

According to the tradition following Cyril of Alexandria, what is the relationship between humanity and divinity in Christ?

This essay will assess the function of the divinity of Christ as described by Cyril of Alexandria. In doing so, it will seek to respond to the modern perception that the deity of Christ is no longer required or necessary today by firstly assessing the implications of Cyril of Alexandria's theology for the individual claiming to be a follower of Christ. Secondly, it will consider the importance of Cyril's theology for the corporate church community before finally analysing how those implications impact society at large.

To begin, however, it will be essential to understand Cyril's theological expression of Jesus' divinity and humanity in light of his own historical context, in order that the correct implications can be understood.

Cyril was a prominent bishop in Alexandria during the ongoing Christological debates. These debates had developed from the time of Marcion, whose attack on the nature of Jesus' relationship with Yahweh was quickly declared heresy, to become extremely detailed and nuanced regarding the nature of Jesus' divinity. The early church, having expelled Marcion, saw the need for a canon with which to refute further heretical teachers, began to contemplate the divine nature of Jesus in a philosophical manner. Both the revelation of the canon and a unified, accurate understanding of Jesus' divine and human natures were vital to guarantee the safety of the Apostolic Gospel for future generations. This philosophical approach, however, was fraught with heretical danger, and led to a number of well-known theories eventually deemed heretical, such as *psilanthropism*, *Sabellianism*, *subordinationism*, *Arianism* and the *Logos-Sarx* theory.

Cyril was Bishop in Alexandria, and followed the teachings of Athanasius passionately. As such, he believed that the teachings of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople offered a theology of the divinity of Christ that was incorrect and even blasphemous. It was because of this fervent belief that he chose to enter into the Christological debates, arguing, 'How can we any longer, under these circumstances, make a defence for our silence...'¹ So strong was his condemnation of Nestorius' theological position that he wrote the *Twelve*

¹ Cyril of Alexandria, *Third Epistle to Nestorius Including the Twelve Anathemas*, accessed <<http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/135-cyril-of-alexandria-third-epistle-to-nestorius-including-the-twelve-anathemas>> on 28/05/2014
4,612 words, excl. bibliography.

Anathemas directly repudiating him and proclaiming that those in agreement with Nestorius, ‘have no lot with us, nor place or standing among the priests and bishops of God.’² Cyril presupposed the Christological problem to be understood in light of adapting the ‘word-flesh’ interpretation, whereby, ‘he thought rather in terms of two phases in the existence of the Logos, one prior to and the other after the incarnation.’³ Therefore, although the Word remained ‘as He was,’⁴ He added to Himself by taking the form of a servant,⁵ whilst ‘continuing to exist eternally in the form of God.’⁶ This means that the only difference for the Son is that before the incarnation He existed ‘outside flesh’ whereas after the incarnation He now was ‘embodied’. Kelly summarizes this clearly: ‘The nature or hypostasis which was the Word became ‘enfleshed’...; henceforth the Word was ‘incarnate’.’⁷ In presenting this perception of the divine nature being manifested in flesh, Cyril made use of the phrase ‘one nature, and that incarnate, of the divine Word,’⁸ whereby ‘nature’ is understood to mean ‘the enfleshed nature of the Word.’⁹

Nestorius sought to address this issue differently by asking how the two natures cohabit within the flesh of Jesus the man. He suggested that the predicates of humanity cannot mix with the predicates of the divine, thus within Jesus’ ministry there are moments when His divinity is active and His humanity is passive. In this line of thought, Nestorius became prominent for preaching that Mary could not be called *theotokos* because her own humanity demanded that she couldn’t give birth to the divine:

Holy Scripture, wherever it recalls the Lord’s economy, speaks of the birth and suffering not of the Godhead but of the humanity of Christ, so that the holy virgin is more accurately termed the mother of Christ than the mother of God.¹⁰

² Ibid.

³ Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Doctrine*, (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), p. 319

⁴ Kelly, *Doctrines*, p. 319

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Nestorius, *Nestorius of Constantinople, Second Epistle to Cyril of Alexandria*, taken from <<http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/34-patrtxts/189-nestorius-to-cyiril2>>, accessed on 23/04/2014. Translator unknown.

