the Church of Jesus Christ are still lying before us. The process of reception of Vatican II is continuing. As already can be demonstrated with the first Ecumenical Councils - such as Nicea I (325) or Chalcedon (451) - this process can take several generations.

I am pleased to dedicate this paper to Fr. Dr. Jacob Thekeparambil, an ecumenical visionary, who has set milestones for interchurch relations and scholarly studies in the Indian context.

Theresia Hainthaler

A SHORT ANALYSIS OF THE DEFINITION OF CHALCEDON AND SOME REFLECTIONS

The christological Definition of the Council of Chalcedon (proclaimed at October 22th, 451) is a basic document in the development to formulate the ecclesial faith in Jesus Christ. This holds true even for those who - sometimes vigorously - opposed this Definition and wrote against it, as for instance for Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria in the fifth century with his refutation (preserved in

---

Armenian, also partly in Syriac translation). Timothy gave the whole text and commented it; a Syriac translation of his work is preserved in B.M. add. 12156, a manuscript of the 6th century, written before 562. This Syriac version of the Definition is given at the end in the appendix.

The history before this Council is, in fact, addressed at in the text of the prooemium of the Definition itself. An attentive reading leads one to a minimum of observations in structure and sources.

I. Prooemium

The Council's understanding of its own role can be drawn from the Prooemium: all christological teaching is based, in the view of the Council, first of all, in the kerygma, that is in the Holy Scripture ("the proclamation of the beginning"), and then next, in the maintenance and preservation of the faith of Nicea (325), as written in its creed. Then follows the council of Constantinople (381), because a clarification was necessary in order to defend the doctrine of Nicea.


5 A. de Halleux, art. cit. (n. 1) 163 resp. 473: "la hiérarchie descendante de la documentation chalcédonienne".

regarding the Holy Spirit against heretic teaching. In other words: Nicea was not lacking anything, but there was need of clarification in a special point. A descendent hierarchy is emerging: first of all the Gospel, then follows the symbol of Nicea ("decrees") and the symbol of Constantinople ("ratifies").

The Prooemium then declares the reception ("accepted") of two letters of Cyril, the one to Nestorius (430) and the other to the Orientals, that is the Antiochians (433) (i.e. the Second Letter to Nestorius and the so-called Laetentur-Letter of the Union of 433). To these documents, is added, the Tome of Leo, written by Pope Leo I, meant to be read at the second synod of Ephesus (449).

After making clear positively the basic documents for the christological teaching, the synod declares negatively its stand against statements to be condemned: a duality of sons, theopaschitism, confusion of two natures in Christ, a heavenly body, Eutychianism.

It is clear that the basis for the fathers of the Council in Chalcedon is the preaching of Jesus and the apostles, the proclamation of the whole scripture. The other documents, which are mentioned, follow a hierarchy.

II. The Structure of the Definition

We find a clear framework: the Fathers (1, 27), one and the same Son (2, 23) - Lord Jesus Christ (3, 24) (in a chiastic order). The framework refers to the tradition (at the end enlarged and with gradation, coming to a climax: the prophets from of old, Jesus Christ himself and the Symbol of the Fathers) and to the unity in Christ. But the unity and identity of Christ is emphasized also elsewhere: the same (5,6,8,10,14). The expression, one and the same can be found three times in the whole text, at the beginning (2), at the end (23) and in the middle (16). This gives a clear division of the document into two parts: 2-15 and 16-22, followed by the final words (23-27). The first part is written in a language known from creeds (kerygmatic)
while in the second part technical terminology prevails. The second part is framed by an inclusion: two (17, 22).

At the end, in the final wording 23-24 all titles of Christ, mentioned before, are gathered. This list increases the solemnity and underlines the conclusion.

Grammatically it is one single sentence ("we ... teach the confession") with the object: "one and the same" (2.16.23), "the same" (5.6.8.10.14), and the adjectives: "perfect" (5.6), "God", "man" (used as adjectives) (7), "consubstantial" (9.10), "like (us)" (11); participles: "begotten" (12), "made known" (17), "parted or divided" (22).

An observation can be made as to the content: There is a move from unity to duality (2.3 - 5.6, 7.9.10, 12-15), 16 - 17. But in vv. 19-21 there is a move from duality (difference) to unity (19, 20 - 21).

