Oleksandr KASHCHUK*

SOPHRONIUS, A MONK OF PALESTINE, AND MIAENERGISM. THE TENSION BETWEEN EXACTNESS AND AMBIGUITY

The Pact of Union between Chalcedonians and Miaphysites was promulgated in Alexandria in 633. The document maintained that the unity of Christ's person manifested itself in the unity of his activity: the one and the same Christ and Son operated divine and human acts by one divine-human (θεανδρικῇ) operation, according to St. Dionysius[1]. That was an official proclamation of Miaenergism.

Approximately at the time when the Pact was accepted, the Arabs began to invade Byzantine territories. Consequently, the need for religious unity among the Byzantine provinces turned to be a desperate necessity in this situation. In response, Emperor Heraclius (610-641) and Patriarch Sergius (610-638) advanced the doctrine of Miaenergism-Miatheletism as a basis for ecclesiastical unity[2]. Unexpectedly for the Emperor and the Patriarch, the most explicable reaction to Miaenergism came not from the Miaphysites but from the Chalcedonian circle, represented by the monk Sophronius (c. 560-638)[3], who was raised in the tradition of Palestinian monasticism.

The aspects of Miaenergist polemics are manifold. Some scholars, like Marek Jankowiak, François-Marie Léthel, and Demetrios Bathrellos, attempted to examine the confrontation mainly from the theological perspective[4]. For

* 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] Cf. *Satisfactio facta inter Cyrum et eos qui erant ex parte Theodosianorum*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 598, 19-22.

[2] Cf. J.M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford – New York 2010, 10; G. Morgan, *Byzantium*, Aylesbury 2007, 74-75.

[3] 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, 348.

[4] Cf. M. Jankowiak, *The Invention of Dyotheletism*, StPatr 63 (2013) 335-342; F.-M. Léthel, *Théologie de l'agonie du Christ. La liberté humaine du Fils de Dieu et son importance sotériologique mises en lumière par saint Maxime le Confesseur*, Théologie Historique 52, Paris 1979; D. Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ. Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of Saint Maximus the Confessor*, New York 2004.

Richard Price the confrontation appears to be rather a dispute over words than over theology[5]. Cyril Hovorun classified the problem as having both political and theological character[6]. Phil Booth associated the problem with the principle of the ecclesiastical oikonomia[7].

The purpose of this article is to inquire into the essence of the dispute between Sophronius of Jerusalem and Sergius of Constantinople and to understand whether other matter that goes beyond theology and politics could also be covered in dispute. The first part of the paper will present the Palestinian monasticism, which was the cradle for Sophronius' formation, as a bastion of Chalcedonianism. The second part of this article will focus on the essence of Sophronius' reaction to Miaenergism. Consequently, the third part will display the Constantinopolitan standpoint regarding this theological issue.

1. The Palestinian monasticism as a bastion of Chalcedonianism. During the first decades of the fifth century, at the time the controversy arose over Christ's person, the Christological position prevailing in Palestine was closer to theology of Alexandria than to that of Antioch. The convergence with Alexandria was also a political necessity for the strategy of Juvenal, the Patriarch of Jerusalem (c. 422-458), who was seeking recognition of patriarchal status for Jerusalem[8]. Initially, Juvenal and monastic groups were opposed to the *Tome* of Leo. The Patriarch attended the so-called "robber-council" of Ephesus (449). He even voted for the rehabilitation of Eutyches (c. 380 - c. 456) and pronounced the deposition of Ibas of Edessa (c. 435-457). Ultimately, at Chalcedon, the Patriarch complied, because the status of the Patriarchate for Jerusalem and Juvenal's position itself was at risk. The Palestinian bishops followed the standpoint of Juvenal. Their tactic did not imply indifference to the doctrinal formulations: the Palestinian bishops asked for an explanation of the *Tome* of Leo[9]. Accordingly, the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Palestinian bishops adopted the Chalcedonian Christology immediately after the Council of Chalcedon (451).

Nevertheless, the majority of population and monastic groups in Palestine remained adherents of Miaphysitism. They resisted Juvenal's decision. As

[5] Cf. R. Price, *Monotheletism: A Heresy or a Form of Words?*, StPatr 48 (2010) 221-232.

[6] Cf. C. Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom. Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century*, Leiden – Boston 2008; idem, *Controversy on Energies and Wills in Christ: Between Politics and Theology*, StPatr 48 (2010) 217-220.

[7] Cf. Ph. Booth, *Crisis of Empire. Doctrine and Dissent at the end of Late Antiquity*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 2014, 218-219.

[8] Cf. L. Perrone, *'Rejoice Sion, Mother of all Churches': Christianity in the Holy Land during the Byzantine Era*, in: *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land. From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*, ed. O. Limor – G.G. Stroumsa, Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 5, Turnhout 2006, 165.

[9] Cf. E. Honigmann, *Juvenal of Jerusalem*, DOP 5 (1950) 233-234 and 240-247; Perrone, *'Rejoice Sion, Mother of all Churches'*, p. 165-166.

a result of opposition, from the beginning of 452 until August of 453 the See was usurped by Theodosius until the Emperor reinstated Juvenal[10]. At that time, the only religious centre in the whole Palestinian desert which accepted Chalcedon was St. Euthymius' laura. Its resistance marked the beginning of support for Chalcedon among the monasteries of Palestine[11]. Generally, the orientation towards Chalcedon during the next decades was unfriendly. Juvenal's successor, Anastasius I (458-478), accepted the *Encyclical* of Basiliscus (475-476) which anathematized Chalcedon[12]. Patriarch Martyrius (478-486) in his turn decided that the basis to unify the monks of the desert should be Zeno's *Henotikon* (482)[13], which did not attach importance to Chalcedon[14].

A clear support for Chalcedon developed in Palestine at the end of the fifth century, after the death of the Miaphysite archimandrite, Marcianus (492). The pro-Chalcedonian monks Sabas and Theodosius became archimandrites; the former – of the lauras and the Anachorets, the latter – of the Cenobites. The monks, led by them, were determined to support the Christology of Chalcedon. Likewise, the official church leaders – Patriarch Elias (494-516) and Patriarch John (516-524) – were defenders of the dyophysite Christological doctrine[15]. In the course of time the dogma of Chalcedon found its supporters in a new generation of theologians: Nephalius, John of Caesarea, John of Scythopolis, and Leontius of Jerusalem. Their theological ideas were officially supported at the second Council of Constantinople (553). Moreover, the particular status of Jerusalem and the Holy Land within the Christian world significantly influenced self-consciousness of the Palestine Christians. The holy places themselves were regarded as a warrant of the true Christianity. In this way, the Palestinian Chalcedonianism became a bastion of Byzantine Orthodoxy[16].

---

[10] Cf. Honigmann, *Juvenal of Jerusalem*, p. 237, 247-253 and 255-259; Perrone, *'Rejoice Sion, Mother of all Churches'*, p. 166-167.

[11] Cf. J. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine 314-631*, New York 1996, 183-185; Honigmann, *Juvenal of Jerusalem*, p. 250; Perrone, *'Rejoice Sion, Mother of all Churches'*, p. 167. The information on the reasons for Palestinian Christianity to be loyal to Chalcedon see Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, p. 191-199.

[12] Cf. Evagrius, HE III 4-5, ed. J. Bidez – L. Parmentier, London 1898, 100-106. See Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, p. 188.

[13] Cf. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, p. 188.

[14] Cf. Evagrius, HE III 14, ed. Bidez – Parmentier, p. 111-114. See S. Bralewski, *Kościół bizantyński przed podbojem arabskim. Historyczno-teologiczne aspekty podziałów w kościołach wschodnich*, in: *Bizancjum i Arabowie. Spotkanie cywilizacji VI-VIII wiek*, ed. T. Wolińska – P. Filipczak, Warszawa 2015, 218-219.

