

Nikoloz Aleksidze

**IDENTIFYING KYROS OF ALEXANDRIA**

MA Thesis in Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest

May 2009

# IDENTIFYING KYROS OF ALEXANDRIA

by

Nikoloz Aleksidze

(Georgia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,  
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

---

Chair, Examination Committee

---

Thesis Supervisor

---

Examiner

---

Examiner

Budapest  
May 2009

# **IDENTIFYING KYROS OF ALEXANDRIA**

by

Nikoloz Aleksidze

(Georgia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,  
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

---

External Examiner

# **IDENTIFYING KYROS OF ALEXANDRIA**

by

Nikoloz Aleksidze

(Georgia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,  
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

---

Supervisor

---

External Supervisor

I, the undersigned, **Nikoloz Aleksidze**, candidate for the MA degree in Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 25 May 2009

---

Signature

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks are due to my two supervisors, Niels Gaul, for his patience while reading and rereading my thesis and for his suggestions and critique, (I should also express my amazement for his ability of noticing even the most minor inconsistencies) and to István Perczel, who although from a great distance, was supporting me morally and intellectually for the whole period of thesis writing. Finally I would like to thank Judith Rasson for the tremendous work she has done by correcting our works.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
1. The statement of the problem .....	1
2. Previous study .....	3
3. Sources .....	4
4. Structure .....	7
5. Methodology .....	8
Chapter I .....	10
Herakleios in the Caucasus .....	10
I. 1. The Period of Herakleios' Campaign in Georgian Sources .....	12
I. 2. The Religious Policy of Herakleios .....	17
I. 3. The Armenian Sources on the Invasion of Herakleios .....	22
Chapter II .....	26
Kyros in Georgia .....	26
II. 1. In Kartli .....	26
II. 1. a. Georgian sources on Kyron .....	27
II. 1. b. The provenance and education of Kyron .....	29
II. 1. c. The Evaluation of Kyron by the Armenian authors .....	31
II. 1. d. The ecclesiastical policy of Kyron .....	33
II. 1. e. Kyron's international policy .....	38
II. 2. The relations of the churches of western and eastern Georgia .....	41
II. 3. In Lazika .....	42
II. 4. Preliminary conclusions .....	45
Chapter III .....	47
Kyros in Alexandria .....	47
III. 1. The nature of Kyros and of his rule .....	49
III. 2. Kyros in Muslim sources .....	51
Chapter IV .....	55
The Doctrine .....	55
IV.1. Introduction: Status questionis .....	55
IV.2. Previous approaches towards Monotheletism .....	56
IV.3. The evaluation of Monotheletism by the Byzantine authors .....	57
IV.4. Early "Monenergisms": Apollinarios and Severos of Antioch .....	59
IV.5. The Christology of Kyros .....	60
IV. 5. a. One activity in the conditions of two .....	61
IV. 5. b. Satisfactio .....	63
IV. 5. c. One theandric activity .....	65
IV. 6. The Antiochian tradition – Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorios, Theodoret of Kyrrhos .....	68
IV.7. Two directions of Monotheletism .....	74
Conclusions .....	78
Appendices .....	82
Bibliography .....	91

# Introduction

## 1. The statement of the problem

After taking the throne Emperor Herakleios faced two great threats to the empire, the Persian invasion and considerable religious “disorder”. Therefore he had to wage a war on these two fronts, although in many cases the two – religious and political – overlapped. This was especially felt in two regions of the empire – in the Caucasus, one of the regions most vulnerable to the Persian offensive, where the religious stand of the population directly determined the political affiliation, and, in Egypt – a province which had almost never seen peace and where Christian denominations had been having bloody showdowns for more than two centuries already.<sup>1</sup>

Along with fighting the Persians Herakleios together with his long-time collaborator, Sergios patriarch of Constantinople, decided to create a theological doctrine which would unite the two most opposing major Christian denominations of the time – the Chalcedonians and the Anti-Chalcedonians, with the idea that it should also unite other Christian denominations under the leadership of the Church of Constantinople. There were two regions where Antichalcedonism was the most widely spread and was thus undermining the stability in the empire and becoming in several cases a support for the hostile forces – the Caucasus and Egypt.

From the very moment when Christianity became an official religion in the first half of the fourth century in the Caucasian kingdoms of Armenia, Kartli and Albania religion became a crucial political and diplomatic tool. After the Council of Chalcedon in 451 the unity of the Caucasian Church started to shatter and finally after one century precisely, in 551 at the Council of Dvin it was finally broken – the Armenians became politically affiliated with the Persians and dogmatically were strong Anti-Chalcedonians,

---

<sup>1</sup> On the reign of Herakleios and religious situation in the period see: Walter Kaegi, *Heraclius Emperor of Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Walter Kaegi, *Army, Society and Religion in Byzantium* (London: Variorum, 1982); Nina Garsoian, *Armenia Between Byzantium and the Sasanians*. (London: Variorum, 1985); Paul Goubert, *Byzance avant l’Islam*. 2 vols. (Paris: Geuthner, 1951 – 1965); John Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*. 2<sup>nd</sup>. edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Michael Whitby, *Emperor Maurice and his Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

while Kartli although at that time under Persian supremacy, still seems to have confessed the creed of Chalcedon. Some details of the dogmatic policies in the Caucasus will be discussed in the next chapters but for the moment it should be clear that from the imperial perspective the Caucasus had a strong need of religious unity. The same applied to Egypt, which was occupied by the Persians and not at all without some local Coptic support, because the Copts and almost every religious or ethnic denomination in Egypt literally hated the Roman rule. Thus these two strategically crucial regions needed a strong hand, to bring them back to the Roman Empire both politically and dogmatically.

Therefore, it was no coincidence that the idea of Christ having two natures, divine and human, at the same time exercising one activity and one will, arose during Herakleios' sojourn in the Caucasus. Monothelism was the last attempt of the emperors after Justinian and Zeno to create a union based on a Christological compromise. The Monothelite controversy turned out to be the longest in the history of dogmatic controversies in the period of Ecumenical Councils and had perhaps the strongest backing from the imperial theologians. The official story of the beginning of Monothelite controversy as told by patriarch of Constantinople Sergios in one of his letters is: Herakleios was waging war against the Persians and was based in the Armenian town of Karin or Theodosiopolis (modern Erzurum) in 622. There he met the head of the Severan Monophysites Paul the One-eyed, with whom he discussed the issues of faith. Paul argued that the confession of two natures in Christ would necessarily lead to the confession of two hypostases as well. Herakleios allegedly answered that although there are two natures in Christ, activity is one. Thus, according to Sergius the initiator of the Monenergist teaching was the emperor himself and the whole controversy was a result of a mere "accident".<sup>2</sup> This information sounds highly improbable, but what matters is the fact that the birthplace of the doctrine was once again located in the Caucasus. As V. Bolotov suggests this was the region where Monophysitism and Dyophysitism came very close to each other and where there was a possibility, even if a rather theoretical one, for the union.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> [Vasilii Bolotov] Василий Болотов, *Лекции по истории древней церкви* (Lectures on the History of the Ancient Church) (Sankt-Peterburg: Aksion Estin, 2006), 438-475.

<sup>3</sup> Bolotov, 438.

Only a few years before Herakleios came to the Caucasus, another person had made a disturbance in the region on the Georgian and Armenian border. Kyron, patriarch of Kartli was trying to establish a union with the Armenians, which eventually backfired into the final separation of the Georgian and Armenian churches. As I will try to show in the next chapters the two persons, by the end of the third decade of the seventh century Herakleios and Kyron met in Lazika and from that point on their fates became inextricably intertwined all the way from the Caucasus to Egypt. Kyros of Phasis the future patriarch of Alexandria, and, as I will argue, the former patriarch of Kartli, created the doctrine which would later be called Monotheletism. I will argue further that the biographies of these three namesakes, Kyros of Alexandria/Kyros of Phasis/Kyron of Mtskheta can be explained only by accepting that they were one and a single person, and moreover as far as I am concerned, the doctrine which Kyros elaborated, which was far more than just Monotheletism, has also its deep roots in the biography of Kyron of Mtskheta.

The identification of Kyros of Alexandria's background will try to cast light on his dogmatic stand on the one hand and to explain his political and theological policy on the other. This should lead to more general conclusions on the emergence of Monotheletism, which is not the aim of the present thesis. If presently Monotheletism is considered a product of Constantinopolitan theological thought, the Caucasian background of Kyros will demonstrate that the idea of such a union based on a dogmatic compromise had to and could emerge precisely in the Caucasus region.

## 2. Previous study

The question of the identity of Kyros of Alexandria is not new in scholarly literature. The first step towards the identification was made almost simultaneously and independently by A. Butler and V. Bolotov at the end of the nineteenth century. They were the first to state that Al-Mukaukas, a Coptic and Arabic name for Kyros of Alexandria, stands for the Greek *Κεκαυκασιωμένος* “meaning the one who was a

Caucasian” or “the one who has been caucasified”.<sup>4</sup> The fact that Mukaukas was the same person as Kyros of Alexandria had been established even earlier by F. Pereira<sup>5</sup> in 1894, but the theory was later fully elaborated and demonstrated by A. Butler.<sup>6</sup> No special study on the biography of Kyros of Alexandria has been done since Butler’s work.

Finally, new light was shed on the identification of Kyros of Phasis and on the ecclesiastical situation in the Caucasus at the beginning of the seventh century with the edition of the *Book of Letters*, of a treatise by Arseni of Sapara *On the Division of the Georgians and Armenians* and of the *History of the Severance of the Georgians from the Armenians* by Ukhtanes. Z. Alexidze prepared these editions along with critical comments and a vast study.<sup>7</sup> The possible identification of Kyron the Katholikos of Kartli and Kyros of Phasis was stated in this study for the first time, based on the correspondence of Kyron of Kartli with the patriarch of the Armenians. Most of the material presented in the second chapter and partly in the third chapter has been analyzed in these editions.

### 3. Sources

For the moment, sources on Kyros of Phasis and Kyron of Kartli are very scarce. Kyron of Kartli is mentioned only in Georgian and Armenian narratives and even in those he is not a popular figure. The life of Kyros of Alexandria/Al Mukaukas, who was the hero of almost every Arabic and Coptic historical narratives of the period is more known. His figure is extremely mythologized, however, and so, it is quite difficult to collect on him any information on him close to the truth.

<sup>4</sup> The details of the identification will be discussed in the third chapter.

<sup>5</sup> Vasilii Bolotov, “К истории императора Ираклия” (On the History of Emperor Herakleios) *Византийский Временник* 19 (1908), 68-124.

<sup>6</sup> Alfred Butler, *The Arab Conquest of Egypt*. Revised by P.M. Fraser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

<sup>7</sup> [The Book of Letters] ეპისტოლეთა წიგნი, ed. Zaza Alexidze (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1968); [Arseni of Sapara] არსენი საფარელი. განყოფისათვის ქართველთა და სომეხთა (On the Separation of the Armenians and Georgians) ed. Zaza Alexidze (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1980); [Ukhtanes] უხტანესი, ისტორია განყოფისა ქართველთა სომეხთაგან (The History of Severance of the Georgians from the Armenians) ed. Zaza Alexidze (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1975).

The main sources may be classified in the following order: 1. Historical narratives: The Georgian and Armenian historical narratives include the *Conversion of Kartli*, a historical-polemic treatise by Arseni of Sapara *On the Division of Armenians and the Georgians*, *The Life and History of the Bagrationis*’ by Sumbat Davitisdze, *The History of Severance of the Georgians from the Armenians* by Ukhtanes.

Two important documents on Kyron of Kartli are a collection of the correspondence between Armenian Church officials and Kyron of Kartli in *The Book of Letters* and the correspondence of Kyron of Kartli with the Roman Pope Gregory the Great, of which only the response of the latter has survived.

*The Book of Letters*<sup>8</sup> is an Armenian collection of correspondence of the Armenian Church and state officials on religious and dogmatic matters in the fifth-seventh centuries. One part of this collection is dedicated to the Georgian and Armenian relations in the beginning of the seventh century around the period of the ecclesiastical schism between the two Churches. The main corresponding figures are Abraham the Katholikos of the Armenians (607–613) and Kyros the Katholikos of Kartli.

The treatise *The History of the Severance of the Georgians from the Armenians*<sup>9</sup>: is part of the *History in Three Parts* by Bishop Ukhtanes of Sebastia (c. 935-1000). The *History* consists of three parts in the following order: *History of the Patriarchs and Kings of Armenia*, *The History of Severance of the Georgians from the Armenians*, and *On the Baptism of the Nation Called Tzad*. The main source which Ukhtanes uses is the *Book of Letters*, which he analyzes and in many cases strongly interpolates for polemical reasons.

The historical and polemical treatise *On the Division of Georgians and the Armenians*<sup>10</sup> was written by the katholikos of Kartli Arseni of Sapara, where the detailed story on the events around the period of ecclesiastical schism between the Georgian and Armenian Churches is given.

---

<sup>8</sup> On *The Book of Letters* see: Leif Frivold, *The Incarnation: A study of the Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Armenian Church in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Centuries according to the Book of Letters* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1981); Gobun Babian, *The Relations between the Armenian and Georgian Churches According to the Armenian Sources, 300-610* (Antelias-Lebanon: Armenian Catholicosate of Cilicia, 2001).

<sup>9</sup> For the editions and study of *the History* of Ukhtanes see: *The Heritage of Armenian Literature II*, ed. Agop Hacikyan, Gabriel Basmajian, Edward Franchuk, Nourhan Ouzounian (Detroit: Wayne State University Press), 250-252; Bishop Ukhtanes of Sebastia, *History of Armenia, Part III, History of the Severance of the Georgians from Armenians*, Translation, Introduction and Commentary by Zaven Arzumanian (Fort Lauderdale: Dr. Zaven Arzoumanian, 1985).

<sup>10</sup> See: Arseni of Sapara.

*The Conversion of Kartli*<sup>11</sup> is the first surviving Georgian historical narrative. It has survived in three editions: The Shatberdi edition (around the 970s), the Chelishi edition (thirteenth century), and the Sinai editions (N/Sin-48 of the tenth century and N/Sin-50 from the beginning of the tenth century). Two independent texts are united under the name of the *Conversion of Kartli*: In the first part of a short history of Kartli is provided from the invasion of Alexander the Great until the ninth century. The second part is a hagiographical text on the life of St. Nino and on the reception of Christianity as official religion by the king of Kartli.

*The Life and the History of the Bagrationis*’ is a historical narrative from the first half of the eleventh century by Sumbat Davitisdze. (Full title: *The life and History of the Bagrationis of our Georgian kings, on Where They Came From and Since Whe they rule over Kartli*)<sup>12</sup> The history starts from Adam and ends with the year 1000. Sumbat’s most famous claim is on the Davidic descent of the Bagrationis. The whole perspective on the history of Kartli is through the prism of this idea.

*The History of Armenia*<sup>13</sup> by Hovhannes Draskhanakertsi (John of Drasxanakert<sup>14</sup>) the katholikos of Armenia from 897 to 925.

<sup>11</sup> On *The Conversion of Kartli* see: G. Patsch. “Die Bekehrung Georgiens”. *Bedi Kartlisa*. No33. (1975); Margaret Wadrop and Oliver Wadrop, “Life of St. Nino.” *Studia Biblica and Ecclesiastica*, V, part. 1 (1900); *Le nouveau manuscrit Géorgien sinaitique N50*, Edition en fac-similé, Introduction par Z. Aleksidze: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Lovanii : Peeters, 2001 ; Zaza Aleksidze, “Four Versions of the ‘Conversion of Georgia’.” In *Die Christianisierung des Kaukasus/ The Christianization of Caucasus (Armenia, Georgia, Albania)*, *Referate des Internationalen Symposions (Wien, 9. bis 12. Dezember 1999)*, ed. Werner Seibt (Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences, 1999), 9–16.; *Rewriting Caucasian History: The Medieval Armenian Adaptation of the Georgian Chronicles. The Original Georgian Texts and the Armenian Adaptation* by Robert W. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); [The Life of Kartli] ქართლის ცხოვრება, ed. S. Qauxch'ishvili., vol. 1. (T'bilisi: saxelgami, 1955), repr. as K'art'lis c'xovreba: *The Georgian Royal Annals and Their Medieval Armenian Adaptation*, new intro. By S. Rapp, vol. 1. (Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1998). [English translation by R. W. Thomson, 1996.].

<sup>12</sup> For Sumbat Davitisdze see: Stephen Rapp, “Sumbat Davitis-dze and the Vocabulary of Political Authority in the Era of Georgian Unification,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 120/4 (Oct. - Dec., 2000), 570-576; Cyril Toumanoff, *Medieval Georgian Historical Literature (VII-XV Centuries)* (New York: Traditio, 1943).

<sup>13</sup> For the major editions and studies on John of Drasxanakert see: Yovhannes Drasxanakerte'i, *History of Armenia*, transl. by Krikor Maksoudian (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987); [Ioane Draskhanakerteli] იოანე დრასხანაკერტელი, *სომხეთის ისტორია (The History of Armenia)*, the Armenian text along with the Georgian translation edited by Elene Tsagareisvili (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1965).

<sup>14</sup> A town in Armenia, modern Gyumri.

## 4. Structure

The first chapter of the present thesis will be dedicated to the of Emperor Herakleios' invasion of the Caucasus and to the attitudes of local historians towards this event. Although the title of the chapter might seem to be only of a local interest, I would argue that Herakleios' invasion of the Caucasus was a crucial moment for the region and for the self-identification of the Caucasian kingdoms as well as for the whole Roman Empire, precisely because it was in the Caucasus that the first seeds of Monotheletism were sown. I will discuss all of the available sources on Herakleios' religious policy in the Caucasus, because in my opinion understanding the history of the emergence of Monotheletism is impossible without a proper study of the role of Herakleios in the region.

The second chapter deals with the biographies of Kyron of Kartli and of Kyros of Phasis and argues for the thesis of their identity, based mainly on Georgian and Armenian sources. I will try to reconstruct Kyron's biography based on the entire corpus of written and nonwritten source material at our disposition. In the third chapter the relation of Kyros of Alexandria with Kyron of Mtskheta is discussed and some additional arguments are advanced regarding the identity of the two.

The last chapter will deal entirely with the theology of Kyros and the possible background of his Christological thinking. Strangely enough in the existing histories of Monotheletism, Kyros does not have a proper place not only in modern Church histories. Kyros was sometimes not even mentioned among the main heresiarchs, along with Sergius, Honorius, Paul and Peter. Contrary to this, I would suggest that Kyros was not only one of the leading figures in the elaboration of the Monothelite doctrine, but that he was indeed its creator and the initiator of the whole controversy. Thus, a thorough analysis of his and others' doctrine will be provided in the fourth and the last chapter of the present thesis, where it will be argued that Kyros managed to restore the Nestorian or better to say, Antiochian Christology in a way that almost nobody thereafter ever suspected Nestorianism in this teaching.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The idea of analyzing Kyros' theology through an Antiochian prism was proposed by István Perczel in personal correspondence, 2009.

## 5. Methodology

The main aim of the thesis is to restore, at least hypothetically, the biography of Kyros of Alexandria. I stress the hypothetical character of the whole reconstruction, mainly because of the scarce nature of the sources. There are no biographies written of Kyron of Mtskheta and he is almost completely forgotten in the Georgian historiography, Kyros of Phasis is mentioned only in one context in almost every text, that is his meeting with Herakleios in Lazika and as what regards Kyros of Alexandria, he is an extremely popular hero of Coptic and Arabic historiography but exactly this popularity is a serious hinder for saying something decisive on him, mainly due to the legendary character of the narratives.

One might notice that my approach towards the sources in the first chapter is quite different from that in the other three. In the first chapter the sources are studied almost hypercritically, while in the last four I am using almost every bit and piece of information that one can gather on the subject. The reason for this is first of all that in the case of Herakleios the information of the narratives like the *Conversion of Kartli* is not confirmed by any other written or non-written sources. At the same time, in the case of Kyron of Mtskheta/Kyros of Phasis/Kyros of Alexandria I will try to show that information on one of these namesakes can better and even can only be understood if one considers all the information on the other two namesakes. Thus, I will try to show how the narratives on Kyros of Alexandria, Kyros of Phasis and Kyron of Kartli are interdependent and most importantly, how they explain each other.

The figure of Herakleios is a vivid contrast to that of Kyros. First, Herakleios is the great hero of the narratives, while Kyron is barely ever mentioned. Second the Caucasian information on Herakleios is not confirmed by any archaeological or other data, while the scarce information on Kyros is supplemented by archaeological, theological, documentary and linguistic data. Also it will be shown later that some of the “merits” of Kyron, that is to say his religious policy, are attributed to Herakleios in the Georgian historiography.

An important problem of dealing with the texts like those of Ukhtanes and Arseni of Sapara is that they are of a strong polemical nature and therefore might be heavily biased and subjective. Despite this fact and I will try to argue this later, it should be possible to retrieve credible information from these authors and in many cases there are no grounds to suspect their credibility.

## Chapter I

### Herakleios in the Caucasus

“And the Emperor Herakleios cleansed  
the Christian faith and left”<sup>16</sup>

After the death of King Vakhtang Gorgasali (c. 502) the unity of the kingdom of Kartli started to shatter.<sup>17</sup> During the reign of Vakhtang’s son Dachi<sup>18</sup> the nobles started to rebel against the central authority. Soon in the 520s western Kartli – Lazika became independent from the kings of Kartli. In 523 the Lazs rebelled against the Persians and accepted Roman supremacy. In the same year, Gurgen, king of Kartli rebelled against the Persians, which provoked a long war between Rome and Persia in the Caucasus. In 532 an “eternal peace” was established between the Persians and Romans which divided the spheres of influence: western Georgia (Lazika) entered Roman dominion while the eastern Georgia (Kartli) had to accept the Persian supremacy. As a result around 541 the Persians abolished the kingship in Kartli (having already abolished kingship in Armenia in 428). During the reign of Khosrau Anushirvan (531–539) Kartli was incorporated into the Persian Empire and the highest authority became a Persian *marzpan*<sup>19</sup>, who resided in Tbilisi. According to Georgian sources (*The Life of Kartli*,<sup>20</sup> *The Conversion of Kartli*) around the last decades of the sixth century during the reign of King Hormizd IV (579–

<sup>16</sup> [*The Conversion of Kartli*] მოქცევა ქართლისა. ძველი ქართული ჰაგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები 1, V-X საუკუნეები (The Monuments of Old Georgian Hagiographical Literature, I. 5<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> c.) ed. Ilia Abuladze (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1963), 95-96.

<sup>17</sup> Almost every point in the following brief overview of the sixth century Caucasus is being debated, but for the present thesis the main points should suffice.

<sup>18</sup> The dates of his reign are unknown.

<sup>19</sup> A ruler of a province in Sassanian Iran in fourth – sixth centuries. They were usually appointed where the kingship was abolished.

<sup>20</sup> [*The Life of Kartli* 1] ქართლის ცხოვრება 1. ed. Simon Khaukchishvili. (Tbilisi: Saxelgami, 1955).

590) the princes (*eristavis*) of Kartli decided to institute local authority and chose Guaram Bagrationi as the *erismtavari*<sup>21</sup> of Kartli. From that moment on the *erismtavaris* of Kartli were received the Roman titles. Around 571 the Armenians also rebelled against Persian rule under the leadership of Vardan Mamikonean. Kartli also took part in that rebellion and in the 570s all of Georgia and Armenia entered Roman protection. In 580s the war for the Caucasus began again. Although the sources about the end of the sixth century are very much blundered, one might suggest that at that time Kartli was still under the Roman dominion until the very end of the sixth century, when the Persians took over once again. Such was the situation in Georgia before the ecclesiastical schism between the Churches of Kartli and Armenia and before the period of Herakleios' invasion.<sup>22</sup>

The first thing that the student of Georgian history notices in studying the beginning of the seventh century is the fact that so little information is given by the sources on this period. Almost all of the available Georgian chronicles date to a later period, namely the tenth and eleventh centuries, except *The Conversion of Kartli*, which is from the seventh century. The events of the seventh century seem to have been obscure to them. Only two authors mention Katholikos Kyron - Arseni of Sapara (XI c.) and Vakshushti Bagrationi, an eighteenth-century historian. One thing is evident: the period around the invasion of Herakleios is mythologized and is heavily influenced by a general apocalyptic perception of the reign of Herakleios.

Almost all the major events and many of the historical figures were omitted from the Georgian sources, including the schism between the Georgian and Armenian Churches and such crucial figures for the period as the katholikos of Kartli, Kyron. At the same time, every source focuses on the person of Herakleios and his role in the Caucasus; he became the central figure in Georgian narratives. The activities of Kyros of Phasis are directly related to those of Herakleios and, according to some indications, Kyron of Kartli may even have had some dealings with the emperor. In order to understand the reason for

<sup>21</sup> A Georgian word (literary the head of *eristavis*) for the prince of princes, supposedly Guaram was the first ruler of Kartli from the Bagrationi family.

<sup>22</sup> For the history of Kartli of the period see: [Davit Muskhelishvili] დავით მუსხელიშვილი, საქართველო მეოთხე-მეექვსე საუკუნეებში (Georgia in Fourth to Eighth Centuries) (Tbilisi: Mematiane, 2003), 200-300.

the omission of these key figures and events, especially of Kyron of Msthketa himself, one needs to clarify the role of Herakleios in the Georgian and Armenian narratives.

## I. 1. The Period of Herakleios' Campaign in Georgian Sources

The role of Herakleios in Georgian historiography becomes clear if one pays attention to the scope and aims of the Georgian historical sources, how they perceived Georgian history and its role in universal history.<sup>23</sup> As the title itself suggests *The Conversion of Kartli*'s program is to tell the history of the process of Christianization in Georgia. For this narrative as well as for the other sources Christianization was not a single act in a single moment of history but a long-term process with a beginning and end. I would argue that the seventh century namely the invasion of Herakleios is a closing moment in the whole history of "salvation" or the conversion of Kartli, after which peace, unity and Orthodoxy flourished in the kingdom.

Looking closely at the *Conversion of Kartli*, only three passages in the text take the form of a narrative, otherwise it is a merely a chronicle, partly only a list of kings and rulers. These three instances at which the annalistic structure turns into a proper narrative are: the invasion of Alexander the Macedonian and the founding of the kingdom of Kartli by King Pharnavaz (third century B.C.), Constantine and the Christianization of King Mirian (middle of the fourth century A.D.), and the institution of the katholikos (or patriarchate), and the autocephaly of the Church during the reign of Vakhtang Gorgasali (c. 540–602); finally, the invasion of Herakleios and the "final cleansing" of the faith.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, there are three focal points in history as presented by *The Conversion of Kartli*: the founding of the kingdom by Pharnavaz and the first idea of Georgian unity, Christianization, Autocephaly; and three central figures: Pharnavaz – the founder of the kingdom, Mirian – the first officially Christian king, and Vakhtang – a great king and the one who brought autocephaly to the Georgian Church. By analogy, there are three

<sup>23</sup> Universal in the sense of the ecumenical empire. For the idea of the universal history see: Robert Bonnaud, *Le systeme de l'histoire* (Paris: Fayard, 1989).

<sup>24</sup> *The Conversion of Kartli*, 95-130.

imperial figures who triggered these liminal points in the history of Kartli: Alexander the Great, Constantine and Herakleios. Therefore when analyzing Herakleios' role in Georgian narratives, one must keep in mind that he had a concrete function for the sources needed to fit into the structure of Georgian "salvation history," which was nurtured by the general apocalyptic ideas of the period.<sup>25</sup> The activities of Herakleios, both religious and military, played a crucial role in later events in the Caucasus. Herakleios remained in the memory of Georgia as the third great "king" who came and brought radical and long-term changes for the region after Alexander the Macedonian and Constantine the Great. These two were the key figures for the formation of Kartli. According to this semi-historical tradition, Alexander "created" the kingdom of Kartli: "He ordered a faith for the whole kingdom [of Kartli] and left"<sup>26</sup> and Constantine "baptized" it. But what did Herakleios do that remained in the memory of Georgians? The problem is to distinguish what is historical fact and from what is another myth<sup>27</sup> of an alien king coming and introducing changes in the history of a people.

