

THE POSSIBLE INFLUENCE OF ARIANISM ON NESTORIUS AND
NESTORIAN TEACHINGS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MURAT KAYA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ART
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

AUGUST 2020

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Master of Arts

Prof.Dr. Ömer Turan
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Richard Dietrich
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Soykut (METU, HIST) _____
Assist.Prof.Dr. Richard Dietrich (METU, HIST) _____
Doç. Dr. Resul Ay (Hacettepe, Uni., Tarih) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Murat Kaya

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE POSSIBLE INFLUENCE OF ARIANISM ON NESTORIUS AND NESTORIAN TEACHINGS

Kaya, Murat

M.A., Department of History

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Richard Dietrich

August 2020, 116 pages

The controversy of Arius was one of the clearest and significant examples of the discussions regarding the divinity and humanity of Christ. These topics were discussed during the council of Nicaea in 325 which was also accepted as the first ecumenical council in the history of Christianity. As a result of this council, Arius was declared a heretic. However, many Arians who had been already declared as a heretic could continue to practice their Arian teachings throughout Byzantine territories. In the 5th century, the discussions related to the nature of Christ, and the concept of Logos has continued and these discussions that emerged during the Arian controversy turned to an explosion by Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria. It was claimed that Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople always said in his speeches that he has disagreed with Arians and Arian theology. Although Nestorius saw himself as a defender of Christian faith against the heresies, however, the truth was different. In other words, Nestorius who has been said to be strictly against Arians seemed to

have practiced similar dogmas or teachings with Arians at certain points. During the fifth century, Arians were the group of people whom the public has not liked and during this century, being an Arian or having Arian title or belonging any Arian groups was not a comfortable position for any person. Therefore, in society, there were many people who could hide their Arian sides in case they might be charged and excommunicated. I think that Nestorius was one of those who was successfully able to hide his Arian sides as it is understood from sources. If Nestorius did not hide his Arian sides, it is accurate that, he could not become the Patriarch of Constantinople. Therefore this thesis, examines whether there were possible influences of Arius and Arianism on Nestorius and his teachings by comparing them with each other and by examining their interactions with each other.

Keywords: Nestorianism, Nestorian Controversy, Arius, Arianism, Antiochian and Alexandrian Tradition.

ÖZ

ARYANİZM'İN, NESTORYUS VE NESTORYAN ÖĞRETİLER ÜZERİNDEKİ MUHTEMEL ETKİLERİ

Kaya, Murat

Yüksek Lisans, Tarih Bölümü

Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Richard Dietrich

Ağustos 2020, 116 sayfa

Hız. İsa'nın ilahi ve beşeri tabiatına ilişkin tartışmaların en belirgin ve somut örneği Aryus'un öğretileri sonucu ortaya çıkmıştır. İznik Konsili (325) neticesinde aykırı görüşleri nedeniyle Aryus ve takipçileri sapkın olarak ilan edilmiştir. Bu konsilin sonucunda da aforoz edilen Aryus, sürgüne gönderilmiş ve sürgün yıllarında ölmüştür. Ancak Aryus'un takipçileri mevcudiyetlerini sürdürebilmişler ve özellikle Bizans topraklarında Aryus'un öğretilerini devam ettirmişlerdir. Bu nedenle de Konstantiniye Aryusçuların faaliyet gösterdikleri önemli bir merkez olmuştur. Öte yandan Aryus'un başlattığı tartışmalar, beşinci yüzyılda Hristiyan dünyasında bir patlama haline gelmiştir. Nestoryus, Hristiyan aleminin yükselen merkezi olan Konstantiniye şehrinde Patriklik mertebesine erişmiştir. Nestoryus nutuklarında her daim Aryusçulara ve Aryan öğretilere karşı olduğunu dile getirmiştir. Her ne kadar Nestoryus'un söylemleri bu eğilimde olsa da hakikat farklıydı. Heretik Aryusçuların karşısında olduğunu beyan eden Nestoryus aslında Aryus'un öğretilerine benzer bir teoloji öğretiyordu. Beşinci yüzyılda, Aryusçular istenmeyen insanlar olarak

etiketlenmişti ve herhangi bir bireyin Aryus kimliğini taşıması ya da Aryusçu bir gruba mensup olarak tanınması kabul edilebilir bir durum değildi. Bu nedenle, toplumda birçok Aryus takipçisi olmasına rağmen, bu insanlar aforoz edilme kaygısından dolayı Aryan kimliklerini saklamışlardır. Nitekim, altını çizmek gerekir ki Nestoryus da Aryan yanlarını saklamış olan bir din adamı olmuştur. Eğer o, Aryan yanlarını saklamasaydı, Konstantiniye gibi Hristiyan dünyasının yükselen bir şehrine Patrik olarak tayin edilemezdi. İşte bu çalışmada Nestoryus'un öğretilerinin şekillenmesinde Aryus'un muhtemel etkilerinin olabileceği tartışıldı. Ayrıca bu çalışmada karşılaştırmalı olarak Nestoryus'un Aryanizmle olan muhtemel etkileşimi gözler önüne serilmiş ve Nestoryus'un öğretilerinde büyük etkisi olan Arius ve Aryanizm'in benimsenmesine imkan tanıyan faktörler incelenip, Nestoryus'un neden Aryanizm'inden etkilenmiş olabileceğine yönelik dönemin dini, siyasi ve sosyal koşullarından bahsedilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Nestoryanizm, Nestoryus Tartışması, Aryus, Aryanizm, Antakya ve İskenderiye Okulları.

“Se non è vero, è molto ben trovato ”

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Richard Dietrich for his encouragement and guidance throughout my research. Without his support and trust, I could not dare to begin this work. I am indebted to him also for that as much as his support during the process, for his decision that gave me the opportunity to study this topic.

I would like to thank Prof. Christopher Erismann who is from the University of Vienna. I have to confess that during my stay in Vienna, Prof. Christophe Erismann always opened his office for me and spent his time sometimes on reading what I have covered and sometimes on reshaping the contents of the study.

I want to give a thousand thanks to Assist of Prof. Dirk Krausmüller who is the partner of Prof. Christophe Erismann, due to his advices about the bibliographies and that he always tried to participate in our studies with dear Prof. Christophe Erismann.

I want to give my thanks to Prof. Dr. Mustafa Soykut whose ideas, lectures, and speeches at METU encouraged me to study the Christian patterns and the topics related to the history of Christianity.

I would like to express my gratitude also to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Resul Ay who is from the Department of History at Hacettepe University due to the fact that he suggested to me vital methods and ideas that make this study more consistent and readable. He has never hesitated to spend his time with me when I need his opinions and suggestions. He also spent his time on reading my thesis.

I am sure that my family deserves thousands of gratitudes for their support, motivation and sometimes for their patient. Lastly, I would like to express special thanks to my friend, “Tutamak” due to her motivation not only for this study but also for my life and career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
CHAPTERS	
1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION AND HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES.....	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Historiography and Sources.....	7
2. CHRISTOLOGICAL DISPUTES IN THE EASTERN PROVINCES: ESPECIALLY ANTIOCHIAN TRADITION-CENTERED CHRISTOLOGICAL DISPUTES	9
2.1. Pre-Arius Period.....	9
2.1.1. Ebionites and their Importance in the Concept of the One Ruling God.....	11
2.1.2. Origen and the Basis of His Teachings	14
2.1.2.1. The Idealism of Origen	16
2.1.2.2. The Humanity of Christ in Origen's Works	17
2.1.2.3. The Concept of the Logos in Origen's Works	20
2.2.Theodotus and Paul of Samosata and Their Influence on Arianism and Nestorianism.....	23
2.3.Sabellianism.....	26
2.4.A main cause of these disputes:the Alexandrian and Antiochian Teachings..	28
2.4.1. Alexandrian Tradition and Its Impacts on Cyril's Theology	29
2.4.2. The Antiochian Tradition and Its Impacts on Arian Theology.....	31

2.4.3. The Rivalry between These the Two Sees.....	32
2.5. Arius and Arian Teachings.....	36
2.5.1. Arius.....	36
2.5.2. The Hierarchy in the Trinity.....	38
2.5.3. Christological Concepts.....	41
3. NESTORIAN TEACHINGS and ITS REFERENCES FROM PAST.....	50
3.1. NESTORIUS.....	50
3.1.1. Who was Nestorius?.....	50
3.1.2. “Theodor was Nestorius before Nestorius”.....	53
3.2. HIS TEACHINGS.....	55
3.2.1. The Concept of Theotokos.....	55
3.2.2. The Human Nature of Christ Among Nestorius.....	56
3.2.3. The Logos.....	56
3.3. Nestorius as a “Heretic”.....	58
3.3.1. The Insincerity of Nestorius towards Heretics.....	60
3.4. Disputes with Cyril of Alexandria.....	64
3.4.1. Cyril’s Twelve Chapters.....	65
3.4.2. The Council of Ephesus (431).....	68
4. THE INFLUENCES OF ARIANISM ON NESTORIAN TEACHINGS.....	70
4.1. Comparing Nestorianism with Arianism.....	71
4.1.1. The Similarities between Arian and Nestorian Teachings.....	71
4.1.2. The Differences between Arian and Nestorian Teachings.....	78
4.2. The Methods of the Transmission of Arius’ Thoughts.....	81
4.2.1. Imperial Policies.....	81
4.2.2. Arius’s First Supporters.....	82
4.2.3. Goths, Arianism and Gothic Arianism.....	83
4.3. Arianism in India, Albyssina, Ethiopia, Asia.....	86
4.4. Arian Bishops in Constantinople until Sixth Century.....	88
4.5. Why would People Prefer to Believe in a Heresy?.....	89
4.5.1. Imperial and Political Reasons for Adopting Arianism.....	89
4.5.2. Ulfila’s Bible Translation.....	90
4.5.3. Supports from Other Heretic Groups.....	91

4.5.4. The School of Edessa.....	92
4.6. The Inter-Imperial Reasons for Nestorius's Disposal	93
5. CONCLUSION	97
5.1. General Conclusions.....	97
REFERENCES.....	101
APPENDICES	
A. TÜRKÇE ÖZET/TURKISH SUMMARY	107
B. TEZ İZİN FORMU/ THESIS PERMISSION FORM	116

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL INTRODUCTION AND HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

1.1. Introduction

Christianity has witnessed several landmark controversies through its past. Until the first quarter of the fourth century, the disputes within Christian society and authorities did not result notable in any schism. However, Christianity found itself in a series of controversies that later on resulted in Orthodoxy as we call it today. The controversy that was caused by the theological interpretations of Arius and the theology of Alexander of Alexandria triggered the other controversies. The main reason for the Arian controversy was the theological conflict between Arius and Alexander of Alexandria, both of whom tried to comment on the divine and human nature of Christ in different ways. While Arius basically emphasizes the human character and nature of Christ, the Alexandrian Bishop, Alexander, stressed the divine character and deity of Christ. In fact, these were the not only the reflections of Arius's opinions or Alexander of Alexandria own views, but in fact these were the outpouring of the mentality, theology, Christology and religious doctrine of the Alexandrian and Antiochian Christian traditions which had a vital role in shaping, educating, training, and organizing the Christian faith. In other words, with the Arian controversy, Christian Church Fathers, bishops, priests and Christian believers recognized that they were beginning to face religious and social disputes due to the different interpretations of the sacred books by Alexandrians and Antiochenes. Therefore, the Arian controversy involved a main issue of Christianity. Many

bishops by the invitation, motivation and financial support of Constantine the Great, met in the Nicaea in 325 to conclude the controversy between Arius and Alexander of Alexandria. It was a vital council for Christian believers because it aimed at ending the Arian controversy, and it was the first time that a council had been attended by almost 300 bishops across all Christian world so it was accepted as the First Ecumenic Council. However, it is doubtful whether the Council of Nicaea produced an absolute, long term conclusion or not, but it is certain that the council of Nicaea demonstrated that the disputes concerning the divine and human natures of Christ had been raised.

The Arian controversy was a landmark in Christianity and the conflict between Arius and Alexander was the trigger and motivation case for the Nestorian controversy in the fifth century. In other words, the explosion of the fifth century took its legitimize power from the controversy that had occurred one century earlier.¹

The Nestorian controversy that emerged between Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius has some features in common with the Arian controversy. One visible similarity between the Arian controversy and the Nestorian controversy is that the dispute was the result of theological and Christological disagreements about Christ's humanity and deity, along with several disagreements about the concept of the Holy Spirit. In addition to these similarities in context, both of the controversies were the reflection of Alexandrian and Antiochian traditions. In the Arian controversy, Arius represented the Antiochian tradition, however, Alexander of Alexandria, and later, Athanasius who was the pupil of Alexander of Alexandria and a most strict opponent of Arianism reflected the Alexandrian tradition. Likewise, in the fifth century, while Nestorius was the defender of Antiochian Schools, Cyril of Alexandria was the representative of the Alexandrian teachings.

It is known that many of the Christological disputes would lead to some other disputes later and many of them would be an inspiration for following individuals or groups. So it can be stated that Arius' and Arian teachings have more impacts on

¹ Husbands, M. and Greenman, J. P. (2008). Ancient Faith for the Church's Future. Intervarsity Press. p.78

Nestorius and Nestorian teachings. This does not mean that Nestorianism copied all of Arius's teaching or that Nestorianism is totally similar to Arianism. However, it does mean that there are more similarities between Arianism and Nestorianism than differences and this also means that Nestorius might be influenced by previous theological and Christological controversies, especially by Arianism. These two controversies that occurred in different centuries have been intensely examined by scholars. However, most of the studies related to both controversies have been done in just one manner. That is most of those studies examined either Arius and his heresy or Nestorius and his dispute with Cyril. However, these controversies must be examined in relation to each other. This thesis does so by not only focuses on the direct similarities between them but also pays attention to their differences as sometimes the interactions originated from the contrast effect. The main idea of this study is to reveal the background of the Nestorian teachings, its interactions with previous figures and that Arius's influences on the emergence of Nestorianism.

Chapter II demonstrates how the divine and the human natures of Christ, the image of the Holy Spirit, and the concept of Logos have been recognized and thought about by several significant bishops who influenced Arius and later, Nestorius. To comprehend Nestorius and his teachings, and especially to understand the concept of the singularity of one God and his authority, it is necessary to understand how Arianism emerged and how various bishops inspired not only Arius but also impressed Nestorius. I start with the Eboinites, a group that stressed the humanity of Christ; Origen, Paul of Samosata, (Samosata is Samsat in Adiyaman today) who became inspiring tutors for Arius. The Sabellianists who also highlighted the human character of Christ, are mentioned in this chapter. The common character of all these people, or groups was that they emphasized the humanity of Christ and as we see in the fourth and fifth centuries, the Arian and Nestorian controversies emerged out of the same types of debates related to the nature of Christ.

In addition to these figures or groups of people, this chapter explains the importance of the Antiochian and Alexandrian teachings as the differences in Christological and theological teachings of these centers are the main reason of most of the controversies. To extend, the influences of the Antiochian and the Alexandrian

traditions on the systematic theology of Christianity and the Christian faith were undoubtedly high and these produced the most important elements to construct and shape Christianity. Until the rise of the patriarchate of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Damascus, and Rome were the main centers of Christianity. In particular, many church fathers and bishops were educated and trained in Antioch and Alexandria. From the foundation of these two schools until the fourth century, these centers formulated their own theology, and the resulting differences in theological, Christological and doctrinal concepts led to increasingly bitter debates. As a result, a schism between these two schools was unavoidable. In this chapter, how and when the conflict between these traditional schools became clearest, and the famous people that maintained and shaped their school are examined. Also, I revealed the names of famous people that maintained and shaped their school. Some of these would be followed later by Arius and Nestorius from the Antiochian side or Cyril on the Alexandrian side. Starting by giving the information related to some significant figures and discussions in pre-Arius periods and mentioning the importance and the impacts of traditional Christian centers on these disputes, this chapter concludes by providing more details about Arius and Arian teachings. The last part of this chapter will examine how Arius thought, and why he was anathematized, and excluded from society. Specifically, Arius's opinions about the divine and human natures of Christ, the Logos and the Holy Spirit will be discussed to better comprehend Nestorian teachings and Arian influences on it.

Chapter III gives detailed information about Nestorius, his life, his theology and how he interpreted the same concepts that Arius had previously examined so that they can be easily compared. After discussing the nature of Christ, the concept of the Logos, and the Holy Spirit, the terms *Theotokos* and *Christokos* and Nestorius's stance over these issues, this chapter gives detailed information about the Nestorius's interaction or connection with other teachings. The influences of the figures or groups in Eastern provinces, and especially the impacts of the Antioch tradition on his theology are discussed. His master was the Theodor of Mopsuestia who was an impressive figure and the defender of the Antiochian tradition so the influences of Antiochian teachings on Nestorius are undeniable. In addition to Theodor of Mopsuestia, the other elements or methods inherited from Antiochian tradition were sophisticated. As

the previous chapter gives details on Arian theology and Christology, this part gives genuine information about Nestorius's opinions on the divine and the human nature of Christ, the position and function of the Holy Spirit, the Virgin Mary and the concept of the Trinity by referring to Arian influences. Moreover, this chapter examines whether the opponents of Nestorius or Nestorian dogmas might have had any impact as a contrast effect on Nestorius. In other words, it is important to examine whether the opponents of Nestorius or the reactions to him might have been motivating factors for Nestorius on forming his teachings. Especially one of his opponents, named Cyril of Alexandria who was Patriarch of Alexandria, was said to be too harsh in his speeches against Nestorius. So in the same chapter, Nestorius' and Cyril's mutual accusations of heresy, including Cyril's claim that Nestorius behaved like the heretical Arians and other heretics, or speaking like the heretic Paul of Samosata will be discussed. While doing so, the information about how the dispute between Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria began, as well as Cyril's thesis against Nestorius and his response will be given. Moreover, how Cyril and Nestorius approached the concept and position of Mary in terms of the concepts *Theotokos* and *Christokos*, will be examined.

The third chapter also gives information about the twelve anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria against the Patriarch of Constantinople. In addition to their theological disagreements, there were other reasons that Cyril wanted to overcome Nestorius. For example, according to Cyril, for a city which was recognized as leading city of the Christian world, Constantinople should have a patriarch who comes from the Alexandrian tradition, but Nestorius came from the Antiochian tradition, resulting in Cyril's dissatisfaction with Nestorius and the start of his efforts to get rid of the new Patriarch of Constantinople.

Chapter IV underlines the possible influences of Arianism on Nestorian Teachings. It begins with compare and contrast methods and examined the similarities between both heresies. It is not forgotten to mention about the differences between them. As much as their similarities, their differences may indicate some interactions. Moreover, this chapter tries to give an answer to the question related to how the teachings of Arius transmitted to Nestorius. This issue is highly important to

comprehend the possible methods, ways or reason that motivated Nestorius to adopt Arian teachings. For example, the followers of Arius or any person who maintained Arian dogmas after Arianism was rejected in the Council of Nicaea in 325, undoubtedly are the focus of this part. At this point, the adoption of Arianism by the leadership of Ulfila and then by other Gothic Kingdoms might be one of the significant reasons that made Arianism alive more. For example, thanks to the Gothic Kingdoms such as Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Vandals, Lombards, and the Burgundian Kingdom, because they have spread the Arianism around the many parts of Europe, and North Africa. The information mentioned in this chapter also shows how the Roman emperors and men who were very close to emperors and the imperial palace, contributed to the existence of Arius's teachings. Therefore, the follower of Arius for instance, Eusebius of Nicomedia who would be the leader of an Arian party later is just one of the examples of those who defended Arius and his teachings. Moreover, after indicating how Arian heritage might survive until the middle of the sixth century and mentioning the methods and channels that enabled Arians to do so, this chapter also speculates on why groups of people in quite large numbers preferred to adopt a heresy. That made it necessary to mention the influences of imperial policies, the behavior of the emperors, the social and religious backgrounds of those people, as well as elements like the social, the cultural and the religious patterns that could have formed the possible connections between Nestorius and Arian teachings.

In short, this thesis aims to examine what were the factors that enabled Nestorius to form his teachings under the influences of Arianism, and what were the political, social and religious conditions that also motivated Nestorius to be inspired by Arian dogmas. It gives an answer of the significant questions like: How did Nestorius' teachings emerge? Which teachings or groups of people he was influenced by? Why did Arianism have more impact than other heretic groups and could there have been several influences from the social, cultural and religious groups or environments on his adoption of some Arian teachings? Was there any impact from the Antiochian tradition since both Arius's and Nestorius's ideas were shaped there? The skeleton of this study consists of these questions.

1.2. Historiography and Sources

Having difficulty in studying a case that requires an interdisciplinary work, I faced many challenges. It would be an unsatisfactory work if the history books or articles were checked only. Instead of using only books of historians, I also took advantage of books written in different disciplines like the philosophy books that are essential to comprehend some concepts like Logos, Holy Spirit in the philosophical way or many books that were written by theologians were used very often. Instead of the primary sources, the secondary sources written by also historians who study social and ecclesiastical history were taken advantage in this thesis.

Both Arius and Nestorius penned their defense in Greek and their works were mostly burnt. However, we know about the Arius's *Thalia* which means festivity and Nestorius *Bazaar of Heracleides* more. These works are so important as *Thalia* is sermonic works of Arius and *Bazaar of Heracleides* can be regarded as the sermon of Nestorius. Thanks to these works as scholars or theologians could have a detailed information about the theologies and doctrines of these religious men.

Thanks to Robert C. Gregg and Dennis E. Groh due to the fact that they produced excellent work of Arianism named *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* by giving references from *Thalia*. This book is regarded as a reference book for those who interest in Arius and Arianism.

That is for that, maybe the most important and challenging thing for the process of this study was that this study requires the comparative study thereby I have not only detected some fundamental books of Arianism but also checked the reference books of Nestorianism

Also thanks to Friedrich Loofs's *Nestoriana: Die Fragmentes of Nestorius and Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine* (1914) and Bethune Baker who enabled the audience to read *Bazaar of Heracleides* in English at the beginning of 20th century.

Later G. R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson due to their study of *Bazaar of Heracleides* (1925) and new translation of this source into English.

Also as for the Gothic Kingdoms have played important role on spreading Arianism, it would be an insufficient and narrow-minded study without Guido M. Berndt' and Roland Steinacher's excellent book named *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. (2004) This book offers great readings related to the adoption of the Arianism by the Gothic and other Barbaric Kingdoms and then shows us how Arianism was transmitted all around the Europe, Africa especially North Africa.

It was not sufficient to read only the old history books, however, to construct this study, I had to contemporary texts, news, articles, and books. For example, "*Nestorius was Orthodox*" (1962), excellent article of Milton V. Anastos, is one of the essential article for sophisticating the ideas and the concepts of the Nestorius' teachings.

CHAPTER 2

CHRISTOLOGICAL DISPUTES IN THE EASTERN PROVINCES: ESPECIALLY ANTIOCHIAN TRADITION-CENTERED CHRISTOLOGICAL DISPUTES

*“ The discussion of the Arian heresy will open up a series of controversies on others, such as the Nestorian, Eutychian or Monophysite, and Menothelite heresies, all of which are intimately and essentially related to and dependent upon each other”.*² John Alzog

2.1. Pre-Arius Period

In the fifth century, Christianity witnessed an explosion within itself which has been recognized by scholars as a landmark in the history of Christianity - the Christological, doctrinal, and theological conflict between Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria that later led to Orthodoxy. It was a theological war due to different interpretations of the concepts of God, the Holy Spirit, and Christ. In particular, their different and opposite approaches gave this controversy a Christological character because Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius discussed the nature of Christ and the concepts of *Theotokos* and *Christokos*.

There was not only a conflict between religious men but also between two of the most important centers of Christianity: the school of Alexandria and the school of Antioch. In fact, the fifth-century controversy was a reflection of the dispute between the Alexandrian and Antiochian traditions under the names of Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria. Undoubtedly, it is clear that both of these schools had a vital role in the

² Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. p. 519

development of Christianity because of the missionaries, systematic theological education, interpretations of the Holy Scriptures, and explanations and descriptions about doctrinal concepts that were developed in these schools, sometimes by Church Fathers and sometimes by other leading figures like bishops, priests and presbyters. However, the different characteristics of the Alexandrian and Antiochian teachings led to many controversies starting at the end of first century. Moreover, almost each century until the fifth century “explosion” (Nestorian Controversy) there were also some other controversies or discussions occurred between the two traditional schools. At this point, it is emphasized that while many think that the fifth-century controversy was a result of the actions of Nestorius who comes from Antiochian traditions and Cyril of Alexandria who reflects the basis of the school of Alexandria. In fact, the core of the controversy dates back to the Arian Controversy which occurred one century earlier than the Nestorian controversy. In other words, the Arian controversy was a landmark in the history of Christianity and in my view, it helped crystallize the basics of what we call “orthodoxy” concerning the divine persons by triggering many other controversies.

To begin, it is necessary to examine how Arianism emerged, which significant figures influenced Arius, and what conditions led to the emergence of this heresy to recognize its influences on Nestorius. Clarifying these issues is essential to understanding the religious conditions of Nestorius’ age since Nestorius somehow shared the same concepts, approaches, and interpretations as Arius. Therefore, I will mention the general conditions and influences that led to Arianism and the significant figures who contributed to the development of Arius’s controversial ideas about the nature of Christ, just as Nestorius would in the following century. Susan Wessel implies that:

Though the Arians wished to assert the lowly status of Christ, consistent with their subordinationist understanding of the Trinity based on Origenism and middle-Platonism, Nestorius sought to preserve the uniquely Antiochene notion of redemption that preserved Christ’s human integrity fully intact while simultaneously safeguarding Christ’s divinity. The arguments Nestorius presented for Christ’s actual increase in moral stature were an unfortunate coincidence of language with that of the

Arians. His Christology could not have been further from Arian concerns.³

One common characteristic of Arian and Nestorian Christology is that both of them emphasized the human nature of Christ. Arius' and later Nestorius' emphasis on the human nature of Christ reflects the influences of Origen, Paul of Samosata, Theodore of Mopsuestia and other Christian groups that focused on the human side of Christ such as the Ebionites, Monophysites, etc. No one can understand Arianism without knowing the basics of the theology and Christology of Origen and Paul of Samosata and no one cannot comprehend the importance of Monophysite perspective without information about the Ebionites. All these influences affected one another accumulatively so as I said before to understand how Arianism affected Nestorianism, we must be aware of that how and under which conditions Arianism emerged and making it essential to mention some patterns of thought, dating back to the first century. Cumulatively they created a "heritage" of the concept of the one absolute God or one monarch concept that ignores the divine nature of Christ as a God. One of the most important early influences were groups in the first century referred to as Ebionites of Jewish- origin Christians.

