

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF EUSEBIUS OF DORYLAEUM IN THE NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY

Towards the end of AD 427 Sisinnius, archbishop of Constantinople, died and a fierce contest between interested parties brought the city into confusion. The heavy lobbying of two renowned citizens, Philip and Proclus quickly divided the city.¹ The Emperor Theodosius II was serendipitously saved from civil unrest in his capital, when one of his officials proposed that Nestorius, an eloquent and respected abbot of the Monastery of Euprepus near Antioch, whom he recently met, be appointed as the next archbishop. Nestorius was renowned not only for his energetic homiletic talent, but he was widely respected as a great ascetic. The fact that he also possessed formidable organizational skills helped the nomination. Hard pressed for a quick decision, Theodosius appointed Nestorius to the see of Constantinople.

In Constantinople, Nestorius was met with suspicion as an outsider. His actions and that of his entourage were closely scrutinized. Moreover, the ecclesiastical situation in the city was rather complex. Being one of the great centers of the ancient world, Constantinople was home to a very diverse population in the cultural and religious sense. The complex setting of the Capital required its bishop to be a skilled diplomat as well. Regrettably, diplomacy was not one of Nestorius' strong suits.

Soon after his arrival to Constantinople Nestorius was thrown into the theological disputes of the city. Both the sympathizers of the "Arian" and "Apollinarian" theologies argued that the Blessed Virgin Mary ought to be called "Theotokos" (Gr. "God-bearer" or "Birthgiver of God"). The "Arians" used the title in order to challenge the divinity of the Logos; namely, the title "Theotokos" suggested that that the Logos was not co-eternal with God the Father but had a beginning in birth, hence the Logos could not be God co-essential with the unoriginate Father. The "Apollinarians," on

¹Kenneth G. Holum, "Theodosian empresses : women and imperial dominion in late antiquity," *The transformation of the classical heritage* Vol. 3 (1982), 148-149.

the other hand, used the title to support their teaching that the Logos was the animating agent in the Incarnation of Christ who took the place of the human intellect (νοῦς) in Jesus. The rationale was that Mary was Theotokos because Christ was the Logos who simply took the possession and control of the human body and animal soul of Jesus. Nestorius was swiftly drawn into the debate, which finally brought his demise.

Nestorius' chancellor, priest Anastasius, who accompanied the new archbishop from Antioch, addressed the controversy over the title "Theotokos" in one of his sermons. In a public sermon, Anastasius, somewhat naively, exclaimed, "Let no one call Mary Theotokos: for Mary was but a woman, and it is impossible that God should be born of a woman."² Naturally, this exclamation created a great disturbance in Constantinople from both clergy and laity. As Socrates testifies, Nestorius, eager to clear his protégé of the charges of blasphemy, delivered a series of sermons in which he decisively rejected the title Theotokos for the Blessed Virgin.³ His reasoning was that, without proper qualifications, the title "Theotokos" could lead to a serious confusion of the divinity and humanity in Christ and even undermine the doctrine of the economy of salvation (ACO I, 1, 6, pp. 31-33).

The public resistance to Nestorius' teaching culminated when a man of 'great erudition and fiery character', as Cyril describes him, interrupted one of the sermons of the new archbishop exclaiming that the same pre-eternal *Logos* had been born for the second time.⁴ This man was the learned Constantinopolitan lawyer Eusebius who was later elected bishop of Dorylaeum.⁵

The significance of this statement lies in its emphasis on the divinity of Christ, by virtue of which the Blessed Virgin could be called *Theotokos*. Thus Eusebius directly challenged not only Nestorius, but the Christological tradition predominant in Antioch, that laid stress on the concreteness of Christ's humanity. Eusebius' interruption was accepted enthusiastically, which probably encouraged him to further action. One document in connection to the 'Nestorian' controversy authored by Eusebius survives. It is the famous pamphlet *Contestatio Eusebii* in which the author attempted to

² Socrates, HE 7. 32.

³ Socrates, HE 7. 32.

