Oleksandr KASHCHUK*

THE PROMOTION OF MIAENERGISM AS A CHALLENGE TO IDENTITY OF NON-CHALCEDONIAN CHRISTIANITY

The late Roman Empire of the sixth and seventh centuries had become thoroughly Christian. However, in course of time disagreement concerning Christian belief became the force on the basis of which the Empire was internally divided into different branches. By the sixth century the most significant religious groups were known as Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians – predominantly Miaphysites and Nestorians[1]. Each group developed its own sense of self-consciousness depending on Christological doctrine: on the one hand, the Chalcedonians confessed the two natures of Christ united in one person of God the Logos, on the other hand the Miaphysites believed in one nature of Christ and Nestorians proclaimed the two natures in Christ to be separated. It led to different senses of identity. Such situation did not favor the political unification of the inhabitants of the Empire, which was in an ardent need of harmony, especially in the seventh century, while in the face of external danger of invasions from the Avars, Slavs, Persians and the Arabs[2].

* Oleksandr Kashchuk Ph.D. – Assistant Professor in the Department of History of the Middle Ages and Byzantium at the Faculty of History of Lviv Ivan Franko National University and Assistant Professor in the Department of Theology at the Faculty of Philosophy and Theology of Lviv Ukrainian Catholic University; e-mail: oleks_andr@ucu.edu.ua.

[1] The process of development of divisions in the Byzantine Church was well described by Sławomir Bralewski. Cf. S. Bralewski, *Kościół bizantyński przed podbojem arabskim. Historyczne-teologiczne aspekty podziałów w kościołach wschodnich*, in: *Bizancjum i Arabowie. Spotkanie cywilizacji VI-VIII wiek*, red. T. Wolińska – P. Filipczak, Warszawa 2015, 177-229.

[2] Cf. A.N. Stratos, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, vol. 1: *602-634*, transl. M. Ogilvie-Grant, Amsterdam 1968, 107-123 and 284-286; idem, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, vol. 2: *634-641*, transl. H.T. Hionides, Amsterdam 1972, 40-116; W.E. Kaegi, *Heraclius. Emperor of Byzantium*, Cambridge 2003, 58-99 and 263; J.F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century. The Transformation of a Culture*, Cambridge 1997, 42-47 and 54-55; P. Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom. Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000*, Oxford 2013, 285-286; G. Dagron, *Kościół bizantyński i chrześcijaństwo bizantyńskie między najazdami a ikonoklazmem (VII wiek – początek VIII wieku)*, in: *Historia chrześcijaństwa. Religia – kultura – polityka*, vol. 4: *Biskupi, mnisi i cesarze 610-1054*, ed. J.M. Mayer – Ch.I.L. Pietri – A. Vauchez – M. Venard, Polish edition – ed. J. Kłoczowski, Warszawa 1999, 18-29 and 30-32; G. Morgan, *Byzantium*, Aylesbury 2007, 70-71; A. Sharf, *Heraclius and Mahomet*, "Past & Present" 9 (1956) 1-2.

Emperor Heraclius (610-641), like his predecessors, was forced to search a compromise with non-Chalcedonians in order to maintain the loyalty of the pro-Miaphysite provinces that were still under his influence, such as Egypt, Syria and Armenia. The acceptance of a common theological doctrine was planned as an expected result of the compromise[3]. The imperial promotion of Miaenergism as a doctrine which declares that Christ performed both human and divine deeds through one divine-human operation was hence initiated.

The goal of the paper is to show that the promotion of Miaenergism in reality became a challenge to a sense of identity of non-Chalcedonian Christians. The first part of the paper will argue that non-Chalcedonian sense of self-consciousness was strongly built on the Christological notions. The second part will be dedicated to the activity of Emperor Heraclius and Patriarch Sergius (610-638) tending to impose Miaenergism on non-Chalcedonian Christians. The third part will present the influence of Mianergist campaign on crystallization of non-Chalcedonian identity.

1. Outlines of the process of formation of non-Chalcedonian identity. The earliest non-Chalcedonian party was comprised of pre-Ephesian Christians, namely Nestorians, which became the Church of the East. These Christians established their Church in Eastern Syria and Persia. The Church was favored by the Persian government[4]. The Christology of some councils and some of the individual writers of the Church of the East from the sixth and the early seventh century is close in tenor to the Chalcedonian definition, except for the term *qnoma* (used to translate as *hypostasis* and carried the meaning of the individual manifestation of nature) which is understood in a significantly different sense from that of hypostasis in the Chalcedonian definition[5]. The East Syrian identity thus by the early seventh century was defined by Christology of the two natures and two hypostaseis in Christ[6]. The Church of the East was the least negative in its self-definition because it was being developed more independently and less reacted against decisions of the Chalcedonian Church[7].

After the Council of Chalcedon (451) many eastern Christians, mainly in the eastern Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, which were loyal to the teachings of Cyril of Alexandria (378-444), did not accept Chalcedon's decrees. They were called the Miaphysites. The only symbol of faith recognized by them as unchangeable was that of Nicaea (325) supplemented

[3] Cf. Stratos, *Byzantium*, vol. 1, p. 299; Kaegi, *Heraclius*, p. 210.

[4] Cf. J.M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford – New York 2010, 14.

[5] Cf. S. Brock, *The Christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the Fifth to Early Seventh Centuries*, in: *Aksum-Thyateira. A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios*, ed. G. Dragas, London 1985, 126-131 and 135-142.

[6] Cf. G.J. Reinink, *Tradition and the Formation of the 'Nestorian' Identity in Sixth- to Seventh-Century Iraq*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 217-250.

[7] Cf. R. Price, *The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 307, footnote 1.

by Constantinople (381) and confirmed by Ephesus (431)[8]. They considered the Chalcedon as a victory of Nestorius and a novelty in respect to Nicaea[9].

The eastern Church which shaped its theological tradition in accord with the See of Rome was regarded as the Church of Empire. This Church by the sixth century has formed a clear conviction that the four ecumenical councils, especially Chalcedon, should be regarded as the criteria of Orthodoxy. Chalcedon was a constituent element of the imperial Church's identity[10]. The Miaphysites were regarded by Chalcedonians as schismatics.

Accordingly, one of the major tasks of Emperors after Chalcedon was to appease the Miaphysites and integrate them into one Church, acknowledged by the Empire. The Patriarchate of Constantinople was engaged into the Emperors' activity in this field. Bishops of Constantinople tried to take a position as mediators between Rome in the West and the Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria in the East. However, after some time, Constantinople began to incline towards a Miaphysite Christology. The Church of Rome remained loyal to Leo's Christology, while the East – both Chalcedonians as well as non-Chalcedonians – defended Cyril's understanding of Christ[11].

The *Henotikon* (482) issued by emperor Zeno (474-491) was an unsuccessful attempt to appease the Chalcedonians and Miaphysites without approval of the Bishop of Rome. The Nicene Creed was posed as the most important theological position. The *Henotikon* affirmed the *Twelve Chapters* of Cyril of Alexandria and asserted that Son of God is consubstantial with the Father in divinity and consubstantial with human beings in humanity. Nestorius and Eutyches were condemned. Although Chalcedon was not refuted, it was not granted with respect[12]. *Henotikon* did not reconcile the Miaphysites but, contrary, in 484 it caused a separation between Rome and Constantinople, called the Acacian schism. The Patriarchs of Contantinople continued to adhere to Chalcedon although they had not been acknowledged by Rome[13].

After years of negotiations, in 519 the Church of Constantinople was reunited with the Roman Church in 519 on the basis of its confession of faith formulated by Hormisdas, pope of Rome (514-523). This document reaffirmed

---

[8] Cf. J. Meyendorff, *Continuities and Discontinuities in Byzantine Religious Thought*, DOP 47 (1993) 69; W.H.C. Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, in: W.H.C. Frend, *Religion Popular and Unpopular in Early Charistian Centuries*, London 1976 = "Studies in Church History" 26 (1975) fasc. 3, 54-55; K. Sarkissian, *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church*, London 1965, 196-200, 203-204 and 212; Th. M. van Lint, *The Formation of Armenian Identity in the First Millenium*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 274-275.

[9] Cf. Meyendorff, *Continuities and Discontinuities in Byzantine Religious Thought*, p. 71-72.

[10] Cf. Price, *The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)*, p. 311-324.

[11] Cf. V.L. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, Oxford 2008, 7.

[12] Cf. Evagrius Scholasticus, HE III 14, ed. J. Bidez – L. Parmentier, London 1898, 111-114. See Bralewski, *Kościół bizantyński przed podbojem arabskim*, p. 218-219.

[13] Cf. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, p. 15-16 and 31; Price, *The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)*, p. 309-310.

the doctrine of Leo the Great and stressed the primacy of Rome in the matter of doctrine. Anathema to Nestorius and Eutyches was declared, as well as to the Miaphysite bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, and to Acacius of Constantinople. The names of all the bishops regarded by Rome as heretical should be erased from the diptychs. This set a process of ultimate separation between Chalcedonians and Miaphysites which culminated in the making of the local orthodox Churches[14]. Separate Miaphysite Churches with their own hierarchy were being intensively formed. The full establishment of an episcopal hierarchy was completed by the second half of the sixth century[15].

Miaphysitism had become the faith of geographically defined areas of the Christian world. By the middle of the sixth century, the Miaphysites were dominant in territories embracing much of Syria, Egypt, Armenia, Nubia, Ethiopia and Arab peninsula. They were territorially more extensive than Byzantine and Latin Christianity combined[16]. It should be noted that the provinces of Syria Secunda and Phoenicia Maritima were predominantly Chalcedonian, while other areas including Isauria, Cilicia Secunda, Syria Prima, Phoenicia Libanensia, and Osrhoene, were loyal to Miaphysitism[17].

