



Leo the Great: letters 1020

Letter XX. To Eutyches, an Abbot of Constantinople.

1020

Leo, the bishop, to his dearly-beloved son, Eutyches, presbyter.

(He thanks him for his information about the revival of Nestorianism and commends his zeal.

You have brought to our knowledge, beloved, by your letter that through the activity of some¹ the heresy of Nestorius has been again reviving. We reply that your solicitude in this matter has pleased us, since the remarks we have received are an indication of your mind. Wherefore do not doubt that the Lord, the Founder of the catholic Faith, will befriend you in all things. And when we have been able to ascertain more fully by whose wickedness this happens, we must make provision with the help of God for the complete uprooting of this poisonous growth which has long ago been condemned). God keep thee safe, my beloved son. Dated 1st June, in the consulship of the illustrious Postumianus and Zeno (448).

¹ Quesnel is of opinion that Eutyches' letter had accused Domnus, Bishop of Antioch and Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus (cf. Lett.CXX., chapters iv and v), of Nestorianizing, and that he thus had gained the approbation of Leo before his own unsoundness had been made known.

Letter XXI. From Eutyches to Leo¹.

1021

I. He States His Account of the Proceedings at the Synod.

God the Word is before all else my witness, being confident of my hope and faith in Christ the Lord and God of all, and discerning the proof of my holding the truth in these matters: but I call on your holiness, too, to bear witness to my heart and to the reasonableness of my opinions and words. But the wicked devil has exercised his evil influence upon my zeal and determination, whereby his power ought to have been destroyed. Whereupon he has exerted all his proper power and aroused Eusebius, bishop of the town of Dorylaeum, against me, who presented an allegation² to the holy bishop of the church in Constantinople, Flavian, and to certain others whom he found in the same city assembled on various matters of their own: in this he called me heretic, not raising any true accusation but contriving destruction for me and disturbance for the churches of God.

Their holinesses summoned me to reply to his accusation: but though I was delayed by a serious illness besides my advanced age, I came to clear myself, knowing well that a faction had been formed against my safety. And, indeed, together with a writ of appeal³ to which my signature was appended, I offered them a statement showing my confession upon the holy Faith. But when the holy Flavian did not receive the document, nor order it to be read, yet heard me in reply utter word for word that Faith which was put forth at Nicaea by the holy Synod, and confirmed at Ephesus, I was required to acknowledge two natures, and to anathematize those who denied this. But I, fearing the decision of the synod, and not wishing either to take away or to add one word contrary to the Faith put forth by the holy Synod of Nicaea, knowing, too, that our holy and blessed fathers and bishops Julius, Felix, Athanasius, and Gregorius⁴ rejected the phrase "two natures," and not daring to discuss the nature of God the Word, who came into flesh in the last days entering the womb of the holy virgin Mary unchangeably as he willed and knew, becoming man in reality, not in fancy, nor yet venturing to anathematize our aforesaid Fathers, I asked them to let your holiness know these things, that you might judge what seemed right to you, undertaking by all means to follow your ruling.

II. His Explanations Were Allowed No Hearing.

But without listening to any thing which I said, they broke up the Synod and published the sentence of my degradation, which they were getting ready against me before the inquiry. So much slander were they factiously making up against me that even my safety would have been endangered had not the help of God at the intercession of your holiness quickly snatched me from the assault of military force. Then they began to force the heads of other monasteries⁵ to subscribe to my degradation (a thing which was never done either towards those who have professed themselves heretics, nor even against Nestorius himself), insomuch that when to reassure the people I tried to set forth⁶ statements of my faith, not only did they, who were plotting the aforesaid faction against me, prevent them being heard, but also seized them that straightway I might be held a heretic before all.

III. He Appeals to Leo for Protection.

I take refuge, therefore, with you the defender of religion and abhorrer of such factions, bringing in even still nothing strange against the faith as it was originally handed down to us, but anathematizing Apollinaris, Valentinus, Manes, and Nestorius, and those who say that the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour, descended from heaven and not from the Holy Ghost and from the holy Virgin, along with all heresies down to Simon Magus. Yet nevertheless I stand in jeopardy of my life as a heretic. I beseech you not to be prejudiced against me by their insidious designs about me, but to pronounce the sentence which shall seem to you right upon the Faith, and in future not to allow any slander to be uttered against me by this faction, nor let one be expelled and banished from the number of the orthodox who has spent his seventy years of life in continence and all chastity, so that at the very end of life he should suffer shipwreck. I have subjoined to this my letter both documents, that which was presented by my accuser at the Synod, and that which was brought by me but not received, as well as the statement of my faith and those things which have been decreed upon the two natures by our holy Fathers⁷).

Eutyches' Confession of Faith.

I call upon you before God, who gives life to all things, and Christ Jesus, who witnessed that good confession under Pontius Pilate, that you do nothing by favour. For I have held the same as my forefathers and from my boyhood have been illuminated by the same Faith as that which was laid down by the holy Synod of 318 most blessed bishops who were gathered at Nicaea from the whole world, and which was confirmed and ratified afresh for sole acceptance by the holy Synod assembled at Ephesus: and I have never thought otherwise than as the right and only true orthodox Faith has enjoined. And I agree to everything that was laid down about the same Faith by the same holy Synod: of which Synod the leader and chief was Cyril of blessed memory bishop of the Alexandrians, the partner and sharer in the preaching and in the Faith of those saints and elect of God, Gregory the greater, and the other Gregory⁸ , Basil, Athanasius, Atticus and Proclus. Him and all of them I have held orthodox and faithful, and have honoured as saints, and have esteemed my masters. But I utter an anathema on Nestorius, Apollinaris, and all heretics down to Simon, and those who say that the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ came down from heaven. For He who is the Word of God came down from heaven without flesh and was made flesh in the holy Virgin's womb unchangeably and unalterably as He Himself knew and willed. And He who was always perfect God before the ages, was also made perfect man in the end of the days for us and for our salvation. This my full profession may your holiness consider.

I, Eutyches, presbyter and archimandrite, have subscribed to this statement with my own hand.

1 Contrary to my general plan, I have thought it wiser, in the matter of the Eutychian controversy, to include other than Leo's own writings, that the reader may fulfil the precept *audi alteram partem* in what was the most important doctrinal discussion of Leo's term of office. This Letter (XXI). bears the stamp of genuineness upon it, though the Gk. original is not found. It is from a collection of documents bearing on Nestorianism published *ex ms. Casinensi*, first by Christianus Lupus (?), and afterwards by Stephanus Baluzius (1630-1718)).

