ABSTRACT
The Council of Chalcedon was an important epoch making event in the history of Christianity because it changed the flow of history. This council formed the fundamental principles of Christology. In the first Quarter of the 5th century a new Christological controversy originated in the church. In this circumstances the Fourth Ecumenical Council i.e. Council of Chalcedon held in 451, from 8 October until 1 November at Chalcedon, a city of Bithynia in Asia Minor. Its principal purpose was to assert the Orthodox Catholic doctrine against the heresy of Eutyches and the Monophysites, although ecclesiastical discipline and jurisdiction also occupied the council's attention. Council of Chalcedon made a lasting contribution to the faith of the church. In this paper the presenter would like to deal with the Council of Chalcedon and its Consequences on history.

INTRODUCTION
The Christian Church began on foundation of a faith catered in the person of Jesus Christ. In clarifying the nature of the faith several centuries were rejected by the church. Through the Council of Nicea (325), Council of Constantinople (381) and Council of Ephesus (431) the church accepted officially the affirmation that the son who became incarnate in Jesus Christ was eternally and fully God in the same way as the Father or the Holy Spirit, is God eternally and fully, without contradicting the emphasis on divine unity. In the first Quarter of the 5th century a new Christological controversy originated in the church. The Fourth Ecumenical Council i.e. Council of Chalcedon held in 451, from 8 October until 1 November at Chalcedon, a city of Bithynia in Asia Minor. Its principal purpose was to assert the Orthodox Catholic doctrine against the heresy of Eutyches and the Monophysites, although ecclesiastical discipline and jurisdiction also occupied the council's attention. It repudiated the Eutychian doctrine of monophysitism, and set forth the Chalcedonian Creed, which declared that “Jesus Christ is one Person in two natures without confusion, change, or severance” and clearly defined the "full humanity and full divinity" of Jesus, the second person of the Holy Trinity. Council of Chalcedon made a lasting contribution to the faith of the church. In this paper the presenter would like to deal with the Council of Chalcedon and its Consequences on history.

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND
Traditionally, it had been held that Nestorius who presided over the see of Constantinople from 428 to 431 was a heretic as he had taught the foul doctrine about Jesus Christ and that on this ground he was condemned by the council of Ephesus in 431. The fact that the Antiochenes were not in full agreement with
its decisions. Though this problem was externally solved by the reunion between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch in 433, the reunion itself was being taken in different ways by the Alexandrine and the Antiochene sides. In that situation the Synod of Constantinople in 448 condemned Eutyches as a heretic exclusively on the ground of the Antiochene interpretation of the union. Now the Council of 449 expressed the Alexandrian reaction. All these controversies are on the basis of Christological interpretation between Antiochene and Alexandrian schools.

In the early 440’s a new generation took over. John died 441 or 42 Leo I became bishop of Rome (440-61), justly called ‘the Great’, who elevated the papacy both in theory and in practice to something like that awesome eminence which it has since enjoyed. The death of Cyril in 444 brought a new faction to power in Alexandria; the ruthless Dioscorus succeeded Cyril in 444, a man of fully as zealous as himself for the prestige and theology of his see and who went beyond Cyril in emphasising the divine nature in Christ; Flavian was made Patriarch of Constantinople in 446. Of the earlier protagonists only Theodoret of Cyrrhus survived.

Since Nestorius so fully divided the Divine and the Human in Christ that he taught a double personality or a twofold being in Christ, it became incumbent on his opponents to emphasize the unity in Christ and to exhibit the God-man, not as two beings but as one. In 446 Flavian, whose sympathies seem to have been with Antioch, conflict soon arose over a monk of Constantinople, Eutyches. ‘Eutyches (c.378-454) was abbot of an important monastery just outside Constantinople during the reign of Theodosius II. He was himself a highly influential person in the life, not of the capital only but of all the Eastern Empire. By reason of his great age, and the repute of his ascetic life, a kind of patriarch of the world of monks, while at the court the all powerful official of the moment was his godson, the eunuch Chrysaphius’. He denounced as Nestorian the creed of 433 in which John of Antioch and Cyril had reached agreement and declared that before the union (the incarnation) there were the two natures, divine and human. But after that the union the two so blended that there was only one only one nature and that was fully divine. Eutyches provocatively attacked the doctrine of two natures after the union. In almost ‘single-nature’ (Monophysite) terms he suggested that Christ’s humanity was completely absorbed by his divinity like a drop of wine in the sea. After the Incarnation, they said, no distinction could be made in Christ between the divine and the human. (Godhood and manhood were so united in Christ that after the union the manhood became absorbed in the Godhood).

