

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

I. Trinitarian Theology and Early Christology: The Problem of Nicaea

- A) *What is Christology?*
 - 1) The study of the relationship between the human and divine natures of Christ.
 - 2) It is how our salvation is effected, the medicine to address our spiritual affliction.
- B) *What is Anthropology?*
 - 1) The study of our condition given the Fall, our fallen condition
 - 2) It describes the spiritual malady needing cure.
- C) *What is Soteriology?*
 - 1) The study of the cure's intended effects and the desired condition of spiritual health
 - 2) It describes our salvation: the process of healing and the goal to be obtained
- D) *Summary:*
 - 1) Anthropology tells us how we are fallen.
 - 2) Christology tells us the means God uses to raise us up from our fallen condition.
 - 3) Soteriology tells us about our intended spiritual goal and how we get there.
 - 4) All three must correspond to each other: the cure must fit the disease and obtain the desired goal.
 - 5) We learn of these from Holy Writ, the Holy Fathers, the worship and prayer life of the Church.
 - 6) None are possible without the Holy Spirit's guidance in the Church (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:23).
 - 7) **All of this comprises theology, which is the Church's attempt to grasp God's plan for our salvation.**

II. Necessary Bounds of Discussion:

- A) *From Scripture that Christ is **God**:*
 - 1) John 20:28: Thomas declaring Christ's divinity
 - 2) John 1:1-19: John the Baptist about The Word as God who became flesh.
 - 3) Matthew 16:16: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God."
 - 4) Colossians 2:9: "For in Him all the fullness of Deity dwells in bodily form"
- B) *From Scripture that Christ is **Man**:*
 - 1) John 1:1-14: Summary: The Word is God *and became flesh*
 - 2) 1 Tim 2:5: "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, *the man Christ Jesus*"
 - 3) Signs of humanity: Jesus weeping, Jesus in Gethsemane; John 11:35, Matthew 26:42, Mark 14:36, Luke 22:44
 - 4) Genealogies of Jesus since God has no ancestors: Matthew 1:1-17; Luke 3:23-38
- C) *Summary:*
 - 1) Scriptural witness permeating the worship and life of the Church cannot be ignored
 - 2) Hence no Orthodox Christology can fail to account sufficiently for Christ's divinity and humanity.
 - 3) Christological heresy errs in compromising integrity of Christ's *humanity* or *divinity*
 - 4) Adoptionism: (Ebionites, Theodotus of Byzantium, Paul of Samosata?) compromises Christ's divinity – Christ as a man adopted/anointed as our Saviour
 - 5) Docetism: (Marcion, Simon, Valentinus): compromises Christ's humanity, God only appears human
 - 6) Sabellianism/Modalism: (Noetus, Praxeas, Sabellius) (Trinitarian heresy) Divine persons indistinct
 - 7) Intermediate Nature (Arius): Christ created, not fully God nor human, both natures compromised

III. Selected Pre-Nicene Patristic Testimonies about Christology and Salvation:

- A) *Ignatius of Antioch (d. ~115): Selected texts about Christ's Nativity, Divinity, Humanity:*
 - 1) Letter to the Ephesians Introduction (Christ as God): **Heartiest greetings of pure joy in Jesus Christ ...**
 - 2) Letter to the Ephesians 19 (Christ as man): **Now, Mary's virginity and her giving birth ...**
 - 3) Letter to the Ephesians 20 (son of David after flesh, Son of God, Son of man): **If Jesus Christ allows me ...**

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

B) *Other Pre-Nicene Fathers:*

- 1) Justin. First Apology 22 (called Son of God and man): **Moreover, the Son of God called Jesus...**
- 2) Justin. Second Apology 6: (Jesus as Christ, Son of God, also man): **But to the Father of all ...**
- 3) Clement of Alexandria. Exhortation to the Heathen 1 (called both God and man): **Well, inasmuch as the Word was ...**
- 4) Athenagoras. A Plea for the Christians 10 (called God, note Trinitarianism): **Who, then, would not be astonished ...**
- 5) Athenagoras. A Plea for the Christians 12 (unity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit): **Are, then, those who consider life to be comprised in this ...**

C) *Irenaeus of Lyon (130-202) Recapitulation:*

- 1) Christ sanctifies every stage of human life by living through it Himself, i.e., recapitulating it
- 2) Against Heresies 2.22.4, 3.18.1-7, 5.16.2-3, etc., assumes divinity of Christ but affirms humanity of Christ since Christ must assimilate each stage of human life to sanctify it.
- 3) Against Heresies 2.22.4 (True humanity affirmed, recapitulation): **Being thirty years old ...**

D) *Athanasius of Alexandria (296-373): Human Condition and God's Fitting Response:*

- 1) *On the Incarnation* encapsulates Athanasius understanding of our condition and redemption and is composed before his controversies with Arius and Arianism.
- 2) God creates man after his own Image but in an indeterminate state wherein his fate is confirmed only by the assent of his own will through obeying God's command: *Incarnation* 27-28
- 3) Man disobeys God, defacing God's Image in himself, loses the knowledge of God, becomes subject to death through his natural mortality arising from being created from nothing, is enslaved to sin since is is rooted in non-being: *Incarnation* 28-30
- 4) God's fitting response On the Incarnation 35: **The Word perceived that corruption ...**
- 5) About our divinization, On the Incarnation 92-93: **As, then, he who desires to see God ...**
- 6) In man the Divine Image, Knowledge of God, and life is restored. By grace man becomes God.

