

TEO, ISSN 2247-4382
76 (3), pp. 69-90, 2018

The Alexandrian Pact of Union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites (633 AD) – the Premise of Monoenergism

Remus Mihai FERARU

Remus Mihai FERARU

West University of Timisoara, Romania

Email: remusferaru@yahoo.fr

Abstract

Our study analyzes the religious union at Alexandria between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites. On June 3, 633, Patriarch Cyrus of Alexandria succeeded to unite Theodosians (the moderate faction of the Egyptian Monophysites) with the Chalcedonian Melkite Church, based on the formula of *one single energy of Christ*. Cyrus issued a *Pact of Union* in the form of a confession of faith which represents the dogmatic basis of this union. The *Pact of Union* drawn up by the Alexandrine Patriarch represents the main premise of *Monoenergism*. We attempt herein an in depth theological commentary on the *Pact of Union*. At the same time, our study presents how the text was perceived in the Chalcedonian and Monophysite circles, as well as its theological consequences.

Keywords

Religious union, *Pact of union*, the Imperial Church, Theodosian Monophysites, energy, Monoenergism, Patriarch Cyrus, Alexandria.

During the first decade of the 7th century, the disputes between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians (Monophysites and Nestorians) were dominating Byzantium's political and religious scene. The non-Chalcedonian churches in the Byzantine Orient, who had refused to accept the rulings of the Council of Chalcedon (451), tended to separate from the Imperial (or *Melkite*¹) Church, which had approved the Chalcedonian dogma and recognized the authority of the Byzantine Emperor; moreover, these separatist tendencies were flamed by political rivalries and older aspirations of independence, especially in Syria and Egypt, where the population had gradually reached the conclusion that their separation from Byzantium was imperative. Monophysite churches in Syria and Egypt suffered violent persecutions at the hands of the Byzantine authorities, who tried to coerce them to adopt the official Chalcedonian doctrine. The persecution against Syrian and Egyptian Monophysites completely annihilated their desire to resist against the Persian attacks². That is why the Persian conquest of the Byzantine East³ was considerably facilitated by the old theological dispute between Constantinople and the Monophysite population from the eastern provinces of the Empire (Palestine, Syria and Egypt).

¹ The term "Melkite" derives from "melek" - king, emperor. Monophysites (Syrian Jacobites and Egyptian Copts) used the generic term *Melkite Church* for any church which had approved the resolutions of the Council of Chalcedon and recognized the authority of the Basileus of Constantinople.

² For instance, the conquest of Syria by the Persians was welcomed by the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius the Camel Driver (595-631), who wrote to his colleague in Alexandria: "Know that the world today rejoices in peace and love, because the Chalcedonian darkness has passed away", SEVERUS of AL'ASHMUNEIN (Hermopolis), *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, Part 2: *Peter I - Benjamin I (661 AD)*, Arabic text edited, translated, and annotated by B. EVETTS, in coll. *Patrologia Orientalis*, I, Paris, 1904, XIV, p. 482,

(http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/severus_hermopolis_hist_alex_patr_02_part2.htm#ANASTASIUS).

³ Within the span of approximately ten years, between 608/610 and 619, the Persians conquered Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine and Egypt, succeeding in rebuilding the great empire of the Achaemenids; see Cécile MORRISSON (coord.), *Le Monde Byzantin*, vol. I: *L'Empire romain d'Orient (330-641)*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 2004, pp. 40-42; Stelian BREZEANU, *Istoria Imperiului Bizantin*, Editura Meronia, Bucharest, 2007, p. 95; Georgije OSTROGORSKI, *Histoire de l'État byzantin*, traduit de l'allemand par J. GOUILLARD, Payot, Paris, 1996, p. 124.

The Alexandrian Pact of Union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites...

In 622, Emperor Heraclius launched a military campaign against the Persians, which resulted in the liberation of former Byzantine territories (Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine and Egypt) from under the Persian occupation (January 628). Even from the times of the military expeditions against the Persians, the Basileus desperately attempted to reestablish the religious unity of the Empire by settling the theological disputes between Chalcedonians and Monophysites. The religious policy of Emperor Heraclius was fully and unconditionally supported by Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople (610-638), who drew up the formulas of dogmatic compromise that helped the Basileus bring Monophysites back into the Imperial Church. Patriarch Sergius came up with the idea of formulating *Monoenergism* as a means of bringing together *Monophysitism* and the *Chalcedonian Dyophysitism*. Monoenergism, although recognizing the existence of two natures in the person of Jesus Christ the Saviour, admitted that their energy (*ἐνέργεια*) remained one⁴. Since the beginning of the military campaign against the Persians (622), the emperor negotiated personally with Monophysite hierarchs from the reconquered territories. By means of their joint actions, the Basileus and the Patriarch wished to rally the Chalcedonians and the Monophysite communities in Armenia, Syria, Palestine and Egypt around a formula of faith that recognized the existence of two *natures* in Christ, but only one *energy* (*μία ἐνέργεια*). More precisely, Heraclius was hoping to accomplish the religious union of Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians based on the formula of Christ's *single energy*.

The Basileus's religious policy of union was successful in Alexandria. In 630/631, Heraclius appointed Cyrus⁵, former Bishop of Phasis, as

⁴ Pompiliu NACU, *Ereziile primelor opt veacuri creștine și dăinuirea lor la începutul mileniului trei*, Editura Partener, Galați, 2010, p. 270; Vladimir LOSSKY, *Introducere în teologia ortodoxă*, translated by Lidia and Remus RUS, preface by Priest Professor Dr. Gh. POPESCU, Editura Sophia, Bucharest, 2006, p. 139.

⁵ *Sfântul Maxim Mărturisitorul (580-662) și tovarășii săi întru martiriu: papa Martin, Anastasie Monahul, Anastasie Apocrisiarul. "Vieți" – actele procesului – documentele exilului*, translated and presented by Deacon Ioan I. ICĂ JR., Deisis Publishing, Sibiu, 2004, chap. 8, pp. 66-67 (hereinafter referred to as *Sfântul Maxim și tovarășii săi*), cap. 9, pp. 67-68. The city of Phasis (currently Poti, in Gruzia) was situated in the province of Lazica, on the Eastern coast of the Black Sea, at the outfall of River Phasis (currently Rioni) into the Black Sea. The eparchy led by Bishop Cyrus of Phasis is given the rank of metropolis in the documents of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, see Vasile IONIȚĂ, "Sinodul al VI-lea Ecumenic și importanța sa pentru ecumenismul actual", in: *Studii Teologice*, XXX (1978) 5-8, p. 378.

