
ARTICLE BY

MORAN MOR IGNATIUS ZAKKA-I IWAS

THE PATRIARCH OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE OF ANTIOCH & ALL THE EAST
THE SUPREME HEAD OF THE UNIVERSAL SYRIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

The Mysteries of Incarnation And Redemption

Appropriate Testimony and Confirmation*

* Permission for printing [the Arabic edition] was issued on 3rd July 1959
by H.H. Moran Mor Ignatius Ya'qub III (d. 1980), Patriarch of Antioch and all the East.

Translated by **Theodora Issa**

Preface

On 24th January 1959 a friend of mine “Brobest Joachim² Philikt”, the Head of the Lutheran Church in Jerusalem, prompted me to attend the “Jerusalem Conference” with an invitation on behalf of the German Theological Academy. The conference was scheduled to be held on 15th and 16th April primarily to discuss the topic, “The nature of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Chalcedonian Council.” This invitation included a request for a speech to be delivered by myself on the position of our Syrian Orthodox Church on this topic.

Following the receipt of permission from H.H. Moran Mor Ignatius Ya'qub III, Patriarch of Antioch and all the East³, I attended this conference and gave the required lecture, titled “*One Nature of God the Incarnated Word.*” I wrote this lecture in a very simple language, exerting every effort to stay away from complex theological and philosophical expressions and phrases. Therefore, I treated and explained the topic from a merely historical point of view, proving the dogma of our Holy Church through the presentation of obvious and unambiguous proofs, derived from both the scripture and cognitive research, with some testimonies that were derived from those who failed to agree with this dogma. This lecture was delivered at the first session of this conference, and was simultaneously translated into English and German.

It is worthwhile to note here that Dr. Fredreich Hayer, theology professor at the German Academy mentioned above, who was the chair of the conference, had the following comments on this lecture:

“We have become convinced with the proof presented by the lecturer that the Chalcedonian Council meetings were not convened with blessing of the Holy Spirit. Further, following this lecture it became apparent to all of us that the doctrine of the Eastern Oriental Orthodox Churches confesses one nature of Our Lord Jesus Christ after the union from two united natures, and one person from two united persons, without confusion, mixture, division or corruption. These churches reject the Chalcedonian Council and its dogma. These churches are not the followers of Eutyches as we incorrectly used to think. These churches excommunicate Nestorius, and his dogma. Therefore, the onus is on each and every one of us and the responsibility lays in our hands upon return to our home lands to explain and amend the wrongful, unjust and unlawful history [of animosity] towards these churches”.

Representatives from the Syrian, Coptic, Armenian and Ethiopian Churches joined those representing different branches of the Protestant Churches—Episcopal, Scriptural, and Lutheran—who attended this conference. Those representatives gathered in Jerusalem from Jordan, Germany, Canada, Belgium and several other countries.

Thus, with God's blessings, and at the request of several of the zealous virtuous people, I publish this lecture as a tool for the dear reader to truly understand the divine truth, the ancient and pure Christian dogma.

Homs, 30th June 1959

Rabban Fr. Zakka Bashir Iwas (Patriarch H.H. Ignatius Zakka-I Iwas)

One Nature of God the Incarnated Word

1. A brief explanation on the mystery of the incarnation and the redemption

When the first man fell into sin, this sin enveloped the whole man kind. *"Just as sin entered into the world by one man, and death by means of sin, so death was imposed upon all men, inasmuch as they all have sinned"* (Romans 5:12). *"They are all gone astray and they have been rejected; there is none who does good, no, not one. But the righteousness of God is by the faith of Jesus Christ to every one, also to every man who believes in him, for there is no discrimination"* (Romans 3:12,22). *"As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one"*.

This sin was infinite being directed to God the Infinite, thus it would be impossible to earn salvation and redemption through the sacrifice of the finite angels, forefathers, and prophets. Those finite people would never be in a position to bring redemption or duly recompense the divine justice, and not even the Mosaic Law would do, but God the Almighty the Divine and Infinite Himself would; as we are told by St. Paul, there is nothing in this world that is infinite, *"For the law was weak through the weakness of the flesh, so God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, on account of sin, in order to condemn sin by means of his flesh."* (Romans 8:3). Thus He became *"... the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world."* (John 2:2).

"But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son who, born of a woman, became subject to the law." (Galatians 4:4). From the Holy Spirit and from Holy Virgin Mary⁴, whom He chose through His divine wisdom, thus the Holy Spirit filled the Holy Virgin Mary, blessed her, cleansing her from the original sin to become worthy of carrying the Son of God in her womb. Simultaneously, and from her virtuous blood incarnated a body with a comprehending⁵ soul of the Son of God, as He opted to. Thus neither the theological divinity, nor the incarnated body of the Son of God was first in the womb of the Holy Virgin Mary, but both were there simultaneously one nature of Our Lord Jesus Christ after the union of two united natures, and one person of two united persons, without confusion, mixture, division or corruption through a supernatural mystery. And he was born from the Holy Virgin Mary, who continued to be a virgin, in nine months; thus, *"... the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we saw his glory, a glory like that of the first born of the Father, full of grace and truth."* (John 1:14).

"Behold, a virgin will conceive and give birth to a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which is interpreted, Our God is with us." (Matthew 1:23), Who was *"The Word was in the beginning, and that very Word was with God, and God was that Word."* (John 1:1). Thus, He took everything that we have with the exception of sin (Philippians 2:6-8).⁶

He grew in essence and wisdom, and when He became thirty years of age was baptized from a mundane person named John, and as He was baptized the Holy Spirit descended in the shape of a dove, and landed on His forehead, and a sound came from heaven saying: *"...This is my beloved Son, with whom I am pleased."* (Matthew 3:17).

Throughout His days on this earth, He was subject to blether by different sorts of people; however, through His divinity He was able to pass on the basics of the eternal merciful dogma to His virtuous disciples. This eternal merciful dogma they needed to believe in and hand over to their followers; thus we hear Him while at the country of Caesarea Philippi, addressing them with a question saying: *"... 'What do men say concerning me, that I am merely a son of man?' They said, 'There are some who say John the Baptist, others Elijah, and still others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.' He said to them, 'Who do you say that I am?' Simon Peter answered, saying, 'You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.' Jesus answered, saying to him, 'Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for flesh and blood did not reveal it to you, but my Father in heaven. I tell you also that you are the stone, and upon this stone I will build my church; and the doors of Sheol shall not shut upon it.'"*⁷ (Matthew 16:13-20). Therefore, on the rock of faith in the living Son of God the Church was established, thus, the foundation of Christianity is not built on anything other than the oneness of Our Lord Jesus Christ. There are no two Christs that we can build on one, and not the other; but there is only *One* Christ only, and He is the Son of the Living God, and the Son of Man [through] the Holy Virgin Mary. Therefore, Christianity can only be built on the truth of Christ in His wholeness.

Once, we heard Him talking to His disciples about the severe pains and sufferings that He will face from the heads of the Jews, how He will die, and on the third day will rise from the dead; thus we should not be surprised to see that His disciples were entirely startled when they contemplated the nature of such a news passed on to them. They did not understand fully the depth of such news; this prompted some questions within them, as to how would He bare the pain, the suffering and the death, while He is the Only Son of God, and even whether He is God indeed? At such a time we notice how Peter took Him aside and began to rebuke Him, saying far be it to you, my Lord that this should happen to you, at which time Our Lord Jesus Christ looked at him and cautioned him saying: *"...Get behind me Satan; you are a stumbling block to me; for you are not thinking of the things of God but of men."* (Matthew 16:21-24).⁸ Yes, Peter and his companions were unaware of the meaning of the pain and the suffering of the Son of God, His death in flesh, and that death was to bestow on them and the whole world life and salvation from the incarceration of sin, death and Satan. Whereas, [and as we are told by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians,] Our Lord Jesus Christ knew that *"... being found in the form of a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross."* (Philippians 8:2). And with His death He erased the written covenant with the human kind, settled the value of the divine justice, and established peace between heaven and earth; yes, the crucifixion of the incarnated God by the Jews, who *"if they knew they would not have crucified the God of Glory."* The incarnated God descended first into the inner parts of the earth, to salvage the spirits of those who departed in their faith in Him, released them from their captivity (Ephesians 4:8-9; Zechariah 9:11-12), and elevated them to paradise (Luke 23:43). Further, on the third day He rose from the dead through His own divine will and strength (Matthew 16:17, 20, 21, and 22), and appeared to His disciples on several occasions, as individuals and as they were gathered. He also appeared to the women, and even entered the attic as all the doors were locked, showing His disciples the multitude of His wounds, and ate in front of them (Luke 24:36-43). He further demonstrated to them

that He was alive providing much evidence (Acts 1:3). He continued to pay them visits throughout the forty days that followed His resurrection endeavouring to explain to them what was written about Him (Acts 1:3); then He took them to the mount and as they witnessed, ascended in His manhood to the heavens (Acts 1:9), and sat on right hand side of God the Almighty (Mark 16:19 & Acts 7:56). Further, He will come again, with great glory for the judgement (Matthew 24:29-31 and Acts 1:11).

This is in brief the Mystery of Incarnation and Redemption that was enacted by the second person of the Holy Trinity in His One Person, One Nature and One Will.

2. The Church and the Heresy

As the disciples were all filled with the Holy Spirit, that generated in them great strength (Acts 2:3,4), they travelled all over the world spreading the Good News of Our Lord Jesus Christ, baptizing all the faithful in the name of The Father, The Son, and the Holy Spirit—the Holy Trinity One God—conveying to them His merciful teaching as they had received it, pure, virtuous, strong, powerful, simple and easy; this could be understood by the simplest of people, while at the same time being difficult and complicated that even the philosophers and great scholars would not be able to dive in and find out its secrets. The aim of the disciples' teachings, both written and verbal, was to spread the right dogma in the Holy Trinity, with emphasis on spreading the Good News clearly, in the age of the complete canon. Further, those disciples would declare the belief in Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God through whom the whole world was created, who is the centre of exploration of the Holy Bible in its two testaments the old and new.

Thus, through such actions Christianity came to endear to the minds of people, and ruled over the hearts of the human kind, spreading in each and every part of the whole world; the [seeds] sown by Our Lord Jesus Christ in His great field has flourished generating a marvellous produce. However, next to this produce appeared the misleading plant that was planted by Satan in a deliberate move to fight the good. A huge number of people, who were originally Jews, and atheists came into Christianity, and brought with them their foolish idealistic misleading philosophies, and their superficial beliefs that were tied up with earthly matters leaving behind the heavenly ones. Such people tried extensively to confuse the issue and present a mixture of their old foolish beliefs and what they received from the merciful Christian beliefs through the righteous disciples and apostles. Therefore, they were misled, spread wrong teachings, departed from the truth, and scattered around strange teachings that resulted in the troubles for the disciples and apostles. Those deceiving people exerted every effort, and employed several methods for misleading those simple faithful, misleading the minds of the shallow believers and trapping them in their wrongful teachings. However, the heads of the church were always alert, and well aware of the deceiving acts of those misleading people, unbelievers, and lying prophets; they went to battle with them, and were victorious with the supreme help and guidance of Our Lord Jesus Christ, thus alerting all the faithful to the deceitful ways they employ. This was the way that the Jews and atheists became the true enemies of the Holy Church, as they were jealous of it; but this Holy Church came out of this battle victorious, keeping the truthful, righteous and virtuous faith, defeating its wrongful enemies.

