

2 THE COPTIC-ORTHODOX CHURCH UNTIL THE COMING OF ISLAM (381-639 AD)

2.1 The Nature of Christ as discussed at the Ecumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon

During the first half of the fifth century, patriarch Kyrollos (Saint Cyril) of Alexandria stressed the unity of the nature of Christ. He spoke of the *one nature (mia physis)* of Christ, as his divine nature fully permeated his human nature.¹ The reality of the human nature of Christ was not denied, but it was compared to a drop of water in the ocean of his divinity. It is hard to not conclude that this approach led to a focus on the divine nature of Christ, though the present followers of Kyrollos, the Coptic-Orthodox, stress that the word *mia* should not be thought to mean *single one* but *unity out of two natures*. Hence it is better to call them *Miaphysites* than *Monophysites*. The Coptic-Orthodox reject that latter designation.²

Kyrollos and his theologians developed their theology in interaction with a competing theological movement that arose in Antioch. Theodorus of Mopsuestia was its main thinker, but his Syrian student Nestorius became the best-known spokesman for this movement. He taught that the Virgin Mary gave birth to a man, not to God. The divine nature of Jesus only dwelled in him as in a temple. Nestorius and his followers stressed the distinction between the two natures of Christ and that there was no fusion between the two natures, which they accused the Alexandrians of teaching. Rather, they believed that by his human *will* Jesus obeyed the divine nature that lived in him.³

When Nestorius became patriarch of Constantinople in 428, he began to attack the Alexandrian theologians for believing that Jesus had one single nature. That led to an exchange of letters between Nestorius and Kyrollos, and eventually to the convocation of the Third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431) where the ideas of Nestorius were discussed by over 200 bishops. In a series of *anathemas* written by Kyrollos, the Council denounced Nestorius' teachings as erroneous. It decreed that

¹ Roldanus, 'Ontwikkeling van het christendom in het oostelijk Middellandse Zeegebied tot aan het Concilie van Chalcedon', p. 12.

² See for instance the book by the Coptic-Orthodox priest, Tadros Y. Malaty, *Introduction to the Coptic-Orthodox Church* (Alexandria, 1993), pp. 73-74. The book is available on www.stfrancismagazine.info. Malaty writes: 'Jesus is at once God and man (Incarnate God)'. Malaty, *Introduction to the Coptic-Orthodox Church*, p. 74.

³ Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, pp. 46-48.

Jesus Christ was completely God and completely man, and that there was a union of the two natures of Christ, in such a fashion that one did not disturb the other. The Virgin Mary gave birth to God who became man, so she could be called *Theotokos* (God-carrying). The Council stressed that the Creed as agreed to at the Council of Constantinople fifty years earlier was complete, binding and unchangeable. Nestorius was deposed and withdrew to a monastery close to Antioch.⁴

After Kyrollos' death in 444, Patriarch Dioskoros of Alexandria and Eutyches, leader of a monastery in Constantinople, proclaimed the radical view that Christ had only a divine nature. The patriarch of Constantinople condemned this and looked for theological support. He received help from Pope Leo the Great, patriarch of Rome. In 451 this led to the convocation of the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, where over 600 Bishops congregated. Dioskoros was not given a hearing and his theological views were anathematized. Dioskoros and Eutyches were branded as *Monophysites* ('one-naturists') by their enemies.⁵ Dioskoros died three years later in exile in Asia Minor. He became venerated as a saint by the Copts. The council proclaimed that Christ has two complete natures: the divine and the human:

Following the holy Fathers we teach with one voice that the Son [of God] and our Lord Jesus Christ is to be confessed as one and the same [Person], that he is perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, very God and very man, of a reasonable soul and [human] body consisting, consubstantial with the Father as touching his Godhead, and consubstantial with us as touching his manhood; made in all things like unto us, sin excepted; begotten of his Father before the worlds according to his Godhead; but in these last days for us men and for our salvation born [into the world] of the Virgin Mary, the God-Bearer according to his manhood. This one and the same Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son [of God] must be confessed to be in two natures, unconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly.⁶

2.2 Shifts in the Positions of the Patriarchates at Chalcedon

The honorary position of the patriarch of Jerusalem was changed into a real patriarchate at these same meetings of Chalcedon. Since that time Jerusalem has always been counted among the patriarchal sees as the smallest and last. At that Council, the gathered bishops also agreed:

⁴ M. Simonetti, 'Ephesus, II. Councils', in Angelo Di Berardino (ed), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* Vol. I (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 275-276.