⁴ Cyril of Alexandria *Adversus Nestorii blasphemias* 1, 20 in PG 76. 41D: "Αὐτὸν τὸν προαιώνιον λόγον καὶ δευτέραν ὑπέμεινε γέννησιν"; see Marius Mercator II, 1 in PL 48. 769B; Friedrich Loofs, *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius gesammelt, untersucht und herausgegeben* (Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1905), 50.

⁵ *The Chronicle*, 79; T. A. Lacey, *Appellatio Flaviani: the letters of appeal from the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 449, addressed by Flavian and Eusebius to St. Leo of Rome*, ed. T. A. Lacey, vol. Vol. 70, Church Historical Society (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903), 8.

discredit what he understood to be Nestorius' theology. Originally, it was published anonymously, however the pamphlet can be found in different collections of the Acts of Ephesus (431) where it is invariably ascribed to Eusebius.⁶ The full text of the pamphlet survives among the writings of Leontius of Byzantium, who also ascribes it to Eusebius.⁷ Eusebius' authorship of the *Contestatio* is universally accepted by the modern scholarship.⁸

The text of the *Contestatio* contains six theological statements in which the Christology of Nestorius is presented as strikingly similar to that of Paul of Samosata.⁹ In addition to these sentences Eusebius included his own interpretation of Nestorius' teaching. It also contains a small section of the Antiochene Baptismal Creed asserting that Christ was the Incarnate *Logos*. The purpose of the selection of the creed was to demonstrate the alleged incongruence of Nestorius' teaching with that of the Antiochene Church. Also, a proclamation of an anathema by 'Eustathius of Antioch'¹⁰ upon those who divided the *Logos* and Christ is appended to the text. Its purpose was to subject Nestorius to it.

The original text of the *Contestatio* is as follows:¹¹

Him who takes this paper I bind with an oath in the Holy Trinity to make it known to the bishops, priests and deacons, readers and laypeople living in Constantinople, and again to make the same

⁶ ACO I. 1. 1, 101-102 (lat. ACO I. 3, 18-19); Mansi IV 1008E - 1012B. See also Loofs, *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius gesammelt, untersucht und herausgegeben.*, 49.

⁷ Leontius Byzantinus, *Libri tres contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* III, 43 in PG 86.1389B.

⁸ Henry Chadwick, *The Church in ancient society : from Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 528-529; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, Fifth (revised 2000) ed. (London and New York: Continuum, 1977), 311; Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, trans. John Bowden, vol. Vol. 1 (London, Oxford: Mowbrays, 1975), 464 note 1; Thomas Graumann, *Die Kirche der Vaeter: Vaetertheologie und Vaeterbeweis in the Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431)*, ed. Johannes Wallman, vol. Vol. 118, *Beitraege zur historischen Theologie* (Tuebingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 310.

⁹ ACO I. 1. 1, 10.

¹⁰ As Graumann observed the author of the passage was not from Eustathius, but from Marcellus of Ancyra's *De incarnatione et contra arianos* PG 26. 1024D - 1025A. Yet, in the old Antiochene tradition the passage was handed down as a work of Nicene origin; see Graumann, *Die Kirche der Vaeter: Vaetertheologie und Vaeterbeweis in the Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431)*, 310-311. It should also be noted here that in the original text Baruch 3:36-38 was mistaken for a passage from Prophet Jeremiah. This mistake was also repeated by Eusebius; see ACO I. 1. 1, 102 section 4.

¹¹ Translation from the Greek critical text in ACO I, 1, 1, 101-2.

public to them for an examination of the heretic Nestorius, since he is like-minded (harmonious) with Paul of Samosata, who was anathematized one hundred and sixty years ago by the orthodox fathers bishops. And this is what the each of the two said:

- (1) Paul said: Mary did not bear Logos.
- (1) Nestorius likewise said: O, the best [of men], Mary did not bear the Godhead.
- (2) Paul: Neither was she before ages.
- (2) Nestorius: and they would prefer timely mother to the Godhead, which is the creator of time.
- (3) Paul: Mary received the Logos and was not superior by birth to Logos.
- (3) Nestorius: How then [is it possible that] Mary gave birth to him who was more ancient than herself?
- (4) Paul: Mary gave birth to a man equal to us.
- (4) Nestorius: A man was born from the Virgin.
- (5) Paul: But fairer in everything, because the Holy Spirit and the grace from the things promised and from the Scriptures [was] on him.
- (5) Nestorius: Because he says: I saw the Spirit that descended as a dove remaining on him, granting him ascension (he said: he was taken up after he had given commandment through the Holy Spirit to the Apostles whom he had chosen), and It (Spirit) granted also such a great glory to Christ.
- (6) Paul: in order that the one anointed by David be neither estranged from the wisdom nor the wisdom in another abide in a similar manner, because it existed in the prophets, in Moses even more, and in many lords (sirs), and in Christ even more as in a temple, and elsewhere he says that one is Jesus Christ and another Logos.
- (6) Nestorius: Could it ever be possible for the one who was born before all the ages to be born once again, and could all this pertain to Godhead?

Behold, it is shown that the transgressor [Nestorius] clearly says: the one born of the Father was not born by Mary. Behold, he agrees with the heretic Paul who says that Logos is one and another Jesus Christ, and is not one as the orthodoxy teaches. Because of this I will point to you, o devotee (zealot) to the holy faith, even a part of the teaching of the Antiochene church, from which the Christians in the beginning received their name, that she [the Antiochene church] does not know of two different sons of God, but only one God who was born before all the ages from the Father,

consubstantial with the Father and the one who was born from the Virgin Mary under August Caesar. It was said:

‘True God of true God, consubstantial with the Father, by whom both the ages were ordered and all was made, who came for us and was born of the holy Virgin Mary and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and further from the creed.’

The same was revered also by the blessed bishop Eustathius of the same Antioch, one of the three hundred and eighteen bishops at the Holy and Great Council [in Nicea], who says this:

‘Not only man, but God as well, just as prophet Jeremiah says: This is our God; no other can be compared to him. He found the whole way to knowledge, and gave her to Jacob his servant and to Israel whom he loved. Afterward He appeared upon earth and lived among men. But when did He live among the men if not when He was born among them of the Virgin and became infant like them and grew with them and ate and drank with them and the rest?’

Therefore, if anyone dared to declare that one is the Son who was born consubstantial of the Father before the ages, and another he who was born of the Virgin Mary, and that it is not one Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema!

In the light of later developments (especially the doctrinal decisions of the Council of Ephesus (431)), it is clear that Nestorius did not simply revive and follow Paul of Samosata’s heresy. Socrates Scholasticus, a contemporary, in his brief analysis of Nestorius’ teaching explicitly said that Nestorius did not follow Paul. Moreover, Socrates believed that Nestorius did not even teach incorrectly about Christ, He did not reject the reality of Christ’s divinity. Socrates believed that the real reason for Nestorius’ downfall was actually his theological incompetence and not malicious revival of old heresies.¹² This testimony bears great importance, as it was given only several years after the controversy ended with Nestorius’ condemnation. Therefore, the major question remains as to the reasons for Eusebius’ association of Nestorius and Paul.

Eusebius was an able theologian, constantly praised for his erudition and theological prowess by his contemporaries. The charge of heresy, which he leveled against Nestorius, is not a coincidence.¹³

¹²Socrates HE 7.32.

¹³For example, Cyril of Alexandria speaks of Eusebius as being remarkably educated, “οὐκ ἀθαύμαστον συναγηγεγκῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν παιδείυσιν”; see

Eusebius pursued the association of Nestorius with Paul of Samosata having in mind the fact that a successful connection between the two would inevitably bring condemnation by association upon Nestorius. This type of condemnation was very common at the time. As Graumann observed, the condemnation by association was a habitual tactic of that period.¹⁴ When there was no established and commonly accepted theological position- *kerygma*, to which a teaching could be compared, the strategy was to accuse one's opponent of an already condemned notorious heresy in order to discredit him. The opponent's 'heresy' often only vaguely resembled the condemned teaching, as it was the case with Nestorius. Thus a whole range of early Church theologians was associated with various 'heretics', of whom Paul of Samosata was the most common.¹⁵