Patriarch of Alexandria; he had been converted to Monoenergism after a series of talks with Heraclius in the Lazica province (626), and because of the insistent pleas of Patriarch Sergius⁶. On June 3, 633, Patriarch Cyrus accomplished the religious union of the Chalcedonians and the Theodosian Monophysites, based on the formula of *one single energy of Christ*⁷. At the same time, Cyrus promulgated a confession of faith entitled the *Alexandrian Pact of Union or Nine Chapters*⁸, which represents the dogmatic basis of this union. The Pact of Union drawn up by Alexandria's Melkite Patriarch is the object of the study herein. More specifically, we aim to accomplish a detailed theological commentary of this document, which has not been analyzed in depth in the specialized literature. At the same time, we wish to present how the Pact of Union promulgated by Patriarch Cyrus was perceived in the Chalcedonian and Monophysite circles, as well as its theological consequences.

I. Emperor Heraclius's religious policy of Union in Egypt

In Egypt, same as in the other eastern provinces of Byzantium, Emperor Heraclius did not wait too long to enforce his plan for unifying Monophysites with the Imperial Church based on the Monoenergistic doctrine. Immediately after being appointed Patriarch of Alexandria (in the fall of 631), Cyrus tried to enforce Constantinople's religious policy of union. In addition to authority within the church, Patriarch Cyrus had

⁶ In the letter sent to Patriarch Sergius, Cyrus writes that, immediately after his discussion with Heraclius in Lazica, he himself had ceased to confess two distinct energies into Christ after the unification of the natures in the person of Saviour, see CYRUS, *First Letter to Sergius* (Document 1), in Pauline ALLEN (ed.), *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy. The Synodical Letter and other documents*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009, pp. 160-162; Venance GRUMEL, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. I: *Les Actes des Patriarches*, Fasc. I: *Les Regestes de 381 à 715, Socii Assumptionistae Chalcedonenses*, Constantinople-Istanbul, 1932, nr. 283, p. 114. (hereinafter referred to as, GRUMEL, *Regestes...*).

⁷ Charles Joseph HEFELE, *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*, vol. III/1, trad. par Dom. H. LECLERCQ, Éditions Letouzey et Ané, Paris, 1909, p. 339.

⁸ In Greek, Ἰσον τῆς γενομένης πληροφορίας μεταξύ Κύρου τοῦ γενομένου πάπα Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ τῶν τῆς μερίδος τῶν Θεοδοσιανῶν, (*The "Announcement" which was agreed between Cyrus, then Pope of Alexandria, and those of the Theodosian Party*).

The Alexandrian Pact of Union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites...

been vested by the Emperor with extended civilian and military powers; especially during the last years of Heraclius's rule, his authority in Egypt was comparable to that of an Augustal Prefect⁹. Also, it is known that the Patriarch of Alexandria was the most powerful and influential among all eastern patriarchs. To believers, he represented the supreme authority, being perceived as the ruler of the country¹⁰.

Patriarch Cyrus used force against Monophysites, with spells of attempts at reconciliation and theological compromise. He launched a terrible persecution against Monophysites, in an attempt to force them to accept their religious union with the Melkite Church¹¹. The Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria himself, Benjamin (626-665), was forced to flee the city; he took refuge to Upper Egypt (631/632) in order to escape the violence of Patriarch Cyrus's persecution¹². Menas, Patriarch Benjamin's brother, as well as other dissident Monophysites were tortured and executed¹³.

II. The Pact of Union Drawn Up by Patriarch Cyrus of Alexandria: Translation and Commentary

Immediately after the cessation of the persecutions against Monophysites (633), Patriarch Cyrus attempted to reconcile with them; he tried to have Monophysites return to the Imperial Church by persuasion and theological

⁹ JEAN, évêque de Nikiou, "Chronique", texte éthiopien publié et traduit par H. ZOTENBERG, in: *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, XXIV, 1^{re} partie, Imprimerie Nationale, Paris, 1883, 120, p. 455; see also Louis Bréhier, *Le Monde Byzantin*, vol. II: *Les institutions de l'empire byzantin*, Éditions Albin Michel, Paris, 1970, pp. 96-97, 361; Georgije OSTROGORSKI, *Histoire de l'État byzantin*, traduit de l'allemand par J. GOUILLARD, Payot, Paris, 1996, p. 143.

¹⁰ Jean MEYENDORFF, *Unité de l'Empire et divisions des Chrétiens. L'Église de 450 à 680*, traduction de l'anglais par Françoise Lhoest revue par l'auteur, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1993, p. 365.

¹¹ MICHEL LE SYRIEN, *Chronique*, vol. II, éditée pour la première fois et traduite en français par J.- B. CHABOT, Ernest Leroux Éditeur, Paris, 1901, XI, 3, p. 411 (hereinafter referred to as, MICHAEL THE SYRIAN, *The Chronicle*).

¹² JEAN, évêque de Nikiou, *Chronique*, 120, p. 464: "Avva Benjamin, Patriarch of the Egyptians, returned to Alexandria 13 years after fleeing to escape the Romans, and visited all our churches".

¹³ J. MEYENDORFF, *Unité de l'Empire...*, pp. 366-367.

compromise. Cyrus initiated religious union negotiations with the Severine Monophysites¹⁴ of Alexandria, also known as *Theodosians*¹⁵. On June 3, 633, Patriarch Cyrus succeeded to unite Theodosians (the moderate faction of the Egyptian Monophysites) with the Chalcedonian Melkite Church, based on the formula of *one single energy of Christ*¹⁶. The union was officially proclaimed in the patriarchal cathedral of Alexandria, at a solemn Divine Liturgy officiated by the Alexandrine patriarch. In the letter addressed to Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, Cyrus writes that the entire Theodosian clergy took communion from his hand¹⁷.

The dogmatic support of this union is a *union agreement*, written in the form of a confession of faith, made up of nine articles (*κεφάλαια*) or *anathematisms*; this union agreement was read by Patriarch Cyrus from the ambo of the patriarchal church, in the presence of numerous clergymen and officials from the two groups – that of the Chalcedonians and that of the Theodosian Monophysites. In the following, we include the original text and the translation of the union agreement drawn up by Patriarch Cyrus of Alexandria; this document had been attached to the letter that Cyrus sent to Emperor Heraclius¹⁸ in order to inform him in depth on the strategy used in order to bring Theodosians into the Imperial Church:

“Τοῦ δεσπότης Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν πάντων
προλάμποντος καὶ πάντα εἰς τὴν σωτήριον καὶ ἀληθινὴν αὐτοῦ
πίστιν ἰθύνοντος καὶ εἰς μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἁγίαν αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν

¹⁴ The *Severines*, whose name derives from that of their leader, Patriarch Severus of Antioch (512-518), represented the moderate wing of the Monophysites, see MEYENDORFF, *Unité de l'Empire...*, p. 236.

¹⁵ Starting with the first half of the 6th century, Severines were named *Theodosians*, which again, derives from the name of their leader, Theodosius, the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria (535-566). Theodosius was a friend of Severus of Antioch; in 535, he had been elected Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria with the support of Empress Theodora, the protector of Monophysites, see MICHAEL THE SYRIAN, *The Chronicle*, vol. II, IX, 21, pp. 192-193; see also MEYENDORFF, *Unité de l'Empire...*, p. 245, 276.

