The Monist, 2021, 104, 366–375
doi: 10.1093/monist/onab005
Article

Nestorius and Nestorianism

Robert Merrihew Adams*

ABSTRACT

This paper has three parts. The first outlines the history of Nestorianism. From the end of the fifth century all the way into the thirteenth century (C.E.), quite a large population—in fact most Christians in Asia—belonged to branches of the Nestorian church. The second part provides a brief biography of Nestorius, after whom this church was named. The third part explores two elements of Nestorius's christology, as they are found in his posthumously discovered theological writings. (1) Does Christ have one nature or two (both human and divine), and if two, how can one person have two natures? (2) To what extent was Adam, the first man, created for a role that Christ eventually fulfilled?

I. WHAT IS (OR WAS) NESTORIANISM?

Nestorianism was for many centuries the name of the tradition of the Christian "Church of the East"—a communion that included the great majority of Christians living in Asia east of the fifth-century-C.E. boundary in western Syria that separated the Persian empire on the east side of the boundary from the Byzantine Roman empire on the west side. That boundary became relatively impermeable ecclesiastically during a period in the second half of the fifth century, some years after the Council of Chalcedon. That council had reached agreement on what were seen as the most fundamental questions about the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ. And for Christians in most of Europe the authority of that agreement was pretty durable for over a thousand years. But the agreement did not last long at all in the Byzantine empire around the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea, where Europe, Asia, and Africa meet. In the period of which I speak, in the latter part of the fifth century, the Christian churches in the northern part of the empire, in Europe and Asia Minor, wavered on the issue but in the longer run remained loyal to the Chalcedonian definitions; but the churches on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean sea, and in Egypt, rejected those definitions.

That resulted in the ecclesiastical impermeability, as I put it, of the border between the Byzantine and Persian empires in western Syria. The dominant christological view among Christians on the Persian side—a view which they called "Nestorian"—was that Christ had two complete natures, perfectly harmonious with each other, one

*Princeton University

divine and one human. The dominant view on the Byzantine side during the decisive period was that Christ had only one nature, both human and divine—a nature which seemed to the Nestorians problematically less human than divine. And the bitterness of the disagreement was such that the largest and most highly regarded Christian theological school in the whole region, sometimes enrolling a thousand students or more, was forced to move from Edessa in the Byzantine Empire to Nisibis in the Persian Empire, because of its Nestorian orientation. In the final part of this essay I will have more to say about the disputed christological issues, but I think I have said enough to identify Nestorianism and its Church of the East.[1]

The Nestorian church developed a remarkably adventurous and successful missionary tradition. Having united most of the Christian churches in west-central Asia, from the valley of the Euphrates River and the Arabian peninsula to the southwest coast of India, it carried Christianity along the "Silk Route" from Persia to Mongolia and beyond. In two different periods it achieved a significant though obviously insecure and somewhat syncretistic presence even in northeastern China, where eventually, in the last decades of the thirteenth century, a Mongolian son of a Nestorian Christian mother ruled as Emperor of China. He was the famous Kublai Khan.

In most of those areas, however, (and in all of the more stable ones) Christianity was a minority religion, often competing with an established state religion. There were times and places in which it enjoyed periods of peaceful growth. But in all its history Nestorian Christianity never attained a position in which it was reliably assured that it was not going to find itself under merciless religious persecution. And in the fourteenth century, amid the murderous rampages of Tamerlane and other invaders from the steppes of central Asia, the Nestorian church—and indeed Christianity—practically ceased to exist in Asia between Persia and China.

The Nestorian church also lost, and continued to lose, membership in its ancient home in Persia and Mesopotamian Syria. By the end of the nineteenth century, it was a shadow of its former self, with churches mainly in the mountains north of Mesopotamia. They were beginning to call their churches "Assyrian" rather than "Nestorian." And why not? For who but professional theologians remembered or cared any more what it would be to agree or disagree with Nestorius?