Moreover, the fact that Nestorius came to Constantinople from Antioch might have contributed to his express association with Paul of Samosata, who was a bishop in Antioch. Associations with Antioch clearly played an important role in Eusebius' case, as is evident from his decision to include the Antiochene Baptismal Creed in the *Contestatio* over the more universally accepted Nicene Creed. The choice could not have escaped the attention of an astute reader of the *Contestatio*. Thus, Eusebius did not spare effort in attempting to demonstrate that the teachings that he ascribed to Nestorius were at variance even with the Antiochene faith. Nestorius' wide unpopularity in Constantinople, due to his vicious persecution of the peaceful Constantinopolitan heretics,¹⁶ could also explain the association with the most notorious heretic up to that time. It easily could have been an act of vengeance.

Cyrilus Alexandrinus, *Adversus Nestorii blasphemias* 1, 20 in PG 76 41D. See also Leontius Byzantinus, *Libri tres contra Nestorianos et Eutyichianos* III, 43 in PG 86.1389B; Chadwick, *The Church in ancient society : from Galilee to Gregory the Great.*, 528.

¹⁴ Graumann, *Die Kirche der Vaeter: Vaetertheologie und Vaeterbeweis in the Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431).*, 310.

¹⁵ The reason for this infamy of Paul was probably a combination of his alleged continuation of Artemon's heresy (i.e., *The Dynamic Monarchianism*) and the political position he occupied. Per the *Synodal Letter* of the council of Antioch 268/9 (preserved by Eusebius Pamphilus), which finally condemned Paul, it was mostly his conduct that concerned the council. Namely, Paul was concurrently bishop of Antioch and *ducenarius/procurator* of Queen Zenobia of Palmyra. Numerous charges regarding activities unbecoming of a bishop, were brought before the council. It is interesting to note that the problem of his theology occupied a relatively small part of the *Letter*; see Eusebius, HE 7. 30. 7-16; also Graumann, *Die Kirche der Vaeter: Vaetertheologie und Vaeterbeweis in the Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431).*, 212; John Behr, *The way to Nicaea, The formation of Christian theology*; v. 1 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001)., 207.

¹⁶ See Socrates HE 7. 29 and 31.

According to Socrates, the title *Theotokos* had a long history in the writings of the orthodox fathers, where it was used in depicting the faith in the incarnation.¹⁷ Gradually, it penetrated into the *kerygma* of the Church and became a popular theological (in Alexandria) and devotional title. Embracing the 'Alexandrian' Christological model with the *Communicatio idiomatum*, which already professed *Deus passus*, the Virgin Mary was titled *Theotokos* in the common devotion at least from the third century (Origen used it in his commentaries).¹⁸ The seemingly double incongruence of Nestorius' teaching with the *kerygma*, regarding the nature of union of divine and human natures in Christ and its devotional consequence in the denial of the popular title *Theotokos*, was a sufficient reason for the learned and zealous Eusebius to write the *Contestatio*.

Eusebius, however, might have had additional reasons for the writing of the *Contestatio*; namely, reasons of political nature. In the first half of the 5th century the teaching on the *Theotokos*, previously present mostly in the public devotion reapidly became institutionalized. It filled the gap in the public devotion that the termination of the Imperial cult left replacing the Roman civic religion. As Limberis observed the person responsible for this rapid transformation was Aelia Pulcheria Augusta, the older sister and regent of the Emperor Theodosius II.¹⁹ According to the official accounts, Pulcheria took a vow of chastity and devoted her life to prayer. Her spiritual advisor was Atticus, bishop of Constantinople. He wrote a treatise *On Faith and Virginity*, which he dedicated to Pulcheria and her sisters. There he affirmed that the consecrated women would receive Christ in the womb of their faith.²⁰ This propelled Pulcheria's reverence for *Theotokos*. Thus, when Nestorius began his attacks on the title *Theotokos*, he set himself not only against the Church's *kerygma* as witnessed in the public devotion, but also against a real authoritative threat in the person of Pulcheria. In addition to his radical teaching Pulcheria had a personal reasons to oppose Nestorius, since on several occasions, as we shall see he publicly humiliated her.

