

TEO, ISSN 2247-4382
79 (2), pp. 77-90, 2019

Christological Prototype and Anthropological Paradigm in Explaining the Hypostatic Union at Leontius of Byzantium and St. Cyril of Alexandria

Vasile CRISTESCU

Vasile CRISTESCU

“Al. I. Cuza” University of Iași
Email: veniamin2001@yahoo.de

Abstract: In his dispute with the Nestorians and the Euthyrians, Leontius of Byzantium explained how the natures of Christ were united in His unique hypostasis and at the same time the unity of this hypostasis. For this he used the analogy of unity between the body and soul of man. This analogy is used to explain that the Word in His nature is united to our body and that it is never seen without it. St. Cyril of Alexandria uses the analogy between the constitution of Christ and man in the answer given to Nestorius to explain the hypostatic union in Christ, but never develops an anthropological reflection for itself, beyond the framework of the history of salvation. Moreover, at St. Cyril there is a limit of the anthropological comparison with the constitution of Christ, a limit assumed and preserved by Leontius. Like St. Cyril, Leontius emphasizes that the constitution of man can only be a paradigm. The model, the prototype, is the hypostatic union in Christ.

Keywords:

God's Word, hypostasis, nature, hypostatic union, body, soul, model, prototype, paradigm.

I. Introduction: Modern problematic evaluations of Leontius' theology

Leontius of Byzantium is the Byzantine theologian who has defended and deepened the Christological dogma of Chalcedon and at the same time has developed his teaching on the theological foundation of the Cappadocian Parents. This is recognized by most modern theologians as well as well-known Byzantinologists such as H. Georg Beck. In his "Byzantinisches Handbuch", Beck shows that the theology of Leontius of Byzantium "rises rather on the soil of the Cappadocians, risen with a brilliant dialectic that only partially leads to Aristotle"¹.

In Leontius of Byzantium the destination of man is fulfilled in the person of Christ. This fulfillment can no longer be expressed in the categories of ancient philosophy, but in new expressions of the Christian revelation that show the reality of God's full union with human nature in Jesus Christ, the transfiguration and deification of this nature in Him. To express this new reality in Christ, Leontius remains closely related to the Christological dogma of Chalcedon, becoming at the same time a powerful defender of her.

Leontius' theological itinerary is more difficult to see in studies of modern theologians, beginning with H. Rindl's study of Aristotelianism at Leontius by Byzantium². Other theologians have seen in Leontius a strong platonic influence, as we have found again in A. Grillmeier³, or neoplatonic, as P. Junglas⁴ had previously stated.

To this understanding of Leontius theology was added the one in which two orientations were made known. The first is represented by B.E. Daley, who states that, unlike Saint Cyril of Alexandria, which sets the subject of the Incarnation, starting from the Scriptural site of John 1, 14, Leontius seems to have retained a remnant of antiochian education. According to Daley, Leontius begins in a series of texts the theological analysis not from

¹ H. Georg BECK, *Byzantinisches Handbuch im Rahmen des Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft*, zweiter Teil, erster Band, München, 1959, p. 374.

² H. REINDL, *Der Aristotelismus des Leontius von Byzanz*, München, 1953.

³ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, II/2, 3. Auflage, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1989.

⁴ P. JUNGLAS, *Leontius von Byzanz. Studien zu seinen Schriften, Quellen und Anschauungen*, Paderborn, 1908.

Christological Prototype and Anthropological Paradigm...

the everlasting Logos and from the history of His action between men, sustained by Him, but from Jesus Christ, God and Man⁵.

According to Leontius, the hypostasis or concrete person of Jesus Christ is neither God nor man alone, though He exists and works as a perfect God and perfect man. Daley states that Leontius never identifies explicitly and logically the hypostasis of Christ's one with the Logos as Logos⁶. His appointments for Jesus of Nazareth are "Christ", "Sotir", "Kyrios". To this subject, called Kyrios, he assigns human attributes and actions.

Daley says that after Leontius, Jesus Christ is in the order of nature a *tertium quid*. This interpretation is seen by A. Grillmeier as just as a great and unfounded suspicion of a theologian and the dialectical instructed⁷. By this Leontius would have put on the same level with the uncertain Sergiu, the adversary of Sever of Antioch. As a third new, Christ would be a new "nature" formed of the infinite divinity and created humanity. The result would be a theopaschism given by the "nature synthesis" that would hurt the transcendence of God⁸.