Extreme opposition to Nestorianism exposed the heresy of Eutychianism. Eutyches expressed the peculiar form of Apollinarianism. The error of Eutyches was first detected by Domnus, Patriarch of Antioch, Theodoret’s supervisor, appealed to the emperor to suppress the new heresy. In this new offensive Eutyches found a powerful ally in the new Bishop of Alexandria. A formal accusation was preferred against the Eutyches by Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum (Phrygia), at a synod of Constantinople in November 448, presided by Flavian. This synod declared it a matter of faith that after the Incarnation, Christ consisted of two natures (united) in one hypostasis or person; hence there was one Christ, one Son, and one Lord. Eutyches was deposed, excommunicated as a reviler of Christ, and was deposed from every priestly office. He protested, and appealed for redress to Pope Leo I (440-61), to other distinguished bishops, and also to Theodosius II. Bishop Flavian of Constantinople informed Pope Leo I and other bishops of what had

---

7 V.C. Samuel, *The Council of Chalcedon Re-examined*, pp.16-18
8 K.S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, p. 170
occurred in his city. Eutyches won the sympathy of the emperor; through the monk's representations and those of Dioscurus, Patriarch of Alexandria, the emperor was induced to invoke a new council, to be held at Ephesus. Pope Leo I, Dioscurus, and a number of bishops and monks were invited to attend and investigate anew the orthodoxy of Eutyches. Leo supported Flavian and send him a long letter, known as the Tome of Leo and the pope was unable to go, but sent three delegates as his representatives. In this Tome of Leo, he explains the mystery of the Incarnation with special reference to the questions raised by Eutyches.

1.1 The Toe of Leo (Pope Leo’s letter to Flavian): Leo took his time to appreciate the situation. Only when summoned to the council at Ephesus did he finally write. His letter to Flavian is generally known as The Tome of Leo; ‘tome’ (Greek tomos) merely means ‘book’ or in this case ‘booklet’. It is in characteristically prose and confident judgement. It condemns Eutyches in uncompromising terms. Leo has perused the record of Eutyches’ trial, he write and judges him ‘very rash and extremely ill-informed. Leo then goes on to quote what is plainly the old Roman version of the creed (related to the so-called Apostle’s Creed), not the Nicene; that in itself indicates his self-assurance as the heir of the prince of the apostles. Surprised as we were at the late arrival of your charity's letter, we read it and examined the account of what the bishops had done. He had no idea how he ought to think about the incarnation of the Word of God; and he had no desire to acquire the light of understanding by working through the length and breadth of the Holy Scriptures. So at least he should have listened carefully and accepted the common and undivided creed by which the whole body of the faithful confess that they believe in: 1). God the Father almighty 2) in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord, and 3). Who was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary.

These three statements wreck the tricks of nearly every heretic. When God is believed to be both almighty and Father, the Son our lord Jesus Christ, perfect in Godhood and perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, of rational soul and body, of the same substance (homoousion) with the father according to the Godhood, and of the same substance (homoousion) with us according to the manhood, like to us in all respects, without sin, begotten of the father before all time according to the Godhood, son is clearly proved to be co-eternal with him, in no way different from the Father, since he was born God from God, almighty from the Almighty, co-eternal from the Eternal, not later in time, not lower in power, not unlike in glory, not distinct in being. The same eternal, only-begotten of the eternal begetter was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, the mother of God (Theotokos), according to the manhood, one and the same Christ, son, Lord, Only-begotten. One and the same are truly Son of God and truly son of man. God, by the fact that in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; man, by the fact that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. God, by the fact that all things were made through him, and nothing was made without him, man, by the fact that he was made of a woman, made under the law. The birth of flesh reveals human nature; birth from a virgin is a proof of divine power. The Word was made flesh in the sense that he emerged from the virgin's womb having a human form but not having the reality of his mother's body. The same one is true God and true man. The Holy Spirit gave fruitfulness to the virgin, but the reality of the body was received from her body. The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us: that is, in that flesh which he derived from human kind and which he animated with the spirit of a rational life. So the proper character of both natures was maintained and came together in a single person (prosopon) and one substance (hypostasis), not parted or separated into two persons. Thus was true God born in the undiminished and perfect nature of a true man. His subjection to human weaknesses in common with us did