This led to widespread unrest, for the untenability of this theological position was visible to many: Mary, said Nestorius, could not be called the Mother of God because she could only give birth to Christ's human nature as the vehicle for divinity,¹¹ yet as Oakes makes clear, '...no human mother gives birth to a human *nature*, only to a human *baby*.'¹² What Nestorius had done by forcing apart the two natures of Christ was to again remove the unity of the 'being' of Christ, thus leaving himself open to the charge that Christ was, at best, 'schizophrenic' in His natures, acting only as man at some points, and only as God the Son at others.

The implications of Nestorius' theology with regards to salvation are obviously immense. If Jesus was to die on the cross as man only (for the divine and immutable cannot die or suffer) then the human Jesus could not bear the full wrath of God the Father for sinful humanity. The Word had to be fully divine on the cross in order to be a suitable and acceptable sacrifice for sin. However, if the being dying on the cross was the Word in His divine nature only, then either He feigned death (for the immutable cannot die) or didn't die, in which case the soteriological implications are equally as disastrous, for as Gregory of Nazianzus had previously argued, 'What he has not assumed he has not healed...'¹³ If Jesus did not assume humanity fully, and die fully human, then He has not reversed the curse, nor redeemed His people. In that instance, salvation cannot be granted for Jesus was incapable of representing mankind as the second Adam.¹⁴

Having set out his theology of the incarnation as being 'one out of two', Cyril refused to accept any argument whereby the unity of the divine and human natures of the incarnate Christ were divided:

Confessing the Word to be made one with the flesh according to substance, we adore one Son and Lord Jesus Christ: we do not divide the God from the man...but we know only one Christ, the Word from God the Father with His own flesh.'¹⁵

¹¹ Kelly, *Doctrines*, p. 311

¹² Oakes, *Infancy*, p. 141, emphasis his.

¹³ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Letter 101*, trans. Charles Gordon Browne and James Edward Swallow, in *A Selected Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd series, vol. 7, (London: Christian Literature Co., 1984), p. 440, taken from Oakes, *Infancy*, p. 137

¹⁴ In *1 Corinthians* 15, Paul explains that Jesus' death for humanity made him a second Adam, whereby the first Adam brought sin into the world, the second Adam defeated its power over humanity.

¹⁵ Cyril, *The Epistle of Cyril to Nestorius with the XII. Anathematisms*, 202, Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia*, Tom. III., col. 395; Migne, *Patr. Græc.*, Tom. LXXVII. [Cyril, *Opera*, Tom. X.], col. 105 *et seq.*, taken from <<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.x.viii.html>> accessed on 23/04/2014

4,612 words, excl. bibliography.

It was clear to Cyril that ‘by ‘flesh’ he meant human nature in its fullness.’¹⁶ However, this idea that Christ was made ‘one out of two’ means that ‘the Incarnate was none other than the eternal Word in a new state,’¹⁷ which of course makes clear that ‘His unity was presupposed from the start.’¹⁸

The question then to answer was whether this unity of two natures in one flesh resulted in a mingling of the natures, or an absorption of one by the other. Cyril was adamant that neither could be the case: ‘He is a babbler who says that there was any confusion of mixture.’¹⁹ It was clear that any suggestion that the two natures became one within their union was false, for divinity does indeed have differing predicates to that of humanity. Whilst the union of natures could not be divided, the difference inherent in the essences of divinity and humanity could not be changed or eliminated. Oakes’ example is helpful in articulating this: ‘Cyril had to insist that the Word was not *transformed* into flesh the way, for example, a caterpillar changes into a butterfly...whereby the caterpillar ceases to exist.’²⁰ Ware describes this act of the Word as, ‘a “subtraction” (i.e., a pouring out, an emptying) by adding human nature to his divine nature.’²¹ Clearly, therefore, the Word was not subsumed from Godhead into manhood, or vice versa. Indeed, to suggest otherwise was to fall foul of Cyril’s Third Anathema, which stated, ‘If anyone divides in the one Christ the hypostases after the union, joining them only by a conjunction of dignity or authority or power, and not rather by a coming together in a union by nature, let him be anathema.’²²

Cyril’s theology, of course, repudiated Nestorius’ arguments. He argued that, because the Word is fully God, being pre-existent and eternal, He is worthy to be the ‘serpent-crusher’ promised in *Genesis* 3:15 and is capable of bearing the covenant curse established in *Genesis* 15:17. This worthiness of the divine nature of the Word is essential for the achievement of man’s salvation: because the Son is eternally God with the Father, He participated in the covenant with Abraham and therefore was obligated to bear the penalty. Indeed,