Leontius, however, had a deep sight at the non-discovery of the goddess, thus avoiding any physical synthesis of the apolarist way. Grillmeier notes that even if it is admitted that Leontius has not reached a formal identification of his teaching about one hypostasis of Christ with the Logos, it does not mean that he was not aware of the fullness of the Logos as such, which excludes any assembly in a third⁹. The theory of a *novum tertium quod* can not be accepted.

II. Theology of Leontius, a clear expression of the theology of the Eastern Church

This is clear from Leontius's clear statements about the Logos, which in Christ the One has the role of subject of the Incarnation, having a clear

⁵ B. E. DALEY, "The Christology of Leontius von Byzantium: Personalism or Dialectics", in: *Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies*, Oxford, 1983.

⁶ B. E. DALEY, "The Christology of Leontius von Byzantium".

⁷ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Bd. 2/2, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1989, p.197.

⁸ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p.197.

⁹ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p. 198.

position within the whole structure of the Incarnate. The places where this aspect is actually affirmed by Leontius are numerous. Thus in his work “Contra aftardocetas” the subject that takes human nature is called Kyrios and human nature is the one taken¹⁰. In another place in this work, the Logos is introduced as the subject that allows suffering (του Λόγου ἐπιέντος τό παθειν)¹¹.

Leontius speaks of union with the Word¹² whose work of the will attributes it to the will of suffering. By the Holy Spirit, the Logos exerts a creative work on his own temple, that is, on humanity taken. Thus the Logos anoints his temple created with the power of the Holy Spirit (ἐαυτὸν περιπλάσας)¹³. Another place is where Leontius speaks of the worship given to the person of Christ and not one given only to the humanity of Christ¹⁴.

So unacceptable is another interpretation that makes Leontius an origenist evagrian. After such an understanding Christ is also seen as a “third”, even though the ones he is constituted are others. This Christ is in fact a synthesis of νοῦς conceived evangrian, which is a created nature, and the human body with which it unites for a Christ-νοῦς¹⁵. For D. Evans this would have been based on Leontius' crypto-origenism, after which both the Logos and the body are natures enipostasized:

“Jesus Christ is the only non-fallen of the spiritual creation (...) who took the flesh (...) and became man without to lose the connection (union) with God, in which it remained from the beginning. In Jesus Christ, God and the body are not united together, but each with the nous Jesus Christ and only together with him (...) Leontius can not say that Jesus Christ is God, for he believes that both the natures of Christ are enipostated”¹⁶.

¹⁰ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra aftardocetas* (λογος β'), PG 86, 1324 D-1325 B.

¹¹ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra aftardocetas*, (λογος β'), 329 C.

¹² LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra aftardocetas*, (λογος β'), 1329 C D.

¹³ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra aftardocetas*, (λογος β'), 1353 A.

¹⁴ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, PG 86, 1273 C.

¹⁵ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christ im Glauben der Kirche*, p. 199.

¹⁶ D. B. EVANS, *Leontius of Byzantium: An Origenist Christology*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 13, Washington D. C., 1970, p. 137 sq.

Christological Prototype and Anthropological Paradigm...

Evans' origenist thesis on Leontius can not be accepted¹⁷. The question for such a thesis is the following: how can Evans bring together the statements about the communication of attributes, to whose consistency Leontius keeps tight in his works?¹⁸. In addition, in his work "Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos". Leontius makes a distinction between the Word and the same incarnate Word: "The Word is not the full Christ; He is He when he is united with humanity, although he has fullness of God"¹⁹. There is no *noûç* intermediate meaning here²⁰.

III. The soul-body analogy used by Leontius to explain the hypostatic union in Christ

On the contrary, we find in Leontius the formula "the union of hypostasis" often used by him and who is on the line of the great Fathers of the Church, especially St. Cyril of Alexandria. On this line, H. Beck's assertion that Leontius' theology "is totally independent of Cyril is unfounded"²¹ is unfounded. It also proves to be unfounded in the use of the body-soul analogy by Leontius to explain the way of the union of the natures of Christ in His unique hypostasis. It should also be noted that the formula "union by hypostasis" used by Leontius can not be used to express the union in Christ by the *tertium quid*.