E) *Pre-Nicene Father, Aphrahat (306-373): Christ as Both True Man and True God:*

- 1) Aphrahat. Demonstration 17:2: **Concerning these things, my beloved ...**

F) *Ephrem of Nisibis (306-373): Albeit a Nicene Father, Ephrem represents early Syriac Orthodoxy well.*

- 1) Paradise Hymn 12:15-18: Adam's (representing all mankind) first state indeterminate, to be immortal or corrupted via his choice in the Garden. The reward must be accompanied by some effort of the will. He lost immortality, true knowledge, and the Robe of Glory.
- 2) In the Incarnation, Christ restores the Robe of Glory to mankind. Nativity Hymn 23:13:
 - **All these changes did the merciful One make ...**
- 3) In the Incarnation, God grants the divinity which Adam sought to usurp in the Garden. Nisibene Hymn 69:12:
 - **The Most High knew that Adam had wanted to become a god ...**
- 4) Also Hymns on Virginity 48:15-18:
 - **free will succeeded in making Adam's beauty ugly ...**

G) *More on Characteristics and Goals of Divinization per Gregory of Nyssa (330-379):*

- 1) On the Soul and the Resurrection 79-80 (soul grows toward Image of God): **So when the soul which has become simple ...**
- 2) Life of Moses 116 (Divinization without end): **This truly is the vision of God: never to be satisfied in the desire to see him ...**

H) *Conclusion: Preconditions for Salvation*

- 1) Incarnate Christ is true God and True Man
- 2) Roots in recapitulation: whatever is not assumed is neither sanctified nor saved.
- 3) Based on divinization, whatever is not assumed is neither divinized nor vivified.
- 4) To save us, Christ must somehow be adequately human and divine, compromising neither!

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- 5) Biblical roots of divinization: John 10:34 “Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?” see also Ps 82:6 and Isa. 41:23
- 6) These are the roots of the Soteriology of the Theological School of Alexandria in which our Orthodox tradition stands. There are other major schools: Antioch, and the Latin West

IV. Council of Nicaea (325), Crisis of Arianism, the Challenge of Athanasius (Logos-Sarx Christology)

- A) *The Council of Nicaea addressed the challenge of Arius’ theology by affirming the full divinity of Christ and consequently His ontological relation to the Father (term homoousios adopted)*
 - 1) Formalization of Orthodox Trinitarian theology: reflects via creed the ontological (substantial) relations of the Father and Son (*homoousios* – of same essence with the Father)
 - 2) Trinitarian struggles within the Roman Empire end at First Synod of Constantinople (381) which finalized the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed which we recite today in the Divine Liturgy.
 - 3) ‘*Homoousios*’ seen by many as an innovation and needed explanation: Nicaea as much a problem as a solution. Constantinople I would resolve this with compromise and theological clarification.
 - 4) While these are Trinitarian issues, they effect Christology directly since any sort of adoptionism or mediate being would be strictly forbidden after Nicaea. Once Christ is clearly defined as God, the relation of Christ’s divinity to his humanity follows next.
- B) ~319, Arius (256-336), a presbyter of Baucalis in Alexandria, an ascetic, and apparently an eloquent and clever preacher codified a definition of the Logos, the Son of God, which posited that the Son was neither co-eternal nor consubstantial with the Father, rather created albeit superior in essence to us; apparently correcting the “Modalism” (Trinitarian issue) of Alexander I of Alexandria (d. 328)
 - 1) Arius defended absolute monotheism, Monarchy of the Father, Divine transcendence and essential simplicity by distinguishing the Father and the Son via Subordinationism against Modalism
 - 2) “there was a time when the Son was not,” phrase attributed to Arius by later opponents, but
 - 3) Arius. Letter to Eusebius V (quoting Prov. 8:22-23): “Before he was begotten or created or ordained or established, he did not exist.”
 - 4) The Subordination of the Son to the Father, inherent in thought of Origen and many early fathers, also popular in Alexandria is made explicit ontologically by Arius who soon gained support of Eusebius of Nicomedia (d. 341) who baptized Constantine.
 - 5) While affirming the Orthodox concerns above, here the Son was a created being, intermediate in essence and consubstantial with neither God nor us, Arius tried to spell out clearly an earlier, but implicit, conservative theological subordinationism – Arius wanted to be Orthodox
 - 6) Arius’ Neo-Platonic approach was pleasing to many conservative theologians, but it could not meet the Alexandrian requirements for Soteriology since Christ was neither properly God nor man.
 - 7) Opposed by Alexander I of Alexandria and then deacon Athanasius, etc., via term *homoousios* used earlier by Gnostics, Modalists, Paul of Samosata(?) (270-275), etc., which needed clarification
 - 8) Called by Constantine I (272-337), Nicaea I (325) would affirm Alexander’s position and condemn Arius, but the struggle against Arianism would go on for 60 more years and even beyond
 - 9) High point of Arianism Sirmium (357), which condemned both homoousians and homoiousians
- C) *Athanasius of Alexandria best remembered father of the early struggle against Arius; But joined by Didymas the Blind (313-398), Amphilochius of Iconium (339-403), Hilarius of Poitiers (310-367)*
 - 1) Answers that the Son is co-eternal and consubstantial (*homoousios*) with the Father, but also with us
 - 2) But *homoousios* as a term has sketchy past: *homoousia* condemned as modalist at Antioch (269), previously used by Paul of Samosata (whose precise theology unclear to us), also a Gnostic term
 - 3) Many post-Nicaean “Arians” are best understood as conservative Origenists who wanted to turn the theological clock back to *status quo ante*; “Arians” ranged from such conservatives to hardline Arian “Homoians” (Acacius of Caesarea), “Anomoians” (Eunomius of Cyzicus and Philostorgius)

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- 4) Affirming the unity of divine essence needed to be tempered by asserting the clear distinction of the three persons of the Holy Trinity (against Modalism) – accomplished later in Athanasius’ life by alliance of homoousians with homoiousians (out of which tradition the Cappadocian Fathers arose)
- 5) Final Theological Resolution: One essence (ousia) and three hypostases (existences) of Holy Trinity
- 6) But only after the term *homoousios* was clarified, even “*three hypostases*” needed cleansing from Arian subordinationism (Arius used phrase with subordinationist intentions): used together and mutually informing, these terms refuted both ontological subordinationism and Modalism
- 7) Yet Athanasius’ “*Logos-Sarx*” terminology soon proved inadequate (e.g., Apollinaris of Laodicea)
- 8) Cappadocian Fathers would finally champion homoousian Trinitarianism and the divinity of the Holy Spirit soon challenged by homoian Macedonius I, resulting in Constantinople I (381) and Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed which we cite today. (Constantinople also as 2nd see after Rome)
- 9) God’s unity embraced *paradoxically*, maintaining one essence of God with three distinct hypostases (Father eternal origin of Godhead and unoriginate, Son begotten of Father, Holy Spirit proceeds from Father – subordination becomes distinction), no philosophy of divine essence (e.g., Augustine)
- 10) Arianism in the West would long survive among the Goths, Vandals, etc., but after Valens’ death at Adrianople (378) and Constantinople I (381) it would never again thrive within the Roman Empire.