2 See introduction, p. 7,

3 *Libelli sc. (appellationis ad Leonem)*: this is referred to by Flavian (Lett XXVI., chap. iii). and denied.

4 Of these four worthies, *Athanasius*; is too well known to need further notice). *Gregorius* is either Greg. Nazianzen, Bishop of Constantinople (circ. 380) or Greg. of Nyssa, both great champions of the Church against Arianism (*not*, as the Ball., Greg. Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neo-Coesarea 244-70): *Julius* was a Bishop of Rome (337-52): an excerpt from one of his letters is printed by the Ball. at the end of this letter as the passage on which Eutyches based his error, though they suspect it (not unnaturally) as being an Apollinarian imposition: *Felix* is probably no other than the Arian Bishop of Rome, Felix II. . (355-8) whose appointment is characterized by Athanasius as effected "by antichristian wickedness," but who is yet a canonized saint and martyr of the Roman Church (see (Schaff's Hist., vol. 2, p. 371; 3,635, 6).

5 Abbots' signatures are found attached to the condemnation of Eutyches by the synod of Constantinople.

6 Cf. Letter XXVI., chap. ii., *propositiones iniuriarum publice ponens et maledictionibus plenas* Gr). *proqemeta u(bre" kai; loio;oriva" ajnavmesta)* which is flavian's account of the matter.

7 Of these four documents (1) Eusebius' *libellus* is preserved in, Act I Chalcedon; (2) is not forthcoming; (3) is appended below; and (4) a fragment of the testimony of Julius, which is given, does not seem important enough to be added in this edition especially as its genuineness is denied).

8 Here we have the two Gregoryses mentioned: cf. n. 7. above.

Letter XXII1 . The First from Flavian, Bp. Of Constantinople to Pope Leo.

1022

To the most holy and God-loving father and fellow-bishop, Leo, Flavian greeting in the Lord.

I. The Designs of the Devil Have Led Eutyches Astray.

There is nothing which can stay the devil's wickedness, that "restless evil, full of deadly poison2 ." Above and below it "goes about," seeking "whom it may" strike, dismay, and "devour3 ." Whence to watch, to be sober unto prayer, to draw near to God, to eschew foolish questionings, to follow the fathers and not to go beyond the eternal bounds, this we have learnt from Holy Writ. And so I give up the excess of grief and abundant tears over the capture of one of the clergy who are under me, and whom I could not save nor snatch from the wolf, although I was ready to lay down my life for him. How was he caught, how did he leap away, hating the voice of the caller and turning aside also from the memory of the Fathers and thoroughly detesting their paths. And thus I proceed with my account.

II. The Seductions of Heretics Capture the Unwary.

There are some "in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves4 :" whom we know by their fruit. These men seem indeed at first to be of us, but they are not of us: "for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us5 ." But when they have spewed out their impiety, throwing out the guile that is in them, and seizing the weaker ones, and those who have their senses unpractised in the divine utterances, they carry them along with themselves to destruction, wresting and doing despite to the Fathers' doctrines, just as they do the Holy Scriptures also to their own destruction: whom we must be forewarned of and take heed lest some should be misled by their wickedness and shaken in their firmness. "For they have sharpened their tongues like serpents: adder's poison is under their lips6 ," as the prophet has cried out about them.

III. Eutyches' Heresy Stated.

Such a one, therefore, has now shown himself amongst us, Eutyches, for many years a presbyter and archimandrite7 , pretending to hold the same belief as ours, and to have the right Faith in him: indeed he resists the blasphemy of Nestorius, and feigns a controversy with him, but the exposition of the Faith composed by the 318 holy fathers, and the letter that Cyril of holy memory wrote to Nestorius, and one by the same author on the same subject to the Easterns, these writings, to which all have given their assent, he has tried to upset, and revive the old evil dogmas of the blasphemous Valentinus and Apollinaris. He has not feared the warning of the True King: "Whoso shall cause one of the least of these little ones to stumble, it was better that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depth of the sea8 " But casting away all shame, and shaking off the cloak which covered his error9 , he openly in our holy synod persisted in saying that our Lord Jesus Christ ought not to be understood by us as having two natures after His incarnation in one substance and in one person: nor yet that the Lord's flesh was of the same substance with us, as if assumed from us and united to God the Word hypostatically: but he said that the Virgin who bare him was indeed of the same substance with us according to the flesh, but the Lord Himself did not assume from her flesh of the same substance with us: but the Lord's body was not a man's body, although that which issued from the Virgin was a human body. resisting all the expositions of the holy Fathers.

IV. He Has Sent Leo the Minutes of Their Proceedings that He May See All the Details.

But not to make my letter too long by detailing everything, we have sent your holiness the proceedings which some time since we took in the matter: therein we deprived him as convicted on these charges, of his priesthood, of the management of his monastery and of our communion: in order that your holiness also knowing the facts of his case may make his wickedness manifest to all the God-loving bishops who are under your reverence; lest perchance if they do not know the views which he holds, and of which he has been openly convicted, they may be found to be in correspondence with him as a fellow-believer by letter or by other means. I and those who are with me give much greeting to you and to all the brotherhood in Christ. The Lord keep you in safety and prayer for us, O most God-Loving Father10

1 There are two Latin versions of the original Gk. of this letter, an older and later: the later, as being more accurate, is here translated, though Canon Bright would seem to be right (n. 139) in saying that we must think of Leo as writing the Tome (Lett. XXVIII). with the older Latin version of Flavian's letter before him.'

2 [Jc 3,8.](#)

3 [1P 5,8.](#)

4 [Mt 7,15.](#)

5 [Jn 2,19.](#)

6 [Ps 140,3,](#)

7 Viz., head of a monastery (Gk. mavndra) or abbot).

8 [Mt 18,6,](#) but it will be noticed that the quotation is confused with 25,40, *minimis* being substituted for *qui in me credunt*.

9 *Pudorem* (instead of the *impudenter* of the mss.) *omnem abiciens et pellem quoe eum circumdabat excutiens*, the Gk. version of this somewhat obscure passage running *aijdw` pa` san ajpobalw;n kai; h]n perievkeito th` " plavn" dora;n ajpotinaxavmeno"* .

10 This was the letter "which was somewhat unaccountably delayed in its transit to Rome" (Bright), which reached Leo after XXIII. was written, and to which Leo refers in the Tome, chap. i., *litteris, quas miramur fuisse tam seras*. Bright's note 139 should be read throughout as a clear exposition of the preliminary steps in the controversy.