Together, with development of the separate Miaphysite Churches, the process of formation of local identity has been set. From the latter half of the fifth century, Chalcedonians and Miaphysites began to emerge as separate self-defining parties standing in opposition to each other[18]. The Miaphysites were not only unwilling to accept Chalcedon but also felt animosity to those who embraced it. For example in Palestine people who did not accept Chalcedon rebelled against Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem (c. 422-458)[19]. In Egypt Timothy Aelurus (454-477) was elected and consecrated as non-Chalcedonian Patriarch

[14] Cf. Hormisdas Papa, *Epistula* 51, PL 63, 460. See Bralewski, *Kościół bizantyński przed podbojem arabskim*, p. 219-223; Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, p. 7-8, 32, 73 and 105.

[15] Cf. W.H.C. Frend, *Severus of Antioch and the Origins of the Monophysite Hierarchy*, OCA 195, Roma 1973, 261-275; idem, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 52; D.G.K. Taylor, *The Psalm Commentary of Daniel of Salah and the Formation of Sixth-Century Syrian Orthodox Identity*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 67-68; T. Wolińska, *Opór, bierność czy kolaboracja? Chrześcijanie w Syrii i Egipcie wobec podboju arabskiego*, in: *Bizancjum i Arabowie*, p. 364; Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, p. 8-9 and 59-60.

[16] Cf. Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 49 and 53; J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314-631*, New York 1996, 193; V.L. Bantu, *Egyptian Ethnic Identity Development in Anti-Chalcedonian Coptic Literature*, Washington 2015 (diss.), 15.

[17] Cf. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, p. 193-194; Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, p. 45.

[18] Cf. Ch. Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity. Topography and Social Conflict*, Baltimore – London 1997, 317; Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, p. 10-11 and 105.

[19] Cf. E. Honigmann, *Juvenal of Jerusalem*, DOP 5 (1950) 247-257; Bralewski, *Kościół bizantyński przed podbojem arabskim*, p. 214-215.

of Alexandria. Proterius, who had been installed by Emperor Marcian (450-457) as Chalcedonian Patriarch of Alexandria, was murdered by a soldier[20].

Accordingly, in Egypt the one-nature Christology had become a defining feature of Egyptian identity immediately after Chalcedon. In this way, Egyptian Miaphysitism saw itself as the guardian of faith as well as the theological and moral center of Empire. Alexandria was acknowledged as the center of the Miaphysite movement. In this way, Egyptian Miaphysitism was an ethno-specific Christianity. However, it was not ethno-centric, because it was not confined only to Egyptians. For example Severus of Antioch was highly venerated in the Egyptian community. Accordingly, the late antique Egyptian Christians were loyal neither to Egypt nor to Byzantium but to the Church. Any national, ethnic or other social identity was subordinate to their religious identity[21].

Likewise in Syria the Miaphysite Church became a distinctive structure with its own identity[22]. The Church was formed predominantly of Syrian believers, but also often of members from other Miaphysite areas because it was open to receiving anyone sharing its faith[23]. The Syrian identity thus, like that of Egyptians, was defined more by the common faith and less by an ethnical element.

The Miaphysite Church in Armenia was also well established. The rejection of Chalcedon was a process which passed through different stages and came to a definite conclusion towards the beginning of the sixth century (informally) and the beginning of the seventh century (formally). The Armenian Church is loyal to Cyril's Christological teaching as expressed in the *Twelve Chapters* and confirmed by Zeno's *Henotikon*. It is thus anti-dyophysite and anti-Nestorian Church, asserting clear anti-Eutychian statements[24].

Both the non-Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians of the sixth century used the past as a point of reference to form a sense of identity. For example John of Ephesus (c. 507 - c. 588) established a counter-identity for the Miaphysites against the Chalcedonians. He indicated that it was very important to remember the previous generations of bishops who suffered persecutions after the Emperor had enforced Chalcedon, but nevertheless they preserved their orthodox faith[25].

---

[20] Cf. Evagrius Scholasticus, HE II 8, ed. Bidez – Parmentier, p. 55-56; Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 5950, English transl. and comm. C. Mango – R. Scott: *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, *Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284-813*, Oxford 1997, 170; Bralewski, *Kościół bizantyński przed podbojem arabskim*, p. 214; Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity*, p. 317-318.

[21] Cf. Bantu, *Egyptian Ethnic Identity Development*, p. 11, 54, 75-95, 85-86, 120, 133 and 139-140.

[22] Cf. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, p. 276.

[23] Cf. D. Weltecke, *Michael the Syrian and Syriac Orthodox Identity*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 117-118.

[24] Cf. Sarkissian, *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church*, p. 196-200, 203-204 and 210-212; Van Lint, *The Formation of Armenian Identity in the First Millenium*, p. 274-275.

[25] Cf. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, p. 6, 64-66, 81-82, 101-104, 194-195 and 229.

Biblical commentaries were of great importance in the formation of a distinctive and independent Miaphysite identity in the sixth century[26].

The Miaphysites defined themselves as the apostolic Church in opposition to the Chalcedonians, which they viewed as the imperial Church. Accordingly, the polarization between Byzantine and Miaphysite identity was completed with the political element[27]. Owing to this during Persian occupation, Miaphysites of Syria and Egypt enjoyed the support of Persian power, while Chalcedon's followers were persecuted because of their connection to Byzantine imperial power. At this time, the Miaphysite Christians had grown in numbers and strength[28].

On the grounds that the independent Miaphysite hierarchy was predominantly established in clearly defined areas filled with a distinct ethnical element Miaphysitism was considered as an expression of local ethnic aspirations against the Byzantine Emperor, who held the Chalcedonian faith[29]. The adoption of a native language as the language of Miaphysitism and the alleged welcome given to Persian and Arab invaders was underlined as an evidence of the afore-mentioned hypothesis[30].

This interpretation was criticized. Arnold Hugh Martin Jones (1904-1970) was one of the first scholars who rejected the hypothesis that Church of Egypt expressed a nationalistic version of Christianity. Furthermore, A.H.M. Jones argues that the motives of Egyptian solidarity were rooted in people's religiosity loyal to the doctrines of Patriarchs of Alexandria and their predecessors. The supremacy of the Patriarch and not any ethnical element produced the solidarity of the Egyptian Church. The refusal to accept any compromise was probably due to Dioscorus' (444-454) condemnation at Chalcedon. Also the Council's recognition of the primacy of Constantinople have contributed to a resistance to Chalcedon. According to A.H.M. Jones the anti-imperial movement and the rejection of the Greek language were not actuated in Egypt and Syria at that time, but only after the Arab invasion. Only in the case of Armenia is there a difference where the division between Chalcedonians and Miaphysites corresponded with a national division[31].

---

[26] Cf. Taylor, *The Psalm Commentary of Daniel of Salah*, p. 65-92. Other factors which influenced the formation of identity are mentioned in B. Ter Haar Romeny – N. Atto – J.J. van Ginkel – M. Immerzeel – B. Snelders, *The Formation of a Communal Identity among West Syrian Christians: Results and Conclusions of the Leiden Project*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 11-39.

[27] Cf. Bantu, *Egyptian Ethnic Identity Development*, p. 146-147 and 276.

[28] Cf. Morgan, *Byzantium*, p. 73.

[29] Cf. Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 49.

[30] Cf. E.L. Woodward, *Christianity and nationalism in the later Roman Empire*, London 1916, passim. See Bantu, *Egyptian Ethnic Identity Development*, p. 45; E.R. Hardy, *Christian Egypt. Church and People. Christianity and Nationalism in the Patriarchate of Alexandria*, New York 1952, 181-182.

[31] Cf. A.H.M. Jones, *Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?*, JTS

William Hugh Clifford Frend (1916-2005) pointed to the fact that the conflict between the parties in Egypt in the context of Miaphysitism divided families but not ethnical communities. Egyptian Christians thus viewed their ethnicity as secondary to their Christian identity. Between religion and nationality the religious issue was primary[32]. Similar conclusions concern Syrian Miaphysites: they viewed themselves first of all as Christians[33]. Therefore W.H.C. Frend stated: "It has been said not untruly that the real history of man is the history of religion"[34]. Such ideas were supported also by John Meyendorff (1926-1992). He claimed that to explain the Christological controversies as an expression of national and cultural opposition of non-Greeks to Byzantium is oversimplified. The opponents of Chalcedon were neither anti-Greek nor disloyal to the Empire[35].

Moreover, Miaphysite leaders asserted their loyalty to the Emperor. For many Miaphysites the one nature of Christ implied even the unity of the Roman Empire under one ruler who was God's representative on earth[36]. However, on the other side, many Miaphysites supported opinions which were at variance with those of the Constantinopolitan political ideology. They treated Empire as a simply historical reality and proclaimed statements against the Emperor. The claim of the Emperors to rule the Empire by divine right was rejected[37]. According to Miaphysites, the loyalty to orthodox faith was the guarantee of holding imperial power: the Chalcedonians were deprived of the power because they deviated from the orthodox faith[38]. Nevertheless, even during persecutions

---

10 (1959) 287-293. As to the language it should be noted that Egypt before 641 was a bilingual country, inhabited by Christian Egyptians who used either Greek or Coptic. Likewise in Syria, the Miaphysite movement was bilingual. The Syriac language was of great importance in the making of the Miaphysite tradition, but there was no rejection of the Greek as the language of the imperial power before the Arab conquest. Cf. J. van der Vliet, *The Copts: 'Modern Sons of the Pharaohs'?*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 287. See Ter Haar Romeny – Atto – van Ginkel – Immerzeel – Snelders, *The Formation of a Communal Identity among West Syrian Christians*, p. 48; F. Millar, *The Evolution of the Syrian Orthodox Church in the Pre-Islamic Period. From Greek to Syriac?*, in: *Empire, Church and Society in the Late Roman Near East: Greeks, Jews, Syrians and Saracens (Collected Studies, 2004-2014)*, ed. F. Millar, Leuven – Paris – Bristol 2015, 631-678. In respect to the claim that the Miaphysites welcomed invaders it should be noted that this claim is unproven. Contrary, apart from a few exceptions of collaboration, we are informed even of anti-Arabian statements. Cf. Wolińska, *Opór, bierność czy kolaboracja?*, p. 371-374 and 377-384; van der Vliet, *The Copts*, p. 287-289; Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, p. 194.