2.1.1. Ebionites and their Importance in the Concept of the One Ruling God

The *Ebionites* were one of the first groups of people to claim, as E. C. Bragg explains, that Christ was not Eugene, a term which means well-born but purely human until he was baptized and the Holy Spirit rested on him.⁴ The origin of their name, as Aloys Grillmeier implies, has still not been fully explained, but some possible explanations related to them are that:

They were called Ebionites, (a) because of the poverty of their intelligence; (b) because of the poverty of the law which they followed; (c) because of the poverty of opinions that they had of Christ; (d) because they were 'poor in understanding, hope and deeds'.⁵

³ Wessel, S. (2004). *Cyril of Alexandria And Nestorian Controversy: Making of A Saint and of A Heretic*. Oxford University Press. p.132

⁴Bragg, C. Ervene. *Systematic Theology Christology*. n.d p.14.

⁵Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p 76

Another claim related to the origin of Ebionites argues that Ebionites were the group of people who followed Ebion who was a historical figure. As Pseudo-Tertullian, Early Christian author and author of *Adversus Omnes Haereses*, states that Ebion was the successor of Cerinthus.⁶

It is known that the Ebionites played a significant role in Christian theology until the end of the second century. They were Jewish-origin Christians so probably the reason why they rejected Christ's nature as God was due to the fact that they practiced a strictly monotheistic religion, and accepted the commands of the Torah even though they had become Christian in practice, and so for them, to believe in Christ as God would damage the nature of the monotheistic religion. Therefore they were said to be a radical and conservative group during their time.

In other words, Ebionites were the most radical and conservative group or society who described themselves as real Christians and they always tried to avoid damaging the absolute authority and singularity of God. According to Ebionites, when someone states that Christ was begotten of God and shares the same substance with his Father, all these meant that the authority of the one monarch/God would shrink. As Frank Leslie Cross described Ebionites as:

The sect flourished esp. on the E. of the *Jordan and two of their principal tenets were (1) a reduced doctrine of the Person of Christ, to the effect, e.g., that Jesus was the human son of Joseph and Mary and that the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove lighted on Him at His Baptism and, (2) over-emphasis on the binding character of the Mosaic law.⁷

They reflected their Jewish roots, so as a result, for the Ebionites it was too hard to assent to the divine nature or Deity of Jesus as this was completely against the Jewish tradition and it would contradict the one absolute God concept.

Unfortunately, there are few sources and information about them, but it is also known that the earliest sources that give information about the Ebionites date to the middle of the second century. It is stated by Irenaeus, born between 120 and 140 and

⁶ Klijn, A. F. And Reinik, G.J. *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.1973. p 73.

⁷ Cross, F L. *The Oxford Dictionary Of Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press,1997.p.523

who served as the Bishop of Lungdunum, that the Ebionites used the Gospel of Matthew. Also in the fourth century, Eusebius was aware of the Ebionites and claimed that they used the Gospel in respect of Judaistic tradition.

Additionally, another source of the information related to the Ebionites was saved by Epiphanius who was the Bishop of Constantia in the last quarter of the fourth century. He not only thinks that “the Ebionites receive the Gospel according to Matthew and call it the Hebrew Gospel but he quotes passages from Gospel used by Ebionites”.⁸

In addition, Susan Ashbrook gives some details about them stressing the impact of Jewish concepts and texts on their theology, including the acceptance of the authority of the Hebrew scriptures, and reliance on Jewish theology, and she underlines the adoptionist Christology that the Ebionites believed.⁹ According to this adoptionist perspective, Jesus was regarded only as a human being who has been ‘adopted’ by God to be His Son, and rejects of the virginal conception of Jesus.¹⁰

Ebionites believed that Christ is the elect of God and above all, the true prophet.¹¹ However, they did not accept the pre-existence of Christ. According to them when the Holy Ghost descends upon Jesus and enters into him and the voice of the Father declares him to be Son, and then Jesus, a human being, gains his divinity.¹²

All of this information shows that there were people or groups that examined the divinity and humanity of Christ even in the second century; Arius or Nestorius were not the only men who concentrated on the human nature of Christ.

In addition to the Ebionites, in the second-century Christendom witnessed Origen who influenced many bishops in the Christian world not only through during his life

⁸ Cross, F. L. *The Oxford Dictionary Of Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford UnivesityPress,1997.p.523

⁹Harvey, S. A. (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Newyork: Oxford University Press. p.74

¹⁰ Harvey, S. A. (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Newyork: Oxford University Press. p.74

¹¹ Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p.77

¹² Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p. 77

but also in the following centuries. Robert Gregg, an expert scholar on Arianism, highlights Origen's approach to underline the divine and human nature of Christ and the position of Christ, arguing that Christ was a mediator, designation of Word as God's image. Origen maintains that "the Father and Son possess a common nature and of which the Father is the origin of all and which he communicates to the Son."¹³ In other words, Origen's idea was that the Son was an emanation and created by the Father. The Holy Spirit, in other words, the Word/Kelam/Logos (or we can also say Wisdom) made him a saviour.

Before giving detailed information about the concept of the Logos in Origen, it is essential to discuss Origen's main teachings and his life because he was an influential figure that underlined not only the human nature of Christ, but also took a controversial approach to and interpretations of the concept of the Holy Spirit that inspired his successors, specifically like Arius and Nestorius.

2.1.2. Origen and the Basis of His Teachings

Origen is one of the most remarkable men in history for his genius and learning, for the influence he exerted on his age, and for the controversies and discussions to which his opinions gave rise.¹⁴ It is known that he was born to Christian parents in the year 185 and grew up in Alexandria.¹⁵ The common idea about his baptism is that it had been performed when he was a child and he was purified according to the Egyptian custom. He learned theology and studied the Bible; thanks to his Greek studies he was able to use Greek literature and copied some manuscripts. His intelligence, abilities, and curiosity enabled him to hold significant chairs. In the early years of the third century, Origen was nominated by the bishop Demetrius, and was promoted to head of the catechetical school of Alexandria.¹⁶ This position also

¹³ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. p. 110

¹⁴ Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Volume II. Newyork: Grand Rapids, 1882. p.692

¹⁵ Ibid, 692-693

¹⁶Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Volume II. Newyork: Grand Rapids, 1882. p. 693

contributed to the expansion of his intellectual horizons. Philip Schaff describes the significance of his new chair:

To fill this important office, he made himself acquainted with the various heresies, especially the Gnostic, and with the Grecian philosophy; he was not even ashamed to study under the heathen Ammonius Saccas, the celebrated founder of Neo-Platonism. He learned also the Hebrew language and made journeys to Rome (211), Arabia, Palestine (215), and Greece. In Rome, he became slightly acquainted with Hippolytus, the author of the *Philosophumena*, who was next to himself the most learned man of his age.¹⁷

Origen would convert many eminent infidels and heretics and bring them into the Catholic church. His reputation spread beyond Egypt; Julia Mamaea, Emperor Alexander Severus's mother, brought him to Antioch so that she could learn from him the doctrines of Christianity and also an Arabian prince honored him with a visit for the same purpose.¹⁸

Generally, he preferred to maintain an ascetic life because according to him the first principle is to renounce earthly things which are not indispensably necessary.¹⁹ It is also known that, due to his ascetic life, he always refused the gifts given by his pupils. Being an ascetic man, he seldom ate fish, never drank and dedicated most of his night to prayer and study, and it is also noted that he tried to sleep on the bare floor.²⁰

In the year of 228, he was ordained presbyter by two friendly bishops, Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Caesarea in Palestine who requested him to teach publicly in their churches and to expound the Scriptures to their people.²¹

The rising fame of Origen triggered jealousy among both some heathens and Christians like Demetrius of Alexandria who accused Origen of corrupting Christianity, a charge that resulted in assembling two councils against him in 231 and

¹⁷ Ibid, 693

¹⁸ Ibid, 693

¹⁹ Ibid, 694

²⁰ Ibid, 694

²¹ Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Volume II. Newyork: Grand Rapids, 1882. p. 694

232. The reasons for these charges were due to his false doctrine, his self-mutilation and his violation of church laws.²² The result was that he was deposed from his offices of presbyter and catechist and was excommunicated.

The number of Origen's works has been estimated at about six thousand in number but Philip Schaff explains that this number counts all his short tracts, homilies and letters as separate volumes.²³ His oral lectures are also included in this total. Moreover, one of his contemporaries, Jerome, described the works of Origen saying that '*he wrote more than other men can read*'.²⁴

Undoubtedly, even though he passed away in 254 in Tyre, his theology, interpretations, and teachings remained at the core of Christianity and Origenist ideas gave different forms and perspectives into the Christian world.

2.1.2.1. The Idealism of Origen

Perhaps Origen's most significant characteristic was that he interested in philosophy in addition to theology. Scholars came across Platonic idealism in his works because as one of the greatest scholar of his ages, he was also a fan of Plato and had a tendency to harmonize Christian doctrines with Greek philosophy by leaning to idealism. Therefore, due to his tendency to harmonize Christianity with Greek Philosophy he got a significant amount of criticism. In other words as Philip Schaff states that:

...leaning to idealism, his predilection for Plato, and his noble effort to reconcile Christianity with reason, and to commend it even to educated heathens and Gnostics, led him into many grand and fascinating errors.²⁵

The question which must be put at this point is that how Platonism affected Origen's theology and Christology. A. Edward Scienski says that Origen's theology of the Trinity has traditionally been considered subordinationist, as a result of his

²² Ibid, p. 694

²³ Ibid, p.698

²⁴ Ibid, p.698

²⁵ Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Volume II. Newyork: Grand Rapids, 1882.p. 698

appropriation of Platonic philosophy and his substitution of Christian personalistic theology for the impersonalistic system of Neoplatonism.²⁶ Also, another explanation of this was done by Sergius Bulgakov and he says that he provided reconciliation of the reason and Christianity by replacing the Hypostasis of the Father with a Neoplatonic God, the personality of the Son with Neoplatonic Reason and the personality of the Logos was centered at place of World Soul.²⁷

According to Origen in his passages, the Father alone is God while the Son and the Holy Spirit are in the position of secondary and tertiary hypostases, and they gained their divinity by participation or derivation. Therefore his tendency to idealism caused an unavoidable dualism as Henry Chadwick also maintains that “as a Platonic idealist, the whole thought of Origen is dominated by the conviction of the inferiority of the material and visible as compared with the immaterial and invisible, and consequently by the dualism involved in this outlook.”²⁸

2.1.2.2. The Humanity of Christ in Origen’s Works

Origen has made himself unique from his contemporaries for not only due to his attraction into Platonic idealism but also because of his efforts to interpret the nature of Christ in different ways, speculating about the pre-existence of Christ and also concentrating on his human nature. Origen underlines that the preexistence soul of the Christ was superior than other souls and was so absolutely holy that he was supposed to be a mediator between the divine and human body.²⁹ Origen in the assist of Plato’s Timaeus formulated a solution for the preexistence of soul of Christ to him Christ had a human soul which is a soul in solidarity with all souls. When his human

²⁶ Sicienski, A. Edward. *The Filioque-History of A Doctrinal Controversy*. Newyork: Oxford University Press, 2018. p. 34

²⁷ Sicienski, A. Edward. *The Filioque-History of A Doctrinal Controversy*. Newyork: Oxford University Press, 2018. p. 34

²⁸ Chadwick, H., & Qulton, J. E. (2006). *Alexandrian Christianity*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press. p. 192

²⁹ Chadwick, H., & Qulton, J. E. (2006). *Alexandrian Christianity*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press. p. 192

soul united with the divine logos, he became dependent with the divine love. In other words as Henry Chadwick penned:

But by being united to the divine Logos this soul adhered to the divine love indefectibly and inseparably. To illustrate this union Origen used a simile which Stoic philosophers had used to illustrate the union of soul and body, saying that the union was like that of white-hot iron in the fire which acquires the properties of fire.³⁰

In some passages, it is clear that Origen has always been aware of the human nature of Christ and he emphasized how the human and the divine nature of the Savior were integrated with each other. He gives the case of white-hot iron in the fire metaphor as an example to describe this integration clearly. As it is known, fire in iron cannot be seen but it makes iron hot so two elements were combined in a material, fire and hot energy in iron or like the humanity and divinity of Christ in one body. Maybe the most important point in the previous metaphor was that until Origen, the concept of the human nature of the Son had not been asserted so strongly. While this emphasis improved the Christian theology and Christology, it also led to occur unpleasant and opposite reactions to Origen. According to him, Christ was an *anima mediatrix*³¹ (intermediary soul/person) between the creator and all creatures and it is interesting that this idea would later be adopted by Arius who was excommunicated as a heretic. Aloys Grillmeier questions Origen's new interpretation about the human nature of Christ and he examines whether the Origen's concept of Christ produces a new picture of the place of Christ in the Alexandrian's System.³² Therefore Grillmeier wrote that Origen's Christ should be regarded as a mediator of the mystical union of the soul with hidden God and also should be seen as intermediary person between the Church and God.³³ At this point, Origen believed that the [divine] soul of the Christ, Logos and the humanity of Savior are the means that served in this process to intermediate.

³⁰ Chadwick, H. (2002). *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great* . NewYork: Oxford Press. p. 516

³¹ Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p. 153

³² Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p. 162

³³Ibid, p. 141

Logos, soul of Christ, the humanity of the Lord, are seen in the service of that movement in which God goes out from himself and returns to himself. The Platonic pattern of antitype-type shows the poles between which this movement takes place and in addition helps to make clear the tension there is between them. The whole drive is from symbol to reality (truth). Despite the extent to which Origen's Christology incorporates the traditional doctrine of Christ, his Godhead and manhood, and of body and soul, it is completely moulded by his subjective interests and thought patterns and hence by his mysticism.³⁴

In Origen's mind, the relation between the Christ who is already divine and Jesus who is an earthly man is illuminated accurately and to extent as Aloys Grillmeier states that Origen underlined the difference between the titles Christ and King. The title king has its basis in the statue of the firstborn of all creation, that is his divine nature.³⁵ Moreover, Grillmier goes further and maintains that Origen interpreted the nature of Christ in a different way which would later be adopted by the Arians.³⁶

About the pre-existence of Christ, Origen also argued a controversial position that affected the following generation as well as his contemporaries. He claimed that whereas the Father is eternal and has no beginning, the Son came into being by the will of his Father and the Son has a distinct hypostasis so Christ differs from the Father. Therefore being distinct from his Father as a result of his substance, to Origen, Christ is not the same and equal with his Father. Henry Chadwick argues that Origen disagreed with the idea that the Father and Son are merely names for the same divine being; there is indeed one God, but the Father is the Father and not the Son.³⁷

Moreover, Origen also opposed the 'Monarchian' answer, considering all persons in Trinity are coexisting and consubstantially One, and he rejected Monarchian the idea of that Father and Son are just different titles for describing one God as Chadwick states that if Origen accepted the monarchian idea, Origen's words or speeches would be like below:

³⁴ Ibid, p.141

³⁵ Ibid, p. 141

³⁶ Ibid, 144

³⁷ Chadwick, H. (2002). *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great* . NewYork: Oxford Press. p. 143

If he then wanted to affirm monotheism, it seemed necessary to say that the Son is divine but not as fully divine as the Father. That proposition would bring a legacy of controversy in the following century.³⁸

2.1.2.3. The Concept of the Logos in Origen's Works

'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' John 1:1

The Logos has been a fundamental concept and one of the bases of Christianity but it has been debated by the Church Fathers in different ways and, undoubtedly, Origen's approach to this concept is still disputable since it has been a major point in theology since from Origen's time. Terminologically, Logos has been used with different meanings throughout the history of Christianity but it has been commonly familiarized or associated with the "Second Person" in the Christian Trinity. It is basically defined as "word" or "reason" and refers to the Holy Spirit in Christianity. However, throughout history, it was used by pagans or Jews, and Frank Leslie Cross explains that Heraclitus (c.500 B.C) conceived of the Logos in a pantheistic way as the universal reason governing and permeating the world; later neo-Platonists took over the idea and popularized that.³⁹ He also maintains that in Hellenistic Judaism the concept of Logos as an independent hypostasis was further developed, and Logos also came to be associated with the figure of Wisdom.⁴⁰

Moreover, Philo, a Jewish thinker who lived in BC 20- AD 50, was the most important figure among the Hellenistic Jews of his age and fertile author.⁴¹ Philo tried to prove that the Torah and Greek Philosophy are identic to each other, combining the Greek and biblical terms. He described Logos as the divine pattern from which the material world is copied, the Divine power in the cosmos, the Divine

³⁸ Chadwick, H. (2002). *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great* . NewYork: Oxford Press. p. 143

³⁹ Cross, F. L. (1997). *The Oxford Dictionary Of Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press. . 992

⁴⁰ Cross, F. L. (1997). *The Oxford Dictionary Of Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press. . 992

⁴¹ Ibid, 1279

purpose or agent in creation and an intermediary between God and man.⁴² Also when the New Testament is examined in detail, the prologue of the Gospel John (verses such as *1:1 and *1:14) claims that Logos is described as eternal like Father so scholars lived in patristic times accept Logos as God from eternity, the Creative Word, who became incarnate in the man, Jesus of Nazareth the Christ.⁴³

In addition to all these descriptions related to Logos, it is widely known that it gained more speculative and complicated meanings, especially in Patristic times. Ignatius and the Apologists saw it in a welcome means of making the Christian teaching compatible with Hellenistic philosophy. As F.L. Cross penned in his book *The Oxford Dictionary of The Christian Church* that Theophilus, following the Stoics distinguished the Logos as being immanent in God before creation; Logos was externalized as the instrument of creation.⁴⁴ He also goes further and informs us about that Clement of Alexandria also made the Logos doctrine as a chief part of his teaching. In the light of all these cases, it is clear that the concept of Logos was a significant matter of study in the history of Christianity.

The preceding paragraphs should give some indication of how the concepts of Logos developed and changed over time.

Perhaps the most influential figure who contributed to the description of Logos and its characteristics was Origen, and he brought new approaches to the concept of Logos that were alien to the Alexandrian tradition.

According to Origen first of all, without integrating with the Logos, Christ would not become totally divine and he argues that having a human body, Christ's mortal body and human soul reached its magnificence or holiness not merely by communion with the Logos but also by its genuine union and intermingling so that they were rendered

*John 1:1 says that in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word wasod.

**John 1:14 also says that and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only Begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth.

⁴² Ibid, 992

⁴³ Ibid, 992

⁴⁴ Ibid, 992

divine.⁴⁵ Moreover, as Henry Chadwick maintains Origen tried to solve the Christological problem by absorbing the humanity of Christ wholly into the divine Logos.⁴⁶ Origen's Logos was the image of God however the soul of Christ was image of Logos.⁴⁷ Grillmeier also uses Origen's metaphor to define the position and characteristics of Logos which says that:

It is worth noting that 'Logos' stands as a personal name for the 'bridegroom of the soul'...The soul is the bride of the Logos ... she takes him to herself, him, the God-Logos who was in the beginning with God, who of course does not always remain with her...but sometimes visits her, sometimes leaves her so that she will long for him still more.⁴⁸

At this point Origen targets to emphasize that the Logos is not eternal in the same way as the Father, coming into existence by the will of the Father. Grillmeier points out that Origen indeed assumed that God is the creator from eternity, but because he refused to accept that the real creation is eternal like God, the Logos had to become from eternity the point of reference to which God's creative will and activity relate.⁴⁹

However, Philip Schaff criticizes Origen on the following points:

Among these are his extremely ascetic and almost docetistic conception of corporeity, his denial of a material resurrection, his doctrine of the pre-existence and the pre-temporal fall of souls (including the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ), of eternal creation, of the extension of the work of redemption to the inhabitants of the stars and to all rational creatures, and of the final restoration of all men and fallen angels. Also in regard to the dogma of the divinity of Christ, though he powerfully supported it, and was the first to teach expressly the eternal generation of the Son, yet he may be almost as justly considered a forerunner of the Arian heteroousion, or at least of the Semi-Arian homoiousion, as of the Athanasian homoousion.⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Chadwick, H. *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. New York: Oxford Press. (2002). p. 516

⁴⁶ Chadwick, H. *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. New York: Oxford Press. (2002). p. 516

⁴⁷ Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p. 143

⁴⁸ Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p. 143

⁴⁹ Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p. 229

⁵⁰ Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Volume II. Newyork: Grand Rapids, (1882).p. 696

Therefore these views resulted in the final declaration of the denial of the Origenist ideas was when the council of Constantinople in 543 was gathered and Origen's ideas were solemnly condemned as heretical.⁵¹

However, even he had been condemned, it can be stated his opinions about the human and divine nature of Christ and his position about the Holy Spirit were criticized by his contemporaries but, were also either partly or totally adopted in following centuries by other men like Arius and Nestorius making it necessary to illuminate his teachings in detail.

2.2. Theodotus and Paul of Samosata and Their Influence on Arianism and Nestorianism

Before discussing Paul of Samosata, it is essential to give summary information about his master, Theodotus who had a severe influence on him.

Theodotus who was the pioneer of the concept of Dynamic Monarchism, a doctrine arguing that Christ was a mere man and he gained his divine character by the will of the Father, in 190s and had been said to be a leather merchant was able to had an influence on many bishops like Paul of Samosata, Arius, and Eunomius who was the most famous representative man of the idea and the concept of Dynamic Monarchianism in the fourth century. In midst of the third century, one of his followers named as Artemon maintained Theodotus's ideas by emphasizing on the human characters of Christ. Then it is notable that Paul of Samosata would follow Theodotus's teachings and theology of Theodotus formed the basis of Paul's teachings. As Turhan Kaçar reveals on his article (2003) that Theodotus's theology is associated with the sole monarch and it implies Christ's position as not an incarnation of God in a human body but as a human who took his wisdom and power from God, absolute monarch.⁵²

⁵¹ Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Volume II. Newyork: Grand Rapids, (1882).p. 697

⁵² Kaçar T. (2003) Ebonitler'den Arius'a: Eskiçağ Doğu Hristiyanlığında İsa Teolojisi Tartışmaları. AÜİFD Cilt XLIV. Vol. 2. p. 202.

Undoubtedly, besides Origen, another figure who had a significant influence on Arian and Nestorian theology was Paul of Samosata. His original name was Dionysius of Alexander and his master was Theodotus. Paul of Samosata was the bishop of Antioch from 260 until he was forced out from his position and lived almost five decades earlier than Arius. Paul of Samosata, during his time as bishop of Antioch, confirmed or described Christ as a man who was a born of Mary.⁵³ He argued that the Logos has a status higher than Christ and also his interpretations about the title *theotokos* (to be explained later) would be adopted by Nestorius in the fifth century. Paul's stand resulted in bishops gathering twice or three times to discuss his ideas related to the humanity of Christ and the position of the Logos. They came from Asia, Syria, and Palestine, and it is even said that Dionysius of Alexandria was too old and ill to attend to this council, the Council of Antioch. Moreover, according to Paul of Samosata, Christ is solely a human that Mary gave birth to and he gained his divinity of when the Logos has appeared and they intermingled. When he rejected the inherited divinity of the Son, it was considered a scandal in the Alexandrian School, accelerating the antagonism between the Alexandrian and the Antiochian Traditions. On his teaching, Paul says that:

The Logos was greater than Christ; for Christ became great through wisdom. The Logos is from above; Jesus Christ is a man from here. Mary... bore a man like us, but greater in all respects since he was from the Holy Spirit. It would appear, then, that Jesus was a man inspired by the wisdom or logos of God; and the logos of God is none other than the one God, *solitary Monad.⁵⁴

What is clear from this passage is that the thing or fact which makes the Son divine was the Logos. Mary gave birth and indeed Jesus was an ordinary man like us but Christ got his divine nature or characteristics that made him superior to all creatures

⁵³ Kaçar T. (2003) *Ebonitler'den Arius'a: Eskiçağ Doğu Hristiyanlığında İsa Teolojisi Tartışmaları*. AÜİFD Cilt XLIV. Vol. 2. p. 202

⁵⁴ Mitchell, Margaret M, ve Frances M. Young . 2009. *The Cambridge History Of Christianity*. Volume 1. Cambridge University Press. p.468

*Monad is a term that was used in many fields differently. However, in Christian perspective, monad is first used by neo-Platonists to signify the One i.e undivisible unit of God. In the work of the Christian Platonists such as Synesius God was described as Monad of Monad. The opposite of Dyad**

** Dyad is basically understood as Duality.

from the Logos of God. By excluding the divine nature and underlying the humanity of Christ, Paul of Samosata was subjected to many challenges, criticisms and he was accused of being Jewish by some of his contemporaries. In other words, some scholars connect with his teachings that highlight a solitary monad i.e. unit, and Judaism as J. W. Etheridge cites below:

According to him (Paul of Samosata), the Lord Jesus Christ was illuminated by the divine wisdom, which was in him by habitation and operation, but not by any kind of personal union. All the sentiments of Paul of Samosata tended to Judaism; and, according to some of the fathers, were inculcated with the purpose of flattering his great patroness, queen Zenobia, the wife of Odenat, prince of Palmyra, who was a Jewess.⁵⁵

It is probable that Paul had close interactions with Jews and it is also revealed that he preferred to go under the title derived from his secular office, namely Ducenarius, the chief of the collectors of taxes in the service of Queen Zenobia with a salary of 200 sesterces, rather than that of a bishop.⁵⁶ The main point is that the Ebionites, people who came from the Jewish tradition, or who lived and had contact with Jewish subjects like Paul of Samosata, gave more interest and focus on the human character of Christ. Therefore it is probable that due to his personal interest related to Judaistic tradition which declares the authority of a sole monad, Paul preferred to focus and teach more the humanity of Christ.

Moreover, we also notice that Paul of Samosata influenced many bishops because of not only his ideas about the humanity of the Savior and the concept of the Logos, but also his ideas regarding the denial of the term ‘*theotokos*’. Later, Nestorius would be one of the bishops that maintained views of Paul of Samosata on this issue.

The concept of *theotokos* might be the main issue that Paul studied, and so it should be defined in detail. The term *theotokos* was appeared after the cult of veneration of Mary spread. It is said that the veneration of the Mary, in the manner of a Virgin who gives birth to God, might be seen in the Alexandria in the early years of third century. Then this veneration resulted in the emergence of the term *theotokos* which

⁵⁵ Etheridge, J. W. (1866) *The Syrian Churches With Their Liturgies and Literatures*. Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans Press. p. 28

⁵⁶ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. pp. 350-351

means *God-bearer*, attributed Mary to refer that she gave birth God Jesus. However it did not get universal acceptance easily and in 427 Nestorius, the patriarch of Constantinople who regarded this veneration as a pagan tradition and lacking logical tenability, rejected it. Instead he proposed the term of *Christotokos* (Christ-bearer) as Mary gave birth to a man, Jesus.⁵⁷

According to him, it is not accurate to use title *theotokos* for Mary because *theotokos* means *God-Bearer*. However, Mary did not give birth to God, but to Jesus who was born as a mere human. As a result of this, Paul refused to use the title *theotokos* and he called Christ “*God from the Virgin*”.⁵⁸

As a result of his controversial teaching at three synods held in Antioch between 264 and 269 Paul’s ideas were condemned and at the last of these synods was he deposed from his position and excommunicated. His followers, who went under the names of Paulianists and Samosatists, continued as a distinct sect down to the fourth century.⁵⁹

2.3. Sabellianism

In addition to all, before moving on to the next chapter which is the main concern of this study, and titled *Nestorius’ Teachings and His References from the Past*, it is necessary to discuss Sabellianism, a movement which denied the distinction of Persons in the Divine Nature.