Letter XXIII. To Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople.

1023

To his well-beloved brother Flavian the bishop, Leo the bishop.

I. He Complains that Flavian Has Not Sent Him a Full Account of Eutyches' Case.

Seeing that our most Christian and merciful Emperor, in his holy and praiseworthy faith and anxiety for the peace of the Catholic Church, has sent us a letter¹ upon the matters which have roused the din of disturbance among you, we wonder, brother, that you have been able to keep silence to us upon the scandal that has been caused, and that you did not rather take measures for our being at once informed by your own report, that we might not have any doubt about the truth of the case. For we have received a document from the presbyter Eutyches², who complains that on the accusation of bishop Eusebius he has been wrongfully deprived of communion, notwithstanding that he says he attended your summons and did not refuse his presence: and moreover asserts that he presented a deed of appeal in the very court, which was however not accepted: whereupon he was forced to put forth letters of defence³ in the city of Constantinople. Pending which matter we do not yet know with what justice he has been separated from the communion of the Church. But having regard to the importance of the matter, we wish to know the reason of your action and to have the whole thing brought to our knowledge: for we, who desire the judgments of the Lord's priests to be deliberate, cannot without information decide one way or another, until we have all the proceedings accurately before us.

II. And Now Demands It.

And therefore, brother, signify to us in a full account by the hand of the most fit and competent person, what innovation has arisen against the ancient faith, which needed to be corrected by so severe a sentence. For both the moderation of the Church and the devout faith of our most godly prince insist upon our showing much anxiety for the peace of Christendom: that dissensions may be cleared away and the Catholic Faith kept unimpaired, and that those whose faith has been proved may be fortified by our authority, when those who maintain what is wrong have been recalled from their error. And no difficulty can arise on this side, since the said presbyter has professed himself by his own statement, ready to be corrected if anything be found in him worthy of rebuke. For it beseems us in such matters to take every precaution that charity be kept and the Truth defended without the din of strife. And therefore because you see, beloved, that we are anxious about so great a matter, hasten to inform us of everything in as full and clear a manner as possible (for this ought to have been done before), lest in the cross-statements of both sides we be misled by some uncertainty, and the dissension, which ought to be stifled in its infancy, be fostered for our heart is impressed by God's inspiration with the need of saving from violation by anyone's misinterpretation those constitutions of the venerable fathers which have received Divine ratification and belong to the groundwork of the Faith). God keep thee safe, dear brother. Dated 18 February (449), in the consulship of the illustrious Asturius and Protogenes.

1 This letter from Theodosius II. came soon after Eutyches, letter (XXI), and "apparently gave Leo the impression, that Eutyches had been badly treated." Bright.

2 See Letter XXI., above.

3 *contestatorios libellos*. See Lett. XXI., chap. 2,

Letter XXIV. To Theodosius Augustus II.

1024

Leo the bishop, to Theodosius Augustus.

I. He Praises the Emperor's Piety and Mentions Eutyches' Appeal.

How much protection the Lord has vouchsafed His Church through your clemency and faith, is shown again by this letter which you have sent me: so that we rejoice at there being not only a kingly, but also a priestly mind within you. Seeing that, besides your imperial and public cares, you have a most devout anxiety for the Christian religion, lest schisms or heresies or other offences should grow up among God's people. For your realm is then in its best state when men serve the eternal and unchangeable Trinity by the confession of one Godhead¹. What the disturbance was which occurred in the Church of Constantinople, and which could have so moved my brother and fellow-bishop Flavian, that he deprived Eutyches, the presbyter, of communion, I have not yet been able to understand clearly. For although the aforesaid presbyter sent in writing a complaint concerning his trouble to the Apostolic See, yet he only briefly touched on some points, asserting that he kept the constitutions of the Nicene

synod and had been vainly blamed for difference of faith.

II. He Finds Fault with Flavian's Silence.

But the statement of bishop Eusebius, his accuser, copies of which the said presbyter has sent us, contained nothing clear about his objections, and though he charged a presbyter with heresy, he did not say expressly what opinion he disapproved of in him: although the bishop himself also professed that he adhered to the decrees of the Nicene synod: for which reason we had no means of learning anything more fully. And because the method of our Faith and the laudable anxiety shown by your piety requires the merits of the case to be known, there must now be no place allowed for deception, but we must be informed of the points on which he considers him unsound, that the right judgment may be passed after full information. I have sent a letter to the aforesaid bishop, from which he may gather that I am displeased at his still keeping silence upon what has been done in so grave a matter, when he ought to have been forward in disclosing all to us at the outset: and we believe that even after the reminder he will acquaint us with the whole, in order that, when what now seems obscure, has been brought into the light, judgment may be passed agreeably to the teaching of the Gospels and the Apostles. Dated the 18th of February², in the consulship of the illustrious Asturius and Protogenes (449).

1 (Is it fanciful to trace an analogy between these words and the language of the Collect for Trinity Sunday (out of the Sacramentary of Gregory), "grace by the confession of a true faith to acknowledge the glory of the Eternal Trinity, and in the power of the Divine Majesty to worship the Unity?"

2 Quesnel reads the 1st of March as the date.

Letter XXV. From Peter Chrysologus, Bishop of Ravenna, to Eutyches, the Presbyter.

1025

[In answer to a letter from Eutyches, he urges him to accept the decisions of the Church on the Faith in fear and without too close inquiry, and to abide by the ruling of the bishop of Rome.]

Letter XXVI1 . A Second One from Flavian to Leo.

1026

To the most holy and blessed father and fellow-minister Leo, Flavian greeting in the Lord).

I. Eutyches' Heresy Restated.

Nothing, as you know, most beloved of God, is more precious to priests than piety and the right dividing of the word of truth. For all our hope and safety, and the recompense of promised good depend thereon. For this reason we must take all pains about the true Faith, and those things which have been set forth and decreed by the holy Fathers, that always, and in all circumstances, they may be kept and guarded whole and uninjured. And so it was necessary on the present occasion for us, who see the orthodox Faith suffering harm, and the heresy of Apollinaris and Valentinus being revived by the wicked monk Eutyches, not to overlook it, but publicly to disclose it for the people's safety. For this man: this Eutyches, keeping his diseased and sickly opinion hid within him, has dared to attack our gentleness, and unblushingly and shamelessly to instil his own blasphemy into many minds: saying that before the Incarnation indeed, our Saviour Jesus Christ had two natures, Godhead and manhood: but that after the union they became one nature not knowing² what he says, or on what he is speaking so decidedly. For even the union of the two natures that came together in Christ did not, as your piety knows, confuse their properties in the process: but the properties of the two natures remain entire even in the union. And he added another blasphemy also, saying that the Lord's body which sprang from Mary was not of our substance, nor of human matter: but, though he calls it human, he refuses to say it was con-substantial with us or with her who bare him, according to the flesh³.