Among Christians who have studied the history of theology, one may encounter (and I have) an argument that the eventual failure of Nestorian missionary efforts in Asia shows that Nestorius's christology is wrong. That's not very plausible. Consider the rapid and total disappearance of Christianity from the ancient Roman province of "Africa" (which is now Tunisia, more or less) after the Muslim conquest of it. That was where Tertullian and Augustine had lived and written the works that more than any others introduced Christian theology to the Latin language. And Augustine's writings largely defined theological orthodoxy in Western Christendom for over a thousand years. I doubt that many critics of Nestorius's theology would blame Augustine's theology for the disappearance of Christianity in what had been Augustine's own stamping grounds. Political and social factors are much more plausible causes. One likely contributing cause is that Augustine and his works were products of a Latin-speaking elite in a country where the majority spoke indigenous African languages.

In fact, I think, the missionary activity of Nestorian Christians in central Asia, extending at least from the seventh century to the end of the thirteenth century of the common era, reaching even to China in two different parts of that period, was by far the most impressive Christian missionary enterprise of what we call the "middle ages." The lack of attention paid to that fact in most thinking about the history of Christianity is appallingly Eurocentric.

II. NESTORIUS AND HIS BOOK

Nestorius himself was never a member of the Church of the East. He was a Greek-speaking Christian clergyman of the first half of the fifth century C.E. who lived his whole life in what was still the eastern part of the Roman Empire. He was native to the northern extremity of the relatively narrow coastal strip of Syria and Palestine (between the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Empire) that was under Byzantine Roman rule at that time. He was in his mid-thirties, and a monk and priest in a monastery in Antioch, in Syria, where he was highly esteemed as a preacher in the churches of the city, when he accepted an invitation from the Byzantine Emperor Theodosius II, in the year 428, to become archbishop and Patriarch of Constantinople.

Disregarding the sensible advice of his mentor, Theodore of Mopsuestia, to spend some time getting the lay of the land before trying to shake things up, Nestorius was no sooner enthroned as Patriarch than he began persecuting Christians that he regarded as heretical. And before long he seriously offended many more of the Christians of Constantinople by preaching that they ought to stop calling Mary, Jesus's mother, "Mother of God" (*Theotokos*)—since there was a great deal of God that never depended in any way on Mary—and call her instead, "Mother of Christ" (*Christotokos*).

Nestorius might have gotten away with that if it had been offensive only to his own congregations in Constantinople. But in fact it rang bells, so to speak, in a controversy of much larger scale. Those bells rang particularly loudly in Egypt, where Cyril, the Patriarch of Alexandria, already felt strongly, on historical grounds, that his office should be recognized as more authoritative than that of the Patriarch of Constantinople, no matter where the Emperor chose to live. It was alarming to him also on theological grounds because Nestorius had come to Constantinople from Antioch, and there was a standing disagreement about christology between most of the Christian church in Egypt and most of the Christian church in and around Antioch. To put it in a nutshell, the Egyptian theologians were not convinced that the Syrian theologians believed that Jesus was fully God, and the Syrian theologians were not convinced that the Egyptian theologians believed that Jesus was fully human. And both sides had reasons for their suspicions.[2]

Cyril began the serious hostilities on Easter Sunday in 429 with a public denunciation of Nestorius as a heretic who denied the deity of Christ, followed by accusations of heresy on a dozen different points that Cyril sent to Nestorius. Antiochene supporters of Nestorius responded with a dozen charges of heresy against Cyril. And both sides sought support from Pope Celestine of Rome, who responded with support for Cyril against Nestorius. Eventually Nestorius, wishing to defend himself,

prevailed on the Emperor Theodosius to call an ecumenical council, which was to meet at Ephesus on 7 June, 431 (which was the feast of Pentecost that year).

Most of the bishops who were summoned to take part were late in arriving (more than a little late by twenty-first-century standards!) but Cyril and his supporters were the best organized and the first to be in Ephesus and ready to meet. On the 22nd of June, refusing to wait longer, and ignoring the protests of the imperial commissioner in charge of organizing the Council, Cyril convened and presided over an assembly of bishops that supported his views. They anathematized and deposed Nestorius, who had declined to participate under such circumstances.[3] And it might have been even worse if he had attended. For supporters of Cyril had stirred up mobs of Ephesians against Nestorius and his opposition to calling Jesus's mother *theotokos*. As Nestorius himself later wrote,

> They acted . . . as if it was a war they were conducting, and the followers of the Egyptian [Cyril] . . . went about in the city girt and armed with clubs . . . with the yells of barbarians, . . . raging with extravagant arrogance against those whom they knew to be opposed to their doings.

