

OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN TEXTS

General Editors

GILLIAN CLARK ANDREW LOUTH



THE CASE AGAINST DIODORE
AND THEODORE

OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN TEXTS

The series provides reliable working texts of important early Christian writers in both Greek and Latin. Each volume contains an introduction, text, and select critical apparatus, with English translations *en face*, and brief explanatory references.

Titles in the series include:

Augustine: De Doctrina Christiana
Edited by R. P. H. Green

Augustine: De Bono Congiugali and De Sancta Virginitate
Edited by P. G. Walsh

Maximus the Confessor and his Companions:
Documents from Exile
Edited by Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil

Leontius of Jerusalem
Against the Monophysites:
Testimonies of the Saints and Aporiae
Edited by Patrick T. R. Gray

Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy
The Synodical Letter and Other Documents
Edited by Pauline Allen

The Epistles of St Symeon the New Theologian
Edited by H. J. M. Turner

Justin, Philosopher and Martyr
Apologies
Edited by Denis Minns and Paul Parvis

Priscillian of Avila
The Complete Works
Edited by Marco Conti

The Case
Against Diodore
and Theodore

Texts and their Contexts

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY

John Behr

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford oxx2 6pp

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© John Behr 2011

The moral rights of the author have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2011

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Library of Congress Control Number: 2010940324

Typeset by RefineCatch Limited, Bungay, Suffolk
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

ISBN 978-0-19-956987-8

3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4

and therefore, Kate;
Take this of me,

PREFACE

HAVING completed a study on the Nicene faith, I realized that before beginning work on the path to Chalcedon and beyond, I needed to do more work on Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. They are the two key figures in the transition from the debates of the fourth century to those of the fifth. Yet their most controversial works have survived only indirectly, as extracts quoted by their opponents. As such, detailed textual work was needed to clarify the relationship between these passages and the evidence they provide of what later writers found problematic. Beginning from such rather arcane matters, I soon became engaged with fundamental issues in theology, in particular the reading of Scripture and the identity of Christ, and the work thereby became even more challenging, for the opponents of Diodore and Theodore regarded their exegesis and Christology, and the relationship between them, as problematic in its approach, an approach that has become, however, the pre-supposition of much modern theology and previous scholarship on our subjects.

The relationship between the various extracts from Diodore and Theodore was much discussed in the mid-twentieth century, as also were their exegetical practices and their Christology. However, no attempt was then made to assemble all the passages together. R. Abramowski (1949) collected most of the fragments from Diodore and provided a German translation. The most complete collection of extracts from Theodore remained that of H. B. Swete (1882), who had printed the Greek and Latin extracts, and some Syriac passages, from Theodore's 'dogmatic works' in the order in which they would have been found in the original texts.¹ I have chosen another route: to present all the extracts from

¹ Unfortunately T. Jansen, *Theodor von Mopsuestia, De incarnatione. Überlieferung und Christologie der griechischen und lateinischen Fragmente einschließlich Textausgabe* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010) appeared too late to be consulted.

the writings of Diodore and Theodore as cited by their opponents and supporters, in their historical order, from the death of Theodore to his condemnation at the Council of Constantinople in 553. The fruit of this labour is not the reconstruction of an original text now lost, but the history of its use, the dependency of one author upon another and the employment of florilegia, revealing in this way what others found problematic and how a case was constructed.

Many of the sources for these fragments of Diodore and Theodore—the writings of Severus, Facundus, Leontius, Justinian, and the conciliar material—have been critically edited over the past century; these texts are reproduced here. Newly edited for this volume are our two most important Syriac sources, last edited in the middle of the nineteenth century: first, the florilegium of texts from Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius found in *Cod. Add.* 12156; second, the very fragmentary remains of the Syriac translation of Theodore's *On the Incarnation* in *Cod. Add.* 14669. Although this latter text is, strictly speaking, outside the scope of this work, nevertheless, as it was apparently translated by his supporters rather than adversaries, and as some of its material parallels important passages found elsewhere in our extracts with significant variations, it seemed appropriate to include it as an appendix in this collection. The texts collected here are presented with an English translation, mostly for the first time. Richard Price's translation of the Acts of the Council of Constantinople, which contains an extensive series of extracts from Theodore, appeared during the preparation of this volume. For the sake of completeness these texts are nevertheless included in this present volume. I am very grateful to Richard Price for sharing his manuscript, and vast erudition, with me.

Texts cannot be studied without their contexts, and so the first part of this work lays out the theological and historical context, for Diodore and Theodore themselves, for the controversy regarding them after their death (during the course of which our sources quote their works), and for the recent scholarship on them. The debate between M. Richard, R. Devreesse, and R. Sullivan, and others, in the middle of the last century, regarding the authenticity of these extracts had at stake the question of whether or not one could use the extracts to understand the theology of Diodore and Theodore. Sullivan's conclusion, on textual grounds, that there are no substantial reasons for suspecting deliberate

falsification of the texts by their opponents, has been generally accepted.

However, as I have already suggested and as we will see, much scholarship of the last century had as its presupposition—often tacitly, but not always—the predilection for the historical-critical reading of Scripture and the desire to find the real human face of Jesus. It was, furthermore, usually elaborated within a historical perspective that saw the theological reflection resulting in the Fifth Ecumenical Council as being a development over and beyond Chalcedon—a ‘neo-Chalcedonian’ Christology—and the condemnation of Theodore, and subsequently of Diodore, as being (only) a retaliation for the condemnation of Origen in the previous year. This sympathy for all things Antiochene, understood very much in terms of our own twentieth-century prejudices and set in opposition to all things Alexandrian through a series of supposed oppositions (in Christology, ‘Word-man’ vs. ‘Word-flesh’; in exegesis, *theōria* vs. allegory), has been dismantled over recent years. Greater attention to the polemical and hagiographical dimensions of texts reporting the controversies, especially regarding ‘Origenism’, has resulted in much greater nuance in our understanding of the controversies themselves. Due regard has been given to the understanding of rhetoric in antiquity, the variety of ‘non-literal’ reading techniques at hand (and the rejection of a naive identification of ‘literal’ with ‘historical’ or ‘authorial intent’), and the way in which the rereading or redeployment of ancient texts is inscribed within the very pages of Scripture itself. Finally, a return to first principles in matters theological, especially the relationship between Christology and exegesis, has, hopefully, produced a more coherent and integrated account of what was at stake in the controversy that led to the condemnation of our two subjects.

This has been a long and laborious project, which could not have been completed without the help of a great many others. I would especially like to thank Eugen Pentiu, Edward Mathews, and the anonymous reader for Oxford University Press, for their careful reading of the Syriac texts and translations; Edward Mathews, again, for his help with the Armenian texts; George Kiraz for his help with the text from Pseudo-Nestorius; and Benedict Churchill for his diligent review of the Greek and Latin texts. I would also like to thank Christopher Beeley for reading through various

chapters in draft form. Eleana Silk and Karen Jermyn provided invaluable help as librarians at St Vladimir's Seminary. This project would not have begun without Andrew Louth, and would not have been brought to completion without Tom Perridge, Elizabeth Robottom, Jeff New, and all those at Oxford University Press; for their support, encouragement, careful preparation and publishing of this work, I am truly thankful. All mistakes that remain are, of course, my own.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to the following publishers for permission to reprint texts from the following books:

Brepols for the extracts from Facundus of Hermiane, found in Facundus, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* and *Contra Mocianum*, ed. J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaeste, CCSL 90A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974), 74–7, 87–8, 92, 94, 96, 263–70, 273–4, 276–83, 289–90, 299–300.

Brian E. Daley for the extracts from Leontius of Byzantium, found in his 'Leontius of Byzantium: A Critical Edition of His Works, with Prolegomenai', D.Phil. thesis, Oxford (1978), 165–88.

Walter de Guyter for the extracts from the Palatine Collection and the Acts of the Council of Constantinople, 553, found in: *Concilium Vniuersale Ephesenum*, ed. E. Schwartz, ACO 1.5, *Collectio Palatina siue qui fertur Marius Mercator* (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1924–5), 173–9; *Concilium Vniuersale Constantinopolitanum Sub Iustiniano Habitu*, ACO 4.1, ed. J. Straub (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 44–70, 74–82, 180–1, 216.

Permission was also sought for publishing the extracts from Severus of Antioch, found in the following: J. Lebon (ed.), *Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis tertiae pars posterior*, CSCO 101, script. Syr. 50 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1933), 13.6–7, 41.27–42.5, 46.25–30, 63.14–20, 64.5–7, 95.23–6, 98.24–99.4, 153.27–8; and R. Hespel (ed.), *Philaletes, Sévère d'Antioche, Le Philaléthe*, ed. R. Hespel, CSCO 133, script. Syr. 68 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1952), 140.2–12, 144.8–21, 144.21–5, 153.3–11, 153.12–21, 156.7–20, 156.21–8, 157.1–10, 157.11–20, 158.15–22.

I would also like to acknowledge gratefully the hospitality and support of the staff at the British Library shown to me whilst I was working on *Cod. Add.* 12156 and 14669, in their collection, and to the Lilly Foundation for a Faculty Research Grant, which made the work possible.

CONTENTS

<i>List of Tables</i>	xv
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xvi
<i>Note to Reader</i>	xviii

Part I. Contexts

1. Introduction	3
I. Theological Background	5
II. Diodore and Theodore in Contemporary Scholarship	28
2. Diodore and Theodore	48
I. Lives and Works	48
II. Diodore, Marcellus, and the ‘ <i>Synousiasts</i> ’	59
III. Julian, Diodore, and Theodore on Exegesis and the Unity of Christ	66
3. The Campaign Against Diodore and Theodore	83
I. Initial Reactions	83
II. The Aftermath of Ephesus	88
III. In the Shadow of Chalcedon	100
IV. An ‘Origenist’ Reprisal?	108

Part II. Texts

4. Cyril of Alexandria and the Common Florilegium	133
I. Five Passages of Disputed Authorship	137
II. A Common Florilegium?	141
III. Cyril’s Treatises	149
IV. A Two- or Threefold Common Florilegium?	152
V. Authorship of the Common Florilegium	155
5. Extracts from the Fifth Century	159
I. Eutherius of Tyana	159
II. <i>The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius</i> (Cod. Add. 12156)	161
III. Timothy Aelurus	220

6. Extracts from the Early Sixth Century	226
I. 'Pseudo-Nestorius'	226
II. Severus of Antioch	230
III. The Palatine Collection	250
IV. Leontius of Byzantium	272
V. Emperor Justinian	314
VI. Facundus of Hermiane	322
7. Extracts from the Council of Constantinople and Pope Vigilius	352
I. The Fourth Session	356
II. The Fifth Session	418
III. The Sixth Session	431
Appendix	432
<i>Cod. Add. 14669: A Syriac Translation of Theodore's On the Incarnation</i>	432
<i>Bibliography</i>	496
<i>General Index</i>	519
<i>Biblical Quotations</i>	523

LIST OF TABLES

1. Diodore's extracts	142
2. Theodore's extracts	144
3. Extracts from Cyril's first book <i>Against Theodore</i>	149
4. Extracts from Cyril's second book <i>Against Theodore</i>	150
5. Extracts from Cyril's <i>Against Diodore</i>	152

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for classical and Patristic texts are those found in H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek–English Lexicon*, rev. H. S. Jones with R. McKenzie, 9th edn. with revised supplement (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); and G. W. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961).

AAWG.PH	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse
ABAW.PH	Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse
ABAW.PPH	Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologisch und historische Klasse
ACO	<i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i>
AJAH	<i>American Journal of Ancient History</i>
ANF	Ante-Nicene Fathers
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> , ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase (1972–)
BLE	<i>Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique</i>
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina
CCT	A. Grillmeier, <i>Christ in Christian Tradition</i> (1975–2004)
CS	Cistercian Studies
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
DSp	<i>Dictionnaire de Spiritualité</i> , ed. M. Viller and others (1937–)
DTC	<i>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique</i> , ed. A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, and É. Amman (1903–50)
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
FC	Fathers of the Church
GCS	Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte

GNO	Gregorii Nysseni Opera
GOTR	<i>Greek Orthodox Theological Review</i>
HJ	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
J ECS	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
JR	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
MSR	<i>Mélanges de Science Religieuse</i>
MT	<i>Modern Theology</i>
NPNF	Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers
OCP	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
OECS	Oxford Early Christian Studies
OECT	Oxford Early Christian Texts
ÖKS	<i>Östkirchliche Studien</i>
PG	Patrologia Graeca
PL	Patrologia Latina
PMS	Patristic Monograph Series
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
RE	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , 2nd edn, ed. G. Wissowa <i>et al.</i> (1894–)
RechSR	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
REArm	<i>Revue des Études Arméniennes</i>
REByz	<i>Revue des Études Byzantines</i>
RHE	<i>Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique</i>
ROC	<i>Revue de l'Orient Chrétien</i>
RevSR	<i>Revue de Science Religieuse</i>
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
SCH	Studies in Church History
StP	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
SBAW.PH	Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
WGRW	Writings from the Greco-Roman World
ZKG	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
ZNTW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums</i>

NOTE TO READER

As this is the first comprehensive collection of the passages from Diodore and Theodore quoted by their opponents from works now lost, it has been necessary to devise a consistent, and hopefully clear, method of referring to these extracts. I have done so by giving first the initial letter of the author in whose work the extract is found (and the number of the session in the case of the Council of Constantinople), followed by the initial letter of either Diodore or Theodore, and then a number:

BD and BT—the Blasphemies of Diodore and Theodore (found in *Cod. Add.* 12156)

TD—Timothy Aelurus, extracts from Diodore

SD and ST—Severus of Antioch, extracts from Diodore and Theodore

PD—Palatine Collection, extracts from Diodore

LT and LD—Leontius of Byzantium, extracts from Theodore and Diodore

JT—Justinian, extracts from Theodore

FT—Facundus of Hermiane, extracts from Theodore

C₄T—Council of Constantinople, fourth session, extracts from Theodore

C₅D—Council of Constantinople, fifth session, extracts from Diodore and Theodore

C₆T—Council of Constantinople, sixth session, extracts from Theodore

VT—Pope Vigilius, extracts from Theodore

The following signs have been used in the texts and translations in Part II:

[] References and clarifications

< > Words added to give sense

All Old Testament references are given according to the LXX. I have translated the word *ἄνθρωπος* by 'man' when the situation requires it, for instance by being concrete and specific, as in Theodore's phrase 'the assumed man'; otherwise I have used 'human' or 'human being' as appropriate. I have also translated *ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος* as 'the God Word', rather than the more usual 'God the Word', as it keeps better to the idiom of the Greek.

PART I
CONTEXTS



INTRODUCTION

Although Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia were active in the years prior to the Council of Constantinople in 381, textbooks usually present them after the Council. This is primarily due to the distinction regularly made between Trinitarian theology and Christology. It is held that Constantinople decisively reaffirmed the Trinitarian faith of Nicaea, and that as Diodore and Theodore, on the one hand, and their principal opponents, Apollinarius of Laodicea and his followers, on the other, were all firmly pro-Nicene, the controversy between them during the 370s (and perhaps earlier) did not so much concern this Trinitarian theology as it anticipated the controversy that flared up between Antioch and Alexandria in the following century, and as such it is treated as part of that subsequent history. Approached in this way, with Constantinople having established Trinitarian theology, the next task becomes to explain how a divine person became human.¹ However, history is never quite so neat, and the debates played out in the early centuries of Christianity resist such clear schematization.

There has indeed been, in recent decades, a growing awareness of the complexity of the fourth-century debates.² Gone are the days when one could categorize them under the single rubric

¹ See e.g. the order of material as laid out, in chaps. 9–12, by J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th edn. (San Francisco: Harper, 1978). Neither Diodore nor Theodore play any significant part in R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) or L. Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). On the other hand, A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, trans. of the 2nd rev. German edn. by J. Bowden (London: Mowbrays, 1975), focusing on the person of Christ, treats Diodore and Theodore in their historical place.

² See Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, and J. Behr, *The Nicene Faith, The Formation of Christian Theology*, 2 (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004), 21–36, and the material cited therein.

of ‘the Arian Controversy’. It is now clear that the debates were more multi-faceted, and that there were significant differences amongst the various groups who opposed Nicaea, differences which were obscured by the rhetorical category of ‘Arian’ (or ‘Semi-Arian’ or ‘Neo-Arian’). Likewise, it has also become clear that the faith presented in the Creed of Nicaea needed further theological reflection. Athanasius did not simply preserve an already-given theological system that he then handed over to the Cappadocians, and there were real differences, and developments, among the pro-Nicenes themselves. That the Council of Constantinople could anathematize not only opponents of Nicaea, but also the followers of Marcellus of Ancyra and those of Apollinarius of Laodicea, both of whom considered themselves fully Nicene, indicates the complexity of the situation.

However, even the recent, more sophisticated, analyses of this period all too often proceed by isolating aspects of the debate, on the basis of categories derived, not from the figures studied, but from the later handbooks of theology, with their systematically ordered chapters presenting supposedly discrete theological dogmas. Everything, certainly, cannot be studied and explicated at the same time, but care should be taken lest our tacitly assumed doctrinal categories obscure the coherence of our subjects’ theology, much as their own polemical designations obscured their opponents’ true positions and alignments. To approach their texts with what for us has become a series of discrete topics—Trinity, Incarnation and Christology, soteriology, ecclesiology, exegesis—whether we treat just a few or all individually, risks misunderstanding not only the debates in which they were engaged, but also how they thought about the topics and even the terms with which we are interested. We will see this particularly clearly in the case of ‘Incarnation’.

Rather than viewing the theologians of the fourth and fifth centuries as contributing to the gradual development of elements of a later systematic edifice, it is better to see them as continuing the task set by the apostles, that of trying to give a good account of their faith in the crucified messiah, affirming that this one who died as a man is indeed the Son of God. An approach abandoned early on was to claim that Jesus Christ only appeared to be human and only appeared to suffer and die. An alternative solution—to differentiate between the man and the Word—though known and rejected earlier (with the ‘Gnostics’ and by Irenaeus of Lyons), was

posed in a particularly sharp manner in the condemnation of Paul of Samosata at the Council of Antioch in 268 and the backlash that followed, reverberations of which spanned the course of the following century and beyond, dividing not only the Nicenes from the non-Nicenes, but also causing divisions among the Nicenes themselves. The historical details of these ripples will be touched upon in this chapter and in greater detail in Chapter 3. Our attention in the section that follows, however, will be primarily focused on Gregory of Nyssa, who in a very striking manner treats not only the issue of the unity of the ‘one Lord Jesus Christ’, but also his identity as the crucified and exalted Lord, challenging what we usually understand by ‘Incarnation’ and providing a good background for our study of Diodore and Theodore.

I. THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

The unity and identity of ‘the one Lord Jesus Christ’, proclaimed by the apostle (1 Cor. 8:6) and a fixed part of every creedal confession thereafter, is a fundamental element of the Christian faith. It is, however, the one that has caused the most divisions amongst Christians, as they struggled throughout the ages to explain how one who was clearly a human being is also God, how one who suffered as a human being, dying on the cross, can be said to be God, and how one who was born in time nevertheless himself created time. As already mentioned, the figure of Paul of Samosata cast a long shadow over this debate. Paul had been bishop of Antioch from around 260, and getting him deposed (to be replaced by the son of the former bishop) was not an easy task. When Paul’s opponents were finally able to unmask his heresy, it was by accusing him of teaching that Jesus Christ was merely human, comprised of body and soul, and therefore other than the Word of God.³ With their own emphasis on the Word of God as an independent, self-subsisting being, who was present in the one Jesus Christ as the soul in the human being (so that Jesus Christ cannot, therefore, straightforwardly be called ‘the Word of God’), it seemed to them that Paul proclaimed ‘two sons’: the human

³ Cf. Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 21–36. For Paul of Samosata and the Council of Antioch see J. Behr, *The Way to Nicaea*, The Formation of Christian Theology, 1 (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2001), 207–35.

being Jesus Christ and the Word of God. For Paul, on the other hand, it was in fact his opponents who were guilty of this division. He held the identity of the one Jesus Christ to be given in the Passion and Resurrection: if a distinction were to be made between one who is from all eternity and another who is revealed at the end of time, this identity would be sacrificed and two Christs proclaimed.⁴ Even if one were to say that the one who is from all eternity as the Word of God is the very same one who is now born of Mary, a distinction has still been made between that which is said of the Word in his eternal state with the Father and that which is said of the one born of Mary (that he was crucified and rose again): the defining characteristics of the one are not the defining characteristics of the other, and so two sons are proclaimed. Both sides accused each other of teaching ‘two sons’, for their approach to understanding the ‘identity’ of the Son of God differed: Paul focusing on the particularity by which the Son of God is known, as the crucified and risen one; his opponents focusing instead on the ‘personality’, as it were, of the Word of God who at a certain point comes to ensoul the body of Jesus.

A few decades later, Origen (died *c.*254) also was posthumously accused of teaching that Christ is merely human and therefore guilty of proclaiming two Christs, on the grounds that if Christ indeed has a human soul, as Origen emphatically affirmed, then he must be other than the Word of God, which his opponents, like those of Paul of Samosata, assumed to have ensouled a human body.⁵ Also at the beginning of the fourth century, Lucian of Antioch, whose memory became a rallying-point for those later opposed to Nicaea such as Arius, likewise taught that the Word of

⁴ Although the theology of Paul of Samosata is known to us only through reports from later figures, which tend to reflect their own polemical context, the following passage from the Acts of the council, which first appeared in Apollinarian circles, illustrates the point made here, even if it belongs to the late fourth century rather than Paul himself: ‘Jesus Christ, he who was born of Mary, was united with Wisdom, was one with her and through her was “Son” and “Christ”. For one says that he who suffered, who endured stripes and blows, who was buried and descended into Hell, who is risen from the dead, is Jesus Christ, the Son of God. For one must not separate him who is before the ages from him who was born at the end of days; as for me, I dread to maintain two sons, I dread to maintain two Christs.’ H. de Riedmatten, *Les Acts du procès de Paul de Samosate: étude sur la Christologie du III^e au IV^e siècle*, Paradoxis 6 (Fribourg en Suisse: St Paul, 1952), S 21.

⁵ Cf. Pamphilus of Caesarea, *Apol.* 87; Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 55–7.

God took the place of the human soul in Christ.⁶ Half-a-century later, but also standing in the tradition of Lucian, Eunomius was equally concerned to avoid proclaiming two sons, though his argument was more exegetical.⁷ He claimed that scriptural statements that speak of Christ in human terms, such as Peter's assertion that 'God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified' (Acts 2:36), should be taken as speaking of the same one as those which speak of Christ as in divine terms; if they were taken as speaking of someone else, he argued, two sons, two Lords, or two Christs would necessarily be proclaimed, one who is divine and one who is not.⁸ Taking the diverse statements of Scripture as speaking of the same subject in a univocal manner does indeed avoid any suggestion of duality. Yet it also results in affirming a Son who is neither fully human nor fully divine, but somewhere in the middle: 'a perfect creature of God, but not as one of the creatures, an offspring, but not as one of the offsprings', as Arius had put it.⁹

If we accept the identification of Lucian the Martyr with the Lucian who was the rallying-point for those opposed to Nicaea, then there was a lengthy backlash against the protagonists of the council that had condemned Paul of Samosata and replaced him with the son of the previous bishop. This swing lasted for the reign of three successive bishops, during which time Lucian was excommunicated from the church in Antioch.¹⁰ Even by the time of the Council of Nicaea there were significant enough numbers of 'Paulinians' that the council had to deal (canon 19) with the question of their readmission into the Church. The leading figure at Antioch standing in opposition to the 'Lucianist' position of seeing the Incarnation as an 'ensouling' of the man by the Word

⁶ Epiphanius, *Anc.* 33 (PG 43.77a); this is the one aspect of their teaching that Hanson (*Search*, 83) regards as 'indisputable'. Cf. Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 48–53. In his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, Arius spoke of himself as a 'co-Lucianist' (preserved in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69.6).

⁷ For the background of Eunomius and Aetius in the tradition of Lucian, see R. P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

⁸ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Eun.* 3.3; Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 436–8.

⁹ 'Letter of Arius to Bishop Alexander', preserved in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69.7.2.

¹⁰ Cf. Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 48–53; also suggested by M. Simonetti, 'Lucian of Antioch', in A. di Berardino (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. A. Walford (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 507.

was Eustathius.¹¹ He was appointed as bishop of Antioch by a council held there in December 324. This council had examined various violations of the canons and erroneous teachings, and concluded by excommunicating three eminent bishops, including the venerable aged bishop of Caesarea, Eusebius. This sentence was, however, only provisional, granting the accused time for repentance before the forthcoming 'great and priestly synod in Ancyra'.¹² A great council was indeed held in the following year, though at Nicaea, and it seemed, initially at least, to have resolved the disputes. Very soon afterwards, however, disagreements broke out between those who had attended and had agreed on the Nicene Creed, regarding how the faith it proclaimed was to be understood. Eustathius soon found himself in conflict with Eusebius of Caesarea, charging him with 'polytheism' and being accused in return with 'Sabellianism'.¹³ After further charges were raised against him, Eustathius was deposed at a council held in Antioch in 327 and presided over by Eusebius of Caesarea.¹⁴

That the Council of Nicaea was originally going to be held in Ancyra shows the influence and importance of Marcellus, whose theology we will examine more fully in the next chapter.¹⁵ To understand the developments being traced here, it is sufficient for now to note that Marcellus of Ancyra took the Nicene confession that Christ is 'true God of true God . . . consubstantial with the Father' to mean that what is said by Scripture of Christ as divine must be differentiated from what is said of him as human, rather than conflating the two to produce a Saviour who is different in

¹¹ See Eustathius, frag. 15, in which he accuses his opponent, though unnamed, of denying the presence of a human soul in Christ, in order to attach human passions directly to the Word, thereby undermining the true divinity of the Word. Eustathius' fragments are edited by M. Spanneut, *Recherches sur les écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioche, avec une édition nouvelle des fragments dogmatiques et exégétiques* (Lille: Facultés Catholiques, 1948).

¹² 'The Letter of the Council of Antioch', ed. H. G. Opitz, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites*, Athanasius Werke, 3.1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1934), Urkunde 18; Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 66.

¹³ Socrates, *H.e.* 1.23.6–24.3. For the background of this conflict, and its further development, see Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 69–75.

¹⁴ Following the revised dating suggested by H. Chadwick, 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch', *JTS* 49 (1948), 27–35, and T. D. Barnes, 'Emperors and Bishops, A.D. 324–344: Some Problems', *AJAH* 3 (1978), 53–75, at 59–60; the conventional date of 330–1 was upheld by Hanson, *Search*, 208–10.

¹⁵ Cf. A. H. B. Logan, 'Marcellus of Ancyra and the Councils of AD 325: Antioch, Ancyra, and Nicaea', *JTS* NS 43.2 (1992), 428–46.

being to God, another *hypostasis* or *ousia*.¹⁶ As a consequence, for Marcellus, it is only as incarnate that the Word can be spoken of as other than God, for as God he is the same. To Eusebius of Caesarea this seemed to make the Word of God 'non-existent' (*ἀνυπόστατον, ἀνούσιον*), 'one and the same with God',¹⁷ and so Marcellus, he concluded, had revived the error of Paul of Samosata, treating Jesus Christ as a mere human being, distinct from the true Word of God.¹⁸ Eusebius' alternative was that the Word of God, as a distinct being, was in Jesus Christ as the soul is present in a human being.¹⁹ Again, the question turns upon how one construes the identity of Christ: Marcellus held that the distinctiveness of the Son is observed only in the person of Jesus Christ; Eusebius' own presuppositions regarding the distinct *hypostasis* of the Word of God prior to the Incarnation led to his charge that Marcellus proclaims 'two sons', the Word and the man Jesus.²⁰ Following the deposition of Eustathius at Antioch in 327, and Athanasius at a council held in Tyre in 335, Marcellus was deposed at a council in Constantinople in 336. And then, before his death a couple of years later, Eusebius concluded his case with two works directed against Marcellus, *Against Marcellus* and *On Ecclesiastical Theology*.

Apollinarius of Laodicaea, another supporter of Nicaea, developed this polemic of Eusebius against Marcellus in a startlingly different fashion.²¹ Although he, more than anyone else, is known for having taught that the Word actually replaced the

¹⁶ Cf. Marcellus, frags. 63-4, 70-4, 76 (cited according to the numeration provided in the edition of these works by Klostermann and Hansen, pp. 183-219).

¹⁷ Cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Marcell.* 1.1.32; 2.2.32; 2.4.21; *E.th.* 1.20.15; 1.20.30, etc.

¹⁸ Eusebius, *E.th.* 1.20.41-3; 3.6.4.

¹⁹ Cf. *ibid.* 1.20.40. It is likely that Eusebius learnt this approach by reading the acts of the Council of Antioch after his conflict with Eustathius of Antioch in the years immediately following Nicaea. See Behr, *Way to Nicaea*, 213-14; *Nicene Faith*, 30, 69.

²⁰ This is also the conclusion of K. M. Spoerl, 'Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition', *JTS* NS 43.2 (1994), 545-68, at 557-8.

²¹ For Apollinarius see R. A. Greer, 'The Man from Heaven: Paul's Last Adam and Apollinarius' Christ', in W. S. Babcock (ed.), *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (Dallas, Tex.: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 165-82, 358-60 (endnotes); K. M. Spoerl, 'Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition'; B. E. Daley, "'Heavenly Man" and "Eternal Christ": Apollinarius and Gregory of Nyssa on the Personal Identity of the Savior', *J ECS* 10.4 (2002), 469-88; Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 379-401.

human mind of Jesus, the irremediable centre of sin, it was much more his resolute determination to avoid any suggestion of duality in the one Lord Jesus Christ, and his particular understanding of how Scripture speaks of Christ, that determines the shape of his theology. He takes very seriously one of the most striking aspects of the apostolic account of Christ: that it speaks of him in divine terms where we would most naturally expect to see human ones, and in human terms where we would expect to see divine ones. His account of this exchange of properties, the *communicatio idiomatum*, grounds his understanding of the unity of Christ: 'if the Son of man is from heaven and the Son of God is [born] from a woman, is not the same one both God and man?'²² Particular affirmations made about Christ may derive from either his humanity or his divinity, but for Apollinarius they always and only have reference to the whole Christ. For instance, Christ's petition 'Glorify me' (John 17:5), according to Apollinarius, 'stems from the body, and the glorification pertains to the body, but it is said of the whole, because the whole is one'.²³ So strong is his insistence on this, that he even claims that when Christ is confessed as consubstantial with God, the flesh is also 'comprehended in that title, since it has been united to that which is consubstantial with God', and likewise when he is said to be consubstantial with human beings, 'the divinity is comprehended with the body'.²⁴ While we must recognize the proper characteristics of each, it is essential, according to Apollinarius, to preserve the union by speaking only of the one Christ, rather than of the divinity or humanity as if they were separable elements: 'of necessity both the corporeal and the divine are predicated of the whole'.²⁵ We cannot contemplate either the flesh or the Word in themselves, for Christ 'exists in the singleness of a commingled incarnate nature'.²⁶ As such, following Jesus' claim to be 'before' Abraham (John 8:58), Apollinarius affirms that 'the man Christ pre-exists (προϋπάρχει ὁ ἄνθρωπος Χριστός)'.²⁷ Christ is the heavenly man spoken of by Paul (1 Cor.

²² Frag. 18. Text in H. Lietzmann (ed.), *Apollinarius von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Tübingen: Möhr, 1904), 209.

²³ Apollinarius, *Corp. et div.* 7 (text in Lietzmann, *Apollinarius*, 185–93); trans. in R. A. Norris, *The Christological Controversy* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 103–7.

²⁴ *Corp. et div.* 8.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 17.

²⁶ Frag. 9 (ed. Lietzmann, *Apollinarius*, 206).

²⁷ Frags. 32, 33 (ed. Lietzmann, *Apollinarius*, 211–12).

15:47), who brings his flesh down from the heavens.²⁸ While Paul had contrasted Adam and Christ in an overarching context of the transformation of the earthly to the spiritual, through death and resurrection, Apollinarius took the apostle as implying that we have different points of origins, and drew a startling conclusion: ‘Every human being is earthly; Christ is not earthly but heavenly, therefore Christ is not a man (οὐκ ἄρα ἄνθρωπος ὁ Χριστός)’, a conclusion which is then repeated as a refrain to a series of similar syllogisms.²⁹ While Apollinarius, like those opposed to Nicaea, unified the diverse scriptural statements regarding Christ into a univocal account, he ends up not with an ‘Arian’ mediating figure, neither fully God nor fully human, but with a heavenly man, fully divine but not human in any way commensurate with ourselves.

Gregory of Nyssa

Eunomius, Marcellus and Apollinarius, and their followers, were all condemned by the Council of Constantinople. Of those named by Theodosius as episcopal norms of orthodoxy, Gregory of Nyssa, in his extensive corpus, presents the most nuanced and profound reflection on the person of Christ.³⁰ Developed largely in response to Eunomius and Apollinarius, his position will also help us understand the background of Diodore and Theodore and the issues with which they grappled. If modern scholarship has found Gregory a difficult character, seeing him at times suspiciously close to Apollinarius and at other times resembling Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius, it is largely because it has assumed that the starting-point after Constantinople is a ‘Trinitarian theology’ and the task is to explain how the second person became man, navigating between the supposedly exclusive alternatives of Antioch and Alexandria.³¹ As we will see, however, Gregory’s starting-point is the passion, and the task as he sees it is to explicate how, on this basis, we confess one Lord Jesus Christ.

²⁸ For an alternative approach to Apollinarius’ understanding of the person of Christ, see C. E. Beeley, ‘Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory of Nazianzus’, forthcoming in *VC*.

²⁹ Apollinarius, *Anac.* 4 (ed. Lietzmann, *Apollinarius*, 242–6).

³⁰ *Cod. Theod.* 16.1.3.

³¹ Cf. Daley, “‘Heavenly Man’ and ‘Eternal Christ’”, esp. 470–2; and id. ‘Divine Transcendence and Human Transformation: Gregory of Nyssa’s Anti-Apollinarian Christology’, *StP* 32 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 87–95, repr. in S. Coakley (ed.), *Rethinking Gregory of Nyssa* (Oxford: Blackwells, 2003), 67–76.

The cross, and the transformation wrought by the passion, is the heart of Gregory's understanding of the identity of the person of Christ.³² Eunomius claimed that it was because Basil was ashamed of the cross that he took Peter's statement, that 'God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified' (Acts 2:36), to refer to someone other than the Son, so proclaiming two Lords and Christs, rather than accepting that the Son is 'made'. In response Gregory argues that Eunomius has both misunderstood Basil and the Scriptures themselves, and rebounds the criticism back onto Eunomius himself. The passion is not, as Eunomius assumes, a mark of the weakness and inferiority of Christ compared to the Father, Gregory argues, but rather reveals 'the surpassing act of power by which this [i.e. the passion] is possible', so that 'it is necessary to honour, even as the Father is honoured, the God revealed through the cross'.³³ This transcendent power, moreover, is effective in such a manner that the body in which the Son suffered death thereby comes to share in the very divinity of God: 'we assert that even the body in which he underwent his passion, by being mingled with the divine nature, was made by that commixture to be that which the assuming nature is.'³⁴ This transformation, for Gregory, is the heart of the apostolic proclamation:

Thus all who preach the Word point out the marvel of the mystery in this respect: that 'God was manifested in the flesh' [1 Tim. 3:16], that 'the Word was made flesh' [John 1:14], that 'the Light shone in the darkness' [John 1:5], 'the Life tasted death' [Heb. 2:9], and all such declarations which the heralds of the faith announce, whereby is increased the marvel of him who manifested the superabundance of his power by means external to his own nature. . . . These are the things which we believe concerning him who was crucified.³⁵

The transcendent power of God is manifest precisely in that which is external to his own nature—in flesh, in darkness, and in death—for it is here that we can contemplate the transforming

³² What follows is based on three texts of Gregory: *Against Eunomius* 3.3 (GNO 1.107–33; NPNF series 2, vol. 5, pp. 172–81, where it is numbered *Against Eunomius* 5, and subdivided differently; I will refer to this text by the section number of the GNO edition, and the section number of NPNF in []); *To Theophilus, Against Apollinarius* (GNO 3.1, pp. 119–28); and his *Antirrheticus Against Apollinarius* (GNO 3.1, pp. 131–233). For a full analysis of these texts see Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 435–58.

³³ Gregory of Nyssa, *Eun.* 3.34 [5.3]; 3.30 [5.3].

³⁴ *Eun.* 3.34 [5.3]. ³⁵ *Eun.* 3.35–7 [5.3].

power of God, bringing about life and light, and making the flesh Word.

When Peter speaks of the crucified Jesus being ‘made Lord and Christ’, this does not imply that the crucified Jesus is other than the Lord, nor that the Lord is created, for according to Gregory, ‘the text of Scripture says that in regard to one person (*περὶ ἓν πρόσωπον*) two things were wrought—the passion, by the Jews; honour, by God—but not as though one had suffered and another had been honoured by exaltation’.³⁶ How there is only one subject is shown, for Gregory, by Peter’s words a few verses earlier, that Jesus was exalted ‘by the Right Hand of God’.³⁷ One who is God does not need to be exalted, and so ‘the apostle said that the humanity (*τὸ ἀνθρώπινον*) was exalted, being exalted by becoming Lord and Christ; and this took place after the passion’.³⁸ For Gregory, therefore, the term ‘made’ does not refer to some pre-temporal origin of the Lord postulated by Eunomius, but to the exaltation, an exaltation which occurs by none other than the Right Hand of God, the Lord who ‘himself raised to his own height the man (*τὸν . . . ἄνθρωπον*) united to him, making him also, by the commixture, to be what he is by nature’. Through this transformation, moreover, ‘the lowliness of the one crucified in weakness’, that is, ‘the flesh’, ‘by virtue of its mingling with the infinite and boundless [nature] of the Good, remained no longer in its own measures and properties, but by the Right Hand of God was raised up together, and became Lord instead of servant, Christ the King instead of a subject, highest instead of lowly, God instead of man’.³⁹

Gregory’s argument is that, before the passion, we are indeed obliged to recognize a different set of properties, those pertaining to the flesh in distinction to the Word: ‘as the flesh is not identical with the divinity, before it was transformed to divinity, of necessity one [character] befits the God Word and another befits “the form of a servant”’.⁴⁰ Contemplated by themselves, the properties of divinity and the flesh remain distinct: the Word is pre-eternal while the flesh has come into being. These properties cannot simply be exchanged, to say that the Word has come into being

³⁶ *Eun.* 3.42 [5.3].

³⁷ Acts 2:33: *τῆ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς*, though not as translated in the RSV: ‘Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God.’

³⁸ *Eun.* 3.43 [5.3].

³⁹ *Eun.* 3.44–6 [5.3].

⁴⁰ *Eun.* 3.62 [5.5].

or that, as Apollinarius inferred, his flesh is pre-eternal. But because of the transformation wrought by the passion, this distinction does not necessitate the proclamation of two Christs: the divine always remains that which it is, 'while the flesh in itself is that which reason and sense apprehend concerning it, yet mixed with the divine it no longer remains in its own limitations and properties, but is taken up to that which prevails and is transcendent'.⁴¹

On the one hand, then, as a result of the passion we can no longer contemplate the exalted 'man' as in any way separate from the Right Hand of God, distinguished by his own 'measures and properties'. Yet neither, on the other hand, can we contemplate the Right Hand of God as distinct from the crucified and exalted one. The unity and identity of 'the one Lord Jesus Christ', the very Word of God, by whom all things were made, is affirmed with respect to the crucified one. Prior to the exaltation, Christ's sufferings appeared as nothing but the weakness of the flesh, but in the light of the exaltation, and the complete identity thus achieved, we can no longer make any such differentiation. The union effected through the passion, therefore, provides the key for understanding the exchange of properties, the principle of *communicatio idiomatum*. As such, 'because of the contact and union (*συνάφειάν τε καὶ συμφυΐαν*) the <proper attributes> of each are common to both, the Lord receiving the blows of the servant and the servant receiving the lordly honour', so that the cross is properly said to be the cross of the Lord of glory and Jesus is confessed as Lord to the glory of the Father.⁴² This is the 'unspeakable economy of the mystery', and it subverts all our usual categories: instead of a lowly, subjected, suffering servant, we now contemplate Christ the King and Lord, no longer man but God. As Gregory put it earlier, it 'is not as though one had suffered and another had been honoured by exaltation', for the one who exalts *is* the one who suffered. Exalted through the passion to become Lord and Christ, 'the man' is identified with the one by whom he is exalted. This is neither adoptionism nor the deification of a man. Rather, the crucified Jesus, as man, becomes that which he, as God, always is.

⁴¹ *Eun.* 3.63 [5.5].

⁴² *Eun.* 3.66 [5.5].

The passion of Christ is thus not an act of weakness, which somehow has to be explained away. It is rather the act of divine power, infusing the first-fruits of our nature with the infinity of his divine power, such that it makes our nature to be that which he himself is, 'the servile form, Lord; and the man, the Christ <born> of Mary; and him who was crucified through weakness, life and power'.⁴³ Everything that belongs to the Word of God by nature is now seen in that which was assumed by the Word, Gregory continues, 'so that these attributes no longer seem to be particularly in either by way of division, but that by its com-mixture with the divine, being made new in conformity with that which prevails, the perishable nature participates in the power of divinity, as if one were to say that mixture makes a drop of vinegar mingled in the sea to be sea-water'. This image, rather than implying the dissolution of human nature, indicates instead its transformation, ablaze with divine power and opened up to its infinity, and as the first-fruits transformed in this way it is as the leaven in the lump of human nature, the beginning and means of our own transformation in Christ. In this way, Gregory can unequivocally assert that he does not teach 'a plurality of Christs', but rather the transformation of human nature in the divine, of the man to the Christ born of Mary, the one Lord Jesus Christ.

Gregory's account of the revelation of God through the transformation wrought through the passion is also the basis for his criticism of Apollinarius. His argument is that our powers of sense perception and reason enable us only to apprehend the flesh and its properties, not to contemplate the Word of God himself. It is, rather, in the transformation wrought upon the flesh through the passion that we contemplate the transcendent power of the divine, as we are forced to recognize the Lord as the one who suffered the blows and the servant as the Lord of glory, an identity which hangs upon the cross. Apollinarius' basic mistake, according to Gregory, is that he 'defines the divine by its phenomenal realization, not by intellectual contemplation', for 'according to the true account, he [i.e. Christ] is both man and God, in appearance man, in contemplation God'.⁴⁴ Rather than contemplating the divine Word, Christ the Lord, not simply in the

⁴³ *Eun.* 3.68–9 [5.5].

⁴⁴ Gregory of Nyssa, *Apoll.* (191.24–7): Οὐκοῦν κατὰ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἔστι καὶ Θεός, τῷ ὀρωμένῳ ἄνθρωπος, τῷ νοουμένῳ Θεός. Ὁ δὲ οὐ τοῦτο φησιν, ἐν τῷ συμεράσματι τῷ φαινόμενῳ τὸ θεῖον, οὐ τῷ νοητῷ ὀριζόμενος.

properties of the flesh, but rather that flesh as assumed by the Word, transformed into himself through the passion, Apollinarius has instead taken the particular properties of the flesh and projected them into eternity.

Apollinarius made the Word of God flesh in this way, Gregory acknowledges, in order to avoid any suggestion of two sons. But, as Gregory points out, if we were to take 'the economic epiphany (τὴν οἰκονομικὴν . . . ἐπιφάνειαν)' of the Son of God through the flesh as evidence for another son, besides the one appearing in the theophanies of old, then strictly speaking we should admit as many sons as there have been divine epiphanies; the one who prophesied to Abraham will be other than the one who appeared to Isaac; similarly for those who appeared to Jacob, Moses, Job, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and likewise for the one who blinded Paul and appeared to those with Peter in even more sublime glory.⁴⁵ Instead of taking the particularity of each theophany as the basis for the identity (or rather identities) of the one (ones) beheld, Gregory argues that we should take these particularities as the accommodation of a single subject to the limitations of the one beholding him. It is because the human race has turned away from the previous, glorious epiphanies, towards the flesh, that the only-begotten Son became flesh. Our attention should neither be fixed upon the properties and limitations of the flesh considered in itself, nor should it project these into eternity. Instead, we should focus upon the one who is glorified, exalted through the cross. And when we contemplate him in this manner, we will then recognize that he is the same one who appeared in the other theophanies.⁴⁶ The Son, made known through his manifestation in the flesh, is contemplated not in the flesh, but in that flesh as it has been transformed by sharing in divinity, becoming one with the one who assumed it, that is, as we have seen, the crucified and exalted Lord.

Thus the manifestation of the Son of God through the economy of the flesh does not reduce the Word of God to what we are, weak and mortal flesh, for this would have achieved nothing. Rather, through this economy, humanity is united to divinity, in such a manner that no duality can thenceforth be perceived:

⁴⁵ Gregory of Nyssa, *Thphl.* 121.15–122.15.

⁴⁶ *Thphl.* 125.11–21.

If the divine <element> that came to be (*γενόμενον*) in the human <element>, and the immortal in the mortal, and the strong in the weak, and the unchangeable and incorruptible in the changeable and corruptible, had allowed the mortal <element> to remain in the mortal or the corruptible in the corruptible, and the others likewise, then one might reasonably have contemplated a certain duality in the Son of God, numbered by the opposite properties beheld in each.

If, on the other hand, the mortal <element> that came to be in the immortal became immortality, and the corruptible likewise changed into incorruptibility, and all the other <properties> similarly were transformed into impassible and divine <properties>, what argument remains for those who divide the one into a duality?⁴⁷

Rather than thinking of ‘Incarnation’ in terms of the divine being born in human nature, Gregory here suggests that it is more proper to say that the human element comes to be in the divine, being transformed in and through the passion, the flesh becoming Word, so that no duality remains: ‘everything weak and perishable in our nature, being mixed with the divinity, became that which divinity is.’⁴⁸

If it is more proper to say that ‘the mortal comes to be in the immortal’, the Lord does nevertheless still come to be in ‘the man’, but the scope of this is far broader than simply the birth of a human being from his mother, and is again connected with the transformative power of the passion by which, as we have seen, we come to know ‘the man’ as ‘the Christ of Mary’.

He is the life (*ζωή*); and therefore at the end of the human course of life (*βίου*), when our evils had reached their peak, so that nothing wicked might be left untreated, then he receives the mixture with the lowliness of our nature, receiving the man in himself (*τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν ἑαυτῷ λαβών*) and himself coming into being (*γενόμενος*) in the man, as he says to the disciples, ‘I am in you and you are in me’ [John 14:20]. What he was, this he made the one mixed <with him> (*τὸν ἀνακραθέντα*); he was eternally the most exalted, therefore he exalted the humble, for the one exalted needs no further exaltation. The Word was Christ and Lord; the one mixed and assumed in the divinity becomes this. For the one who is Lord is not reordained again into lordship, but the form of the servant becomes Lord. Therefore ‘the one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things’ [1 Cor. 8:6], is called just in the same way as he who is surrounded before the ages with the glory of the Spirit (for this is what ‘the chrism’ (*ἡ χρῆσις*) signifies), and after the passion, beautifying the

⁴⁷ *Thphl.* 124.21–125.10.

⁴⁸ *Thphl.* 126.9–11.

man united to him by the same chrism, he makes him Christ. . . . [commenting on John 17:5] . . . And the pre-eternal glory that is contemplated regarding the only-begotten God is the Holy Spirit.⁴⁹

The glory of the Spirit, which beautified the one who was crucified, making him Christ, is the same pre-eternal glory that is the Spirit. Yet this pre-eternal reality is only revealed at the end of days, when human evil has reached its zenith, when the human race has become so fleshly-minded that it needs the revelation of the Son of God through the flesh. As this revelation occurs through the passion, transforming ‘the man into the Christ of Mary’, he ‘receives the man in himself and himself comes to be in the man’, referring not straightforwardly to the birth of his flesh in this world, but, following the words of Christ who said to his disciples ‘I am in you and you are in me’, to his presence in those who are born again in him, as his body. In this birth from the Virgin, ‘a truly new man was created, the first and only to demonstrate such a mode of subsistence (*τρόπον τῆς ὑποστάσεως*), created according to God, not according to man’.⁵⁰ And the ‘mode of subsistence’ demonstrated by ‘the truly new man’ is also to be our own, as we are born again in his body by undergoing a death like his, through freely dying with Christ in baptism to share in the resurrection of ‘the man according to Christ (*τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀνθρώπου*)’.⁵¹

Gregory of Nyssa presents us with a very profound and highly nuanced understanding of ‘Incarnation’. Yet it is also likely to strike us as strange and even disorienting, for Gregory holds our attention relentlessly on the passion. The focal turning-point of the contemplation of the eternal Son is not so much the history that follows his human birth from his human mother, but rather the transformative economy in the flesh, the human element coming to be in the divine. As he puts it, in a rather stark fashion:

Christ <is> always, both before the economy and after this; <the> man, however, <is> neither before this nor after these things, but only during the time of the economy. Neither <is> the man before the Virgin, nor, after the ascent into heaven, <is> the flesh still in its own properties.⁵²

⁴⁹ Gregory of Nyssa, *Apoll.* 221.9–222.19.

⁵⁰ *Apoll.* 223.30–224.2. ⁵¹ *Apoll.* 226.20–6.

⁵² *Apoll.* 222.25–9: Ἀλλὰ πάντοτε μὲν ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ πρὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο· ἄνθρωπος δὲ οὔτε πρὸ τούτου οὔτε μετὰ ταῦτα, ἀλλ’ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ τῆς οἰκονομίας καιρῷ. Οὔτε γὰρ πρὸ τῆς παρθένου ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὔτε μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνοδὸν ἔτι ἡ σὰρξ ἐν τοῖς ἐαυτῆς ιδιώμασιν.

It is not to his human flesh that we look to contemplate him, even though because of our weakness he had to stoop to this level to make himself known. The one Lord Jesus Christ confessed by the Christian faith exists eternally, one and the same both *before and after* the economy. ‘The man’, on the other hand, exists neither before nor after, but only *during* the period of the economy. This is not simply some kind of crypto-monophysitism in which the humanity is lost in the divinity, but a reflection of the fact that, as Paul says, we no longer know Christ after the flesh (2 Cor. 5:16). The flesh of Christ no longer exists in its particular properties, but as the flesh *of Christ*, possessing *his* divine properties. When Gregory asserts that Christ is no longer beheld in the particularities of his human nature, as something distinct from his divinity, this is not meant to assert the total obliteration of Christ’s human reality, for it, as united to the divinity, has become the very locus of the transcendent power of divinity. Theological contemplation does not remain at the level of the flesh, but must ascend to contemplate the true divinity of the crucified and exalted Christ, the eternal Word of God, and ‘Incarnation’ is not so much about a divine person becoming human as it is about the man becoming that which as God he always is, the Word of God, who now takes flesh in Christ’s disciples.