---

10 Stuart G Hall, Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church, p.227.
11 Tim Dowley, The History of Christianity, p.175
12 Stuart G Hall, Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church, p.227.
not mean that he shared our sins. He took on the form of a servant without the defilement of sin, thereby enhancing the human and not diminishing the divine. The distinctive character of each nature and substance remaining therefore unimpaired, and coming together into one person, humility was assumed by majesty, weakness by power, mortality by eternity, and in order to pay the debt of our condition, an inviolable nature was united to a nature capable of suffering, so that as a remedy suitable to our healing one and the same Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ, was capable of death in one nature and incapable of death in the other.\textsuperscript{13}

Leo proposes that Eutyches should yet have opportunity to repent, and in place of ourself, we have arranged for our brothers, Bishop Julius and the priest Renatus of the church of St Clement, and also my son, the deacon Hilary, to ensure a good and faithful conclusion to the whole case. To their company we have added our notary Dulcitius, of proven loyalty to us. We trust that with God's help he who has fallen into error might condemn the wickedness of his own mind and find salvation.\textsuperscript{14}

Thus, he declares that after the Incarnation what was proper to each nature and substance in Christ remained intact and both were united in one person, but so that each nature acted according to its own qualities and characteristics. As to Eutyches himself, the pope did not hesitate to condemn him.

1.2 Council of Ephesus (449): The council was held at Ephesus, in August, 449. Only the friends and partisans of Dioscurus and Eutyches were allowed to have a voice. The Alexandrine Patriarch Dioscorus presided; he ignored the papal delegates, would not permit the letters of Pope Leo, including the "Epistola Dogmatica", to be read in the assembly. Eutyches was declared orthodox and reinstated in his priestly and monastic office. On the other hand, Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylaeum were deposed. The former was banished, and died shortly afterwards in consequence of ill-treatment; he was succeeded by the deacon Anatolius, a partisan of Dioscorus. Owing to the gross violence of Dioscorus and his partisans, this assembly was called by Leo I the "Latrocinium", or Robber Council\textsuperscript{15} or the robber synod\textsuperscript{16}.

Theodosius II, who sympathized with Eutyches, approved these violent deeds; Leo I, on the other hand, when fully informed of the occurrences at Ephesus, condemned, in a Roman synod and in several letters, all the Acts of the so-called council. He refused also to recognize Anatolius as lawful Bishop of Constantinople, at least until the latter would give satisfaction concerning his belief. At the same time he requested the emperor to order the holding of a new council in Italy, to right the wrongs committed at Ephesus. As a special reason for the opportuneness, and even necessity, of the new council, he alleged the appeal of the deposed Flavian of Constantinople. Theodosius, however, positively declined to meet the wishes of the pope.