These marked characteristics in the structure led André de Halleux (1976) to the hypothesis of one single author (and not merely a redactor of the text), which he presumed to be the Metropolitan Basil of Seleucia. Before de Halleux's hypothesis, normally the Definition was seen as a mosaic of formulations of diverse origin. The structure found so far is the following.

**Structure as to the content**

1. The one Christ
   - perfect in divinity and humanity
   - truly God and truly man (with rational soul and body)
   - consubstantial with the Father and with us, in all like us sin excepted
   - double birth (→ Theotokos)

6 A. de Halleux, art. cit. 157. Also G. Martzelo in his study: Τέων και ο

a) For the first part of the Definition

v. 12-15 and 9-10 coincide, except for slight deviations, with the Formula of Union.

v. 5-6 is very close to the explanation given by Cyril in § 8 of his Laetentur-Letter (of 433) (in the Formula of Union of the Antiochians are found the concrete nouns „God“ and „man“. When Cyril cited this text he changed without comment the wording into the abstract nouns „divinity“ and „humanity“. This reading is incorporated into the Definition of Chalcedon).

v. 11 (a mixed citation of Hebr 2,17; 4,15) can be found in Basil of Seleucia (according to de Halleux).

For the first part of the Definition it can be affirmed with M. Richard: the Formula of Union of the Antiochians is interpreted according to Cyril’s Laetentur-Letter.

b) For the second part of the Definition

v. 19 coincides nearly literally with Cyril’s (2nd) Letter to Nestorius.

v. 20-21 (the first four terms) follow with slight changes the wording of v. 54-55 of Leo’s Tome.

v. 17, „made known in two natures“, is found in Basil (this is in conformity with the Cyrillian idea, that the natures, after the union, are to be distinguished only in thought, en theoria mone).

v. 21, „the one hypostasis“, can be found in the Profession of Flavian (made during the home synod in Constantinople against Eutyches in 448), but can be derivated also from Cyril (cf. union according to the hypostasis, hypostatic union).

v. 18: Three of the four adverbs were mentioned by the imperial commissioners in exactly the same order immediately before the meeting of the special commission who worked out the final wording of the Definition. These adverbs can be found in Cyril as well as in the Antiochian tradition, they are common to Rome, Alexandria and Antioch!

The first three of the four adverbs were mentioned by the imperial commissioners: Act. V, nr. 26 (ACO II 1, 2, p. 125): (two natures in Christ united) ἀσυγχωτος καὶ ἐτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαρέτως; nr. 28: (two natures united) ἐτρέπτως καὶ ἀμερίστως καὶ ἀσυγχωτος (in Christ).

In Actio IV the bishops of Illyricum, who doubted the orthodoxy of Leo’s Tome, declared (ACO II 1,2, p. 102,39): (things in conformity with the divinity and with the humanity are called) ἀσυγχωτος καὶ ἐτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαρέτως.

For instance, Basil requests to speak after the union of ἀκροίστους καὶ ἀσυγχωτος natures (ACO II 1,1, p. 93,30-31).

Considering these findings, André de Halleux offers the following hypothesis. If the additions (the four adverbs and v. 19-21) are taken out from the passage vv. 16-24, one gets a profession, well formulated in a chiasm, which could attributed to Basil of Seleucia as it is in his spirit:

one and the same Christ Son Lord Only-begotten
made known in two natures
not parted or divided into two persons,
but one and the same Son, Only-begotten, God Logos, Lord Jesus Christ.

André de Halleux presumed that during the last session the additions have been inserted into this profession. With this explanation, the share of Cyril in the Definition becomes even stronger, for Basil is a Cyrilian. Further, the citation of Leo’s Tome was inserted, according to de Halleux, with some „Cyrillianisation“ in the wording. The addition of the one hypostasis (21) is, for de Halleux, also Cyrilian and not taken from the Profession of Flavian.  

8 A. de Halleux, art. cit. 157-160 resp. 467-470.
9 Ibid. 160 resp. 470.
10 Ibid. 163 resp. 473.
11 Ibid. 164 resp. 474; in fact, a correction of the analysis of Marcel Richard (cf. ibid., 12 resp. 454).
Altogether, it could be found that the prehistory of the Council of 451 is reflected in the text of the Definition.