A. Grillmeier states that in Leontius the "way of union" of natures in the person of Christ is emphasized so much as it is not accentuated to any

¹⁷ J. MEYENDORFF accepted the origenist thesis in his work: *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, Washington, DC, 1969, pp. 43-49. J. MEYENDORFF, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*, New York 1974, p. 38 et seq. Without discussion, he received the original thesis and Chr. VON SCHÖNBORN, *Sophrone de Jerusalem: Vie monastique et confession dogmatique*, Paris, 1972, p. 48 et seq. He joined this thesis and Patrick T. GRAY, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)*, Leiden, 1979, p. 101: "It is impossible not to see in this origenist notion of Christ - explanation designed for Leontius' tertium quid". Against the origenist thesis is A. DE HALLEUX in his reviews in RHE 66 (1971), pp. 977-985; B. DALEY, "The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium", in: *Journal of Theological Studies*, 27, 1976, Oxford, pp. 333-369.

¹⁸ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, 1289 C.

¹⁹ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, 1281 CD.

²⁰ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p. 199.

²¹ H. Georg BECK, *Byzantinisches Handbuch im Rahmen des Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft*, p. 374.

theologian previously²². With this emphasis, we are given new access to his Christology. But by his notion of hypostasis, Grillmeier shows, Leontius does not go beyond the Cappadocian Parents's teaching about it²³.

As an analogy for the union of the natures in Christ, Leontius uses the unity of the soul-body. The reason for this approach is his constant dispute with Nestorians and Euthehians. The unity and the distinction between body-soul sends to Chalcedon's formula about the union of natures in one hypostasis. For the body-soul report, however, the following is true: "The hypostasis is common, nature is its own and by its own definition"²⁴.

Leontius' opponents have criticized this comparison and its demonstrating power. The first distinction between this report and Christ lies after them in the fact that the Logos is full before his union with human nature. On the contrary, man is made up of "non-full parts". Leontius' opponents, on the Aristotelian line, could say "nonspecific natures" (incomplete nature). On the contrary, in Christ, they said it was different: "He took full parts, if we can speak of the parts"²⁵.

Against these claims Leontius points out that this finding of adversaries only helps them to claim that in Christ there are two hypostases. Here Nestorians are targeted. On the contrary, the Euthyans would use this affirmation badly, in order to discover in it the "prototype synchysis and its precise image"²⁶, meaning a single nature. But the misunderstanding of opponents can not overcome an old theological tradition that must be emphasized. In this latter direction, Leontius argues to the conclusion that what was wanted to be an anthropological model is not fully valid for Christ. Therefore the inability to resemble them should not be overlooked²⁷. Leontius wants to direct the use of this comparison to a central point: "We use the example to explain that the Word in His nature is united to our body and that it is never seen without it"²⁸.

In the case of both Christ and man, Leontius points out that the union of the unseen nature with the seen one, the immortal with the mortal, is done by preserving their properties. What exists before union, that is, invisibility

²² A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p , 210.

²³ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p , 210.

²⁴ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, 1280 B.

²⁵ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* 1280 C.

²⁶ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, 1280 C..

²⁷ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, 1280 C.

²⁸ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, 1281 A

Christological Prototype and Anthropological Paradigm...

and vision, remains after the union. This is true of what is seen and mortal, and this last aspect is underlined by Leontius against monophysites.

IV. The Limit of Body-Soul Analogue to St. Cyril of Alexandria to Explain the Hypostatic union in Christ. His position in the “Explanations”

Long before Leontius, the analogy between the constitution of Christ and that of man has been used since the fourth century, but has become commonplace from the Nestorian controversy. St. Cyril of Alexandria uses it in his answer to Nestorius to explain the hypostatic union in Christ, but never develops an anthropological reflection for herself, beyond the framework of the history of salvation. Moreover, at St. Cyril there is a limit of the anthropological comparison with the constitution of Christ, a limit assumed and preserved by Leontius.

In view of this limit, it should be noted that the expression of modern and contemporary theology “anthropological model”²⁹ generally used by the Eastern Fathers and the Ecumenical Councils to explain their teaching of hypostatic union is inappropriate. Another reason that does not make this possible is the strict Augustinian conception under which these theologians elaborated it.

The anthropological model serves better the interests of Nestorius, to which correspondence remains valid even in detail, since the subject of assignment is the “Christ”, ie the compound. J. Liebaert states that Nestorius made this model a dispute in the dispute. For St. Cyril, who appeals to him occasionally, it is rather an illustration that seeks to show that every act must be attributed to a unique subject, in the ontological and logical sense and not a juxtaposition of two subjects.

