THE SYNODICAL LETTER FROM SEVERUS TO JOHN OF ALEXANDRIA

Introduction

Letters are one of the most important sources of the life of Severus of Antioch. Synodical Letters are those written by a patriarch soon after his consecration, conveying the news of his election by the Synod which presided over it. The purpose of these instruments of ecclesial communion was to prove the orthodoxy of the writers. They contain a profession of faith, a statement by the new Patriarch, etc. In his monumental study, J. M. Fiey highlights the importance of the Synodical Letters between the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch especially starting at the time of Severus of Antioch.

After the election of Dioscorus II as new Patriarch, he wrote to Severus and received from him a reply (515–517). It seems that Timothy III did not write a Synodical Letter to Severus, since Severus was hiding. However, according to the History of the Patriarchs and the Synaxarium, he welcomed Severus while exiled and escaping.

---

(4) E. R. Hardy, Discoruscus II, in: Coptic Encyclopedia 3, 915b.
(6) C. F. Seybold, Severus Ben El-Moqaffa’, Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum I, 1 (Louvain 1962) (CSCO, 52; Scriptores Arabici, 8) 87–89.
(7) I. Forget, Synaxarium Alexandrinum I (Louvain: Peeters, 1963) (CSCO, 47, 48, 49; Scriptores Arabici 3, 4, 5) 266.
from one place to another. His successor Theodosius I (535–567) was a disciple of Severus; however, neither the *Synaxarium* nor the *History of the Patriarchs* mention a Synodical Letter to Severus. The Letter of Severus to Theodosius is attested to by several sources.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Severus Patriarch</th>
<th>Synodical Letter from Severus and a fragment of reply survived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John II (506–515 AD)</td>
<td>27 Bashans10</td>
<td>Synodical Letter from Severus and a quotation in the <em>Synaxarium</em> and the <em>Antiphonarion</em> (for the reply from Timothy to Severus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorus II (515–517) 7 Babah</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Synodical Letters survived; Severus was exiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy III (517–535) 13 Amshir</td>
<td></td>
<td>Synodical Letter from Theodosius to Severus and reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius (535–567) exiled 537 28 Baunah</td>
<td>535–567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Importance of these Letters

Despite the fact that the Synodical Letter is mentioned in the *History of the Patriarchs*11 as well as in the *Synaxarium*, very few historians have paid enough attention to the patriarchate of John II and his relations with Severus of Antioch.12 These letters between the two prelates are

(8) E. R. Hardy, Theodosius I, in: *Coptic Encyclopedia* 7, 2241a–b.


(10) E. R. Hardy, John III, in: *Coptic Encyclopedia* 4, 1337.

(11) See below.

(12) He is mentioned only a few times in the main reference books, such as J. Maspero, *Histoire des Patriarches d’Alexandrie depuis la mort de l’empereur Anastase jusqu’à la réconciliation des églises Jacobites* 518–616 (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Edouard Champion, 1923) (Bibliothèque de l’école des hautes études sciences historiques et philologiques, 237) 72, n. 3; 84, n. 1; 220, n. 2;
very important, as they are the most ancient witnesses known about the correspondence between the ecclesiastical seats. They became therefore the model or the pattern to be followed by the followers of John and Severus.

**Historical Context**

By the end of the sixth century, Evagrius Scholasticus affirmed the existence of Synodical Letters between Severus of Antioch and John II, the successor of John I, Dioscorus, and Timotheus.

“He sent (letters) to all the patriarchs, though they were received only at Alexandria, by John, the successor of the former John, and by Dioscorus and Timotheus: which epistles have come down to our time.” [The source of Evagrius, for this chapter is not clear].

We have another letter from Severus to John, Patriarch of Alexandria. The first Letter to John II was written while Anastasius, an anti-Chalcedonian Emperor, was reigning.

Severus was succeeded by Flavian of Antioch, who broke communion with John II of Alexandria when the latter denounced Chalcedon; hence it is logical that Severus, wishing to resume this relationship, insisted that his faith was the same as that of the fathers, and rejected the faith of Chalcedon.


(13) We have other examples from the seventh century (see Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*...).