325
Nicea

429/30
Nestorius problem <-> Cyril's 2nd letter to Nestorius

431
Ephesus: Formula of Union

433
Union 433: Formula of Union - Cyril's Letter to John of Antioch (Laetentur-Letter)

448
Eutyches problem <-> Profession of Flavian

449
<> Leo's Tome

IV. Some remarks on the result of the analysis (of the sources)

1. First of all, the council aimed at the crisis which came through the victory of Eutychianism at the so-called robber synod of Ephesus 449; the council met the challenge of Eutychianism. The "solution" of the problem was found in the spirit of Cyril. The "newcomer" in the christological documents at hand, the Tome of Leo, was proven as being in conformity with Cyril (the letters of Cyril). This is obvious in the course of the Council: in a severe struggle the orthodoxy of Leo's Tome was recognized.

 Therefore de Halleux observed a "descendent hierarchy" of the sources Nicea, Constantinople, 2nd letter of Cyril to Nestorius, Formula of Union according to the Laetentur-Letter, Tome of Leo, in the following sense: the respective preceding documents act as a test (touchstone) for the orthodoxy of the succeeding.

 Consequently, the Western christology of Leo had a significantly smaller impact in the Definition as it was supposed in the research till the fifties of the 20th century - and as it could be presumed, taken into consideration all the struggles and the strong opposition after the Council. Uptil now some Oriental Orthodox call the Definition of Chalcedon "Nestorian".

2. What was achieved in Chalcedon? Although it was not expressed very distinctively and clearly, the Definition pointed the way: the unity in Christ has to be searched for in the one person or the "one hypostasis", the duality is situated in the natures. A distinction has to be made between a natural unity and a substantial unity in the subject, in the person. According to Grillmeier, this kind of union is so deep and fundamental that it cannot be surpassed (therefore all the objections of a more unitarian christology are met, if this union is understood in all its implications; no amendment or improvement is necessary). The Apolinarian "sources of errors" are definitely excluded.

3. The Definition carried on to make a distinction of the two concepts hypostasis (prosopon) and nature also in Christology. In the Trinity, the Cappadocian Fathers (Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa) taught this distinction with the formula: one essence (ousia, ituta) and three hypostases. Chalcedon made a step in the history of christological terminology, and the Anti-Chalcedonian did not follow this step (according to Grillmeier). It has to be admitted that the Fathers of the Council might not have been fully aware of this step, especially not of all the consequences. But the process of reception deepened this way that the Council has shown for the christological reflection. Further clarification in the 6th century sharpened the concept of hypostasis. In the Latin West, Boethius found a new definition of persona, when he dealt with the christological controversies.

 Chalcedon did not state explicitly that the "one hypostasis" is the hypostasis of the Logos; but, of course, the text of the Definition does not contradict this statement at all. The theologians of the 6th century had to clarify this point (and so they came to the concept of enhypostasia, or in Latin insubsistentia).

4. In Chalcedon's solution of the christological problem, the Cyril of the Twelve Anathema is left aside, and also Nestorius is excluded. Therein remains a source of conflicts, which will be effective in the later struggles.

5. The Definition of Chalcedon is not a complete creed; the focus is only on the clarification of how to understand Christ, the incarnate God Logos. The presupposition of the whole text is the
Symbol of Nicea-Constantinople. It was explicitly read before the Definition— and the acts of Chalcedon are the first testimony for this symbol! The Definition of Chalcedon is unlike the Nicean-Constantinopolitan - no baptismal creed.  

6. Back to Timothy Aelurus, it seems, that he did not analyze the text. The aim of his polemic against the text is, as expressed in the headline of the passage published by Nau, to show that the Council of Chalcedon has done everything „to accept and to preach in all churches of God the impure doctrines of Nestorius“. The polemic against Chalcedon focussed on the „two natures“ in Christ, a line which prevailed in the struggles after the council. The text in itself was not studied very much as can be seen in the post-chalcedonian literature. Attempts to clarify concepts in an open dialogue between Chalcedonians and Severians have been made, for instance with the conversation („collatio“) in Constantinople in 532 under emperor Justinian I, but failed.  