¹⁶ Kelly, *Doctrines*, p. 319

¹⁷ Kelly, *Doctrines*, p. 320

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Cyril, *Quod unus*; ep. 45 (PG 75, 1292; 77, 232), taken from Kelly, *Doctrines*, p. 321

²⁰ Oakes, *Infancy*, p. 145

²¹ Ware, Bruce A., *The Man Christ Jesus: Theological Reflections on the Humanity of Jesus*, (Illinois: Crossway, 2013). P. 20

²² Cyril, *Third Epistle to Nestorius Including the Twelve Anathemas*, accessed <<http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/135-cyril-of-alexandria-third-epistle-to-nestorius-including-the-twelve-anathemas>> on 28/05/2014

4,612 words, excl. bibliography.

only the Divine could bear the wrath of God. Because Jesus was fully the Son, completely God, He was able to be a sufficient atonement. As Cyril argued, before the incarnation, the Word always existed and was God, making Him worthy and capable of bearing the Father's wrath (anticipated, biblically, by Genesis 3). It was only after the incarnation, however, that He was physically able to go to the cross.

In his determination to maintain the fullness of Jesus' humanity, Cyril maintained the Apostolic link with Paul's teaching in Philippians 2, where he explained that Christ had to be human in order to suffer as man, and be punished for mankind as substitute. Because it was humanity that broke the covenant and was sinful, humanity deserved God's righteous judgement. However, no human could meet the conditions of sinlessness required to represent mankind on the cross. The covenant made with Abraham in *Genesis* 15 made clear that God knew a sacrifice would be required, and that humanity could not provide a suitable sacrifice from within itself. The Word could not go to the cross in His divine nature, just as the penalty should not be paid by any but a human being. If the full humanity of Christ were compromised (such as suggested by Apollinaris, or Nestorius) then on the cross Jesus did not redeem all aspects of fallen humanity. His death was only sufficient for that which His death carried responsibility.

For the individual today, Cyril's stand on both these issues is vital. The salvation for the individual depends upon the full divinity of Christ on the cross as one who fulfils God's covenant obligations whilst being capable of bearing the full weight of the judgement for sin that the Father poured out upon Jesus at the cross, which sinful humanity deserved. Yet the salvation for the individual equally depends upon the full humanity of Christ on the cross as one who can completely represent mankind by assuming all aspects of our nature in order to redeem it by His atoning death. Were Jesus neither fully human, nor fully divine, His sacrifice would have been a poignant act of compassion, but useless to a race of sinful beings under the wrath of a just and righteous God. Personal, individual salvation requires the Gospel that Cyril inherited from the Apostles and defended with passion and theological fervour. Humanity needs Jesus on the cross to be both God and man.

What has been demonstrated so far, therefore, is that Cyril's theology of the Incarnation required an understanding that the Word became flesh in entirety – the Word had not simply procured the vestments of

4,612 words, excl. bibliography.

humanity, but had indeed become fully man. Yet his understanding also involved an awareness that the Word did not transform into flesh in such a way as to demolish the differences between the divine and the human. Cyril's theological expressions followed Paul's logic. In doing so, he was helping to sharpen the church's understanding of the nature of salvation through Christ. Soteriologically, therefore, Cyril's theological developments were of the utmost importance for the individual Christian: without the divine nature of Christ, the cross would be insufficient; without the human nature, the cross would be impossible. By being both fully divine and fully man, however, Jesus embodied all the required criteria for the substitutionary atonement He sought to achieve.

As Cyril argued, Jesus must be both fully God and fully man for this transaction to be acceptable, suitable and complete. However, this then presented a philosophical and theological problem for the early church. In what way can the immortal become mortal? Indeed, how can the immutable God experience suffering and pain to the point of death?²³

Cyril's theology of Christ's suffering is exceptionally important for the church today. For a church accustomed to respect and some degree of public approbation, the swift cultural change has proved difficult to comprehend: how can the church continue with the Gospel in light of such violent and vitriolic opposition?