Speaking of Incarnation

Gregory’s approach, stated as bluntly and forcefully as we have seen, although challenging to our usual dogmatic perspective, does in fact follow the apostolic account of how the disciples came to know Jesus Christ as the Son of God. In the synoptic gospels the disciples are presented as continually failing to understand who Jesus is. The one time before the Passion that Peter confesses that Jesus is ‘the Christ, the Son of the living God’ (Matt. 16:16), it is said to be by a revelation from the Father not by flesh and blood, a revelation that he was not yet ready to understand, for when he then attempts to get between Christ and the cross he is dramatically called ‘Satan’ (Matt. 16:23). It is only after the Passion—the crucifixion, the empty tomb, and even the resurrectional appearances—that the disciples finally come to know him, when Christ opens the Scriptures to show how it was necessary for him to have gone to his passion to enter into his glory, so that their hearts begin to burn, preparing them to recognize him in the

breaking of the bread, at which point he disappears from sight (Luke 24:28–35). ‘The man’ they knew in the flesh, through the event of the passion they know no longer according to the flesh but as the Lord Christ, who appeared and spoke to and through all the prophets of old: Christ is indeed both before and after the economy, ‘the man’ only during the time of the economy. On this basis, and in its terms, his birth is proclaimed, as gospel, in the infancy narratives: gold, frankincense, and myrrh for a dead, divine king, born in the virginal womb of the one betrothed to Joseph, just as he had been buried in the ‘virginal’ tomb belonging to Joseph.⁵³ His identity is known to the reader of the gospel, but this ‘messianic secret’ remains hidden from his disciples, who must still learn of his identity through the Passion.⁵⁴

That the evangelists describe the birth of Christ after, and on the basis of, the passion, enlarges the scope of ‘Incarnation’ to include those who conform themselves to Christ, dying in him to live in him. This is already intimated by Paul in his allegory of the two covenants, calling ‘the Jerusalem above . . . our mother’ (Gal. 4:21–31). His scriptural basis for this is the verse following the fourth hymn of the suffering servant in Isaiah, the passage that is central to understanding the Passion of Christ:

Sing, O barren one, who did not bear; break forth into singing and cry aloud, you who have not been in travail! For the children of the desolate one will be more than the children of her that is married, says the LORD. (Isa. 54:1)

Though treated as the beginning of a separate oracle by modern scholarship, this joyful proclamation that the barren woman will give birth to many children was taken by early Christians as the conclusion to the message about the Passion, for it is into the death of Christ that Christians are baptized as newly reborn children of God in their mother Church. It is by preaching the

⁵³ For further reflection on the connection between the tomb and the womb in early Christian texts and iconography, the celebration of Pascha and the Nativity of Christ, and what these connections imply for how we speak of Mary, see J. Behr, *The Mystery of Christ: Life in Death* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2006), 115–40.

⁵⁴ The same point can be made for the gospel of John, where although Jesus is described in exalted terms from the beginning, his moment of exaltation is specifically his lifting up on the cross and this is described in revelatory terms: ‘When you have lifted up [for ‘exalted’] the Son of man, then you will know that I AM’ (John 8:28, rather lamely translated in the RSV as ‘I am he’).

gospel of the crucified Lord that Paul is 'in travail' with his converts, 'until Christ be formed in you' (Gal. 4:19), till they can say, as Paul did, that having been crucified with Christ 'I no longer live, but Christ lives in me' (Gal. 2:20), for it is the Christians who are, individually and collectively, 'the body of Christ' (1 Cor. 12:27), all those who 'by the one Spirit have been baptized into the one body' (1 Cor. 12:13), calling upon God as 'abba, Father' (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6).

We can already see some of these elements being deployed by Ignatius of Antioch at the beginning of the second century. As he journeyed to Rome to undergo martyrdom, he describes how 'the pains of birth are upon me' and urges the Roman Christians not to interfere with his impending destiny: 'do not keep me from living; do not wish me to die . . . Allow me to receive the pure light; when I have arrived there, I will be a human being. Allow me to be an imitator of the suffering of my God.'⁵⁵ And even more, not only will he attain the stature of a human being, according to 'the divine plan that leads to the new human being Jesus Christ involving his faith and his love, his suffering and resurrection', 'one who became the perfect human being', but, as he tells the Romans, 'if you are silent about me, I will become a word of God', as Jesus Christ himself is 'the Word proceeding from silence'.⁵⁶ It is by the cross, in the passion, that Christ calls all those who are parts of his body, for 'the head cannot be born (*γεννηθῆναι*) without the other parts'.⁵⁷ And, as he notes, all of this has become evident as a result of the passion: 'our God, Jesus Christ, being in the Father is all the more visible.'⁵⁸ It is, again, not simply in the flesh, but in the transformation wrought upon the flesh through the passion, that Christ becomes visible, and thereafter in the transformed flesh of those who follow in his footsteps.

The maternity of the Church and the birth of Christians into true life is especially evident in the martyrdom literature from the early centuries. *The Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons*, for instance, while describing in graphic detail the sufferings of the Christians of Gaul, refers to the Church simply and bluntly as 'the Virgin Mother'.⁵⁹ The 'stillborn' Christians who were unable

⁵⁵ Ignatius of Antioch, *Rom.* 6.

⁵⁶ *Id.*, *Eph.* 20.1; *Smyrn.* 4.2; *Rom.* 2.1, *Magn.* 8.2.

⁵⁷ *Id.*, *Trall.* 11.2.

⁵⁸ *Rom.* 3.2.

⁵⁹ The letter is preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea in *H.e.* 5.1-2.

to endure the torture were encouraged through the zeal of others, especially the young slave-girl Blandina, the epitome of weakness in antiquity, who was hung on a stake to be devoured by the wild beasts, but who appeared to the other Christians as the very embodiment of Christ: 'in their agony they saw with their outward eyes in the person of their sister the One who was crucified for them.'⁶⁰ In this way, the letter continues, 'through their continued life the dead were made alive, and the witnesses [lit. martyrs] showed favour to those who had failed to witness. And there was great joy for the Virgin Mother in receiving back alive those who she had miscarried as dead.'⁶¹ The Christians who turned away from making their confession are simply dead; their lack of preparation has meant that they are stillborn children of the Virgin Mother, the Church. But strengthened by the witness of others, they also are able to go to their death, so that the Virgin Mother receives them back alive, finally giving birth to living children of God, by their death, or rather their 'new birth' celebrated thereafter as their true birthday.⁶²

It is in this broader context that the Word becomes flesh. As Hippolytus put it:

For the Word of God, being fleshless, put on the holy flesh from the holy Virgin, as a bridegroom a garment, having woven it for himself in the sufferings of the cross, so that having mixed our mortal body with his own power, and having mingled the corruptible into the incorruptible, and the weak with the strong, he might save perishing man.⁶³

The flesh of the Word, received from the Virgin and 'woven in the sufferings of the cross', is woven, according to the extended analogy that follows, by the patriarchs and prophets, whose actions and words proclaim the manner in which the Word became present and manifest. That is, it is in the preaching of Jesus Christ, the proclamation of the one who died on the cross, interpreted, understood, and proclaimed through the Scriptures, that the Word receives flesh from the Virgin: we see the enfleshed Word in the gospel. The Virgin, as Hippolytus later affirms following Revelation 12, is the Church, who will never cease 'bearing from her heart the Word that is persecuted by the unbelieving in the world', while the male child she bears is Christ, God and

⁶⁰ *H.e.* 5.1.41.

⁶¹ *H.e.* 5.1.45-6.

⁶² *H.e.* 5.1.63.

⁶³ Hippolytus, *Antichr.* 4.

man, announced by the prophets, 'whom the Church continually bears as she teaches all nations'.⁶⁴

The same perspective is kept even in the more philosophical and speculative reflection of Origen. For instance, following Paul who knew nothing but 'Christ and him crucified' (1 Cor. 2:2), Origen notes that while all the various miracles wrought by Christ can be passed over in silence, 'it is necessary to the proclamation of Jesus as Christ that he should be proclaimed as crucified'.⁶⁵ Most interesting, and arresting, is the way in which he takes the *kenosis* of Philippians 2 as the very means of manifesting, rather than veiling, the divinity of Jesus:

For we must dare say that the goodness of Christ appeared greater and more divine and truly in accordance with the image of the Father when 'he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even death on a cross', than if 'he had considered being equal to God robbery', and had not been willing to become a servant for the salvation of the world.⁶⁶

Origen also understands this kenotic exaltation as effecting a transformation: 'the high exaltation of the Son of Man which occurred when he glorified God in his own death consisted in the fact that he was no longer any different from the Word, but was the same with it'.⁶⁷

Also perhaps to be understood within the same perspective are Origen's words about the falling away of rational creatures from the Word of God. Although taken by Jerome and others in terms of a mythology of pre-existent intellects and their fall into bodies, this account might better be contextualized in terms of the falling away of all the disciples, and all other human beings, at the time of the Passion. This is suggested by the fact that the verse cited by Origen to illustrate the adherence of a single soul to the Word of God is John 10.18, 'No man takes my soul from me', for he alone has the power to lay it down. Origen continues that this soul cleaved to God 'from the beginning of creation and ever after in a union inseparable and indissoluble, as being the soul of the Wisdom and Word of God', such that 'it was made one spirit with him' and acts 'as a medium' between God and the flesh so that through its tenacious adherence to the God Word 'there is born

⁶⁴ *Antichr.* 61: ὃν ἀεὶ τίκουσα ἡ ἐκκλησία διδάσκει πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

⁶⁵ Origen, *Comm. in Mt.* 12.19. ⁶⁶ Origen, *Comm. in Io.* 1.231.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 32.325: . . . τὸ μηκέτι ἕτερον αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ Λόγου ἀλλὰ τὸν αὐτὸν αὐτῷ.

the God-man (*nascitur . . . Deus-homo*), whose being embraces the opposite extremes of divinity and humanity.⁶⁸ If one were to take this passage as an expansion of the event of the Passion, it would mean taking ‘creation’ as that which is inaugurated by Jesus Christ through the Passion, the event which enables us to speak of the Incarnation and birth in all the dimensions we have seen. Origen’s account of creation is, of course, notoriously elusive.⁶⁹ Yet it should be noted that in the infamous passage where he concludes that creation must in some sense be eternal, so that God can eternally be almighty just as he is eternally Father by virtue of the eternally present Son, Origen turns once again to the *kenosis*-exaltation passage of Philippians 2 ‘to make it more clearly understood what the glory of omnipotence is’.⁷⁰ His argument is that as it is ‘in Wisdom’ that God has created all things (Ps. 103:24), and by the Word that all things were made (John 1:3), ‘the title of “Almighty” cannot be older in God than that of “Father”, for it is through the Son that the Father is almighty’. As such the dominion held by the Father over all things and by virtue of which he is called ‘the Almighty’ is exercised through his Word, ‘for at the name of Jesus every knee bows’ (Phil. 2:10). Thus, he concludes, ‘it is undoubtedly Jesus to whom all things have been subjected, and it is he who wields dominion over all things and all things have been subjected to the Father through him’. Not only does the attribute of omnipotence which calls all things into being derive from the relationship between the Father and the Son, but ‘the glory of omnipotence’ is found once again in the passion, ‘death, even death on the cross’.

Similar points can be made regarding the classic text from the fourth century on the topic, Athanasius’ *On the Incarnation*. The argument of this text is often reduced to the well-known saying, ‘he became human so that we might become god’, resulting in the supposition that Athanasius holds to a ‘physical

⁶⁸ Origen, *Princ.* 2.6.3.

⁶⁹ Rowan Williams’s point is worth noting, that the reason why Origen can call the Son a ‘creature’ is because for him ‘[i]t could be said, though rather awkwardly, that the world we inhabit as material beings is not “created” by God: it is made, or at least conditioned, by the choices of his creatures. “Creation”, *ktisis*, is strictly only the unimpeded expression of God’s rational will’ (*Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 2nd edn. (London: SCM Press, 2001 [1987]), 141.

⁷⁰ Origen, *Princ.* 1.2.10.

theory of redemption' that renders the passion unnecessary.⁷¹ However, when read on its own terms, it is clear that Athanasius' understanding of 'incarnation' is much more sophisticated. This is apparent already in the introduction, as he outlines his project:

Well then, my friend and true lover of Christ, let us next with pious reverence tell of the incarnation of the Word and expound his divine manifestation to us, which the Jews slander and the Greeks mock, but which we ourselves adore, so that from the apparent degradation of the Word you may have ever greater and stronger piety towards him. For the more he is mocked by unbelievers, the greater witness he provides of his divinity, because what men cannot understand as impossible he shows to be possible, and what men mock as unsuitable by his goodness he renders suitable, and what quibbling men laugh at as human by his power he shows to be divine, overthrowing the illusion of idols by his apparent degradation through the cross, and invisibly persuading those who mock and do not believe to recognize his divinity and power.⁷²

Athanasius' mention of the 'incarnation' of the Word, his divine 'manifestation', is glossed by an allusion to Paul's words on the folly of preaching Christ crucified (cf. 1 Cor. 1:23), for the 'apparent degradation of the Word' is not simply a kenotic or self-deprecating act of a divine person assuming human nature, but 'his apparent degradation through the cross'. It is only 'apparent' because while it might seem all-too-human, nevertheless by his power he shows it to be divine. In fact, the more he is mocked, the more his divinity is made manifest, so that the absolute limit of such degradation, his death on the cross, is the very manifestation of the Word. Even if we failed to recognize this, creation itself bore witness, the sun turning back, the earth shaking, the mountains being rent, and all things standing in terror: 'these things showed the Christ on the cross to be God, and the whole of creation his handmaid, witnessing in fear to the coming (*παρουσίαν*) of her master.'⁷³

⁷¹ Hanson (*Search*, 450), for instance, comments that 'one of the curious results of this theology of the incarnation is that it almost does away with a doctrine of the atonement. Of course Athanasius believes in the atonement, in Christ's death as saving, but he cannot really explain why Christ should have died. When in chapters 19 and following of the *De Incarnatione* he begins trying to explain the necessity of Christ's death, he can only present a series of puerile reasons unworthy of the rest of the treatise. The fact is that his doctrine of the incarnation has almost swallowed up any doctrine of the atonement, has rendered it unnecessary.'

⁷² Athanasius, *Inc.* 1.

⁷³ *Inc.* 19; cf. 26.

By taking a body the Word accomplishes two things, analysed by Athanasius in two sequential accounts of the ‘incarnation’ (chaps. 3–10 and 11–19). First, as human beings had subjected themselves to death, the Word took a body specifically so that he can die and thereby conquer death, this being ‘the primary cause of the incarnation of our Saviour’.⁷⁴ Secondly, as human beings had also turned their attention away from the Word to the body, the Word came in a body to catch our attention, so that once we apprehend him as man, he makes known, by the works done in the body, that he is in fact the Son of God. As with Gregory, the sequence of Athanasius’ analysis follows the scriptural account: it is after the passion that ‘the theologians’ (i.e. the evangelists) speak of Christ as God. In describing the Incarnation, Athanasius strikingly does not even mention the accounts of Jesus’ birth given by Matthew and Luke; his preferred idiom is to say that the Word fashioned for himself a body from the Virgin as a temple in which to dwell. Likewise, he devotes only a few passages to considering the divine works of Christ as recorded in the gospels.⁷⁵ Rather, after examining the scriptural background for Christ’s death on the cross, he gives considerably more space to the divine works which Christ now does in those who have ‘put on (ἐνδυσάμενος) the faith of the cross’, so demonstrating the resurrection of the body which Christ had ‘put on (ἐνεδύσατο)’.⁷⁶ Seen in the light of the passion, the body which the Word fashioned as his temple cannot be separated from the body in which he now dwells, comprised of those who by faith in the cross are no longer subject to the corruption of death: ‘And now no longer does the actual corruption in death hold ground against humans because of the Word dwelling in them through the one body.’⁷⁷ The scope of what Athanasius meant by ‘incarnation’ is again considerably larger and more nuanced than is often assumed.

As a final example from the fourth century, we may turn to the orations delivered by Gregory of Nazianzus on the eve of the

⁷⁴ *Inc.* 10.

⁷⁵ Only in *Inc.* 18, as part of his second account, does Athanasius describe the works of Christ, citing John 10:37–8, and referring to his making the lepers pure, the lame walk, the deaf to hear, the blind to see, and casting out every illness and disease, ‘from which anyone could see his divinity’. Intriguingly, in *Inc.* 32 he cites Luke 4:34 and Mark 5:7 to demonstrate that the Saviour must have raised up his body for he continues to work even now.

⁷⁶ *Inc.* 28, 44.

⁷⁷ *Inc.* 9: . . . διὰ τὸν ἐνουκήσαντα Λόγον ἐν τούτοις διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς σώματος.

Council of Constantinople. In the third ‘Theological Oration’, Gregory, summarizing the exegetical method that lies behind the Nicene faith, reiterates the perspective that we have been considering:

In sum: you must predicate the more sublime expressions of the divinity, of the nature which transcends sufferings and the body, and the lowlier ones of the compound, of him who because of you was emptied and became flesh, to say nothing worse, and became human, then was also exalted (*ὑψωθέντι*), in order that you might abandon these carnal and grovelling doctrines, and learn to be more exalted, and to ascend with the divinity, and not linger on things visible (*τοῖς ὄρωμένοις*) but rise up to things understood (*τοῖς νοουμένοις*), and might know what is the expression of nature and what is the expression of the economy (*τίς μὲν φύσεως λόγος, τίς δὲ λόγος οἰκονομίας*).⁷⁸

Rather than compounding all things said about Christ in the Scriptures, to conclude that he is only semi-divine as did the opponents of Nicaea, or a heavenly man, divine but not really human, as did Apollinarius, the exegetical basis and practice of the Nicene faith as presented by Gregory is to distinguish between what is said of him as divine and what is said of the same one as human, the former pertaining to his nature, the latter expressing what he has undertaken for our sake. That what is said of him as divine ‘transcends sufferings and the body’ reflects the fact that it is not simply from seeing him in the flesh that we know him as the Son of God. By his exaltation, rather, we are taught to abandon our fleshly perception and to ascend with his divinity, so that we may not merely perceive the physical appearance but instead understand the spiritual reality conveyed. ‘When you have lifted up (*ὑψώσητε*) the Son of man, then you will know that I *AM*’ (John 8:28). His exaltation on the cross is indeed a stumbling-block to our human ways of thinking about God, and so forces us to abandon our ‘grovelling doctrines’ to acquire a proper understanding of the revelation of God in Christ.

As we have now seen, while Gregory of Nyssa’s presentation of the identity of Christ might seem idiosyncratic and confused from the standpoint of our usual dogmatic concerns and frameworks, it is a thoroughly traditional perspective, even if stated as forcefully as he does. Christ is indeed known no longer according to the flesh, and the theologians’ words about the Incarnation do not

⁷⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 29.18.

simply refer to a past event—his human birth and subsequent biography—but to the continuing birth and presence of the Word of God dwelling in the temple of his body. The identity of the eternal Son of God is revealed in the dynamic event of the passion, as this is understood and proclaimed ‘in accordance with the Scriptures’, transforming both the human nature assumed by the Word and also our minds in our understanding of true divinity. With the identity of Christ understood in this way, it is not surprising that Gregory uses the more abstract and technical term *hypostasis* to refer not so much to the particular entity itself (for which, at least in the created realm, he uses *πρᾶγμα*), but the particularizing properties by which it is made known.⁷⁹ The theological reflection that we have traced is very sensitive not only to what is said, but to how it is said and on what basis.

II. DIODORE AND THEODORE IN CONTEMPORARY SCHOLARSHIP

Christology

Having reviewed the theological landscape of the fourth century from a different, yet thoroughly traditional, perspective, we are now in a position to look anew at modern assessments of the theology advanced by Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. As we shall see in the following chapter, though they died in the peace of the Church, soon after the Council of Ephesus in 431 they were accused of being the real sources of Nestorius’ errors, resulting in further controversies and ultimately the condemnation of Theodore at the Second Council of Constantinople in 553 and Diodore thereafter. Modern assessment of ‘Antiochene Christology’ has also been no stranger to

⁷⁹ Gregory of Nyssa, *Ep. ad Pet.* 5: ‘the *hypostasis* is particularizing sign of each (ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις τὸ ἰδίαζον ἐκάστου σημείον ἐστίν)’; *ibid.* 6: ‘we have taught that the *hypostasis* is the concurrence of the particular properties in respect to each (ὑπόστασιν ἀποδεδώκαμεν εἶναι τὴν συνδρομὴν τῶν περὶ ἕκαστον ἰδιωμάτων)’; and ‘the *hypostasis* is the distinctive sign of the existence of each (ἡ ὑπόστασις τὸ ἰδίαζον τῆς ἐκάστου ὑπάρξεως σημείον ἐστίν)’. This usage is already present in the Letter of George of Laodicea (in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 73.16.4) and also in the way in which Gregory of Nazianzus treats the term *ιδιότης* as synonymous with *hypostasis*, cf. *Or.* 31.9, and 39.11, as noted by L. Wickham in L. Wickham and F. Williams (trans.), *St Gregory of Nazianzus: On God and Christ* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2002), 144, n. 29.

disagreement and sometimes intense debate, especially regarding Theodore (the remnants of Diodore's work being much more sparse).⁸⁰ Two works, however, from the mid-twentieth century—those of Francis Sullivan and Richard Norris—have staked out defining, though still contested, positions, a brief review of which will further aid our investigation.

Sullivan advanced two main arguments in his 1956 monograph on Theodore.⁸¹ First, that Marcel Richard and Robert Devreesse were not justified in claiming that the passages of Diodore and Theodore cited by their opponents were not only presented without proper context but also deliberately corrupted, making them so unreliable that they should not be used in any reconstruction of their true thought.⁸² The basis for their claim lay in the discrepancies between the passages quoted by their opponents in Greek and Latin (especially by Leontius and the Fifth Ecumenical Council) and the same texts preserved by their supporters but now extant only in Syriac, together with similar discrepancies found in the extant versions of Theodore's exegetical works, principally the *Commentary on John*. Re-examining these textual variants, Sullivan concluded that any differences are due to the inaccuracy of the Syriac translator rather than the Greek or Latin source. Thus, while the passages were certainly taken out of context, to make them seem as problematic as possible, it is nevertheless necessary, Sullivan claims, to take them into account in any thorough study of Theodore's Christology, for they comprise the major part of what remains of his dogmatic works.⁸³

⁸⁰ For a full review of scholarship on Theodore from the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century see R. A. Norris, *Manhood and Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 246–62. See also J. S. Romanides, 'Highlights in the Debate Over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology and Some Suggestions for a Fresh Approach', *GOTR* 5.2 (Winter, 1959–60), 140–85, and most recently P. B. Clayton, *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus: Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*, O ECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 53–74.

⁸¹ F. A. Sullivan, *The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, *Analecta Gregoriana*, 82 (Rome: Gregoriana, 1956).

⁸² Cf. M. Richard, 'La Tradition des fragments du traité Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως de Théodore de Mopsueste', *Le Muséon*, 56 (1943), 55–75, and 'Les Traités de Cyrille d'Alexandrie contre Diodore et Théodore et les fragments dogmatiques de Diodore de Tarse', in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat*, I (Paris: Pecqueur-Grat, 1946), 99–116; R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, *Studi e Testi*, 141 (Rome: Biblioteca Vaticana, 1948).

⁸³ Sullivan, *Christology*, 158; he analyses the fragments of Diodore on pp. 172–81.

On the basis of this investigation, and these texts, Sullivan's second major argument is that while Theodore often sounds orthodox, and protests that he does not teach 'two sons', his understanding of the unity of the one Lord Jesus Christ is lacking. Sullivan traces this deficiency to the predicament posed by the Arian argument against the divinity of the Word, which he presents as a syllogism:

Maj. The Word is the subject even of the human operations and sufferings of Christ.

Min. But whatever is predicated of the Word, must be predicated of him *κατά φύσιν*.

Ergo: The nature of the Word is limited and affected by the human operations and sufferings of Christ.⁸⁴

In order to preserve the divinity and transcendence of the Word, according to Sullivan, the Alexandrines denied the minor premise, to be able to predicate human attributes to the Word of God, not according to his divine nature but according to the human nature that he assumed, and thus implicitly at least differentiating between 'nature' and 'person'. The Antiochenes, on the other hand, denied the major premise. This approach seems to have begun already with Eustathius of Antioch, but becomes most fully developed first with Diodore. Diodore's immediate opponents, the Apollinarians, emphasized the substantial unity of the Word and flesh in the one Jesus Christ by taking the principle of *communicatio idiomatum* to imply that both human and divine predicates are to be applied to one and the same subject in an undifferentiated manner. Reacting to this, Diodore was led to distinguish, in Christ, two *prosōpa*, not only two subjects of predication, but two 'persons' or subjects of experience: the Son and Word of God, begotten of the Father before all ages, on the one hand, and, on the other, the Son of Mary, who was born, subject to passions, suffering the cross and death, and raised again.⁸⁵ According to Diodore, as even his supporters reported, the Virgin Mary is therefore properly the mother of a man (*anthrōpotokos*), and only indirectly Mother of

⁸⁴ Sullivan, *Christology*, 162.

⁸⁵ Ibid. 195: 'In this "Son of Mary" who is an "adopted son of God", it is impossible not to recognize a true human person, really distinct from the Divine Person of the Word.'

God, 'Theotokos', by virtue of the conjunction of the man from David with the Word of God.⁸⁶

Theodore, on Sullivan's account, is more nuanced, but equally divisive. In order to maintain the transcendence of the divine he speaks of two 'natures', and tries to emphasize the unity of Christ by speaking of 'one *prosōpon*', which Sullivan takes in the sense of 'outward countenance' rather than 'subject of experience', so that it is the man Jesus, 'the assumed man', not the Word, who is the subject of human passions. Theodore, every bit as much as Diodore, is unable to distinguish between 'person' and 'nature', so as to allow a *communicatio idiomatum* which ascribes human passions and affections to the Word, the one subject, as incarnate, as man. The Word's becoming flesh is explained by Theodore in terms of the second half of John 1:14, that is, as dwelling amongst us, or more particularly, dwelling in 'the assumed man' 'as in a son', sharing with him the honour and dominion proper to the Son of God. There is a communication of idioms here, but it is valid in only one direction, allowing us to call the assumed man 'Son' and 'Lord' from the instant of his conception, resulting from his divine election, and thereafter by virtue of his perfect obedience. We cannot say in turn, however, that the Word of God was born of the Virgin in respect of the humanity which he assumed. The result of this inhabitation and asymmetrical transfer of properties is, for Theodore, certainly 'one *prosōpon*', but, as Sullivan concludes, 'it is a *prosōpon* effected by the union of the two natures; it is a *common prosōpon*, including both God the Word and the man in whom he dwells'.⁸⁷ As such, for Sullivan, both Diodore and Theodore ultimately deny the reality of the Incarnation, where this is understood as the birth of the Word of God from the Virgin Mary to live a life, in the flesh, subject to all the limitations that properly belong to human beings.

Sullivan's assessment of the Greek and Latin versions were quickly challenged, and defended.⁸⁸ However, a new perspective

⁸⁶ Cf. Euthérius of Tyana, *Ep. ad Alex. Hier.* (ACO 1.4, p. 216.16–20), presented in Chap. 5, Sec. I, below.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 287.

⁸⁸ Cf. P. Galtier, 'Théodore de Mopsueste: sa vraie pensée sur l'Incarnation', *RechSR* 45 (1957), 161–86, 338–60; J. L. McKenzie, 'Annotations on the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia', *TS* 19 (1958), 345–55; F. A. Sullivan, 'Further Notes on Theodore of Mopsuestia: A Reply to Fr McKenzie', *TS* 20 (1959), 264–73;

was opened by with the publication of Norris's book seven years later. While accepting that Sullivan had 'settled [the] matter clearly', such that 'it is no longer possible to ignore the evidence supplied by these fragments', and that it is clear that Theodore 'does not intend to say the sort of thing which Cyril of Alexandria meant when he spoke of the "one hypostasis" of Christ',⁸⁹ yet, Norris argued, this does not necessarily make him heretical. Theodore, just as much as Cyril, was concerned to maintain both Christ's divinity and humanity, and also the unity of his person, but 'his way of conceiving the *problem* of the unity of Christ' differed. Rather than struggling to apply two contrary sets of attributes to a single subject, for Theodore 'it appears essentially to be a question about the reconciliation of divine prevenience and human freedom in a single action, which is at once an action of divine grace and condescension, and an action of human obedience and self-sacrifice'.⁹⁰

Norris thus revives the thesis of Dorner and Harnack, that the driving force of Antiochene Christology was its concern with anthropology and moral progress, especially that of the assumed man Jesus. However, while they traced this emphasis to an Aristotelian background, and saw in it an implicit Pelagianism (summed up in the dictum that 'a Nestorian Christ is a fitting saviour for a Pelagian man') and thus devoid of any real soteriological concern,⁹¹ Norris argued that it was based on a biblical view of man and was indeed soteriologically determined.

L. Abramowski, 'Zur Theologie Theodors von Mopsuestia', *ZKG* 72 (1961), 263–93, trans. in ead., *Formula and Context: Studies in Early Christian Thought* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), item II, and much more recently her piece 'Über die Fragmente des Theodor von Mopsuestia in Brit. Lib. Add 12.156 und das doppelt überlieferte christologische Fragment', *Oriens Christianus*, 79 (1995), 1–8. The scholarly consensus still lies with Sullivan, despite occasional attempts to appeal to the claims of Devreesse and Richard.

⁸⁹ Norris, *Manhood*, 260, 236.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 236.

⁹¹ Cf. Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. from 3rd German edn. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1989), 4.165–6: 'The most important characteristic of perfect humanity is its freedom. The thought that Christ possessed a free will was the lodestar of their Christology. To this was added the other thought that the nature of the Godhead is absolutely unchangeable and incapable of suffering. Both of these thoughts have at least no concern with the belief in the real redemption of humanity from sin and death through the God-man. *The Christology of the Antiochians was therefore not soteriologically determined*; on the contrary, the realistic-soteriological elements were attached to it by way of supplement' (emphasis in the original).

Theodore's opponents, the Apollinarians, held to a Neoplatonic-influenced anthropology which focused on the rational soul or mind as the most important faculty of human beings, and which needed to be redeemed from its absorption in material reality, not by being freed of the body, but through overcoming the irrational motions of the flesh by the rule of an immutable intellect, which would thereby divinize the body itself. Norris argues that for Theodore, on the other hand, human rationality instead expresses itself in the ability to know good and evil and the freedom to choose between the two:

Theodore's thought requires not only that 'the Man' be a subject of attribution, logically independent of the Word; it requires also that he have a function, as a center of voluntary activity, in the work of redemption. And just as this emphasis issues in a definitive Christological dualism, so it derives from what we have called the biblical strain in Theodore's doctrine of man and human nature: his comprehension of the problem of sin in terms of the categories of rational freedom and rational obedience to the divine Law.⁹²

So strong is Theodore's insistence upon this, that he can even create a dialogue, apropos of John 12:30, in which 'the assumed man' speaks of the Word in the third person. This is 'scarcely' simply a rhetorical device, Norris argues, concluding that 'the Man and the Word in Christ are not only two logical subjects of which attributes may be predicated. They are psychological subjects as well, at once distinct and intimately related as two centres of will and activity. . . . [They] are two intimately related agents bent upon an identical project.'⁹³

For Theodore, redemption is effected by the Word uniting to himself a complete human being, the man born of Mary, who then freely cooperates with the Word in the work of salvation. As the Word unites the man to himself from the moment of conception onwards it is solely the result of a divine initiative, God's 'good-pleasure'. The resulting union is not simply a 'moral union' resulting from the Word's pleasure at the man's prior virtue, for there is no moment before which the man was not assumed. Rather, the obedience which 'the assumed man' demonstrates results from the grace received from the Word at his very conception. This cooperation is such that it results in a unity

⁹² Norris, *Manhood*, 209–10.

⁹³ *Ibid.* 200–1, referring to Theodore, *Comm. in Ia.* 12:30.

of *prosōpon*, the one Lord Jesus Christ, which is therefore ‘a *product* of the union’.⁹⁴ ‘The indwelling of the Word in the Man through a disposition of the will . . . unites the prosopa of the two natures, so that one who knows Christ knows him as a single prosopon.’ This is not merely a habit of speech, fictitiously treating two things as one, for ‘by the fact of the union, a relationship is established which creates a basis in reality for the one prosopon. . . . If Christ is one prosopon, this is because to know him in his humanity is to know the glory and the power of the second Person of the Trinity.’⁹⁵ Theodore’s doctrine of ‘one prosopon’, Norris concludes, is therefore not equivalent to the later dogma of the ‘hypostatic union’, but neither is it ‘a doctrine of merely *moral* union’, for ‘the moral relationship or cooperation between the Word and the Man is itself the result of the sole initiative of the divine Son, who “works all things” in the Man whom he assumes’.⁹⁶

In this way, although sharing many of Sullivan’s conclusions regarding the dualism of Theodore’s Christology, Norris offers an alternative paradigm, a ‘*problématique*’ other than that of Cyril and Chalcedon, for contextualizing Theodore’s assertions. Whether it is capable of also accounting for the issues tackled by Cyril and Chalcedon is besides the point, Norris claims, for it needs to be assessed on its own terms. Yet it is not clear that one can so peremptorily dismiss the need to be able to address other, even later, questions.⁹⁷ Nor, for that matter, is it clear whether Norris’s presentation of Theodore’s theology, on his own terms, is even coherent: as the obedience of the assumed man is solely determined by God’s grace and initiative from the moment of the man’s conception, it would seem to be less than fully rational and free, less than truly human. Nevertheless, Norris has reminded us of the anthropological dimensions of Theodore’s theological reflection, and this aspect has continued to hold sway in subsequent scholarship.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ Norris, *Manhood*, 231.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 232–3.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷ Cf. Clayton, *The Christology of Theodoret*, 66–7.

⁹⁸ It is the basis, for instance, of F. Young’s account in *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 199–213. It is also present in A. Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol. 1, 2nd edn. (London: Mowbrays, 1975), 421–39, though as Clayton notes (*Theodoret*, 73–4), his use of the disputed fragments is thoroughly confused. See also Donald Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology in the Early Church*, OPCS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Exegesis

Alongside these debates regarding Antiochene Christology, we must also note the changing assessments of Antiochene exegesis, for the charges against Diodore and Theodore in antiquity were not limited to their Christology, but also criticized their treatment of Scripture, if, indeed, these were thought of as being separable. In addition to problematic passages from their dogmatic treatises, Leontius and the Council of Constantinople also reproduced extracts from Theodore's exegetical works, and accused him of mutilating the Scriptures by denying that they speak of Christ. As Leontius put it: 'Completely rejecting the inscription of the holy Hymns, Psalms and Odes, <Theodore> attributes all—in Jewish fashion—to the circles around Zerubbabel and Hezekiah, allowing the Lord only three.'⁹⁹

The background for Leontius' charge is the well-known Antiochene assertion that, as Diodore put it, 'we far prefer τὸ ἱστορικόν to τὸ ἀλληγορικόν'.¹⁰⁰ What is meant by this preference, however, has never really been clear, and is again in dispute.¹⁰¹ At the end of the nineteenth century it seemed self-evident. H. B. Swete praised Theodore highly as, 'except when led astray by theological prepossessions, his firm grasp of the grammatical and historical method and a kind of instinctive power of arriving at the drift of his author's thought have enabled him often to anticipate the most recent conclusions of exegesis'. Theodore thus holds 'a position in which he stands among ancient expositors of Scripture almost alone—that of an independent inquirer, provided with a true method of eliciting the sense of his author, and considerable skill in the use of it'.¹⁰² Mid-twentieth-century

⁹⁹ Leontius, *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* (PG 86A.1365d).

¹⁰⁰ From a fragment from his work on the Octateuch, quoted by C. Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophaneia: Beiträge zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums, 13 (Cologne-Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1974), 55.

¹⁰¹ Cf. *ibid.* 156: 'Ihre erhaltenen Schriften teilen keine Definition des ἱστορικόν mit, und einigen Bemerkungen Diodors vermag man bloß eine sehr allgemeine Abgrenzung gegenüber der Allegorese zu entnehmen.' For a survey of scholarship on Antiochene exegesis from 1880 to 1990, see Bradley Nassif, "'Spiritual Exegesis" in the School of Antioch', in *id.* (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996), 343–77.

¹⁰² [H. B. Swete], 'Theodorus', in W. Smith and H. Wace (eds.), *A Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century A.D.* (London: J. Murray, 1877), 966–73, at 972.

scholarship was equally positive in its assessment of Theodore's exegesis, though it was more likely to describe his contribution not so much as a fidelity to authorial intent but as a concern to preserve the real, historical account of the biblical narrative of salvation.¹⁰³ Standing firmly against the Platonizing allegorical interpretation characteristic of Alexandrian theology, Theodore was seen as returning to the biblical record of God's engagement with human beings in history, arranged as this is towards the coming of his Son, which is understood, as with Sullivan and Norris, in terms of his human birth and subsequent history, his historical and human 'personality'. Whilst there might be some typological parallels between the Old Testament and the New, to be discerned through 'contemplation' or 'insight' (*θεωρία*), this is a *sensus plenior* that ensures the historical integrity of the original event, word, and context.¹⁰⁴

Over the last decades, as the limitations of historical-critical methodologies have become more apparent, and perhaps reflecting the 'linguistic turn' of modern thought more generally, such attempts to see Antiochene exegesis as foreshadowing the modern concern for historicity have largely, and rightly, been abandoned. Christoph Schäublin and Francis Young have pointed instead to the background of Antiochene exegesis in the rhetorical schools of antiquity, with their training in grammatical and historical methods, rather than the more philosophical approach of Alexandria, so continuing the long-standing tension between sophists and philosophers.¹⁰⁵ In this 'rhetorical' approach,

¹⁰³ See e.g. Rowan A. Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Exegete and Theologian* (London: Faith Press, 1961), for whom 'Theodore understood the Bible because he had an understanding of the way of thinking implicit in the Bible. He could enter into the Bible in a way that the Alexandrians with their philosophical preconceptions could not' (p. 100). Yet even Greer (p. 104) can note that 'Theodore draws his theology from the text, organizes it somewhat systematically, and then reimposes the more sophisticated theological system upon the text'.

¹⁰⁴ Attempts to see Antiochene *theōria* as an anticipation of the theories of *sensus plenior* advanced in the 1950s were subsequently abandoned, sometimes forcing an author to retract an earlier position, such as Raymond Brown in his essay 'The *Sensus Plenior* in the Last Ten Years', *CBQ* 25.3 (1963), 262–85, at 268. Bertrand de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse*, vol. 1 (Paris: Cerf, 1980), 194, admits that an exact and unified explanation of the meaning of *theōria* even in one writer has yet to be given.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. F. Young, 'The Rhetorical Schools and Their Influence on Patristic Exegesis', in Rowan Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 182–99; id., *Biblical Exegesis*

interpretation of a text begins with setting out its *hypothesis*, the subject-matter at hand; the lexical level is examined next, establishing the correct punctuation and construal of sentences; attention is then paid to questions of translation and etymology, foreign words, metaphors, and figures of speech; and finally the interpreter turns to the train of thought in the text, comparing it to other texts, which might provide further background material, from the scriptures, to set the text in its proper context. Despite the fact that this method investigates ‘*to historikon*’, the proper context of a text here is understood to be its place within the Scriptural account rather than a reconstructed historical past.¹⁰⁶ With this method, Diodore and Theodore were led, as we have seen Leontius complain, to assert that the Old Testament Scriptures, with scant exception, did not speak of Christ. If Christ is described as using a verse from the Psalms to speak of himself, Theodore claimed, ‘he used this testimony, not because it was something predicted of him through the oracle of prophecy, or certainly the Psalm (as a whole) would have been composed concerning him’.¹⁰⁷

Turning to the interests and methods of the grammatical and historical instruction of the ancient rhetorical schools certainly offers a better insight into Diodore’s and Theodore’s exegetical practices. However, as John J. O’Keefe points out, nagging questions remain, for it is also clear that such concerns were not limited to the Antiochenes, nor do they themselves apply such methods consistently.¹⁰⁸ For instance, one can only imagine Origen, for whom nothing in Scripture is incidental, turning in his grave at Theodore’s statement that: ‘While some commentators claimed the phrase “from Bothros” [Amos 9:7] should read as

and the Formation of Christian Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), esp. 161–213. See also David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992).

¹⁰⁶ As Young puts it (*Biblical Exegesis*, 167): ‘No Antiochene could have imagined the critical stance of the Biblical Theology movement, explicitly locating revelation not in the text of scripture but in the historicity of events behind the text, events to which we only have access by reconstructing them from the texts, treating the texts as documents providing historical data.’

¹⁰⁷ *Commentaire sur les Psaumes*, ed. R. Devreese, Studi e Testi, 93 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939), 121; cited in Greer, *Theodore*, 110.

¹⁰⁸ John J. O’Keefe, ‘“A Letter that Killeth”: Towards a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms’, *J ECS* 8.1 (2000), 83–104.

what is now called Kara and at one time Haran, I shall pass over this effort at precision on the place hereby indicated as a pointless exercise contributing nothing to the meaning, and treat of the sense in the present case.¹⁰⁹ The Antiochenes were also capable of using allegory, so long as it did not destroy what they saw as the textual coherence of the Scripture, and could even accuse the Alexandrians of being overly literal.¹¹⁰ And on the other hand, it was not only the Antiochenes who were interested in the *hypothesis* of a text or its proper context: establishing the proper *hypothesis* was a central element in Irenaeus' battle with his opponents, and Athanasius is every bit as concerned with the necessity of clarifying the 'time' (καιρόν), the 'person' or 'character' (πρόσωπον), and the 'subject-matter' (πράγμα) of a text, lest the reader miss its true sense (διάνοια).¹¹¹ Any difference there might be between Alexandrian and Antiochene approaches cannot simply be explained by method.

More recently, examining the attack launched earlier in the fourth century by Eustathius of Antioch against Origen's exegesis, Margaret Mitchell has suggested that the very dichotomy between 'literal' and 'allegorical' interpretation was one that in fact originated within the rhetorical tradition itself as a means of debating 'controversies which turn upon texts', enabling orators to persuade others that either the letter or the intent of what has been written should hold, depending upon the case in question.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ Robert C. Hill (trans. and intro.), *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on The Twelve Prophets*, Fathers of the Church, 108 (Washington, DC, Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 169. Likewise his disregard for any attempt to locate Tarshish in Jonah 1:3 (p. 194): 'For my part, however, I consider this entire chase after detail to be irrelevant to the subject in hand so far as the account by the prophet is just as equally beyond question, no matter which city you think it to be.' As Hill comments (pp. 12–13): 'though such a peremptory attitude may seem to have some merit in a commentator cutting to the chase, it frequently masks an inability or unwillingness to take the trouble to investigate the background of his text . . . τὸ ἱστορικόν is a priority only when it suits.'

¹¹⁰ Cf. F. Young, 'Rhetorical Schools', 193–5.

¹¹¹ Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8–10; Athanasius *Ar.* 1.54.1, 3.29.1; *Decr.* 14.1. On Irenaeus, see Behr, *Way to Nicaea*, 30–48; on Athanasius, see Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 208–15.

¹¹² The quotation is from Cicero *In.* 2.39.115, which introduces a lengthy section (2.40.116–51.154) presenting rhetorical *topoi* that the orator can use to argue the case either way. The earliest listing of such *topoi* is Aristotle *Rhet.* 1.15.1–12. Cf. Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 2.36–7, against this rhetorical practice: 'That rhetoric is against the laws is manifestly clear even in the things proposed in their mal-artful "arts of rhetoric" handbooks. For at one time they advise one to attend to the text and the statements of the lawgiver—as clear and in need of no interpretation—and at

As such, ‘the construction of a hard and fast distinction between a literal and a figurative reading of a text is itself a rhetorical act moored in rhetorical training, which generates the paradox that the appeal for a single, clear meaning from either direction belies the textual ambiguity that gave rise to the exegetical disputes in the first place’.¹¹³ While Origen presents a ‘literal’ reading of the account of the ‘witch of Endor’ (1 Kgs [1 Sam.] 28), insisting on ‘the narrative’ (ἡ ἱστορία), ‘the literal sense’ (κατὰ τὸν λόγον), ‘the text itself’ (ἡ γραφή αὐτή), and ‘the narrative voice of the text’ (ἡ διηγηματικὴ φωνὴ τῆς γραφῆς), in so doing he ‘paradoxically creates the conditions for a supreme ἀναγωγή (“elevated sense”) of the text, as the site of revelation of the secure eschatological hopes of each Christian’.¹¹⁴ It is, as Mitchell puts it, ‘a “spiritual reading” wrapped up in a “literal procedure,”’ determined by the conviction that what this text has to offer us regarding our understanding of the resurrection must be true in a literal sense. Origen’s ‘appeal to the literal, in other words, is itself a rhetorical move that, in the way presented, greatly constricts the interpretative options for his hearers and funnels them towards his particular spiritual interpretation’, thus turning ‘this text from a hostile witness to favorable testimony for his chosen thesis and his ultimate catechetical goal’.¹¹⁵

Eustathius, on the other hand, presents what he claims is a truer ‘literal’ reading of the passage. But by calling upon Origen to take the role of a witness (without, as Mitchell notes, any hint of self-irony ‘for bringing a witness back from the dead to testify against necromancy!’), and contesting his overly literal reading of a single passage, rather than paying attention to what is said elsewhere in Scripture, Eustathius ‘executes a sharp denunciation of Origenic allegorical method as being in collusion with such a “belly-myther”’.¹¹⁶ His reading is ‘literal’, yet it is nevertheless ‘in some

another time they turn around and advise one not to follow either the text or the statements, but the intention of the lawgiver.’ Translated by Mitchell, in Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell (trans. and intro.), *The ‘Belly-Myther’ of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*, WGRW 16 (Atlanta, Ga: SBL, 2007), pp. lxxxix–xc, n. 16. Mitchell’s chapter in this book is a revised version of her article, ‘Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory: Origen and Eustathius Put 1 Samuel 28 on Trial’, *JR* 85 (2005), 414–45.

¹¹³ Mitchell, *The ‘Belly-Myther’ of Endor*, pp. lxxxvii–lxxxviii.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. cii.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. ciii.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. cviii, cxv. ‘Belly-myther’ is their translation of ἐγγαστρίμυθος, cf. pp. xiii–xviii.

sense the supreme figurative reading, given that Eusthatus's ultimate purpose in his interpretation of this narrative is not to uncover the "facts" about the Endor event but to reject Origenic allegorism through a creative conceit of convicting Origen of the crime of the "belly-myther" of Endor: conjuring words and ideas from thin air'.¹¹⁷ Thus, while presenting a trenchantly 'literal' interpretation, Eustathius has nevertheless 'ironically read First Kingdoms 28 as an allegory about Origen and his exegesis'.¹¹⁸ As such, whilst points of theology do emerge as contested items of belief in this early fourth-century exegetical contest between Antioch and Alexandria—especially concerning the fate of the soul after death and the question of the resurrection—the primary site of their exegesis is the *ἀγών*, the 'trial', in which both sides are called upon to debate a problematic passage of Scripture, much as the Daphne–Apollo narrative had been used in the schoolroom 'to encapsulate the essential hermeneutical dynamics of all the myths the poets tell about the gods'.¹¹⁹

Returning to Diodore and Theodore, developing the suggestion of Young 'that what developed into a methodological discussion was motivated by doctrinal imperatives', John J. O'Keefe has argued that it was the attempt to guard against the theological errors of Origen, specifically those regarding the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the Trinity, that prompted Diodore and Theodore into a stricter application of the grammatical/historical method and so into a debate regarding proper exegetical practice.¹²⁰ What characterizes their exegesis is not simply that they used the book of Kings to supply the *historia* of David's life, contextualizing particular Psalms within its narrative (which was and is a common practice), but 'that the narrative of the historical books completely controls and restricts the meaning of other texts', even if some allegorical interpretation is occasionally used

¹¹⁷ Mitchell, *The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor*, p. cxix.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. cxxii.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. cxxii; for parallels between the narratives, see p. xciii, n. 32.

¹²⁰ O'Keefe, 'Antiochene Exegesis', citing Frances Young, 'The Fourth Century Reaction Against Allegory', *SP* 30 (1997), 120–5, at 124. O'Keefe (p. 91) points to an excursus entitled 'A Treatise against the Allegorists' in Theodore's *Commentary on the Psalms* (Lucas von Rompay (ed.), *Théodore de Mopsueste: Fragments syriaque du Commentaire des Psaumes*, CSCO 190 (Louvain: Peeters, 1982), 17–18), in which Theodore claims that Origen's errors would have been avoided if he had 'learned the real sense of what is written and had he studied the significance of each of the words. Thus, he would have been able to know that there is only a single sense in all of the divine scriptures.'

to make the Psalms fit such a mould. The Psalms do not speak of Christ, for David belongs to the narrative stream of 'the old age' rather than the 'new age' of Christ, which has its own narrative. As such, O'Keefe argues, the anti-Origenist driven recourse to a stricter application of exegetical method, brought to light the limitations with the method itself. It failed, not, as Schäublin would have it, because their method was not as adequate as the tools of modern criticism, nor, as Young, because it was not sufficiently appreciated. It failed because 'the school method suffered more from theological limitations. It was simply not up to the task of uniting the stories of Ancient Israel and Jesus of Nazareth. . . . Antiochene commitment to method would end up creating an interpretative style that emptied the Old Testament of the theological and, more significantly, christological references.'¹²¹

How such Christological references might work, O'Keefe explains by recourse to Erich Auerbach's analysis of figural language and *mimesis*: 'The connection between the Exodus from Egypt and the Exodus from sin', for instance, 'is not a horizontal connection between events in a sequence; it is, rather, a vertical connection between events that are connected in God's plan for salvation'.¹²² Concerned as they were for the sequence and coherence of the narrative, horizontal connections appeared self-evident to Diodore and Theodore, while any vertical connection was bound to appear arbitrary. Their restrictive assumptions about what a text might mean, however, put them at odds with the Christian tradition as a whole, which depends upon figural reading, especially in the case of the Old Testament, for 'some figural reading is necessary to transform the text into something that the Christian community can use and "imitate". . . . In the end, Antiochene exegesis failed precisely because it did not appreciate how central a Christ-centred figural reading of the Old Testament was to its appropriation by the Christian Church.'¹²³

On the basis of our survey of theological reflection prior to Diodore and Theodore, we can perhaps restate O'Keefe's argument in a more radical fashion, and by so doing construe the issue more precisely. To assume that the Old Testament needs to be 'transformed' to become something that can be 'appropriated' by Christians, presumes both that these Scriptures primarily speak

¹²¹ O'Keefe, 'Antiochene Exegesis', 92-4.