Well, the history of the Holy Church is full of several and different examples representing different eras of the Church's life when some of these misleading people attempted to spread poison around the merciful and righteous teachings of the Holy Church. Those people were faced forcefully by our fathers and forefathers, the saints and heroes who defended the Holy Church by their own lives, exerting every effort to keep the Holy Church's faith and dogma safe and sound, defeating the repeated attempts of its enemies to confuse the straight and righteous teachings of the Holy Church.

The lying prophets and the deceiving brethren were apparent and very active in the apostolic era; they were excommunicated by the righteous apostles and disciples and were thrown out of Our Lord Jesus Christ's fold. Unfortunately the actions of those lying prophets and deceiving brethren were the idols for hundreds of other creators of heresies, the most dangerous of those emerging in the fourth century—Arius who believed that “the Son is not a God but was created by God as one of his first creatures, he is younger than God, and his strength is coming from God, therefore he is not equal to God in substance.” Arius became very active in the Roman Empire exerting every effort to spread his deceptive teachings, until it was argued and totally rejected by the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea in the year 325; [this Council] composed the first part of the Christian Creed that is based on the teachings of the Holy Bible and commences with the statement, “We believe in one God...” and ends with the phrase “... and we believe in the Holy Spirit...” This Creed, in brief, conveys a message that “Our Lord Jesus Christ is One True God, and is truly the Son of the eternal God, and is equal to His Father in substance.” This Council of Nicaea excommunicated Arius.

Then the second Ecumenical Council was convened in Constantinople in the year 381, and this time the Council argued and totally rejected Macedonious' heresy in which he ignored the divine nature of the Holy Spirit and said, “The Holy Spirit is a creature that looks like the angels but has a higher rank than them.” Thus, this second council came up with the second part of the Christian Creed that states, “...we believe in the Holy Spirit God the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and with the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified...”

3. The Oneness of the Incarnated God and the Heresy - Historically

The fifth century came carrying within its years some treacherous heresies and fruitless opinions that resulted in divisions and schisms in the body of the Holy Church that continue to be apparent to our day. In the first four centuries, the forefathers of the Holy Church including those who participated in the two major councils of Nicaea and Constantinople, who were handed the righteous faith from the virtuous disciples and apostles, were of the belief that Our Lord Jesus Christ “is the Son of the living God, the second person of the Holy Trinity, and the innate Son of God the Father [through] the Holy Virgin Mary, and in His incarnation He joined the divinity with the manhood without any division, corruption or mixture, and thus has one only nature that is composed of two natures⁹, and one will¹⁰. There are several writings in this respect; however, here we can only share with you a part of those writings, and will refer to some other parts of those writings later.

That was the Universal Church's doctrine and continued to be so until the fifth century, the time of the appearance of Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who fell in an awful heresy that occupied the Holy Church for several generations to follow. Nestorius denied the two mysteries of Incarnation and Redemption. He was of the opinion that “The Holy Virgin Mary did not give birth to an incarnated God, but gave birth to a pure human, on whom divinity was bestowed when He was baptised at the age of thirty. Therefore, The Holy Virgin Mary should not be named as the Bearer of God (Theotokos), and Our Lord Jesus Christ has two natures and is of two persons.” Further, he underestimated the fact that the three wise men kneeled and worshipped the baby Jesus (Matthew 2:11). Nestorius' heresy goes on to state that “God was not born, therefore it is not appropriate to declare that he was crucified and died, but when the time came for Him to be crucified His divinity and manhood became separated, and therefore the person who was hanged on the wooden piece was a pure human.” Thus, Nestorius omitted the phrase that is repeated in the Holy Liturgy “...O You who were crucified for our sake” from all the hymns that are sung in the Holy Church.¹¹

As a result of these declarations and his heresy, the faithful erupted in a revolt against him, and denounced his heresy, demonstrating to him his diversion from the true and genuine faith. Further, several of the Holy Church's fathers and forefathers such as the Saint Cyril, Pope of Alexandria, denounced his heresy and advised him to repent and revert to the Church's yard, but he did not conform, rather, on the contrary continued to insist on his ideas. Thus, Emperor Theodosius the Second issued a decree to convene the Ecumenical Third Council at the city of Ephesus in the year 431.

Some 200 bishops attended and participated in this Council, during which they studied, argued and denounced Nestorius' heresy, and its treacherous consequences on the Holy Church, stating that such teachings (Nestorius' heresy) are strange and do not relate in any way, form or shape to the true Christian spirit; therefore they voted to denounce and reject his heresy and excommunicate him. At the same time those present at the Council of Ephesus presented the Church's true doctrine that is derived from the Holy Bible, proving that Our Lord Jesus Christ is One Person of one nature following consolidation without confusion, mixture, division or corruption, and The Holy Virgin Mary is the Bearer of God (Theotokos)¹².

Based on this Council's decision, the king [Emperor] ordered the exile of Nestorius to his monastery in Oasis of Hibis (al-khargah), in Egypt where he stayed until he departed this earthly life. However, his heresy and its impact continued to be apparent in the Church's body well after his departure from this earthly life, especially in the East. Therefore, several of the Holy Fathers who were of an orthodox opinion, exerted every effort to defend the true faith, argued against, and thus rejected Nestorius' treacherous heresy. Among the Holy Church's fathers who were fighting Nestorius was Eutyches, the head of a monastery in the suburbs of Constantinople. While he intended to argue and reject Nestorius' heresy he got mixed up in expressing his thoughts in relation to the mystery of Incarnation; thus he came up with a more treacherous heresy that stated, "it would be impossible to have a consolidation between divinity and manhood," and became confused and mixed up in the two natures of Our Lord Jesus Christ thus mixing them together, resulting in him denying the fact that Our Lord Jesus Christ took a truthful manhood status from The Holy Virgin Mary.

Such a heresy led Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, who was one of his close friends to argue with him and advise him to reject such strange ideas, and as he was trying to convince him of his mistaken ideas that declared "the one combined and mixed nature," Eusebius too became misled by the treacherous Nestorius' heresy, thus declaring and calling for the "separation of the two natures of Our Lord Jesus Christ after their consolidation." Later, he presented a complaint about Eutyches' attitude to his patriarch Phlabianus¹³ of Constantinople, and as this Patriarch was leaning towards Nestorius' teachings, he accepted Eusebius' complaint, and decided to chair a council in Constantinople in the year 488 that was attended by 30 bishops. This Council decided to excommunicate Eutyches, made him redundant from his position as the head of the monastery, and supported Nestorius' heresy that states "Our Lord Jesus Christ has two natures and two wills following consolidation." With such an action this small Council nurtured that mistaken doctrine, which was further nurtured and enhanced through the recommendations of the Council of Chalcedon, that came to be totally rejected by the Holy Forefathers of our Church. This rejection was apparent in those Holy Fathers' writings, sayings, declarations and the Councils that followed.

When the news of this verdict reached Eutyches, he became scared and took refuge with King Theodosius, asking for his protection from the brutality of the Patriarch of Constantinople, claiming that the only thing he did was defending the true, genuine and orthodox faith. As a result the King issued a decree calling for the Council to convene again in Constantinople in April of the following year; it was attended by Phlabianus of Constantinople the King's representative and Macedonius the leader. They

commenced with a review of the recommendations and decisions of the previous small council to ensure its correctness. Although, several of those who attended this second council were present in the first, they started to blame each other for what was included in those recommendations and decisions leading to the failure of this second council.

The Second Council of Ephesus

As a result of his declaration, the public opinion shifted against Phlabianus of Constantinople due to his statement, "Our Lord Jesus Christ would have two natures following the consolidation." Thus Eutyches took advantage of the situation and submitted a complaint to Theodosius the Second, and wrote to several of the Church's fathers, amongst whom was Leo, Bishop of Rome, explaining to them the opinions of the Patriarch of Constantinople and claiming that this Patriarch exercised on him a severe measure of brutality. He begged for mediation with the Emperor to re-open his case and appealed the verdict issued by the Ecumenical Council.

Leo answered him through a letter of 1st June 449 saying, "To the dear son Eutyches the Priest from Leo the Bishop. From your correspondence we became aware that there are some people who allowed themselves, through the ugliness of their aims to re-establish Nestorius' heresy. Please note that we are very pleased with your interest and care for such an issue, and from the contents of your letter your intentions are apparent to us, thus we have no doubt that God the Almighty who created the whole world would help you in everything. As for us, as we received the news of those misleading people, we decided with God's help to cut off such a misleading opinion. May God the Almighty bless you my dear son."¹⁴

The disagreement went beyond all expectations; thus Emperor Theodosius the Second, at Eutyches's request, wrote to all the Patriarchs and Bishops calling for another Ecumenical Council to be convened in the year 449 in Ephesus to put an end to this disagreement. When such news reached Phlabianus of Constantinople, he wrote to Leo the Bishop of Rome, Theodoret the Bishop of Korosh and others who were apparent followers of Nestorius' heresy, taking refuge in them; thus they sent representatives to the Council, Bishop Youlyanous, Priest Ranad, and Deacon Elyarnous.¹⁵

Further, in the same context the Emperor dispatched three letters to Pope Dioscorus of Alexandria, and in the third letter he gave him the authority to chair the council. From what he wrote: "I do understand that we previously ordered Theodoret the Bishop of Korosh not to attend the council until the matter in relation to his enemies becomes clearer to us, as he dared and talked against what Cyril the righteous wrote earlier... thus, hereby we offer your holiness the authority that you become the front runner, not only in relation to Theodoret but also in whatever related to this Holy Council."¹⁶ Then the king appointed two of his assistants to be his deputies in this council, and gave him instructions not to mingle with those who issued the verdict in the matter of Eutyches, as they were to be present in this council.

Thus, the Council in Ephesus was attended by some one hundred and thirty bishops from different parts of the world. The sessions of this council were held at the Church of the Holy Virgin Mary commencing the eighth day of August of the year 449.

Eutyches was invited and questioned about his belief, and he admitted and confessed in front of the council members the true, genuine and orthodox belief, and supported his verbal confession with a signed written statement that declared his full adherence to the faith as declared in the councils of Nicaea and

Ephesus, and that of the orthodox forefathers and fathers, excommunicating any heretics, especially Mani, Walintees, Abu Lynaryous and Nestorius, even Simon the Magician having Our Lord Jesus Christ as his witness.¹⁷

Then the forefathers who participated in this council went ahead with the other sessions of this council, and repeated the Creed of the Council of Nicaea, and the teachings of the forefathers the saints in the mystery of incarnation. But these participants ignored to read the letter that was sent to the Council by Leo, the Bishop of Rome.