⁵ Roldanus, 'Ontwikkeling van het christendom in het oostelijk Middellandse Zeegebied tot aan het Concilie van Chalcedon', pp. 13-16.

⁶ Parcival, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church*, p. 264.

The city which was honored with the sovereignty and the senate [i.e., Constantinople, 'the New Rome'], and which enjoys equal privileges with the old imperial Rome, should in ecclesiastical matters be as she is, and rank next after her.⁷

This decision lowered Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem in the hierarchy of Churches.⁸ The fact that the vast majority of church leaders and Christians in those patriarchates rejected the theological decisions of Chalcedon may be seen in this light. According to Aziz S. Atiya, a Coptic-Orthodox historian of the Churches of the Arab World, the 'Alexandrines were used to having their way, and would not be governed by the Council'.⁹ There is no indication that the sequence of honor in ecclesiastical matters of the five patriarchates had juridical implications, as Rome would later claim.¹⁰

Of the five historic patriarchates, only Rome was based in a land that would continue to respect its liberty. The patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem would within two centuries after Chalcedon fall under Arab domination; Constantinople enjoyed another millennium of freedom until it fell under Ottoman rule. For the historic Churches in the realm of what later became the Arab World, the Ecumenical decisions about how the Church was to be ruled were very important; they would continue to be the framework for how the Churches in the Arab World dealt with each other and with the Churches of Rome and Constantinople.

2.3 Divisions after Chalcedon

The Chalcedonian confession seems to have been an effort to find a middle way between Miaphysitism and Nestorianism, but it pleased neither party. Most 'heretics' did not repent. The precise definition of what was considered orthodoxy at Chalcedon, supported by many churches and by the Roman state, initiated the formalization of two dissident Churches beside the Church that was supported by the state. This proc-

⁷ Parcial, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church*, p. 287.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁹ Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, p. 58.

¹⁰ The Roman Pope Leo the Great (440-61) refused to admit this canon that lifted Constantinople to a place under Rome, as it was made in the absence of his legates. It was not until the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) that the Latin patriarch of Constantinople was allowed this place; in 1439 the Council of Ferrara-Florence finally recognized the position for the Greek patriarch.

ess was not linear, as different emperors and Church leaders tried at times to work towards unity by conciliatory statements and actions.

It is noteworthy that during the fourth and fifth century, the Christian Arabs in Palestine followed the Chalcedonian faith. According to Theresia Hainthaler, the Arabic bishops were initially supportive of the Chalcedonian bishop of Jerusalem.¹¹

2.4 Nestorians

The coming to power of the Sâsânid rulers of Persia during the first half of the third century, just when Christianity began to spread rapidly, hampered the growth of the Churches in Persia. The Sâsânids leaned heavily on Zoroastrism, a religion that experienced a revival and that had strong priestly leadership with great powers over the Persian population and its rulers.¹² It is probably no coincidence that these Sâsânid leaders began persecuting the Christians in Persia after the Roman Empire, its archenemy, adopted Christianity as its favored religion. Emperor Constantine considered himself a protector for Christians in Persia, and wrote to King Sapor II of Persia that he should protect the Church in Persia. This added to the reasons for Sapor II to think that the Christians in his lands were in fact a fifth column and supporters of Rome.¹³

In 410, a synod was held by the Persian churches in Ctesifon, the Persian capital and its most important bishopric. The bishops adopted the Nicene Creed, but the subsequent decisions of Ephesus were not accepted. Many Nestorians escaped to the Persian Empire after the verdict of Ephesus, and among them were their main theologians from the schools in Antioch and Edessa. Many went to the city of Nisibis, a center for theological learning.