II. The Means Eutyches Has Taken to Circumvent the Synod.

And this notwithstanding that the acts of Ephesus⁴, in the letter written by the holy and ecumenical synod to the wicked and deposed Nestorius, contain these express words "the natures which came together to form true unity are indeed different: and yet from then both there is but one Christ and Son. Not as if the difference between the two natures was done away with through the union, but rather that these same natures, His Godhead and His Manhood perfected for us one Lord Jesus Christ, through an ineffable and incomprehensible meeting which resulted in unity." And this does not escape your holiness, who have no doubt read the record of what was done at Ephesus. Yet this same Eutyches attaching no weight to these words, thinks he is not liable to the penalties fixed by that holy and ecumenical synod. For this reason, finding that many of the simpler-minded folk were injured in

their faith by his contention, upon his being accused by the devout Bishop Eusebius, and upon his attending at the holy council, and with his own mouth declaring what he thought to the members of the synod, we have deposed him for his estrangement from the true Faith, as your holiness will learn from the resolutions passed about him: which we have sent with this our letter. Moreover, it is fair in my opinion that you should be told this also that this same Eutyches, after suffering just and canonical deposition, instead of making amends for his earlier by his later conduct⁵, and appeasing God by careful penitence and many tears, and by a true repentance, comforting our heart which was greatly saddened at his fall: not only did not do so, but even made every effort to throw the most holy church of this place into confusion: setting up in public placards full of insults and maledictions, and beyond this addressing his entreaties to our most religious and Christ-loving Emperor, and these too over-flowing with arrogance and sauciness, whereby he tried to override the divine canons in everything.

III. He Acknowledges the Receipt of Leo's Letter.

But after all this had occurred, your holiness' letter was conveyed to us by the most honourable count Pansophius: and from it we learnt that the same Eutyches had sent you a letter full of falsehood and cunning, saying that at the time of trial he had presented letters of appeal to us, and to the holy synod of bishops who were then present, and had appealed to your holiness: this he certainly never did, but in this matter, too, he has been guilty of deceit, like the father of lies, thinking to gain your ear. Therefore, most holy father, being stirred by all that he has ventured, and by what has been done, and is being done against us and the most holy Church, use your accustomed promptitude as becomes the priesthood, and in defending the commonweal and peace of the holy churches, consent by your own letter⁶ to endorse the resolution that has been canonically passed against him, and to confirm the faith of our most religious and Christ-loving Emperor. For the matter only requires your weight and support, which through your wisdom will at once bring about general peace and quietness. For thus both the heresy which has arisen, and the disorder it has excited, will easily be appeased by God's assistance through a letter from you: and the rumoured synod will also be prevented, and so the most holy churches throughout the world need not be disturbed. I and all that are with me salute all the brethren that are with you. May you be granted to us safe in the Lord, and still praying for us, O most God-Loving and Holy Father.

1 In reading the Tome (Lett. XXVIII). the reader is warned to remember that he must take no account of this letter, which did not reach Leo until later, and which is Acknowledged in Lett. XXXVI. dated a week after the Tome. Bright (n. 139). There are two versions of this letter also, the ancient one and a modern one by Joannes Cotelerius, which latter, as being a more exact reproduction of the Gk. original, we have taken as the basis of our English translation).

2 *Ignarus*: it will be remembered that in the Tome (chap. i). this is the chief fault which Leo also has to find with Eutyches, calling him *multum imprudens et nimis imperitis*, &c.

3 (So in Lett. XXII., chap. iii., *Domini corpus non esse quidem corpus hominis, humanum autem corpus esse quod ex Virgine est*).

4 The date of this Council is 431 b.c.

5 *Saltem secundis curare priora* (Gk). *kavn toi" `deutevros ijavsasqai ta; provtera*).

6 Cf Lett. XXVII., n. 7, where the difference between Flavian's request here and in Lett. XXII., chap iv., is pointed out).

Letter XXVII. To Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople.

1027

Leo to Flavian, bishop of Constantinople. An acknowledgment of Flavian's first letter and a promise of a fuller reply.

On the first opportunity we could find, which was the coming of our honourable son Rodanus, we acknowledge, beloved, the arrival of your packet¹, which was to give us information about the case which has been stirred up to our grief among you by misguided error. Since this man, who has long seemed to be religiously disposed, has expressed himself in the Faith otherwise than is right, though he never ought to have departed from the catholic tradition, but to have persevered in the same belief as is held by all. But on this matter we are replying more fully² by him who brought your letter to us, beloved: that we may give you all necessary instructions, beloved, on the whole matter. For we do not allow either him to persist in his perverse conviction; or you, beloved, who with such faithful zeal are resisting his wrong and foolish error to be long disturbed by the adversary's opposition. Our aforesaid son, by whom we are sending this letter, we desire you to receive with the affection he deserves, and to reply when he returns to us. Dated 21st May in the consulship of Asturius and Protogenes (449).

Letter XXVIII. To Flavian Commonly Called "The Tome"

1028

I. Eutyches Has Been Driven into His Error by Presumption and Ignorance¹.

Having read your letter, beloved, at the late arrival of which we are surprised², and having perused the detailed

account of the bishops' acts³, we have at last found out what the scandal was which had arisen among you against the purity of the Faith: and what before seemed concealed has now been unlocked and laid open to our view: from which it is shown that Eutyches, who used to seem worthy of all respect in virtue of his priestly office, is very unwary and exceedingly ignorant, so that it is even of him that the prophet has said: "he refused to understand so as to do well: he thought upon iniquity in his bed⁴ ." But what more iniquitous than to hold blasphemous opinions⁵, and not to give way to those who are wiser and more learned than ourself. Now into this un wisdom fall they who, finding themselves hindered from knowing the truth by some obscurity, have recourse not to the prophets' utterances, not to the Apostles' letters, nor to the injunctions of the Gospel but to their own selves: and thus they stand out as masters of error because they were never disciples of truth. For what learning has he acquired about the pages of the New and Old Testament, who has not even grasped the rudiments of the Creed? And that which, throughout the world, is professed by the mouth of every one who is to be born again⁶, is not yet taken in by the heart of this old man.