[32] Cf. Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 51 and 55; Bantu, *Egyptian Ethnic Identity Development*, p. 54.

[33] Cf. Ter Haar Romeny – Atto – van Ginkel – Immerzeel – Snelders, *The Formation of a Communal Identity among West Syrian Christians*, p. 47.

[34] Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 56.

[35] Cf. Meyendorff, *Continuities and Discontinuities in Byzantine Religious Thought*, p. 71.

[36] Cf. Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 51-52.

[37] Cf. Taylor, *The Psalm Commentary of Daniel of Salah*, p. 79-84.

[38] Cf. Ioannes Nikiensis, *Chronographia* CXX 60, English transl. R.H. Charles: *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*, London – Oxford 1916, 198.

Miaphysites did not rebel against the Empire[39]. Therefore, the Miaphysite's loyalty to the Emperor should be seen as their allegiance to the Empire as an institution – but not to the Emperors themselves who held the wrong opinions in doctrinal matters. Accordingly, there was a clear hope that the Empire would become Miaphysite[40]. Until the seventh century there was dominant conviction that Chalcedon should be annulled by no other person than the Emperor[41].

Although the Miaphysite movement did not evolve from ethnical and political aspirations, yet it is not possible to separate completely the religious aspect from the secular. Non-theological aspects of divisions in the Church also had significant influence. The Miaphysite Churches, as was stated, were being developed in clearly defined areas having their own specific ethnical feature. Accordingly, it was not possible to avoid the secular element[42].

We may conclude that Chalcedonian and Miaphysite Christians rooted their identity in the orthodox faith as viewed by them, respectively. This means that Christianity became the force forming a sense of self-consciousness which projected to social and political situations of the Empire. The lack of harmony between some groups of Christian inhabitants of the Byzantine Empire and the imperial government implied their different senses of identity. This prompted Byzantine officials to search the feature which would provide the common sense of identity.

2. Miaenenergism as a feature common to non-Chalcedonian and Chalcedonian identities. The majority of Miaphysites were ready to come to union with Chalcedonians. For example this position was supported by the important champion of the Miaphysitism – Severus, Patriarch of Antioch (512-518)[43]. He represented orthodoxy alternative to that of Chalcedon[44]. Severus confessed one divine-human nature and hypostasis and one incarnate nature of the God the Logos[45]. Severus strictly denied the supposition that he devalued

[39] Cf. Taylor, *The Psalm Commentary of Daniel of Salah*, p. 89-91.

[40] Cf. Ter Haar Romeny – Atto – van Ginkel – Immerzeel – Snelders, *The Formation of a Communal Identity among West Syrian Christians*, p. 47.

[41] Cf. Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 51-52.

[42] Cf. ibidem, p. 39 and 48; Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, p. 196.

[43] Cf. W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge 2008, 201, 206, 208, 213 and 318-319; A. Grillmeier – Th. Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604)*, part 2: *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, transl. into English P. Allen – J. Cawte, London 1995, 20; A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, transl. into English N. Buchanan, vol. 4, Boston 1898, 235-236.

[44] Cf. Grillmeier – Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2/2, p. 152-173; P.T.R. Gray, *Introduction*, in: *Leontius of Jerusalem. Against the Monophysites: Testimonies of the Saints and Aporiae*, ed. and transl. P.T.R. Gray, Oxford 2006, 32; S. Rees, *Leontius of Byzantium and His Defence of the Council of Chalcedon*, HTR 24 (1931) fasc. 2, 113.

[45] Cf. *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi*, ed. F. Diekamp, Münster 1907, 309, 24-25: "μίαν ὁμολογοῦμεν φύσιν τε καὶ ὑπόστασιν θεανδρικήν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ

the fullness of the human nature of Christ[46]. Moreover, he was opposed to the Eutychians and the Apollinarians[47].

Emperor Heraclius was careful to find a balance between doctrine and politico-social reality in the Empire, especially in its eastern parts. The Emperor resolved to insist on integration than to continue to study difference. In cooperation with the Patriarch Sergius the Emperor was searching for a basis on which reconciliation between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians might have been possible[48]. Patriarch Sergius was well-disposed to Miaphysites because he was a Syrian by birth and probably of Miaphysite parentage[49]. In the late 610s and early 620s as a compromise for reconciliation the Emperor and Patriarch advanced the doctrine of Miaenergism elaborated in the previous centuries in the circles of Logos-centric theologians[50]. The doctrine might have been perceived as having the same importance as the military operations of Heraclius in Asia Minor and Armenia[51]. According to the Miaenergist formula Christ is out of two natures but his activity is performed by one divine-human operation. The doctrine seemed to be acceptable for both non-Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians[52]. Therefore, Heraclius and Sergius had favorable grounds for dialogue. Negotiations were conducted with great efforts through correspondence, personal meetings and representatives.

a) Sergius' correspondence. Patriarch Sergius was active supporter of Miaenergism predominantly by writing letters. In 618, he presented the Miaenergist doctrine in a letter to the Miaphysite monk George Arsas of Alexandria. Sergius asked George to supply him with texts supporting the doctrine[53]. We know also

---

λόγου σεσαρκωμένην". In Severus' Christology the words φύσις, ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον have a common meaning, namely "nature" Cf. P. Allen – C.T.R. Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*, London – New York 2004, 34; Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, p. 209.

[46] Cf. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. 4, p. 237.

[47] Cf. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, p. 205-206.

[48] On relations between Emperor Heraclius and patriarch Sergius see Kaegi, *Heraclius*, p. 60. On Sergius' and Heraclius' search for reconciliation see F.-X. Murphy – P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, Paris 1974, 139-143.

[49] Cf. Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 461.

[50] Cf. Ph. Booth, *Crisis of Empire. Doctrine and Dissent at the End of Late Antiquity*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 2014, 196; M. Jankowiak, *The Invention of Dyotheletism*, StPatr 63 (2013) 336-337; Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, p. 344-345.

[51] Cf. Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, p. 184.

[52] Cf. C. Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom. Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century*, Leiden – Boston 2008, 60; J. Tannous, *In Search of Monotheletism*, DOP 68 (2014) 30-31 and 49-60.

[53] Cf. *Le Patriarcat Byzantin*, Série I: *Les Regestes Des Actes Du Patriarcat de Constantinople* 280 (279), vol. 1: *Les Actes des Patriarches*, fasc. 1: *Les Regestes de 381 a 715*, ed. V. Grumel, Paris 1972, 214 (further – Grumel, *Regestes*) – the letter is not preserved. See Maximus Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 332C - 333A. Cf. Murphy – Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, p. 140-141; *Introduction*, in: *Maximus the Confessor and his Companions. Documents from Exile*, ed. and transl. P. Allen – B. Neil, New York 2002, 8.

about Sergius' letter written before 622 to bishop Theodore of Pharan, in which Sergius cited a forged letter of Patriarch Menas of Constantinople (536-552) to Pope Vigilius (537-555). Sergius asked Theodore to express his views on the single will and operation[54]. Theodore responded approving this teaching[55].

A letter from Sergius to Paul One-eyed was written in 622 in order that Paul might return to the official Church through Miaenergism[56]. Paul was a leader of Miaphysites in Cyprus and he one of Heraclius' interlocutors. Paul has met with the Emperor in Armenia (622-623) in Theodosiopolis (Erzurum). The subject of discussion was the question of one operation in Christ[57]. It concluded in some uncertain agreement, because as a result Heraclius still tried to convict Paul. Emperor sent a letter to Patriarch Sergius asking him to provide theological arguments in favor of Miaenergism. Sergius sent aforementioned letter to Paul One-eyed with the letter of Menas and the opinion of Theodore of Pharan concerning the single operation. Paul rejected the Miaenergist compromise. As a result he was sent to archbishop Arcadius in Cyprus to whom Emperor dispatched a special decree. The document forbade all discussions concerning the two operations of Christ[58].

At this stage of the campaign the most fervent supporter of Miaenergism became Cyrus of Phasis, in Lazica (bishop of Phasis 620-630; Patriarch of Alexandria 631-643). Cyrus was contacted during Heraclius' campaign against Persia in Hierapolis in 626 when he discussed with Athanasius, Patriarch of the Jacobites (593-631). Cyrus was called there by person and Sergius was consulted by letters[59]. Cyrus received from Heraclius a commission to examine the Emperor's decree composed for Arcadius of Cyprus against Paul[60]. Cyrus appeared to be confused. He stated that he did not know which of the phrases is correct – either *one operation* or *two operations* of Christ. At first he refrained

[54] Cf. Grumel, *Regestes* 281, p. 215 – the letter is not preserved. See Maximus Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 332B-C.

[55] Cf. Maximus Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 332B-C. The *Chronicle of Seert* affirms that Sergius imitated the doctrine of Theodore. See *Historia Nestoriana*, ed. and French transl. A. Scher – R. Griveua: *Histoire Nestorienne (Chroniqe de Séert)* II, PO 13, 528. See Murphy – Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, p. 141.

[56] Cf. Grumel, *Regestes* 282, p. 215 – the letter is not preserved. See Maximus Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 332C - 333A.

[57] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 534, 23 - 536, 14. See Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, p. 345; Murphy – Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, p. 142.

[58] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Cyrum*, ACO II/2,2, 528, 4-10; Cyrus, *Epistula ad Sergium*, ACO II/2,2, 588, 14 - 590, 17; Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 534, 11 - 536, 14.

[59] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 536, 15 - 538, 7; *Vita ac Certamen Sancti Maximi Confessoris*, PG 90, 76C - 77A.