In “*Explanations at the Incarnation of a Born*” St. Cyril shows that union takes place in many ways. In the field of nature, there is a unity between elements that are distinct but connected by joining (παράθεσις), by bond (μίξις), by blending (κρᾶσις). Unlike these, the union of the Word with human nature goes beyond man’s understanding. It is not fulfilled according to one of the mentioned processes concerning union,

²⁹ F. GAHBAUER, “Das anthropologische Modell. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie der frühen Kirche bis Chalkedon”, in: *Das östliche Christentum*, NF XXXV, Würzburg, 1954.

being inexpressible, exceeding the knowledge of all created beings. Even the union of the soul with the body in ourselves exceeds our spirit.

After St. Cyril when we work with comparisons to bring us closer to the bottom-up realities of our understanding, we must return to this unity of the soul with the body, though it remains totally inappropriate:

“For the soul does its own owns everything that is of the body, although by its own nature it does not have its natural (of body o.n) passions, and those that come from outside. For the body is moved according to the natural desires, and the soul that is in it, due to union, feels with it, without being part of it in any way; less for his joy to fulfill the fulfillment of his desire. And even if the body is attracted to something, or cut off by iron, suffering with it because it is its own body that suffers, it itself can not suffer in its own nature, no matter what it is worn against his body”³⁰.

Thus the soul does not take part (συμμετέχειν) in the sufferings of the body, but it suffers with the body (συναλγεται) or feels with it (συναισθάνεται), because the suffering body is its own body (ἰδίου). While the Word has knowledge of what comes into the soul in an impassable way (ἀποθῶς ἦν ἐν εἰδήσει), the term “to feel” (συναισθάνεται) is not attributed to it.

St. Cyril always shows the impossibility of any language to truly explain the union of the Word of God with human nature in the same hypostasis:

“But for what is in Emmanuel we say that the union goes beyond it. For if it was necessary for the soul to suffer with its own body, being united with it, wanting to follow evil behaviors, it would portray God a submissive head, instead, in the case of the Word of God, to say that He feels and sufferings is absurd, for divinity is unassailable and is not in the same condition as we are. But He was united with the body endowed with a rational soul, and when he suffered something, he remained unfeigned in the knowledge of what was happening to him; As God made

³⁰ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, “Scholia de incarnatione Unigeniti”, VII, 8, in: E. SCHWARTZ (ed.) *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (ACO), I, 5, Berlin-Leipzig, p. 261, 31-261,1.

Christological Prototype and Anthropological Paradigm...

the weaknesses of the body disappear, making them their own, though they were the ones of his own body. It was said that he was hungry, he was tired and suffered something for us”³¹.

To the question of whether the union of Emanuel is the same as in man, A. Grillmeier shows in an analysis, which nevertheless unjustifiably brings Saint Cyril’s position to that of Sever by Antioch, that St. Cyril gives us a glimpse of his understanding by introducing the notion of ἴδιος (ἰδίᾳ σάρξ, ἴδιον σῶμα), as a property relationship that in Emanuel and in man masters between their components³². The word makes its own the body and with it the affections of the body (idiopoiēn) in the strict sense of the word.³³ Testimonies about this are in many places in St. Cyril:

“That is why we say that the body is the property of the Word, not of any other man, separated from Him, understood as Christ and the Son. As it is said that each person’s body belongs to his person, we also have to think about Christ”³⁴.

V. The meaning of St. Cyril’s use of the body-soul analogy for explaining the hypostatic union. His position in the “Commentary on St. John’s Gospel” and in “Thesaurus”

In *Commentary on St. John’s Gospel* St. Cyril says:

“For when Christ says «I will resurrect him», he has the power to raise the sleeping man, dressed not only with his own body, but being united with his own body, saying God the Word in him «I» and this quite rightly. For Christ is not divided into a duality, the more one should not think that the body of the One-Born is alien, as no one will say to my knowledge that the body is alien to our soul”³⁵.

³¹ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *Scholia de incarnatione Unigeniti*, VII, 8, p. 261, 31-261,1.

³² A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p. 37.

³³ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, “Florilegium Cyrili” 99, in: *Corpus Scriptorum christianorum orientalium*, 1903, nr. 134, Rome, p. 262, 14-15.

³⁴ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, “Apologia contra Orientales”, 96, in: *ACO*, I, 5, p. 137, 24-28.

³⁵ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *In Iohannem, lib. X, cap. II*, ed. by P. E. PUSEY, Oxford 1872, p. 343.