V. Apollinaris of Laodicea (d. 382) and the First True Christological Controversy:

- A) Formerly a respected bishop and earlier friend of Basil the Great (330-379) and Athanasius; under Julian’s reign (361-363) together with his father, Apollinaris the Elder, would cast the OT in the style of Greek heroic poetry and the NT in the style of Platonic dialogues.
- 1) First mature Christological heretic: *Logos-Sarx* terminology falters; against Arianism, Apollinaris proposes God the Logos assumed all human nature except the *nous* (soul/intellect), being that of the Logos Himself (divinity transcendent, impassible against Arian critics, no double subjectivity)
 - 2) Although the remainder of human nature would be divinized, the human soul/intellect would not be assumed and thus not redeemed which fails Alexandrian canons of Soteriology
 - 3) We know little of Apollinaris’ works since they were torched, but one phrase from his tradition lived on, albeit with an Orthodox reinterpretation: “*One Incarnate Hypostasis of God the Word.*”
 - 4) Apollinarianism would linger on and be contested by foes as Theodore of Mopsuestia (350-428).

VI. Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Antiochene “Logos-Anthropos” Christology

- A) Mentored by Diodore of Tarsus (d. 390), Theodore became the leading light of the School of Antioch and would be the single most influential theologian embraced by the Church of the East (Nestorian)
- 1) Most famous exegete of the Antiochene School (emphasizing historical and typological analysis of Scripture, opposing the allegorical interpretation embraced by the School of Alexandria), in the Church of the East he is called, “*the Exegete*” (*mphashkana*).
 - 2) Two *katastases* (*mortality, immortality*) vs Alexandrian three (*immaturity, mortality, immortality*), obedient Adam receives immortality only via Resurrection; death (once natural, now punishment)
 - 3) Like John Chrysostom, Theodore stressed ethical dimensions of faith, informing his Soteriology and Christology. *Ethical use of will, not mortality, his concern*, “moral jumpstart” by grace required
 - 4) Hence *Synaphia* of natures in Christ affirmed, *Divine nature and full individual human being* (Logos-Anthropos): refutes Apollinaris soulless/incomplete humanity; Divine Nature also helps human person of Christ obey Divine Will, facilitating by grace our proper use of the will (Matthew 26:42, Mark 14:36, Luke 22:44) - *posthumously accused of “Arian” adoptionism!*
 - 5) Hence he stresses complete distinction of natures in Christ (*Two Hypostases in One Prosopon*)
 - 6) Integrity of human nature and transcendence of God affirmed, communication of natures wanting!
 - 7) Such Christology suffices for moral jumpstart, not divinization; *ethics not ontology stressed!*
 - 8) Theodore would die in the peace of the Church (427) only to be condemned posthumously at Constantinople II (553) – first mooted in *Three Chapters Controversy* (443), however,

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- B) Nestorius (386-450) Archbishop of Constantinople (428-431), promises Theodosius II (401-450) that he would be a “hammer of heretics”, only to be hammered as a heretic in the end
- 1) Obstreperous, ham-handed tactician as well as pedantic/mediocre theologian, Nestorius opposes term “*Theotokos*” as practiced in Ephesus, stressing distinction of natures in Christ, promotes “*Christotokos*” as fitting term since Mary mother only to “man” Jesus and not to divine nature!
 - 2) Stresses integrity of human nature in Christ, but do Divine and human natures communicate?
 - 3) Opposed by Cyril of Alexandria (376-444), Christological giant of age, also dexterous over-the-top politician (e.g., 415 Hypatia murder, but Theophilus, Athanasius also pugnatious archbishops)

VII. Ephesus I (431) and its Immediate Aftermath, Alexandria at Pinnacle, Antioch Banished:

- A) *Antioch and Alexandria house rival schools of theology and both seek primacy in Roman Empire*
- 1) Cyril more dexterous than enemies, also more violent, importing monastic shock troops from Egypt
 - 2) Secured unconditional support of Pope Celestine I beforehand, imperial chairman Candidian soon supports Cyril – Synod location at Church of Mary, Ephesus boon for Cyril - *local popular support!*
 - 3) Party of John of Antioch (r. 429-441), supporting Nestorius, delayed too long: Cyril does wait at first, but secures condemnation of Nestorius before John’s arrival.
- B) *Yet Primary Issue is Christology, not Politics!*
- 1) Nestorius’ clumsily stated Antiochene Christology cannot sway Alexandrian crowd for whom the communication of human and divine in Christ essential for divinization – an impossible task since ethical regeneration and not divinization was the soteriological goal of Antiochenes!
 - 2) Two traditions of Christology/Soteriology clash, *but each Christology fits its own Soteriology!*
 - 3) For Alexandria, communication between divine and human natures essential to heal human mortality – *what cannot be assumed cannot be sanctified and deified!*
 - 4) Logos as Image of God also communicates divinity to creation, in that creation images the divine in universe, the latter thus receptive of Divine Revelation – revelation/salvation thus possible without compromising Divine transcendence, but the means of such communication remain foggy until later energies/essence distinction of Gregory Palamas
 - 5) Also double-subjectivity in Christ is unacceptable to Alexandria (Apollinaris’ aware of this issue in his rough solution of Jesus’ *nous* being that of the Logos! - human *nous* close to divine anyway? Divine must not be passible!), yet amenable to Antiochene notion of ethical renewal.
 - 6) Cyril of Alexandria. Scholia on the Incarnation 13 (p. 307 McGuckin) “***So when sacred Scripture says ...***”
 - 7) To Alexandrians at Ephesus, Nestorius divides Christ into two beings, breaking the conduit of grace and smacking of adoptionism, i.e., Logos adopting a specific human being.
- C) *Nestorius condemned five days before John’s and Antiochene Arrival – Union “from two natures”*
- 1) John of Antioch holds counter-synod, condemning Cyril as Arian, Apollinarian, Eunomian heretic, eventually condemning Ephesus as Apollinarian, soon initial support from Theodosius I lost
 - 2) In end, Ephesus condemns Nestorius, Caelestius (follower of Pelagius who studied at Antioch) and their followers, schism between Alexandria and Antioch, fanatics lost, could moderates be mollified?
 - 3) Cyril, more nimble politically/theologically than successor Dioscorus and encouraged by Celestine to accommodate theological moderates, thus signs statement crafted by Antiochene Theodoret
 - 4) Finally Cyril’s 433 Formula of Union with John of Antioch: “***We confess, therefore ...***” Feared confusion of natures had to be denied to assuage John. (Bolded text from Theodoret, reflected in Cyril’s letter to John). Moderates assuaged, fanatics on both sides displeased.
 - 5) Alexandria and Antioch reunited mostly on Alexandrian terms: Cyril astute enough to see concerns of Antioch, i.e., the integrity of both natures, important also to Alexandrian Soteriology
 - 6) Not all in the Christian East would follow and Church of the East evolves in Sasanian Empire, rejecting Ephesus I, affirming only Nicaea I and Constantinople I: First lasting schism in Church!