Herakleios is widely regarded as one of the few late Roman emperors who left the capital city and personally took part in military campaigns.<sup>28</sup> But the question has not yet been posed of how trustworthy the sources actually are which deal with his sojourn in the Caucasus.<sup>29</sup> In the history of Caucasus the invasion of Herakleios plays a double role. From the seventh century onward, the three Caucasian kingdoms received their final geopolitical and religious shapes; the process of the final unification of Iberia and Lazika

<sup>25</sup> For the apocalyptic ideas around Herakleios see: G.J. Reinink, "Heraclius, the New Alexander: Apocalyptic Prophecies during the Reign of Heraclius," *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641): Crisis and Confrontation*" ed. Gerrit J. Reinink and Bernard H. Stolte (Louvain: Peeters, 2002), 81-94; Gerrit J. Reinink, "Die Entstehung der syrischen Alexanderlegende als politisch-religiöse Propagandaschrift für Herakleios' Kirchenpolitik," in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday* (OLA 18; ed. C. Laga, et al.; Louvain: Peeters, 1985), 263-81. Wout Jac. van Bekkum, "Jewish Messianic Expectations in the Age of Heraclius," *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641): Crisis and Confrontation*, ed. Gerrit J. Reinink and Bernard H. Stolte (Louvain: Peeters, 2002), 95-112.

<sup>26</sup> The Life of Kartli, 19. The whole passage says: And he [Alexander] ordered Azon to worship the sun and the moon and five stars and to serve an invisible god, the father of all, for there was not a prophet and teacher of true faith in those times, to teach and to show, but he himself made up a faith ordered it for the whole kingdom [of Kartli] and left. და უბრძანა ალექსანდრე აზონს, რატა პატივსცემდნენ მზესა და მთოვარესა და ვარსკულავთა სუთთა და ჰმსასურდებდნენ ღმერთსა უხილავსა, დამბადებელსა ყოვლისასა. რამეთუ მას ჟამსა არა იყო წინასწარმეტყველი და მოძღუარი სჯულისა ჭეშმარიტისა, რომელმანცა ასწავა და ამხილა, არამედ თ თ მოიგონა სჯული ესე ალექსანდრე. მეფობასა შინა მისსა ყოველსა ქუეყანასა სჯული ესე დაუღვა. და წარვიდა ალექსანდრე.

<sup>27</sup> I would rather use word *myth* than *legend* to stress the foundational meaning of Herakleios' invasion.

<sup>28</sup> Kaegi, 156-92.

<sup>29</sup> Here and after I will mention Caucasus as a single geopolitical entity.

started and the Chalcedonian faith finally prevailed there. Armenia finally chose the anti-Chalcedonian faith i.e. a pro-Persian position. After several decades of uncertainty Albania ceased to exist as a kingdom as well as a cultural entity.

The march route of Herakleios in the Caucasus was: In 619, Herakleios established a truce with the Avars and having thrown his troops from Thrace to the east in 621, started to prepare a major offensive against the Persians. According to the traditionally accepted route, Herakleios first took quarters near Nikomedia. He spent the winter in Pontus and in April 623 crossed Armenia (Erzerum – Kars – Shiraq – Dvin) and invaded Atropatene (Dvin – Nakchevan - Khoi – Ganzak). In Pontus he met and discussed Cristological issues with Kyros of Phasis. In the spring of 624, the allied army of Lazs, Abazgs and Iberians<sup>30</sup> joined him. The campaign ended with failure and in the winter 625-626 Herakleios returned to Pontus. In summer 626 Herakleios started another campaign and passed through Lazika and with the Khazars as allies he crossed the Likh ridge and assaulted Tbilisi in 627. He left the Khazars there and invaded Persia and in spring 628 returned victorious to the city of Ganzak in Atropatene.<sup>31</sup> He returned to Constantinople via Armenia and according to some other sources once again passed through Kartli. Georgian historical chronicles are more or less unanimous about his sojourn in Kartli and the assault of Tbilisi but reconstructing the whole story is still problematic. Though, they do not say anything about his travel to Egrisi (Lazika).<sup>32</sup>

The attitude towards Herakleios was equally determined by the period in which the historian was writing. For example, Sumbat Davitisdze has a concrete mission as a historian of the eleventh century, when Georgia was a united kingdom with great ambitions. The main aim of *The Life and the History of Bagrationis* is to chronicle the lives of the members of Bagrationi dynasty and how they came to power.<sup>33</sup> The story starts, of course, from the creation of the world and argues for a Davidic descent of the royal dynasty. But the chronicle has another aim, too: By that time (the beginning of the eleventh century) the idea of a united Caucasian kingdom was flourishing in Georgia and

---

<sup>30</sup> Lazs, Abazgs and Iberians were southwestern, northwestern, and central Georgians.

<sup>31</sup> Kaegi, 122-56

<sup>32</sup> Except an eleventh century compilation “The Wonderful Stories of the Deeds from the Old Books”, which repeats the Greek narratives.

<sup>33</sup> See Stephen Rapp, “Sumbat Davitisdze and the Vocabulary of Political Authority in the Era of Georgian Unification,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 120, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 2000), 570- 576.

most importantly, this idea was formed in opposition to the Greeks. Therefore, Sumbat wants to tell the story of opposition and enmity between the Greeks and Georgians and starts the narrative from Herakleios' invasion of Kartli. Once again three Byzantine emperors play a crucial role in Georgian historiography: Herakleios, Basil the Bulgar-Slayer (976–1025) and Constantine VIII (1025–1028).<sup>34</sup>

Thus, Herakleios was a central figure in the Georgian conception of united Georgian history.<sup>35</sup> On the one hand, he was seen as the “finalizer” of the Georgian “salvation” history and on the other hand, as the initiator of “national” history.

Sumbat repeats *The Convesrion of Kartli* almost word by word, while describing Herakleios' activities in Kartli, but he adds some additional information.

After he left the fortress of Tbilisi he went to Gardabani, to Varaz Gageli, and camped on the place called Khuzashani, and blessed Varaz Gageli and all of his people. And he started to erect a Church – the most splendid one of the Churches. And he went to Burduj and stood in the middle of the village. And here he erected a stone cross and laid the foundation of the Church of the Holy Mother of God and finished its dome and from Gardabani he left for Lal and he summoned the prince Metsekevneli and blessed him and left for Baghdad.<sup>36</sup>

Once again foundation myths are ascribed with Herakleios, and moreover, he blessed two local princes Gageli and Metsekevneli. One should not think, though, that most of the information provided by Georgian sources is either purely mythological or inaccurate. The existence of the Albanian house of the Metsekevneli is attested in other Georgian sources. Namely, according to the recently discovered N/Sin-50 manuscript on Mt. Sinai the Metsekevnelis transferred the bodies of the royal family from one place to

<sup>34</sup> The Life of Kartli 1, 229-45.

<sup>35</sup> This is the period when for the first time term Georgia *Sakartvelo*, emerges, describing the territory under the single rule of a member of Bagrationi dynasty, with one language and one faith.

<sup>36</sup> The Life of Kartli. p. 374-375. და მივიდა გარდაბანს, ვარაზ გაგელისასა, და დაილაშქრა ადგილსა მას, რომელსა ჰქვიან ხუზაშანი, და ნათელ-სცა ერეკლე ვარაზ გაგელსა და ყოველსა ერსა მისსა. და იწყო შენებად ეკლესიასა, რომელი იგი უბრწინვალეს არს ყოველთა ეკლესიათა. და წარვიდა ბურღუჯს და დადგა გულსა სოფლისასა. და აღმართა ჯუარი ქვისა და დადგა საფუძველი წმიდისა ღმრთისმშობელისა ეკლესიისა, და აღასრულა გუმბათი მისი. ხოლო მან ჯიბლუ წარიღო კალა და ციხე იგი ტფილისისა გამოიღო, და ციხისთავი შეიპყრა. და დრაჰკნითა პირი აღუესო ამისთვის, რამეთუ თქუა სადიდებელი იგი მეფისა ერეკლესი. ხოლო კადრებისა მისთვის ტყავი გაჰ ადა და მეფესა მისწია იგი გარდაბანს ვარაზ გაგელისსა. და გარდაბანით მეფემან მიცვალა ლალს, და უწოდა მეწიკეპნელთა მთავარსა, ნათელ-სცა და წარვიდა ბაღდადს.

another at the beginning of the Arab invasion.<sup>37</sup> By the first half of the eighth century they were already an advanced dynasty in the Kingdom of Georgia.<sup>38</sup> But the main point is that almost all the important building activities are more or less close to that period and the roots of the great families are directly connected to Herakleios.

Another text, attributed to Leonti Mroveli, *The Martyrdom of Archil King of Kartli* is a good example of how the period of Heracleian invasion was blurred:

Don't you know who is this Archil, he is the son of Stephanoz, descendant of great king Vakhtang of the descendant of Mirian, the son of Kasre. And he was with his father when the latter was burying the treasury of the kingdom of Kartli. And he knows that King Herakleios buried his treasure. Know that I was young in my years when King Herakleios passed through these lands, for my father and brother hid all the treasure in that fortress, which that deaf emir assaulted and which belongs now to the Greeks.<sup>39</sup>

The burying of treasure is another topos around Herakleios. The information that Herakleios or somebody connected to him buried a treasure is repeated by every medieval Georgian narrative. The text is also full of anachronisms. Archil (738–762) claims to be a witness of events which happened one hundred years earlier. The reason is that the author mixed his father, Stephanoz III (711–735), with Stephanoz II (639–663) – a contemporary of Herakleios. I would call this fact of blurring a contamination. Herakleios's invasion or, better to say, his personal role, contaminated almost all accounts of the seventh-century history in medieval Georgian historiography. This can be seen especially when dealing with the case of Kyron the katholikos of Kartli.

It remains a mystery why nothing is said either about Kyron or about the events prior to the invasion of Herakleios. Neither *The Conversion of Kartli* nor Juansher nor

<sup>37</sup> [Zaza Alexidze] ზაზა ალექსიძე, “გარეჯიდან სინას მთამდე: უცნობი მასალა სამონასტრო კომპლექსის შესახებ სინას ტის ქართულ ხელნაწერთა ახალი კოლექციიდან (From Gareja to Mount Sinai: Unknown material in Gareja Monastic Complex from the New Collection of Georgian Manuscripts from Mt. Sinai) *Desert Monasticism – Gareja and the Christian East* (2001).

<sup>38</sup> As for mentioning of Gagelis, that may be a scribal or other kind of error because at that time the Gageli house did not exist yet. One could also suggest that this was an attempt of Gagelis to legitimize their rule.

<sup>39</sup> The Life of Kartli 1, 247-56. არა უწყია, თუ ვინ არს ესე არჩილ? ესე არს ძე სტეფანოზისი, ნათესავი დიდისა მეფისა ვახტანგისი, რომელი იყო ნათესავისაგან მირიანისა, ძისა ქასრესა. და ესე იყო მამისა თუსსა თანა, რაჟამს იგი დაჰფლვიდეს საგანძურთა სამეფოსა ქართლისათა; და იგიცა იცის, რომელ ერეკლე მეფემან ადფლნა საგანძურნი თუსნი, რამეთუ ერაკლეცა უშუენებდა, სადაცა დაჰფლვიდა.

Sumbat were interested in this; in the eleventh century the memory of the actual events could already have been erased. Only the foundational and apocalyptic myths around Herakleios were left from that period.

## I. 2. The Religious Policy of Herakleios

Although Herakleios was a popular hero in Georgian narratives, most of them see him as a conqueror and the one who liberated (or captured, according to the point of view) Tbilisi. Few of the sources mention Herakleios's religious policy; *The Conversion of Kartli* gives an account of Herakleios's campaign:

Then the king of the Greeks Herakleios came. And the commander of the fortress<sup>40</sup> called upon him and called him a goat, but the king was stubborn and he brought the book of Daniel and found the words: The goat of the west will come and will destroy the horns of the ram of the east. And he said: For these are the words of the prophets regarding me and you will receive what you deserve. And he left Jibgho<sup>41</sup> to fight the fortress and went to Babylon to fight Khosrau. And soon Jibgho overtook the fortress and captured the head of the fortress and tore his skin and sent it to the king. And king Herakleios came to Babylon and captured Khosrau and destroyed Baghdad. And he brought the Wood of Life, turned back and started to rebuild Jerusalem by the Lord's command. And he put Modestos as a patriarch.<sup>42</sup> And he left and before he came to Tpilisi, they have already finished building Sioni<sup>43</sup> and only the dome was left. And the king sent the messengers to Tpilisi, Mtsketa and Ujarma and ordered all the Christians to gather in the churches and all the *magi* and the fire worshipers should either be baptized or perish. But they didn't wish to be baptized and they mingled with the Christians and the king took the sword and blood flooded the churches. And the emperor cleaned the Christian

<sup>40</sup> *Kala* (კალა) – a Georganized form for Arabic *Qaa'lah* – fortress. Sometimes it is mistakenly considered as a proper name for a city (Kaegi, 144-145) Kala is a just a word for the main fortress, or the citadel of the city.

<sup>41</sup> The person of Jibgho has not yet been prosopographically identified. According to one theory, Jibgho was the title of the Khazar viceroy, the second person after the khagan. Movses Kalankatuatsi mentions “Jibghokhakan” this might mean the “vice khagan”. On Khazars see: Svetlana Pletnjowa, *Chasaren, Mittelaklterliches Reich an Don und Wolga*, (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1978).

<sup>42</sup> Patriarch of Jerusalem in 632-634.

<sup>43</sup> A cathedral in Tbilisi – it was first built by Vakhtang Gorgasali in fifth century and later rebuilt by *erimstavari* Adarnase in 639.

faith and left. And *Erismtavari* at that time was Stephanoz and Katholikos was Barthlomeos II.<sup>44</sup>

The mention of the Book of Daniel is an apocalyptic insertion in the text and a topos. Receiving this information literally and, moreover, drawing some general conclusions from it, like “Herakleios here took counsel from the Book of Daniel, which he used to vindicate claims to divine aid. Frequent resort to the Bible reinforced the religious character of this campaign,”<sup>45</sup> is not acceptable. This rather shows the attitude of the sources towards Herakleios – he was perceived as an apocalyptic figure, with a divine mission.

The expression: “the emperor cleaned the Christian faith and left” is subject to different interpretations. Some call this action of Herakleios a “Church-dogmatic” policy, claiming that the victims of Herakleios according to this sentence were local Monophysites or pro-Persian Christians.<sup>46</sup> A slightly different interpretation says: “Herakleios efforts to restore ecclesiastical unity were also recorded in Georgia.”<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> The Monuments of Old Georgian Hagiographical Literature, 95-96. მაშინ ჩამოვლო ერაკლიმ მეფემან ბერძენთამან. და უკმო ციხის თავმან კალათ თფილისით მეფესა ერაკლეს გამოძრახვად, ხოლო მან ფერკი დაიპყრა და დანიელი წიგნი მოიღო და მოიძია სიტყუად ესე ვითარმედ: “მაშინ მოვიდეს ვაცი იგი მზისა დასავლისა და შემუსრნეს რქანი იგი ვერძისა მის მზისა აღმოსავლისანი”. და თქუა ერაკლე: “უკუწთუ ესე ესრეთ იყოს სიტყუად წინასწარმეტყუელისაჲ ჩემთჳს, მე მიგავო მრჩობელი მისავებელი შენ”. დაუტევა ჯიბლო ერისთავი კალას ბრძოლად და იგი წარვიდა ბაბილოვნად ბრძოლად სუასრო მეფისა. ხოლო ამან ჯიბლო მცირეთა დღეთა შინა კალა გამოიღო და იგი ციხისთავი შეიპყრა, დრაჰკანით აეგსო, და მერმე ტყავი გაჰხადა და მეფესა უკან მიაწია. მოვიდა ერაკლე მეფე ბაბილოვანს და შეიპყრა სუასრო მეფე და შემუსრა ბაღდადი და ბაბილოანი. და მოაღებინა ძელი ცხორებისაჲ, უკმოიქცა და იყო ბრძანებითა ღმრთისაჲთა შენებად იერუსალჴმისა. და მოდისტო დასუა პატრიარქად. და წარვიდა კუალად მუნვე. და ვიდრე მოსლვამდე ტფილისს სიონი გაასრულეს, ხოლო ჯუარისა ეკლესიასა აკლდა. ამან ერაკლე მეფემან ტფილისს და მცხეთას და უჟარმას განავლინა ქადაგნი, რადთა ყოველნი ქრისტეანნი ეკლესიათა შინა შემოკრბენ და ყოველნი მოგუნი და ცეცხლის მსახური ანუ მონათლენ ანუ მოისრნენ. ხოლო მათ მონათვლად არა ინდომეს, ზაკუვით თანა აღერივნეს, ვიდრემდის ყოველთა ზედა წარმართთა მეფემან იკვდა მახული. და ეკლესიათა შინა მდინარენი სისხლისანი დიოდეს. და განწმიდა ერაკლე მეფემან სჯული ქრისტესი და წარვიდა. ერისთაობდა სტეფანოზ და კათალიკოზი იყო ბართლომე.

<sup>45</sup> Kaegi, 144.

<sup>46</sup> “In cleaning the Christian faith, as correctly suggested by scholars, the extermination of Monophysites is meant, whose anti-Chalcedonian stand was supported by Persia.” [Mikheil Gogoladze] მიხეილ გოგოლაძე, ქართლის სოციალური და პოლიტიკური ისტორია მოქცევაჲ ქართლისაჲს მიხედვით (The Social and Political History of Kartli according to Conversion of Kartli) (Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press, 2004), 193-194

<sup>47</sup> Cyril Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom: Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008), 66. Here we encounter a mistranslation of the source. First of all *Qadagi* is not a priest but rather a messenger or a prophet and secondly it is not said that *all Christians would be united in the Church*, but that all the Christians should enter the Church. In entering the Church a mere physical entrance is meant and not receiving the union. Otherwise how the magi could mingle with them and be exterminated in the Church could not be explained.

Neither the first nor the second interpretation sounds reasonable to me, first of all because nothing of this kind is said in this or any source. Secondly, judging from the syntactic construction this sentence directly follows the passage in which the author describes Herakleios' slaying fire worshippers. The third reason is the religious policy of Herakleios. It is highly improbable that he would have slaughtered the Monophysites while in the meantime trying to create a union; there are no known sources whatsoever which record anything about such an aggressive policy by Herakleios against Anti-Chalcedonians. I would rather suggest that this sentence is a logical conclusion of Herakleios slaying the fire worshippers and "cleaning" Christianity – in short, another topos befitting a "holy" king.

The same information is repeated almost word for word by Sumbat Davitidze and Juansher. The only indication of Herakleios' religious policy is that he slaughtered pagans and enforced Christianity. No Georgian source records anything about the "imperial heresy." The only negative information on Herakleios' religious activity is found in the *Life of Vakhtang* by Juansher:

Some years after this there appeared in Greece a man related to the Emperor Maurice, by the name of Herakleios. He slew the Emperor Phocas and seized Greece. He grew powerful and brought Turks from the west. He gathered innumerable troops and attacked Persia in order to seek out the Wood of Life. First he came to Kartli. Stepanoz did not wish to rebel against the Persians. So he fortified the citadels and took up his position in Tpilisi. King Herakleios arrived and laid siege to Tpilisi. But Stepanoz was a valiant and resolute warrior. Daily he made forays out of the city gates and fought against the Greeks. Then in one encounter they cut down Stepanoz and killed him. So the emperor seized Tpilisi.<sup>48</sup>

King Herakleios entered Persia and slew King Xuasro. He captured Baghdad and took away the Wood of Life. He returned along the same road to Kartli in the seventh year since he had set out. The Church of the Venerable Cross and the Sioni of Tpilisi had been completed by Adarnase, *mtavari* of Kartli. Then King Herakleios took away the foot-rest and nails

<sup>48</sup> The Life of Kartli, 223. ხოლო შემდგომად ამისა რაოდენთაჲმ წელიწადთა გამოჩნდა საბერძნეთს კაცი ერთი, თჳსი მავრიკ კეისრისა, სახელით ერაკლე. ამან მოკლა ფოკას კეისარი, და დაიპყრნა საბერძნეთი. განძლიერდა იგი და მიიყვანნა დასავლეთით თურქნი, და შეკრიბნა სპანი ურიცხვნი და წარმოემართა სპარსეთად ძებნად ძელისა ცხოვრებისასა. და მოვიდა პირველად ქართლს. ამან სტეფანოზ არა ინება განდგომა სპარსთაგან, და განმაგრნა ციხე-ქალაქნი, და დადგა ტფილისსა შინა. მოვიდა ერაკლე მეფე და მოადგა ტფილისსა, ხოლო სტეფანოზ იყო ქუელი მკჳდარი და შემმართველი: დღეთა ყოველთა გამოვიდის კართა ქალაქისათა და ებრძოდის ბერძენთა. მაშინ უკუე მას წყობასა შინა შამოაგდეს სტეფანოზ და მოკლეს. და დაიპყრა კეისარმან ტფილისი.

of our Lord Jesus Christ, which had been given to Mirian by Constantine. Adarnase, *mtavari* of Kartli, importuned and begged the emperor not to remove these gifts from God. But the emperor did not heed his request and took them away. In the time of Adarnase three Katholikoi passed away: John, Babila and Tabor. Adarnase died, and his son Stepanoz succeeded.<sup>49</sup>

The information that Herakleios took relics from Georgia may be the mirror image of his same action in Jerusalem. According to one Armenian text *On the Holy Cross and the Narrative on King Herakleios*, after having regained the Holy Cross, “he put it on a wagon and with a multitude of troops he took it on the main road of Kartli and brought it to the kingdom of the Greeks, Constantinople.”<sup>50</sup> Although in reality he did not pass Kartli with the Cross, the *main road of Kartli* really did exist and was a pathway through the broad valleys of the ridge connecting the basins of the Chorokhi (according to Arrian the Acampsis River in the southwest of modern Georgia) and Euphrates rivers.

In several manuscripts of the text there is an interesting addition from a much later period (the eighteenth century), which indicates the strong tradition of the foundational activities of Herakleios:

And he came to Samtskhe and heard about the wonder working nature of the icon made by the Holy Virgin and given to Andrew the Firstcalled, who brought it and put in the chapel at Atskhuri. So the emperor came to see and venerate the icon. And the emperor began to build the foundation of the great Church of Atskhuri which was finished later by faithful men and made into a Bishopric.<sup>51</sup>

No Georgian source mentions anything about the Monothelite heresy introduced by Herakleios or about his travel to Egrisi. The narrative of his invasion in Kartli sounds

---

<sup>49</sup> Rewriting Caucasian History, 236.

<sup>50</sup> [Nicholas Marr] Н. Марр, *Антиох Стратиг: Пленение Иерусалима персами в 614 г.* (Antiochos Strategos: The capture of Jerusalem by the Persians in 614) Изд., пер. и комм. Н. Марра. *Тексты и разыскания по армяно-грузинской филологии*, 9 (1909) (*Texts and studies in Armeno-Georgian philology*); Antiochus Monachus. *La Prise de Jerusalem par les Perses* [Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientaliu, scriptores georgi 203]. Ed. and trans. G. Garitte (Louvain, 1960).

<sup>51</sup> The Life of Kartli, 224. მოვიდა სამცხეს, და ესმა სასწაულო-მოქმედება ხატისა მის, რომელი წმიდასა ღმრთისმშობელსა გამოესახა და მიეცა პირველწოდებულისა ანდრიასოვს, და მას მოესვენა და დაესვენებინა მცირესა ეკუდერსა შინა აწყუერს. მოვიდა კეისარი ერაკლე ხილვად და თაყუანისცემად ხატისა მის. მაშინ იწყო ერაკლე აწყუერს დიდისა საყდრისა სამირკუელისა შავდებად და შენებად, ვიდრემდის მიერთებან განსრულნა მორწმუნეთა კაცთა მიერ, და მიერ შექმენს საეპისკოპოსო.

like rather legendary information, which is based on Herakleios' real travel to Georgia. Herakleios appears suddenly and out of nowhere, captures the city, cleans the faith, leaves to fight the Persians, on the way back passes once again victorious and while passing by takes with him the relics handed by Constantine gave to the king of Kartli. The only conclusion one can draw from these stories is that these sources were interested in Herakleios only so far as it concerned the royal dynasty of Georgia. The story of baptizing of the magi might be another literary topos. The fact that Herakleios's heresy is not mentioned at all, however, does not mean that it did not exist in Georgia, but rather that this fact was subject to deliberate omission.

The dogmatic activity of Herakleios in Armenia is recorded by the eleventh century polemicist Arseni of Sapara. Even this great dogmatic polemist of the period, who should have definitely known what the essence of Monenergism/Monothelitism was, does not mention anything about this heresy.

After a while Emperor Herakleios came to Armenia and saw the heresy of the Armenians and was worried for their damnation. He ordered to summon a big council of the bishops and priests of Armenia and wrote a letter to Katholikos Eyr and the princes, to gather at the city of Karin and study the Creed of the council of Chalcedon and accept the true two natures in Christ. So everybody gathered there in front of the king and after much study they received the truth. And the Armenians obeyed by signing the document so that nobody would object to it.<sup>52</sup>

Herakleios's invasion of Georgia and the events around the capture of Tbilisi is recorded by Theophanes Confessor. While the Persians were attacking Constantinople, Herakleios divided his army into three parts: he sent one part of it to defend the city and gave another part to his son Theodoros to fight against Sain and the third part he took himself and went to Lazika. While there he called the Turks of the east, known as

<sup>52</sup> Arseni of Sapara, 90. მოვიდა ჰერაკლე მეფე სომხითს და იხილა წკალება სომეხთა და ფრიად შეწუხნა წარწყმედისა მათისათჳს უნებლიებით მიქცევითა. და ბრძანა კრებად დიდი ყოფად ეპისკოპოსთა და მოძღუართა სომხითისათა და მიწერა წიგნი ეზრა კათალიკოზისა და აზნაურთა, რადთ შემოკრბენ კარნუ-ქალაქს და გამოიდიონ სარწმუნოება კრებისათის ქალკიდონისა და ცნან ჭეშმარიტად ორი ბუნებად ქრისტესი სომეხთა. და მოიწივნეს ყოველნი ერთობით წინაში მეფისა და გამოიწულილეს მესამედ მრავლითა ძიებითა და დაამტკიცეს მართალი. და დაემორჩილნეს სომეხნი ფიცით ჳელ-წერილითა, რა თა არღარავის წინააღუდგნენ ცილობად მისთჳს.

Khazars, as allies. Meanwhile, through a divine miracle Theodorus defeated Sain and an angry Khosrau killed him. The Khazars crossed the gates of the Caspian and forced their way into Adraigan under the command of Ziebiel, who held the second office after the khagan. Every place they passed through they burnt down villages and cities and captured the Persians. The king (Herakleios) left Lazika and went to meet the Khazars. The Persians watched the meeting of the two armies from the city of Tiflis.<sup>53</sup>

Only rarely does any source mention anything about the Kyron the katholikos of Kartli. The explanation of historical contamination is possible, but there might be another reason for the falling into oblivion of Kyron the katholikos of Kartli, Kyros of Phasis and the Monothelite controversy in the region. The question is – what was the reason?

### I. 3. The Armenian Sources on the Invasion of Herakleios

The evaluation of Herakleios's invasion of the Caucasus and generally the attitude towards his personality is different between Georgian and Armenian sources. It depends on the period in which the author was writing. The approach of a seventh-century Armenian author might be different from that of an eleventh-century author, because by that time Armenia had joined an ecclesiastical union with Herakleios. In the later period, however, this union was an object of cursing for Armenians. Generally speaking, Armenian sources give much detailed information on Herakleios' travel to the Caucasus.<sup>54</sup>

Another popular cycle around Herakleios deals with the story of the travel of the True Cross through the Caucasus, namely, Armenia. Authors like John of Draskhanakert (John the Katholikos), Asoghik and other sources like the *Tshar'ntirs*<sup>55</sup> tell stories of the travel of the Holy Cross to Armenia. Although these stories do not have a direct relation to the subject here, it is useful to show the kind of popular narratives which existed

<sup>53</sup> Theophanes Confessor, 447

<sup>54</sup> See: James-Howard Johnston, "Armenian Historians of Heraclius: An examination of aims, sources and working methods of Sebeos and Movses Daskhurantsi." *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641): Crisis and Confrontation* ed. Gerrit J. Reinink and Bernard H. Stolte (Louvain: Peeters, 2002), 41-62; *The Armenian Sources Attributed to Sebeos*. Translated by R. Thomson. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. 1999).