The Sabellianist groups were not only important for their ideas stressing the absolute unity and indivisibility of God, but also because it has appeared when the rudiments of Arianism were being worked out, and subsequent rivalry between Sabellianists and Arianists. John Henry Cardinal Newman describes the main concern of Sabellianism as:

⁵⁷ MacGuckin, and John Anthony. 2011. *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*. Volume I. Pondicherry: Wiley-Blackwell.

⁵⁸ Lardner, N. (1815) *The works of Nathaniel Lardner*. In Five Volumes. Volume I. Newyork. T. Bensly Press. p 625.

⁵⁹ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. pp. 350

The Sabellian peculiar tenet is the objection to the distinction of Persons in the Divine Nature; or the doctrine of the Monarchia, as it is called by an assumption of exclusive orthodoxy, like that which has led to the term Unitarianism at the present day.⁶⁰

In other words, they taught that these three (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) are one: “if the three testimonies are one and the same, then each of them has the same Divinity, the same substance.”⁶¹ Having accepted this formula, they refused to separate these three from each other.

The movement emerged about the middle of the third century and the pioneer of this disturbance was Sabellius, who gave his name to the movement. It is said that he was a bishop or presbyter in Pentapolis, a district of Cyrenaica, included within the territory afterward called, and then virtually forming, the Alexandrian Patriarchate.⁶²

The interaction of Sabellianists with Arianism is quite interesting because they sometimes expressed the same points of focus, however sometimes they were said to have been opposed to each other. For instance, Philip Schaff indicated that Arius accused his enemy, Alexander of Alexandria for being Sabellianist as below:

Arius...pressed and overstated the Origenistic view of the subordination, accused Alexander of Sabellianism, and taught that Christ, while he was indeed the creator of the world, was himself a creature of God, therefore not truly divine.⁶³

In contrast, Aloys Grillmeier in his book *Christ in Christian Tradition* states that Arianism and Sabellianism shared the same purposes that are to protect the authority of the one absolute monarch as below:

For Arianism, Sabellianism, the supporters of the formulas of one hypostasis and three hypostases all pursued the same goal: preserving the strict unity of God.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Newman, J. H. (1890). *The Arians Of Fourth Century*. London: Longsman, Green and Comp. p. 117

⁶¹ Liguori, A. M. (185). *History of Heresies and Their Refutations*. Dublin: James Duffy. p. 422

⁶² Newman, J. H. (1890). *The Arians Of Fourth Century*. London: Longsman, Green and Company. p. 118

⁶³ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. pp. 518-519

⁶⁴ Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p. 277

Moreover, the relations between Arian and Sabellian teaching is said to be that Arianism, in particular, emerged as a counter-effect or reaction. In other words, according to St. Thoma, Arius avoided the Sabellian heresy, however, his zeal against to the teachings of the Sabellius resulted in the emergence of his heretic ideas related to accepting the divisions of Persons in Trinity.⁶⁵

The significant point to be mentioned in this section is that both the Alexandrian and the Antiochian tradition were the primarily reason for the emergence of most of these various, opposite teachings. In other words, Alexandria and Antioch had become two important centers of Christianity since their foundation. They had a determinative role and influence on those theologies and Christologies. In particular, the impact of the Antiochian tradition is highly visible on Arian and Nestorian teachings and similarly, the influence of the Alexandrian tradition is recognizable clearly on Alexander of Alexandria and Athanasius who were opponents of Arius and on Cyril of Alexandria. Therefore, it is necessary to cover their past and functions.

2.4. A main cause of these disputes: the Alexandrian and Antiochian Teachings

The classical Christian schools were the centers where pupils received their religious education and gained their theological, Christological and doctrinal backgrounds. Naturally, each school displayed different characteristics or taught their students different methods or concepts on several points. When we consider the general situation of third century Christianity, it was the age when heresies appeared and there was a real threat to the unity of Christianity and the Empire. However it was not only an age of emerging heresies and struggles against them, but it was also the period when the conflict between religious schools appeared.

Up until the fourth century the significant religious schools and centers of Christianity were Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, and Jerusalem. After the middle of the

⁶⁵Worral P. (1956) *St Thomas and Arianism*. Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. 23 Peters Publishers. p. 217

fourth century, Constantinople began to take its own place in this list and would soon be one of the main centers of Christianity. However, the schools of Alexandria and Antioch in particular played a very significant role in shaping Christianity. These schools educated many Christian pupils who would later enter the clergy, some of whom would be among the Church Fathers. The problem was that students who were educated in these schools naturally reflected what they had been taught, but disputes between churchmen from these two schools over theological issues had the potential to develop into a schism within Christianity. For example, according to John Alzog, Arius's dispute with his opponent, Athanasius, was also a reflection of the controversy between two systems of thought i.e. the Antiochian tradition and the Alexandrian tradition. According to him, while Arius represented the teachings of Antioch, Athanasius reflected the ideology and theology of the tradition of Alexandrian Christian School.⁶⁶ The main reason for these controversies was the fact that two schools interpreted the writings of Christianity and the words of the Christ differently. In order to better understand the fourth-century controversy between Arius and Alexander of Alexandria and his pupil Athanasius, and the fifth-century dispute between the Cyril and Nestorius, it is necessary to examine the teachings of the Alexandrian and Antiochian traditions.

Prior to the foundation and rise of the Constantinople, the most significant city of the empire was located in the Egyptian port city of Alexandria. Its only potential rival was Antioch, however, Antioch was located inland while Alexandria had an excellent harbour.

2.4.1. Alexandrian Tradition and Its Impacts on Cyril's Theology

Alexandria was a center of population and a major port, so it attracted many Christian missionaries. In less than two hundred years, Alexandria became a center of the Christian faith. The origin of this city's religious significance was the tradition that Mark the Evangelist had been sent by the disciple Peter to Alexandria as his representative. Mark became the pioneer of the missionaries there and was accepted

⁶⁶ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. pp. 563-564

as the first Bishop of Alexandria.⁶⁷ Saint Mark's first followers were Anianus, Abilius, and Cerdon. In addition to this legend related to Sts. Peter and Mark, there was another important reason for Alexandria to take precedence over other bishoprics or patriarchates, and that was that the first Christian catechetical school, the Catechetical School of Alexandria was founded there. In the late second century Pantaenus, introduced a number of innovations that contributed to Catechetical School's later fame as a center of Christian learning.

Two of the most remarkable theologians who were educated at this school were Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Turhan Kaçar point out that Origen was expelled from Alexandria for political reasons.⁶⁸ Origen, in particular, brought new interpretations to the sacred writings by combining elements of Greek philosophy with Christianity. As a result, his ideas and comments were accepted in certain points, but due to some of his other interpretations, he was declared a heretic and his name was put on the list of heretics for a long time. It was only after the Second Council of Constantinople in 553, that his name was taken off this list. Having tried to integrate Greek philosophy with Christianity, Clement of Alexandria and Origen were rejected and strictly criticized by others. As in his papal Bull "Postquam Intelleximus", Pope Benedict XIV, refused Clement the honors of a saint, due to a suspected want of orthodoxy in their works.⁶⁹ J. B. Bury also mentioned that the controversies between the traditional school of Alexandria and Antioch began with an attack made by an influential theologian, Theophilus of Alexandria, as a result of Origen's anthropomorphic approach that gives the Christ a human character.⁷⁰

The Alexandrian tradition raised many Church Fathers and theologians who stressed the divinity of Christ, among them Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Bishop of Nyssa Gregory and Gregory Nazianzen the Theologian, Eusebius

⁶⁷ Fortescue, A. (1908). *The Orthodox Eastern Church*. London: Catholic true Society. p. 11

⁶⁸ Kaçar T. (2003) Ebonitler'den Arius'a: Eskiçağ Doğu Hristiyanlığında İsa Teolojisi Tartışmaları. AÜİFD Cilt XLIV. Vol. 2. P. 199

⁶⁹ Ibid, 12

*Hypostatic union can be defined as the singularity in Personalities.

⁷⁰ Bury, J. B. (1991). *The History of Medieval History*. Newyork: The Macmillian Company. p. 490

the Bishop of Caesarea, St. Hillary, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria and many others. The common characteristic of all these churchmen was that almost all of them insisted on the union of the two natures in Christ or **hypostatic union* of two natures in one person.

2.4.2. The Antiochian Tradition and Its Impacts on Arian Theology

In the same way that Alexandria was the leading city of Egypt, Antioch was the chief city of Syria. Antioch was built by the Seleucid king, Seleucus Nicator in 301 B.C. Even before the Roman control over this territory, Antioch was already a great and famous city in Asia. Many Roman emperors, among them Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, and Diocletian had lived in Antioch and they had many bathes, temples, and palaces built.

Antioch was the place where Christians were first called Christians and it is said that St. Peter was the Bishop of Antioch. During the Roman persecution of Christians, many Christians from Antioch became martyrs.⁷¹

In a short time, Antioch was able to become the one of the vital centers of Christianity and the Bishop of Antioch was the head of all bishops in Syria, as well as the bishops in Cyprus, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and Phoenicia. It maintained its significance until the Persian conquest of the city in the last quarter of the fourth century. Although the Roman Empire lost its authority in those territories and the Persians took the city, Christians continued to accept the authority of Bishop of Antioch for a long time.

Similar to Alexandria, Antioch also had its own school of theology. However, according to the Alexandrians, Antiochenes was suspected of unorthodoxy. In other words, according to those educated in the Christian school of theology in Alexandria, the Antiochian school of theology was doing a disservice to Christianity.

⁷¹ Fortescue, A. (1908). *The Orthodox Eastern Church*. London: Catholic true Society. p. 15

In fact, the Antiochian tradition was defended by influential bishops like Paul of Samosata, who was the Bishop of Antioch until he was excommunicated in 269, Lucian of Antioch who was the master of Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Eustatius of Antioch, Diodore of Tarsus, Theodor of Mopsuestia who was regarded as the father of Nestorianism, Theodor of Cyrus, and St. John Chrysostom. However, keeping the enmity between the Alexandrian and Antiochian traditions in mind, it should not come as a surprise then that Arius and Nestorius, who would be declared heretics, were also pupils of the same tradition.

2.4.3. The Rivalry between These the Two Sees

The bitter rivalry between the schools of Alexandria and Antioch had a long history. These two theological schools each maintained its own respective theological and Christological system, and mainly they argued different proposals or claims related to these topics. Despite the different positions they maintained, they were not at war with each other until the Origenist controversy when the differences became acute.⁷²

James Franklin Baker describes these two schools as follows:

“the mystical tendency prevailed at Alexandria the historical and practical at Antioch; and these distinct tendencies shewed themselves in different methods of study and different ways of expounding Scripture and presenting doctrine.”⁷³

To extend, as Philip Schaff explains in detail that:

The Alexandrian school of theology, with its characteristic speculative and mystic turn, favored a connection of the divine and human in the act of the incarnation so close, that it was in danger of losing the human in the divine, or at least of mixing it with the divine; while, conversely, the Antiochian school or Syrian school, in which the sober intellect and reflection prevailed, inclined to the opposite extreme of an abstract separation of the two natures. In both cases the mystery of the incarnation, the veritable and permanent union of the divine and human in the one person of Christ, which is essential to the idea of a Redeemer

⁷² Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. p. 566

⁷³ BAKER, J. F. (1908). *Nestorius and His Teaching- A Fresh Examination of The Evidence*.

Cambridge: University Press. p. 9

and Mediator, is more or less weakened or altered. In the former case the incarnation becomes a transmutation or mixture of the divine and human; in the latter, a mere indwelling of Logos in the man, or a moral union of the two natures or rather of the two persons.⁷⁴

As understood from the text above, the Alexandrian schools taught a more mystic, sophistic and philosophic theology than the Antiochenes who practiced and favored the use of allegoric interpretations of Scripture. However, it is clear that the Antiochian schools generally stressed sober, literal teachings.

The mystic nature of the Alexandrian tradition is not surprising because the integration of Christianity with Greek philosophy gave it a more sophistic character. However, in the Antiochian School, the interpretation of Christianity was more strict and maintained some characteristics inherited from the Judaistic tradition. For example, Antiochian theology strictly upheld the tenet of the unity of God so they interpreted the concepts of Logos, the divine nature of Christ, the human nature of Christ, and *theotokos* differently from Alexandria.

The Antiochenes argued that “Mary bore the Christ, not the Logos and the Logos has an omnipresent character. However he was incarnated in Jesus and after this incarnation, Christ became a divine person”⁷⁵ and so they rejected the concept of *theotokos*. Alexandrians took an opposite stance to this view. However, Alexandrian theology underlined that Mary bore God, she was the mother of God and so she must be called *theotokos* (God-Bearer). Also, while Alexandrians claimed that Christ had always existed as God with his Father even before Mary bore him, the Antiochians believed that Christ lived life as a man among men after a certain time.⁷⁶ Moreover, another difference between these schools was that the Alexandrians stressed that Christ shared the same substance with the Father whereas Antiochenes taught that Christ did not come from the same, but from a similar substance to the Father.

⁷⁴ Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post- Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids. pp. 612-613

⁷⁵ Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post- Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids. p. 622

⁷⁶ BAKER, J. F. (1908). *Nestorius and His Teaching- A Fresh Examination of The Evidence*. Cambridge: University Press. p. 3

These are the main differences in interpretation on some of the significant topics between Alexandria and Antioch. In the light of this, it is more understandable how and why the controversy between Arius and Alexander of Alexandria and the dispute between Nestorius and Cyril emerged. At this point, it is clear that while Alexander of Alexandria and Cyril were representatives of the theology of the Alexandrian tradition, it is clear that Arius and Nestorius reflected the perspectives of the Antiochian Schools. Therefore, as previously mentioned, the controversy between Arius and Alexander of Alexandria must also be understood as a controversy between the two traditions of Christianity, and the dispute between Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria should also be understood as a dispute between the two Sees. In other words, the dispute between Arius and Alexander of Alexandria and Nestorius and Cyril are a result of the differences between the Alexandrian and Antiochian teachings.

Furthermore, since Nestorius and Cyril were two representatives of the great theology schools, the dispute between Cyril and Nestorius was a landmark controversy in the Christian schools in late antiquity. The conflict between these two schools not only damaged their own systems and reputations, but also led to the rise of the See of Constantinople. In other words, the clash between the Patriarchate of Antioch and the Patriarchate of Alexandria was a great opportunity for Constantinople. Due to the lack of authority or the inadequacy of existing authority within Christianity, the Patriarchate of Constantinople was able to assert its authority within a short time. Having come from the Antiochian Tradition, Nestorius also reflected this theology and Christology in Constantinople. But Cyril, being an Alexandrian Bishop, maintained his opposition to Nestorius and accused him of behaving and speaking like a heretic in Constantinople. O. Bardenhewer explains why, as an Antiochian, Nestorius opposed Cyril, claiming that Nestorius was himself intensively imbued with the Christological and theological perspectives of Antiochian tradition. Additionally, Nestorius believed that the *Apollinarists heresy⁷⁷ lurked in the teachings of Cyril of Alexandria.⁷⁸ This means that while Cyril

*Apollinarism was proclaimed by Apollinarius the bishop of Laodicea. He rejected the existence of the rational human soul and he was regarded as a vigorous advocate of orthodoxy against the Arians.

accused Nestorius of being a heretic due to the similarity of his speeches with the teachings of Paul of Samosata and Arius, Nestorius accused Cyril of causing the emergence of the Apollinarist's heresy. Of course, this was just one reason for the conflict between these bishops.

While Nestorius reflected the ideas of his Antiochian master Theodor of Mopsuestia, there were other links in this chain of teaching. It has been said that members of the Antiochian tradition succeeded each other and contributed to Nestorian theology. According to scholars, Artemon took his theology and knowledge from Ebion; and Paul of Samosata took his heresy from Artemon, and then Diodore maintained Paul's theology; Theodor of Mopsuestia followed Diodore and Paul of Samosata; finally, Nestorius was the pupil of Theodor of Mopsuestia.⁷⁹

To sum up:

<u>Antiochian School</u>	<u>Alexandrian School</u>
Ebion ↓	Clement of Alexandria ↓
Artemon ↓	(Integration with Greek Philosophy) ↓
Paul of Samosata ↓	Origen ↓ (He changed his position later and defended some Antiochian teachings)
Diodore ↓	Alexander of Alexandria ↓

It was also known that he was the close friend of Athanasius. (Cross, F. L. (1997). *The Oxford Dictionary Of Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press. p.86)

The doctrine of Apollinaris was firstly condemned in by a council held in Alexandria in 362, in Rome in 375, and finally, it was formally condemned in 378. However, Apollinarian doctrine spread through most of the eastern churches, in 388, Byzantine Emperor Theodosius who already forbade them had many meetings whether there were any bishoprics, ecclesiastics dwell in cities. (A. Bell and C. MacFarquhar. *The Encyclopedia Britannica. The Dictionary of the Arts, Sciences and Micellaneous Literature. Vol. II p. 123. Edinburgh*)

⁷⁸ Bardenhewer, O. (1908). *Patrology- The Lives and Works of The Father Of the Church*. Germany: B. Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau.

⁷⁹ E.P.B. (1881). *Five Tome Against Nestorius*. Oxford: James Parker and Co. and Rivingtons. p. xxxviii

Theodor of Mopsuestia ↓	Athanasius ↓
Nestorius ↓	Cyril of Alexandria ↓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul of Samosata also inspired Arius and we know that Arius also reflected Antiochian tradition so this brings Arius and Nestorius at same group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As Cyril followed the Alexandrian Tradition, it can be said that the dispute between Nestorius and Cyril was a conflict between Alexandrian tradition and Antiochian tradition.

It is noteworthy that Origen even he was a strict Alexandrian-taught bishop, he would be accused of being heretic for teaching some Antiochian teachings. It is clear that avoiding a Christianity which was integrated with Greek philosophy and mysticism, Arius adopted and defended the Antiochian teaching.

Moreover, Arius was a supporter of Paul of Samosata. In the light of this chain, we have to believe that Arius and Nestorius both received an education from the same tradition and the same religious center and shared the same stances. Also, it is known that Nestorius was charged with echoing the ideas of Paul of Samosata on the doctrine of the Incarnation.

2.5. Arius and Arian Teachings

2.5.1. Arius

Arius, a pupil of Lucian, was a priest in Antioch and became known because of his new interpretations on significant topics related to Christ, the Holy Spirit and the concept of the Trinity. He was born in Libya. When he grew up, it is known that his father taught him three languages: Latin, Greek and Hebrew.⁸⁰ Thanks to his father, Arius could practice these languages at the same time. When he was twelve years

⁸⁰ Couts N. C. (1922). Arius the Libyan. New York: D. Appleton and Company Press. p. 25

old, he was said to have been fluent in Greek and Latin and be well-informed about the Hebrew language.⁸¹ Later, he concentrated on theological and Christological concepts. His approaches to Christological issues would result in his excommunication later on.

In general, he argues that in Christ there existed two natures; one is divine and the other one is human nature. Arius's main claim was to underline the humanity of the Christ. Sometimes it was said to be exaggerated when he claimed that Christ is just one of the sons of God, and in fact, all men are the sons of God. However, some men became a son by creation, and others acquire the divine nature by adoption, but Christ had it by generation and he was begotten.⁸²

Arius himself traced his doctrine to Lucian of Antioch, who advocated the heretical views of Paul of Samosata on the Trinity, and was for a time excommunicated, but afterward rose to great reknown, and died a martyr under Maximinus.⁸³

However, Arius' new approaches to Christology resulted in him being exiled immediately after the Council of Nicaea (325) during the reign of Constantine the Great. But what were the ideas, situations, obligations and systems or mechanisms which sent Arius into exile?

⁸¹ Ibid, 26

⁸² Ibid, p. 42

⁸³ Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post- Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids. P. 377



Icons by Eileen McGuckin (Trinity) (<http://www.sgtt.org>) retrieved in 27/10/2019

2.5.2. The Hierarchy in the Trinity

“For the Father is greater than I.” John 14:28

The term is said to derive from the Greek word *Τριάς* which means a set of three. In the manner of Christian theology, the word *Τριάς* was first mentioned on in the works of Theophilus of Antioch who lived in A.D 180. However, he did not mention the Trinity of God. The person who used the term Trinity in his works as referring to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, was Tertullian. It is said that Tertullian, who was a Christian theologian and scholar living in the first quarters of the third century,

used this term to explain that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one in substance.⁸⁴

The Trinity is a central doctrine of Christian theology and is described as one God who exists in three persons and one substance: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. According to this dogma, God is monad i.e. one, yet self-differentiated and the God who presents Himself to mankind is one God equally in three distinct modes of existence, yet remains one through all eternity.⁸⁵ Orthodox Christians believe that the Trinity is three divine Persons and these three Persons shares One substance. In other words, they are consubstantial with each other and coeternal. The unity and the source of the Holy Trinity is the Father from whom the Son and the Holy Spirit proceed. In 325 the council of Nicaea established a formula related to the Holy Trinity and this Creed was formulated against the Arians. But why? Did Arius and Arians not believe the Holy Trinity, or did they misunderstand the concepts, or did their opponents falsely accuse the Arians of rejecting the Holy Trinity?

First of all, there has been a common misconception among some scholars that Arius did not believe in the Trinity. On the contrary, he believed in the Trinity, but he asserted that there must be a hierarchy within the Trinity because of the differences of the position between the “uncreated God” and the “created Gods” i.e. the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Moreover, Philip Schaff implies that the Arian trinity was therefore not a trinity immanent and eternal, but arising in time and in descending grades, consisting of the uncreated God and two created demi-gods.⁸⁶ In other words, according to his view of the hierarchy within the Trinity, each one (Father-Son -Holy Spirit or Logos) had different positions as the Father is unique and has no beginning, and nothing has ever existed similar to the Father. The Son was a superior form of man who was incarnated by the will of the Father, but unlike the Father he had a beginning and end

⁸⁴ Cross, F L. (1997) *The Oxford Dictionary Of Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press. p. 1641

⁸⁵ Ibid, p.1641

⁸⁶ Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post- Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids. p. 403

in his earthly life. Additionally, as a creature, the Holy Spirit was also made by the Father and dwelled in Christ by the will of the Father. In this understanding of the Trinity, Arius wondered how each person in the Trinity could be equal to others in position. As Robert Gregg in his book *Early Arianism- A View of Salvation* (1981) wrote:

The preserved utterances of Arius about the Trinity are vivid- their “purpose is to prohibit belief in any substantialist connection between the Persons:

There is a triad not in equal glories; their subsistences are unmixed with each other, one infinitely more estimable in glories than the other. The essences of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are separate in nature and are estranged, unconnected, alien and without participation in each other. They are utterly dissimilar from each other with respect to both essences and glories to infinity.⁸⁷

Also similar to Arian view, Augustine who was also far more important in the history of Christianity for his theological writing and ideas, describes the relations between the Father and the Son like Arius even two century later and says that “*The Father is not the Son nor the Son the Father, one is unbegotten, other is begotten.*”⁸⁸ This approach is based on the problem of *homoousios*, meaning *same substance*, and was used for describing the relations between the Father and the Son. It emphasizes that each one shared the same substances, but as a person who did not accept *homoousia* as a genuine concept, Arius believed that they shared not the same but a *similar substance*. Since their substance is not same, this places them in a distinct hierarchy within the Trinity. As Christ says in John 14:28 Christ says: “*For the Father is greater than I.*” For the Arians, all this meant that Christ and Logos were different from the Father in many aspects and it does not make a sense to if one says they are same in Trinity.

⁸⁷ Gregg R. C . and Groh D. E. (1981). *Early Arianism- a view of salvation*. Fortress Press. Philadelphia. p.98

⁸⁸Rea, Michael C. 2009. *Oxford Readings in Philosophical Theology*. Volume I. Oxford University Press.p.116

2.5.3. Christological Concepts

2.5.3.1. *The Pre-existence of Christ*

Another controversial claim asserted by Arius, concerned the pre-existence of Christ. In other words, the common belief, regarding the eternity of Christ was that Christ like the Father had no beginning, but Arius opposed this idea and in his work *Thalia* which means festivity he writes that:

The Father is alien in being to the Son and he has no origin,
Know that monad was monad but dyad was not, before it came into
being.⁸⁹

Moreover, Christ was a mediator who came into existence by the will of the Father as God wanted to create human beings. Therefore, the Son has a beginning and limited knowledge, unlike his Father; and he was able to know only as much as God allowed him to know. Like Robert Gregg says:

For neither perfectly normal accurately does Logos know the Father, not
is he able to see him fully. And indeed the Son as he is does not even
know his own essence.⁹⁰

According to Arius, due to the fact that Christ is not eternal like the Father, God gains the title “‘ Father” when he creates the saviour and as John Alzog expressed that:

Arius also held, in common with Sabellius, that God had not been the
Father from all eternity, but became so only after His Son had gone out
from Him, as an agency or mode of action to create the world. Adopting
such a theory, Arius was, of course obliged, like the Gnostics and
Manichaeans, to make the whole work of Christ's redemption consist
merely in His teaching and in the example of His life.⁹¹

⁸⁹Grillmeier, Aloys. 1975. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Second. Volume One. Atalanta:John Knox Press. p. 224

⁹⁰Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia:Fortress Press. p.7

⁹¹ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. p. 521

The main idea of all these points is that the Father who begat must have had a priority of being before the son who was begotten, latter (the Son) must not be eternal nor, consequently, in the absolute sense, divine.⁹²

2.5.3.2. *The Human and Divine Nature of Christ*

In addition to all these opinions, perhaps the major reason for Arius' excommunication was his ideas on the nature of Christ. The nature and existence of Christ for Arius is described in Aloys Grillmeier's study and stated that:

Now Arius has various definitions of the nature, the existence and the function of the Son: Because of the unavoidably narrow understanding of the divine monad, Son and *pneuma* must be removed from the divine sphere and put ill the order of creatures. Although the Son is '*theos*' in an analogous sense, he is not true God. He *is* therefore alien to the Father and dissimilar from him. It follows from this difference and alien character that the Father himself cannot be truly known by the Son.⁹³

In his work, Grillmeier also emphasized that before the Council of Nicaea, there was no terminological distinction for describing the substance of God and the Son, however when the discussions appeared about "*the begotten one*" and "*unbegotten one*," meaning uncreated things and things which came into being, if the divine monad is considered as *uncreated*, then the Son and Logos were understood by Arius to have come into existence by the will of Father.⁹⁴ Therefore the Son, being a creature, could no longer become prominent from his Father as who was in truth begotten.⁹⁵ Also, Johannes Quasten in his famous book series of *Patrologia* describes how Son and Father are different from each other as below:

It was said Father was not always Father, there was a time when he was not the Father. The wisdom of God was not always existed but he was come into being. The Father who has always existed created him (Word

⁹² Etheridge, J. W. *The Syrian Churches with Their Liturgies and Literature*. London:

Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1966. p. 59

⁹³ Grillmeier, Aloys. 1975. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Second. Volume One. Atalanta: John Knox Press. p. 228

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 230

⁹⁵ *Ibid*, p. 230

of God) out of nothing who was not always existed. The Son who was the creature and the work of the Father is not the same as Father in his substance and his wisdom.⁹⁶

Many scholars and theologians argue that Arius did not believe the two natures, the divine and human natures of Christ. However, when classical sources like religious and theological writings are examined in detail, it refutes the arguments that Arius and Arians did not believe in the divine nature of Christ. In other words, unlike the image his opponents created, Arius believed in the divine and the human natures of Christ, but the main issue was whether these two natures were mingled with each other or.