At this stage the sudden death of the emperor (28 July, 450) changed at once the religious situation in the East. Theodosius was succeeded by his sister, Pulcheria, who offered her hand, and with it the imperial throne, to a brave general named Marcian (450-57), was Catholic too. Pulcheria’s ecclesiastical policy was dictated at this time by two motives. In the first place, she was determined to support Rome in its conflict with Alexandria for ultimate leadership in the Church. Secondly, she gave up Alexandria, praised Rome, but planned to elevate the see of Constantinople. Anatolius of Constantinople, and with him many other bishops, condemned the teaching of Eutyches and accepted the dogmatic epistle of Pope Leo. The exiled bishops were immediately recalled, the body of Flavian brought back to Constantinople with all manner of solemnity. Any new discussions concerning the Christian Faith seemed therefore superfluous. Both Marcian and Pulcheria were opposed to the new teaching of Dioscurus and Eutyches; and Marcian at once informed Leo I of his willingness to call a new council according to the previous desire of the pope.\textsuperscript{17}
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Europe, moreover, was in a state of turmoil owing to the invasion of the Huns under Attila, for which reason most of the Western bishops could not attend a council to be held in the East. Leo I therefore protested repeatedly against a council and wrote in this sense to the Emperor Marcian, the Empress Pulcheria, Anatolius of Constantinople, and Julian of Cos; all these letters bear the date of 9 June, 451. Meanwhile, 17 May, 451, a decree was issued by Marcian, in the name also of the Western Emperor Valentinian III (425-55), ordering all metropolitan bishops with a number of their suffragan bishops to assemble the following September at Nicæa in Bithynia, there to hold a general council for the purpose of settling the questions of faith recently called in doubt. Though displeased with this action, the pope nevertheless agreed to send his representatives to Nicæa. He appointed as legates Paschasiusin, Bishop of Lilybaeum in Sicily, Lucentius, also a bishop, Julian, Bishop of Cos, and two priests, Boniface and Basil; Paschasius was to preside over the coming council in the pope's place. On 24 and 26 June, 451, Leo I wrote letters to the Emperor Marcian, to his legate Paschasiusinus, to Anatolius of Constantinople, to Julian of Cos, and to the synod itself, in which he expressed the desire that the decrees of the synod should be in conformity with his teaching as contained in the aforesaid dogmatic epistle. A detailed instruction was also given to the papal legates, which contained directions for their guidance in the council; this document, however, has perished, with the exception of two fragments preserved in the Acts of the council.

2. THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON (451)

In July the papal legates departed for their destination. Many bishops arrived at Nicæa during the summer, but the opening of the council was postponed owing to the emperor's inability to be present. Finally, at the complaint of the bishops, who grew weary of waiting, Marcian requested them to come to Chalcedon, in the near vicinity of Constantinople. The exact number of bishops present is not known. The synod itself, in a letter to Pope Leo, speaks of 520, while Pope Leo says there were 600; according to the general estimate there were 630, including the representatives of absent bishops. According to V.C Samuel, the famous historian says that about ‘500 delegates assembled in the great church of St.Euphemia, and the first session of the council was held on 8 October at Chalcedon’. No previous council could boast of so large a gathering of bishops, while the attendance at later councils seldom surpassed or even equalled that number. Apart from the papal legates and two African bishops, practically all the bishops belonged to the Eastern Church. The more prominent among the Eastern bishops were Anatolius of Constantinople, Maximus of Antioch, Dioscurus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Stephen of Ephesus, Quintillus of Heraclea, and Peter of Corinth. The honour of presiding over this venerable assembly was reserved to Paschasiusinus, Bishop of Lilybaeum, the first of the papal legates, according to the intention of Pope Leo I, expressed in his letter to Emperor Marcian (24 June, 451).

Moreover, Paschasiusinus proclaimed openly in presence of the council that he was presiding over it in the name and in the place of Pope Leo. The members of the council recognized this prerogative of the papal legates. When writing to the pope they professed that, through his representatives, he presided over them in the council. In the interest of order and a regular procedure the Emperor Marcian appointed a number of commissioners. The commissioners simply directed the order of business during the sessions; they opened the meetings, laid before the council the matters to be discussed, demanded the votes of the bishops on the various subjects, and closed the sessions. ‘But the actual presidency was in the hands of a body of eighteen
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high officials of the court. Upon them lay the responsibility for maintaining order within the council. Besides these there were present several members of the Senate, who shared the place of honour with the imperial commissioners.

2.1 Sessions of the Council: As to the number of sessions held by the Council of Chalcedon there is a great discrepancy in the various texts of the Acts, also in the ancient historians of the council. According to the deacon Rusticus, there were in all sixteen sessions; this division is commonly accepted by scholars, including Bishop Hefele, the learned historian of the councils. If all the separate meetings were counted, there would be twenty-one sessions; several of these meetings, however, are considered as supplementary to preceding sessions.