<sup>55</sup> Literally *The Chosen Words* equivalent of Georgian Mravaltavi – the literal translation of "Polycephala".

around Herakleios. Herakleios was once again in the center of a semi-mythological cycle of the restoration of the True Cross and just as in Georgian sources he is the founder of churches and monasteries. Once again, there is no indication about Herakleios' religious policy. The religious policy of Herakleios is mentioned in a single case, when the story of the ecclesiastical union with Katholikos Eyr is mentioned. The story is that Herakleios tried to achieve a union with Katholikos Eyr based on the compromise formula of Monenergism. According to John of Draskhanakert, Eyr yielded to temptation after having received one third of the revenue of Kolb and the revenues from the salt mines in exchange. Herakleios also threatened Eyr, that he would establish a parallel hierarchy if he rejected the union. Soon, in 632, a synod was summoned in Theodosiopolis which Herakleios himself supposedly attended.<sup>56</sup> The union was kept until 726 when Katholikos Hovanness of Odzun finally rejected Chalcedon at the Council of Manazkert and returned to the Monophysite formula.<sup>57</sup>

Then the Greek general Mzhezg Guni came from Armenia, and took control of all the land according to the agreed border. He told the Catholicos Eyr to go to him in the territory of the Greek borders, and to communicate with the emperor. "Otherwise, we shall make for ourselves another Catholicos, and do you hold your authority on the Persian side." Since the Catholicos was unable to leave the territory of his authority, he requested a statement of faith from the king. Immediately a document was sent to him written in the king's hand, anathematizing Nestorius and all heretics; but it did not anathematize the council of Chalcedon. The Catholicos went to the land of Asorestan, visited the king, and communicated with him. He asked the king for the salt [-mines] of Kolb as a gift; and receiving this gift, he returned home with great ceremony. Thereafter he resided in the Greek camp until the general satisfied his wishes and established detachments of soldiers and the distribution of stores over the whole land.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> There is no mention whatsoever of Monenergism or Monotheletism in Armenian sources. They refer to it as the Chalcedonian heresy.

<sup>57</sup> Five *katholikoi* after Ezra and right before John are usually considered as Chalcedonian and therefore heretical and condemned by the Armenian Church. These are: Nerses III, Anastasius, Israel, Sahak III and Elias.

<sup>58</sup> *The Armenian History Attributed to Sebeos*, 91-92.

A problem arises here, namely, that none of the Armenian sources mention a union achieved on a dogmatic compromise between Herakleios and Euz, nor does John of Odzun, the author of the history of Church councils of Armenia mention anything about any Monenergist or Monothelite formula of Herakleios. According to the unanimous testimony of the sources the reasons for accepting the union was purely political. Then where do the claims such as “a union based on Monenergist formula was accepted and signed at the synod of Theodosiopolis”<sup>59</sup> come from? Logically speaking, this is the only possibility, that in the middle of the Monothelite controversy it would be exactly Monothelism that was the basis of the union with the Armenian Church. Even if such compromise, based on a Monothelite insertion, really occurred then the next five Katholikoi, who were condemned by the Armenian Church, should have been adherent to the Monothelite doctrine and condemned by the Council of 681. Or there should be some indications that after the condemnation of Monenergism the Armenian Church was requested to do the same. This is not the case, however, the Armenian Church at that time was even collaborating with the Church of Constantinople without any problems. The one and only text which I have yet found, where the Armenians are accused in Monothelism is the Georgian translation of the Greek text *Thirty Chapters of the Armenian Heresy*: “The evil Armenians say that after the union the Son of God has one nature, one will and one energy, which is the faith of Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and all the communion of theirs which was condemned by the sixth Holy Synod called in Constantinople by one hundred and seventy fathers during the reign of Constantine.”<sup>60</sup> The problem here is that “one nature, one will and one activity” was not the faith of Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, but two natures, one will and one activity. This formula could not have been the compromise achieved at the council of Theodosiopolis because it was already the faith of Monophysite Armenians. On the other hand, however, this might be explained by the polemical character of the treatise.<sup>61</sup>

To conclude, there were several attitudes towards Herakleios. First of all there are legendary cycles, like that around the True Cross in Armenian texts, or on his activities in

<sup>59</sup> Hovorun, 65.

<sup>60</sup> [Zaza Alexidze] ზაზა ალექსიძე, არსენი ვაჩეს ძის “დოგმატიკონში” შესული ანტიმონოფიზიტური ტრაქტატი და მისი გამომავალი ძველ სომხურ მწერლობაში (An antiMonophysite treatise included in the Dogmatikon of Arseni Vacheszde and a reaction on it in the Armenian literature) *Mravaltavi* 1 (1971).

<sup>61</sup> On the Christology of the Monothelites see the fourth chapter.

Georgia. The problem is that none of the sources mentions Herakleios being a heretic and trying to introduce the new doctrine. For the Armenians, this is a mere Chalcedonian faith and nothing more,<sup>62</sup> while the Georgians did not have any problems at all with Herakleios's dogmatic stand. Even the Armenian sources do not attack Herakleios on that issue; they rather blame and curse Katholikos Eyr for subjecting to the Chalcedonian heresy. The Armenian sources do not say that this union was achieved because of a dogmatic compromise or that Herakleios introduced a new doctrine, but for all of them this was a pure Chalcedonian doctrine.

This was important to show at this place in the thesis in order to explain why the first half of the seventh century was so obscure. It seems that the Caucasian sources tell a different story of the events than the standard Church histories. There is no direct indication of the Imperial heresy; Georgian sources do not even record the schism between the Churches, except the special treatise of Arseni of Sapara *On the Division of Kartli and Armenia*.

The “cleansing of the faith” has really happened though, but that happened almost two decades before Herakleios invaded the Caucasus. It was done not by the hand of an “emperor” but through the activities of the patriarch of Kartli – the katholikos of Mtskheta – Kyron.

---

<sup>62</sup> Although Armenians tended to call any faith Chalcedonian or even more strictly, Nestorian, that did not admit one nature of Christ after the incarnation.

## Chapter II

### Kyros in Georgia

Some *aznaurs*<sup>63</sup> wrote me something proper to ravings of a sick man.

They say: We have this faith as well as your faith too.

We communicate the faith here and with you too.

Vrthanes Kherdol to Abraham<sup>64</sup>

#### II. 1. In Kartli

In 506 a council was convened in the Armenian city of Dvin, where the Caucasian churches of Armenia, Kartli, and Albania accepted the *Henotikon* of Zeno. During this period the dogmatic situation was not stable in the empire itself – Anastasius had Anti-Chalcedonian tendencies while Justinian was a strict anti-Monophysite. The religious situation in the Caucasus was strongly determined by the rivalry between the Roman Empire and Persia, which was respectively supporting Nestorians or Monophysites, depending on whether the Roman emperor was Chalcedonian or anti-Chalcedonian. The position of the Georgian Church during these times is still not completely clear, until 551 or 554, when a second council was called in Dvin by the Armenian katholikos Nerses II (548-557). At this council Armenia finally accepted the Anti-Chalcedonian, therefore pro-Persian, stand. According to Arseni of Sapara, the “Georgians, one fourth part of Armenia and the Synians”<sup>65</sup> did not take communion with the Armenians. Thus, until the very end of the sixth century the Church of Kartli was Chalcedonian. The last attempt of

---

<sup>63</sup> A high social layer in Armenia and Georgia.

<sup>64</sup> The Book of Letters, 45.

<sup>65</sup> Arseni of Sapara, 40.

the Armenian side to take over the Church of Kartli was the appointment to the see of Mtskheta of Kyron, who was supposed to enforce the pro-Armenian policy.<sup>66</sup>

## II. 1. a. Georgian sources on Kyron

The chronicle part of the *Conversion of Kartli*, while listing the *erismtavaris* and kings of Kartli, lists the *katholikoi* of Kartli too. When it mentions Stepanoz *erismtavari* it says that at that time Bartlome was *katholikos* of Kartli. This is the period of the ecclesiastical separation of Kartli and Armenia, when according to other data, that is to say, *The Book of Letters*, the *History* of Ukhtanes and all of the Armenian texts dealing with the period, *katholikos* was Kyron and the *erismtavari* was Adarnase and not Stepanoz. Then, having finished with the story of Herakleios, *The Conversion of Kartl* says once again: “And at that time Stepanoz was *erismtavari* and Bartlome was *katholikos* for the second time.”<sup>67</sup> So according to the *Conversion of Kartli* Barthlome became *katholikos* once again during the rule of Stepanoz or the two were ruling together in Kartli for more than thirty years.

The first problem is that we know according to the sources (*The Book of Letters*, Ukhtanes, Arseni of Sapara), that at that time Kyron was *katholikos* of Kartli and not Bartlome and the *erismtavari* was Adarnase and not Stepanoz.<sup>68</sup> After Kyron had left Kartli, there might have been someone named Bartlome, but at this point the author either makes a mistake or deliberately hides the fact of the existence of Kyron. The problem

---

<sup>66</sup> On the ecclesiastical situation in the Caucasus in the sixth – seventh centuries see: Zaza Alexidze, “*Establishment of National Churches in the Caucasus*,” *The Caucasus and Globalization: Religion and Caucasian Civilization* 2, vol 3, (2008), 142-150; Zaza Alexidze, *Kaukasien und der christlich Orient zwischen 451 und 780*. Georgika (1981), 34-36; Babian, Gobun. *The Relations between the Armenian and Georgian Churches According to the Armenian Sources, 300-610*. (Antelias-Lebanon: Armenian Catholicosate of Cilicia, 2001); Nina Garsoian, *L’eglise armenienne et le grand schisme d’orient*. (Louvain: Peeters, 1999); Karekin Sarkissian, *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church* (Antelias-Lebanon: Arms Pr Inc, 1984); Ervand Ter-Minasean, *Die Armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu den Syrischen Kirchen* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904); Cyril Toumanoff, „Armenia and Georgia“, in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. J.M. Hussey, vol. 4.1. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966) 593-637; *La Narratio de Rebus Armeniae*, critical edition and commentary G. Garitte, (Louvain: Peeters, 1952).

<sup>67</sup> *The Conversion of Kartli*, 96.

<sup>68</sup> *The Book of Letters*, 189.

arises even more in the next passage, when the author lists nine married katholikoi of Kartli in order: Tavpachag, Aelali, Iovel, Samoel, Giorgi, Kyron, Izidbozid and Petre.<sup>69</sup> The fact that Kyron was married is well known, but the problem is that he is said to be katholikos much later than it is known he was. The place of Kyron in the chronological order is very confused in both cases. This was either done deliberately and later, while restoring the real situation, historians mixed him with the other katholikoi or he was forgotten from the beginning. Another option was that there were two Kyrons, one mentioned by the *Conversion of Kartli* and the other in *the Book of Letters*, but this would be highly improbable because Kyron/Kyrion was not a common name in Georgia and no other Georgian or Armenian source knows anything about second Kyron. Besides in the old Armenian translation of the *Life of Kartli* the same Kyron, who is said to be much later, is called “filthy” – a common Armenian reference to Kyron of Mtskheta.<sup>70</sup> It would be improbable, that Kyron, the main protagonist in the Armenian-Georgian polemics and the person who enforced and finally established the Chalcedonian faith in Kartli, who resisted Persian influence and was persecuted for this, was just forgotten accidentally by the later generations.

In addition to this source another Georgian author – Arseni of Sapara – mentioned Kyron in his polemical text *On the Division of Georgians and Armenians*. Here Kyron is mentioned only twice, although the whole text is dedicated to the dogmatic opposition between the Georgian and Armenian Churches, where Kyron was the leading figure.

And when the katholikos of the Georgians, Kyron of Mtskheta and the Katholikos of Hers,<sup>71</sup> Abaz<sup>72</sup>, saw, that by the hand of Abdisho the Syrian<sup>73</sup> the Armenians convened a council in Dvin, renounced and cursed the Holy Catholic Church and gave up four patriarchates and betrayed the commandment which Gregory of Caesaria<sup>74</sup> gave to their Church, that for ever the bishops of Armenia should be ordained by his see, and that now

<sup>69</sup> The Conversion of Kartli, 97. “სოლო კათალიკოზნი, რომელ ევნონისითგან მომართ ივენეს თავფაჩაგ, ევლაღე, იოველ, სამოველ, გიორგი, კკრიონ, იზიდ-ბოზიდ, პეტრე. და ესე ცხრანი ცოლოსანნი ივენეს.” Unfortunately we do not have any other information on these katholikoi.

<sup>70</sup> ქართლის ცხოვრების ძველი სომხური თარგმანი (*The old Armenian translation of the Life of Kartli*), edited by Ilia Abuladze (Tbilisi: Georgian Academy of Sciences Press, 1953), 261.

<sup>71</sup> By that period Hereti was a Georgian name for Albania, resp. Hers means Albanians.

<sup>72</sup> The katholikos of Albania in 552-596.

<sup>73</sup> A Julianite Syrian who became the bishop in Armenian during the patriarchate of Nerses II (548-557). He is considered to be one of the responsables for convening the Council of Dvin.

<sup>74</sup> i.e. Gregory the Illuminator

Armenia received an order from the king of Persia to ordain the bishops by themselves. When all this became known to katholikos Kyron, Abaz the katholikos of Hers and Grigol the katholikos of Synians,<sup>75</sup> a big argument started between Armenia and Kartli.<sup>76</sup>

The last mention of Kyron is when Arseni describes the events just before the ecclesiastical schism, when Kyron expelled the Armenian bishop of Tsurtavi<sup>77</sup> from Kartli.<sup>78</sup> At the very first glance one would notice that the information in Georgian sources on Kyron is extremely scarce, so much that Arseni in the eleventh century has very little information on him. As for the earlier sources, discussed above, like the *Conversion of Kartli*, Kyron is mixed up with other katholikoi. This should suggest that Kyron was at a certain point deliberately erased from the chronicles and dyptychs. In the rest of the thesis I will argue that the reason for Kyron being forgotten should have been the heresy adherent of which he supposedly became later – that is to say of Monotheletism.

## II. 1. b. The provenance and education of Kyron

A much more detailed biography of Kyron is given only by the Armenian authors. In the first chapter of his *History of the Severance of the Georgians from the Armenians* Bishop Ukhtanes gives detailed data on Kyron's background:

---

<sup>75</sup> The north-eastern province of Greater Armenia, which was always trying to gain political and ecclesiastical from Armenia.

<sup>76</sup> Arseni Safareli, 81. “და ვითარცა იხილეს კათალიკოზმან ქართველთა კკრონ მცხეთისამან და კათალიკოზმან ჰერთა აბაზ, რამეთუ ჴელითა აბდიშო ასურისა თა კრებად ყვეს სომეხთა ქალაქსა ღვინს და შეჩუენებით განდგეს აღსარებისაგან წმიდისა კათოლიკე ეკლესიისა და განეყენეს ოთხთა საპატრიარქოთაგან და გარდააქციეს აღთქუმად იგი, რომელი დაუდვა წმინდამან გრიგოლი კესარია ეკლესიისა, უკუნისამდე არა განშორებად მისგან ჴელთ-დასხმა ეპისკოპოსებისა სომხითისა და რამეთუ სომხითმან ბრძანებად მიიღო სპარსთა მეფისაგან ელთ-დასხმა ეპისკოპოსებისა თავით თუხით, ესე რად ცნეს შეშმარიტად კკრიონ კათალიკოზმან, აბაზ ჰერთა კათალიკოზმან და გრიგოლი სივნიელთა ეპისკოპოსმან, და იქმნა ცილობად დიდი შორის სომხითისა და ქართლისა.”

<sup>77</sup> A town in southern Georgia. Had a strong Armenian diaspora and was allowed to have its own Armenian bishop.

<sup>78</sup> Arseni of Sapara, 81.

He was by land and by origin a Georgian, from the *gavar*<sup>79</sup> of Javakheti<sup>80</sup>, from a village called Skutri<sup>81</sup> and he was educated both in the Georgian and in the Armenian languages. When he went to the land of the the Romans, he lived there for fifteen years in the *gavar* called Kolonia<sup>82</sup>, in the big city of Nikopolis, at the river called Gail. There he studied their scholarship and other evil matters by which he broke off from us.<sup>83</sup>

Thus, according to Ukhtanes, Kyron was Georgian by ethnicity and was fluent in Georgian and Armenian scholarship. Despite the polemical and biased nature of the text, in this case there is no particular reason to mistrust the author. Besides, his Georgian provenance is attested by *the Book of Letters*, when the katholikos of the Armenians Movses (574–604) writes to Kyron:

Having trusted your past life and your love towards us, we fulfilled your will and appointed you as the superior of that country, while although by ethnicity and provenance you were from that country, you had alienated from it and had lived in the country of the Romans.<sup>84</sup>

Kyron had studied in the Roman Empire and therefore should have been fluent in Greek too, just as Ukhtanes claims it was. There are various reasons why Kyron might have been in Nikopolis, but probably he was taken hostage in his early youth during the Persian wars of 572 to 582.<sup>85</sup> Here he stayed for an additional fifteen years, so by the time he returned to Armenia he would have been about 20 to 25 years of age.

From Armenia Minor he returned to the Persian part of Armenia. During this time the katholikos of the Armenians was Movses of Elivard (574-604), who appointed Kyron as the bishop of the monastery in Dvin, granted him the title of *chorepiskopos*<sup>86</sup> and gave

---

<sup>79</sup> An Armenian administrative unit.

<sup>80</sup> The southern region of Georgia, bordering with Armenia.

<sup>81</sup> The exact location of Skutri is not identified.

<sup>82</sup> An eastern Roman province on the territory of former Lesser Armenia.

<sup>83</sup> Ukhtanes, 20-22. Սա էր աշխարհաւ և ազգաւ ի Վրաց՝ ի գաւարտ Ջաւախաց՝ ի գեղջէ՝ որ կոչի Սկուրիի. և ունէր զղարութիւն վասն Վրաց և Տալոց: Եւ երթեալ յերկիրն Տորոմոց բնակեցաւ անդ ամս հնգետասան ի գաւառին՝ որ կոչի Կողոնիայ. և բնակի անդ ի մեծ քաղաքագեղն Նիկոպոլիս կոչեցեալ՝ յեզր գետոյն՝ որ կոչի Գայլ: Եւ վարժեալ և ուսեալ զղարութիւն նոցա, և զայլ ևս չարարուեստ զիտութիւն, որով որոշեցաւ ի մէնջ:

<sup>84</sup> The Book of Letters, 128.

<sup>85</sup> See Nerses Akinian, *Kirion katolikos Vrac [Kirion the Katholikos of Georgians]* (Vienna: Mkhitarist Press), 169; The Book of Letters, 210; on the Persian war around the Caucasus see Michael Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 262-268.

<sup>86</sup> According to I. Javakshishvili the chorepiskopos was the highest priest of a certain administrative territory who was also the highest spiritual authority. On the function of the chorepiskopos in the Caucasus

him the *gavar* of Airarat. It is to be noted that according to Arseni of Sapara, at the time when Kyron was in Armenia, the bishops and generally clergy was exercising a strong political authority too.<sup>87</sup> So in Armenia Kyron should already have had an experience in combining worldly and ecclesiastical rule. Besides, although this is a pure assumption, it might be the case that Kyron got married while in his office of *chorepiskopos*.

As soon as he returned to his fatherland, he received the patriarchal see. He could not have become a *katholikos* before the age of thirty-five;<sup>88</sup> therefore he must have stayed in Armenia for at least ten years. He became *katholikos* of Kartli by the end of the sixth century. Kyron might have planned to receive the see while he was still in Armenia, however, the only way to do that was to take the communion with the Armenian *katholikos*, because at that time the Church of Kartli was, if not anti-Chalcedonian, at least was under the influence of the Armenian Church, i.e., Persia.<sup>89</sup>

## II. 1. c. The Evaluation of Kyron by the Armenian authors

Kyron is said to have been a strong political ruler in Kartli. Various anecdotes demonstrate his secular power and political ambitions:

When he reached his diocese, his see and his city called Mtskheta he summoned the bishops, the princes, the nobles, the *mtavaris* and the *erismtavaris* of the country and got the upper hand over them and brought the whole country under his supremacy. And when he saw that everything was arranged according to his will, he let an evil plan into his heart<sup>90</sup>

---

see: [Ivane Javakshishvili] ივანე ჯავახიშვილი, ქართული სამართლის ისტორია [The History of the Georgian Law] vol. 2, part 2 (Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press, 1929), 6-7.

<sup>87</sup> Arseni of Sapara, 87.

<sup>88</sup> The title of a Patriarch can no be granted until the age of thirty five. See: Javakshishvili, *The History of the Georgian Law*, 7.

<sup>89</sup> [Zaza Alexidze] ზაზა ალექსიძე, “რელიგიური სიტუაცია კავკასიაში VI საუკუნეში” [The Religious Situation in the Caucasus in the sixth century]. *Matsne* 3 (1973).

<sup>90</sup> Ukhhtanes, 22. ისე ჯიქამ თხა ყირონ ი ქინას ჯიქო იქხანოქთანს და ი შაღაქ ჯიქთანგ' იო ლიქი შგხეშაჲ, ძიოიქლ აოზ ინჲნ ენაქსიკოიოისანს ხანოქნძ ქაააქ აქხაროქინ და ექხასანს და ენაქარარო, და ნოადაქ ნოქააქ ხანოქნძ აოზხააარაქ დამნსაქან აქხაროქინ ენოქ ჯიქოიქ იქხანოქთანძ:

Here once again if we leave aside the polemical nature of the text and the “evil plan in his heart”, it is reasonable to believe with Ukhtanes that Kyron was exercising strong political authority in Kartli, because as later we will see, he indeed was the decision maker in the international politics of Kartli. The Armenian historians always stress the tyrannical nature of Kyron and his rule. Once again, this might be a fully polemical topos but the fact that Kyron was not of a humble nature and was quite ambitious is visible from his correspondence with the Armenian katholikos Abraham too. For example, in one letter he says:

In my person our Lord glorified our Church even more, and strengthened our faith, from the glories of the King of Kings he glorified me too and made me more successful than my fathers and even more than any of my fellows.<sup>91</sup>

This is a rather harsh statement of a powerful ruler who has full civil and Church authority, just as the patriarch of Alexandria had later. And Kyron did indeed exercise political rule, too, having subjected the princes to himself. The reason for such an influence might have been the fact that religious affiliation was strongly determining the political one, thus Kyron took upon himself the political leadership of the country too. From his letters we know that he was the decision maker in the matters of external policy and could convoke the princes of Kartli and give orders to them. Moreover, he was famous for his harsh and inexorable character, bringing fear to his surroundings, once again just as later Kyros of Alexandria terrified his opponents and not only theirs. When Vrthaness sent Kyron the first letter of allegations, no one dared to pass the message to him. Movses informed Vrthaness:

The letter that you wrote to the so-called katholikos and to the lords of that country I sent through my servant and he just returned. Due to tiredness he could not come to you and could not bring the news, of how nobody dared to pass the letter to the so called Katholikos and how then although they brought it to him, having read it he got outraged with an evil heart, pale as a sick man, how he was swearing and imprecating Armenia and how it

---

<sup>91</sup> The Book of Letters, 90. Մանաւանդ զի յիմումս Տէր Ասրուած մեր զեկեղեցիս մեր անելի պայծառացոյց, և զիսուարս մեր առաւել հաստատեաց, և յարթայից արթայի փառաց զիս անելի մեծացոյց. և յառաջադէմ արար, քան զհարսն իմ, մանաւանդ թէ, և քան զամենայն ընկերս իմ:

happened that neither did he write an answer nor did he let anybody else write it.<sup>92</sup>

## II. 1. d. The ecclesiastical policy of Kyron

It is very difficult to reconstruct Kyron's dogmatic stand; even his letters do not provide any important clues to reconstructing his theology. In Georgia (namely the souther part of it, adjacent to Armenia) he clearly grew up in an anti-Chalcedonian surrounding, but these early beliefs could have been shattered while he was staying in Kolonia, where he could have become acquainted with the Chalcedonian faith. When he returned to Armenia nobody noticed anything suspicious in his "orthodoxy" and, on the contrary, he was much trusted by katholikos Movses since he received a monastery and the *gavar* to rule. The first suspicion he attracted, which was actually the official reason for the schism between the Churches of Armenia and of Kartli, was much later when he alreday katholikos of Kartli received a Nestorian bishop in communion. Besides, he expelled an Armenian bishop named Movses from Kartli. Allegedly the protest of the expelled Movses against this act of Kyron was the impetus for the discord between the two Churches. Movses, the katholikos of the Armenians wrote to Kyron:

Now I hear that the divisions crept into your flock, to which I gave little credence first but later I did believe because the news reached me by way of faithful witnesses. That is what we heard: that certain man, a Nestorian *khuzhik*<sup>93</sup> came to you and received the ordination of the episcopate from your hands. I was deeply shocked knowing that not only such a man should never be worthy of such honor, but he should be punished and not accepted by the faithful.<sup>94</sup>

Although it would be naive to suppose that the reason for the schism was only the appointment of a Nestorian bishop or even the expulsion of the Armenian one, it seems

---

<sup>92</sup> The Book of Letters, 102.

<sup>93</sup> A person from Khuzhastan – a Persian province.

<sup>94</sup> The Heritage of Armenian Literature, 253.

that Kyron was not acting only on his own behalf, when dealing with the Nestorians, but had some contacts with the Western Church. A letter of Pope Gregory I (540–604) is preserved where he answers Kyron’s letter on how to deal with the Nestorians who repent, and how to receive them in communion, whether it is enough for them to accept the creed of Chalcedon or whether they should be re-baptized, also how to deal generally with the growing number of Nestorians in Kartli. Gregory’s answer was that if Nestorians repent, accept the Ecumenical Councils, and anathematize Nestorius, he should receive them in communion and leave them all the privileges and ranks they had.<sup>95</sup> One might suggest that Kyron followed Gregory’s instructions and appointed a Nestorian bishop, but the problem is that Kyron assigned a Nestorian Bishop to a Nestorian parish.<sup>96</sup> Ukhtanes gives account of these events in a very polemical manner:

He [Kyron] appointed a *khuzhik* Nestorian called Kis, which means ruthlessness, as a bishop. For he was austere and with ruthlessness he came to the Lord’s land and enraged the Lord. He came [to Kyron] from the land of the Romans, from the *gavar* of Kolonia, from the village close to Nikopolis called Zutarima, both of them being situated at the banks of the river Gail. I suppose that they were not only from the same *gavar* or even from the same village, but both were accomplices in the heresy and were evil students of the same evil teacher. So Kyron appointed him as the overseer of the aliens [i.e. of the heretics].<sup>97</sup>

Here the situation is even more complicated. Ukhtanes suspects that Kyron and Kis were students of a same Nestorian tutor.

Thus Kyron was loyal to the Council of Chalcedon, having hidden in himself their faith, even earlier coloured in the colours of Diphysites [litteraly: of those confessing two natures], but he renewed it by the agency of the *khuzhik* Nestorian. And as said above he ordained the Khuzhik bishop secretly from Movses the katholikos of the Armenians.<sup>98</sup>

<sup>95</sup> Migne, PL77. col. 1204-1208. For the full Latin text cf. appendix 1. Note that Gregory calls Kyron Quiricus or Quirinus.

<sup>96</sup> An attempt of reconstructing Kyron’s/Kyros’ theology will be given in the fourth chapter.

<sup>97</sup> Ukhtanes, 22. ձեռնարկը եպիսկոպոս մի խուժիկ նեստորական. որում անուն Կիս կոչիւր, որ է խստութիւն: Քանզի էր իսկ խիստ, և խստութեամբ վարեցաւ ի րեառնակողմն կոյս, և ի ցամաքութիւն ցասմամբ բարկացոյց զՏէր: Սա եկեալ առ նա յաշխարհէն չորսմոց՝ ի գաւառէն Կողոնիայ՝ բնակութեամբ ի գեղջէն՝ որ կոչի Զուրարմիայ, մերձ ի Նիկոպոլիս: Եւ են երկրքեան յեզր Գայլ գետոյ, որպէս նախասացեալ եղև. որ կարծեմ ոչ միայն գաւառակից միմեանց լեալ՝ կամ գեղակից, այլև աղանդակիցք և ուսումնակիցք չար ուսմանց ի չար վարդապետաց. և ձեռնարկէ զնա աւարարտեսուչ՝ այսինքն աղանդաւոր եպիսկոպոս

<sup>98</sup> The Book of Letters, 227.