Basically his theology and Christology accepts two different natures of Christ but regards them as separated from each other. To strengthen their theology, Arians stressed those biblical passages which focused on and emphasized the human characteristics of Christ. Arius and his followers clearly tried to legitimize their ideas appealing to the verses of the Holy Gospel. For instance, some verses of the Holy Bible were interpreted as providing information on the human nature of Christ which has been already existed before he gained his divinity. Therefore, the divine nature of Christ was an incarnation of the Holy Spirit or Wisdom of God or Logos in his human nature. For example, they pointed to Luke 2:52, “And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.” and claimed that he (the Son) was not equal with the Father, because the text implies that he gained his divinity through Wisdom. Another example which Arians interpreted it as a hint to understand Christ’s humanity, focuses on the Baptism of Christ which gave Christ his supreme nature as Mark 8-9-10 says:

I have baptized you with water, but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit. In those days Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan: And when he came up out of the water, immediately he saw the heavens being torn open and Holy Spirit descending on him like a dove.

With these verses, Arians tried to prove that Christ was a human being like everyone and needed also to be purified as much as any human being. As a result of their view which strongly emphasized Christ’s humanity, Arians always were subjected to

⁹⁶ Quasten, Johannes. 1969. *Patrologia* . Volume II. Utrecht: Spectrum Publishers. P. 19

intense criticism from their contemporaries, such as Alexander of Alexandria and Athanasius who was a pupil of Alexander. They accused Arius and his followers of being heretics, saying that by emphasizing the human characteristics of the Saviour they (the Arians) have considered Christ as a creature.⁹⁷ Robert Gregg also maintained that while they hear and see the Saviour's human attributes in the Gospels they have utterly forgotten the Son's paternal Godhead.⁹⁸

2.5.3.3. The Concept of Logos for Arius

The Father and his creatures as Johannes Quasten says in his *Patrologia* are like that “Neither the Son of the God nor the Logos are truly God. The Logos take an intermediary seat between the world and God who made creation.”⁹⁹

As is clear from the quotation above, Logos is believed to have an intermediary role between the world and God who made creation. Due to the fact that Logos has a limited, intermediary position, in Arius' theology, Logos is considered inferior to the Father.¹⁰⁰ Naturally, even though Logos is inferior to the Father, its interaction with Christ is like that “Word was made flesh so Logos and the flesh of Christ constituted a single nature.”¹⁰¹ At this point, another comment was made by Grillmeier who says that Arius described Logos as having no rational soul so he is accepted as mortal and capable of suffering in addition to having a divine nature.¹⁰² Grillmeier maintains

⁹⁷ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. p. 1-2

⁹⁸ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. p. 1-2

⁹⁹ Quasten J. (1969). *Patrologia II. Dal Concilio di Nicea a quello di Calcedonia*. Spectrum Publishers Utrecht. p.11

¹⁰⁰ Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post- Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids. p. 517

¹⁰¹ Chadwick, H. *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great* . New York: Oxford Press. (2002). pp. 516-517

¹⁰² Grillmeier, Aloys. 1975. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Second. Volume One. Atalanta: John Knox Press. pp. 238-239

that *“the suffering itself is not of free will, as the flesh without soul no longer has free motivating principle.”*¹⁰³ He also describes Logos as below:

By nature Logos itself is changeable, like all creatures; but his own freedom of will he remains good as long as he wills. But he so wills, he can also change as we can. As he has a changeable nature. But because of God knew before and that would be good, he gave him this glory by anticipation which after he also had from virtue as thus from his works which God foresaw, he allowed him to become the Logos that he now is (i.e. unchangeable and in glory).¹⁰⁴

When we recall what Origen taught about the Logos, it is clear that Arius maintained some Origenist ideas reflected perspectives of Antiochian School. As Liguori says that *“the roots of the Arian controversy are to be found partly in contradictory elements of Christology of great Origen which reflected the crude condition of the Christian mind in the third century; partly in antagonism between Alexandrian and the Antiochian traditions”*.¹⁰⁵

Although Arius and Arianism were severely criticized due to these unusual interpretations among the others, Arianism was adopted by significant numbers of people, and it has even been claimed that Constantius by an Arian bishop. As it is narrated by St. Gregory of Nazianzen that:

Constantius, just before his death, repented, but in vain, of three things:

- 1) Of the murder of his relatives;
- 2) Of having made Julian, Caesar;
- 3) And of causing such confusion in the Church. However, he died in the arms of the Arians, whom he protected with such zeal and Euzoius, whom he had made Bishop of Antioch, administered him baptism just before his death.¹⁰⁶

Regarding this issue, it must be underlined that there has been always suspicion related to Constantine's baptism by Arians. In particular, the historian Socrates,

¹⁰³ Ibid, p. 241

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 241

¹⁰⁵ Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids. p. 376

¹⁰⁶ Liguori, A. M. (185). *History of Heresies and Their Refutations*. Dublin: James Duffy. p. 82

Theodor, Sozomen and also St. Athanasius examined the aspect of the Constantine's baptism in detail. Moreover, the legends about Arius were spread in many places and people credit Arius with magical or miraculous Powers. There was even a rumour which spread to around the corners of the empire, saying that if one is disagreed with Arius, undoubtedly God would punish him. For example, it was narrated that:

St Alexander, grieved to the heart, went to the church accompanied by only two persons, and prostrating himself on the floor, with tears in his eyes, prayed to the Lord: O my God, either take me out of the world or take Arius, that he may not ruin your Church. Thus St. Alexander prayed, and on the same day, Saturday, at three o'clock, the Eusebians were triumphantly conducting Arius through the city, and he went along, boasting of his re-establishment when he came to the great square the vengeance of God overtook him; he got a terrible spasm in the bowels, and was obliged to seek a place of retirement; a private place near the square was pointed out to him; he went in and left a servant at the door; he immediately burst open like Judas, his intestines, his spleen, and his liver all fell out, and thus his guilty soul took her flight to her Creator, deprived of the communion of the Church when he delayed too long, his friends came to the door, and on opening it, they found him stretched on the floor in a pool of blood in that horrible state This event took place in the year 336.¹⁰⁷

Unlike the positive accounts of Arius and Arianism, it should not surprise us that many believed that Arius died in his own excrement in his cell. Other accounts claim that Arius sought the wrath of God, and died in bad conditions in his exile.

Moreover, at first glance, even though it appears that there is no connection between Arianist concerns related to Logos and Nestorian doctrines, on closer examination it is clear that Nestorius shared some approaches to the Logos that were similar to Arianism. It was for this reason that, Nestorius was accused by his opponents of being heretic for sharing approaches to a number of issues that were similar to those of heretics.

Before moving on following chapter, it is necessary to remind how the different teachings, previously mentioned, and the Christian tradition, taught in Antiochia and Alexandria influenced the Arius' teachings.

¹⁰⁷ Liguori, A. M. (185). *History of Heresies and Their Refutations*. Dublin: James Duffy. p. 69

In the light of all this information, it can be stated that Ebionites were the groups of Christian people that had been reflected some aspects and the rule of Jewish tradition so they refused to assert that Christ was a God to preserve the authority of the one monad. Otherwise, acceptance of Christ as God would have been damaged the authority of the one supreme and absolute God. Therefore it may be true to certain extent that Arius was likely to adopt the idea that Ebionites already had to product the authority of one monarch.

As another impressive figure, Paul of Samosata inspired Arius so much that Arius formed his teaching by referring Paul's ideas related to the purity of the human nature of Christ and the concept of the Logos. Like Paul, Arius regarded the Savior as mere human. Therefore unsurprisingly we witness that forming the roots of Arian teachings, the Paul's views caused Arius excommunication too. As it was mentioned in following chapter, his (Paul's) ideas concerning the veneration of Virgin and the concept of *Theotokos* were adopted by Nestorius in the fifth century.

Moreover, maybe one of most important who influenced Arius was Origen. He brought new interpretations about the nature of Christ and the concept of Logos. He underlined that Christ was a mere human and he gained his divinity through the Logos. Whenever the Logos incarnated and intermingled with Christ and then Christ attained his divine nature. As Phillip Schaff also maintains that the roots of Arian theology are to be found partly in the Christology of Origen but it (Origen's Christology) led to an antagonism between Alexandrian and Antiochian theology.¹⁰⁸ On the one hand while he taught a theology that attributed to Christ divine characteristics which later on leads to logically to the Orthodox doctrine of the identity of substance, basically meaning Christ is a person with a fully human nature and a fully divine nature, as Schaff states on the other side Origen, also due to his zeal for personal distinctions in the Godhead and the subordination of Christ as a

¹⁰⁸ Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post- Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids. p. 697

secondary or secondary God below the Father, was criticized for furnishing a starting point for Arian heresy.¹⁰⁹

In addition to these, J. Rebecca Lyman (2008) in her article “ *Arius and Arians* ” stated that Arius is depicted as indebted to the thought of Origen concerning the human soul of Christ¹¹⁰ and Arius was seen as a person who reframed the Origen’s process of incarnation by modifying Origen’s claim of the eternal generation of Logos.¹¹¹

Edward Scienski confirms these claims and expresses the relation between Origen and Arius as that while Origen readily affirmed that the Son is eternally begotten and thus not a creature, as Arius did in the following century when he adopted this idea and made it the core of his theology, his language concerning the Spirit is less precise, at the time questioning whether he was begotten like the Son, created or brought forth in some manner.¹¹²

Lastly, Sabellianism on the one hand, is said to have shared the same aims of the Arians such as a tendency to protect the unity of God but on the other hand, it is also described as an opponent of Arianism.

In the light of this information it is clear that all of these people and groups that were mentioned formed the intellectual and spiritual backgrounds of Arius and then the previous discussion of Arius and his theology will help in understanding the issues and controversy surrounding Nestorius and his teachings.

The reason why whole these concepts were mentioned by corresponding in Arian perspective is because of indicating where Arian ideas may have influenced Nestorius’ thinking to some extent. Also, the following chapters will reveal how

¹⁰⁹ Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post- Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids. p. 697

¹¹⁰ Harvey, S. A.. (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Newyork: Oxford University Press. p. 244

¹¹¹ Harvey, S. A. (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Newyork: Oxford University Press. p. 244

¹¹² Siecienski, A. Edward. *The Filioque-History of A Doctrinal Controversy*. Newyork: Oxford University Press, 2018. p. 34-35

Nestorians were affected by Arian theology or Christology but to recognize the interactions between them the first step was to examine all these concepts and their process in a historical manner from their origin to pre-Nestorian era.

CHAPTER 3

NESTORIAN TEACHINGS and ITS REFERENCES FROM PAST

3.1. NESTORIUS

3.1.1. Who was Nestorius?

About his earlier life, we do not have so much detailed information, however, it is known that he was a native of Germanicia, a small city of Syria, in the Euphrates region, which was under the responsibility and control of the Patriarch of Antioch. He was brought up in the Monastery of St. Euprepus. Nestorius was tutored to become a priest by Theodotus and appointed his catechist, to explain the faith to the catechumens,^{*113} and defend it against heretics. It is said that he was the most ambitious and zealous person who was against the heretics and then he disturbed the Eastern Church- Arians, the Apollinarists, and the Originists and he professed himself a great follower of St. John Chrysostom and he tried to imitate the St. John.¹¹⁴

Nestorius was educated at the School of Antioch, became a priest, and then obtained his theological and Christological knowledge from Theodor of Mopsuestia. He was

^{113*} F.L Cross described the *catechumen* as that:

In the early Church those undergoing training and instruction for preparatory to Christian Baptism. They were assigned a place in the church but solemnly dismissed before the Eucharist proper began. Since F. X Funk's researches, the older view that they were divided into several grades, corresponding to the well-known stages of those undergoing penance, has been generally abandoned. Only those who had reached the stage of awaiting Baptism at the coming Easter formed a separate group. (Cross, F L. *The Oxford Dictionary Of Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press, 1997.)

¹¹⁴ Liguori, A. M. (185). *History of Heresies and Their Refutations*. Dublin: James Duffy. p. 119

also said to have been under the influence of Diodore of Tarsus who was the founder of the Antiochian dogmatic school.¹¹⁵ So it should not surprise us when Cyril regarded Theodor of Mopusestia and Diodore of Tarsus as behind Nestorius and insisted on their condemnations. Cyril's assumption was reasonable to a certain extent and it can be seen clearly when their teachings were examined. For instance; Diodore of Tarsus claimed that in Jesus, there are two different persons, the Logos (who Diodore calls him as the Son of the God and the Son of the David and in fact, the Son of the David was born of Mary but not the Logos.¹¹⁶ Adrian Fortescue describes this case as pure Nestorianism.

In Antioch, Nestorius met with John who became Patriarch of Antioch later on, and with "Theodore of Cyrus, who was considerably younger than himself, lie was clever and brilliant, gifted with a talent for eloquence and possessed a stock of varied learning but was superficial withal."¹¹⁷ While many scholars confirm that he was good in Greek-speaking, Fortescue even confirms too that Nestorius always speaks and writes in Greek, however he also has some concerns about that whether Nestorius could speak any Syriac or not.¹¹⁸

After the Patriarch Sisinnius passed away, it is said that the Church of Constantinople fell into disagreements over who would succeed him. To put an end to the disagreement the Emperor Theodosius himself selected a bishop to become the new Patriarch-Nestorius. Since no one could complain about an imperial decision the emperor summoned Nestorius from Antioch and honoured him as Patriarch.¹¹⁹ When he became Patriarch of Constantinople, his ambitious, zealous instincts and feeling against heretics appeared publicly. His public speeches made his ambition clear to all his listeners. However, it was just a three-years duration that Nestorius was the Bishop of Constantinople. Having assigned by Theodosius in 428, Nestorius was

¹¹⁵ Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society. pp. 59-60

¹¹⁶ *Ibid*, p. 60

¹¹⁷ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. p. 592

¹¹⁸ Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society. pp. 54

¹¹⁹ Liguori, A. M. (185). *History of Heresies and Their Refutations*. Dublin: James Duffy.p. 120

suspended from his position when his teachings were rejected at the council of Ephesus in 431. At the end of the council of Ephesus he was enforced to return to his monastery where was located at Antioch and the patriarchate of Constantinople was succeeded by an archbishop named Maximian. The exact date of Nestorius' death was not known. However, it is assumed that since his place of exile had been changed, he also stayed in a monastery at bottom of the Libyan deserts and after he spent the rest of his life there and passed away on the eve of the Council of Chalcedon.¹²⁰

As an imperial edict taken in 431, disallowed the meetings of the Nestorians and declared that those who do any affairs or actions to copy, preserve, and even to read any writings related to Nestorius which had already ordered to be burned, would be subject to heavy penalties.¹²¹ Even he was said to have written six works named the Tragedy, the Bazaar of Heracleides, a Liturgy, a letter to Cosmos, a book of Homilies and Sermon, the two of them, Liturgy and Bazaar of Heracleides are well known.¹²² It is very interesting that the full name of the latter book is the Bazaar of Heracleides of Damascus. G. R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson answer the question of why not Nestorius but Damascus by saying that Nestorius's own name was very dangerous and his works would be destroyed or burnt.¹²³ Normally, Nestorius penned his Bazaar of Heracleides in Greek, however, we know more about him and his teachings through the Syriac copies of his books as Greek original of his books were burnt. Just several letters and sermons which were written in Greek and Latin could survive.

Before discussing Nestorius's time in Constantinople and investigating rigorously his teachings, it is necessary to give information about the most important person who trained, ordained and shaped the basis of theology and Christology of Nestorius and Nestorianism: Theodor of Mopsuestia.

¹²⁰ Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society. p.65

¹²¹ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) *Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 9

¹²² *Ibid*, pp. 9-11

¹²³ Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society. p.66

3.1.2. “Theodor was Nestorius before Nestorius”

It has been claimed that Theodor was regarded as the Father of Nestorianism. However, he is also remembered as a vigorous defender of the Church doctrines against the heresies of his day when he was consecrated the bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia. As we can learn from the sources he was one of the active figures who made up the contemporary history of the Church in the East. It is assumed that the school of Antioch was under the influence of Theodor of Mopsuestia since 430 and said that his teachings were translated Syriac language and thanks to this translation his works would reach Syriac-speaking worlds. For example, Qiore who was the ascetical and brilliant leader of the school of *Edessa had magnificent contributions to these translations.¹²⁴

Besides his teachings and writings, Theodor should be remembered as for that he was also very good at winning back people who had converted themselves from Christianity into other religions or who belonged to heretic groups. In 449, he wrote a letter to Pope Leo and stated that:

“With the aid of divine grace, I have cleansed more than a thousand souls from the virus of Marcion and from the party of Arius and Eunomius. I have led back many others to Christ the Lord.”¹²⁵

The things that make Theodor significant for this study are his critical and unusual interpretations related to some Christological and theological positions that were held by Nestorius, earning him title of “Nestorius before Nestorius”.

It is interesting that while many of the scholars accept that Nestorius was a student of Theodor, there are few scholars who have taken more sophisticated approaches to this issue. For example, F. Loofs wrote in his book *Nestorius and His Place in History of Christian Doctrine* that:

¹²⁴ Baum, W. and Winkler, D. W. (2003) *The Church Of the East-A Concise History*.Routledge Curzon Press: London

¹²⁵ Bardenhewer, O. (1908). *PATROLOGY- The Lives and Works of The Father Of the Church*. Germany: B. Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau. p. 371

“Nestorius was an Antiochian as regard as his theological upbringing. I do not believe that he was a personal pupil of Theodor of Mopsuestia-the chronology contradicts this, and there are no convincing arguments for this assumption. But that he was educated in the traditions of the Antiochian school is without a doubt.”¹²⁶

Theodor was the one who underlined the human nature of Christ even though he also accepted the divine nature of Christ. However, Theodor would not use the word *theotokos*, using instead the Word *anthropotokos* that means “mother of man.”

To extend, the most obvious impact of Theodor of Mopsuestia on Nestorius was that he believed and taught that Christ had two persons in himself thus his nature is consisted of two substantially different persons. The divine nature is a person and the human nature is a person. In particular, his ideas related to Christ’s human nature were derived from the concept of *theotokos* and the position of Mary. According to Theodor, Mary gave birth to a man, not God. He says that “in the womb of the virgin Mary was conceived by the Holy Spirit that son of Man, in whom, as in a temple, the divine Word dwells as a perpetual inhabitant.”¹²⁷ He also maintains that he (Christ) who was born was the man and not the God; and he who died was the same.”¹²⁸ Theodor criticized the ones who claimed that “*the three-month-old baby Jesus was God.*” Among the followers of Theodor, it would take so much time to accept the divine nature of Christ. Each of these statements is vital for this study because these same statements can be found in Nestorius. For example, as Bishop Theodotus of Ankyra narrated that, Nestorius’s argument was that “*a baby two or three months old cannot be called God*” and so he Nestorius rejected the basis of the canons and the letter of Cyrill.¹²⁹ This is merely one example of Theodor of Mopsuestia’s influences on Nestorius. Therefore the first issue to examine is the concept of *Theotokos*.

¹²⁶ Loofs, F. (1914). *NESTORIUS and His Place in the History Of Christian Doctrine*. London: Cambridge University Press. p.65

¹²⁷ Etheridge, J. W. (1866) *The Syrian Churches With Their Liturgies and Literatures*. Longman, Brown, Green and Longsmans Press. p. 55

¹²⁸ Etheridge, J. W. (1866) *The Syrian Churches With Their Liturgies and Literatures*. Longman, Brown, Green and Longsmans Press. p. 55

¹²⁹ Chadwick, H. (2002). *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great* . New York: Oxford Press. p. 533

3.2. HIS TEACHINGS

3.2.1. The Concept of Theotokos

Theotokos was a term that means “God-bearer” and it was generally used to indicate that the Virgin Mary bore a God. This term has become a popular concept during the time of some significant theology teachers of theology such as Origen, Athanasius, Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem.¹³⁰ According to the Church historian Socrates, who was said to have a weak knowledge about the Nestorius, “he (Nestorius) simply made a bug-bear of the term *theotokos*, acquits him of this charge and gives it as his opinions that Nestorius was no follower of Paul or of Photinus.”¹³¹ In fact, *theotokos* means for the Nestorius, that the Virgin Mary gave birth to God, so he never accepted the use of this term in regard to Mary. Instead, he formulated another word *Christokos*, “Christ-bearer”.

Moreover, Nestorius’s approach emphasizes that Mary was the mother of a man who gained his divinity when the Holy Spirit appeared to him. For him, Christ did not pass through Mary like water a pipe.¹³² Actually, this was the result of the theological disputes since Origen, Paul of Samosata, Arius, and Photinus who was the Bishop of Sirmium (a small city in Roman Pannonia) since the third century. According to Paul of Samosata, Mary cannot be called *theotokos* or in the Arian view, Christ was the just a man like us, so Mary simply bore a man like us. As a result, Mary was not the Mother of God, but the Mother of Christ. The passage expressed in Philippians II, was also motivating for Nestorius. As this passage says that Christ Jesus who though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with a God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant being born in the likeness of men. Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on

¹³⁰ BAKER, J. F. (1908). *Nestorius and His Teaching- A Fresh Examination of The Evidence*.Cambrige: University Press. pp. 58-59

¹³¹ BAKER, J. F. (1908). *Nestorius and His Teaching- A Fresh Examination of The Evidence*. Cambrige: University Press. p. 44

¹³² Anastos M. V. (1962) Nestorius was Orthodox. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 16. p.140

him the name which is above every name.’’¹³³ It is remarkable that this was a common nature of the Arians that they also used these kinds of passages to illustrate the pure humanity of Christ.

3.2.2. The Human Nature of Christ Among Nestorius

Discussion related to *theotokos*, in fact, was the result of differences in comprehending the human and the divine nature of Christ. As an Antiochian bishop, Nestorius regarded the nature of Christ as a unity which was formed by various *prosopon* (person). According to him, in Christ, there are two different *prosopon* and these two persons are separated from each other. In other words, Christ had one nature and had two distinct characters (persons) in that. In his Bazaar of Heracleides Nestorius says to Sophronius that: I say therefore that they (running water and water frozen) have no distinction in nature; and things which have no distinction in nature, and are distinguished, are distinct in the *prosopon* i.e schema.¹³⁴ In other words, water can exist in different shapes like running water and frozen water and this means that they are the same in nature. Like this, Christ’s body is same for his divinity and humanity however his human character and the divine character are distinct from each other. He also thinks that during the integration of the persons, none of them are changeable and neither the human nature nor the divine nature affects the other one. In fact, the both of those persons are always in harmony and they function and operate together incoherence without any mutation.¹³⁵

3.2.3. The Logos

Nestorius’ tendency towards the nature and the function of the Holy Spirit was the important reason for his excommunication. He maintained a dogma similar to Arian

¹³³ Chesnut R. C. (1978). The Two Prosopa in Nestorius’ ‘‘Bazaar of Heracleides.’’ The Journal of Theological Studies, NEW SERIES, Vol. 29, No. 2 p. 401

¹³⁴ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 15.

¹³⁵ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

doctrine and claimed that Christ is God only by participation.¹³⁶ This participation means that the logos indwelled upon Christ and his human prosopon intermingled with his divine prosopon which the Logos provided.

The idea of “indwelling of Logos” might be found in the teachings of Theodor of Mopsuestia. According to George Evan, his formula was bequeathed to Nestorius by Theodor¹³⁷ and to Grillmeier, Diodere was also familiar with the indwelling formula.¹³⁸ Therefore Nestorian maintained the concept of indwelling of Logos. However, this indwelling of logos undoubtedly was completely arisen by the will and the power of God the Father. Grillmeier points out that the idea of the divinization of man through the Logos is notable in Nestorian teaching and described that: *As the power of the Most High, he takes ‘servant form, the substance which was born of the Virgin Mary, to raise it to his own exalted status and to transform it into the pure and divine nature.*¹³⁹

That was not the incarnation of God into the human body but it was the deification of man.¹⁴⁰ At this point, Logos was the person who made man deified. However, it is clear that in this deification of man, neither the nature of God is changed into bodily frame by mixture or by changing or the human body changed itself divine image of God so they are not mixture to each other.¹⁴¹

If the union of the divinity and the humanity resulted in one nature, the one nature is neither that of God nor that of man, but another nature which is foreign to all natures.¹⁴² Therefore he rejected the mixture or changeability of the natures.

¹³⁶ Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p 375

¹³⁷ Bevan, G. A. (2005). *The Case of Nestorius: Ecclesiastical Politics in the East 428-451*. Thesis. Toronto: University of Toronto. p. 65

¹³⁸ Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Atalanta: John Knox Press, 1975. p 359

¹³⁹ Ibid, p. 371

¹⁴⁰ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) *Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p.25

¹⁴¹ Ibid, p. 26

¹⁴² Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) *Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 36

Consequently, the second man was created by the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High and he has received from him to be holy and the Son of God.¹⁴³

3.3. Nestorius as a “Heretic”

Being a student of the traditional School of Antioch and according to many scholars a student of Theodor of Mopsuestia, Nestorius later expanded and sometimes gave new forms to his theological and Christological perspectives. His denial of *Theotokos* and emphasis on the human nature of Christ were such kind of concepts that not only reflect the ideas and approaches of his former master, but they are also the main concepts that Nestorius in some aspects or interpreted differently. Significantly, these changes that Nestorius made share some mutual characteristics with the teachings of some people or groups who had been declared as heretics.

One of the most problematic issues is that Nestorius was accused of being a heretic due to his teachings and giving speeches similar to those of Paul of Samosata, the Arians, and others. For example, due to his denial of the concept of the *theotokos*, it is stated that in “early spring of 429 Eusebius, afterward bishop of Dorylaeum, accused Nestorius by means of a public placard of thinking as Paul of Samosata.”¹⁴⁴ As we mentioned earlier, Paul was one of the most influential figures on Arius who was excommunicated and declared as a heretic so on this issue, Nestorius seems like a heretic.