At the very beginning of the first session, the papal legates, Paschasinus at their head, protested against the presence of Dioscurus of Alexandria. Formal accusations of heresy and of unjust actions committed in the Robber Council of Ephesus were preferred against him by Eusebius of Dorylaeum; and at the suggestion of the imperial commissioners he was removed from his seat among the bishops and deprived of his vote. In order to make a full investigation of his case the Acts of the Robber Council, with those of the synod held in 448 by Flavian of Constantinople, were read in full; this occupied the whole first session. Finally all declared themselves satisfied with the deposition of Dioscurus.

The second session (10 October) was occupied with the reading of testimonial bearing on questions of faith, chiefly those under discussion. Among them were the symbols or creeds of the Councils of Nicaea (325) and of Constantinople (381); two letters of St. Cyril of Alexandria, viz. his second letter to Nestorius and the letter written to the Antiochean bishops in 433 after his reconciliation with them; finally the dogmatic epistle of Pope Leo I. All these documents were approved by the council. Tome of Leo was accepted with cry, “Peter has spoken through Leo”.

The third session was held 13 October; Eusebius of Dorylaeum presented a new accusation against Dioscurus of Alexandria in which the charges of heresy and of injustice committed in the Robber Council of Ephesus were repeated. At the end of the session the papal legates with the permission of emperor declared that Dioscurus should be deposed from his bishopric and from all ecclesiastical dignities for having supported the heretic Eutyches, for having excommunicated Pope Leo, and for having refused to answer the charges made against him.

The fourth session, which comprised two meetings, was held on 17 and 20 October. At the request of the imperial commissioners the bishops again approved the dogmatic epistle of Pope Leo I; Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia in Cicilia, former partisans of Dioscurus in the Robber Council of Ephesus, were pardoned and admitted to the sessions; finally a dispute between Photius of Tyre and Eustathius of Berytus concerning the territorial extent of their respective jurisdiction was adjudicated.

At the fifth session, held 22 October; a text was presented to the bishops, it had been edited by a commission under the chairmanship of Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople and has been preserved by the bishop but opposed by Paschasinus; who did not think it did justice to the doctrine of Leo. The commission developed a new formula of faith, which conformed to Leo’s thought by explicitly defining the two natures in Christ. This statement was accepted by the bishops and was solemnly approved on October 25 in the presence of Marcian and Pulcheria. The Emperor confirmed all that had been done by the council.

The sixth session (25 October) was celebrated with special solemnities; Marcian and Pulcheria were present with a great attendance, with all the imperial commissioners and the Senate. The emperor made an appropriate address; the decree of faith made in the preceding session was read again and approved by the
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emperor. The object of the council was attained in the sixth session, and only secondary matters were transacted in the remaining sessions.²⁴

The seventh and eighth sessions were both held 26 October. In the seventh an agreement between Maximus of Antioch and Juvenal of Jerusalem was approved, according to which the territory of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was restricted to the three provinces of Palestine. In the eighth session Theodoret of Cyrus, a former partisan of Nestorius, was compelled to condemn the name of his friend under threats of expulsion from the council. He was then reinstated in his bishopric. The ninth and tenth sessions (27 and 28 October) dealt with the case of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, who had been deposed on charges made by some of his ecclesiastics. The accusation proved to be unfounded and Ibas was reinstated in his office. A decision was also given to the effect that a pension should be paid by Maximus of Antioch to his deposed predecessor Domnus.²⁵

The eleventh and twelfth sessions (29 and 30 October) dealt with a conflict between Bassianus and Stephen, both raised successively but irregularly to the See of Ephesus. The council declared that a new bishop should be chosen for Ephesus, but the two aforesaid should retain their Episcopal dignity and receive a pension from the church revenues of Ephesus. The thirteenth session (30 October) decided a case of conflicting jurisdiction. Eunomius of Nicomedia and Anastasius of Nicaea both claimed metropolitan rights, at least for a part of Bithynia. The council decreed that in a province there could be only one metropolitan bishop, and in favour of the Bishop of Nicomedia.

The fourteenth session (31 October) decided the rival claims of Sabinian and Athanasius to the See of Perrha in Syria. If the charges should prove untrue, Athanasius should be reinstated and Sabinian receives a pension from the diocese. In the same session a letter of Pope Leo was read, and the council approved the decisions in regard to Maximus of Antioch. In the fifteenth session (31 October) the council adopted and approved 28 disciplinary canons.