[15] Cf. L. Perrone, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche. Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Constantinopoli (553)*, Brescia 1980, 144-145 and 155-168; J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism. A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries*, Washington 1995, 289-290. Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, p. 189-190; Perrone, *'Rejoice Sion, Mother of all Churches'*, p. 168.

[16] Cf. Perrone, *'Rejoice Sion, Mother of all Churches'*, p. 168-171; idem, *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*, p. 169-171.

The theological tradition cherished by the pro-Chalcedonian monks of Palestine influenced the monk Sophronius and his friend John Moschus (c. 550-619). They lived for a lengthy period of time in the New Laura and in the Monastery of Theodosius. Both of them were counselors to the Chalcedonian Patriarchs of Alexandria – Eulogius (581-610) and John the Almsgiver (610-619) – in their struggle against the Miaphysites[17]. Moreover, John Moschus and Sophronius were not only counselors to John the Almsgiver but friends[18]. He himself was regarded by Maximus the Confessor (c. 580-662) as one of the first opponents to Miaenergism, maintained by the Miaphysite monk George Arsas, who expressed his doctrine in the letter to Sergius of Constantinople[19]. The promotion of Miaenergism, thus, appeared to be a challenge for the Palestinian monk Sophronius, because the doctrine of one operation was perceived in Palestine as a threat for dyophysitism.

2. Sophronius' reaction to Miaenergism. As a result of wars in the seventh century there were huge numbers of refugees who fled from the eastern provinces to the western territories of the Empire[20]. Among them was a large number of monks; Sophronius might have been one of them[21]. At the time of promulgation of Cyrus' Pact of Union (633) the monk has already sojourned in Alexandria[22]. Sophronius did not agree with the idea of the single operation in Christ. He had a meeting with Cyrus at Alexandria shortly after the proclamation of the Pact[23]. Cyrus failed to convince Sophronius of the rightness of policy concerning the Union[24].

---

[17] Cf. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism*, p. 348.

[18] Cf. P. Allen, *Life and Times of Maximus the Confessor*, in: *The Oxford handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, ed. P. Allen – B. Neil, Oxford 2015, 7.

[19] Cf. Maximus Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 332B - 333A.

[20] Cf. A. Cameron, *The Eastern Provnces in the 7th Century A.D. Hellenism and The Emergence of Islam*, in: Ἑλληνισμος*: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*, ed. S. Said, Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1991, 292; Allen, *Life and Times*, p. 3-4.

[21] On the fall of Jerusalem to the Persians and its consequences to monasteries in the context of the flight of Sophronius and his companion Moschus see Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 94-127 and 151.The information on the flight of monks to Constantinople, Rome, the Egyptian and Libyan deserts or any other location in the face of Persian invasion see in P. Hatlie, *A Rough-Guide to Byzantine Monasticism in the Early Seventh Century*, in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641): Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.J. Reinink – B.H. Stolte, Leuven – Paris – Dudley 2002, 205-208 and 219-220; Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, p. 51 and 54.

[22] Cf. Ch. Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem. Vie monastique et confession dogmatique*, Théologie Historique 20, Paris 1972, 75-76; Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism*, p. 348.

[23] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 538, 8 - 540, 3. B. Markesinis (*Les débuts du monoénergisme. Rectifications concernant ce qui s'est passé entre Cyrus d'Alexandrie, Serge de Constantinople et S. Sophrone de Jérusalem*, AnBol 133:2015, 7-10 and 17) argues for the trustworthiness of Sergius' relation in the letter to Honorius.

[24] Cf. Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 11.

In 633 Sophronius travelled to Constantinople to protest in person before Patriarch Sergius[25]. The monk brought to Sergius the letter in which Cyrus gave his version of the recent dispute between himself and Sophronius[26]. The reason for the letter was the refusal of Sophronius to accept the Miaenergist formula[27]. In this way, the Pact of Unity, concluded in Alexandria, initiated the controversy.

Patriarch Sergius noticed that the confrontation between adherents and opponents of Miaenergism had started to spread. The Patriarch decided that this discussion, which, in his opinion, was a superfluous dispute over the phrases should be put aside. In June of 633 Sergius issued *Psephos*, according to which the terms *one activity* and *two activities* were not to be used[28]. According to Basile Markerinis, Sergius accepted personally this decision[29]. The Patriarch's document, thus, was issued as the response to the confrontation and it should not be treated as the point of departure for it. Our conclusions differ from the statement of F.-M. Léthel, who maintained that the *Psephos* initiated the first stage of the controversy[30].

Patriarch Sergius communicated his resolution to the figures most concerned with the discussion[31]. First of all, he immediately wrote the letter to Cyrus[32], in which he announced his decision that he had forbidden any discussion on one or two operations in Christ[33]. After that Sergius communicated his verdict to Sophronius, still present in Constantinople, first orally[34], and then, at his request, in a letter; Sophronius, it seems, had assured Sergius that he

---

[25] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 540, 4-8; Honorius, *Epistula ad Sergium*, ACO II/2,2, 548, 8-11.

[26] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 540, 4-7.

[27] Cf. Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 11. The traces of the letter concerning the refusal of Sophronius are found in ACO (ACOII/1, 240, 31 - 242, 1). See Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 16. Sergius sent to Honorius the exact copies of the documents relating to the affairs, as an appendix to his letter. See Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 546, 19-25. Cf. Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 17.

[28] Venance Grumel (1890-1967) states, that this document was a synodal dogmatic decree. 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, 287, p. 218 (further – Grumel, *Regestes*). The text of the document is not preserved. It is probably hinted in Sergius' *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 546, 7-17. Cf. also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 542, 1-7 and 544, 16-22.

[29] Cf. Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 11-12.

[30] Cf. Léthel, *Théologie de L'Agonie du Christ*, p. 19.

[31] Cf. Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 12-13.

[32] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 540, 22 - 542, 1. Most of this letter to Cyrus is preserved in the *Epistula ad Honorium*. See Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 12.

[33] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 542, 1-7.

[34] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 544, 16-18.

agreed to his decision[35]. The letter from Sergius to Sophronius was certified by Pope Honorius in his *Epistula I ad Sergium*, wherein he said that he had received the copy of this letter[36]. Finally, the Patriarch reported his resolution in the letter addressed to Emperor Heraclius, but from this report we have only a summary[37].

Unexpectedly, Sophronius was elected the Patriarch of Jerusalem (633/634-638) at the end of 633 or at the beginning of 634[38]. Ph. Booth claims that Sophronius' election to the Patriarchate came about with imperial approval[39]. The election to the Patriarchate crystallized Sophronius' primary standpoint: on the one hand, he did not wish to put aside his views in this sphere; on the other hand, they could not be ignored. After Sophronius had become a Patriarch, he held a synod in Jerusalem[40]. He expressed his Christology in the *Synodical letter*[41].

a) The unity of hypostasis in diversity of natures. The point of departure in the letter was the Trinitarian profession of faith. Sophronius preaches one principle (ἀρχὴν) of one Divinity, one activity (ἐνέργειαν), one intent (βούλησιν), one will (θέλησιν), one motion (κίνησιν)[42]. Neither anything created (κτιστόν), nor servile (δοῦλον), nor introduced (ἐπείσακτον) is there in Trinity[43]. Then the Patriarch proceeded to the profession of the unity of Christ's person in diversity of natures: Christ is one composed hypostasis in two natures[44], as a consequence of the union of two elements – divinity and humanity[45]. This statement is close in tenor to the Chalcedonian formula and to the Cyrillian Christology. The Patriarch also claims that Christ is incarnate Logos[46] and applies the phrase of Cyril *one incarnate nature of God the Logos*[47].

---

[35] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 544, 19-22.

[36] Cf. Honorius, *Epistula ad Sergium* ACO II/2,2, 548, 11-12. See. Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 17-18.

[37] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 546, 7-17. See Markesinis, *Les débuts du monoénergisme*, p. 13.