And guards were posted around the house in which Nestorius was staying in Ephesus, to prevent his murder.[4]

When the bishops of the Syrian part of the Roman empire arrived in Ephesus four days later with their patriarch John of Antioch, they held their own council at which they deposed Cyril and repudiated his charges of heresy against Nestorius. Finally, on the 10th of July the papal legates from Rome arrived and declared the meeting convened by Cyril to have been a genuine General Council of the Christian church. But it had settled very little and won little enduring respect, though it is still classified in many contexts as the Third General Council of the Christian Church.

The decrees of the competing assemblies that the Emperor Theodosius decided to accept first were those of Cyril's bishops deposing Nestorius and Nestorius's supporters deposing Cyril from their ecclesiastical offices; and Theodosius imprisoned both of them. But that's where the evenhandedness ended. As Samuel Moffett put it, "Cyril promptly bribed his way back to power." The gifts he bought and gave to the Emperor's grand chamberlain and adviser saddled the church of Alexandria with a debt that has been reckoned as equivalent to three million 1990s American dollars. Thus Cyril regained his office as bishop, and was freed to wheel and deal among the bishops and theologians.[5] So far as we know, Nestorius attempted no such thing, whether or not he had enough friends or the wealth to do so. What we know he did is that he asked the Emperor to send him back to his former monastery in Antioch—going into exile and voluntarily resigning his office as Patriarch of Constantinople.

The unripeness and unclarity of the theological thinking that went into the spate of anathemas of the Council of Ephesus is striking. I am inclined to think that the banishment and eventual excommunication of Nestorius was the clearest upshot of the Council. I also think it was probably the upshot that Cyril of Alexandria cared most about. Once Nestorius was safely out of the public's eye, Cyril managed to

come to terms that were mutually acceptable with the leaders of the Syrian bishops, and perhaps even to take somewhat more seriously their concerns about the adequacy or inadequacy of his conception of Christ's humanity.[6]

Nestorius lived another twenty years, approximately, after his banishment—four years in the monastery in Antioch, and the rest of the time in the desert, first in ancient Petra near the southwestern edge of what is now the kingdom of Jordan, and finally in an oasis in the desert of upper Egypt. He had learned quickly about the games of imperial power. By telling the Emperor that he *wanted* to retire to his monastery in Antioch, he avoided reproaching the Emperor openly for abandoning him, thus making it all the easier for the Emperor to feel guilty about abandoning him. I would say he won that game; for far worse could have befallen him. Four years later, for instance, eighteen bishops from Cilicia who refused to assent to an anti-Nestorian settlement of controversies about the Council of Ephesus were not only deposed, but banished to slavery in the Egyptian mines.[7]

It is thought that Nestorius was moved farther and farther from major cities in order to isolate him, to prevent his presence from becoming a focus of religious disturbances. I think that is plausible. Our knowledge of his situation in the Egyptian oasis is very incomplete. We have a big book that he wrote at least partly there, in which he tells us that in the end he liked it in the desert. But that book is our only direct evidence of what his life there was like, and it contains little or nothing about mundane details of life in the oasis. We can infer that he had the papyrus and ink and leisure to write what he wrote. And that is evidence that he was still winning his game with the Emperor.

Were there Imperial soldiers there to keep Nestorius from leaving—and/or to protect him from the fiercely monophysite majority of Egyptians? Maybe, but we don't know. And while Nestorius was writing, who was raising crops and cooking meals and cleaning the house? I have not seen any evidence on that; but slavery was an institution taken for granted in ancient Hellenistic society.

Another possibility, which I suspect Nestorius would have preferred, was suggested by J.F. Bethune-Baker in one of the first books about the *Bazaar* after its modern rediscovery. He opined that in the Egyptian oasis Nestorius was

> probably [living] as a monk, and perhaps in connection with some monastery . . .; for though he had been bitterly assailed by Schenute, the great hero of the Egyptian monks, he seems to have won respect from others and to have had some friends. His personal holiness and devotion to the religious life . . . must have been appreciated on its merits.[8]

That hypothesis is arguably supported by much more recent research which documents a fairly lively exchange of letters and documents between Nestorius in southern Egypt and other theologians as far north as Constantinople, though it could take half a year for the communication to get from one to the other.[9]

Anticipating his death, Nestorius wrote in the very last paragraph of his book, "Farewell, desert, my friend, . . . and exile, my mother," implying that in this world, the oasis was where he wanted to be. That sentiment suggests that Nestorius died

satisfied with the way he had played his game with the Emperor Theodosius. For Theodosius had died without any further persecution of Nestorius, and Nestorius knew that. He makes it clear a dozen paragraphs earlier in the book that he knew of the Emperor's death, and thought it was an occasion for glorifying God because "Theodosius . . . had raised himself up against God."