The Council was adjourned without any new decisions or recommendations, but this Council verified, authenticated and substantiated the decisions and recommendations taken by the previous council of Ephesus.¹⁸ This council declared full adherence with the doctrine and belief of the Old Church and following several sessions of discussions they came up with a final statement: "For the second time we specifically state that there is only one nature following the consolidation of the Incarnated Word without confusion, mixture, division or corruption."

Further, this Council decided on the demotion of those who continued to believe and declare that Our Lord Jesus Christ is of two natures, such as Phlabianus of Constantinople, Domnus of Antioch, Theodoret of Korosh, Hiba of Edessa, Eusebius the Bishop of Dorylaeum, and as a result they were stripped of their positions and ranks. Those authentications and decisions were submitted to Emperor Theodosius who endorsed the outcome and issued a decree for the exile of Phlabianus of Constantinople.¹⁹ Then all those bishops, who participated in the council, went back to their own parishes pleased with their achievements, and assured that they have kept the true, genuine and orthodox faith, thus defeating the treacherous heresies.

It was not long when it became apparent that Eutyches did not fully repent, but once again went on spreading his wrong teachings that contradict the true orthodox faith, despite all the verbal and signed written statements submitted by him in the aforementioned Council, that lead the forefathers and fathers to accept him amongst them. Therefore, the forefathers and fathers of the Councils became sure that what he declared (verbally and in writing) in the above council did not agree with his inner intentions and belief. Although the Council following Eutyches' confession issued a "not guilty" verdict, it declared his teachings as wrongful. However, the forefathers and fathers participating in the Holy Council had no other choice at that time, in the presence of his verbal and written confession, but to declare his innocence. Further, for the record, had the council at that time issued a guilty verdict on Eutyches it would have been considered as unfair and unjust. Therefore, later as a result of his withdrawal from his earlier confessions, the forefathers and fathers looked into the matter again and demoted Eutyches and this time excommunicated him too.²⁰

When the representatives of Leo the Bishop of Rome went back to their master following the adjournment of the sessions of the Second Council of Ephesus carrying with them a copy of the council's recommendations and verdicts, he became aware of all the developments that took place. He felt humiliated and angered as it became apparent that the letter he sent was not read in the council, bearing in mind that he dreamed of becoming the head of the whole church and attaining the status of infallibility. There were also other reasons that stirred his anger, including the fact that the Council did not take his opinion that was in agreement with that of Phlabianus of Constantinople, but went further and excommunicated Phlabianus of Constantinople and all his followers considering them heretics as they believed in two natures of Our Lord Jesus Christ following the consolidation. Therefore, Leo established a strong relationship with those who had been demoted and excommunicated as a result of the second Council of Ephesus. Those who were aware of his weaknesses thus were able to gain his trust; they also

took refuge in him and accepted them in his fellowship. Further, he wrote to Emperor Theodosius begging that he be allowed to convene a council in his See to appeal the outcome of the second Council of Ephesus. The Emperor replied to him saying: "The Second Council of Ephesus had examined everything in full adherence to the faith and just requirements, thus resulting in the excommunication of those who do not deserve the priesthood, while elevating those who deserve the priesthood to their own ranks."²¹

When Leo noticed that Theodosius did not comply with his requirements, he went weeping and begging to Valentinian the Caesar of Europe to write to Theodosius on the same issue; he complied with this request. Theodosius answered him expressing the opinion that there is no need to convene another council. From what he wrote: "As for Phlavianus of Constantinople's situation we consider that he erupted a new and important issue against our dogma, and from the time the verdict was issued against him, peace and harmony has prevailed, and currently [we] enjoy the Christian truth," as stated by the historian Thawfanees.²²

As the news of Leo's acceptance of all the demoted bishops into his fellowship spread, Dioscorus of Alexandria called upon all the bishops of the See of Mark in Alexandria and issued a verdict calling for the excommunication of Leo and declared this verdict to all.

Two years passed following the Second Council of Ephesus at which time King Theodosius the Victorious departed this earthly life with no apparent heir except a sister named Pulcheria who had taken vows of celibacy and purity, had joined one of the convents, and had become a nun. Some of those deceiving bishops²³ persuaded her to marry Marcian who was an army commander and at the same time a follower of Nestorius' heresy. As a result she renounced her vows, departed the convent, and got married to him, handing him the power; thus he (Marcian) became the Emperor of the East through the authority given to him by his wife Pulcheria.

Leo was pleased with the sudden change in the political arena in the East, and hurried seeking revenge on his enemy Dioscorus. Thus, he sent a delegation to Pulcheria and her husband Marcian that was composed of several of those bishops who were demoted in the second Council of Ephesus seeking that another council be convened to appeal the outcome of the Council of Ephesus. Bearing in mind that Pulcheria was compassionate with Phlavianus, had the intention to curb the authority of Pope Dioscorus²⁴, and that her husband was a follower of Nestorius' heresy, they both opted to help Leo accomplish his wishes and called for a another council to be convened to examine the outcome of the second Council of Ephesus.

Thus Marcian issued an invitation to Pope Dioscorus to attend the Council; he traveled to Constantinople to question the reasons behind convening such a council. He was advised that the main aim was to clarify the doctrine; he answered very bluntly, "the doctrine is totally complete and it does not need any further clarification. This doctrine has been issued and confirmed by the forefathers, such as Athanasios, Cyril and others. However, in case Marcian and some of the bishops wish to alter this to be more in line with the teachings of Leo and prove that there are two natures following the consolidation, he added saying that the doctrine of the church should not be added to or deleted from, and Our Lord Jesus Christ is one in nature, substance, action and will as we are taught by the forefathers. Do listen to what my Father the saint Cyril said about the consolidation between the priesthood and manhood and how it is similar to that of fire and steel; when steel is hit by the hammer, the steel will feel the impact but the fire will not."

Given the fact that Dioscorus had great logic and ability to explain truthfully and clearly the doctrine and belief of the church, both Pulcheria, Marcian and those demoted bishops decided that the new council was to be convened away from the capital Constantinople, and should be held in Chalcedon next to Bosphorus fearing the consequences of even discussing the issue of the doctrine and faith of Dioscorus. Therefore, they changed the aims of this new Council to discuss the issue of the demoted bishops and to recite Leo's tome.

The Council of Chalcedon

The Church of Rome had authored a book with the name *The History of the Council of Chalcedon*. This book described the events that took place in the second Council of Ephesus and the Council of Chalcedon. This book was translated into Arabic from Latin by Monk Francis the Latin, and was printed and published in Rome in the year 1694.²⁵ As I will be discussing this Council, I will be deriving my evidence from this book, which assisted me in proving the facts through the issues raised in this book.

This Council was held on the 8th of October of the year 451²⁶ at the church of Ophemia in the city of Chalcedon²⁷ that is named "Kadi Kawi" today opposite the city of Constantinople. The historians differ when it comes to the number of the bishops who attended the council; some said there were 330, while others were of the opinion that there came up to 630 bishops, and the most famous amongst them were Dioscorus the Pope of Alexandria, Maximus the Patriarch of Antioch, Youbeenlyanous the Bishop of Jerusalem, and Anadolyous the Patriarch of Constantinople. Further, Leo the Bishop of Rome, sent three representatives and those were Bishop Baskaseenous, Bishop Loshinisyous and Priest Bonyanasyous.

The judges who were selected to run the sessions of this council sat in the middle, while the bishops sat in places assigned to them. At such a time Baskaseenous one of Leo's representatives stood and said, "We have instructions from his beatitude the Bishop of Rome that Dioscorus should not be present in this council, but can only be present to defend his actions. Further, we are obliged to leave if he is not ordered to leave this council."

The judges immediately asked him what exactly did Dioscorus do that was considered to be against the canons, and he answered saying: "He can only attend to defend what he came up with bearing in mind that he does not have the authority in this issue, as he decided to convene a council without the authority of the Holy See."

This statement was strange since even though the second council of Ephesus was held without the knowledge of the Bishop of Rome, this council continued to have the full authority as it complied fully with the conditions of Ecumenical councils that were held following a decree from the king, and the aim of convening such councils was mainly to solve church problems. Further, none of the books on the Church's history would state that any of those councils requested the authority of the Bishop of Rome, whose vote and position in any of those councils was similar to any other of the bishops present; thus his presence or absence of such a council was of no importance. The full script of the royal decree that was issued calling for the second council of Ephesus to convene was published in books authored by those opponents themselves.²⁸

And what was really puzzling, was the ignorance of the Bishop of Rome's representative about the facts, and his claim that the Bishop of Rome was not advised of the second council of Ephesus. If that was right, why did the Bishop of Rome sent three representatives to this council namely: Bishop Youlyanous, Priest Ranad and Deacon Elarous? Who were those three representing at this council? And who wrote Leo's tome, which they continued to insist should have been read?

That was what the judges noted; thus they reprimanded and silenced Baskaseenous, Bishop of Rome's representative, saying: "If you are a judge, you do not have the right to be the plaintiff."²⁹

Then, it was time for the excommunicated Eusebius, the Bishop of Dorylaeum, to present his complaint basically claiming that Pope Dioscorus was a companion of Eutyches, and that he had judged them unlawfully. At this time Dioscorus interrupted and said, "The truth is extremely apparent when you read the minutes of the second Council of Ephesus where I ensured to record everything with extreme clarity."

This was followed by a request from the judges to recite the letters received from King Theodosius and King Falentanyous to Pope Dioscorus inviting him to Ephesus. Further they recited the letter addressed to him too by King Theodosius in relation to the invitation issued for the head of Mor Barsoum Syrian Monastery. Then Constantine, the Royal Palace secretary, advised that there were several other letters to several other bishops inviting them too, but the judges did not allow sufficient time for those letters to be recited, but allowed the admission of Theodoret of Korosh to the Council, as Bishop of Rome had reinstalled him in his see and the king ordered his attendance at this council. Therefore, when he entered the council, the bishops of Egypt, Elerya and Palestine shouted saying, "Have mercy on us, O you people; now as for the destroyer of faith, you know the law would dictate that such a person would have to be kicked away from us." However, the judges did not pay any attention to them or to their sayings, but were obliged to act in line with the mass opinion of the deacons and Nestorians who were highly represented in this council; their huge number was much higher than that of bishops in this council. They shouted and called for the installation of Theodoret of Korosh in the council. With such a development the bishops of Egypt and their supporters addressed the judges saying: "These deacons were the first to prove this issue, and why do we see them shouting in disagreement now? This Council is not a meeting for deacons but it is merely a meeting for bishops; therefore you are obliged to cast away those who are not privileged to speak at this gathering, and whoever proved this issue would only attend and sit at the midst of this council as we have proved it after they had already proved it."