¹²² *Ibid.* 95.

¹²³ *Ibid.* 96.

of something else and also that we have our primary material for the knowledge of Christ elsewhere, that is, in the New Testament. In a sense this is the very step taken by Diodore and Theodore, assuming that the Old and New Testaments are distinct bodies of literature, each with their own proper narrative stream, which can be related through various methods. But as we have seen, it is in fact by recourse to the ‘Old Testament’ (not that it was initially thought of as such, but simply as ‘the Scriptures’), by using the images and words that they offer, that the work of God in Christ is understood from the first, by the apostle in his proclamation of the death and resurrection ‘in accordance with the Scriptures’ (1 Cor. 15:3–5), by the evangelists in their depiction of Christ in the canonical gospels, and by subsequent theologians in their contemplation of the unchanging identity of the eternal Word of God revealed in the crucifixion and exaltation of Christ. For the early Christians, the New Testament was not primarily understood as a distinct body of literature, recounting a different *historia* than the Old Testament. It was, instead, seen as a ‘recapitulation’, to use Irenaeus’ word, providing a ‘concise word’ or a resume of Scripture. The Word of God, who had been veiled by the prolixity of the Scriptures, can now be seen clearly in and by means of this epitome. He is the treasure in the field, brought to light by the cross, according to Irenaeus, without which the Scriptures seem to be nothing more than myths and fables.¹²⁴ Understood in this way, the subject throughout Scripture (the ‘Old Testament’) is the crucified and exalted Christ: “O foolish men and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?” And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself (Luke 24:25–8). Rather than narrating a different *historia*, Moses ‘wrote of me’, says this Christ (John 5:46).

Theodore knew as well as Gregory of Nyssa the importance of the passion as the event in which the identity of the man and the Word is realized. In one of the lengthiest passages reproduced by Leontius, Theodore provides a full account of the relationship between the Word and the man he assumes. Arguing by analogy with how in the future Christians will be governed perfectly by

¹²⁴ Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.26.1; Behr, *Way to Nicaea*, 17–38, 113–33.

the Spirit in both body and soul, yet even now possess a partial first-fruits of that condition, Theodore comments:

Before his crucifixion, because it was needful, he was permitted to fulfil by his own purposes a righteousness which was for our sake, and even in this undertaking he was urged on by the Word, and strengthened for the perfect fulfilment of what was fitting, for he had union with the Word straightway from the beginning when he was formed in the womb.

Theodore goes on to explain how Christ, when arriving at maturity, demonstrated a more acute power of judgement than other humans beings and, because of his union with the Word, inclined beyond the ordinary manner to the nobler things. Then he concludes:

after the resurrection and ascension into heaven, when he had shown himself worthy of the union by his own will (having received the union even before this in his very fashioning, by the good pleasure of the Lord), he also unmistakably furnished for ever after the proof of the union, having no activity separating and dividing him from the God Word, but having the God Word accomplishing everything in himself through the union with him [i.e. the Word].¹²⁵

Though this passage has frequently been commented on, scant attention has been given to the fact that for Theodore the passion still constitutes the event whereby the man becomes fully unified, identified, with the Word, and even that this is ‘the perfect fulfilment of what is fitting’. Focusing instead on whether the Word, by being united to the man from his conception, can truly be said to have become incarnate, modern scholarship tacitly takes for granted the radical step taken here by Theodore, that the New Testament relates a distinct *historia*, and neglects that to which Theodore still held, the crucial significance of the passion for speaking about the identity of the Word of God and ‘Incarnation’.

The similarity to and differences from Gregory of Nyssa are instructive here. As we have seen, Gregory, more so than any earlier theologian, seems very ‘Antiochene’ in speaking of ‘the man’ as distinct from the Word. But he does so only sparingly, referring to how before the passion ‘the man’ was distinct by the properties and limitations of the flesh, yet is so no longer (for we

¹²⁵ Text preserved by Leontius, *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* (the Theodorean extracts from its florilegium are printed in PG 66); given as LT 2 in Part II below.

do not know Christ after the flesh) and as such is not a subject for theological reflection, focused as this is on the Word of God revealed through the transformative event of the passion. Theodore, on the other hand, clearly wants to provide an account of the relationship between ‘the man’ and the Word prior to the passion, extending the intimations of Gregory, and in so doing shifts the crux by which we speak of ‘Incarnation’, with all the dimensions of this that we explored earlier. While, on the basis of the passion, Gregory spoke of how ‘the man’ becomes ‘the Christ <born> of Mary’, with all the broader dimensions of this that we have seen, Theodore speaks instead of ‘the man’ being fashioned in the womb in a union with the Word which enables him, ‘by his own purposes’, to go to the cross, ‘strengthened’ and ‘urged on’ by the Word, so that thereafter there is no longer any specifically human action differentiating him from the Word. Theodore, as Diodore before him, is bound to conclude that Mary gave birth only to a man, not to the Word of God as man: she is *anthrōpotokos* not *Theotokos*. The man is a distinct *prosōpon*, and even if, as Frederick McLeod has recently argued, the term *prosōpon* functions in a broader fashion for Theodore, their paradigm-shift is seismic, and results in a very different understanding of theology.¹²⁶ If Apollinarius took the human properties of Christ and projected them into the eternity of the heavenly man (‘the man Christ pre-exists’), Diodore and Theodore remain more earth-bound, taking the human *historia* of Christ, rather than the event of the passion, as the locus for the revelation of God. As such, Gregory’s charge against Apollinarius, that ‘he defines the divine by its phenomenal realization’, is equally applicable to

¹²⁶ F. G. McLeod, *The Roles of Christ’s Humanity in Salvation: Insights from Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005), argues that, for Theodore, ‘Christ *qua* man serves as the head of the “bodies” of both the church and the universe, and as the visible “image of the invisible God”’, so that the ‘common *prosōpon*’ and his analogy between the union of Christ’s divine and human natures as one ‘person’, and that of the soul and body in one person, indicates that ‘Theodore asserts a much stricter union than a merely moral one’ (pp. 252–3). This may well be true, but it still takes the Incarnation in the more limited scope of Diodore and Theodore, rather than the broader and more dynamic perspective opened up by starting from the passion. McLeod, along with most modern scholarship, takes the passion as a problem to be accounted for subsequent to the Incarnation (how to ascribe suffering to the Word), rather than as the transformative event which enables us to speak of the flesh becoming Word and the Word becoming flesh in those who take up the faith of the cross, as Athanasius put it.

Diodore and Theodore. While a focus on the human *historia* might be more palatable to our modern sensibilities than the Apollinarian solution, it dramatically reduces the scope of Incarnation that we have seen in the earlier tradition, restricting it to a historical event in the past.

The problem presented by Diodore and Theodore is not simply that they were unable to differentiate between person and nature, and so were reluctant to ascribe suffering to the Word of God. Nor was it their anthropological concerns, the reality of human history and agency. It was, rather, that instead of starting with the opening of the Scriptures in the light of the passion, as had the earlier theological tradition culminating in the Nicene Faith affirmed at the Council of Constantinople, their starting-point (different as this was to both opponents of Nicaea and supporters such as Apollinarius) was the *historia* of the New Testament, which they treated with all the tools they had from their rhetorical training, tools which they shared with their opponents. The novelty of both the exegesis and Christological reflection of Diodore and Theodore was that they treated the Old Testament as a distinct *historia* from the New, and consequentially 'the man' as a distinct subject from the Word.

Quite what prompted their approach is difficult to say. There are certainly anthropological dimensions to what they have to say, and Theodore was involved later on in the Pelagian controversy, writing against Augustine; but it would be difficult to take anthropology as the motivating factor for the earlier developments in exegesis and Christology. Certainly, again, their rhetorical training comes into play; but the methods they learnt were not unique to them, even if they did apply them in a distinctive manner. Were they driven to apply these methods more strictly by their opposition to the errors of Origen? But it is unclear why opposing errors regarding the soul, resurrection of the body, and the Trinity should lead to the exclusion of a Christocentric reading of the Old Testament. Undoubtedly their well-known opposition to Apollinarius was a major factor, and perhaps his overly unitive Christology based in his idiosyncratic application of the principle of *communicatio idiomatum* prompted the pendulum to swing in the opposite direction.

Another factor, so far not mentioned, are the three books *Against the Galileans* written by the emperor Julian in Antioch in the winter of 362/3, in which he set out 'to show all men the reasons why I

am convinced that the Galilean fabrication is a human fiction contrived by evil'.¹²⁷ Of particular interest is the way that he claims that each passage he quotes from Genesis, 'unless it is a myth involving some ineffable contemplation (*θεωρία*)', speaks blasphemously about God; his taunt that 'you do not cease calling Mary "Theotokos"', although Isaiah nowhere says that it is the only-begotten Son of God who is born of the virgin; and his comment that the evangelist John, by calling the Word 'God' 'with God', proclaims two gods, and, because 'nowhere does he call him either Jesus or Christ so long as he calls him God and the Word . . . some of the impious think that Jesus Christ is one and another is the Word proclaimed by John', something that even Julian realizes is not the case.¹²⁸ All these themes, and even the words (especially his request for a *θεωρία*), come to play significantly in the theology of both Diodore and Theodore. Amongst the Galileans singled out for Julian's invective, moreover, was that 'magus of the Nazarene', Diodore.¹²⁹ As Felix Thome has recently concluded, although neither Diodore nor Theodore, in what we have left of their works, mention Julian in the context of their rejection of allegory, it is all but certain that his work was a major factor in their turn against any reading of Scripture other than that dictated by the *historia*.¹³⁰ Responding to Julian's rhetorical challenge, Diodore and Theodore, as Eustathius before them, summoned Origen from his grave to an exegetical debate that would open out onto (if it was not already enmeshed in) the further theological problematics that we have traced in this chapter.

All attempts to understand motives are going to be inadequate, and what has been advanced so far, in the context of reviewing the theological landscape of the late fourth century and contemporary scholarship on the Christology and exegesis of Diodore and Theodore, is only provisional. There were many other factors at play, such as the fact that it was in Antioch, in these very decades, that the feast of the Nativity was celebrated in the East for the first

¹²⁷ Julian, *Gal.* 39a.

¹²⁸ *Gal.* 94a; 262d; 262c; 3271–333c.

¹²⁹ Julian, *Ep.* 55 (Facundus, *Pro def.* 4.2.61–4).

¹³⁰ Felix Thome, *Historia contra Mythos: Die Schriftauslegung Diodors von Tarsus und Theodore von Mopsuestia im Widerstreit zu Kaiser Julians und Salustius' allegorischem Mythenverständnis*, Hereditas: Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte, 24 (Bonn: Borengässer, 2004), 219.

time.¹³¹ Having now reviewed the theological and exegetical issues at stake, their history and contemporary scholarly assessment, we are now in a position to turn to Diodore and Theodore themselves, the strife-ridden city of Antioch where they first appear, the controversies in which they were embroiled, and the path that led to their condemnation, and then, in the second part of this work, present the passages of their works that were quoted during the course of the controversy surrounding them.

¹³¹ See the homilies delivered there by John Chrysostom in 386, discussed in T. Talley, *The Origins of the Christian Year*, 2nd edn. (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 135–6; and for the connection between the date of this feast, 25 December, with the date of the passion, see pp. 9, 91–9.

DIODORE AND THEODORE

I. LIVES AND WORKS

Diodore and Theodore first appear on the historical scene in Antioch, the city in which followers of Christ were first called Christians, but where they had suffered from division and factionalism at least since the condemnation of Paul of Samosata at the council held there in 268.¹ By Diodore's time there were two main groups in Antioch: a small but stubborn body loyal to Eustathius, who, after attending the Council of Nicaea in 325 as one of the leading opponents of Arius, had been deposed by a council in Antioch in 327,² and a larger body led by a succession of various non-Nicene bishops. After his initial theological

¹ Paul, and the repercussions of his deposition, were discussed in Chap. 1 and will be further investigated below. For more details see Behr, *Way to Nicaea*, 207–13, and *Nicene Faith*, 48–53. The most comprehensive study of the fourth- and fifth-century divisions in Antioch remains Ferdinand Cavallera, *Le Schisme d'Antioche (IV^e–V^e siècle)* (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1905). For the history of the fourth-century controversies more generally, see Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 61–122; Hanson, *Search*; L. Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*. For Antioch, see J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972); C. Kondoleon (ed.), *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

² Following the revised dating suggested by Chadwick, 'The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch', and Barnes, 'Emperors and Bishops', 59–60; the conventional date of 330–1 was upheld by Hanson, *Search*, 208–10. It is unclear when Eustathius died: Theodoret (*H.e.* 3.4.5) states that it was before the ordination of Meletius; Socrates (*H.e.* 4.14–15) and Sozomen (*H.e.* 6.13) on the other hand say that he that he was recalled by Jovian (June 363–Feb. 364) and went to Constantinople, where he lived privately, confirming the Nicene faith there, until 370, when he ordained Evagrius as bishop of Constantinople. R. V. Sellers, *Eustathius of Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928), 50–6, concluded that he died before 337, or at the latest 343, and likewise R. P. C. Hanson, 'The Fate of Eustathius', *ZKG* 95 (1984), 171–9. C. E. Raven, *Apollinarianism: An Essay in the Christology of the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), 118, allowed for the possibility of the alternative, as also assumed by G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, *Bibliothèque Byzantine* 7 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974), 446.

training with Silvanus, later bishop of Tarsus, and further study in Athens, Diodore returned to Antioch where, with his friend Flavian, he embraced an ascetic life.³ According to Theodoret, this pair took an open stand against Leontius (bishop of Antioch since 344) when he ordained Aetius to the diaconate, probably in 346. Such was their reputation even by this stage that their threat to withdraw from communion with Leontius and to go to the West to make known his activity sufficiently alarmed Leontius to prompt him to suspend Aetius.⁴ Theodoret continues by describing how during this period Flavian and Diodore, though not yet ordained to the priesthood, laboured tirelessly to encourage zeal for the truth in others, gathering them in the tombs of the martyrs to keep night-long vigil singing psalms antiphonally, a practice they introduced to the city.

It is as a presbyter of Meletius during the 360s and 370s that we next hear of Diodore. Meletius' transfer from Sebaste to Antioch had been arranged by Acacius of Caesarea following the Council of Constantinople in 360 (which had transferred Eudoxius, Leontius' successor in Antioch from 357, to Constantinople).⁵ At the request of the emperor Constantius, Meletius, either at his installation or shortly thereafter, took part in a rhetorical contest with George of Alexandria and Acacius, their text being Proverbs 8:22.⁶ Showing himself to be more pro-Nicene than had been expected, Meletius not surprisingly was deposed and sent into exile, to be replaced by Euzoius, a former associate of Arius. This exile was not for long, for probably within the same year, though news of it took some time to reach the different corners of the

³ Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 244.3; Julian *Ep.* 55 (to Photinus; preserved by Facundus, *Pro def.* 4.2.63).

⁴ Theodoret, *H.e.* 2.24.6–8. For the dating see Thomas A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, PMS 8 (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 96. Athanasius also visited Antioch in 346, where he deliberately shunned Leontius, communing instead with the continuing supporters of Eustathius of Antioch assembled in a private house; neither Diodore nor Paulinus (later a bishop of the continuing Eustathians) are mentioned in this context. Cf. Sozomen, *H.e.* 3.20.4.

⁵ Epiphanius, *Haer.* 73.28.1; Cf. Kelley McCarthy Spoerl, 'The Schism at Antioch Since Cavallera', in Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (eds.), *Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993), 101–26, at 106–7.

⁶ Meletius' oration is preserved by Epiphanius, *Haer.* 73.29–32. For the different reports of this contest and an analysis of the oration, see Spoerl, 'The Schism at Antioch', 108–23.

empire, Julian issued an edict allowing all Christians exiled under Constantius to return to their sees. On his returned to Antioch, however, Meletius was unable to win over those Christians loyal to the memory of Eusthatus, despite just having been exiled for his pro-Nicene stance.

The resulting tension in Antioch deteriorated as a result of the events surrounding the Council of Alexandria in 362. The ancient historians report how a number of bishops exiled to the Thebaid met together to discuss how best to resolve the division in Antioch.⁷ It seems that some kind of plan was hatched, involving Lucifer of Cagliari going directly to Antioch, perhaps to prepare the ground for a rapprochement between the two groups, and Eusebius of Vercelli going to Alexandria to gain the support of Athanasius and other bishops stopping there on their return from exile. But before Lucifer could reach Antioch, Meletius had already returned and with his supporters had taken possession of 'the old church', a place of special symbolic importance for Antiochene Christians, who referred to it as their 'mother' and believed it to have been founded by the apostles themselves.⁸ On his arrival Lucifer responded in turn by ordaining Paulinus as bishop of the city. When Eusebius arrived in Alexandria, a council was held there in the spring (perhaps after Pascha, which that year fell on 31 March).⁹ The council consisted of bishops mainly from Egypt and Libya but also a small number of bishops from elsewhere, together with two deacons representing Lucifer, two deacons from Paulinus, and monks of 'Apollinarius the bishop'.¹⁰ The *Tōme to the Antiochenes*, issued by the council, urged the Christians assembling in 'the old church' (not mentioning Meletius by name) to be 'joined to' the beloved brethren led by Paulinus, asking nothing more of them than that they confess the Creed of Nicaea and anathematize the Arian heresy and those

⁷ Socrates, *H.e.* 3.5–6; Sozomen, *H.e.* 5.12–13; Theodoret, *H.e.* 3.4–5.

⁸ Cf. John Chrysostom, *Hom. 1–4 in Ac. princ.* 2; *Pan. Lucn.* 1.

⁹ According to Rufinus, *H.e.* 10.28, it was Eusebius who convened the council; Socrates also implies this (*H.e.* 3.6–7.1), but stresses that it was 'in concert' with Athanasius.

¹⁰ Athanasius, *Tōm.* 9.3. That Apollinarius is designated as a bishop indicates that Laodicea was falling into the same kind of factionalism that had beset Antioch, for Pelagius had been ordained as bishop of Laodicea in 360 by Acacius of Caesarea. Cf. K. M. Spoerl, 'A Study of the *Κατὰ Μέρος Πίστις* by Apollinarius of Laodicea', Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto (1991), 15–19.

who assert that the Holy Spirit is a creature.¹¹ When Eusebius arrived in Antioch, bearing a copy of the *Tome*, he thus found two pro-Nicene bishops of the city (in addition, that is, to Euzoius). Unable to reconcile these two factions, he left in frustration, as also did Lucifer, annoyed that Eusebius had not simply acknowledged Paulinus as the rightful bishop of Antioch.

The historians emphasize Lucifer's hot-headedness as the cause of his rash consecration of Paulinus as bishop of Antioch. But, as Athanasius' support of the continuing Eustathians was well known, it could be that, by ordaining Paulinus, Lucifer was simply carrying out what he, at least, thought would be Athanasius' intention. Athanasius may, alternatively, have had more carefully nuanced plans for reconciling the pro-Nicenes in Antioch. However, as neither Meletius himself nor a representative of his was present at the Council of Alexandria, and as he was pointedly not mentioned by name, it seems clear that whatever the plans or intentions were, they had never included Meletius at all: they were designed to persuade his followers to abandon Meletius and accept Paulinus as their bishop.¹² When Jovian became emperor in the following year, Athanasius gained an audience with him in Hierapolis, and then accompanied him to Antioch. There Meletius also gained the emperor's favour, and a council was held under his presidency. At this point Athanasius now approached Meletius, hoping to establish communion with him, but was rebuffed.¹³ The divisions were thus further entrenched, becoming one of the most serious problems for the consolidation of the pro-Nicene cause in the Christian East in the following decades.

Diodore and Flavian were ordained as presbyters by Meletius in the early 360s, and the reputation of Diodore in particular grew quickly, attracting the ire of the emperor Julian, who transferred his court to Antioch in July 362. He described Diodore in sarcastic

¹¹ Athanasius, *Tóm.* 3.1: καὶ συνάψαντες αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν τοῖς περὶ Παυλίνον. This is frequently misconstrued as a request for the followers of Eustathius to enter into communion with Meletius. See e.g. T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994), 157.

¹² Given the absence of Meletius from the council and his name from the *Tome*, it does not seem likely that Athanasius 'was content to accept the *status quo* and recognize Meletius' claim to the see after the unification of the two communities', as suggested by K. M. Spoerl, 'Study', 25.

¹³ Cf. Basil of Caesarea, who reminds Meletius of this (in *Ep.* 89.2; see also *Ep.* 258.3), but mentions neither the full circumstances nor the terms of the offer.

terms as a 'magus of the Nazarene', whose 'whole body has wasted away', with sunken cheeks and a body deeply wrinkled, not as a result of his asceticism, as many assume, but as a punishment from the gods for his impiety.¹⁴ Meletius was exiled twice under the emperor Valens (365–6 and 371–8), during which time Diodore and Flavian looked after his flock: forbidden to assemble within the city, they made numerous house-calls and gathered the congregation in the soldiers' training grounds outside the city walls, with Flavian providing the scriptural and theological arguments which Diodore then adorned with suitable rhetorical form.¹⁵ Diodore himself also suffered much during these years, and on at least one occasion, in 372, was driven out of the city, joining Meletius in Getasa in Armenia, where he met, and impressed, Basil of Caesarea.¹⁶ Basil, in a letter to Diodore in the following year, praised two writings Diodore had sent to him, the first more than the second, on account of its brevity and clarity, noting that the latter was 'much more elaborately adorned with rich diction, many figures, and niceties of dialogue, requiring considerable time to read and much mental labour, both to gather its meaning and retain it in memory'.¹⁷ Diodore was known as a prolific writer of diverse works, from dogmatic and apologetic treatises to astronomical and chronological works, and especially scriptural commentaries, though all that now remains of this literary output is his *Commentary on the Psalms* and the extracts preserved in other writers.

During these years Theodore of Mopsuestia also appeared on the ecclesiastical scene in Antioch. Born in Antioch, Theodore remained there to study with Libanius, where he counted among his fellow students John Chrysostom and Maximus (later bishop of Seleucia in Isauria).¹⁸ At some point, aged around 20, Theodore, together with Maximus, was persuaded by John to join him in entering the ascetic community (*ἀσκητήριον*) in Antioch led by Diodore and Carterius. Theodore gave himself over to study and ascetic discipline wholeheartedly, until his attention was captivated by a girl called Hermione, leading him to abandon the school, return to the world, and contemplate marriage. Theodore's lapse caused much consternation among his fellow

¹⁴ Julian, *Ep.* 55 (Facundus *Pro def.* 4.2.61–4).

¹⁵ Theodoret, *H.e.* 4.25.1–5; John Chrysostom, *Diod.* ¹⁶ Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 99.3.

¹⁷ Basil, *Ep.* 135.1. ¹⁸ Socrates, *H.e.* 6.3; Sozomen, *H.e.* 8.2.

students and teachers, who offered many prayers on his behalf and expended much effort to persuade him to return. It also elicited two lengthy letters from John Chrysostom to Theodore on the occasion of his fall. Theodore returned to the ascetic school, and devoted himself to its discipline with renewed vigour. It is probably during the early 370s that Theodore composed his own *Commentary on the Psalms*, a work much influenced by Diodore, but whose immaturity he later came to acknowledge,¹⁹ and perhaps also his *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*.²⁰

During the course of the 370s Basil of Caesarea became increasingly concerned with the schism in Antioch and actively engaged himself in trying to bring about its resolution, deploying all his diplomatic effort on behalf of Meletius' claim to the see.²¹ In the middle of the decade the situation at Antioch became yet more complex. Vitalis, one of Meletius' presbyters, began to come under the influence of Apollinarius of Laodicea, and perhaps because of a letter from Basil to Meletius warning him that Apollinarius seemed to 'approximate to the impiety of Sabellius', Vitalis came to be regarded with some suspicion.²² Events flared up when Flavian prevented Vitalis from having his customary meeting with Meletius.²³ In 376 Vitalis travelled to Rome, no doubt hoping to ingratiate himself with Pope Damasus. He presented the pope with a statement of faith emphasizing the unity

¹⁹ Cf. Facundus, *Pro def.* 3.6.13–14 (FT 8 below).

²⁰ Cf. R. C. Hill (trans.), *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, FC 108 (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press of America, 2004), 4.

²¹ According to Socrates (*H.e.* 4.26.11), it was Meletius who ordained Basil to the rank of deacon. Basil was distinctly suspicious of Paulinus, though not until the final stages of his correspondence with the West does he finally reveal that this has to do not simply with the question of Paulinus' ordination, but because he shows an inclination towards the teaching of Marcellus of Ancyra, who did not 'confess the Son in his proper hypostasis' nor does his teaching admit that 'the Paraclete subsists particularly'. Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 263.5. For the various embassies and epistles sent by Basil to Rome and Alexandria, and their responses, during this period, see P. Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 294–317; Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 106–17.

²² Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 129.1. It was during the course of his falling-out with Eustathius of Sebaste, involving correspondence that Basil had had with Apollinarius some twenty years earlier, that Basil came to learn of the problems with Apollinarius' theology; after reading some of Apollinarius' writings sent to him by an unnamed person with whom, in the same context, he says that he is in communion (*Ep.* 244.3). It is possible that his informant was Diodore, who, as we shall see, was possibly also the source of Gregory of Nazianzus' knowledge of Apollinarius' errors a few years later.

²³ Cf. Sozomen, *H.e.* 6.25.1–4.

of the one Christ,²⁴ and returned to Antioch bearing a letter from Damasus addressed to Paulinus, confirming Vitalis' orthodoxy, but leaving it to Paulinus whether or not to accept him. Upon his return to Antioch, however, Vitalis did not join Paulinus' community, but was instead consecrated by Apollinarius as bishop of Antioch (in addition, that is, to the two pro-Nicene bishops, Meletius and Paulinus, and the non-Nicene Euzoius). Soon after Vitalis' departure from Rome, Damasus' suspicions were raised and so he sent two more letters to Paulinus, the second of which emphasized the Nicene Creed as the standard of faith and the further need to affirm both the unity of the one Jesus Christ, that is, that the one from before all ages is not other than the one born from the Virgin, and also that Christ had assumed the completeness of human nature—body, soul, and mind.²⁵ Epiphanius also visited Antioch at this time and reports that, when questioned about their faith, Paulinus was able to produce as evidence his subscription to the *Tome to the Antiochenes*, while Vitalis balked at affirming that Christ assumed a human mind.²⁶ From this point on concern with the teaching of Apollinarius and his disciples comes to be focused on the claim that the Word took the place of the mind in Christ.

Although the presence of a third pro-Nicene bishop in Antioch did not help, all attention at the end of the 370s was focused on Paulinus and Meletius. When Meletius returned from his final exile in 378, he seems to have begun seeking ways of reconciling this division in Antioch.²⁷ Although the report is often dismissed by modern historians, Socrates recounts that an agreement was finally reached between Paulinus and Meletius, such that whoever should survive the other would assume full possession of the see, with all the possible candidates in both factions, including Flavian, taking an oath that they would abide by this pact.²⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus, a contemporary witness, also alludes to such an arrangement.²⁹ In 378 Diodore was ordained as bishop of Tarsus, and it is in this capacity that he attended a council held in Antioch under Meletius in the autumn of 379. This council brought

²⁴ Probably the statement of faith preserved by Cyril of Alexandria (ed. Lietzmann, *Apollinarius*, 273; trans. and comment in Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 383–5).

²⁵ Damasus, *Per filium meum* (PL 13.356–7).

²⁶ Epiphanius, *Haer.* 77.20–4.

²⁷ Gregory of Nazianzus (*De vita sua* 1573–7) suggests that it was Meletius' own 'reconciliatory advice' that had led to a resolution.

²⁸ Socrates, *H.e.* 6.5.

²⁹ Gregory of Nazianzus, *De vita sua* 1625.

together a significant number of pro-Nicene Eastern bishops, with an eye to signalling to the newly appointed emperor Theodosius the broad scope of support for a pro-Nicene policy. The council received a compilation of texts, assembled by Pope Damasus from letters sent over the previous years and authorized by a Roman synod of ninety-three bishops, acceptance of which was a condition of re-establishing communion with Rome.³⁰ This *Exemplum synodi* was accepted by the Antiochene Council, signed by seven named bishops, including Meletius and Diodore, and 146 other bishops whose names are said to be on file in the archives of the Roman church. The council also issued its own undoubtedly pro-Nicene *Tomos*, which is no longer extant. The reception by Rome of the *Exemplum synodi*, as signed by the Antiochenes and others, entailed recognition by Rome of Meletius as a legitimate bishop of Antioch. Whether the West had expected this response from Antioch or not, the opening had been given, and so Meletius and Paulinus were brought into communion with each other through Rome, thus legitimizing the ‘pact’ between them, or ‘creating’ it if they had not personally established it nor actually communed with each other.³¹

To further prepare the way for a pro-Nicene settlement, the Council of Antioch commissioned Gregory of Nazianzus to go to Constantinople, ‘to defend the Word’ against a new teaching being spread by a group of bishops, a heresy which Gregory begins by describing in terms of ‘Apollinarianism’, the teaching that in Christ the Word of God had replaced a human mind.³² Gregory had until recently been in retreat in Seleucia, and it is likely that it was Diodore, now bishop of the nearby see of Tarsus, who had informed him of the debate regarding the person of Christ in the Antiochene vicinity and the problems with Apollinarius’ teaching.³³ However, it seems that Gregory was equally wary of Diodore and his teaching, for he continues his assessment by commenting that the Apollinarian teaching makes ‘a similar mistake, but in the opposite way, to those who

³⁰ For an edition, translation, and thorough analysis of this document and its history see L. L. Field, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius: Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis LX, with a Critical Edition and Translation*, PIMS Studies and Texts, 145 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004).

³¹ Cf. *ibid.* 192.

³² Gregory of Nazianzus, *De vita sua* 607–31.

³³ Cf. C. Beeley, *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God: In Your Light Shall We See Light*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 33–4.

unthinkingly posit two Sons, one issuing from God and the other from the Virgin'.³⁴ And, in fact, when he arrived in Constantinople, Gregory did not so much carry out the agenda of the Council of Antioch, but rather highlighted the danger of dividing the one Christ: after rallying the pro-Nicene Christians there with an orthodox confession of the Trinity, Gregory turned to the Christological dispute, first criticizing those who would divide the one Christ into 'two sons' before turning to those who teach that Christ did not assume a human mind.³⁵ Only having addressed this point does Gregory then turn to the problem of resolving the claims to the episcopal throne of Antioch.³⁶

Diodore attended the Council of Constantinople in 381, presided over by Meletius. When Meletius died suddenly during its proceedings, Gregory, now bishop of Constantinople, took his place. But when the question turned to the succession in Antioch, the council disintegrated into chaos. According to Gregory, it was neither Meletius (now dead) nor Paulinus who were the cause of this, but certain 'power-seekers on both sides . . . looking after their own interests nicely among friends', 'raging against each other with great bitterness . . . in a frenzy for power, for sole power'.³⁷ Almost certainly among these, if not at their head, was Diodore. Gregory pressed the case for Paulinus, as now the sole bishop of Antioch and legitimate occupant according to the terms of the 'pact'. But this was unacceptable to the majority of the council, and so Gregory resigned from his position as president of the council and retired to his country house, swearing never

³⁴ Gregory of Nazianzus, *De vita sua* 632–4, a theme continuing to 651; when Gregory catalogues all the heresies later on in the poem (1184–5), he lists the error of Diodore before that of Apollinarius.

³⁵ Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus *Or.* 22.13; according to J. McGuckin (*Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2001), 248), this would be the second oration he delivered (following *Or.* 20) after his arrival in Constantinople.

³⁶ Cf. C. Beeley, *Gregory*, 35, 137–8; id., 'Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory of Nazianzus', forthcoming in *VC*. 'In his accounts of the situation in 379, Gregory disagrees strongly with the Christological position of his Antiochene sponsors. He not only calls them to account for the errors being propagated by Diodore—to the point of making the astonishing claim that Diodore's Christological debate with Apollinarius is more detrimental to the unity of the faith than the Antiochene schism . . . we may also detect a subtle indication that he regards the Antiochene problem as worse than the Apollinarian.' Gregory, of course, aware of the political realities of the day, does not mention Diodore by name.

³⁷ Gregory of Nazianzus, *De vita sua* 1551–71.

to attend a council of bishops again.³⁸ At Diodore's prompting, Nectarius, a prominent civil servant, but an unbaptized catechumen, was appointed as archbishop of Constantinople and president of the council.³⁹ Diodore's prominence and influence in the Eastern ecclesial scene was recognized by the emperor Theodosius: after the conclusion of the council, he issued an edict (*Episcopis tradis*, 30 July 381) confirming its position and naming Diodore, along with a number of other bishops, as ones who were to be regarded as episcopal norms of orthodoxy.⁴⁰ Whether Flavian was in fact appointed as the bishop of Antioch by the Council of Constantinople itself is unclear. But it was Diodore again who took the initiative: together with Acacius of Beroea, he went to Antioch to ordain his old friend Flavian as the bishop of the church there, causing divisions in the city to continue for a couple more decades and dividing the Christian East into competing support for the two claimants to the see. Rome, together with the Western bishops, took a stronger step, sending their synodical epistles to Paulinus and breaking communion with Diodore and Acacius.⁴¹ As Phalerius attended a council in Constantinople in 394 as bishop of Tarsus, it is generally assumed that Diodore died in the early 390s.

Theodore's connection with Diodore seems to have come to an end in 378, when Diodore was ordained as bishop of Tarsus. Theodore was ordained to the priesthood in 383, almost certainly by Flavian, the long-time colleague of Diodore and whose 'most loving disciple' he now became.⁴² According to Gennadius, it was as a presbyter in Antioch that Theodore wrote his great treatise *On the Incarnation of the Lord*.⁴³ During these years Theodore no doubt also continued his work of producing commentaries on the

³⁸ Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *ibid.* 1797–1918; *Or.* 42; *Ep.* 130.

³⁹ Cf. Sozomen, *H.e.* 7.8. ⁴⁰ *Cod. Theod.* 16.1.3.

⁴¹ Sozomen, *H.e.* 7.11: the churches in Egypt, Arabia, and Cyprus recognized Paulinus; those in Syria, Palestine, Cappadocia, Galatia, and Pontus sided with Flavian. Hanson, *Search*, 810, and McGuckin, *Gregory*, 351, mistakenly describing Flavian as a presbyter of Paulinus, suggest that his appointment kept to the spirit of the pact.

⁴² The date of Theodore's ordination is based on the comment of John of Antioch, in a letter to Proclus (preserved by Facundus, *Pro def.* 2.2.11) that he served for 45 years; the description of his relation to Flavian is from a letter of John to Theodosius (*ibid.* 2.2.12–15).

⁴³ Gennadius *Vit. ill.* 12.

Old Testament and developed his skill as a preacher. It is possible that Theodore took refuge with Diodore for a period, and it is almost certainly by the arrangement of Diodore that Theodore was consecrated as bishop of Mopsuestia in 392, where he served for thirty-six years until his death, continuing the fight against the teachings of both Arius and Eunomius and also that of Apollinarius.⁴⁴ During these years he maintained a warm correspondence with John Chrysostom, impressed the emperor Theodosius with his oratory, when Theodore had to occasion to preach in Constantinople whilst attending a council there in 394, and, according to Ibas, became 'the herald of the truth and teacher of the church', who 'not only converted his own city from error to the truth but also instructed far distant churches by his teaching'.⁴⁵ Theodore's episcopacy seems to have been full—preaching, teaching, and writing (his *Catechetical Homilies* almost certainly date from this period)—but also tranquil, for as bishop of a minor see, he does not seem to have become embroiled in any controversy. He did, however, give refuge for a few years to Julian of Eclanum and others who had refused to subscribe to the condemnation of Pelagianism in 417, this most likely being the occasion for Theodore's book *Against the Defenders of Original Sin*. In his last years, according to ancient reports, Theodore entertained Nestorius himself, who is said to have stopped in Mopsuestia, on his way from Antioch to Constantinople, to take counsel with the great teacher. The reports, however, are rather vague, and are probably designed to demonstrate Theodore's role as the teacher of Nestorius.⁴⁶ Theodore died in 428, the very year that Nestorius

⁴⁴ An extract from Hesychius of Jerusalem's *Ecclesiastical History* read at the Council of Constantinople in 553 (*ACO* 4.1, p. 90) reports that Theodore left Antioch for Tarsus from which he moved to Mopsuestia when ordained as bishop. It is with Theodore's activity in Mopsuestia that Theodoret ends his *Historia ecclesiastica* (5.40).

⁴⁵ For Chrysostom's continued affection for Theodore, see *Ep.* 204, 212; for Theodosius' commendation of Theodore, see the letter of John of Antioch preserved by Facundus (*Pro def.* 2.2.12–15); for bibliographical information about Ibas' letter to Mari see Chap. 3, n. 21 below.

⁴⁶ The report is given by Evagrius, *He.* 1.2, who gives as his source a letter of a certain Theodulus, whom W. Ensslin ('Theodulus', 28, in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* [2] 10 [1934], 1967) identifies as a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia, on the basis of the description of a Theodulus in Gennadius (*Vir. ill.* 91) and Marcellinus Comes (*Chronicle*, year 178). Barhadbešabba, *He.* 2● (PO 9.519) also records that Nestorius broke his journey for two days in Mopsuestia to speak with Theodore.

ascended the throne in Constantinople, starting a train of events that would ultimately result in Theodore's and Diodore's condemnation.

II. DIODORE, MARCELLUS, AND THE 'SYNOUSIASTS'

That Theodore died in peace with the Church yet was condemned as a heretic a century later, with reluctance and opposition on the part of some, has given the impression, promoted in some ancient sources and frequently adopted in modern scholarship, that 'the affair of the Three Chapters' was primarily, if not solely, a politically motivated expediency, and has thus given occasion for attempts to rehabilitate 'Antiochene' Christology and exegesis. However, while Theodore developed his master's teaching in the peaceful minor see of Mopsuestia, Diodore spent the greater part of his life in Antioch, a hotbed of controversy, and was himself no stranger to controversy while there and after. Nevertheless, it is difficult to determine the sources for Diodore's theology, and likewise difficult, even with the sketch of his career that we have seen, to establish a chronological framework for his theological development.⁴⁷

Textbooks of historical theology often point to the challenge provided by Julian the Apostate as that which prompted Diodore to develop from a 'Word-flesh' Christology to an incipient 'Word-man' Christology (incipient because the human soul of Christ is not considered to be a 'theological factor' for Diodore, as it is for his pupil Theodore), and argue that this in turn prompted Apollinarius to respond with a strongly unitive 'Word-flesh' Christology.⁴⁸ Whether these are even suitable categories for schematizing the theological debates of the age, or whether rather they reflect modern concerns for 'bringing back the historical

⁴⁷ We have no information about what kind of theological formation Diodore would have had with Silvanus, whose 'nursling' Diodore was according to Basil (*Ep.* 244.3); and Jerome's comment that Diodore followed the 'meaning' of Eusebius of Emesa in his scriptural commentaries, but lacked his eloquence because of his ignorance of secular literature, is likewise unhelpful (*Vix ill.* 119).

⁴⁸ See e.g. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 290-1, 301-3, and Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol.1, pp. 352 ff.

Jesus', is debatable.⁴⁹ It seems plausible, given what we have seen, that Diodore and Apollinarius came into open conflict with each other only in the late 370s, that is, after Apollinarius had become involved in ecclesial affairs in Antioch, leading to an increasing suspicion of his teaching and ultimately its condemnation. It is generally reckoned that his writings against Diodore belong to this late period.⁵⁰ This being so, then, as has been recently and persuasively argued, Apollinarius' own formation does not lie in opposition to Diodore but is best understood as developing the tradition of theology that Eusebius of Caesarea pitted against Marcellus of Ancyra.⁵¹ This in turn offers us a lead for unearthing the roots of Diodore's own theology.

From the extracts that remain of his principal work, *Against Asterius*, it is clear that Marcellus held to a Christology and exegetical practice that seemed as 'divisive' to his opponents as Diodore's did to his. Marcellus states that his work offers 'seeds and principles of this exegesis', enabling others to provide further demonstrations from Scripture against any error.⁵² His practice was to differentiate between what Scripture attributes to the Word alone and what it attributes to 'the Word of God together with his human flesh': all the more recent names applied to him by Scripture, such as 'Jesus' and 'Christ', as well as 'Life', 'Way', 'Bread', and so on, derive 'from the new and recent dispensation of his flesh' and as such do not belong to the eternal state of the Word in the beginning with God.⁵³ Although the general lines of such an exegetical approach was common to the previous

⁴⁹ The words quoted are Kelly's, applauding Diodore (*Early Christian Doctrines*, 302). R. Greer, 'The Antiochene Christology of Diodore of Tarsus', *JTS* xs 17.2 (1966), 327-41, challenges the utility of such schematization for the analysis of Diodore.

⁵⁰ Fragments of Apollinarius' work *Πρὸς Διόδωρον ἢ τὸ κατὰ κεφάλαιον βιβλίον* can be found in Lietzmann, *Apollinarius*, 237-42 (frags. 122-46).

⁵¹ Cf. K. M. Spoerl, 'Apollinarian Christology'. For a full survey of the opposition to Marcellus, see J. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellus: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1999).

⁵² Marcellus, frag. 89. The extracts cited by Eusebius in his *Against Marcellus* and *On Ecclesiastical Theology* (cited here according to the numeration provided in the edition of these works by Klostermann and Hansen, 183-219), together with Marcellus' 'Letter to Julius', remain the basic source for our knowledge of Marcellus' theology, despite recent attempts to attribute certain anonymous or pseudonymous fourth-century texts to Marcellus. For a survey of these texts see Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, 19-27.

⁵³ Cf. Marcellus, frags. 42, 43, 49.

tradition, and was at that time being used by Athanasius as a mainstay of his argument against the Arians, it has a particular twist in Marcellus that has dramatic consequences.⁵⁴ Athanasius, for instance, differentiates between what is said of Christ as God (theology) and what is said of him as human (economy): one and the same subject *is* divine—the Son, Word, Image, and Wisdom of God—who has *become* human, taking upon himself our condition to effect our salvation. Thus Athanasius can say, on a theological level, that 'if the Son as offspring is other [than the Father], yet as God he is the same'.⁵⁵ Marcellus, on the other hand, holds that it is only as incarnate that we can speak of the Son as other than God. This means, first, that for Marcellus the Word who was 'in the beginning with God' was only an 'efficient force' (*δραστική ἐνέργεια*) active in creation, not a separate or distinct *hypostasis* (or even *ousia*), as his opponents maintained.⁵⁶ This refusal to recognize a divine Son earned for Marcellus the sobriquet 'Sabellius' and provoked a series of fourth-century tracts 'Against Sabellius'.⁵⁷

More important for our concerns is a second implication of Marcellus' exegetical practice, that is, that it leads him to speak not only of 'the flesh' which is united to the Word,⁵⁸ but much

⁵⁴ For the earlier tradition, see esp. Origen, *Princ.* 1.2.1, which asserts that it is necessary 'to know that the divine nature in Christ, as he is the only-begotten Son of the Father, is one, and the human nature, which he assumed in the last times for the economy, is another'; these two tasks are carried out in *Princ.* 1.2. and 2.6 respectively. Closely related to this is his analysis the titles of applied by Scripture to Jesus in terms of his various 'aspects' (*ἐπινοίαι*): some ('Word' 'Truth' 'Wisdom', etc.) pertain to Jesus in his divinity with the Father, others ('Physician' and 'Redemption') are ones he has assumed for the benefit of those yet unable to contemplate his divinity (cf. *Comm. in. Ia.* 1.123–4). Cf. Behr, *Way to Nicaea*, 181–4, 191–201.

⁵⁵ Athanasius *Ar.* 3.4.2. Despite this fundamental difference, it was likely from Marcellus that Athanasius had learnt the practice of differentiating between what is said of Christ as human from what is said of him as divine when they were both in exile in Rome in the early 340s. For Athanasius' exegetical practices, and the relation between theology and economy, see Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 208–15.

⁵⁶ Cf. Marcellus, frags. 52, 60. According to Marcellus (frag. 81), Narcissus of Neronias asserted that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three *ousiai*, in the sense of three beings.

⁵⁷ For a survey of these texts see Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, 210–40.

⁵⁸ Although the human soul of Christ had been an important issue for Eustathius of Antioch earlier, as we will see later, it does not seem to have played any significant role for Marcellus, though when he uses the term 'flesh' it is clearly not meant to refer to a soulless flesh.

more vividly of ‘the man’ who was united to, or assumed by, the Word. The classic incarnational text, ‘the Word became flesh’ (John 1:14), teaches, according to Marcellus, that ‘the man united to the Word’ (ὁ δὲ τῷ Λόγῳ ἐνωθεὶς ἄνθρωπος) did not previously exist.⁵⁹ The ‘beloved Son’ in whom God was well pleased (Matt. 3:17) refers to ‘the man united to the Word’.⁶⁰ Christ did not refer to himself as ‘Son of God’ but ‘Son of Man’, Marcellus suggests, ‘so that by this confession he might prepare the man by relation (θέσει) to become Son of God through his communion with him’.⁶¹ By relation to the Word, ‘the man’ becomes the Son of God, a title that does not belong to the Word. More specifically, it is ‘the man who had fallen through disobedience’ that he honoured, so as ‘to be conjoined (συναφθῆναι) to his own Word through the Virgin’.⁶² And to enable the man who was deceived by the devil to be able to conquer the devil in turn, ‘he assumed the man (ἀνείληφεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον) so as to prepare him in due course to receive the first-fruits of authority’. So strong is Marcellus’ sense of the reality of ‘the man’, that he underscores the conflict of wills between God and ‘the man’ in Gethsemane: ‘to say “let this cup pass” indicates disagreement, and what he added shows a complete absence of agreement, for he said “let not my will be done, Father, but yours”’.⁶³ When, on the other hand, Christ said ‘I and the Father are one’, he was not speaking of ‘the man whom he assumed’ (τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὃν ἀνείληφεν), but referring to ‘the Word who proceeded from the Father’; while the saying ‘all that the Father has is mine’ shows the Son grasping at what belongs to the Father.⁶⁴

Strictly speaking, Marcellus did not advocate a ‘dyoprosopic’ Christology, that is, one which would see two distinct *prosōpa* in Christ—the divine Word and ‘the man’—for it is only with ‘the man’ united to, conjoined with, or assumed by, the Word that the Word is distinct from God, for as divine the Word is one with God. Thus Marcellus insists that we cannot speak of the Word as being the image of God: ‘it is clear that when the holy apostle speaks of “the image of the invisible God” [Col. 1:15], he means the flesh, which became attached to the Word so that the invisible might be made manifest through the visible.’⁶⁵ However, assuming, as his

⁵⁹ Frag. 42.⁶⁰ Frag. 109.⁶¹ Frag. 41.⁶² Frag. 107.⁶³ Frag. 73; Matt. 26:39.⁶⁴ Frag. 74, John 10:30, 16:15.⁶⁵ Frag. 94.

opponents most certainly did, that the Word is a divine *hypostasis* or *prosōpon* in his own right prior to the Incarnation, Marcellus' statements would necessarily seem to posit an unacceptable 'dyoprosopic' division within the one Christ, affirming a (mere) human being alongside the divine Word.⁶⁶

It is likely that at least some of Marcellus' statements regarding 'the man' should be taken in a corporate sense, referring to the redeemed and re-created humanity that constitutes the Church, the body of Christ. Thus, for Marcellus Proverbs 8:22, 'The Lord created me', does not refer to 'the beginning of the divinity of our Saviour', but speaks rather of 'the second economy', the new order and life brought into being by our Saviour.⁶⁷ This one is thus called 'the firstborn of all creation' and also 'the firstborn of the dead' together, for he is 'the new man, in whom God willed to unite all things'.⁶⁸ And 'the foundation' mentioned in Proverbs 8:23 is again the foreordained economy of the flesh, there being no other foundation laid than Jesus Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 3:11), through whom he would 'call the race of godly men unto adoption'.⁶⁹ This qualification granted, however, the realistic picture of 'the man' as portrayed by Marcellus, together with the vocabulary of 'the man' being united to, conjoined with, or assumed by the Word, is a striking foreshadowing of what we find in Diodore.

This similarity raises the question of whether Diodore stands in a more specific tradition of theology than simply 'Antiochene', and one having roots going further back in history. A clue might be given by the title of his work: *Against the Synousiasts*. Apollinarius

⁶⁶ As Spoerl ('Apollinarian Christology', 558) comments: 'To begin with, I think that at least in the case of Marcellus . . . the perception of a dyoprosopic Christology results partly from projecting the grid of emerging Trinitarian orthodoxy onto his Christological reflection. . . . When one applies to his theory the view articulated in express opposition to him . . . the Christological equation inevitably concludes with a dyoprosopic conclusion: one divine *πρόσωπον* + one human *πρόσωπον* = two *πρόσωπα* in Christ.'

⁶⁷ Frags. 9, 12.

⁶⁸ Cf. frags. 2, 6; Col. 1:15, 18; Eph. 1:10, 2:15. Related to this is the question of the status of the flesh of Christ once it has become immortal in the Word (cf. frag. 121), about which Marcellus is vague, though he is clear that 'the man assumed by the Word of God' will be received by the heavens, to reign alongside the Father, until 'the end comes, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father' (1 Cor. 15:24), at which point creation itself is renewed by a perfect restoration, from slavery to freedom, and the economy of the flesh, which had a beginning in time, will come to an end (frag. 117).