In another place, Saint Cyril shows in the dispute with Nestorius that he is ready to make certain restraints in understanding the body-soul analogy and using them in understanding the hypostatic union in Christ:

“And then we have to think about this: something else is godness and something else is human nature, by the way that is in nature, by union but being true unity, one Christ of both, as I have often said. But when the hypostasis, as you say (Nestorius), is thought to be in two, separated as each existent for oneself, then how would one unity be made in a person, if we do not admit that one belongs to the other, as the soul of man thinks his own body, although he has a different nature than this one? For the body and the soul can not be the same”³⁶.

Concerning the relationship of possession in the analogy of body-soul union, divinity-humanity in Christ, Grillmeier notes that St. Cyril can more easily clarify the latter than the relationship of body-soul possession. For, for having made his own body through the Word, he may refer to the creative power of the Word. Creature is the property of the One Who Creates, the Creator³⁷. In the “*Thesaurus*” St. Cyril will respond in dispute with the Aryans about their interpretation of Solomon’s Wisdom 8, 22: “The Lord made me in the beginning of His ways before His works at the beginning of the world“. While the Aryans attribute the fact of being created to the pre-existing one, the Nicene attributed him to the humanity of Christ: “As the Word is born of the Father forever, as He says. As a man, he is created when He became flesh for us, as the Evangelist says”³⁸. “From this being created is born directly the relationship of possession between the Word and humanity united to Him”³⁹. St. Cyril expresses this relationship in particular:

“He (the Word) expresses himself about being created on the basis of the creation of the body, although after His being is uncreated. Because the body belongs to Him and not to another,

³⁶ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, “Contra Nestorius”, III, 6, in: *ACO*, I, 1, 6, p. 73, 1-8.

³⁷ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p. 38.

³⁸ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *Thesaurus*, PG 75, 280 C.

³⁹ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p. 39.

Christological Prototype and Anthropological Paradigm...

He may call Him His own, what is happening to Him (the body) (to be created)⁴⁰.

Only the creative power of the Word of God and the Spirit can fulfill the Incarnation. This is where the depth of the relation of possession between the Word and humanity in Christ comes from a totally different measure than in the body-soul relationship in man⁴¹. Such a creative work as the fact of making one's own human nature by the Word can not be affirmed when it comes to the relationship of possession between body and soul in man. The soul is not the creator of the material part of man, but both the soul and the body are suddenly given through the creative act of God.

In *St. John's Gospel Commentary*, St. Cyril refers to the Scriptural place of John 20, 31 where Christ says: "To believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God". Against those who divide Christ in two, the Word and the man after union, St. Cyril shows that the body is nothing but the divine Word, but after union, we see that they only do one. The word is not transformed. Scripture proves that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is one going from the divine Word and from the temple "that contains the whole definition of humanity" (δλόκληρον ἔχοντος τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τὸν ὄρον)⁴².

However, the following anthropological comparison appears as an a posteriori analogy argument for the proof and acceptance of the reasoning of this unity starting from the two, as Scripture shows. The later texts of St. Cyril will remain in this line⁴³.

Another text used by St. Cyril is that of John 9, 37: "You have seen him (the Son of God), He who speaks to you, He is". This verse is one of the unique subject that is Christ, linking with the visibility characteristic of man identical to the Son of God. Pronouns αὐτόν of verse 37 sends to the incarnate Son of God. Comparison with the human compound only serves to show how one can see (καταδείκνομι) a person through one of

⁴⁰ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *Thesaurus*, PG 75, 281 C.

⁴¹ A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, p. 39.

⁴² St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *In Iohannem*, lib. X, cap. II, pp. 15-16.

⁴³ St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, "Apologia Against Orientals" 72, in: *ACO*, I. 1, 7, p. 50. 1, 11-15; "Epistle I to Succensus" 7, in: *ACO*, I. 1, 6, p. 154, 1. 3-8; "Epistle II to Succensus" 3, in: *ACO*, I. 1, 6, p. 160, 1. 2-7. Another proof is a fragment of a lost epistle to Theodosius on the edict of union, published by M. RICHARD, "Deux lettres perdues de Cyril of Alexandria", in: *Patria*, 7, Berlin, 1966, pp. 274-275 .

its components, the body at the same time, as it might be called, as shown in the previous verse.