Nisibis, the present city Nusaybin in southeastern Turkey, had been a mostly Greek city in the Roman Empire. During the fourth century bishop Mar Yaqûb had founded a theological school there. Persia however conquered the city in 363, resulting in the flight of the Greek population. Persia then populated the city with 12,000 Persians.¹⁴ During the fifth century, metropolitan Barsawma of Nisibis revived the theological school. Barsawma and the school played an important role in the fast spread of Nestorian ideas and the formal adoption of these views by the

¹¹ Theresia Hainthaler, *Christliche Araber vor dem Islam* (Leuven, 2007), p. 47.

¹² Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* Vol. 1, p. 227.

¹³ Ibid., p. 228. Roldanus, 'Ontwikkeling van het christendom in het oostelijk Middellandse Zeegebied tot aan het Concilie van Chalcedon', p. 6.

¹⁴ R. Lavenant, 'Nisibis', in Angelo Di Berardino (ed), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* Vol. II (Cambridge, 1992), p. 598.

Christians in Persia. The fact that these ideas were condemned by the Roman Empire may have helped their acceptance among the Christians in Persia. Barsawma also founded a hospital where the physicians of Nisibis were trained. This institute later had great influence in the Persian and the caliphal courts.¹⁵

After the Nestorians were condemned at Ephesus, Nestorian Christians in Persia were no longer actively persecuted though they continued to be treated as second-rate citizens. Their relative freedom was comparable to how early Islam treated its Christian minorities. In schools and monasteries the Nestorian Church, which presently prefers to be named *Assyrian Church of the East* (Assyrians), developed its own impressive culture and it played an important role as the mediator of Greek learning. During the fifth and sixth century, this Church expanded quickly throughout Persia and eastward. The Christian Arabs in the Persian realms tended to opt for the Nestorian faith; both al-Ḥīrah and the eastern parts of the Arabian Peninsula had many Nestorian churches. Najrān was probably also a Nestorian center, influenced from Persia.¹⁶ The formal language used in the Nestorian Church was Syriac, the language of culture in Syria and Iraq where the Church was initially mostly found. Many adherents of the Persian state religion, Zoroastrism, converted and gave the Church a more Persian character.¹⁷

Toward the end of the sixth century, Assyrian Christology was finalized by its greatest theologian, abbot Mar Babai the Great (569-628) of the Monastery of Mount Izla. His words were incorporated into important parts of the Assyrian liturgy and are still in use today in the Assyrian Church:

One is Christ the Son of God, worshipped by all in two natures. In his Godhead begotten of the Father without beginning before all time; in his manhood born of Mary, in the fullness of time, in a united body. Neither his godhead was of the nature of the mother, nor his manhood of the nature of the Father. The natures are preserved in their *qnume* in one person of one Sonship.¹⁸

¹⁵ Lucas van Rompay, 'Opkomst en groei van onafhankelijke volkskerken in het Oosten tot aan de Arabisch-islamitische veroveringen (451-461)', in Herman Teule and Anton Wessels (eds), *Oosterse Christenen binnen de wereld van de islam* (Kampen, 1997), p. 19. These Nestorian Churches in Persia have become known as the Church of the East, Nestorian Church, Persian Church, East Syrian Church, Chaldean Syrian Church (in India only), Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East, and as the Assyrian Church of the East.

¹⁶ Hainthaler, *Christliche Araber vor dem Islam*, pp. 110, 136.

¹⁷ Van Rompay, 'Opkomst en groei van onafhankelijke volkskerken in het Oosten tot aan de Arabisch-islamitische veroveringen (451-461)', p. 20.

¹⁸ Quoted in Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, p. 254. The Syriac term *qnume* has been the subject for a wealth of literature. Its probable meaning is *hypostasis* (Greek), or underlying substance.

During the same period, Khosraws II came to power in Persia with the assistance of the Roman Empire. This, and the fact that he had a Syriac-Orthodox wife, was why he was initially favorable toward the Syriac-Orthodox Church. His hostility towards the Assyrians resulted from their patriarch having sided with his rival in the struggle for succession. After Khosraws II was defeated by Heraclius in 630, he turned against *all* Christians in his Empire.¹⁹

2.5 Miaphysites

Egyptian Christians turned in large numbers against the decisions of Chalcedon, which they saw as treason against the Council of Ephesus and against their popular patriarch, Kyrollos. Patriarch Dioskoros was banned and in his place Proterios was appointed by the Council of Chalcedon. He was murdered by an Egyptian mob in 457.