II. Concerning the Twofold Nativity and Nature of Christ.

Not knowing, therefore, what he was bound to think concerning the incarnation of the Word of God, and not wishing to gain the light of knowledge by researches through the length and breadth of the Holy Scriptures, he might at least have listened attentively to that general and uniform confession, whereby the whole body of the faithful confess that they *believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son⁷, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Spirit and⁸ the Virgin Mary.* By which three statements the devices of almost all heretics are overthrown. For not only is God believed to be both Almighty and the Father, but the Son is shown to be co-eternal with Him, differing in nothing from the Father because He is *God from God⁹*, Almighty from Almighty, and being born from the Eternal one is co-eternal with Him; not later in point of time, not lower in power, not unlike in glory, not divided in essence: but at the same time the only begotten of the eternal Father was born eternal of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary. And this nativity which took place in time took nothing from, and added nothing to that divine and eternal birth, but expended itself wholly on the restoration of man who had been deceived¹⁰: in order that he might both vanquish death and overthrow by his strength¹¹, the Devil who possessed the power of death. For we should not now be able to overcome the author of sin and death unless He took our nature on Him and made it His own, whom neither sin could pollute nor death retain. Doubtless then, He was conceived of the Holy Spirit within the womb of His Virgin Mother, who brought Him forth without the loss of her virginity, even as she conceived Him without its loss.

But if He could not draw a rightful understanding (of the matter) from this pure source of the Christian belief, because He had darkened the brightness of the clear truth by a veil of blindness peculiar to Himself, He might have submitted Himself to the teaching of the Gospels. And when Matthew speaks of "the Book of the Generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham¹²," He might have also sought out the instruction afforded by the statements of the Apostles. And reading in the Epistle to the Romans, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called an Apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God, which He had promised before by His prophets in the Holy Scripture concerning His son, who was made unto Him¹³ of the seed of David after the flesh¹⁴," he might have bestowed a loyal carefulness upon the pages of the prophets. And finding the promise of God who says to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all nations be blest¹⁵," to avoid all doubt as to the reference of this seed, he might have followed the Apostle when He says, "To Abraham were the promises made and to his seed. He saith not and to seeds, as if in many, but as it in one, and to thy seed which is Christ¹⁶ ." Isaiah's prophecy also he might have grasped by a closer attention to what he says, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son and they shall call His name Immanuel," which is interpreted "God with us¹⁷ ." And the same prophet's words he might have read faithfully. "A child is born to us, a Son is given to us, whose power is upon His shoulder, and they shall call His name the Angel of the Great Counsel, Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Prince of Peace, the Father of the age to come¹⁸ ." And then he would not speak so erroneously as to say that the Word became flesh in such a way that Christ, born of the Virgin's womb, had the form of man, but had not the reality of His mother's body¹⁹. Or is it possible that he thought our Lord Jesus Christ was not of our nature for this reason, that the angel, who was sent to the blessed Mary ever Virgin, says, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: and therefore that Holy Thing also that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God²⁰ ," on the supposition that as the conception of the Virgin was a Divine act, the flesh of the conceived did not partake of the conceiver's nature? But that birth so uniquely wondrous and so wondrously unique, is not to be understood in such wise that the properties of His kind were removed through the novelty of His creation. For though the Holy Spirit imparted fertility to the Virgin, yet a real body was received from her body; and, "Wisdom building her a house²¹ ," "the Word became flesh and dwelt in us²² ," that is, in that flesh which he took from man and which he quickened with the breath of a higher life²³).

III. The Faith and Counsel of God In Regard to the Incarnation of the Word are Set Forth.

Without detriment therefore to the properties of either nature and substance which then came together in one person²⁴, majesty took on humility, strength weakness, eternity mortality: and for the paying off of the debt belonging to our condition inviolable nature was united with possible nature, so that, as suited the needs of our case²⁵, one and the same Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, could both die with the one and not die with the other.²⁶ Thus in the whole and perfect nature of true man was true God born, complete in what was His own, complete in what was ours. And by "ours" we mean what the Creator formed in us from the beginning and what He undertook to repair. For what the Deceiver brought in and man deceived committed, had

no trace in the Saviour. Nor, because He partook of man's weaknesses, did He therefore share our faults. He took the form of a slave²⁷ without stain of sin, increasing the human and not diminishing the divine: because that emptying of Himself whereby the Invisible made Himself visible and, Creator and Lord of all things though He be, wished to be a mortal, was the bending down²⁸ of pity, not the failing of power. Accordingly He who while remaining in the form of God made man, was also made man in the form of a slave. For both natures retain their own proper character without loss: and as the form of God did not do away with the form of a slave, so the form of a slave did not impair the form of God. For inasmuch as the Devil used to boast that man had been cheated by his guile into losing the divine gifts, and bereft of the boon of immortality had undergone sentence of death, and that he had found some solace in his troubles from having a partner in delinquency²⁹, and that God also at the demand of the principle of justice had changed His own purpose towards man whom He had created in such honour: there was need for the issue of a secret counsel, that the unchangeable God whose will cannot be robbed of its own kindness, might carry out the first design of His Fatherly care³⁰ towards us by a more hidden mystery³¹; and that man who had been driven into his fault by the treacherous cunning of the devil might not perish contrary to the purpose of God³².