Ukhtanes suspected that Kyron was cooperating with the Nestorians against the Armenians and sometimes accused him of Nestorianism too, although for the Armenians there was not a big difference between the Chalcedonians and the Nestorians.<sup>99</sup> According to Kyron's writings at this stage we have no grounds to "accuse" him of Nestorianism, but the fact is that he tried to arrange relationships with the Nestorians and bring them closer to him. He called a special council on that issue and consulted with the nobles and bishops.<sup>100</sup> So judging according to his religious policy one can conclude that Kyron, himself a Chalcedonian tried to unite the country and its religious denominations. In a single region he tolerated an Armenian diocese and a Nestorian one too. As Z. Alexidze suggests, the ecclesiastical policy of Kyron was based on an almost total tolerance and perhaps even on a dogmatic compromise to achieve a political result – to unite various Christian denominations under the rule of the Georgian Church,<sup>101</sup> hence his continual consultations with the rulers of Kartli. Everything seemed to go well until the scandal on the issue of banishment of Movses from the bishopric of Tsurtavi occurred. Either this was a serious flaw of Kyron or a deliberate act as a signal of final separation from the Armenian Church and therefore from the Persian dominion. I would say and will try to argue this later that not only the political goal was the motivation of Kyron but his own personal religious experience too. The fact that gave a Nestorian bishop to a region populated by Nestorians makes suspicious the claims of Kyron that he received the Nestorian in communion after his repentance.<sup>102</sup> It also seems that Kis was not the only Nestorian who was received in communion by Kyron and he had special policy towards the Nestorians. As he himself confesses, "once he [Movses] was angry at me for accepting the Nestorians, but he has not written anything else on the faith, that we are not orthodox."<sup>103</sup> So it could be suggested that Kyron's policy regarded not only one bishop but generally Nestorians in Kartli.

---

<sup>99</sup> Although I would not agree with identifying Nestorians with Chalcedonians every time the Nestorians are mentioned in an Armenian source.

<sup>100</sup> The Book of Letters, 69.

<sup>101</sup> The Book of Letters, 225-30.

<sup>102</sup> The heritage of Armenian Literature, 254. "I concluded that it is lawful not to reject all those who wish to come back to the fold after they have acknowledged their faults and have repented. But when we heard this *khuzhik's* iniquity we rejected him at once and expelled him from among us, charging people not to exchange greetings with him."

<sup>103</sup> The Book of Letters, 82.

The second grave allegation from the Armenian side was that Kyron betrayed the faith of Jerusalem and of Gregory the Illuminator (c. 257–331) and received the heresy of the “two natures.” Interestingly enough, although Kyron answers every point of the Armenian accusation he skips this one and says:<sup>104</sup>

Now as what regards the faith, the council and the Tome<sup>105</sup> and that you say it is unimaginable for you that we, the servants of the king of kings, have common faith with an alien king and that we reject the relatives. Ours as well as your father were the servants of the king of kings but meanwhile had the faith of Jerusalem. And we and you as well, although we are the servants of the king of kings, we have and will always have the faith of Jerusalem...When you wrote that you wanted to send the bishops to us so that they might teach, of course, if you wish, send them so that they might teach and they might learn. But indeed I should have come and have prayed in your holy Church and have received blessing from you or I should have sent students to you, so that they might have brought the greetings from your holiness to us, but the bad times and the needs of the country did not let.<sup>106</sup>

As one can see, Kyron just skipped the issue of faith and directly started to speak about the politics. Manipulating the common idea that there can not be two emperors in the world he argued that while being in communion with Byzantium he remains the servant of the Persians. As regards the faith, he kept insisting that the Georgians never betrayed the faith of Jerusalem. When katholikos Abraham discovered that these words were just manipulations, it was already too late.

<sup>104</sup> In fact we can not be sure, whether this is really Kyron’s diplomatic tactic, or later Armenian interpolation to diminish Kyron’s theological abilities, as Ukhtanes does.

<sup>105</sup> I.e. the Tome of Leo I to Flavian of Constantinople.

<sup>106</sup> The Book of Letters, 69-72. Իսկ այն, որ վասն հաւաւորաց և ժողովոյն և փոռմարին գրեալ էր, և գայս գրեալ էր, թէ արքայից արքայի ծառայից ընդ աւարտ թագաւորաց ծառայս հաւաւորի ի զուգաց ունել և զքնական հաղորդակիցս ուրանալ՝ յոյժ անհնարին թուի: Մեր և ձեր հարքն արքայի ծառայք էին, և զհաւաւոր գերուսաղեմի ունիմք և կալցուք: Չի թէ ցայժմ խոնսուող էին Տեարք, այլժմ որչափ ևս առաւել երանելի ենք, որք յարքայից արքայի ծառայութեան հասեալ ենք: Չի մինչ երկինք և երկիր լեալ էին, չէր եղեալ և ոչ մի փեր, որ ամենայն ազգի զիր արեւնս ի վերայ թողեալ էր, որպէս այս փեր եթող, և մանաւանդ զմեր քրիստոնէից հաւաւորս. իսկ ազգարի աշխարհի մերոյ աւելի քան զամենայն աշխարհաց, և բարի անձինս իմոյ՝ լաւագոյն քան զամենայն ընկերաց իմոց: Եւ արքայից արքայ նոյնպէս փեր է՝ Տոռոմոց, որպէս և փիրեաց աշխարհի. և չէ այսպէս, որպէս դուք գրեցէք, թէ որիչ որիչ թագաւորութիւնք են:

Եւ որ գրեալ էր, թէ կամէաք եպիսկոպոսունս արձակել, որ գային և ուսուցանէին. թէ կամիք արձակեցէք, թող զի գան որ ուսուցանեն և ուսանին: Բայց պարտ էր ինձ, զի գայի և յաղաթս կայի ի սուրբ եկեղեցիս և ի ձէնչ արհնէի. կամ արձակել զիմ աշակերտս, որ զողջոյն սրբութեանդ ձերոյ առ մեզ բերէին. բայց վասն չար ժամանակիս և աշխարհի կարեաց խափանեցաք. ի բնի մի ունիք:

Kyron's second letter is even more obscure: An answer to Smbat Bagratuni<sup>107</sup> the *Marzpan* of Vrkan His main argument still is still that the Georgians have not changed their faith from the times of Gregory the Illuminator.<sup>108</sup>

The second letter of Abraham is already quite irritated. He saw that Kyron was manipulating him, now Abraham directly accused him of lying that they both have the faith of Jerusalem and suggesting that in reality this was a play of words. Of course Kyron has the faith of Jerusalem, now Jerusalem is in hands of heretics just as Kyron himself. Kyron's answer was equally irritated but still diplomatic.<sup>109</sup>

To the third letter of Abraham, Kyron, completely outraged, answered that he was not going to discuss the issue any longer and gave a brief account of four Ecumenical Councils, saying that this is his faith and that the discussion is closed on that.<sup>110</sup> This was the last letter of Kyron documented in *The Book of Letters*. Until the very end, when Kyron showed his ruthless character, he tried to balance and not strain the relations with the Armenians. He even compromised his faith in the sense that he was not stressing his Chalcedonian faith at all. It seems that, expelling of the Armenian bishop was a forced act in order to get rid of the Armenian resistance against the policy of Kyron. As Movses said, he reacted against Kyron right away, when katholikos started to bring the Nestorians close to himself.

---

<sup>107</sup> See: The Armenian History Attributed to Sebeos, 43.

<sup>108</sup> The Book of Letters, 76-79.

<sup>109</sup> The Book of Letters, 88-91.

<sup>110</sup> While giving an account of the First Council of Nicea Kyron quotes the Nicene creed, which should sound like this: "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, **being of one substance with the Father**; by whom all things were made..."

But while quoting it Kyron commits a great "mistake" instead of saying one substance with the father, he says: **similar to the Father**. thus quoting the exact opposite of the Nicene creed – the faith of the *Homians*. I can't find the explanation for such a mistake, it is highly improbable that this is a mere mistake....

## II. 1. e. Kyron's international policy

It is not surprising that the Armenians were puzzled; Kyron's behavior must have seemed completely unpredictable. The same can be said about the lay nobility of Kartli. The nobles of Kartli wrote a letter to Vrthaness Kherdol.<sup>111</sup> Vrthaness says:

Some *aznaurs* wrote me something proper to ravings of a sick man, who does not know what he is speaking about. They say: We have this faith as well as your faith, too. We communicate the faith here and with you, too.<sup>112</sup>

This statement is quite strange. It seems to me that some conspiracy had taken place, conducted by Kyron. The whole country was preparing for some serious changes. It is still not clear what the dogmatic stand of Kartli was prior to the schism, whether it was Chalcedonian or not. The fact is that in those times in the purely dogmatic stand they were Chalcedonians, although in the political sense they did not want to draw strict lines. Kartli was still under Persian dominion. I infer that Kyron had some dealings with the Romans and was aware about the possible invasion from the west, hence his firm and brave opposition to the Persians as well as the attempt to create a union. On the one hand he was Chalcedonian, on the other hand he did not admit to being different from the Armenian faith, and on top of that he also received a Nestorian priest in communion. Ukhtanes confirms that Kyron already had some agreement with the Romans:

Smbat, about whom I already said that he was the *Marzpan* of the Armenians, a good man and God's servant, a trusted man and firm in Orthodoxy, he knew Kyron's will, that he was in agreement with the Greeks, so he could not inform the emperor on the deeds of Kyron. Nor did he say anything to the king [i.e. Persian Shah] because he knew it

<sup>111</sup> The keeper of the throne *φύλαξ τοῦ θρόνου* of the Armenian katholikos in 604-607 – he was one the most uncompromising Armenian anti-Chalcedonians.

<sup>112</sup> The Book of Letters, 45. և զոր արարեալն իսկ է առ իս ազապ արանց ոմանց այնպէս է՝ որք ի հիւանդութեան ինչ ընդ բարբաջ անկեալ ոչ գիրեն զինչպէս խաւսին: Ասեն , մեք և զայս ունիմք հաւար և զայր, արիհաց աստ հաղորդիմք և այդր

would be pointless. Meanwhile he was informed about the will of the emperor too, that he was in agreement with Kyron and that everything was conducted under his order, because quite suspicious are Kyron's words, which he says in his letters to Abraham and to Smbat that may God bless the emperor as the emperor blessed our country.<sup>113</sup>

Abraham had wondered in his letter to Kyron how he could betray the King of Kings and make friends and unity with an alien kingdom<sup>114</sup>. Kyron himself did not reject the accusations. He was an able diplomat and gave diplomatic answer with the knowledge of conceptual political theology: “The king of Persia is the lord of the Romans as well as of the Arians and therefore the kingdom of the Romans is not alien to us” and later he says: “How can we betray the multitude of the Orthodox bishops, the kings and the counts and all the Orthodox countries and join you?”<sup>115</sup> Thus the fact that Kyron is pro-Roman is evident, but what was the reward for the cooperation with the Romans?<sup>116</sup> The reward might have been exactly the granting of the title of archbishop of Lazika, a step further towards the ecclesiastical unification of Kartli and Egrisi, which would have led to their final political unification. By the first decade of the seventh century Kartli was already a strong state and made its own politics independent from Persia or the Roman Empire. The emperor whom Ukhtanes refers to could have been Maurice or Phocas or both. Both Maurice and Phocas were strongly involved in anti-Persian politics and would have been very interested in having local support in the Caucasus.<sup>117</sup>

As one can see, until the very end Kyron tried to settle the discord and not tackle the issues of faith, but this turned out to be impossible and ended with the mutual excommunication of two *katholikoi*. It seems that Kyron had a plan to establish strong communications with the Orthodox bishops: His correspondence at least with the Roman pope and the patriarch of Jerusalem is known. This would have led to political independence from Persia. Kyron did not want to create a tension with the Armenians yet,

---

<sup>113</sup> Ukhtanes, 40. Եւ Սմբարն՝ գորմէ ասացաք՝ թէ մարզպան էր Տայոց, այր բարի, և բարեպաշտ, և հաւարարիմ, և հասարարուն ի հաւարս ուղղափառութեան, զիւրէր զկամս Կիւրոնի՝ եթէ ձայնակից եղև Տորոմոց, ոչ կարաց զգացուցանել կայսեր զերեպոս ի Կիւրոնէ, նա և ոչ արքայի ծանոյց. քանզի զիւրէր՝ եթէ ոչինչ աւգրի. միանգամայն և իմացեալ իսկ էր զկամս կայսեր, եթէ միաբան է ընդ Կիւրոնի՝ և նորա հրաման՝ ասէ՝ գործն այն. քանզի կարծիս քայ մեզ բանն Կիւրոնի՝ զոր յիւր թուղթսն գրէ առ Աբրահամ և առ Սմբար. թէ կեցուցէ Աստուած զկայսրն, զի նա զաշխարհս մեր կեցոյց: Եւ դարձեալ, թէ Աստուած փառաւորեցէ զարքայ, քանզի նա փառաւորեաց

<sup>114</sup> The Book of Letters, 68.

<sup>115</sup> The Book of Letters, 68.

<sup>116</sup> Compare to the policy of Kyros of Alexandria during the Arab conquest of Egypt.

<sup>117</sup> See Whtiby, 276-305.

hoping to make a union with them, based on the Chalcedonian faith. Kyron did not succeed in his attempt and was forced to flee from Kartli. From this moment on, no text mentions him as Katholikos Kyron. According to Ukhtanes Kyron, whose whereabouts are not specified contracted a stomach disease and died in severe pain.<sup>118</sup>

After capturing Jerusalem, supposedly around 617, Khosrau (590–628) convened the so-called “Persian Council” where he ordered that all the Christians should receive the “Armenian Faith.”<sup>119</sup> The supervisor of the council was Smbat Bagratuni. Sebeos quotes a letter of Nerses the katholikos of Armenians (641–661) to Emperor Constans II (641–668) in which the former gives the details of the council, he divides those who attended the council in two groups: Those who had been servants of the Persian king from the beginning and those who were Chalcedonian but had received the Armenian faith. The list of the Church officials is given next but there is no mention of Kyron the katholikos of Kartli at all and generally of no representative from Kartli.<sup>120</sup> In all likelihood this silence might mean that by that time Kyron had already left Kartli and gone into exile and he was not among those who compromised.

It is difficult to judge, due to the nature of the sources, whether Kyron’s dogmatic stand was determined purely by the politics or there was something more behind it. For Ukhtanes and other Armenian authors, on the one hand, it was clear that these actions of Kyron was a treason against the Persian rule and a political movement. Arseni of Sapara, on the other hand, would never have agreed on this, claiming that Kyron was moved by purely religious motives. I would suggest that both reasons were behind the logic of Kyron’s actions.

Kyron became an uncompromising opponent of Persian dominance in the Caucasus; he was trying to find strong allies in the Romans and therefore was an unpopular figure among the Persians and pro-Persian Armenians. In the second decade of the seventh century, when the Persians were taking over, Kyron was forced to leave Kartli. The most logical place, frequently used for political exile, was Lazika.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> The Book of Letters. 262.

<sup>119</sup> I.e. the anti-Chalcedonian stand.

<sup>120</sup> The Armenian History Attributed to Sebeos, 116-17.

<sup>121</sup> King Vakhtang and then Gurgen, both found asylum in Lazika.

## II. 2. The relations of the churches of western and eastern Georgia

The question of the relationship between the Church of Lazika and the Church of Kartli is not yet fully studied, but as Z. Alexidze proposes, by the beginning of seventh century, something like unity may already have existed between these two Churches.<sup>122</sup> Two more arguments suggest that in the sixth and seventh centuries Kartli and Lazika were closely tied by something like an ecclesiastical unity and were maybe even under a single ecclesiastical authority. In the beginning of the seventh century the same cross-shaped churches are built all over Georgia – in Lazika and in Kartli – coinciding with the patriarchate of Kyros.<sup>123</sup> Another interesting coincidence: According to the studies of N. Marr and I. Javakhishvili in the sixth and seventh centuries the eastern Georgian linguistic elements began to invade the western Georgian linguistic area.<sup>124</sup> At this stage it is still not clear, of exactly what kind the ties between Egrisi and Kartli were in the turn of the sixth century but one thing is evident, that the bonds were becoming stronger and stronger.

This is the main clue for the identification. So according to nonwritten sources (linguistics and archaeology) by the beginning of the seventh century eastern and western Georgia were in close relations. One would suggest that in this case there should have been some single authority over these two regions which would unite them. The solution to this problem is provided by Hovanes Draskhanakertatsi (katholikos of the Armenians in 897–925) who directly says that Kyron the katholikos of Kartli was meanwhile the archbishop of Egrisi<sup>125</sup> or the metropolitan of Lazika:

<sup>122</sup> The Book of Letters, 191-201; also [Zaza Alexidze] ზაზა ალექსიძე. “რელიგიური სიტუაცია კავკასიაში VI საუკუნეში” [The Religious Situation in the Caucasus in the sixth century] *Matsne* 3 (1973), 103-110

<sup>123</sup> [Giorgi Chubinashvili] Георгий Чубинашвили, Памятники типа Джвари (The Cross-shaped Monuments) (Tbilisi: Georgian Academy of Sciences Press, 1948), 82-83.

<sup>124</sup> [Ivane Javakhishvili] ივანე ჯავახიშვილი, ქართველი ერის ისტორია 1 (*The History of the Georgian Nation I*). (Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press, 1979), 56.

<sup>125</sup> A Georgian name for Lazika, modern Samegrelo.

Movses [the katholikos of the Armenians] ordained the head of the Holy Synod Kyrion as the archbishop of Kartli, of Gugark and of Egrisi.<sup>126</sup>

As noted by I. Javakhishvili, this source indicates that the katholikos of Kartli already had his influence over the western Georgia and the borders of the Georgian katholikosate was moved over the range of Likhi. It is clear that Hovanes Draskhanakertatsi has this information from some other source, but for the moment it is impossible to find out from which one.<sup>127</sup> This could have been true only in the period of Kyron's rule and not between the years 616 and 628 when Iberia and Lazika were divided between Byzantium and Persia. As noted above, it might be suggested that Kyron received the western Georgian eparchy from the Roman emperor as a reward for turning Kartli back to the pro-Roman policy or for enforcing Dyophysitism and hence his second title in the Armenian sources.<sup>128</sup>

So to sum up, according to the Armenian sources Kyron the katholikos of Katli was meanwhile the archbishop of Egrisi. He was a political and ecclesiastical leader of the country and a pro-Byzantine ruler. His policy failed in Kartli, because there was not sufficient backup from the Roman Empire yet. After the intervention of the Persians and the so called "Persian council" he had to flee and supposedly did so to his western eparchy – to Lazika, where he continued his activity now as the bishop of Lazika.

### II. 3. In Lazika

Kyros of Phasis emerges in history for the first time when he meets Herakleios in Lazika and discusses the issues of *energeia* in Christ with him. To the best of my knowledge there are no Georgian or Armenian sources which would mention him or his meeting with Herakleios. The problem is when exactly this meeting happened and at

---

<sup>126</sup> [Ioane Drasxanak'ert'eli] იოანე დრასხანაკერტელი. Translated and edited by Ilia Abuladze. (Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press, 1937), 9.

<sup>127</sup> Javakhishvili 1, 301.

<sup>128</sup> See the Book of Letters, 168 – 171; [Simon Janashia] სიმონ ჯანაშია, *ფეოდალური რევოლუცია საქართველოში* (Feudal Revolution in Georgia) (Tbilisi: Georgian Academy of Sciences Press, 1949), 122-123.

what stage of Herakleios' campaign. According to Theophanes it happened in 627/628.<sup>129</sup> It is also not completely clear, whether Herakleios met Kyros once or twice, or whether this meeting took place in Lazika or in Hierapolis, as Theophanes claims, or in both places.<sup>130</sup>

Theophanes Confessor tells the story that on his way to the Caucasus, Herakleios stayed in Hierapolis where he was engaged in theological debates with the Jacobite patriarch Athanasios and called the bishop of Phasis for council. He compared the dogmatic stand of Kyros to that of Athanasios and Sergios, the patriarch of Constantinople and saw that all three were agreeing with each other in their Monenergist convictions. Thus, according to Theophanes Kyros was already a Monothelite when he met Herakleios.

In this year while the emperor Herakleios was in Hierapolis, the patriarch of the Jacobites, Athanasios, came to him. The skilful and wicked man, who was filled with the cunning that is native to Syrians, took up with the emperor a discussion about religion, and Herakleios promised him that if he accepted the Council of Chalcedon, he would make him patriarch of Antioch. So he pretended to accept the council and confessed the two natures that are united in Christ and also enquired of the emperor concerning the energy and the wills, namely how these would be defined in Christ, double or single. The emperor was disconcerted by this novel language and wrote to Sergios, bishop of Constantinople, he also called in Kyros, bishop of Phasis, whom he questioned and found him agreeing with Sergios on the one will and the one energy. For Sergios, being himself of Syrian origin, the son of Jacobite parents, confessed and propounded in writing one natural will and one energy in Christ. The emperor, being satisfied with the views of these two men, found that Athanasios, too, was in agreement with them. For the latter knew that if only one activity was recognized, one nature would thereby be acknowledged. Being assured in this matter the emperor wrote the opinion of the two men to John, Pope of Rome, but the latter did not accept their heresy. And when George of Alexandria had died, Kyros was sent to be bishop of Alexandria.<sup>131</sup>

Georgios Kedrenos repeats the story almost word for word with the only exception that he directly calls Kyros a Monothelite, so according to Kedrenus Kyros had

<sup>129</sup> Theophanes Confessor, 461; Kaegi, 142.

<sup>130</sup> See: J.R Martindale, "Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria". *The prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. III (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 377-378.

<sup>131</sup> Theophanes Confessor, 461. For the full Greek text cf. appendix 2.

Monothelite inclinations even before he talked to Herakleios: “He [Athanasius] asked the Emperor on how should one confess energies and wills in Christ, single or double, and the Emperor wrote to Sergios of Constantinople and called Kyros of Phasis, **both Monothelites**, and found out that they were both on the same position that Athanasius.”<sup>132</sup> John Zonaras also suggests that when Herakleios asked Kyros, the latter had already taken a Monothelite stand and together with Sergios persuaded Herakleios to accept their doctrine<sup>133</sup> and almost the same is told by Pseudo-Anastasius.<sup>134</sup> Other than the information of Theophanes and Georgios Kedrenos, we have the following documents on Kyros of Phasis: One letter of Sergios to Kyros,<sup>135</sup> the story of the dispute of Kyros with Herakleios in Lazika,<sup>136</sup> letter of Kyros to Sergios,<sup>137</sup> answer of Sergios on that letter.<sup>138</sup> In the acts of the seventh Ecumenical Council Kyros is mentioned sometimes as the patriarch of Alexandria and sometime as bishop of Phasis.<sup>139</sup> Kyros is also referred as the metropolitan of the Lazs by Sergios in his letter to Honorius. In this very letter he is mentioned as the patriarch of Alexandria as well.<sup>140</sup> So two facts are undisputed and unanimously attested by the historiographers about Kyros: That he met Herakleios in Lazika, discussed with him the Christological problem of *energeia* and will and that later he was transferred to Alexandria.<sup>141</sup> The only question is whether Kyros was the author and initiator of Monenergism/Monothelism together with Sergios, or was he persuaded to accept the doctrine by the latter, because if we follow the acts of the Second Council of Constantinople it seems that Kyros spoke about this with Herakleios and was on contrary persuaded by him to accept Monothelism. At least this is what one can conclude from his letter to Sergios of Constantinople.<sup>142</sup> But as I will argue later, not

<sup>132</sup> I. Bekker, *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae opera*, 2 vols. (Bonn: Weber, 1:1838; 2: 1839), 736.

<sup>133</sup> T. Buttner-Wobst, *Ioannis Zonarae epitomae historiarum libri xvii*, vol. 3. (Bonn: Weber, 1897), 213.

<sup>134</sup> K.H. Themann, “Die dem Anastasios Sinaites zugeschriebene Synopsis de hereresibus et synodis,” *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 14 (1982), 77-86.

<sup>135</sup> Maximus Homologetes. PG 91, 333 a.

<sup>136</sup> ACO II, 584, 15–21, 588, 14–590.

<sup>137</sup> ACO II 2, 588, 7–592.

<sup>138</sup> ACO II 2, 528, 1–530.

<sup>139</sup> ACO II, 2, 526, 20; 562, 16; 578, 15; 584, 17; 586, 2.

<sup>140</sup> ACO II, 2, 534, 25.

<sup>141</sup> On Kyros of Phasis and his transfer to Alexandria see also J.M. Duffy, and J. Parker, *The Synodicon Vetus* [Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, Series Washingtonensis 15] (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1979), 2-142; J. Polemis, *Theodori Dexii Opera Omnia* [Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 55] (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 118.

<sup>142</sup> For a detailed analysis of Kyros’ writings see chapter 4 of the present thesis.

only it was not just the case that Kyros was persuaded to accept Monotheletism, but he was the initiator of the whole controversy and the one who elaborated the doctrine.

Kyros of Phasis has always been held a mysterious figure, who influenced the events of the period so much that he was later even appointed patriarch of Alexandria. This was already noticed by V. Bolotov, moreover, he noticed that somehow the activities of Kyros of Phasis were connected to those of Kyron of Kartli.<sup>143</sup> Although Bolotov's ideas are partly erroneous,<sup>144</sup> the fact that he intuitively connected these two figures is important.

## II. 4. Preliminary conclusions

As no political authority is known in Lazika at that time, one might conclude that Kyros was responsible for the political course of the region. The fact that Lazs and Abazgs were taking a crucial part in the army of Herakleios is unanimously attested by various historians, both Greek and Armenian.<sup>145</sup> While Abazgia was a northwestern region of western Georgia, it should have been under the jurisdiction of the see of Phasis, therefore it would have been Kyros who guided the Lazs and Abazgs into joining the army of Herakleios. Kyros seems to have been very interested in the affairs in Kartli. He was the first whom Herakleios consulted on that issue and, maybe, exactly because Herakleios knew about Kyros' background and about his role in the religious situation in the Caucasus.

As I have already pointed out, both Kyros of Phasis and katholikos Kyron were erased from the Church history. The writings of the former were burned as a result of the

---

<sup>143</sup> Bolotov, 453. "Kyros of Phasis is one of the most interesting figures in history and maybe even mystical: Not everything in his meeting with the Emperor is random. Not long before that in Kartli Kyron has started a strong movement which resulted in the separation of part of his Diocese from that of the Armenian Katholikos. It was clear to Kyros that under special conditions it would have been possible to persuade the Armenians to join the Orthodox Church. But Kyros was careful and wanted to establish good relationships first with Constantinople. He was already distinguished and exercised a great authority and finally was appointed the patriarch of Alexandria."

<sup>144</sup> The Church of Kartli has not been under the Armenian supremacy by the end of the sixth century.

<sup>145</sup> See, for example: *Theophanis chronographia*, vol. 1, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig: Teubner, 1883, repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963), 311-313; *The Armenian History Attributed to Sebeos*, 216.

Sixth Ecumenical Council. The same with Kyron – he should have been deliberately erased from the diptychs of Georgian Church because he was a heretic too. In the light of the evidence presented so far it can be suggested that besides the title of katholikos of Kartli Kyron had the title of archbishop of Egrisi. Soon after Kyron had to leave Kartli, and supposedly he left for Lazika (his western eparchy and a usual political asylum for the fugitives from the Persian rule), Kyros of Phasis emerged and conducted a policy of union now together with Herakleios. He was soon transferred to the see of Alexandria where he spent the last ten years of his life under the much hated name of Al-Mukaukas.

## Chapter III

### Kyros in Alexandria

“Then shall the Antichrist rise  
and shall go before the Roman Emperor,  
and be made governor with double office  
of a ruler and of bishop.”  
*The Life of Shanûdah*<sup>146</sup>

In 631 Kyros became patriarch of Alexandria. The legitimate question which arises is why precisely Kyros of Phasis, who apparently had nothing to do with Egypt and did not know the intricacies of the patriarchal rule in Alexandria? Moreover he was a new “proselyte” and his Monothelite convictions do not seem to have been as deep as of those in Constantinople for example. The reason for this choice of Herakleios becomes more plausible if the identification of Kyros with Katholikos Kyron is accepted. Kyron had a strong background in diplomacy and Church politics, having polemicized for years with the Armenians and knowing all the touching points of Chalcedonian and Anti-Chalcedonian theologies. Moreover he had perhaps the biggest experience in doing politics through dogmatic compromises.<sup>147</sup> The situation in Egypt was strongly in need of an experienced Church politician. Although it is not the place here to study the development of the Egyptian Church, a brief review at it is still needed, in order to understand what kind of political and ecclesiastical situation Kyros inherited.