Then, and following this interlude, the Council's secretary commenced reading the remainder of the minutes of the second Council of Ephesus. As he finished he went on to recite the letters received from the Emperor that dictated the council be convened, Dioscorus declared, "it has become apparent from whatever has been recited to you that King Theodosius did not give me the sole authority of this council but gave me the authority jointly with Youbelyanous and Tlasenyous; thus why do they refer only to me whenever they talk about the recommendations given by the Council of Ephesus? Truthfully we are all equal in our authority and whatever decisions were declared by the council were approved by all the bishops, who voted and signed to this effect. And we conveyed all this to the king who endorsed the recommendations of this Holy Council."³⁰ Some of the Eastern bishops intervened and said, "We did not approve the recommendations of the previous Council, and we did not issue a verdict on Phlabianus of Constantinople voluntarily, but we were enforced and threatened by force; thus we signed a blank document while surrounded by soldiers who were directing their weapons towards us."

The bishops of Egypt answered them saying: "The Christian would never fear anyone; the soldier of Christ would not be frightened by the force that would frighten only the fearful. Bring on fire and let us demonstrate a lesson in martyrdom to all of you. If the martyrs were fearful people they would have never succeeded with their martyrdom."

Following this dialogue the writer went on to read the minutes of the previous council, when he came to a statement by the bishops of the East saying: "Those who would consider the renewal of the doctrine would be considered excommunicated, and whoever dares to examine the faith of the forefathers' saints

would also be excommunicated; therefore keep the faith of the virtuous forefathers.” At this moment the bishops of the East erupted claiming that they did not say such a thing, and blamed the secretaries of Dioscorus for writing such a thing. This time the judges enquired who would be the writer of the copy that is being read. Dioscorus answered that each and every one of the bishops had his own writers who were writing his own copy, a statement that was confirmed immediately by Youlyanous, Thlasyous, the Bishop of Korosh, and others; thus Dioscorus questioned their claim that his secretaries were the only people who wrote those minutes.

The judges here ordered the reciting of the remainder of those minutes, and when the reader reached the point where the minutes described the confession given by Eutyches to the members of the Second Council of Ephesus, and the endorsement of the bishops of his orthodoxy, including that of Baselyous, Bishop of Salocia, the latter denied his endorsement, which brought sadness to the heart of Dioscorus as he was apparently not stating the facts, and said: “I wonder what carried Baselyous to deny his speech that was recorded in the minutes despite the fact that he knows and understands that he endorsed a true teaching that was presented to us.” He went on to say: “If Eutyches had denounced the truthful doctrine as detailed in his letter, and promoted a strange teaching instead, he should not only be penalized but he is worthy to be burned in fire. As for me, I will never change my mind in relation to the truthful faith of the Apostolic Universal Church. I only care for my salvation, and will keep safe the truthful doctrine and orthodox faith.”

Following this statement by Dioscorus, the secretary re-commenced the reading of the minutes and came to the declaration given by Baselyous of Slocia who stated: “I would excommunicate anyone who dares to segregate the One Christ, following the consolidation of his divinity and manhood, into two natures or two persons or two substances, and thus be unable to find the one nature that is the nature of the Only Incarnated Son.” And as he was present he denied his above confession and statement. Then the judges asked him why he excommunicated Phlabianus of Constantinople who was of that belief; he answered saying: “My judgment was a result of the judgment of some one hundred twenty of even one hundred and thirty bishops, thus I had no other choice but to obey the instructions that they laid down to me.”

At this moment Dioscorus addressed him saying that with this statement he did not tell the truth in relation to the Holy Book that says: *“For by your words you shall be justified, and by your words you shall be found guilty.”* (Matthew 12:37). You have exceeded the limits of conformity and you have insulted the faith. Have not you heard what was written “do not be shy of anything, as that could destroy you?”

As a result of Dioscorus’ preaching, the rest of the bishops felt the severity of their actions, and knowing that they will not be in a position to face his solid arguments and proofs, they found that it would be prudent for them to give up; thus they stood there and said: “We have sinned, and we ask for forgiveness.”

At this moment the judges addressed them saying: “Then why did you state earlier that you were forced to write your names on a blank document when it came to the excommunication of Flabyous”? As they were faced with these facts, they had no alternative but to submit their apology again, saying “We have sinned and we ask for forgiveness.”

It is strange that while the Chalcedonians objected to the actions of Dioscorus in admitting Eusebius the Bishop of Dorylaeum to the second Council of Ephesus, we see them allowing Theodoret a follower of Nestorius, the forbidden bishop, to attend the Council of Chalcedon, which led Pope Dioscorus to reprimand them saying: “You blame me and curse me as if I had acted against the law. I wonder whether

you kept those laws when you admitted Theodoret to the council?" This time the judges replied saying, "Theodoret was admitted in his capacity as a plaintiff." Dioscorus interrupted saying, "So why he was seated at the rank of the bishops?" This time they came back to him saying that both Eusebius and Theodoret were sitting in the same line and that was the line of the plaintiffs.

Further, Dioscorus clarified and explained the justice of the verdict issued on Phlabianus of Constantinople saying: "It is an apparent matter that Phlabianus of Constantinople was expelled, as he called for the belief in two natures following consolidation, and I have proofs of the sayings of the forefathers, starting with Athanasius, Gregorius, and Cyril, and it is forbidden to declare the faith in two natures following consolidation, but we can only state one nature for God, the incarnated Word."

This time the bishops of the east interrupted and said "he (i.e. Phlabianus) claims that this is a saying of Eutyches; Dioscorus said, "we do not articulate in confusion, mixture, division or corruption."³¹

Therefore, with such statements Dioscorus was able to reject the claims that were originally spread by his enemies which claimed that he was a companion of Eutyches in faith, and proved that his confession and declaration of one nature, and this one nature is the direct conclusion of the natural consolidation. Whereas, the teachings of Eutyches called for one nature that is the result of confusion, mixture, division or corruption, the difference between those two declarations is vast,³² and if it was not for that declaration we would not have seen several of the holy church saints refuse the outcome of the Council of Chalcedon such as Saint Timotheous the second of Alexandria, Severius of Antioch, Theodosius of Alexandria and Philoxenus of Mabbog, Boutros the Second, Ya'qub of Sroogh, Ishaq of Antioch and several others excommunicating Eutyches the same way they excommunicated Nestorius; their writings are the main support and proof of such a statement.³³ Thus the Holy Universal Orthodox Apostolic Church has the foundations of its teachings from those forefathers; the misleading statements of the old and new historians of the Byzantines and others, who always try to label our Holy Church with Eutyches' heresy become apparent. In this respect the historian Mosheem said "Eutyches called on one divine nature of Our Lord Jesus Christ that was consolidated with the human nature thus forming Jesus of one divine nature. Yet, it was not clear if this was clear, unclear, sure or unsure, but this statement accompanied by the name of Eutyches was left and abandoned by those who rejected the Council of Chalcedon, led by Zenon and Boutros Al-Kassar; thus they gained the name "the ones of one nature" and not Eutychians, whereas all those named Eutychians are the ones who declared that the divine nature and the human nature consolidated thus forming one nature *only* without any confusion, mixture, division or corruption."³⁴

The acquitting of Eutyches in the second Council of Ephesus did not denote that the council had a similar belief of his doctrine. We all know that the previous Ecumenical Councils would never issue their verdicts on heretics without first making sure that those heretics continued to insist on their own opinions that were totally against and in contradiction with the Orthodox faith. However, in case they were to issue their verdict on heretics, they would do that with sorrow and regret, as they wished that those heretics would repent and come back to follow the righteous doctrine and belief, so that they (as the council members) would be able to issue their verdict of acquitting them. Therefore the second council of Ephesus acted entirely in line with this general rule and acquitted Eutyches. The forefathers argued with him verbally in what he believed and thus he confessed the true faith; then he presented to the council a representation of his faith in his own hand-writing, which proved to be the truthful orthodox faith. Thus the council with its members had no other option but to issue a verdict acquitting him.

Following the above, the Chalcedoneans should not have objected to Dioscorus and other fathers at the second council of Ephesus, but as they witnessed the written confession of Eutyches and the

declaration that formed part of the minutes of this council, they noticed that there was nothing that indicated Eutyches' declaration contradicting with the faith of the saintly fathers and the universal church. However, Eutyches, following the adjournment of the Council changed his stand and went back to declare his original belief; thus Dioscorus and the other fathers who joined him in this council were not at fault. Further, a possibility could have been that Eutyches would become subject to another verdict from a follow-on council based on the fact that he denied his written declaration of the Orthodox faith and went back to his heresy. However, Leo, Bishop of Rome encouraged Eutyches, prior to the latter being cleared by the forefathers in the second council of Ephesus, as he wrote him a letter "commending him on his care of the faith, and calling him the dear son the priest", as mentioned earlier.³⁵

In conclusion, and following the presentation of all these proofs, it is apparent that Dioscorus was innocent and had nothing to do with all the wrong sayings and untruthful statements that were attributed to him by the Council of Chalcedon. Then the judges declared the adjournment of the first session of the council, and decided to reconvene in five days.³⁶

The Second Session

As Rome's representatives became restless and unhappy with the sound argument of Dioscorus, they were sure that if the council members continued their arguments and dialogue with him, he (i.e. Dioscorus) would emerge from this council victorious. Thus, they took advantage of the absence of the judges, agreed with the Nestorians, Eastern bishops, and some other cowardly hesitant bishops to hold a secret session on the third day of the adjournment of the first session (i.e. some two days prior to the council's second session). They did not advise the judges of their agreement; neither did they invite the bishops of Egypt to this meeting. They placed guards on the door of the house where Dioscorus resided to prevent him from leaving in case he attempted to, and then they sent him an invitation to attend this illegal session. He advised their representatives that he would not be able to attend due to the presence of the guards at his door, and those guards were forbidding him from leaving; however, they sent a second and third invitation, and every time he went back to them advising them of the guards and their attitude. Finally, he recognized that the judges would not be attending this illegal session; thus he became puzzled and said, "The council had examined my situation. What would the council need from me now? Do they intend to relinquish and abandon what was decided in the presence of the judges? I would never attend this session if it is not attended by the judges."³⁷

Thus, those cowardly bishops met under the pressure exerted upon them by Rome's representatives, and without establishing any argument with Dioscorus they issued their illegitimate and dishonest verdict against him. This verdict stated that the actions of Dioscorus had become apparent, that he accepted the heresy of Eutyches, which is against the law, and that he obstructed authority and did not give permission for the letter of Leo of the Church of Rome to be recited. Further, the council had invited him three times, as dictated by the Church's law, but he did not abide, and did not attend the council's session... Therefore, due to these reasons, we are authorized by Leo to remove the rank of Bishop from him and expel him from the priesthood. This council issued this verdict on Dioscorus in line with the canons and laws at hand.³⁸

They did not waste time in declaring and publishing this verdict. However, the judges of the council objected to this tyranny and requested that this verdict be quashed. Their efforts were of no avail. The verdict satisfied the needs of Pulcheria and her husband Marcian who were extremely keen to take revenge from Dioscorus.