(17) We will follow P. Allen in using this term rather than the contentious word “monophysite” (cf. Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem*..., 4, n. 2).

Theological Context

Severus repeated the Creed more or less verbally, and turned to the nature of Christ. This statement is close to the theological statement in the life of Severus on the affairs of Macedonius. The same themes occurred nearly word for word in the Biography of Severus by Athanasius, which had the same purpose of clarifying the faith.

The reply of John II relates to the same issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter to John II(^{19})</th>
<th>The affairs of Macedonius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| He also said in his Synodical Letter written to saint John, the Patriarch of Alexandria.  
“For us, we do not come up with a new faith, but in everything we are conservatives as we have said preserving the holy faith which handed down to us by our holy Fathers, and we refuse what had been established by the others in Chalcedon. |
| “We believe and confess, the straight faith of our holy fathers the three hundred and eighteen bishops assembled at Nicaea by the power of the Holy Spirit present with them and who declared it to them. And this was accepted by their successors, our preceding fathers like a holy heritage. And also (those that had been established) by the hundred and fifty assembled, in the city of Constantinople and the two hundred assembled in the first council at Ephesus against the mad Nestorius. We believe in one God, the Father and we confess also the Only Son of God who was incarnated for our sake. He is One and cannot be divided or separated neither before nor after the incarnation. |

Mary, the God-bearer. He became man for our sake. We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Eternal, and consubstantial with the Father and the Son.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the life-giver by the Lord. (God) is sanctified in Three distinct and perfect hypostases, three equal hypostases without any difference in glory or brightness; one nature, one substance, one lordship, and one confession worship. The faithful should confess thus: We confess that the Father is in the rank of Fatherhood He is not a Son. The Son is in the rank of Sonship and He is not a Father. The Holy Spirit is a holy spirit that proceeds from the Father. The Son shall not change to Fatherhood nor the Father shall not change to Sonship. Three existing and established hypostases, each has his own personality yet they are united, without separation one divinity, one nature, one action, one authority, one power. There is no slavery or submission in the Trinity and no (one) is inferior to the other nor one is whole and the other has less authority. The honour of the divinity unique is one, Lordship where there is no master and servant but all equal in honour, lordship, One light brightness and splendour. The Father has never been without the Son and the Holy Spirit for a

(20) It seems that there is an error in the Arabic text — it is very hard to understand the passage.
We also confess One Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, before the incarnation and after the incarnation, the unchangeable and who is beyond impossibility, neither brought the body with Him from Heaven nor being anything else like a ghost or fantasy, but He took flesh, which means He was incarnated and He became man without alteration, for He is the bodiless God the Word, He took a body from our own substance, from the God-bearer, the ever Virgin. He has a rational soul and became One with it in her womb as the hypostasis. This whom Gabriel, the angel, who had been entrusted with the great mystery, announced it to her, saying: “Hail to you, full of grace, The Lord is with you.”21 He took flesh with blood, like ours, and became man like us without sin, He endured the birth of the flesh in order that the flesh might become one with Him. He was conceived and born by the flesh to obliterate the grief of the children’s birth and free the human race from the first curse.22 For this, we say that the holy Virgin, is truly the God-bearer, for God the Word took flesh from her and she had second or even for the twinkling of an eye, but the Holy Trinity exists without a beginning or an end.

We should believe in God the Word as having two births one unperceptive birth from the Father, before the ages and the other one in the fullness of the time from the holy Virgin Mary without male intercourse, an incomprehensible and unperceptive birth that only He knows.

“The Word became flesh and dwelt among us (Jn 1:14), which we have seen with our eyes and touched with our hands (1 Jn 1:1). The Father did not create Him like the angels or like the Cherubim and the Seraphim, or any one of the ranks, * but He is born from His essence, and His Nature. He is higher than the rulers and all the authorities, and all the lords and all names called in this generation and in the coming one. He is equal to the Father and the Holy Spirit, being in one divinity. Therefore, He said ‘the Holy Spirit will take what is mine and declare it to you’ (Jn 16:15). The same we saw on the Jordan (river) descending like a dove upon the Incarnated Son. When God the Word saw that sin has