As early as the third-fourth centuries onwards the clergy in Egypt was exercising strong influence and power and were much more competent in ruling than the civic authorities appointed by the emperor. Especially from the period of Athanasios of Alexandria the patriarch’s power was dominated not only the church but on occasions influenced and controlled civic authorities, too. Whether justly or not at the council of Tyre in 335 Athanasius was charged of using extreme violence against the sect of

---

<sup>146</sup> Butler, 518.

<sup>147</sup> See Kyron’s Nestorian and Armenian policy.

Meletians and of interfering politically with the imperial trade. The period of Athanasios's rule was the beginning of the series of violence in the Church.<sup>148</sup> The same influence, if not even greater, was exercised by Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>149</sup>

Through time, the Alexandrian Church became a considerable landowner, exercising military power along with the economic power. Violence and unrest continued in the Alexandrian Church after Cyril and Dioskoros too, and after the death of Markian a fight began over the patriarchal see between two Timothys, (one of them chosen illegally by the Alexandrians), but soon he was chased away, order was restored under Emperor Leo (457–474) and as a result another Timothy was appointed as an archbishop. It should be noted that this Timothy had the nickname *Basilikos* a Greek alternative to the later Arabic name *Melchite* for Egyptian and Syriac Church authorities who were forcing the imperial Orthodoxy.<sup>150</sup>

After the council of Chalcedon and especially at the beginning of the sixth century, Egypt became extremely diverse in religious sects. One such anti-Chalcedonian group was that of the *Akephaloi*. After 518 two theologians came to Alexandria who had a strong influence – Severos of Antioch and John of Halicarnassus. The doctrine of the first was backed by the Theodosians<sup>151</sup> while the second gave birth to the teaching of Julianism. The next several decades under the reign of Justinian passed with rivalry between these two Monophysite parties.<sup>152</sup>

During the reign of Justinian Egypt was once again torn into two parts by religious rivalries. On one hand, Justinian was trying to enforce Orthodoxy and suppress

---

<sup>148</sup> The title of the patriarch of Alexandria was either archbishop or the pope, while the title *Patriarch* is of a later period and has never been as popular as the first two. He was sometimes even called pharaoh - a mock name to describe his extreme political power. The mock-name pharaoh began to be used during the Nestorian controversy for Cyril of Alexandria, by his opponents, as designating the Egyptian persecutor of the true Israelites. On the politics during the time of Athanasios of Alexandria see: Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius* (London: Routledge, 2004).

<sup>149</sup> On Cyril's policy see: Norman Russel, *Cyril of Alexandria* (London: Routledge, 2000); John A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy. Its History, Theology and Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1994); Daniel Keating, *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

<sup>150</sup> Edward Rochie Hardy, "The Patriarchate of Alexandria: A study in National Christianity," *Church History* 15/2, (June 1946), 81-100.

<sup>151</sup> Followers of Theodosios (535-566) – the anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria.

<sup>152</sup> On the political and religious situation in Late Antique Egypt see: Roger S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); *Egypt in the Byzantine World*, ed. by R.S. Bagnall, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

the Copts and on the other hand, Theodora was openly sympathized with the Copts.<sup>153</sup> The policy of Justin against the Copts was much harsher than that of Justinian. The whole Egypt was at arms.<sup>154</sup>

This was the situation in Egypt when Kyros received the see. The whole empire was torn by ecclesiastical rivalries and Egypt was the center of these disputes. Kyros received both ecclesiastical and civic authority<sup>155</sup> and was entrusted to bring peace and unity to the Church as well as to politics. During the Persian wars Herakleios had seen how easily the Copts and other anti-Chalcedonians were switched sides to the enemy. Kyros was entrusted with creating a union with the Monophysites, but as it later turned out the union grew into the calamities which Egypt has not seen for two centuries.<sup>156</sup>

### III. 1. The nature of Kyros and of his rule

In autumn of 631 Kyros moved from Lazika to Egypt. Before Kyros' arrival and during the Persian rule of Egypt the Melchite Church declined greatly, giving supremacy to the Copts. John the Almoner (p. 606–616) the Melchite patriarch, even had to flee to Cyprus, and his successor, George seems have been only nominally appointed.<sup>157</sup> It was not before the reoccupation of Alexandria by the Romans in 627 that George set foot in Egypt. The Coptic Church, in contrast existed peacefully and flourished under Persian rule. After the death of Coptic Archbishop Andronicus<sup>158</sup> in 622, Benjamin (p. 622–661) was chosen, who secured the power of the Coptic Church throughout the whole of Egypt, but

<sup>153</sup> Volker Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syriac Orthodox Church*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 208-229.

<sup>154</sup> Butler, 3.

<sup>155</sup> Kaegi, 257.

<sup>156</sup> A. Butler describes the advent of Kyros in very expressive words: Herakleios courted disaster in making choice of Kyros. For this was the evil genius who not only wrecked the Emperor's hopes of religious union in Egypt, but who after making himself a name of terror and loathing to the Copts for ten years, after stamping out to the best of his power the Coptic belief by persecution, made Coptic allegiance to Roman rule impossible; the tyrant who misgoverned the country into hatred of the Empire, and so prepared the way for the Arab conquest; and the traitor who at the critical moment delivered it over by surrender to the enemy. This was the man of evil fame, known afterwards in Egyptian history as Al-Mukaukas — that mysterious ruler the riddle of whose name and nation have hitherto confused and baffled historians, but whose identity with Kyros is now absolutely certain. Butler, 175.

<sup>157</sup> Butler, 170.

<sup>158</sup> See: Aziz S. Atiya, "Andronicus", in *Coptic Encyclopedia* 1, 131-32.

in 631 the news about Kyros advancing towards Alexandria spread and Benjamin have seen the need to flee.<sup>159</sup> He also sent encyclical letters to all the bishops and monks to be prepared and to protect themselves. It seems that Kyros already had an infamous reputation as a ruthless ruler, otherwise why would Benjamin need to flee? There is no information that Kyros was coming with an army. After his arrival a series of severe persecutions of the Copts started, which is described in many Coptic sources in all the bloody details.<sup>160</sup> The appointment of Kyros might be considered as a failure of Herakleios's policy. The emperor should have used this moment when the liberation of Jerusalem and the restoration of the Cross brought euphoria to the Copts and Orthodox alike, which might have been the best moment for the union of the two; instead Herakleios appointed Kyros who was not planning to make peace at all.<sup>161</sup>

Kyros received both the highest ecclesiastical authority and civic power. Al-Mukaukas was called the governor of Egypt and the prefect of Alexandria. He was also responsible for Egypt's fiscal policy.<sup>162</sup> The Coptic and Arabic sources mixed Mukaukas with all possible persons but the point on which all of them agree is that he was a ruler and also a bishop.<sup>163</sup> He was the one who negotiated with the Arabs and finally signed the surrender of Egypt.<sup>164</sup>

It is clear that Kyros had a strict nature; he was hated almost by everyone, first by the Copts and later by the Greeks and even his former supporters too.<sup>165</sup> Later on he was denounced even by Herakleios and exposed to public dishonor.<sup>166</sup> This is not a conclusive argument, but it is impossible not to notice the resemblance between the characters of Kyros and Kyron of Mtskheta.

---

<sup>159</sup> See: Detlef C. G. Müller, "Benjamin I", in *Coptic Encyclopedia* 2, 375.

<sup>160</sup> For the details on the Kyros' persecution of the Copts see Butler. p. 180-93.

<sup>161</sup> Butler, 174.

<sup>162</sup> Kaegi, 280.

<sup>163</sup> On the Coptic policy of Kyros see: Aziz S. Atiya, "Cyrus Al-Muqawqas", in *Coptic Encyclopedia* 3, 682; A. Grohman, "Al-Mukawkas", in *Encyclopedia of Islam* 6, 712-15.

<sup>164</sup> Kaegi, 281-287.

<sup>165</sup> I will not be judging the sources on Kyros' rule due to my incompetence in the Coptic and Arabic languages.

<sup>166</sup> Kaegi, 295-96.

### III. 2. Kyros in Muslim sources

Arabic sources give detailed information on Kyros of Alexandria. They mainly refer to him as Al-Mukaukas or Muqauqis. The sources are far from being unanimous on his identity of Al-Mukaukas. According to some of them (Baladhuri, Tabari, Abu Salih, Ibn Khaldun, Ibn Dukmak) he was the governor of Egypt and Alexandria, others call him the controller of finances in the name of Herakleios (Eutychius); to yet other authors he is both patriarch and ruler “the misbeliever governor, who was both prefect and patriarch of Alexandria” (Severos of Ushmunain, Makrizi).<sup>167</sup> Three different names were popular among the Arabic historians for Kyros: Abu Maryam, Al-Araj and Al-Mukaukas, according to A. Butler, all of them referred to one and the same person. The point that A. Butler makes is that the Arabic authors having forgotten the real identity of Al-Mukaukas mixed him with all possible rulers or commanders of Christian Egypt before or during the Arab invasion. Therefore he argues that most of these stories are legendary and have a form of narratives similar to *Thousand and One Nights*.<sup>168</sup>

Interestingly according to one author, Al-Mukaukas had a wife and daughter. A. Butler did not accept this information as trustworthy, mainly because a patriarch is not supposed to have a family and therefore he ignored this information.<sup>169</sup> Rather than to reject the credibility of this rather strange information, I would suggest as one possibility of explaining it by once again turning back to Kyron of Mtskheta who, as is known, although a patriarch, still had a family and was listed among the nine married *katholikoi*

---

<sup>167</sup> Butler, 498-508; Grohman, 712-15.

<sup>168</sup> Butler, 500.

<sup>169</sup> Butler, 216. So much may be believed of the entertaining legend about Armanûsah, daughter of Al Mukaukas, told by Wakidî. He relates that she was on her way to Caesarea to marry Constantine, son of Herakleios, when, learning that Caesarea was besieged by the Arabs, she returned to Egypt with all her servants and treasures, and reached Bilbais, only to be besieged by `Amr's forces. `Amr is said to have treated her with chivalrous regard, and to have restored her with all her jewels to her father. I need not waste time in dissecting this legend: the fact that Al-Mukaukas was Patriarch of Alexandria would alone be decisive in disproving it. The story is given by Quatremère (*Mém. Hist. et Géog.* t. i. p. 53), and upon it is based the historical novel *Armenosa of Egypt* by the Very Rev. C.H. Butcher, D.D. It is worth adding that `Armanûsah' is given as the old name of Armant by Abû Sâlih (p. 279). Ibn `Abd al Hakam with similar unreality speaks of the *wife* of Al-Mukaukas, and tells a story about a vineyard which she owned and flooded, so that Lake Mareotis was formed. It is a pity that these myths, which are often inspired by the fancy of the Arabian Nights, must be banished from the domain of history.

of Kartli.<sup>170</sup> Kyros would have moved to Egypt together with his family, considering this, the information on Kyros does not sound so improbable.

The name Al-Mukaukas, as I have already pointed out in the introduction, was simultaneously and independently connected to the Caucasus by A. Butler and V. Bolotov.<sup>171</sup> Both agree that Mukaukas should be an Arabic rendering of Greek *Κεκαυκασιωμένος* a mocking name for Kyros meaning “the one who once used to be a Caucasian” or “the one who had been caucasified”. Beyond this point, however, Bolotov’s argument does not sound convincing any more, when he suggests that Kyros might have been an Egyptian who was moved to Lazika and then moved back to Egypt.<sup>172</sup> His argument is not convincing first of all because the name Kyros does not necessarily need to be of Egyptian origin but was a very popular name in the Persian realm too. Even more unlikely is the supposition that Kyros might have been exiled to the Caucasus. If so, how did he consequently become the metropolitan of Lazika? I agree with A. Butler, for whom Kyros was from the Caucasus region and neither an Egyptian and nor a Greek.<sup>173</sup> Kyros would have been ethnically alien to both to the Greeks and to the Copts, hence the pejorative and mock name of “the Caucasian” and taking into account that the territories between Erzerum, Lake Van, and the south-western Caspian have never been considered nor called Caucasus, the only place of origin for a Caucasian would have been the region directly adjacent to the southern slopes of the Caucasian mountains.

Important linguistic analyses have been conducted by A. Butler and later by Z. Alexidze on the name of Mukaukas. Arabic sources refer to him as to *jurij ibn mena* and *jurij ibn karkab*. The first name *jrj* has been interpreted mainly in two ways: either it is an Arabic form for George and the Arab historians mixed Kyros with his predecessor

<sup>170</sup> See chapter I, p. 28 of the present thesis.

<sup>171</sup> See. Bolotov, *On the History of Herakleios*, 15.

<sup>172</sup> “We should take into consideration that Herakleios met Kyros when the latter was the metropolitan of Phasis (Poti) in the country of the Lazs. Judging according to his name *Kyros* he should have been of Egyptian descent. This makes the translation of Kyros to the See of Alexandria even more motivated. And when the harsh agents of Kyros started the persecution of the “Acefals” who rejected the “Synod” and the “Tome” the Egyptian Monophysites who had the experience of pious and loved “Popes-synodites” as Timothy the Salophakiolos or John the Almoner, met the news of Kyros’ appointment with a grief, calling him *ο Κεκαυκασιωμένος*, “completely caucasianized” “a wild person”. An Egyptian could have appeared in the Caucasus without his will too – for refusing to pay taxes. Bolotov, 72.

<sup>173</sup> Butler, 525.

patriarch George<sup>174</sup> or it might be connected to the Arabic ethnonym for Georgian – *gurj* (jrj/krj).<sup>175</sup> It is rather difficult to imagine that the Arabic sources confused him with Patriarch George, because he exercised almost no rule in Egypt and hardly even stepped on Egyptian soil, not to mention that he did not exercise any sort of political authority in Egypt and was much less known than Kyros. The second explanation, although still hypothetical, might sound more trustworthy because for the contemporary Copts the provenance of Kyros might have been known but later on was forgotten and the ethnonym *jrj* was interpreted as the name George. As for *karkab*, A. Butler himself followed the trail to the Caucasian explanation of the name but does not develop this idea further:

The word *krkb* occurs far too late in Arabic literature to represent anything but a blunder or a series of blunders in copying. Abû Sâlih says that *krkr* is derived from “Gregorius.” Now if we suppose that *krkr* was corrupted into *krkb* — an extremely probable supposition — we have the simple explanation that Ibn Karkab is a mistake for Ibn Karkar and that it means “son of Gregory”. Note also that Gregory appears as “Grigor” in Armenian, and that the name was a very favorite one in that part of the world. The form “Karkûr” is the common equivalent of “Gregory” among Copts and Armenians today. Hence it is perfectly possible that Kyros was son of Gregory, and George son of Mînâ.<sup>176</sup>

Another strong argument supporting his Caucasian provenance is the name of Mukaukas’ daughter attested in Al-Wakidi’s story mentioned above. The name *Armanusah*, as Z. Alexidze suggests, has a clear Armenian etymology. It could not have emerged in an Egyptian realm and moreover not in a Greek one. This name is still popular in Western Armenian and is a composite of *Armen* + *anush*, the daughter of Armen.<sup>177</sup> It is logical to conclude that Kyron gave his daughter name from the Armenian realm, because he lived in Armenia until the age of 35. It is improbable that the name *Armanusah* was just created in the Arabian folk or literary tradition, where such a name did not exist at all.<sup>178</sup>

<sup>174</sup> Butler, 178; Bolotov, On the History of Herakleios, 18.

<sup>175</sup> The Book of Letters, 258-60.

<sup>176</sup> Butler, 523.

<sup>177</sup> The Book of Letters, 258.

<sup>178</sup> Although this can not be considered as a proper argument for the thesis it is worthwhile noting that even the death of Kyros of Alexandria is the same as that of Kyron of Mtskheta. According to Ukhtanes (see.

Once again, as in the case of Kyron and Kyros of Phasis, some archaeological data can be advanced in support of the identification. As in the case of the intensive building of the cross-type churches in Lazika and Kartli, Z. Alexidze points out two studies on the Georgian church discovered in Thebes in the mid 1940s.<sup>179</sup> The church is of a Georgian type called a three-church basilica. The architectural form of the church is defined not by the constructional but by the liturgical needs. In Egypt no bipartite or tripartite churches existed. Although Monneret de Villart dates the church to the ninth/tenth centuries, M. Tarkhnishvili does not agree with him, saying that in that period there is no Georgian building activity known in Egypt and besides, churches of this type were no longer built in the ninth century even in Georgia. The spread of this type of church is dated to the fifth-seventh centuries. The building of Georgian churches in Egypt might be explained in several ways and one of them might be the figure of Kyros of Alexandria, who could have brought with him the tradition together with a Georgian church community. Although this argument is very hypothetical and raises questions like why a single small church in provincial Thebes would be commissioned by the patriarch of Alexandria, still it might be left open for some deliberation. A separate study of Georgian building activities in Egypt will be needed in order to reach amore decisive conclusion to this issue.

As one can see, no textual data exist to support the theory of a single identity for Kyros of Alexandria and Kyron of Mtskheta, while it is backed by certain amount of linguistic and archaeological data. This is not surprising, because, as was pointed out above, there are practically no reliable sources on the life of Kyros of Alexandria.

---

Ukhtanes, 108) the latter died with some heavy illness and severe pains in a very old age while Kyros of Alexandria died with a heavy disinter or according to some other information he committed suicide and drank poison, also at a very old age. However, in both cases this might be a polemical insertion demonstrating what is the usual end of a “heretic”.

<sup>179</sup> Ugo Monneret de Villard, “Una chiesa di tipo georgiano nella necropoli Tebana,” *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum, The Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute II* (1950), 495-500; Mikheil Tarkhnishvili, “Un vestige de l’art Georgien en Egypte”, *Bedi Kharthlisa* VI – VII, 1959.

## Chapter IV

### The Doctrine

Did not Nestorius, who indeed maintained  
that there were two *prosopa*,  
rather say that there was but one energy?  
Maximos Homologetes<sup>180</sup>

#### IV.1. Introduction: *Status questionis*

Although I partly touched on the theology of Kyros in the previous chapters, here I will try to restore as far as it is possible the concrete theological and philosophical system that could have lurked behind Kyros's statements. Given the importance of not only the dogmatic debates but also of the philosophico-theological positions underlining the different dogmatic positions during the Christological controversies, it is justified to ask the following question: Was there any philosophical system behind Kyros's theology, which would have had roots in a concrete spirituality? To answer this question a thorough analysis of the Monothelite doctrine will be needed along with the close study of Kyros's theological legacy. After all he was considered a Monophysite, a Nestorian and a Chalcedonian, being along these also a Monothelite and a Monenergist.<sup>181</sup>

---

<sup>180</sup> *The Disputation with Pyrrhus of Our Father among the Saints, Maximus the Confessor*, trans. Joseph P. Farrell (South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon, 1990), 56.

<sup>181</sup> For the Byzantine sources mentioning Kyros of Phasis

## IV.2. Previous approaches towards Monothelism

The literature discussing Monothelism and its nature focuses in general on the evaluation of the question how orthodox or unorthodox the Christology of the Monothelites was. I will not touch on the notion of orthodoxy at all, because in this case a large overview of what orthodoxy was according to St. Cyril of Alexandria and others would be needed, a subject rather remote from the purpose of the present thesis.<sup>182</sup>

The main theories concerning Monothelism elaborated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries seem to have been ideologized by the opposition between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches, thus sometimes limiting the whole debate to the issue of how orthodox or unorthodox Pope Honorius was. By the end of the nineteenth century Charles Joseph Hefele was supporting the traditional idea that Monothelites completely rejected the human will in Christ.<sup>183</sup> Somewhat later Venance Grumel proposed the theory that Monothelism was a kind of a mixture of diphysitism and of the idea of one will and activity taken from Severos of Antioch. J. Tixeront called Monothelism a form of Apollinarism from which it apparently sprang.<sup>184</sup> This theory was mainly motivated by the usage of the notion of *κίνησις* by the Monothelites in the same way as Apollinarios did. The same theory is supported by M. Jugie. Jugie generally denies the existence of a seventh-century Monothelite heresy and calls this problem a terminological confusion.<sup>185</sup> So does Hans-Georg Beck, who wrote that the Sixth Ecumenical Council condemned an

---

<sup>182</sup> The discussion on the Orthodoxy of some Monothelites is stipulated by the Catholic theologians due to the problematic fact of Pope Honorius' condemnation by the Council of Constantinople. The literature on this issue is quite vast: John Chapman, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*. (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1907); Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, 2: *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 150-154; Georg Kreuzer, "Die Honoriusfrage im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit". *Päpste und Papsttum*, 8 (1975); Georg Schwaiger, "Die Honoriusfrage: zu einer neuen Untersuchung des alten Falles," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 88 (1977), 85-97.

<sup>183</sup> Demetrios Bathrellos, *Person, Nature and Will in the Christology of Saint Maximus the Confessor* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 65

<sup>184</sup> Joseph Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, iii, 2nd ed. (London: Herder, 1926), 168

<sup>185</sup> M. Jugie, "Monothélisme", in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, x (1929), cols. 2307-23, at 2310.

outdated Christology which was a matter of a mere terminology and nothing more.<sup>186</sup> Contemporary studies on Monotheletism also see a revival or a refinement of the Cyrillian theology.<sup>187</sup> Here I will attempt a different theoretical approach.

One thing is to be made clear before proceeding with the analysis of Monotheletism. Monotheletism and Monenergism were an ongoing issue for more than a half a century, and was to that date the longest lasting heretical movement in the history of Ecumenical Councils. It was elaborated by people coming from very diverse theological, cultural and political milieux and backgrounds. Therefore we should not expect the whole doctrine to be a straightforward theory with uniform argumentation and not even with a single philosophical and Christological basis. Because of the notion of “oneness,” Monotheletism was pending between two radical opposites and had sometimes a tendency to turn to the Cyrillian Christology and understanding of wills and actions in Christ. Actually for the later generations this aspect of Monenergism was left in the memory, and was always compared although, in my opinion, completely erroneously, to Monophysitism.

### **IV.3. The evaluation of Monotheletism by the Byzantine authors**

The term Monotheletism sounded confusing to both contemporary and later authors and was closely associated with Monophysitism, suspecting that it was a variety of anti-Chalcedonian Christology. Theophanes Confessor for example, when recounting Herakleios’s meeting with Athanasios and Kyros, says that Athanasios was very content with this novel doctrine because he thought that confessing one activity and one will in Christ would automatically lead to confessing one nature in Him; as for Sergios, he accepted Monotheletism because he was of Jacobite origin and “confessed and propounded in writing one natural will and one energy in Christ”.<sup>188</sup> John of Damascus while crediting Kyros for the invention of this doctrine saw a revival of Apollinarism in

---

<sup>186</sup> Hans-Georg Beck, “Justinian’s Successors: Monoenergism and Monothelism,” in *History of the Church*, ii: *The Imperial Church from Constantine to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Hubert Jedin and John Dolan, trans. Anselm Biggs (London: Burns and Oates, 1980), 457-63.

<sup>187</sup> Andrew Louth, *Maximus the Confessor* (London: Routledge, 1996), 55.

<sup>188</sup> Theophanes Confessor, 461.

it.<sup>189</sup> The later commentators and Church historians were unanimous in their evaluation of Monothelism/Monenergism. Gennadios Scholarios,<sup>190</sup> for example, completely equates these two, saying that although Monothelites anathematized the Monophysites, in reality they were the same.<sup>191</sup> The same is to be said about other later theologians, who generally mention the two in the same context.<sup>192</sup> Meanwhile the same sources almost unanimously credit Kyros of Alexandria for creating the doctrine.<sup>193</sup> So, according to Theophanes we have three people who eagerly accepted Monothelism, Sergios, Athanasios and Kyros. In Sergios's and Athanasios's case the cause of this acceptance seems to be their alleged Monophysitism, but the problem remains what motivated Kyros in his choice of Monothelism. Neither Theophanes, nor anybody else called Kyros a Monophysite. I would propose that this statement of Theophanes might hint at two radically opposite tendencies of Monothelism: One of these was following Cyril of Alexandria towards confessing one activity and will in Christ, suggesting that the Divinity was the sole subject of the activity and this activity passed through the humanity of Christ, while the second view, an advocate of which, to my mind, was Kyros, confessed two natures with two volitions and two activities, and namely, one hypostatical activity and volition.<sup>194</sup>

<sup>189</sup> John B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 4. Patristische Texte und Studien 22 (Berlin: De Gryoeter, 1981), 55. *Μονοδηλήται, οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας Κύρου τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰληφότες, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Σεργίου βεβαιωθέντες. Οὗτοι δύο μὲν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ φύσεις πρᾶσβεύουσι καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν, ἐν δὲ θέλημα καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν δογματίζουσιν, ἀναιροῦντες διὰ τούτου τὴν τῶν φύσεων δυάδα καὶ τοῖς Ἀπολιναρίου δόγμασιν ἰσχυρῶς ἀντιποιοῦμενοι.*

<sup>190</sup> Patriarch of Constantinople from 1454 to 1464.

<sup>191</sup> *Oevres completes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios*, vol 3 ed. M. Jugie, L. Petit, X. A. Sideridas, (Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1930), 156.

<sup>192</sup> See for example: *Φιλοθέου Κόκκινου δογματικά ἔργα. Μέρος Α'* (The Dogmatic Works of Philotheos Kokkinos) in *Thessalonian Byzantine Writers 3*. ed. D. Kaikames. (Thessalonica: Centre for Byzantine Research, 1983).

<sup>193</sup> See: F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi* (Munster: Aschendorf, 1907), 270.

<sup>194</sup> Although one can not claim that Theophanes was purposefully pointing out at these two trends, he surely should have been basing himself on some other sources.

#### IV.4. Early “Monenergisms”: Apollinarios and Severos of Antioch

I suggest that when using the terms Monothelism or Monenergism, one should be very strict about the terminology and in the application of these terms. For example can we call Apollinarios of Laodocia or Severos of Antioch Monothelites, both confessing one nature in Christ? If one confesses one nature, he automatically confesses one will and one activity as long as acting and willing is considered, following Aristotle, a capacity of the nature (*φύσις*), that is, of the substance (*οὐσία*). The philosophical problem arises when, according to the Monothelite doctrine, one professes one activity and one will simultaneously with the doctrine of the two natures. In fact, logically, this would lead towards the conclusion that the will and the *energeia* are properties not of nature but of hypostasis, that is, the common reality of the two natures defined by Chalcedon as constituting Christ’s unity. If this is correct, then, it would be methodologically misleading to call Apollinarios the first Monenergist.<sup>195</sup>

For Apollinarios the animated flesh and the Divine Logos are parts of the single nature of Christ. The flesh is not a complete humanity because it lacks the human *nous*, which is substituted by the Logos. The Divine intellect is self-movable (*αὐτοκίνητος*) and the flesh completely subordinate to it. But even Apollinarios did not confess only one *energeia* in Christ and admitted that

the human [*energeia*] takes part in the Divine *energeia*, as far as it can reach it, being lesser than what is greater. Also man is the slave of God and God is not the slave of man, nor of Himself, also is the former the creature of God while the latter is not a creature of man or of himself.<sup>196</sup>

Although Apollinarios preferred to call the human activity not *energeia*, but a movement (*σαρκικαὶ κινήσεις*), to stress the complete dependence of the humanity on the Divine *energeia*,<sup>197</sup> his theory is far from what is generally called Monenergism.

<sup>195</sup> See, for example, Hovorun, 5.

<sup>196</sup> Hovorun, 7.

<sup>197</sup> Hovorun, 7.