In fact, he was not only accused of being an imitator of Paul of Samosata, and he was also associated with other heretic groups such as the Sabellians, Arians, and Gnostics. J. W. Etheridge stated that:

Nestorius did not, with Arius, regard the Son as inferior in nature to the Father; nor maintain with the Docetae and the Gnostics, that his humanity was merely phantasmal; nor with Apollinarius, that he had but the

¹⁴³ Ibid, 60

¹⁴⁴ Loofs, F. (1914). *Nestorius and His Place in the History Of Christian Doctrine*. London: Cambridge University Press. p. 32

exterior of our nature; nor, with Paul of Samosata and the others, in afterdays, that he was a perfect man and only a man.¹⁴⁵

According to the same author, Nestorius rejected the Son in the manners of his divinity. As a result, it is obvious that “Nestorius fell notwithstanding, into a great and grievous heresy.”¹⁴⁶

Regarding the same issue, the Bishop of Sirmium rejected the idea that Christ was not consubstantiality with God the Father and he insisted on that the divine nature of Christ came into existence only after Mary bore him. Even Photius argued this doctrine, but at the end of the Council of Sirmium in the year 351, his proposals were rejected. However, this was not the first time that this proposal had been presented. This doctrine had been argued previously by the Arians. As a reaction to the Arians, Nicene Creed was declared at the council of Nicaea in 325. This creed says that anyone who rejected that Christ, the Son of God was before all ages and by whom all things were called into being, and claimed that he had no existence before he was born of Mary and he gained his divinity only afterwards, should be anathematized.

A. M. Liguori, in his book named *The History of The Heresies And Their Refutations*, stated that this formula also brings into minds Arian views and he also strictly says that this formula indeed includes an Arian sense.¹⁴⁷

Moreover, J. F. Baker underlined that this is how Paul of Samosata thought and the opponents of Nestorius accused Nestorius of being the same as Paul of Samosata who had been anathematized a hundred and sixty years ago. Similarly, the historian Socrates criticized Nestorius for claiming that Christ was a mere man, and by doing so he brought the doctrines of Paul of Samosata and Photinus into the Church.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁵ Etheridge, J. W. (1866) *The Syrian Churches With Their Liturgies and Literatures*. Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans Press. p. 65

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 65

¹⁴⁷ Liguori, A. M. (185). *History of Heresies and Their Refutations*. Dublin: James Duffy. pp. 75-76

¹⁴⁸ BAKER, J. F. (1908). *Nestorius and His Teaching- A Fresh Examination of The Evidence*. Cambridge: University Press. p. 43

Nestorius's view related to the concept of the indwelling of the Logos to Christ also raised the tension between Nestorius and his opponents. As he claimed that Christ's divine nature was gained by Logos he was subjected to notable criticism. His opponents claimed that to Nestorian formula, the divine nature comes with Logos so this might be understood that Christ does not have anything in himself. How can it be as they questioned? For his opponents, this idea was quite erroneous. Cassian criticizes Nestorius and accuses him of sharing Pelagian ideas. Cassian says that despite Nestorius' speeches, Jesus does not need to be filled by the Holy Spirit and if he needed this so what leaves to Christ so everything in Christ would be a gift of the Holy Spirit.¹⁴⁹

3.3.1. The Insincerity of Nestorius towards Heretics

It is said that the public was satisfied with the decision given by the emperor and declared Nestorius as the patriarch of Constantinople. According to one account in his first sermon, Nestorius' tone was harsh and ambitious, as were his words on his reception by the Emperor:

“Give me, Emperor, the world free from heretics, and I will give thee heaven in return, help me to destroy the heretics and I will help thee to destroy the Persians!”¹⁵⁰

Or, according to another report:

“Emperor, drive heretics from thy empire, and I will grant to thee the kingdom of Heaven; strengthen my hands in putting down the enemies of the Church and I will aid thee in conquering the Persians.”¹⁵¹

So having attacked the heretic groups, in his first days as Bishop of Constantinople Nestorius found a chapel which was believed to belong to the Arians and ordered it

¹⁴⁹ Grillmeier, Aloys. 1975. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Second. Volume One. Atalanta: John Knox Press. p. 471

¹⁵⁰ BAKER, J. F. (1908). *Nestorius and His Teaching- A Fresh Examination of The Evidence*. Cambridge: University Press. p. 8

¹⁵¹ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. pp.592-593

to be burnt down along with many adjacent buildings.¹⁵² Afterward, Nestorius was given the nicknames *Incendiary* and *Firebrand*.¹⁵³ However, according to J. F. Baker, this event was a well-organized plan that was made by the Arians. In other words, Baker explains that the Arians had burned their own church down and damaged their neighbor' houses believing that after the fire, Nestorius would be blamed and, as a result, he would lose his public popularity.¹⁵⁴

This story is significant because it seems to reflect Nestorius' hatred of Arians. However, it is actually a reflection of Nestorius' insincerity. That is, Nestorius was accused of not being sincere in his opposition to heretics and that he used all his actions against heretics only for his own benefit. A. M. Liguori explained this situation as below:

In the beginning of his reign, it is true, he was a most ardent persecutor of the Arians, the Slovations, and the Quartodecimans; but, as St. Vincent of Lerins tells us, his chief aim in this was only to prepare the way for teaching his own errors. He declared war against all heresies, to make way for his own." He brought a priest from Antioch with him, of the name of Anastasius, and he, at the instigation of the Bishop, preached one day the blasphemous doctrine that no one should call Mary the Mother of God, because she was only a creature, and it was impossible that a human creature could be the Mother of God. The people ran to Nestorius, to call on him to punish the temerity of the preacher; but he not only approved of what was said, but unblushingly went into the pulpit himself, and publicly defended the doctrine preached by Anastasius.¹⁵⁵

This passage shows that Nestorius was accused of not being sincere in his words regarding heretics. Although the passage claims that Nestorius even took a stance against the heretics, he did not take the necessary measures to stop his "heretical" priest. Nestorius' purported speech given in the section following the previous passage, is given to demonstrate his heretical beliefs:

In that sermon, called afterwards by St. Cyril the Compendium of all Blasphemy, he called those Catholics blind and ignorant, who were

¹⁵² BAKER, J. F. (1908). *Nestorius and His Teaching- A Fresh Examination of The Evidence*. Cambridge: University Press. p. 8

¹⁵³ Ibid, 8

¹⁵⁴ Ibid, 8

¹⁵⁵ Liguori, A. M. (185). *History of Heresies and Their Refutations*. Dublin:James Duffy p.120

scandalized by Anastasius preaching, that the Holy Virgin should not be called the Mother of God. The people were most anxiously waiting to hear what the Bishop would say in the pulpit, when, to their astonishment, he cried out: " How can God, then, have a mother? The Gentiles ought to be excused, who bring forward on the stage the mothers of their Gods; and the Apostle is a liar, when, speaking of the Divinity of Christ, he says that he is without father, without mother, without generation: no, Mary has not brought forth a God. What is born of the flesh is nothing but flesh; what is born of the spirit is spiritual. The creature does not bring forth the Creator, but only a man, the instrument of the Divinity."¹⁵⁶

In addition to all these, Martin Luther also criticized Nestorius on the grounds that he thought what the Arians and Apollinarists thought. Luther states that as a being a disciple of Theodor of Mopsuestia, Nestorius wished to safeguard the church's confession of Jesus Christ from Arianist and Apollinarianist views and so he rejected to the title of *theotokos* for Mary.¹⁵⁷ Martin Luther maintains that according to Nestorius, God the Logos had no beginning as the Arians said, he did and he did not substitute for any components of the man Jesus e.g his soul or his spirit, as Arians and Apollinarists said.¹⁵⁸ As a result of this interpretation, having thought like the heretic Arians, Nestorius claimed that God the Logos could have no mother and Mary could not be *theotokos*.¹⁵⁹

Another indication that held heretical views is John Alzog's criticism that Nestorius's efforts were targeted mainly against the few existing advocates of Arian and Apollinarian beliefs and that he promised to give his community some carefully considered instructions of their heresy. However, at the same time, he kept the leader of the *Pelagian heresy¹⁶⁰, who was exiled from the West, under his protection. That is, on one hand, he was giving speeches against heresies, and contesting with them,

¹⁵⁶ Ibid, 120

¹⁵⁷ Boisclair, David R.(2005). *Martin Luther on Nestorius and Eutyches in On the Councils and the Church (1539)*

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 9

¹⁵⁹ Ibid, p. 9

¹⁶⁰ *Pelagianism is a heresy which holds that the man can take initial and fundamental steps towards the Salvation by his own efforts, apart from Divine grace. Historically, it was regarded as an ascetic movement composed of disparate elements united under the name of the British theologian and exegete Pelagius, who taught in Rome in the 4th and early 5th cents. (Cross, F. L. *The Oxford Dictionary Of Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.p.1249)

on the other hand, he maintained the opposite image.¹⁶¹ For example, the sentences that were written below also shows us how Nestorians hated and criticized heretics like the Arians, but also gave speeches like them:

Woe, and woe again, to all the conclave of heretics.

Woe, and woe again, to all who say that God died.

Woe, and woe again, to all who do not say that God is immortal.

Woe, and woe again, to all who say **Mary is Mother of God.**

Woe, and woe again, to all who do not say **Mary is Mother Of Christ.**

Woe, and woe again, to all who do not confess Three Persons in one Essence.

Woe, and woe again, to all who do not confess the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Woe, and woe again, to all who do not confess **in Christ two Natures, two Persons** and one Parsopa of Filiation.

Woe, and woe again, to Simon, **Arius**, and Eunomius.

Woe, and woe again, to Macedonius and Sabellius.

Woe, and woe again, to Apollinaris and **Origen**

Woe, and woe again, to **wicked Cyril** and Severus...¹⁶²

All these show that he was not serious or sincere in his approach to heresies; on the contrary, it clearly appears that all his speeches and actions regarding the Arians and other heretics were a method to fulfill his plans and dreams.

In the light of all of these cases and information, it is clear that two different approaches or behaviors were acted by Nestorius and now two different Nestorius were recognizable. Nestorius who combated with heresies also contested with

¹⁶¹ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. pp.592-593

¹⁶² Badger, G. P. (1852). *Nestorians and Their Rituals*. London: Josep Masters and Co. Printers. pp.79-80

himself who was not serious and sincere on his oppositions related to heresies and who kept his Arian side in secret. Therefore as Luke 3:9 says that:

Now the ax is already at the roots of the trees. Every tree that does not produce good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.¹⁶³

In other words, Arius spread his teachings and his teachings produced some fruits that Nestorius took. At this point, if the teachings of Arius were regarded as not good fruits, the teaching of Nestorius would be considered as not good fruits too. If an ax cut down the heresy of Arius, it was probable that the same ax should cut down the heresy of Nestorius. However, the fifth-century Christianity witnessed Nestorius's Patriarchate. This means that Nestorius who followed Arius in some manners produced good fruits. Therefore Cyril's reactions and accusations were unavoidable.

3.4. Disputes with Cyril of Alexandria

Cyril is one of the most influential figures in the first half of the fifth century. He was a very intelligent person and was also a well-educated Christian theologian who solved the challenging problems of Christological and theological patterns and explained them by logical terms and distinctions that he had gotten from Neoplatonic writers. Cyril is remembered for his theological and Christological doctrines against Nestorius and those who denied the Theotokos.¹⁶⁴ For example, Gabrielle Zagarese in his book described Cyril as one who contested with heretics and wrote that during the Council of Ephesus against Nestorius, the father who combatted against heretics, St. Cyril of Alexandria showed us his errors.’’¹⁶⁵ He is known as Cyril of Alexandria because of that he was the Patriarch of Alexandria in between 412 and 444. His spiritual father and his master was St. Athanasius of Alexandria who taught strict catholic Christology and theology and was also a defender of these dogmas against heresies, especially Arianism and Nestorianism.

¹⁶³ Alzog, J. (1912). *History Of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers. p. 146

¹⁶⁴ Siecienski, A. E. (2010). *The Filioque- History of a Doctrinal Controversy*. Newyork: Oxford University Press. pp. 47-48

¹⁶⁵ Zagarese, G., & Lordi, G. (1844). *Corso Di Storia Ecclesiastica*. Napoli: Giuseppe Barone Tipografia. p. 234

Cyril focused on the same topics, such as the doctrine of salvation, the divine nature of Christ, the concept of *theotokos*, the Holy Spirit and Mary.

It is known that Cyril never tolerated heretics, pagans, and Jews because he thought that his duty was to overcome heresies. His commentaries generally included criticism for Arians, Sabellians; he also wrote about the interpretation of Old Testament texts like the Pentateuch and wrote commentaries on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets.¹⁶⁶

The dispute between Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria clearly arose when Nestorius became the Patriarch of Constantinople. It seems that both of them technically accepted the clause of the Nicene Creed declaring that the Trinity is co-equal in essence, dignity, power, and will; and all confess of Christ that he was perfect God and perfect Man as approved by the Church Fathers of 318.¹⁶⁷ However the disagreement arose when the Nestorius rejected the term *theotokos* that was related to Mary and Cyril maintained the use of this term, calling the Virgin Mary the Mother of God. In addition to insisting on the use of *theotokos*, Cyril also wrote twelve anathemas that excommunicated those who believed that Christ has two different natures.

Prior to the Council of Ephesus, Nestorius firstly was excommunicated in Rome by Pope Celestine. Having good relations with Cyril of Alexandria, Pope Celestine requested Cyril to write about the errors of Nestorius to legitimize his decision. As a result, Cyril wrote a letter that described the failures of Nestorius, and Cyril proposed that twelve anathemas below be applied to Nestorius.

3.4.1. Cyril's Twelve Chapters

1. That Immanuel is God: Therefore the Virgin, inasmuch as according to the flesh she gave birth to Him who is the Word made flesh, may be called "Mother of God."¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Chadwick, H. (2002). *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. New York: Oxford Press. p. 526

¹⁶⁷ Badger, G. P. (1852). *Nestorians and Their Rituals*. London: Josep Masters and Co. Printers.p. 398

¹⁶⁸ Etheridge, J. W. (1866) *The Syrian Churches With Their Liturgies and Literatures* p.133)

2. The Word who proceeded from God the Father is hypostatically united to the flesh, and with his human nature made one sole Christ, who is alike God and man.¹⁶⁹
3. This union is not a mere connection of dignity, authority, or power, but is substantial and real.¹⁷⁰
4. Hence the things affirmed of Jesus by the apostles and evangelists are not to be attributed to the man as considered separately from the divine nature, nor to the latter considered apart from the fact of the incarnation.¹⁷¹
5. Nor can we accurately call the Lord Jesus a man who carries, or bears, the divine nature, inasmuch as the Word was made flesh,—made partaker of our nature.¹⁷²
6. Nor that the Word who proceeded from the Father is the God or the Lord of Jesus Christ; the Redeemer being himself God and man in one person; for the Word was made flesh.¹⁷³
7. Nor that the Lord Jesus, as man, was actuated by the divine Word, and invested with the glory of the only begotten Son, as being another person than himself.¹⁷⁴
8. Therefore in offering that worship which is due to Jesus Christ, we do not adore the human nature as with the Word, nor the divine nature as apart from the humanity; but we worship and glorify one Immanuel, the Word made flesh.¹⁷⁵
9. We must not say that Jesus was glorified by the Holy Spirit, as receiving from him an extraneous power for the performance of miraculous works; for the Spirit by whom he performed those works was his own Spirit.¹⁷⁶
10. And with regard to the sacrifice which Jesus as our High Priest had offered for us unto God, it may not be said that our High Priest is not the Word of God himself, but a man born of a woman, as if he were another person than the divine Word; nor that he who knew no sin offered that sacrifice for himself.¹⁷⁷
11. The flesh of the Lord is vivific; because belonging hypostatically to the Word, who proceeded from the Father, and who quickened all things, and not to another only morally one with the Word through his dignifying inhabitation.¹⁷⁸

¹⁶⁹ Ibid, p.133

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, p.133

¹⁷¹ Etheridge, J. W. (1866) *The Syrian Churches With Their Liturgies and Literatures*. p. 133

¹⁷² Etheridge, J. W. (1866) *The Syrian Churches With Their Liturgies and Literatures*. p. 133

¹⁷³ Ibid, p.133

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, p.133

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, p.133

¹⁷⁶ Ibid, p.133

¹⁷⁷ Ibid, p.134

¹⁷⁸ Ibid, p.134

12. The Word, the Lord and Giver of life, suffered according to the flesh, and was crucified, and was the first-begotten from among the dead.¹⁷⁹

According to Cyril, if one argues the opposites of all these points, he should be anathematized. In response, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Nestorius insisted on the rightness of his dogmas and urged Cyril of Alexandria to reconsider again his proposals for Christ. In his last letter to Cyril, he wrote that: “ *If one is disposed to be contentious, Paul will cry out through us to such a one, were recognize no other practice, neither do the churches of God.*¹⁸⁰”

According to Cyril, the divine nature and human natures of Christ exist together in one body and they are not separated from each other. As Cyril explains, when one fills a cup with some water and wine it is visible that the water and wine are mingled with each other and nobody can say that they are separated from each other.¹⁸¹ The human and divine natures of Christ are like water and wine in same cup and so inseparable.¹⁸² However, Nestorius used a different metaphor to explain the two nature of Christ. According to him, if one puts some water, and oil into the same cup, he sees that the water and the oil that were filled do not mix each other because the oil rises to the surfaces of the cup. Since the human and divine natures of Christ are like water and oil in same cup, they are separate from each other. This is similar to what Arius taught about the two natures of Christ, that human nature and divine natures of Christ are not mixed with each other and that they served each other. His divine character enabled Christ to fulfill his religious duties, while his human character helped his divine nature to complete his mission.

When Nestorius tried to bring to Cyril’s attention the fact that neither the writings nor speeches of the Prophets or the Apostles had said that Mary was the Mother of God, so she should be called the Mother of Man as Paul of Samosata, Photinus of Galatia and Arius had claimed. As a result, instead of using *theotokos*, Nestorius

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, p. 134

¹⁸⁰ Nestorius of Constantinople, Epist. II *ad Cyrillum*. PP. 77, 57A. I Cor. 11:16

¹⁸¹ MacCulloch, D. (2009). Christianity.-The First Three Thousand Years. New York. Penguin Books Ltd. pp. 167-168

¹⁸² Ibid, 168

used the term *Christokos* meaning Mother of Christ. This doctrine led to a division within the Church with some Christians following Nestorius, and others who accepted the teachings of Cyril of Alexandria.

For Nestorians, accepting the term of *theotokos* in reference to the Virgin Mary would be so problematic because if Mary is accepted as the Mother of God, then who is the Mother of Christ? As George Percy Badger explains about Nestorius's defense against Cyril in his book, Nestorius says to Cyril:

If the Mary is the Mother of the God, and Peter testified of Him whom she brought forth, saying: thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God; then according to you, she is not the Mother of Christ, but the Mother of His Father, and Christ is her grandson, not her Son, and she is the mother of His Father. Where, then is the mother of Christ?¹⁸³

The debate over these theological and Christological grew increasing heated and divisive within a short time and resulted in the summoning of a church council in Ephesus in 431.

3.4.2. The Council of Ephesus (431)

As an Antiochian bishop, Nestorius became the Patriarch of Constantinople and bishops like Cyril, who came from the Alexandrian tradition could not bear his enthronement because, in their view, one who came from the Antiochian tradition and was averse to understanding and the language of salvation, was taking the chair of the patriarchate of Constantinople. Therefore, the emperor's decision caused dissatisfaction within the Alexandrian camp and inflamed the rivalry between these two schools. Then, Cyril has delegated four of his apocrisiaries to Constantinople to request the emperor to hold an inquiry into Nestorius and his teachings. However, Nestorius did not respond to the questions and requests of those nuncios and protested against them. Meanwhile, Cyril was aware of the ideas and positions of the monks in Constantinople, attempted to bring them to his own side by making speeches and presenting his ideas to the monks. He knew that there was a tradition of

¹⁸³ Badger, G. P. (1852). *Nestorians and Their Rituals*. London: Josep Masters and Co. Printers. p. 402

distrust between patriarchates and monasteries since the time of John Chrysostom. As a result, he presented the monks with an encyclical which described him as the defender of *theotokos*, and listed the monks' concerns about Nestorius. Later, the atmosphere in Constantinople became worse and when Nestorius became aware of all these scenarios regarding himself, he appealed to the emperor to call a synod to examine the accusations against Cyril.¹⁸⁴ For instance, Nestorius accused Cyril of being a supporter of Apollinarian heresy. Therefore, during the last days of June of 431, the Council of Ephesus, under the leadership of Cyril, was begun. Every stage of the council was highly problematic due to the fact that while Cyril rejected Nestorius's views, also Nestorius was equally opposed to Cyril's positions. However, thanks to the bribes that Cyril gave to the Emperor's men and relatives and his close relations with influential figures in the empire, Cyril was able to have his views accepted by the council.

As a result of this council that has been accepted as third ecumenical council, Nestorius was declared a heretic and later, his name was entered into the list of heretics in 435.

¹⁸⁴ Chadwick, H. (2002). *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. New York: Oxford Press. p. 530

CHAPTER 4

THE INFLUENCES OF ARIANISM ON NESTORIAN TEACHINGS

After Arius was excommunicated and his teachings were rejected at the end of the Council of Nicaea, many of his followers tried to find more comfortable territories for themselves so that they could continue to practice Arius's teachings. It is known that some of Arius' followers who were talented and well educated, were able to be elected as bishops. This is interesting that even though Arianism has been regarded as a heresy, Arians were heretics who had bishops (like many other heresies), but it is important that they had their own church unlike many other heresies. In other words, many heretic groups might have their own bishops, but few of them were able to establish their own church. However, Arians not only had effective bishops but they also established and served in their own churches. It is known that Pelagianism could never build their own church and Manichaeism formed many communities however they disappeared later on.¹⁸⁵ In addition other heretics such as the Bogomils, Paulicians, Albigensians, and Bonshommes disappeared too and even though Monotheletism founded their church, they eventually returned to the Catholic Faith. However, Arians enjoyed the formation and the organization of their churches in many districts until the middle of the sixth century.

It is known that they acted as missionaries in Constantinople. For example, Demophilus who was a devout Arian, occupied the seat of the Patriarchate of Constantinople until the emperor Theodosius drove him from his position. Demophilus was just one of those bishops who had been a supporter of Arian teachings. There was a significant number, of bishops and emperors who were Arian

¹⁸⁵Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society. p. 4

Christians. For example, the emperor Constantius II, and Valen, and many of the kings of the Goths and some bishops from Edessa and Antioch, like Leontius (344-357) who was the bishop of Antioch, contributed to keep Arian teachings alive.¹⁸⁶ Those are the means of transmission which exposed people to Arian perspectives on Christological and theological issues. It can be stated that Nestorius, who professed similar teachings at certain points with Arians, might have been taught Arian teachings as a result of those figures who were defenders of Arianism. Therefore this chapter indicates the possible influence of Arianism on Nestorian teaching by stressing the similarities between them and then it covers how Nestorianism received Arian teachings or what are the reasons or methods that were transmitted those dogmas to Nestorius? At this point, it is useful to show their similarities and differences with each other.

4.1. Comparing Nestorianism with Arianism

As was mentioned earlier some of the people who were contemporaries of Nestorius accused him of being insincere in his speech against the heretics. When the Nestorius actions or reactions toward the heretics are examined Nestorius's insincerity towards heretics is highly visible. Also when his religious teachings are investigated, it is visible too. One can easily recognize the similarities between Nestorius' and Arius' teachings. As those similarities encourage us to think about the possible Arian influences on Nestorius so it is necessary to discuss the similarities between both of them.

4.1.1. The Similarities between Arian and Nestorian Teachings

One of the similarities between the teachings of Arius and the teachings of Nestorius is the human sense of Christ. Both accepted the human and divine nature of Christ. Arius believed that in Christ there were the human and divine natures and claimed that these natures are separated from each other. They do not get confused with each

¹⁸⁶Woods, D. (1993). Three Notes on Aspects of the Arian Controversy c.354-367. The Journal of Theological Studies, NEW SERIES, Vol. 44, No. 2. p. 601

other as if there has been an invisible barrier that preclude the integration of these natures. He believed that as a born of Mary, Christ at the beginning was purely human and he gained his divinity when the Holy Spirit descended upon him. Like Arius, Nestorius taught a Christology which confirms that Christ was a man who was born of Mary. As he was born of a woman he cannot be regarded as God. Therefore, to Nestorius, Christ gained his divinity when he integrated with the Holy Spirit. While his human nature comes through by born, his divine nature comes from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. These are completely different and distinct from each other. He regards it as impossible that the Divine nature of God can not be altered or mixed with human nature when Christ was praised by Holy Spirit.¹⁸⁷ This was a perfection of man for Arius and the deification of man for Nestorius. In other words, according to Arius stated that Christ's human nature was so perfect that this purity enables Christ to get his divinity or deify himself. Similarly, Nestorius thought that the divine nature of the Savior was not formed as a result of the incarnation of God into the human body but that by his will, God deified a man.¹⁸⁸ Ultimately for both Arius and Nestorius, the two of the natures of Christ work in harmony and they form a union together, but in this union both natures function without confusing the other one.

Nestorius also maintained the Arian idea related to the preexistence of Christ. Both rejected the words of the Nicene Creed which accepts that the Son is eternal and was created before all ages. According to Arius, Christ had a beginning and as he says there was a time when the Son did not always exist.¹⁸⁹ Arians underlined the beginning and the full creaturehood of Christ in this way. Similar to the Arians, Nestorius and his followers believed that the human body of Christ came into being by Mary, however, as a divine being he came into existence when the Holy Spirit appeared to him. After that he began to be called the Son of God.¹⁹⁰ Nestorius

¹⁸⁷ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 26

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, p.25

¹⁸⁹ William, R. (2002). Arius: Heresy and Tradition. Second Edition. Wm. B. Eerdmans Company: Cambridge. p. 100

¹⁹⁰ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 59

believed that Jesus is the one who was made a faithful priest of God and who did not exist as such from eternity.¹⁹¹ This is why he denied the title *theotokos* as Mary's son was not God.¹⁹² At this point, it is better to point out that Arians can be assumed to have opposed the term *theotokos* practically but not terminologically. In other words, even if they did not use any specific term like *theotokos* it is clear that they rejected the idea that God could be born of a woman.¹⁹³ Thus it can be stated that both theologies assigned a certain beginning for Christ. Meanwhile, they agreed on the Father's eternal existence and none of them claimed that the Father had a beginning or an end.

Another similarity between Nestorian and Arian teaching is that both theologies accepted the Holy Trinity. Although some scholars have claimed that Arius rejected the existence of the Trinity, in fact, he believed in the Holy Trinity. However in fact his Trinity existed through the creation of the distinct and subordinate being by the original monad-a delegation of functions.¹⁹⁴ The thing which makes Arius different from other perspectives is that he believed that there must be a hierarchy within the Trinity as the three persons in Trinity are substantially different from each other. As it was reported in the first chapter, to Arius each member of the Holy Trinity has distinct character and substance. They are also different in many manners like their pre-existences, their functions, their mortality or immortality, their knowledge and abilities for they are diverse in nature and substance.¹⁹⁵ Arius was condemned as he asserted that Father is one person and the Son is another one and the Holy Spirit is another person so their essences of substance are different from each other. Therefore there must be some differences in their role or functions in the Holy Trinity. He basically believes that the Son and the Father are not equal to each other. Former is

¹⁹¹ Wilken, R. L. (1965). Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies. Church History, Vol. 34, No. 2 p. 133

¹⁹² Fortescue, A. (1913) The Lesser Eastern Churches. London: Catholic True Society. p. 69.