During the two centuries until the Islamic conquest of Egypt, there were usually two contending patriarchs in Egypt. The Coptic patriarch could generally count on the support of the population while the patriarch who followed the decisions of Chalcedon had the advantage of the military support of the Roman state troops. Those who followed Chalcedon were called *Melkites*, (Syriac for *royalists*, i.e., followers of the Roman emperor in Constantinople) by their enemies.

According to Atiya, 'the Copts became acrimoniously self-centred in their own religious nationalism' during these centuries.²⁰ Atiya's usage of the term *nationalism* for the Coptic sentiments of the fifth century is an anachronism. It seems true, however, that the Copts had already developed enough of their own identity to not be willing to accept dictates from distant bishops from other cultures. Part of the unique Coptic identity was its attachment to the story of the visit of the Holy Family to Egypt, the belief that the Apostle Mark was the founder of the Coptic Church, and the usage of the Coptic language in the liturgy. The severe persecutions suffered by the Copts during the third and early fourth century from the pagan Roman state, and then again during the fifth and sixth century from the Christian Roman state, strengthened their sense of uniqueness. Pride in hosting the influential Catechetical School of Alexandria also played a role in building the Coptic identity.²¹

¹⁹ Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* Vol. 2: *The Thousand Years of Uncertainty; 500 AD to 1500 AD* (Grand Rapids, 1976, first edition 1956), pp. 269-270.

²⁰ Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, p. 13.

²¹ Stephen J. Davis describes the relationship of the Copts and the Chalcedonian State Church as the relationship of the colonized and the colonizers. He shows how the Copts

Emperor Justinian (527-565) played an important role in tying the Roman Empire and its Church together. He built the Hagia Sophia Church beside his palace, symbolizing his conviction that state and Church should serve each other.²² He was able to create a long-lasting peace arrangement with Persia and in so doing secured peace in the eastern half of the Roman Empire. It was this peace that then enabled him to reclaim North Africa from the Arian Vandals, Italy from the Arian Ostrogoths, and his armies also occupied southeast Spain. The Mediterranean Sea once more became a Roman lake.²³

Justinian is also known for having closed the pagan school of philosophy in Athens, for curtailing the activities of Jews, and for allowing the assets of those who resisted baptism to be confiscated. During his reign, the majority of people living in the Middle East and North Africa came to profess the Christian faith even though by the end of the sixth century the Semitic cults in the Middle East were still strong. Even in the Christian center of Antioch paganism still had a titular head during the last quarter of the sixth century.²⁴ According to Church historian Kenneth S. Latourette, 'conversion [...] must for many have been recent or superficial when the Moslem invasion overwhelmed the land and led to defections to Islam'.²⁵

Justinian endeavored to unify all Christians under one theology, both by proposing theological formulas for reconciling the different viewpoints, and by using force against the Miaphysites. His theological proposals for bringing the Miaphysites back into the Church of the state were not accepted. His efforts were a result of the common view that one united Church would mean a strong nation. Justinian's wife Theodora was a Miaphysite.²⁶ She was known as a supporter of the

saw the Chalcedonian Church leadership in Alexandria increasingly as 'foreigners', though he also underlines that to speak of Coptic nationalism would be an anachronism. See Stephen J. Davis, *The Early Coptic Papacy; The Egyptian Church and Its Leadership in Late Antiquity* (Cairo, New York, 2004), pp. 87, 120-121.

²² A century later, in 655, Emperor Constans II punished Maxim the Confessor for defending the idea that the emperors could not also be priests. His right hand and his tongue were cut off. See Adelbert Davids, 'De Kerk van Byzantium', in Herman Teule and Anton Wesels (eds), *Oosterse Christenen binnen de wereld van de islam* (Kampen, 1997), p. 37.

²³ J. Irmscher, 'Justinian', in Angelo Di Berardino (ed), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* Vol. I (Cambridge, 1992), p. 464.