IV. The Properties of the Twofold Nativity and Nature of Christ are Weighed One Against Another.

There enters then these lower parts of the world the Son of God, descending from His heavenly home and yet not quitting His Father's glory, begotten in a new order by a new nativity. In a new order, because being invisible in His own nature, He became visible in ours, and He whom nothing could contain was content to be contained³³: abiding before all time He began to be in time: the Lord of all things, He obscured His immeasurable majesty and took on Him the form of a servant: being God that cannot suffer, He did not disdain to be man that can, and, immortal as He is, to subject Himself to the laws of death. The Lord assumed His mother's nature without her faultiness: nor in the Lord Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin's womb, does the wonderfulness of His birth make His nature unlike ours. For He who is true God is also true man: and in this union there is no lie³⁴, since the humility of manhood and the loftiness of the Godhead both meet there. For as God is not changed by the showing of pity, so man is not swallowed up by the dignity. For each form does what is proper to it with the co-operation of the other³⁵; that is the Word performing what appertains to the Word, and the flesh carrying out what appertains to the flesh. One of them sparkles with miracles, the other succumbs to injuries. And as the Word does not cease to be on an equality with His Father's glory, so the flesh does not forego the nature of our race. For it must again and again be repeated that one and the same is truly Son of God and truly son of man). God in that "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God³⁶"; man in that "the Word became flesh and dwelt in us³⁷." God in that "all things were made by Him³⁸", and without Him was nothing made:" man in that "He was made of a woman, made under law³⁹." The nativity of the flesh was the manifestation of human nature: the childbearing of a virgin is the proof of Divine power. The infancy of a babe is shown in the humbleness of its cradle⁴⁰: the greatness of the Most High is proclaimed by the angels' voices⁴¹. He whom Herod treacherously endeavours to destroy is like ourselves in our earliest stage⁴²: but He whom the Magi delight to worship on their knees is the Lord of all. So too when He came to the baptism of John, His forerunner, lest He should not be known through the veil of flesh which covered His Divinity, the Father's voice thundering from the sky, said, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased⁴³." And thus Him whom the devil's craftiness attacks as man, the ministries of angels serve as God. To be hungry and thirsty, to be weary, and to sleep, is clearly human: but to satisfy 5,000 men with five loaves, and to bestow on the woman of Samaria living water, droughts of which can secure the drinker from thirsting any more, to walk upon the surface of the sea with feet that do not sink, and to quell the risings of the waves by rebuking the winds, is, without any doubt, Divine. Just as therefore, to pass over many other instances, it is not part of the same nature to be moved to tears of pity for a dead friend, and when the stone that closed the four-days' grave was removed, to raise that same friend to life with a voice of command: or, to hang on the cross, and turning day to night, to make all the elements tremble: or, to be pierced with nails, and yet open the gates of paradise to the robber's faith: so it is not part of the same nature to say, "I and the Father are one," and to say, "the Father is greater than I⁴⁴." For although in the Lord Jesus Christ God and man is one person, yet the source of the degradation, which is shared by both, is one, and the source of the glory, which is shared by both, is another. For His manhood, which is less than the Father, comes from our side: His Godhead, which is equal to the Father, comes from the Father.

V. Christ's Flesh is Proved Real from Scripture.

Therefore in consequence of this unity of person which is to be understood in both natures⁴⁵, we read of the Son of Man also descending from heaven, when the Son of God took flesh from the Virgin who bore Him. And again the Son of God is said to have been crucified and buried, although it was not actually in His Divinity whereby the Only-begotten is co-eternal and con-substantial with the Father, but in His weak human nature that He suffered these things. And so it is that in the Creed also we all confess that the Only-begotten Son of God was crucified and buried, according to that saying of the Apostle: "for if they had known, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory⁴⁶." But when our Lord and Saviour Himself would instruct His disciples' faith by His questionings, He said, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" And when they had put on record the various opinions of other people, He said, "But ye, whom do ye say that I am?" Me, that is, who am the Son of Man, and whom ye see in the form of a slave, and in true flesh, whom do ye say that I am? Whereupon blessed Peter, whose divinely inspired confession was destined to profit all nations, said, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God⁴⁷." And not undeservedly was he pronounced blessed by the Lord, drawing from the chief corner-stone⁴⁸ the solidity of power which his name also expresses, he, who, through the revelation of the Father, confessed Him to be at once Christ and Son of God: because the receiving of the one of these without the other was of no avail to salvation, and it

was equally perilous to have believed the Lord Jesus Christ to be either only God without man, or only man without God. But after the Lord's resurrection (which, of course, was of His true body, because He was raised the same as He had died and been buried), what else was effected by the forty days' delay than the cleansing of our faith's purity from all darkness? For to that end He talked with His disciples, and dwelt and ate with them, He allowed Himself to be handled with diligent and curious touch by those who were affected by doubt, He entered when the doors were shut upon the Apostles, and by His breathing upon them gave them the Holy Spirit⁴⁹, and bestowing on them the light of understanding, opened the secrets of the Holy Scriptures⁵⁰. So again He showed the wound in His side, the marks of the nails, and all the signs of His quite recent suffering, saying, "See My hands and feet, that it is I. Handle Me and see that a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have⁵¹;" in order that the properties of His Divine and human nature might be acknowledged to remain still inseparable: and that we might know the Word not to be different from the flesh, in such a sense as also to confess that the one Son of God is both the Word and flesh⁵². Of this mystery of the faith⁵³ your opponent Eutyches must be reckoned to have but little sense if he bus recognized our nature in the Only-begotten of God neither through the humiliation of His having to die, nor through the glory of His rising again. Nor has he any fear of the blessed apostle and evangelist John's declaration when he says, "every spirit which confesses Jesus Christ to have come in the flesh, is of God: and every spirit which destroys Jesus is not of God, and this is Antichrist⁵⁴." But what is "to destroy Jesus," except to take away the human nature from Him, and to render void the mystery, by which alone we were saved, by the most barefaced fictions. The truth is that being in darkness about the nature of Christ's body, he must also be befooled by the same blindness in the matter of His sufferings. For if he does not think the cross of the Lord fictitious, and does not doubt that the punishment He underwent to save the world is likewise true, let him acknowledge the flesh of Him whose death he already believes: and let him not disbelieve Him man with a body like ours, since he acknowledges Him to have been able to suffer: seeing that the denial of His true flesh is also the denial of His bodily suffering. If therefore he receives the Christian faith, and does not turn away his ears from the preaching of the Gospel: let him see what was the nature that hung pierced with nails on the wooden cross, and, when the side of the Crucified was opened by the soldier's spear, let him understand whence it was that blood and water flowed, that the Church of God might be watered from the font and from the cup⁵⁵. Let him hear also the blessed Apostle Peter, proclaiming that the sanctification of the Spirit takes place through the sprinkling of Christ's blood⁵⁶. And let him not read cursorily the same Apostle's words when he says, "Knowing that not with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, have ye been redeemed from your vain manner of life which is part of your fathers' tradition, but with the precious blood of Jesus Christ as of a lamb without spot and blemish⁵⁷." Let him not resist too the witness of the blessed Apostle John, who says: "and the blood of Jesus the Son of God cleanseth us from all sin⁵⁸." And again: "this is the victory which overcometh the world, our faith." And "who is He that overcometh the world save He that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God. This is He that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ: not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that testifieth, because the Spirit is the truth⁵⁹, because there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the water and the blood, and the three are one⁶⁰." The Spirit, that is, of sanctification, and the blood of redemption, and the water of baptism: because the three are one, and remain undivided, and none of them is separated from this connection; because the catholic Church lives and progresses by this faith, so that in Christ Jesus neither the manhood without the true Godhead nor the Godhead without the true manhood is believed in.