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- VIII. Alexandria Ascendant: But Brilliant Cyril replaced by Merely Clever Dioscorus (d. 454)**
- A) *One Incarnate Hypostasis of God the Logos:*
- 1) Fighting words of Cyril (actually Apollinarian tradition) affirms hypostatic union of two natures in Christ against mere prosopic (outward appearance) union of Antiochene Christology.
 - 2) Means of divinization almost secured, but faulty relation of two natures which undid Apollinaris would undo Eutyches (380-456), a presbyter and archimandrite at Constantinople.
 - 3) Antioch seeks vindication, Rome and Constantinople now suspicious of exalted Alexandrian See.
 - 4) Inspired by poor understanding of “One Incarnate Hypostasis ...” and Cyril, **Eutyches asserts, “I confess that before the union the Lord had two natures, but after the union I confess one single nature,”** also Christ’s human nature presumably “**dissolved like a drop of honey in the sea**”
 - 5) Since Cyrillian terminology could be misunderstood that way, more clarification was needed.
 - 6) In 448 Flavian of Constantinople (d. 449) condemns Eutyches in local synod
 - 7) Imperious, clever, but clumsier mentally than Cyril, Dioscorus did not grasp Eutyches’ *persistence in error*, believing that Eutyches already renounced this heresy – *Orthodox Cyrillian in intent!*
 - 8) Presiding at 449 Synod of Ephesus (“*Robber Synod*”) he reinstates Eutyches, deposes Flavian of Constantinople, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, Theodoret of Cyrrihus, Ibas of Edessa, and Domnus II of Antioch. Roman delegates protest but ignored. Flavian flogged, imprisoned, exiled, and finally dies.
 - 9) Dioscorus runs roughshod over foes: Rome, Constantinople, Antioch regroup against Alexandria!
- IX. Synod of Chalcedon (451): Alexandria Toppled but New Theological Problems Emerge!**
- A) *Theodosius II (once pro-Antioch, now pro-Alexandria) dead in 450; Marcian (450-457, wife Pulcheria, pro-Constantinople) calls 451 Synod of Chalcedon*
- 1) Leo I of Rome active via delegate, his *Tome* influential in language of Chalcedon (balance talk, features of human and divine natures distinguished), “**in two natures**” replaces “**from two natures.**”
 - 2) Eastern Cyrillian intentions obscured by new terminology from Latin West (derived from liturgical and baptismal language of Latin churches) which to Greek Cyrillian theologians sounds Nestorian!
 - 3) Eutyches recondemned: Dioscorus concurs “if” Eutyches held condemned opinions, but condemned and exiled for canonical violations at 449 “Robber” Synod, *not theology!* - replaced by Proterius.
 - 4) Egyptian Christians mostly loyal to Dioscorus; soon mob murders Proterius, affirms Timothy (457)
 - 5) Egypt, Ethiopia, much of Syria, soon Armenia lost to Chalcedon: Second lasting schism, non-Chalcedonians (Copts, “Jacobites,” Armenians, etc.), beginning of 200 years of battle in Empire
- B) *Christology seems resolved to Leo I/Latin West which never understood eastern Christological issues, (Leo/Cyril agree!) and whose language required clarification provided later by Constantinople II (553)*
- 1) To conservative Cyrillians, Chalcedon innovated, essentially Nestorian: early leading defenders like Theodoret (renounced Nestorius only on October 26, 451 under duress) reinforced this impression!
 - 2) To succeed, forthcoming neo-Chalcedonianism must round the square of Leo’s foreign terminology with Cyril’s intentions; *key figure will be Leontius of Jerusalem whose theology will prevail at CII*
 - 3) Chalcedon and Beyond: Cyrillians prevail (except in West growing more isolated and theologically irrelevant) but divide. Who are the true Cyrillians? *Chalcedon, like Nicaea, a theological problem!*
- X. Chalcedon Aftermath: Changing Imperial Policies, Ongoing Ecclesiastical and Theological Struggles**
- A) *Zenon (r. 474-491): Rome falls (476), revolts crushed (Basiliscus, Illus, etc.), Henotikon (482) enacted:*
- 1) *Henotikon* (Act of Union): first change of religious policy after pro-Chalcedonian Marcian (d. 457)
 - 2) Developed with Acacius of Constantinople (d. 489) to conciliate non-Chalcedonians
 - 3) Affirmed Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, condemned Eutyches and Nestorius, sought neutrality
 - 4) Ignored Synod of Chalcedon, silent about one or two natures, *forbids further discussion!*
 - 5) Felix III Rome rejected it, causing Acacian Schism (484-519), *first eastern break with Rome!*
 - 6) 489 Zeno also closed Antiochene School of Edessa at request of bishop Cyrus II of Edessa
 - 7) Non-Chalcedonians budged a little; nobody shut up; but schism created with Rome!