²⁴ Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* Vol. 1, pp. 192-193.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

²⁶ Theodora was born in Constantinople but left for North Africa as a young woman. She is said to have been an actress and courtesan there, but through some Miaphysites whom she met in the Middle East, she was converted. She then returned to Constantinople. J. Irmscher, 'Theodora', in Angelo Di Berardino (ed), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* Vol. II (Cambridge, 1992), p. 822.

proclamation of that persuasion throughout the Empire and she tried to stop its persecution.²⁷

In 541, Justinian forcefully replaced the Alexandrian Miaphysite Patriarch Theodosius with Apollinarius, a staunch supporter of Chalcedon. He also gave this patriarch prefectural military powers as well as the right to collect taxes for the upkeep of the churches. These powers enabled the Chalcedonian hierarchy to enforce its policies to persecute the Miaphysite Christians of Egypt, who defiantly stuck to their own hierarchy of leaders.²⁸

Justinian was more successful in Syria than in Egypt. Whereas Egypt formed a geographic unity with a united population, Syria did not. Both the Chalcedonian and the Miaphysite branches of the Christian faith had large numbers of adherents, bishops and monasteries in Syria during the fifth century. As there was no unified 'national' resistance against Roman actions as in Egypt, Justinian was able to have Miaphysite bishops and monks replaced by Chalcedonians all over Syria, without a similarly strong development of an alternative Miaphysite hierarchy.

The Arabs inside the Roman provinces tended to be Chalcedonians. Outside the Byzantine Empire, they were mostly Nestorians or Miaphysites. Many Arabs greatly admired the many saintly Miaphysite monks who had fled from the realm of the Byzantine Emperor.²⁹ King Ḥārith II of the Arabic Ghassânid buffer state between the Byzantines and the Persians is said to have asked Justinian's wife Theodora to ensure that some Miaphysite bishops would be installed for serving the Ghassânid churches. It is interesting that Justinian went along, possibly because he needed the Ghassânids good services against Persia. The first two bishops were installed in 542. These were the Syrian Ya'qûb al-Barda'î and an Arab monk Sarjis.³⁰

Al-Barda'î was very effective and injected new life into Syrian Miaphysitism, to give it its permanence. He was an intellectual, fluent in Greek, Arabic and Syriac, and during his episcopate he is said to have consecrated over one thousand priests and at least 27 bishops, among whom two would become patriarchs. He traveled discreetly throughout

²⁷ Davids, 'De Kerk van Byzantium', p. 173. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, p. 73.

²⁸ Van Rompay, 'Opkomst en groei van onafhankelijke volkskerken in het Oosten tot aan de Arabisch-islamitische veroveringen (451-461)', pp. 24-26. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, p. 74.

²⁹ Hainthaler, *Christliche Araber vor dem Islam*, pp. 79-80.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 28. M. van Esbroeck, 'Jacob Baradaeus', in Angelo Di Berardino (ed), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* Vol. II (Cambridge, 1992), p. 428. Lucas van Rompay, 'Opkomst en groei van onafhankelijke volkskerken in het Oosten tot aan de Arabisch-islamitische veroveringen (451-461)', p. 28.

the Middle East under cover of a simple horse blanket (Syriac: *burd'ô*). His followers have often been called Jacobites, but this name is presently rejected by the Church that prefers to refer to itself as Syriac-Orthodox.³¹

As the Miaphysites were persecuted in the Roman Empire, many found safe haven in Mesopotamia. Persia recognized the Syriac-Orthodox alongside the Assyrians as a distinct religious community. Their followers spread widely, though they were never as numerous as the Assyrian communities. The Ethiopians impact on Yemen since the sixth century, was also supportive of the Miaphysite faith.³²