There are a two clear answers available. Firstly, the church can follow the cultural trends. This will ingratiate it once more with society, protecting its interests in the immediate term, and perhaps maintaining some form of cultural 'voice' against the more extreme developments of anti-Christian ideology, such as argued by Bishop Alan Wilson: 'In Britain a social tsunami has swept through national life...'²⁴ meaning that, 'Officially, the Church plays King Canute,'²⁵ implying that the church should accept society's priorities just as 'Leaders like Steve Chalke and Rob Bell are re-thinking conventional shibboleths in the light of contemporary realities.'²⁶ The obvious impact of such a decision, however, can barely be over-emphasised.

²³ *Philippians* 2:8 being a classic example of this tension: 'And being found in human form, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death – even death on a cross.' *Philippians*, The Holy Bible, NRSV (HarperCollins Publishers, 1989), p.p. 1341-1342. All subsequent Bible quotations will be from the NRSV unless otherwise stated.

²⁴ Bishop, Dr. Alan Wilson, *It's time for the Church of England to drop the Culture Wars*, taken from, <<http://blogs.spectator.co.uk/coffeehouse/2013/04/its-time-for-the-church-of-england-to-drop-the-culture-wars/>> accessed on 13.05.2014

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

If the church continues to liberalise its position to satisfy an increasingly pagan society, it will only become more and more pagan itself. Any and all talk of ‘sin’ will slowly disappear, making the need for the crucified God-man, Jesus, also disappear. This will turn the church into a cultic organization interested only in social change and progress, forgetting its moral heritage and spiritual charge.

Alternatively, the church can bolster itself by regaining theological clarity on the issues assaulted by society. This approach will no doubt antagonise, causing deeper rifts with those who inherently disagree with the Christian faith, perhaps ultimately resulting in state-governed persecution in an effort to satisfy public lobbyists. By taking this decision, will the church be signing its own death warrant?

Cyril’s theology of the nature of Jesus’ suffering speaks into such a decision. It is because Jesus is united with the Second Person of the Trinity that one can say ‘Jesus suffered’ and mean the ‘Son of God’ suffered. Gavriilyuk writes, ‘Thus, according to Cyril, the statements ‘God wept’ or ‘God was crucified’ were theologically legitimate, as long as it was added that the subject was God-in-the-flesh, and not God outside the framework of the incarnation.’²⁷ Louth concurs, ‘the human suffering of Christ belongs to the Word incarnate, and no one else.’²⁸ Thus it is that Cyril can say,

Although according to his own nature he was not subject to suffering, yet he suffered for us in the flesh according to the Scriptures, and although impassible, yet in his Crucified Body he made his own the sufferings of his own flesh,²⁹

meaning that the Word, through the incarnation, was able to suffer and die an atoning death as substitution for a fallen human race. McGuckin writes of Cyril’s paradoxes, ‘It [the omnipotent instrument of the incarnate Word] is at once powerful and fragile, majestic and humble. Cyril loved to press the force of this economy by the use of strong paradoxes.’³⁰ These paradoxes preserved Cyril from the cries of heresy because they enabled him to explain the Biblical statements that God suffered at the cross in such a way as to not imply the

²⁷ Gavriilyuk, Paul, *Suffering of the Impassible God: The Dialectics of Patristic Thought*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 156

²⁸ Young, Frances; Ayres, Lewis and Louth, Andrew, *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

²⁹ Cyril, *Epistle to Nestorius*, 203

³⁰ John McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts*, (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2004), p. 185

4,612 words, excl. bibliography.

immutable nature suffered, but only the eternal Word ‘made flesh’ suffered. This preserved the immutability of the Word in eternity, yet enabled Him to ransom that which He assumed – humanity. After all, as Ware emphasises, ‘It was only the God-man who could obey in this way. To obey to the point of death requires the ability to die...to be placed on a cross required that he be in a human body.’³¹ Louth succinctly agrees, by arguing that what the Son did was, ‘...unite itself directly to humanity, even, or especially, to the material body,’³² because it is, ‘the measure of God’s love for humankind.’³³ Not only does Cyril reinforce the Word’s divinity in His humanity, but he continues to emphasize the reason behind the action. Because God loved the world, He send His Son to die, as the Apostle John wrote.³⁴

The impact of Christ’s suffering is important to the church in view of the societal shift. Firstly, and most importantly, as has been noted, Christ is the divine Word made flesh. Thus, with Paul, Cyril affirms that Christ is the head of the church: ‘He himself is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church...’³⁵ Therefore to *be* a church the community claiming the title must accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour,³⁶ believing Him to be the only option for salvation. Consequently, even in light of the change in attitude to the church, the church’s teaching of sin must remain as it always has been: as a barrier between man and God. It also means, however, that regardless of what society believes regarding morality or ethics, the church serves Christ alone, following His commands before those of the world. In so doing, the church cannot change the Gospel or what Christ has commanded His followers to believe and do. The very suggestion of that would have been anathema to Cyril.