(21) Lk 1:28.
(22) Gn 4:16.
conceived and brought Him forth. One Person of two: Divinity and Humanity, as the true saying. We confess the Unique Emmanuel as One Lord, One Christ, God the Word became flesh.

increased greatly, He descended from the heaven and came to the womb of the Virgin Mary. He took flesh\textsuperscript{23} from her, by an imperceptible and incomprehensible mystery. He dwelt in her womb for nine months and He created for Himself a body from her. The Father was not in the womb of the Virgin, so that, no one can, neither say that the Father passes from fatherhood to sonship, nor the Son passes from sonship to fatherhood, and also the Holy Spirit cannot pass to fatherhood or to sonship. But there is one will and one wish in the Holy Trinity, so no one will dare estrange Him from the divinity. But He is the only one who took flesh and endured undoubtedly\textsuperscript{24} the sufferings. He did not descend from heaven with a body, but He took it from the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, * without human intercourse. It was not a phantom birth but really a natural one. This is our faith, and what we believe that He is God and He is Man in an indescribable union. He, Emmanuel, ate and drank what was offered to Him. He ascended to the cross by His own will to offer an acceptable pure sacrifice to His Father. His hands and feet were nailed to the cross, and he was pierced by a

\textsuperscript{(23)} A and P omit “flesh” which occurs in Ethiopic version. The word “flesh” occurs in the parallel part, quoted in the History of the Patriarchs (cf. Yassa Abd Al-Masîh and O. H. E. Burmester, History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church, vol. 2, part 3 (Le Caire, 1959) (Textes et Documents, 3) 238 (text), 379 (translation) and the Book of the Confessions of the Fathers).

\textsuperscript{(24)} Cf. § 48. This means that He suffered the passion really and not as a fiction.
spear, He (who is) God, for He is one, not two. He who is by His nature immortal, He accepted death by His own will. The immortal and the mortal had been united in one person. Blood and water came out from His side (cf. Jn 19:34) as the economy of the holy mysteries. Someone might say; it is only the humanity that was made to suffer and it was separated from the divinity — God forbade — but undoubtedly the divinity accepted the sufferings of the body, for they are united with a singleness in everything. One nature and not two separated natures; whatever the Word had performed was by one single economy without separation from his humanity, either in the deeds that is exclusively Divine or that which is purely human. Do not go astray like Qndyānūs and the rest of the opponents who said impiously that the divinity was separated from the humanity at the time of crucifixion. By saying this, those apostates indicated that God had feared from what was to befall on the humanity so He was separated from it and left it on its own. Thus is their blasphemous statement * and their false wisdom as well as their insolence and their blasphemy towards God.”


(26) A reads “Mdnāyūs, the Ethiopic version has “Cyprian” Cf. infra §66 “Odnāyūs, §75 Fndyānūs. This name is disfigured and it is hard to identify.
Commentary

1. Although the Synodical Letters between Severus of Antioch and the Coptic prelates are very well attested to, our text seems to be the unique witness of this letter. The corpus of letters of Severus did not survive, only the sixth book of his letters is known.\(^{(27)}\) It seems that a Corpus of the letters of Severus had existed in Coptic and was translated to Arabic.

2. It is known that John II demanded from Timothy of Constantinople (511–518) the formal condemnation of Chalcedon as a prerequisite for ecclesiastical communion.\(^{(28)}\)

3. As we can see the Synodical Letter, which could be dated to 512 AD has many similarities with the Letter sent by Severus to Anastasius regarding the faith of Macedonius. However the Synodical Letter is more concise than the Letter concerning the faith of Macedonius. It is safe to say that this quotation from the Life of Severus reflects well his theological thoughts.

4. This Synodical Letter is mentioned in *The History of the Patriarchs*. Most of the biographical section of Severus, *i.e.* Biography 30–42, is attributed to George the Archdeacon of Alexandria:\(^{(29)}\)

> “And God showed forth in his days a wonderful thing, and raised up royalty and priesthood together for the Church, in the persons of the prince Anastasius, the pure believer, and the excellent patriarch Severus, clothed with spirit, occupant of the see of

\(^{(27)}\) See above.