¹⁹³ Wilken, R. L. (1965). Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies. Church History, Vol. 34, No. 2 p. 133

¹⁹⁴ Barnard, L.W. (1970).The Antecedents of Arius. Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. 24, No. 3. Published by: Brill p. 175

¹⁹⁵ Worrall P. (1956) *St Thomas and Arianism*. Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol.23. Peters Publishers. p. 215

creator and latter are creatures so how can they be equal in the Trinity? However, Arius's these ideas were followed by Nestorius. As it is understood from his teachings, Nestorius stated that as it was written in passages in Phillipians Christ should not be count as equal with his father. Like Arius, Nestorius the deification or perfection of Christ was arisen by the exaltation and the bestow of God.¹⁹⁶ Therefore the Father and the Son and the Spirit are different from each other in nature, in function, and in character so Nestorius sophisticates that each person in Trinity is different from each other and so their functions and operations must be different too. As a result, it can be stated that Arian and Nestorian ideas regarding Trinity are against the Nicene Creed that declares the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are equal in Trinity.

It is not surprising but very meaningful that the controversy surrounding Nestorius was mainly induced by those heretic ideas or rejections of that all persons within the Trinity, are equal to each other and resulted in the discussion of Filioque, a term used to signify Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. To Arians, only the Son proceeds from the Father¹⁹⁷ and they put an order like that they made Father greater than the Son and also regarded both the Father and the Son as greater than Holy Spirit.¹⁹⁸ In other words, they put the Son below the Father and the Holy Spirit below both.¹⁹⁹ That was the tendency to deny the Filioque. At this point, David T. Ngong penned that being an Antiochian bishop, Nestorius though he was with the zeal for heretics like Arius, became the victim of his own theological zealousness due to his ideas opposing the Filioque.²⁰⁰ Then Nestorians believed that the Holy Spirit comes solely from the Father.

¹⁹⁶ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 11

¹⁹⁷ Grillmeier, Aloys. 1975. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Second. Volume One. Atalanta: John Knox Press. p. 292

¹⁹⁸ Worrall P. (1956) *St Thomas and Arianism*. Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol.23. Peters Publishers. p. 240

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, 240

²⁰⁰ Ngong, T.D (2017). *A New History of African Christian Thought: From Cape to Cairo*. New York: Routledge Press.

Moreover, it is interesting that the concept of “salvation” in Nestorian teaching is not so far from the Arian idea of salvation. Robert Gregg describes the Arian view of salvation is like that Arians thought that the Son came into existence for the sake of all humankind but not for his own humankind.²⁰¹ In other words, as Arius said in his *Thalia*:

Christ was made for our sake in order that God might create us through him by an instrument.²⁰²

As it is understood that Christ, for Arians, took on himself for the salvation of all humanity and his divine nature enabled Christ to do so. Like Christ, saints and religious men, ordinary men can also contribute to their salvation by their religious practices. In Nestorian thought, by his own merit, the man Jesus earned the acceptance of a Son.²⁰³ As he learned from Theodor, Nestorius believed that Christ sacrificed himself for the human race and exalted his status.²⁰⁴ In his *Bazaar of Heraclides*, he says that:

Whereas I have said that Christ has offered the sacrifice of himself for his race and for himself, for his race, in deed that he may release them from the condemnation of the signed bond of sin. While he was free from sin, he yet offered himself for himself that there might be given unto him a name which is more excellent than all names, and he was obedient unto death and accepted the death upon the cross, he who was free from sin. For he who was not found with sin was obedient death he might die for us.²⁰⁵

Nestorius copied the Arian idea of Christ’s salvific efficacy and he also thought that salvation was the task of human as Arius claimed. To remind, as it was previously mentioned Arius believed that men are supposed to do their duties to reach salvation or, in other words, men need to make efforts to gain their redemption. Thus,

²⁰¹ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. p. 81

²⁰² Ibid, p. 80

²⁰³ Grillmeier, Aloys. 1975. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Second. Volume One. Atalanta: John Knox Press. pp. 467-468

²⁰⁴Laansma, L. C. and Guthrie, G. H. and Westfall, C. L. (2009). *So Great a Salvation: A Dialogue on the Atonement in Hebrews*. Bloomsbury Publishing. p. 95

²⁰⁵ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) *Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 251

Nestorius similarly accepted “salvation” as a largely human task with God’s assisting grace which raises men from an imperfect human stage into the perfect human stage.²⁰⁶ This assisting grace of Nestorius is exactly equal with the bestowal of the divine favor and approval of obedient creatures, mankind.²⁰⁷

Another possible impact of Arianism on Nestorius is that both heresies thought that the exaltation of God upon Christ occurred through the indwelling of Logos. The position and the function of the Logos were adopted by Nestorius not fully but generally. As mentioned earlier Logos was the authority or power which gave a divine statue to Christ among the Arians. Being a man like us Jesus became the Son of God after his integration with the Logos. In same way, Nestorius also stressed the function of the Logos by its indwelling with Christ. He believed that Father bestowed Christ with his wisdom by the Logos’s embodying on Christ. These similarities existed between them due to the fact that both approached the position and the nature of the Logos in similar ways. In fact, it is visible the Nestorian adoption of Arian Logos. In addition to the fact that they both recognized the differences between the Father and the Son in substance, they also agreed that the Logos has a distinct nature from other persons. That is what Arius and Nestorius claimed about the diverse substance of the Holy Spirit and its function to deify the Son. It can be stated that due to this function Arius regarded the Logos as “a Mighty God”²⁰⁸ and Nestorius thought it as he was the God the Word who created the Son of God, from a two, three months old baby Jesus.²⁰⁹

The last but maybe the most interesting similarity between Arius and Nestorius becomes visible if we remember that both Arius and Nestorius were the representatives and defenders of the Antiochian teachings. Arius was the follower of

²⁰⁶ Sanders, F. and Issler, K. (2007). *Jesus in Trinitarian Perspective*. B. H. Publishing Group. Tennessee p. 96

²⁰⁷ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

²⁰⁸ Stead, Christopher. (1994). Arius in Modern Research. *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NEW SERIES, Vol. 45, No. 1. Oxford University Press. p. 25

²⁰⁹ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) *Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 137

Paul of Samosata, and of Lucian of Antioch who were both tutors of Antiochian teachings. In addition, Nestorius is said to have been the pupil of Theodor of Mopsuestia who had more influence and control over the Alexandrian school in the 5th century and after the 430s in the schools in Edessa. Therefore the direct impact of the Antiochian tradition on Nestorius became remarkable and its main purpose was to protect the authority and the uniqueness of the One-Monad. In particular, his ideas related to the divine and the human nature of Christ were imposed by Theodor. As T. E. Pollard stated about the general motivation of the Arians:

there can be no doubt that the compelling motive of the Arianism was to desire to preserve a strict monotheism.²¹⁰

Nestorian theology was also centered on this perspective. Since they were influenced by the same teachings, is it surprising that both of these systems were rejected and accused of being heretical by the same theologies of the Alexandrian tradition? As much as they shared mutual center in that their teachings were formed by the same tradition, it is highly meaningful that they were rejected by a mutual enemy i.e the Alexandrian tradition. Athanasius who was a strict defender of Alexandrian teachings vehemently opposed Arian teachings and the Arians; Cyril, a rigorous speaker of the Alexandrian tradition rejected the teachings of Nestorius. Athanasius accused the Arians of reviving the teachings of the Samosatene, the followers of the Paul of Samosata,²¹¹ similarly, Nestorius was charged for being a placard of ideas of Paul of Samosata²¹² as mentioned earlier. In short, this important detail as much as their teachings have many similar points, their opponents were also originated from the same tradition, formed in Alexandria.

These similarities show that there existed more similarities between Arius's teachings and Nestorian teachings than expected. This was the result of the adoption of Arian dogmas by Nestorius. As previously explained, Nestorius did not copy all of Arius's theology therefore, some differences between their teachings are notable.

²¹⁰ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.p. 87

²¹¹ Ibid, p. 22

²¹² Loofs, F. (1914). *Nestorius and His Place in the History Of Christian Doctrine*.London: Cambridge University Press. p. 32

Those differences may be stated to have existed only in details, however their theologies mainly agree with each other. Nevertheless, at this point, it is helpful to mention the significant differences in their theologies.

4.1.2. The Differences between Arian and Nestorian Teachings

While both Arius and Nestorius agreed that two different natures existed in Christ, one human and the other divine, it is visible that there were the differences in understanding the character of these natures. Arius believed that Christ has an entirely changeable nature while his opponents Athanasius insisted that Jesus Christ was the same yesterday, today and will remain the same in the future.²¹³ As Athanasius reported, the Arians described his thesis related to changeability that:

Someone asked them if the Logos of the God is able to be changed, as the devil was, and they were not afraid of to say, Yes, he is able; [to be changed] for being begotten and created, he has a changeable nature.²¹⁴

The Arians also stated that as he has free will and he can change by his own choosing. Since he is not like a stone remaining unchangeable he must be changeable.²¹⁵ The Arian idea of changeability is sometimes yoked with Christ's advance.²¹⁶ Some scholars claimed that Arian changeability refers to the Son's improvability. The Arians highlighted that Jesus:

Having a changeable nature, on account of the diligence and exercise of conduct did not undergo a change for worse.²¹⁷

In light of this kind of reference, scholars claimed that Arian changeability of Christ should be regarded in the sense of the advance and improvability of Christ.

²¹³ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. pp. 15-20

²¹⁴ Ibid, 14

²¹⁵ Ibid, 14

²¹⁶ Ibid, 19

²¹⁷ Ibid, 19

In contrast to this, Nestorius rigorously rejected the changeability of the natures in Christ, he even agreed with the idea that two different natures existed in Christ. According to Nestorius, neither the divine nature of God that was incarnated in Jesus nor Jesus's human nature are changeable. He writes in his *Bazaar of Heracleides* that:

It is not possible that the nature of God should be changed into bodily frame or by change, not yet that the body should be changed into the nature of God the Word.²¹⁸

Nestorius's idea, in fact, was related to his comprehension of the Logos. In other words the Logos deifying Christ cannot be changeable, thus Christ's human nature too is unchanging. Both of the natures function in harmony but without mingling with each other and each of them is able to preserve itself. His main concern is likely to be that the divine nature of Christ is not changeable. However, it is interesting that Nestorius hesitated over whether the man Christ is changeable or not. He underlines the time when Christ had not yet become God the Son. In other words, however, strictly he rejects the changeability of the divine nature of Christ, it is clear that he had some concerns about the changeability of Christ's human nature. In his work, he stated that:

For in so far as he is God, he is unchangeable but when he was not God, he was nothing.²¹⁹

In the light of this information, it can be stated that Nestorius disagreed with the Arian idea which says Christ has a changeable nature, however, he might adopt Arius's idea at certain points as he had a concern regarding the alteration of the human nature in Christ.

The other difference between Arianism and Nestorian teaching is that they interpreted the preexistence of the Logos in different ways. Even they both accepted the Logos as a creature and the wisdom of God that made Christ deified by incarnation, their ideas related to whether the Logos is eternal or not conflicted with

²¹⁸ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides. Oxford: Clarendon Press. pp.25-26

²¹⁹ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides. Oxford: Clarendon Press. pp. 27-28

each other. While Arius assigned a beginning to the Logos, Nestorius thought that God the Logos is eternal, descended from heaven and he was joined with the human nature in the womb of Mary.²²⁰ Arian views, arguing that the Logos was not eternal, said to have originated from the term “made” used in Paul’s **Letters to Hebrews* for referring the Son of God.²²¹ In this commentary on Hebrews, Theodor explained why Arians did not think the Logos as eternal that:

the writer of the Hebrew uses the term “made” when referring Christ. The Arians recognizing the support of this, give their argument, quickly jump to the conclusion that Hebrews says the Word was made and is therefore a creature like men.²²²

Therefore, it is a notable difference between Arius’s teaching and Nestorian teachings that while the former thought that the Logos had a beginning like all creatures, the latter did not.

The other interesting difference between them is about the holiness of Christ and the saints. In other words, according to the Arians even though Christ is the most superior man, he could be just one of those who might or would be in perfection. The Arians claim that God the Word visited one man, and sanctified Christ and became manifest in him and also in the others.(saints)²²³ Furthermore, they believed that God has and will have many sons but they also knew that Christ is the most excellent of

*Letter to Hebrews Chapter I (Prologue) 4: Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name than they. 5 For to which of the angels hath he said at any time, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?

Letter to Hebrews Chapter 2 (Appeal to Faith) : 5 For God hath not subjected unto angels the world to come, where of we speak. 6 But one in a certain place hath testified, saying: What is man, that thou art mindful of him: or the son of man, that thou visitest him? 7 Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels: thou hast crowned him with glory and honour, and hast set him over the works of thy hands: 8 Thou hast subjected all things under his feet. For in that he hath subjected all things to him, he left nothing not subject to him. But now we see not as yet all things subject to him. 9 But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour: that, through the grace of God, he might taste death for all.

²²⁰Anastos M. V.(1962) Nestorius was Orthodox. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 16 (1962), p. 132

²²¹ Wilken, R. L. (1965). *Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies*. *Church History*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (Jun., 1965), pp. 131

²²² *Ibid*, 131

²²³ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. p.55

men and God will not create anyone superior to him.²²⁴ However, Nestorius did not adopt this idea. To him Christ was unique and one. In his *Bazaar of Heracleides*, he implied that:

It is not said that God became incarnate also in one of the prophets or saints, nor even that he made use of any of them in his own *prosopon i.e person or nature*.²²⁵

In the light of these words, it is understandable that Nestorius had a stance against the Arian idea that Christ is one of many brothers.

After the possible influences of Arius on Nestorius and his teaching by revealing their similarities, and underlying that their differences in very detailed minutes, now it seems necessary to cover how the Arian teachings might be transmitted to Nestorius. The reasons for the Nestorian adoption of the Arian theology (to a certain extent) may be from a lack of conviction or remain insufficient to comprehend unless the methods of the transmissions of Arius' thoughts and the driving reasons why people still adopted Arianism partly or totally even though it had been declared a heresy are examined.

4.2. The Methods of the Transmission of Arius' Thoughts

4.2.1. Imperial Policies

It is better to discuss the channels, methods, and conditions at first for conceiving why people sympathized with Arianism. As it was mentioned earlier that Arianism even it was rejected by the Council of Nicea in 325 and its supporters were sent to exile, it was able to survive longer than assumed. The important channels which kept the Arian heritage alive were the Barbaric Kingdoms, Goths, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Lombards, Burgundian Kingdom Suebi Kingdom, and Vandals.²²⁶

²²⁴ Ibid, p. 56

²²⁵ Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) Nestorius- Bazaar of Heracleides. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

²²⁶ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.86

Having realized that Arian dispute would divide the unity of the church and would damage the entire empire, emperor Constantine did not hesitate to seek the mediate. Therefore he called the Council of Nicea as he thought himself as *pontifex maximus*. It is said that Constantine took sides with the anti-Arian party and he assigned a term *homouoios* to reject Arius's opinions related to the subordination of the Son with his Father. Eusebius of Caesarea narrates that the term *homouoios* was used just because Arius had polemically branded it as Manichean and as a result, Arius and a few his followers were driven from the city.²²⁷

4.2.2. Arius's First Supporters

However Arius until this period, had already had supporters in many territories so his supporters expressed their solidarity by local synods in Bithynia and Palestine and outside of the Egyptian Metropolis. When he was sent to exile those supporters maintained their sympathies. The letters, wishing Alexander to receive Arius into communion, were supported by many Palestinian bishops.²²⁸ Therefore it would not take so much time²²⁹ that Arius was rehabilitated by a local synod but assembled by the order of the emperor. It is known that Arius died after his return to Alexandria

²²⁷ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.12

²²⁸ Baynes, N. H.(1948). *Sozomen Ecclesiastica Historia I*.The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 49, Published by: Oxford University Press. p.167

²²⁹ This local council is assumed to have been held in Jerusalem shortly before 335. This local synod may refer to the synod of Jerusalem in 335. As emperor Constantinen confessed that if Arius signs the Decrees of the Synod he was ready to see him and to send it back to Alexandria. This event dated in the years of 330 or 331 and then with the motivations and efforts of other bishops, these attempts resulted in calling upon the synod of Jerusalem in shortly before 335. (Hefele, C. J. (1896) *A History of The Councils of The Church, From Its Original Documents*. Volume II A.D 326 to A.D 429. Translated by Henry Nutcombe Oxenham. Edinburgh: T&T Clark)

In another account:

“Again, the Arian movement did not seem to have been suppressed by excommunicating the Arians and sending the leaders into exile; on the contrary, their opposition became more active. The Emperor felt that it would be well to call the synod together again in Nicaea in the late autumn of a.d 327 in order to reach a final settlement. Arius and his fellow-sufferer in exile Euzoios, had prayed for clemency, and a petition had been supported by a lady of the royal house. In compliance with the Emperor's orders, Arius had presented a confession of faith...When given an audience, Arius assured the Emperor that he assented to the Nicene Creed; it was thought appropriate to accept his word. They synod readmitted Arius to their fellowship.” (Lietzmann H. (1967). *A History of Early Church*. Lutterworth Press.)

however his followers increased in number. They continued to worship their faith in many districts outside of Alexandria, Constantinople, Gaul, Spain, Toledo, and Thrace and many other places where were controlled by Arian emperors. For example, if the population of Arians reaches a considerable number in Constantinople, it must remind us the emperor Valens's contribution to his Arian subjects. Maurice Wiles states that the fall of the emperor Valens in Adrianople should be regarded as the fall of the Arianism.²³⁰ He thinks the succession of Theodosius was the beginning of an end for Arians for Theodosius would embark on many strict laws against Arians. Theodosius' law included some orders rejecting Arian worship and the existence of any Arian church in his empire. He also did not allow Arians to assemble in towns.²³¹ Furthermore, in 383 these restrictions were extended and even in their private homes, they were prohibited to assemble any kind of meetings.²³²

4.2.3. Goths, Arianism and Gothic Arianism

However, Arians were believers who did not simply go down and die. That was mainly, but not fully, due to the contribution of the Gothic kingdoms to Arianism and their adoption of this faith. They kept alive Arianism alive in many places even in Constantinople even it was where Emperor Theodosius condemned Arians at first. It was accounted that with the leadership of Gothic Count Gainas, nearly 7,000 Goths who wanted an Arian church in Constantinople were massacred in 400.²³³ The church historian Sokrates informs us about the Arians who were referred to Arian Goths in around 400s. He reported that there were many Arians in Constantinople and they were maintaining their rituals in contrast to all challenges that they faced with. Sokrates reports that:

²³⁰ Wiles, M. (2001). Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries. The Oxford University Press. p.32

²³¹ Ibid, p. 32

²³² Ibid.

²³³ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.183

The Arians, as we have said, held their meeting outside the city. As often therefore as the festal days occurred- I mean Saturday and the Lord's day- in each week, on which assemblies are usually held in the church, they congregated within the city gates about the public squares, and sang responsive verses adapted to the Arian heresy. This they did during the greater part of the night: and again in the morning, chanting the same songs which they called responsive, they paraded through the midst of the city and so passed out of the gates to go to their places of assembly.²³⁴

It may be more interesting that when the Visigoths plundered the city of Rome in 410, Arian Goths and Nicene Romans sang hymns together.²³⁵ According to Ralph W. Mathisen, this means that both groups had some familiarity with each other's liturgy.²³⁶ Moreover, it should be understood that both faiths were moving together when a foreign incursion occurred. It will be true to a quite extent to assert that the Goth maintained the Arian faith since they adopted this belief. At this point to comprehend the entire picture it is essential to mention the past of Gothic Arianism*.²³⁷

Arianism began to be adopted by Goths under the pioneer Ulfila who was said to be an Arian leader of Goths and Gothic Arianism. The cradle of the Gothic Arian²³⁸ Christendom is a small Christian group of Goths that settled on the Roman territory in Lower Moesia (where Bulgaria and Romania are located today) during the period of the emperor Constantius from 337 to 361.²³⁹ In his entire life, he practiced an Arian belief that subordination of Son to the Father and the Logos to the Son. However, as he or many of the Arian Goths knew that none of the supporters of the Arian teaching would satisfy better life so they instead of using the of Arian, preferred to be remembered as being a homoian, a theology defending the similar

²³⁴ Ibid, p.183

²³⁵ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.182

²³⁶ Ibid, 182

²³⁷* Gothic Arianism as a term, was said to be defined by its creed and its use of the Gothic language. (Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.46)

²³⁸ The author uses the term Gothic homoian Christendom as Goths avoided directly to pick up the term Arian instead. The label Homoian is used to signify the relationship between the Father and the Son and specifies that the Son is not same with the Father but similar to him.

²³⁹ Ibid, p.45

dogmas to Arians and formulated at the Synod of Sirmium in 357. Otherwise how and why his ideas would be understood as being more closer to the early supporters of Arius including Arius himself.²⁴⁰ Also, it was known that Ulfila was memorialized as Sanctus Ulfila by the strict Arian supporter, Maximinus.²⁴¹ Whether Ulfila wished to be called as an Arian or not has been still controversial. However, there is a common idea that he might show some efforts to avoid for being called as Arian directly due to the political reasons. Knut Schäferdiek claims that even Arius was rehabilitated and readmitted to communion by the imperial and religious authorities of Constantinople, it was highly interesting that he died suddenly after this rehabilitation and so his friends thought the suspect of any poison or witchcraft for his death.²⁴² Therefore, if Ulfila released his affection or his adoption of Arius would have resulted in bad consequences.²⁴³ Similarly, this may be possible answer to show how and why Nestorius shrouded his Arian sides.

When the political reasons to adopt or reject the Arianism are considered, it should be mentioned that political reasons not only caused the rejection of Arianism, and if we re-turn the Ulfila's affection for Arius, and remind his adoption of Arianism, it is visible that the political reasons were said to be effective on his adoption. Even some scholars accept him as an Arian from birth, many of the scholars made a consensus on that he became an Arian during the Arian emperor Valens. It is assumed that “when he was expelled from Gothia in 347 and he flock were settled South of the Danube, Ulfila had effectively been kicked to touch[with the Arian emperor Valen.]”²⁴⁴ Maurice Wiles takes all attentions into the fact that Ulfila's missionaries is just one of the remarkable activities and remind us that there was existed Christian presence among the Goths before Ulfila's time.²⁴⁵ Even it is accounted that the first

²⁴⁰ Ibid, p.51

²⁴¹ Ibid, p.51

²⁴² Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.58

²⁴³ Ibid, p.58

²⁴⁴ Ibid, p.76

²⁴⁵ Wiles, M. (2001). *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries*.The Oxford University Press. p. 40

Gothic bishops were identified as Nicenes until when Valen inducted Visigoths, including Ulfila, to become Arian.²⁴⁶ This may be interpreted as that Ulfila gave an Arian character to the existing Christianity.

Starting with Ulfila, many Gothic kingdoms began to practice the Arian version of Christianity. Many of the Visigothic Kingdoms practiced it all around Spain, where was said that Arian heresy lasted longer than anywhere²⁴⁷ and almost the entire rulers of the small kingdom of Burgundians on the soil of Gaul, were Arian emperor and they had Arian clergy. The references dates back to the Vandal Kingdoms revealed the Arian heritage in North Africa.

Moreover the Arian heritage in Central Europe would be neglected if the references and evidences showing that in the Ostrogothic Italy not only Arian churches existed in the cities of Ravenna and Roma but also Arian Clergy existed.²⁴⁸ Furthermore, it is also known that Ostrogothic king Theodoric offered a tax exemption to the Arians.²⁴⁹ In last circle of these Barbaric kingdoms, there existed the Lombards. They were said to be last of the Arian Germanic gentes.²⁵⁰

4.3. Arianism in India, Abyssinia, Ethiopia, Asia

Undoubtedly, all of the kingdoms contributed to maintaining Arianism and in the light of these information it can be assumed that Arianism had a huge number of believers inside and outside of Roman soil; in North Africa, Central Europe, East and West of the European Continent. However, that was not all. In other words, there is so much information that Arianism also reached to India, Abyssinia, Ethiopia, Asia. As Gothic Kingdoms kept it alive in their territories, there were also other motivations or reasons that moved the Arian teaching to countries which are so far.

²⁴⁶ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.150

²⁴⁷ Fortescue, A. (1908). *The Orthodox Eastern Church*. London: Catholic true Society. p. 381

²⁴⁸ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.168

²⁴⁹ *Ibid*, 168

²⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 169

For example, in Cappadocia there was a famous Arian bishop named George of Cappadocia. It is said that he is an attractive figure for the emperor Julian, and when he passed away in 361, the emperor Julian ordered his men to bring the library of this Arian bishop to him as he regards George's library as considerable.²⁵¹ Meanwhile, it is said that Arian Ulfila even he did not have a direct connection with any bishops from Pannonia, there are some clues that he might have had some indirect relation with Cappadocian bishops. Also, the name of George of Cappadocia appears in the sources as a influential figure on the bishop Frumentius who was one of the founders of the Abyssinian Church. It is known by the letters of the emperor Constantius when he wrote the Abyssinian King. In his letter, Byzantine emperor requested Abyssinian King to send the Frumentius to Alexandria who might be an influenced by the Arian Patriarch of George in 365²⁵² In this letter, it does not refer directly the George of Cappadocia however the chronology corrects this as George of Cappadocia was murdered in a rival in Alexandria. It means that by wishing the bishop Frumentius in Alexandria again, the emperor was knowing that George of Cappadocia, the possible master of Frumentius was in Alexandria. In the same letter, the emperor also warned the Abyssinian King against the Arius's enemy, Athanasius.²⁵³ By his way, the Roman emperor might have wished to strengthen the existing Arian faith there. As for this, it can be stated that Abyssinian church even with its Arian ingredients, formed the core of the Ethiopian Church later on by the efforts of the monks.

Also during the period of Constantine the Great, Theophilus of Diu who was an Indian bishop came to Constantinople and stayed there for a while. During his stay, he had adopted Roman manners.²⁵⁴ However, most important thing regarding him is that he became an Arian during his stay and when he returned to India it is said that he made some attempts to propagate Arianism there.²⁵⁵

²⁵¹ Gamble, H. Y. (1995). *The Books and the Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven and London. Yale University Press. p. 175

²⁵² Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society. p.297

²⁵³ *Ibid*, p. 297

²⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p. 357

²⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p. 357

4.4. Arian Bishops in Constantinople until Sixth Century

Although Arianism was satisfying with finding new followers outside of the Roman territories, Constantinople as the religious tension raised after the Council of Constantinople, would experience bad days. The Council of Constantinople in 381 as mentioned earlier, condemned the Arianism over its entire territories. Unfortunately, in 386 Demophilus passed away. He was a very famous and influential Arian bishop who was able to gather the Arians outside of the city of Constantinople in contrast to Theodosius' declaration. After Demophilus's death, the significant Gothic Arian bishops have led the Arian communities. For example, an Arian bishop Marinus was summoned from Thrace and soon later he was replaced with another Gothic Arian bishop named Dorotheus.²⁵⁶ This chain was maintained by another Arian bishop of Constantinople and when he died in 430 he was succeeded by Sabbatius.²⁵⁷ Lastly, Deuterius was known as a Roman Arian bishop in Constantinople during the years 491- 518.²⁵⁸

These are indicating that when Theodosius condemned the Arian teaching in Constantinople, those who are defining themselves as Arian did not disappear but Arian practices were maintained unlike the imperial order even for long years.