[38] Ch. Schönborn (*Sophrone de Jérusalem*, p. 91) maintains that Sophronius became the Patriarch of Jerusalem at the beginning of 634.

[39] Cf. Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 234.

[40] Cf. Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem*, p. 91.

[41] Cf. *Synodicon Vetus* 131, ed. and English transl. J. Duffy – J. Parker, CFHB 15, Washington 1979, 110.

[42] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica ad Sergium Constantinopolitanum*, ACO II/2,2, 424, 20 - 426, 2.

[43] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 428, 17-18.

[44] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 436, 13-14: "ὑπόστασις … σύνθετος, καὶ ἐν δυσὶν … φύσεσιν".

[45] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 434, 21-22: "ἐκ δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἔσχε τὴν ἕνωσιν θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ ἐν δυσὶ τελείαις ἐγνωρίζετο φύσεσι, θεότητί τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι". See *Introduction*, in: *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy. The 'Synodical Letter' and Other Documents*, ed. and transl. P. Allen, Oxford – New York 2009, 37.

[46] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 436, 12-13.

[47] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 436, 16-17: "«μίαν τοῦ θεοῦ λογοῦ φύσιν» ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ «σεσαρκομένην» δοξάζομεν".

Sophronius stressed the fullness of Christ's natures: Christ is perfect in both divinity and humanity[48]. In respect to divinity He is consubstantial with the Father, and in respect to humanity He is consubstantial with His Mother and humankind[49]. Christ assumed the flesh, consubstantial with humankind, and the soul, which possessed reason and was of the same stock as human souls, as well as the mind like the human minds[50]. The flesh and the Logos came together in one person in the moment of conception. Neither division, nor mutability, nor confusion is possible in the person of Christ. Accordingly, the properties of both natures were preserved in Christ[51]. The Logos was incarnate without change and the flesh, which possessed soul and mind, was deified (ἀμεταβλήτως τεθέωται) without change[52]. Sophronius repudiates the views of Nestorius (division of natures) and Eutyches (confusion of natures)[53], as well as of Apollinaris and Dioscorus[54]. In this way, the Patriarch represented himself as a neo-Chalcedonian theologian, having made combination of the Chalcedonian and the Alexandrian Christology[55].

b) From the diversity of natures to the diversity of operations. On the basis of Christ's unity in diversity of natures, Sophronius developed his teaching concerning Christ's activity: each nature possesses its operation as an essential and natural element[56]. Each of the two operations proceeds from its essence and nature and each operation is performed according to the properties of the nature[57]. Each natural operation (φυσικὴν … ἐνέργειαν) corresponds to its nature[58], so that each operation is congenial to and befitting each nature (φίλην καὶ πρόσφορον)[59]. The Patriarch maintains that Christ as God has the same intent (ἔστιν ὥσπερ τῆς αὐτῆς βουλῆς) and the same essence (οὐσίας) as the Father and the Spirit, and through this intent He performs divine operation (θεικὴν ἐνέργειαν)[60]. In the same way Christ as a man performed human acts with human motions[61]. The distinction of operations is a warranty of the distinction of natures: only from the distinction of operations are

[48] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 438, 16-17.

[49] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 438, 18-19.

[50] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 432, 5-7.

[51] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 436, 18-19 and ACO II/2,2, 434, 16 - 436, 3.

[52] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 436, 4-5.

[53] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 436, 3-9.

[54] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 436, 17-18.

[55] Cf. *Introduction*, in: *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy*, p. 36-37.

[56] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 444, 21 - 446, 1: "τῆς ἑκατέρας φύσεως ἑκατέραν ἴσμεν ἐνέργειαν, τὴν οὐσιώδη λέγω καὶ φυσικὴν καὶ κατάλληλον".

[57] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 444, 20 - 446, 3. See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 446, 1-2: "ἐξ ἑκάστης προϊοῦσαν οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως κατὰ τὴν ἐμπεφυκυῖαν αὐτῇ φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη ποιότητα".

[58] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 446 ,16-18 and 3-4.

[59] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 448, 7.

[60] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 430, 15-18.

[61] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 11-12: "ἀνθρωπίναις κινήσεσιν ἐποίει καὶ ἔπραττεν". See also ibidem, 450,8-12.

recognized the natures and their properties[62]. Sophronius strongly refutes the claims on the same indistinguishable from each other operation of Christ[63].

The Patriarch makes distinction of Christ's operations not only from the point of view of Christ's ontology but also from the point of view of soteriology. He proves that the human operation in Christ was necessary element because of the *oikonomia* of salvation. Although Christ is God, He assumed human attributes in order to save humans by his passions[64]. So Christ assumed all human properties and infirmities, and willed to suffer and to perform everything that was befitting human nature in order to dissolve characteristics of human vitiated condition: passible, mortal and corruptible element[65]. So Christ assumed the human operation. The faculty of human operation embraces all human experiences, such as eating and drinking, walking and growing, sleeping and fatigue, and pain of the body et cetera[66]. Christ was like human beings in all natural aspects which do not involve sin[67]: he was subject to human natural and blameless passions[68] in order that he might cleanse like with like and rescue kin by kin[69]. In this way, the Patriarch recalls the Christology of Gregory of Nazianzus (329-390): what was not assumed, could not be healed[70]. Sophronius seems also to emphasize the other aspect of Christ's salvific work, namely Christ's activity as a model: Christ willed to suffer, to act and to operate humanly in order to help those who contemplate him (τοὺς ὁρῶντας ὠφελεῖν ἐψηφίζετο)[71].

c) The communion of the operations and the principle of activity. Patriarch Sophronius stresses that each nature operates and works according to its properties, but in communion with the other nature (μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας)[72]. Each operation works in cooperation with the other (συνέργεια);

---

[62] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 446, 19-21.

[63] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 446, 13-14: "οὐδὲ μίαν καὶ μόνην αὐτῶν τὴν ἐνέργειαν λέγομεν ἢ οὐσιῶδη καὶ φυσικὴν καὶ παντελῶς ἀπαράλλακτον".

[64] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 12-14: "θεὸς γὰρ ἦν ὁ ταύτα πάσχειν σαρκικῶς ἀνεχόμενος, καὶ σῴζων ἡμᾶς τοῖς οἰκείοις παθήμασι καὶ βραβεύων ἡμῖν δι᾽ αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπάθειαν".

[65] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 452,1-2: "τὸ παθητὸν ἡμῶν καὶ θνητὸν καὶ φθαρτὸν καταλέλυκε". See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 14 - 452, 2.

[66] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 448,15 - 450, 8.

[67] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 434, 9-11.

[68] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 18-19 and ACO II/2,2, 458, 6-8.

[69] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 432, 9-10.

[70] Cf. Gregorius Nyssenus, *Epistula* 101,7, PG 37, 181C - 184A: "Τὸ γὰρ ἀπρόσληπτον, ἀθεράπευτον· ᾧ δὲ ἥνωται τῷ Θεῷ, τοῦτο καὶ σώζεται".

[71] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 450, 15.

[72] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 442, 14-16. See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 444, 4-7: "εἰ δύο τὰς κοινῶς ἐνεργούσας μορφὰς δογματίζομεν ἑκάστην κατὰ τὴν ἑαὐτῆς φυσικὴν ἰδιότητα, ἀλλ᾽ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ Χριστὸν τὸν τὰ ὑψηλὰ καὶ πτωχὰ φυσικῶς ἐργαζόμενον κατὰ τὴν ἑκάστης τῶν δυοῖν αὐτοῦ φύσεων φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη ποιότητα λέγομεν".

the cooperation is without separation or confusion[73], so that each operation is corresponding to the other (κατάλληλον)[74] and at the same time preserves its individual properties[75]: the Logos operates acts which befit the Logos in communication with the body, and the body performs acts which befit the body in communication with the Logos[76]. The divinity of the incarnate Christ never operated without the body, and the body never performed activity without the divinity[77].

d) The communion of operations and the unity of Christ's hypostasis. Concerning the activity of both operations, Sophronius refers to Christ as the agent of His common activity according to his single hypostasis[78]. Although the two natures operate their properties[79], the acts flow (προϊέναι)[80] from one and the same hypostasis of Christ[81]. The one and the same Christ perfectly operates both (ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἑκάτερα)[82] – divine and human acts[83]. From Christ proceeded (προβαλλόμενος) naturally the two operations inseparably and without confusion[84]: in respect to the divine nature, He performed divine signs (τὰς θεοσημείας εἰργάζετο) and in respect to the human nature – He performed human deeds (τὰ ταπεινὰ παρεδέξατο)[85]. One and the same Christ thus performed miracles and suffered passions[86].