VI. The Wrong and Mischievous Concession of Eutyches. The Terms on Which He May Be Restored to Communion. The Sending of Deputies to the East.

But when during your cross-examination Eutyches replied and said, "I confess that our Lord had two natures before the union but after the union I confess but one⁶¹," I am surprised that so absurd and mistaken a statement of his should not have been criticised and rebuked by his judges, and that an utterance which reaches the height of stupidity and blasphemy should be allowed to pass as if nothing offensive had been heard: for the impiety of saying that the Son of God was of two natures before His incarnation is only equalled by the iniquity of asserting that there was but one nature in Him after "the Word became flesh." And to the end that Eutyches may not think this a right or defensible opinion because it was not contradicted by any expression of yourselves, we warn you beloved brother, to take anxious care that if ever through the inspiration of God's mercy the case is brought to a satisfactory conclusion, his ignorant mind be purged from this pernicious idea as well as others. He was, indeed, just beginning to beat a retreat from his erroneous conviction, as the order of proceedings shows⁶², in so far as when hemmed in by your remonstrances he agreed to say what he had not said before and to acquiesce in that belief to which before he had been opposed. However, when he refused to give his consent to the anathematizing of his blasphemous dogma, you understood, brother⁶³, that he abode by his treachery and deserved to receive a verdict of condemnation. And yet, if he grieves over it faithfully and to good purpose, and, late though it be, acknowledges how rightly the bishops' authority has been set in motion; or if with his own mouth and hand in your presence he recants his wrong opinions, no mercy that is shown to him when penitent can be found fault with⁶⁴: because our Lord, that true and "good shepherd" who laid down His life for His sheep⁶⁵ and who came to save not lose men's souls⁶⁶, wishes us to imitate His kindness⁶⁷; in order that while justice constrains us when we sin, mercy may prevent our rejection when we have returned. For then at last is the true Faith most profitably defended when a false belief is condemned even by the supporters of it.

Now for the loyal and faithful execution of the whole matter, we have appointed to represent us our brothers Julius⁶⁸ Bishop and Rhenatus⁶⁹ priest [of the Title of S. Clement], as well as my son Hilary⁷⁰, deacon. And with them we have associated Dulcitus our notary, whose faith is well approved: being sure that the Divine help will be given us, so that he who had erred may be saved when the wrongness of his view has been condemned). God keep you safe, beloved brother.

The 13 June, 449, in the consulship of the most illustrious Asturius and Protogenes.

1 *Epistolas*. This refers to Lett. XXII., and includes the *gesta* (or minutes of the synod's proceedings) which accompanied it.

2 This is the Tome (Letter XXVIII.): it will be noticed that Flavian (in Lett. XXII). had not asked for any instructions, but only that Leo should inform the bishops under his jurisdiction of Eutyches' deposition (chap. iv).. Flavian's second letter (XXVI)., however, does mention *vestras sacras litteras*, which he hopes will avoid the necessity of a council (chap. iii).. Leo himself seems to be conscious of this: for in Letter XXXIII., chap. 2, he twice pointedly puts in the word "seems," as if Flavian had not expressed himself quite clearly: "the points which he seems to have referred to us," and "this error which ,seems to have arisen."

1 The original word (*imperitia*) "implies that a recluse like Eutyches (an archimandrite of a convent) ought never to have entered into a nice controversy like the present: he has not enough *savoir faire*, and his knowledge is not quite up to date, is a little old-fashioned.

2 The exact reason of the delay is not altogether certain: we know Flavian had written much earlier than the date of arrival warranted: it is No. XXII. in the series.

3 Viz., the proceedings of the *synodus* summoned by Flavian at Constantinople.

4 [Ps 36,4](#),

5 *Impiaia sapere*, to think disloyal things against God: cf. the *recta sapere*, "to have a right judgment" of the Collect for Whitsunday.

6 Knowledge of and belief in the principles of the Faith as contained in the Creed (*symbolum*) have of course always been required before Baptism from very early times. Leo here calls catechumons *regenerandi*, just as those who are being baptized are spoken of as , *renascentes* (e.g. Lett. XVII. 8), those who have been baptized as *renati* (*passim*) and the rite itself as *sacramentum regenerationis* (e.g. Lett. IX. 2)

7 The Latin *unicus* is not so exact as the Greek original *monogenhv* : elsewhere, however, *unigenitus* is used.

8 N.B). *et*(and)not *ex* (out of).

9 The language of the Nicene Creed.

10 I.e. by the Devil: the allusion is to Adam's fall in Paradise.

11 *Sua virtute* : in patristic Latin *virtus* is, as is well known, usually the translation of the Greek *duvnamis* and has a much wider meaning than moral excellence, our virtue.

12 [Mt 1,1](#).

13 *ei*. So the Vulgate.

14 [Rm 1,1-3](#).

15 [Gn 12,3](#)

16 [Ga 3,16](#),

17 [Is 7,14](#), [Mt 1,23](#),

18 [Is 9,6](#) "The angel of the great counsel" (*magni consilii angelus*) is a translation of the LXX. (which in the rest of the verse either represents a very different original text, or contents itself with a loose paraphrase), and is again repeated in the "Counsellor" (*Consiliarius*), two words farther on (which is also the Vulgate reading).

19 This was the third dogma of Apollinaris (more fully stated in Lett. CXXIV. 2 and CLXV. 2) that our Lord's acts and sufferings as man belonged entirely to His Divine nature, and were not really human at all.

20 [Lc 1,35](#).

21 [Pr 9,1](#).

22 *In nobis*, which he seems from the immediately following words to interpret as meaning "in our flesh," and not "amongst us," as the R.V. and others.

23 *Quam spiritu vitoe rationalis* (*logikou`*) *animavit*.

24 A famous passage quoted by Hooker *Qo Pol.* 5,53,2, and Liddon *Bampton Lect.*, p. 267. Compare *Serm.* 62,1 *quod...in unam personam concurrat proprietates utriusque substantioe* (Bright), also 22,2, 23,2.

25 *Quod nostris remediis congruebat*, where *remedia* must mean the disease which needs remedies (a sort of passive use).

26 This passage from "Thus in the whole" to "not the failing of power" is repeated again in *Sermon* 23,2, almost word for word.