⁶⁹ Frags. 17-20.

certainly used the vocabulary of *synousia*, and by the sixth century it would be assumed that Diodore refers to him.⁷⁰ But there is no indication that Diodore's *Against the Synousiasts* belongs to the late 370s: the extracts that remain give no suggestion that the presence or absence of a human soul in the Incarnate Christ was a matter of concern, which it certainly was by that date.⁷¹ Moreover, such vocabulary was not limited to Apollinarian circles. In fact, its first extensive employment in a Christological context was by those who condemned Paul of Samosata at the Council of Antioch in 268. Against what they perceived as Paul's reduction of Jesus Christ to the status of a mere human being, they argued that the Incarnation is best understood as an 'ensouling', with the Word taking the place of the human soul in Christ, so that the Word and the flesh are united essentially.⁷²

As we saw in the last chapter, there was a lengthy backlash at Antioch against the condemnation of Paul of Samosata, and the installation of the son of the previous bishop in his stead, during which Lucian (accepting the identification of Lucian the Martyr with the Lucian who was the rallying-point for the non-Nicenes) was excommunicated for the reign of three successive bishops. It was precisely for denying the presence of a human soul in Christ, taking the Incarnation as an 'ensouling' of the man, that the 'Lucianists' were chiefly known, a position which was resolutely opposed by Eustathius of Antioch.⁷³ As we also saw in Chapter 1,

⁷⁰ The fragments of Diodore provided by Leontius are said to come from his work *Against the Synousiasts*; an extract provided by the fourth session of Constantinople, mistakenly attributed to Theodore (see below C4T 28), is said to be 'from the book *Against the Synousiasts or Apollinarians*'. The similarity of material argues that the extensive collection of extracts of Diodore provided by *Cod. Add.* 12156 comes from the same work.

⁷¹ M. Richard dates Diodore's *Against the Synousiasts* to the late 370s, during the time of his episcopate and probably after the Council of Antioch in 379. Cf. id., 'L'Introduction du mot "hypostase" dans la théologie de l'incarnation', *MSR* 2 (1945), 5-32, 243-70, at 12.

⁷² Eusebius, *He.* 7.29-30. The language of '*synousia*' is found in the Acts of the Council of Antioch, which are, however, first cited by Eusebius of Dorylaeum in 428/9, so raising the much-debated question of whether they are in fact Apollinarian forgeries. This material can be found in Riedmatten, *Acts du Procès*. As an example, Paul's opponents said (S 34): 'He was formed, in the first instance, as a man in the womb, and, in the second instance, God was in the womb co-substantiated with the human (Θεὸς ἦν ἐν γαστρὶ συνουσιωμένος τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ).' Cf. Behr, *Way to Nicaea*, 225-35.

⁷³ Epiphanius, *Anc.* 33 (PG 43.77a); this is the one aspect of their teaching that Hanson (*Search*, 83) regards as 'indisputable'.

Eusebius of Caesarea attended the Council of Nicaea under a cloud, as he had been excommunicated by a council in Antioch in previous year, the same council that had appointed Eustathius as bishop of Antioch, and directed that Eusebius' case would be re-examined at a council to be held shortly in Ancyra, the see of Marcellus. However, the location of the council was changed to Nicaea, and shortly afterwards both Eustathius and Marcellus discovered that the tables had turned: Eustathius found himself deposed at a council held in Antioch in 327, presided over by Eusebius, and Marcellus was condemned for heresy by a council in Constantinople in July 336. This remarkable turn of events was then supplemented by Eusebius before his death a few years later, by two works, *Against Marcellus* and *On Ecclesiastical Theology*, in which Eusebius likens Marcellus to Paul of Samosata, and redeploys the arguments and position raised against Paul earlier. It is Eusebius' theology that Apollinarius, it is argued, further developed.

Diodore, as we have seen, makes his first appearance in the following decade, in the 340s. Although his first recorded act was to threaten to break communion with Leontius of Antioch when the latter ordained Aetius to the diaconate, and to publicize this action in the West, Diodore's relations with Leontius must have been one of expediency rather than shared theological outlook, for at that time there was no obvious leader for those in Antioch loyal to the memory of Eustathius, and it was under the pro-Nicene Meletius that Diodore was ordained some twenty years later. If the roots of Apollinarius' teaching lie in the 'anti-Marcellian' theology of Eusebius of Caesarea, as has been argued, it is possible that Diodore was tapping into a tradition that had been shaped by its opposition to the Council of Antioch in 268 (though not, of course, claiming to follow Paul!) and which had previously found expression in both Eustathius and Marcellus. This tradition took seriously the human character of Jesus but also, now in the second half of the fourth century, the full divinity of the Son and Word of God, and, as a result of other pressures, which we shall now consider, differentiated between them as two distinct *prosōpa*.

III. JULIAN, DIODORE, AND THEODORE ON EXEGESIS AND THE UNITY OF CHRIST

If Marcellus seemed to others to present a 'dyoprosopic' Christ, Diodore, judging from the extracts collected in this volume, did so resolutely. This partly results from his position on the other side of an emerging grid of Trinitarian theology, the development of which has been frequently studied. Another factor that may have pushed him in this direction, however, is the vigorous challenge raised by the apostate emperor. In fact, Julian's sarcastic description of Diodore noted above comes from his letter to Photinus, Marcellus' extreme disciple. And in this letter Julian also touches upon issues that would become central to Diodore's theology and the controversy surrounding him. He praises Photinus for holding that 'he whom one holds to be a god can by no means be brought into the womb', while Diodore, on the other hand, that 'magus of the Nazarene, when he tries to give point to that nonsensical theory about the womb by artifices and juggler's tricks, is clearly a sharp-witted sophist of that creed of the country folk'.⁷⁴ Julian also announces his intention to show that 'that new-fangled Galilaeen god of his, whom he by a myth styles eternal, has been stripped by his humiliating death and burial of the divinity falsely ascribed to him by Diodore'.

It was in Antioch itself, during the winter nights of 362/3, that Julian laboured to produce his three books *Against the Galilaeans*.⁷⁵ The purpose of this work, Julian says, is 'to set forth to all mankind the reasons by which I was convinced that the fabrication (*σκευωρία*) of the Galilaeans is a fiction (*πλάσμα*) of men composed by wickedness'.⁷⁶ In the same way that, as we saw in the last chapter, Eustathius of Antioch took Origen to court for his allegorical reading of the witch of Endor (offering a supposedly more 'literal' reading that is in fact supremely figurative), Julian also presented his case against Christianity as set in 'a court of law', dealing with 'all the dogmas, as they call them', so that his opponents must respond to his charges before they bring in

⁷⁴ Julian, *Ep.* 55 (Facundus *Pro def.* 4.2.61-4).

⁷⁵ Libanius, *Or.* 18.178-9. ⁷⁶ Julian, *Gal.* 39ab.

any counter-charges.⁷⁷ Although the complete work is no longer extant, he outlines his work in terms of a threefold case: first, regarding human conceptions of the divine; second, comparing Greek and Jewish understandings of God; and third, investigating how Christians, while they prefer Jewish beliefs, have abandoned these and followed their own way.⁷⁸

In the course of this work Julian elaborates two points that are significant for our understanding of Diodore and Theodore: first, the nature of religious language as mythic; and second, the unity of the person of Christ. Regarding the first, Julian unequivocally affirms that 'it is true that the Hellenes invented their myths (τοὺς μύθους ἔπλασαν) about the gods'.⁷⁹ For Julian, it is unquestionable that narratives regarding the gods were written in a mythic manner, so that they lead those capable of a higher understanding to be enlightened by penetrating the veil of these myths.⁸⁰ Julian continues by giving examples of the way in which the activities of the Greek gods are described, and then compares this to the writings of Moses, who describes, for instance, how God planted a garden and set Adam to work in it; his conclusion is that 'such things are wholly mythic (μυθῶδη παντελῶς)'. Julian specifically mentions the conversation between the serpent and Eve (something that Diodore takes up), asking what kind of language it was that the serpent used. Again, his comparison leads him to ask: 'in what do such things as these differ from the

⁷⁷ Julian, *Gal.* 41e. It is also worth recalling that Meletius' first exile had resulted from a similar competitive context. For the ἀγών, the 'trial', as the site of exegetical disputes, see M. Mitchell, 'Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory'.

⁷⁸ Julian, *Gal.* 42e–43a. For an analysis of this work, see Rowland Smith, *Julian's Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate* (London: Routledge, 1995), 189–218.

⁷⁹ Julian, *Gal.* 44a.

⁸⁰ Speaking of Iamblichus, Julian comments: 'He does not treat all kinds of myth, but rather, those concerning initiation into the Mysteries. . . . For it is the incongruous element in myths that lead us to the truth. The more paradoxical and outrageous a riddle is, the more it seems to tell us not to trust in the words themselves, but rather to direct our efforts to the hidden, and not to give up until they are plain, until they initiate, or rather perfect, our intelligence' (*Or.* 7.217cd). As Rowland comments (*Julian's Gods*, 122), 'the clear message is that Mystery doctrines are a kind of myth and that the most appropriate interpretation of them is an allegorical exegesis of the type accorded to myth'. Cf. *Or.* 5, 170–9; *Caesars* 306c; *Or.* 7, 206c, 216c, 220. For the background of this approach, see R. Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), D. Dawson, *Allegorical Readers*.

myths invented (*πεπλασμένων μύθων*) by the Hellenes?⁸¹ After giving more examples from Genesis, Julian concludes: ‘unless every one of these is a myth having an ineffable contemplation (*μῦθος ἔχων θεωρίαν ἀπόρρητον*), as I indeed believe, they are filled with many blasphemous sayings about God.’⁸² Literature about the gods is, for Julian, properly mythic, needing to be read with a proper ‘contemplation’ (*θεωρία*).

Regarding the person of Christ, Julian refers to the Mosaic prescription to believe in only one God, and contrasts this to the Christian belief, following the evangelist John, that the Word was with God and was God. Anticipating a discussion resumed later, he adds ‘whether this is he who was born of Mary or someone else (*εἴτε ὁ ἐκ Μαρίας γεννηθεὶς εἴτε ἄλλος τίς ἐστίν*)’ is an issue that he will leave to the Christians to dispute.⁸³ Julian instead turns to the claim that believing Christ to be ‘God’ is justified by Isaiah’s words, ‘Behold the virgin shall conceive and bear a son’ (Isa. 7:14). Even accepting that this refers to Mary (which he doubts, as, if she has given birth, he argues, she cannot be a virgin), the text does not speak of the one born of her as ‘God’. ‘Why do you not cease to call Mary Theotokos’, he asks, if the one born of her is said to be ‘the only-begotten Son of God’ (John 1:18) or ‘the firstborn of all creation’?⁸⁴ On the other hand, even if, as Christians affirm, the Word is ‘God from God and proceeded from the substance of the Father’, the virgin still should not be called ‘Theotokos’, he argues, ‘for how could she bear a god since she is, according to you, a human being?’⁸⁵ It is thus not so much the idea of a god coming down from heaven to earth that causes Julian difficulty,⁸⁶ but the notion of ‘incarnation’, that God could ‘become flesh’, that is, be subject to passibility, and that the one from whom he is born would remain a virgin.

Besides the Christian claims to an ‘incarnate God’, Julian also points out discrepancies in the accounts given by Christians for the identification of Jesus Christ as the Word of God, indicating that some were seeking to soften this proclamation by introducing a distinction. Julian notes that neither Paul nor the

⁸¹ Julian, *Gal.* 75b.

⁸² *Ibid. Gal.* 94a.

⁸³ *Ibid. Gal.* 262c.

⁸⁴ *Ibid. Gal.* 262d.

⁸⁵ *Ibid. Gal.* 276e.

⁸⁶ Cf. *ibid.* 138a, where Julian discusses how God came down to confound the languages of the human race.

evangelists Matthew, Luke, or Mark, called Jesus ‘God’.⁸⁷ This began, he claims, with John, who was motivated to do so because he had heard that even the tombs of Peter and Paul were being worshipped. John, Julian points out, called the Word ‘God’, and says that ‘the Word became flesh’ (John 1:14), ‘but does not say how, because he was ashamed’. However, Julian points to a subtlety in John’s account:

Nowhere does he call him either Jesus or Christ, so long as he calls him God and the Word, but as it were insensibly and secretly he steals away our ears, and says that John the Baptist bore this witness on behalf of Jesus Christ, that in very truth he it is whom we must believe to be the God Word.

Accepting, as Julian does, that John does in fact say this of Jesus Christ, he notes that nevertheless, ‘certain of the impious think that Jesus Christ is one and another is the Word proclaimed by John (ἄλλον μὲν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Χριστόν, ἄλλον δὲ τὸν ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου κηρυττόμενον Λόγον)’. But this is not the case, Julian points out, ‘for he whom John himself calls the God Word, this is he who, says he, was recognized by John the Baptist to be Jesus Christ’. Yet at the same time, John ‘quietly and insensibly’ introduces the crowning words of his impiety by adding, ‘No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him’ (John 1:18). But if this one is ‘the God Word become flesh, the only-begotten Son in the bosom of the Father’, then Christians have indeed beheld God, ‘for he dwelt among you and you beheld his glory’ (John 1:19). Alternatively, ‘if the only begotten Son is one and the God Word another (εἶ δὲ ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μονογενῆς Υἱὸς, ἕτερος δὲ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος), as I have heard from certain of your sect, then it appears that not even John made that rash statement.’

As far as we know, Diodore never composed a direct rebuttal of Julian’s tomes. However, the issues he raised are clearly ones with which Diodore grappled. We can see this from the extracts of Diodore preserved by later writers (and collected in Part II below), which primarily concern the relationship between the God Word and the man born of Mary, and from the preface to his *Commentary on the Psalms* and his introductory words on Psalm 118, both of which tackle the nature of scriptural language and its proper

⁸⁷ Ibid. 327a–333d.

exegesis.⁸⁸ In the preface Diodore states his intention to treat the Psalms ‘according to the *historia* and the text (κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ τὴν λέξιν)’. This will not, he claims, impede offering an ‘anagogy and a higher contemplation (θεωρίαν)’, for the *historia* is not opposed to this, but rather undergirds it, as its basis and foundation. The one thing, he continues, that must be guarded against is anything that might overturn or discard the foundation, for that would not be contemplation but allegory.⁸⁹ According to Diodore, this is how the Greeks use ‘allegory’, as ‘something understood in one way but said in another’.⁹⁰ He gives as an example the myths that speak of Hera as the wife and sister of Zeus: here the text (ἢ λέξις) implies that Zeus had intercourse with his sister, but the text is allegorized to speak of ether mixing with air to produce a mixture which influences events on earth. Diodore insists that, despite using the word ‘allegory’, Paul does something quite different with respect to Sarah and Hagar (Gal. 4:22–31): ‘with the *historia* laid out, he theorizes and relates the things lying before him to higher things. This contemplation the apostle calls “allegory”’.⁹¹ The prior *historia* remains intact, and the apostle ‘theorizes’ or contemplates other similar realities (ἀλλὰ ὅμοια πράγματα), that is, compares it to similar things, events or figures,

⁸⁸ Only the preface and commentary on Ps. 1–50 have been critically edited and translated (ed. J.-M. Olivier, *Diodori Tarsensis commentarii in Psalmos*, vol. 1: *Commentarius in Psalmos I–L* (CCSG 6; Turnhout: Brepols, 1980), trans. R. C. Hill, *Diodore of Tarsus: Commentary on Psalms 1–51*, WGRW (Atlanta, Ga: SBL, 2005)); the prologue to Ps. 118 was edited by L. Mariès, ‘Extraits du commentaire de Diodore de Tarse sur les Psaumes: preface du commentaire—prologue du Psaume CXVIII’, *RSR* 9 (1919), 79–101. A translation of both the preface to the *Commentary* and the prologue to Ps. 118 can be found in K. Froehlich, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

⁸⁹ Preface (Olivier, 7.125–132; Hill, 4): . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ τὴν λέξιν αὐτὴν ἐκθροσόμεθα καὶ τὴν ἀναγωγὴν καὶ τὴν θεωρίαν τὴν ὑψηλοτέραν οὐκ ἀποκωλύσομεν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐναντιοῦται ἡ ἱστορία τῇ ὑψηλοτέρᾳ θεωρίᾳ, τοῦναντίον δὲ κρηπίς εὐρίσκειται καὶ ὑποβάθρα τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων νοημάτων. Ἐκεῖνο δὲ μόνον χρὴ φυλάττεσθαι, μὴ ποτε ἀνατροπὴ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου ἢ θεωρία ὀφθῆ, ὅπερ οὐκ ἐτί ἂν εἴη θεωρία ἀλλ’ ἀλληγορία. Given the observations by recent scholars (e.g. Young, quoted in Chap. 1, n. 106), I will transliterate the term ἱστορία rather than translate it as ‘history’.

⁹⁰ Ibid. (Mariès, 90.11–12; Froehlich, 87): Ἐλληνες μὲν γὰρ ἀλληγορίαν ὀνομάζουσα πρᾶγμα ἄλλως μὲν νοοῦμενον, ἄλλως δὲ ἀγορευόμενον.

⁹¹ Ibid. (Mariès, 92.4–6; Froehlich, 88): Κεϊμένης οὖν τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπεθεώρησε καὶ ἐξέλαβεν εἰς ὑψηλότερα πράγματα τὰ προουκείμενα. Ταύτην οὖν τὴν ἐπιθεωρίαν ὁ ἀπόστολος ἀλληγορίαν καλεῖ, . . .

in other *historias*.⁹² Thus rather than allegorizing ‘abyss’ as demons and ‘dragon’ as the devil, and so effectively removing the original realities from the *historia*, Diodore urges us ‘to contemplate respectfully and to elevate the ideas to a higher anagogy (σεμνῶς ἐπιθεωρεῖν καὶ εἰς ἀναγωγὴν ὑψηλοτέραν ἀποφέρειν τὰ νοήματα)’, comparing, for instance, Cain and Abel to the Jewish Synagogue and the Church; this neither discards the original *historia* nor introduces alien ideas, yet still offers a higher understanding than is possible under a slavish adherence to the letter.⁹³

Diodore takes the talking serpent in Genesis, mentioned by Julian, not as an allegory but as an ‘enigma’. Even so, his concern is again that the original reality (πράγμα) of the text remains intact: the text indeed has a serpent through which the devil speaks, for, he argues, had it been allegory ‘only the word “serpent” would have been used’.⁹⁴ Although Genesis in fact only uses the word ‘serpent’ (and not also ‘devil’), Diodore’s point is that, instead of being an allegorical cipher indicating something else, the serpent is and must remain a reality of the *historia*. As Diodore concludes: ‘the truth is that there was both a reality and an enigma: the reality was the serpent, but since the serpent is by nature irrational and yet was speaking, it is obvious that it spoke empowered by the devil.’⁹⁵ Even if it is evident that his own presuppositions lead him to this conclusion, the connection of the devil to the serpent ultimately rests, as Diodore continues, upon the authority of Christ: he alone ‘has the authority to reveal mysteries and enigmas’ and has pointed out that the devil is a liar and the father of lies (John 8:44). While the prophets and apostles, according to Diodore, speak of realities (πράγματα), the ability to open up enigmas within the Scriptures in this way resides solely with the Lord.⁹⁶

⁹² Ibid. (Mariès, 90.27–8; Froehlich, 88): *Ἱστορίαν προουποκειμένην μὲν οὐδαμῶς ἀναιρεῖ, ἐπιθεωρεῖ δὲ ἄλλα ὅμοια πράγματα, οὐκ ἀναιρουμένης τῆς ἱστορίας.*

⁹³ Preface (Olivier, 7–8; Hill, 4–5).

⁹⁴ *Comm. in Ps. 118* (Mariès, 94.17–20; Froehlich, 90): *Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐκ ἦν ὄφεις, ἀλλ’ ἦν μὲν καὶ ὄφεις, ἐνήργει δὲ διὰ τοῦ ὄφειος ὁ διάβολος. Λέγει οὖν τὸν μὲν ὄφιν ὡς φανερόν, τὸν δὲ διάβολον λαθραίως αἰνίττεται. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἀλληγορία, ὄνομα μόνον ἐχρῆν εἶναι ὄφειος, καθὼς εἴρηται.*

⁹⁵ Ibid. (Mariès, 94.20–3; Froehlich, 90): *Νῦν δέ, κατὰ τὸ ἀληθές, καὶ πρᾶγμα ἦν καὶ αἰνίγμα: πρᾶγμα μὲν ὁ ὄφεις, ἐπειδὴ δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἄλογον ἐστὶν ὁ ὄφεις, ἐφθέγγετο δέ, εὐδελον ὡς τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐφθέγγετο.*

⁹⁶ Ibid. (Mariès, 94.29–30; Froehlich, 90): *Τῷ μὲν οὖν Κυρίῳ ἐξῆν σαφηνίζειν τὰ αἰνίγματα, προφήταις δὲ ἀποστόλοις αὐτὰ λέγειν τὰ πρᾶγματα.*

As such, the *historia* recounted by the prophets and the apostles, the Old Testament and the New respectively, are essentially about different realities, and any connection between them beyond the contemplation of similarities, such as opening an enigma in the Old Testament, can only be done by the Lord himself. In the case of the Psalms, Diodore is emphatic that the proper context for understanding them is that of the Old Testament. All the Psalms, Diodore insists, were not only composed by David, but for the most part their *historia* is that of David's own life. Those which speak prophetically (which for Diodore operates retrospectively as well as prospectively) do so strictly within the *historia* of the Old Testament: some recall what happened in Egypt and the desert, whereas others pertain to the Babylonian exile, the Maccabees, and even Jeremiah.⁹⁷

In the case of the words of Christ from the cross—‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’ (Matt. 27:46, Mark 15:34)—Diodore breaks with the earlier ubiquitous Christian tradition that took this verse of Psalm 21 as spoken of or by Christ himself. For Diodore the proper context for understanding this psalm is instead the situation of David after his sin with Bathsheba, when God allowed him to fall into tribulations. As he puts it:

Similarities in realities (*ὁμοιότητες δὲ πραγμάτων*) emerged also in the case of Christ the Lord, especially in the passion, such that some have thought from this that the psalm is uttered in the character (*ἐκ προσώπου*) of the Lord. But it does not fit (*οὐχ ἀρμόζει*) the Lord: David appears to be both mentioning his own sins and attributing the causes of sufferings to the sins, something which in no way fits Christ. The partial resemblances in the sufferings do not completely displace the psalm's theme (*τῆν ὑπόθεσιν*): it is possible both for the *historia* to be preserved and the similarity to occur as well, with neither displacing the other.⁹⁸

Diodore takes the psalm as a whole, with its particular theme, and concludes that it cannot be applied to the sinless Christ. Thus, also with respect to the verses: ‘my hands and feet they gouged; I could count all my bones, but they observed and looked at me’ (vv. 17–18). Even if the first phrase could be taken as speaking of Christ, for we see in all the gospels nails being driven into his hands and feet, the second verse cannot, Diodore argues, for

⁹⁷ Preface (Olivier, 5–6; Hill, 2–3).

⁹⁸ *Comm. in Ps. 21* (Olivier, 126–7; Hill, 69).

according to Scripture no bone of his was broken.⁹⁹ The psalm's theme emphatically does not apply to Christ, and so any attempt by the evangelists to use the words of this psalm results in no more than partial similarities between two different *historias*.

There are, however, a few instances where Diodore is prepared to see a psalm as being spoken of or by Christ, as long as there is no possibility that in doing so passibility or sinfulness is attributed to Christ. For instance, the obscure heading to Psalm 44, 'regarding the end, concerning those to be changed', Diodore takes as referring to 'those taking a turn for the better in later times when the Son of God appears'. As such, he asserts that 'this psalm seems to refer to the Lord Jesus', and not, as the Jews think, to Solomon. Even if they violently transfer most of its content to Solomon, they cannot do so, Diodore points out, with verse 7, 'Your throne, O God, is forever and ever', for Solomon was never called 'God' nor did he reign for ever. Christ, on the other hand, even while adopting the human condition, retained his own natural status, so that this verse can apply to him; yet, having accepted the human condition, he also received suffering and commendation as a human being, as spoken of by the psalm.¹⁰⁰ For instance, verse 8, 'Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your partners', Diodore takes as speaking of the Holy Spirit with which Christ alone was anointed, rather than the oil of prophecy, priesthood, or royalty which was used to anoint others. And because of the economy, the psalm is able to call the same one 'God' and yet speak of him as being anointed by his 'God'.¹⁰¹ Similarly, in his concern to avoid any 'Arian' interpretation of Psalm 2:7, 'You are my son, today have I begotten you', Diodore unquestioningly accepts that it speaks of Christ, but emphasizes that it does not mean that the dignity of sonship was transferred to Christ by the decree of the Father, but rather that 'his being itself imprinted on me a stamp of

⁹⁹ Ibid. (Olivier, 132; Hill, 72); John 19:36, citing Exod. 12:46.

¹⁰⁰ *Comm. in Ps. 44* (Olivier, 268–9; Hill, 142): Ἄλλ' ὁ Χριστὸς μόνος ὡς Θεὸς καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα κατεδέξατο δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ τὰ οἰκεία ἐφύλαξε διὰ τὴν φύσιν θεὸς ὢν καὶ βασιλεὺς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Εἰ δὲ ἀνθρώπινα λέγει τὰ πλείστα ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἐνανθρωπήσας καὶ τὸ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐπαινεῖσθαι κατεδέξατο. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ παθεῖν ὡς ἄνθρωπος κατεδέξατο, πολλῶ πλεον καὶ τὸ ἐπαινεῖσθαι ὡς ἄνθρωπος, οὐδὲν εἰς τὴν φύσιν παραβλαπτόμενος.

¹⁰¹ *Comm. in Ps. 44:8bc* (Olivier, 272; Hill, 145).

the *hypostasis* of the Father', while the word 'today' indicates the ever-present reality of God's eternity.¹⁰²

The same points can be made in the case of Theodore. Leontius, as mentioned in the previous chapter, reports that Theodore took all the psalms except three to refer to the circles around Zerubbabel and Hezekiah.¹⁰³ More interesting is Theodore's *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, which survives intact in Greek. Theodore opens this work by asserting that the task of these prophets is essentially one of recollection: David 'had clearly addressed in the psalms all the vicissitudes that would befall the people', but because 'he had foretold everything satisfactorily, silence had prevailed in the intervening time'; however, when Hezekiah reigned over Judah together with Benjamin, 'divine grace communicated to the prophets when the events were close at hand', to warn the people that the disasters long ago predicted by David were about to happen.¹⁰⁴ Thus Hosea 'recounted what would befall them from God as though recalling what was said by David in the dim and distant past'.

There is no question but that for Theodore the *historia* of the prophets' words, and the proper context for interpreting them, is limited to this specific time-frame. He does, however, grant an overarching economy within which events do indeed lead to Christ. Thus Hosea, according to Theodore, made it clear that what was about to happen was not by chance, but rather foreseen and foretold by God, who understood the people's wickedness 'yet clearly realized how he needed to arrange (*οἰκονομεῖν*) things in their regard by way of preparation for the manifestation and coming of Christ the Lord'.¹⁰⁵ In his commentary on Jonah, Theodore sets this arrangement in the context of his teaching on the two states (*κατάστασεις*): the present state in which we have been from the beginning, and the one already determined by God to be manifested in the future. Starting in our mortality, we will be 'transformed into the other through the resurrection from the dead, so that we might realize by comparison the greatness of

¹⁰² *Comm. in Ps.* 2:7 (Olivier, 14; Hill, 8).

¹⁰³ Cf. Leontius, *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* (PG 86A.1365d).

¹⁰⁴ *Comm. in Hos.* Pref. (Sprenger, 1-2; Hill, 37-8).

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* (Sprenger, 2; Hill, 38).

the goods revealed'.¹⁰⁶ Yet even within this present condition, God has arranged things in such a way as to indicate the coming Christ and so demonstrate that this was not merely an afterthought. Abraham, through his offspring, and David, through the monarchy guaranteed in perpetuity to his descendants, already point to Christ. 'Although in popular belief these things suggested the one in whom they were due to be fulfilled, the truth of the realities (*ἡ δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλήθεια*) achieved its goal in the things accomplished by the Lord Christ'. A number of things were arranged in the Old Testament in this way, to provide benefit for the people of the time, and to intimate the reality to come, such that the former things became 'types' of the latter, and the latter were seen to surpass the former.¹⁰⁷ Such indeed was Jonah, who was 'a type of the things regarding Christ the Lord', and by his extraordinary deeds was worthy of belief, 'displaying in himself a type of such a great reality'.¹⁰⁸ For Theodore, then, figures and events both lead through the Old Covenant to Christ and can be placed in typological relationship with him.

Nevertheless, although he grants this overarching framework and typological relationship in principle, the span of the *historia* within which he explains the particular words, sayings, or visions of the prophets is extremely and deliberately restrictive, such that he is stubbornly reluctant, unless compelled otherwise, to refer the words of the prophets to Christ. For instance, Hosea 6:2, 'He will restore our health after two days, on the third day we shall arise', does not bring to Theodore's mind any reference to the resurrection. Instead, he comments that we will be healed 'so promptly that in two days, or at most three, he will restore us to our former prosperity', and then relates the next verse to Psalm 15:11.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ *Comm. in Ion.* Pref. (Sprenger, 169; Hill, 185). Theodore's understanding of the 'two states' is outlined in the fragments from the *Collectio Palatina* presented below and in his *Catechetical Homilies* more generally. Cf. Norris, *Manhood and Christ*, 160–73; McLeod, *The Roles of Christ's Humanity*.

¹⁰⁷ *Comm. in Ion.* Pref. (Sprenger, 170; Hill, 186).

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* (Sprenger, 173; Hill, 189).

¹⁰⁹ *Comm. in Hos.* 6:1–3 (Sprenger, 32–3; Hill, 64). Hill comments: 'The echoes of this v.2 in resurrection statements in the NT like Luke 24:7 and 1 Cor 15:4 would have been so strong that it is almost perverse of Theodore not at least to advert to them, even without developing a Christological digression. The psalm echo is not nearly so deafening.'

On occasion Theodore is compelled to treat a prophetic utterance as speaking about a New Testament event, and his account of what is involved in such cases is fascinating. One prominent case is the prophecy of Joel (2:28–32) regarding the outpouring of the Spirit. Given its use by the apostle Peter in his speech at Pentecost, it would have been hard to take this passage in any other way, though this did not stop Diodore in the case of Christ's use of Psalm 21. It is not because Peter used these words that Theodore refers the prophecy to the New Testament, for he does more than this. Theodore in fact asserts that the words in reality pertain to the event of Pentecost:

what happened in their [the prophets'] time was all insignificant and like a shadow, so that the account was given with the use of hyperbole rather than containing the realities, whereas the truth of the account was found to be realized in the time of Christ the Lord . . . so whereas what happened in the time of the Old Testament was in the order of an enigma, the magnitude of what happened in the time of Christ the Lord was in the order of truth.¹¹⁰

To further illustrate what he means, Theodore then gives Psalm 15:10 ('You did not abandon its soul to Hades nor did its flesh see corruption'), as an example of 'hyperbole' or 'metaphor': in its original context it cannot be taken at the level of 'reality' (*ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων*), whereas 'the truth of the reality' is demonstrated by Christ himself.¹¹¹ It is the same, Theodore argues, with the words of Joel: the description of the outpouring of the Spirit was an 'enigma' in his time, but was true at Pentecost. Peter therefore used a passage which had been expressed metaphorically for its own purpose at that time, but which in his time had a true outcome in reality.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ *Comm. in Joel* 2:28–32 (Sprenger, 96; Hill, 118): *Καὶ ἦν τὰ μὲν ἐπ' ἐκείνων μικρὰ πάντα, καὶ ὡς ἐν σκιᾷ γινόμενα, ὥστε καὶ ὑπερβολικῶς εἰρήσθαι μᾶλλον, ἢ τὰ πράγματα εἶχεν· ἡ δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀλήθεια τὴν ἔκβασιν ἐφαίνετο ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου λαμβάνουσα Χριστοῦ, . . . ὡς αἰνίγματος μὲν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης τάξιν ἐπέχειν, ἀληθείας δὲ εἶναι τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ γινομένων τὸ μέγεθος.*

¹¹¹ Diodore had used Ps. 29:3–4 ('O Lord my God, I cried to you and you healed me. O Lord you brought up my soul from Hades') as an example of 'hyperbole' on the part of Hezekiah, which will 'find truth' when he actually rises from the dead (*Comm. Ps. 118*; Mariès, 96.35–98.5; Froehlich, 92). Diodore, however, is much more careful to differentiate between 'hyperbole', 'metaphor', and 'enigma'.

¹¹² *Comm. in Joel* 2:28–32 (Sprenger, 97; Hill, 118): *Διόπερ ἐχρήσατο τῇ φωνῇ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος, ὡς ἂν τότε μὲν κατὰ τινα αἰτίαν μεταφορικῶς εἰρημένῃ, νῦν δὲ ἀληθῆ τὴν ἔκβασιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν λαβοῦσα τῶν πραγμάτων.*

What drives Theodore to conclude that Joel's prophecy was originally an 'enigma', 'hyperbole', or 'metaphor', however, is significant. It is his conviction that the Holy Spirit was not known prior to Pentecost. Before discussing the relationship between the enigma and the true outcome, Theodore states emphatically:

The people in the time of the Old Testament did not understand the Holy Spirit to be singular in person distinct from the others (*μοναδικὸν ἐν ὑποστάσει κεχωρισμένως τῶν λοιπῶν*), being both God and from God; by 'spirit of God', 'holy spirit', and every other such name at the time they referred to his grace, care, and affection.¹¹³

David's petition, 'take not your holy spirit from me' (Ps. 50:11), simply means 'take not your care from me'. Thus what prompts Theodore to provide a reading of this passage which relates its reality to the New Testament event of Pentecost is not that Peter used these very words, but Theodore's own theological conviction that the reality of the Spirit belongs to the second state or age of God's creation; not being known in the first state, any mention of the 'spirit' there refers only to God's care and affection, and any dramatic prophetic utterance is just that, hyperbole or metaphor.

A similar phenomenon occurs when Theodore turns to the words of Zechariah 1:8–11, describing a vision of a man riding on a red horse and conversing with an angel. Theodore immediately dismisses any attempt to read this as referring to Christ, on the grounds that, prior to the coming of Christ, no one knew that God was the Father of an equally divine Son who draws his being from the Father; any use of the terminology of 'father' and 'son' in the Old Testament simply refers, for Theodore, to the paternal care that God has for his people.¹¹⁴ The truth of this, he argues, is seen clearly from the apostles, who, having enjoyed the company of Christ for a long time, nevertheless did not know him to be the Son of God until after Pentecost. If before this Peter asked to see

¹¹³ Ibid. 2.28–32 (Sprenger, 95; Hill, 117).

¹¹⁴ *Comm. in Zech.* 1.8–11 (Sprenger, 325; Hill, 328): Πολλῆς δὴ πλανῆς καὶ ἀνοίας ἐστὶ μετὸν καὶ οὐδὲ ἀσεβείας ἀφεστὸς τὸ παρά τινων λεγόμενον ὅτι τὸν Υἱὸν ἑώρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐνταῦθα δὴλου γε ὄντος, ὅτι τῶν πρὸ τῆς τοῦ δεσπότητος Χριστοῦ παρουσίας οὐδεὶς ἠπίστατο Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν οὐ Πατέρα Θεὸν Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ Πατέρα, οὐχ Υἱὸν Θεὸν Υἱὸν Πατρὸς Θεοῦ τοῦτο ὄντα ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατὴρ, ἅτε καὶ ὄντα ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Ἐπειδὴ Πατρὸς μὲν ὀνομασία καὶ Υἱοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἦν διαθήκης, Πατρὸς μὲν κοινῶς κατὰ κληρονομίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ λεγομένου τῶν τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἐπιμελείας ἀξιουμένων ἀνθρώπων, υἱῶν δὲ τῶν ἐχόντων τι πλεον κατὰ οἰκείωσιν Θεοῦ Πατέρα δὲ Θεόν, ὡσπερ οὖν ἔφη ἡδη, Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Υἱὸν Θεὸν Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἠπίστατο τῶν τότε καθάπαξ οὐδεὶς.

his father (John 14:8–9), it was because he held Christ to be a son of God in the way that the holy and righteous people of olden times were said so to be. Christ himself also looked forward to a time when he would ‘tell plainly of the Father’ rather than in parables (John 16:25), thus making it clear that the disciples ‘heard the word “Father” as in an enigma, taking it in human fashion, but that they would truly know the Son when they knew him to be God in his being, coming from him and being one in being with him’. If the prophets and those of old had known this, Theodore argues, surely the apostles would have learnt it before the others; as they did not, such knowledge belongs to the things that Christ has to tell them once he has bestowed the Spirit of truth (cf. John 16:12–13). So Theodore concludes that, since ‘neither did any of the people before the coming of Christ the Lord understand the divinity of the Only-Begotten, nor does any of the prophets speak about it, that claim is also characterized by utter stupidity, or more truthfully insanity, that says that when an angel of the Lord is mentioned, by it the Old Testament speaks of the Son of God’.¹¹⁵ Persuaded that the revelation of the Son of God belongs solely to the new state or age, Theodore emphatically, and dismissively, rejects any attempt to see the Scriptures as speaking of the Son of God through terms such as ‘the angel of the Lord’.

It is thus clear that for Diodore and Theodore the prophets and apostles each speak of ‘realities’, different *historias* (the Old and the New Testaments) between which there may indeed be similarities, and, for Theodore at least, there is an overarching narrative leading from one to the other. On the rare occasion when the ‘reality’ of the Old Testament text *is* the event of the New Testament, it speaks of something or someone, the Son or the Holy Spirit, not known in the Old Testament; in such instances, therefore, Scripture is held to have spoken hyperbolically or metaphorically in its original context. In all of this a seismic change has occurred, entailing a radically different way of relating Christ to the Scriptures compared to the earlier tradition. For the earlier tradition it was a given that the Scriptures (the Law, the Psalms,

¹¹⁵ *Comm. in Zech.* 1.8–11 (Sprenger, 326–7; Hill, 329): *Τὴν τοίνυν θεότητα τοῦ Μονογενοῦς οὔτε ἠπίστατό τις τῶν πρὸ τῆς τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ παρουσίας οὔτε τις τῶν προφητῶν περὶ ταύτης διαλέγεται, ἐπεὶ κακείνο πάσης ἀνοίας ἐστὶ μεστόν, ἀληθέστερον δὲ εἰπεῖν φρενοβλαβείας, τὸ λέγειν, ὅτι ὅταν ἀγγέλου τε μέμνηται καὶ κυρίου κατὰ τοῦτον ἢ παλαιὰ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγειν.*

and the Prophets) spoke of Christ: most of the fourth century indeed was torn apart debating *how*, not *if*; Proverbs 8:22 applied to Christ. It was by recourse to the Scriptures, the words and images that they contain, that the apostles and evangelists (at least as they are presented in what became canonical Christianity) understood the work of God in Christ and fleshed out their *historia* concerning him, as an epitome or a resumé of the Scriptures, a ‘concise word’ recapitulating the whole, making it visible and present with greater force. In this way the Christ they portray can indeed assert that Moses, rather than writing a different *historia* about a different reality, ‘wrote of me’ (John 5:46). For Diodore and Theodore, on the other hand, Christ is found primarily within the *historia* of the New Testament, and only subsequently do we contemplate correspondences between this *historia* and that of the Old Testament. The separation of the writings of the prophets and the apostles as two distinct bodies of literature, even if similarities can be contemplated between them, recalls the distinction made by Marcion between the God of the Old Testament and that of the New, and indeed earned Theodore the charge of being a follower of Marcion.¹¹⁶

Treating the New Testament as its own distinct *historia* further entails, as we saw in the previous chapter, bringing into sharper focus the human figure of Jesus. While this, for obvious reasons, is not developed in the commentaries we have been considering, it is readily apparent from the extracts of their works collected in this volume. Although Theodore, and less explicitly Diodore, recognize the event of the Passion as the key factor in the identification of Jesus as the Word of God, their presentation of the work of God in Christ does not start from that interpretative crux, looking backwards from the tomb to the womb, as had the earlier tradition, with the broader scope of ‘womb’ and Incarnation that we saw in the previous chapter. Instead of looking backwards with a scriptural hindsight, they looked forward, focused on the cooperation of God and the man beginning in the womb and leading to the Passion. Theodore compares Jesus to Christians, who have already received partial first-fruits of the Spirit’s guidance, which will be perfectly effected in the resurrection, so that even now they are aided by the Spirit not to succumb to

¹¹⁶ Cf. Leontius, *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* (PG 86A.1372c)

temptations. He suggests that, in the same way, the man Jesus is united to the Word from the first moment of his formation in the womb, such that he is 'strengthened' and 'urged on' by the Word, but nevertheless still goes to the cross 'by his own purposes'. Only after the resurrection is he so fully united to the Word, who thereafter 'accomplishes everything in him by the union with himself', so that there is no longer any specifically human action differentiating him from the Word, as there was before the passion, when we could see him hungry, thirsting, and ignorant.¹¹⁷ The difference between Jesus and Christians is that this privilege was given to him, according to Theodore, specifically on the basis of the foreknowledge that the Word had of what kind of person he would turn out to be. If Jesus grew 'in age and wisdom and in grace before God and man' (Luke 2:52), the first two are consequent upon the passing of time, but the grace was an addition given by God, so that he could grow before God and men, bearing witness to and cooperating with the gift which enabled him to fulfil virtue more exactly and with greater ease than was possible for others.¹¹⁸

Rather than going from the tomb to the womb, for Diodore and Theodore the womb becomes, in itself, the locus for the event of 'incarnation', the starting point for the earthly journey of the man Jesus, and also the occasion for their most controversial statements (given how frequently they are cited). For both, there is no doubt that Mary gave birth to a man, not the Word of God. The human being conceived in her womb was certainly, from the first moment onwards, united to the Word of God. And, moreover, this union is by divine initiative: it is through foreknowledge of how he would turn out, rather than by anything he already did, that the Word is united to the one conceived. Nevertheless, even if Theodore allows the title *theotokos* 'by transference', 'since God was in the man born', she is, by nature and in the straightforward application of terms, *anthrōpotokos*, one who gave birth to a human being.¹¹⁹ Having turned their attention to the particular *historia* of the human Jesus in the New Testament, Diodore and Theodore had

¹¹⁷ LT 2. Cf. BT 7, where Theodore explains how the Word did not remove the passions and the movements proper to the flesh of Jesus, but 'sapped their strength', such that he was not conquered by the passions.

¹¹⁸ Cf. LT 3; BT 14.

¹¹⁹ Cf. LT 28 and parallels; see also LD 2 and parallels. This is also the subject of the extract preserved by Eleutherius of Tyana, a supporter of Diodore.

to develop what Julian derided as a ‘nonsensical theory about the womb by artifices and juggler’s tricks’.

As such, the one born of Mary has or is a distinct *prosōpon*, is spoken of as other than the Word of God, and has particularizing properties other than those identifying the Word of God. As Diodore puts it in a series of rhetorical questions: ‘if he who is of Mary is truly man how is he before the heavens and the earth? And if he is before them, he is not a man. If he is of Abraham, how is he before Abraham? If he is of the earth, how is he before the earth?’¹²⁰ The man and the Word are, quite clearly, ‘one and another’, just as Julian reported was the teaching of certain Christians. This is also implied by the notorious analogy suggested by Theodore, that the man and the Word, each with a complete *prosōpon*, come together in union as do a man and woman in marriage, no longer known as two, but one.¹²¹

Much attention has been devoted to Theodore’s technical terminology, and especially his affirmation that there is in Christ ‘one *prosōpon*’. As we have seen, scholarship has differed regarding whether this affirmation can be taken as equivalent to the later dogma of the ‘hypostatic union’, or whether it is merely a ‘moral union’, or whether, indeed, these are the only alternatives. It has recently been argued that the term *prosōpon* functions for Theodore in a much broader fashion, so that the ‘common *prosōpon*’, for which Theodore gives various analogies, is ‘a much stricter union than a merely moral one . . . Christ *qua* man can bring salvation to all of creation because of his inseparable, “exact” union with the Word in a real common *prosōpon*’.¹²² Christ’s human nature is united with the Word’s uncreated nature in a manner similar to how the soul interacts with the body in an organic unity, so that Christ is truly both and therefore a proper

¹²⁰ BD 4.

¹²¹ BT 17 and parallels.

¹²² McLeod, *The Roles of Christ’s Humanity*, 253. McLeod (p. 204) would like to differentiate between Apollinarius’ ‘organic view of how the Word has united itself to Christ’s body’ and Theodore, who, he concedes, ‘does appear to have conceived of the presence of a quasi-organic relationship between the Word and Christ’s humanity’. That the two are differentiated only by the addition of a ‘quasi-’ suggests that both are closer to each other than typically realized. I would argue that this is because their Christology is developed from a human perspective or narrative, rather than from the event and perspective of the passion. As we saw in the previous chapter, Apollinarius, as Gregory of Nyssa put it, ‘defines the divine by its phenomenal realization, not by intellectual contemplation’ (*Apoll.* 191.24–7).

mediator. As such, 'the Word, like the soul, takes the initiative and supplies the power', so that the humanity of Christ can act freely in accord with its own nature, always in agreement with the divine will, so that the Word is 'the one who saves, but he achieves this through the ways that all of creation is united with Christ's humanity—and also indirectly with God himself—and is able to share in what Christ's human nature now enjoys'.¹²³ Even if this is indeed the case, and we take the word *prosōpon* in a broader or more nuanced fashion, this doesn't diminish the change of theological approach and starting-point that we have been arguing has occurred with Diodore and Theodore, from the revelation of God in Christ seen through the crux of the passion, to the birth of the man Jesus, in whose life thereafter we can see the man benefiting from, and cooperating with, the Word. The trajectory of his life is still understood, by Theodore at least, as culminating at the cross, for it is after the passion that he becomes inseparable and indistinguishable from the Word, but he brings the human Jesus, the 'man' on his way to Calvary, into sharper focus than ever before, with his own *prosōpon* and *historia*, preparing the way for an understanding of 'incarnation' not only not seen through the passion but even unrelated to the passion.¹²⁴

¹²³ McLeod, *The Roles of Christ's Humanity*, 253.

¹²⁴ It is striking that in McLeod's recent book, for instance, despite analysing Christ's salvific role as bond of the universe and as God's perfect image, the salvific role of Christ's common *prosōpon*, and the role of Christ's body in human salvation, no mention is made of the passion. See also Hanson's assessment (*Search*, 450) cited above (Chap. 1, n. 71).

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST DIODORE AND THEODORE

As we have seen, while surveying the lives and careers of our subjects, Diodore received considerable criticism, not only from Julian and Apollinarius and his followers, but also from some of his own pro-Nicene colleagues. It is, however, only after the death of Theodore that the case began to be made openly against them, building momentum in the decade following the Council of Ephesus (431). In the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon (451) Diodore and Theodore receded into the background, appearing only sporadically as more immediate and severe divisions loomed large. Only in the second phase of Justinian's reign does Theodore regain centre-stage, as one of the 'Three Chapters' (referring to, first, the person and works of Theodore; second, the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus against Cyril of Alexandria; and third, the letter of Ibas to Mari) ultimately condemned by the Second Council of Constantinople (553), in a debate which was not only driven by political expediency but also by diverse theological issues, in particular the question of 'Origenism'. It is with these four moments that we shall conclude Part I of this book, turning in Part II to the texts themselves.

I. INITIAL REACTIONS

It is possible that we can see a reaction to Diodore already at the Council of Alexandria in 362. Although he had been an influential figure for a couple of decades, Diodore's ecclesiastical career began to flourish in earnest once Meletius was installed in Antioch. However, while monks representing 'Apollinarius the bishop' attended the council, neither Meletius nor any representative of his were invited, and the *Tome to the Antiochenes*, issued by the council, pointedly never mentions Meletius by name. After resolving the differences between those who speak of three

hypostases and those who speak of one, both sides accepting that they each hold the same faith while using the word differently for different purposes, the council then also agreed that the Word did not ‘dwell in a holy man’ at the end of the ages, but ‘was himself made flesh’. Moreover, they also affirmed that ‘the Saviour did not have a body without a soul or without sense or intelligence’, so that the salvation he effects is a salvation of both body and soul. The *Tome* further specifies that a (‘dyoprosōpic’) distinction should be not made between ‘two sons’:

Wherefore neither was there one Son of God before Abraham, and another after Abraham; nor was there one that raised up Lazarus, and another that asked concerning him; but the same it was that said, as man, ‘Where does Lazarus lie?’ and, as God, raised him up. . . . For which reasons, thus understanding all that is said in the Gospel, they assured us that they held the same truth about the Word’s incarnation and becoming human.¹

While we can be sure that it was Apollinarius’ monks who were pushing the unity of the one Christ, it is difficult to identify the opponents. We can at least say, however, that they were characterized by their opponents as proclaiming ‘two sons’, and as such they stand in continuity with those opposed to the tradition of Lucian. Given the kind of language used here, which is far more redolent of Diodore than it is of Marcellus, and given also how pointedly Meletius was sidelined by the council, it is possible, in fact likely, that it is his presbyter, Diodore, who is intended here.² Athanasius, the author or editor of the *Tome*, also had further occasion to rebut such a position, in similar terms, in letters written a decade or so later.³

¹ Athanasius, *Tom.* 7.

² E. Mühlenberg, *Apollinarius von Laodicea* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 226–230, also suggests that Diodore was in view here. For similar language, see BD 4.