Antioch, who became a horn of salvation to the orthodox Church, and who sat upon the throne of the great Ignatius. And he (Severus) wrote a Synodical Letter to Father John, the Patriarch, concerning the unity of the faith, wherein he announced the agreement between them in the one orthodox creed of the holy fathers... And John, the holy patriarch wrote to the great Severus an answer to his letter in canonical language full of the orthodox faith, which is that of the doctors of the Church, as the blessed Severus\textsuperscript{30} had written to him.”\textsuperscript{31}

In the biography of Severus, the author insisted on enumeration of ecumenical councils accepted.

5. The Synaxarium of the Coptic Church\textsuperscript{32} repeats what is written in The History of the Patriarchs, we read for the commemoration of John II on 27 Bashans:

So the father Severus wrote a Synodical (Letter) to this father John concerning the unity of faith and wherein he described Christ our God, after the union became one nature without separation and he believed in the faith of father Cyril and father Dioscorus.”\textsuperscript{33}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(30)] Apparently different than that which we have (cf. Brooks, The Sixth Book of the Select Letters..., 98–99).
\item[(33)] Forget, Synaxarium Alexandrinum II (Louvain, 1954) (CSCO, 67; Scriptores Arabici 11) 141.
\end{enumerate}
Then father John wrote a reply to the letter using words full of the grace of faith and testifying the unity of substance of God and the Trinity of His Hypostases and the incarnation of the Eternal Son in the human nature and by union it became one not two. He excommunicated all whoever separated Christ or mixing His nature and all who said that that who suffered and was crucified, dying for the human kind was a simple man, or whoever entered the passion and death to the divine nature. But the straight faith is to confess that God the Word suffered for us in flesh, which he took from us. These are the royal paths, which whoever followed would not go astray or be scandalized.\(^{34}\)

In the quotation of the *Profession of the Fathers*, we find in his Synodical Letter to John II, Severus is clearly mentioned:

“we refuse what had been established by the others in Chalcedon”

6. Nothing is known about the literary activity of John II in order to compare with the quotation in the Synaxarium, however the *Antiphonarion*, (Difnar)\(^{35}\) of this Patriarch makes allusion to teaching for his flock. It is not sure whether this is a stereotype text or the author of this had came across a text attributed to him.

7. Hence our unique witness of the reply of John II is only the quotation of the *Synaxarium*. The topic treated in the reply of John II corresponds exactly to the Synodical Letter of Severus, i. e.:


The Unity of God and the trinity of His Hypostases;  
The incarnation of the Eternal Son and His unique Nature without separation or mixing;  
The Divinity of the Crucified and passion of God the Word incarnated with a flesh like us.

Lost Parts

Our text survives in a theological book of the Coptic Church; therefore, other parts of the letters were intentionally omitted. We may assume that the beginning of the text, which contains a greeting did not survive, and also the conclusion. We do not know the length of these parts but by comparison, in the letter from Severus to Dioscorus archbishop of Alexandria, we find about 25 lines of greetings and introduction to the theological part, we find also four Biblical quotations, two Patristic quotations of which one was from Timothy and one from Saint Basil, which are absent from our text. It is hard to guess that there were other theological parts not included in our quotation.

Conclusions

1. The Synodical Letter of Severus of Antioch to John II is the first Synodical Letter known to us. It is only attested to in the Arabic text of the book of the Profession of the Fathers.
2. It became the model to follow in all Synodical Letters between Antioch and Alexandria.
3. It corresponds to the Letter sent by Severus to Anastasius the Emperor concerning the faith as mentioned in the biography of Severus by Athanasius.
4. The Synaxarium provides a quotation of the reply of John II to Severus where we find the main points treated in the Synodical Letter of Severus.
5. This study shows once more the importance of compiling the data concerning Severus of Antioch in all languages.
6. This study provides us with a supplementary source of the Life of Severus attributed to Athanasius.36