---

[73] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 446, 2-3: "ἀμέριστον ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀσύγχυτον τῆς θατέρας οὐσίας συνεπαγομένην συνέργειαν".

[74] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 444, 21 - 446, 1: "τῆς ἑκατέρας φύσεως ἑκατέραν ἴσμεν ἐνέργειαν, τὴν οὐσιώδη λέγω καὶ φυσικὴν καὶ κατάλληλον".

[75] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 444, 10-13: "Μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ἑκάστη φύσις τὸ ἴδιον ἔπραττε καὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν φεύγουσα καὶ τὴν τροπὴν οὐ γινώσκουσα καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν πρὸς τὴν θατέραν φυλάττουσα καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν καὶ σύνθεσιν ἀδιάλυτον καὶ ἀρραγῆ διασῴζουσα".

[76] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 442, 15-18.

[77] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 442, 2-4 and 454, 7-11.

[78] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 442, 18-20 and ACO II/2,2, 444, 8-9.

[79] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 444, 4-7: "εἰ δύο τὰς κοινῶς ἐνεργούσας μορφὰς δογματίζομεν ἑκάστην κατὰ τὴν ἑαὐτῆς φυσικὴν ἰδιότητα, ἀλλ᾽ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ Χριστὸν τὸν τὰ ὑψηλὰ καὶ πτωχὰ φυσικῶς ἐργαζόμενον κατὰ τὴν ἑκάστης τῶν δυοῖν αὐτοῦ φύσεων φυσικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη ποιότητα λέγομεν".

[80] The word προϊέναι means *go forward*, *proceed*, *advance*. Cf. Lampe, p. 1145.

[81] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 442, 18-20.

[82] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 444, 14-15.

[83] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 440, 18-20: "τὰ ἑκατέρας φυσικῶς οὐσίας εἰργάζετο κατὰ τὴν ἑκατέρα προσοῦσαν οὐσιώδη ποιότητα, ἢ καὶ φυσικὴν ιδιότητα". See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 442, 1-2: "τὰ ἑκατέρας ἐντελῶς κατειργάζετο φύσεως"; ACO II/2,2, 454, 13-14: "ὁ πάσαν ἐξ αὐτοῦ προφέρων ἐνέργειαν, θείαν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπειαν". Cf. *Introduction*, in: Sophronius *of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy*, p. 38.

[84] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 448, 1-10.

[85] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 454 ,18-19. See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 458,6: "ἀληθῶς ὑπελθῶν τὰ ὑμέτερα ἔργα καὶ πάθη".

[86] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 442, 8-10. See P. Parente, *Uso e significato del termine* Θεοκίνητος *nella controversia monotelitica*, REB 11 (1953) 244.

Although the whole activity of Christ, which is divine and human, cannot be separated from the same subject[87], the unity of Christ's activity is associated with the single principle of activity[88], namely the Logos[89]. Sophronius claims that the humanity of Christ was controlled by His divine will and acted not *when natural and fleshly motions wished to be moved naturally to activity*[90]. Even natural human experiences and affects were subjected to His divine volition: Christ, when He willed, granted to His human nature the occasion to operate and suffer the experiences proper to it[91]. He assumed human experiences when and to what extent He willed. He yielded to the things which brought the sufferings, and to sufferings themselves, which were effected in accordance with nature[92]. Accordingly, it was God who suffered in the flesh and He saved humans with his own sufferings[93]. In this way Christ was a steward of human passions and acted not merely as a steward but also as a governor[94]. Therefore, Christ's human works surpassed the works of a mere human being[95]. The concept of humanity being moved by divinity is thus present in Sophronius' Christology[96].

Sophronius, in some passages, seems to admit slightly that Christ possessed human volition, which was always in accord with his divine will. The Patriarch claimed that the Son emptied himself completely by a will that was

---

[87] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 456, 3-5. Sophronius applies to Pseudo-Iustinus' *Expositio rectae fidei*, PG 6, 1232A: "πάσαν μὲν ἐνέργειαν οὐκ ἄν τις χωρίσαι τῆς μιᾶς υἱότητος".

[88] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 454, 17-20.

[89] Cf. Parente, *Uso e significato del termine* Θεοκίνητος, p. 244-245; *Introduction*, in: *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy*, p. 38-39.

[90] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 450, 14-17. See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 16: "οὐχ ὅτε αἱ φυσικαὶ κινήσεις καὶ σαρκικαὶ κινεῖσθαι φυσικῶς πρὸς ἐνέργειαν ἤθελον".

[91] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 8-9: "ἐδίδου γὰρ, ὅτε καὶ ἤθελε, φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπείᾳ καιρὸν ἐνεργεῖν καὶ πάσχειν τὰ ἴδια". See *Introduction*, in: *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy*, p. 39.

[92] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 452, 9-10: "συγχωρεῖν αὐτὸς τοῖς τὰ πάθη προσφέρουσι τοῖς τε παθήμασιν αὐτοῖς κατὰ φύσιν ἐνεργουμένοις ἐπένευσε". According to Sophronius, Christ assumed human experiences voluntarily and not under necessity (οὐ γὰρ ἀκουσίως … ἢ ἀναγκαστῶς), although He submit to them in a natural and a human manner and performed them with human motions. Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450,10-12.

[93] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 12-13. See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 14-16.

[94] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 452, 3-5: "ταμίας γὰρ ἦν αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ παθῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ πράξεων, καὶ οὐ μόνον ταμίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρύτανις". See Parente, *Uso e significato del termine* Θεοκίνητος, p. 244-245. On the meaning of the concept expressed by the words ταμίας and πρύτανις see Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, p. 138-141. The scholar explains that these terms mean that Christ was ultimate source of the operations, from where and by which they are distributed and provided, as well as directed and controlled.

[95] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 452, 5-6: "ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπου αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα".

[96] Cf. Parente, *Uso e significato del termine* Θεοκίνητος, p. 245.

both his Father's and his own (ὅλον ἑαὐτὸν κενώσας πατρικῷ καὶ οἰκεί ῳ θελήματι)[97]; Christ descended to wretched people with free will and by the intent of the Father (ἑκουσίῳ θελήματι καὶ θεοῦ βουλήσει)[98]. Nevertheless, these statements are ambiguous. On the one hand, they might mean that Christ's human will was in accordance with the will of the Father; but on the other hand, they might indicate the common divine will of the Father and the Son. Therefore, Sophronius' standpoint concerning Christ's human volition is not clear. The Patriarch is more expressive in respect to Christ's divinity as an absolute principle of activity.