This last canon provoked another session of the council, the sixteenth, held on 1 November. At the closing of the sessions the council wrote a letter to Pope Leo I, in which the Fathers informed him of what had been done; thanked him for the exposition of Christian Faith contained in his dogmatic epistle. Similar letters were written to Pope Leo in December by Emperor Marcian and Anatolius of Constantinople. In reply Pope Leo protested most energetically against canon twenty eight and declared it null and void as being against the prerogatives of Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, and against the decrees of the Council of Nicaea.²⁶

Their protests, however, were not listened to; and the council persisted in retaining this canon in its Acts. The 28 canon begins by confirming the canon of 381. The council, in response to the invitation of Marcian, promulgated 28 canons, devoted to ecclesiastical discipline and to the direction and moral conduct of the clergy and monks. Like protests were contained in the letters written 22 May, 452, to Emperor Marcian, Empress Pulcheria, and Anatolius of Constantinople. Otherwise the pope ratified the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, but only inasmuch as they referred to matters of faith. With this incident the Council of Chalcedon was closed.

The Canon clearly defined the following matters: individual rights of Bishop and Metropolitans, states all canons of previous councils shall remain in force; States that those who buy their office are anathema; Prohibits bishops from engaging in business, priests were to be under the individual rights of bishops; monks were to reside in their monasteries and were too be under the jurisdiction of the bishop; Monasteries are permanent; they were both to observe celibacy under pain of excommunication; Travelling bishops are subject to canon law; The clergy were forbidden to change dioceses or to serve in the military; The poorhouses are under the jurisdiction of the bishop; Prevents clergy belonging to multiple churches; No
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province shall be divided for the purposes of creating another church; No clergy shall be received by others without a letter of recommendation; A deaconess must be at least 40; Twice a year the bishops shall conduct a synod; Says an accuser of a bishop shall be suspect before the bishop; A new bishop shall be ordained within 3 months of election; Grants equal privileges to Constantinople as of Rome because Constantinople is the New Rome as renewed by canon 36 of the Quinisext Council and declared Jerusalem and Constantinople patriarchates. All these regulations were justified by events proceedings the council.\(^{27}\) In all likelihood an official record of the proceedings was made either during the council itself or shortly afterwards. The assembled bishops informed the pope that a copy of all the "Acta" would be transmitted to him; in March, 453, Pope Leo commissioned Julian of Cos, then at Constantinople, to make a collection of all the Acts and translate them into Latin. Most of the documents, chiefly the minutes of the sessions, were written in Greek; others, e.g. the imperial letters, were issued in both languages; others, again, e.g. the papal letters, were written in Latin. Eventually nearly all of them were translated into both languages. The Emperor Marcian issued several edicts (7 February, 13 March, and 28 July, 452) in which he approved the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, forbade all discussions on questions of faith, forbade the Eutychians to have priests, to live in monasteries, to hold meetings, to inherit anything, to bequeath anything to their partisans, or to join the army. The clerics among the followers of Eutyches, hitherto orthodox, and the monks of his monastery, were to be expelled from Roman territory. The writings of the Eutychians were to be burned; their authors, or those who spread them, were to be punished with confiscation and banishment. Finally Eutyches and Dioscurus were both banished. The former died about that time, while the latter lived to the year 454 in Gangra in Paphlagonia.\(^{28}\)

2.2 The Chalcedonian Definition: It was in the context of the upgrading of the imperial city that the construction of the Chalcedonian Definition of the faith (or Chalcedonian Formula) should be understood. The Definition was needed because the emperors were not content to let Leo’s authority suffice. A unanimous Christological settlement was desired, and this would be achieved by a formal declaration of faith. For obvious reasons it had to be based on things already agreed, but its method is very important for understanding how doctrine took its classic shape. First the principle is asserted in section 2 that Jesus Christ passed the whole truth to his disciples, and that the council is driving away the errors since implanted devil. It then goes on to reaffirm proclaimed at Nicaea in 325, Constantinople 381, and Ephesus 431. These councils thus became, from the perspective of Chalcedon, ‘ecumenical councils’ of authoritative standing. Nicaea in 325 and Constantinople 381 are set out. In the Definition the texts are adjusted to fit the theory outlined in section 3. The council ratified that aggressive letter with its anathemas only insofar as it ratified the proceedings of Cyril’s council of Ephesus in 431, and did not intend it to be understood as annexed to its own Definition. In section 4 the Council goes on to state its own position, first by disowning ‘double sonship’, the error attributed to Nestorius, and four errors rightly or wrongly associated with Eutyches: godhead, confusion of two natures in Christ, a heavenly substance in the ‘form of a servant which Christ took, and two natures before, one after, the union. There follows a positive creed. This is based on the Formula of Reunion of 433, Cyril’s Second letter to Nestorius, and from Leo’s Tome.\(^{29}\)

