are really decisions of Nicaea, as the question regarding the Easter and its calendar, or the condemnation of Arius and other heretical doctrines; other details come from local traditions and legends, such as the nomination of Metropolitan as the bishop of Constantinople. However, the condemnation of Eusebius of Nicomedia and his friends as reported by Eutychius 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.

Eutychius, continuing his narration, refers to the attempts by which Arius 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. 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, but he became the patriarch of Constantinople at the time of Constantine II, the son of Constantine the great. Eutychius makes this "mistake" since he follows his Mellite reading of history. For this reading, orthodoxy should win at end since it is defined by orthodox emperors. In this narration, Eusebius, after becoming patriarch of the capital, repeats again his heretic doctrine, and Constantine, the orthodox emperor and defender of orthodoxy, condemns him; the heretic Eusebius, consequently, dies condemned by Constantine himself.

The post-Nicean account of Eutychius is concentrated on the will of Constantine to convulse 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. Elsewhere I discussed in detail this narration; 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. 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. It is not known to me, however, that such a conversation between Eunomius and Athanasius actually occurred. I think that Eutychius applies his Mellite 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, 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 Constantine, who knew what happened and honored Athanasius, sending him back to Egypt, while excommunicating Eunomius and Eusebius, now of Constantinople. I have elsewhere commented on the non- historicity of the information Eutychius furnishes us in his accounts. He bases his narrations on some historical sources, but he inserts in them other information taken from legends and non historical works. Eutychius' Mellite 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. 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'tazilite 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 however, were not created by the Word", attributed to Eunomius, can be found in some Muslim thinkers.

More evidence of Eutychius' Mellite reading can be found in the affirmations he attributes to Athanasius in this supposed debate. According to H. Wolfson, "thereafter knew the doctrines of Sabellianism and Arianism, and therefore, they applied them to their doctrine on the attributes of God." Topics like will and creation in God, necessity in God, freedom of God's will etc., are found in dialogues with Muslims, especially the mu'tazilite, regarding the nature of God, His attributes, and the created/uncreated character of the Quran. Words such as 'illah (will), 'aql (uncreated-eternal), nafsah (created) and aqil (imperfect) etc. are found in the opinion of Athanasian in the dispute as invented by Eutychius. In fact, our Alexandrian patriarch author has Athanasian attributing to Arians doctrines that we find in the mu'tazilite, such as God creating through his word or through his will, and that both his word and His will are created. This special Mellite reading of faith has a catastrophic goal: (a) Islam is similar to heresies. (b) The doctrines of the different schools of Islam is similar to the famous heresies of..."
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, Athanasius, bishop of Thessalonika, who took part in the council.

Another detail that should be noted in Eutychius’s account is the answer given to Macedon by Timothy of Alexandria, who declares the victory for orthodoxy. 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. In his Melkite reading of history, this Egyptian element has a catalytic 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. 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 finite, this means that He was not always alive and the giver of life.

Among the heretics that the council condemned were in fact Sabelicius, for his Trinitarian doctrine, and Apollinaris, for his Christological doctrine. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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

64 Cf. Davis, L., The First Council, 141-120.
66 It is known that this council was presided over by two bishops at different times. The first president was Gregory Nazianzus, who was appointed from Damascus to bishop of Constantinople, the capital of 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 Nectarios, cf. Davis, L., The First Council, 115-120.
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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.52,53 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 Constantineople I, declaring the see of Constantinople to be second after that of Rome, elicited a negative reaction in the West. Eutychian presents this canon, however, according to his understanding of the pentarchy system.54 In his narration however, he makes a historical mistake.55 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 Constantineople 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,56 which actually did not occur until the council of Chalcedon.57

THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS (431 A.D.)

The narration of the council of Ephesus begins with the controversy between Nestorius of Constantineople and Cyril of Alexandria. Eutychian gives a detailed description of this controversy, beginning with the doctrine of Nestorius: he proclaimed that Mary was not really the Theotokia, the Mother of God; he taught a dualism of persons, the Son of God and the Son of man, the first was born from the Father, the second of Mary; he maintained that 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 there was an agreement in honor and in name; and Christ was like one of the prophets.58

In this description we can easily see the Melkite-Chalcedonian reading of faith applied by Eutychian to Nestorius's 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', Eutychian 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.59 We know, however, that although Nestorius60 and later Nestorians61 rejected this characterization of their teaching, Chalcedonians and Monophysites nonetheless continued to attribute this duality of sons to their doctrine.62