When Sophronius asserted that the human nature acted only by an act of divine will and not *when natural and fleshly movements wished to be moved naturally to operation*[99], he seems to claim that the human operation of Christ was deprived of volitional aspect. It leads to the conclusion that the concept of *operation* implies only the process of activity and the mode of its expression, but not to the internal impulse of activity. The Patriarch thus did not take into consideration the volitional aspect of human operation, and, as it was observed by M. Jankowiak, he did not indicate the interconnection between Miaenergism and Miatheletism[100].

e) The communion of operations as a warranty of divine-human operation. Sophronius makes distinction of the three kinds of operations in Christ: the operations befitting God, the operations befitting man, and others concerning both God and man at the same time, which are of medium disposition[101]. The Patriarch further proceeds to the more accurate statement that the latest kind of operation corresponds to the common divine-human operation, which is not the single operation, but the distinctive operation of another kind. This operation is of another grade than those: it has both the divine and human characteristics at the same time. In this context, Sophronius refers to Pseudo-Dyonysius (V-VI century), who, according to the Patriarch, through the phrase *divine-human operation* fully expressed the operations of each nature[102]. Consequently, for Sophronius, it is possible to talk of one common operation only if the existence of both divine and human operations

---

[97] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 432, 4-5.

[98] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 430, 13-15.

[99] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 450, 16: "οὐχ ὅτε αἱ φυσικαὶ κινήσεις καὶ σαρκικαὶ κινεῖσθαι φυσικῶς πρὸς ἐνέργειαν ἤθελον".

[100] Cf. Jankowiak, *The Invention of Dyotheletism*, p. 338. The *Synodicon Vetus* (131, ed. Duffy – Parker, p. 110) wrongly asserts that Sophronius proclaimed two operations and two wills of Christ.

[101] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 456, 11-15: "κἂν αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν εἰσιν θεοπρεπεῖς, αἱ δὲ οὕτω πάλιν ἀνθρωποπρεπεῖς, αἱ δὲ μέσην τινὰ τάξιν ἐπέχουσιν ὡς ἔχουσαι τὸ θεοπρεπες ἐν ταυτῷ καὶ ἀνθρώπινον, ταύτης δὲ φαμεν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ «τὴν κοινὴν καὶ θεανδρικὴν» λέγομεν «ἐνέργειαν», οὐ μίαν ὑπάρχοῦσαν, ἀλλ᾽ ἑτερογενῆ καὶ διάφορον".

[102] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 456, 17-18: "ἑκάστης οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως ἑκάστην ἐντελῶς δηλοῦσαν ἐνέργειαν".

in Christ is acknowledged. Otherwise, the divine-human operation will be only the single operation which is inadmissible. When Sophronius rejected the idea of a single combined operation emanating from the God-Logos incarnate, he followed the orientation of some pro-Chalcedonian authors[103].

In his statement on different grades of operations, Sophronius takes into consideration different aspects of Christ's hypostasis. When the Patriarch originated from the harmonious co-existence of natures in unique hypostasis, he taught of one operation in Christ: the common divine-human operation was perceived as a manifestation of Christ's whole activity, which flows from His unity. When the point of departure was diversity of natures, Sophronius emphasized two operations.

The afore-given analysis indicates that the Patriarch builds his theory in respect to operations trying to be strongly loyal to Chalcedonian expressions interpreted in the light of a Cyrillian Christology. Sophronius positions himself as a theologian loyal to Chalcedon and to Cyril, as well as an adversary of all the misinterpretations of Cyrillian Christology and all the unions concluded by their adherents[104]. The Patriarch's Chalcedonianism is manifested in his terminological precision strongly analogous to Pope Leo's understanding of Christ. Sophronius' faithfulness to Cyril demonstrates his stress on the unity of Christ's person and his activity, which was expressed in the Cyrillian terminology. In this way, on the one hand, the Patriarch applies to Leo's duality of natures and their operations; but, on the other hand, he applies Cyril's singleness of subject in Christ's activity. According to Leo, the Logos performs what belongs to the Logos, and the flesh accomplishes what is proper to the flesh[105], but they perform their activity in communion with each other[106]. According to Cyril, Christ manifests a single operation (μίαν τε καὶ συγγενῆ […] τὴν ἐνέργειαν) which proceeds from the incarnate Logos[107]; Christ operated at the same time divinely and humanly as one subject[108].

[103] Cf. Ch. Lange, *Miaenergetism – A New Term for the History of Dogma?*, StPatr 63 (2013) 333. See also O. Kashchuk, *Logos-Sarx Christology and the Sixth-Century Miaenergism*, VoxP 37 (2017) t. 67, 197-223.

[104] Cf. Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica*, ACO II/2,2, 466, 11 - 486, 16.

[105] Cf. Leo Magnus, *Epistula* 28, 4, PL 54, 767A-B: "Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est; Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est". See also idem, *Sermo* 54, 2, PL 54, 319C.

[106] Cf. idem, *Epistula* 165, 6, PL 54, 1163B: "Verbi et carnis una persona sit, quae inseparabiliter atque indivise communes habeat actiones, intelligendae tamen sunt ipsorum operum qualitates, et sincerae fidei contemplatione cernendum est, ad quae provehatur humilitas carnis, et ad quae inclinetur altitudo Deitatis: quid sit quod caro sine Verbo non agit, et quid sit quod Verbum sine carne non efficit". See also ibidem, PL 54, 1163B-C: "Sine Verbi enim potentia nec conciperet Virgo nec parert, et sine veritate carnis obvoluta pannis infantia non jaceret".

[107] Cf. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Commentarii in Joannem* IV 2, PG 73, 577C-D: "δία τῆς ἀφῆς τῆς ἁγίας σαρκὸς, μίαν τε καὶ συγγενῆ δι᾽ ἀμφοῖν ἐπιδείκνυσι τὴν ἐνέργειαν". Cf. Lange, *Miaenergetism*, p. 329.

[108] Cf. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Fragmenta in Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG 74, 1005B: "πῶς οὐκ

The scholars like C. Hovorun and D. Bathrellos claim that Sophronius sometimes regarded Christ as the subject of the human and divine actions, and other times he regarded the natures as the subjects of their proper actions[109]. Moreover, D. Bathrellos confesses that Sophronius does not explain how these subjects should be distinguished[110]. Ph. Booth derived a more general conclusion: the Patriarch attributed the operations both to the natures and to the person of the Logos; in this aspect Sophronius' position is ambiguous but nevertheless unequivocal in its refutation of Miaenergism[111].

Our conclusion in this aspect differs from that of the above-mentioned scholars. In our opinion, Sophronius' Christology in the aspect of operations is not consistent. He did not manage to combine Chalcedonian and Cyrillian Christology in this sphere. Sophronius maintains that Christ is wholly God and wholly man with human reason and mind. Accordingly, as God, Christ performed divine operations and divine volition; as a man, He performed human operations, yet the Patriarch does not admit human volition, which is an inalienable element of the human mind. In this way, the Logos was the subject of Christ's activity and the humanity appeared to be only an instrument subordinated to the Logos: the human flesh, though it was animated with the soul, which possessed reason and mind, was always controlled by the will of divinity. Thus the humanity was not the subject of Christ's human activity in the strict sense of the word. Sophronius did not take into consideration the volition of humanity of Christ and he has not yet convincingly grounded his dyenergist Christology.

3. Patriarch Sergius' reaction to Sophronius' opposition. At the close of 633, or at the beginning of 634, Sergius wrote a letter to Pope Honorius (625-638) to inform him of the situation at hand and to explain the doctrinal problems[112]. Sergius mentioned the Union, which Cyrus, encouraged by the Emperor, concluded with the adherents of Eutyches and Dioscoros, Severus and Julian[113]. Sergius stated that until now, he had not received Sophronius' *Synodica*[114]. This indicates that Patriarch Sergius presented non-convincing arguments to reach an agreement with Sophronius and was not certain concerning his position; therefore, Sergius decided to act ahead and without clear evidence.

ἐνήργηκε θεϊκῶς τε ἅμα καὶ ἀνθρωπίνως ὁ αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων καὶ ὡς ἐν ἑνὶ θεός τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπος"; idem, *Thesaurus* 24, PG 75, 393D and 400A-B. See G. Kalantzis, *Single Subjectivity and the Prosopic Union in Cyril of Alexandria and Theodore of Mopsuestia*, StPatr 48 (2010) 61.

[109] Cf. Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ*, p. 179-180; Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, p. 142.

[110] Cf. Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ*, p. 180.