³ See esp. Athanasius, *Ep. Epict.* (PG 26.1053bc): ‘How can they wish to be called Christians who say that the Word has descended upon a holy man as upon one of the prophets, and has not himself become man, taking the body from Mary; but that Christ is one, while the Word of God, who before Mary and before the ages was Son of the Father, is another? Or how can they be Christians who say that the Son is one and the Word of God another?’ Also *Ep. Adelph.* (PG 26.1076): ‘Neither do we separate that body from the Word and worship it on its own, nor do we cast the Word far from the flesh when we wish to worship him. But knowing, that “the Word became flesh” we acknowledge him as God even when he comes in the flesh. . . . And what is even greater and more wonderful (though this perhaps scandalized these most impious people) is that even when the Lord was hanging on the cross (for the body was his, and

For various reasons, that we have explored earlier, open conflict erupted in the mid- to late 370s between Diodore and Apollinarius and his disciples. It is almost certainly during this period that Apollinarius wrote his two works against Diodore: the *Syllogistic Argument Against Diodore to Heraclion* (*Λόγος συλλογιστικός, κατὰ Διοδώρου πρὸς Ἡράκλειον*) and *To Diodore, The Chapter Book* (*Πρὸς Διοδώρον ἢ τὸ κατὰ κεφάλιον βιβλίον*).⁴ Only a few fragments remain from these works, and they generally concern Apollinarius' own teaching rather than his assessment of Diodore's. However, there are a few fragments that echo extracts from Diodore collected in Part II and that enable us to see the point of contention. For instance:

Since you ask us to answer 'How is that which is of the divine essence a seed of David?', listen: it is according to incarnation (*κατὰ σάρκωσιν*). 'How is the created uncreated?' As united to the Uncreated. 'How is the fruit of David's womb the Maker of creation?' As united to the Maker. 'How is the one from Abraham before Abraham?' As united to the one from Abraham.⁵

In return, several extracts of Diodore and Theodore report their opponents' position, usually in a similar rhetorical context.⁶ One passage from what remains of the Syriac text of Theodore's *On the Incarnation* (*Cod. Add. 14660, fol. 4*) specifically mentions the 'Apollinarians' (and the 'Eunomians'), and argues against depriving Christ of a human mind. Another intimation regarding the controversy is given in Vitalis' statement of faith, presented to Pope Damasus after Flavian had prevented Vitalis from having his usual meeting with Meletius. As preserved by Cyril of Alexandria, the statement asserts that: 'If someone divides and separates our Lord and Saviour and says that God the Son and Word is one [thing] and the assumed man another, and does not confess

the Word was in it), the sun became darkened and the earth shook, and the rocks were rent and the veil of the temple was torn, and many bodies of saints who slept arose.' Cf. BD 17 and parallels.

⁴ For a description and text of the remaining fragments of these works see Lietzmann, *Apollinarius*, 142, 235–6 (text), for the former, and 142–4, 237–42 (text), for the latter.

⁵ Frag. 143. Cf. SD 13.

⁶ Cf. BD 1, 2, 4, 26; BT 21; TD 1; SD 12; ST 2; LT 32, 33, and parallels.

[him as] one and the same, he is anathema.⁷ A last indication of this stage of the controversy is Theodore's allegation that anonymous disciples of Apollinarius had tampered with his writings, interpolating a passage which made him assert that it was necessary to affirm 'two sons', whereas in fact, Theodore claims, he had written that it was not necessary to affirm 'two sons'.⁸ Beyond these sparse references and intimations, we know nothing more about the specific details and precise content of the controversy that our subjects had with the Apollinarians.

A final indication of controversy during their own lifetime comes, as we have already seen, from Gregory of Nazianzus. Although sent to Constantinople 'to defend the Word' against the teaching that Christ lacked a human mind, Gregory in fact seems to have placed a greater stake in countering the opposite heresy that proclaimed 'two sons', dividing the one born of God from the one born of the Virgin.⁹ After forsaking the capital and the council for a life of quiet retirement in his home town, Gregory addressed these issues again a few years later, when Apollinarians began causing trouble in his neighbourhood. However, although his letters to Cleodion clearly tackle the 'mindless' theology of the Apollinarians, his sights are again primarily set, as has only recently been pointed out, on Diodore.¹⁰ This is seen particularly clearly in the ten anathemas invoked by Gregory, for only the last two concern Apollinarian teaching, whereas the first eight are unambiguously, though anonymously, directed against Diodore.

The first anathema takes up the very term that we saw Julian fix upon, which was then promoted by Apollinarius, and which thereafter becomes the touchstone of Orthodoxy: 'Whoever does not accept the holy Mary as *Theotokos* has no relationship with

⁷ For Vitalis' statement, see Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 102.3, trans. Wickham (102.6, ed. Gallay). Text in Lietzmann, *Apollinarius*, 273; translated and discussed in Behr, *Nicene Faith*, 383-5.

⁸ FT 26.

⁹ Gregory of Nazianzus, *De vita sua* 607-41. As already noted, his second oration in Constantinople (*Or.* 22) tackles the 'two son' teaching first, and even seems to think it a greater problem than the episcopal divisions in Antioch. See above, Chap. 2, at n. 35.

¹⁰ Cf. Beeley, 'Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory of Nyssa': 'he is not so much countering the Apollinarian doctrine from, say, an Antiochene viewpoint, as he is beating Apollinarius at his own game, by confessing a *more* unitive doctrine, which he plays more strongly against Diodore.'

divinity.¹¹ If Diodore, and following him Theodore, accepted this term, it was only 'by transference', in the sense that God was in the man whom she bore, for how, they argued, could she be said to beget God?¹² To eliminate any ambiguity or fudging of the issue, Gregory continues by spelling out the implications of this title in the following two anathemas: first arguing that Christ was 'formed in her divinely and humanly, divinely because without a husband, humanly because by the law of conception', rather than passing through her as through a channel; and then condemning those who would say that a human being was formed, and then God put him on to wear, for 'this is not God's birth, but the avoidance of birth'.¹³ The fourth anathema is directed against those who proclaim 'two sons', one from God and another from the mother.¹⁴ It also reiterates forcefully the formula 'one and the same', used from the time of Irenaeus (against the Gnostics who also appeared to teach 'two sons') and most recently by Apollinarius (against Diodore), while also distinguishing between how we speak of unity and of duality in Christ: two natures but one son. 'The pair is one by coalescence, God being "in-manned" and man "deified".' Having specified this, Gregory then goes on to exclude any account of the union in Christ as being by grace, as in the case of a prophet.¹⁵ The sixth anathema affirms that it is none other than the Crucified One himself who is worshipped, that is, that there is a single worship to be paid directly to this one, rather than an adoration of the flesh because of the one wearing it.¹⁶ After this affirmation, Gregory then goes on to counter any suggestion that he was made perfect by his works, or that he became worthy of adoption after his baptism or after his resurrection.¹⁷ The eighth anathema is directed against those who claim that his flesh has been discarded, rather than that he still exists

¹¹ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 101.5, trans. Wickham (101.16–25, ed. Gallay).

¹² Cf. Eutherius of Tyana; BD 3, 4, 12, 13 (though none of these extracts from the *Blasphemies* use the term *theotokos*, it is found again in the extracts from Theodore, esp. LT 28 and parallels).

¹³ Cf. BD 19, 22 (and parallels); SD 1.

¹⁴ This point is found frequently throughout the extracts, differentiating what can be said of the man and what can be said of the Word.

¹⁵ Cf. BD 31 (and parallels), 33; PD 2.

¹⁶ Cf. SD 8; PD 6.

¹⁷ Cf. SD 5. Most interesting in this respect is LT 2, which speaks specifically of the progress made by the assumed man on his journey to the cross and his perfect unity and identity with the Word thereafter.

in what he has assumed and will come with it, in glory, in the parousia. Compared to this barrage of criticism aimed very clearly and directly against Diodore, his criticism of Apollinarius in the following two anathemas is mild indeed. It is surely only Diodore's success in the capital, such that he is even named as one of the touchstones of Orthodoxy by Theodosius, that inhibited Gregory from mentioning him by name.

II. THE AFTERMATH OF EPHESUS

In the year that Theodore died Nestorius was transferred from Antioch to Constantinople, setting off a chain of events that led to Nestorius' condemnation at the Council of Ephesus three years later and brought Theodore in particular into the open as a target of criticism and opposition. Events surrounding the Council of Ephesus have been explored often and need not detain us here.¹⁸ As we will see in the following chapter, Cyril of Alexandria was already, between 428 and 432, reading the writings of Theodore with a critical eye and extracting passages for use later on. However, the real catalyst for this stage of the controversy regarding Theodore was the decision of Rabbula of Edessa, in 432, to switch his allegiance and begin an attack on Theodore. These

¹⁸ See, most recently, J. McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004), 20–125; S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*, OPCS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 138–80. There are many studies of the events in the decade following the Council of Ephesus, of which the most important of the older pieces are E. Schwartz, *Konzilstudien*, Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg, 20 (Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1914), 18–53; Devreesse, *Essai*, 125–60; M. Richard, 'Proclus de Constantinople et le théopaschisme', *RHE* 38 (1942), 303–31, repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, 3 vols. (Turnhout and Leuven: Brepols, 1976–7), vol. 2, §52; and id., 'Acace de Mélitène, Proclus de Constantinople et la Grande Arménie', *Mémorial Louis Pétit: Mélanges d'histoire et d'archéologie byzantines*, Archives de l'orient chrétien, 1 (Bucharest: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1948), 393–412, repr. in *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §50; L. Abramowski, 'Der Streit um Diodor und Theodor zwischen den beiden ephesinischen Konzilien', *ZKG* 67 (1955–6), 252–87, Eng. trans. in ead., *Formula and Context: Studies in Early Christian Thought*, Variorum Collected Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992), no. 1, examines the different reconstructions of the events given by Schwartz, Devreesse, and Richard, and offers her own analysis. More recently, see N. Constans, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 92–125; and Richard Price (trans. and intro.), *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553 with Related Texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*, *TIH* 51, 2 vols. (Liverpool University Press, 2009), 1.271–81.

events are recounted by Ibas of Edessa in a letter that needs to be placed in its own context before turning to the events which it describes. It was written in 433, shortly after the two estranged parties following the Council of Ephesus were able to agree upon a 'Formula of Reunion', drafted by John of Antioch and accepted by Cyril of Alexandria: Cyril, though not obliged to withdraw the twelve anathemas appended to his third letter to Nestorius, nevertheless accepted a Christological statement that was clearly Antiochene in its emphases, while John, in turn, accepted Nestorius' condemnation. Not everyone, however, was happy with this settlement. Cyril wrote a number of letters to his followers, assuring them that he had not abandoned his theology and that the Formula was compatible with the twelve anathemas, and, in this context, he pointed to Diodore as the teacher of Nestorius.¹⁹ John, on the other hand, was faced with the disapproval of a number of Syrian bishops, and so together with Theodoret of Cyrus he emphasized that Cyril had always been orthodox even if he had sometimes expressed himself poorly, and that by having accepted the Formula of Reunion Cyril had abandoned the twelve anathemas.²⁰

It is in this context that Ibas wrote his letter to 'Mari', ostensibly a letter to a friend but clearly designed for wider circulation and to promote the idea that Cyril had capitulated.²¹ Ibas claimed

¹⁹ See Cyril's letters to Acacius of Melitene (*Ep.* 41; *ACO* 1.1.4, §134, pp. 40–8; also ed. and trans. in L. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters*, OECT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 34–61), to Eulogius (*Ep.* 44; *ACO* 1.1.4, §132, pp. 35–7; Wickham, *Select Letters*, 62–9), and the two to Succensus (*Ep.* 45, 46; *ACO* 1.1.6, §§171, 172, pp. 151–62; Wickham, *Select Letters*, 70–93); he mentions Diodore in *Ep.* 45, which will be presented and discussed in the next chapter.

²⁰ See John's letter to the Syrian bishops, *ACO* 1.1.7, §119, pp. 156–7; his letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, *ACO* 1.4, §165, pp. 112–13; and the letters of Theodoret to Acacius of Beroea, *ACO* 1.4, §149, pp. 101–2, and to Alexander, *ACO* 1.4, §155, p. 104.

²¹ Sixth-century Syriac sources identify Mari as a bishop of the Persian empire, though as 'Mari' simply means 'my lord', it is likely that it is a generic title rather than a genuine name. M. van Esbroeck ('Who is Mari, the Addressee of Ibas' Letter?' *JTS* NS 38.1 (1987), 129–35), on the other hand, would identify 'Mari the Persian' as the archimandrite of the Acoemete monastery in Constantinople. The letter was read out during the investigation of Ibas at Berytus in 449, the proceedings of which were then read out at the Council of Ephesus later that year (preserved in the Syriac Acts, ed. J. Flemming, *Akten der ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449*, AAWG.PH NF 15.1 (Berlin, 1917; repr. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970); trans. in R. Doran, *Stewards of the Poor: The Man of God, Rabbula, and Hiba in Fifth-Century Edessa*, CS 208 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 2006), 169–73), at the Council of Chalcedon in 451

that Bishop Rabbula of Edessa (412–35/6), ‘the tyrant of our city’, had harboured hatred for Theodore ever since the latter had reproached him publicly at a synod meeting.²² Despite having continually praised Theodore and read his books while he was alive, Ibas continued, Rabbula had dramatically changed sides and began denouncing the deceased bishop of Mopsuestia, searching out and burning his books.²³ The consternation that Rabbula’s volte-face caused for Ibas was shared by various bishops of the surrounding area, as can be seen from their letters.²⁴ Ibas himself seems to have been dismissed from Edessa at about this time, though he was evidently a popular figure with much support, as is shown by the fact that he became bishop of Edessa upon Rabbula’s death. Eventually John of Antioch promulgated a circular letter to the bishops of the province of Osrhoene warning them about Rabbula’s actions and saying that if the rumours about him were true, then communion with him should cease until he would come to Antioch to give an account of himself.²⁵

Meanwhile, Rabbula turned to Alexandria for support. He wrote to Cyril complaining of ‘the hidden disease’ which ‘has become chronic in the East, preying undetected like an incurable wound on the body of the Church’, that is, the veneration of Theodore of Mopsuestia. It is Theodore, according to Rabbula, who was the first to assert that Mary was not ‘Theotokos’, and that the human nature was joined to the Word ‘by good pleasure’ rather than ‘by substance or subsistence’, and it is he, therefore,

(Greek *ACO* 2.1.3, §138, pp. 32–4; Latin *ACO* 2.3.3, §138, pp. 39–43; trans. in R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of Chalcedon*, TTH 45, 3 vols. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), 2.295–8), and also at the Council of Constantinople in 553 (*ACO* 4.1, sixth session §5, pp. 138–40; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 2.6–10). For Ibas, his letter, and its subsequent history, see Price and Gaddis, *Chalcedon*, 2.265–73; Price, *Constantinople*, 1.88–98.

²² Barhadbešabba, around 600, also reports that Theodore rebuked Rabbula at a council in Constantinople for striking his clergy (*Foundation of the Schools*, PO 4.4, pp. 380–1). For Rabbula, see G. G. Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa. Der Christ, der Bischof, der Theologe*, CSCO 300 (Louvain: CSCO, 1969), and Doran’s introduction to, and translation of, the Life of Rabbula in his *Stewards of the Poor*, 41–105.

²³ Barhadbešabba (*Foundation*, PO 4.4, p.381) reports that Rabbula burnt all Theodore’s writings, so that only his commentaries on John and Ecclesiastes survive.

²⁴ See e.g. the letter of Andrew of Samosata to Alexander of Hierapolis, *ACO* 1.4, §132, pp. 86–7.

²⁵ The letter is found at *ACO* 1.4, §133, p. 87.

who is the true originator of Nestorius' errors.²⁶ Cyril welcomed his new ally and replied to his letter very warmly, praising him as 'the pillar and foundation of the truth' for all those in the East and encouraging him to dig out the root of Nestorianism.²⁷ Accompanying the letter, Cyril sent Rabbula copies of his treatise *Against the Blasphemies of Nestorius* and his own work on the Incarnation written for the emperor, asking him to have them read publicly in the assembly.

At the same time, others rallied round Rabbula in his campaign against Theodore. Acacius of Melitene for one was especially active and forceful. He had been a key supporter of Cyril at the Council of Ephesus, and shortly afterwards, in an assembly of bishops gathered in the presence of the emperor, had made such a strong theopaschite confession—he is reported to have said that 'the divinity was capable of change'—that it so shocked the emperor that his purple robe fell to the ground.²⁸ Acacius wrote to Cyril informing him that he had come across some people in nearby Germanicia who rejected the notion of 'two sons' but still spoke of 'two natures' acting as if independent, one as passible, the other as impassible, which, he claimed, amounts to the same thing as 'two sons', and so he urged Cyril to speak out against all who proclaim two natures after the union.²⁹ Likewise, Deacon Maximus of Antioch also wrote to Cyril about this time to report that there were some in Antioch who claimed to have abandoned their former ways, but who still thought as had Nestorius, and on this ground had broken communion with John.

The next phase of the controversy was initiated in Armenia.³⁰

²⁶ Cyril *Ep.* 73 (*ACO* 4.1, §23, p. 89; cf. *ACO* 1.4, §290, p. 212.23–30).

²⁷ Cyril *Ep.* 74. This letter survives intact only in Syriac, published in J. J. Overbeck (ed.), *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabbulae episc. Edessen, Balaai aliorumque opera selecta* (Oxford, 1865), 226–9; the first part is also preserved in Latin, in *ACO* 4.1, fifth session §20, p. 87; R. Devresse ('Le Début de la querelle des Trois-Chapitres: la lettre d'Ibas et le tome de Proclus', *RevSR* 11 (1931), 543–65, at 548, n. 1) and Price (*Constantinople*, 2.302, n. 149) take the reference to Theodore in this letter as an interpolation.

²⁸ Cf. *ACO* 1.1.7, §66, p. 77, lines 23–7.

²⁹ For Acacius letter to Cyril see *ACO* 1.4, §172, pp. 118–19, and §304, p. 232. Apart from this letter, there exists a sermon of Acacius delivered during the Council of Ephesus (*ACO* 1.1.2, §74, pp. 90–2).

³⁰ For this dimension of the controversy, see G. Winkler, 'An Obscure Chapter in Armenian Church History (428–439)', *REArm* 17 (1985), 85–179, repr. in ead., *Studies in Early Christian Liturgy and Its Context*, Variorum Collected Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), no. 7; and N. Garsoïan, *L'Église arménienne et le Grand Schisme d'Orient*, CSCO 547, subs. 100 (Louvain: Peeters, 1999), 45–134.

As part of their efforts to resist the increasing influence of Persia, Sahak I, Catholicos of Armenia, and Mesrop Maštoc³¹, at the turn of the fifth century, devised a new Armenian alphabet, stimulating a remarkable new era of literary activity. In the middle of the second decade Maštoc³¹ and his colleagues went to Edessa to begin work on a new translation of the Syriac Bible together with exegetical and theological commentaries, and there they soon became acquainted with Ibas and heavily influenced by his teaching. Armenian translations of Theodore's works began circulating, together with cover letters denouncing Rabbula and Acacius. Hearing of this, Acacius wrote to Sahak in 433/4, denying the charges laid against himself. Exploiting Sahak's ignorance at what had transpired at Ephesus, Acacius then informed him that the Council of Ephesus had ordered that Theodore's works, especially his *On the Incarnation*, be burned and that he be anathematized alongside Nestorius.³¹ Copies of Theodore's works were indeed seized by government officials soon thereafter. They then sent a delegation of three Armenian clerics to Acacius to inform him of their actions, and received in return a letter of commendation from Acacius.³²

In 435 a delegation of Armenian clergymen arrived in Constantinople seeking an audience with Archbishop Proclus to solicit his guidance in these matters. They presented Proclus with a letter describing how they 'have been approached by certain individuals from the diocese of the East who, thinking perhaps that we are simple people, endeavoured to disturb us, having in their possession certain works (*συγγράμματα*) of Theodore, the one-time bishop of Mopsuestia'.³³ However, they have learnt from

³¹ The letter from Acacius to Sahak is edited in J. Ismireantz, *Book of Letters* (Tiflis, 1901), 14–15; French trans. in Garsoïan, *L'Église arménienne*, 412–14. On the question of whether the relevant pronoun refers to Theodore's works or Nestorius, see Winkler, 'Obscure Chapter', 110; Garsoïan, *L'Église*, 81–3.

³² Letter of Acacius, ed. Ismireantz, *Book of Letters*, 19–21; French trans. Garsoïan, *L'Église arménienne*, 417–20. The letter might also refer to Diodore, though their names were often confounded by Armenian scribes. Cf. Garsoïan, *ibid.* 83–4.

³³ This letter is preserved in Syriac: P. Bedjan (ed.), *Nestorius: Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1910; Piscataway, NJ: Georgias Press, 2007), 594–6; retroversion into Greek by Schwartz in *ACO* 4.2, pp. xxvii–xxviii; Eng. trans. Constatas, *Proclus*, 102–3, modified here, for he translates ἀντίγραφον τῶν Θεοδώρου συνταγμάτων as 'a compilation of Theodore's works' (see comment at end of this paragraph). Winkler ('Obscure Chapter') argues for an alternative ordering of events: an initial delegation to Constantinople, resulting in the *Tōme* of Proclus, which was deliberated upon in a council held in Aštišat in 435/6, after which the letter now being

Rabbula of Edessa and Acacius of Melitene that this Theododore ‘was a perverter who confused the unconfused faith’. Moreover, they continue, certain individuals from Cilicia have approached them calumniating Rabbula and Edessa, ‘saying that they reject the writings (*βιβλία*) of Theodore out of enmity and hatred’. As such, ‘it seemed good to all the most-holy bishops to send us here in order to learn from your Piety if in fact these writings and the statements in the collections (*τὰ συγγράμματα καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν συνταγμάτων*) are really corrupt’. They then asked Proclus to prepare a statement determining whether they should accept the works (*συγγράμματα*) of Theodore or heed the warnings of Rabbula and Acacius. They add that they ‘have brought with us a copy of the collections of Theodore (*ἀντίγραφον τῶν Θεοδώρου συνταγμάτων*)’ for Proclus’ inspection, to determine whether what is written in it is indeed pleasing or not.³⁴ These words (especially those mentioning *τῶν συνταγμάτων*, in the retroversion of Schwartz) seem to imply that some kind of compilation or florilegium of extracts from the works of Theodore was presented to Proclus, which, given what is said in the letter, would seem most likely to have been drawn up by either Rabbula or Acacius, or perhaps the two together.

Proclus was faced with a difficult task, and responded with his *Tōme to the Armenians*, sent sometime around 435.³⁵ The *Tōme* is a careful and moderate statement of Christology, based largely on Cyril’s second letter to Nestorius. Appended to the *Tōme* was the florilegium of Theodore’s texts presented to Proclus by the Armenian delegation, without any mention of the name of the author of these extracts, though clearly setting them in contrast

discussed was presented to Proclus in an unofficial delegation. L. van Rompay, ‘Proclus of Constantinople’s “Tomus ad Armenios” in the Post-Chalcedonian Tradition’, in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Albert Van Roey*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 18 (Leuven: Peeters, 1985), 425–49, at 433, argues that the authenticity of the letter is in fact open to doubt. Garsoïan, *L’Église arménienne*, 99–116, argues convincingly that the supposed council held in Aṣṭiṣat is in fact fictitious and that attempt to reconstruct a different order of events is mistaken; Constat, *Proclus*, 101–4, follows Garsoïan.

³⁴ Innocent of Maronea (*ACO* 4.2, p. 68.21) calls it ‘unum volumen blasphemiarum Theodori’.

³⁵ Following Price, *Constantinople*, 1.272–3, n. 9, who follows Richard (‘Proclus’) and Abramowski (‘The Controversy’), in holding that there was only one dispatch of the *Tōme*, but allowing more time for the subsequent activity of Ibas before the council of 438.

to the theology outlined in the body of the *Tome*. John of Antioch requested and received a copy of the *Tome*, and sent a letter to Proclus in return expressing his pleasure at its 'caution with regard to sacred doctrines and its piety', apparently avoiding, as far as we can tell, any mention of the extracts or Theodore, whose authorship he would undoubtedly have recognized.³⁶

Either that same year or the following, Rabbula of Edessa died and was succeeded by none other than Ibas. With all the resources now available to him, Ibas renewed his campaign on behalf of Theodore, having the florilegium translated into Syriac and composing a work in their defence.³⁷ However, Ibas was soon confronted by a sizeable number of clergy and laity from his see, who charged him with Nestorianism.³⁸ News of this reached Proclus in Constantinople, perhaps by a monastic deacon called Basil. According to sixth-century sources, Basil was disappointed by Proclus' reluctance to condemn Theodore explicitly, and, after a journey to Alexandria, armed with a dossier of texts, to visit Cyril, he returned to Constantinople where he urged Proclus to take further action.³⁹ There were a number of other trouble-makers in Constantinople at this time, mentioned without any names in letters between John of Antioch and Cyril; they were most likely pro-Cyrellian clergy, though later sources identify them as Armenian monks.⁴⁰ It is also to a delegation from Armenia that a diatribe against Theodore, containing a report of a sermon he gave in Antioch, is attributed by the Council of Constantinople in

³⁶ The quotation comes from a fragment of John's letter preserved by Facundus (*Pro def.* 1.1.11). Richard ('Proclus', 304) points out that Proclus would have to have been extremely naive to think that John would not know who was the author of the extracts.

³⁷ Cf. Letter of Proclus to John, in *ACO* 4.1, fifth session §83, p. 112 (Price, *Constantinople*, 1.335).

³⁸ Cf. *ibid.*

³⁹ For Basil, see Innocent of Maronea (*ACO* 4.2, p. 68.25–37), followed by Liberatus, *Breviarium* 10 (*ACO* 2.5, pp. 111–12); his dossier included the letter presented by the original Armenian delegation, Proclus' *Tome*, and a tract of his own composition (Constas, *Proclus*, 113, n. 94 suggests PG 65.851–6). Abramowski ('The Controversy', 4, n. 11a) claims that Basil 'is of extremely dubious historicity'. That Cyril was motivated to write against Diodore and Theodore by a visit from this deacon Basil is extremely unlikely: his *Against Diodore and Theodore* is still a few years away, and, as Price notes, there is no mention of any of this in Cyril's own letters (*Constantinople*, 1.273, n. 11).

⁴⁰ For the letters see *ACO* 1.5, §§12–15, pp. 310–15. Cf. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.273.

553, though this has plausibly been identified with the tract given to Proclus by Basil.⁴¹

As the controversy escalated, Proclus wrote to John of Antioch in 438, criticizing Ibas and his activity and urging John to instruct him in the errors of the florilegium, still not mentioning their author, so that Ibas might anathematize them and subscribe to the *Tome*.⁴² John was the one now in a difficult position. He had previously welcomed the support of Constantinople, but now found such involvement to his detriment. He had also previously been willing to abandon Nestorius, but he now refused to do so with Theodore. John acted by calling for a council of all the Syrian bishops to be held in Antioch in August 438. Hearing of this, Proclus sent a letter to all the Syrian bishops, urging them not to neglect what he had said to the Armenians, that is, that they should compel Ibas to condemn the anonymous extracts.⁴³ Seventy-five or eighty bishops assembled in Antioch that August, and although no minutes remain we know of their deliberations through three letters dispatched after their meeting, one each to Theodosius II, Proclus, and Cyril, the first two surviving only in fragmentary form.⁴⁴

The bishops made it clear that, while they recognized the orthodoxy of Proclus' *Tome*, they could never be brought to anathematize extracts from 'the blessed Theodore'. Any pretence regarding their supposed anonymity was thus abandoned. Not all these extracts were problematic, they pointed out, and even those that were 'uncertain and obscure' and 'capable of various interpretations' had been removed from their proper context, which should include not only the literary setting of the extract, but the historical and theological circumstances in which the text was composed. They conceded that Theodore did indeed speak

⁴¹ Text in *ACO* 4.1, fifth session §14, pp. 83–5 (Price, *Constantinople*, 1.295–9). Cf. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.273.

⁴² Letters of Proclus to John, preserved in *ACO* 4.1, fifth session §83, p. 112 (Price, *Constantinople*, 1.335), and sixth session §7, pp. 140–3 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.10–14).

⁴³ This instruction of Proclus is mentioned at the beginning of the letter sent to Cyril by the council (Cyril, *Ep.* 66; *ACO* 1.5, §14, p. 311, line 4).

⁴⁴ 75 bishops is the count of Pelagius (*Def.* 3; ed. Devreesse, p. 15, line 20); 80 is that of Barhadbešabba, *History* 29 (PO 9.5, p. 572, line 10). For the letter to Theodosius, see *ibid.* (PO 9.5, pp. 576–8); Pelagius, *Def.* 3 (ed. Devreesse, 18–19); Facundus, *Pro def.* 2.2.12–16, 8.3.8. For letter to Proclus, see Facundus, *Pro def.* 8.1.3–7; Barhadbešabba, *History* 29 (PO 9.5, pp. 573–5). The letter to Cyril is preserved in Latin as Cyril, *Ep.* 66 (*ACO* 1.5, §14, pp. 310–15).

of 'a certain great distinction' regarding the natures in Christ, but did so in order to combat his Arian opponents, 'deciding to use that mode of expression more efficaciously against the heretics'; he divided the properties of the natures more fully to fight the battle as it had been dictated by his opponents, yet his works are also full of expressions relating to the 'total unity' of the natures.⁴⁵

In addition, they continued, even some of the more difficult extracts from Theodore have parallels in the orthodox fathers of the past, those of Antioch such as Ignatius, Eustathius, Meletius, and Flavian, and others including Diodore of Tarsus, Athanasius, Basil and the two Gregories, Amphilochius, and John Chrysostom. In their letter to Cyril the bishops tactfully dropped the name of John Chrysostom, and also that of Diodore, adding instead Alexander and Theophilus of Alexandria, Proclus of Constantinople, and even Cyril himself—'for there are some [statements] which even your holiness confesses in the same way and has the same opinion'.⁴⁶ The bishops also suggested that condemnation of Theodore would add fuel to the Nestorian cause. Their final argument, the one which was to become the most difficult to overcome a century later, was that it was not for them to condemn one who had died in the peace of the Church, a judgement which belongs to God alone.⁴⁷

Around the time that Cyril would have received this letter from the council in Antioch he visited Jerusalem, where he received 'a large sealed letter of many lines from the orthodox in Antioch'.⁴⁸ Contained in this missive was an accusation from many clerics, monks, and laity in Antioch charging the bishops of the East with only pretending to abhor Nestorius and using Theodore's books on the Incarnation to propound far more dangerous blasphemies than those of Nestorius. This impression was reinforced upon his return to Alexandria, when the archimandrite deacon Maximus turned up reporting that the orthodox were not allowed to

⁴⁵ These quotations come from the letter to Cyril (*Ep.* 66.8; *ACO* 1.5, §14.11, p. 313, lines 8–14), but are also repeated in the letter to Proclus (see previous note). This is also a point conceded a few years earlier by Cyril himself in his letter to Acacius (*Ep.* 40.22; *ACO* 1.1.4, §128.19, p. 29, lines 5–15).

⁴⁶ Cyril *Ep.* 66.4–5 (*ACO* 1.5, §§14.5–7, pp. 311–12). That Diodore is mentioned in the letter to Proclus (Facundus, *Pro def.* 8.1.5; Barhadbešabba, *PO* 9.5, p. 574, lines 11 [Syriac]), but not in the one to Cyril, is intriguing, indicating that his orthodoxy was not in question for the Syrian bishops and perhaps for Proclus.

⁴⁷ Facundus, *Pro def.* 8.1.7.

⁴⁸ Cyril, *Ep.* 70 (ed. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr.* 1431, 16–17).

proclaim the true faith in Antioch, for the leaders there only pretend to confess the creed of Nicaea while in reality they misinterpret it. Hearing such reports, Cyril raised the tone of his own letters. He dispatched a stiff letter to John of Antioch, urging him not to liken the discredited statements of Diodore and Theodore to those of the orthodox fathers, and urged him to bring peace to his region by holding fair hearings for those charged with teaching Nestorianism.⁴⁹ He also sent a letter to Acacius of Melitene, Theodotus of Ancyra, and Firmus of Caesarea, letting them know of what had transpired in Antioch and how the bishops assembled in council there had refused to condemn the florilegium of Theodore's texts as requested by Proclus.⁵⁰

According to Cyril himself, it was at the urging of the deacon Maximus that he finally decided to set down in writing the correct interpretation of the Nicene Creed, which, though only mentioning Theodore by name on the last page, is a wholesale rebuttal of his Christology.⁵¹ Cyril also wrote to Acacius that John's synod had so persuaded everyone that people were crying out in the churches: 'Let the faith of Theodore increase. As Theodore believed, so we believe!'⁵² As such, Cyril continued, it was necessary to compose counter-arguments, and so, 'after looking into the books of Theodore and Diodore in which they had written, not about the Incarnation of the Only-Begotten, but rather against his Incarnation, I selected certain of the chapters and in the approved manner I set myself against them revealing that their teaching was in every way full of abomination'.⁵³ This

⁴⁹ Cyril, *Ep.* 67 (*ACO* 1.1.4, §133, pp. 37-9).

⁵⁰ Cyril, *Ep.* 68 (only in Latin: *ACO* 1.4, §303, pp. 231-2; *ACO* 4.1, fifth session §19, pp. 86-7).

⁵¹ Cf. Cyril, *Ep.* 70; the exposition of the creed is *Ep.* 55 (*ACO* 1.1.4, §135, pp. 49-61; Wickham, *Select Letters*, 94-131).

⁵² Cyril, *Ep.* 69 (ed. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, 15-16).

⁵³ Cyril, *Ep.* 69.4. It is often assumed, because of the rapidity with which Cyril produced his works against Diodore and Theodore, that the material given to him in Jerusalem by the disaffected Christians of Antioch must have included a florilegium from which he then worked. This florilegium must, moreover, be other than the one probably prepared by Rabbula and/or Acacius, presented to Proclus by the Armenian delegation, and then appended to Proclus' *Tōme*, for this only ever contained extracts from Theodore and not also from Diodore. However, our sources are silent about the existence of any other florilegium. As was mentioned at the beginning of this section, Cyril was already extracting selections from the writings of Theodore, and, as we shall see in the next chapter, the issues that arise in the later history of these texts are best resolved by taking Cyril at his word.

activity resulted in his book *Against Diodore* and the two books *Against Theodore*, which soon made their way into Syria, from where Theodoret of Cyrus responded with a work *In Defence of Diodore and Theodore*, using other texts from Theodore.

As the Syrian bishops had also written to the emperor to make their case, Cyril too composed a letter to the Theodosius II, claiming that Diodore and Theodore were the real fathers of Nestorius' errors, so that when bishops from the East claim to have anathematized Nestorius' teachings but promote those of Diodore and Theodore, they are being duplicitous, for their account of the mystery of Christ does not at all resemble that given by Athanasius, Gregory, and Basil.⁵⁴ Despite pushing his case forcefully, Cyril did not, however, make any request or suggestion that Diodore and Theodore should be formally condemned. Having been brought into the controversy, the emperor insisted that peace be brought to the Church, adding, in what remains of his letter to John of Antioch, that nothing could be more useful than that he would resolve together with the whole Church that no one should presume to do anything against those who had died in her peace.⁵⁵

At the same time, Proclus wrote to John insisting that he had never asked for the anathema of 'Theodore or any one else already dead', perhaps an allusion to Diodore, who by now had been mentioned several times by Cyril.⁵⁶ Proclus also wrote to the deacon Maximus, his official representative in Antioch, asking him to make clear to John that Constantinople had not changed its position with respect to the florilegium: John and his synod were still required both to sign the *Tōme* (which had already been done) and to condemn the appended extracts, regarding whose author Proclus continued to claim ignorance.⁵⁷ It was only ever precision of expression in matters doctrinal, Proclus protested, that had motivated him, not a desire to see Theodore or any other deceased person condemned. John, either in 439 or

⁵⁴ Cyril, *Ep.* 71 (only in Latin: *ACO* 1.4, §288, pp. 210–11).

⁵⁵ Facundus, *Pro def.* 8.3.12–13.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 8.2.2–3 and Pelagius, *Def.* 3 (ed. Devreesse, 24–5).

⁵⁷ Facundus, *Pro def.* 8.2.6–7. There is, of course, no way in which Proclus could have been ignorant of their author: the Armenian delegation had told him explicitly; Ibas had been active translating and propagating them; and Cyril (*Ep.* 68) had written to Acacius, Theodotus, and Firmus, stating quite simply that Proclus had appended some extracts from Theodore to his *Tōme*.

440, seems to have held another synod meeting in Antioch, which criticized certain clergy living in the city (and reporting back to Constantinople) and sent a letter to Cyril asking him to intervene with Proclus so as to dissuade him from condemning the dead.⁵⁸ Perhaps because of increasing imperial pressure from Constantinople, together with a certain uneasiness regarding the increasingly prominent role of the church there, Cyril wrote to Proclus urging that Theodore should not be anathematized.⁵⁹ Cyril remained adamant about the errors of Theodore's teaching, but, as John of Antioch had said that they would rather be burnt alive than condemn Theodore, such an action would certainly lead to open schism and divisions within the Church. If Theodore were still alive, Cyril asserted, he would assuredly be anathematized, but as he has gone to God it is sufficient to reject the absurdities that he had written, and this is covered by the formal condemnation of Nestorius' errors, to which all have agreed.⁶⁰

As neither Cyril nor Proclus had in fact explicitly called for Theodore's condemnation by name, the only actual concession they needed to make to end the controversy and re-establish peace was to drop the demand that John and his synod condemn the 'anonymous' florilegia or that John 'educate' his more truculent clergy such as Ibas. The latter continued to be a difficult personality, being arraigned at various times during the following decade, and condemned at the council in Ephesus in 449.⁶¹ Ibas was, of course, rehabilitated at the tenth session of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, during which the acts of his previous trials were read, and thereby his letter to Mari was included (and implicitly approved) in the records of Chalcedon itself. Although Chalcedon maintained a discreet silence with respect to Diodore and Theodore, the offence caused by its apparent exoneration

⁵⁸ For the second synod meeting, see Barhadbešabba, *History* 29 (PO 9.5, pp. 573, lines 5–12), and the comments of Richard, 'Proclus et le théopaschisme', 318, n. 2, and Constat, *Proclus*, 121, n. 128. In *Ep* 91, to John and his synod, Cyril mentions the letters sent to him by the synod (preserved in Latin: *ACO* 1.5, §15, pp. 314–15; and in different version in *ACO* 4.1, fifth session §66, pp. 105–6).

⁵⁹ Cyril, *Ep* 72, preserved in Latin: *ACO* 4.1, fifth session §§77–8, pp. 109–10.

⁶⁰ On the reasoning that led the actors involved in the Council of Constantinople in 553 to conclude that Cyril's *Ep* 72 and 91 were really forgeries, and to reconstruct the sequence of the controversy, see Price, *Constantinople*, 1.277–9, who concludes that 'the version of events presented in 553 was more the fruit of wishful thinking than of deceit'.

⁶¹ For Ibas, his letter, and its subsequent history, see Price and Gaddis, *Chalcedon*, 2.265–73; Price, *Constantinople*, 1.88–98.

of Ibas' letter was such that the letter became one of the 'Three Chapters' in the controversy that finally led to Theodore's condemnation a century later.

III. IN THE SHADOW OF CHALCEDON

Not mentioned at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, the figures of Diodore and Theodore fell into the shadows for the remainder of the fifth century in the face of more immediate problems, only to re-emerge sporadically at the beginning of the sixth. The second half of the fifth century was a period of chaos as the repercussions of the Council of Chalcedon reverberated throughout East and West, with many alarmed at the inclusion of 'in two natures' in the definition, seeing it as a resurgence of Nestorianism, and preferring instead a 'one-nature' ('miaphysite') approach to articulating the reality of the Incarnation.⁶² The most significant attempt to restore unity in this period was the *Henotikon*, drafted by Acacius of Constantinople and issued by the emperor Zeno in 482.⁶³ This edict reaffirmed the faith of Nicaea and Constantinople, and, importantly, the twelve anathemas of Cyril's third letter to Nestorius, and condemned 'anyone who has thought, or thinks, any other opinion, either now or at any time, whether at Chalcedon or at any synod whatsoever'. The reference to Chalcedon here probably alludes to Theodoret and Ibas. However, rather than unifying everyone around a common formula,

⁶² For a survey of the situation after Chalcedon, see the monumental four-part second volume of Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2, *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590-604)*, trans. J. Cawte and P. Allen (London: Mowbray, 1986-96); the first part deals with the period from Chalcedon to Justinian; the second and fourth part, completed with the help of T. Hainthaler, deal respectively with Constantinople in the sixth century and with Alexandria, Nubia, and Ethiopia; the third part, dealing with Jerusalem and Antioch, was the last to appear in German (Freiburg: Herder, 2004) and has not yet been translated. For a recent and concise summary of this period, as pertinent to our subject, see Price, *Constantinople*, 1.1-42. For an excellent and comprehensive analysis of different dimensions of the establishment of the miaphysite church, see V. L. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, OECIS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). On the term 'miaphysite', in preference to 'monophysite', see D. W. Winkler, 'Miaphysitism: A New Term for Use in the History of Dogma and Ecumenical Theology', *The Harp*, 10 (1997), 33-40.

⁶³ The text of the *Henotikon* is preserved in Evagrius, *H.e.* 3.14.

as intended, the *Henotikon* in fact produced yet further divisions. Rome, together with the Acoemete ('non-sleeping') monks of Constantinople and a number of Palestinian monasteries, simply rejected the document and broke communion with those who accepted it, resulting in the 'Acacian Schism' between Rome and Constantinople which lasted for almost forty years. In the East, all patriarchs and bishops were required to subscribe to the *Henotikon* as a condition of holding their sees. Not only did Chalcedonian bishops sign, but some non-Chalcedonians did so as well, taking it on their own terms. For instance, Peter Mongus in Alexandria, professed support for the *Henotikon* to the emperor, while presenting it to his own bishops as a rejection of Chalcedon and the *Tōme* of Leo.

The names of Diodore and Theodore surfaced at the beginning of the following century, as the emperor Anastasius I (491–518), who was committed to maintaining the *Henotikon* but who was also more sympathetic to the non-Chalcedonians, increasingly came under the influence of Philoxenus of Mabbug and Severus of Antioch. These two leading non-Chalcedonians were themselves increasingly moving to an explicit anti-Chalcedonian position. Macedonius II of Constantinople, Flavian II of Antioch, and Elias of Jerusalem, on the other hand, were all firm Chalcedonians. Philoxenus visited Constantinople in 507, and at his suggestion Anastasius ordered a synod meeting at which, if Philoxenus was not actually there himself, his confession of faith was read before the assembly.⁶⁴ This synod condemned Diodore and Theodore, together with Theodoret, Ibas, and a few other minor named figures, those who would not accept the formula 'one of the Trinity was crucified', Leo and his *Tōme*, and all those who accepted Chalcedon. Severus arrived in Constantinople shortly after this council, and gradually gained the confidence of the emperor, while Philoxenus intensified his campaign against Flavian of Antioch and perhaps Elias of

⁶⁴ This council, which Victor of Tunnuna records as happening in 499 (*Chronica minora*, ed. Cardelle de Hartmann, CCSL 173A, p. 25), is now accepted to have occurred in 507. For further reports of the council, see Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 9.8 (ed. Chabot, 2.160) and Barhebraeus, *Chron. eccles.* 1.41 (ed. Abbeloos and Lamy, 1.187–8). For discussion see L. Abramowski, 'Le Prétendue Condamnation de Diodore de Tarsé in 499', *RHE* 60 (1965), 64–5, and F. K. Haarer, *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, ARCA 46 (Cambridge: Francis Cairns, 2006), 140–2; Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 270–1.

Jerusalem. Two years later, in 509, Flavian convened a synod in Antioch, at the emperor's request, which not only reaffirmed loyalty to the *Henotikon*, the faith of Nicaea and Constantinople, passing over Chalcedon in silence, but also condemned Diodore, Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas, together with a few other minor figures.⁶⁵

Despite Flavian having conceded ground, Philoxenus continued his battle with the patriarch of Antioch, and the conflict came before the emperor for resolution, who in turn placed the matter in the hands of Severus. Severus drafted a document known as the *Typos*, which reasserted the *Henotikon*, but presents it as anathematizing Leo and his *Tome* together with the Council of Chalcedon in its doctrinal teaching, that is, a rejection of all those who teach two Christs or two Sons, who say that there are two natures, after the union, two persons, two modes, two properties or operations (because this is contrary to the twelve anathemas of Cyril). And as such, the *Typos* continues, Paul of Samosata, Diodore and Theodore, together with a number of other Antiochene figures, and also Eutyches, are to be anathematized. In other words, the doctrinal teaching of Chalcedon was to be rejected, but its disciplinary action of deposing Eutyches was accepted.⁶⁶ Despite what happened shortly thereafter, it seems, given the embarrassed and confused way that the Byzantine historians report the events, that Macedonius, Flavian, and Elias might have initially and conditionally been prepared to accept this formula.⁶⁷

However, when the controversy spilled over into liturgical practice, this proved to be too much. The monks who had accompanied Severus to the capital brought with them the practice of singing the *Trisagion* with the interpolation added by Peter the Fuller, the non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, in the 470s ('Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, who was

⁶⁵ Theophanes, *Chron.* A.M. 6001 [AD 508/9] (trans. Mango, 231–2). Cf. A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie* (Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1963), 65; Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 271–2.

⁶⁶ See Severus' *Letter to Bishop Constantine* (ed. Brooks, *Select Letters*, 1.1 (vol. 1 (text) and vol. 2 (trans.) pt. 1, pp. 3–12, at p. 4)). The text is only preserved in two Armenian extracts; for details, and a Latin and English translation, see Haarer, *Anastasius*, 280–1, and 146 for discussion.

⁶⁷ Cf. de Halleux, *Philoxène*, 69.

crucified for us, have mercy on us').⁶⁸ This 'theopaschite' addition specifies both the unity of the one Christ, that Jesus Christ is himself the divine Word of God, as well as the fact that it is this one Son of God who suffered, in the flesh, rather than a second subject alongside a divine subject. Anastasius at first allowed this practice, but retreated when Chalcedonian monastics in Constantinople, together with reinforcements from Palestine, protested. It seems that Macedonius was initially able to counsel Anastasius to redirect his support towards Chalcedon. Once the danger passed, however, Anastasius, keen to show his independence, decided to renew his efforts in a non-Chalcedonian direction, resulting in Macedonius' deposition and the appointment of a more malleable Timothy to the see of Constantinople.⁶⁹ It was at this point that Elias of Jerusalem sent a deputation of monks, led by Sabas (who will be an important figure in the next stage of the controversy, as we will see in the next section of this chapter), to the imperial court to present the Chalcedonian cause.

The general dissatisfaction with the non-Chalcedonian persuasion of the emperor was further exacerbated when Severus was elected as patriarch of Antioch in 512, and he, with Philoxenus, began to speak explicitly and directly against Chalcedon itself. Such is the background for the revolt begun in 513 by the general Vitalian against the imperial court. Although ultimately unsuccessful, it did force Anastasius to change the direction of his policy and begin negotiating with Rome. By the time of Anastasius' death in 518, it was clear that the *Henotikon* was a failure, primarily because it attempted, by not taking an explicit stand with respect to Chalcedon, to hold together the irreconcilable. As Evagrius put it, Anastasius, wishing not to make any innovations whatsoever, allowed each to go his own way, so that, 'as the synod at Chalcedon was neither openly proclaimed in the most holy churches nor indeed universally repudiated, each of the prelates conducted himself according to his belief . . . as a result all the

⁶⁸ For the case of the 'interpolated *Trisagion*' see Menze, *Justinian*, 165–75. At root, however, the problem was not so much a 'miaphysite' as opposed to a 'dyaphysite' Christology, but more a differing understanding regarding to whom the hymn is addressed: in Antioch it was taken as addressing Christ; in Constantinople, and the later Chalcedonian tradition, it was understood as addressing each person of the Trinity in succession.

⁶⁹ Cf. Haarer, *Anastasius*, 147–52.

churches were divided into distinct parties and their prelates had no communion with one another'.⁷⁰

Justin I (518–27) came to the throne, if not already a pro-Chalcedonian, then one prepared to accept that stance for the good of the empire, setting a direction that was subsequently solidified under Justinian (527–65). A number of miaphysite bishops, including Severus of Antioch, were immediately deposed. Reunion with Rome was achieved in the following year in 519, on the basis of the *libellus* issued by Pope Hormisdas, which every bishop was required to sign and return to Rome, stating his obedience to the authority and faith of the apostolic see.⁷¹ It also demanded an explicit acceptance of the Chalcedonian definition and the *Tome* of Leo, and rejected all post-Chalcedonian developments, naming various patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch as heretics and demanding their removal from the diptychs. At this point some fifty non-Chalcedonian bishops refused to sign the *libellus* and went into exile.

Soon after Justin ascended the throne some Scythian monks, led by John Maxentius, arrived in Constantinople seeking assistance in a dispute with their bishop, Paternus of Tomi, regarding their confession that 'one of the Trinity was crucified'. While the earlier theopaschite interpolation of the *Trisagion* had been used as an anti-Chalcedonian catchphrase, the Scythian monks insisted that such a statement was in fact needed in defence of Chalcedon, as it made clear that the one hypostasis of the definition, the one Jesus Christ, is indeed himself the divine Word of God. Although later used as outreach towards the miaphysites, it seems that it was intended by the Scythian monks as staking out their own Chalcedonian claim upon Cyril of Alexandria in distinction to the non-Chalcedonian claim.⁷² But it also entailed at least a tacit recognition that the Chalcedonian definition itself was inadequate and needed to be supplemented. As one of the monks was related to Vitalian, they were able to present themselves in court. However, they were vehemently opposed by the Acoemete monks, who had always aligned themselves with Rome in holding to the sufficiency of the Chalcedonian definition and the *Tome* of Leo, and who were allergic to any theopaschite confession.

⁷⁰ Evagrius, *H.e.* 3.30.

⁷¹ For the *libellus* of Hormisdas see Menze, *Justinian*, 67–94.

⁷² A point made by Menze, *Justinian*, 39.

The Scythian monks left to plead their case in Rome in 519, but were anticipated by letters from the papal legates, and also from Justinian, expressing concern with their teaching.⁷³ As communion had just been re-established between Rome and Constantinople on the basis of Horsmisdas' *libellus*, it was not surprising that they were not well received there. Only in 527, when Justinian acceded to the throne and seemed to switch his focus to the East, attempting, on the basis of Chalcedon, to reunite the miaphysites, did the Scythian monks and their theopaschism find a receptive audience.

In the following decade Justinian began a concerted attempt to achieve reconciliation with the miaphysites. In 532 select miaphysite leaders were invited to Constantinople for discussions, during which the names of Diodore and Theodore re-emerged. Attempting to get beyond the question of whether Chalcedon had followed Cyril or not, Justinian asked the miaphysite bishops what they found objectionable besides the formula 'in two natures'. Their answer was that, while there were many other things to censure, most disturbing was the council's reception of Ibas and Theodoret.⁷⁴ They argued that because Ibas' letter had been read out, the letter had been approved by the council (thus endorsing its criticism of Cyril), while Theodoret, although repentant, had not in fact changed his mind.⁷⁵ In a private audience after the conference, Justinian asked the miaphysites whether peace could be achieved under the following conditions: that they could anathematize Diodore, Theodore, Theodoret, Ibas, Nestorius, and Eutyches, accept Cyril's twelve anathemas,

⁷³ These letters are found in the *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35.2, pp. 677–9 (legates) and 644–5 (Justinian).