¹⁶ CYRUS, *Second Letter to Sergius* (Document 4), in ALLEN (ed.), *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, pp. 174-175; see also HEFELE, *Histoire des conciles...*, vol. III/1, p. 339.

¹⁷ CYRUS, *Second Letter to Sergius* (Document 4), pp. 174-175.

¹⁸ J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. XI, Graz-Austria, Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1960-1961, col. 562 (hereinafter referred to as MANSI).

συγκαλοῦντος τὴν παροῦσαν πληροφορίαν πεποιήμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνώσει τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησιῶν μηνὶ Παυνὶ ἰνδικτιῶνος ἕκτης. Πληροφορία γενομένη παρὰ Κύρου ἐλέω Θεοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὸν τόπον ἐπέχοντος κατὰ θεῖον θέσπισμα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλλινίκων ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου ταύτης τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων φιλοχρίστου πόλεως.

Κεφάλαιον α΄

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τριάδα ὁμοούσιον, μίαν θεότητα ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον β΄

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ ‘τὸν ἓνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος’ τὸν Θεὸν λόγον, τὸν πρὸ αἰῶνων ἀχρόνως γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἐνδόξου Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκὶ καὶ ἀποθανόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον γ΄

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνὸς Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ τά τε πάθη καὶ τὰ θαύματα, ἀλλ’ ‘ἄλλου καὶ ἄλλου’, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον δ΄

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἄκρας ἐνώσεως τὸν Θεὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας ὑποστῆσαι ἑαυτῷ καθ’ ἐνωσιν σάρκα ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου τὴν ἡμῖν ὁμοούσιον ἐμψυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ τε καὶ νοερᾷ ἐνώσει φυσικῇ τε καὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν καὶ οὕτως προελθεῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἓνα ὄντα, ἀσύγχυτόν τε καὶ ἀδιαίρετον, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον ε΄

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν ἁγίαν δέσποιναν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀειπάρθενον Μαρίαν κυρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν Θεοτόκον εἶναι, ὡς τὸν Θεὸν λόγον σεσαρκωμένον κυήσασαν καὶ τεκοῦσαν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον ζ'

Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ ἐκ δύο φύσεων, τουτέστι θεότητός τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ἓνα Χριστόν, ἓνα υἱόν, 'μίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου φύσιν σεσαρκωμένην' κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Κύριλλον ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀναλλοιώτως ἤγουν μίαν ὑπόστασιν σύνθετον, ὅπερ ἐστὶν αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, 'εἷς ὢν τῆς ἀγίας ὁμοουσίου τριάδος', ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον ζ'

Εἴ τις τὸν ἓνα Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν ἐν δυσὶ θεωρεῖσθαι λέγων ταῖς φύσεσιν οὐχ 'ἓνα τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος' τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖ, τὸν ἀδίως μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα Θεὸν λόγον, ἐν ἐσχάτοις δὲ τοῦ αἰῶνος καιροῖς τὸν αὐτὸν σαρκωθέντα καὶ τεχθέντα ἐκ τῆς παναγίας καὶ ἀχράντου δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, ἀλλ' 'ἕτερον τοῦτον' οἶδε 'καὶ ἕτερον', καὶ οὐχ 'ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν', κατὰ τὸν σοφώτατον Κύριλλον 'ἐν θεότητι τέλειον καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν' καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ μόνον 'ἐν δύο' θεωρούμενον 'φύσει τὸν αὐτὸν πάσχοντα καὶ μὴ πάσχοντα κατ' ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο', ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀγίοις ἔφησε Κύριλλος, πάσχοντα μὲν ἀνθρωπίνως σαρκὶ καθὸ ἄνθρωπος, μένοντα δὲ ὡς Θεὸν ἀπαθῆ ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς πάθεσι, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἓνα Χριστόν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα 'μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ' κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Διονύσιον· θεωρία μόνη διακρίνων τὰ ἐξ ὧν ἡ ἔνωσις γέγονε, καὶ ταῦτα τῷ νῷ διασκοπῶν ἄτρεπτα καὶ ἀσύγχυτα μετὰ τὴν αὐτῶν φυσικὴν καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἔνωσιν μένοντα, καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀδιαιρέτως καὶ ἀχωρίστως τὸν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν καὶ υἱὸν γνωριζόμενον, καθὸ δύο τὰ ἀλλήλοις ἀσυγχύτως συνηνεγμένα καθορᾷ τῷ νῷ, πραγματικὴν αὐτῶν τὴν θεωρίαν ποιούμενος, ἀλλ' <οὐ> φαντασία ψευδεῖ καὶ διακένοις νοῦ διαπλάσμασι, διστῶσι δὲ οὐδαμῶς ὡς ἀνηρημένης ἤδη τῆς εἰς δύο διατομῆς διὰ τὴν ἄφραστον <καὶ ἀσύγχυτον> καὶ ἀπηρινόητον ἔνωσιν, λέγων κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Ἀθανάσιον· 'ἅμα γὰρ σὰρξ, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ, ἅμα σὰρξ ἔμψυχος λογική, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ ἔμψυχος λογική', ἀλλ' ἐπὶ διαιρέσει τῇ ἀνὰ μέρος τὴν τοιαύτην ἐκλαμβάνει φωνήν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον η'

Εἴ τις οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει Ἄρειον, Εὐνόμιον, Μακεδόنيον, Ἀπολινάριον τὸν αἰρετικὸν Νεστόριον, Εὐτυχεά τὸν δυσώνυμον καὶ Κῦρον καὶ Ἰωάννην τοὺς Αἰγεώτας καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀντειρηκότας καθ' οἷον δήποτε τρόπον τοῖς δώδεκα κεφαλαίοις τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου Κυρίλλου καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντας, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ πλάνῃ ἀποθανόντας καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶν φρονήσαντας ἢ φρονοῦντας, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον θ'

Εἴ τις οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει τὰ συγγράμματα Θεοδώριτου τὰ κατὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Κυρίλλου, καὶ τὴν λεγομένην Ἰβα ἐπιστολήν, καὶ Θεόδωρον τὸν Μομψουεστίας καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἴ τις οὐ δέχεται τὰ συγγράμματα τοῦ ἁγίου Κυρίλλου καὶ μάλιστα τὰ κατὰ Θεοδώρου καὶ Θεοδώριτου καὶ Ἀνδρέου καὶ Νεστορίου καὶ τῶν τὰ ὅμοια αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνὸς αὐτῶν πεφρονηκότων ἢ φρονοῦντων, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.”