Well, here we are today presenting to you these awful events, but let me say, the hurtful and destructive giddy actions to the pure Christian conscious. We present these events without any specific interpretation, depending entirely on the history of the Council of Chalcedon that was authored by the opponents themselves.

So, what would be their verdict on the unlawful judge who issued his verdict in a secretive illegal session, held at a time contrary to the decision of the council's first session? That too by a gathering that did not represent the Ecumenical Council, but had most of its members with verdicts issued against them in previous legally held ecumenical councils for being followers of the heresy of Nestorius? This gathering was not attended by the judges, the king's representatives, and the orthodox bishops. This fraudulent verdict was issued in absentia, despite the fact that the plaintiff was near the session's meeting place. This verdict was issued based on claims and accounts that Dioscorus argued against and was acquitted from in the first legal session, when the complainants admitted saying, "we have sinned, and we ask forgiveness." Even in this illegal session, those who issued the verdict did not mention in any way that Dioscorus had swayed away from the true faith. It is worthwhile to note here that the deviation from the true faith would allow the bishops to issue such a verdict, bearing in mind that the council with its full members had earlier declared the innocence of Dioscorus and his council, thus, and unintentionally, confessing the legality of the second council of Ephesus. This was council that demoted Domnus the Bishop of Antioch and Phlabianus the Bishop of Constantinople the Capital, who were found guilty of their admission of two natures following the natural pure consolidation; we have noted the change in the representation in the Council of Chalcedon—Maximus was present instead of Domnus (who was alive at the time), and Anatolyous instead of Phlabianus (who was dead at the time), and we bear in mind that this Anatolyous was promoted by Dioscorus.

Well, if the actions of Dioscorus and that of the second Council of Ephesus were inappropriate, why was Domnus not reinstated on the See of Antioch? Why they did not expel Maximus and Anatolyous? Why were both promoted at the time? Their promotion should have been considered as illegal.³⁹

Following the events that took place in the first session and in the second illegal session, their treacherous aims became apparent, and they, unintentionally, proved the innocence of Dioscorus and his council (the second council of Ephesus); therefore their second verdict on Dioscorus was a failure.

Some of the histories recorded that Dioscorus wished to read the written form of the Creed of the Council of Chalcedon which was sent to him. He read this Creed in front of his bishops, who directly noticed that this Creed was full of statements that were totally against the sayings of the forefathers and the faith declared by the previous Ecumenical Holy Councils. Thus, they wrote their notes on the four margins that proved its unsuitability and inappropriateness, declaring that whoever believes in those statements would be excommunicated, and would be considered as a person who dared to change the true Holy Orthodox doctrine and belief and the laws of the Ecumenical Councils.⁴⁰

Then, following these events Marcian issued a decree for Mor Dioscorus to be exiled to Ghanfarah in Paphlagonia of Smaller Asia [now Turkey]. Further, the Chalcedonians exerted every effort to force the righteous bishops of Egypt to sign Leo's letter, and the declaration of their council, and they decided that they will not diverge an inch away from the true faith that they presented their own lives in defense.

Thus, I reject the Council of Chalcedon, as it changed the true faith, and supported Nestorius' heresy that spoke of the two natures of Our Lord Jesus Christ following the consolidation, dividing the *one* savior in two, and separating the one universal church, scattering its children instead of combining and uniting

them. Thus commenced the divisions and disentanglement between the parties, and the church continues until these days to suffer as a result of this awful division. As a result, great persecution erupted against those who rejected the Council of Chalcedon. Even Fartoryous who forcefully overtook the See of Alexandria with the help of Byzantine soldiers persecuted and killed twenty four thousand of those who followed coherently the forefathers' faith, mostly bishops, priests and monks.⁴¹ Further, the remainder of the orthodox bishops were expelled from their parishes and Sees, and installed instead were those strangers. Thus, the Roman Empire exerted every effort to exile, persecute and discriminate against those who rejected the Council of Chalcedon in order to validate its recommendations,⁴² but all these efforts were of no avail, as the true orthodox faith was so strong in the hearts of those great heroes who were not frightened of the Romans' supremacy and military strength as witnessed by the historians from among the opponents themselves.⁴³ Further, they disregarded the difficulties that they faced and were not worried about exile and expulsion. Among those who faced such a situation was the Syrian Patriarch of Antioch, Boutros the Second (nicknamed Al-Kassar), the saint Barsoum the hermit and the head of the Monasteries of the East, Philoxenus of Mabbog, Severius of Antioch and several more. Thereafter the Church held several other councils in which it excommunicated the declaration of the council of Chalcedon and the tome of Leo. Among these councils it is worthwhile to cite the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople that was held in the year 476 following a decree from Emperor Basyleskous and was attended by Mor Boutros the Second, Patriarch of Antioch, the Saint Timothawous the second Patriarch of Alexandria, and some five hundred bishops. This was followed by a decree that was issued by Basyleskous against the council of Chalcedon and the tome of Leo, confirming and restating the doctrine of one nature in Our Lord Jesus Christ following the consolidation⁴⁴ that was signed by some seven hundred bishops.⁴⁵

Further, in the year 482 yet another council was held in Constantinople by an order of Emperor Zenon. This order was accepted by Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, and was also signed by the representatives of the Bishop of Rome and endorsed by King Zenon under the name (Hantokyoun⁴⁶) which means the union bull that was written at the request of Akak the Patriarch of Constantinople and addressed to the bishops, and faithful in Alexandria, Libya and the five cities. In this bull it was stated, that we totally reject any research, or any attempt to specify in any way shape or form any other belief that is beyond the truthful decision taken by the 318 forefathers, and consider such attempts as strange to us, as this original belief and doctrine is complete, orthodox and was supported by the one hundred fifty forefathers in Constantinople, and was followed by our saint fathers who met saint Cyril, exiled the heretic Nestorius, and accepted the twelve chapters that were written by Beatitude Cyril. Further, we excommunicated Nestorius, the imaginative Eutyches, and who ever thought of any other doctrine or belief that is beyond our true faith that was mentioned earlier. Moreover, we confess of one God, who is of one nature, our God and Saviour Our Lord Jesus Christ who is equal to us in His manhood, who descended and incarnated from the Holy Spirit, and from Our Lady the Holy Virgin Mary is the Son of God. As for those who try to divide Him into two, or think of him as a mixture or a combination., we will not accept them among us, whereas He Who was born of the Virgin Mary had not added another Son, but was confirmed in the Trinity, and the Trinity itself had become confirmed as the Word of God became One of the Trinity in flesh.⁴⁷

From the above it is concluded that the faith in two natures as decided by the Council of Chalcedon is something out of the ordinary when it comes to the Church's teachings and had become a part of the church in a very peculiar way. Thus, it was fought by the faithful fathers, yet it was accepted forcefully by some of the cowardly bishops when hatred had its opportunity. Our guide to such a statement is that the aforementioned Hantokyoun of Zenon was not only accepted by those churches in Antioch and Alexandria but also by the church of Constantinople. And this document does not confess the faith of the first three

Ecumenical Councils and the twelve chapters of Cyril that supports the one nature of God the Incarnated Word.

However, if we intend to go on tracing the historic events that followed this period of time, and the developments of the argument on one and two natures or one or two wills, we will need a long time. But, Hereclius in the seventh century suggested that the research on the doctrine of one nature and two natures be left alone, and the doctrine of the belief in one nature in the Incarnated Word should be circulated and accepted by all. This statement was welcomed by several of the bishops amongst them Enoryous Bishop of Rome who, and as a result of this sent to Sergious Patriarch of Constantinople saying, “as for will I confess in one will in Jesus⁴⁸, thus the confession of one will would directly defeat any teachings of two natures.”

Thus, what we have mentioned in this brief time, in this speech, is sufficient to convince the smart researcher that the belief in one nature of God the Incarnated Word is the universal belief of the universal church since its establishment.

4. The Oneness of the Incarnated God and the Fathers of the Church

As mentioned earlier the forefathers of the Church in the different generations believed in one nature of God the Incarnated Word and in this regard had left for us a vast amount of solid research, obvious interpretations, and truthful confessions. We now have the opportunity to only mention some of those:

1. In his book, “Faith and the True God who is without body became apparent in body being whole in true and full divinity,” Saint Gregorios the Miraculous (+270) stated that He is *not* two persons, and does not have two natures, and we do state that we believe in a quadrant, God, The Son of God, The Human, and the Holy Spirit.⁴⁹

2. At the time when the forefathers composed the known Nicaean Creed they referred to all the eternal and the earthly issues and the high and the humble deeds combined that happened through the *One* and that is Our Lord Jesus Christ. In this respect they said: “True God from the True God... Descended from heaven and incarnated ... crucified ... suffered, died, buried and resurrected ... and ascended to heaven.”

3. In his letter to King Youbyanous, Saint Athanasious the Apostle (+373) said, “we should believe in one nature, one person of God the Perfect Incarnated Word, and whoever does not believe in this would be in divergence with God and would create a rift between Him and the saintly fathers.” Further, in his article on Incarnation, he said, “The Godhood and the Manhood combined in one nature, and that is the God and human simultaneously with one action, and one nature for God the Word that had incarnated.”

4. In the fourth century, Julius the Bishop of Rome wrote in his letter to Dionosious the Bishop of Cyprus saying, “Those who do not confess that God who descended from heaven became incarnated of a Virgin, and He is one in His body will be counted amongst the deceivers and the fraudulent, who would state that the news they received is that He is of two natures. Therefore, those who speak of two natures should not worship the two but the one nature.⁵⁰ Further, in one of his letters, and on the topic, ‘*Equal in Substance*,’ he said, “In the divine book we did not find any difference between the Word and His body, but both are one nature, one person, one action and all one *God* one *Human*.” He added, “If the act happened by one thus the action would be one, I mean, with this the act of the actor.”⁵¹

5. The Sun and the Prophet of the Syrians, St. Ephraim (+373), in an elegy on the Friday of Passion said: "They presented a stick to humiliate the great Creator; they nailed the hand that measured the heavens. For God in His Christ had salvaged the creation that He created. The sons of Adam nailed those hands that originally created Adam, yet God stood there in the court room and was slapped on His face by the hands of a slave. We cannot bear to hear a tiny word, while God is hanged on the cross, and the creation is mourning. We drank the wine and committed the greatest sin."