[60] We are informed about a letter from Cyrus to Sergius written in 623 which is the replica of the imperial order against Paul One-eyed. Cf. Grumel, *Regestes* 283, p. 215-216 – text not preserved. See Murphy – Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, p. 142.

from this trying to refer to the Tome of Leo in which the Pope maintains two operations of Christ[61]. On the order of the Emperor he wrote to Sergius of Constantinople[62] to ask him whether he should apply the phrase *two operations* or *one operation* in Christ[63]. It leads to the conclusion that Cyrus hesitated and became conscious of the risks posed by the expression *one operation*. It testifies that the phrase *single operation* was not easily acceptable in Chalcedonian Christology and it seemed to be a challenge for Chalcedonian doctrine.

Sergius of Constantinople in the letter to Cyrus of 626[64] is trying to explain why it is correctly to use the phrase *single operation*. *Synodicon Vetus* reports that before dispatching his reply, appointed to Heraclius (probably because of Heraclius' direct contacts with Cyrus), Sergius convoked a synod which confirmed his position that there is one will and operation in Christ[65]. Sergius states that he refers to the Fathers of the Church and, accordingly, he added nothing from himself[66]. He teaches that none of the Fathers taught of the two operations of Christ[67]. The Patriarch refers also to the universal councils and claims that none of the councils neither discussed this question nor promulgated the definition in this aspect. Instead, some of the Fathers, especially Cyril of Alexandria, taught of the single life-giving operation (μίαν ζωοποιὸν ἐνέργειαν) of Christ. He also mentioned the letter allegedly written by Menas of Constantinople to Pope Vigilius, which supports the conviction about the single will and the single operation of Christ[68]. As to the Tome of Leo, in which operations of Christ's natures were mentioned, Sergius affirms that none of the doctors of the Catholic Church, who defended the Tome against the Miaphysites, stated that Pope Leo taught on the two operations of Christ. Sergius refers especially to a book of Eulogius of Alexandria (581-608)[69] who wrote in defense of the Tome of Leo. In the end, Sergius is convinced that it is necessary to follow the dogmas of the Fathers not only according to their idea (ἔννοιαν) but also according to phrases (φωναῖς)[70].

[61] Cf. Cyrus, *Epistula ad Sergium*, ACO II/2,2, 588, 18 - 590, 5.

[62] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 534, 23 - 536, 6; *Synodicon Vetus*, ed. and English transl. J. Duffy – J. Parker, CFHB 15, Washington 1979, 106-108.

[63] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Cyrum*, ACO II/2,2, 528, 4-10.

[64] Cf. Grumel, *Regestes* 285, p. 216-217. Text – ACO II/2,2, 528, 1 - 530, 24. See Maximus Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 333A.

[65] Cf. *Synodicon Vetus* 128, CFHB 15, 106-108. We are also informed (*Synodicon Vetus* 129, CFHB 15, 108) that after Heraclius had returned to Constantinople, Sergius held a synod in which he proclaimed the doctrine of one will and operation in Jesus Christ.

[66] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 534, 23 - 536, 14.

[67] Cf. idem, *Epistula ad Cyrum*, ACO II/2,2, 530, 12-24.

[68] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 528, 10-19.

[69] Eulogius made a strong emphasis on the mia-physis formula, asserting statements on the two natures of Christ. Cf. A. Grillmeier – Th. Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604)*, part 4: *The Church of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451*, transl. into English O.C. Dean, Louisville 1996, 65-71.

[70] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Cyrum*, ACO II/2,2, 528, 24 - 530, 20.

Cyrus was ordered to take into consideration the advice of Sergius of Constantinople. Cyrus accepted the advice of Sergius[71]. The idea of Miaenergism thus was being gradually confirmed and propagated in Chalcedonian circle as the teaching congruent with Cyril's theology and the Council of Chalcedon.

b) Heraclius' meetings. As to negotiations led by Emperor Heraclius in person the sources give some different information concerning details, and interestingly, they are harmonious in portraying the Emperor as the protagonist of Miaenergism. Heraclius conducted several negotiations in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia and even with pre-Ephesian Christians. The results of the negotiations are presented below.

As to Syria, the well documented is a meeting between the Emperor and non-Chalcedonian Patriarch Athanasius (593-631) in Hierapolis in the winter of 629/630. Michael the Syrian (1126-1199) informs that Heraclius confessed to the Syrian Miaphysites (namely Patriarch Athanasius) two natures of Christ which are united in one operation. Emperor assured that he followed the teachings of Cyril on one incarnate nature of the God-Logos[72]. However, the Patriarch Athanasius rejected Chalcedon[73]. Michael the Syrian details that the Emperor debated with the Miaphysite bishops during twelve days and demanded the confession of faith. When he received it he praised their faith but asked them to give him communion and to accept the doctrine of two natures and one will and operation. Emperor convinced that this doctrine was preached by Cyril. When Syrians saw that this confession was in accordance with Nestorius and Leo, they refused to accept it. Then the Emperor got angered and attempted to enforce Chalcedon throughout Syria. Hence the persecutions of Miaphysites in Syria were initiated. Several monastic communities accepted Chalcedon[74]. The similar information give other sources[75]. Animosity to Chalcedon thus is viewed as a constituent element of Syriac identity.

---

[71] Cf. Cyrus, *Epistula ad Sergium*, ACO II/2,2, 590, 5-17.

[72] Cf. Michael Syrus, *Chronicon* XI 1, ed. and French transl. J.-B. Chabot: Michel le Syrien, *Chronique*, II, Paris 1901, 401-403.

[73] Cf. ibidem XI 2, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 405-408.

[74] Cf. ibidem, XI 3, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 412.

[75] Barhebraeus informs that when Chosroe was killed by his son in 628, Heraclius retained again Syria. People, priests and monks went forth to him. When Emperor went in to Mabbug (Hierapolis), to him came patriarch Mar Athanasius and with him twelve bishops. Emperor requested from them the confession of the faith. He praised them when they had made their confession but he insisted on acceptance of Chalcedon. When they refuted he was angered. The Emperor said: if somebody does not accept the synod, his nose and ears will be cut and his home will be devastated. Then many were forced into the union by violence. Some communities, including monastic ones, condoned the Emperor's faith. Cf. Gregorius Barhebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, ed. and Latin transl. J.B. Abbeloos – Th.J. Lamy, I, Lovanii 1872, 269-274. See Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, p. 65; Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 202-203. About the meeting of Athanasius, patriarch of Jacobites, with Heraclius at Mabbug refers also *Chronicle of Seert*. We are informed that Emperor and Patriarch had a conflict concerning the Communion because of the difference concerning Chalcedon. See *Historia Nestoriana* II 98, PO 13, 544-545.

Theophanes the Confessor (758-817) presents a different account. He informs that Athanasius pretended to accept Chalcedon in order to become the official Patriarch of Antioch. He inquired the Emperor about the operations and the wills in Christ. The Emperor, as we are informed, was disconcerted by this novel language and wrote to Sergius and Cyrus to seek their opinion and found them in agreement with Athanasius over the operation in Christ[76]. Athanasius knew that if only one operation was recognized, one nature would thereby be acknowledged[77]. John of Rome did not accept their compromise[78]. The similar information was given by Anastasius of Sinai (630-701), before Theophanes wrote his Chronicle[79].

Accordingly, the author of the *Vita Maximi* for the Miathelite controversy blames Patriarch Athanasius, claiming that he persuaded Heraclius that he would accept Chalcedon, if the Emperor agreed to the doctrine of Miaenergism[80]. Here animosity against Chalcedon is not represented as a substantial element of Syriac Christian identity. The identity is viewed as rooted in openness to a new interpretation of Orthodoxy.

The meeting had significant results since perturbation among the people and monastic communities appeared[81]. A number of the major monasteries in Syria accepted Miaenergism, and these represented both Miaphysite and Chalcedonian definition of faith. After the death of Athanasius (631) the union failed[82]. The decisions were never formally implemented, although some communities, including monastic groups, accepted the Emperor's viewpoints. The communities which accepted Miaenenergism retained the doctrine even after it was rejected in Byzantium. They later became known as Maronites[83].

In respect to Mesopotamia, Jack Tannous suggests that it is very possible that the Miaenergist Chalcedonian communities were there in times of Heraclius[84]. While residing in Edessa sometime between 630 and 633, Heraclius wrote a letter to Sergius asking him for the patristic passages supporting belief

---

[76] Cf. Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 460-461. See Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 202.

[77] Cf. Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 461. See Murphy – Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, p. 148-149.

[78] Cf. Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 461.

[79] Anastasius reports that Emperor Heraclius talked with patriarch Athanasius of Antioch. Emperor promised him that if he accepts Chalcedon, he will be appointed as an official patriarch. Athanasius confessed the two natures. He also asked the Emperor about activities and wills in Christ. Cf. Anastasius Sinaita, *Sermo adversus Monotheletas qui communiter dicitur. Homilia tertia de creatione hominis* 1, CCG 12, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, Turnhout 1985, 58, 63-65.

[80] Cf. *Vita ac Certamen Sancti Maximi Confessoris*, PG 90, 76C - 77B.

[81] Cf. Antiochus Monachus, *Homilia* 130, PG 89, 1844.

[82] Cf. Michael Syrus, *Chronicon* XI 3, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 412-413. See Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, p. 347.

[83] Cf. Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, p. 65-66; Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 202-203.

[84] Cf. Tannous, *In Search of Monotheletism*, p. 54.

in one operation and will expressed in Mena's letter to Pope Vigilius[85]. Sojourning in Edessa Heraclius said that such a glorious people should not remain alienated from the Byzantine Christians. He attempted to attract them to Chalcedonian faith. Emperor wished to accept the Holy Sacrament. But Isaias the metropolitan of Edessa prohibited him from the participation in the sacraments saying: *If you do not anathematize the Chalcedonian synod and the Tome of Leo you will not be allowed to accept communion*. Then Heraclius expelled Isaias from the Church and gave it to Chalcedonians[86]. The Miaenergist compromise thus won an insignificant success in the churches of Mesopotamia. This insignificance of success shows that they also had a well-crystallized sense of identity based on opposition to Chalcedon and anti-dyophysitism.