⁷⁴ S. Brock, 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47 (1981), 87–121, edits and translates what remains of a Syriac text containing the miaphysite minutes of this meeting; the passage in question is at p. 98. See also Innocent of Maronea's letter to the presbyter Thomas of Thessalonika summarizing the account (in *ACO* 4.2, pp. 169–84). There is also an anonymous summary from the miaphysite side in *PO* 13.192–6 (from *BL Cod. Add.*, 12155, fol. 110^v–111^r), and the statement they issued for Justinian and his bishops, preserved in Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor *H.e.* 9.15 and Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 9.22 (ed. Chabot, 2.196–203), translated in W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* (Cambridge, 1972), 362–6. For further discussion of this conference see Menze, *Justinian*, 58–67, 94–101.

⁷⁵ On this phenomenon, see Price, *Constantinople*, 1.97: 'We may detect in the debate over the Letter to Mari a tendency to attribute authority not just to the decrees of Chalcedon but to whatever was to be found in the acts, thereby making even *obiter dicta* the subject of impassioned debate.'

and condemn anything written against them; that they could confess the 'one nature of the God Word incarnate', but would refrain from anathematizing those who speak of 'two natures after the ineffable union', accept the Council of Chalcedon as far as the expulsion of Eutyches was concerned, and cease anathematizing the tome of Leo; and, finally, that they would not require the suspension of the *libellus* of Pope Hormisdas.⁷⁶ In this way their acceptance of Chalcedon would be qualified, limited to recognizing the deposition of Eutyches but not the reinstatement of Ibas or Theodoret, nor even an explicit acceptance of the definition. Even if all this were conceivable, the last requirement, allowing the *libellus* of Hormisdas to stand, was too much, for it would require that the names of the great non-Chalcedonian bishops no longer be commemorated.

Justinian continued his efforts to seek a compromise with the miaphysites, for instance by introducing a hymn with a strong theopaschite confession ('Only-begotten Son and Word of God . . .'), based on an almost identical one by Severus, into the liturgy at a point close to the *Trisagion*.⁷⁷ Justinian also extended repeated invitations to Severus himself to come to Constantinople. Severus finally came in 535/6, at which point, according to miaphysite sources, communion was restored for a time between Severus, Anthimus of Constantinople, and Theodosius of Alexandria.⁷⁸ But protests soon erupted, and petitions were submitted against the miaphysites by the clergy and people in Constantinople and shortly after in Syria and Palestine. When Pope Agapetus arrived in Constantinople in 536, sent by the Ostrogoth king Theodahad to intercede with Justinian to help ward off an invasion of Italy, he was able to turn his position of weakness into one of strength and so turn the emperor against both Anthimus and Severus. They were both expelled from the city, and Agapetus consecrated Menas as the new patriarch of Constantinople, who soon after

⁷⁶ Brock, 'Conversations', 116–17.

⁷⁷ Cf. G. Bühring und S. Uhlig, 'Antiochenisches und Justinianisches im Hymnus "Eingeborener Sohn"', *OstKSt* 37 (1988), 297–307, and J. H. Barkhuizen, 'Justinian's Hymn', *BZ* 77 (1984), 3–5. For a translation of Severus' hymn, see F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), 1.77.

⁷⁸ Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *H.e.* 9.19–26 and Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 9.25 (Chabot, 2.208–20). See A. Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 351–5; F. Millar, 'Rome, Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church Under Justinian: Two Synods of 536', *JRS* 98 (2008), 62–82.

received an order from the emperor to hold a synod to examine the case of Anthimus. Five sessions were held in May and June, and a further session in September in Jerusalem, condemning the main leaders of the miaphysites and marking the end of this phase of Justinian's official attempts at reconciliation.⁷⁹

Before turning to the final episode leading to the conciliar condemnation of Theodore and Diodore, it should be noted that even if rapprochement was not achieved with the non-Chalcedonians, Justinian's first decade as emperor had been tremendously productive in many other areas. He had regained large regions of Africa and Italy; undertaken the editing and publishing of the Code, the Digest, and the Institutes, the most comprehensive and voluminous body of legal texts to date; and overseen major construction projects, not least of which was Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. This is the background for the sudden dramatic reversal of fortune in the 540s, which is itself the backdrop for the condemnation of the 'Three Chapters'.⁸⁰ In 540 the city of Antioch was captured and ransacked by the Persians, followed, shortly afterwards, by the loss of the regained regions of Italy to the Goths. In 542/3 the bubonic plague swept across the empire, the first recorded pandemic, devastating the population.⁸¹ Finally, the first miaphysite episcopal consecration, Jacob Baradaeus for Edessa, occurred in 542/3. Although it would be a few years yet before Jacob began his programme of establishing a non-Chalcedonian episcopal hierarchy (including two patriarchs, twenty-six bishops, and thousands of priests and deacons), this was an ominous sign, as it signalled that the miaphysites were indeed going their own way in forming a

⁷⁹ The material produced by these synod meetings is collected in the so-called 'Collectio Sabbaitica' (ACO 3). For an analysis of this material, see Millar, 'Rome, Constantinople, and the Near Eastern Church'. Justinian and his consort Theodora seem to have deliberately taken distinct roles, public and private, with respect to the miaphysites. See Procopius, *Anecdota* 10.23 and Evagrius, *H.e.* 4.10. Regarding Theodora, their dual roles, and the unofficial efforts of Justinian on behalf of the miaphysites thereafter, see Menze, *Justinian*, 206–28.

⁸⁰ For this period of Justinian's reign as a 'second age', see M. Meier, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians. Kontingenzerfahrung und Kontingenzbewältigung im 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

⁸¹ Cf. P. Allen, 'The "Justinianic" Plague', *Byzantion*, 49 (1979), 5–20; D. Stathakopoulos, 'The Justinianic Plague Revisited', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 24 (2000), 256–76.

separate church, even if at the time it was no more than a response to an immediate pastoral need.⁸²

IV. AN 'ORIGENIST' REPRISAL?

In 544/5 Justinian issued an edict condemning 'Three Chapters', referring, that is, to the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus against Cyril, and the letter of Ibas to Mari, also criticizing Cyril and praising Theodore.⁸³ This followed hot on the heels of an edict condemning Origenism in 543.⁸⁴ Although the condemnation of the Three Chapters falls within the trajectory of Justinian's overtures towards the miaphysites, the actual promulgation of an edict, and its emphasis on Theodore, together with the edict against Origenism in the previous year, results from an internal controversy in Palestinian monasticism, the actual contours of which, behind the rhetorical polemics and caricatures, are difficult to discern.

Liberatus of Carthage, writing in the 560s what would become the most influential account of the controversy, presents the condemnation of the Three Chapters as an act of revenge on behalf of Origen. He claims that Theodore Askidas, a committed Origenist, persuaded Justinian to condemn Theodore and Ibas, because Theodore had written against Origen, and Ibas had praised Theodore. Moreover, Theodore Askidas allegedly argued that, as Ibas' letter had been received by Chalcedon, his condemnation would facilitate reconciliation with the miaphysites.⁸⁵ The other key source, Cyril of Scythopolis' *Life of Saint Sabas*,

⁸² Cf. John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, PO 19.153–8. Cf. D. D. Bundy, 'Jacob Baradaeus: The State of Research, a Review of Sources, and a New Approach', *Le Muséon*, 91 (1978), 45–86.

⁸³ The actual text of the edict condemning the Three Chapters has not survived, but its content is clear from the many references to it. For the Three Chapters controversy, see Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 411–62; Price, *Constantinople*, 2.76–99; and for the broader dimensions of the controversy and its reception, see C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt, *The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).

⁸⁴ The text of the edict is in *ACO* 3, pp. 189–214. For analysis, see Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 385–402.

⁸⁵ Liberatus, *Breviarium* 24 (*ACO* 2.5, p. 140); the relevant passage is translated in Price, *Chalcedon*, 1.18–19.

written shortly after the Council of Constantinople in 553, also presents the controversy as being primarily about the pernicious presence of Origenists in the Palestinian desert, though his account traces their eventual downfall despite their influence in court. Cyril, on the other hand, relegates the condemnation of Theodore to but a few brief mentions and veiled allusions, and makes no mention whatsoever of the two other Chapters.⁸⁶ Both these key sources, however, give highly tendentious accounts and need to be treated with caution. In particular, care needs to be taken with the description 'Origenist' and with determining the theological outlook of their opponents. As has been recently argued very convincingly, Cyril of Scythopolis has deliberately cast the figure of his beloved Saint Sabas in the mould of Orthodoxy as defined by the Fifth Ecumenical Council, making him out to be a 'Neo-Chalcedonian' *avant la lettre* and labelling his opponents as 'Origenists', thereby largely concealing the former attachment of the anti-Origenists towards Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁸⁷

To trace the developments that culminate in the edicts of 543–5, we need to take a few steps further back. Writing shortly after the Council of Constantinople, looking back with the benefit of hindsight, Cyril of Scythopolis recounts various events during the life of Sabas in a particular way. For instance, the tension resulting from the expansion of Sabas' community at the very beginning of his career is described in terms of an opposition between intellectuals and those who prefer simplicity: in 486 a number of monks from his *laura* went to Sallustius of Jerusalem to complain about Sabas' 'rusticity' and 'boorishness', which

⁸⁶ The *Life of Sabas* was edited by E. Schwartz, together with Cyril's other *Lives*, in *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939), and translated by R. Price, *Cyril of Scythopolis: The Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, CS 144 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1991). For Sabas and a full survey of Palestinian monasticism more generally, see J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1995).

⁸⁷ This has been brilliantly examined by D. Hombergen, *The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism*, *Studia Anselmiana*, 132 (Rome: S. Anselmo, 2001). F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert* (Münster in Westfalen, 1899) remains useful, as does A. Guillaumont, *Les 'Képhalia gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, *Patristica Sorbonensia*, 5 (Paris: Seuil, 1962). See now also Price, *Chalcedon*, 2.270–86.

made him, they said, incapable of leading.⁸⁸ At stake here is not so much the virtue of education, for both sides were educated (as was Cyril himself), but the ideal of a certain type of simplicity promulgated by educated monks against those whom they perceive as intellectuals.⁸⁹ Twenty years later, around 505/6, Sabas' opponents left his *laura* and settled in the ruins of cells built by non-Chalcedonian monks, calling their new establishment the New *Laura*.⁹⁰ It is here, according to Cyril, that Origenism was first detected, in 514, when Agapetus, the third superior of the New *Laura*, discovered four monks 'who whispered in secret the doctrines of Origen'. According to Cyril, their leader Nonnus, 'pretending to be a Christian and simulating piety, held the doctrines of the godless Greeks, Jews, and Manichees, that is, the myths concerning pre-existence related by Origen, Evagrius, and Didymus'. When Agapetus reported his discovery to Elias of Jerusalem, the monks were expelled and took refuge in the 'plain'. Agapetus' successor, Mamas, admitted them back, around 519/20, but they 'maintained in their souls their wicked fictions, keeping them totally secret from the hearing of the monks out of fear of our sainted father Sabas; for, as long as he was still alive, there was only one confession of faith among all the monks in the desert'.⁹¹

Nothing more is said by Cyril about this discovery of 'Origenism' in the New *Laura* in the second decade of the sixth century. However, we know from Philoxenus of Mabbug that shortly after 512 a Syrian monk called Stephen Bar Sudaili fled from Edessa and took refuge in the vicinity of Jerusalem, somewhere near the tomb of Abraham, that is, only a few miles from the New *Laura*.⁹² According to Philoxenus, Stephen taught some kind of pantheistic

⁸⁸ *V. Sab.* 19 (Schwartz 103–4).

⁸⁹ Cf. Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 231–52, who would see this as resulting from the distinct spiritual approaches of Evagrius, on the one hand, and Theodoret of Cyrus, on the other.

⁹⁰ *V. Sab.* 36 (Schwartz 123–5). For the New *Laura*, see Patrich, *Sabas*, 107–10.

⁹¹ *V. Sab.* 36 (Schwartz, 124.2–125.23).

⁹² Cf. *Letter to Abraham and Orestes*, in A. L. Frothingham, *Stephen Bar Sudaili: The Syrian Mystic (c.500 A.D.) and the Book of Hierotheos on the Hidden Treasures of the Divinity with Original Syriac Documents, Edited and Translated* (Leiden: 1886; repr. Amsterdam: APA-Philo Press, 1981), 28–47, at 28–9. See also Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 9.30.2 (ed. Chabot, 2.249–50). For Stephen, see Guillaumont, *Les 'Képhalaia Gnostica'*, 302–32, and K. Pinggéra, *All-Erlösung und All-Einheit: Studien zum 'Buch des heiligen Hierotheos' und seiner Rezeption in der syrisch-orthodoxen Theologie*, Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients, 10 (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2002).

heresy. He is said to have written on the wall of his cell that 'All nature is consubstantial with the divine essence', though when others saw it and charged him with blasphemy, he removed it from the wall and secretly put it into his writings.⁹³ Also according to Philoxenus, Stephen derived his understanding of the term 'motion' from Evagrius, and connected it to the sixth day in such a manner that, 'by the Sabbath, Christ will be all and in all men, and by the first day God will be all in all'.⁹⁴ We also have a text attributed to Stephen entitled *The Book of the Holy Hierotheos*, which is a fascinating description of the stages of the spiritual life in the Evagriian tradition.⁹⁵ The title, added by a later disciple, is clearly meant to link it to the works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, the supposed disciple of Hierotheos. It is often assumed that the relationship between the works is the other way round, that is, that the *Book of the Holy Hierotheos* depends upon the *corpus dionysiacum*. However, it has recently and plausibly been argued that the *corpus dionysiacum* is rather a reaction to the free, self-authenticating theological and spiritual speculations of Stephen Bar Sudaili, probably by Sergius of Reshaina, as part of an effort to bring ecclesiastical and theological order to the evolving miaphysite church.⁹⁶ As we will see, we can be certain that at least some of those accused of 'Origenism' by Cyril of Scythopolis, such as Leontius, do not subscribe to the kind of pantheistic teaching found in Stephen; yet, on the other hand, the anathemas against Origen, especially those of 543, do echo what can be found in his work.⁹⁷ There was clearly a burgeoning of

⁹³ Frothingham, *Stephen*, 42–3.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* *Stephen*, 36–7.

⁹⁵ Ed. and trans. F. S. Marsh (London, 1927; repr. Amsterdam: APA-Philo, 1979). See also I. Hausherr, 'L'Influence du 'Livre de Saint Hiérophée', *Orientalia Christiania*, 30 (1933), 176–211.

⁹⁶ R. A. Arthur, *Pseudo-Dionysius as Polemicist: The Development and Purpose of the Angelic Hierarchy in Sixth Century Syria* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), esp. 116–26, 154–7, 175–87. For an alternative reconstruction see I. Perczel, 'Pseudo-Dionysius and Palestinian Origenism', in J. Patrich, *The Sabaitic Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, 98 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 261–82; and *id.*, 'The Earliest Syriac Reception of Dionysius', *MT* 24.4 (2008), 557–71; and A. Louth, 'The Reception of Dionysius up to Maximus the Confessor', *MT* 24.4 (2008), 573–83.

⁹⁷ It is also worth noting that Leontius quotes 'the great Dionysius' (PG 86A.1288c, 1304d), and that the first commentaries on Dionysius were written by John of Scythopolis, about whom Cyril is silent. Hombergen (*Second Origenist Controversy*, 366, n. 531) observes that Cyril left his monastery in Scythopolis, having been warned by his mother about the Origenists (see *Life of Euthymius* 49 and *Life of John the Hesychast* 20), at the time when John was most likely bishop of the place.

spiritual and theological reflection in Palestine in the early sixth century, though beyond positing the concurrence of ideas, places, and dates, it is not possible to come to any firmer conclusion.

The name of Theodore of Mopsuestia figures in Cyril's account only twice. The first is rather unexpected and awkward. It occurs in Cyril's explanation of a statement made by Sabas to the emperor during a visit to Constantinople in 530/1. Sabas had gone there, on behalf of the bishops of Palestine, to petition the emperor for tax relief. As on an earlier mission during the time of Anastasius, Sabas created a good impression on the emperor, who promised to help, and in return Sabas promised him a prosperous reign, the recovery of Africa and Italy, 'in order that you may extirpate the Arian heresy together with those of Nestorius and Origen'.⁹⁸ Cyril then explains:

He named the heresy of Nestorius because some of the monks who had accompanied him had been found siding with Theodore of Mopsuestia when disputing with the Aposchists [i.e. non-Chalcedonians] in the Basilica. He included the destructive heresy of Origen in the rejection of the said heresy, since one of the monks with him, Byzantine by birth and named Leontius, who was one of those admitted with Nonnus into the New Laura after the death of the superior Agapetus, had been found embracing the doctrines of Origen; though claiming to support the Council of Chalcedon, he was detected holding the views of Origen.⁹⁹

Discovering these heretics in his entourage, Cyril continues, Sabas expelled both parties from his company and sailed back to Palestine, leaving them in Constantinople.¹⁰⁰

This is, to say the least, a highly contentious depiction of what must have happened. First, from everything we have seen so far, although Theodore's name had been brought up for condemnation by non-Chalcedonians at various times and Justinian

⁹⁸ *V. Sab.* 72 (Schwartz, 175.23–4).

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* (Schwartz, 176.7–16).

¹⁰⁰ Despite how Cyril presents Sabas dissociating himself from both heretical groups, it is not at all clear that Sabas stood in a third, distinct position. Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 198: 'In this struggle we may well distinguish "Origenists" and "Antiochenes" as reciprocal enemies, but there is poor evidence for the existence of a third party of "Neochalcedonians" who, as the common opponents of the former two, rigidly lumped these two together.' That Sabas was a 'Neochalcedonian' was B. Daley's argument ('The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium', *JTS* NS 27.2 (1976), 333–69), but this cannot be sustained, as Hombergen demonstrates (*Second Origenist Controversy*, 190–200).

was prepared to consider his condemnation, pro-Chalcedonians did not, in the early 530s, simply take his heretical status for granted: Cyril has clearly conformed his saint to the standards of Orthodoxy at the time of writing, that is, after the Council of Constantinople (553). Moreover, it is not at all clear that Sabas was the leader of this delegation. Rather than being abandoned in Constantinople, Leontius in fact seems to have been the Jerusalem patriarchate's representative (*apocrisarius*) to Constantinople, taking part in the discussions with the non-Chalcedonians in 532 and again in 536, and, as Cyril is forced to concede, he flourished in the city, having made a connection with a certain 'father' (*πάππας*) Eusebius who had access to the palace and the emperor himself.¹⁰¹

More important still is that, as is now generally recognized, Leontius was definitely not an 'Origenist', at least, not in the sense of holding to any of the items condemned in 543 or later in 553, most of which he explicitly denies.¹⁰² In fact, according to his own testimony, Leontius once belonged to the anti-Origenist faction, and then during the 530s laboured hard to reveal their true colours in his three-part work *Against Nestorius and Eutyches*.¹⁰³ In the preface to the third part (the *DTM*) he recounts how he once

¹⁰¹ *V. Sab.* 83 (Schwartz, 189.1–5). Present at the discussions with the non-Chalcedonians in 532 was a Leontius who is described as the 'venerable monk and apocrisarius of the fathers assembled in the holy city' who took part in the discussions with the non-Chalcedonians in 532 (*ACO* 4.2, p. 170.5–6); and in 536 a certain Leontius is described as 'superior and representative of all the desert' (*ACO* 3, pp. 37.1, 50.30, 145.34). That this is in fact the Leontius of Byzantium mentioned by Cyril is now generally accepted. On this basis, J. Binns (*Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314–631* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 252), concludes: 'Leontius was at least as important as Sabas, if not more so. Far from being dismissed by Sabas, he remained in Constantinople to continue to represent the interests of the Patriarchate.'

¹⁰² This was definitively demonstrated by Daley in 'The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium'. This fact has now been generally accepted, as also has Daley's clarification of the various figures named Leontius and the works ascribed to them, in his unpublished dissertation, 'Leontius of Byzantium: A Critical Edition of His Works, with Prolegomena', D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University (1978). Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 131–76, Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 181–4, and Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors*, 249–53, offer very useful surveys of the results of older and recent scholarship.

¹⁰³ The first book goes by the same title, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, and is abbreviated *CNE* (PG 86A.1273a–1309); the second book, *Contra Aphthartocetas* (*CA* PG 86A.1316d–1356c), and the third *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* (*DTN* PG 86A.1357b–1385b). There is no mention at all of Theodoret or Ibas, thus dating the work to the period prior to the condemnation of the Three Chapters.

‘formerly belonged to the sect against which, with God’s help, I am now resolved to bring an open indictment’.¹⁰⁴ He recounts how he had been snared by them when he was young in age and reason. He was, however, saved by a grace from above, inspiring in him a desire for a life of virtue such that he willingly embraced the life of a stranger wandering in the desert till he eventually came into the hands of godly men (*θεῖοι ἄνδρες*) who purified the eye of his soul and filled it with a sacred light (*φῶς ἱερόν*) by means of the writings of lovers of wisdom (*θεόσοφοι*), probably referring to Nonnus.¹⁰⁵

In the common preface to the work, Leontius further specifies that in the third book (the *DTM*) he will refute ‘those who pretend to adhere to the great ecumenical council of Chalcedon, but who are advocates of the doctrines of Nestorius’, words which are echoed later by Cyril describing how Sabas abandoned Leontius in Constantinople as one who was ‘claiming to support the Council of Chalcedon [but] had been found embracing the doctrines of Origen’.¹⁰⁶ The similarity of charges here is not coincidental; Cyril must have read Leontius and was responding in kind: Leontius unmasks his opponents as adherents of Theodore of Mopsuestia, while Cyril claims that his opponents are really Origenists.¹⁰⁷ When he finally gets to the third book (the *DTM*), which is nothing short of a diatribe against Theodore, and to a lesser extent Diodore, it becomes clear that his opponents are not Nestorianism and Eutychianism in general, but specifically those who *now* promote the heresy of Nestorius under their promotion of Theodore. In other words, prior to the first climax of the controversy in 544/5 Leontius launched a full-scale attack upon those who opposed what they call ‘Origenism’ and who regard Chalcedon as being compatible with Diodore and Theodore.

According to Cyril, Sabas’ personality was such that he was able to hold these tensions together; and so when he died, shortly after his return from Constantinople (5 December), the situation

¹⁰⁴ See the passage in *DTNPG* 86A.1357c3–1360b5; the Greek text and a translation can also be found in Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 153 (trans.), 373 (text).

¹⁰⁵ At least that was the conclusion of the tenth-century scribe who produced *Codex Vaticanus Gr.* 2195, fol. 5, making the identification in a scholium that seems to have been copied along with the text from its source. Cf. Daley, ‘The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium’, 335.

¹⁰⁶ Leontius *PG* 86A.1272a; Cyril, *V. Sab.* 72 (Schwartz, 176.15–16).

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 151.

began to unravel and the Origenists began to prevail.¹⁰⁸ His successor, Melitas, did not have as firm a grip, and so Nonnus and his party were able to attract others with their teaching, not only from the New Laura, but also from the monastery of Martyrius and the laura of Firminus, together with their superiors, Domitian and Theodore Askidas respectively. In 536 these two figures travelled to Constantinople, again 'pretending to be battling for the Council of Chalcedon', where they joined forces with Leontius and 'father' Eusebius. Enjoying their 'initial boldness' (*πρώτης παρρησίας*) in the palace, they were also able to gain episcopal appointments, Domitian receiving Galatia, and Theodore Askidas Caesarea of Cappadocia.¹⁰⁹

Opposition to this 'Origenist' ascendancy began with Gelasius, Melitas' successor as superior of the Great Laura. In 537 Gelasius had his monks assemble together in the church and had the work of Antipatrus against Origen read out to them.¹¹⁰ Protests and riots ensued, with the result that about forty monks were expelled, 'by common consent', from the laura, going to the New Laura where they were received by Nonnus and Leontius. After a frustrated attempt to storm the Great Laura, they appealed to 'father' Eusebius, who put pressure on Gelasius to receive them back or to expel their opponents.¹¹¹ Six anti-Origenists from the Great Laura accepted voluntary exile and went to Antioch, where they presented their case to Patriarch Ephrem. He then convoked his synod and issued a public anathema condemning the doctrines of Origen. Nonnus, Leontius, Domitian, and Theodore Askidas responded by pressing Peter of Jerusalem to remove Ephrem's name from diptychs. Peter, however, secretly commissioned Sophronius and Gelasius to compose a petition against the Origenists and exhorting him not to remove Ephrem from the diptychs. Peter then sent this petition to the emperor, resulting in the imperial edict against Origenism. Patriarch Menas of Constantinople and his synod appended their signatures to this edict, and Domitian and Theodore were forced to do the same. The edict was published in Jerusalem in February 543 and, according to Cyril, was

¹⁰⁸ Just prior to Sabas' death, Cyril repeats a statement made earlier: 'while our all-praiseworthy Sabas was still in the flesh, there was one confession of faith in all the monasteries of the desert', *V. Sab.* 83 (Schwartz, 188.7-9); cf. 36 (Schwartz, 125.22-3).

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 83 (Schwartz, 188-9).

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* 84 (Schwartz, 189-90).

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* 84 (Schwartz, 191-2).

signed by all the bishops of Palestine except one, together with all the superiors from the desert.

By this time 'father' Eusebius and Leontius had died. Nonnus and his supporters 'left the catholic communion' and withdrew, as they had done in the time of Agapetus (c.514), to the 'plain' (*πεδιάς*).¹¹² It was left to Theodore Askidas to coordinate a response. His influence had grown to such an extent that in Cyril's mind Askidas 'controlled the palace'. He summoned Peter of Jerusalem's legates and threatened to have Peter deposed unless he were to order that the exiles be received back into the laura, which Peter duly did.¹¹³ This was then followed by the edict issued by Justinian in 544/5 condemning Theodore of Mopsuestia and the two other 'Chapters'. The inclusion of Theodoret and Ibas strongly indicates that it was not simply an act of revenge for the condemnation of Origen instigated by Theodore Askidas, as Cyril asserts, but that the concerns expressed by the miaphysites over the previous decade had indeed been heard, as Liberatus also suggests. In addition to the intrigues of various feuding parties, Justinian's own interest in matters theological and ecclesial no doubt played a role, especially in the context of the ravages that were befalling his empire at this time, as noted earlier. In an unprecedented manner, this decade saw the publication of a number of theological treatises composed by Justinian himself. No doubt, by issuing an edict against both sides Justinian felt he had responded in a balanced manner to the Palestinian feuding, bringing about peace where he could.

The condemnation of the Three Chapters was not well received.¹¹⁴ According to Facundus, Menas of Constantinople initially refused to approve of the edict, protesting that it went against Chalcedon. He eventually signed off on the document, but told the deacon Stephen, Pope Vigilius' *apocrisarius* at Constantinople, that he would withdraw his signature if Vigilius did not concur. No doubt he had in mind the fate of his predecessor

¹¹² *V. Sab.* 86 (Schwartz, 192). This is probably the coastal regions around Gaza, where a more open attitude towards Origenism and especially Evagrius could be found, as seen, for instance, in the letters of Barsanuphius and John: both condemn Evagrius' speculations about matters such as pre-existence and the apocatastasis, but were also prepared to recommend those texts of his which were beneficial for the soul. Cf. Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 206–52, esp. 222–3.

¹¹³ *V. Sab.* 86 (Schwartz, 192–3).

¹¹⁴ For what follows, see Facundus, *Pro def.* 4.4.2–9.

Anthimus, sacrificed by the changing policies of the emperor of the time. Zoilus of Alexandria and Ephrem of Antioch likewise signed, while explaining in private that they had been compelled to do so. Peter of Jerusalem publicly protested the edict, together with a mass protest of pro-Chalcedonian monks, but also acquiesced soon enough. From the Palestinian desert, however, the place where the controversy had erupted, all we hear is a stony, perhaps embarrassed, silence. The most striking aspect about Cyril's *Life of Sabas* is that this condemnation is not overtly mentioned at all; his only allusion to it is the mention of a reaction against it. Before going to Constantinople in 545, to report personally to the emperor all the woes that have befallen the Great Laura, Gelasius exhorts his monks not to let any adherent of Theodore of Mopsuestia settle with them, since Sabas had abhorred him along with Origen. He then adds: 'I myself regret deeply having appended my signature to the petition made by the desert at the order of the patriarch [Peter] against his being anathematized.'¹¹⁵ Gelasius, the second successor of the saintly Sabas who now guided his community from heaven, signed a petition initiated by Peter of Jerusalem to the effect that Theodore of Mopsuestia should not be anathematized. Unlike Peter of Jerusalem, and later Pope Vigilius, and even the Roman deacon Pelagius, all of whom initially defended Theodore of Mopsuestia but then eventually yielded, Gelasius died before being able change his mind. He was not received by anyone in Constantinople and died en route back to Palestine, by foot, in October 546.

The conclusion is inescapable that Cyril's party, tracing its line back to Sabas himself, had initially defended Theodore of Mopsuestia and that they had refashioned their self-understanding in the light of the Council of Constantinople. As we have seen, there were tensions within Sabaite monasticism from an early stage. It seems that the focus of these tensions became clearer in the visit to Constantinople in 530/1, during the discussions there with the miaphysites, resulting in two opposed factions divided over the figure of Theodore of Mopsuestia. That Leontius had accused them of being crypto-Nestorians, because of their respect for Theodore and Diodore, does not mean that they did not think of themselves as being Chalcedonian. Both

¹¹⁵ *V. Sab.* 87 (Schwartz, 194.17-27).

admit that their opponents at least feign to defend Chalcedon. But, in turn, that Cyril, and the characters in his *Lives*, accuses Nonnus and Leontius of being 'Origenists', indicates that the tension within Sabaite monasticism that developed into open conflict and division was also a matter of different spiritual and intellectual orientations.¹¹⁶ In all, we must conclude that the condemnation of Theodore was not simply an act of revenge, but the result of the work undertaken over the previous decade by Leontius and others in unmasking the 'Nestorianism' of their opponents, and that, for his part later on, Cyril carefully refashioned his heroes according to the demands of Orthodoxy as defined by the Council of Constantinople in 553.

The 'Origenists' were now the strongest party in Palestine, and one of them, George, 'by extensive intrigue', was even made the superior of the Great Laura in February 547. However, on the very day that the monks disaffected by the appointment left the Great Laura, Nonnus was seized by sudden death, and soon after George was ousted from his position, to be replaced, briefly by Cassianus, and then by Conon in July 548.¹¹⁷ As their fortunes reversed, the 'Origenists' were racked by internal divisions, splitting into two groups: those at the New Laura were called 'Isochrists' by their opponents, presumably teaching something like the doctrine that all will become equal to Christ at the restoration; while those at the laura of Firminus were called 'Protoktists' or 'Tetradites', presumably holding a special place for Christ as one created before all others, but who, as a created being, is thus added as a fourth person to the Trinity.¹¹⁸ The charge of adding a fourth person to the Trinity was one repeatedly made against those who showed any division within the one Christ, and it would soon be used by Justinian against

¹¹⁶ The only indication that the 'Origenists' were classified together as 'monophysites' is Liberatus *Breviarium* 23-4, *ACO* 2.5, p. 140, lines 13-15: 'Theodore bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, a favourite and familiar of princes, an *Acephalus* in doctrine, a vigorous defender of Origen, and an imitator of Pelagius.' For the spiritual and intellectual dimensions of the conflict, see Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 206-52, 329-67.

¹¹⁷ *V. Sab.* 87-8 (Schwartz, 195-6).

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.* 89 (Schwartz, 197.13-17). For this division, and the fact that the condemnation of Origenism in 553, unlike that of 543, was directed specifically at the 'Isochrists', see Guillaumont, *Les 'Képhalaia gnostica'*, 132-3, 149.

Theodore and Nestorius and in the fifth anathema of the Council of Constantinople.¹¹⁹

Cyril completes his account of the life of Sabas in an even more lopsided manner than anything we have seen so far. According to him, while Theodore Askidas ordained many of the 'Isochrists' as bishops of Palestine, the 'Protoktists' formed a coalition with the anti-Origenists and went with Conon to Constantinople in 551/2. When the 'Isochrists' overplayed their hand by putting Macarius on the episcopal throne of Jerusalem, thus bringing upon themselves the emperor's ire, Conon was able to seize the moment: he presented the emperor with a petition against the 'Origenists' and having 'complete boldness' (*πλείστης παρρησίας*) with the emperor (contrasting with Leontius' 'initial' (*πρώτης*) boldness), he persuaded him to place Eustochius on the Jerusalem throne and call an ecumenical council, which duly met, and 'a common and universal anathema was directed against Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia and against the teaching of Evagrius and Didymus on the pre-existence and a universal restoration in the presence and with the approval of the four patriarchs'.¹²⁰

The denouement of the drama was not as simple as Cyril presents it, nor in fact was Origen, let alone Didymus and Evagrius, officially condemned by the council alongside Theodore of Mopsuestia. If Cyril's concerns were with the resolution of the monastic conflict in Palestine, Justinian's concerns after issuing the edict against the Three Chapters were westward and focused upon Pope Vigilius.¹²¹ As noted above, Menas of Constantinople had given his provisional support for the edict, reserving the right to rescind it if Vigilius opposed it. As Vigilius had been groomed by Theodora and elected pope following the execution of the previous pope once Belisarius had taken Rome from the Goths, the emperor no doubt expected his support in return.¹²² The papal

¹¹⁹ Cf. Justinian, *Confessio fidei* (ed. Schwartz, pp. 76.38–78.1, 88.15–20); *ACO* 4.1, eighth session §3.5, p. 241.16–26 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.121).

¹²⁰ *V. Sab.* 90 (Schwartz, 198–9).

¹²¹ For the relationship between Justinian and Vigilius leading up to the Council of Constantinople see É. Amman, 'Trois-Chapitres (Affaire des)', *DTC* 15.2 (Paris, 1951), 1868–1924, at 1891–1910; J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989), 237–45; Price, *Constantinople*, 1.23–31, 42–58.

¹²² Cf. Liberatus, *Breviarum* 22 (*ACO* 2, pp. 136–8).

legate in Constantinople, the deacon Stephen, broke communion with Menas of Constantinople over the edict, and Datus of Milan and Facundus of Hermiana, both there as refugees, also expressed their opposition. The pope's deacons, Anatolius and Pelagius, seeing Vigilius' hesitation, wrote to Fulgentius Ferrandus, a deacon in Carthage, requesting a conciliar response to the edict. The main concern seems to have been that it undermined the authority of Chalcedon by its stance against Theodoret and Ibas. Vigilius himself was clearly the key person for the success of Justinian's policies, and so he sent his agents to Rome in November 545 to escort Vigilius to Constantinople, in a ruse which enabled him to leave the city and escape the Goths without obviously taking flight.¹²³ He spent the better part of a year in Sicily en route, where he was advised by Datus of Milan to oppose Justinian's edict. When Vigilius eventually arrived, on 27 January 547, he was met with great ceremony. However, on the advice of Facundus and Pelagius he refused to celebrate with Menas, who then raised the stakes by removing Vigilius' name from the diptychs. However, after several months of pressure, and the recapture of Rome by the Goths, Vigilius agreed to celebrate with Menas for the feast of Peter and Paul on 29 June, and signed secret declarations condemning the Three Chapters, one for Justinian and one for Theodora, while demanding the rights of his see, that is, that he would render a judgement on the matter, in consultation with the episcopate, rather than simply signing the edict of an emperor.¹²⁴ Following such a meeting, with seventy bishops who had not yet accepted the edict, Vigilius delivered his *Iudicatum* to Menas on Holy Saturday, 11 April 548, publicly and formally condemning the Three Chapters.¹²⁵

Vigilius' action caused a storm of protest, not only in the West, but even amongst his own entourage in Constantinople, in particular the deacons Rusticus and Sebastian, who had initially

¹²³ Cf. Price, *Constantinople*, 2.45, following E. Chrysos, *Hē ekklesiastikē politikē tou Ioustinianou kata tēn erin peri ta tria kephalaia kai tēn e'oi Koumenikēn sunodon*, *Analekta Blatadon*, 3 (Thessalonika, 1969), 44–57.

¹²⁴ See the comments of the *quaestor* Constantine opening the seventh session of the Council of Constantinople, and documents signed by Vigilius, *ACO* 4.1, seventh session §§4–7, pp. 183–8; Price, *Constantinople*, 2.77, 79–81.

¹²⁵ The text is now lost. It is mentioned at Constantinople 553 (*ACO* 4.1, first session §7.11, pp. 12; Price, *Constantinople*, 1.194) and five passages are preserved in Vigilius' first *Constitutum* §§299–302 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.210–11).

been enthusiastic about the *Iudicatum* but turned against Vigilius, even refusing to celebrate the feast of the Nativity with him, so that the pope was forced to discipline them.¹²⁶ It is probably at this juncture that Justinian issued his 'Letter on the Three Chapters', and, realizing that *Iudicatum* had been premature, allowed Vigilius to withdraw it. However, Vigilius was also obliged, on 15 August 550, to take a secret oath, in the presence of Theodore Askidas and over the nails of the passion and the book of the gospels, to do all in his power to secure the condemnation of the Three Chapters. He also promised to make known to the emperor anyone who spoke against the faith, 'without incurring the danger of death' for having heard such talk.¹²⁷ At the same time, as we learn from a letter of Vigilius dated 14 August 551, it was decided to hold a council of Eastern and Western bishops, and that no one should do anything regarding the Three Chapters until the matter had been resolved by the council.¹²⁸

Many of the churches in the West were reluctant to attend such a council, excusing themselves by appealing to difficult circumstances at home. However, even before receiving these replies, and despite having assured Vigilius that nothing more would be done before the council, in mid-July 551 Justinian issued his edict *On the Orthodox Faith*.¹²⁹ The first half of the document is a thoughtfully developed Christological reflection, in which he presents the formula 'one composite hypostasis', deals with issues of differentiating in thought alone between the divinity and humanity, and emphasizes not only the unity of the one subject in Christ, but that this one subject is none other than the eternal Word of God. This is followed by thirteen anathemas condemning various aspects of Theodore's teaching, which were taken up, in a slightly expanded form, by the Council of Constantinople and

¹²⁶ See Vigilius' letter to Rusticus and Sebastian, preserved in *ACO* 4.1, seventh session §8, pp. 188–94 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.81–90).

¹²⁷ See the oath of Vigilius preserved in *ACO* 4.1, seventh session §11, pp. 198–9 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.96–7).

¹²⁸ See Vigilius' letter excommunicating Theodore Askidas and Menas of Constantinople, ed. E. Schwartz, *Vigiliusbriefe; Zur Kirchenpolitik Iustinians* SBAW.PH 2 (Münich: Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., 1940), 10–15 at 11; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.161–5, at 162.

¹²⁹ Justinian *On the Orthodox Faith*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians*, ABAW.PH NF 18 (Munich, 1939), 72–110; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.129–59. For his assurance to Vigilius, see Vigilius' letter *Dum in Sanctae Euphemiae* 2, ed. Schwartz, *Vigiliusbriefe*, 1–10; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.170–9, at 171.

promulgated as canons.¹³⁰ The last two anathemas deal with Theodoret and Ibas and lead into the second half of the work, in which Justinian argues three points regarding the Three Chapters against the Western Chalcedonians, each of which is also taken up by the council in 553: first, that Ibas' letter itself was not approved by Chalcedon and is in fact heretical; second, that it does keep within Christian tradition to anathematize a heretic posthumously; and third, that Theodore did not receive letters of praise from Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. It also seems that Justinian followed up this edict with invitations to the non-Chalcedonians to come to Constantinople.¹³¹ As *On the Orthodox Faith* makes no demand that Chalcedon be accepted either in full or in part, it is perhaps possible that Justinian had decided to make one last-ditch attempt to effect a reunion with the non-Chalcedonians, on the basis of his Christological exposition but bypassing Chalcedon altogether.¹³² However, he would surely have known that this would never be accepted by Vigilius, and he had just come to an agreement with the pope about holding a council at which he had reason to expect that Vigilius would arrange for the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Perhaps, then, Justinian's aim in inviting the non-Chalcedonians to Constantinople was a more modest attempt to persuade them not to establish a separate hierarchy: by a full conciliar condemnation of the Three Chapters he could demonstrate that the imperial church, East and West, was not Nestorian as they alleged, and therefore, irrespective of their disagreement about Chalcedon, they should not secede into schism.¹³³

Not surprisingly, Vigilius reacted with shock and indignation, seeing Justinian's edict as a betrayal of their agreement. On

¹³⁰ For the canons, see *ACO* 4.1, eighth session §8.5, pp. 215–20 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.120–6).

¹³¹ See esp. the letter of John Philoponus, the miaphysite Alexandrian philosopher, to Justinian declining his invitation and criticizing his *On the Orthodox Faith*, the relevant parts of which are translated and discussed in U. M. Lang, *John Philoponus and the Controversies over Chalcedon in the Sixth Century: A Study and Translation of the Arbitrator*, *Specilegium sacrum lovaniense, Études et Documents*, 47 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 23–8. A visit of 400 representatives of the Syrian non-Chalcedonians to Constantinople at the emperor's invitation for a full year, concluding that they were irreconcilable, is mentioned by Michael the Syrian (*Chronicle* 9.30; ed. Chabot 2.172, 250–1), and is plausibly dated to this period. Cf. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.25.

¹³² Suggested by Price, *Constantinople*, 1.25–6.

¹³³ As is also suggested by Price, *ibid.* 1.35.

14 August 551 Vigilius composed a letter declaring Askidas deposed and breaking communion with Patriarch Menas of Constantinople and anyone who subscribed to the edict.¹³⁴ Fearing arrest, Vigilius, together with his clergy, took refuge in the church of St Peter in Hormisdas. After imperial soldiers failed to remove him from the church by violence, he was eventually persuaded that he could safely reside in the Placidia Palace, nearby the emperor's own palace and Hagia Sophia.¹³⁵ Finding themselves further abused, however, Vigilius and his clergy took refuge once again, on 23 December, in the church of St Euphemia, the church where the Council of Chalcedon had been held. And when he received further threats from Justinian, Vigilius, on 5 February 552, issued his *Dum in sanctae Euphemiae*, an appeal 'to the whole people of God' throughout the world, describing in dramatic detail the maltreatment he had received and giving his own statement of faith.¹³⁶ The emperor and the pope found themselves in an escalating battle: Justinian responded to the pope's letter by arresting several of the pope's deacons and secretaries, and Vigilius retaliated by posting his excommunication of Askidas and Menas all around the city. Eventually, however, the emperor and the pope were reconciled, with Vigilius returning to the Placidia Palace and being received in court by 'our pious master who had repented'.¹³⁷ Justinian had, at least outwardly, backed down, and his *On the Orthodox Faith*, though not retracted, was not explicitly referred to thereafter. On the other hand, however, it was a tactical concession for a strategic gain, for the canons of 553 reproduce the anathemas in the edict with slight enlargement. Menas and Askidas were encouraged to apologize to the pope and to affirm their unity in faith with him. Vigilius, for his part, also accepted the confession of faith of Euty chius, newly installed as patriarch of Constantinople in January 553.

The idea of holding a general council was revived and preparations begun. In the first week of January 553 Euty chius sent a letter to Vigilius, inviting him to attend and preside at the

¹³⁴ Ed. Schwartz, *Vigiliusbriefe*, 10–15; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.161–5.

¹³⁵ For a vivid account of this episode, see the letter from the Church of Milan to the Frankish Envoys: text, Schwartz, *Vigiliusbriefe*, 18–25; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.165–70.

¹³⁶ Ed. Schwartz, *Vigiliusbriefe*, 1–10; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.170–9.

¹³⁷ The words of an almost contemporary source (*Fragmenta Tusculana* 4; PG 85.1821b), quoted in Price, *Constantinople*, 1.27.

council, an invitation that Vigilius in a return letter seemed to accept.¹³⁸ However, after further negotiations and the eventual arrival of 170 bishops in Constantinople, Vigilius prevaricated, thus delaying the opening of the council.¹³⁹ There was only a small delegation from Palestine, but it did include, as we have already seen, the monks Conon and Eulogius. It must have been they who pressed the case for the condemnation of Origen, something that Askidas did his best to oppose.¹⁴⁰ Realizing that it was no longer possible to prevent the condemnation of the Three Chapters, they seized the moment to ensure that 'Origenism' was also formally condemned, by presenting the (Evagrius) 'Origenism' of the 'Isochrists' as a resurgence of Nestorianism by its apparent treatment of the man Jesus as a distinct subject to the Word of God.¹⁴¹ Moreover, they also managed to gain a victory of sorts for themselves and their spiritual tradition, by providing Justinian with documents which refuted 'Origenism' by extensive, but unacknowledged, quotations from Theodoret.¹⁴² However, although Cyril of Scythopolis asserts that the condemnation of Origenism, together with Theodore of Mopsuestia, was the central business of the Council of Constantinople, the Acts of the Council have no mention of this. It is generally accepted that Justinian's letter regarding Origenism and the attached canons were accepted by a meeting of bishops held during the period prior to the opening of the council, which had been delayed by Vigilius stalling for time.

The council eventually opened on Monday, 5 May 553, and met for eight formal sessions, the last of which was held on 2 June. Its goal was very clear, to reaffirm the condemnation of the Three

¹³⁸ These letters were read out at the first session of 553: *ACO* 4.1, §§10–11, pp. 15–18 (Price, *Constantinople*, 1.199–203).

¹³⁹ Price (*Constantinople*, 1.27–8) reaches the number 170 on the basis of the 152 signatories of the Acts, together with the 17 signatories together with Vigilius to his first *Constitutum*. Of the 170, only 31 came from areas subject to Rome: 12 from Illyricum, 11 from Italy (in addition to Vigilius himself), and 8 from Africa.

¹⁴⁰ *V. Sab.* 90 (Schwartz, 198.7–9).

¹⁴¹ Cf. M. Richard, 'Le Traité de Georges hiéromoine sur les hérésies', *REByz* 28 (1970), 250–69, repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §62; Price, *Constantinople*, 2.278–80.

¹⁴² Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 321–2: 'In other words, the anti-Origenists had not only provided the Emperor with a series of *κεφάλαια* extracted from Evagrius, but they had added on the very eve of Justinian's Council against the Three Chapters, passages actually taken from Theodoret of Cyrus in order to demonstrate the heretical character of the Evagrius texts.'

Chapters, explaining that this did not undermine in any way the authority of Chalcedon, as was feared by the Western bishops, but in fact was done in adherence to Chalcedon. Unlike previous councils which had met in or nearby Constantinople, the emperor did not attend any of the sessions. If he was physically absent, his control was nevertheless maximal. In the opening session his envoy 'gave the bishops exact instructions on what questions they were to explore, what evidence they were to examine, and which conclusions they were to draw. The council proceeded to follow the emperor's instructions to the letter. The acts show a maximum of stage-management and a total lack of spontaneity.'¹⁴³

The only role that could not be stage-managed was that of Vigilius. The first session began with the reading of the letter from the emperor and the correspondence between Eutychius and Vigilius. But as the pope had not turned up, Eutychius, together with nineteen other senior bishops, left to pay him a call, only to return empty-handed, reporting that Vigilius had refused to give an immediate reply on the grounds of ill health. At the beginning of the second session, on 8 May, Eutychius reported that when they had visited the pope two days earlier he had made some counter-proposals, including inviting more bishops from Italy and that a smaller group of four Eastern and four Western bishops (including himself) should be constituted to discuss the Three Chapters.¹⁴⁴ When Eutychius criticized the proposal, Vigilius informed him that he had requested a twenty-day period from the emperor in which to prepare a written response. On the following day, when some imperial officials accompanied the episcopal delegation, Vigilius again played for time. He was indeed granted a postponement, but it was only on the condition that he would thereafter attend the council in person, and he was warned that if he did not the council would proceed without him. The day nevertheless closed with Eutychius summoning the bishops to appear on the following day. The bishops duly met on 9 May, but this third session did not actually proceed to its business, as they still hoped that Vigilius might be induced to attend.

The fourth session of the council, on 12 May, consisted of the reading of an extensive florilegium of seventy-one excerpts from

¹⁴³ Price, *Constantinople*, 1.29.

¹⁴⁴ *ACO* 4.1, second session §5, pp. 24-7 (Price, *Constantinople*, 1.210-13).

the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, with occasional outbursts, no doubt scripted, of indignation and outrage from various bishops. The fifth session, on 17 May, heard further excerpts from Theodore (some of which, as we shall see in Chapter 4, were actually from Diodore), and looked at how he had been spoken of by the fathers, in imperial edicts, and in the historical writings.¹⁴⁵ The session also considered the disputed issue of the propriety of condemning a deceased figure, and finally looked at the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus. The third and final chapter, the letter of Ibas to Mari, was dealt with in the sixth session, on 19 May.

The seventh session was held on 26 May. It was due to finalize the condemnation of the Three Chapters and issue the council's formal declarations. However, this conclusion was interrupted by Vigilius who, on 25 May, at the close of his requested twenty-day deferment, attempted to present his first *Constitutum*, his written judgement on the Three Chapters that he had in fact completed on 14 May.¹⁴⁶ This document contains sixty extracts from Theodore, drawn from the florilegium used by the council in its fourth session. Vigilius provided his own commentary on each passage and also condemned each as heretical. This did not, however, lead to a general condemnation of Theodore, but to the conclusion that these chapters, said to be by Theodore, but whose authenticity is not proven, should lead to more careful reflection on what the fathers and early councils had said, and not said, about Theodore, in particular that he was not condemned and therefore neither should we presume to condemn those who had died in the peace of the Church. Vigilius also exonerated Ibas and Theodoret, and declared any contrary judgement to be invalid. Vigilius attempted to have this document, the strongest possible protest that he as pope could make, delivered into the hands of the emperor through the mediation of high officials, including Theodore Askidas.¹⁴⁷ Justinian, however, was not going to back down. He refused to receive it, and on the following day sent the

¹⁴⁵ Price (*Constantinople*, 1.277–9) points out how the council presented Cyril of Alexandria's correspondence as reflecting a movement from treating Theodore with leniency to demanding his condemnation, rather than the reverse movement that we traced earlier in this chapter.