“Since Christ the Master, true God of us all, is shining forth and directing everyone towards the saving and true faith in him, and summoning them to one and the same church of his, we have made the present announcement on the occasion of the union of the holy churches of God, in the month of Pauni (June) in the sixth indiction. An announcement made by Cyrus, bishop by the mercy of God, who, by the divine sanction of our good and victorious Masters, holds the office of the apostolic throne of this Christloving city of the Alexandrians.

Article of Faith I

If someone does not confess Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, consubstantial Trinity, one Godhead in three hypostases, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith II

If someone does not confess that one of the Holy Trinity, God the Word, before the ages was timelessly begotten of the Father, and descended from heaven, and was made incarnate by the Holy

Spirit, and became human from our Lady, the holy, glorious Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary, suffered in his own flesh, and died and was buried, and rose on the third day according to the Scriptures, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith III

If someone does not confess both the sufferings and miracles of our same and one Lord, Jesus Christ, true God, but [says they are] of one and of the other, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith IV

If someone does not confess that from the very moment of the union God the Word, in the womb of the holy Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary, hypostatized with himself through the union a flesh from the same holy Theotokos which is consubstantial with us, ensouled with a rational and intellectual soul, in a union that was both natural and hypostatic, and came forth from her being one, without confusion and without division, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith V

If someone does not confess that our holy Lady and ever-virgin Mary properly speaking and in truth is the Theotokos, in that she conceived and bore God the Word incarnate, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith VI

If someone does not confess one Christ, one Christ, one Son, from two natures, that is, from both Godhead and humanity, 'one incarnate nature of God the Word', according to Cyril [now] among the saints, without confusion, without change, without alteration, or rather one composite hypostasis, which is our same Lord Jesus Christ, being one of the holy, consubstantial Trinity, let such a person be anathema.

Article of Faith VII

If someone, in saying that our Lord, Jesus Christ, is discerned in two natures, does not confess that the same is one of the holy

Trinity, God the Word begotten eternally from the Father, that in the last times of the age (cf. Heb. I: 2) the same became incarnate, and was born of our Lady, the all-holy and undefiled and ever-virgin Mary, but knows him to be this one and another, and not as one and the same, according to the most wise Cyril, the same being perfect in Godhead and perfect in humanity, and in that respect and in that alone discerned in two natures, the same one suffering and not suffering in two distinct respects, as the same Cyril, [now] among the saints, said, suffering in human fashion in the flesh as a human being, but remaining impassible as God amidst the suffering of his own flesh, and that one and the same Christ and Son performed things befitting God and things human by one theandric activity, according to Dionysius [now] among the saints, distinguishing in contemplation alone the elements from which the union came about, and mentally considering these as remaining without change and without confusion after their natural and hypostatic union, and recognizing in these the one and the same Christ and Son without confusion and without separation, as he mentally considers the two to be brought together mutually without confusion, holding the contemplation of them as a matter of reality and not of lying illusion, but he does not separate them in any way, since the rending into two has already been undone because of the union which is ineffable and unconfused and inconceivable, saying according to holy Athanasius: ‘At the one time there is the flesh of God the Word; at the one time there is flesh ensouled and rational, at the one time there is the flesh of God the Word endowed with a rational soul’; but takes such an expression as dividing into parts, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith VIII

If someone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris the heretic, Nestorius, Eutyches of ill-repute, and Cyrus and John of Aigiai, and all who, in whatever way, contradict the Twelve Chapters of the most holy Cyril, and do not repent, but die in such error, and those who thought or think like them, let him be anathema.

Article of Faith IX

If someone does not anathematize the writings of Theodoret which are contrary to the right faith of Cyril [now] among the saints, and the so-called Letter of Ibas, and Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings; and if someone does not accept the writings of holy Cyril, especially against Theodore, and Theodoret, and Andrew, and Nestorius, and those who have thought or think like them or one of them, let him be anathema”¹⁹.

The Pact of Union includes nine articles of faith (*κεφάλαια*); each article is formulated as an anathematism; it states the doctrine in positive terms, after the negative form of the verb, “does not confess”, to which the final anathematism refers.²⁰ The nine articles of faith express the Christology of Saint Cyril of Alexandria (370-444)²¹ and the Chalcedonian Christology inspired by him.

The first article confesses faith in the Holy Trinity: “... πατέρα καὶ υἰὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τριάδα ὁμοούσιον, μίαν θεότητα ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν...”.

Articles II, III and IV express the official Chalcedonian Christology. Jesus Christ is the Self-same Perfect in Godhead and the Self-same Perfect in Manhood, consubstantial with the Father according to his divinity and consubstantial with us according to his humanity. He was before the ages begotten of the Father as to the Godhead (“...τὸν Θεὸν λόγον, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων ἀχρόνως γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς...”.) and was made incarnate from Virgin Mary, in the last days, as to the Manhood (“...καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ ... τῆς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἐνδόξου Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας”). Jesus Christ became man and suffered with His own body for us and for our salvation (“...καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκί”)²².

Article V summarizes the Orthodox beliefs on Virgin Mary: Virgin Mary is the Mother of God (“...τὴν ἁγίαν δέσποιναν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀειπάρθενον Μαρίαν κυρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν Θεοτόκον εἶναι, ὡς τὸν Θεὸν λόγον

¹⁹ The text in Greek and the translation into English were taken from ALLEN, *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, pp. 168-173.

²⁰ F. X. MURPHY, P. SHERWOOD, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, Éditions de l’Orante, Paris, 1974, pp. 149-150.

²¹ Saint Cyril was the Patriarch of Alexandria between 412 and 444.

²² Ioan G. COMAN, “*Și Cuvântul trup S-a făcut*”. *Hristologie și mariologie patristică*, Editura Mitropoliei Banatului, Timișoara, 1993, p. 192.

The Alexandrian Pact of Union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites...

σεσαρκωμένον κυήσασαν καὶ τεκοῦσαν...”); this is an old Orthodox doctrine, researched in depth by Cyril of Alexandria²³.

Article VI summarizes the Cyrilian Christological doctrine, underlining *the unity of Christ's hypostasis*. According to Cyril, the union of the two natures, divine and human, in the person of Jesus Christ the Saviour is a real, physical or hypostatic union, expressed by *μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*²⁴. By *φύσις* (*nature*), Saint Cyril means *person* or *hypostasis*. This formula was kept by the Monophysites, but was not accepted as fully “Orthodox” by the Council of Chalcedon (451). The text goes on to talk about *one composite hypostasis* of the Word (*μίαν ὑπόστασιν σύνθετον*), a phrase coined by Severus of Antioch²⁵.