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- B) *Anastasius I (431-518): Silentiary made emperor, effective fiscally/administratively, well-remembered*
- 1) Pursues Henotikon, but unlike Zenon, with increasing anti-Chalcedonian slant!
 - 2) Supports Severus of Antioch, several Coptic Popes, deposed Euphemius of Constantinople (496) pressurizes, deposes Macedonius II (511) Constantinople, supported anti-Chalcedonian Timothy I
 - 3) Non-Chalcedonians at height under Anastasius (491-518), but Constantinopolitans and Rome never yield, Anastasius' pro-miaphysite policies fail but last until rise of Justin I (518-527)
- C) *Early Post-Chalcedon Theological Battles Lop-sided against Chalcedonians*
- 1) Theodoret (d. 457) compromised by tardy repudiation of Nestorius, nobody listened to Leo I (d. 461) in East nor read Latin, both soon died, early successors mediocre (e.g., John the Grammarian)
 - 2) Burdened with uphill defense of innovative terms of Chalcedon against conservative Cyrillians
 - 3) Non-Chalcedonians blessed with several notable theologians: Severus of Antioch (459-538 [512-518]), Philoxenus of Mabbug (d. 523), Jacob of Serug (451-521), Julian of Halicarnassus (d. after 527) – Cyrillian conservatives had downhill task of defending traditional language of Cyril
 - 4) Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Serug: powerful theologians and popularizers in Syriac realm
 - 5) Severus of Antioch true giant of non-Chalcedonian theology: major author and polemicist in Greek
 - 6) Severus is main debater with Chalcedonians, mainly asserting unmodified Cyrillian terminology; main concession: after the union two natures distinct only “in contemplation” (***en theoria***)
 - 7) Seen as fanatical by Chalcedonians (being a rigorist at Antioch), moderate by non-Chalcedonians for opposing *aphthartodocetism* of Julian of Halicarnassus, his party prevailed by end sixth century

XI. Constantinople II (553): Theological Square Circled, Yet Parties too Alienated for Reconciliation

- A) *Justin (r. 518-527)/Justinian(r. 527-565) change everything for Roman politics and religion*
- 1) Justin I and Justinian I are both Illyrian and last native Latin speakers on Roman throne
 - 2) Backward looking Justinian looks westward, reconquers Africa, Italy, SE strip of Spain
 - 3) Western in outlook/political orientation, Justinian wants and needs cooperation of Roman Popes
 - 4) Henotikon dropped (518), Severus of Antioch deposed (518), “pro-Eastern” religious policy ended
 - 5) John II Constantinople accedes, reluctantly under imperial pressure, to formula of Pope Hormisdas; Acacian Schism ends (519) – now non-Chalcedonians rather than Chalcedonians pressurized
 - 6) 529 Justinian closes Neo-Platonic Academy of Athens: Intellectual paganism goes underground
 - 7) As emperor and competent theologian, Justinian sees politics and religion as facets of Roman imperial policy; as God’s political image on earth he must guide empire to Orthodoxy and prosperity
 - 8) Would conciliate non-Chalcedonians, pursuing on/off policy of persecution throughout reign
 - 9) Empress Theodora (500-548): love match of Justinian, astute politician, wields much political power, seen most in defiant stance during Nika Riots (532), and in supporting non-Chalcedonians
 - 10) Pro-miaphysite, she founds miaphysite monastery of Sykae, protects miaphysite Severus of Antioch and Anthimus of Constantinople, secretly pushes Justinian toward policy of conciliation with non-Chalcedonians – a saint in Syrian Orthodox Church; her death in 548 unhinges Justinian somewhat
 - 11) Under Justinian, Syrian Orthodox Church develops independent hierarchy through efforts of Jacob Baradaeus (“Jacobites”) and John of Tella, such movement well underway in Egypt since late 5th century – effective headquarters oft in rural monasteries, e.g., Enaton (Egypt), Mardin for Syrians until WW1 – roots of Nestorians, Jacobites, Melkites in Christian NE now established
 - 12) Justinian’s religious policy peak: Condemnation of Three Chapters (443), Constantinople II (553)
- B) *Neo-Chalcedonianism developed and enshrined at Constantinople II (553)*
- 1) In 543, *Condemnation of Three Chapters*: that of the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, certain writings of Theodoret of Cyrus, The Letter of Ibas of Edessa to Maris
 - 2) Three Chapters condemnation solemnized at Constantinople II (553), intended but failed to conciliate non-Chalcedonians, Nestorians little effected since mostly in Sasanian Iran since 489

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- 3) Leontius of Jerusalem, previously confused with Leontius of Byzantium (485–543), rounds the christological square of Chalcedon with concept of *enhypostasis*, apparently also shared with Leontius of Byzantium, but used as defined by Leontius of Jerusalem at Constantinople II
 - 4) *Both the divine and human natures shared the same hypostasis, namely that of the Logos*; both thus had their own existence by *sharing the one hypostasis of the Logos*, the Incarnate Word of God
 - 5) Hypostatic union facilitates divinization: human nature now communicates closely with divine nature yet without confusion, human nature fully assumed by maintaining full integrity of both natures - whatever is assumed, that only is sanctified!
 - 6) Also avoids trap of Tri-Theism where each nature has unique hypostasis, implying that the three Hypostases of Holy Trinity actually comprise three God's!
 - 7) Also preserves Cyril's notion of *One Incarnate Hypostasis* with Logos of God as single subject of the Incarnate Christ, *adding Chalcedon's "in two natures" to preserve integrity of each* – this redefined Chalcedonian terminology with Cyrillian meaning affirms Cyrillianism of Greek theologians of Chalcedon: where "Cyril and Leo" agree, *Cyril shown to set terms, not Leo!*
 - 8) Synod of Constantinople II (553) Affirms: Three Chapter Condemnation, condemnations of Origen and Evagrius of Pontus, Enhypostatic Christology.
 - 9) Term *Hypostasis* now clearly distinguished from *ousia/physis*, blessed innovation in terminology!
 - 10) *CII and beyond only formally affirmed in Latin West*: Chalcedon suffices for Western Satisfaction/Substitution Soteriology, works well with the Western "Perfection/Fall/Restoration" katastasis incompatible with Alexandrian Soteriology – West sees later synods as monophysitizing!
- C) *Synod of Constantinople II: Theological Success, but Ecclesiastical and Political Failure*
- 1) Apparently Justinian died an apthartodocetist per Church Historian Evagrius: mentally enfeebled in old age, he died before any public policy enacted - last attempted non-Chalcedonian conciliation?
 - 2) Non-Chalcedonians unmoved: per Evagrius CH, theological issues resolved theologically at CII but too much bloodshed had already occurred to allow reconciliation – schism lasts until today!
 - 3) Successors must fight Persians, Avars, Lombards, defend bloated empire financially depleted by Justinian's wars and grandiose building projects: pressure on non-Chalcedonians relaxed for a while
 - 4) Justin II (565-574): proclaimed policy of religious toleration
 - 5) Tiberius II (574-582): mostly tolerant of non-Chalcedonians, but not of Arians in Roman West
 - 6) Maurice (582-602): first of effective Roman/Byzantine emperor/generals, financially stingy, very anti-Chalcedonian; 584 ended subsidy to non-Chalcedonian Ghassanids, having Al-Mundhir III ibn al-Harith arrested and Ghassanid kingdom dissolving into many small kingdoms – assassinated in 602 by Phocas (602-610) and troops – this disaster sparks Final Byzantine-Persian War (602-628)
 - 7) Next Christological development comes in reign of Heraclius (610-641)