Perhaps a more poignant implication, however is regarding the church’s endurance through persecution. Just as the divinity of the Word made incarnate ensures individual salvation, so too does it encourage steadfastness for the church. The immutable Word, eternal and fully God, became flesh not to

³¹ Ware, *The Man Christ Jesus*, p. 26

³² Louth, *Early Christian Literature*, p. 356

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *John* 3:16

³⁵ *Colossians*, 1:17, p. 1349

³⁶ As he articulated in the Fifth Anathema: ‘If anyone dares to say that Christ was a God-bearing man and not rather God in truth, being by nature one Son, even as "the Word became flesh", and is made partaker of blood and flesh precisely like us, let him be anathema.’ Cyril, *Third Epistle to Nestorius Including the Twelve Anathemas*, accessed <<http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/135-cyrl-of-alexandria-third-epistle-to-nestorius-including-the-twelve-anathemas>> on 28/05/2014

4,612 words, excl. bibliography.

reign on the throne in Jerusalem as the vanquisher of Rome, but to go to the cross. The Son of God, who is ‘in [The Father] and whom the Father is in,’³⁷ suffered in the flesh, and died. He who was eternal tasted humiliation and death. For a church facing growing intensity of persecution,³⁸ the knowledge that Jesus perfectly modelled how to accept suffering is encouraging, because of the certainty of hope that Christ gives to His church, whom He calls His bride. It is a helpful reminder of what Luther later termed the ‘theology of the cross’, which says that Christians in fact ought to *expect* suffering; the church as a whole most of all.

Finally, therefore, this essay will consider the implications of Cyril’s theology on a society increasingly hostile to the Christian community. Richard Dawkins is one loud voice in British society whose self-proclaimed objective is to ‘destroy Christianity.’³⁹ Yet Cyril’s theology answers Dawkins’ quest forcefully. Publicly, Cyril’s theology became the orthodox teaching of the Christian faith with the writing of the *Chalcedonian Creed*. It is not, however, a strictly Cyrillian creed, for although it contains the theology set out by Cyril, it contained the linguistic terminologies of Pope Leo that were, arguably, the decisive ones: ‘The formula [of the Council], like the *Tome*, condemned any notion of hypostatic union that would jeopardize “the differences of the natures” or would violate the rule that the union was accomplished “without confusion.”’⁴⁰ Indeed, notably different from Cyril was the inclusion of Nestorian language that said Christ was united *in* two natures, whereas Cyril wrote of Christ’s unity emanating *from* the two natures.⁴¹ Nevertheless, ‘It established ‘four boundaries for future Christological discussion...which theologians must not transgress in order to remain orthodox.’⁴² It was a creed, however, that is noticeable for its ‘negative’ theology: ‘It is effectively defining where one must not go with one’s Christology rather than setting forth a positive

³⁷ *John* 17:21, p. 1215

³⁸ Consider the CEO of Mozilla, who was forced to resign because of his beliefs regarding same sex marriage. Dave Lee, *Mozilla Boss Brenden Eich Resigns After Gay Marriage Storm*, <www.bbc.co.uk/new/technology-26868536> accessed on 13/05/2014

³⁹ Rev. George Pitcher, *Professor Richard Dawkins makes a festive vow to ‘destroy Christianity’*, taken from <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2073985/Professor-Dawkins-makes-festive-vow-destroy-Christianity.html>> accessed on 13/05/2014

⁴⁰ Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, vol. 1 of *The Christian Tradition: A history of the Development of Doctrine*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), pp. 236-264, as quoted by Oakes, *Infancy*, p. 150

⁴¹ See Oakes, *Infancy*, p. 150, footnote 76 for a fuller discussion.

⁴² Trueman, Carl R., *The Creedal Imperative*, (Illinois: Crossway, 2012), p. 100– these are Christ’s divinity, Christ’s humanity, no mixing of the natures and yet no undermining of the unity by separating the natures of Christ.