Nestorius's big book mentions no news, however, about the decisions of the hugely important Council of Chalcedon, though it followed fairly closely on the death of Theodosius and the inheritance of most of his powers by his sister Pulcheria. She was inclined to be guided by the Bishop of Rome and his emissaries, and to reject the monophysite views of the Egyptian hierarchy; and the Council did that. It is generally assumed that Nestorius died before news of the actual decisions of the Council of Chalcedon reached his oasis in the desert; for surely he would have written something about those decisions—applauding them for the most part. He claimed at the end of his big book (with how much sincerity, is contested) that he did not want to be at the Council, or to send any message there. He stated in one of the last entries in his book that he was "content to endure the things whereof they accused me, in order that, while I was accused thereof, they might accept without hindrance the teaching of the Fathers." And he claimed not to care to live to learn the news from the Council. Rather, he wrote, "every day I beseech God to accomplish my dissolution, whose eyes have seen the salvation of God."[10]

And here I must say more about Nestorius's big book. Very little that he wrote has survived in the original Greek, and it was long thought that nothing more than that had survived in any language. But in 1889 a medieval manuscript in Syriac was discovered that is generally recognized as being a translation, from the Greek, of a major work by Nestorius—in fact the book described above that he was writing in the desert. Its title was *The Bazaar of Herakleides*. A preface purporting to come from the Syriac translator ascribes the title to Nestorius, and suggests that the name "Herakleides" was adopted to insulate the book from anti-Nestorian prejudice.

We do not know in detail how Nestorius's book got into friendly hands and survived so many centuries, at least in Syriac. The ancient records tell us nothing about the social and economic structure of his situation in the oasis. I suppose that when Nestorius died, he may have had faithful servants, or admiring monastic brothers, who knew his wishes and made their way back to Syria, to Antioch, or Edessa, taking his manuscript where he told them he wanted it to go, and where they could expect a nice reward or at least a warm reception for bringing it. One way or another, at any rate, the manuscript eventually found its way into a Nestorian library in Persia. Its translation into Syriac has been dated to approximately ninety years after the Council of Chalcedon and the death of Nestorius.[11] And the libraries of those Nestorian schools in Persia continued for some centuries to be the likeliest places for such manuscripts to be kept, read, translated, translated, and recopied.

Not that Nestorius's book was the most recommended or the most read in those libraries. That distinction belonged to his mentor, Theodore of Mopsuestia. Theodore's books, largely devoted to literal exegesis of the scriptures, were the backbone of the curriculum of the Nestorian School of Nisibis. Narsai, the director of the school during the final decades of the fifth century C.E., called Theodore "the doctor

of the doctors" (where 'doctor' means 'teacher'), and his own guide in understanding the sacred scriptures.[12]

Why then was the Nestorian Church called "Nestorian," rather than, say, "Theodoran" (after Theodore of Mopsuestia)? Theodore would have condemned the Council of Ephesus, and signed the Chalcedonian definition just as readily as Nestorius, if he had not died before either of those events came to pass. And he arguably was a better theologian, or at least more carefully clear and consistent in his theological writing than Nestorius was in his *Bazaar of Heracleides*.

I suspect the main reason for naming the movement after Nestorius rather than Theodore was that Theodore did not live long enough to suffer the sort of living martyrdom that Nestorius did.