Confession of Chalcedon or the Chalcedon definition Read: “Whoever Following the holy Fathers, we all with one voice confess our Lord Jesus Christ, one and the same Son, the same perfect in Godhead, the same perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, like us in all things apart from sin; begotten from the Father before all ages as touching the
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Godhead, the same in the last days, for us and for our salvation, born from the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God (Theotokos), as touching the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures without confusion, change, division, or separation; the distinction of natures being in no way abolished because of the union, but rather the characteristic property of each nature being preserved and concurring into one person (prosopon) and one subsistence (hypostasis) not as if Christ were parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same son and only begotten God, word, Jesus Christ; and our Lord Jesus Christ instructed us, and the creed of the fathers was handed down to us".  

The Value of the Definition: Even though the principle Orthodox Churches of Egypt, Ethiopia, Syria, Armenia, and India rejected the Chalcedon, its achievement was considerable. Firstly, the Formula of Reunion is upheld, and with it the principle that Antiochene, Alexandrian and Roman theology should all contribute positively to the understanding of the Christ. Secondly, the error perceived in Eutyches is firmly set aside. Thirdly, at the same time the formula is put down to exclude other earlier errors like Arianism, Apollorianism, and Nestorianism etc. The definition claims continuity with the earlier established tradition in the church, and particularly with the council of 431, the synod of 448 and the council of 449.

3. CONSEQUENCES OF THE COUNCIL

The near-immediate result of the council was a major schism. The bishops that were uneasy with the language of Pope Leo's Tome repudiated the council, saying that the acceptance of two physes was tantamount to Nestorianism. This is the origin of Oriental Orthodoxy as a distinct communion, which still today rejects the results of this council. Monophysitism even though frequently only verbal, was about to be born and to provoke many quarrels and schism which still remain unsolved. The traditional historical view is that this Chalcedon definition must be interpreted as a compromise between Antiochean and Alexandrian Christology or it is the answer of the west to the problem of the east. Theology of Alexandria emphasised the unity in Jesus Christ that the Word who appeared in the flesh of Jesus was necessary for people to be united with God in Love. Antioch, on the other hand, insisted on the two aspects of Jesus, being the human and divine. Theologians in Antioch stressed the need to take Jesus’ humanity seriously. This debate sowed the seed for the great division between the Eastern or non-Chalcedonians (Orthodox) and Western or Chalcedonians (Roman Catholic) churches, which exists to this day. The council of Chalcedon did not being the peace that had been expected from it. On the contrary, it finally caused a first great confessional split in Christianity. (This development in turn weakened the Christian population of the Monophysite territories in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt eventually passed almost without a struggle under the domination of Islam).

By 451 a great change had come over the church since its birth four centuries earlier. The small body of believers, of those who had followed Christ and seen the risen Lord, Jewish in upbringing, had expanded by the middle of the 5th century to include members from Britain in the west and India in the east. In the beginning they had included not many wise, not many mighty; by 451 not only was the emperor himself a Christian, but after resistance and hesitation, the governing classes had followed the imperial example. The institutions of the worldwide Empire would affect the shape of the churches, and the shape of their doctrine, even more than the Church’s faith affected the way the Empire was run.