27 The reference, of course, is to [Ph 2,6](#). no passage is a greater favourite with the Fathers than this.

28 Compare S. Aug. *ad Catech.* § 6, *humilitas Christi quid est? manum Deus homini iacenti porrexit: nos cecidimus, ille descendit: nos iacebamus, ille se inclinavit. Prendamus et surgamus ut non in poenam cadamus.*

29 *De proevicatoris consortio* : *proevicator* originally is a legal term, signifying "a shuffler" in a suit, an advocate who plays into the hands of the other side.

30 *Pietas*, as in the collect for xvi. S. aft. Trin., where the English , "pity" represents the Latin "*pietas*" philologically as well as in meaning. Cf. n. 2 in chap. vi.

31 *Sacramento*, (musthriw): what the "mystery" was is finely set forth by Canon Bright's hymn, No. 172, H. A. and M. (new edition)

32 The whole of the end of this chapter from "For inasmuch as," and the beginning of the next down to "laws of death," is repeated word for word in *Sermon* XXII., chaps. 1, and ii.

33 *Incomprehensibilis voluit comprehendere*. Canon Bright's references are most apposite: "compare *Serm.* lxxviii 1, : and *Serm.* 37,1., *idem est qui impiorum manibus comprehenditur et qui nullo fine concluditur* : This 'antithesis' has been grandly expressed in Milman's, 'Martyr of Antioch, 0'" And Thou wast laid within the tomb. . . Whom heaven could not contain, Nor the immeasurable plain Of vast infinity enclose or circle round. 0'"

34 I.e. , there is no fancy, no pretending: each nature is in equal reality present, the human as well as the Divine,

thus opposing all Docetic and Monophysite heresies.

35 This passage (which is repeated in Serm. Iiv., chap. 2, down to "injuries"), was objected to by the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops as savouring on the heresy of Nestorius who "divided the substance:" but it is obvious that the same words might have an orthodox meaning in the mouth of one who was orthodox and to the unorthodox would bear an unorthodox construction).

36 [Jn 1,1](#).

37 [Jn 1,14](#).

38 Ibid. 3, the Latin is *per ipsum* (Gk. δι' αὐτοῦ) (through Him).

39 [Ga 4,4](#)

40 Vis., that it was laid "in a manger : " the Gk. version has *sparyavnwn*, "swaddling clothes," to represent *cunaram* and this meaning is adopted by Bright [and Heurtley], [Lc 2,7](#).

41 Ibid. 13.

42 *Similis est rudimentis hominum*.

43 [Mt 3,17](#).

44 [Jn 14,28](#) [Jn 10,30](#): the reconciliation of this class of apparently contradictory statements is often undertaken by Leo [e.g. Sermon 23,2 and 77,5 ; Ep. 28,4 and lix. 3], and by other fathers (e.g. by Augustine *de Fide et Symbola*, 18).

45 This is what theologians call, *communicatio idiomatum*, or in Gk. *ajntivdosi* , the interchange of the properties of the two natures in Christ. The passage from the beginning of the chapter to "the Lord of glory" is somewhat freely adapted from S. Aug., c. Serm. Arian., cap. 8.

46 [1Co 2,8](#),

47 [Mt 16,13-16](#).

48 *A principali petra* . The Gk. version giving *ajpo j th` n prwtotuvpou pevtra* : others translate it "from the original (or archetypal) rock," but it seems better to link the passage more closely with Eph 2,20; 1P 2,6, &c., although the Greek rendering is against this: see Serm. 4, chap. 2, where Leo is expounding the same favourite text. Bright's note 64 is most useful in explaining the Leonine exposition. "Three elements," he says, combine in the idea; (1) Christ Himself (2) the faith in Christ; and (3) Peter considered as the chief of the Apostles and under Christ, the head of the Church." Hence *petra* is applied to each of these at different times).

49 [Jn 20,22](#).

50 [Lc 24,27](#).

51 Ibid 39.

52 i.e. not to fall into the Charybdis of Nestorianism in avoiding the Scylla of Eutychianism.

53 *Fidei sacramento* .

54 [Jn 4,2-3](#). the Lat. for "destroys" (or "dissolves," Bright) is *solvit* (see also in Lett. CXLIV. 3), which appears to be an exclusively Western reading: for Socrates, "the only Greek authority for *luvei*" (the Gk. equivalent), according to Dr. Westcott, quotes no Gk. mss. as giving it, though he unhesitatingly makes use of that reading. The Gk. version here however, gives *diairei`n* which simply begs the question (in Leo's favour) as to the original meaning of the phrase *solvere Jesum*, though on the face of it that is not at all necessarily obvious.

55 *Et lavacro rigaretur et poculo* : that is by the two great "Generally necessary" sacraments of which he takes the water and the blood "from His riven side which flowed" to be a symbol.

56 This refers to [1P 1,2](#) (q.v).

57 .

58 [1Jn 1,7](#).

59 Some of the mss. here give *Christus* for *Spiritus* (the reading adopted also by the Vulgate): in this case you must translate *that Christ* is the Truth instead of, *because of the Spirit*, &c. but see Westcott's note *in loc*.

60 [1Jn 5,4-8](#). The absence of the verse on the "Heavenly witnesses" (distinctly a western insertion) is to be noticed. On Leo's interpretation of this mysterious passage Canon Bright's note 168 should be consulted).

61 This was the only compromise of his views which Eutyches could be brought to make at the synod of Constantinople. Though it was rejected, and did not hinder his condemnation, it was never met with a direct, categorical refutation.

62 *Gestorum ordo* , as before, in chap. 1. A report of the proceedings had accompanied Flavian's letter.

63 *Fraternitas vestra* : or, as the Gk. version apparently took it, "you and the rest of the brethren." (hJ uJmw` n ajdelfovth").

64 It will be remembered that he had been degraded from the priesthood and deprived of his monastery, as well as excommunicated : he might be reinstated in all these privileges, the mercifulness of Leo hints, if he recant his errors.

65 [Jn 10,11](#) [Jn 10,15](#).

66 [Lc 9,50](#).

67 *Pietatis*, a beautiful word expressing now the Father's pitying protection, now the children's loyal affection, and here the Elder Brother's love for the younger and weaker. Cf. n. I. on chap. iii.

68 Bishop of Puteoli.

69 Died at Delos on the way. The words "of the title of S. Clement" are of doubtful authenticity, and not found in the Gk version. The parish churches of Rome seem to have been called *tituli* at their founding about the beginning of the 4th cent). a.d. Cf. our Eng. term "title," and refer to Bingham, Bk. 8, § 1.

70 Afterwards Leo's successor in the see of Rome, 461-8.

Leo the Great: letters 1020