¹⁴⁶ Text ed. by O. Günther, *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab A. CCCLXVII usque ad A. DLIII datae. Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, CSEL 35.1 (Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig: Tempisky, 1895), 230–320; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 2.145–213.

¹⁴⁷ *ACO* 4.1, seventh session §4.2, p. 185 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.76–7).

quaestor Constantine to the council to be present for the reading of a series of documents dating from 547 to 550, some of which had been signed by Vigilius in secret, demonstrating that he had in fact already condemned the chapters and that it was thus perfectly possible to ignore the pope's *Constitutum*. Eutychius expressed the council's gratitude for the clarification, and postponed the formal condemnation of the Three Chapters till the next session.¹⁴⁸ Constantine, however, continued by reporting that a new decree from Justinian had been received during the reading of the dossier, stating that the pope's recent statement had implicated him in perjury and shown him to be 'alien to the catholic church', and therefore his name was to be removed from the diptychs.¹⁴⁹ Eutychius had no choice but to accept the decree, though he himself avoided any criticism of Vigilius and emphasized that the churches remained in communion, thereby implying that Vigilius was suspended from his seat.¹⁵⁰ The acts of the seventh session were only published on 14 July, delayed, no doubt, in the hope of persuading Vigilius to capitulate.

The eighth and final session of the council was held on 2 June 553. With the pope's opposition now dealt with, the council moved to pass a formal verdict on the Three Chapters, which it did in the form of fourteen canons, based largely on the thirteen anathemas of Justinian's *On the Orthodox Faith*. The first ten canons focus on Christological teaching, dealing mainly with aspects of Theodore's teaching, mentioning his name occasionally, in addition to providing a positive exposition of an emphatically single-subject Christology. The eleventh canon provides a list of previous heretics, now including Origen, who had not been mentioned in the anathemas in Justinian's *On the Orthodox Faith*. Canon twelve is focused directly on Theodore; thirteen on Theodoret's impious writings; and fourteen on the letter to Mari, 'said to have been written' by Ibas. There is no mention of Diodore of Tarsus in these canons. The name of Diodore, as we have seen, had been raised, and even condemned, earlier in the century. But by this time, with all attention focused on the Three Chapters, Diodore faded into the background. In fact, Diodore had receded from consciousness to such an extent that his name is

¹⁴⁸ Ibid. §13, p. 200 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.99).

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. §§14–16, pp. 200–2 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.99–101).

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. §17, p. 202 (Price, *Constantinople*, 2.101).

occasionally dropped from texts in which he had originally been mentioned.¹⁵¹ There was no one interested in adding him to the list of those to be condemned, but neither, at least within the churches that accepted the Council of Ephesus 431, was there anyone interested in defending him, as there was in the case of Theodore. A century later, in canon eighteen of the Lateran Council of 649, Diodore is simply included along with Theodore and Nestorius as condemned, and remained considered such thereafter.

Vigilius remained under house arrest in Constantinople, becoming increasingly isolated, until he finally capitulated, under the threat of deposition. On 8 December Vigilius sent a brief letter to Eutychius stating his reconsidered position, and on 23 February 554 he published his second *Constitutum*, which accepted the condemnation of the Three Chapters. He devotes most space in this text to trying to prove that the letter 'said to be' by Ibas was in fact disowned by him, leaving precious little for a discussion of Theodore, where he simply followed canon twelve of the Council and Justinian's argument regarding the use of Theodore's work made by Nestorians, and even less space for Theodoret, who barely gets a mention.¹⁵² His capitulation was pilloried by his deacon, Pelagius, in his work *In Defence of the Three Chapters*. However, Pelagius was also able to be accommodating, for upon Vigilius' death it was none other than Pelagius who was chosen by Justinian to be Vigilius' successor. Pelagius did not immediately attempt to get the Western bishops to accept the condemnation of the Three Chapters, but rather presented a profession of faith, once he returned to Rome, which recognized the persons, rather than the writings, of Theodoret and Ibas to be orthodox, and lauding the four great councils, passing by in silence the second Council of Constantinople. Only once his position was secured did he then work to gain acceptance of the council and its decrees. However, because of the concern to maintain the total sufficiency of the previous councils, the line taken in the West in the sixth century, and thereafter, was that the Council of Constantinople had only pronounced regarding individuals and not the faith

¹⁵¹ Price (*Constantinople*, 1.312–13) notes the instance of a letter from Theodoret to Irenaeus, in the Greek text of which (*Ep.* 16) both Diodore and Theodore are mentioned, but in the Latin version given in the Acts of Constantinople (*ACO* 4.1, session 5, §35, p. 95) only Theodore.

¹⁵² Text in *ACO* 4.2, pp. 138–68; trans. Price, *Constantinople*, 2.221–69.

itself, thus minimizing the theological reflection that culminated in the council and the emphatic affirmation by the council itself of a single-subject Christology. Apart from the church of the East, for whom Theodore remained the great teacher, it was not until the nineteenth century that there was a renewed appreciation for Theodore's exegetical practices and for his recognizably human figure of Christ, as we saw in Chapter 1. It is in this context that theological reflection after the Fifth Council is often described as 'neo-Chalcedonianism', and Maximus the Confessor and the Sixth Council, with their affirmation of a human will alongside a divine will in the one Jesus Christ, are seen as returning to a more 'Antiochene' Christology in a more balanced manner, despite the fact that neither give any indication that they are doing anything other than continuing in the lines set down by the Council of Constantinople. That theological reflection after Constantinople can be presented in this way shows clearly the need to return to the first principles examined in Chapter 1.¹⁵³

¹⁵³ In his review of the reception of the council, Price makes some very insightful observations. Regarding the claim by 'a whole galaxy of modern Catholic theologians' that 'the dogmatic canons of 553—Canons 1–10, with their strongly Cyrillian and neo-Chalcedonian Christology—were never formally accepted in the west', he comments: 'The motive for this claim is hostility towards neo-Chalcedonianism and a preference in most modern Christology for what in the sixth century would have been regarded as neo-Nestorianism' (*Constantinople*, 2.100). His conclusion is that: 'In retrospect the Council of Constantinople in 553 can be seen to mark a parting of the ways' (*Constantinople*, 1.103).

PART II
TEXTS

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA AND THE COMMON FLORILEGIUM

Investigations into Cyril's knowledge and use of the writings of Diodore and Theodore almost always begin in 438, the year in which he wrote his treatises against them. However, as we have seen, a passage in his *Commentary on Hebrews*, written between 428 and 432, indicates that Theodore's teaching had already caught his eye several years earlier.¹ In this passage Cyril partly quotes and partly paraphrases a text whose author he does not reveal. The text is as follows:

But I do not know how some, not understanding rightly the mystery concerning this, speak vain words and even have written, wishing to interpret the words of the eighth psalm, 'Let us consider then who is the man about whom he is amazed and wonders that the Only-begotten indeed deemed it worthy to remember him and to make visitation'. (Σκοπῶμεν τοίνυν τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος περὶ οὗ ἐκπλήττεται καὶ θαυμάζει ὅτι δὴ ὁ Μονογενὴς κατηξίωσεν αὐτοῦ μνησθῆναί τε καὶ ἐπισκοπὴν ποιήσασθαι.) Then he adds to these words, and quite plainly, that 'the phrase "What is man that you are mindful of him or the son of man that you visit him?" was not said about every man but about the Son alone', (οὐκ εἴρηται μὲν ἐπὶ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου τό τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὅτι μνησθήσκη αὐτοῦ ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὅτι ἐπισκέπηται αὐτόν; ἀλλὰ περὶ μόνου τοῦ Υἱοῦ.) and they attempt to confirm their words as true by saying that the blessed Paul referred the words of the psalm to his person because he said 'And we see Jesus lowered a little below the angels because of the passion of death, crowned with glory and honour' [Heb. 2:9]. Then, dividing the natures, they say that the man born of the holy Virgin is whole and apart, about whom also David, he [i.e. Paul] says, wonders because he was made worthy of remembrance and visitation and he was made

¹ Cf. P. M. Parvis, 'The *Commentary on Hebrews* and the *Contra Theodorum* of Cyril of Alexandria', *JTS* NS 26.2 (1975), 415-19.

worthy also of things beyond his own nature, as receiving a benefaction from God the Word.²

Leontius provides us with an extract (LT 21), said to come from the tenth book of Theodore's *On the Incarnation*, which has the same *incipit*, though is shorter and slightly different. The same passage is also given by the fifth session of the Council of Constantinople (C5T 1), reproduced from Cyril's second book *Against Theodore*, again with the same *incipit*, though this time longer. The different attributions of this passage will concern us later in this chapter, but for now we can conclude that Cyril was already concerned with a passage of Theodore in the years around Ephesus, and was perhaps himself gathering passages from the writings of the recently deceased bishop of Mopsuestia.³

Diodore also had begun to attract the attention of Cyril during these years. The date of Cyril's first letter to Succensus is uncertain, but was most likely written after the reunion established in April 433 and before the beginning of his explicit literary attack against Diodore and Theodore in 438, probably closer to the former than the latter. In this letter, after the opening greeting, he addresses the question put to him by Succensus, namely, 'whether or not one should ever speak of two natures in respect of Christ?' He then continues:

Somebody called Diodore, one who had previously been a foe of the Spirit (according to general report), joined the communion of the orthodox church. Having rid himself, as he therefore supposed, of the contamination of Macedonianism, he went down with another illness. He thought and wrote that David's descendant through the holy Virgin was one distinct son and the Word begotten of God the Father was yet another distinct son. He masked the wolf by a sheep's fleece. He pretends to call Christ 'one' and restricts the name 'Son' to the Only-begotten Son, the Word begotten of God the Father, yet he also styles David's descendant 'son', awarding him the term (as he says himself) 'by

² ed. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti patris nos Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Ioannis Evangelium*, vol. 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872; repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965), 386.15–387.8; trans. Parvis, 'The *Commentary*', 416, slightly revised.

³ 'In other words, at least one of the texts which has been assumed to come from the hostile florilegium was in Cyril's hands well before the end of 432. Whether he had already been given such a florilegium or whether he was himself compiling one for future use, it would seem that, at least six years before the writings of his books against Diodore and Theodore, Cyril was already gathering supplies for the next phase of his campaign against the theology of Antioch'. (Parvis, 'The *Commentary*', 418).

way of the category of grace' on the grounds, he declares, of being united with the real Son—united, though, not in our sense of the term but merely in rank, sovereignty, and equality of honour.⁴

As Diodore is nowhere else alleged to have had early sympathies with the 'pneumatomachians', Marcel Richard concludes that this report of Diodore's career, 'excessivement déformée', derived from his bitter enemies the Apollinarians, and that so also does Cyril's knowledge of problematic passages in the writings of Diodore and Theodore.⁵ Whether this is indeed so must wait for further investigation later in this chapter, but for now it should be noted that Cyril again seems to be concerned with particular passages of Diodore's writings—those that assert that the son of David is Son of God by grace, by sharing in his rank, sovereignty, and honour—that recur with some frequency, as we shall see, in the surviving extracts of Diodore.

As we have seen in Chapter 3, Cyril composed a book *Against Diodore* and two *Against Theodore* in 438 after a visit to Jerusalem. In Jerusalem he had been handed a sealed letter from 'the orthodox in Antioch', alleging that 'the bishops of the East' no longer referred to Nestorius but had instead 'switched over to the books of Theodore on the Incarnation'.⁶ Cyril was spurred into literary activity when, on his return to Alexandria, he was visited by the deacon Maximus, who lamented that the orthodox were being denied the freedom to teach the right faith in Antioch and urged Cyril to write down the correct interpretation of the Creed of Nicaea. Cyril then continues:

after looking into the books of Theodore and Diodore in which they had written, not about the Incarnation of the Only-begotten, but rather against his Incarnation, I selected certain of the chapters (ἐπελεξάμην τινὰ τῶν κεφαλαίων) and in the approved manner I set

⁴ Cyril, *Ep.* 45 (*ACO* 1.1.6, §171, pp. 151–7, at 151; also in Wickham, *Select Letters*, 70–8, at 70–3). Wickham (70–1, n. 1) points out that the reference in §11 to the negotiations regarding the reunion suggest that this was still news, and hence indicate an earlier date.

⁵ Cf. M. Richard, 'Les Traités de Cyrille d'Alexandrie contre Diodore et Théodore et les fragments dogmatiques de Diodore de Tarse', in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat*, I (Paris: Pecqueur-Grat, 1946), 99–116, at 113, repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §51.

⁶ Cyril, *Ep.* 70 (ed. E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1421: Eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, ABAW.PPH 32.6 (Munich: Bayer. Akad. D. Wiss., 1927), 16–17).

myself against them, revealing that their teaching was in every way full of abomination.⁷

His phrasing—he ‘selected certain of the chapters’—certainly suggests that Cyril was working from a florilegium of their texts rather than reading through the writings of Diodore and Theodore themselves. Moreover, that both Cyril and Leontius (writing a century later and, as we shall see, not drawing his material from Cyril’s treatises against Diodore and Theodore) refer to the work as ‘against the Incarnation’, might also be taken to suggest that behind both their works lies a common florilegium with this polemical heading.⁸

The books of Cyril *Against Diodore* and *Against Theodore* are now lost. Passages from these works, including places where Cyril quotes Diodore and Theodore, are nevertheless preserved in later writers: the diphysite *Florilegium Cyrillianum* (preserved directly but incompletely in Greek, and indirectly by being quoted extensively by Severus in his *Philalethes*), Severus of Antioch, and the Acts of the fifth session of the Council of Constantinople in 553.⁹ Theodoret of Cyrus also wrote a work in response to Cyril, his *In Defence of Diodore and Theodore*, which is no longer extant, though his selection of texts was used later by Facundus.¹⁰ Extracts relating to these passages cited by Severus and the fifth session of the Council of Constantinople also occur in *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius* contained in *Cod. Add.* 12156, the *Collectio Palatina*, and in writings of Timothy Aelurus, Leontius, and Justinian. The relationships between these different collections of extracts is far from simple. However, the fundamental lines were disentangled by Marcel Richard in two articles written in the 1940s, and summarized by Francis Sullivan a

⁷ Cyril, *Ep.* 69.4 (ed. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus*, 15–16).

⁸ Cf. Leontius, PG 86A.1384c, 1385a.

⁹ The passages from these works preserved in later writers were compiled by Pusey, working in the case of Syriac texts from manuscripts in the British Museum: *Sancti patris nos Cyrilli . . . in Iohannem*, vol. 3.492–538; trans. in *S. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, Five Tomes Against Nestorius; Scholia on the Incarnation; Christ is One; Fragments Against Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Synousiasts*, Library of the Fathers of the Church, 46 (Oxford: James Parker, 1881). The works of Severus have now been edited, and will be considered below. For the *Florilegium Cyrillianum* see R. Hespel, *Le Florilège Cyrillien réfuté par Sèvre d’ Antioche. Étude et édition critique*, Bibliothèque du Muséon, 37 (Louvain: Publications Universitaires—Institut Orientaliste, 1955).

¹⁰ Cf. L. Abramowski, ‘Reste von Theodorets Apologie für Diodor und Theodor bei Facundus’, *StP* 1, TU 63 (Berlin, 1957), 61–9.

decade later.¹¹ It will be useful, nevertheless, before presenting the sources and their texts later in this chapter and those that follow, to describe briefly some features of these extracts and how they relate to each other, both so that we can determine what passages were derived from Cyril himself and also to discern, as far as possible, the kind of material from which Cyril was working, whether it was indeed the treatises of Diodore and Theodore or a florilegium of their texts, and whether later writers drew their material from Cyril's treatises or also from florilegia, and if the latter, how they stand in relation to that used by Cyril.

I. FIVE PASSAGES OF DISPUTED AUTHORSHIP

The most immediate issue concerns the authorship of the first five passages given at the fifth session of Constantinople. In the Acts of the council they are all said to come from the first book of Cyril *Against Theodore*, and are attributed to Theodore himself. The fifth session of Constantinople goes on to present a further five extracts said to be from Cyril's second book *Against Theodore*—four of which have parallels in Leontius (LT 12, 14, 17, 28) and one in *The Blasphemies* (BT 31)—and a sixth from Theodore's *Catechetical Homilies*. A serious problem arises, however, from the fact that the first five extracts are said to be by Diodore in the parallel quotations, in either shorter or longer versions, given by the *Blasphemies* (BD 17, 22, 23, 27, 31–2), Timothy Aelurus (TD 2), and Leontius (LD 2, 3, 4). There is clearly some confusion at work here. The important question is whether the confusion is that of the scribes drafting the material used at Constantinople, or a misattribution already present in Cyril's own work.

To resolve this initial question, we need to continue reviewing our sources. The *Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius* provides thirty-two extracts from Diodore, of which nine have parallels elsewhere, and thirty-four from Theodore, with seventeen parallels. The passages from Diodore are only identified by the opening sentence of the book (BD 1). The first twenty-five from Theodore are said to be from his *On the*

¹¹ M. Richard, 'Les Traités' and 'La Tradition des fragments du traité *Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως* de Théodore de Mopsueste', *Le Muséon*, 56 (1943), 55–75, repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §41; Sullivan, *Christology*, 35–54.

Incarnation, identified by section number rather than by book; the remaining extracts are from Theodore's *Against Apollinarius*, his *Exposition of the Faith*, the *Commentary on Matthew*, and the *Catechetical Homilies*. Timothy Aelurus provides four extracts from Diodore, three of which (TD 1, 3, 4) have parallels only in the *Blasphemies* and are given by Timothy in a shorter form. However, as the remaining extract (TD 2) is given in a form that incorporates two extracts from the *Blasphemies* (BD 31, 32) and supplies a missing sentence, as also do the parallel extracts in Severus (SD 2) and Leontius (LD 2), Timothy cannot be dependent upon the *Blasphemies*. Timothy also provides a title, 'Discourse on the Incarnation', for the work of Diodore from which two (TD 3, 4) extracts are taken.

Severus reproduces thirteen extracts from Diodore and ten from Theodore. The passages from Diodore are either given in Severus' lengthy quotations from Cyril in his *Philalethes*, or in his other works, where, with one very short exception (SD 11), they are explicitly said to come from Cyril. Two of the passages in the *Philalethes* reproduce the disputed Constantinopolitan extracts: SD 2 exactly and SD 3 in a shorter form. These two are ascribed in the manuscripts to 'Theodoret', but, on the basis of the identification of the parallel extracts in the fifth session of Constantinople, we can be assured that this is a scribal error for 'Theodore' (rather than 'Diodore').¹² The *Philalethes* also presents five passages from Theodore. Severus provides two further extracts (ST 8, 10) explicitly said to be from Cyril's treatment of Theodore. The remaining three passages are quoted as if directly from Theodore himself, giving references to specific books: ST 6, from Theodore's *Commentary on Hebrews*; ST 7, from Theodore's seventh book *To Patrophilus, On the Holy Spirit*; and ST 9, from Theodore's Symbol of Faith. With the passages explicitly taken from Cyril, on the other hand, Severus does not give any indication regarding the works of Diodore or Theodore in which the passages were originally located.

Leontius, who, like Cyril, also claims to have read through Theodore's *On the Incarnation* (or rather 'against the Incarnation'), gives us thirty-six passages from Theodore, the first two of which

¹² Cf. Richard, 'Les Traités', 104, n. 2; Sullivan, *Christology*, 39. Severus, or a later scribe, does on at least one occasion write 'Theodoret' where it should be 'Diodore': Severus, *Contra additiones Juliani*, 5–12, ed. and trans. R. Hespel (CSCO 295–6 [script. Syr. 124–5]); see Hespel's note on CSCO 296, p. 12.

are exceptionally long, followed by five passages from Diodore. The original location of each of these passages are clearly stated: the five passages purporting by Constantinople to come from the first book of Cyril *Against Theodore* are said by Leontius to be from Diodore's first book *Against the Synousiasts*; four of the five extracts reproduced by the fifth session of Constantinople from Cyril's second book *Against Theodore* are said by Leontius to be from Theodore's work *On the Incarnation*. Closely related to Leontius' series of extracts from Theodore are the ten supplied Justinian. Eight of Justinian's texts are said to be from Theodore's third or fourth book *Against Apollinarius*, and one each comes from his commentary on Psalm 8 (JT 8) and *On the Incarnation* (JT 10). Eight extracts (JT 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10) are paralleled by Leontius, and three (JT 5, 6, 8) by the fourth session of Constantinople; only one (JT 9) has no parallel elsewhere. Justinian's texts, however, do not parallel any of those claiming to be from Cyril.

The *Collectio Palatina* presents five texts from Diodore (and a sixth, PD 4, said to be from Diodore but attributed to Paul of Samosata by Leontius); none of these texts correspond to those used by the Council of Constantinople, but three do have parallels elsewhere: two in Severus (PD 1, 6b = SD 5, 8) and one in Leontius (PD 5 = LD 1). This collection also contains five quotations from Theodore's work against Augustine's understanding of original sin and Adam's subjection to mortality resulting from his transgression. The passages from Theodore are given detailed references, to book and folio; those from Diodore are headed simply 'Diodore bishop of Tarsus dividing the divinity of Christ from his humanity'.

Finally, the fourth session of the Council of Constantinople produces a series of seventy-three extracts from Theodore, with two exceptions (C4T 28, 46) referring to the writings of Theodore himself rather than those of Cyril, with many parallels in both Leontius and Justinian.¹³ This collection largely duplicates the sixty extracts given in the *Constitutum* of Vigilius, only one of which (VT 13) has no parallel. Five texts introduced in the fourth session

¹³ Note that the numeration given here for 73 extracts from the fourth session differs from that used by others, who have followed the editors of *ACO* in reckoning 71 extracts, counting C4T 30 and 31 together (30a and 30b respectively), and also C4T 43 and 44 (42a and 42b). C4T 31 and 44 are introduced by 'et post alia', but this is also the case for many other extracts not combined by *ACO*; thus for completeness and clarity, we have enumerated 30-1, 43-4 separately.

(28, 45, 46, 47, 48) duplicate passages from the fifth session. The fifth disputed extract of the fifth session is introduced in the fourth session (C4T 46) simply as ‘a statement of Theodore quoted and refuted by Cyril’; it is paralleled by BD 31–2. Likewise, the second disputed extract is said by the fourth session (C4T 47) to be ‘from statements that Cyril refuted’. C4T 45 and 48 are also given in the fifth session (C5T 3 and 2, respectively), where they are said to be from Cyril’s second book *Against Theodore*. Yet, in the fourth session, C4T 48 is attributed to Theodore’s *Commentary on Hebrews*, while Leontius, on the other hand, ascribes it to *On the Incarnation*, Book 12; and C4T 45 is attributed to *On the Incarnation*, Book 12, but by Leontius to Book 15. There is no reason to doubt Leontius, who carefully provides references for all his texts, and so we must conclude that both ascriptions in the fourth session are scribal conjectures, perhaps to bring the presentation of these passages into conformity with the introduction of the other extracts. More interesting is C4T 28, which duplicates the fourth disputed text: in the fifth session it is described as coming from the first book of Cyril *Against Theodore* (C5D 4), but in the fourth session is introduced as ‘of the same Theodore, from the book against the Synousiasts or Apollinarians, which Cyril quoted and refuted’.¹⁴ The title of the work is noteworthy because it is, in fact, the title of the work of Diodore from which the quotations given by the fifth session derive, as is shown by Leontius, who does not, however, cite this passage.

Such are the essential facts regarding the extracts from Diodore and Theodore. What, then, can we conclude with regard to the authorship of the first five passages of disputed authorship cited by the fifth session of Constantinople? Richard and Sullivan point out that the language of the first five extracts in the fifth session of Constantinople—especially phrases such as ‘son of David’, ‘the one from David’—recurs with much greater frequency in the texts unambiguously attributed to Diodore than in the writings of Theodore.¹⁵ While Leontius only provides one further extract from Diodore, the homogeneity of these five passages with the other twenty-seven extracts in the *Blasphemies* and the five extracts of the *Collectio Palatina* provides a significant witness to the Diodorean character of the disputed passages. The content of

¹⁴ A variant reading omits the name ‘Theodore’.

¹⁵ Richard, ‘Les Traités’, 110–11; Sullivan, *Christology*, 38.

these passages thus strongly suggests that their attribution to Diodore by the *Blasphemies* and Leontius is more likely to be correct.

As regards Severus' attribution of the disputed passages to Theodore rather than Diodore, Marcel Richard points out that in these cases Severus is dependent upon Cyril: only in the *Philalethes*, where his material is drawn from Cyril, does Severus quote these passages (SD 2, 3), attributing them to Theodore (though 'Theodoret' in the manuscripts).¹⁶ In addition, as Sullivan further observes, Severus elsewhere twice cites Cyril's refutation of the fourth of these passages, and on one of these occasions specifically states that it is from the first book *Against Theodore*.¹⁷ This, then, leaves us with the attribution of these disputed passages to Theodore depending upon Cyril, and their authorship by Diodore asserted by the *Blasphemies* and Leontius. Moreover, as we have seen from a consideration of C4T 28, 45, 46, 47, 48, it is pretty certain that Cyril did not include specific references for the passages that he quoted and refuted. As such, the attribution of the disputed passages to Theodore by the two sources dependent upon Cyril—Severus and the fifth session of Constantinople—simply depends upon their having found these passages in the first book of Cyril *Against Theodore*. Thus, rather than being a scribal error at Constantinople, it must be Cyril himself who ascribed these passages to Theodore.

Accepting Diodore's authorship of these texts, we can tabulate the extracts of Diodore which occur in more than one writer or which are derived from Cyril, as shown in Table 1.

II. A COMMON FLORILEGIUM?

With the attribution to Diodore of the first five Constantinopolitan extracts accepted, further issues then arise regarding Cyril's misattribution of these texts, the material he was working from, and how this material relates to that used by our other witnesses. To address these questions, it is necessary to consider the interconnections between the extracts of Theodore cited by our various writers. These are shown in Table 2.

¹⁶ Richard, 'Les Traités', 104.

¹⁷ Severus, *Contra Grammaticum* 3.41 (text CSCO 101, script. Syr. 50, p. 333; trans. CSCO 102, script. syr. 51, p. 246); *Oratio II ad Nephaliu* (text CSCO 119, script. Syr. 64, p. 56; trans. CSCO 120, script. Syr. 65, pp. 41–2). Sullivan, *Christology*, 39.

TABLE I. *Diodore's extracts*

<i>Blasphemies</i>	Timothy	Severus	Leontius	<i>Collectio Palatina</i>	Constantinople	Source as indicated by B, T, S, L, or C
		SD 1				S Cyril <i>C. Diod.</i>
		SD 4				S Cyril
		SD 5		PD 1		S Cyril
		SD 6				S Cyril
		SD 7				S Cyril
			LD 1	PD 5		L Diodore <i>C. Syn. bk. 1</i>
		SD 8		PD 6a b		S Cyril
		SD 9				S Cyril
		SD 10				S Cyril
		SD 11	LD 5a b			S Cyril L Diodore <i>C. Syn. bk. 1</i>
		SD 12				S Cyril
		SD 13				S Cyril
BD 1	TD 1					B Diodore

BD 7a b	TD 4				B Diodore T Diodore <i>Inc.</i>
BD 17a b				C5D 4 [=C4T 28]	B Diodore C4 Cyril from Theod. <i>C. Syn.</i> C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1
BD 22a b			LD 3	C5D 2a b [=C4T 47] c	B Diodore L Diodore <i>C. Syn.</i> bk. 1 C4 Cyril; C5 <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1
BD 23				C5D 3a b	B Diodore C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1
BD 27		SD 3	LD 4a b	C5D 1a b c d	B Diodore S Cyril L Diodore <i>C. Syn.</i> bk. 1 C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1
BD 30a b	TD 3				B Diodore T Diodore <i>Inc.</i>
BD 31	TD 2a	SD 2a	LD 2a	C5D 5 [=C4T 46] a	B, T Diodore S Cyril L Diodore <i>C. Syn.</i> bk. 1
BD 32	b c	b c	b c	b c	C4 Cyril from Theodore C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1

TABLE 2. *Theodore's extracts*

<i>Blasphemies</i>	Severus	Leontius and Justinian	Constantinople session 4	Constantinople sessions 5 & 6	Source as indicated by B, S, L, J, or C
BT 1		LT 1a b c	C4T 25b C4T 30		C4 Theodore <i>Inc.</i> bk. 1 L, C4 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 7
	ST 5			C5T 6a b	S Cyril C5 Cyril from Theodore's <i>ad Bapt.</i>
BT 12		LT 2a b c			B <i>Inc.</i> §59 S <i>Philalethes</i> [from Cyril] L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 7
	ST 4	d e f g			
BT 13		LT 3a			B <i>Inc.</i> §59
BT 14		b			L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 7
BT 15	ST 1a b c	LT 4a b c d			B <i>Inc.</i> §60 S Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 2 L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 7

BT 17a	LT 6a			B <i>Inc.</i> §63
b	b--JT 10a	C4T 29a		L, J, C4 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 8
c	c--JT 10b	b		
BT 21a	LT 7			
b			C6T 1	B <i>Inc.</i> §73
BT 31			C5T 4	C6 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 11
	LT 12		C5T 1a	B <i>Com. Hebr.</i>
	LT 14a	C4T 48	b	C5 Cyril C. <i>Theod.</i> bk. 2
	b		C5T 2a	L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 10
	c		b	C5 Cyril C. <i>Theod.</i> bk. 2
	LT 16	C4T 49		L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 12
	LT 17		C5T 5a	L, C4 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 12
	LT 18	C4T 48	b	L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 12
		C4T 55a		C5 Cyril C. <i>Theod.</i> bk. 2
	LT 21	b		L, C4 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 12
	LT 27	C4T 56		L, C4 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 13
				L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 13; C4 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 14

Continued

TABLE 2. — *continued*

<i>Blasphemies</i>	Severus	Leontius and Justinian	Constantinople session 4	Constantinople sessions 5 & 6	Source as indicated by B, S, L, J, or C
	ST 2	LT 28	C4T 45	C5T 3a b c	S Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 15; C4 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 12 C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 2
		LT 29	C4T 27a b		L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 15 C4 <i>Inc.</i>
		LT 30—JT 1			L, J <i>C. Ap.</i> bk. 4
		LT 31—JT 2	C4T 10		L, J, C4 <i>C. Ap.</i> bk. 3
		LT 32—JT 3	C4T 8a b		L, J, C4 <i>C. Ap.</i> bk. 4
		LT 33—JT 4			L, J <i>C. Ap.</i> bk. 4
		LT 34—JT 5	C4T 1a b c		L, J, C4 <i>C. Ap.</i> bk. 3
		JT 6	d		
		LT 35—JT 7			L, J <i>C. Ap.</i> bk. 4
		LT 36—JT 8	C4T 19		L, J <i>Com Ps.8</i>

By any standard, Theodore's *On the Incarnation* was a huge work: it was comprised of fifteen books, and, according to Theodore himself, contained 15,000 lines.¹⁸ It would thus be very surprising indeed to find people working independently from these tomes citing the very same passages. Yet this is in fact what we find: of the thirty-four extracts from Theodore in the *Blasphemies*, the first twenty-five come from *On the Incarnation*, with five held in common with other sources; the first twenty-nine of Leontius' thirty-six extracts come from the *On the Incarnation*, with fourteen parallels; and of the eleven passages from *On the Incarnation* given by the fourth session of Constantinople, nine again are used by others.¹⁹ Even more remarkable is that amongst these common extracts seven have an identical *incipit* (LT 4, 12, 16, 17, 18, 27, 29 and parallels) and six have an identical *explicit* (LT 3, 7, 16, 18, 21, 27 and parallels), and three cases where the extract coincides exactly (LT 16, 18, 27 and parallels). There is one further possible common *incipit* of the extracts from *On the Incarnation*: LT 14 and C4T 48. Leontius, who is very specific in his attribution, asserts that this passage is from Book 12 of *On the Incarnation*, while the fourth session attributes it to Theodore's *Commentary on Hebrews*. As the fifth session also quotes this same passage, in a fuller version, but simply says that it is from Cyril's second book *Against Theodore*, and as we have seen that Cyril did not specify to which book the extracts belong, the attribution of C4T 48 to Theodore's *Commentary on Hebrews* is most likely a scribal conjecture based on the content of this short passage, a comment on Heb. 2:10. Also noteworthy is the exact coincidence of BT 31 and C5T 4, and the same *explicit* in BT 21 and C6T 1. Finally, LT 6–7, and its parallels, also provides an important instance of how our authors did not always simply reproduce the full passage, but extracted those parts of interest to them.

Given these parallels, it must be the case that they either drew from each other or from a common source, despite the fact that

¹⁸ Theodore, *De Apollinario et eius haeresi*, quoted by Facundus, *Pro def.* 10.1.20 (= FT 27). Gennadius, *Vit. ill.* 12 (PL 58.1067b) reports the same estimation.

¹⁹ C4T 51–2 are also said to be from Theodore's *On the Incarnation*, but in the fifth session (ACO 4.1, Session 5, §14.3–4, pp. 83–4; Price, *Constantinople*, 1.296–7) are given as part of a sermon said to have been given by Theodore at Antioch, as reported by a diatribe attributed to the Armenians sent to Proclus in 435, but which seems to be based on a passage by Innocent of Maronea (ACO 4.2, p. 70). Cf. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.296, n. 117.

both Cyril and Leontius claim to have read through the works of Diodore and Theodore themselves.²⁰ It is not possible, however, that the extracts from Theodore's *On the Incarnation* and *Against Apollinarius* presented at the fourth session of Constantinople were drawn from Leontius, for it also presents three texts of the first work (C4T 17, 25, 31) not found in Leontius, and one (C4T 27) in a fuller form than that given by Leontius. Thus, both the fourth session of Constantinople and Leontius must have utilized a similar compilation of extracts. Likewise, the *Blasphemies*, which contains many texts of Theodore not found elsewhere (those not tabulated above) but itself lacks extracts found in others, must also have had recourse to a similar source. Finally, although seven of Justinian's quotations are identical with Leontius, he also contains an unparalleled extract (JT 6), and so he too must also have had independent access to such a compilation.

That the *Blasphemies*, Timothy, Leontius, Justinian, and the fourth session of Constantinople were all drawing upon the treatises of Cyril *Against Theodore* is not possible. We only possess a fraction of these books, and so conceivably the extracts we find in later writers could have been utilized there. But, as we have seen, Cyril almost certainly did not provide specific references for his passages in his treatises; and yet our other sources do so in varying detail. Moreover, the strikingly high number of coincidences between the extracts derived from Cyril's treatises and the parallel extracts elsewhere necessitate the conclusion that Cyril himself and our other authors were working from a common florilegium of texts from Diodore and Theodore, or at least very closely related florilegia.

A further point, hitherto not noted, is that we have one clear instance of one of our sources adding to the florilegium being used. This is the case of the compiler of the series of quotations presented to the fourth session of Constantinople. We have seen that five of his texts (28, 45, 46, 47, 48) were drawn from Cyril's treatises themselves, and that in two cases (45, 48) the compiler conjectured the origin in Theodore's works, probably wishing to bring these citations into conformity with the other extracts presented in his collection. Yet two of the other passages were in

²⁰ As Price (*Constantinople*, 1.229) puts it: 'They recognized contemporary standards of scholarship that required the perusal of the original codices, but they found deceit less demanding than study.'

the florilegium as it was earlier used by the *Blasphemies*, where they were ascribed to Diodore, as is shown by the correspondence of C₄T 28 to BD 17, and C₄T 46 to BD 31-2. Therefore, either the Diodorean section of the florilegium was still available to the compiler at the time of the Council of Constantinople and he simply did not notice the presence of these extracts there, or else he only had the Theodorean section before him and wished to include passages from Cyril's two books *Against Theodore* (two passages in fact being from Diodore), supplying conjectured references himself. The same would also go for Justinian, who provides an unparalleled extract from Theodore (JT 6), but none from Diodore. Interest in Diodore, as we have seen, had considerably waned by the time of the Council. Even Leontius only appends five extracts from Diodore to his extensive collection from Theodore, three of which were in the florilegium as represented by the *Blasphemies*. If Cyril's treatise *Against Diodore* was even still available in these circles at this time, there is no evidence that it was used.

The existence of a common twofold florilegium of texts from Diodore and Theodore is postulated by Richard in his explanation of how Cyril came to misattribute texts of Diodore to Theodore.²¹ His suggestion is that Cyril based his first and second treatises *Against Theodore* on such a florilegium, but that for some reason, partly no doubt the haste at which he composed these books, he took all the texts to be of Theodore, refuting the first part in his first treatise and the second part in his second treatise. This hypothesis for a twofold florilegium is strengthened by the fact that the *Blasphemies* gives texts of Diodore followed by those of Theodore, with some of the texts of Diodore it presents paralleling those drawn from Cyril's first book *Against Theodore* and some of the texts of Theodore paralleling those in Cyril's second book.

III. CYRIL'S TREATISES

We can now present the extracts that we know were taken from Cyril's two books *Against Theodore* (asterisked) and their parallels (Tables 3 and 4).

²¹ Cf. Richard, 'Les Traités', 112; Sullivan, *Christology*, 50.

TABLE 3. *Extracts from Cyril's first book Against Theodore*

<i>Blasphemies</i>	Timothy	Severus	Leontius	Constantinople session 4	Constantinople session 5	Source as indicated by B, S, L, C
BD 17a b				C ₄ T 28*	C ₅ D 4*	B Diodore C ₄ Cyril from Theod. <i>C. Syn.</i> C ₅ Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1
BD 22			LD 3		C ₅ D 2a* b c	B Diodore L Diodore <i>C. Syn.</i> bk. 1 C ₅ Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1
BD 23					C ₅ D 3a* b	B Diodore C ₅ Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1
BD 27		SD 3*	LD 4		C ₅ D 1a* b c d	B Diodore S Cyril L Diodore <i>C. Syn.</i> bk. 1 C ₅ Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1
BD 31	TD 2a b	SD 2a* b	LD 2a b	C ₄ T 46a* b	C ₅ D 5a* b	B Diodore S Cyril
BD 32	c	c	c	c	c	L Diodore <i>C. Syn.</i> bk. 1 C ₄ Cyril from Theodore C ₅ Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 1

TABLE 4. *Extracts from Cyril's second book Against Theodore*

<i>Blasphemies</i>	Severus	Leontius	Constantinople session 4	Constantinople session 5	Source as indicated by B, S, L, C
BT 15	ST 1a* b	LT 4a b c			B <i>Inc.</i> §60 S Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 2 L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 7
BT 31				C5T 4*	B <i>Com. Hebr.</i> C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 2
		LT 12		C5T 1a* b	L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 10 C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 2
		LT 14a b c	C4T 48*	C5T 2a* b	L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 12 C4 <i>Com. Hebr.</i> C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 2
		LT 17		C5T 5a* b	L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 12 C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 2
	ST 2*	LT 28	C4T 45*	C5T 3a* b c	S Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> L <i>Inc.</i> bk. 15; C4 <i>Inc.</i> bk. 12 C5 Cyril <i>C. Theod.</i> bk. 2

Regarding the material used by Cyril in his book *Against Diodore*, it seems most likely that the texts attributed to Diodore by Severus are drawn from Cyril, his usual source. It is striking that none of these passages parallel the extensive series of extracts provided by the *Blasphemies* or any of those used at Constantinople.²² But we do find parallels to these Diodorean texts of Severus in the *Collectio Palatina* (PD 1, 6) and Leontius (LD 5). Yet, unless Cyril had given references to Diodore's works in his treatise against him, Leontius, who again does so, cannot have been working from Cyril's *Against Diodore* but from some other source. On the other hand, with two of its six texts attributed to Diodore coinciding with Severus' extracts, it is likely that the *Collectio Palatina* did draw its material from Cyril's *Against Diodore*. The case for this is strengthened by the fact that PD 4 is attributed by Leontius to Paul of Samosata. Cyril would have been familiar with the material circulated by Eusebius of Dorylaeum in the years before Ephesus, demonstrating the similarities between Paul of Samosata and Nestorius, and so Cyril once again, as Richard concludes, seems to have misattributed a passage that lay before him.²³

Thus the extracts that we know were taken from Cyril's book *Against Diodore* (asterisked) and their parallels are as shown in Table 5.

IV. A TWO- OR THREEFOLD COMMON FLORILEGIUM?

With the results established so far, we can turn again to the theory of a common florilegium. Given the manner in which we know that Severus worked, and the parallels between his extracts of Diodore and those in Leontius and the *Collectio Palatina*, Richard argues that there was a florilegium of Diodorean extracts distinct from his conjectured twofold florilegium, and that it was supplied to Cyril by the same Apollinarians who had presented him with the 'deformed image' of Diodore that Cyril recounts in his letter

²² SD 2 does indeed have parallels in the *Blasphemies* and Constantinople, but is attributed by Severus to Theodore ('Theodoret'), and is said by both C₄ and C₅ to be from Cyril, C₅ specifying his first book *Against Theodore*, which is undoubtedly the source of this extract for Severus.

²³ Richard, 'Les Traités', 108–9. The 'Declaration' paralleling texts of the Samosatene and Nestorius is found in *ACO* 1.1.1, pp. 101–2; it is in fact none other than Leontius, who reproduces the text, who reports that 'they say' that the document was placarded by Eusebius of Dorylaeum (PG 86A.1389b).

TABLE 5. *Extracts from Cyril's Against Diodore*

Severus	Leontius	<i>Collectio Palatina</i>	Source in S or as indicated by L
SD 1*			S <i>Philal.</i> ; C. <i>Gram.</i> 2.21, 3.15; <i>Ep. II to Sergius</i>
SD 4*			S. <i>Philal.</i>
SD 5*		PD 1*	S. <i>Philal.</i>
SD 6*			S C. <i>Gram.</i> 2.7
SD 7*			S. C. <i>Gram.</i> 3.23
	LD 1	PD 5*	L Diodore C. <i>Syn.</i> bk. 1
		PD 6a*	S C. <i>Gram.</i> 3.25
SD 8*		b	
SD 9*			S C. <i>Gram.</i> 3.25
SD 10*			S C. <i>Gram.</i> 3.26
SD 11*	LD 5a		S C. <i>Gram.</i> 3.23
	b		L Diodore C. <i>Syn.</i> bk. 1
SD 12*			S <i>Apol. for Philal.</i> 101
SD 13*			S <i>Apol. for Philal.</i> 101

to Succensus.²⁴ On this account, Cyril first used this Diodorean florilegium in his work *Against Diodore*, and then the twofold florilegium, assuming all its extracts to be of Theodore, in his subsequent volumes *Against Theodore*.

Strongly arguing against this reconstruction is the fact that we have no other evidence for a separate florilegium of Diodore's texts alone, as we do for a twofold florilegium in the example of the *Blasphemies* (though this also has a third section containing Nestorius' texts). Richard's reconstruction, moreover, would require that Leontius had access to both the twofold florilegium and the Diodorean florilegium, drawing three texts (LD 2, 3, 4) from the former and two (LD 1, 5) from the latter. This cannot be ruled out, but there is again no evidence for this, nor is it really

²⁴ Richard, 'Les Traités', 107–8; this is accepted by Sullivan, *Christology*, 53.

plausible to suppose that Leontius consulted two sources for a meagre five extracts. Finally, it also presupposes that the twofold florilegium only contained the extracts from Diodore given in the *Blasphemies*. Yet, as we have seen, the twofold florilegium would have contained more passages of Theodore than are reproduced in the *Blasphemies*, and there is no reason to suppose that this was not also the case for Diodore's extracts. It is much simpler to conclude that the common florilegium contained more texts of Diodore than are reproduced in the *Blasphemies*, and that this was the source for Cyril in his work *Against Diodore* and also for Leontius, with the latter happening upon two of the same passages as the *Collectio Palatina* and one in common with Severus.

Is there anything else to suggest that the common florilegium was in fact twofold, containing only texts from Diodore and Theodore? As we have seen, the *Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius* must be a shortened version of the florilegium used in common with our other sources, for it contains too many exact parallels to be an independent document, and yet lacks extracts used by others. Therefore either the third section containing texts from Nestorius is the addition of the scribe to a twofold florilegium, or there was a Nestorian section in the common florilegium. Quite why the compiler of the *Blasphemies* would choose to add texts of Nestorius is not at all clear. But it is readily understandable why our later sources, writing at the time of the Three Chapters controversy, should ignore the Nestorian section (if indeed all three sections remained together until this date), for Nestorius was no longer a live issue. It is possible that they only knew the Diodorean and Theodorean parts, or perhaps only the latter; but these, as we have seen, must have derived from the florilegium that is also reflected in the tripartite *Blasphemies*. The existence of a threefold common florilegium would thus explain our evidence better, and more simply, than Richard's twofold florilegium.

One further argument in support of a common threefold florilegium is that the relationship between the extracts of Nestorius contained in the *Blasphemies* and Cyril's five tomes *Against Nestorius*, written in 430, show the same patterns as we have seen in the case of the passages from Diodore and Theodore reproduced in the *Blasphemies* and Cyril's treatises *Against Diodore* and *Against Theodore*. The Nestorian passages of the *Blasphemies* have not been fully edited nor translated, but they have been analysed by Friedrich

Loofs. According to his investigations, of the twenty-two separate extracts in the *Blasphemies* (some with several parts), thirteen have no parallel.²⁵ Five passages (again with several parts) do have parallels with Cyril's *Against Nestorius*, including cases which have an identical *incipit* and some which supply linking passages between Cyril's extracts.²⁶ And, on the other hand, Cyril provides passages from Nestorius not included in the *Blasphemies*. Finally, the *Blasphemies* again include specific references to the places from which the extracts were taken (usually sermons, identifying them by their opening lines), while Cyril's *Against Nestorius* provides no references. Thus, in writing his tomes *Against Nestorius* Cyril again seems to have had recourse to a compilation of texts which is longer than the *Blasphemies*, but has enough in common to conclude that they were both drawing upon the same threefold source.

V. AUTHORSHIP OF THE COMMON FLORILEGIUM

The final question to be addressed concerns the origin of this common threefold florilegium. It was unquestionably composed in Greek before 438, when Cyril composed his rebuttals. Richard attempts to argue that it originated in the same Apollinarian circles that he supposes had presented Cyril with a distorted image of Diodore, an image which 'he could not have found anywhere else but in the introduction to the florilegium of texts of the first book against the Synousiasts'.²⁷ Cyril, Richard conjectures, received a twofold florilegium together with the letter from the 'orthodox' in Antioch complaining about the way in which the former supporters of Nestorius had switched their allegiance to Theodore.²⁸ Such Apollinarian circles are known to have produced literary frauds, which had fooled Cyril on other occasions. And Theodore himself complained that the Apollinarians had

²⁵ These passages are edited by F. Loofs in his *Nestoriana* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905), 365–86, numbered nos. 254, 256–8, 262–7, 270–2.

²⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 76–80. The passages with parallels in Cyril's *Against Nestorius*, in Loofs' numbering, are nos. 259, 260, 262, 270, 272, 274. I would draw especial attention to 259 and 260 as examples of how the *Blasphemies* supplement the passages supplied by Cyril. The parallels in Cyril's writings are found at *ibid.* 21–33.

²⁷ Richard, 'Les Traités', 113.

²⁸ Cf. Richard, 'La Tradition', 61–2.

texts from his *On the Incarnation* in which they had interpolated the 'two sons' teaching.²⁹ Therefore, Richard concludes, the florilegia that lay behind this attack against Diodore and Theodore must have come from their bitter enemies, and so the extracts contained in this compilation cannot be trusted.

That all our sources have in fact taken great care in their reproduction of the extracts is shown by their striking coincidence. But this fact cannot be used to argue that they are indeed faithful to the texts of Diodore and Theodore themselves. Although both Cyril and Leontius claimed to have worked through their texts, they, as all our other sources, were drawing their material from a common florilegium, and it is this which they faithfully reproduce. Even so, there is no reason to assume forgery or interpolation, for, as Price observes, the common florilegium was composed at a time when Theodore's writings were widely available and his supporters were informed and vocal, and yet we hear no complaint about falsification.³⁰ In fact, more than that, Ibas, as we saw in the last chapter, took it upon himself to translate a (hostile) florilegium supplied by the Armenian delegation into Syriac in order to further propagate Theodore's teaching. Facundus, a century later, does indeed repeat Theodore's complaint about interpolation, but it remains a fact that no more original form of the extracts adduced by his opponents were produced by his supporters.

Moreover, Richard's argument, as Sullivan points out, is rather circular: there is no external evidence upon which it is based, and it seeks to prove that which it assumes.³¹ Cyril makes no mention of receiving any supporting documentation from the orthodox at Antioch. In fact, as we have seen, the only florilegium that we hear about is that which was presented to Proclus by the Armenian priests visiting him in 435 to solicit his support against the spreading teaching of Theodore. But this is only said to have contained texts by Theodore, and is therefore unlikely to have been the same one now used by Cyril, even allowing for revisions and additions, for their concern was not yet with Diodore, and no longer with Nestorius, but only Theodore. Moreover, it is not necessarily the case that these 'orthodox' were 'Apollinarians': once peace had been established in 433 by the common rejection of Nestorius'

²⁹ Cf. Facundus, *Pro def.* 10.1.20-4 (= FT 27).

³⁰ Price, *Constantinople*, 1.230. ³¹ Sullivan, *Christology*, 54.

teaching, it need not only be 'Apollinarians' who were troubled by the Eastern bishops now looking to Theodore. With the lack of any real historical evidence upon which to base his a conjecture, Sullivan rightly argues that what motivates Richard's reconstruction is an a priori desire to conclude that the texts have been tampered with, and on this basis to connect the florilegium to Apollinarians, the renowned forgers.

One concluding suggestion may be offered. Could it not be that it was none other than Cyril himself who compiled the threefold florilegium? The arguments advanced against our later sources being dependent upon Cyril have limited themselves to a consideration of his works *Against Diodore* and *Against Theodore*, in which, most importantly, he did not (so far as we can tell from Severus and the fifth session of Constantinople) include references to the works from which the extracts were drawn. However, if we accept that Cyril was already gathering texts from Theodore at the time that he wrote his *Commentary on Hebrews*, sometime between 428 and 432, and that soon after Cyril became concerned with Diodore, if he was not already, alluding to passages of his work which we know from later sources, then there is nothing to counter the supposition that Cyril was already compiling texts from these figures during the time of his campaign against Nestorius. The simplest solution would be to suppose that Cyril compiled such a threefold florilegium, including references to the works from which he was extracting passages, beginning this work in the years before Ephesus with the writings of Nestorius and composing his *Against Nestorius* in 430; that he continued his reading in the early 430s, turning to the writings of Diodore and Theodore; and that, when he returned from his trip to Jerusalem and was spurred to action by Maximus, he began a comprehensive refutation of Diodore and Theodore, utilizing his earlier florilegium, but in his haste no longer including the references. Perhaps we might finally take Cyril at his word!³²

³² Barhadbešabba, *History* 29 (PO 9.5, pp. 571–2) also reports that Cyril compiled extracts from the works of Diodore and Theodore. Sullivan (*Christology*, 50–1, n. 56) argues that Barhadbešabba seems to be dependent upon Cyril's own letters and in fact conflates this compilation with that presented by Proclus to John of Antioch and the Eastern bishops for condemnation. However, that this incident occurred several years before Cyril wrote his treatises against Diodore and Theodore is not sufficient reason for concluding that Cyril did not compile his florilegium, and we have seen good reason to conclude that he did just that.