7. The reception of the Definition, although it was a difficult process, nevertheless reveals that the whole Church of the West and large parts of the Church in the East found in this text the basic formulation of their faith in Christ. In 516/517 the venerable archimandrite and monastic leader Theodosius in Jerusalem exclaimed: „If someone does not accept the four Councils even as the four Gospels, let him be anathema.“. This slogan was disseminated in the days of Gregory the Great and afterwards.  

8. In the ecumenical rapprochement, to me, it is important to overcome the anathemas and accusations of the past, but also to be aware of the valuable legacy of the fathers. Grillmeier saw a possibility for peace, „if both traditions, the mia physis language and the two-natures formula, were accepted as valid, without each declaring that the other was heretical. But this would have to happen on the basis  

12 The bishops later had to realize this, see the Codex Encyclogus, cf. A. Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition 2/1 (1987) 195-235.  
13 See the analysis of A. Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition 2/2 (1995) 232-248. „Instead of question and answer, there were only attack and accusation“ (ibid. 248).  

APPENDIX

Proemium:  

... Therefore this sacred and great and universal synod, now in session, in its desire to exclude all their tricks against the truth, and teaching what has been unshakable in the proclamation from the beginning, decrees that the creed of the 318 holy fathers (of Nicea) is, above all else, to remain inviolate. And because of those who

15 A. Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition 2/1, 334-335, with n. 48 and the citation of the declaration of the Joint Commission of the Catholic Church and the Coptic Orthodox Church in the meeting in Vienna, 26-29 August 1976: „When the Orthodox confess that our Lord’s divinity and humanity are united in one nature, then they understand by „nature“ not purely a simple nature, but rather one single composed nature, in which divinity and humanity are united without division and without confusion. And when the Catholics confess Jesus Christ as one in two natures, they do not divide the divinity from the humanity, not even for a single instant; they strive rather to exclude the mingling, confusion, falsification or change of the one by the other ... This is our faith in the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the salvific plan (oikonomia) of our redemption. In this faith we all concur." Grillmeier commented (ibid.): „we can accord historical significance to such a document." Is this document of 1976 still present in the memories?  

16 See the Agreed Statement on Christology issued by the Anglican Oriental Orthodox Inter-Commission on November 10, 2002, at Holy Etchmiadzin, Armenia. The Anglican delegation agreed to take into account the Oriental Orthodox concerns about the Christology of the Assyrian Church of the East in any further christological work or discussions with the Assyrians. Such kind of conditions seem to be rather unusual.
oppose the Holy Spirit, it ratifies the teaching about the being of
the Holy Spirit handed down by the 150 holy fathers who met
some time later in the imperial city; - the teaching they made
known to all, not introducing anything left out by their predecessors,
but clarifying their ideas about the Holy Spirit by the use of scriptural
testimonies against those who were trying to do away with his
sovereignty. And because of those who are attempting to corrupt
the mystery of the economy and are shamelessly and foolishly
asserting that he who was born of the holy virgin Mary was a mere
man, it has accepted the synodical letters of the blessed Cyril,
pastor of the church in Alexandria, to Nestorius and to the Orientals,
as being well-suited to refuting Nestorius's mad folly and to providing
an interpretation for those who in their religious zeal might desire
understanding of the saving creed.

To these it has suitably added, against false believers and
for the establishment of orthodox doctrines, the letter of the
primate of greatest and older Rome, the most blessed and most
holy Archbishop Leo, written to the sainted Archbishop Flavian
to put down Eutyches's evil-mindedness, because it is in
agreement with great Peter's confession and represents a
support we have in common.

It is opposed to those who attempt to tear apart the mystery
of the economy into a duality of sons; and it expels from the
assembly of the priests those who dare to say that the divinity
of the Only-begotten is possible; and it stands opposed to those
who imagine a mixture or confusion between the two natures
of Christ; and it expels those who have the mad idea that the
servant-form he took from us is of a heavenly or some other
kind of being; and it anathematizes those who concoct two
natures of the Lord before the union but imagine a single one
after the union.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} Greek: ACO II 1, 2, p. 128,24-129,22. English translation following N.
P. Tanner, Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils I (London 1990) '85-
86, with some corrections.