[111] Cf. Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 237.

[112] Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 534, 1 - 546, 25. See also Grumel, *Regestes*, 291, p. 219-220.

[113] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 536, 15 - 538, 7.

[114] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 538, 9-10.

Sergius mentioned that Sophronius, who recently became the patriarch of Jerusalem, had been present in Alexandria and had opposed the statement on one operation of Christ and had also maintained the view of two operations[115]; he also insisted on removing the phrase *one operation* after the concluding the Pact[116]. Sergius in his letter argued before the Pope that owing to the Pact the name of Pope Leo and the Council of Chalcedon were acknowledged by the Church of Alexandria and its provinces[117]. Moreover, Sergius kept claiming that this dispute was only over words, but the Pact itself was a very significant achievement. Sergius asserted also that according to Cyrus, as the author of the Pact of Union, the Fathers for the sake of salvation would have been satisfied to hear of an agreement in analogous situation without undermining the accuracy of the dogma of the Church. Moreover, some of the Fathers applied the phrase *one operation*[118]. Sergius stated also that Sophronius had not managed to supply the testimonies of the Fathers on the existence of the two operations in Christ[119].

Then Sergius, in order to avoid contention and the arising of a new heresy, made efforts to silence the dispute over the words (λογομαχία). He wrote to Cyrus that after the Pact the phrases either *two operations* or *one operation* should not be proposed[120]. The phrase *one operation* (μιᾶς ἐνεργείας φωνήν), though was used by some of the Fathers, still is alien to many Christians and confuses their ears[121]. Likewise, the mention of the two operations scandalizes many people on the grounds that such a phrase was not uttered by the Church teachers[122]. Sergius asserts that the well-tried phrases of the Fathers and the synodical definitions, which were not occasionally expressed by the Fathers, but exactly in this context, and which were unambiguous should be applied[123]. The expression *two operations*, according to the Patriarch, was not uttered by the Fathers, therefore the teaching on two operations cannot be exposed as the dogma of the Church[124]. Sergius addressed also the Emperor that there is no need to scrutinize this question but the well-tried terms of the Fathers should be retained[125]. Such position of the Patriarch was a mere simplification of the issue.

Patriarch Sergius maintains that instead of mention of one or two operations, it is necessary to confess, as the holy Synods teach, that one and the

[115] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 538, 8-14.
[116] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 540, 6-8.
[117] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 540, 7-13.
[118] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 538, 15 - 540, 2.
[119] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 540, 14-19.
[120] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 540, 19 - 542, 3.
[121] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 542, 7-9.
[122] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 542, 11-16.
[123] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 544, 9-13: "τετριμμέναις μᾶλλον τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων φωναῖς καὶ συνοδικῶς ὡρισμέναις".
[124] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 544, 12-16.
[125] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 546, 10-12.

same Son operates both divine and human acts. The whole of Christ's activity is befitting God and man and proceeds without division from one and the same incarnate Logos and is to be referred to one and the same Logos[126]. Sergius thus emphasized the oneness of subject in Christ and pointed that his understanding of Christ's activity was Logos-centric. Sergius expressed the same idea in the second letter to Cyrus, written after the synod in Alexandria (633) but before the letter to Honorius: therein Sergius used the phrase *one operation* in respect to Christ's activity[127]. Nevertheless, to root his teaching in patristic tradition, Sergius in the letter to Cyrus and in the letter to Honorius, refers to the known passage of Pope Leo that *both natures operate what is proper to them in communion with each other*[128]. He seems to stress Leo's phrase *in communion with each other* as indicating to union.

D. Bathrellos draws attention that according to the text edited by Giovanni Domenico Mansi (1692-1769), Sergius in his second epistle to Cyrus cites the formula of Leo using the dative case instead of the nominative for the words *both natures* (ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ)[129]. It means that Christ performs his acts by each of the two natures in communion with the other. So Christ is clearly the subject of the actions and the natures become merely the instruments through which Christ performs the actions. Thus, the divine works and the human works are performed through the single operation.

a) From simplification to Miatheletism. Patriarch Sergius proceeded from the question of operation to the question of volition. For Sergius, talking of two operations leads to the conclusion that there are two wills in mutual conflict (δύο … θελήματα ἐναντίως πρὸς ἄλληλα ἔχοντα), so that while God the Logos wills (θέλοντος) to perform salutary passion, his human nature opposes and resists His will. Accordingly, this indicates that the two willing subjects are contrary (δύο … τοὐναντία θέλοντας)[130]. For it is impossible that in the one and the same subject (ὑποκειμένῳ) subsist the two contrary wills at the same time (δύο ἅμα καὶ κατὰ ταυτὸν <ἐναντία> ὑφεστάναι

[126] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 542, 4-7: "ἐνεργεῖν … τάτε θεῖα καὶ ἀνθρώπινα, καὶ πᾶσαν θεωπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρωποπρεπῆ ἐνέργειαν ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεσαρκωμένου Θεοῦ λόγου ἀδιαιρέτως προϊέναι, καὶ εἰς ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀναφέρεσθαι". See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 546, 13-15.

[127] Cf. idem, *Epistola II ad Cyrum*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/1, Berolini 1984, 136, 36-38: "καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν ἐνεργεῖν τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα, μιᾷ ἐνεργείᾳ. πᾶσα γὰρ θεία τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐνέργεια ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεσαρκωμένου λόγου προήρχετο".

[128] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/1, 136, 38 - 138, 12; idem, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 546, 15-17. See Leo Magnus, *Epistula* 28, 4, PL 54, 767A-B: "Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est; Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est".

[129] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistola II ad Cyrum*, Mansi X 973C. The critical edition of R. Riedinger (ACO II/1, 138, 1) cites the formula of Leo in the proper form. See Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ*, p. 178-179.

[130] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 542, 11-16.

θελήματα)[131]. In this way Sergius clearly conjoins the operation to the will. Such a tactic laid the basis for Miatheletism: if the two operations imply that the two wills are contrary to each other, then there must be only one operation and one will in Christ.

The conviction concerning the single will in Christ is associated with the idea that Christ's humanity was absolutely controlled by the Logos. According to Sergius, the flesh (or body) of Christ, that is His human nature, never separately and of its own impulse performed the natural motions in opposition to the will of the Logos hypostatically united to it, but whenever and however and to whatever extent God the Word himself willed it[132]. The Logos thus is an absolute principle of Christ's activity – divine and human.

Patriarch Sergius makes an analogy between the status of the human body being ruled by the rational and spiritual soul on the one hand and the status of the human condition of Christ being ruled by his divinity on the other hand. Such hypothesis has some inconsistencies. It deprives Christ's human nature of the act of a rational soul and of the act of a human free will, and as a result, of its internal motions, since according to Sergius, the human nature of Christ was wholly moved by God (θεοκίνητον)[133]. Christ's humanity, thus, was only a passive element[134]. In this way Sergius refutes the internal impulse of human nature in Christ since it would lead to the opposition in Christ. Accordingly, the Patriarch could not admit that Christ had human will.

Sergius refers to the fragment of Gregory of Nyssa (c. 335-394), who claimed that Christ operated passions through the human nature, because divinity does operate through body, so the passion belongs to flesh and the operation to divinity[135]. Sergius' arguments are not convincing, since Gregory of Nyssa did not build his assertion in this context: his purpose was to argue that neither the pre-existent Logos had properties of the flesh, nor the flesh had properties of divinity. Moreover, Sergius is contrary to his own proposition to use the phrases uttered in a proper context. Thus, the Patriarch was not

---

[131] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 542, 16-17. See also ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 542, 5-7 and ACO II/2,2, 542, 12-13.