Moreover it is not clear that the most controversial views that Theodore and Nestorius held were held, or even known and understood, by most people who called themselves "Nestorians" in the fifth and sixth centuries C.E. The main thing that most of them meant by it seems to have been just Chalcedonian christological orthodoxy, professing that Christ had two distinct complete natures: a perfect human nature and a perfect divine nature, the nature of the one true God. Indeed the reasons Nestorius offered for preferring not to be present at the Council of Chalcedon, so as not to be a stumbling block to acceptance of "the teaching of the fathers," suggest that he himself would have agreed that Chalcedonian orthodoxy articulated the most important christological truths. From a scholarly point of view, however, that gave too little credit to Nestorius for his thinking about christology, which is the topic of the third and final part of this paper.

III. NESTORIUS'S CHRISTOLOGY

The *Bazaar of Herakleides* has been divided into five parts. The contents of the last four of them are mostly narrative and argument, focused on the various theological and ecclesiastical controversies of Nestorius's career. The first part, not quite a quarter of the whole, is largely an attempt at a systematic christology, with much less attention to Nestorius's biography.[13] This final part of my essay is about that christological part of the book, and specifically its treatment of two christological issues that were salient during his lifetime (roughly 390–450 C.E.).

(1) The first of these issues is the one that divides monophysite—that is, one nature—christologies from dyophysite—that is, two nature—christologies. Does Christ have just one nature, which is both divine and human, as Cyril of Alexandria held? Or does Christ have two different natures, one that is divine and a different one that is human, as Nestorius claimed?

In this part of the *Bazaar* Nestorius attacks a doctrine rather than a person, leaving Cyril unmentioned. His argument on the point is interesting and thought-provoking—though not, I think, as compelling in a nineteenth-century or more recent context as in an ancient, medieval, or early modern setting. The argument starts with the assumption that it is part of being God that God exists always and "can do everything that he wishes." And that, Nestorius says, is incompatible with becoming flesh, because "that which becomes flesh ceases to be able to do everything."[14]

For Nestorius, of course, there was a polemical point in that conclusion, because Cyril and other monophysites agreed with Nestorius and other dyophysites that a body of flesh was part of Christ's nature. But unlike Nestorius and the Nestorians, monophysites like Cyril inferred that once God was incarnate in Jesus, being God and having a body of flesh were both part of the one single nature of one of the three persons of the Trinity.

One might think that Nestorius's dyophysite view was the harder position to defend. He wasn't saying that Christ was only partly God and only partly human. But how can he have thought that Christ had two complete natures that were distinct from each other, being both fully God and fully human? He had a very interesting set of ideas about that. They are in fact the ideas that got me interested, recently, in writing about Nestorius.[15] They revolve around a Greek word that I have not used or mentioned above: *prosôpon*.

The original meaning of *prosôpon* in ancient Greek was 'face' (and 'faces' for the plural *prosôpa*). But in the later Greek of the New Testament and early Christian theology, it sometimes meant 'person'.[16] Nestorius uses the word a lot in his discussion of christology. Not all of his uses of it are obviously consistent; to some extent that may be due to the Syriac translator's misunderstanding of the Greek text. The passage that first caught my interest and still seems to me the most richly suggestive is part of paragraph I.i.58 of the *Bazaar*:

> As a king and a lord, who has taken the *prosôpon* of a servant as his own *prosôpon* and gives his *prosôpon* to the servant and makes known that he is the other and the other he, is content to be abased in the *prosôpon* of the servant while the servant is revered in the *prosôpon* of the lord and king, and for this reason, . . . [so] are these things in regard to the two natures which are distinct in *ousia* but are united by love and in the same *prosôpon*.[17]

'Face' seems to me too superficial a translation of *prosôpon* for this passage. 'Person' seems better, especially in the legal sense in which personhood is a matter of *ownership*—which I believe is actually the most important aspect of personal identity. And I believe that the phrase "two natures which are distinct in *ousia* but are united by love and in the same *prosôpon*" is the heart of Nestorius's christology. In *ousia* (substance), Nestorius maintains, Jesus is only human, and the same as we are; and God is only God. But in *prosôpon*, they are the same, because they have given each other their *prosôpa*. Nestorius clearly conceives that mutual giving as a merger, not an exchange. And that enables Nestorius to hold consistently that the life and ministry of Jesus are divine, in belonging to God, without maintaining, for example, that Jesus was omniscient, which is denied in the New Testament.