The same holds true to Severos of Antioch. For him the activity is single in Christ as single as Christ is himself. Severos condemned Leo for ascribing two activities to Christ's two natures. For Severos, "flesh of Christ endowed with a rational soul" is just an instrument through which the Logos acts. This instrument is not detachable from Christ's single nature but is an integral part of it.<sup>198</sup> It should be noted at this point that Severos opposed the Nestorian teaching on the activity as coming from a God-bearing human being and stresses that the only subject of Christ's activity is Logos:

The incarnate has done and said this, for it is united hypostatically to the body and through adhering together it had this as an organ for the deeds, as the soul too, which is peculiar to every one of us, has chosen its own body as organ; the Logos does not act through the extrinsically united God-bearing human being, as the ravings of Nestorios would have it, nor in the way in which an artisan uses a tool and thus completes the work nor as a cithara player strikes the cithara.<sup>199</sup>

#### IV.5. The Christology of Kyros

It should be noted that Theophanes mentioned that Sergios professed one **natural** activity in Christ. However, the doctrine of one natural will and activity would inevitably lead to the ultimate idea of one nature in Christ. The clue to solving this problem lies once again in the person of Kyros. Theophanes gives interesting information on Kyros's approach to this doctrine. In fact, Theophanes relates that Sergios's idea was not acceptable to Kyros. While he says nothing on Kyros's background theology and on what was the reason that only Kyros doubted and asking Sergios for clarification. I would argue that Kyros did not doubt about the idea of one will and *energeia* in Christ at all, whether or not he would accept this, yet, for him it was unacceptable to attribute the unity of the *energeia* and the will according to nature. Kyros, who was undoubtedly much sophisticated in theology than Sergios, wrote a letter where he as if doubting the idea of one will, asked Sergios for precision.

---

<sup>198</sup> Hovorun, 18.

<sup>199</sup> Hovorun, 18.

#### IV. 5. a. One activity in the conditions of two

A problem which was faced any time, when referring to one activity in Christ was be the formula of Leo. For the anti-Chalcedonians, interpreting Dionysios was easy, thus refuting Leo's Christology, but what should have a "Chalcedonian" Monenergist have done? Kyros found an escape from this dilemma and once again with the help of Antiochian Christology. This was made clear even in the very first document ascribed to Kyros, in his first letter addressed to Sergios.

To my honorable lord, to the kind shepherd, to the father of fathers and the world Patriarch Sergios, from Kyros the inferior to you: When I was pondering the idea to address the present report (*ἀναφοράν*) to my Lord honoured by God, various thoughts entered my mind and two opinions divided my soul. Either I would follow the injunction: *O teacher, seek not out things that are too high for thee, neither search the things that are too deep*<sup>200</sup> and so, *having put a lock on my lips*.<sup>201</sup> I would keep silence, or I would listen to the one who said: *Seek and stay with me*.<sup>202</sup>

Having examined myself in this for a long while, finally I decided to write when I considered the divinely inspired teaching of Your Thrice-blessedness, having become convinced that either one or both of the following two would happen to me. For, according to Scripture either I would be accepted, or, certainly, I would be corrected in what I say in this my report, being deemed worthy, o You Honoured by God [*θεοτίμητοι*], of the all-pious traces of our Ruler strengthened by God. At the same time, having obtained His [the Emperor's] God-imitating condescension, I drew courage, having encountered by a divine command the treatise of Your own Meekness written to Arkadios, the most holy Archbishop of Cyprus,<sup>203</sup> against Paul the head of those without bishops,<sup>204</sup> written in the most divine manner. The entire aim of that treatise is praiseworthy and God-loving, piously teaching our immaculate Orthodoxy, but it prohibits speaking about two activities of our Lord Jesus Christ after the union. Having found this treatise I rejected this statement and tried to bring forward against it the most honorable letter of the holy Leo, which clearly

<sup>200</sup> A paraphrase of Sir. 3:21. My translation follows the Greek text of Kyros.

<sup>201</sup> A paraphrase of Ps. 140:3.

<sup>202</sup> A paraphrase of Is. 21:12.

<sup>203</sup> Archbishop of Konstantia, Cyprus. He would have held office between 625 and 641, when he was condemned by the Lateran Synod. He was one of the very first Monothelites. See: Friedhelm Winkelman, *Der Monenergetisch-Monothelische Streit* (Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang, 2001), 196-97.

<sup>204</sup> These are the Akephaloi, a group of anti-Chalcedonians following the theology of Severos of Antioch.

proclaims two activities in communion with each other,<sup>205</sup> according to the teaching of my most holy Lord. Our discussion starting from this point, I was ordered to compose an honourable report to submit to your Godly-inspiredness for reading, [the letter] being called a copy [*ἀντίγραφον*] and showing the aforementioned pious order. It had mentioned that Paul but also contained a copy of the order and reproduced its meaning. At that moment I was taught to keep quiet and to avoid contradicting, understood that I had to take refuge in Your godly-spoken teaching, asking for being deemed worthy to receive precious morsels of it, which would clarify more obviously that, if we avoid speaking of two activities after the union, we are able to enclose, according to the divine Scriptures, into one unique activity the passible and impassible parts of the undivisible oikonomia of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, in order that our uneducatedness, having been illuminated by the God-proclaiming education of Your God-taughtness, it should perhaps imitate – at least in this respect – the greasy and fertile soil, and so, having gladly received the seed of the word sown in it, it would preserve it for bearing fruit.<sup>206</sup>

This letter of Kyros was presented as the first document of the Monothelites at the thirteenth session of the Sixth Ecumenical Council. It also seems to have been chronologically one of the first documents in the Monothelite controversy.<sup>207</sup> The interpretation of the letter can not be uniform. On the one hand, according to the structure and the content the letter seems to be a complete subordination to the imperial will, first to Herakleios and then to Sergios and consequently he receives their will without contradiction [*ἥκιστα ἀντιλέγειν ἐπαιδευόμενῳ*]. But on the other hand the amazing easiness and moreover willingness with which Kyros “accepted” what would later be called Monenergism is striking. This letter does not seem to belong to a straightforward Chalcedonian who is just about to convert to a new faith and needs much explanation and assurance, as it is usually presented. On the contrary, one gets the impression, that Kyros had a clear mind about what he is speaking and just pushes Sergios to confirm this. What Kyros fears in this letter is that one activity in Christ might be interpreted in the way Athanasios would want it to be interpreted, that is in a Monophysite way, where one activity would mean one nature. To avoid this he notes the main Chalcedonian formula of Leo *agit utraque natura quod proprium est cum communione*. This is one Christological

<sup>205</sup> See the *Tome* of Pope Leo I to Flavian of Constantinople.

<sup>206</sup> ACO II, 2, 588-590. For the full Greek text cf. appendix 3.

<sup>207</sup> Winkelmann, 57.

formula that Kyros proposes and the other is the confession of one activity in Christ. So what Kyros basically says is that in the conditions of two natures, human and Divine, in Christ, and both having their own volitional capacities, the *activity* in Christ is still one. Besides according to the historical data, presented above, Herakleios called upon Kyros in order to help elaborate Sergios' idea.

#### IV. 5. b. Satisfactio

Kyros himself provided the answer to the question a bit later, when he had already been transferred to Alexandria. In 633 Kyros created an act of union with the Theodosians the so-called *satisfactio*. The act became a backbone of the Monothelite doctrine. It consists of nine anathemata. The anathemata were declared in the following way,

1. Whoever does not confess the Father the Son and the Holy Spirit, the consubstantial Trinity as one Divinity and three hypostases, let him be anathema!
2. Whoever does not confess “the one of the Holy Trinity” the Word of God, who was born before the ages intemporally from the Father, who came down from heaven and became incarnate from the Holy Spirit and our Lady, the holy and glorious Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, became man, suffered in his own flesh, died, was buried and was risen on the third day according to Scripture, let him be anathema!
3. Whoever does not confess that to the one and the same Lord of ours Jesus Christ belong the passions and the miracles, but professes that they belong to one and another (*ἄλλου καὶ ἄλλου*), let him be anathema!
4. Whoever does not confess, that by the closest union God the Word in the womb of the Holy Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary created for himself according to the union the flesh from the same holy Mother of God, which [flesh] is consubstantial to us, animated by a rational and intellectual soul, by a natural and hypostatic union, and in this way He proceeded from her, being one, unconfusable and indivisible, let him be anathema!
5. Whoever does not confess that our Lady and ever-virgin Mary is in the proper sense [*κυρίως*] and in truth the Mother of God, having conceived and given birth to the Divine Logos, let him be anathema!
6. Whoever does not confess from two natures, that is, from the divinity and the humanity, and from Divinity, one Christ, one Son “one incarnate nature of the Divine Logos” according to St. Cyril, unconfusably, unchangeably, inalterably,

that is, one complex hypostasis, which is our Lord Jesus Christ, “one from the Holy consubstantial Trinity”, let him be anathema!

7. Whoever, while saying that our one Lord Jesus Christ is to be contemplated in two natures, does not confess that he is “one of the Holy Trinity”, the Logos eternally begotten by the Father, the same in the last times of the present age having become incarnate and been born from our most holy immaculate Lady, the Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, but says that He was “one” and “another” and not “one and the same” as the most wise Cyril taught, “the same being perfect in the Godhead and perfect in the manhood,” being contemplated, according to this and only to this, “in two natures, the same suffering and not suffering according to one and another condition of His”, as the same St. Cyril said, having suffered as man in flesh, so far as He was human, but having remained incapable of suffering the sufferings of His proper flesh, and the same being one Christ and Son performing the divine and the human things through “*one theandric energy*” according to St. Dionysius - those [elements], out of which the unity was made, being discernable only in theory by the one contemplating these in mind as being inalterable and unconfusable, while there remains their natural and hypostatic union, and the one and the same Christ and Son being recognised as remaining indivisible and inseparable in these, given that the perceiver perceives these in his mind as being two things in an unconfusable union, in an actual contemplation rather than in a fake fantasy and in the vain imaginations of the mind, but at the same time he does in no way separate the two, because their cutting into two had been erased by the ineffable and unconfusable and incomprehensible union, according to Saint Anasthasius: “it is at the same time flesh and the flesh of the Word of God, at the same time animated and rational flesh and animated and rational flesh of the Word of God,” but understands this expression in the sense of a separation into two, let him be anathema!
8. Whoever does not anathematize Areios, Eunomios, Makedonios, the heretic Apollinarios, Nestorios, the ill-famed Eutychios, as well as Kyros and John of Aigeia and all those who, in any manner, contradicted the twelve chapters of the most holy Cyril and have not repented, but died in this error, and all those who have been or are thinking like them, let him be anathema!
9. Whoever does not anathematize those writings of Theodoret, which are against the right faith of Saint Cyril, and the letter which is attributed to Ibas, as well as Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings, and who does not accept the writings of St. Cyril, especially those written against Theodore and Theodoret and Andrew and Nestorius and all who were thinking or are thinking like them, be it for a single element of their teaching, let him be anathema!<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>208</sup> For the full Greek text cf. appendix 4.

One could suggest that the Orthodox party called this document *ὑδροβαφής*<sup>209</sup> because, according to them, being prolix it did not contain many concrete statements. For example in the third anathema the fact that to Christ belong both miracles and passions every party could have understood in its own way. The sameness for the Orthodoxy is hypostatical while Monophysites could have understood this as that the oneness refers to the nature and not to the hypostasis and Monothelites would have seen the argument for their thesis that acting and willing is a hypostatical capacity.

The sixth anathema does not say anything decisive either. The expression “from the two natures” is equally confessed by Diphysites as well as Monophysites, although no Diphysite would accept this expression in a pure form. It looks like this statement was a rhetorical insertion to flatter the Monophysites with their beloved expression. The Diphysite “in two natures” was not mentioned here at all. It was only pointed out in the seventh chapter, but still under strict conditions. In the sixth century, the so-called Neochalcedonian theology interpreted the Cyrillian expression on one incarnate nature as indicating two natures: One nature of the divine Word, but incarnate, providing the second, human, nature. Other Diphysites with a different stance – for example in the West – have never accepted this interpretation. The sixth anathema accepts it and elaborates upon it. Most importantly it uses the “one complex hypostasis” of Justinian, being the counter-formula of “one complex nature” of Severus of Antioch. As I. Perczel suggests, this anathema, together with anathemas 8 and 9, reiterates the teaching of of the Second Council of Constantinople.<sup>210</sup>

#### IV. 5. c. One theandric activity

The expression, one theandric activity, originates in a letter of Ps. Dyonisios the Areopagite to Gaios:

<sup>209</sup> See: Anastasius Sinaita. *Sermo iii in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem Dei neconon opuscula adversus Monotheletas*. Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 12. Ed. K. H. Uthemann (Tunhout: Brepols, 1985), 57; *Theophanis chronographia*, vol. 1, 739.

<sup>210</sup> István Perczel, personal correspondance, 2009.

For even to speak summarily, He was not a man, ‘not as not being man’, but as ‘being from men was beyond men’, and was above man, having truly been born man; and for the rest not having done things Divine as God, nor things human as man, but exercising for us a certain **new theandric energy** of God having become a man.<sup>211</sup>

This passage has provoked controversies which have lasted until modern times. As I. Perczel has shown the expression “new theandric activity” clearly leads towards the Antiochian Christology.<sup>212</sup>

The seventh anathema, where the Dyonisian insertion is made, is the most important for the theology of Kyros. It is usually suggested that the seventh anathema was the key point for the Monenergist doctrine. This point was the most scandalous and most explicitly pointed out at the Lateran Council. The most important point which provoked huge debates for the next century was the changing and insertion of the Dyonisian “new theandric *energeia*” with “one theandric *energeia*,”<sup>213</sup> thus drawing a Monenergist conclusion out of the Dyonisian expression.<sup>214</sup> This became the main argument for the Monenergists<sup>215</sup> later during the council of Lateran and of Constantinople, where they were basically arguing that “new theandric *energeia*” and “one theandric *energeia*” were interchangeable.<sup>216</sup> The issue was mainly debated at the Lateran Council.<sup>217</sup>

A question which logically arises is, why did Kyros need to address Pseudo-Dionysius for the Monenergist formula and why did not he continue in Cyrillian terms? It would have been very easy to interpret Cyril in a Monenergist way and this would have been even more acceptable for the Theodosians. I think that the difference between “new theandric *energeia*” and “one theandric *energy*” is not as big as the opponents of Monoenergism pointed out. Kyros and later Pyrrhos of Constantinople and Makarios of

---

<sup>211</sup> *CorpDyonys* II, 161, PG 3, 1027.

<sup>212</sup> István Perczel, “The Christology of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite: The Fourth Letter in Its Indirect and Direct Text Traditions.” *Le Muséon*, 117 (2004), 409-46.

<sup>213</sup> See Pope Martin’s accusation against Kyros. ACO II, 1. 142, 35-37; the accusation of Bishop Deusdedit against Pyrrhus that he “inmutavit dictionem beati Dyonisii”, ACO II, 1 153;

<sup>214</sup> Although Kyros was not the first who interpreted Dyonisius in this way. Severos of Antioch already saw the idea of single Divine energy in Christ here but he drew these conclusions from “new Theandric energy” and did not falsify it with “one Theandric energy”.

<sup>215</sup> See. Sergius’ letter to Kyros, ACO II, 1 136.

<sup>216</sup> See The “Dogmatic Tome” of Pyrrhos. ACO II, 1 152.

<sup>217</sup> ACO II, 1 142, 153.

Antioch sincerely believed that there is no difference, whether one says “new” or “one” and this sounds quite reasonable.<sup>218</sup>

It seems to me that this was exactly where Kyros was gambling, he was choosing the formulae which were very misleading and which each party could have understood them in its own way. In the case of “one theandric *energeia*” Kyros was counting on the fact that Severos of Antioch was the first to interpret this Dyonisian expression in a Monenergist way.<sup>219</sup> Thus, Theodosians, who were adherents of Severos would have been completely satisfied, and if there had been an accusation from the Chalcedonians that Kyros says “from two natures” one could easily have objected that even though “in two natures” is not stated, does not mean that it is not true. All the points were indeed written in *ἰδιόβαση*, in a masterly diplomatic way, so that the Theodosians were saying: “It is not we who have communicated with Chalcedon, but rather Chalcedon with us by confessing one nature of Christ through the one energy.”<sup>220</sup> This accusation of writing in a washy way closely resembles the Armenian comparison of Kyron’s faith to a tree with only leaves and no fruit on it. Kyros does not betray his style. His theological language is on the one hand, very careful and diplomatic and, on the other hand, very daring and sometimes astonishingly sloppy.<sup>221</sup>

The composition and the rhetoric closely resemble that of Kyron of Mtskheta. Both of them dealt with Monophysite opponents, and both of them, argued in the same way that in fact there was no difference between the two parties, and both advance theological arguments which literally say nothing decisive. The union was seemingly a success; Kyros was content and was writing victorious letters to Sergios.<sup>222</sup> No less content were the Theodosians; they saw a great defeat of the Chalcedonian faith in this

<sup>218</sup> See the *Dogmatic Tome* of patriarch Pyrrhos (ACO II, 1 152).

<sup>219</sup> See Hovorun, 19. “As we have already developed in full breadth in other writings, we understood and understand the statement of utterly wise Dyonisius the Areopagite, who says that: Since God became a human being he performed in us the new theandric activity, of the one composite (activity), it can not be interpreted other than rejection of every duality; and we confess the incarnate God who operated in this new manner. as the one theandric nature and hypostasis and also as the one incarnate nature of God-Logos. Because the reason of salvation, which has established two natures, together with them has established new appellations. So that if Christ is one, then we ascend, so to say, to a high mountain, and profess one – because he is one – nature, hypostasis and *energeia*, (which are also composite); also we anathematize all those who, concerning this (question) teach about dyads of natures and activities after the unity.”

<sup>220</sup> See for example The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor, 461.

<sup>221</sup> See chapter two, footnote 111 on the “mistake” of Kyron of Mtskheta.

<sup>222</sup> ACO II, 2, 602 – 607.

document and were even saying: “It was not us who went to Chalcedon, but Chalcedon came to us.”<sup>223</sup>

Kyros is sometimes “accused” of having had some Monophysite tendencies in his theology<sup>224</sup> because of the statements like “from two natures”, but one should always keep in mind that Kyros’ main goal was to achieve a union with the anti-Chalcedonians, which might best explain his wording. But on the other hand he was entrusted to make this union, perhaps exactly because of his Monophysite background, this explains his inclination towards the Monophysite terminology as well. Kyron of Mtskheta grew up in a Monophysite surrounding and was bishop in a Monophysite Church. However, I personally think that he confessed the exact opposite of what Monophysitism was, that is, a kind of Antiochian Diphysitism adapted to the post-Constantinople II theological language, formally accepting all the preceding dogmatic developments in the imperial Church.

#### **IV. 6. The Antiochian tradition – Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorios, Theodoret of Kyrrhos**

Now let us have a look at what Theodore of Mopsuestia said on wills and activities in Christ. As odd as it might sound for someone for whom Monotheletism is heavily associated with one nature in Christ, the idea in reality, had deep roots in the Antiochian tradition and was elaborated, if not created, by Theodore of Mopsuestia. The Christology of Theodore was formed by his opposition to Areios and Apollinarios. His main aim was, just as it was for Athanasios and Diodoros of Tarsos, to overcome the problem posed by Areios and Apollinarios. Apollinarios had created a *Λόγος-Σάρξ* theory, according to which the humanity of Christ is only in his body, animated by an irrational soul, while the human mind (*nous*) had been replaced by the divine Logos. For him the Logos, God the Word, was the only ultimate subject of the “human” activity and

---

<sup>223</sup> Bolotov, 460.

<sup>224</sup> Catholic Encyclopedia. Kyros of Alexandria. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04597c.htm> (20/02/2009). It is somehow curious that Kyros was “accused” in Nestorianism too as I have pointed out in the second chapter.

according to A. Grillmeier a “vital, dynamic influence of Logos”. So for the Apollinarians this principle of unity also involved a derogation of the divinity of the Logos.

Theodore, in opposition to this theory, created a *Λόγος-Ἄνθρωπος* theory thus stressing the complete humanity of Christ. His main aim was to defend the reality of Christ’s humanity and his human faculties, including human activity and will. Therefore the human and the Logos in Christ were self-standing entities, two real beings in combination. To explain the combination of the two self-standing realities, Theodore further elaborated on the traditional concepts of *indwelling* and *assumption*, which were used before him by Patristic authors, among others the Cappadocian Fathers, but without much emphasis, together with other expressions and without the theoretical framework elaborated by Theodore. Thus, the Logos indwelled a man and the whole man was assumed by the Logos. In Christ, according to Theodore, there are two sources of action, independent from each other and cooperating with each other. “The Divine Son furnished his co-operation in the proposed works to the one who was assumed.”<sup>225</sup> So each nature has its own capacity to will and to act.

With indissoluble love he formed himself according to the good, receiving also the cooperation of God the Word in proportion to his own choice of good...He held fast to this way by his own will, while on the other hand this choice was made secure in him in the cooperating work of God-Logos.<sup>226</sup>

Nevertheless, in the conditions of two wills and actions Theodore still speaks about one will and activity in Christ. The explanation for this lies in his theory of the *prosopon*, which for him as well as later for Saint Cyril and Nestorius was synonymous with “according for hypostasis,” and argued that the unity was according to a common *prosopon* of the two entities. Theodore rejected the idea of unity according to nature and argued that the unity was according to *prosopon* which was for him as well as for Nestorius synonymous for *hypostasis*.

---

<sup>225</sup> Hovorun, 10.

<sup>226</sup> Hovorun, 11.

The idea of the unity according to nature is only true if applied to the being of the same essence, but it is wrong if applied to the beings of different essence; otherwise it could not have been free from confusion. At the same time the way of unity according to benevolence, while preserving natures unconfused and undivided, indicates a single *prosopon* of both as well as single will and *energeia*, which are followed by a single power and dominion.<sup>227</sup>

Therefore, for Theodore, willing and acting is a capacity of the *prosopon*. Theodore prefers to use *prosopon*, as it denotes one common honor, one greatness, and one worship. It is the way God appears and reveals himself in Christ.<sup>228</sup> Theodore's thesis was further elaborated by Nestorios. For Nestorios, the *prosopon* was a common space, where the energetical and volitional capacities manifested themselves, that is one will and one activity. These manifestations do not appear separately but always as one.

The Gordian knot of the debate between the Alexandrian and the Antiochian theologians, both identifying nature and *hypostasis*, but one proposing a natural union of divinity and humanity in Christ, and the other proposing a prosopic, or energetic, or volitional union (*κατ' εὐδοκίαν ἕνωσις*), was the Council of Chalcedon, which had brought a kind of Alexandrian solution. It separated the concept of *hypostasis* from nature in Christology, just as earlier the Cappadocian teaching had separated these two notions in the domain of Trinitarian theology, and identified *prosopon* with *hypostasis*, proposing, in Cyrilian terms, a "hypostatic union", without identifying this with a "natural union." From this, a conceptual ambivalence was born: *hypostasis* being a strong term and *prosopon* being a weak term, henceforward the meaning of the hypostatic union depended on the question of whether *prosopon* was defined by *hypostasis*, or *hypostasis* by *prosopon*. The letter of Theodoret of Cyrus to John of Aigeia shows that there was a tendency to do the latter and thus to save the original tenets of Antiochian theology in Chalcedonian terms.<sup>229</sup>

---

<sup>227</sup> Hovorun. 11.

<sup>228</sup> For some of the works on the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia see: Francis A. Sullivan, *The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, *Analecta Gregoriana* 82 (Rome: Analecta Gregoriana, 1956); Richard A. Norris, *Manhood and Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963).

<sup>229</sup> István Perczel, personal correspondence, 2009.

How did the expression “one theandric energy” fit into this system? I would say that this expression is a summary of the whole Antiochian tradition stressing the common human and divine activity in Christ.<sup>230</sup> The idea of this expression is that humanity and divinity both having their volitional and acting capacities were manifesting these capacities in a single way – that is a human-divine way. Dionysios’s Fourth Letter is a patent example of the post-Chalcedonian renewal of Antiochian Diphysite theology, operating with the new concepts. According to I. Perczel’s proposal, it should be exactly in this doctrinal framework that one could best understand Kyros’s version of Monotheletism.<sup>231</sup>

To summarize the creed of Kyros in one sentence, we could say that he confesses two natures in Christ, both being independent realities and having independent activity and acting in cooperation (*agit utraque natura.....*), and meanwhile one will and one activity are manifested as one divine-human activity, that is to say, coming from the hypostasis of Christ. The only previous tradition which this thesis corresponds to, is the Antiochian Christological tradition of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorios and, partly, Diodoros of Tarsus.

The fact that what Kyros was defending was of Antiochian origin is further proved by Pyrrhos in his debate against Maximos<sup>232</sup> and later by Makarios of Antioch at the first session of the third council of Constantinople. Particularly interesting is Makarios statement:

Makarios, the venerable archbishop of Antioch, said: As what concerns me, my Lord, I do not confess two activities in Christ and I do not think that venerable to the memory Leo spoke about in about two activities in these words. The pious emperor Constantine said: You suppose that he confessed one activity? The most honorable archbishop Makarios said: I do not speak about the number, but I fully follow Saint Dionysios and call his activity *theandric*. The most pious emperor said: So how do you

---

<sup>230</sup> For the argument about an Antiochian Diphysite background of Pseudo-Dionysios and the doctrinal meaning of “a kind of new theandric activity” in his Fourth Letter, see István Perczel, “The Christology of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite: The *Fourth Letter* in its Indirect and Direct Text Traditions” *Le Muséon* 117/3-4 (2004), 409-446, also online: [http://poj.peeters-Louvain.be/issue.php?journal\\_code=MUS&issue=3&vol=117](http://poj.peeters-Louvain.be/issue.php?journal_code=MUS&issue=3&vol=117)

<sup>231</sup> István Perczel, personal correspondence, 2009.

<sup>232</sup> Disputation, 51.

understand a *theandric* activity? The most honorable archbishop Makarios said: I do not reason.<sup>233</sup>

This stand of Makarios once again shows clearly that he was a follower of Kyros and of the Antiochian Christology. The subject of actions and willing according to Makarios is Christ as a *prosopon* and as a *hypostasis*. At the eight session of the council Makarios stated his creed:

I confess that our Lord Jesus Christ is one of the Holy Trinity and after the incarnation he stays in two perfect natures unconfusably and unseparably in one *prosopon* and one *hypostasis*, “so that the difference of the natures has not been abolished because of the union but, rather, the properties of each nature preserved and come together in one *prosopon* and one *hypostasis*” [see the definition of Chalcedon]. Given that the One of the Holy Trinity did not assume another *prosopon* even after the incarnation, therefore we say that he has not assumed anything deriving from the sin. Therefore we confess one Lord Jesus Christ in the image of renovation,<sup>234</sup> without bodily wishes and human thoughts, because “having one will for receiving all these passions, He had one and the same power to endure all these,” according to the holy and honorable Augustine. On this issue we have already composed a confession of faith and we agree with the holy Five Councils as well as with Honorius, Sergios, Paul, Peter and the others, whose testimonies we used in the document submitted to the Emperor, confessing one **hypostatical** will and **theandric** activity in our one Lord Jesus Christ. In fact, we confess according to the teaching of Saint Dionysios that He “did the divine thing not as God, nor the human things as man, but God the Word having become man, He has lived a kind of a new god-manly activity.”<sup>235</sup>

This confession adds very precious new information to the understanding of at least this version of Monothelite theology. In this doctrinal statement Makarios is

---

<sup>233</sup> ACO, II, 1, 34. Μακάριος ὁ ὁσιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Ἀντιοχείας εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ, δέσποτα, δύο ἐνεργείας οὐ λέγω, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ νοῶ τὸν ἐν μακαρίᾳ τῇ λήξει Λέοντα δι’ αὐτῆς τῆς ῥήσεως δύο ἐνεργείας φήσαντα. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς εἶπεν· Ἀλλὰ μίαν ἐνέργειαν νοεῖς λέγοντα. Μακάριος ὁ ὁσιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ ἀριθμὸν οὐ λέγω, ἀλλὰ θεανδρικὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Διονύσιον. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς εἶπε· Πῶς γὰρ νοεῖς τὴν θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν; Μακάριος ὁ ὁσιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐπικρίνω.

<sup>234</sup> See Rm 6:4: „let us walk in the novelty of life” – referring to the resurrection. I. Perczel suggests, that Makarios's allusion seems to refer to another doctrine that was much discussed earlier, in the second half of the sixth century, diphsite apthartodocetism, which, while fully accepting the two natures of Christ, credited his humanity from the very moment of the Incarnation with the characteristics of the risen body, so that only by specially willing so did He let the passions of the mortal nature – a consequence of the sin – arise in Him.