According to Eutychian, Nestorius taught a union according to love, but in describing his doctrine, Eutychian 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 (τῆς ἕνς προσώπου); "conjunction" (συνδύσις); "union according to will" (Εὐγνωμον ἐνθα θέλειν μοινή); and "union according to goodwill" (Εὐγνωμον κατὰ λογίους). He never called it a union according to the virtue of love, as Eutychian attributes to him. One might maintain that Eutychian is translating the Greek συνένωσις as the virtue of love, which is a possibility. I think, however, that the Melkite reading should help us understand why the patriarch of Alexandria makes this attribution. In later Syriac Nestorian texts we find the concept "union according to perfect love" (συνένωσις εὐγνωμον) used against the concept "union according to substance" (συνενώσις εὐγνωμον).63 In addition, the fact that Eutychian does not mention in his description the technical term "person" that was important in Nestorius's Christology, supports my hypothesis regarding the Melkite reading. Elsewhere I showed that at the time of Eutychian, Nestorians did not use this term in their Christological works.64 All this confirms that Eutychian is keen to inform his Melkite readers what the doctrine of Nestorians is 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 past through the past.

Having described the doctrine of Nestorius, Eutychian 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. Nestorians, 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, 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, Προφυλακτος of Jerusalem, and John of Antioch, convoking them to a council in Ephesus to examine the doctrine of Nestorius.65 Eutychian 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

[Pages 62-63 of text are not fully visible or legible, but the text continues with further discussions and references related to the Council of Ephesus and its implications.]
Nestorius, but his chronological ordering of these correspondences is not exact, and the name of the bishop of Jerusalem is wrong, the bishop at that time being Juvenal. Such elements, however, do not interest me as much as those that show Eutychius’ special reading of history. First of all, Eutychius is a Chalcedonian and neo-Chalcedonian, trying 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. For Eutychius, Chalcedonian orthodoxy is the most important element in his Melkite reading of history. 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. The same reason was behind his omission of the fact that it was the idea of Nestorius to convocate a council, and that he asked the emperor to convocate it. 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. Historically, Celestine sent representatives to the council with a letter that was read there. 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 pontifical. One, in fact, must take into consideration the accusation made by the followers of Nestorius against this council and its authority. It is known that Cyril began the council with neither the delegation from the Pope, nor John of Antioch and his bishops. To avoid such accusation, Eutychius, underlines the presence of the bishop of Jerusalem 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. This really happened, and one of the sources confirming it is Nestorius himself. 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 in two natures, one hypostasis known in two natures. 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.

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 Nicene; orthodox Christology is expressed by the interpretation Cyril made of this Creed in his second letter to Nestorius. While Eutychius’ affirmation that the title Theodore express 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 hysptastic union, expressed by Eutychius as the oneness of the hypostasis, is interpreted not just in opposition to a union according to love, but also as one hypostasis in two natures. This is, in fact, the doctrine of the neo-Chalcedonian theologians, to equate the hysptastic union professed by Cyril with the Chalcedonian expression “one hypostasis in two natures.”

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 name of this doctrine can be found in Nestorius’ Liber Hæreticæ, 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. Meanwhile, for the Melkite-Chalcedonian Eutychius, person and hypostasis, as metaphysical terms, are considered as synonymous, and therefore, he presents Nestorian doctrine using the

---

113 See the chronology of events during the controversy between Nestorius and Cyril in Nestorius in The Becar of Heresies, trs. G. Driver and L. Hodgson (Oxford, 1925), xviii-xviii.
115 That his Chronology might be considered a Neo-Chalcedonian see Ebéd, B., La Tonici di Al-Mahb, 145-147, and the analysis I made for his Chronology on pp. 161-262.
118 Cfr. Ibid., 180-182.
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term person (waq′li); thus, he applies his own metaphysical system and underscoring of concepts to the doctrine of the Nestorians. In this way he distinguishes between the Nestorian "prosopos union" and the Chalcedonian "hypostatic union," applying hypostasis (and not person) to Chalcedonian Christology, while applying persons (not metaphysical) to Nestorian doctrine.

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

Again Eutychius 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.218 Behind this omission we see Eutychius' consideration of Theodosius II as a heretic, meaning that his heretic emperor is not the one who could recognize and decide which council was orthodox. For this reason, he says that the emir between the Antiochans 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.219 Another point that should be noted is that Eutychius 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.