Nestorius was convinced that Pulcheria was not honest in her vow of chastity and that she enjoyed adulterous relationships with different men.

¹⁷ See Socrates HE 7. 32 in PG 67 812AB; cf. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*., 448 note 3.

¹⁸ See *ibid.*, 447.

¹⁹ See Vasiliki Limberis, *Divine Heiress: The Virgin Mary and the Creation of Christian Constantinople* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994)., 62. See also Kenneth G. Holum, *Theodosian empresses : women and imperial dominion in late antiquity*, vol. Vol. 3, The transformation of the classical heritage (Berkeley ; London: University of California Press, 1982)., 79-111.

²⁰ See Holum, *Theodosian empresses : women and imperial dominion in late antiquity*., 138-140.

He even made a complaint to Theodosius about this.²¹ The relationship between the new archbishop and Pulcheria, the powerful Augusta, quickly deteriorated. Within a week of coming to Constantinople, Nestorius stopped praying for Pulcheria as the 'bride of Christ', discontinued a practice of entertaining the princesses for dinner in the Episcopal palace after the Sunday communion, removed Pulcheria's portrait which hang over the altar in the Great Church and removed her robe, which served as altar covering, from the Holy Table.²² The final blow was Nestorius' refusal to allow Pulcheria to receive communion, as she was accustomed, inside the altar on the Easter Sunday. He stated that laypersons and women were not allowed into the altar. Then, Pulcheria, invoking the words of Atticus, asked 'Why? Have I not given birth to God?' Nestorius, shocked, replied: 'You? You have given birth to Satan!' He drove then the princess out of the altar.²³ This had brought him not only an extreme enmity of a powerful authority, but also great unpopularity among her many supporters. Eusebius, being Pulcheria's protégé, was almost certainly one of them.

Ancient sources present Eusebius as a 'rhetor distinguished in legal practice'²⁴ and an '*agens in rebus*' to the court.²⁵ Moreover, Theopanes says that he was also σχολαστικός (i.e., legal representative)²⁶

²¹ See *ibid.*, p. 153.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 153.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

²⁴ Evagrius HE 1. 9 in PG 86 2445; Leontius Byzantinus, *Libri tres contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* III, 43 in PG 86.1389B.

²⁵ See Henry Wace and William C. Piercy, *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 1999), 334.

²⁶ The title "σχολαστικός" has an ambiguous meaning. In the classicist period it generally meant 'teacher of eloquence' (see Epictetus 1. 11. 39 and 4. 1. 138 in Flavius Arrianus and Johann Schweighaeuser, *Epicteti Manuale et Cebetis Tabula Graece et Latine. Recens. curavitque J. Schweighaeuser* (Lipsiae 1798). and Plutarch *De Vita Homeris* 1. 863 in Plutarch, *Ploutarchou tou Chairaoneas ta Ethika : Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia, id est opera, exceptis vitis, reliqua*, ed. Daniel Albert Wytttenbach and Wilhelm Xylander, vol. Vol. 5 (Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1795).). This meaning of the word would indeed correspond to the previous descriptions of Eusebius as an able 'rhetor'. However, Christian authors of the fourth and fifth centuries use the title σχολαστικός to denote a representative of the legal profession (see Athanasius in PG 25.821C; Basil the Great in PG 29.613; Macarius in PG 34.604D; Marcus Eremita in PG 65.1072A; Synesius PG 66.1557; Socrates HE 7. 32 in PG 67.681;). Thus, one concludes that by the time of Eusebius the title σχολαστικός acquired an additional meaning – lawyer (see also William Smith and Samuel Cheetham, eds., *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. Vol. 2 (London: John Murray, 1908), 1845; E. A. Sophocles, J. H. Thayer, and H. Drisler, *Greek lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine periods : from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100*, Memorial ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), 1064; Skarlatos D. Vyzantios, *Byzantios*

of the empress.²⁷ Apparently, Eusebius was close to Pulcheria's court, which she ran as a regent of her brother. It ought not be surprising to suspect that behind Eusebius' *Contestatio* was not only his fiery character and devotional zeal combined with theological learning, but also his personal friendship with the scorned Augusta Pulcheria.