Heraclius made further efforts to realize his plans in Armenia. The Catholicos Esdras (630-641) was informed that if he did not accept the Sacrament with Emperor Heraclius, he would be replaced by someone who would. The Catholicos requested a statement of faith from the Emperor. The Emperor cursed Nestorius and all heretics, but he did not curse the Council of Chalcedon. Esdras went to the country of Asorestan, met the Emperor and communed after his fashion[87].

Esdras' acceptance of union was confirmed by a synod at Theodosiopolis (Erzurum) in 633, at which meeting Heraclius may have been present personally. The synod studied the question of the two natures in Christ[88]. The debate lasted for thirty days. The Armenians were persuaded on the basis of Scripture and they bound themselves with an oath and signs not to oppose Chalcedon. Catholicos Esdras accepted union with the Byzantine Church and, accordingly, a formula on one operation was adopted. A strong opposition to union, charged by an Armenian theologian John Mayragomec'I, arose. At the beginning he had allies – bishops Stephan of Kartmana and Mathousala of Syne and others – which were not present at the synod. Nevertheless, after some time Stephan and Mathousala had agreed with the Catholicos. Esdras defended his views before John on the basis of the Scriptures and the Fathers and stated that he did not yield to the Emperor but to the truth. However, John and his allies

[85] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 546, 1-6. See Grumel, *Regestes* 286, p. 217-218.

[86] Cf. Gregorius Barhebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* I 50, ed. and Latin transl. Abbeloos – Lamy, I, p. 271. Cf. *Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* I 102, ed. and Latin transl. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 109, Scriptores Syri 56, Louvain 1952*,* 185; Michael Syrus, *Chronicon* XI 3, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 411-412.

[87] Cf. Sebeos, *Historia Armeniae* I 41, transl. R.W. Thomson: *The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos*, Liverpool 1999, 91-92. See Ch. Maranci, *Byzantium Through Armenian Eyes. Cultural Appropriation and the Church of Zuart'noc'*, "Gesta" 40 (2001) fasc. 2, 108.

[88] Cf. *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* 121*,* ed. et comm. G. Garitte: *La narration de rebus Armeniae*, CSCO 132, Subsidia 4, Louvain 1952*,* 43. See Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, p. 345-346; W. Kaegi, *Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquests*, Cambridge 2000, 181.

were not persuaded stating that Nestorians applied the same arguments[89]. After the death of Esdras his successor Nerses III the Builder (641-661) was in community with the Byzantine Emperor[90].

However, Heraclius' ecclesiastical policies later continued by his descendents aroused considerable domestic resistance from many Armenian clerics and monks[91]. Nerses III retained Chalcedonianism until the council of Dvin rejected it in 648-9[92]. Nerses was ejected from the seat of the Catholicos[93]. The union thus was not strongly held by the people and hierarchs because animosity to Chalcedon was a substantial element of Armenian identity. Miaenergism was not strong force to unite Miaphysite Christians. There is hypothesis that it is likely that Armenian opposition to Chalcedon arose not so much from doctrinal dissent as from hostility towards the subordination of Armenia to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Constantinople[94].

Emperor Heraclius wished to approach not only the Miaphysites but also the pre-Ephesian Christians in Persia. The Sasanian queen Boran (629-631) desired a closer religious union between the two Empires. Catholicos Ishoyahb II (628-645) and his bishops were dispatched to guarantee the peace. His profession of faith was the same as that of the Fathers of Nicaea. He also exposed to the Emperor the profession of Nestorius. The Emperor asked Ishoyahb to celebrate Mass in his presence in order that the Emperor might participate in communion; the Catholicos complied. Then Heraclius asked him to celebrate Mass for the second time in order that communion was participated by the Catholicos, all his Patriarchs and bishops, all of his court and all the assistants. He granted his request under condition that diptychs which contain the names of Patriarchs and Fathers, apart from the name of Cyril of Alexandria, would be read; the Emperor accepted the condition. The Mass thus was celebrated and Emperor's demand was fulfilled. Then Ishoyahb wrote a *libellus* of confession of the faith and presented it to the Emperor. In this profession of faith the Catholicos stated that pre-Ephesians prefer to call the Mary Mother of Christ, not of God, because talking of Mary as only Mother of God suppressed the humanity of Christ who is God and man at the same time. When Ishoyahb returned to Persia, he was reprimanded by his own bishops because of celebrating the Mass on the altar of Greeks without having made mention of the three lights of Syrian Church: Diodore, Theodore and Nestorius. The Catholicos was accused

---

[89] Cf. *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* 122-134, CSCO 132, 43-45.

[90] Cf. ibidem 138, CSCO 132, 45-46.

[91] Cf. Kaegi, *Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquest*, p. 181-182; Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 200.

[92] Cf. Sebeos, *Historia Armeniae* I 45-46, transl. Thomson, p. 113-132. See Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, p. 65-66.

[93] Cf. *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* 139-141, CSCO 132, 46.

[94] Cf. Murphy – Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, p. 148; Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, p. 15.

of treason of faith and the preference of the Emperor's presents over the faith. Ishoyahb's mission did not lead to any reconciliation[95].

It should be noted that Ishoyahb's profession of faith was in agreement with that of Sergius regarding the recognition of a single will and operation. Miaenergism was acceptable to Nestorians because Nestorius himself confessed one will in Christ[96]. It is possible that Miaenenergist confession was not in fact a constituent element of the agreement. But it was a component of Constantinopolitan attempts at doctrinal union[97]. Also, among the Nestorian Christians, it was difficult to conclude a treaty on the basis of common confession of faith. The memory of the Fathers venerated by them was a component of their identity.

c) Activity through representatives. At the focus of Heraclius' campaign were the Miaphysites of Egypt. In 631 Heraclius appointed Cyrus[98] to combine the offices of Patriarch and governor of Egypt[99]. By the order of the Emperor, the new Patriarch attempted to make unity with Coptic Church. Patriarch Benjamin (623-662) fled at his coming[100]. After Cyrus had been sent to Alexandria, he consulted with Theodore of Pharan[101]. This shows that he was still hesitated and needed further support.

The unionist document known as *Nine Chapters*, which should have led to reconciliation between Egyptian Miaphysites and Chalcedonians on the grounds of the unionist doctrine, was promulgated in Alexandria in 633. The formula on a single combined operation emanating from the Incarnate God the Logos and on Christ's divine and human natures was accepted[102].

---

[95] Cf. *Historia Nestoriana* II 93, PO 13, 557-561. See Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, p. 63-64.

[96] Cf. Nestorius, *Fragmenta*, in: *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente Des Nestorius*, ed. F. Loofs, Halle 1905, 224, 12-15: "Οὐκ ἄλλος ἦν ὁ θεὸς λόγος καὶ ἄλλος ὁ ἐν ᾧ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος. ἓν γὰρ ἦν ἀμφοτέρων τὸ πρόσωπον ἀξίᾳ καὶ τιμῇ, προσκυνούμενον παρὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, μηδενὶ τρόπῳ ἢ χρόνῳ ἑτερότητι βουλῆς καὶ θελήματος διαρούμενον".

[97] Cf. Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 200-202.

[98] Cf. Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 461; *Synodicon Vetus* 130, CFHB 15, 108.

[99] Cf. *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, ed. and English transl. B. Evetts: *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, II: *Peter I to Benjamin I (661)*, PO 1, 495-498; CII 14, PO 1, 489; *Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* I 118, CSCO 109, 197.

[100] *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, PO 1, 490. See Stratos, *Byzantium*, vol. 1, p. 286-298; Kaegi, *Heraclius*, p. 213-214 and 216; Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, p. 16.

[101] Cf. *Vita ac Certamen Sancti Maximi Confessoris*, PG 90, 77C-D; Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 461; Anastasius Sinaita, *Sermo adversus Monotheletas qui communiter dicitur* III 1, CCG 12, 58, 54-57.

[102] Cf. *Satisfactio facta inter Cyrum et eos qui erant ex parte Theodosianorum*, ACO II/2,2, 594, 17 - 600, 20; ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 598, 20-22: "τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα «μιᾷ θεανδικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ» κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἁγίος Διονύσιον·"; *Synodicon Vetus* 130, CFHB 15, 108. See Murphy – Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, p. 149-151; Ch. Lange, *Miaenergetism – A New Term for the History of Dogma?*, StPatr 63 (2013) 331.

After the promulgation of the Pact, Cyrus wrote a letter to Sergius in which he informed his addressee about the peace concluded between him and the Miaphysites called Thedosians. The Tome of Union of 633 and various books of Theodore of Pharan were also added to this letter[103]. The Act of Union was apparently confirmed by a local synod of the Alexandrian church[104].

The Pact of Union expresses Chalcedonian teaching combined with Cyrillian interpretation of Christology. One Christ, which is out of two natures, is one incarnate nature of the Logos of God at the same time; that is he is one hypostasis[105]. In this view, Christ is united with flesh in natural union and according to hypostasis, as one person, without confusion and division. Christ has a flesh consubstantial with humankind animated by soul which possesses reason and mind[106]. Accordingly, Christ is perfect in both divinity and humanity. The lack of confusion of the natures in the union on the one hand, and the lack of separation and division on the other hand, was stressed. Christ suffered in the flesh as human being, but as God he remained impassible[107]. All the heretics including Apollinarius, Nestorius and Eutyches, and those writers who opposed to the *Chapters* of Cyril, were anathematized[108].

In this light, the unity of Christ expressed itself in the unity of his activity. The passions and the miracles belong to one and the same Lord Jesus Christ[109]. The one and the same Christ and Son operated divine and human deeds by one divine-human (θεανδρικῆ) operation, according to St. Dionysius. The elements of which the unity in Christ came about may be differed only in theory[110].

The document introduced a new phrase *divine-human* (θεανδρικῆ) operation in Christ into the official terminology of the Byzantine Church. It seems that the one divine-human operation of Christ is perceived here as an activity that flows from the single agent but this activity results in the various kinds of action. The single operation is viewed from the point of view of the single subject. Activity thus is an attribute of the person rather than of nature. Accordingly, the single operation was stressed in order to appease the Miaphysites. Chalcedon was not mentioned.