All these show that how and where people adopted the teachings of Arius. Now it is necessary to mention about the reasons why people might have been a follower of Arianism that had already been declared as heresy.

²⁵⁶ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.153

²⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p.153

²⁵⁸ *Ibid*, p.153

4.5. Why would People Prefer to Believe in a Heresy?

4.5.1. Imperial and Political Reasons for Adopting Arianism

In fact, one of the reasons why people practised Arian Christendom has already been mentioned - political reasons. For example, if we concentrate on the question of why Ulfila adopted Arian Christianity, it was due to the fact that the emperor Valen encouraged Ulfila's Arian adoption. Could the policy of an emperor be influential in altering someone's faith? Absolutely, for conversion and rejection both. In other words, the Church historian Sokrates claims that Eusebian bishops who were later remembered as an Arian party and called Eusebians, did not admit that Arius had taught the errors of which he was accused, however they signed the Nicene Creed.²⁵⁹ This may be a sign that many might accuse Arius of being a heretic for political considerations. Although it is doubtful, it is said that Eusebius and another bishop, Theognis of Nicaea bribed an imperial notary i.e scribe to erase their signatures from the Creed. Similarly, although Ulfila was an Arian, he did not define himself as Arian but described himself as homoian which is an alternative term. Therefore it can be said that many Arians might hide their Arian beliefs.

Another reason why Arius's heresy survived for a long time is the support that came from imperial authorities and the palace. As it was mentioned earlier about the imperial authorities, there were the Roman emperors who tolerated or directly supported the Arians. Constantine the Great, Constantius, Valen were only a few of those emperors. Also, the rulers or the kings of the other kingdoms such as Gothic kingdoms might be said to have supported the Arian heritage all around Europe as said below:

As foederati (federates) the Gothic, Vandalic or Herulian barbarians were not bound to the religious legislation of the Emperors. For that reason, they just adhered to the form of Christian faith they had adopted in the first place. Even after 381 Germanic military contingents in Roman service could officially remain 'Arian'. As we know, this is the background of the famous conflicts around the basilicas in Milan between

²⁵⁹ Hefele, C. J. (1896) A History of The Councils of The Church, From Its Original Documents. Volume II A.D 326 to A.D 429. Translated by Henry Nutcombe Oxenham. Edinburgh: T&T Clark p.2

Bishop Ambrose and Valentinian II's mother Justina. Since the shift of imperial church policy towards 'orthodoxy' under Theodosius and Gratian, however, these barbarians became Arian heretics in the eyes of the Imperial Church. Finally, the establishment of barbarian kingdoms within the Western Roman Empire since the beginning of the fifth century led to the rise of Arian Churches in Gaul, Spain, Italy, and Africa.²⁶⁰

However, there existed some periods that the support to Arians was not directly handed by an emperor's ownself. In other words, there were Arian bishops who were serving in the imperial palace. For example, being a strict Arian, Eusebius of Nicomedia was the service of the emperor Constantine. It is said that he was very effective on the emperor and his policies over Arians.²⁶¹ Being an effective bishop who enabled Arius's rehabilitation by his efforts convincing the emperor for remitting Arius, Eusebius by his party was also maintaining the Arian dogmas by his own party since from the Council of Nicaea.

4.5.2. Ulfila's Bible Translation

Moreover, one other reason why Arian teachings remained alive in practice is due to the fact that Arius's teachings might be suitable, comfortable and consistent with the character of any local tribes, communities or bigger societies. To extent. In Guido's books, Henry Lietzmann sophisticates the question of that why Gothic or Germanic Kingdoms adopted and maintained the Arianism for a long time. Regarding the case of the Gothic Arianism, Uta Heil rejeted the idea of arguing that Arianism as naturally suitable to Germanic religion and to him this term was resulted by Nationist desires to create a Germanic religiosity.²⁶² However, in his article, he mentioned about the Gothic Arianism's three hypostasis and this was the Arian view expressing the subordination of the Son and Holy Spirit. Ulfila enjoyed this Arian idea. This may claim that Germanic Kingdoms prefer a religion that preserves the authority of the sole monad. So this is general for the people who adopted Arianism they present

²⁶⁰ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. pp. 122-123

²⁶¹ Lietzmann H. (1967). *A History of Early Church*. Lutterworth Press

²⁶² Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.129

some characters or tendencies protecting God's absolute authority. As for this, Goths might wish God's authority not to be damaged thus they practiced a theology that knew the position of Trinity without damaging the nature and authority of the Father. That was the language of Arians. Otherwise, why did the Arians want the new converts to accept this formula mentioned above like Ralf Bockmann penned that Arians requested from new converts that they use the Arian dogma of Homoian formula?²⁶³

Also, the bible translation of Ulfila can be seen as another reason which enabled to Arian senses to release. Ulfila's bible translation has spread among the barbarian kingdoms soon. As he was an Arian and used an Arian terminology, in fact, he also might transmit or impose the Gothic Arianism through this translation. Ralf Bockmann also states Gothic Arianism and Ulfila's translation spread together within the Barbarian federates.²⁶⁴

4.5.3. Supports from Other Heretic Groups

In addition to all this support for Arius and his teachings, at this point, it is necessary to mention the social patterns in Alexandria regarding the relations between the Arians and the Meletians who were declared heretics and led by bishop Meletus. The Meletians, after their leader Meletius died, survived for the following two centuries, and were known for their close interactions with the Arians. This claim might be true. It is said that Meletians in Egypt, had always stood against Athanasius, Arius's zealous opponent and they had exerted significant efforts to bring Arius into the communion of the church.²⁶⁵ The reason for their support of Arius is said that have been due to the fact that Arius and Meletus had had close relations.

²⁶³ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.216

²⁶⁴ Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R.(2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing. p.216

²⁶⁵ Hefele, C. J. (1896) *A History of The Councils of The Church, From Its Original Documents*. Volume II A.D 326 to A.D 429. Translated by Henry Nutcombe Oxenham. Edinburgh: T&T Clark

4.5.4. The School of Edessa

Another factor that might be effective in transmitting Arian teachings to Nestorius is the city of Edessa. (today Şanlıurfa) This city was said to be one of the cities where Arians were found in quite large numbers. It is even reported that St. Ephrem, who was the leader of the school of Edessa until his death in 373, resisted the Arians, however, when he passed away the Arians took possession of the school for a while.²⁶⁶ However, the school of Edessa also was a center where Nestorius's tutor, Theodor of Mopsuestia taught. Theodor's theologies were spread there. Living within a great number of Arians Theodor might have been influenced by Arian teachings and so Nestorius adopted these ideas. It is highly remarkable as Adrian Fortescue highlights that:

After his [St. Ephrem] death they [Arians] got the possessions of it [Edessa] for a short time and drove out the Catholic bishop Barsees with his followers in 361. But their triumph lasted only a short time; then the Catholics came back. It seems, indeed, that the later Nestorian controversy was taken up at Edessa, at least partly...²⁶⁷

It is noteworthy that the Nestorian heresy occurred where Arian heretics were active.

Each of these factors is a possible reason that Arianism survived for longer than expected. Each of them contributed to save and to transmit the Arian teachings.

Under the leadership of Ulfila, if Gothic kingdoms had not adopted Arianism how it would it have spread through all of Europe, or North Africa? Is it surprising how many Gothic Arians were influenced by Ulfila's Arian terminology, used in the process of the bible translation?

Also, could Arius and his followers be re-saved or forgiven if Constantine and the men who were close to the emperor did not follow such tolerant, adaptive and self-preserving strategies among them?

Or what would happen if Demophilus did not maintain to gather missionary meetings in and out of the gates of Constantinople?

²⁶⁶ Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society. p.36

²⁶⁷ Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society. p.36

It is possible that some churches in Abyssinia, India, Ethiopia were influenced by some of the Arian bishops who were sent there by imperial policies? It is interesting that the Arian heresy was able to establish its own churches, something that few heresies achieved. It must be also interesting that there are indications showing that Arian bishops existed even until the middle of the sixth century. In short, all of these patterns are a means of preservation and transmission of Arian Christendom.

In the light of all this information above, it can be stated that when the Nestorius arrived in Constantinople and was promoted to Patriarch of Constantinople, he probably knew that there were still many Arians since he immediately gave several speeches arguing that he was against Arians. However, it should not be forgotten that the emperor promoting him was Theodosius II who was a strict opponent of heresies.

Therefore, if Nestorius did not side with the imperial power, he would never be able to remain in the leading city of Christianity, so he concentrated on hiding his teachings and practices, mentioned in first part of this chapter, that were similar to Arius.

In other words, assigned as a Patriarch of Constantinople, how much or in what sense did Nestorius behave and speak freely? Might he become another Ulfila in the manner of hiding his Arian sides? However in his disposal, there might be also some internal and external policies kept by emperor Theodosius II and his elder sister Augusta Pulcheria. At this point, it is better to mention briefly those reasons.

4.6. The Inter-Imperial Reasons for Nestorius's Disposal

Since it is said that the emperor Theodosius venerated Nestorius and even 'sat his feet' as a disciple,²⁶⁸ it is highly interesting why he deposed or "had to depose" Nestorius later.

One more factor to keep in mind is the internal and external political conditions in Constantinople during the period of Nestorius's patriarchate. In other words, there

²⁶⁸ McGuckin, J.A. (1996). Nestorius and The Political Factions of Fifth-Century Byzantium: Factors in His Personal Downfall. page 8.

were some explicit conditions that had already developed in Constantinople, including ecclesiastical and imperial policies that eventually led to Nestorius's disposition. When Nestorius became the Patriarch of Constantinople in 428, he addressed the emperor Theodosius by making a promise that he would assist the emperor in his battle with Persians. That meant that a unified, orthodox church was regarded as a huge military advantage for the empire²⁶⁹, since Nestorius apparently believed that by linking spiritual and imperial authority he would easily overcome heretics (Arians) and secure the empire's border from Persian attacks. At this point, it is thought that Nestorius did not fully perceive the ecclesiastical political condition in Constantinople. Eager to fulfill his project Nestorius started to dismantle apprehensive Arians and their church.²⁷⁰ With this attack, Nestorius created dissatisfaction and triggered an increase in public tension as there were many supporters of the Arian teaching and many Germanic groups who practiced Ulfila's Homoian orthodoxy i.e Gothic Arianism. J.A. McGuckin writes that the fatal mistake with Nestorius' policy of insisting on purging the last Arian elements in Constantinople was that the Arian presence in the capital was significant and they were supported by Gothic troops of Arian faith who were stationed there in large numbers.²⁷¹

There were other reasons which made Nestorius a victim. Having been a Syrian monk, Nestorius was said to be keen to confine the monks to their monasteries as Nestorius recognized that they were behaving improperly in the streets and planning hidden visits to the houses of the rich. He also accused the abbots of these monks of not taking care of their flocks.²⁷² It is known that even though monasticism appeared relatively late in Byzantium it developed there quicker than in other regions.

²⁶⁹ Wessel, S. (2004). *Cyril of Alexandria And Nestorian Controversy: Making of A Saint and of A Heretic*. Oxford University Press.

²⁷⁰ Wessel, S.(2004). *Cyril of Alexandria And Nestorian Controversy: Making of A Saint and of A Heretic*. Oxford University Press.

²⁷¹ McGuckin, J.A. (1996) . Nestorius and The Political Factions of Fifth-Century Byzantium: Factors in His Personal Downfall. Page 10

* She was the elder sister of and regent for Theodosius II and is said to have considerable influence over internal and external policies in the Byzantine Empire during his brother's reign.

²⁷² Casiday A. And Norris F. W. (2008) *The Cambridge History of Christianity Volume 2*

Byzantine monasticism developed in a peculiar way, in close proximity to the affairs of the city; the monasteries were patronized by the nobility, and Augusta Pulcheria* had shown herself to be an active patron and protector of the monks.²⁷³ She was said to be an influential figure in the internal policies of the imperial administration. Therefore, Pulcheria tried to prevent Nestorius's strategies on monastics. By doing so, she increased her own popularity and influence in Constantinople. Now, there was a power struggle between Pulcheria who wished to control her brother and imperial power and Nestorius who wanted to reduce monastic involvement in the affairs of the church and the city.²⁷⁴ The near future would soon show which side would win the fight.

These were not all the mistakes or mistakenly followed implementations that Nestorius carried out. Another of the wrong policies that Nestorius practiced concerned the women in Constantinople. Nestorius planned to make some restriction regarding some women's (deaconesses, and dedicated virgins- Pulcheria among them) involvement in church affairs²⁷⁵. As McGuckin wrote, Nestorius wished to rein in the activities of certain virgins as he suspected that these women sinned a great deal during by being promiscuous with men.²⁷⁶ It is said that this act exposed him to almost being stoned by these women.²⁷⁷ In effect, Nestorius was damaging the social character of Byzantium that offered social rights to highly placed women. Unsurprisingly, his most challenging opponent was Pulcheria.

In the same way that he attempted to interfere with the social structure in Byzantium, Nestorius made other interventions related to cultural habits there. He aroused public anger when he restricted "immorality" of the entertainments. Even Nestorius believed that these things were immoral, in fact, many others did not regard like him.

²⁷³ McGuckin, J.A. (1996).Nestorius and The Political Factions of Fifth-Century Byzantium: Factors in His Personal Downfall. page 14

²⁷⁴ Ibid, page 14

²⁷⁵ Ibid, page 16

²⁷⁶ Ibid,page 16

²⁷⁷ Ibid, page 16

For example, he prohibited nudity in the theatre, circus, and stadium,²⁷⁸ and this was seen as an attempt by Nestorius to destroy the traditional entertainment of the Roman past. Therefore, Nestorius faced large demonstrations with crowds chanting slogans against him that are said to have lasted three days. After they occupied vital buildings in the capital, these crowds demanded the emperor depose his unpopular bishop.²⁷⁹ In such conditions, Theodosius ultimately decided to abandon his protection of Nestorius, especially when the Sees of Rome and Alexandria condemned Nestorius' teachings.

At the beginning, it was significant that Theodosius II tried to find an outsider bishop for the see of Constantinople. Aware of his sister's influence among Constantinople's monks and aristocrats, he did not permit Proclus, said to be Pulcheria's man, to succeed the patriarch Sisinius. Instead, Theodosius appointed Nestorius as Patriarch, in an attempt to reduce his sister's involvement in imperial affairs. However, when Nestorius made fatal errors that raised public discontent he had to confirm Nestorius's deposition. However, Pulcheria was a brilliant woman and she married a general named Marcion. Later, when Theodosius passed away, Marcion was the man who took the throne. Being under the influence of his wife, Marcion was determined to reverse the religious policy of their predecessor and convoked a new council in 451 in Chalcedon. In this council, the emperor sided with the language of the Pope in Rome, Cyril of Alexandria was supported by Pope Leo, monks in Egypt, and Constantinople. As a result, Nestorius Christology was banned again, but his sympathizers organized another council in Persia. This was said to be the first church council held outside of the empire and they established the independence of a new and long-lived church.²⁸⁰

²⁷⁸ Ibid, page 16

²⁷⁹ McGuckin, J.A. (1996). Nestorius and The Political Factions of Fifth-Century Byzantium: Factors in His Personal Downfall. page 13

²⁸⁰ Casiday A. And Norris F. W. (2008) *The Cambridge History of Christianity Volume 2*

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1. General Conclusions

The history of Christianity has witnessed numerous controversies that were significant in the development of Christianity. However, two of the controversies, in particular, the Arian and Nestorian controversies, were very similar for reasons that they emerged and how they ended. This thesis has examined whether there was any influence by Arius on Nestorius or not and began examining the backgrounds of Arius and his theology first for the following reasons.

The main reason that makes the interaction between Nestorianism and the Arianism very likely is the legacy of the theological school of Antioch. The most important reason for similarities between Arius and Nestorius was that they came from Antiochian tradition and they were inspired by same figures who played a significant role on the Christian future.

Undoubtedly, bishops who were educated in Alexandria reflected Alexandrian Christianity and likewise, it to be expected that Arius and Nestorius, both educated in the Antiochian tradition, presented Antiochian dogmas in their teachings.

One common characteristic of Arius and Nestorius is that their theology stressed the humanity of Christ so this study examined people and groups who taught doctrines similar to Arian views. As mentioned in the first chapter, the Ebionites were one of the important groups that strongly affirmed the unity of God and this perspective was adopted by the Antiochians later on. Robert Gregg regards the Arianism as a salient

feature of Ebonite Christology.²⁸¹ Origen, even though he came from the Alexandrian tradition, due to his efforts to integrate Christianity with Platonist philosophy, gave Alexandrian Christianity a new face. His interpretations concerning the nature of Christ and Logos, not only affected the Alexandrians, but even some Antiochenes like Arius and, later, Nestorius. As a result of his new interpretations and his adoption by the Antiochians, he became an important figure in the creation of orthodoxy. Like Origen, Paul of Samosata was another inspiring person for Arius. The theology and Christology of Paul laid the foundation for Arianism. It is interesting that in the fifth century the opponents of Nestorius attacked him by accusing him of speaking like Paul of Samosata. Perhaps the most important part of this study is the chapter which shows how similar Arianism and Nestorianism are to each other by comparing their teachings on the nature of Christ, the Holy Spirit and the concept of *theotokos*. As they are both from the Antiochian tradition and inspired by the same bishops, the similarities between the theology of Arius and Nestorius are unsurprisingly clear. Therefore, due to the similarities of his theology and teachings with those of Arius, Nestorius was accused of being an Arian heretic.

The second chapter was devoted on expressing the theology and Christology of Nestorius. His ideas about the divine and the human nature of Christ, the position of the Virgin Mary, and the subordination of the Holy Spirit were discussed. This chapter also covered the figures who had direct influences on Nestorian teachings such as Theodor of Mopsuestia, Diodore of Tarsus. Both of these theologians were effective on Nestorius's rejection of the term *theotokos*. Nestorius's interaction with other heretics is also a significant part of this thesis. This part indicates that even Nestorius gave several speeches against the heretics he was not sincere or serious on his words. In fact, he has always become aware of that the emperor who assigned him as Patriarch of Constantinople was Theodosius II who was a rigorous enemy of the heretic thus Nestorius prepared such speeches that satisfied the emperor. However, brilliant patriarch, Cyril of Alexandria behaved as if he realized the insincerity of Nestorius for heretics. In addition, rejecting some of the Nestorius ideas related to the nature of Christ and the position of Virgin Mary, Cyril accused

²⁸¹ Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. p. 165

Nestorius of being heretic and they had a dispute. In Cyril's mind, Nestorius was practicing a religion that was similar to heretic Arians, Samosatans. Hopefully, given information concludes that Cyril's personal zeal for Nestorius became the main concern for his rejection of Nestorius. As Alexandrian Patriarch, he would never bear to see an Antiochian bishop on the see of Constantinople.

The last chapter is dedicated to illustrating the main similarities that lead to speculation about the possible influences of Arianism on Nestorius and his teachings. In this chapter, the similarities between these two religious men, coming from the same tradition were underlined. The highlighted similarities were that both of them accepted the two different natures of Christ, the subordination of the Son to the Father and the Holy Spirit's subordination to the Son. Both argued that the Holy Spirit should be regarded as below the other two. In addition to the similarities mentioned in this chapter there was also information about the minor differences between Arian and Nestorian teachings. However, without knowing how Arians or Arianism survived for so long, it would be insufficient to describe these similarities without examining the possible explanations for how or why people adopted and spread Arian teachings. Perhaps the most important reason was political - concerns about the emperors' policies were effective in influencing the adoption or rejection of a religious movement, thus, the importance of Constantine's toleration and policies, as well as the policies of other emperors such as Constantius, Julian, and Valen. The Gothic Kingdoms were seen as an important reason for the spread of Arius' teachings through Europe and Africa, especially North Africa. In addition, the actions of Arius' followers and of men who had a close friendship with imperial authorities were regarded as an important issue for they might give shape to imperial policies. Lastly, Edessa was the city where Arians had existed in large numbers. However, it was also the city where Theodor of Mopsuestia's teachings were taught. So it was possible that even in Theodor's ideas there might be some Arian ideas and they are adopted by Nestorius through Theodor.

In the light of all this, I conclude that there are more similarities between Arianism and Nestorianism than there are differences, and I believe that Nestorius, even though he claimed to be an enemy of the Arians, was a patriarch who reflected Arian

ideas in his own teachings. However, the reasons why he was deposed must be investigated not only in his teachings but also in the internal and external policies as internal policies, being shaped by Pulcheria and raised the public tension against Nestorius, made him a heretic. But it should be kept in minds that he could gather many followers outside of the Byzantine Empire, especially in Persian territories.

REFERENCES

- Alzog, J. (1912). *History of The Church*. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- Anastos M. V.(1962) Nestorius was Orthodox. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 16.
- Badger, G. P. (1852). *Nestorians and Their Rituals*. London: Josep Masters and Co. Printers.
- Baker, J. F. (1908). *Nestorius and His Teaching- A Fresh Examination of The Evidence*. Cambrige: University Press.
- Bardenhewer, O. (1908). *Patrology-The Lives and Works of The Fathers of the Church*. Germany: B. Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau.
- Barnard, L.W.(1970).*The Antecedents of Arius*.*Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 24, No. 3.
Published by: Brill
- Baum, W. and Winkler. D. W. (2003) *The Church Of the East-A Concise History*.
RoutledgeCurzon Press: London
- Baynes, N. H.(1948). *Sozomen Ecclesiastica Historia I*.*The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 49, Published by: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, A. and MacFarquhar, C. (1797). *The Encyclopedia Britannica*. The Dictionary of the Arts, Sciences and Micellaneous Literature. Vol. II. Edinburgh.
- Berndt G. M. and Steinacher R. (2014). *Arianism: Roman Heresy and Barbarian Creed*. England: Ashgate Publishing.

- Bevan, G. A. (2005). *The Case of Nestorius: Ecclesiastical Politics in the East 428-451. Thesis*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Bragg, Ervene C. nd. «*Systematic Theology Christology*.»
- Boisclair, David R.(2005). *Martin Luther on Nestorius and Eutyches in On the Councils and the Church (1539)*
- Casiday A. And Norris F. W. (2008) *The Cambridge History of Christianity Volume 2*
- Chadwick, H. (2002). *The Church in Ancient Society From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Chadwick, H. (2009). *Augustine Of Hippo*. New York: Oxford Univesity Press.
- Chadwick, H., & Qulton, J. E. (2006). *Alexandrian Christianity*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Chesnut R. C. (1978). The Two Prosopa in Nestorius' "Bazaar of Heracleides." *The Journal of Theological Studies, NEW SERIES, Vol. 29, No. 2*
- Cook, A. S., Adcock, F. E., Charlesworth, M. P., & Baynes, N. H. (1939). *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume XII- Imperian Crisis and Recovery*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Couns N. C. (1922) *Arius the Libyan*. New York: D. Appleton Company Press.
- Diarmaid MacCulloch. (2009). *Christianity-The First Three Thousand Years*. New York. Penguin Books Ltd.
- Driver, G. R. And Hodgson, L. (1925) *Nestorius- The Bazaar of Heracleides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- E.P.B. (1881). *Five Tomes Against Nestorius*. Oxford: James Parker and Co. and Rivingtons.
- Fortescue, A. (1908). *The Greek Fathers*. London: Catholic True Society.
- Fortescue, A. (1908). *The Orthodox Eastern Church*. London: Catholic True Society.
- Fortescue, A. (1913) *The Lesser Eastern Churches*. London: Catholic True Society.
- Gamble, H. Y. (1995). *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven and London. Yale University Press.
- Gregg, Robert C., ve Dennis E. Groh. 1981. *Early Arianism - A view of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. 1975. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Second. Volume One. Atalanta: John Knox Press.
- Gwatkin, H. (1880). *The Arian Controversy*. New York.
- Hefele, C. J. (1896) *A History of The Councils of The Church, From Its Original Documents. Volume II A.D 326 to A.D 429*. Translated by Henry Nutcombe Oxenham. Edinburgh: T&T Clark
- Harvey, S. A.. (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Newyork: Oxford University Press
- Horsch, J. (1902). *A Short History Of Christianity*. Cleveland.
- Husbands, M and Greenman, J. P. (2008). *Ancient Faith for the Church's Future*. Intervarsity Press.
- Kaçar, Turhan. 2003. *Ebonitler'den Arius'a : Eskiçağ Doğu Hristiyanlığında İsa Teolojisi Tartışmaları*. Cilt XLIV. AÜİFD.

- Laansma, L. C. and Guthrie, G. H. and Westfall, C. L. (2009). *So Great a Salvation: A Dialogue on the Atonement in Hebrews*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Lietzmann H. (1967). *A History of Early Church*. Lutterworth Press.
- Liguori, A. M. (185). *History of Heresies and Their Refutations*. Dublin: JAMES DUFFY.
- Loofs, F. (1905). *Nestoriana- Die Fragmentes Des Nestorius*. Palermo: Halle A.S Max Niemeyer.
- Loofs, F. (1914). *Nestorius and His Place in the History Of Christian Doctrine*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- McGuckin, J.A. (1996). *Nestorius and The Political Factions of Fifth-Century Byzantium: Factors in His Personal Downfall*.
- MacGuckin, J.A. (2011). *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*. Volume I. Pondicherry: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mitchell, Margaret M, ve Frances M. Young. 2009. *The Cambridge History Of Christianity*. Volume 1. Cambridge University Press.
- Nestorius of Constantinople, Epist. II *ad Cyrillum*. PP. 77, 57A.
- Newman, J. H. (1890). *The Arians Of Fourth Century*. London: Longsman, Green and Comp.
- Ngong, T.D (2017). *A New History of African Christian Thought: From Cape to Cairo*. New York: Routledge Press
- Quasten, Johannes. 1969. *Patrologia* . Volume II. Utrechth: Spectrum Publishers.

- Rea, Michael C. 2009. *Oxford Readings in Philosophical Theology*. Volume I. Oxford University Press.
- RG, M. M. (1728). *The History of Arianism*. London: W. Roberts.
- Sanders, F. and Issler, K. (2007). *Jesus in Trinitarian Perspective*. B. H. Publishing Group. Tennessee
- Schaff, P. (1889). *History of the Christian Church, Volume III: Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity A.D 311-600*. New York: Grand Rapids.
- Schaff, Philip. (1882). *History of the Christian Church*. Volume III. Grand Rapids.
- Siecienski, A. E. (2010). *The Filioque- History of a Doctrinal Controversy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Siecienski, A. E. (2017). *Constantine: Religious Faith and Imperial Policy*. New York: Routledge-Taylor and Francis Group.
- Stead, Christopher. (1994). *Arius in Modern Research*. The Journal of Theological Studies, NEW SERIES, Vol. 45, No. 1. Oxford University Press.
- Vine, Aubrey Russel. 1937. *The Nestorian Churches*. London: Independent Press.
- Wessel, S. (2004) *Cyril of Alexandria And Nestorian Controversy: Making of A Saint and of A Heretic*. Oxford University Press.
- Wilken, R. L. (1965). *Tradition, Exegesis, and the Christological Controversies*. Church History, Vol. 34, No. 2
- Wiles, M.(2001). *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries*. The Oxford University Press.