---

31 Stuart G Hall, Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church, p. 234-235.
32 The term Oriental Orthodoxy refers to the churches of Eastern Christian Traditions that keep the faith of only the first three Ecumenical Councils- the first Council of Nicaea, the First Council of Constantinople, and the Council of Ephesus- and rejected the dogmatic definition of the Council of Chalcedon. Hence these churches are also called Old Oriental Churches.
34 Those who cherished Cyril’s one nature portrayal of the incarnate Christ, these dissidents were known as Monophysites.
By the year 451 the threefold ministry was fixed and universal. By the 5th century areas of jurisdiction (later called dioceses), through still based on cities, were spread over wider areas. The bishops themselves were organised regionally under Archbishops, and the archbishops were in turn grouped under metropolitans, whose jurisdiction coincided with the geographical units of administration imposed by the Empire. Over these metropolitans was an even wider division, that of patriarchs, though the name was not used till the 6th century. The five original patriarchs were Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. Bishops of larger cities might have churches under them governed by presbyters.36 The seniority of Constantinople among the Eastern Bishopric had been acknowledged. The Bishop of Constantinople was placed second in precedence to the Bishop of Rome, thus promoting his see above the more ancient ones of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. The council also had settles other issues of ecclesiastical order. The boundaries of Antioch and Jerusalem had been established.

Chalcedon certainly marks the end of an era. A century after its triumph during the reign of Constantius II the church had become the most powerful single factor in the lives of the peoples of the empire. The virgin and the saints had replaced the Gods as patrons of cities. The bishops were equated in precedence and often in salary with a provincial governor. The clerical career was as formalized as that of the civil services. The century had seen fundamental shifts in the structure of society to the church’s advantage.37

The 4th and 5th centuries saw the theological basis of Christian doctrine; receive a definite shape which remains basis for Christian self-understanding today. Numerous councils were held to deal with threats or resolve conflicts. The four ecumenical councils of Nicaea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451) were those in the end emerged as the norms for imperial religion and catholic truth. The chief doctrines they stated these: a) that the son is of the same substance as the Father; b) that the Holy Spirit shares the honour and dignity of the Father and the Son; c) that Mary is to be honoured as “Theotokos”, Godbearer; d) that Jesus Christ is fully divine and fully human.38 The council of Chalcedon represented a culmination in the history of the dogma of the incarnation. Beyond dealing with the diverse theological tendencies that confronted each other, it stated the catholic doctrine that preserved in dissolubly the two facts of the mystery: the unity of person in the Incarnate Word and the perfect integrity of His two natures. The Council of Chalcedon formulated a statement of faith inspired by Leo’s Tome which in effect further developed what was in the Nicene Creed. This highly sophisticated theological statement is one of the most significant in the entire history of the church. The creeds and confession of the ecumenical councils were bought at considerable cost of peace.

The Council of Chalcedon marked an important step in the development of the Roman Primacy. The authority of Celestine had been affirmed at Ephesus, that Leo was imposed with still greater vigour at Chalcedon. The doctrine of the Primacy of the Apostolic See, as opposed to a “Church of the Empire” held by the emperors of Constantinople, was affirmed. Even though this primacy was unanimously recognized at Chalcedon; and the unity of the church was compromised by the dangerous political principle that was invoked to justify the primacy of Constantinople, in the east. On this problem further disputes and schisms were in the offing, all was not settled in 451.39

CONCLUSION

The Council of Chalcedon was an important epoch making event in the history of Christianity because it changed the flow of history. This council formed the fundamental principles of Christology. This council divided the church in to two: Eastern and Western or the non- Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians. The

38 Stuart G Hall, Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church, p.240.
Council of Chalcedon with its dogmatic definition did not put an end to the controversy concerning the natures of Christ and their relation to each other. Many people in the East disliked the term ‘person’ used by the council to signify the union of, or the means of uniting, the two natures in Christ. They believed that Nestorianism was thereby renewed; or at least they thought the definition less satisfactory than St. Cyril's concept of the union of the two natures in Christ. In Palestine, Syria, Armenia, Egypt, and other countries, many monks and ecclesiastics refused to accept the definition of Chalcedon; and Monophysites are found there to this day. The important effects of the Council of Chalcedon are: Schism between Eastern and Western churches; compromise between Antiochene and Alexandrian Christology; formation of Chalcedon definition; threefold ministry was formed; Bishop of Constantinople was placed second in precedence to the Bishop of Rome; fundamental shifts in the structure of society to the church’s advantage; originated theological basis of Christian doctrine; development of the Roman Primacy etc. Therefore this council was an important episode in the history of Christianity.
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