Andrew Louth (1944-) maintains that Cyrus' pact of union was very carefully phrased. The crucial terms were ambiguous, for example ἐνέργεια, but such terms then did not bear the weight of theological reflection[111]. Marek

[103] Cf. ACO II/2,2, 584, 21 - 586, 4; Cyrus, *Epistula II ad Sergium*, ACO II/2,2, 592, 6 - 594, 15.

[104] Cf. *Synodicon Vetus* 130, CFHB 15, 108.

[105] Cf. *Satisfactio facta inter Cyrum et eos qui erant ex parte Theodosianorum*, ACO II/2,2, 598, 4-9.

[106] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 596, 16-21.

[107] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 598, 15-20.

[108] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 600, 7-12.

[109] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 596, 12-14.

[110] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 598, 19-22.

[111] Cf. A. Louth, *St. Maximus the Confessor Between East and West*, StPatr 32 (1997) 341.

Jankowiak, on the contrary, argues that the concept of one operation was not central to this document. He perceives the document as an effort to phrase Chalcedonian dogma in terms familiar and acceptable to the Miaphysites, avoiding any reference to the controversial council of Chalcedon[112]. Likewise Francis X. Murphy (1914-2002) and Polycarp Sherwood (1912-1969) assert that the goal of document was to reconcile the Miaphysites with the doctrine of two natures. The focus was laid on unity of Christ as the only agent of the entire work of salvation. Only one divine-human operation corresponded to this one agent of salvation. However, these scholars claimed that the seventh chapter of the Pact as a doctrinal formulation won an insignificant success[113].

Sources prove that for the Egyptians the document had a theological weight and the notion of the single operation was crucial. The Union, without explicitly denouncing Chalcedon, was accepted among Egyptians since it was seen by them that one activity involved one nature[114]. The weight of the document is indicated by the reaction of the Jacobites of Syria and the Theodosians of Alexandria, as they claimed: *It is not we who have come into communion with Chalcedon but rather Chalcedon with us*[115]. The Miaphysites were content with the union but after Emperor had issued *Ekthesis* they did not understand why he did it[116]. For many Egyptian Miaphysites, the Miaenergism seemed to provide a possible reconciliation[117].

The theological meaning of the document acknowledged also the letter written by Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus after the synod in Alexandria (633). The letter proves the weight of the single operation of Christ and praises Cyrus for Pact of Unity[118]. Sergius supports and deepens the view that one and the same Christ operates things befitting God and humankind by one operation, because the whole divine and human operation proceeds from one and the same incarnate God the Logos[119]. The term *proceeds* here seems to confirm the conclusion that point is to stress the unity of the Logos as the single agent

---

[112] Cf. Jankowiak, *The Invention of Dyotheletism*, p. 337.

[113] Cf. Murphy – Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, p. 150-151.

[114] Cf. Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 461.

[115] Anastasius Sinaita, *Sermo adversus Monotheletas qui communiter dicitur* III 1, CCG 12, 58, 63-65: "Οὐχ ἡμεῖς τῇ Χαλκηδόνι, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ Χαλκηδὼν μᾶλλον ἡμῖν ἐκοινώνησε, διὰ τῆς μιᾶς ἐνεργείας μίαν ὁμολογήσασα φύσιν Χριστοῦ". See Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 461.

[116] Cf. Anastasius Sinaita, *Sermo adversus Monotheletas qui communiter dicitur* III 1, CCG 12, 58, 68-77; Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia* 6121, transl. Mango – Scott, p. 461.

[117] Cf. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, p. 350; Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, p. 117.

[118] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula II ad Cyrum*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/1, Berolini 1984, 134, 31 - 139, 35. See Grumel, *Regestes* 290, p. 219.

[119] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula II ad Cyrum*, ACO II/1, 136, 36-38: "καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν ἐνεργεῖν τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα, μιᾷ ἐνεργεία. πᾶσα γὰρ θεία τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐνέργεια ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεσαρκωμένου λόγου προήρχετο".

and the source from which activity emanates[120]. However, the operation has distinct manifestations. Such a meaning of *operation* is close to that of the pre-existing concept of Miaenergism[121].

Sources confirm the success of Cyrus in providing the reconciliation between Miaphysites and the Byzantine Church. But the means through which he achieved his plans were not worthy. Cyrus is portrayed as a tyrannical man who did much evil to the Miaphysites through the force which he received from Emperor Heraclius. Cyrus initiated a great persecution in Alexandria in order that Miaphysites might enter into the Chalcedonian faith. Mennas, the brother of Miaphysite Patriarch Benjamin, was tortured and then drowned in the sea[122]. A countless number of the Miaphysites went astray not only because persecution, but also because of bribes and honors as well as by persuasion and deceit. Many bishops denied the faith[123]. Except one monastery, all the churches and monasteries had been defiled by Heraclius, when he forced them to accept the faith of Chalcedon[124]. Edward R. Hardy (c. 1863-1951) confines Cyrus' success to a minority comprised predominantly of former Chalcedonians, officials and aristocratic population of Alexandria willing to accept imperial favor. People from outside of Alexandria rejected the new compromise regarded as imposed by the Byzantine government[125].

Although sources point to the success of the new campaign in Egypt, the persecution and non-worthy methods imply a significant domestic resistance and non-sincere acceptance of union, respectively. Anastasius testifies to the confusion of the Emperor himself before the Pact[126]. The Miaenergist union thus was perceived as a threat for Egyptian faith and, accordingly, for their identity.

On the basis of the aforesaid, we may assert that the Miaphysites built their identity not only on loyalty to one-nature theology but also, and primarily, on their refutation of Chalcedon. The latter element seems to be stronger. The Byzantine government searched for common feature of identity not only rallying to Miaenergism but also to the acceptance of Chalcedon in its Cyrilian interpretation which carried notions close to those of Miaphysites. Accordingly, the standpoint towards Chalcedon was the stumbling-block to finding

---

[120] Προέρχομαι – go out, come forth, come into being, appear, Lampe, p. 1147.

[121] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula II ad Cyrum*, ACO II/1, 136, 38 - 138, 12.

[122] Cf. *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, PO 1, 491-492; Ioannes Nikiensis, *Chronographia* CXVI 14, transl. Charles, p. 186; ibidem CXX 68, transl. Charles, p. 199; *Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* I 118, CSCO 109, 197; Michael Syrus, *Chronicon* XI 3, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 411. See Hardy, Christian Egypt, p. 185-186.

[123] Cf. *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, PO 1, 491-492. See Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, p. 186.

[124] Cf. *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, PO 1, 498. See J.J. van Ginkel, *Heraclius and the Saints. The 'Popular' Image of an Emperor*, in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641). Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.J. Reinink – B.H. Stolte, Leuven – Paris – Dudley 2002, 235-236.

[125] Cf. Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, p. 185.

[126] Cf. Anastasius Sinaita, *Sermo adversus Monotheletas qui communiter dicitur* III 1, CCG 12, 56, 34 - 57, 53.

the compromise doctrine which would become common for the both parties. Miaphysite Christians were ready to compromise on the condition of erasing the differences, namely the approach to Chalcedon. On the contrary, the Emperor was looking for a common sense of self-consciousness on the basis of Miaenergism. This prompted both parties to crystallize their sense of identity.

3. The Miaenergist campaign and the crystallization of identity. The main elements of a purely Byzantine identity were defined by the sixth centuries. In the age of Justinian, there was a clear recognition that to be a Byzantine meant to be both at the same time a Greek in a cultural aspect and a Roman in a political aspect[127]. The other substantial element of Byzantine identity was Christianity centered in doctrine of Chalcedon combined with Cyrillian interpretation of Christology. Chalcedonianism deprived of Cyrillian Christology was not a major component in the development of Byzantine self-consciousness. Richard Price came to the conclusion that the rejection of Chalcedon had more importance for Miaphysite Syria and Egypt than the affirmation of Chalcedon for Byzantium[128].

The seventh century witnessed a well-crystallized Byzantine identity as sensed by imperial government and the Church of Constantinople. Heraclius was the first Emperor who in the year 629 formally assumed the title βασιλεύς with a descriptive phrase πιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ[129]. The complete formula contained four constituents – the Roman, the Hellenistic, the Christian, and the military cognomina[130].

The fact that Christianity was treated by Heraclius as a force capable of providing common identity throughout Empire is well-evidenced by his approach to the Jews. They regarded the Persian invasion as their liberation from Byzantine rule. The large Jewish communities supported the Persians. However, the Persians saw the insignificance of their Jewish supporters and, as a result, all Jews were deported from Jerusalem. After Heraclius had returned to Jerusalem, he ordered that all the Jews and Samaritans should be baptized[131].

Although the Byzantine sense of identity was crystallized in the official Constantinopolitan circles, in reality it was confused among the people. According

[127] Cf. S. Dmitriev, *John Lydus and His Contemporaries on Identities and Cultures of Sixth-Century Byzantium*, DOP 64 (2010) 27-42.

[128] Price, *The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)*, p. 311-325.

[129] For the use of these phrases see: J. Konidaris, *Die Novellen des Kaisers Herakleios*, Fontes Minores 5, Band 8, Frankfurt am Main 1982, 62, 72, 80 and 84.

[130] Cf. I. Shahîd, *The Iranian Factor in Byzantium during the Reign of Heraclius*, DOP 26 (1972) 295-296 and 302-303.

[131] Cf. Michael Syrus, *Chronicon* XI 4, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 413-417; *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, PO 1, 492. See Kaegi, Heraclius, p. 216; W.J. van Bekkum, *Jewish Messianic Expectations in the Age of Heraclius*, in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641)*, p. 103 and 108; J.W. Drijvers, *Heraclius and the "Restitutio Crucis". Notes on Symbolism and Ideology,* in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641)*, p. 188-200.

to A. Louth the disasters of the seventh century raised questions of identity with their full force for the inhabitants of the Roman and Byzantine Empire. The confused sense of identity needed to be defined afresh[132]. Averil M. Cameron (1940-) points to the effects of the significant events on the Christian population of the Empire: government of the tyrant Phocas, the Sassanian invasion, the siege of Constantinople by the Avars and the Persians, the aftermath of the Persian invasion. These events made profound changes in society and aroused a sense of confusion not only concerning the religious beliefs but also the cultural and social identity. As a result an abundance of theological texts appeared which may be understood as an expression of searching for identity[133].