6. In his interpretation of the verse, "God created me," St. Baselious says: We say that the *One Son* is two, and we do not say that "*Priesthood*" is one by itself, neither the "*Manhood*" is one by itself; but we say one nature, one person, just as St. Peter did not say two natures, but confessed saying: "Jesus suffered for us in flesh, and in relation to His birth in flesh the angels spread the good news to the shepherds saying: "Today a saviour was born who is Jesus God." ⁵²

7. Saint Gregoreous Althe'ologous says, "He is one person, one nature worshiped by the Wise men, whereas the oneness of God the Word should not be considered by counting how many natures, or persons, but the fact that He was born of a virgin who kept her virginity throughout without any change... He is One Son, thus there are no two natures of Jesus following consolidation, and he is not a separation or a mixture of what resulted from two sides, because the nature of the priesthood and the nature of the manhood combined into oneness."

8. In the third article of his interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians St. John the Chrysostom says: "I would declare here that God the Word took the whole human from our nature, and he is complete in everything. He has his own person, and with this I mean the *Word*, and for this we say He is one nature, the Word that becomes flesh."

9. Saint Cyril of Alexandria says: "We confess that the Son of God is God in Spirit, and the Son of human in flesh, thus there are *no* two natures of this One Son, one to be worshiped while the other would not be worshiped, but we worship the Word the Incarnated God of one nature." Further, in his correspondence with King Theodosius says: "We would not uncliothe the manhood of the priesthood, and would not uncliothe the Word of the manhood following that mysterious consolidation that is difficult to interpret, but we confess that the one Jesus is composed of two combined that are one formed of two, without any destruction to any of those two natures, without any mixture, but through pure and honorable consolidation in purpose." Moreover, he says: "The two natures are combined, and the Word became human, and incarnated. Thus we say this consolidation is natural in order to defeat the untruthful statements that aim at separating us from the union with God the Almighty through holiness and virtuousness "i.e. partakers of the divine nature" (2 Peter 1:4).⁵³ Moreover, and in his letter to Sophokyouos we read, "If we contemplate the trend that does not impair saying: "Prior to the consolidation the natures were two, however following the consolidation these natures would not be separated; thus we cannot refer to two sons, but we do not segregate that which is not subject to any segregation, but say the One Son as our fathers said, and the substance of God is the One Incarnated Word."⁵⁴ In addition to all the above, and in the same context, and in chapter five of his twelve chapters says: "whoever dares and says that Jesus is human, and God descended in him, and would not say that He is True God, One Son in nature as the Word became flesh (John 1:14), and shared with us the flesh and blood (Hebrews 2:12) should be excommunicated."⁵⁵

5. The Oneness of the Incarnated God – Theologically

The Churches of the Syrian Orthodox of Antioch, the Alexandrian Coptic, the Armenian and the Ethiopian believe in one nature, one person, one will, and one action of the eternal God the incarnated without any mixture, division or corruption.

As for the Roman Catholic, Greek and Protestant churches, they believe that Our Lord Jesus Christ and following the consolidation of natural truthful substance is of two natures, one which is divine that acts of what is unique to the priesthood, while the other is human which acts of what is unique to the manhood.

Thus, while our Church confesses the consolidation of the two natures in aphorism and action, the other churches call for the segregation of those two natures, even if they intend to consolidate them in a linguistic way, thus differentiating between Jesus *God* and Jesus human, as it refers some actions to the priesthood, while other actions to the manhood, as it is evident in Leo of Rome's saying in his letter, "Truly, Jesus the two Gods—the one human brilliantly conveys miracles while the other is a recipient of humiliation." While our Church states that whatever relates to priesthood and whatever relates to the manhood are referred to equally in the Incarnated Word without any discrimination. This opinion is based on brilliant arguments, solid proofs, if those proofs are logical, historical and even the testimony of the opponents themselves.

Well, in order to shed some light on such a complicated matter, it is prudent that we understand what *Nature* is, what *Person* is, and what is meant by the natural person consolidation.

The philosophers had defined *Nature* saying: The word *Nature* describes the truthful or essential characteristics by which something is recognized (its truth and its essence). As in our saying, "*The Nature of God*," this means God himself. As for '*Person*' this describes that this thing itself had acted, or in other words, the '*Person*' is a spiritual essence of a nature that is able to participate with others, while its purpose is to stand alone away from consolidation with others.⁵⁶ The '*Person*' allows for individuals to be distinguished between each other; thus we can distinguish Peter from Paul, and Paul from John.

'*Person*' is a more general term than individual or someone or being. We Syrians recognize '*Person*' as being the specialized essence, or the specialized nature, which can refer to the Creator and the created together. As for '*Individual*,' it relates to the created; thus when '*Self*' is specialized it becomes '*Person*' whether that was in relation to the Creator or any other being. However, if the description is stated thus this is a '*Person*.'⁵⁷

In this context, in his Encyclopedia [*Mnorath Qudshe*], Mor Gregorios Bar 'Ebroyo says: We clergy understand that each essence is a nature and each nature is an essence. A nature, in our comprehension, is not established on conditions, rather conditions are established in a nature; while according to these outsiders each essence is a nature, but not each nature is an essence. The same conditions that prevail in an essence, as the outsiders see it, is different from each other. Nature, either proper or general, as understood by us and those outsiders, thus the proper nature is *Person*, and based on this fact nature could not exist if it does not have a *Person* in reality, but in creation only. As for the many *Persons* it is not impossible to have several of those combined in a general nature.⁵⁸

Further, Bishop Isidoros says: "Nature, when compared to intellectual or physical creatures can be considered either in its exclusive or general way. If it is considered in its general way it will cover each and every kind of its physical creatures, such as Peter, Paul, John who are considered of the human kind,

horse, beast of prey, donkey, cat of the animal kind, while Michael, Gabrielle are from the spirit kind. However, if it is considered in its exclusive way it will take into account the *Person* or *Individual* from the kind such as Peter only from the human kind, horse only from the animal kind and Michael only from the spirit kind.

An anonymous [person] stated, “where there is an essence there is exclusiveness and generalization. Thus exclusiveness would be an essence thus the *Person* is one. But in case of generalization there will be too many *Persons*.” He went further saying: “The substance, or nature or essence in specific is the *Person*, thus it is impossible to have a substance, or nature of essence without *Person* in action with the exception of mind.”⁵⁹

What is the Meaning of Consolidation?

Consolidation in general is the result of two or more things that are grouped into one thing. However, in theology, consolidation—union without confusion, mixture, division or corruption, which is in the substance, is not subject to change, confusion or corruption. It is in a way similar to the union between the soul and the body without any confusion, mixture, division or corruption. It would also be similar to the union between fire and steel, and electricity and wire.

Each, the soul and the body keep whatever is specific to each of them in this union, whereas if the soul is changed into the body, it would have been robbed of the ability to speak or think and any other unique actions that it is known of, thus became similar to the animals, would have been perished with death, and could have been transformed into sand. Further, in case that the body in this union is transformed into the soul, this body would not have needed the food or drink. Therefore, each (the body and the soul) would keep what is specific and unique to each of them despite this union.

That kind soul, when it approaches its union with that heavy body it affects this body, but it does not get affected by this body, whereas with this union the soul would deliver to the body whatever it has of life and honor thus differentiating this body from animals' body through intellectual abilities. Therefore, the human being is composed of two substances, one is earthly and the other one is heavenly, and in this specialized union they transformed into one; thus no matter what happens to a part of this one united presence that is composed of the union of two it will affect the whole human being. It is a fact that some actions would only happen with the soul, while others would happen for the body or any part of this body. But, as far as both are united and the human being is one that is composed of different parts that are combined naturally, whatever happens to the parts would be directed and referred to the whole. As we say, John ate, drank or slept, or we say Salem is an engineer, lawyer, dead or alive.

Saint Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria says, “we have taken a perfect example of the union between the fire and steel to try and simplify this union between the manhood and the priesthood. Even if both are different in nature, they became of one nature as they become united, the same as it is the case with fire and steel, whereas with such union neither the steel is transformed into fire, nor the fire would be transformed into steel... whereas when the steel is hit by the instrument with the fire, the fire is hitting the steel that is suffering, while the fire does not suffer.”⁶⁰

Saint Cyril goes on saying, and this time in his letter to Luteekos, Bishop of Caesarea (we have to take example out of our nature we human being, as we are created of a soul and body, and both have different natures prior to the union, and with the union both formed one human with one nature. Thus the soul did not change its nature when it became united with the body, and it did not become the body, and the body did not become the soul, but the soul and body became one nature, thus one person.”⁶¹

Thus, we understand the union of the priesthood and the manhood in *One* Jesus, and that is what the Holy Book in its divine script aimed at. This is what the virtuous fathers meant in their statements, and that is what the uncorrupted mind would believe in. Thus, we should not address as two, the two natures that have been united, as following the union between the priesthood and the manhood those become *One* and not two. In the same token, regarding the union between soul and body in the human being, we do not refer to this union as an intellectual and animal, but we say an intellectual animal. Further, we could not see an easier example to the human mind than this example, the union between the sweetness of the *Word* with the greatness of the *Manhood*. Thus, following the union we would not say a human and God, neither would we say a God and a human, but we say the *Human God*, and the *God Human*, and as it is apparent in the words of the scripture, '*God the Incarnated Word*'.

6. The Oneness of the Incarnated God and the Holy Bible

From the above we came to understand that the followers of the Council of Chalcedon, while they confess the union of the two natures, the Priesthood, and Manhood, of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in expression, they call for the division of those two in reality. This belief explains what was written in that Leo's famous tome that states "truly, Christ the two "God and Man" would come, whereas the first would surprise all with the miracles conveyed, while the second would be subject to humiliation." This belief and conviction is well away from the spirit of the Holy Bible. The Holy Divine Book did not differentiate between the two natures of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and His person, and its divine contents clearly demonstrate the *One* nature of the *Incarnated God*, whereas all actions (both majestic and humble) are referred to Him. Further, in several instances, the divine content would refer the eternal actions to the earthly and the earthly actions to the divine without any distinction between the actions. The reason behind this is that whatever is done by Jesus Christ is referred to *One* God, who is the *God the Incarnated Word*.

1. John the Theologian says in the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ, "*I am the first and the last; I am He who lives, and was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore.*" (Matthew 1:17-18). The speaker here is the eternal priesthood, while at the same time He says (I was dead), but the event; the death of the Incarnated Word did not happen in priesthood, but in manhood. However, the expression (I) at the beginning of the verse and towards the end of the verse is a solid proof that there is only *One* nature of the Incarnated Word, and that what was behind referring both death and life to *Him*. We should not be surprised; whereas the Holy Bible refers death to the soul, due to its union with body, bear in mind that the soul is eternal, and the death should only be referred to the body. In the Old Testament, we read, "*Then you shall select for yourselves cities to be cities of refuge for you; that the person who kills someone unaware may flee there.*" (Numbers 35:11), and in the same token the author of Proverbs says: "*And they lie in wait, they hide themselves to shed blood.*" (Proverbs 1:18). Thus, we would not diverge from the spirit's way, and the strength of the Holy Scriptures, when we say *God* suffered, crucified and died, because both the priesthood and manhood and following their natural substance union became *One*.