XII. Constantinople III (680-681): Reconciliation Near Miss, Neo-Chalcedonianism Perfected

- A) *Heraclius (610-641): Saves Empire from Persians, Loses East to Arabs, Religious Policy as Near Miss*
- 1) 610, hailing from Byzantine Africa, Heraclius topples Phocas, builds up forces, 622 onward successful offensive ends Persian threat, exhausting Roman Empire: Sasanians left "dead in water"
 - 2) Not without aid of Church: Sergius I Constantinople (r. 610-638) in 622 dissuades Heraclius from moving capital to Carthage, opens church coffers to state to rebuild army; 626 as regent and in charge of Constantinople's defense (with magister militum Bonus) holds out against Persians under Shahrbaraz in Anatolia and Avars in Balkans.
 - 3) 634 Arab Conquests: 636 Yarmouk, East lost to Empire, 642 Egypt, Sasanians soon ground to dust
- B) *Religious polices have mixed results: True Cross Restored, Monergism/Monothelism, Ekthesis (638)*
- 1) 629 Heraclius restores True Cross to Jerusalem, previously lost to Persians with Jerusalem in 614.
 - 2) Sergius I and Heraclius seek conciliation with non-Chalcedonians during reconquest of Roman East
 - 3) 622 Heraclius promulgates Monergism in Armenia, Lazica with some success, encouraging more of same; 633 Alexandrian Pact of Union with Copts height of success, Pope Honorius even supportive

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- 4) Monergism refined into Monothelitism in 630's, Monothelitism asserted in 638 imperial *Ekthesis*
 - 5) Monergism: based on unity of Christ's subject sought by Cyril, CII, even Severus, also Pseudo-Dionysius "*one theandric energy*", proposes one energy/activity in Incarnate Christ - develops into
 - 6) Monothelitism: One will in Incarnate Christ – *both clear attempts to reconcile non-Chalcedonians*
 - 7) Nearly successful: mid 630's Pope Honorius even (d. 638 before *Ekthesis*) supportive of 633 Pact of Union of Alexandria, among supporters, Sergius I, Heraclius, Cyrus of Alexandria, Honorius, Arcadius II of Cyprus, etc.
 - 8) Sophronius of Jerusalem opposes early on (r. 634-638), Pope John and successors of Honorius soon repudiate Pact of Union and oppose *Ekthesis*; Maximus Confessor (580-662) in open opposition ~640; Maximus' assertion of two energies and wills (human and divine) in Incarnate Christ is basis of CIII (680-681); Maximus writes canons of Lateran Council 649 condemning Monothelitism
 - 9) Maximus pays the price, however, hence called *Confessor*: 658 tried as heretic and traitor and banished, 662 tried again as heretic, tongue cut out, banished to Lazica where he dies
 - 10) Maximus represents neo-Chalcedonian theological and monastic/spiritual traditions, weaving both more closely together; securing divinization via dogma motivates his christological endeavors!
 - 11) With no human energy/activity in Christ, nor human will especially, such key facets of humanity left unassumed and thus neither divinized nor redeemed - *fallen humanity remains unsaved!*
 - 12) Free will central to human nature, its proper use and discipline required for Christian life; salvation possible only if both human and divine wills exist in Incarnate Christ; Maximus' Christology based on grounding spiritual life dogmatically – *confluence of monastic and dogmatic concerns*
 - 13) Divine Natural Will in Christ, Human *Natural Will* in Christ: Christ's human will being fully divinized, hence *natural*, not in *gnomic* (determinative), diseased state as humans now experience it
 - 14) Incarnation to heal our *gnomic* wills, restoring them by God's grace to their *natural* state
 - 15) Jesus in Gethsemane, John 11:35, Matthew 26:42, Mark 14:36, Luke 22:44, per Maximus does not reveal double-mindedness of Theodore, rather divinized/healed human will and energies in full integrity and in submission to divine will – not struggle but willing unity of purpose revealed!
 - 16) Maximus, Opusculum 6 (65C-68A): "***If, however, you understand the subject of the phrase, ...***"
 - 17) Roman Synod (649): having condemned Monergism and Monothelitism. Rome in schism with Constantinople until Constantine IV (r. 668-685), after beating Arabs back from Constantinople,
 - 18) Calls Synod of Constantinople III (680-681): condemns Monergism and Monothelitism, the human will being "*in subjection to his divine and all-powerful will;*" Maximus yet unhailed at synod since he was still held under imperial suspicion.
 - 19) Neo-Chalcedonian Christology now fully refined, later development involves consequences, not the dogma itself, e.g., Iconoclasm, Nicaea II (787)), Gregory Palamas (1296-1359), energies/essence
- C) *Imperial Religious Imperative Recedes: Arab Conquest and Beyond*
- 1) Arab Conquests under Rashidun Caliphate (632-661): Syria, Palestine, Egypt lost forever (by 642), but Empire survives in Anatolia, Balkans, Italy, and Africa (until 690's), Sasanian Empire ground out of existence by 651 – Late Antiquity lingers on among Byzantines and Umayyads (661-750)
 - 2) Non-Chalcedonians join Nestorians under Islamic rule outside Roman Imperial orbit
 - 3) Within Empire theological attitudes harden, reconciliation becomes less urgent as time passes
 - 4) As dhimmis under Islam, Melkite, Jacobite, Nestorian religious institutions and identities develop: eventually seen as one religion with differing theologies: spiritual works, e.g., of Nestorian Isaac of Nineveh popular among all Eastern Christians, apologetics before Islam becomes shared effort
 - 5) After CIII, theology shifts from foundational dogma, to application/consequences of dogma, e.g., rise of ascetical theologies of John Climacus (579-649, perhaps early), Maximus Confessor (580-662) whose Christology inseparable from ascetical/spiritual concerns, Theodore the Studite (759–826), John of Damascus (675-749), Symeon New Theologian (949-1022), Gregory Palamas (1296-1357), Nicholas Cabasilas (1319-1392)