[132] Cf. ibidem, ACO II/2,2, 542, 18-21: "κεχωρισμένως καὶ ἐξ οἰκείας ὁρμῆς ἐναντίως τῷ νεύματι τοῦ ἡνωμένου αὐτῇ καθ' ὑπόστασιν θεοῦ λόγου τὴν φυσικὴν … ποιήσασθαι κίνησιν, ἀλλ' ὁπότε καὶ οἵαν καὶ ὅσην αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς λόγος ἐβούλετο". See Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom*, p. 149.

[133] Cf. Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ACO II/2,2, 542, 21 - 544, 3: "καὶ, σαφῶς εἰπεῖν, ὃν τρόπον τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἡμέτερον ἡγεμονεύεται, καὶ κοσμεῖται, καὶ τάττεται ὑπὸ τῆς νοερᾶς καὶ λογικῆς ἡμῶν ψυχῆς, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ ὅλον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ σύγκριμα ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου θεότητος ἀεὶ καὶ ἐν πάσιν ἀγόμενον θεοκίνητον ἦν, κατὰ τὸν Νύσσης Γρηγόριον".

[134] Cf. P. Parente, *Uso e significato del termine* Θεοκίνητος, p. 243.

[135] Cf. Gregorius Nyssenus, *Contra Eunomium* 6, PG 45, 713A = ACO II/2,2, 544, 6-8: "ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἡ θεότης διὰ τοῦ περὶ αὐτὴν σώματος τὴν τοῦ παντὸς σωτηρίαν, ὡς εἶναι τῆς μὲν σαρκὸς τὸ πάθος, τοῦ δὲ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν".

consistent in his Christology in respect of Christ's volition and he has not convincingly grounded his miaenergist Christology.

***

Sophronius and Sergius in effect expressed the same belief in one activity of Christ: human activity of Christ, defined by Sophronius as human operation was regarded by Sergius as natural human motions. Both Patriarchs claimed that human acts of Christ were controlled by his divinity. Accordingly, the dispute was not over Christology. The difference between the teaching of both Patriarchs, thus, seemed to consist in the sphere of terminology[136]. Sergius, indeed, attempted to convince that it was a mere discussion over phrases. Nevertheless, the arguments of the Patriarch were not convincing. Sergius often applied to *well-tried doctrine* of the Fathers, but he did not refer to precise patristic testimonies. His statement that the Fathers did not talk of two operations, because it would have led to the two wills, does not correspond to the testimonies themselves. For example, Ambrose (337-397) claimed that there is another will of God and another will of human being in Christ[137]; to the human nature of Christ befits human will[138]. According to Augustine (354-430), Christ as a genuine human being also had human motions of the soul[139]; the humanity of Christ was endowed with a will. Augustinus comments that Christ's Prayer in Gethsemane is a proof of His human will[140]. Although the contexts of the fourth-century Latin and the seventh-century Greek inquiry into the question of the will were different, nevertheless the testimonies of the above-mentioned Latin fathers had value as an argument during the Miathelite controversy[141].

Sergius' insistence on the prohibition of the dispute reveals that he might be conscious of the insufficiency of his arguments and of the adequateness

[136] Cf. Price, *Monotheletism*, p. 223; Booth, *Crisis of Empire*, p. 218.

[137] Cf. Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *De fide* II 7, 52, PL 16, 570B: "Una ergo voluntas, ubi una operatio; in Deo enim voluntatis series operationis effectus est. Sed alia voluntas hominis, alia Dei". See also ibidem II 7, 53, PL 16, 570C: "Suscepit ergo voluntatem meam, suscepit tristitiam meam. […] Mea est voluntas quam suam dixit; quia ut homo suscepit tristitiam meam, ut homo locutus est; et ideo ait: Non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu vis (Mt 26, 39)".

[138] Cf. ibidem II 5, 45, PL 16, 568C - 569A: "Eousque autem hominem, quem veritate corporis demonstrabat, aequabat affectu, ut diceret: «Sed tamen non sicut ego uolo, sed sicut tu uis» (Mt 26, 39)".

[139] Cf. Augustinus, *De civitate Dei* XIV 9, 21, ed. E. Hoffmann, CSEL 40/2, Lipsiae 1900, 21, 12-14: "Neque enim , in quo verum erat hominis corpus et verus hominis animus, falsus erat humanus adfectus". See also ibidem, CSEL 40/2, 21, 5-22.

[140] Cf. idem, *Epistula* 130, 14, 26, ed. Al. Goldbacher, CSEL 44, Lipsiae 1904, 71, 4-9: "nam et huius modi exemplum praebuit nobis ille mediator, qui cum dixisset: Pater, si fieri potest transeat a me calix iste, humanam in se voluntatem ex hominis susceptione transformans continuo subiecit: Verum non quod ego volo, sed quod tu vis, pater. Unde merito per unius oboedientiam iusti constituuntur multi".

[141] Cf. J. Börjesson, *Augustine on the Will*, in: *The Oxford handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, p. 217-219.

of the arguments of the adversaries. Therefore he preferred to smother the discussion than to deepen it. The *Psephos* appears to indicate that Sergius did not wish to enter into discussions which would inevitably have revealed the real doctrinal inconsistency. The Patriarch, thus, changed his tactics expressed in the letter to Cyrus of 626, wherein he claimed that it is necessary to follow the dogmas of the Fathers, not only according to their idea (ἔννοιαν) but also according to the phrases (φωναῖς)[142].

Such an approach to the concept of Christ's activity is oversimplification of the issue. The Patriarch's new tactics to appease the discussion initiated a prolonged and ardent misunderstanding concerning human operation and will in Christ: it resulted in the ambiguity and the lack of precision. Sergius seemed to be ready to sacrifice the doctrinal precision for the sake of ecclesiastical union. Our conclusions here both agree and argue with the conclusions of F.-M. Léthel. The scholar makes the distinction between the Byzantine Miatheletism, the Miaphysite Miatheletism, and the Miatheletism of propaganda. The *Psephos* of Patriarch Sergius is regarded by the scholar as an expression of the Byzantine Miatheletism. For F.-M. Léthel, the Miatheletism of Sergius at this stage was absolutely irreproachable from the point of view of Orthodoxy. Nevertheless, in our opinion, it is impossible to draw any certain conclusions on the basis of *Psephos*, because the text of the document is not preserved. Moreover, Sergius' Miatheletism was not irreproachable from the point of view of Orthodoxy, since he deliberately did not admit the other state of human will apart from will contaminated with the sin of Adam, which has an inclination to be contrary to the will of God. Accordingly, the *Psephos* initiated another version of Miatheletism, namely that of propaganda which, in opinion of F.-M. Léthel, attached importance mainly to the affirmation of a single will, not being preoccupied with the doctrinal coherence[143]. Patriarch Sergius' Miatheletism, thus, was not convincing and coherent doctrine.

For Sophronius, the exactness in terminology appears to reflect the principle of loyalty to Chalcedon. While he was at Constantinople, he agreed to the proposition of Patriarch Sergius to appease the dispute over words. After Sophronius had come to Palestine, where the consciousness of loyalty to Chalcedon flourished, he returned to the precision of Chalcedonian terminology. He was inclined to regard the Alexandrian Pact of Union as the doctrinal compromise.

From the *Libellus* of Stephanus of Dora we know that Stephanus was sent by Sophronius to Rome to convince the Pope of the danger of the new doctrine through letter and personally[144]. After Sophronius' emissaries had met the Pope,

---

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

[143] Cf. Léthel, *Théologie de L'Agonie du Christ*, p. 26-27.

[144] Cf. Stephanus Dorensis, *Libellus*, ACO II/1, 40, 13-17. The more information on the mission see ibidem, ACO II/1, 40, 11 - 42, 20.

they promised that their Patriarch would stop proclaiming *two operations* if Cyrus would stop talking of one operation[145]. That was the chance to silence the confrontation. It reveals that Sophronius was not the ardent adherent of *two operations*, but he was the decisive adversary of *one operation*, which he perceived as the threat for Chalcedonian Orthodoxy. Nevertheless, the agreement was not kept.