(2) The other issue I will discuss here about Nestorius's christology is about the relation between Christ, the redeemer, and Adam, the first man. In paragraph I.i.66 of the *Bazaar*, Nestorius portrays God as having tried twice to share his *prosôpon* with a man that he created. The first time, Nestorius implies, "the Creator of all refused not to prostrate himself" before "Adam, to whom he gave his image in all glory and honor; for he subjected everything under his feet." But Adam fell. He did not keep the image.

And the second time, God took a different approach. "He took the likeness of a servant, a humble likeness, a likeness which had lost the likeness of God."[18] More comprehensively, Nestorius declares, God

> took a nature that had sinned, lest in taking a nature which was not subject unto sins he should be supposed not to have sinned on account of the nature and not on account of his obedience. But, although he had all those things which appertain unto our nature, anger and concupiscence and thoughts, and although also they increased with the progress and increase of every age [in his life], he stood firm in thoughts of obedience.[19]

What Nestorius says in these passages and in the paragraphs containing them suggests some questions for his christology. Did Nestorius suppose that Adam was created for the role that Jesus eventually occupied? I would hesitate to say that, though I don't see anything in the first Part of the *Bazaar* that would rule that out. And in the fifth to seventh centuries C.E. there were lots of different views in the eastern Roman Empire about whether Jesus had two wills or one.

It would be more troubling for Nestorius's *prosôpon* christology if he held that God gave his *prosôpon* to Adam as he later gave it to Jesus. That would suggest that the divine *prosôpon* was not strong enough to hold the incarnation together. But in fact what Nestorius says in I.i.66 that God gave to Adam is not his *prosôpon* but "his image in all glory and honor." I think he was being careful about that, and I think that is significant. His *prosôpon* theory passes muster on that point at least.

NOTES

1. For a much fuller account of the above matters, and of most others in Part I of this essay, see Samuel Hugh Moffett, *A History of Christianity in Asia, Vol. I Beginnings to 1500*, 2nd ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998), 186–93, 197–202.
2. For a fuller account of the events and motives to this point, see Moffett, op. cit., 170–74.
3. See J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958), 326–27, and Moffett, op. cit., 174–75.
4. See Moffett, op. cit., 174, quoting from Nestorius, *Bazaar of Heraclides*.
5. Moffett, op. cit. 175.
6. See Kelly, op. cit. 327–30.
7. Nestorius, *The Bazaar of Heracleides*, trans. G.R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), Introduction, Part iv.
8. J.F. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and His Teaching: A Fresh Examination of the Evidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908), 34.
9. George A. Bevan, "Interpolations in the Syriac Translation of Nestorius' *Liber Herakleides*," *Studia Patristica*, Vol. LXVIII, Papers presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford in 2011, ed. Marcus Vinzent, *Vol. 16: From the Fifth Century Onwards (Greek Writers)*, (Leuven, Paris, Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2013), 33–34. See especially footnotes 15 and 16.
10. Nestorius, in the last paragraph of *The Bazaar of Herakleides*.
11. Moffett, op. cit., 176.
12. Narsai, *On the Three Doctors*, cited by Moffet, op. cit., 201, on the authority of A. Voobus, *History of the School of Nisibis*, 106.
13. I am simplifying here. The historic modern editions of the *Bazaar* divide it into two "Books," assigning the first three of the five "Parts" to "Book" I, and the remaining two "Parts" to "Book" II. I fail to see a clear rationale for that structure. In particular, the first "Part," which will be my main source for the remainder of this paper, seems to me less closely related to any of the other four "Parts" than they

are to each other. In order to facilitate reference to modern editions of the *Bazaar*, however, I will cite references by Book, Part, and paragraph. Thus 'I.i.58' is a reference to the 58th paragraph of Part i of Book I.

14. Nestorius, *Bazaar of Herakleides*, I.i.16.
15. Though I must acknowledge that I would never have known enough to get interested in writing about him if the late Donald Sykes, my patristics tutor in Oxford, had not gotten me interested in him sixty years ago.
16. See William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 729.
17. I quote this passage in a footnote in my forthcoming book, *What Is, and What Is in Itself* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2021) as a way of conceiving a possible divine incarnation (or better: *inhumanation*) in a panentheistic context—not that Nestorius himself was actually a panentheist.
18. Paragraph I.i.67 of the *Bazaar*.
19. Paragraph I.i.68 of the *Bazaar*.