Taking into consideration Nestorius' Christological position one is inclined to consider an alternative approach to the accusations of *Contestatio* against Nestorius regarding the title *Theotokos*. It has been made manifest from that incident of the Constantinopolitan devotional exaggeration that Nestorius' primary concern were the possible misinterpretations of the title. Moreover, the incident with Pulcheria's allusion to the God-bearing of every woman in combination with personal impatience, did not help in resolving the issue.

Therefore, Eusebius' fishing for a Christological error in Nestorius' opposition to the title *Theotokos*, apart from its obvious inadequacy, seems to be unsustainable. However, Eusebius was undoubtedly devoted to the title *Theotokos* as the result of his Christological position, which due to the *Communicatio idiomatum* was imposed as an orthodox *kerygma* by the time. There is as yet little doubt that Eusebius correctly understood the title. The later developments Eusebius it would have been unacceptable to speak of Christ only in terms of his divinity, as it was to speak only in terms of his humanity. Thus, for Eusebius the title *Theotokos* was a result of the *Communicatio idiomatum* of the united natures in Christ, and not of Blessed Virgin's birth-giving to *Logos qua Logos* (i.e. second person of the Trinity).

In conclusion, the Christology of Eusebius of Doryleum in the "Nestorian" controversy was defined by both theological concerns and political allegiances. Although, the Christology of Eusebius at this stage must be restored from the scant evidence of a single, rather brief, document, nonetheless the *Contestatio* contains valuable information for the reconstruction. It suggests, in the Nestorian controversy, Eusebius did recognize the full divinity and full humanity of Christ and that these two natures were united in one person, who was born of the *Theotokos*.²⁸ Although, this rather general Christological formulation is far from being satisfactory, in terms of later debates and theological developments, it proves to be satisfactory when compared to the statements of the leading theologians in the Nesto-

Lexicon: Lexikon tes Hellenikes glosses, vol. Tomos A' (Athenais: Typographia tou Andreou Koromila, 1852), 1864). Consequently, taking into account the testimonies of Eusebius' close relations with the court, a possibility that Eusebius was legal representative of Pulcheria cannot be overruled.

²⁷ *The Chronicle*, 76; also Wace and Piercy, *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography*, 334.

²⁸ See ACO I. 1. 1, 101-102.

rian controversy (e.g, Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrrhus). The Christology, as a full fledged theological discipline was just emerging and the debates about the exact relationship of the divinity and humanity in Christ was in domain of uncharted waters. Thus, the fact that Eusebius was able to detect a suspicious theological teaching, and perhaps use it to his advantage, bears witness to his theological erudition and prowess, which will be fully revealed some twenty years later in his opposition to a new heresy – that of Eutyches.

Summary

Vasilije Vranic (Chicago)

Contestatio Eusebii: The Christology of Eusebius of Dorylaeum in the ‘Nestorian’ controversy

Eusebius of Dorylaeum was involved in both Christological controversies of the fifth century in very important ways. In the ‘Nestorian’ controversy he was the first to challenge the theological orthodoxy of the newly installed archbishop of Constantinople, Nestorius, by writing a pamphlet known as the *Contestatio Eusebii*. In it he likened the theology of Nestorius with condemned heretical teachings of Paul of Samosata. Some twenty years later, he accused a powerful archimandrite in Constantinople, Eutyches, of heresy, which set in motion the Miaphysite controversy.

Yet, despite his prominence in the theological events leading to the definition of Christological orthodoxy at the Council of Chalcedon (AD 451), very little is known about his Christology.

In this paper I argue that the *Contestatio Eusebii* plays a crucial role in identifying the Christological position of Eusebius of Dorylaeum in the Nestorian controversy. I argue that Eusebius believed in a full, personal union of the divine and human natures of Christ into one reality without confusion.

Keywords: Christology, Patristics, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, Nestorian Controversy, *Communicatio idiomatum*, *Contestatio Eusebii*