2. Our Lord Jesus Christ says: "... *before Abraham was born, I was.*" (John 8:58), thus who *was* before Abraham was *His* priesthood and not in *His* manhood, whereas eternity is a description of manhood. While, we need to consider here that the speaker is the manhood who has an end, but what He talks about demonstrates eternity which is a description of manhood. Further, in this verse He did not say Priesthood was, but said "*I Was*". With the expression (I) is a solid proof of the *One* nature of the Incarnated Word, whereas (I) would never ever refer to two.

3. St. Paul says: “... *for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory.*” Who was apparent on the cross was the Son of Man – *Manhood* – but the verse here states the crucified is the *Lord of Glory*. This naming would never be given to a simple human; the *Lord of Glory* is a True God. Further, the verse is very specific in expressing that the Lord of Glory who is *One* in His nature is the same who was crucified by the Jews. Thus, in case they crucified a pure human, curse would not have followed their whole generations; we could have continued to be living with our original sin, and the aim of the Incarnation of the Word God would not have been achieved. That which aimed at the salvation of the humans from the slavery of death, evil and sin. Thus, it would be incomprehensible to have that manhood, no matter how virtuous this manhood is, erase that severe first sin of the human kind, if this manhood was not united with the priesthood, which bestowed on the manhood that great value which equates to the importance of redemption and the repayment of the divine judgment. Thus, through the participation of the priesthood with the manhood in suffering, crucifixion and death, the substance of the priesthood was not affected. In the same context the human being is a union between the soul and the body and in some instances sorrow might have its impact on the soul; thus the body might be affected and as a result become ill. Further, on some other occasions some pain and suffering might affect the body of the human being, such as the amputation of one of the limbs; thus the soul would participate with the body in the suffering. In both cases nothing would depart the soul’s substance, despite the missing limb of the body. Thus, in this context we can explain how the priesthood participated with the manhood in the suffering without losing anything from the substance of the priesthood. This in itself is what the saint fathers, church scholars of the first century understood, as it is apparent in the Syriac poem on faith written by Mor Ishaq of Antioch that says: “it is the pride of the church that *God* died on the cross.

4. St. Paul also says: “*For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.*” (Romans 5:10). Well, is not the Son of God also God? Then how come the Son of God dies? Thus, St. Paul, and in this verse, did not differentiate between the Priesthood and Manhood, as he says: “... God has reconciled us with the death of His Son” which means the death of the manhood for our sake. This is an evidence of the existence of one nature, one action of the Incarnated Word.

5. St. John says: “*For God so loved the world that he even gave his only begotten Son.*” (John 3:16). This verse is of no difference to the previous verse; it demonstrates the *Love* of God to the world, even to sacrifice His Son. Further, it cannot be stated here that the sacrificed was only the manhood, but what is meant with in the context of this verse is simple, the *Only Son of God*. Thus, it is imprudent to state here that the sacrificed is only the priesthood of the Son, bearing in mind that the sacrifice had impacted the manhood. Therefore, the logical conclusion of this argument would be that the Son the Incarnated Word is one nature one person.

6. St. Paul also says: “*Take heed therefore to yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit has appointed you overseers, to feed the church of Christ which he has purchased with his blood.*” (Acts 20:28). Well, does St. Paul here mean the blood of God? God is a spirit, and the spirit neither has flesh nor blood. Thus, was the mystery of salvation completed with merely the blood of manhood? Thus, what is its importance to the world? And why would this verse refer to the blood of God? The logical conclusion in reply to all these questions would be that the mystery of salvation was completed by the Son the Incarnated Word; referring the description of one nature to the other, as it is apparent in this verse, is a solid and unyielding proof of the statement ‘*One Nature*’ and the action of this statement.

7. St. John says about Our Lord Jesus Christ: “*No man has ascended to heaven except him who came down from heaven, even the Son of man who is in heaven.*” (John 3:13). The description, ‘The Son of Man’ refers to the Incarnated Son following the incarnation. Here Saint John refers to the ascension to Him and descent from heaven to Him, and both actions were undertaken by the priesthood that

descended from heaven; what descended from heaven is the priesthood, and not the manhood, as the latter was begotten from Virgin Mary. Therefore, the saint was right in referring both to the ascension to and descent from heaven to the Son of Man as the union between the Person the Eternal Word with the earthly body becoming *One*, and that this *One* is treated in the third person singular in the context of the above verse is in itself a solid proof of what we have been arguing all along.

8. St. Paul says: "*Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and for ever.*" This verse is also similar to those already mentioned so far, whereas the word '*Jesus*' is the name that the Word took when incarnated, the verse here describes Jesus as "for ever" which is one of the descriptions of the manhood. Further, the word '*same*' is included in this verse to re-assert the proof that there is only one nature one person God the Incarnated Word.

9. St. Paul says: "... *The first-born of God, [the only Son] who is in the bosom of his Father, He has declared Him.*" (John 1:18). Thus, the Only son had declared the news to the visible human, the news that became apparent to and heard by the saint. In this verse He says "who" which means He is in the bosom of the Father. This Only Son is one in substance, thus if He is one in the scripture and one in the mind He is one in substance. And He is One Son, He is One person of One nature. Further, having referred to Him twice in this verse is in itself a solid proof that He is of one nature.

10. At the time when the Incarnated Word baptized at the hands of John the Baptist in the River Jordan, the Divine Voice from heaven addressed Him directly saying: "... *This is my beloved Son, with whom I am pleased.*" (Matthew 3:17). Well, did God mean in this saying His son in manhood only? As the manhood was being baptized at the time, and this manhood by himself can never be considered a natural Son of God the Father. In the same context, it is impossible to say here that what was meant with the word *Son* was the priesthood Son, as the divine words came at the time Our Lord Jesus Christ was in the water, and the dove descended on His forehead... therefore, what is meant here is the Son the Incarnated Word of one consolidated nature.

11. St. Paul says: "*We see that he is Jesus, who humbled himself to become a little lower than the angels through his suffering and his death, but now he is crowned with glory and honor; for he tasted death for the sake of every one but God. And it was meet and proper for him, in whose hand is everything and for whom are all things, to bring many sons to glory, so that from the very beginning of their salvation they are made perfect through sufferings.*" (Hebrews 2:9 and 10).⁶² Thus the apostle when he states, '*Jesus*' that is followed by '*himself*' in his grace tasted death, he did not differentiate between his priesthood and manhood, and thus supports the fact that Jesus Christ is of one nature one person. This statement is supported by the saints and fathers, such as St. Ephraim (+373) who says in the elegy of Good Friday, "They presented a stick to humiliate the great Creator; they nailed the hand that measured the heavens. For God in His Christ had salvaged the creation that He created. The sons of Adam nailed those hands that originally created Adam, yet God stood there in the court room and was slapped on His face by the hands of a slave. We cannot bear to hear a tiny word, while God is hanged on the cross, and the creation is mourning." Further, in his twelve chapters, St. Cyril says "that who does not confess that the Word of God suffered in flesh, tasted death in flesh, and became the first-dead to be alive who creates life, should be excommunicated."

In addition to the above verses, there are several other verses that discuss this same topic: Ephesians 4:11, 1 Corinthians 8:6, Galatians 4:4, Ephesians 4:8-10, Timothy 3:16, Philippians 2:6-8, Hebrews 1:31, 1 Corinthians 10:4, 1 Corinthians 10:9, Luke 1:44, Colossians 2:9, Timothy 2:13, and John 10:38.

Going through the above divine verses it becomes apparent that there is a union between the Divine Word of God and the Incarnated body by the Holy Spirit from the Holy Virgin Mary, this union is natural, pure and beyond any multiplication or division.

In addition to the supernatural birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ which in itself is solid proof of the union of priesthood and manhood, the fact that the virginity of the Holy Virgin Mary continued even after the birth, thus the prophecy of Ezekiel about Holy Virgin Mary was fulfilled "... *This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it because the Lord, the God of Israel, will enter in by it; therefore shall it be shut.*" (Ezekiel 44:2).

If birth is considered of only the birth of manhood – as they claim – thus the virginity of Holy Virgin Mary should have ceased with the birth, but as it is evident that the virginity of Holy Virgin Mary continued after the birth in the same status as it was before the birth; in this statement itself there is a solid proof that the union of priesthood and manhood had happened. One of our fathers asked those who believe in two natures of Our Lord Jesus Christ, "Did the Holy Virgin Mary give birth to a God or a Man. If you say she gave birth to a God you are misled as God is not born, and if you say a Man she was the mother of Man and not the mother of God, thus you are denying Him in nature. Further, if you answer this question by saying she gave birth to a God and Man, making her the mother of God and Man, she would thus have two Sons, one God and the other Man, and such a statement lacks logic and it is totally fraudulent. Therefore, the proper statement describing such an event would be God and Man became *One*, thus the Holy Virgin Mary gave birth to *One*. The *One* that was born from the Holy Virgin Mary is not totally God, not totally human, nor He is God and Human, *But He is Incarnated God*, and this is the whole truth.⁶³

7. The Oneness of the Incarnated God and the Opponents of the Church

1. In the *History of Division of Jeronemous Masarah of the Greek Orthodox [Church]*, p. 193, we read, "Apparently the teachers of the west were in agreement with those of Alexandria in the method and expression as it is apparent from the letters of Julius the Pope of Rome to Dionosious the Bishop of Cyprus in the midst of the fourth century, although he failed to confess the two natures, and he based his denial on the sayings of the Holy Bible, 'The *Word* become flesh' and the saying of St. Paul, 'One God Our Lord Jesus Christ'. Further, he confessed in one nature of priesthood who did not suffer and the manhood that suffered."

2. In the book, *The true faith in Our Lord Jesus Christ*, that was authored by one of the Roman Catholic Bishops, and was translated to Arabic and printed first in Rome, then in Beirut in the year 1864, pp. 92-93, he said, the Roman Church believes and teaches that there are two natures of Jesus, then declares excommunication on anyone who does not believe in *One* nature of Jesus. In the same context this what was written following the Council of Lataria that was held as ordered by St. Martino the Pope in the year 649 in the fifth canon as follows: "that whoever does not believe in the opinion of the holy fathers that truly there is *One* nature of God the Word in Jesus, is a proof that Jesus took our substance completely with the exception of sin should be excommunicated."

3. In the book, "The Summary of the Theological Articles" by Beiruni JR, (translated by Fr. Yousef Al-Dibis) vol. 3, p. 171, in a comment on the sayings of the fathers he states: "*One* nature of the Incarnated Word" that was written as "What I want is that they know the *One* incarnated nature has become *One* following union, and I confess to that. But if they state the same for the nature I would deny that."

Further, on p. 183 of the same book we read what supports the saying, “one action of Our Lord Jesus Christ” as he says: “I confess that Jesus became apparent as *One*, or it can be stated *One* combined action following the supernatural union between the two natures and their ability to commit *One* action.”