Immediately after 633 the tension between Sergius' ambiguity and Sophronius' exactness in terminology turned to be a significant crisis[146], which was a part of a sociocultural problem of the Byzantine world. The tension cannot be explained only within the framework of theology and politics. This issue needs further well-grounded analysis.

(Summary)

The scholars who examined the Miaenergist confrontation focused their attention on the different aspects of the controversy. The purpose of the article is to understand whether the sociocultural matter could also be covered in confrontation between Sophronius of Jerusalem and Sergius of Constantinople. Sophronius' views were formed in the circle of the Palestinian monasticism, which was strongly loyal to the verbal confession of two-nature Chalcedonian Christology. Accordingly, he expressed his protest against the statement on one operation in Christ. In response, Sergius of Constantinople developed his tactics in order to defend the stance of the Church and Court of Constantinople. As a result, a significant tension between the both Patriarchs arose.

SOFRONIUSZ, MNICH PALESTYŃSKI, WOBEC MONOENERGIZMU. NAPIĘCIE MIĘDZY PRECYZJĄ A DWUZNACZNOŚCIĄ

(Streszczenie)

Autorzy, którzy badali spór wokół chrystologicznej doktryny monoenergetyzmu, zwrócili uwagę na różne aspekty kontrowersji. Celem artykułu jest zrozumienie czy kwestia społeczno-kulturowa może być również przedmiotem konfrontacji między Sofroniuszem z Jerozolimy a Sergiuszem z Konstantynopola. Poglądy Sofroniusza zostały uformowane w tradycji monastycyzmu palestyńskiego, który był wierny wobec dosłownego wyznania chalcedońskiej chrystologii dwóch natur. W związku z tym wyraził on swój protest przeciwko stwierdzeniu o jednym działaniu w Chrystusie. W odpowiedzi Sergiusz z Konstantynopola opracował swoją taktykę, aby bronić stanowiska Konstantynopolitańskiego Koś-

[145] Cf. Honorius, *Epistula II ad Sergium*, ACO II/2,2, 624, 16-20.

[146] Cf. George of Resh'aina, *An Early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor* 7-16, transl. S. Brock, AnBol 91 (1973) fasc. 3, 315-317.

cioła i rządu. W konsekwencji powstało napięcie między dwoma patriarchami. Artykuł analizuje szczegóły konfrontacji..

Key words: Sophronius of Jerusalem, Sergius of Constantinople, Miaenergism, Miatheletism, Church.

Słowa kluczowe: Sofroniusz z Jerozolimy, Sergiusz z Konstantynopola, monoenergizm, monoteletyzm, Kościół.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *De fide*, PL 16, 549A - 726D.
Augustinus, *De civitate Dei* (Libri XIV-XXII), ed. E. Hoffmann, CSEL 40/2, Lipsiae 1900.
Augustinus, *Epistulae* (124-184A), ed. Al. Goldbacher, CSEL 44, Lipsiae 1904.
Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Commentarii in Joannem*, PG 73 (libri I-VI); PG 74, 9A - 104C (fragmenta librorum VII et VIII); PG 74, 105A - 756C (libri IX-XII).
Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Fragmenta in Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, PG 74, 953A - 1005C.
Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Thesaurus*, PG 75, 24A - 656D.
Cyrus, *Epistula II ad Sergium*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 592, 6 - 594, 15.
Evagrius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez – L. Parmentier, London 1898.
George of Resh'aina, *An Early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor*, transl. S. Brock, AnBol 91 (1973) fasc. 3, 299-346.
Gregorius Nyssenus, *Contra Eunomium*, PG 45, 709A - 1122B.
Gregorius Nyssenus, *Epistulae*, PG 37, 21A - 388B.
Honorius, *Epistula ad Sergium*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 548, 1- 558, 8.
Honorius, *Epistula II ad Sergium*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 620, 20 - 624, 20.
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.
Leo Magnus, *Epistulae*, PL 54, 581-1218.
Leo Magnus, *Sermones*, PL 54, 137-463.
Maximus Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG 91, 288-353.
Pseudo-Iustinus, *Expositio rectae fidei*, PG 6, 1207A - 1240D.
Satisfactio facta inter Cyrum et eos qui erant ex parte Theodosianorum, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 594, 17 - 600, 20.
Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Cyrum*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 528, 1 - 530, 24.
Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistula ad Honorium*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 534, 1- 546, 25.
Sergius Constantinopolitanus, *Epistola II ad Cyrum*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/1, Berolini 1984, 134, 31 - 138, 37.
Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Epistula synodica ad Sergium Constantinopolitanum*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/2,2, Berolini 1992, 410, 13 - 494, 9.
Stephanus Dorensis, *Libellus*, ed. R. Riedinger, ACO II/1, Berolini 1984, 38, 4 - 46, 36.
Synodicon Vetus, ed. and English transl. J. Duffy – J. Parker, CFHB 15, Washington 1979.

Literature

Allen P., *Life and Times of Maxius the Confessor*, in: *The Oxford handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, ed. P. Allen – B. Neil, Oxford 2015, 3-18.

Bathrellos D., *The Byzantine Christ. Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of Saint Maximus the Confessor*, New York 2004.

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.

Börjesson J., *Augustine on the Will*, in: *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, ed. P. Allen and B. Neil, Oxford 2015, 212-234.

Bralewski S., *Kościół bizantyński przed podbojem arabskim. Historyczno-teologiczne aspekty podziałów w kościołach wschodnich*, in: *Bizancjum i Arabowie. Spotkanie cywilizacji VI-VIII wiek*, ed. T. Wolińska – P. Filipczak, Warszawa 2015, 177-229.

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.

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.

Hatlie P., *A Rough-Guide to Byzantine Monasticism in the Early Seventh Century*, in: *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641): Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. G.J. Reinink – B.H. Stolte, Leuven – Paris – Dudley 2002, 205-226.

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

Hovorun C., *Controversy on Energies and Wills in Christ: Between Politics and Theology*, StPatr 48 (2010) 217-220.

Hovorun C., *Will, Action and Freedom. Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century*, The Medieval Mediterranean 77, Leiden – Boston 2008.

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

Introduction, in: *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy. The 'Synodical Letter' and Other Documents*, ed. and transl. P. Allen, Oxford – New York 2009, 3-64.

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

Kalantzis G., *Single Subjectivity and the Prosopic Union in Cyril of Alexandria and Theodore of Mopsuestia*, StPatr 48 (2010) 59-64.

Kashchuk O., *Logos-Sarx Christology and the Sixth-Century Miaenergism*, VoxP 37 (2017) t. 67, 197-223.

Lampe G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1969.

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

Léthel F.-M., *Théologie de l'agonie du Christ. La liberté humaine du Fils de Dieu et son importance sotériologique mises en lumière par saint Maxime le Confesseur*, Théologie Historique 52, Paris 1979.

Markesinis B., *Les débuts du monoénergisme. Rectifications concernant ce qui s'est passé entre Cyrus d'Alexandrie, Serge de Constantinople et S. Sophrone de Jérusalem*, AnBol 133 (2015) 5-22.

Morgan G., *Byzantium*, Aylesbury 2007, 74-75.

Parente P., *Uso e significato del* Θεοκίνητος *nella controversia monotelitica*, REB 11 (1953) 241-251.

Patrich J., *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism. A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries*, Washington 1995.

Perrone L., *La Chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche. Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Constantinopoli (553)*, Brescia 1980.

Perrone L., *Rejoice Sion, Mother of all Churches': Christianity in the Holy Land during the Byzantine Era*, in: *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land. From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*, ed. O. Limor – G.G. Stroumsa, Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 5, Turnhout 2006, 139-171.

Price R., *Monotheletism: A Heresy or a Form of Words?*, StPatr 48 (2010) 221-232.

Schönborn Ch., *Sophrone de Jérusalem. Vie monastique et confession dogmatique*, Théologie Historique 20, Paris 1972.