Eutychius then recovers 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.220 Eutychius does not mention who the composer of this formula was, but for him the initiative came from the Egyptians 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.221 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.222 Eutychius is historically correct in saying that the formula was sent to Cyril by Paul of Emesa.230 It is known also that Cyril accepted this document and considered it orthodox, and therefore he congealed with Paul.231 Eutychius confirms this fact, and also says that Cyril informed the other bishops about this formula, according to which: Easterns returned to orthodox; they do not agree anymore with Nestorius; and they

—translated—

It is clear that orthodoxy for Eutychius means condemnation of Nestorius. It is known, however, that the real formula does not mention any kind of condemnation of Nestorius, as Eutychius maintains. The formula, in fact, contains two important elements: (1) a Christology expressed in Antiochene terms; and (2) an acceptance of the title Theodosius for Mary.232 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.233 John of Antioch, in fact, had already condemned Nestorius in a synod of his bishops, before sending Paul to Alexandria;234 however, such condemnation was not included in the document sent to Cyril. Eutychius, 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.235 We know that the real formula, besides the acceptance of the term Theodosios,236 affirms: (1) the two substantialities of Christ;237 (2) the oneness of the person (procopof) of Christ;238 and (3) the duality of the natures.239 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.240 A neo-Chalcedonian reading of the formula is clearly being applied to his historical narration. Eutychius wants to portray Cyril, who accepted the formula, as Chalcedonian. Thus, Eutychius presents the formula in Chalcedonian language, inserting into it the term hypostasis.

Eutychius 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.241 These two elements, in fact, were behind the rejection of the formula by some Egyptian bishops and other followers of Cyril.242 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


Cyril's doctrine. Neo-Chalcedonians, however, referred always in their discussions with Miaphysites to the acceptance of this formula by Cyril, considering it an agreement with Chalcedon, 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 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. We know, in fact, that Eutyches was a monk in Constantinople, but there is no evidence that he was a physician by profession. We know that his doctrine was full of confusions; that he did not affirm the humanity in Christ as consubstantial to ours. The doctrine Eutychus attributes to him seems to be in fact what Eutyches affirmed in the synod of Constantinople in 448, convoked and presided over by Flavius of Constantinople.

OurMelkite patriarch of Alexandria is detailed regarding the reaction against Eutyches' doctrine. He informs us that Flavians, patriarch of Constantinople, knew about the doctrine of Eutyches and invited him to have a debate. He assumes that Eutychus here alludes to the synod of 448, and to the discussions with Eutyches occurred during it. He furnishes us with the dialogue between Flavius 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; affirming two natures means Nestorianism; Christ is of two natures before the Incarnation, while after Incarnation He is one nature and one hypothesis.

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

See the analysis of ibid, 254-261.


147 To be noted that I preferred to use for the heretic Eutyches the form Eutychus so the reader might not confuse him with Eutychus himself, our author who had the same name and was also a doctor.
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The number that Eutychius gives for the bishops who attended the council is almost double what scholars today estimate, ca. 370.139 In other sources, we have numbers between 500 and 520.140 Eutychius, following his Melkite reading, gives this huge number in order to convince his readers that the council was the same as that of 449, and that the bishops had 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.141

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 that they affirmed the double consubstantiality, and that Christ is one, but known in two natures, perfect in His divinity and perfect in His humanity.142 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.143 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.144 Eutychius, in his narration, remarks also the doctrine of the third ecumenical council of Ephesus. Reading it carefully, we see that this is not the real reason 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 Eutyches quoted before.145 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 natures: without confusion or mixture, and without division or separation: ἀναστροφή, ἀπόστροφη, ἀδιαστάσεις, and ἀδιπλοστασία. 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.
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141 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 Ἀπὸ Γερράς has the same purpose, cfr. Griffith, S., "Muslims and Church Councils", 293-299.
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146 For example, while the formula of union of the Easterns quoted by Eutyches is "καθαρὸν τὸ φύσεως ζώον καθαρὸν καὶ οὐ μείζοναν παρείχοι των οὐσιών τῶν οὐσιών των μονογενώς καθαρὸν μειώτατον παραξενοῖς τοῖς θεολογοῖς των οὐσίων των παραπάνω..." (John Leo Magnani, Epistola XC Ad Eusebium Marci Monumentum Augustum, Patrologia Latina, 54, 932-934).