وقال أيضاً في رسالة
سندقين منه يكتب إلى
القدس بوحداً بطريرك
الإسكندرية، اما يهنئ
فانا لا
نأتي بأمانة جديدة بل شارك
في كل شيء كما قلت شارك
في تمام الجليلة التي سلمها
الابنا اباdiet الأظهار ونراقض
ما قره فبرهم في خلقدون
ونم بالله وله من البول
ما منبسط كل ونوم هكذا
برب واحد يسمع المسيح
الملود من الاب قبل كل
الدهور المساوي للاب قبل
كل الأزمان وان بعد الأيام
تجسم من الروح القدس
ومن مريم العذراء في كل
حين والدها الامقدس
وصائر انسان لاجلنا ونوم
باروح القدس الامام
المساوي مع الاب والابن
ونعرف أيضاً باب واحد
سيدنا يسمع المسيح من
قبل ان يتجسد ومن بعد
ابنا وهذا الغير متغير ولا
 مستحيلاً لم يات بالجسد
معمن السما ولا من شيء
اخر كحيال أو فطستة
صار جسداً اي ان تجسد
وصائر انسان من غير
استحالة وهو الام وكلمة

67 نؤمن ونعرف بالامانة المستقبلة امانة الابتين
القديسين الالهيين ومانية عشر المتعمين بقوة
روح القدس المقدسة ومعهم الذي ظهر لهم ذلك وهو
الذي قبه خلقاهم مقدمياً في مبادئهم المقدس و
ايضآ الملكة وحضر الاباء المجتمعين بقسططنينية
المدينة الالهيين الذين اجتمعوا بافسس في الجمع الأول
الذي كان على تسطير المجتمون نورن بالله الواحد
الاب ونعرف باب الله الوحيد الذي يجسد آمن
اءكنا انه لا يقسم ولا يفرق هو قلب يجسد واحد
وهو ايضا واحد بعد يجسد ونوم من توحيد
الرجل الذي يترساق تلك مقابلة كاملة
ثلثة اقيان متساوية غير مختلفة في الحج ولا في الضياء
طبعة واحدة لحور واحد روبية واحدة ساحة
اعتراف واحد هكذا يجب ان يكون اعتراف المومن
نعرف أن الاب في طقس الابوية وليس هو ابن
والابن في طقس الابنة وليس هو ابن الروح القدس
روح قدس منبثق من الاب فلابن لاينتقلى الى الابوية
واما الاب في البنوة ثلاثة اقليات موجودة كل
منها بشخصية متصلة بغير افتقار بلالاوية
واحدة طبعة واحدة فلول واحد سلطان واحد
قوة
واحدة ما في الناثوث عبودية ولا خضوع ولا ينص
واحد عين واحد ولا واحد تام واحد دورة في سلطانه
قلعلا للاهوية واحدة واحدة روبية واحدة ليس فيها
حلا دوم وعندم بروتساوية في الكرامة و
والروحية وحل
الله وحيد وبا واحد لم يكن الاب لحلف ولا طرفة
بيلا ابن ولا روح القدس بل الناثوث المقدس موجود
بلا ابنا ولا ماية ويجب لنا ان نؤمن بالنار الكلمة ان
له وحدة ولادة من الاب قبل كل الدهور غير
 مدروكة ولادة في آخر الأزمان من مريم العذراء
بغير مضاجعة بشر دقيق لا يدرك ولا يفصح ولا
يعرف الا هو.
77 والكلمة صار جسدة وسكن فيها وراث وعينا وجعل جسمه من جوهرا الواحد من مريم والدة الاله العذراء القديسة في كل زمان لوه نفس عالية وصبر واحد معه في احتساه كالاقترح هذا الذي ينهر العذرا بجهوار الملك الذي امتن على السر العظيم قابلاً لسلام لكانت تحتية نعمة الرب ملك أحمد جسد ديم ونحو ملكنا وصار أنسانا كشبنا محلاً لطيفاً وصار للولاية بالجسد ليس للجسد واحد معه جبل به وولد بالجسد ليبدل الحقن الذي ولادة الأبناء ويعت جنس البشر من اللهات الأوله ولاج هذا نقول ان الالهة المقدسة والدة الاله بالحقيقة لأن الله الكلمة تجسد منها وحولته به وولدنا هو شخص واحد من التنين لاوتون وناسرت كفوت الحق ونعرف بعمانويل انه الوحيد رب واحد مسيح واحد الله الكلمة صار جسداً