4,612 words, excl. bibliography.

definition.⁴³ As Wiles articulates, ‘Like all such compromises it failed to satisfy the extremists of either party,’⁴⁴ and ultimately led to a split in fellowship among the churches.

What this creed demonstrates is that what society believes or articulates about the message of Jesus, whether He is simply a role model, a gifted teacher or a two thousand year old lunatic, doesn’t matter. The church does not answer to society, and ought not to try to compromise on the Gospel simply to become more socially acceptable. Rather, the fact that Jesus, the Word of God made flesh, died a substitutionary death and was then raised to life, proves both His humanity and His divinity.⁴⁵ Therefore, because He is indeed God, and has indeed established the church through that ransom, society cannot and will not prevail against it. Rather, the church will always survive, somewhere and to some degree. Dawkins and the other ‘New Atheists’ contend with a church whose founder claimed even Hell couldn’t prevail against.⁴⁶

Whether it is the ‘Big Society’ stealing the teachings of Jesus without the Passion of Jesus, or the liberal gospel picking apart His teachings like Marcion, or the prosperity gospel adapting His teachings for personal gain, all have the same fundamental flaw: they take Jesus out of Christianity. In doing so, they remove the power and authority He gives to His people, and ultimately forfeit the only mediator between man and God,⁴⁷ thereby forfeiting eternal salvation for temporal popularity, acceptance or wealth. These false gospels may be attractive, but they are false, with eternal soteriological ramifications. They are powerless, even heretical, because they don’t need the Jesus who was fully God and fully man. Indeed, that Jesus is quite an inconvenience.

British society, contrary to what it perceives, is in greater need of a church grounded in the theology of Cyril, for Cyril rightly identified and understood that the Apostolic Gospel alone is the only remedy for a world spiralling out of control morally, ethically and spiritually. The church preaching the Gospel faithfully presents Jesus as judge of sin and as saviour of sinners. Society needs to hear both, otherwise salvation is

⁴³ Trueman, *Creedal Imperative*, p. 100

⁴⁴ Wiles, *Christian Fathers*, p. 80

⁴⁵ As Paul articulates in *1 Corinthians* 15:13-17

⁴⁶ *Matthew* 16:18

⁴⁷ *1 Timothy* 2:5-6

4,612 words, excl. bibliography.

deemed either unneeded or impossible. Likewise, society needs to realize that the church cannot capitulate on these issues because they are of eternal significance. Salvation is at stake.

Cyril's theology of Jesus being God encourages the church to proclaim that He is worthy to be judge over humanity. Thus, Cyril's adamant defence of the humanity of Christ ensures the church can proclaim that Jesus is capable of being our representative on the cross, and therefore can bring about the ransom of humanity. Preaching this message faithfully may hurt the Christian community in the short term, but Cyril's theology is clear: the God-man died a substitutionary death that impacts all of creation from the individual sinner, to the church, to the world that hates Him and, ultimately, killed Him.

Therefore, the nature of Christ's divinity greatly impacts the nature of salvation for the individual. If Christ were not fully divine, there is no way He could bear the wrath of God the Father, yet if He were not fully man, there is no way He could be acceptable as the representative of humanity at the cross. Individually, Christians require Christ's humanity and divinity to be both full and complete, yet neither mingled nor one dominating over the other. The union required must be equal and full for the Word-made-flesh to be acceptable and worthy.

With regards to the church, Cyril's theology of the cross encourages the Christian community to remain steadfast, refusing to bend under the brace of attacks by a society that is becoming increasingly aggressive towards it. This encouragement can be perceived because of the nature of Jesus' headship over it: the church is united to Him through His worthiness as substitute, and therefore the transaction He paid has been paid in full. All His promises to His church rest on that headship, meaning that the church is not under any other authority than that of Christ.

Finally, this essay noted that the salvific implications for society were large and bearing eternal consequence. The social gospel and prosperity gospel that currently pervades society in the United Kingdom is at odds with the Gospel promulgated by Cyril and the Apostles. As such, a church faithfully adhering to the Apostolic Gospel will refuse to bend on the issue of Christ's divinity because of the eternal ramifications of doing so. Society, it was noted, needs the church to be faithful, even if that faithfulness results in violent opposition.