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. A. Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition I, 544; cf. N. P. Tanner,
Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, '86-87.
Α΄ πόμενα τοίνυν τοίς ἁγίοις πατράσιν
έκα καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ὄραμας ἦλθον
τῶν κύριων ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸν
συμφώνως ἐπιπέπτες ἐκδόθηκεν,
τέλειοι τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν θεότητι
καὶ τέλειοι τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι
θεοῦ ἐλεηθείᾳ καὶ ἀνθρωποκοσμίᾳ
τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος,
ἀμοιβαῖον τῷ Πατρι κατὰ τὴν θεότητα
καὶ ἀμοιβαῖον ἡμῖν τῶν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,
κατὰ πάντα ὁμοιόν ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἀμοιβαίας,
πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα,
ἐπ᾽ ἐκχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμῶν
τῶν αὐτῶν δὴ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,
ἐναλλὰ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν Χριστὸν ὦν κύριον μονογενῆ,
ἐν δόλῳ φόροιν
ἀναγχότως ἀντέποστος ἀδιαπρέπως ἀχώριστος γνωρίζομεν,
οἴδαμεν τῆς τῶν φόρων διαφοράς ἀναφοράς διὰ τὴν ἐνωσιν
συμφωνεῖν δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἁγίωτος εκκλησίας φόρους
καὶ εἰς ἐν πρόσωπῳ καὶ μέσῳ ἐν συνεργασίᾳ
οὐκ εἰς δόλῳ προσώπῳ μεριζόμενον ἀ διαρκομένων,
ἀλλὰ ἐναλλὰ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἦν μονογενής
θεόν λόγων κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν,
καθὼς ἠκούσατο οἱ προσδέχατε προ αὐτῶν
καὶ αὐτῶν ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εξεσπάδευσεν
καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν παραδόθηκε σύμβολον.19

Text of B. M. add. 12156, fol. 41r-41v, ed. Nau, PO 13, p. 229,9-230,11:

1. Δῆμοι καὶ ἡμείς συμμάχους ἐν θαυμάσιῳ Μεταολόγημα
2. Σὺ ἑσφαγήν ὑπὸ πνεύμονος δίκαιον.
3. Καὶ ἐλέησέ μου σήμερα.
4. Μελέτη στοιχείων Ἀγίου.
5. Καὶ προσευχήσετε τοῖς θεοπάμπαις.
6. Καὶ προσευχήσετε τοῖς θεοπάμπαις.
7. Ἐλέησέ μου σήμερα.
8. Σὺ ἐστιν ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμετέρας.
9. Ἔχω ἐν μέρει τοὺς μαθητὰς τούτους.
10. Ἐλέησέ μου σήμερα.
11. Αμὴν αὕτις ἐστιν τὸ ἐλέησόν μου σήμερα.
12. Ἐλέησέ μου σήμερα.
13. Ἐλέησέ μου σήμερα.
14. Αμὴν αὕτις ἐστιν τὸ ἐλέησόν μου σήμερα.
15. Ἐλέησέ μου σήμερα.
16. Ἐλέησέ μου σήμερα.
17. Δῆμοι καὶ ἡμείς συμμάχους ἐν θαυμάσιῳ Μεταολόγημα
18. Προσευχήσετε τοῖς θεοπάμπαις.
19. Προσευχήσετε τοῖς θεοπάμπαις.
20. Εἰς τὸν Χριστόν μετατρέψεσθαι δόξα.
21. Εἰς τὸν Χριστόν μετατρέψεσθαι δόξα.
22. Εἰς τὸν Χριστόν μετατρέψεσθαι δόξα.
23. Εἰς τὸν Χριστόν μετατρέψεσθαι δόξα.
24. Εἰς τὸν Χριστόν μετατρέψεσθαι δόξα.
25. Δῆμοι καὶ ἡμείς συμμάχους ἐν θαυμάσιῳ Μεταολόγημα.
26. Τοίούτως ἐστίν τὸ ἐλέησόν μου σήμερα.
27. Τοίούτως ἐστίν τὸ ἐλέησόν μου σήμερα.