Article VII repeats and develops the contents of the prior article. It exposes clearly the Monoenergistic doctrine: “One and the same Christ and Son performed things befitting God and things human *by one theandric activity*, according to Dionysius [now] among the saints” (“... τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα *ἡμᾶ θεανδρικῆ ἐνεργείᾳ*’ κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Διονύσιον”).²⁶ The object of Article VII is the interpretation of the Chalcedonian doctrine, summarized by “in saying that our one Lord, Jesus Christ, is discerned in two natures” (“τὸν ἕνα Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν δυοῖ θεωρεῖσθαι”). In other words, Article VII tends to reconcile Monophysitism with the Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures in the person of the Saviour Jesus Christ.

In order for the Chalcedonian doctrine to be understood in the sense of its Cyrillian interpretation, the doctrine of One Christ who performs both what is divine and what is human by means of a single divine-human activity is proposed (*Monoenergism*). Here, Chalcedonian doctrine is sacrificed, being given a Monophysite orientation. The importance put on the unity of Christ's energy appears to view Christ as the sole agent of the entire redeeming work; according to the reasoning and the statement of the unification agreement, this sole agent can only have one single divine-and-human energy. Therefore, the energy (*ἐνέργεια*) becomes a characteristic of the person of Christ rather than of his nature; in other words, the *ἐνέργεια* belongs to the person or the hypostasis of the Saviour, and not to the nature of Jesus Christ. The followers

²³ COMAN, “*Și Cuvântul trup S-a făcut*” ..., p. 192.

²⁴ COMAN, “*Și Cuvântul trup S-a făcut*” ..., p. 106.

²⁵ Severus rejects the idea of a combination of natures into Christ; he talks about a *composite hypostasis*, see COMAN, “*Și Cuvântul trup S-a făcut*” ..., pp. 212-213.

²⁶ See *supra*.

of Monoenergism believed that the human energy was passive and entirely subordinated to the divine energy of Christ, which they connected to the Word incarnate. It is therefore evident that there is no distinction made between the energy coming from the person (*action*) and the energy as a characteristic of nature. Yet Saint Cyril not only fails to establish this distinction, but in fact excludes it altogether when saying: “One and the same Christ who does his divine and his human work by means of a single divine-human energy.”

Patriarch Cyrus succeeded in convincing some of the Theodosian clergy to accept the unification with the Chalcedonian Church based on the formula *μία θεανδρική ἐνέργεια* (“a single theandric energy”), wrongfully attributed to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. In reality, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite does not talk about *a single theandric energy* – as interpreted by Patriarch Cyrus in a false and tendentious manner²⁷ – but about *a certain new theandric energy of God incarnate* (*ἀλλ’ ἀνδρωθέντος Θεοῦ, καινὴν τινα τὴν θεανδρικήν ἐνέργειαν*)²⁸. Patriarch Cyrus was rightfully accused of distorting Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite’s text in order to make it seem like they were of the same opinion. In the opinion of Saint Maximus the Confessor, *ἡ καινὴ θεανδρική ἐνέργεια* refers to the cooperation between Jesus’s two energies, human and divine²⁹. For this reason, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite is not talking about one energy, but about a new energy. This “novelty” conveys the aspect of unity, but the unity he is referring to is not an issue of arithmetic, as clearly pointed out by Saint Maximus the Confessor³⁰.

²⁷ CYRUS, *Pact of union. Nine Articles of Faith* (Document 3), in: ALLEN, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, pp. 170-172: “καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ Ὑιὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα ‘μιᾶ θεανδρική ἐνέργειᾳ’ κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Διονύσιον”; Jaroslav PELIKAN, *Tradiția creștină. O istorie a dezvoltării doctrinei*, vol. II: *Spiritul creștinătății răsăritene (600-1700)*, translation and notes by Priest Professor Nicolae BUGA, Ed. Polirom, 2005, p. 93; Lars THUNBERG, *Antropologia teologică a Sfântului Maxim Mărturisitorul. Microcosmos și mediator*, translated from English by Anca POPESCU, Ed. Sophia, Bucharest, 2005, p. 48 and n. 74.

²⁸ PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE, *Epistula IV ad Gaium*, in: Jacques-Paul MIGNE (ed.), *Patrologia Graeca; Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*, 3, Paris, 1857, 1072 C (hereinafter referred to as PG); PELIKAN, *Tradiția creștină...*, vol. II, p. 93.

²⁹ SAINT MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR, “Ambigua”, in: *Ambigua. Tâlcuiri ale unor locuri cu multe și adânci înțelesuri din Sfinții Dionisie Areopagitul și Grigorie Teologul*, coll. *Părinți și Scriitori Bisericești*, (PSB), vol. 80, translation from Greek, introduction and notes by Priest Professor Dr. Dumitru STĂNILOAE, EIBMBOR, Bucharest, 1983, 5d-e, p. 61.

³⁰ SAINT MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR, *Ambigua*, p. 62.

The Alexandrian Pact of Union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites...

The union agreement is concluded with two *anathematisms*. Article VIII casts anathemas on Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches and all those who rejected the 12 *anathematisms* of Saint Cyril³¹; they include Bishop Cyrus of Tyre³² and priest John of Aigiai³³.

Article IX reiterates the damnation of the *Three Chapters*: the person and the works of *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, the writings of *Theodoret of Cyrus* against the true faith and against Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the letter of *Ibas of Edessa* against the same Cyril³⁴; the three Nestorians were considered feral enemies of the Monophysites and had been damned repeatedly by Emperor Justinian. The damnation of the *Three Chapters* was confirmed by the Fifth Ecumenic Council (553). They were probably hoping that by damning people who died at peace with the Church, they will determine Monophysites to return to “Orthodoxy.” The damnation extends to those who reject the writings of Cyril of Alexandria against Theodore of Mopusuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, bishop Andreas of Samosata³⁵ and against heretic Nestorius.

³¹ CYRUS, *Pact of union. Nine Articles of Faith* (Document 3), in: ALLEN, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, p. 172: “Ἐἴ τις οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει Ἄρειον, Εὐνόμιον, Μακεδόنيον, Ἀπολινάριον τὸν αἰρετικὸν Νεστόριον, Εὐτυχεῖα τὸν δυσώνυμον καὶ Κῦρον καὶ Ἰωάννην τοὺς Αἰγεώτας καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀντειρηκότας καθ’ οἷον δῆποτε τρόπον τοῖς δώδεκα κεφαλαίοις τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου Κυρίλλου καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντας, (...) ἀνάθεμα ἔστω”.

³² Bishop Cyrus of Tyre was one of the supporters of Bishop John of Antioch. He was sworn in by Cyrus of Alexandria at the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431), see SOPHRONIUS OF JERUSALEM, *The Synodical Letter*, in: ALLEN, *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, 2.6.1, p. 139 and n. 156.

³³ According to Patriarch Photius of Constantinople, John of Aigiai was a Nestorian. He was sworn in by Cyril of Alexandria at the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431), similarly to Bishop Cyrus of Tyre, see SOPHRONIUS OF JERUSALEM, *The Synodical Letter*, in: ALLEN, *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, 2.6.1, p. 139 and n. 156.