147 It again is notable that our author gives this strange name to Jesus Christ the person who took part at Chalcedon.


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 Monophysites, 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.\(^{177}\) 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 Monophysite party, Severus of Antioch and Jacob Baradacius, trying to reveal their particular reading of their doctrines.\(^{178}\) According to Eutychius' narration on the reign of Anastasius I, Severus was living in Constantinople; he was follower of the doctrine of Diodorus and Eutyches; and he was teaching that in Christ there was one nature, one hypostasis, and one will.\(^{179}\) By telling us that Severus was in Constantinople, Eutychius is probably alluding to his sojourn at the capital,\(^{180}\) 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 Diodorus. It is true that Severus was a follower of Cyril of Alexandria and his Christology, and also that he was in agreement with Diodorus, but certainly not with Eutyches, whom he in fact condemned.\(^{181}\) We have again a Chalcedonian reading of the history.

That Diodorus 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."\(^{182}\) For the Chalcedonian and Melkite tradition, however, all of them belonged to the same theological current without distinction, 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.


of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret of Cyr maintained that the body of Christ was not real.\textsuperscript{197} The appearance of these heretics was known by Justinian who convoked them to the capital to meet Euchius of Constantineople, who after having discussed with them their opinions, he condemned them.\textsuperscript{198}

Even if the doctrine of metempsychosis, attributed to Origin in the narration, can have its nucleus in the thought of Origen and, especially, in the thought of some Origenists,\textsuperscript{199} I assume that Euchius 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.\textsuperscript{200} Some Mawzalah followers, in fact, supported this doctrine, which later had a huge diffusion in Islamic Shiah.\textsuperscript{201} What supports my hypothesis is the information that al-Mas‘ud, a Muslim historian who died in Cairo in 956, and al-Bayrānī, 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 10th and 11th centuries.\textsuperscript{202} The second problem, according to our narration, in Origin'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,\textsuperscript{203} 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.\textsuperscript{204} Muslims who taught metempsychosis rejected, consequently, the resurrection of body, claiming the reincarnation of human beings.

Going back to the narration, we note a description of the dispute between Euchius 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 Euchesis and Flaviius. 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.\textsuperscript{205}

Euchius of Constantineople, the narration says, after having demonstrated the orthodox doctrine to the heretics communicated them. Justinian however, desired an excommunication by a council, so he convoked the fifth ecumenical council in Constantineople.\textsuperscript{206} Again for Euchius, it is the orthodox emperor who convokes the ecumenical council. In fact, in his
Among those who reacted to this heresy Eutychius mentions Sophronius of Jerusalem and Pope John IV, providing some quotations from their works.234 Regarding Maxim the confessor, he does not quote or mention in detail his doctrine, he simply alludes to it in his life and his role in this controversy.235 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.236 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 monothelitism did not survive,237 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.238 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 convened the council.239 The reason was his orthodox faith and his desire to defend it from the heresy of monothelitism and monooenergism.240 His information on the bishops who took part in the council is also correct.241 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 Agapit and not Agatho.242
not rejected in the sixth ecumenical council, as some scholars sustain. 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. 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 Anállas, 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 Anállas 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 polemical 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 Cyrus, the council of Ephesus, and Chalcedon. The result of such an approach was a unique and different narration of this historical period, not 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 philosophical codes. The new loguician fancier was the language of apologists 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 (MîhîÛ), what their followers contemporary to Eutychius teach.

---

234 The fathers, the narration continues, after anamorphosing the monothelitises, 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.235

Eutychius' description of the doctrine is based, in fact, on the decisions of the council, but presented once again, according to his particular and special way.236 The Chalcedonian reading of faith is revealed in 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 Teachings of Leo,237 Eutychius says that the fathers based their doctrine on the one of Sophronius of Jerusalem.238 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 (ἀποσυνέχεια), without corruption (ἀποσκληρύνημα), without separation (ἀποσφαλεία) and without division (ἀποσυφύλεται).239 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.

Eutychius' mention of the neo-Chalcedonian expression "the one of the Trinity", which played an essential role in neo-Chalcedonian reading of the text, it is an expression that has a polemical finality against the addition to the trisagion 240 that miaphysites had made.241 This in fact, confirms my hypothesis that the neo-Chalcedonian was
Furthermore, the linguistic and philosophic code in which such reading is expressed is also interesting. Eutychius uses the Islamic language and philosophy, especially the one of the *Ma'ālik* al-Islam. Such use indicates, not just the degree of his Arabization, but also his desire to use a language and philosophic arguments common among Melkites, non-Melkite Christians, and Muslims. In this reading I underlined the importance of the use of *pentarchya* 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-Melkite, 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 according to them. Presenting the bishops of Alexandria, in fact, at 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.
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