Bibliography

Canonical Texts:

- *1 Corinthians*, The Holy Bible, NRSV (HarperCollins Publishers, 1989)
- *1 Timothy*, The Holy Bible, NRSV (HarperCollins Publishers, 1989)
- *Colossians*, The Holy Bible, NRSV (HarperCollins Publishers, 1989)
- *John*, The Holy Bible, NRSV (HarperCollins Publishers, 1989)
- *Matthew*, The Holy Bible, NRSV (HarperCollins Publishers, 1989)
- *Philippians*, The Holy Bible, NRSV (HarperCollins Publishers, 1989)

Ancient Texts

- Arius, *Letter to Alexander of Alexandria* in Rusch, William, *Trinitarian Controversy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1980)
- Chalcedonian Creed, trans. Philip Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical notes*, Volume II, *The History of Creeds*, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1889), p. 89, accessed at < <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/creeds2.pdf> > on 22/04/2014
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle to Nestorius*, 202, taken from < <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.x.viii.html> > accessed on 23/04/2014
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Quod unus; ep.* 45 (PG 75, 1292; 77, 232)
- Cyril of Alexandria, *The Epistle of Cyril to Nestorius with the XII. Anathematisms*, 202, Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia*, Tom. III., col. 395; Migne, *Patr. Græc.*, Tom. LXXVII. [Cyril, *Opera*, Tom. X.], col. 105 *et seqq.*, taken from < <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.x.viii.html> > accessed on 23/04/2014
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Third Epistle to Nestorius Including the Twelve Anathemas*, accessed <<http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/135-cyril-of-alexandria-third-epistle-to-nestorius-including-the-twelve-anathemas>> on 28/05/2014

- Definition of the Council of Chalcedon: <<http://www.ewtn.com/faith/teachings/incac2.htm>>, accessed on 23/04/2014
- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Letter 101*, trans. Charles Gordon Browne and James Edward Swallow, in *A Selected Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd series, vol. 7 (London: Christian Literature Co., 1984)
- Nestorius, *Nestorius of Constantinople*, Second epistle to Cyril of Alexandria, taken from <<http://www.monachos.net/content/patristics/patristictexts/34-patrtexts/189-nestorius--to-cyiril2>>, accessed on 23/04/2014. Translator unknown.
- The Chalcedonian Formula, *Documents of the Christian Church*, trans. Henry Bettenson (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1947), taken from <<http://www.anglicanonline.org/basics/chalcedon.html>>, accessed on 23/04/2014

Secondary Sources:

- Carson, D.A., *Jesus the Son of God, a Christological Title often Overlooked, sometimes Misunderstood, and Currently Disputed*, (Nottingham: IVP, 2012)
- Chester, Tim, *Delighting in the Trinity: Why Father, Son and Spirit are Good News*, 2nd Edition, (London: Good Book Company, 2005)
- Gavriilyuk, Paul, *Suffering of the Impassible God: The Dialectics of Patristic Thought*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- McGuckin, John, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts*, (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004)
- Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Doctrines*, (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013)
- Oakes, Edward T., *Infinity Dwindled to Infancy*, (Eerdmans, Michigan, 2011)
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, vol. 1 of *The Christian Tradition: A history of the Development of Doctrine*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971)
- Trueman, Carl R., *The Creedal Imperative*, (Illinois: Crossway, 2012)

- Ware, Bruce A., *The Man Christ Jesus: Theological Reflections on the Humanity of Jesus*, (Illinois: Crossway, 2013)
- Wiles, Maurice, *The Christian Fathers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982)
- Young, Frances; Ayres, Lewis and Louth, Andrew, *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Digital Sources

- Open Letter to *The Telegraph*, taken from <www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/letters/10777417/David-Cameron-fosters-division-by-calling-Britain-a-Christian-country.html> accessed on 13/05/2014
- Wilson, Alan, Bishop, Dr., *It's time for the Church of England to drop the Culture Wars*, taken from, <<http://blogs.spectator.co.uk/coffeehouse/2013/04/its-time-for-the-church-of-england-to-drop-the-culture-wars/>> accessed on 13.05.2014
- Dave Lee, *Mozilla Boss Brenden Eich Resigns After Gay Marriage Storm*, <www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-26868536> accessed on 13/05/2014
- Rev. George Pitcher, *Professor Richard Dawkins makes a festive vow to 'destroy Christianity'*, taken from <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2073985/Professor-Dawkins-makes-festive-vow-destroy-Christianity.html>> accessed on 13/05/2014