It is impossible to say when exactly the division between the Chalcedonian leadership and the Miaphysites became permanent. Until late in the sixth century, the Miaphysites considered themselves loyal citizens of the Empire, and they assumed the emperor and Church leadership in Constantinople would eventually adopt their viewpoints. However, the persecutions during the sixth century continued to widen the chasm between the Chalcedonians and the Miaphysites. Another difference that increased the separation was that in Syria the Miaphysite Church used Syriac as the main language and in Egypt it used Coptic, while the Chalcedonian Church used mostly Greek and Latin. In the Miaphysite Churches, Arabs and Egyptians regularly occupied important positions. This unique identity, that included the commemoration of the victims of state persecution who were seen as martyrs, gradually made the divisions insurmountable.³³

Between 604 and 620, Persia conquered almost all Middle Eastern parts of the Roman Empire, including Egypt, so that the patriarch in Constantinople lost touch with his Church in those lands. Chalcedonian churches and monasteries went through intense suffering as a result of their bishops being seen as representatives of the power of Rome.³⁴ Chalcedonian bishops were replaced by Miaphysite and Assyrian bishops. The position of Miaphysites in Syria became that of a tolerated minority, a position all Christians had already enjoyed for two centuries in Persia.

The Egyptian Miaphysites did not have much time to enjoy the relief of the Persian conquests; Egypt was only made part of the Persian Empire in 619, after a bloody and destructive war. Emperor Heraclius was

³¹ Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* Vol. 2, pp. 265-266. H. Teule, 'De syrisch-orthodoxe (jakobitische) kerk van Antiochie', in Herman Teule and Anton Wessels (eds), *Oosterse Christenen binnen de wereld van de islam* (Kampen, 1997), p. 155.

³² Ibid. Hainthaler, *Christliche Araber vor dem Islam*, p. 136.

³³ Van Rompay, 'Opkomst en groei van onafhankelijke volkskerken in het Oosten tot aan de Arabisch-islamitische veroveringen (451-461)', pp. 27-28.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 29.

able to re-conquer all the lands that were lost to Persia by 630. This gave the Chalcedonian Patriarch Sergius (610-638) the chance to endeavor a unification of Christianity with the support of Heraclius. Sergius proposed not to speak of the *nature* or *natures* of Christ, but of his human and divine *activities* (Greek: *energeiai*). These were enacted in one united manner as Christ had only *one will* (Greek: *hen thelema*). This idea, also known as *Monothelism*, was published by Heraclius in an edict, but the proposed ideas were eventually rejected as heretical at the Sixth Ecumenical Council in Constantinople (680-681) by all Churches. Only the isolated community in Central Syria that would later develop into the Maronite Church did not distance itself from the concept.³⁵

After Heraclius had re-conquered Egypt, he immediately appointed Cyrus as patriarch in Alexandria. He held Monothelistic views and persecuted the Coptic Churches by torture, imprisonment and killings. Atiya speaks of a 'reign of terror' all over Egypt. The Coptic counter-patriarch had to hide for many years in small monasteries in the south.³⁶ During the Arab advance in Egypt in 640, Cyrus was accused by Heraclius of treason. In November 641 Cyrus negotiated the capitulation of Alexandria.³⁷

³⁵ Van Rompay, 'Opkomst en groei van onafhankelijke volkskerken in het Oosten tot aan de Arabisch-islamitische veroveringen (451-461)', p. 29. M. D. Knowles, *De Kerk in de Middeleeuwen* I (Hilversum, 1968), pp. 134-135. This book is Part III of ten books in the series of Dr. L.J. Rogier, Dr. R. Aubert and Dr. M.D. Knowles (eds), *Geschiedenis van de Kerk* (Hilversum, 1968). Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, p. 395. M. Simonetti, 'Monoenergism, Monothelism', in Angelo Di Berardino (ed), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* Vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1992), p. 568.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 29. Entry 'Persian (Sassanian) Conquest of Egypt', in Joan Wucher King, *Historical Dictionary of Egypt* (Cairo, 1984), p. 509. G.P. Luttikhuisen en H.W. Havelaar, 'De koptisch-orthodoxe kerk vanaf haar ontstaan tot 1900', in Herman Teule and Anton Wessels (eds), *Oosterse Christenen binnen de wereld van de Islam* (Kampen, 1997), pp. 209-210. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, p. 77.

³⁷ E. Prinzivalli, 'Cyrus of Alexandria', in Angelo Di Berardino (ed), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* Vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1992), p. 216.