When no formula could be found to unite Cyril and Chalcedonian definition, the Miaphysite Churches consolidated into national and regional areas[134]. The essence of non-Chalcedonian identity transformed from a predominantly theological aspect towards theologico-political aspect. To be an Orthodox was to be also a member of an ethnic community – Egyptian, Syrian or Armenian etc. It is well documented in the *History of Patriarchs*. We are told that Heraclius could not incline towards him the hearts of only one monastery's inmates, so they did not accept Chalcedon. This monastery was strong in its Miaphysite faith because the power of its monks was connected to their being Egyptians by race, without a stranger among them[135]. This passage shows that the basis of Miaphysite self-consciousness was transformed from religious level to religio-ethnical.

Accordingly, between Chalcedonians loyal to the Emperor and Miaphysites disloyal to him appeared a strong opposition also in political aspect[136]. For John of Nikiu (fl 680-690) to be a Chalcedonian meant to be a Roman. Heraclius was the Emperor of Chalcedonians. They rejected the orthodox faith confessed by the Miaphysites[137]. Also to Miaphysite Syrians imperial rule was the rule of the Romans[138]. The strong opposition existed also between the orthodox Armenians and Romans who confess two natures[139].

---

[132] Cf. Louth, *St. Maximus the Confessor between East and West*, p. 332-345; A. Cameron, *The Eastern Provinces in the 7th Century A.D. Hellenism and The Emergence of Islam*, in: ΈΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ*: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*, ed. S. Said, Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1991, 295-296.

[133] Cf. Cameron, *The Eastern Provinces in the 7th Century A.D.*, p. 288-289 and 291-292; van Ginkel, *Heraclius and the Saints*, p. 228.

[134] Cf. Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 56; Bantu, *Egyptian Ethnic Identity Development*, p. 54.

[135] Cf. *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, PO 1, 498. See van Ginkel, *Heraclius and the Saints*, p. 235-236; Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, p. 185-186.

[136] Cf. Frend, *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, p. 51.

[137] Cf. Ioannes Nikiensis, *Chronographia* CXX 56 and 60, transl. Charles, p. 198; CXXI 1-2, transl. Charles, p. 200.

[138] Cf. Michael Syrus, *Chronicon* XI 4, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 413-417.

[139] Cf. *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* 125-134, CSCO 132, 44-45; 144-150, CSCO 132, 46-47.

The national and anti-imperial element among Miaphysites became strongly predominant only after the Arab conquest[140]. John of Nikiu stated that the Moslem saw the hostility of the people of the Egypt to Emperor Heraclius because of persecution[141]. E.R. Hardy claims that the promotion of Miaenergism had produced the state of general dissatisfaction that facilitated the Moslem conquest of Syria and Egypt[142]. The Miaphysites were ready to come to terms with their new Muslim masters[143]. We are informed that Benjamin promised to give over the Egypt to the Saracens. They in return obliged to give him all the churches and to kill Chalcedonians. Benjamin encouraged people to rebel against the Romans and give the region to the Saracens in order to liberate themselves from the bitter oppression of the Romans which persecuted them because of their faith. The commander Amrus invaded and killed the Romans[144]. When Amrus took full possession of Alexandria Benjamin returned to the city and he had good relations with the commander[145].

It should be noted that although both elements were significant in defining a sense of identity in the seventh century – ethnicity and religion – the latter seems to be more substantial. John of Nikiu notes that many Egyptians who had been false Christians refuted the holy orthodox faith (Miaphysitism) and life-giving baptism. They embraced the religion of the Moslem and persecuted Christians, that is, the Miaphysite people[146]. Accordingly, ethnicity deprived of the orthodox faith did not constitute a true Egyptian. The identity was based on true religion, which was more important than ethnicity.

In conclusion, we may assert that Heraclius' Miaenergist campaign was viewed as an appeal to non-Chalcedonian identity which was primarily built against Chalcedon and secondary on the basis of one-nature Christology. By the seventh century, non-Chalcedonian identity was so deeply rooted that further negotiations and plans without denouncing Chalcedon were doomed to failure. Chalcedon became a stumbling-block in finding a common feature which would create a Byzantine identity. R. Price asserts that Chalcedonianism

---

[140] Such inclination is seen in the literature written after the Arab conquest. Cf. *Chronicom ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* I 102, CSCO 109, 185-186; I 117, CSCO 109, 196-197; Cf. Michael Syrus, *Chronicon* XI 3, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 412-413; XI 4, ed. and French transl. Chabot, p. 413-417; *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, PO 1, 469-471; Gregorius Barhebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* I 50, ed. and Latin transl. Abbeloos – Lamy, I, p. 273. See J. W. Watt, *The Portrayal of Heraclius in Syriac Historical Sources*, in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641)*, p. 75-76; Meyendorff, *Continuities and Discontinuities in Byzantine Religious Thought*, p. 71; Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, p. 153-154, 178-179 and 187-188; van Ginkel, *Heraclius and the Saints*, p. 236.

[141] Cf. Ioannes Nikiensis, *Chronographia* CXV 9, transl. Charles, p. 184; CXVIII 1-10, transl. Charles, p. 187-188.

[142] Cf. Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, p. 186.

[143] Cf. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, p. 18.

[144] Cf. *Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* I 118, CSCO 109, 197-198.

[145] Cf. *Historia Patriarcharum* CII 14, PO 1, 495-498.

[146] Cf. Ioannes Nikiensis, *Chronographia* CXXI 10-11, transl. Charles, p. 201.

was in no position to help in the definition of Byzantine identity until the loss of the non-Chalcedonian regions in the seventh century[147]. From the point of view of non-Chalcedonians, Mianergist campaign must have been viewed as a challenge which prompted them to rethink and crystallize their sense of self-consciuosness. As a result, it was transformed from predominantly religious to political, and yet, fully religious at the same time.

The promotion of Miaenergism was a challenge which crystallized also the Chalcedonian sense of identity. Heraclius' attempts aroused significant disquiet within Chalcedonian Christians, because the Mianergism was perceived as a threat for Orthodoxy and, accordingly, it did not correspond to their identity. The defeat to the Mianergist reconciliation came not from non-Chalcedonians but from Chalcedonian monks, Sophronius of Jeruslaem and Maximus the Confessor; they regarded the recent union as the doctrinal compromise. Accordingly, Miaenergism led to the further bitter division[148].

(Summary)

The article discusses the question of interrelation between the promotion of Miaenergism and its influence on the sense of religious identity of non-Chalcedonian Christians. The purpose of the article if to point that the promotion of Miaenergism was perceived by Miaphysites as an challenge for their religious identity formed in the period after the Council of Chalcedon (451) on the basis of refutation of Chalcedon, absolute loyalty to the teachings of their Patriarchs, especially to Christological notions of Cyril of Alexandria. The promotion of Miaenergism became the stimulus that caused the crystallization of a sense of religious identity of the Miaphysites. The promotion of Miaenergism strongly influenced a sense of the Miaphysite political identity, opposite to Byzantine government.

PROPAGOWANIE MONOENERGIZMU JAKO WYZWANIE DLA TOŻSAMOŚCI NIECHALCEDOŃSKIEGO CHRZEŚCIJAŃSTWA

(Streszczenie)

Artykuł omawia kwestię zależności między propagowaniem przez cesarza Herakliusza (610-641) chrystologicznej doktryny monoenergizmu a jej wpływem na poczucie religijnej tożsamości chrześcijan niechalcedońskich. Celem artykułu jest ukazanie, że propagowanie monoenergizmu zostało odebrane przez chrześcijan-monofizytów jako wyzwanie dla ich religijnej tożsamości ukształtowanej

[147] Cf. Price, *The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)*, p. 311-312 and 325.

[148] Cf. Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 203-208, 212, and 219-221; Cameron, *The Eastern Provinces in the 7th Century A.D.*, p. 292.

w okresie po Soborze Chalcedońskim (451) na podstawie odrzucenia Chalcedonu, bezwzględnej wierności nauce swoich Patriarchów oraz trzymania się terminologii chrystologicznej Cyryla z Aleksandrii. Propagowanie monenergizmu stało się bodźcem do krystalizacji poczucia tożsamości religijnej u chrześcijan-monofizytów, które silnie rzutowało na poczucie tożsamości politycznej, wrogiej wobec rządu bizantyńskiego.

Key words: Miaenergism, Miaphysitism, Chalcedon, Church, identity, Christianity.

Słowa kluczowe: monoenergizm, monofizytyzm, Chalcedon, Kościół, tożsamość, chrześcijaństwo.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Anastasius Sinaita, *Sermo adversus Monotheletas qui communiter dicitur. Homilia tertia de creatione hominis*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, CCG 12, Turnhout 1985, 53-83.

Antiochus Monachus, *Homilia* 130, PG 89, 1841-1849.

Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens, ed. and Latin transl. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 109, Scriptores Syri 56, Louvain 1952.

Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/1, Berolini 1984.

Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum Tertium (680-681), ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,1: *Actiones I-XI*, Berolini 1990; ACO II/2,2: *Actiones XII-XVIII. Epistulae. Indices*, Berolini 1992.

Cyrus, *Epistula ad Sergium*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 588, 7 - 592, 4.

Cyrus, *Epistula II ad Sergium*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 592, 6 - 594, 15.

Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi, ed. F. Diekamp, Münster 1907.

Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez – L. Parmentier, London 1898.

Gregorius Barhebraeus, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, ed. and Latin transl. J.B. Abbeloos – Th.J. Lamy, I, Lovanii 1872.

Heraclius, *Novellae*, ed. J. Konidaris: *Die Novellen des Kaisers Herakleios*, Fontes Minores 5, Band 8, Frankfurt am Main 1982, 33-106.