³⁴ CYRUS, *Pact of union. Nine Articles of Faith* (Document 3), in: ALLEN, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, p. 172: “Ἐἴ τις οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει τὰ συγγράμματα Θεοδώριτου τὰ κατὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Κυρίλλου, καὶ τὴν λεγομένην Ἰβα ἐπιστολήν, καὶ Θεόδωρον τὸν Μομψουεστίας καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τοῦ αὐτοῦ (...) ἀνάθεμα ἔστω”.

³⁵ Bishop Andreas of Samosata is the author of a treaty against the 12 anathemas of Saint Cyril. He also refused to sign the unification agreement of 433 establishing the reconciliation between Alexandrines and Antiochians, disagreeing with the damnation of Nestorius - see Remus RUS, *Dicționar enciclopedic de literatură creștină din primul mileniu*, Editura Lidia, Bucharest, 2003, pp. 48-49 (s.v. *Andreas of Samosata*).

The analyzed document reveals Patriarch Cyrus's attempt to reach a consensus with the Theodosian Monophysites regarding the teachings of faith. Cyrus is trying to formulate the articles of faith so as to please and accommodate Monophysites. That is why, in order to express the mystery of the embodiment of Christ, he uses a series of Cyrillian and Severine phrases well-liked by Monophysites: *ἔνωσις φυσικῆ*³⁶, *ἐκ δύο φύσεων, μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σσαρκωμένη* ἢ *μία ὑπόστασις σύνθετος*³⁷; it is known that the Severine Monophysites were attached to the Monophysite language of Saint Cyril of Alexandria³⁸, whom some of them considered "the father of Monophysitism." In fact, it was this strict adherence to Cyrillian terminology in matters of Christology that prevented the Monophysites to accept the confession of faith formulated in Chalcedon³⁹. That is why Cyrus diplomatically avoids formulating theological explanations that would not be tolerated by the Monophysites. At the same time, Patriarch Cyrus places an anathema Nestorius and his followers, who had rejected the 12 anathemas of Cyril⁴⁰.

In order to avoid leaving the impression that the text of the unification agreement gives privilege to the Cyrillian Christological terminology agreed by Monophysites, Cyrus combines it with Chalcedonian terminology. Therefore, as opposed to the Cyrillian phrase *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* used in article VI of faith and approved, among others, by Dioscorus⁴¹ and Severus of Antioch, in article VII he uses the Chalcedonian phrase *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν*,

³⁶ See, *supra*, Article of Faith IV: ...*ἔνώσει φυσικῆ*.

³⁷ See, *supra*, Article of Faith VI. Severus of Antiochia talks about *a composite hypostasis* (*μία ὑπόστασις σύνθετος*), see also Hefele, *Histoire des conciles...*, vol. III/1, p. 341.

³⁸ The leader of Severine Monophysites, Patriarch Severus of Antioch, had been a follower and a defender of Cyrillian Christology. His Christological teachings are based on the 12 anathemas of Saint Cyril, see Diac. Ioan RĂMUREANU, "Posibilitatea întoarcerii Bisericii monofizite la ortodoxie. Considerații istorice și dogmatice asupra poziției lor față de ortodoxie", in: *Ortodoxia*, 4 / 1951, pp. 588-589 (hereinafter referred to as RĂMUREANU, *Bisericile monofizite*).

³⁹ MEYENDORFF, *Unité de l'Empire...*, pp. 212-213.

⁴⁰ In the memory of various Monophysite factions that remained loyal the theological language of Cyril of Alexandria, the Council of Chalcedon was known as "the cursed council." The damnation of Eutyches by the Council of Chalcedon was perceived by certain Monophysites as a return to Nestorianism, see Bernard SESBOÛÉ, Joseph WOLINSKI, *Histoire des dogmes. Le Dieu du salut*, vol. I, Éditions Desclée, Paris, 1994, p. 414.

⁴¹ Patriarch Dioscorus (444-451) followed Saint Cyril on the patriarchal see of Alexandria. He defended Cyril's memory and theology.

The Alexandrian Pact of Union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites...

stating that “Jesus Christ is discerned in two natures”⁴². Also, at the end of Article VII he proclaims the Chalcedonian idea of *theopaschism*: “... the same one suffering and not suffering in two distinct respects, as the same Cyril, [now] among the saints, said, suffering in human fashion in the flesh as a human being, but remaining impassible as God amidst the sufferings of his own flesh”⁴³.

III. The Reception and Consequences of the Religious Union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosians

In the letter sent to Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, Patriarch Cyrus describes enthusiastically the unification with Theodosians; he praises Emperor Heraclius and Patriarch Sergius; in his opinion, they had a determining role in the unification⁴⁴. At the same time, Cyrus informs Sergius that most members of the Theodosian clergy of Alexandria had accepted the unification with the Imperial Church; also, all civilian and military officials, as well as a few thousand Alexandrian citizens received the holy communion from the hand of the Patriarch himself:

“For this I make clear that all the clergy belonging to the teaching of the so-called Theodosians in this Christ-loving city of Alexandria, together with those who are illustrious in public office and in the military, and in addition those, running into thousands who pay public tax, on the third day of the month of June were united to our most holy, catholic church of God, and partook with us of the undefiled mysteries of God”⁴⁵.

⁴² Article VII of Faith: “... ἕνα Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν δύο θεωρεῖσθαι ... φύσεσιν”; “... καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ μόνον ἐν δύο θεωρούμενον φύσεσι...”. The phrase ἐν δύο φύσεσιν is used by Pope Leon I in his letter to Bishop Flavian of Constantinople, see COMAN, “*Și Cuvântul trup S-a făcut*”..., pp. 155-158.

⁴³ Article VII of Faith: “... τὸν αὐτὸν πάσχοντα καὶ μὴ πάσχοντα κατ’ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο’, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀγίοις ἔφησε Κύριλλος, πάσχοντα μὲν ἀνθρωπίνως σαρκὶ καθὸ ἀνθρώπου, μένοντα δὲ ὡς Θεὸν ἀπαθῆ ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς πάθεσι...”.

44 CYRUS, *Second Letter to Sergius* (Document 4), in: ALLEN, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*, pp. 174-175.

⁴⁵ CYRUS, *Second Letter to Sergius* (Document 4), p. 174: “Δῆλον γὰρ ποιοῦμαι, ὡς ἅπαντες οἱ τοῦ δόγματος τῶν λεγομένων Θεοδοσιανῶν κατὰ ταύτην τὴν Ἀλεξανδρέων φιλόχριστον πόλιν κληρικοί, ἅμα καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἀξίαις καὶ στρατεῖαις διαλάμπουσιν, ἔτι

At least two bishops, Victor of Fayoum and Cyrus of Nikiu, accepted the unification with the Melkite Church: “So that even Cyrus, bishop of Nikiu, and Victor, bishop of the Faiyum, and many others denied the orthodox faith, because they had not obeyed the injunctions of the blessed Father Benjamin, and had not hidden themselves as the others did.”⁴⁶ Cyrus writes that the event brought joy not just to Alexandria, but to the entire region: “... but throughout the entire Christ-loving city of Alexandria and its districts even to the very clouds, and to those ranks of heaven beyond, rejoicing in the peace of the most holy churches and in those who are returning to it”⁴⁷.