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

XIII. Consequences and Significance for Later Theology and Our Christian Lives

- A) *Iconoclasm and Nicaea II (787): Consequences rather than Development of Christology now Focus*
- 1) 730-787: Isaurian Emperors Leo III, Constantine V (754 Iconoclastic Synod of Hieria) pushed for iconoclasm; successor Leo IV sought conciliation, wife Irene as regent for Constantine VI summons 787 Nicaea II - Motivation: 8c military losses to Arabs, 726 volcanic eruption/deadly psunamis
 - 2) 814-843: Leo V Armenian reinstates iconoclasm (9c military losses to Bulgarians), pursued by Michael II, but ended by Theodora as regent for Michael III – *843 Triumph of Orthodoxy!*
 - 3) Reasons for Iconoclasm: God punishing empire for idolatry? Exegesis of Exod. 20:4, iconoclastic strand in Patristic thought; Constantine V also asserts that image must be *homoousios* with what it portrays hence icons invalid, Eucharist only valid image of Christ since *homoousios* with Christ
 - 4) Cross venerated as “type” of Christ, venerated for One crucified on it (Gal. 6:14; 1 Cor. 1:18),
 - 5) Theotokos and saints, since human, to be honored but not portrayed in worshipful images, angels not to be imaged since invisible – *as theologian, Constantine V is no Justinian!*
 - 6) Iconoclastic tendencies of CH Eusebius and Epiphanius of Salamis stressed after 787 as well as need of images to portray both human and divine natures of Christ – consequences of Christology cut both ways! - *but Iconoclasts seemingly have problems with communication of natures!*
 - 7) Influential respondents: Theodore Studite, John of Damascus; at 1st John less influential since more polemical against Islamic iconoclasm, Theodore based in Empire in midst of theological struggles
 - 8) OT condemnations of images while once valid (Exod. 20:4; Deut. 7:5,25, 12:3; Ps. 97:7; Isa. 42:8, 17; Jer. 8:19, etc.) pre-date Incarnation of Christ, Incarnate Christ (whose natures communicated) may be portrayed in images – Incarnation firmly establishes matter as means of grace!
 - 9) John of Damascus. On the Divine Images I:5-6 (Icons portray Divinized, visible humanity of Incarnate Christ): ***I do not adore creation ...***
 - 10) On the Divine Images I:24 (Honour passes to prototype, veneration of saints, icons grounded in Incarnate Christ): ***We depict Christ as our King and Lord ...***
 - 11) John D: Cherubim portrayed in Tabernacle (Exod. 36:8, 35; Heb. 9:5), Abraham venerated an angel at Mamre! - So spiritual beings could properly be represented and venerated!
 - 12) Theodore the Studite. First Refutation of the Iconoclasts 5 (Mosaic prohibition qualified by Moses’ brazen serpent, type of Incarnate Christ, Christological basis of icon veneration): ***So Moses made a bronze serpent ...***
 - 13) John D: icon as ***“mirror/figurative”*** type appropriate for our dull senses; Theodore S: ***“seal and representation”*** getting authenticity from what portrayed, so veneration of image passes on to prototype: *Theotokos/Saints honored, not wood and paint. To deny this denies true honor of saints!*
 - 14) Theodore the Studite. First Refutation of the Iconoclasts 13 (Honour passes to prototype, hence not idolatry): ***So whether in an image ...***
 - 15) Matter means of blessing via Incarnation since in Christ divinity communicates with humanity, divinizing it! Logos imprinting image in all creation also makes divine revelation possible, Incarnation is the basis for icons, relics and their veneration – veneration of relics also affirms ongoing effects of divinization after death of saint!
 - 16) Icons not sacraments but means of grace to be venerated; Theotokos, saints, and relics to be honored
- B) *Gregory Palamas (1296-1359): Energies/Essence distinction against Barlaam and rationalists, how seeing uncreated light of Mount Tabor possible if divine essence is transcendent? How do we experience transcendent God? Theological Grounds for Effective Prayer and Divinization Refined!*
- 1) Symeon New Theologian (949-1022): roots of new mystical theology, first Byzantine mystic to share his own experiences, some of his writings in *Philokalia*, roots of Palamite Hesychasm; humans can and should experience God directly in *theoria*, i.e., contemplation
 - 2) Hesychasm defended by Gregory Palamas in conflict with Barlaam of Calabria (1290-1348) who conflated aims (skopos) of philosophers and divine revelation assuming both arrived at same truth

