But this distinction might easily lead to the
denial of the absolute value of the suffering,
death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus
Christ."
*

In other words, he stressed the humanity in such a
way as to deny integrity to the whole person.
Whereas Apollinaris had made Jesus almost docetic,
Nestorius had divided the Person so that the human is
virtually a denial of the total person. The reaction
to one extreme has produced something quite different
from the desired result. In some ways, the more one
reads, the more one wonders of the terminology of the
time and the nature of Nestorius' findings. Probably
with just a little semantic understanding his view
could have been reconciled...had he and the others
been willing to do so.

Development of the Problem

          Opposition came quickly in the
person of Cyril of Alexandria (bishop 412-444). Cyril
maintained Christ had but one true nature and that
was Divine and he meant by this that there was no
part of Christ that was simply or only human. Conse-
quently he designated Mary as the mother of God, and
used the Greek term "theotokos" Nestorius assumed
that Cyril was denying the real humanity and charged
him with Apollinarianism while Cyril felt Nestorius'
position was almost Sabellian (monarchian) or any-
thing else unpleasant. The battle raged.

The Council

          The problem came to Rome and
was heard by bishop Celestine I (422-432). He
announced in favor of Cyril and called on Nestorius
to repent. As you may know, it is just typical of
human nature that the bishop of Constantinople is not
going to repent on a summons from the bishop of Rome,
particularly when he thought he was right! The
weight of Celestine's arguments were for Cyril and he
(Celestine) was reflecting the view of the western
church at that time. The need for a council was
apparent and Theodosius II made the call in 431. He
was joined in this by Valentinian III. The notes in
Walker (class text) are particularly good..pp146-148.
They do set Cyril in a good theological light but the
portrayal of his character and ambition is probably
correct. He seems to have had good doctrine but not