

Nestorius has not proved adequate for telling what should be right about the doctrine. Therefore the matter that gave rise first to Appollinarianism and second to Nestorianism is still very much alive.

(2) The teaching of Eutychus

Well, the chief leader for the orthodox expressions at Ephesus had been Cyril of Alexandria whose term "theotokos" had caused such great strife to Nestorius. Cyril was succeeded in 444 by Dioscurus as bishop of Alexandria...and he was an ambitious and argumentative brother with some great political skills and less appreciated in the west due to the outcome of the next few years. But he was interested in continuing the theological mastery of Alexandria, which seemed to have been shown by Cyril, over the leading rival bishopric in the east, Constantinople. He found an occasion to exert influence in this direction with a case involving the patriarch of Constantinople and an aged monk, Eutychus. (d. 454)

The
Eutychus
Problem:

Monophysitism

*one nature
rather humanity not clearly distinguishable
in God-Man*

It seems that Eutychus taught that there had been two distinct natures in Christ until the union of the Logos and the Corpus whereafter there was but One Nature. This is known as monophysitism. It is an obscure point in the total picture but a hot one. Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, found the view offensive to the complete person of Christ and ordered Eutychus not to teach it...but the latter clung to the point and apparently got sufficient press that his bishop disciplined him. This was achieved in 448...both Eutychus and his views condemned in Constantinople.

Apparently Dioscurus found this an opportunity to seek further theological attainments over Constantinople. He therefore took the side of Eutychus (whereas he should not have interfered in another bishop's jurisdiction, according to the canons) and succeeded in having Theodosius II call for a council to meet at Ephesus in 449 and this group would review the Eutychus matter.

*Many Bishops felt no
Council was needed.*

*"Robber
Council"*

The council was not so widely attended as Dioscurus and his friends packed the place. Flavian did come and there were outbreaks of physical violence between the two sides. Leo of Rome (bishop) sent a letter to the council expressing the view of the western church (as he understood it) and the council would not read it or give it a hearing and this prompted Leo to brand this as a council non iudicium sed latrocinium .."not judges but a band of robbers." The council of 449 is popularly called