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- 3) Gregory asserts that believers obtain more than knowledge of God, but attain to union with God, emphasizing the *objective and non-symbolic reality* of uncreated Light of Mt. Tabor
 - 4) But if God's nature is transcendent and unknowable, how is this possible? Given: theology as apophatic, revelation truly experienced as light, and salvation as deification? - *How can an unknowable God be experienced?*
 - 5) God unknowable and utterly transcendent in essence: but reveals Himself to us via His *energies*, (activities/operations) allowing for real, objective, non-symbolic communion with God:
 - affirming Maximus Confessor's statement: "**All that God is, *except for an identity in ousia*, one becomes when one is deified in grace.**"
 - per Gregory himself: "*the deifying gift of the Spirit is not the superessential ousia of God, but the deifying operations (energeia) of the superessential ousia of God.*"
 - also distinctions, "**not only according to hypostases but also according to operations ...**" which allows human participation in God without blasphemous notion of becoming God in essence
 - 6) The energies of God are inseparable from Divine essence, but not identical with it, and being eternal they offer true union with God compromising neither God's essence nor ours.
 - Gregory Palamas. Triads 24: **But even if we affirm that this energy is inseparable from the unique divine essence ...**
 - Gregory Palamas. Triads 29: **But you should not consider that God allows Himself to be seen in His superessential essence ...**
 - Gregory Palamas. Triads 31: **Yet the divine Maximus has not only taught ...**
 - 7) Communion with God occurs without crossing ontological gap, i.e., without blasphemous idea of *essential* union and compromising human and divine natures – *something Alexandrian Christology forbids where union in Christ is enhypostatic, not essential, deification is by operations/grace*
 - 8) To know God is possible, becoming God too, via operations/energies/grace of God, not via essence!
 - 9) Human experience of divine realities and deification certainly made possible by Alexandrian Christology, but bounded by it as well:
 - no "I am the real," or "I am the Truth" as per Sufi al-Hallaj, executed 922 for blasphemy
 - nor more moderate *fana'* (self-annihilation)/*baqa'* (subsistence in God) of al-Junayd (d. 910)
 - personal experiences of God not focus of Orthodox ascetical literature, rather the process
 - 10) Bounded by Christology, humanity remains forever intact, enhanced and divinized by grace
 - 11) *Hence divinization's goal refined: unity with God through Divine energies, no dissolution into Divine Essence abolishing human and Divine integrity; God's nature remains transcendent and simple, unmixed with human nature; human nature restored to proper divinized state, not dissolved!*
- C) *No Incarnation – No Sacraments:*
- 1) Incarnate Christ institutes Eucharist: "This is my Body." "This is My Blood." (Mt. 26:17–30; Mk. 14:12–26; Lk. 22:7–39; Jn. 13:1–17:26)
 - 2) Christ makes water salvific through his own baptism (Mt. 3:13–17; Mk. 1:9–11; Lk. 3:21–23): Christ illumines the waters so that we are illuminated by them!
 - 3) Holy Matrimony as Sacrament: (Jn. 2:1-11) Wedding blessed at Cana, Incarnate Christ's first miracle (per John)!
 - 4) Incarnate Christ's healings as basis of Divine Unction, e.g.,
 - Christ heals the deaf mute of Decapolis (Mk.7:31-37) *Jesus touched the man's ears, and touched his tongue after spitting, and then said Ephphatha!*, Aramaic for "Be opened."
 - (Jn. 9:1–12) Healing of man blind from birth (uses spittle and mud)
 - 5) Christ teaches *Prayer*: (Mt.6:9-13; Lk. 11:2-4); *Fasting* (Mt. 4:1-11 40 day fast, Mt 6:16 no display)
 - 6) Incarnation basis of communion with God! Revelation since Logos created universe as image
- D) *Death, Hades Conquered, Resurrection of Incarnate Christ vivifies His Church:*
- 1) Death/Resurrection of Incarnate Christ: "Christ is Risen from the dead, trampling down ..."
 - 2) Saints of all ages redeemed: Sacred as well as historical time redeemed (Eph. 4:9; 1 Peter 4:6)

The Incarnation of Christ our God: Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives

- 1 Cor.15:55: "O Death, where is your sting? O Hades, where is your victory?"
 - Mt. 16:18: "And I also say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build My church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."
- E) *Ascension of Incarnate Christ shows forth regeneration of Universe via man as microcosm of universe*
- 1) Rom 8:18-23: *For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*
- F) *Effects of Incarnation applied to us by Holy Spirit collectively at Founding of Church at Pentecost (Acts 2) and individually at personal Pentecost of Baptism/Chrismation into Incarnate Christ in Church; we grow by availing ourselves willingly of God's grace henceforth*
- 1) John 14:15-27: *Sending of Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth to the Church promised*
 - 2) Romans 6:3: *Or do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into His death?*
 - 3) Colossians 2:12: *Having been buried with Him in baptism, in which you were also raised up with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead.*
 - 4) 1 Corinthians 12:13: *For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free, and we were all made to drink of one Spirit.*
 - 5) Galatians 3:27: *For all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.*
 - 6) 1 Peter 3:21: *Corresponding to that, baptism now saves you - not the removal of dirt from the flesh, but an appeal to God for a good conscience - through the resurrection of Jesus Christ,*
 - 7) John 3:5: *Jesus answered, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."*
 - 8) *Divinization of human nature accomplished by the Incarnation, but applied to us by Holy Spirit*
 - 9) *The Incarnate Christ in the Church is made real by Holy Spirit to Church as a whole at Pentecost*
 - 10) *The Incarnate Christ is made real to each member of Church at our Baptism and Chrismation*
 - 11) *Henceforth we grow into our union with God consciously and deliberately (not by some osmosis) through the Eucharist primarily, but certainly by prayer, ongoing repentance to God (not morose, ungodly sorrow), and worshiping God in the Church - ongoing human efforts made effective by God's great mercy and grace.*
 - 12) *In conclusion, from Ephrem, Nativity Hymn 23:11-14:*
 - *Mary's lap astonishes me that it sufficed for You, my Lord, and embraced You.*
 - *The entire creation was too small to hide Your Majesty.*
 - *Earth and Heaven were too narrow to be like laps*
 - *to hide Your Divinity. Too small for You is the earth's lap,*
 - *but large enough for You is Mary's lap.*
 - *He dwelt in a lap, and He healed by the hem of His garment.*
 - *He was wrapped in swaddling clothes in baseness, but they offered Him gifts.*
 - *He put on the garments of youth and helps emerged from them.*
 - *He put on the water of baptism, and rays flashed out from it.*
 - *He put on linen garments in death, and triumphs were shown in them.*
 - *With His humiliation came His exaltations.*
 - *Blessed is He Who joins His glory to His suffering!*
 - *All these are the changes that the Compassionate One shed and put on*

***The Incarnation of Christ our God:
Its Meaning and its Consequences for our Lives***

- *when He contrived to put on Adam the glory He had shed.*
- *He wrapped swaddling clothes with his leaves and put on garments instead of skins.*
- *He was baptized for Adam's wrongdoing and embalmed for his death.*
- *He rose and raised him up in glory.*
- *Blessed is He Who came down and put on a body and ascended!*
- *Since Your birth sufficed for the sons of Adam as well as Adam,*
- *O Great One Who became a babe, by Your birth again You begot me.*
- *O Pure One Who was baptized, let Your washing wash us of impurity.*
- *O Living One Who was embalmed, let us obtain life by Your death.*
- *I will thank You entire in Him Who fills all.*
- *Glory to You entirely from all of us!*