4. In the book, *The Teaching Principles in Traditional Theology*, of the Protestants, vol. 2, p. 199, we read what totally agrees with our merciful doctrine and belief. It reads: “The actions of Jesus, some are totally divine such as miracles, while others are total human, such as drinking, eating and sleeping, and others are both divine and human and those actions that need both the priesthood and manhood natures to participate as it happened in the mystery of redemption. It is clear that all those actions are the actions of one person, and the actions of Jesus are the actions of a divine Person, even if those actions are a characteristic of humans. Therefore, it is allowed to consider the obedience and suffering of Jesus, even if that obedience and suffering is of the divine nature, that it is the obedience and suffering of the divine *Person*. Thus, the *Person's* soul could never be injured or burned, but when the body suffers, we would state that the whole human suffered. Based on this principle, we say, that the obedience of Jesus is the righteousness of God, and the blood of Jesus is a divine blood, thus it is concluded that the eternal settlement took place. Further, it might happen that the name *Christ* might be given when talking about an action that was done by one nature, and this action was a specialty of another nature. For instance, when we talk about Him delivering Himself to death, here we refer to God, the Son of God, and the God of Glory, and also we refer to Man, the Son of Man, and whatever actions that were referred to Him that are of divine nature. From those sayings the Son of Man who forgives the sins, the God of Sabbath, raises the dead, sends the angels to pick up His elect.

5. The Catholic Archimandrite Vladimir Guette, in the fifth volume of his book, *The Church's History*, about the Council of Chalcedon that decided the doctrine of the two natures, says: “The recommendations and decision of the Council of Chalcedon includes expressions that are beyond the Nestorius heresy, whose ghost frightened and continues to frighten thus apparent to all.” The author declares here saying: “A number of bishops who abstained from confessing the legitimacy of the Council of Chalcedon should really be excused, whereas the recommendations and decisions of this council especially those in relation to the doctrine and belief, included expressions that might even damage the Nestorius' heresy.” (Guett T., 5, p. 46). Moreover, he says: “Leo Bishop of Rome was led by his jealousy for his crusade; the jealousy that he led everyone to believe is his zealousness for religion.” (vol. 5, p. 21).⁶⁴

Thus, from the above testimonies that were derived from the opponents themselves, we comprehend, and others who have a living conscience should comprehend and understand with us, that our Holy Church did not diverge an inch from its orthodox faith that was delivered to it from the virtuous apostles and the holy fathers, but continued to safe-keep this doctrine and belief without any change. It paid dearly to safe keep this doctrine that calls for '*One Nature of God the Incarnated Word*,' producing even thousands of martyrs, [whose names are] written in the white pages of history of this fruitful struggle, and receiving the victorious crown through the strength of its saviour Our Lord Jesus Christ who promised that He will be with us for eternity; the doors of hell would never prevail against it.

Conclusion

The above was what I wished to talk to you about in your esteemed conference, in reply to the invitation received from the members of this conference. I pray to God to support us for His glory, for the spread of His divine kingdom, and for the gathering of all the scattered sheep in one yard, thus confirming the Holy Church on the rock of the orthodox faith. O Christ please listen to us. Amen.

1. The translator, Theodora Issa, acknowledges the assistance of V. Rev. Fr. Boutros Touma Issa, Afodyakno Touma Issa, and Afodyakno Theodore Issa for their insightful comments and immense help, as well as the support of Bathqyomo Marine Khoury-Issa, and sisters Tomayess and Tamara. Further, thanks are extended to Dr. Thomas Joseph and Dr. Matti Moosa.
2. 'Yowakheem' in the Arabic text. (tr.)
3. d. 1980. (tr.)
4. *Bthulto Qadishto Maryam, Yoldath Aloho*. (tr.)
5. The author here specifies that this soul thinks and speaks. (tr.)
6. This statement was derived from the meaning of those verses from St. Peter's Epistle to the Philippians. Also please refer to St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews 4:15. (tr.)
7. These are the verses 19 and 20 that were not included in the original version of this lecture, but there was a reference to those two verses I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Then he charged his disciples not to tell any man that he was the Christ.
8. This whole paragraph was derived from the verses 21-24 from Matthew chapter 16; only a part of verse 24 was recorded word by word by the author. (tr.)
9. *Al-Khareedah Al-Nafeesah* Vol. 1, pp. 462-482, on Julius the Roman's tome to Dionysios, Bishop of Cyprus and *Nahj Waseem* of Bishop Jirjes Shahin the Catholic, p. 20, and the *History of the Division of Gorgeous Masarah* vol. 1, p. 191 and p. 192 and the *History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 1, pp. 306-307.
10. The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch, vol. 1, p. 307. The Speech of the Crostomos in the sayings of Our Lord Jesus Christ ("Not as I wish but as you wish." Matthew 26:39).
11. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, p. 36.
12. Mother of God.
13. Flavian (tr.)
14. *The Chalcedon Council Book*, in Arabic, (Rome, 1694) (34:41).
15. *Ibid* (14:43 and 43).
16. *The History of Chalcedon Council* (18:89).
17. *The History of the Second Council of Ephesus* (Syriac), and the *History of the Church* by Bar 'Ebroyo (Demnos Translation), and the *History of Mor Michael Rabo*, p. 180, and the *History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 123-135.
18. *The History of Mor Michael Rabo*, p. 180.
19. *The History of the Council of Chalcedon*, 15:45, and 16:62. *The History of the Second Council of Ephesus* (Syriac), and the *History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 119-147.
20. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 133-137 and 309-313.
21. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 148-150.
22. *The History of Division*, Jaraseemous Masarah, 1:225.
23. *The History of Nations in Brief*, Bar 'Ebroyo, 2nd Edition, p. 85.
24. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, p. 150 and the *History of the Coptic Nation and its Church*, Madam Butcher vol. 2, p. 51.
25. Please refer to *Al-Khareedah Al-Nafeesah*, vol. 1, p. 497.
26. Lumon the Jesuit, vol. 1, p. 258; *The History of Syria*, Madbas, vol. 4, p. 104; *The History of Division*, vol. 1, p. 266, and *The History of the Syrian Church*, vol. 2, p. 154.
27. Bar 'Ebroyo on the Council of Chalcedon in the translation of Maximus, and the *History of Mor Michael Rabo*, p. 187.
28. Please refer to the *History of the Council of Chalcedon* in Arabic, Chapter 18: 84 and 85, and the *History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 108-109 and 159-160.
29. *The History of the Council of Chalcedon*, Chapter 18: 8-83.
30. Please refer to the royal decrees in the *History of the Council of Chalcedon*, 18:89. *The History of Syria* of Madbas, vol. 4:405, and the *History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 145-147 and 168.
31. These people earlier claimed that some of Dioscoros' men, and three monks, followers of Eutyches, and the soldiers forced them to expel Flabyous, and had threatened them with beating and exile, frightened them with swords and other weapons, and thus they signed a blank document. The truth was finally discovered, and they were unable to deny it any longer; thus they confessed their wrong doing. These claims were repeated by several of the Byzantian writers, and several others up to this date including Dr. Asad Rustum in his book *Rum-Byzantines*, vol. 1, p. 126, and in the book, *The*

- Church of the City of God—Antioch*, vol. 1, p. 334; this book did not only contain similar claims, but in addition several of the Nestorians, Protestant, and Latin opinions, and even some of those claims were referred back to sources that had nothing to do with it, and even such claims would be considered to those same sources as old women's fantasies. (Please read all these events in the *History of the Council of Chalcedon* in Arabic, printed in Rome, and *Al-Kharidah Al-Nafisah*, vol. 1, p. 528, and the *History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 158-178.
32. *Al-Kharidah Al-Nafisah*, vol. 1, p. 531, and the *History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, p. 173, 129 and 313.
 33. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 231-309.
 34. *Mosheem Century*, second part, chapter 5:23.
 35. Please refer to the earlier paragraphs of this speech.
 36. *The History of the Council of Chalcedon*, chapter 27:163-171.
 37. *The History of the Council of Chalcedon*, chapter 28:171-176. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, p. 176 .
 38. *The History of the Council of Chalcedon*, chapter 28:187 & 188.
 39. *Al-Kharidah Al-Nafisah*, vol. 1, p 534. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 116-167.
 40. *The History of the Coptic Church*, Priest Manassa Pierre Youhanna, p. 310.
 41. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 195-198, as derived from the writing of the faithful historians.
 42. *Kaldo Athur*, vol. 2, p. 133.
 43. *Ibid*, pp. 132-133.
 44. *The History of Division*, vol. 2, p. 265.
 45. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2, pp. 231-232.
 46. Henoticon. (tr.)
 47. *The History of the Syrian Church of Antioch*, vol. 2 pp. 241-242. *Al-Kharidah Al-Nafisah* vol. 1 pp. 550–551 and 553-554.
 48. *Al-Kharidah Al-Nafisah*, vol. 2, p. 124; *The History of Division*, vol. 1, p. 192.
 49. *Al-Kharidah Al-Nafisah*, vol. 2, p. 124; *The History of Division*.
 50. *Manarat Al-Akdas*, Chapter 2, Section 2, sub-section 4, paragraph 4 of the *Theoretical Recommendation of Bishop Eedoros*, p. 188.
 51. *Al Manarah M2 F2 B4* and 4 and *Al-Mataleeb Al-Nazarieh*, p. 188.
 52. *Theology*, Michael Mina vol. 1, p. 342, and *Al-Kharidah Al-Nafisah*, vol. 1, pp. 462-481.
 53. *Manarat Al-Akdas* "Minorath Qudshe" and *Al-Mataleeb Al-Nazareyah*, p. 189.
 54. *Ibid*.
 55. *Kaldou Athur*, vol. 2, p. 129.
 56. *The Science of Theology*, Michael Mina, vol. 1, p. 324.
 57. *Al-Mataleeb Al-Nazaryah*, p. 104.
 58. *The Fourth Base*, chapter 1.
 59. *Al-Mataleeb Al-Nazaryah*, p. 105.
 60. The fourth chapter of the manuscript "Majame" of Ibn El-Mukafa'.
 61. *Ibid* and *Dioscoros*, a book authored by Kumous Armanyouos of Ethiopia Shata Al-Barmawi, p. 186 and p. 187.
 62. They object... I have read this verse in several prints and translations..., the prints that are in the hands of the Syrians, Greeks, Europeans, Armenenans, Copts, Croats, Cecilians, Serbs, and Ethiopians. However, the text itself would not give the meaning its value, and this relates to other verses that are derived from the sayings of the Apostles. *Al-Mataleeb Al-Nazareah*, p. 187, chapter 5, section 4 of the fourth division of *Manarat Al-Akdas* of the scholar Bar 'Ebroyo.
 63. *Theology*, Komos Michael Mina (second edition), vol. 1, p. 336.
 64. Please refer to the *The Age of Councils*, Rev. Kerelus Al-Antony, pp. 216-217.