<sup>235</sup> ACO II, 2, 215-216. For the full Greek text cf. appendix 5.

reviving – through the expression of Dionysios – a very important element of the Antiochian doctrine – that of Christ’s exceptional humanity, which is in fact expressed in Dionysios’s Fourth Letter. This led the Antiochians to denying what later Saint John of Damascus later called “the natural and unblamable passions” (τὰ φυσικά καὶ ἀδιάβλητα πάθη) in Christ. That is to say, according to this doctrine, originally stated by Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Logos took upon himself a different, more noble, humanity than ours, exempt from the consequences of sin, while willingly accepting these passions, including death, whenever this was needed for our salvation.<sup>236</sup>

The Antiochian background of the Christology of Makarios and his followers is shown further when Stephen, the disciple of Makarios said that before the fall Adam did not have a separate will from God. This once again is an Antiochian teaching: Adam as a person of course has the capacity to will, but his willing is completely identical to that of God’s.<sup>237</sup> Along with these terms Constantine of Apamea confessed, admitting the natural will in Christ and meanwhile confessing one will and one theandric activity in Him.

The “Nestorianism” of Kyros of Alexandria did not go completely unnoticed though. The only person in the whole debate, who noticed a revival of the teaching of Nestorios was Maximos Confessor. His debates with ex-Patriarch Pyrrhos makes it clear:

Those who say one will, vindicate his [Nestorios’] teaching, for their *Ecthesis* testifies, advocates and decrees one will, which is exactly what Nestorios advocated: The doctrine of one will in two *prosopa* was invented by him.<sup>238</sup>

Further, refuting Pyrrhos’s thesis on the hypostatical character of *energeia*, Maximos says:

But according to what you say if *prosopa* be introduced along with the energies and vice versa, energies with *prosopa*, then you are compelled, following the same principles, either to say that because of the one operation of the Holy Godhead there is one person as well, or because of

<sup>236</sup> Cf. Theodore, *De incarnatione* (PG. 66, 985 B): “It is clear that He possesses the sonship above all the other men in an exceptional manner because of His union to [the Word]” (πρόδηλον γὰρ ἐκεῖνο, ὡς τῆς υἰότητος αὐτοῦ παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους πρόσσεσι τὸ ἐξαιρετον, τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν [τὸν Λόγον] ἐνώσει). Cf. also *ibid.* 980 D-981 A.

<sup>237</sup> Perczel, 17.

<sup>238</sup> Disputation, 36.

the three Hypostases, there are three operations. Or you might maintain that their union is relational, as Nestorios said of Christ, for the one energy was the union, as Nestorios and his party maintained in their writings.<sup>239</sup>

Maximos was very eager to identify Monotheletism with Antiochian Christology and was even searching for proof of this identification.<sup>240</sup> Supposedly he collected the Nestorian florilegia, which were eventually included in the acts of the Lateran Council.<sup>241</sup> The florilegia are divided according to whether the “heretic” was confessing one will and one activity according to nature or according to *prosopon* or *hypostasis*. The quotations from the Antiochians include Theodore of Mopsuestia, Paul the Persian,<sup>242</sup> Theodulos, and Ibas of Edessa.

#### IV.7. Two directions of Monotheletism

I would suggest that Monotheletism had two main streams, one originating from Kyros and the other from Sergios. Above I have tried to show the Antiochian character of Monotheletism as presented by Kyros and later by Makarios of Antioch. A second stream of Monotheletism I would call Cyrillian. The perfect example of this alternative trend in Monotheletism is the Christology presented by Theodore of Pharan. There are no hints at of *theandric* activity in Christ or the cooperation of divinity and humanity producing a common activity by a common willing. On the contrary, the Christology presented by Theodore of Pharan is in terms of Cyrillian understanding, thus tending more towards the Monophysite confession of one nature. Thus, I would propose that Monotheletism had, so to speak, two “takeoffs” – one by Kyros of Phasis with a strong Antiochian undercurrent and the second by Theodore of Pharan leaning towards Monophysitism. This is clear in the words of Theodore read at the thirteenth session of the third council of Constantinople. To demonstrate the contrast between Theodore of Pharan’s Christology and that of Kyros and Makarios, I will bring the whole text as quoted at the session of the council.

---

<sup>239</sup> Disputation, 57.

<sup>240</sup> Hovorun, 15.

<sup>241</sup> ACO II, 1. 332-334. For the full Greek text of the *florilegia* cf. appendix 6.

<sup>242</sup> A sixth century Nestorian philosopher from Dersshahr, Persia.

Because earlier He (the Logos) due to some kind of divine and most wise economy allowed sleep, fatigue, hunger and thirst whenever he wanted, we are justified to attribute to the almighty and all-wise activity of the Logos the initiation and interruption of these (conditions); therefore we confess one activity of one and the same Christ.

Therefore for Theodore the sole source of activity is Logos and there is no place for any divine-human activity. All the human actions and passions were just “allowed” by Logos.

I think that this exposition demonstrated clearly from the inquiry that whatever is told about the Lord Christ, whether belonging to God, or to the soul, or to the body, or to the composition of the two, I mean of the body and the soul, was done unitarily and inseparably without separation, having its beginning and so to say flowing from the wisdom and virtue and power of the Logos and passing through the intellectual soul and the body. Therefore all this is and is being called one activity of the whole, as of one and the same Saviour of ours.

Here again humanity is considered as an instrument resembling very much the notion of *organon*, introduced by Severos of Antioch.

So from this it is clear for us, that whatever we hear or believe about Christ is the work of God, independently of the question whether this refers to the divine or to the human nature. So it is pious to call all this, whether belonging to his divinity or to his humanity, one activity... so that the entire Inhumanation from the beginning to the end, including whatever small or great elements, is truly one most high and divine activity and divine will, which belongs to Christ himself, because he has only one will and this will is divine.

Therefore, through all this we are assured without any doubt that whatever belonging to the saving economy is told about our Saviour Christ, be it divine or human, originally received its impetus and its cause from the divinity and, through the mediation of the intellectual and rational soul, was performed by the body, whether we speak of the wonderworking power, or of some natural movement of the human being, such as the desire for food, sleep, tiredness, the perception of pains, grief and sadness, which are improperly called passions by habitude but which are properly speaking the elements of the natural movement performed by means of the animated and perceiving living being, and so also those conditions that are properly called and really are passions, such as the cross, the death, the pains, the wounds, the opening in the chest, the nailing, the spitting, the

slapping - all this would be rightly called one activity of the one and the same Christ.

Per consequent, from all this we should conclude that whatever is stated about the inhumanation of Christ our Saviour is truly one divine and saving activity. From all these arguments and the suchlike, clearly and rightfully it should be believed and professed that all those proper to the Inhumanation are one activity of God.<sup>243</sup>

Contrary to the texts emanating from Kyros' circles, this exposition by Theodore of Pharan has a definite Cyrilian tenet and does not use any reference to passions or actions of Christ as a human. Theodore seems to continue in the direction of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, which emphasised that, although there are two natures in Christ, there is only one subject of all that Christ did or suffered – the divine Logos. He even avoids the using the word activity to denote the earthly *oikonomia* of Logos. None of the human passions and actions of Christ comes from the human nature but from divinity. I will not try to analyze the Christology of other heresiarchs of Monothelism like Paul and Peter of Constantinople or Honorius, because these seem irrelevant for the present study. I would not want to push my thesis too far at this stage, because I understand quite clearly that Monothelism and Monoenergism of the seventh century were strictly and clearly elaborated doctrines and carried the interests of diverse parties.

As a matter of fact, would it be reasonable to suggest that at the council of Theodosiopolis, where the union with the Armenians was achieved, that a variety of Monoenergism-Monothelism similar to the doctrine of Theodore of Pharan was adopted? Another option for reconstruction would be to completely reject any dogmatic compromise achieved at this council and claim that the union was a purely political act because no source which speaks about the union, be Armenian or other, mentions anything about one will and one energy in the conditions of two natures being adopted by the Armenians. On the contrary the anonymous treatise *Thirty Chapters of the Heresy of the Armenians* accuses the Armenians of confessing one nature, one will and one energy in Christ.

Of course I am not saying that Antiochian Diphysitism was the only leitmotif of the entire Monothelite controversy, as we have seen on the example of Theodore of

---

<sup>243</sup> ACO II 2 602-606. For the Greek text cf. appendix 7.

Pharan and also on the example of Sergios that there was also a strong tendency towards “Monoenergism” as understood by Severos and the anti-Chalcedonians. The point is though, that, apparently, Kyros was indeed thinking in Antiochian terms and, when meeting with Herakleios saw a perfect opportunity to implement his Antiochian teaching into a newly emerging “Imperial orthodoxy”. I am aware that my proposal of an Antiochian theological background for Kyros is still hypothetical and will trigger criticism. However, at this point I leave this issue for further studies.

From the historical and human angles Kyros’s Antiochian stance will not be very problematic to explain by, once again, turning back to Kyron the *katholikos* of Kartli, who grew up in Nikopolis among the Nestorians, had a Nestorian teacher and a Nestorian friend whom he called to Kartli and consecrated a bishop several years later. The identification of Kyros of Phasis and Kyron of Mtskheta might also explain the eagerness with which the former accepted the unial doctrine proposed by Herakleios and Sergios. He already had experience, although an unsuccessful one, in trying to create a union based on a dogmatic compromise. Monotheletism could have been a realization of Kyron’s plan which he had already during his office as *katholikos* of Kartli.

## Conclusions

The process of identification of Kyros Al-Mukaukas started by A. Butler will not be complete until we accept that Kyron of Mtskheta, Kyros of Phasis and Kyros of Alexandria are one and the same person and that the events of the life of the “three” are logically interwoven and can best be explained by cross-referencing. Here I will finally try to give a tentative summary of the biography of this reconstructed person:

He was born in the late 560s in southern Georgia and was a Georgian by ethnicity. During the Persian wars he was probably taken as a hostage and lived for fifteen years in Nikopolis. Here he supposedly grew up in a Nestorian surrounding and had a Nestorian teacher. Afterwards he returned to Armenia and was received the monastery in Dvin. By the end of the sixth century at the age of approximately forty he received the patriarchal see in Mtskheta. In 608 the Georgian and Armenian churches were finally separated and in 614 (or 616) during the Persian council, he was forced to flee to his western eparchy, Egrisi, having lost the title of *katholikos* he became the bishop or archbishop of Phasis and metropolitan of Lazika. Around 622 he met Herakleios in person in Lazika, confessed Monotheletism, and became the cooperator of Herakleios and Sergios, helping the emperor in creating the union with the Armenians and generally consulting him on Caucasian issues. Due to these services he received the crucial office for the policy of union – the see of Alexandria. Here he elaborated his Christology and created a union with the local Monophysites. He was also granted the title of prefect of Alexandria and viceroy of Egypt. He was known as such by the Arabs and local population, who gave him a mock nickname of Al-Mukaukas, a name which brought more terror than happiness. In 641 he died because of some stomach disease and was posthumously anathematized first by the Council of Lateran (541) and later by the third Council of Constantinople (680/1).

Several facts can be explained only by the identification of Kyros with Kyron:

1. The coincidence in names, that at a certain point Kyron is forced to flee from Kartli and several years later in western Georgia a bishop called Kyros emerges and leads the regional ecclesiastical politics.
2. The reason why Kyron of Mtskheta was deliberately forgotten by Georgian historiography is that he was condemned as a heretic by the Sixth Ecumenical Council and before that by the Council of Lateran.
3. The reason why Armenian sources call Kyron the metropolitan of Egrisi was the fact that he indeed was the metropolitan of Egrisi and therefore the archbishop of Phasis.
4. Herakleios consulted Kyros in Phasis and later appointed him as the patriarch of Alexandria to conduct the act of union with the anti-Chalcedonians, owing to Kyros' experience in dealing with the Anti-Chalcedonians and his relationships with Armenia.
5. The otherwise strange information of Arabic sources on the family of patriarch of Alexandria will become explicable if we take into account that Kyron of Mtskheta was married and had a family.
6. The name of his daughter *Armanusah* has a clear Armenian etymology.
7. The name *Al-Mukaukas* indicates his provenance, namely that he was of Caucasian origin. The name suggests that he was from the region closer to the Caucasian mountains i.e. from Kartli, rather than from Pontus.
8. Besides this, the character and nature of Kyros seem to be the same as that of Kyron, both being violent and extremely strict on the one hand and very diplomatic on the other.
9. Both Kyron and Kyros died by some strange stomach disease in a very old age.
10. Last but definitely not least, almost the whole idea of Monoenergism/Monothelism can be explained by the biography of Kyros/Kyron. A Nestorian by education and by spirituality, he created a clandestine Nestorian Christology later called Monothelism and pushed it as far as to Constantinople and Alexandria.

Wherever the hypothetically single Kyros stepped his foot, he played a crucial role in the region. He became both an authoritative theologian and an influential political leader. Kyros was responsible for the final formation of the independent Church of Kartli and gave the stimulus for the further unification of Georgia, through his hand emperor Herakleios and even his predecessors conducted the Caucasian policy and he was responsible for the ecclesiastical union in the region. In Egypt he showed his ruthless character and created a new theology of union. Finally he was the one who negotiated with the Arabs and who surrendered Egypt to them. His name became an object of curse for the Greeks and Copts, for Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians, alike for the Arabs and for the Armenians alike and was forgotten by his own people.

### **1. Further study**

The identification of Kyros Mukaukas with Kyron of Mtskheta should lead further to the examination and reevaluation of the dogmatic and ecclesiastical situation in the Caucasus. If we accept this theory, then a completely new approach will be needed for the study of the emergence of Monothelism and Monenergism. On the one hand, as I tried to argue in the thesis, Monothelism/Monenergism was a clandestine attempt of revival of Nestorianism by Kyros of Phasis. This endeavor of Kyros was so much successful that the Monophysite Theodosians really thought that the union was their own victory. On the other hand the so called “imperial heresy” will not seem any more created and elaborated at the imperial court in Constantinople, but rather being born in the place where it was needed the most that is in the Caucasus. The Caucasus was a kind of a microcosm where politics and dogmatic theology was interwoven due to its strategic location at the borders of the Roman, Persian and Arabic empires. From the introduction of Christianity in the region down to the fall of Constantinople Caucasus was a trigger of dogmatic controversies and truly a birthplace of various heretical movements in the sixth and seventh centuries, which radiated towards all directions of the Empire. On the other hand almost all of the attempts of creating a dogmatic union had the Caucasus in its center. Kyros was one of the examples of the “exporters” of this unificatory theology. In the future studies should be conducted in two main directions, towards reevaluating the history of emergence of Monothelite controversy and conducting a systematic study of

the development of the dogmatic theology and Church practice in the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia in order to create a more or less full image of what was happening at the core of the dogmatic controversies in the region and in the whole of the empire.

## Appendices

### **Appendix 1. The Letter of Pope Gregory the Great to Kyron the Katholikos of Kartli.**

**Migne, PL077. col. 1204-1208.**

**Epistola LXVII. Ad Quiricum Episcopum, etc.** *Eos qui in haeresi cum Trinitatis invocatione baptizanti sunt, si ad Ecclesiam revertantur, non baptizandos; sed aut impositione manuum, aut chrismatis unctione, ait professione fidei reconciliandos. Redeuntes Nestorianos veram de incarnato Verbo fidem docendos, quam hic ipse firmat ex Scripturis; atque si Nestorium anathematizent, si quas recipit Ecclesia synodos venerentur, suscipiendos in propriis ordinibus.*

Gregorius Quirico vel Quirino episcopo, et caeteris episcopis in Hiberia catholicis:

Quia chartitati nihil est longe, quos dividunt loca iungat epistola. Lator itaque praesentium ad beati Petri apostolorum principis Ecclesiam veniens fraternitatis vestrae se asseruit ad nos epistolas accepisse, easque in Jerosalymorum urbe cum rebus quoque aliis perdidisse. In quibus, sicut ipse ait, studuistis inquirere sacerdotes ac plebes quae Nestorianae hareseos errore confusae sunt, cum ad matrem electorum omnium catholicam Ecclesiam revertuntur, utrum debeant baptizari, an certe solius verae fidei confessione ejusdem matris Ecclesiae visceribus adjungi

Et quidem an antiqua Patrum institutione didicimus ut quolibet apud haresim in Trinitatis nomine baptizantur, cum ad sanctam Ecclesiam redeunt, aut unctione chrismatis, aut impositione manus, aut sola professione fidei ad sinum matris Ecclesiae revocentur. Unde Arianos per impositionem manus Occidens, per unctionem vero sancti chrismatis ad ingressum sanctae Ecclesiae catholicae Oriens reformat. Monophysitas vero et alios ex sola vera confessione recipit, cum vel illi per impositionem manus Spiritum sanctum acceperint, vel isti propter professionem verae fidei sanctae et universalis Ecclesiae visceribus fuerint uniti. Hi vero haeretici qui in Trinitatis nomine minime baptizantur,

sicut sunt Bonosiaci et Cataphrygae, quia et illi Christum Dominum non credunt, et isti sanctum Spiritum perverso sensu esse quemdam pravum hominem Montanum credunt, quorum similes multi sunt alii, cum ad sanctam Ecclesiam veniunt, baptizantur, quia baptisma non fuit quod in errore positi in sanctae Trinitatis nomine minime perceperunt. Nec potest hoc ipsum iteratum dici baptisma, quod, sicut dictum est, in Trinitatis nomine non erat datum. Nestoriani vero quia in sanctae Trinitatis nomine baptizantur, sed eos Judaicae perfidiae similes, Incarnationem unigeniti non credentes, suae haereseos error obscurat, ad sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam venientes de verae fidei firmitate et confessione docendi sunt, ut unum eudemque Dei et hominis Filium, Deum Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum credant, ipsum existentem in divinitate ante saecula, et ipsum factum hominem in fine saeculorum, quia *Verbum caro factum est, habitavit in nobis* (Joan. I, 14). Verbum vero carnem dicimus factum, non amittendo quod erat, sed suscipiendo quod non erat. Incarnationis enim suae mysterio unigenitur Patris nostra auxit, sua non minuit. Una itaque persona est verbum et caro, sicut ipse ait: *Nemo ascendit in coelum, nisi qui de coelo descendit, Filius hominis qui est in coelo* (Joan. III, 13). *Quia Filius Dei in coelo, erat Filius hominis qui loquebatur in terra*. Hinc Joannes ait: *Scimus quia Filius Dei venit, et dedit nobis sensum* (I Joan. V, 20). Qui nobis quem sensum dederit, illico subjunxit: *Ut cognoscamus Deum verum*. Quem hoc loco verum DEum insinuat, nisi Patrem omnipotentem? Sed quid etiam de omnipotente Filio Jesum Christum. Quem verum Filium quid esse sentiat apertius ostendit: *Hic est, inquit, verus Deus et vita aeterna*. Si igitur juxta Nestorii alius Verbum, alius esset homo Jesus Christus, qui verus est homo, utique verus Deus non esset et vita aeterna. Sed unigenitus Filius Verbum ante saecula factus est homo. Hic est ergo verus Deus et vita aeterna. Certe cum hunc sancta Virgo conceptura esset, et loquentem ad se angelum audiret, ait: *Ecce ancilla Domini, fiat mihi sicut dicis* (Luc. I, 38) .... Hanc ergo nativitatis ejus veritatem quicumque a perverso errore Nestorii revertuntur coram sancta fraternitatis vestrae congregatione fateantur, eundem Nestorium cum omnibus sequacibus suis, et reliquas haereses anathematizantes. Venerandes quoque synodos quas universalis Ecclesia recipit, se recipere et venerari promittant; et absque ulla dubitatione eos sanctitas vestra, servatis eis propriis ordinibus, in suo coetu recipiat, ut dum et per sollicitudinem occulta mentis eorum discutitis, atque eos per veram scientiam recta quae tenere debeant

docetis, et per mansuetudinem nullam eis contrarietatem vel difficultatem de propriis suis ordinibus facitis, eos ab antiqui hostis ore rapiatis; et tanto vobis apud omnipotentem Deum aeternae gloriae crescat retributio, quanto multos colligitis, qui vobiscum in Domino sine fine gloriantur. Sancta itaque Trinitas orantes pro nobis sua vos protectione custodiat, vobisque in amore suo dona adhuc multipliciora concedat.

## Appendix 2. Theophanes Confessor on Herakleios meeting Kyros.

*Theophanis chronographia*, vol. 1. Ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig: Teubner, 1883. repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963): 331-32.

Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει τοῦ βασιλέως Ἡρακλείου ὄντος ἐν Ἱεραπόλει, ἦλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἀθανάσιος, ὁ πατριάρχης τῶν Ἰακωβιτῶν, δεινὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ κακοῦργος τῇ τῶν Σύρων ἐμφύτῳ πανουργίᾳ, καὶ κινήσας πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα περὶ πίστεως λόγους ὑπισχεῖτο αὐτῷ Ἡράκλειος, εἰ τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον ἀποδέξεται, πατριάρχην αὐτὸν ποιεῖν Ἀντιοχείας. ὁ δὲ ὑποκριθεὶς ἐδέξατο τὴν σύνοδον ὁμολογήσας τὰς δύο ἐν Χριστῷ ἡνωμένας φύσεις· ἠρώτησέ τε τὸν βασιλέα περὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ τῶν θελημάτων, τὸ πῶς δεῖ ταῦτα λέγειν ἐν Χριστῷ, διπλᾶ ἢ μοναδικά; ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ξυνοφωνηθεὶς γράφει πρὸς Σέργιου, τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον, προσκαλεῖται δὲ καὶ Κῦρον, τὸν Φάσιδος ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ τοῦτον ἐρωτήσας εὗρεν αὐτὸν συμφωνοῦντα τῷ Σεργίῳ εἰς τὸ ἐν θέλημα καὶ τὴν μίαν ἐνέργειαν. Σέργιος γάρ, ἅτε Συρογενῆς καὶ γονέων Ἰακωβιτῶν ὑπάρχων, μίαν φυσικὴν θέλῃσιν καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν ἐν Χριστῷ ὡμολόγησε καὶ ἔγραψεν. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀμφοτέρων στοιχήσας τὴν βουλὴν εὗρε καὶ τὸν Ἀθανάσιον συμφωνοῦντα αὐτοῖς. ἐγίνωσκε γάρ, ὅτι, ἔνθα μία ἐνέργεια εὔρηται, ἐκεῖ καὶ μία φύσις γνωρίζεται. βεβαιωθεὶς δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν τούτῳ γράφει πρὸς Ἰωάννην, τὸν πάπαν Ῥώμης, ἀμφοτέρων τὴν γνώμην· ὁ δὲ οὐ κατεδέξατο αὐτῶν τὴν αἴρεσιν. Γεωργίου δὲ τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας τελευτήσαντος, ἀποστέλλεται Κῦρος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας, καὶ ἐνωθεὶς Θεοδώρῳ, τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς Φαράν, ἐποίησε τὴν ὑδροβαφῆ ἐκείνην ἔνωσιν, μίαν καὶ αὐτοὶ γράψαντες ἐν Χριστῷ φυσικὴν ἐνέργειαν.

### Appendix 3. The letter of Kyros of Alexandria to Sergios.

#### ACO II, 2, 588-590

1. Προθυμηθέντι μοι τὴν παροῦσαν ἀναφορὰν ἀνατεῖναι τῷ θεοτιμῆτῳ μου δεσπότη διάφοροι εἰσήεσαν λογισμοὶ καὶ δυσι γνώμαις τὴν ψυχὴν ἐμεριζόμην. ἄρα γε, φησί, πεισθεῖην τῷ διδάσκον ὑψηλότερά σου μὴ ζήτηι καὶ βαδύτερά σου μὴ ἐρεύνα καὶ κλείθρα ἐπιβαλὼν τοῖς χεῖλεσι σιγὴν ἀσκήσω ἢ ἀκούσοιμι τοῦ λέγοντος· ζητῶν ζήτηι καὶ παρ' ἐμοὶ μένε;

Εἶτα ἱκανῶς ἐμαυτὸν ἐν τούτῳ βασανίσας τότε καὶ γράφειν ἐπαρρησιαζόμην, ὅτε τὴν τῶν τρισμακαρίστων ὑμῶν θεόπνευστον διδασκαλίαν κατὰ νοῦν ἐλάμβανον, πεπεισμένος, ὅτι δυοῖν θάτερον ἢ καὶ ἐκάτερα ἐκ τούτου μοι περιγένηται· ἢ γάρ, φησίν, ἀποδειχθεῖν ἢ πάντως διορθωθεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναφερομένοις οὖσιν ἐν τούτοις ἀξιωθεῖς, θεοτίμητοι, τῶν πανευσεβῶν ἰχνῶν τοῦ θεοστηρίκτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου· ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῆς θεομιμήτου αὐτοῦ συγκαταβάσεως τυχῶν παρρησίας μετελάμβανον θεία κελεύσει τῆς αὐτῶν ἡμερότητος ἐντυχεῖν πρὸς Ἀρκάδιον τὸν ἀγιώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Κύπρου κατὰ Παύλου τοῦ κεφαλαιώτου τῶν ἀνεπισκόπων μάλα θεοπρεπῶς συνταγείση, ἥς ἐπαινετὸς καὶ θεοφιλὴς ὡς ἀληθῶς ἅπας μὲν ὁ σκοπὸς εὐσεβῶς τὴν ἀμώμητον ἡμῶν ὀρθοδοξίαν θρησκευῶν, δύο δὲ ἐνεργείας ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν λέγεσθαι κωλύουσιν. αὐτὴν εὐρηκῶς ἀνένευον καὶ προφέρειν ἐπειρώμην τοῦ μακαρίου Λέοντος τὴν πάντιμον ἐπιστολὴν δύο ἐνεργείας μετὰ τῆς ἀλλήλων δηλαδὴ κοινωνίας, καθὼς διδάσκει ὁ πανάγιός μου δεσπότης, ἀναφανδὸν βοῶσαν. ἐνθένδε λοιπὸν ὀρμηθέντος ἡμῶν τοῦ λόγου πάντιμον ἀναφορὰν τῶν θεοπνεύστων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν ἐγχειρίζεσθαι ἐκελευόμην, ἀντίγραφον εἶναι λεγομένην καὶ δοκοῦσαν τῆς ῥηθείσης εὐσεβοῦς κελεύσεως· μνήμην γὰρ ἐποιεῖτο ἐκείνου Παύλου τοῦ φαύλου, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τοῦ τῆς κελεύσεως ἴσου καὶ τὸν ἐγγεγραμμένον αὐτῷ νοῦν ἀπεδέχετο. εἰκότως οὖν τηνικαῦτα ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν καὶ ἡκιστα ἀντιλέγειν ἐπαιδεδομην, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν υμετέραν θεόφραστον διδασκαλίαν καταφεύγειν ἔγνων τιμίων αὐτῆς κεραιῶν ἀξιωθῆναι θεόμενος τηλαυγέστερον διασαφούντων, ὅπως δύο ἐνεργείας λέγειν μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν παραιτούμενοι εἰς μίαν ἡγουν ἐνικὴν ἐνέργειαν δυνάμεθα ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς θείοις λογίοις συγκλείειν τό τε παθητὸν καὶ ἀπαθὲς τῆς ἀρρήτου οἰκονομίας τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα τῆς θεοφανοῦς παιδείσεως τῶν θεοδιδάκτων ὑμῶν φωταγωγηθὲν ἡμῶν τὸ ἀπαιδευτὸν ἴσως κἂν ἐν τούτῳ μιμήσῃται τὴν πύονα καὶ εὐθαλῆ γῆν καὶ τὸν καταβαλλόμενον τοῦ λόγου κόκκον ἀσμένως ὑποδεξάμενον πρὸς εὐκαρπίαν διασώσῃ.