This shows that for St. Cyril is not a complete correspondence in such a use of comparison. The Body of the Word corresponds in this comparison to the body of man and the Word of the soul. The reasoning is mainly to emphasize the unity of the subject and the fact that the body discovers the Word itself. This parallel is not pushed to the end: in Christological reality, the unique subject is not the whole, that is, the Christ composed of the Word-flesh, in which the Word is merely a “part”, an affirmation that can not be accepted by St. Cyril.

Conversely, looking at the human constitution, one can also see here that there is a limit to which the comparison can be used. Otherwise it should be said that in man the soul is the real subject, which presupposes that he will have to assume his body and that he would preexist, what St. Cyril refuses to admit⁴⁴.

VI. The sense of Leontion’s use of body-soul analogy to explain the hypostatic union. His position in “Contra Nestorianos et Eutychi-anos”

In the analogy between the constitution of Christ and that of man as in all his Christology Leontius follows St. Cyril, “convinced that ... the doctrine of Chalcedon was that of St. Cyril”⁴⁵. That is why S. Helmer's statement that Leontius was the one who used the “anthropological model” for Christology, a “model” previously used by St. Cyril, is not right:

“The purpose of human union as a physical union that has as a φυσικὸν εἶδος, ie a εἶδος καινότερον to nature, soul, and

⁴⁴ On the contrary, in the Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, he rejects Platonic anthropology, as can be seen in his explanation of the place of John 1.9, a passage to which he refers when referring to the place of John 9, 2 -3. In the Epistle to the Monks, Saint Cyril shows that the soul is born (συναπογεννᾶται) at the same time as the body (St. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, “Epistola ad monachos”, 12, in: *ACO*, I, 1, p.15, 1.27).

⁴⁵ Pr. Prof. Ioan G. COMAN, “Și Cuvântul trup s-a făcut”. *Hristologie și Mariologie patristică* (“And the Word Was Made Flesh”. *Patristic Christology and Mariology*), Editura Mitropoliei Banatului, Timisoara, p. 214.

Christological Prototype and Anthropological Paradigm...

body, means a disqualification of the anthropological paradigm claimed to a large extent in the Christological disputes (...) through this the image of the man used unlimited by Cyril is exiled by Christology”⁴⁶.

In fact, Leontius follows St. Cyril in understanding the comparison between the constitution of Christ and the constitution of man. Leontius emphasizes that the constitution of man can only be a paradigm. The model, the prototype, is the hypostatic union in Christ. In addition, both St. Cyril and Leontius, while showing the limit of the analogy between the constitution of Christ and man, emphasizing that it can not go all the way to its use, they do not totally exclude it, as Helmer states, but reject its misunderstanding to the Nestorians and the Euthylianians.

The analogy between the unity of Christ and that of man was used by the Fathers of the Church to emphasize the devotion with us of the Word of God incarnate after His humanity, as St. Cyril and then the Fourth Council of Ecumenical of Chalcedon showed. This fact is clearly shown by Leontius in his work “*Contra Nestorianos et Eutyhianos*”:

“But, they objected, if man is composed of natures of different kinds, neither of these two natures has existence without the other; The word, however, is before the Incarnation. In addition, man exists from partial non-partial natures. Christ, however, from full natures, which is why they can not be called partial nonsense natures. So how can you compare man’s unity to that of the Incarnate, in which both are not alike?

That’s what the Nestorians, the lawyers of the separation of natures, and therefore the defenders of another extreme, speak. On the contrary, the Eutyches have the pleasure of Christologico-anthropological analogy not in the sense in which they have to understand correctly, but only how they can understand false: as a model of true intermingling here and as a contemplated face there.

So this analogy is not our own discovery; on the contrary, we have taken it from the word «like the son of the father». This proves

⁴⁶ S. HELMER, *Der Neuchalkedonismus. Geschichte, Berechtigung und Bedeutung eines dogmengeschichtlichen Begriffes*, Bonn, 1962, p. 105, note 12.

the writings of the learned by God, in which the comparison with the unity of man is used. Because our opponents force this comparison, I can not understand it correctly. But she would not express a fair analogy if she did not keep her own mistakes. However, we are not interested in human unity for comparison, because man's partial natures would exist before or together, nor because they would be non-linear; we use the analogy only to make it clear that His united word with our human nature and beyond it could not be seen, although He retained in this fact to become One and kept His distinction - obviously is the case for any man⁴⁷.

⁴⁷ LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, (λογος β'), PG 86, 1280 C.