الغير جسد قبل جسد من جوهرا الواحد من مريم والدة الاله العذراء القديسة في كل زمان لوه نفس عالية وصبر واحد معه في احتساه كالاقترح هذا الذي ينهر العذرا بجهوار الملك الذي امتن على السر العظيم قابلاً لسلام لكانت تحتية نعمة الرب ملك أحمد جسد ديم ونحو ملكنا وصار أنسانا كشبنا محلاً لطيفاً وصار للولاية بالجسد ليس للجسد واحد معه جبل به وولد بالجسد ليبدل الحقن الذي ولادة الأبناء ويعت جنس البشر من اللهات الأوله ولاج هذا نقول ان الالهة المقدسة والدة الاله بالحقيقة لأن الله الكلمة تجسد منها وحولته به وولدنا هو شخص واحد من التنين لاوتون وناسرت كفوت الحق ونعرف بعمانويل انه الوحيد رب واحد مسيح واحد الله الكلمة صار جسداً وسكن فيها وراث وعينا وجعل جسمه من جوهرا الواحد من مريم والدة الاله العذراء القديسة في كل زمان لوه نفس عالية وصبر واحد معه في احتساه كالاقترح هذا الذي ينهر العذرا بجهوار الملك الذي امتن على السر العظيم قابلاً لسلام لكانت تحتية نعمة الرب ملك أحمد جسد ديم ونحو ملكنا وصار أنسانا كشبنا محلاً لطيفاً وصار للولاية بالجسد ليس للجسد واحد معه جبل به وولد بالجسد ليبدل الحقن الذي ولادة الأبناء ويعت جنس البشر من اللهات الأوله ولاج هذا نقول ان الالهة المقدسة والدة الاله بالحقيقة لأن الله الكلمة تجسد منها وحولته به وولدنا هو شخص واحد من التنين لاوتون وناسرت كفوت الحق ونعرف بعمانويل انه الوحيد رب واحد مسيح واحد الله الكلمة صار جسداً وسكن فيها وراث وعينا وجعل جسمه من جوهرا الواحد من مريم والدة الاله العذراء القديسة في كل زمان لوه نفس عالية وصبر واحد معه في احتساه كالاقترح هذا الذي ينهر العذرا بجهوار الملك الذي امتن على السر العظيم قابلاً لسلام لكانت تحتية نعمة الرب ملك أحمد جسد ديم ونحو ملكنا وصار أنسانا كشاب...
Appendix 2