#### **Appendix 4. The *satisfactio*.**

##### **ACO II, 2, 594.**

###### *Κεφάλαιον α΄*

*Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τριάδα ὁμοούσιον, μίαν θεότητα ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

###### *Κεφάλαιον β΄*

*Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ „τὸν ἕνα τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος“ τὸν θεὸν λόγον, τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων ἀχρόνως γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἀγίου καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἀγίας ἐνδόξου θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκὶ καὶ ἀποθανόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

###### *Κεφάλαιον γ΄*

*Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνὸς κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ τὰ τε πάθη καὶ τὰ θαύματα, ἀλλ’ „ἄλλου καὶ ἄλλου“, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

###### *Κεφάλαιον δ΄*

*Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἄκρας ἐνώσεως τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς ἀγίας θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας ὑποστῆσαι ἑαυτῷ καθ’ ἑνωσιν σάρκα ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀγίας θεοτόκου τὴν ἡμῖν ὁμοούσιον ἐμφυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ τε καὶ νοερᾷ ἐνώσει φυσικῇ τε καὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν καὶ οὕτως προελθεῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἕνα ὄντα, ἀσύγχυτόν τε καὶ ἀδιαίρετον, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

###### *Κεφάλαιον ε΄*

*Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν ἀγίαν δέσποιναν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀειπαρθένον Μαρίαν κυρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν θεοτόκου εἶναι, ὡς τὸν θεὸν λόγον σεσαρκωμένον κινήσασαν καὶ τεκοῦσαν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

###### *Κεφάλαιον ς΄*

*Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ ἐκ δύο φύσεων, τουτέστι θεότητός τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ἕνα Χριστόν, ἕνα υἱόν, „μίαν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φύσιν σεσαρκωμένην“ κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Κύριλλον ἀσύγχυτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀναλλοιώτως, ἡγῶν μίαν ὑπόστασιν σύνθετον, ὅπερ ἐστὶν αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, „εἷς ὢν τῆς ἀγίας ὁμοουσίου τριάδος“, ὁ τοιοῦτος, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

###### *Κεφάλαιον ζ΄*

*Εἴ τις τὸν ἕνα κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν ἐν δυσὶ θεωρεῖσθαι λέγων ταῖς φύσεσιν οὐχ „ἕνα τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος“ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖ, τὸν αἰδίως μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα θεὸν λόγον, ἐν ἐσχάτοις δὲ τοῦ αἰῶνος καιροῖς τὸν αὐτὸν σαρκωθέντα καὶ τεχθέντα ἐκ τῆς παναγίας καὶ*

ἀχράντου δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, ἀλλ' „ἕτερον τοῦτον“ οἶδε „καὶ ἕτερον“, καὶ οὐχ „ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν“ κατὰ τὸν σοφώτατον Κύριλλον „ἐν Θεότητι τέλειον καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν“, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ μόνον „ἐν δύο“ θεωρούμενον „φύσει τὸν αὐτὸν πάσχοντα καὶ μὴ πάσχοντα κατ' ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο“, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀγίοις ἔφησε Κύριλλος, πάσχοντα μὲν ἀνθρωπίνως σαρκὶ καθὸ ἄνθρωπος, μένοντα δὲ ὡς Θεὸν ἀπαθῆ ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς πάθεσι, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἓνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ Θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα „μιᾷ Θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ“ κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Διονύσιον· Θεωρία μόνῃ διακρίνων τὰ ἐξ ὧν ἡ ἔνωσις γέγονε, καὶ ταῦτα τῷ νῷ διασκοπῶν ἄτρεπτα καὶ ἀσύγχυτα μετὰ τὴν αὐτῶν φυσικὴν καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἔνωσιν μένοντα, καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀδιαιρέτως καὶ ἀχωρίστως τὸν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν γνωριζόμενον, καθὸ δύο τὰ ἀλλήλοις ἀσυγχύτως συνηνεγμένα καθορᾷ τῷ νῷ, πραγματικὴν αὐτῶν τὴν Θεωρίαν ποιούμενος, ἀλλ' (οὐ) φαντασίᾳ ψευδεῖ καὶ διακένοις νοῦ διαπλάσμασι, διιστῶσι δὲ οὐδαμῶς ὡς ἀνηρημένης ἤδη τῆς εἰς δύο διατομῆς διὰ τὴν ἄφραστον (καὶ ἀσύγχυτον) καὶ ἀπερινόητον ἔνωσιν, λέγων κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Ἀθανάσιον· „ἅμα γὰρ σὰρξ, ἅμα Θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ, ἅμα σὰρξ ἔμφυχος λογικῆ, ἅμα Θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ ἔμφυχος λογικῆ“, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ διαιρέσει τῆ ἀνά μέρος τὴν τοιαύτην ἐκλαμβάνει φωνήν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον η'

Εἴ τις οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει Ἄρειον, Εὐνόμιον, Μακεδόنيον, Ἀπολινάριον τὸν αἰρετικόν, Νεστόριον, Εὐτυχεᾶ τὸν δυσώνυμον καὶ Κῦρον καὶ Ἰωάννην τοὺς Αἰγεώτας καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀντειρηκότας καθ' οἷον δῆποτε τρόπον τοῖς δώδεκα κεφαλαίοις τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου Κυρίλλου καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντας, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ πλάνῃ ἀποθανόντας, καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶν φρονήσαντας ἢ φρονοῦντας, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Κεφάλαιον θ'

Εἴ τις οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει τὰ συγγράμματα Θεοδορίτου τὰ κατὰ τῆς ὀρθοῆς πίστεως τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Κυρίλλου, καὶ τὴν λεγομένην Ἰβα ἐπιστολήν, καὶ Θεόδωρον τὸν Μομφουεστίας καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἴ τις οὐ δέχεται τὰ συγγράμματα τοῦ ἀγίου Κυρίλλου καὶ μάλιστα τὰ κατὰ Θεοδώρου καὶ Θεοδορίτου καὶ Ἀνδρέου καὶ Νεστορίου καὶ τῶν τὰ ὅμοια αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνὸς αὐτῶν πεφρονηκότων ἢ φρονούτων, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

## Appendix 5. Creed of Makarios of Antioch.

ACO, 215-216.

Ὁμολογῶ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἕνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος εἶναι καὶ μετὰ σάρκωσιν ἐν δυοῖς τελείαις ταῖς φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως ἐν ἐνὶ προσώπῳ καὶ ὑποστάσει μιᾷ, „οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, σφωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἐκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἐν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης.“ ἐπειδὴ οὖν ἕτερον πρόσωπον καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ὁ εἷς τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος οὐ προσέλαβε, διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε τι τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας λέγομεν αὐτὸν προσλαβεῖν· δίχα γὰρ σαρκικῶν θελημάτων καὶ λογισμῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐν εἰκόνι καινότητος ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸν ἕνα κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. „ὁ γὰρ ἐν θέλημα ἔχων πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τῶν παθῶν τούτων ἀπάντων μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν εἶχε δύναμιν πρὸς ὑπομονὴν τούτων ἀπάντων“ κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἔκκριτον Ἀγούστίνον. περὶ τούτου γὰρ καὶ ὁμολογίαν πίστεως ἤδη πρότερον ἐξεθέμεθα καὶ σύμφρονές ἐσμεν τῶν τε ἁγίων πέντε συνόδων Ὁνωρίου τε τοῦ Θεόφρονος, Σεργίου καὶ Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, ὧν μνήμην καὶ ἐν αἷς ἐπιθεδώκαμεν τῷ δεσπότη χρηῖσιν πεποιήμεθα, ὁμολογοῦντες ἐν θέλημα ὑποστατικὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ <ένος> κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεανδρικήν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν. „οὔτε γὰρ τὰ θεῖα κατὰ θεὸν οὔτε τὰ ἀνθρώπινα κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλ’ ἀνθρωπέντος τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου καινὴν τινα τὴν Θεανδρικήν ἐνέργειαν πεπολιτεῦσθαι“ ὁμολογοῦμεν κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Διονύσιον.

## Appendix 6. The *Florilegia* of the Heretics.

### ACO I, 332-334.

Χρήσεις τῶν διαιρούντων αἰρετικῶν.

**1** Θεοδώρου τοῦ ἄσεβοῦς ἐπισκόπου γενομένου Μοψουεστίας ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὰ θαύματα λόγου β·

Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι πρὸς τὸν λεπρὸν εἰπὼν ὁ σωτὴρ ἔδειξε μίαν εἶναι τὴν θέλησιν, μίαν τὴν ἐνέργειαν κατὰ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐξουσίαν προαγομένην, οὐ λόγῳ φύσεως, ἀλλ’ εὐδοκίας, καθ’ ἣν ἠνώθη τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ ὁ κατὰ πρόγνωσιν ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ αὐτῆς μήτρας τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐνδιάθετον ἔχων οἰκείωσιν.

**2** Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως·

Κατὰ τὴν πρόγνωσιν τοῦ λόγου δειχθεῖς ὁ τεχνεὺς ἐκ τῆς παρθένου δίχα σπορᾶς ἄνθρωπος οὐ διεκρίθη τοῦ λόγου ταυτότητι γνώμης αὐτῷ συνημμένος καθ’ ἣν εὐδοκήσας ἤνωσεν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ καὶ διέδειξεν αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπαράλλακτον, αὐθεντίαν τε καὶ ἐξουσίαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἀδιαιρέτον ἔχοντα καὶ τὴν προσκύνησιν ἰσότητος νόμῳ μὴ παραλλάσσουσαν.

**3** Νεστορίου ἐκ τῆς λεγομένης αὐτῷ „ἐπιφανοῦς μυσήσεως“ λόγου β·

Ἄσυγχύτους φυλάττομεν τὰς φύσεις, οὐ κατ' οὐσίαν, γνώμην δὲ συνημμένας· διὸ καὶ μίαν αὐτῶν τὴν θελήσιν, ἐνεργεῖάν τε καὶ δεσποτεῖαν ὀρῶμεν, ἀξίας ἰσότητι δεικνυμένας. ὁ γὰρ θεὸς λόγος ἀναλαβὼν ὃν προώρισεν ἄνθρωπον τῷ τῆς ἐξουσίας λόγῳ, πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐ διεκρίθη διὰ τὴν προγνωσθεῖσαν αὐτῷ διάθεσιν.

**4** Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς πραγματείας λόγου δ·

Οὐκ ἄλλος ἦν ὁ θεὸς λόγος καὶ ἄλλος ὁ ἐν ᾧ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος· ἐν γὰρ ἦν ἀμφοτέρων τὸ πρόσωπον, ἀξία καὶ τιμῇ προσκυνούμενον παρὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, μηδενὶ τρόπῳ ἢ χρόνῳ ἐτερότητι βουλῆς καὶ θελήματος διαιρούμενον.

**5** Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Ἱεραπολίτην ἐπιστολῆς·

Τῶν δύο φύσεων μία ἐστὶν αὐθεντία καὶ μία δύναμις ἥτοι δυναστεία καὶ ἐν πρόσωπον κατὰ μίαν ἀξίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν τιμὴν.

**6** Παύλου διακόνου Πέρσου Νεστοριανοῦ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ κρίσεως λόγου·

Ἐπειδὴ κατ' οὐσίαν ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς ὃν ἀνέλαβεν ἄνθρωπον οὐ γέγονεν ἕνωσις, μία φύσις οὐ γέγονεν. εἰ δὲ μία φύσις οὐ γέγονε, μία μονοπρόσωπος ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπόστασις. οὐκοῦν κατ' εὐδοκίαν ἢ ἕνωσις βουλῆς καὶ γνώμης ταυτότητι κρατουμένη, ἵνα καὶ τὸ διάφορον τῶν φύσεων ἀσύγχυτον δείκνυται καὶ τὸ τῆς εὐδοκίας μυστήριον μονάδι βουλήσεως διαδείκνυται.

**7** Θεοδούλου Νεστοριανοῦ ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου λόγου τῶν γραφέντων παρ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς συμφωνίας τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ τῆς νέας διαθήκης·

Ἐν μὲν οὖν τὸ ἀξίωμα τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς εἰκόνας, μία δὲ ἀμφοῖν ἢ ἐνεργεῖα.

**8** Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου·

Ἐμφανῆ δὲ λοιπὸν τὴν τιμὴν τῆς βασιλείας παρὰ πάντων κομίζεται. ἐν μὲν γὰρ λοιπὸν τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς εἰκόνας καὶ τοῦ ταύτην προσθησαμένου θεοῦ, μία δὲ ἀμφοῖν ἢ ἐνεργεῖα.

**9** Ἐκ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰβᾶ ἐπιστολῆς τῆς καὶ δικαίως ὑπὸ τῆς ἀγίας πέμπτης συνόδου ἀναθεματισθείσης·

Ἡ ἐκκλησία γὰρ οὕτως λέγει ὡς καὶ ἡ σὴ θεοσέβεια ἐπίσταται. καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐδιδάχθη καὶ ἐστηρίχθη τῇ θείᾳ διδασκαλίᾳ ἐκ τῶν λόγων τῶν μακαρίων πατέρων δύο φύσεις, μία δύναμις.

## **Appendix 7. The Creed of Theodore of Pharan.**

### **ACO II 2 602-606.**

Ἐπειδὴ προηγουμένως διὰ τινος θείαν καὶ σοφωτάτην οἰκονομίαν ὑπνον (καὶ) κάματος καὶ πεινᾶν καὶ δίψαν προσήκατο ὁπότε καὶ ἠβουλήθη, καὶ μάλιστα δικαίως καὶ τὴν ἐν τούτοις κίνησιν καὶ

ήρεμίαν τῇ πανσθενεῖ καὶ πανσόφῳ τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργείᾳ προσάπτομεν, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν μίαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνὸς Χριστοῦ ἐνεργεῖαν προσαγορεύομεν.

Ἰκανῶς οἴμαι παρέστησεν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος διὰ τῆς ἐξετάσεως, ὅτι πάντα ὅσα ἰστόρηται περὶ τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ, εἴτε θεοῦ, εἴτε ψυχῆς, εἴτε σώματος ἢ τοῦ συναμφοτέρου, ψυχῆς λέγω καὶ σώματος, μοναδικῶς ἅμα καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως ἐπράττετο, ἀρχόμενα μὲν καί, ψυχῆς λέγω καὶ σώματος, μοναδικῶς ἅμα καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως ἐπράττετο, ἀρχόμενα μὲν καί, οἷον εἶπεῖν, πηγάζοντα ἐκ τῆς τοῦ λόγου σοφίας καὶ ἀγαθότητος καὶ δυνάμεως διὰ μέσης [δὲ] ψυχῆς νοεραῖς καὶ σώματος προϊόντα· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μία ἐνεργεῖα ὅλου ὡς ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ταῦτα πάντα καὶ εἰσὶ καὶ ἐλέχθησαν.

Ἔχομεν ἄρα ἐκ τούτων σαφῶς, ὅτι ἔργον θεοῦ ἅπαντα ὅσα περὶ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀκούομεν καὶ πιστεύομεν, εἴτε τῇ θείᾳ φύσει προσεικίота εἴτε τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο μία ἐνεργεῖα ταῦτα τῆς τε θεότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος εὐσεβῶς ὠνόμασται. ... ὡς εἶναι πᾶσαν τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς μέχρι τέλους καὶ ὅσα ταύτης μικρά τε καὶ μεγάλα μίαν ἀληθῶς ὑψηλοτάτην καὶ θείαν ἐνεργεῖαν. Τὸ δὲ θεῖον θέλημα ὅπερ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, αὐτοῦ γὰρ τὸ θέλημα ἐν ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦτο θεῖον.

Διὰ τούτων ἄρα χωρὶς πάσης [ἀμφιβολίας] ἀμφιβολίας παιδευόμεθα, ὅτιπάντα <τὰ> τῆς σωτηριώδους οἰκονομίας, εἴτε θεῖα εἴτε ἀνθρώπινα, περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ ἀνιστόρηται. ἀρχοειδῶς μὲν, οἷον εἶπεῖν, ἐκ τοῦ θείου τὴν ἔνδοσιν καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐλάμβανε, διὰ μέσης δὲ τῆς νοεραῖς καὶ λογικῆς ψυχῆς ὑπουργεῖτο παρὰ τοῦ σώματος, εἴτε θαυματοποιόν τινα δύναμιν εἴποις εἴτε καὶ φυσικὴν τινα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κίνησιν, οἷον τροφῆς ὄρεξιν, ὕπνον, κάματον καὶ πόνων ἀντίληψιν, λύπην καὶ ἀδημονίαν, ἃ καὶ πάθη κατὰ σύγχρησιν ὀνομάτων ἐκ τῆς συνηθείας προσαγορεύεται. κυρίως δὲ φυσικῆς κινήσεως διὰ τοῦ ἐμφύχου καὶ αἰσθητικοῦ ζῆρου πεφύκασι, καὶ αὐτὰ δέ, ἅπερ κυρίως ἐστὶ καὶ λέγεται πάθη, ὁ σταυρός, ἡ νέκρωσις, οἱ μώλωπες, ἡ ὠτειλή καὶ καθήλωσις, τὰ ἐμπτύσματα, τὰ ῥαπίσματα, πάντα ταῦτα ὀρθῶς ἂν καὶ δικαίως κληθεῖν μία καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνὸς Χριστοῦ ἐνεργεῖα Νοεῖσθω οὖν ἡμῖν ἐκ παντὸς ἅπαντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ ἐνανθρώπησιν μία θεία τε καὶ σωτηριώδης ὄντως ἐνεργεῖα. Ἐκ τούτων γε πάντων καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων εὔ γε καὶ μάλα δικαίως μία θεοῦ ἐνεργεῖα πάντα <τὰ> τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως ἴδια πιστευέσθω καὶ λεγέσθω.

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

Anastasius Sinaita. *Sermo iii in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem Dei neconon opuscula adversus Monotheletas*. Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 12. Ed. K. H. Uthemann. Tunhout: Brepols, 1985.

Antiochus Monachus. *La Prise de Jerusalem par les Perses* [Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium, scriptores georgi 203] Ed. and trans. G. Garitte. Louvain, 1960.

*The Armenian Sources Attributed to Sebeos*. Translated by Robert Thomson. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. 1999.

[Arseni of Sapara] არსენი საფარელი. განყოფისათვის ქართველთა და სომეხთა [On the Separation of the Armenians and Georgians]. Ed. Zaza Alexidze. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1980.

[The Book of Letters] ეპისტოლეთა წიგნი. Ed. Zaza Alexidze. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1968.

[*The Conversion of Kartli*] მოქცევაჲ ქართლისაჲ, ქართული ჰაგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები, 1 [Monuments of Georgian Hagiographical Literature, 1 (V-X c.)] Ed. Ilia Abuladze. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1964.

[The Dogmatic Works of Philotheos Kokkinos] *Φιλοθέου Κόκκινου δογματικά έργα. Μέρος Α'* in *Thessalonian Byzantine Writers* 3. Ed. D. Kaikames, Thessalonica: Centre for Byzantine Research, 1983.

*The Disputation with Pyrrhus of Our Father among the Saints, Maximus the Confesso*. Trans. Joseph P. Farrell. South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon, 1990.

Drasxanakertc'i, Yovhannes. *History of Armenia*. trans. by Krikor Maksoudian. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

*Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope.* 2 vols. Ed. I. Bekker. Bonn: Weber, 1838-1839.

*Ioannis Zonarae epitomae historiarum libri xvii.* vol. 3. Ed. T. Buttner-Wobst. Bonn: Weber, 1897.

[The Life of Kartli] ქართლის ცხოვრება, ed. S. Qauxchishvili., vol. 1. T'bilisi: Saxelgami, 1955; repr. as Kartlis cxovreba: *The Georgian Royal Annals and Their Medieval Armenian Adaptation*. English trans. by R. W. Thomson. New intro. S. Rapp. vol. 1. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1998.

[*The Life of Karti*] ქართლის ცხოვრება. Ed. by Simon Qauxchishvili. Tbilisi: Saxelgami, 1955

*La Narratio de Rebus Armeniae.* Critical edition and commentary G. Garitte. Louvain: Peeters, 1952.

*Le nouveau manuscrit Géorgien sinaitique N50*, Facsimile edition. Intro. Z. Aleksidze. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Louvain: Peeters, 2001.

*Oevres completes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios.* vol 3. Ed. M. Jugie, L. Petit. and X.A. Sideridas. Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1930.

*Rewriting Caucasian History: The Medieval Armenian Adaptation of the Georgian Chronicles.* Original Georgian texts and the Armenian adaptation by Robert W. Thomson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

*Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos.* Vol. 4. Ed. J.B. Kotter. Patristische texte und Studien 22. Berlin: De Gryeter, 1981.

Themann, K.H. "Die dem Anastasios Sinaites zugeschriebene Synopsis de haeresibus et synodis." *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 14 (1982): 58-94.

*Theophanis chronographia*, vol. 1. Ed. C. de Boor. Leipzig: Teubner, 1883. repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963.

[Ukhatnes] უხტანესი, ისტორია განყოფისა ქართველთა სომეხთაგან [The History of Severance of the Georgians from the Armenians] Ed. Zaza Alexidze. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1975.

Bishop Ukhtanes of Sebastia. *History of Armenia, Part III, History of the Severence of the Georgians from Armenians*. Trans. intro. and commentary Fr. Zaven Arzumanian. Fort Lauderdale: Dr. Zaven Arzoumanian, 1985.

### Secondary sources

Akinian, Nerses. *Kirion katolikos vrac [Kirion the Katholikos of Georgians]* Vienna: Mkhitarist Press, 1910.

Alexidze, Zaza, “Establishment of National Churches in the Caucasus.” *The Caucasus and Globalization: Religion and Caucasian Civilization* 2, No 3, (2008): 142-150.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Kaukasien und der christlich Orient zwischen 451 und 780.“ *Georgika* (1981): 34-36.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Four Versions of the ‘Conversion of Georgia.’” In *Die Christianisierung des Kaukasus/ the Christianization of Caucasus (Armenia, Georgia, Albania), Referate des Internationalen Symposions (Wien, 9. bis 12. Dezember 1999)*. Ed. Werner Seibt (Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences, 1999): 9-16.

\_\_\_\_\_. “გარეჯიდან სინას მთამდე: უცნობი მასალა სამონასტრო კომპლექსის შესახებ სინას ტის ქართულ ხელნაწერთა ახალი კოლექციიდან [From Gareja to Mount Sinai: Unknown material in Gareja Monastic Complex from the New Collection of Georgian Manuscripts from Mt. Sinai]. *Desert Monasticism – Gareja and the Christian East*. (Materials of an international conference) Ed. Z. Skhirtladze (Tbilisi: 2001): 34-67.

\_\_\_\_\_. “არსენი ვაჩეს ძის “დოგმატიკონში” შესული ანტიმონოფიზიტური ტრაქტატი და მისი გამოძახილი ძველ სომხურ მწერლობაში” [An antiMonophysite treatise inserted in the Dogmatikon of Arseni Vachesdze and reaction on it in the Armenian literature] *Mravaltavi* 1 (1971), 133-153.

\_\_\_\_\_. “რელიგიური სიტუაცია კავკასიაში VI საუკუნეში” [The Religious Situation in the Caucasus in the sixth century] *Matsne* 3 (1973): 103-110.

Anatolios, Khaled. *Athanasius*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Babian, Gobun. *The Relations between the Armenian and Georgian Churches According to the Armenian Sources, 300-610*. Antelias-Lebanon: Armenian Catholicosate of Cilicia, 2001.

Bagnall, Roger S. *Egypt in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Barnes, Timothy. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Bathrellos, Demetrios. *Person, Nature and Will in the Christology of Saint Maximus the Confessor*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Beck, Hans-Georg. "Justinian's Successors: Monoenergism and Monothelitism." in *History of the Church, ii: The Imperial Church from Constantine to the Early Middle Ages*, trans. Anselm Biggs, ed. Hubert Jedin and John Dolan. 457-463. London: Burns and Oates, 1980.

Chapman, John. *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1907.

[Chubinashvili, Giorgi] Чубинашвили, Гиоргий, Памятники типа Джвари. [The Cross-shaped Monuments] Tbilisi: Georgian Academy of Sciences Press, 1948.

Clayton, Paul. *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Diekamp, F., *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi*. Munster: Aschendorf, 1907.

*Egypt in the Byzantine World 300-700*. Ed. by Roger S. Bagnall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Frivold, Leif. *The Incarnation: A study of the Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Armenian Church in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Centuries according to the Book of Letters*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1981.

Garsoian, Nina. *Armenia between Byzantium and the Sasanians*. London: Variorum, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. *L'eglise armenienne et le grand schisme d'orient*. Louvain: Peeters, 1999.

Goubert, Paul. *Byzance avant l'Islam*. 2 vols. in 3. Paris: Geuthner, 1951-1965.

Grillmeier, Alois. *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*. vol. 1. Freiburg: Herder, 1979.

*The Heritage of Armenian Literature*. Vol. 2. Ed. Agop Hacikyan, Gabriel Basmajian, Edward Franchuk and Nourhan Ouzounian. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002

Haldon, John. *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hardy, Edward Rochie. "The Patriarchate of Alexandria: A study in National Christianity," *Church History* 15 No.2 (June 1946): 81-100.

Hovorun, Cyril. *Will, Action and Freedom: Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

[Janashia, Simon] ჯანაშია სიმონ. ფეოდალური რევოლუცია საქართველოში. [*Feudal Revolution in Georgia*]. Tbilisi: Georgian Academy of Sciences Press, 1949.

[Javakhishvili, Ivane] ჯავახიშვილი ივანე. ქართველი ერის ისტორია 1 [*The History of the Georgian Nation*, vol 1]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press, 1979.

\_\_\_\_\_. ქართული სამართლის ისტორია. [*The History of the Georgian Law*] Vol. 2. Part 2 (Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press, 1929).

Johnston, James-Howard. "Armenian Historians of Heraclius: An Examination of Aims, Sources and Working methods of Sebeos and Movses Daskhurantsi." *The Reign of Heraclius (610-641): Crisis and Confrontation.*" ed. Gerrit J. Reinink and Bernard H. Stolte (Leuven: Peeters, 2002): 41-62.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Army, Society and Religion in Byzantium*. London: Variorum, 1982.

Kaegi, Walter. *Heraclius Emperor of Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Keating, Daniel. *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004

Kotter, P.B. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 4. Patristische texte und Studien 22. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1981.

Kreuzer, Georg. *Die Honoriusfrage im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit*. Päpste und Papsttum 8. Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag, 1975.

Louth, Andrew. *Maximus the Confessor*. London: Routledge, 1996.

[Marr, Nikolai] Марр, Николай. *Антиох Стратиг: Пленение Иерусалима персами в 614 г.* [Antiochos Strategos: The capture of Jerusalem by the Persians in 614] *Тексты и разыскания по армяно-грузинской филологии* [Texts and studies in Armeno-Georgian philology] 9 (1909).

McGuckin, John A. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy. Its History, Theology and Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Menze, Volker. *Justinian and the Making of the Syriac Orthodox Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Monneret de Villard, Ugo. "Una chiesa di tipo georgiano nella necropoli Tebana." *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum. The Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute* 2 (1950): 495-500.

[Muskhelishvili, Davit] მუსხელიშვილი დავით. *საქართველო IV-VIII საუკუნეებში* [Georgia in Fourth to Eighth Centuries]: Tbilisi: Mematiane, 2003.

Norris, Richard A. *Manhood and Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Patsch, Gertrud. "Die Bekehrung Georgiens." *Bedi Kartlisa* 33. (1975): 288-337.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, Vol. 2: *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Perczel, István. "The Christology of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite: The Fourth Letter in Its Indirect and Direct Text Traditions." *Le Muséon* 117 (2004): 409-446.

Pletnjowa, Svetlana. *Die Chasaren*. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1978.

Russel, Norman. *Cyril of Alexandria*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Sarkissian, Karekin. *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church*, Antelias-Lebanon: Armenian Church Prelacy, 1984.

Schwaiger, Georg “Die Honoriusfrage: zu einer neuen Untersuchung des alten Falles,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 88 (1977): 85-97.

Sullivan, Francis A. *The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Analecta Gregoriana 82. Rome: Analecta Gregoriana, 1956.

Tarkhnishvili, Mikheil. “Un vestige de l’art Georgien en Egypte”, *Bedi Kharthlisa* 6-7 (1959): 32-33.

Ter-Minasean, Ervand. *Die Armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu den Syrischen Kirchen*, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904.

Tixeront, Joseph. *History of Dogmas*. Vol. 3. 2nd ed. London: Herder, 1926.

Toumanoff, Cyril. “Armenia and Georgia“, In *The Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. J. M. Hussey, vol. 4.1. 593-637. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966,

Wardrop, Margary and Oliver Wardrop. “Life of St. Nino.” *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* 5, No. 1 (1900).

Whitby, Michael. *Emperor Maurice and his Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Winkelman, Friedhelm. *Der Monenergetisch-Monothelische Streit*. Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang, 2001.