Historia Nestoriana, ed. and French transl. A. Scher – R. Griveua: *Histoire Nestorienne (Chroniqe de Séert)* II, PO 13, 435-639.

Historia Patriarcharum, ed. and English transl. B. Evetts: *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, II: *Peter I to Benjamin I (661)*, PO 1, 381-518.

Hormisdas Papa, *Epistula* 51, PL 63, 459-460.

Ioannes Nikiensis, *Chronographia*, English transl. R.H. Charles: *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*, London – Oxford 1916.

Le Patriarcat Byzantin, Série I: *Les Regestes Des Actes Du Patriarcat de Constantinople* 280 (279), vol. 1: *Les Actes des Patriarches*, fasc. 1: *Les Regestes de 381 a 715*, ed. V. Grumel, Paris 1972.

Maximus Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 288-353.

Michael Syrus, *Chronicon*, ed. and French transl. J.-B. Chabot: Michel le Syrien, *Chronique*, II, Paris 1901.

Narratio de rebus Armeniae, ed. et comm. G. Garitte: *La narration de rebus Armeniae*, CSCO 132, Subsidia 4, Louvain 1952.

Nestorius, *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Loofs, in: *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente Des Nestorius*, Halle 1905.
Satisfactio facta inter Cyrum et eos qui erant ex parte Theodosianorum, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 594, 17 - 600, 20.
Sebeos, *Historia Armeniae*, transl. R.W. Thomson: *The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos*, Liverpool 1999.
Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Cyrum*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 528, 1 - 530, 24.
Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula II ad Cyrum*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/1, Berolini 1984, 134, 31 - 138, 37.
Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 534, 1- 546, 25.
Synodicon Vetus, ed. and English transl. J. Duffy – J. Parker, CFHB 15, Washington 1979.
Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, vol. 1, Leipzig 1883 = CSHB, t. 28; English transl. and comm. C. Mango – R. Scott: *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, *Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284-813*, Oxford 1997.
Vita ac certamen Sancti Maximi Confessoris, PG 90, 68A - 109B.

Literature

Allen P. – Hayward C.T.R., *Severus of Antioch*, London – New York 2004.
Bantu V.L., *Egyptian Ethnic Identity Development in Anti-Chalcedonian Coptic Literature*, Washington 2015 (diss.).
Bekkum W.J. van, *Jewish Messianic Expectations in the Age of Heraclius*, in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641). Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.J. Reinink – B.H. Stolte, Leuven – Paris – Dudley 2002, 95-112.
Binns J., *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314-631*, New York 1996.
Booth Ph., *Crisis of Empire. Doctrine and Dissent at the End of Late Antiquity*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 2014.
Bralewski S., *Kościół bizantyński przed podbojem arabskim. Historyczne-teologiczne aspekty podziałów w kościołach wschodnich*, in: *Bizancjum i Arabowie. Spotkanie cywilizacji VI-VIII wiek*, red. T. Wolińska – P. Filipczak, Warszawa 2015, 177-229.
Brock S., *The Christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the Fifth to Early Seventh Centuries*, in: *Aksum-Thyateira. A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios*, ed. G. Dragas, London 1985, 125-142.
Brown P., *The Rise of Western Christendom. Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000*, Oxford 2013.
Cameron A., *The Eastern Provinces in the 7th Century A.D. Hellenism and The Emergence of Islam*, in: *Ἑλληνισμός: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*, ed. S. Said, Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1991, 287-313.
Dagron G., *Kościół bizantyński i chrześcijaństwo bizantyńskie między najazdami a ikonoklazmem (VII wiek – początek VIII wieku)*, in: *Historia chrześcijaństwa. Religia – kultura – polityka*, vol. 4: *Biskupi, mnisi i cesarze 610-1054*, red. J.M. Mayer – Ch.I.L. Pietri – A. Vauchez – M. Venard, ed. of Polish edition J. Kłoczowski, Warszawa 1999, 17-85.
Dmitriev S., *John Lydus and His Contemporaries on Identities and Cultures of Sixth-Century Byzantium*, DOP 64 (2010) 27-42.

Drijvers J.W., *Heraclius and the "Restitutio Crucis". Notes on Symbolism and Ideology,* in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641). Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.J. Reinink – B.H. Stolte, Leuven – Paris – Dudley 2002, 175-190.

Frend W.H.C., *Heresy and Schism as Social and National Movements*, in: W.H.C. Frend, *Religion Popular and Unpopular in Early Charistian Centuries*, London 1976 = "Studies in Church History" 26 (1975) fasc. 3, 37-56.

Frend W.H.C., *Severus of Antioch and the Origins of the Monophysite Hierarchy*, OCA 195, Roma 1973, 261-275.

Frend W.H.C., *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge 2008.

Ginkel J.J. van, *Heraclius and the Saints. The 'Popular' Image of an Emperor*, in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641). Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.J. Reinink – B.H. Stolte, Leuven – Paris – Dudley 2002, 227-240.

Gray P.T.R., *Introduction*, in: *Leontius of Jerusalem. Against the Monophysites: Testimonies of the Saints and Aporiae*, ed. and transl. P.T.R. Gray, Oxford 2006, 1-43.

Grillmeier A. – Hainthaler Th., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604)*, part 2: *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, transl. into English P. Allen – J. Cawte, London 1995.

Grillmeier A. – Hainthaler Th., *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604)*, part 4: *The Church of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451*, transl. into English O. . Dean, Louisville 1996.

Haas Ch., *Alexandria in Late Antiquity. Topography and Social Conflict*, Baltimore – London 1997.

Haldon J.F., *Byzantium in the Seventh Century. The Transformation of a Culture*, Cambridge 1997.

Hardy E.R., *Christian Egypt. Church and People. Christianity and Nationalism in the Patriarchate of Alexandria*, New York 1952.

Harnack A., *History of Dogma*, transl. into English N. Buchanan, vol. 4, Boston 1898.

Honigmann E., *Juvenal of Jerusalem*, DOP 5 (1950) 209-279.

Hovorun C., *Will, Action and Freedom. Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century*, Leiden – Boston 2008.

Hussey J.M., *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford – New York 2010.

Introduction, in: *Maximus the Confessor and his Companions. Documents from Exile*, ed. and transl. P. Allen – B. Neil, New York 2002, 1-46.

Jankowiak M., *The Invention of Dyotheletism*, StPatr 63 (2013) 335-342.

Jones A.H.M., *Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?*, JTS 10 (1959) 280-298.

Kaegi W.E., *Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquests*, Cambridge 2000.

Kaegi W.E., *Heraclius. Emperor of Byzantium*, Cambridge 2003.

Lampe G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961.

Lange Ch., *Miaenergetism – A New Term for the History of Dogma?*, StPatr 63 (2013) 327-333.

Lint Th. M. van, *The Formation of Armenian Identity in the First Millenium*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 251-278.

Louth A., *St. Maximus the Confessor Between East and West*, StPatr 32 (1997) 332-345.

Maranci Ch., *Byzantium Through Armenian Eyes. Cultural Appropriation and the Church of Zuart'noc'*, "Gesta" 40 (2001) fasc. 2, 105-124.

Menze V.L., *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, Oxford 2008.

Meyendorff J., *Continuities and Discontinuities in Byzantine Religious Thought*, DOP 47 (1993) 69-81.

Millar F., *The Evolution of the Syrian Orthodox Church in the Pre-Islamic Period. From Greek to Syriac?*, in: *Empire, Church and Society in the Late Roman Near East: Greeks, Jews, Syrians and Saracens (Collected Studies, 2004-2014)*, ed. F. Millar, Leuven – Paris – Bristol 2015, 631-678.

Morgan G., *Byzantium*, Aylesbury 2007.

Murphy F.-X. – Sherwood P., *Constantinople II et Constantinople III*, Paris 1974.

Price R., *The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 307-325.

Rees S., *Leontius of Byzantium and His Defence of the Council of Chalcedon*, HTR 24 (1931) fasc. 2, 111-119.

Reinink G.J., *Tradition and the Formation of the 'Nestorian' Identity in Sixth- to Seventh-Century Iraq*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 217-250.

Sarkissian K., *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church*, London 1965.

Shahîd I., *The Iranian Factor in Byzantium during the Reign of Heraclius*, DOP 26 (1972) 293-320.

Sharf A., *Heraclius and Mahomet*, "Past & Present" 9 (1956) 1-16.

Stratos A.N., *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, vol. 1: *602-634*, transl. M. Ogilvie-Grant, Amsterdam 1968; vol. 2: *634-641*, transl. H.T. Hionides, Amsterdam 1972.

Tannous J., *In Search of Monotheletism*, DOP 68 (2014) 29-67.

Taylor D.G.K., *The Psalm Commentary of Daniel of Salah and the Formation of Sixth-Century Syrian Orthodox Identity*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 65-92.

Ter Haar Romeny B. – Atto N. – van Ginkel J.J. – Immerzeel M. – Snelders B., *The Formation of a Communal Identity among West Syrian Christians: Results and Conclusions of the Leiden Project*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 1-52.

Vliet J. van der, *The Copts: 'Modern Sons of the Pharaohs'?*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 279-290.

Watt J. W., *The Portrayal of Heraclius in Syriac Historical Sources*, in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641). Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.J. Reinink – B.H. Stolte, Leuven – Paris – Dudley 2002, 63-79.

Weltecke D., *Michael the Syrian and Syriac Orthodox Identity*, "Church History and Religious Culture" 89 (2009) fasc. 1-3, 115-125.

Wolińska T., *Opór, bierność czy kolaboracja? Chrześcijanie w Syrii i Egipcie wobec podboju arabskiego*, in: *Bizancjum i Arabowie. Spotkanie cywilizacji VI-VIII wiek*, ed. T. Wolińska – P. Filipczak, Warszawa 2015, 362-387.

Woodward E.L., *Christianity and Nationalism in the Later Roman Empire*, London 1916.