The *Antiphonarion*\(^{37}\) of the Coptic Church for 17 Babah, the commemoration of Dioscorus II, mentions also the Synodical Letter to Severus of Antioch\(^{38}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Греческое  Αλεξανδρινός Εκκλησιαστικός Πατριαρχείος: Η Παμπλήρωση της Ευαγγελικής Παρακλήσεως του Αυτοκράτορος Αββα Διοσκορός</th>
<th>I <em>truly</em> will <em>dare</em> to speak, with my tongue full of abomination, about this man of God, our father Abba Dioscorus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Παμπλήρωση της Ευαγγελικής Παρακλήσεως του Αυτοκράτορος Αββα Διοσκορός</td>
<td>The great <em>high priest</em> of the <em>city</em> Alexandria, when he sat on the <em>throne</em> after Abba John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Του Γερμανικού Εισαγγελέα</td>
<td>This man being a <em>bishop</em>, very humble and great <em>Master</em> in his work and his <em>wisdom</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{37}\) For the *Antiphonarion* see Gawdat, Untersuchungen zum Difnär I, 37–52; idem, Untersuchungen zum Difnär II, 49–68.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐτε ἐπισκόπος ἦν πεπερατός τὸν λόγον τὴς δόξας τοῦ θεοῦ τιμῶν τὸν πάντας</td>
<td>A perfect in his generation, no body resembled to him, the Holy Spirit chose him in order to become high priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἱματρόπος ὄφος ἀδέσποτος ἰδιογνώμονα ἱστομονὴς ἀργοπρεπῶς ἐκεῖνος πνευματικὸς ἐρωτότας</td>
<td>He (Disocorus) started and wrote a <em>synodical letter</em>. He sent it to Severus the holy <em>patriarch</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐχθὸς ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ τοῖς παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ τοῖς παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ τοῖς παντὸς</td>
<td>Wherein he revealed to him the thought of the holy <em>Trinity</em> being <em>equal in substance and divinity</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξ ἅμα ἀδελφοῖς ἡσύχασεν ἐν πνευματικῷ ἐκεῖνος ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>Then he spoke in it about the <em>incarnation</em> of the Son of God joining to the human <em>flesh</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐκτικὸς ἐν ἔκτισι τῷ ἱδίῳ τῷ ἱδίῳ τῷ ἱδίῳ τῷ ἱδίῳ τῷ ἱδίῳ τῷ ἱδίῳ</td>
<td>Perfect in every aspect with a <em>rational soul</em> being <em>equal</em> to us except only sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπαναλήφθη ἐν ἑπίσκοπῳ ἐκείνῳ ἐν ἑπίσκοπῳ ἐκείνῳ ἐν ἑπίσκοπῳ ἐκείνῳ ἐν ἑπίσκοπῳ ἐκείνῳ</td>
<td>When he read the <em>epistle</em> to the <em>people</em> in Antioch, the <em>patriarch</em> rejoiced then he informed him saying:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν ἑνωμένῳ ἐν ἑνωμένῳ ἐν ἑνωμένῳ ἐν ἑνωμένῳ ἐν ἑνωμένῳ</td>
<td>“Do not bend upon the faith right or left for this is the faith of our fathers who assembled in Nicaea”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άνθρωπος ἰδιογνώμονα ἰδιογνώμονα ἰδιογνώμονα ἰδιογνώμονα ἰδιογνώμονα</td>
<td>He wrote to him a <em>letter</em>, he wrote it in the same <em>manner</em>, he read on the <em>Cathedra</em>, the <em>faithful</em> rejoiced because of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἑταρχημετασχημάτι τῇ ἑταρχημετασχηματικῇ ἑνωμένῃ ἑνωμένῃ ἑνωμένῃ ἑνωμένῃ ἑνωμένῃ</td>
<td>When he accomplished his service in the <em>high priesthood</em> he rested in <em>peace</em>, he went to Jesus <em>Christ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ ἐρωτήτας ἐγὼ ἐγὼ ἐγὼ ἐγὼ ἐγὼ</td>
<td>Pray for us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(39) Read ἐνεπίσκοπον
(40) Read ἀδέσποτος
The commemoration of Timothy II, on 13 Amshir contains only a few words about Severus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σέν πασχεούς εὐογγαρ ψευτον ημοίον υες πεινατ πινατριαρχες εὐογγαρ παπα αββα ρενοθωος</td>
<td>In this holy day our father the holy patriarch papa abba Timothy rested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παριαίνεν εὐαχριστος εὐχαίνην ηρατινος ημεν θανατην εὐπροξατε εὐχανεν πιναρος εὐρα ανογης</td>
<td>This blessed man found persecutions, and great sufferings for the straight faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραρχο εὐαριστος ημεν εὐχαριστος σεγηρκος πινατριαρχος ετη εξορη εξηνεν παραρηγος εὐο το ανογης</td>
<td>He was strengthening the faithful with Severus the Patriarch who came to Egypt and he walked from one place to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αρχων εὐολευραριστος αριστον ημοιον έγραμεν ειρηνης ευχηνεν περανος ην απον ιερωνος</td>
<td>he accomplished his course, he rested in peace, he sat on the throne for 17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τώρα μυστήρεα ευρανε ευχαν</td>
<td>Pray for us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

Excellent relations between Alexandria and Antioch after the Council of Chalcedon are reflected by the exchange of Synodical Letters between both prelates. In this paper, we will highlight the Coptic Patriarchs with whom Severus of Antioch exchanged Synodical Letters. In addition, we will study his Synodical Letter to John Nicaiotes, which survives only in an Arabic translation in the book of the *Profession of the Fathers*. We will compare the biography of Severus of Antioch attributed to Athanasius, and will mention what is known about the reply of John to Severus.

(41) Read σεν ογη έογην