The religious union of the Theodosians with the Imperial Church ignited the protest of Palestinian monk Sophronius, who was in Alexandria at the time. Sophronius disagreed with the Monoenergist doctrine formulated in the 7th article of the unification decree. The honorable Palestinian monk threw himself at the feet of Patriarch Cyrus, begging him tearfully not to publish the union agreement that proclaimed Monoenergism⁴⁸. Saint Sophronius’s gesture marks *the beginning of the fight against Monoenergism*⁴⁹. Sophronius traveled to Constantinople to warn Patriarch Sergius about the erroneous doctrine hiding behind the Monoenergist formula. He asked the Patriarch of Constantinople to eliminate from the union agreement drawn up by Cyrus the sentence referring to a single energy into Christ⁵⁰. Sophronius insisted on the acknowledgement of *two*

δὲ καὶ τοῖς εἰς δῆμον τελοῦσιν εἰς χιλιάδας συντείνοντες, κατὰ τὴν τρίτην τοῦ Ἰουνίου μηνὸς ἐνωθέντες τῇ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἀγιωτάτῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατολικῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν ἀχράντων τοῦ Θεοῦ σὺν ἡμῖν μυστηρίων μετέλαβον”.

46 SEVERUS OF AL’ASHMUNEIN (Hermopolis), *History of the Patriarchs*, in: *Patrologia Orientalis* I, p. 491.

⁴⁷ CYRUS, *Second Letter to Sergius* (Document 4), pp. 174-175: “... ἀλλὰ κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἀλεξανδρέων φιλόχριστον πόλιν καὶ τὰς ὑπ’ αὐτὴν ἐνορίας μέχρι τῶν νεφελῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τούτων ἐπέκεινα τῶν οὐρανίων τάξεων τῇ τῶν ἀγιωτάτων ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοῖς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐπιστρεφομένοις εὐφραινόμενων...”.

⁴⁸ In the letter sent to Peter the Illustrious, Saint Maximus talks about the meeting between Cyrus and Sophronius, see MAXIME LE CONFESSEUR, *Lettres*, introduction par Jean-Claude LARCHET, traduction et notes par Emmanuel PONSOYE, coll. *Sagesses chrétiennes*, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1998, XIII, pp. 150-164; see also Christoph VON SCHÖNBORN, *Sofronie al Ierusalimului. Viața monahală și mărturisirea doctrinară*, translated by Măriuca și Adrian ALEXANDRESCU, Fundația Anastasia Publishing, Bucharest, 2007, p. 95; HEFELE, *Histoire des Conciles...*, vol. III/1, p. 342.

⁴⁹ VON SCHÖNBORN, *Sofronie al Ierusalimului...*, pp. 95-96.

⁵⁰ SERGIUS, *First Letter to Honorius* (Document 6), in: ALLEN (ed.), *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, pp. 186-188.

The Alexandrian Pact of Union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites...

energies or *activities* into Christ and not one, the activity being situated at the level of his natures, and not his person⁵¹. After a long period of deliberation, Patriarch Sergius promised Sophronius that he would not preach about *a single energy into Christ*, “in order not to disturb the peace of the Church.” After a series of heated discussions related to the doctrine on a single energy into Christ, Patriarch Sergius reached an understanding with Saint Sophronius; the two agreed that the stress should not be placed on *the action, activity-energy*, but on the *operating subject*, meaning *a single operating subject for both human and divine activities into Christ*⁵².

These objections of the honorable Palestinian monk were partially retained within the works of the permanent council that Patriarch Sergius summoned in Constantinople in order to conclude the discussion on this topic; in August 633, the Council issued a Dogmatic Decree (*ψῆφος*) whose contents are replicated fully in the letter that the Patriarch of Constantinople sent to Pope Honorius in year 634. The *Psephos* states that Patriarch Cyrus of Alexandria was recommended not to allow anybody to talk about one or two energies of Christ, but about *a single operating subject, Jesus Christ, in the energies of each nature*⁵³. Therefore, the *Psephos* does not nullify the union agreement of Alexandria, but rather annotates it, stressing the unity *of the operating subject* (meaning Christ) and not the activity or the energy itself⁵⁴. Also, in the letter sent to Patriarch Cyrus of Alexandria in August-September 633, Patriarch Sergius approves the unification between the Melkite Church and the Theodosians⁵⁵.

Immediately after his installation on the patriarchal see of Jerusalem (at the beginning of year 634), Saint Sophronius sent a synodal letter, known as *Sinodikon*, to Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, Pope Honorius and all the other patriarchs and bishops of the pentarchy. The *Sinodikon* is the first official Orthodox reaction against Monoenergism. Saint Sophronius talks about the unity of the person of the Saviour and the duality of Christ's

⁵¹ MANSI XI 481 C.

⁵² SERGIUS, *First Letter to Honorius* (Document 6), in: ALLEN (ed.), *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, p. 188; HEFELE, *Histoire des Conciles...*, III/1, p. 343, 345.

⁵³ Sergius, *First Letter to Honorius* (Document 6) in ALLEN, *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, p. 188; Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles...*, III/1, p. 345.

⁵⁴ SERGIUS, *Second Letter to Cyrus* (Document 5), in: ALLEN (ed.), *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, p. 178.

⁵⁵ SERGIUS, *Second Letter to Cyrus* (Document 5), in ALLEN (ed.), *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, p. 178.

natures. According to him, the duality of natures results in the duality of Christ's energies, each nature having its own natural energy⁵⁶.

Patriarch Sergius tasked his friend, Hegumen Pyrrhus⁵⁷, with presenting to Saint Maximus the Confessor the *Psephos* council decree; it was from the decree that the latter found out about the union between the Imperial Church and the Theodosian Monophysites and, implicitly, about the Monoenergistic doctrine formulated by Patriarch Cyrus. Hegumen Pyrrhus asked Saint Maximus to take a stand in relation to the formula of *a single energy into Christ*. In spite of a his reticence, Maximus approves the *Psephos* because this document refuses to talk about a single energy into Christ; more precisely, he says he is satisfied with the *Psephos*, as it annuls the heretic innovation introduced by the Alexandrian *Pact of Union* (June 633) and, therefore, saves the Orthodox faith inherited from the Holy Fathers in its entirety⁵⁸. It is evident that Saint Maximus disagrees with the Monoenergistic allusions of the *Psephos*. The Holy Father refutes the erroneous doctrine formulated by Cyrus, showing that the energy pertains ontologically and primordially to the nature. The existence of two natures into Jesus Christ implies that the Saviour has two natures - the human and the divine. By means of their union into a single hypostasis, each nature keeps its natural energy, unchanged and unadulterated⁵⁹.