William, Rowan. (2002). *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Second Edition. Wm. B. Eerdmans Company: Cambridge.

Woods, D. (1993). *Three Notes on Aspects of the Arian Controversy c.354-367*. The Journal of Theological Studies, NEW SERIES, Vol. 44, No.2.

Worral P. (1956) *St Thomas and Arianism*. Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale, Vol. 23 (December) Peters Publishers.

Zagarese, G., & Lordi, G. (1844). *Corso Di Storia Ecclesiastica*. Napoli: Giuseppe Barone Tipografa.

APPENDICES

A. TÜRKÇE ÖZET/TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu çalışmada dördüncü yüzyılda patlak veren ve Hristiyanlık tarihi içerisinde dönüm noktası olarak algılanan Aryanizm'in, yaklaşık bir asır sonra şekillenen Nestoryanizm üzerindeki muhtemel etkileri tartışılmıştır. Genel itibariyle, Konstantiniye Patriği Nestoryus'un Aryusçularla olan iletişiminden ve etkileşiminden bahsedilmiş olup ayrıca bu etkileşimler sonucunda Nestoryus'un Aryusçulardan ya da başka bir deyişle Aryan teolojiden ne derecede etkilendiği sorgulanmıştır. Aryanizm'in öğretileri ile hangi konularda benzerlik gösterdiği çalışmamızın dayanak noktası olmuştur. Tezimizde bahsedildiği üzere, Aryanizm ve Nestoryanizm'in birbiri ile olan benzerliklerinin hangi faktörlerden doğduğu ele alınmış, her iki akımın da şekillenmesinde etkili olan Hristiyan dünyasının önde gelen isimlerinin kim oldukları ve Aryus ile Nestoryus'un sözü zikredilen kilise babaları ve diğer din adamlarından nasıl ve hangi hususlarda etkilendiğine dikkat çekilmiştir.

Tezimizin birinci bölümünde bu çalışmanın içeriği ve bölümleri hakkında bilgiler verilmiş ve böyle bir çalışmanın ortaya çıkmasında karşılaştığımız problemlerden bahsedilmiştir. Şüphesiz bu çalışmanın hazırlanması esnasında karşılaştığımız en büyük zorluk, böylesine hassas bir konunun tezimizde olduğu üzere karşılaştırmalı bir şekilde incelenmemiş olmasıdır. Diğer bir ifade ile ilim adamları şimdiye değin ya Aryus ve Aryanizm konusunda çalışmalar yaptılar veya Nestoryus ve Nestoryanizm hakkında çalışmalar üretmişlerdir. Genellikle bu iki farklı konuya dair yapılan çalışmalar doğal olarak birbirinden bağımsız birer çalışma olmakla beraber

Nestoryus'un Aryanizm'den etkilenmiş olabileceği iddiası net bir ifade ile ileri sürülmemiştir.

İlk bakışta Nestoryus'un Aryusçu akımdan etkilenmiş olduğu düşüncesi gerçeklikten uzak gibi görülse de, detaylı bir araştırma ve geniş bir literatür taraması yapıldıktan sonra anlaşılacağı üzere, aslında her ne kadar Aryusçulara ve diğer heretiklere karşı her daim savaşaacağını dile getirmiş olsa da Nestoryus'un, gerçekte Aryusçulardan etkilenmiş olabileceği ve Aryusçuların yanı sıra, sapkın olarak ilan edilen başka gruplardan da izler taşımış olabileceği ihtimali öne çıkmaktadır.

Bu çalışma hazırlanırken karşılaştığımız diğer bir zorluk ise kaynakların çok yönlü olması gerekliliğidir. Konusu nedeniyle bu tezi hazırlamak için sadece tarih disiplininin yelpazesi altındaki kaynakları irdelemek kısır bir yazımla neticelenebilirdi. Eminim ki yazarı kadar okuyucuyu da memnun etmezdi. Bu nedenle bu çalışmayı hazırlarken tarih kitaplarının yanı sıra, başta teoloji olmak üzere felsefe gibi disiplinlerin literatüre kazandırdığı kitaplar ve makalelerden de yararlanılmıştır. Ayrıca her iki konuya da detayları ile vakıf olmak gerektiği için çok yönlü kaynakçaya başvurulmuştur.

Bu çalışmamızın ikinci bölümünde Aryus öncesi döneme ait olan ve Aryus'un devam ettireceği Kristolojik tartışmalardan ve bu tartışmaları ortaya koyan din adamlarının Aryus'u hangi konularda etkiledikleri ve Aryus'un öğretilerini şekillendirmeleri hususundaki etkilerinden bahsedilmiştir. Bir başka ifadeyle, Aryus'un öğretilerinin nasıl oluştuğu ve Aryanizm'in ortaya çıkmasında hangi kişi, grup yahut dini hareketlerin etkili olduğu konusunda bilgiler verilmiştir. Zira, Nestoryus ve onun öğretilerini anlamak için en başta Aryanizm'in nasıl ortaya çıktığını bilmek gerekmektedir. Bunun en önemli sebebi, Nestoryus da Aryanizm'in ileri sürdüğü şekilde Hz. İsa'nın bir beşer olarak doğduğunu ve beşeri tabiatının her daim ilahi tabiatından ayrı olduğunu vurgulamıştır. İşte bu noktada belirtilmelidir ki, Hz. İsa'nın beşeri tabiatını öne çıkaran görüşler en başta Aryus'un öğretilerinin temelini oluşturmaktaydı. Bu nedenle ilk olarak Aryus'un öğretilerinin şekillenmesinde etkili olan faktörlerden bahsetmek gerekliydi. Örneğin, Ebonitler olarak bilinen ve kendilerini Jewish Christian/ Yahudi hristiyanları olarak tanımlayan grup, Hz. İsa'nın tanrılığını şiddetle reddetmiş ve henüz ikinci yüzyılın ortalarında Hz. İsa'nın

beşeriyeti üzerinde ısrar etmişlerdir. Bu Yahudi inancının bir gereği idi çünkü tek tanrı ve onun mutlak otoritesine iman etmeyi emreden Yahudilik ve bu gelenekten gelen Ebonitlerin, Hz. İsa'nın ilahi tabiatını öne çıkarmaları beklenemezdi. Eboniteler hakkında literatürde geçen geniş çaplı bir eser yoktur. Ebonitlere göre Hz. İsa beşer olarak doğmuş ve Kutsal Ruhun üzerinde tecelli ettiği ana kadar normal bir beşer olarak yaşamıştır. Bu görüşün daha sonra Aryus tarafından da benimsenmiş olması şaşırtıcı olmasa gerek. Tezimizin bu bölümünde Ebonitler dışında Aryus öğretinin şekillenmesinde Origen'in ve Samsatlı Paul'un söylemlerinin etkisinden de bahsedildi. Döneminin en etkili isimlerinden biri olan Origen, Hz. İsa'yı yaratılanlar ile yaratıcı arasında mutavassıt diğer bir deyişle aracı konumda görür. Ona göre Hz. İsa, tanrının emri ve iradesi sonucunda, insanlar ile yaratıcı arasında birleştirici bir köprü gibidir ve daha sonra Aryus'un da benimseyeceği üzere, Hz. İsa, tanrının kelamı ile onurlandığı zaman ilahi kimliğini kazandı. Bu bölümde ayrıca O Aryus'un öğretileri üzerinde etkileri olan Samsatlı Paul hakkında bilgi verilmiştir. Dionysius of Alexander ismi ile zikredilse de genellikle Samsatlı Paul olarak literatürde karşımıza çıkar. Samsatlı Paul için "Aryus'dan önceki Aryus" ifadesi de kullanılmıştır. Kendisi Aryus'un teolojisinin merkezinde kalmıştır. Paul sadece Hz. İsa'yı bir beşer olarak gördüğü için değil, ayrıca Logos/Kutsal Ruh konusundaki görüşleri nedeniyle de Aryus tarafından benimsenmiştir. Ve onunla ilgili belirtilmesi gereken en önemli hususlardan biri de, onun Hz. Meryem'in konumuna yönelik görüşleridir. Ona göre Hz. Meryem için theotokos (Tanrı Doğuran) kelimeleri kullanılmamalı çünkü Meryem sadece bir insan doğurmuştur. Zira bu görüşler daha sonra Nestoryus tarafından tamamen benimsenmiştir. Kısacası diyebiliriz ki Samsatlı Paul sadece Aryus'u etkilememiş ve buna ek olarak Nestoryus için de ilham kaynağı olmuştur. Bütün bunlara ek olarak bu bölümde yine Aryanizm'in gelişmesine etki eden faktörlerden biri olarak gördüğümüz papaz Sabellius'un da başlattığı akımdan bahsetmeyi unutmadık. Bu bölümde üzerinde durduğumuz bir başka konu da Aryus'un yukarıda bahsedilen din adamları ya da akımların yanı sıra Antakya öğretilerinden etkilenip onun teolojisini devam ettirmesidir. Diğer bir ifade ile hem Aryanizm'in hem de Nestoryanizm'in şekillenmesinde önemli ve bir ortak payda olan Antakya okulunun öneminden bahsedilmiştir. Bilindiği gibi erken dönem Hristiyanlığının önde gelen eğitim merkezleri İskenderiye, Antakya, Roma, Kudüs

ve Şam Hristiyan okullarıdır. Bu okullarda birçok Kilise Babaları, piskoposlar ve din adamları eğitim görmüşler ve yine bazıları bu okullarda birçok öğrenci yetiştirmiştir. Büyük Konstantin'nin Yeni Roma olarak Konstantiniye'yi inşasından sonra önemli Hristiyan merkezler halkasına Konstantiniye de dahil edilmiştir. Bundan sonra Konstantiniye, Hristiyanlar için yükselen bir merkez olmuştur. Ancak bütün bu merkezlerin içerisinde Antakya ve İskenderiye geleneği ayrıca bir önem arz etmektedir. Her iki okul da kendi teolojisini öğretmiştir. Zaman içerisinde bu iki geleneğin Hz. İsa'nın ilahi ve beşeri tabiatına, Kutsal Ruhun pozisyonuna ve Hz. Meryem'in ilahiliği hususuna dair görüşlerinin birbirinden farklı olması tartışmalara ve hatta ayrılıklara sebep olmuştur. Antakya geleneğinden yetişen din adamları Hz. İsa'nın beşeri yönlerini öne çıkarırken, İskenderiye geleneğini yansıtanların temel tezi Hz. İsa'nın ilahiliği üzerineydi. Bir başka deyişle, İskenderiye Hristiyan okullarında yetişen din adamları Hz. İsa'nın ilahiliğine vurgu yapmışlardır. Onlara göre Hz İsa her daim ilahi vasıfları ile var olmuştur ve onun beşeri tabiatı, ilahi tabiatı ile bir bütün olarak mevcudiyet göstermiştir. Oysa Antakya geleneğinde Hz. İsa'nın ilahi ve beşeri yönleri birbirinden kesin bir suretle ayrı olarak algılandı. Bir beşer olarak doğan İsa, Kutsal Ruh'un tecellisi sonucu, ilahi vasıflarını kazanmıştır. Bu nedenle onun ilahi ve beşeri tabiatları birbirinden ayrı olup birbirine karışmamaktadır. Özellikle Origen'den itibaren Antakya ve İskenderiye geleneği arasında teknik olarak anlaşmazlıklar doğsa da Aryus'un sebep olduğu tartışmalara kadar fiilen herhangi bir çatışma olmamıştır. İşte dördüncü yüzyılda İskenderiye geleneğini temsil eden İskender /Alexander) ile Antakya geleneğini temsil eden Aryus arasında çıkan tartışmalar, bu iki okul arasındaki temel çatışmanın gözle görülür bir şekilde idrak edilmesini sağlamıştır. Aryus ve İskenderiyeli İskender arasındaki tartışma Antakya ve İskenderiye Okulunu kesin bir çizgi ile ayırmıştır. Yine aynı şekilde, beşinci yüzyıla gelindiğinde bu iki gelenek arasındaki çatışma, Antakya geleneğini temsil eden Nestoryus ve İskenderiye geleneğini devam ettiren Kiril vasıtasıyla tescil edilmiş ve Hristiyanlar arasında bir ayrılık doğurmuştur. Neo-Platoncu felsefe ile kaynaşmış olan İskenderiye geleneği daha mistik bir eğilimde olurken, Antakya geleneğinin tek tanrının mutlak otoritesini korumayı amaçlayan öğretileri (ki kimilerine göre Judaistic/ Yahudi geleneğinin bir etkisi olarak) daha somut ve akılcı yollarla işlenmiş ve öğretilmiştir. Aryus'un teolojisinin hangi kişi

yada öğretilerden etkilendiğini gösterdikten sonra bu bölümü Aryus'un öğretileri hakkında detaylı bilgiler vererek noktalandık. Hz. İsa'nın tabiatına dair getirdiği yeni yorumlamaları ile Logos kavramının fonksiyonu ve Kutsal Üçlü Birlik içerisindeki elementlerin birbiri ile olan ilişkisine değinilmiştir. Onun bu kavram ve konseptler hakkındaki görüşler incelendiğinde, bir önceki bölümde bilgisi verilen kişi ya da kavramlardan ne derecede etkilendiği göze çarpmaktadır. Nitekim Ebonitler, Samsatlı Paul ve Origen gibi kişilerden esinlenen Aryus da Hz. İsa'nın beşeri doğasını ön plana çıkarmış ve nutuklarını bu yönde devam ettirmiştir. Ona göre Hz. İsa diğer insanlar gibi bir beşer olarak dünyaya gelmiş ve söz gelimi tanrının oğullarından sadece birisidir. Onu diğer insanlardan ayıran ve ona ilahilik vasfı kazandıran mekanizma Kutsal Ruh/Logos yani bir başka deyişle tanrı kelamının onda tezahür etmesidir. Bu safhaya kadar normal bir beşer olan Hz. İsa, Kutsal Ruhun tecelli etmesinden sonra ilahi bir karakter elde etmiştir. Bu bölümde, Aryusçu anlayış dahilinde Baba Oğul ve Kutsal Ruhun üçlü birlikteki fonksiyonlarından ve bunlar arasındaki hiyerarşiden bahsedilmiştir.

Bu çalışmanın üçüncü bölümü Nestoryus ve onun öğretilerine ayrılmıştır. Kendisi hakkında biyografik bilgiler verildikten sonra onun öğretilerini şekillendirmesinde Mapsuestalı Theodor ile Tarsus'lu Diodore başta olmak üzere, diğer kişi ve öğretilerden bahsedilmiştir. Zira Teodor Nestoryus'dan önceki Nestoryus olarak de bilinmektedir ve Nestoryus'un Mapsuestalı Teodor'un öğretilerinin savunucusu olduğu reddedilemez bir gerçekliktir. Ancak bilinen odur ki; Nestoryus'un öğretilerini şekillendiren ya da onu etkileyen isimler sadece bu iki isimden ibaret değildi. Görüleceği üzere Samsatlı Paul, Aryus gibi heretik ilan edilen dini figürlerden etkilenmiş ve özellikle Aryusçu öğretilerden izler taşımıştır. Nitekim Bu bölümün en önemli alt başlıklarından birisi de Nestoryus hakkında Aryus'un öğretilerinin takipçisi olduğu iddiası ve rakipleri tarafından heretik olarak ilan edilmesi konusudur. Zira başta İskenderiyeli Kiril olmak üzere, birçok rakibi Nestoryus'u, Samsatlı Paul'un ve Aryus'un öğretilerini devam ettiren ve heretiklere karşı olan söylem ve fiillerinde samimi olmayan bir piskopos olarak tasvir ederler. Nestoryus, Konstantiniye Patriği olduğuna Bizans İmparatoru Theodosius'a en başta Aryusçular olmak üzere dine ve devlete zarar veren bütün sapkınları ortadan kaldırmak için savaşağını vadeder. Nitekim ilk bakışta, Nestoryus'un

söylemlerinin de bu yönde olduğu görülmektedir. Ancak gerçekte Nestoryus'un bu tür amaçlarını yerine getirme konusunda pasif davrandığını görmekteyiz. Örneğin, İskenderiyeli Kiril, Nestoryus'un bir Aryus fanatığı olduğunu ve öğretilerinin de pratikte Aryan teolojiiyi yansıttığını dile getirmektedir. Ayrıca Nestoryus'u heretik olarak ilan edenlerin dikkat çeken bir başka ortak söylemi de onun Aryus'un da takip ettiği Samsatlı Paul'dan izler taşıdığıdır. Bu nedenle rakipleri Nestoryus'un heretikleri hedef alan görüşleri konusunda dürüst olmadığını belirtmişlerdir. Bu bölümün son kısımlarında İskenderiye Patriği Kiril'in Nestoryus'a karşı tutumundan ve Nestoryus'un aforoz edildiği Efes Konsili'nden bahsedilmiştir. İskenderiye geleneğinin en önde gelen isimlerinden birisi olan Kiril, kimilerine göre entelektüel açıdan Nestoryus'dan daha bilgili ve kültürlü bir patrik olarak hatırlanır. İyi bir ilahiyatçı olmasının yanı sıra Latince kaynakları zorlanmadan okuyabilmesi açısından da iyi bir prestij elde etmiştir. Birçoklar onu sapkınlara karşı mücadele eden İskenderiyeli Büyük Kiril olarak tanımlar. Bunun sebebi Samsatlı Paul, Aryanizm taraftarları ile Nestoryanizm takipçileri gibi sapkın olarak nitelendirdiği gruplara karşı verdiği amansız mücadeledir. Şüphesiz İskenderiye okulunun en etkili temsilcisi olarak kabul edilir. Hristiyanlıktaki kurtuluş doktrini,(salvation) Hz. İsa'nın tabiatı, Hz. Meryem'in tanrısallığı/theotokos gibi konularda önemli çalışmalarda ve söylemlerde bulundu. Bu çalışmalarında Aryus ve Nestoryus gibi sapkınların hiçbir şekilde tolere edilmeyeceğini ve onların dini ve sosyal platformlardan aforoz edilmesi gerektiğini savunur. Bu nedenle Nestoryus'un her daim karşısında durmuştur. Nestoryus Hz. İsa'nın beşeriyeti üzerinde dururken ve bu beşeri karakter ile ilahi karakterin birbirine karışmadığını savunurken, Kiril, Hz. İsa'da tecelli olan ilahi ve beşeri karakterin birbirinden ayrılmadığını, her iki tabiatında birbiri ile uyum içerisinde faaliyet gösterdiğini vurgulamaktadır. Nestoryus'a göre Hz. İsa'nın ilahi ve beşeri tabiatı aynı bardağa doldurulmuş yağ ve su gibidir. Zira suyun ve yağın birbirine karışmadığı ve aralarında bir sınırın baş gösterdiği görülecektir. Oysa Kiril'in tezine göre ise Hz. İsa'nın ilahi ve beşeri tabiatı birbiri ile iç içedir ve aralarında herhangi bir sınır yoktur. Kiril bu durumu aynı bardağa konulan su ve şarap emsali ile açıklar. Zira boş bir bardak, bir miktar su ve bir miktar şarap ile doldurulursa, her iki elementin de birbiri ile karışmış olduğu ve aralarında herhangi bir sınırın olmadığı göze çarpacaktır. Aynı konu üzerinde Kiril'in

ve Nestoryus'un tartışması ve Kiril'e göre Nestoryus'un diğer heretikler gibi düşüncelere sahip olması bu iki isim arasındaki çatışma ve gerilimi artırmıştır. Ayrıca Nestoryus ve Kiril, Hz. Meryem'in tanrısallığı konusunda da uzlaşmamıştır. Kiril, Hz. Meryem için theotokos/tanrı-doğuran ifadesini kullanmaktaydı. Ona göre Hz. İsa bütün ilahi vasıflarını taşıyor halde dünyaya getirildiği için Meryem de theotokos yani tanrı-doğuran olarak kabul edilmeliydi. Oysa Hz. İsa'nın bir beşer olarak dünyaya geldiğini savunan Antakya geleneğinin temsilcileri (Samsatlı Paul, Antakyalı Lucian, Aryus, Nestoryus) Hz. Meryem'e olan theotokos kavramına karşı çıkmışlardır. Onlara göre Hz. Meryem Christotokos/İsa'yı-Doğuran olarak anılmalıdır. Bütün bu farklılıklara ve çatışmalara ek olarak, Bizans İmparatoru Theodosius'un otoritesiyle Konstantiniye Patrikliğine Nestoryus'un atanması, Kiril ve taraftarları açısından hazmedilemedi. Bu nedenle Kiril, kendi taraftarlarını ve Konstantiniye'de yaşayan keşişleri Nestoryus aleyhinde kışkırtarak ilk olarak Efes Konsilinin toplanmasına zemin hazırladı ve daha sonra da Nestoryus'un heretik olarak ilan edilip aforoz edilmesini sağladı. Bu bölümde ayrıca Efes Konsili ve daha sonraki süreçte Kiril'in Nestoryus'un görüşlerine karşı çıktığı on iki tezine ve Nestoryus'un da Kiril'i hedef alan savunmalarına bilgilere yer verilmiştir.

Bu çalışmanın dördüncü bölümünde Aryus'un öğretileri ile Nestoryus'un öğretilerinin benzer ve farklı yanlarına değinilip, tahmin edilenden fazla ortak öğretileri olduğu vurgulandıktan sonra Aryus'un öğretilerinin Nestoryus'a ulaşmasına imkan sağlayan faktörlerden bahsedilmiştir. Hz. İsa'nın tabiatına ilişkin görüşleri konusunda, Kutsal Ruhun'un konumu ve görevi gibi hususlarda benzer eğilimde olan ve Antakya okulunun etkilerinin bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkan benzer iki teolojinin ve Kristolojinin mukayesesi yapılmıştır. Daha sonra da İznik Konsili'nde (325) heretik olarak ilan edilen Aryanizm'in neden daha sonraki nesiller tarafından benimsenmeye devam edildiği sorusunun muhtemel cevapları verilip, Nestoryus'un da Aryanizm'i hangi kanallar aracılığı ile benimsemiş olacağı tartışılmıştır. Nitekim Aryanizm'in hayatta kalmasının en önemli sebepleri siyasi politikalar, imparatorların bizzat kendi eğilimleri, imparatorlara yakın din adamlarının imparator üzerindeki tesirleri ile her ne olursa olsun Aryus'un öğretilerini devam ettirmeye çalışan din adamlarının uğraşları olmuştur. Özellikle Constantius II, Valen gibi imparatorların Aryanizm'i benimsemeleri imparatorluk sınırları dahilinde bu teolojii canlı tutmuştur. Zira

neredeyse altıncı yüzyılın sonlarına kadar Konstantiniye şehrindeki Aryanlar tebaasının varlığından ve Aryan piskoposların bu şehirde aktif olarak misyonerlik yaptıklarından haberdarız.

Bu hususta Aryanizm'in canlı kalabilmesindeki en önemli etken olarak Ulfila önderliğinde Gotların ve diğer Gotik krallıkların/imparatorlukların Aryanizm'i benimsemesidir.

Ayrıca Aryanlar öğretinin savunucusu olan Ulfila'nın kendi diline kazandırdığı İncil tercümesi ve bu tercümenin büyük ilgi görmesi neticesi ile kullandığı terminoloji vasıtasıyla Ulfila'nın aynı zamanda Aryanizm'i de geniş kitlelere ulaştırdığı dikkat çeken bir durum. Nitekim Konstantiniye meydanlarında henüz dördüncü yüzyılın sonlarına doğru artan ve beşinci yüzyılın sonunda sayıları çok büyük rakamlara ulaşan Aryanlar Gotların bulunduğu ve çeşitli festival veya dini ritüeller düzenlediklerinden bahsedilir. Finalde de bütün bunlardan yola çıkarak Nestoryus'un Aryan öğretiyi hangi kanallar aracılığı ile elde etmiş olabileceği konusunda muhtemel cevaplar verilmiştir. Bunlara ek olarak Nestoryus'un Konstantiniye'den sürülmesinde ki iç siyasi nedenlere de değinilmiştir. Zira dönemin Bizans imparatoru ve en başlarda Nestoryus'u patrik olarak atayan II. Theodosius, Nestoryus'a olan bu koruyucu ve iyimser tavırlarından vazgeçmiş yahut vazgeçirilmiştir. Bunun en önemli nedeni imparator Theodosius'un büyük kız kardeşi Augusta Pulcheria'nın kardeşinin yönettiği imparatorluk üzerinde etkili olması ve etkilerini daha da fazla artırmak istemesidir. Nestoryus ve Theodosius yakın olduğu sürece Pulcheria siyasi ve dini nüfuzunu çok fazla hissettiremiyordu ve bu nedenle önce Nestoryus'tan kurtulması gerekirdi. Nitekim, öyle de oldu. Nestoryus'un söylemlerini ve yaptığı bazı uygulamaları sebep gösterip önce onun patriklik görevinden alınmasına ve şehirden uzaklaştırılmasını sağladı ardından da II. Theodosius öldükten sonra yerine geçecek olan Marcianus ile evlenip devlet ve kilise işlerini tamamen kontrol altına aldı. Bu bize Nestoryus'un aforoz edilmesindeki iç siyasi politikaların etkisini göstermektedir. Ancak dış politikaya bakıldığında da Nestoryus'un özellikle Pers topraklarında çok sayıda taraftar bulması, öğretilerinin çabucak benimsenip ve yayılması hayli ilginçtir.

Çalışmamızın son bölümde ise genel bir değerlendirme yapılmış ve şimdiye kadar değindiğimiz bütün benzerliklerden ve ortak paydalardan yola çıkarak Nestoryus ve onun öğretileri üzerinde Aryus'un ileri sürdüğü iddiaların yahut öğretilerin bazı konularda kısmen bazı konularda ise önemli ölçüde etkisinin olabileceği vurgulanmıştır. Nitekim Aryanizm ve Nestoryanizm arasında tahmin edilenden fazla benzerlik olduğu konusunda farkındalık oluşturulmuştur. Bu farkındalık, şimdiye değin çoğunlukla birbirinden ayrı olarak çalışılan bu iki konuya dair (Aryanizm ve Nestoryanizm) ilerleyen zamanlarda aralarında ilişkiler kurulacak şekilde yeni çalışmaların ortaya çıkmasına katkı sağlayacaktır.

B. TEZ İZİN FORMU/THESES PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Kaya

Adı / Name : Murat

Bölümü / Department : History

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): **The Possible Influence of Arianism on Nestorius and Nestorian Teachings**

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two years. *
3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. *

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir./ A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date