According to Coptic sources, a large part of the Egyptian population had accepted the Chalcedonian faith in its Monoenergistic interpretation; the same sources admit that the union of Alexandria caused a deep tear amongst non-Chalcedonians. Regarding this, Severus of Al'Ashmunein writes that:

“These were the years during which Heraclius and Al-Mugaugas (*i.e.* Cyrus, the "Caucasian") were ruling over Egypt: and through the severity of the persecution and the oppression, and the chastisements which Heraclius inflicted on the orthodox [*i.e.*

⁵⁶ *Epistola Synodica*, in: ALLEN (ed.), *Sophronius of Jerusalem...*, 2.3.7., p. 96; see also VON SCHÖNBORN, *Sofronie al Ierusalimului...*, p. 118, 226.

⁵⁷ Pyrrhus followed Patriarch Sergius on the patriarchal see of Constantinople (638-641).

⁵⁸ SAINT MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR, “Epistola 19 către Pyrrhus”, in: *Scrieri, partea a doua. Scrieri și epistole hristologice și duhovnicești*, coll. *Părinți și Scriitori Bisericești* (PSB), vol. 81, translation from Greek, introduction and notes by Priest Professor Dumitru STĂNILOAE, EIBMBOR, Bucharest, 1990, pp. 200-201.

⁵⁹ SAINT MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR, *Epistola 19 către Pyrrhus*, in PSB, vol. 81, pp. 155-156; MURPHY, SHERWOOD, *Constantinople II et III*, p. 158.

the Monophysites, J.M.] in order to force them to adopt the faith of Chalcedon, innumerable multitudes were led astray, some by tortures, others by promise of honors, some by persuasion and guile”⁶⁰.

In reality, the unification of Melkites with Theodosians in Alexandria was inconsistent. Theophanes the Confessor calls it “the watercolor unification” (*τὴν ὑδροβαφῆ ἐκείνην ἔνωσιν*)⁶¹. Also, *The Greek Life*⁶², a biography of Saint Maximus the Confessor, underlines the inconsistency of the union calling it “the watercolor union.”⁶³ It is very likely that on June 3 633, Patriarch Cyrus imposed on the Theodosians the union with the Imperial Church, against their will. This is why no Coptic document alludes to Cyrus’s attempt to impose the Monoenergistic formula, and the union agreement is not mentioned anywhere. Besides, in the tradition of the Coptic Church, Patriarch Cyrus left a very bad impression. He remained known as the great persecutor of Monophysites, and that is why, in Coptic literature, he is associated with the Antichrist⁶⁴.

Both *The Chronicle* of Theophanes Confessor, and *The Greek Life* state unanimously that Patriarch Cyrus prepared the union of Alexandria in collaboration with Bishop Theodore of Pharan⁶⁵, Patriarch Sergius’s

⁶⁰ SEVERUS OF AL’ASHMUNEIN (Hermopolis), *History of the Patriarchs*, p. 491; see also MEYENDORFF, *Unité de l’Empire...*, p. 379.

⁶¹ THEOPHANES, *The Chronicle*, an English translation of anni mundi 6095-6305 (A.D. 602-813), with introduction and notes by Harry TURTLEDOVE, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1982, 330, p. 32: “He [*i.e.* Cyrus] joined with Theodore the bishop of Pharan to celebrate this union, *though it was not durable*”.

⁶² *The Greek Life* is a biographic compilation drawn up in the second half of the 10th century by Studite monk Michael Exabulitis see *Sfântul Maxim și tovarășii săi...*, pp. 16-17.

⁶³ *Sfântul Maxim și tovarășii săi...* (*Viața greacă*), chap. 9, p. 68: “... And naturally, Cyrus, speaking with Theodore, the Bishop of Pharan, who was an important supporter of the Monothelites, resolved to enact a so-called „watercolor union,” meaning pigment mixed with water, which gets diluted, remains blended and indistinct and does not preserve the brightness of either of the original colors...”.

⁶⁴ IONIȚĂ, *Sinodul al VI-lea...*, p. 380.

⁶⁵ During the second half of the 6th century, Theodore of Pharan, identified as Theodore of Raithu, activates as a monk at the monastery of Raithu (at-Tur), a port town on the south-western coast of Sinai peninsula. During the first half of the 7th century, Theodore became bishop of Pharan in Arabian Petraea; he got in contact with Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople. It seems that Theodore of Pharan died around the year 638.

advisor⁶⁶. Theodore of Pharan was the first theologian to bring arguments in favor of the Monoenergist formula proposed by Patriarch Cyrus as a basis for the Alexandria union⁶⁷. Also, *The Chronicle* of Theophanes Confessor talks about how the union between Melkites and Theodosians discredited the Council of Chalcedon so much that Jacobite and Theodosian Monophysites were boasting, saying: “Not we to Chalcedon, but rather Chalcedon has accommodated itself to us. Through His one energy (διὰ τῆς μιᾶς ἐνεργείας), it agrees Christ has one nature (μίαν φύσιν Χριστοῦ).”⁶⁸

IV. Conclusions

Despite the lack of popularity of Patriarch Cyrus in Egypt, the union of the Theodosian Monophysites with the Imperial Church was the crowning achievement of the religious politics of union advanced by Emperor Heraclius and Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople. Heraclius attempted to return the Monophysites to the Imperial Church by theological concessions regarding the Dyophysite doctrine, formulated during the Council of Chalcedon (451). In other words, the Monoenergist dispute was simply a fight for the “cause” of Chalcedon’s dogmatic formula, with the aim of making it acceptable to non-Chalcedonians. The Tomos of Faith drawn up by Patriarch Cyrus does not recant the Chalcedonian doctrine: the union of the two natures in the hypostasis of the Saviour is unequivocally reaffirmed; the document enounces the Christology of Saint Cyril of Alexandria with a Dyophysist meaning covered in a Monophysist language. From a doctrine point of view, the Tomos of Cyrus represents an attempt to align Severan Monophysitism with the Chalcedonian doctrine. The ecclesiastical policy of Patriarch Sergius, enforced by Patriarch Cyrus in Egypt, proved that combining theological initiative with military pressure could still represent a useful strategy for reconciling Christians from the Byzantine Orient within the imperial system.

⁶⁶ THEOPHANES, *The Chronicle*, 330, p. 32; *Sfântul Maxim și tovarășii săi... (Viața greacă)*, chap. 9, p. 68.

⁶⁷ Theodore of Pharan says that the energy is an attribute of the hypostasis or person of Christ, and not of his character or nature, see PELIKAN, *Tradiția creștină...*, vol. II, p. 94.

⁶⁸ THEOPHANES, *The Chronicle*, 330, p. 32.