If the simpler scenario is to be preferred, we can conclude, against Richard and Sullivan, that Cyril is indeed the originator of the common florilegium, which he then used in his five tomes *Against Nestorius*, and subsequently in his treatise *Against Diodore* and the two *Against Theodore*; that the *Blasphemies*, Timothy, Leontius, and Justinian all based themselves on this threefold florilegium (known to them in whole or in part); that the *Collectio Palatina* based itself on Cyril's *Against Diodore*, as did Severus, who, along with the fifth session of Constantinople, also had recourse to Cyril's two books *Against Theodore*; and that the compiler of the extracts presented at the fourth session used Cyril's books *Against Theodore* and the common florilegium (again, in whole or in part), ignoring the section of Diodore's texts in the heat of the Three Chapters controversy.

EXTRACTS FROM THE FIFTH CENTURY

I. EUTHERIUS OF TYANA

Amongst our fifth-century witnesses for the texts of Diodore and Theodore, Eutherius of Tyana holds an exceptional place, inasmuch as he alone cites Diodore favourably.¹ Eutherius was metropolitan of Tyana in Cappadocia Secunda during the early fifth century, and was a strong supporter of Nestorius. Before the Council of Ephesus, John of Antioch had corresponded with Eutherius, together with Firmus of Caesarea and Theodotus of Ancyra, denouncing Cyril's twelve chapters as Apollinarian.² At Ephesus in 431 Eutherius joined with John of Antioch, and was deposed together with him. Most of our knowledge, meagre as it is, regarding subsequent events is contained in a work known as *The Tragedy of Irenaeus*, by Irenaeus of Tyre, who had been a close friend of Nestorius. The deacon Rusticus, a nephew of Pope Vigilius, found this work in the monastery of the Acoemete at Constantinople and included it in his *Synodicon*, which is usually known, with reference to the Abbey of Monte Cassino in which the manuscript is found, by the title *Collectio Casiensis*. Firmus, who had remained on good terms with Eutherius despite having taken part in his deposition,³ was sent to Tyana to consecrate Eutherius' successor. Meeting much opposition there, Longinus, the imperial officer in charge of the Isaurian troops, was forced to intervene, and both Firmus and the newly consecrated bishop had to flee.⁴ When peace was established

¹ The most complete study of Eutherius remains G. Ficker, *Eutherius von Tyana: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ephesinischen Konzils vom Jahre 431* (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1908), esp. 81-119.

² Theodoret, *Ep.* 112.

³ Cf. Firmus, *Ep.* 23 (PG 77.1497c).

⁴ Cf. Theodoret, *Ūponnisticum ad Alexandrum metropolitanum*, *ACO* 1.4, p. 87.

between John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria in 433, Eutherius wrote to John reproaching him, to Helladius of Tarsus encouraging him to stand firm, and to Alexander of Hierapolis he sent a long letter defending the position that they had taken.⁵ It is in the course of this last-mentioned letter that Eutherius cites a passage from Diodore of Tarsus. He was eventually sent to exile in Scythopolis in Palestine, from where he escaped to Tyre. The circumstances of his death are unknown. Apart from the few letters which have been mentioned, he is also the author of a short treatise.⁶

Eutherius of Tyana, *Letter to Alexander of Hierapolis*
(ACO I.4, p. 216.16–20)

Verumtamen dicatur propter unionem Maria dei genitrix; deus enim fortis est semen Abrahae propter unionem ad deum verbum. fatendo vero et hominis genitrix. si enim propter naturam hominis genitrix est Maria (dei genitrix est) non tamquam naturae sit partus, sed quia id quod est e David homo deo verbo coniunctus est.

Certainly Mary is to be called ‘Mother of God’ because of the union, for the seed of Abraham is ‘mighty God’ [Isa. 9:6] because of the union with the God Word, confessing in truth also ‘mother of man’. For if, by nature, Mary is mother of man, (she is Mother of God) not as if it were the birth of <the divine> nature, but because that which is from David is man conjoined to the God Word.




There is nothing remarkable in this extract; it echoes the central point, regarding how Mary is to be called ‘mother of God’ (*theotokos*) and ‘mother of man’ (*anthropōtokos*), made by the passages provided by our other sources. The value of this testimony is rather that it demonstrates that such claims were in fact made by the supporters of Diodore and Theodore.

⁵ ACO I.4, pp. 109–11 (to John of Antioch), pp. 111–12 (to Helladius of Tarsus), and pp. 213–21 (to Alexander of Hierapolis).

⁶ ed. M. Tetz, *Eine Antilogie des Eutherios von Tyana*, PTS 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964).

II. THE BLASPHEMIES OF DIODORE, THEODORE, AND THE
 IMPIOUS NESTORIUS (COD. ADD. 12156)

The most important source of extracts from Diodore and Theodore in the fifth century is a florilegium known as *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius*, found in a sixth-century non-Chalcedonian manuscript. Parts of this manuscript have been investigated, edited, and translated, but the manuscript as a whole has not yet been subject to a detailed scholarly examination. It is necessary to begin by reviewing the whole manuscript, in order to try to determine the date and context of this particular florilegium.

British Library *Cod. Add.* 12156 is a fine vellum manuscript, measuring about $12\frac{1}{8}$ by $9\frac{3}{8}$ inches, with 137 leaves in eighteen quires, marked with letters.⁷ It is written in a clear Edessene hand in three columns of 43–51 lines, with titles and headings in red ink, and with consistent diacritical points, and scriptural passages usually indicated by the mark ‘<’ on the right-hand side of each line of the quotation. The manuscript is missing one leaf at the beginning and four after fol. 8.⁸ The name of the scribe, Talyā of Edessa, is given in a note in the colophon on fol. 136^v. In the second column of the same folio, after five carefully erased lines, a different hand mentions that the volume was presented by the deaconess , of Beth-Mānā, to a certain convent in A.G. 873 (i.e. AD 562), at the time when the priest Bacchus, of , was oeconomus, the priest 'Aziz, librarian, and the priest Simeon, of , janitor. On the reverse side of the final folio (137^v), in a hand that Wright describes as ‘rude’, are the words:

⁷ For a full description see William Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the year 1838* (London, Longmans: 1870–2), 2.639–48 (entry DCCXXIX). For an overview of the ms. see L. Abramowski, ‘Zur geplanten Ausgabe von Brit. Mus. add. 12156’, in J. Irmscher (ed.), *Texte und Textkritik: Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, TU 133 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987), 23–8.

⁸ A. Moberg, *On Some Syriac Fragments of Timotheos Ailuros Against the Synod of Chalcedon* (Lund: H. Ohlsson, 1928), 3–9, has identified, on the basis of a Serto manuscript dating to 932, the text contained in the missing first folio of *Cod. Add.* 12156, the lengthy quotation from the letter of Ignatius to the Smyrneans. It is noteworthy that these extracts from Ignatius, along with the anathemas of Pope Simplicius (fols. 2^v–3^r), are absent from the Armenian version, which led Schwartz to conclude that they were added by the ‘epitomator’ who compiled, in Greek, the abbreviated work (*Codex Vaticanus*, 130–1).

ܘܢܫܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ
 ܘܢܫܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ

This book belongs to Jacob and John, priests, nephews of Abraham, metropolitan of Mabug. The Book of Timothy

The Timothy in question is Timothy Aelurus, archbishop of Alexandria (d. 477), though, as we will see, not all the texts in this manuscript are his.

As mentioned, the beginning of this work is lost; it opens with a large collection of excerpts from the fathers, described in the headings on fols. 6^v and 10^v as:

ܘܢܫܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ

Testimonies from the fathers against those who say two natures

These folios contain extracts from twenty different fathers, from Ignatius to Dioscorus (1^r–11^r). There follows an account of events since the Council of Ephesus and extracts, with Timothy's rebuttal, from the *Tōme* of Leo and the Acts of Chalcedon (fols. 11^r–15^r).⁹ Folios 15^r–29^r present Timothy's own scriptural and theological argument, described on the headings on folios 18^v and 26^v:

ܘܢܫܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܪܘܫܐ

Of the bishop Timothy, against those who say two natures

These first twenty-nine folios appear to be an abbreviated and rearranged recension of Timothy's treatise, preserved in a longer version in Armenian, referred to as *Against Those Who Say Two Natures*.¹⁰

⁹ Fols. 11^r to 13^v were edited and translated by F. Nau in PO 13, pp. 202–17.

¹⁰ The Armenian text was edited by K. Ter-Mekertschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz with the title *Timotheus Aelurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien: Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzten Lehre* (Leipzig, 1908). This is a rather unfortunate title, given that the *Cod. Add.* 12156 also contains what appears to be an epitome of a work with a similar title (fols. 39^v–61^r, mentioned below). Moreover, the title of the Armenian text, as it appears on the first page (with the variants of the title as it appears on p. 316 given in parenthesis) is: 'Concerning the affirmation that our Lord and God Jesus Christ is one along with his flesh [the fact that . . . was made one . . .] and the attribution to the same of all the divine and human things, and that having been

There follows six letters of Timothy (fols. 29^v–36^v),¹¹ several creeds (of Nicaea, Constantinople, Athanasius, and John of Jerusalem; fols. 36^v–38^v),¹² and an extract from the seventh homily of John Chrysostom on 1 Thessalonians (1Thess. 4:15; fols. 38^v–39^v).¹³ The first letter of Timothy is particularly noteworthy, as it contains a florilegium against the ‘Eutychianists’ (as they are described at the conclusion of the letter on fol. 32^r), thus confirming that Timothy’s own concern related to both extremes of the controversy. The heading ‘Of the bishop Timothy, against those who say two natures’ also appears above the fourth letter (on fol. 34^v) addressed ‘to all Egypt, the Thebaid and Pentapolis, giving these his rulings about those who say two natures’.

A new work begins on folio 39^v, with the heading, clearly not by Timothy himself:

ⲛⲓⲟ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲛⲁⲓⲧⲏⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲧⲏⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲧⲏⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲧⲏⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ ⲁⲓⲟⲩⲏ

made consubstantial with us he remained even thus God and that it is blasphemy to divide him into two [natures], [wherein also is a rebuttal of the blasphemies contained in Leo’s Tome and of the impieties of the definition produced at the Council of Chalcedon].’ This translation is provided by R. Y. Ebied and L. R. Wickham, in their essay ‘Timothy Aelurus: Against the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon’, in C. Laga, J. A. Munitiz, and L. van Rompay (eds.), *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History* (Leuven: Peeters, 1985), 115–67, at p. 118. For an initial comparison of the two texts, see J. Lebon, *Le Monophysisme sévérien* (Louvain: Peeters, 1909), 98–103; id., ‘Version arménienne et version syriaque de Timothée Élure’, *Handes Amsorya: Monatsschrift für Armenische Philologie*, 11–12 (1927), 713–22. For an analysis of the florilegia contained this text and the longer Armenian version, see F. Cavallera, ‘Le Dossier patristique de Timothée Aelure’, *BLE* 4.1 (1909), 342–59; and esp. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus*, 98–117 for the Armenian florilegium and pp. 117–26 for the Syriac, and pp. 126–32 for further reflections on the Syriac text and its place in *Cod. Add.* 12156.

¹¹ These letters have been translated, alongside a reproduction of fols. 29^v–36^v, in R. Y. Ebied and L. R. Wickham, ‘A Collection of Unpublished Syriac Letters of Timothy Aelurus’, *JTS* ns 31.2 (1970), 321–69.

¹² ed. in C. P. Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols* (Christiania: P. T. Malling, 1866), 1.100, 143, 161.

¹³ Cf. L. Abramowski, ‘Ein Text des Johannes Chrysostomus über die Auferstehung in den Belegsammlungen des Timotheus Älurus’, in Laga, Munitiz, and van Rompay (eds.), *After Chalcedon*, 1–10.

Saint Timothy archbishop of Alexandria's rebuttal of, and answer to, the definition given at Chalcedon, so that its readers may know that the synod at Chalcedon ordained nothing other than the prevalence and proclamation in all God's churches of the profane dogmas of Nestorius.¹⁴

Folios 39^v-61^r divide into four parts.¹⁵ The first (fols. 39^v-42^v) presents a line-by-line refutation of the Definition of Chalcedon, and includes two extracts from Nestorius (at fol. 41^v and fol. 42^r).¹⁶ The second (fols. 42^v-51^v) deals likewise with the *Tome* of Leo, marshalling texts from numerous fathers in opposition. The third part (fols. 51^v-59^v) contains passages from the *Acta* of the Council of Ephesus in 449, demonstrating the volte-face of the bishops when they gathered together two years later at Chalcedon. The fourth part (fols. 59^v-61^r), praising Dioscorus and urging his readers to stand firm in the faith, seems to indicate that the treatise was written in exile (i.e. AD 460-75). These folios (39^v-61^r) are usually identified as an epitome of a treatise of Timothy referred to as *The Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo*, a distinct text from that epitomized in fols. 1-29^v, but one which is no longer extant in any other version.

The following two folios (61^r-63^r) contain four texts either by Timothy himself or connected to him: an anathema to be affirmed by diphysites, Nestorians, Eutychians, and others when they are received into the true faith; a prayer of Timothy for such converts; articles of faith from the Egyptian clergy; and Timothy's Confession of Faith.¹⁷ The material directly from Timothy himself concludes at this point.

Folios 63^r-69^r present a collection of seven letters.¹⁸ Folios 69^r-90^r contain two florilegia: the first (69^r-80^r) now known as the

¹⁴ As translated by Ebied and Wickham ('Timothy Aelurus', 119, n. 6), who comment that this title 'is obviously not Timothy's own *in toto* (nobody calls himself a saint) but recalls part of the original no doubt'.

¹⁵ Cf. Ebied and Wickham, 'Timothy Aelurus: Against the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon', 119; this essay reproduces fols. 42^v-51^v and 59^v-61^r, with a translation.

¹⁶ Fols. 39^v-42^v are edited and translated by Nau, PO 13, pp. 218-36.

¹⁷ Fols. 61^r-63^v are edited and translated by Nau, PO 13, pp. 237-47.

¹⁸ The letters are: (1) from Proclus to the Armenians (fols. 63^r-67^r); (2) from Theodoret to Nestorius (fols. 67^r-67^v); (3) extract from a letter from Nestorius to Theodoret (fol. 67^v); (4) and (5) extracts from a letter of Theodoret to Dioscorus (fols. 67^v-68^v); (6) from Rabbula of Edessa to Andrew of Samosata (fol. 68^v); (7) extracts from the reply of Andrew to Rabbula (fol. 69^v).

Florilegium Edessenum anonymum,¹⁹ and the second (80^r–90^r), being described in a heading on fol. 82^v as:

ܠܘܘܝ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ ܠܘܘܝ

The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius²⁰

Folios 90^r–91^r contain one letter and two extracts from other letters.²¹ It is possible that these two collections of letters, all of which originate from the period after Ephesus, were originally a single collection, subsequently divided by the two florilegia. At the end of these extracts, on folio 91^r, there is the statement:

ܠܘܘܝ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ ܠܘܘܝ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ ܠܘܘܝ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ
... ܠܘܘܝ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ ܠܘܘܝ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ ܠܘܘܝ ܘܢܝܢܘܨܘܘܢ

Here ends the book of the refutation of the wicked Synod which was assembled at Chalcedon.

It was composed by the venerable Mar Timothy, bishop of Alexandria . . .

This colophon clearly indicates that the scribe took the entirety of folios 1–91^r as a unity, a collection of texts either from Timothy himself, or his work as epitomized by others, together with other material associated with his argument against Chalcedon. It seems likely that a document structured in a similar manner to these ninety-one folios was known also to Philoxenus of Mabbug (c.440–523).²²

The remaining folios of *Cod. Add. 12156* contain two short treatises of Cyril of Alexandria on the Twelve Anathemas, the

¹⁹ ed. I. Rucker, *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum (Syriace ante 562)*, SBAW.PH 1933.5 (Munich: Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1933).

²⁰ The extracts from Diodore and Theodore were first printed by P. Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca* (1858; repr. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1967), 91–108. E. Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta syriaca* (Leipzig: William Engelmann, 1969), 63–70, provided a Latin translation of Theodore's extracts. M. Brière, 'Quelques fragments syriaques de Diodore de Tarse, évêque de Tarse (378–394?)', *ROC* 10 (1946), 231–83, re-edited Diodore's extracts and provided a French translation. Finally R. Abramowski, 'Der theologische Nachlass der Diodore von Tarsus', *ZNTW* 42 (1949), 19–69, republished Lagarde's text, accompanied with a German translation, together with all other surviving extracts of Diodore. The extracts from Nestorius were analysed by F. Loofs, as described earlier (Ch. 4, nn. 25–7).

²¹ The letter is from Cyril to Proclus (fol. 90^r–91^r); the extracts are from a letter of Rabbula to Cyril (fol. 91^r) and from Theodotus of Ancyra to the monk Vitalis (fol. 91^r).

²² Cf. A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog: lettre aux moines de Senoun*, CSCO 232, script. Syri. 99 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1963), XIV.

first against the Eastern bishops (fols. 91^r–107^v), the second against Theodoret (fols. 107^v–122^v); a text of Gregory Thaumaturgus dealing with the question of whether God can suffer (fols. 122^v–129^v);²³ and, finally, portions of Epiphanius' *Anakephalaiosis* together with a list of the Greek names of the sects mentioned by Epiphanius (fols. 129^v–137^r).²⁴

As presented by its compiler, *Cod. Add. 12156* thus falls into two main parts. The first part consists of material from or associated with Timothy (fols. 1–91^r), and can be further subdivided into three parts: (A) material from Timothy himself (fols. 1–63^r); (B) a collection of letters stemming from the period after Ephesus (fols. 63^r–69^r and 90^r–91^r), which is divided by (C) two florilegia (69^r–90^r). The second main part (D) consists of material from Cyril, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Epiphanius (fols. 91^r–137^r).²⁵ It is also most likely, as we have seen, that A–C already existed as a compilation of material, to which the compiler added the texts in D.

The question naturally arises: where, in what language, and when was this collection compiled? Luise Abramowski has pointed to the fact that, whereas A is dominated by an anti-Chalcedonian tendency, appropriate to Timothy himself, B and C seem to strike a more anti-Antiochian note, concluding that the 'Sitz im Leben' of at least this part of the collection is no longer the Patriarchate of Alexandria but the Patriarchate of Antioch.²⁶ Likewise, she notes that the material from Cyril in D accentuates this anti-Antiochian tendency, while the text of Gregory Thaumaturgus, on the suffering of the impassible one, would be a useful support for advocates, such as Peter the Fuller or Philoxenus, of the theopaschite addition to the *Trisagion*, and that Epiphanius joins Cyril and Gregory in this second major part of the manuscript, as the anti-heretical writer par excellence prior to the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy. In addition, one might note that Gregory himself is a natural addition to such a compilation, not only because of his tremendous importance as the legendary founding father of Christianity in Neocaesarea, the capital of

²³ Cf. H. Crouzel, 'La Passion de l'impassible: un essai apologétique et polémique du III^e siècle', in *L'Homme devant Dieu: Mélanges H. de Lubac*, I (Paris: Aubier, 1963), 269–79.

²⁴ Cf. L. Abramowski, 'Die Anakephalaiosis zum Panarion des Epiphanius in der Handschrift Brit. Mus. Add. 12156', *Le Muséon*, 96 (1983), 217–30.

²⁵ This schematization follows that of Abramowski, 'Zur geplanten Ausgabe von Brit. Mus. add. 12156', 23–5.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 24.

Pontus, but because he was known to have participated in the Council of Antioch which had condemned Paul of Samosata, who by this time had come to be seen as a precursor of Nestorius.²⁷ Eduard Schwartz surmised that the collection (at least to 91^r) was compiled in Greek, an assessment which Abramowski finds confirmed by the fact that the excerpt from the letter of Andrew of Samosata to Rabbula of Edessa preserved here (69^v) is not taken from the translation of the complete letter found elsewhere.²⁸ As for the date of the collection, whilst the manuscript itself can be securely dated to a period prior to AD 562, there is no indication that its concerns reflect any division within the non-Chalcedonian camp, such as that between Severus and Julian, so that one can probably date the collection to the last years of the fifth century or the early years of the sixth.

The text with which we are here concerned, *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius*, falls together with the *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum* within the section (A–C) that the compiler of the completed collection regards as belonging to Timothy, and that probably already existed as an independent collection. The *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum* has been identified by Ignaz Rucker as a collection originating in the decade following Ephesus, probably in the circles around Rabbula of Edessa; compared to the style of Timothy himself, this florilegium represents an ‘overworked tradition of Monophysitism’, due to a changing dogmatic situation, but one which is still determined by the Alexandrian tradition of Cyril rather than marked by later division between the non-Chalcedonians themselves.²⁹ It seems most plausible to see *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius* as being produced or reproduced in the same milieu. Yet it is not an original composition, for as we have seen, the *Blasphemies* seem to be a shorter version of a threefold florilegium of texts compiled by Cyril of Alexandria in the early 430s.

²⁷ Cf. Behr, *Way to Nicaea*, 225–35; references to the Acts of the Council of Antioch in 268/9, begin to appear in 428/9 when Eusebius of Dorylaeum juxtaposed a series of statements from Nestorius alongside ones claiming to derive from Paul of Samosata.

²⁸ Cf. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus*, 131; Abramowski, ‘Zur geplanten Ausgabe von Brit. Mus. add. 12156’, 25. A Syriac translation of this letter is preserved in Vat. Borg. Syr. 82, edited and translated by F. Pericoli-Ridolfini, ‘Lettera di Andrea di Samosata a Rabbula de Edessa’, *Revista degli Studi Orienta*, 28 (1953), 153–69.

²⁹ Cf. Rucker, *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum*, XV–XVI.

Sigla

- M Manuscript: British Library *Cod. Add. 12156*, fols. 80^r–90^r.
- L P. Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca* (1858; repr. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1967), 91–108.
- B M. Brière, ‘Quelques fragments syriaques de Diodore de Tarse, évêque de Tarse (378–394?)’, *ROC* 10 (1946): 231–83.
- A R. Abramowski, ‘Der theologische Nachlass der Diodore von Tarsus’, *ZNTW* 42 (1949), 19–69.

Diodore of Tarsus

BD 1 (L 91.14–18)

[=TD 1]

[80^r2] חבכר ונבטו ונענא

... חבכר ונבטו ונענא חבכר ונבטו ונענא ...
 לכו דענא דעס: כד אלתא חבוכ למ נענא: ונבטו ונענא חבכר
 ונבטו ונענא חבכר ונבטו ונענא: ונבטו ונענא חבכר
 ונבטו ונענא חבכר ונבטו ונענא: ונבטו ונענא חבכר
 ונבטו ונענא חבכר ונבטו ונענא: ונבטו ונענא חבכר

BD 2 (L 91.18–92.3)

חבכר ונבטו

חבכר ונבטו: למ כד למ חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 ונבטו ונענא חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו
 חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו חבכר ונבטו

³⁰ As M, B; L (p. xv: 91.17), A חבכר

Diodore of Tarsus

BD 1 (L 91.14–18)
[= TD 1]

Blasphemies from the writings of Diodore.

From the book the beginning of which is:

Certain people though confessing that our Lord Jesus Christ is God and begotten ineffably of the Father before the ages, yet not, so they say, denying his manifestation in the last times through the flesh whose mother was the blessed Mary, they seek to confuse the word of truth with novel expressions which are incorrect . . .

BD 2 (L 91.18–92.3)

And after other <words>:

And in what respect do they suggest that he be considered to be one and the same, as both from heaven and from earth (just as one human being also is immortal in soul but mortal in body?), from before the ages and from the seed of David, from God and in the manger, in every place, both on the cross and in heaven? One and the same who suffered yet who was not crucified and who did not receive the nails, both before Abraham and after Abraham, Creator of the world and a creature, who is dead and who raises up—this according to the flesh, that according to his divinity? One and the same, therefore not one and another but one composite <being> (as indeed we said above): a single Son complete in both—the body and the God Word; not the one <as> superior, the other <as> inferior, and not the one by nature, the other by grace, because the divine Scripture speaks of one Son and not two—the one from above but the other from below, nor

even that the Son who is from before the ages is impassible, but the one at the end of the ages is passible—but one and the same is both this and that. Those from among them who love learning have this opinion, and they cannot say that they have been slandered by us . . .

BD 3 (L 92.3–12)

And after other <words>:

For this reason, neither because he [Christ] was from Mary nor because he was conceived in her and born of her, did David call his own son ‘Lord’, but it was in view of the glory and pre-eternal birth of the Only-begotten that he confesses him as Lord. For Christ is the Lord of David even according to the flesh, just as the martyrs so much excel their parents that punishment will be reserved for the latter and royal estate for the former. But our Lord is not more exalted than David as a ruler though he is his son (meaning <his son> according to the flesh); but because he was the temple of the God Word and formed without intercourse—not by the law of nature, but by an arrangement of divine power—he is the Lord of David. . .

BD 4 (L 92.12–93.1)

And after other <words>:

But I hear them saying that he who was conceived in Mary and born of her is also the Creator of all. For, they say, the child was called ‘Jesus’ because he has saved the people from their sins’ [Matt. 1:21]. The apostle Paul too proclaims that ‘there is one God from whom is all and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom is all’ [1 Cor. 8:6]: the Creator of all, therefore, is a man, and I know that their opinion is weak and easily refuted. But in case by remaining silent we should give occasion to the simple for supposing it to be as valid and true as it is <really> weak and alien to the truth, I will again expose it by an apt rebuttal. For if he who is of Mary is truly man how is he before the heavens and the earth? And if he is before them, he is not a man. If he is of Abraham, how is he before Abraham? If he is of the earth, how is he before the earth, and all that we have said above? How is David’s maker and the Creator of all David’s son—if we ought to credit them, folk who by witlessness have blinded the sight of their

תכלה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יֵאָמֵר וְיִשְׁתָּחֶוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבְּחֶיךָ וְיִשְׁמְחֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ
 לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ

BD 5 (L 93.1-2)

וְכִּי יִשְׁתָּחֶוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ

BD 6 (L 93.2-6)

[80^v3] וְכִּי יִשְׁתָּחֶוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ

BD 7 (L 93.6-13)
 [a=TD 4]

וְכִּי יִשְׁתָּחֶוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ

BD 8 (L 93.13-20)

וְכִּי יִשְׁתָּחֶוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ
 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ

³⁴ A אָמַר

³⁵ L (p. xviii: 93.6) suggests וְיִשְׂמְחוּ לְפָנֶיךָ

³⁶ A אָמַר

minds? But faith is of realities neither visible nor manifest; <faith in> things seen and expressed is not faith, but presumption and folly passing measure. And the divine Scripture has not decreed that he who is of the seed of David is the maker of all, but confesses that the God Word is the creator of all.

BD 5 (L 93.1–2)

And after other <words>:

But how is he who existed after many human beings very latterly, the creator of the universe? . . .

BD 6 (L 93.2–6)

And after other <words>:

There are certain titles for the God Word. Do not call the God Word by those that pertain to the body! For you do not predicate ‘body’ of the God Word, because he is uncircumscribed, nor ‘son of David’, because neither does our Lord himself, who was begotten of the Father before all ages, require himself to be called ‘son of David’ [cf. Matt. 22:41–5] . . .

BD 7 (L 93.6–13)

[a=TD 4]

And again:

[a] Before the body of our Lord decomposed, while it was still intact and not corrupted, he arose, not having been left in the tomb three full days, [b] for he was buried at the setting of the sun on Friday and, having waited a whole night and the Sabbath and again the following night, he arose early in the morning, while it was still dark, on Sunday. And because of this his flesh did not see corruption, but was still intact. And for this reason, Peter, after having said earlier that he died, quoted the testimony of the Psalm that ‘his flesh did not see corruption’ [Ps. 15:10; Acts 2:27, 31].

BD 8 (L 93.13–20)

And after other <words>:

Observe how, after having said earlier that ‘he was crucified and died and was buried in the tomb’, <Paul> then repeated that ‘he rose’, and as witness to this, he summoned David, who said, ‘You

ומגן אמונתא למי קא [81^r1] לוגן דא יתהוה דא דא ליהוה לעמיה
 ונשא עבדא: בן דא קא עמיה למי קא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 מן דא עבדא ברא אקא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 וחסד מברין ברא לעבדא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 ברא עבדא חלל דא עמיה למי קא עבדא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא

BD 9 (L 93.20–94.1)

אבדו אטעבא
 עלתה יתהוה בן לעבדא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא עמיה דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 עמיה ברא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא

BD 10 (L 94.1–17)

אבדו
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא
 דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא דא

³⁷ B אַ מא
⁴⁰ L יתהוה
³⁸ L omits דא
⁴¹ As L (p. xv: 94.6); M דא
³⁹ As L, B, A; M דא

will not let your Holy One see corruption' [Ps. 15:10, Acts 13:35]. In explaining this verse, he said: 'David, after his falling asleep remained <thus> and did not rise but saw corruption' [Acts 13:36]—as also Peter, in explaining the same <text>, said 'his tomb is with us until this day' [Acts 2:29]—and 'he whom God raised up saw not corruption' [cf. Acts 13:37]. It is because <God> has raised him that he saw not corruption, that is to say dissolution. And there are many more things one could say . . .

BD 9 (L 93.20–94.1)

And after other <words>:

The apostles, when they saw that the fury against their Master was at boiling point among the Jews, were so terrified that when he was captured they forsook him, considering nothing other than 'save yourself', praying that they might use supernatural wings for flight. When they shut the doors against them, attempting to hide, a great fear, as well as delusion, frequently came upon them, that the Jews would find them out, seize and deliver them, torture them and kill them. Our Lord, when he found them in this state, did not knock on the door nor open it suddenly, lest, supposing that it was the feared calamity, they would be violently troubled; but <he entered> when the doors, as they believed, were closed . . .

BD 10 (L 94.1–17)

And again:

If, then, they want our Lord to enter naturally, with the doors opened secretly, because of the fear mentioned earlier, it is not necessary to say anything more. For in the same way that before the passion, being apprehended by the Jews many times, even in his own country he passed unseen between them [cf. Luke 4:30] and escaped from the eyes of those who pursued him, having struck them with hallucinations, so too he prevented the eyes of the disciples from seeing his natural entry because of the reason we mentioned earlier. Or was he not able to do the very same thing as those angels who were sent to Sodom, who deceived the eyes of the impious of that time? They went all around, seeking the doors, yet not finding them, although they were before their eyes; but, believing that the walls of the house were doors, they

סמס . סלמס סמס סמס . ללמל ית [81^r3] יעזיניניניני סמס
 יתניניני : לל סמס . סמס סמס ית יתניניני סמס יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני סמס יתניניני סמס : סמס יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 סמס . סמס יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני .
 סמס לל סמס יתניניני : יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני : סמס יתניניני יתניניני .⁴² יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני סמס יתניניני יתניניני . . .

BD 11 (L 94.17-20)

סמס יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני .

BD 12 (L 94.20-4)

סמס יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני . . .

BD 13 (L 94.24-95.2)

[81^v1]
 סמס יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
⁴³ יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני
 יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני יתניניני . . .

⁴² I. (p. xv: 94.16) omits . ⁴³ A יתניניני
⁴⁴ M, L, A . לל ⁴⁵ A . יתניניני ⁴⁶ L יתניניני

ascended by them, not seeing the real doors [cf. Gen. 19:9–11]. The prophet Elisha, by his prayer, made the eyes of the Edomites not see naturally, and led into Samaria the soldiers who had come to take him; when they fell into the hands of the children of Israel, they <only> discovered it at the end [cf. 4 Kgs 6:18–20]. In this way, it is not very surprising that our Lord entered after the doors were open and that the disciples believed the opposite, because of the fear of the Jews and because they themselves were shown to be in the wrong not having believed hitherto [cf. Mark 16:14] . . .

BD 11 (L 94.17–20)

And after other <words>:

On the one hand, before the ages the God Word was born of the Father, the Unique of the Unique; on the other, the likeness of the servant, the offspring of the holy Virgin in the last times, is man, from the Holy Spirit.

BD 12 (L 94.20–4)

And after other <words>:

Paul does not stipulate that the God Word, when he became flesh and was formed, was the infant from Mary. But he says that the man born of Mary was sent for our salvation, for God did not send his Son to be born, but sent him who was born to save. The saying of Paul concerns him who was born of Mary [Gal. 4:4] . . .

BD 13 (L 94.24–95.2)

And after other <words>:

But perhaps someone would like to learn precisely whether this is truly said by the Apostle of the man from Mary, the very same <Paul> in what follows is his teacher of the desired <points>. For what does he say? ‘When the fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, and he was made of woman, and was made under the law, that he might redeem those under the law’ [Gal. 4:4–5]. Who, then, is he who was <made> under the law? Who was circumcised, who was brought up in a Jewish way? Is it not the man from Mary, or do these statements also apply to the God Word? . . .

BD 14 (L 95.2–6)

And after other <words>:

For ‘being in the likeness of God, he took the likeness of a servant’ is not ‘he became a servant’, ‘and was found in appearance like a man’ is not ‘he became a man’ but ‘like a man’ [cf. Phil. 2:6–8]: the very one who took the likeness of a servant is in the likeness of God, for human nature is indeed ‘servant’, whereas the one hidden in him on account of him who is manifest <is> ‘like a man’ . . .

BD 15 (L 95.7–15)

And after other <words>:

For just as when we read that ‘the Son of Man has descended from the heavens’ [cf. John 3:13], from on high, from where he was formerly, without being misled by the surface meaning of the term we say that the Seed of Abraham came from on high but being convinced that the God Word was called man because he dwelt in the son of man: so too, when the divine Scripture says ‘the Lord of glory was crucified’ [1 Cor. 2:8] or ‘God did not spare his own Son’ [Rom. 8:23], while assenting to the profundity of the sense of Scripture, we are not led by the expression to believe that the God Word suffered, but rather the man from Mary was deemed worthy of sonship, the temple of the God Word which was destroyed by the Jews but raised up by him who dwelt in it . . .

BD 16 (L 95.16–19)

And after other <words>:

Who is it that, at the time of the crucifixion, promised that the thief would be with him in paradise [cf. Luke 24:43]? The one who died, was buried, and arose not on the same day, nor even on the one that followed? It is not possible both that he, as dead, was buried, and that he, as living, led the thief into paradise . . .

BD 17 (L 95.19-96.13)
[b=C₄T 28; C₅D 4]

אבחה

ונתן ליה ⁵⁴ אהרן בן נחמן. ויהי עתה ⁵⁵ בראש חודש אלול ⁵⁶ ויהי עתה ⁵⁷ בראש חודש אלול
 [81^v3] ויהי עתה ⁵⁸ בראש חודש אלול. ויהי עתה ⁵⁹ בראש חודש אלול. ויהי עתה ⁶⁰ בראש חודש אלול.
 ויהי עתה ⁶¹ בראש חודש אלול. ויהי עתה ⁶² בראש חודש אלול. ויהי עתה ⁶³ בראש חודש אלול.
 ויהי עתה ⁶⁴ בראש חודש אלול. ויהי עתה ⁶⁵ בראש חודש אלול. ויהי עתה בראש חודש אלול.
 ויהי עתה בראש חודש אלול. ויהי עתה בראש חודש אלול. ויהי עתה בראש חודש אלול.

54 A אהרן	55 L (p. xv: 95.20) בראש חודש	56 A בראש חודש	57 L בראש חודש
58 A בראש חודש	59 L (p. xiii: 95.28), B בראש חודש	60 L בראש חודש; B בראש חודש	64 L (p. xv: 96.4) בראש חודש
61 A בראש חודש	62 M, L בראש חודש	63 B בראש חודש	
65 M בראש חודש			

BD 17 (L 95.19–96.13)

[b=C4T 28; C5D 4]

And again:

[a] And that this is not <merely> a word of persuasion, but the truth, Paul shall come as a witness when he writes to Timothy, ‘Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, from the seed of David’ [2 Tim. 2:8], and declares that the suffering pertained to the man. No one, therefore, should occupy themselves with vacuous questions, nor give an answer simplistically; but reprove the vacuity of <this> opinion. If anyone were to ask: ‘Was the Lord of glory crucified?’ [1 Cor. 2:8], one should ask who he believes to be ‘the Lord of glory’, whether the God Word, who was before the ages, or the one from the seed of David? If it is the first, it is not necessary to say anything about this immeasurable impiety, for he has immediately uttered an absurdity: which has also been sufficiently demonstrated by many of the previous statements. If it is the second, we are in agreement with them, and there is no need for conflict. [b] If it were the flesh, they say, which was crucified, why did the sun turn away its rays [cf. Luke 23:45], and darkness and earthquakes seize the whole earth, and the rocks get smashed and the dead arise [cf. Matt. 27:45, 51–3]? What, then, is there for them to say regarding the darkness that occurred in Egypt in the days of Moses, not for three hours, but three days [cf. Exod. 10:21 ff.]? What indeed of those other marvels, which were <wrought> by Moses [cf. Exod. 7:8 ff.] and those by Jesus, son of Nave [Joshua, son of Nun], who made the sun stand [cf. Jos. 10:12 ff.], <the sun> which in the days of King Hezekiah supernaturally went backwards [cf. 4 Kgs 20:11], and of the bones of Elisha which raised a dead man [4 Kgs 13:21]?⁶⁶ For if those which occurred at the time of the crucifixion show that the God Word suffered, and they do not grant that they happened because of a man, <then> neither <did> those things which happened in the days of Moses for the sake of the race of Abraham, nor <those> in the days of Jesus, son of Nave, nor <those> in the days of King Hezekiah. But if those were miraculously wrought for the sake of the people of the Jews, much more were those at the time of the crucifixion because of the temple of God . . .

⁶⁶ A Latin version of [b] to this point occurs in Pelagius II, *Ep.* 3 (*ACO* 4.2, p. 122.1–7).

BD 18 (L 96.13–27)

And after other <words>:

At that time the earth shook and the sun turned back because of the one from Mary, the temple of the God Word, through whom salvation was effected for humans, the annulling of the curse and the destruction of the principdom of the devil, because <the earth> is rebuking the presumption of the Jews and does not tolerate the number,⁷³ which the Jews did not weary of making! For the [cry] ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’ [Matt. 27:46] not only is not of the God Word, but I contend that it is not even of the body, crying out as if it had been abandoned. For why would it cry out for help, as if he had been abandoned? Would it not have foreseen his resurrection and his glory? Was it not by Peter that it heard that ‘the Son of Man will be delivered and they would crucify him’, <Peter> whom, when saying in concern (as he believed) about him, said ‘Let this be far from you, Lord!’, he trenchantly rebuked, calling him ‘Satan’ [Matt. 16.21–3]: for Satan it is who would possess his power (that is, sin and death) unimpaired through his [i.e. Christ’s] not suffering. <Satan> did not know that the man was born from Mary the Virgin, for this reason: to cleanse the race of men by his blood.

BD 19 (L 96.27–97.15)

And after other <words>:

Therefore because the infant who was conceived in Mary and was born from her was the seed of Abraham and David and the fruit of the root of Jesse, it is clear that what is born is <born> from its parent; and the same lineage descended to the holy Mary, who from herself gave birth to the temple for the God Word. He was not foreign to her own nature, but of human nature, a holy formation and first-fruits, by which he killed sin and brought death to an end. And this <one> who was born of Mary, lived humanly: he was weary and he put on clothes, he was hungry and thirsty, he was crucified, his side was pierced and blood and water flowed out, and those who crucified him divided his garments, and he himself was dead and buried, and when he rose, he

⁷³ One would expect a word meaning ‘noise’ or ‘outcry’ here, but no such word suggests itself for the Syriac text; the corruption might have already been there in the Greek, where ἀριθμός might have replaced something like θόρυβος or γογγυσμός.

showed himself to his disciples, that he had flesh and bones, that were no longer subject to suffering or death, and for forty days he ate and drank with his disciples, he ascended on a cloud in the sight of his disciples, and that he is coming in the manner in which he ascended, we have earlier said sufficiently and shown from the divine Scriptures. . . . But that the God Word, on the other hand, who from before the ages was begotten of the Father, is subject neither to change nor suffering, nor was he turned into a body, he was neither crucified nor died, neither ate nor drank nor was tired, but that he remains incorporeal, uncircumscribed, without deviating from the paternal likeness, we have clearly shown by sound reasoning and by the divine Scriptures . . .

BD 20 (L 97.15–98.1)

And after other <words>:

The Power of God overshadowed Mary [cf. Luke 1:35], when it formed a temple, although it was not mixed with the body. For the Holy Spirit filled John the Baptist also, while he was still in the process of conception without his being from that <Holy Spirit's> nature. Indeed, if the Son had undergone some irrational mixing, how would our Lord have said, 'for him who blasphemes against the Son of Man there can be forgiveness, but for him who <speaks> against the Holy Spirit there never will be' [Luke 12:10], as has been said before? Because they dispute this it is also just that they should be caught in their own nets. If there is a mixture of the nature of the God Word and the flesh, how does he who blasphemes against Christ have forgiveness, which he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit does not have? Tell me: is the Son inferior to the Spirit? The second to the third? He who sends to him who is sent? To blaspheme against the God Word mixed with the body is without peril; but against the Holy Spirit is a misfortune from which one cannot escape either here or in the age to come. But he who blasphemes against the Son of Man born of Mary has a pardon; but he who insults the God Word who dwelt in a temple, the body, and calls the holy power (the Holy Spirit) 'Impure Spirit' [cf. Mark 3:30] and 'Beelzebub' [cf. Mark 3:22], will have torment inescapable . . .

BD 21 (L 98.1–10)

And after other <words>:

But if certain spiritual men have not erred because they have acknowledged the body from Mary as corruptible and passible until the death by the cross and, even after the ascension into heaven of our Saviour, as a created thing, who <then> are despising the Lord of the apostles because they do not accept the apostles' words? But our Lord's disciples too, the evangelists, since they knew that our Lord no longer wished to be called, according to the flesh, 'Son of David' (and concerning this he quoted to the Jews those <words> of David [i.e. Ps. 110:1; Matt. 22:41–6]), they acknowledged and taught others that he was not the son of David and Abraham. No, they were precisely conscious that the God Word is the Lord of David and that he does not confess himself as Son of David. . . .

BD 22 (L 98.10–14)

[=C5D 2bc; a=LD 3, C4T 47]

And after other <words>:

[a] And when discussion is of natural births, the God Word is not considered to be the son of Mary, for by nature a mortal being bears a mortal and a body that which is like it.⁹¹ The God Word did not undergo two births, one before the ages, the other at the end; [b] but he was begotten of the Father by nature, while the temple that was born from Mary he fashioned for himself from the womb.

BD 23 (L 98.14–17)

[=C5D 3a]

And again:

But when a question is mooted on the saving economy, let God be called 'man', not because he was it [i.e. man] but because he assumed it; and also let man be called 'God'.

⁹¹ LD 3 has 'that which is consubstantial with it'.

BD 24 (L 98.17-19)

אֱלֹהִים

אָרַף עֵינָיו מִן הַיָּמִים וְרָאָה נִבְיָא דְּכָרְתָּא : לָא לְמוֹת דְּגַח וְיַחַס דְּוִוִּינֵי .

אָרַף לְמוֹת דְּגַח מִגְּזֵי חַיְתָּא דְּכָרְתָּא דְּוִוִּינֵי .

BD 25 (L 98.19-21)

אֱלֹהִים

דֵּאָרְתֵּי דְּגַחְתָּא וְהַעֲבַדְתָּא אִינוֹמְפְּ אִינוֹמְפְּ אִינוֹמְפְּ : מִגְּזֵי אֱלֹהִים וְרָאָה נִבְיָא דְּכָרְתָּא

עֲרֵב : דְּמִדְּכָרְתָּא מִן גְּזֵי דְּכָרְתָּא : מְרַבְּרָא דְּגַח אָרַף מִן הַיָּמִים עֵינָיו מִן הַיָּמִים

אֱלֹהִים . . .

BD 26 (L 98.21-99.28)

אֱלֹהִים

אָרַף דְּגַח אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

וְעָבַד עָבַד עָבַד עָבַד עָבַד [83^f1] אֱלֹהִים וְרָאָה נִבְיָא דְּכָרְתָּא אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

וְרָאָה נִבְיָא דְּכָרְתָּא אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

פְּרָאָה דְּגַח וְרָאָה נִבְיָא דְּכָרְתָּא וְרָאָה נִבְיָא דְּכָרְתָּא : מִגְּזֵי אֱלֹהִים וְרָאָה נִבְיָא דְּכָרְתָּא

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים אֲדָרְבָּנִים

⁹² L (p. xv: 98.21) עָרַב עָרַב עָרַב עָרַב עָרַב ⁹³ L אֲדָרְבָּנִים ⁹⁴ L ,מִן ⁹⁵ L אֲדָרְבָּנִים

BD 24 (L 98.17–19)

And again:

And even though we hear that ‘the Son of Man descended from the heavens’ [cf. John 3:13], we confess not the one from the seed of David, but the one from the Father from before the ages.

BD 25 (L 98.19–21)

And again:

<Even if> it is said that ‘the Lord of glory was crucified’ and died [cf. 1 Cor. 2:8], and that ‘the Son of Man descended from the heavens’ [cf. John 3:13] and that the one from Abraham is ‘before Abraham’ [John 8:58], none of these <statements> should be taken in this way . . .

BD 26 (L 98.21–99.28)

And again:

There are some in their entourage—whom they particularly honour, and believe to be wiser than themselves, and well versed in the divine Scriptures—who do not admit mixture and reckon as fools those who accept <it>. They confess that that body which is from Mary is truly the seed of David and of Abraham which in the last times was fashioned in the womb of the Virgin and bore those things pertaining to a body; and that the God Word, who is outside all these things, begotten from the Father before all ages, remained without change and as he is in his own nature. They do not wish to say that this one is from on high and that one is from below, nor that this one is the son of David and that one the Son of God, but <they say:> one and the same, both of God before the ages and of David in the last times—of God according to divinity, of David according to humanity; one and the same, impassible and passible—this according to the spirit, that according to the flesh; one and the same, who hungers and is fed; who suffered and did not suffer—this according to the spirit, that according to the flesh; one and the same, who died and gave life, who was placed in the tomb and who rose, who was touched and was not touched. Do not, they say, separate, saying that this one is the son of David and not <the Son> of God, and that that one is <the Son> of God and not <the son> of David, but both of them are of God and of David. For just as man consists of soul and

body, the one invisible and immortal, the other visible and mortal, yet he is called 'a man', as both of them together form one *hypostasis* [*gnoma*] and a complete son, for it is not the soul alone that is called son of the one who begets, nor the body, but both of them at the same time, as they are remote in nature but connected in all the rest. For who ever has said that the soul of someone is dead, or is ill, or is clothed, or eats? Who, again, says that the body of someone is enraged and has done evil and blasphemed? Although this is of the soul and that of the body, yet we connect with the general the natural property of each one of them. In the same way, also, the God Word assumed the body from David and formed a single Son and a single *hypostasis* [*gnoma*]; the God Word is not properly called the Son of God, neither is the body (the body is the seed of David, and not the Son of God). But both of them <comprise> a single son, whether David's or God's. And all that we have said above. . . . You also find that the argument, as it were in brief, of the one who introduced these new teachings, in his own words is, according to him, thus: 'I believe that the Son of God became the son of man, taking flesh from the Virgin Mary, and that he is one son, complete, and not two—one the Son of God and the other the son of man—a single *hypostasis* [*gnoma*] and a single *prosōpon* [*parsoḡa*] and a single adoration of the Word and flesh; and I anathematize those who say two <sons> and offer different adorations, the one divine and the other human'. Those people say all this polemically, and when writing they concede to those who wish to concur with them . . .

Leontius, *Adv. Fraudes Apollinaristarum* (PG 86.1972d–1973a; Daley ed. pp. 221–2)

Ἐτι ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου γεγενῆσθαι, οὐκ ὀνόματι ἀλλ' ἀληθείᾳ προσλαβόντα σάρκα ἐκ Μαρίας παρθένου, καὶ εἶναι ἓνα τέλειον, οὐ δύο τέλεια ἡνωμένα, αὐτὸν Υἱὸν Θεοῦ καὶ υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου, **μίαν ὑπόστασιν καὶ ἐν πρόσωπον**, καὶ **μίαν τὴν προσκύνησιν τοῦ Λόγου καὶ τῆς σαρκός**. καὶ ἀναθεματίζομεν τοὺς δύο λέγοντας καὶ διαφόρους προσκυνήσεις ποιοῦντας, **μίαν θεϊκὴν καὶ μίαν ἀνθρωπίνην**, καὶ προσκυνοῦντας τὸν ἐκ Μαρίας ἀνθρωπον, ὡς ἕτερον ὄντα παρὰ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Θεόν.

BD 27 (L 99.28-100)
[=SD 3; LD 4a; C5D 1a]

ובחזקתו יתעורר ¹⁰¹
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות ¹⁰² בחזקתו
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות ¹⁰³ בחזקתו
... , ויחיה

BD 28 (L 100.1-4)

ובחזקתו יתעורר
לדמותו אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות [83^vI] אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
... , ויחיה

BD 29 (L 100.4-7)

ובחזקתו יתעורר
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות ¹⁰⁴ אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
... , ויחיה

BD 30 (L 100.7-10)
[a=TD 3]

ובחזקתו יתעורר
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
... , ויחיה

BD 31 (L 100.10-13)¹⁰⁵
[=TD 2a, SD 2a, LD 2a, C4T 46a, C5D 5a].

ובחזקתו יתעורר
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
אשר לא יתעורר אדם לחיות ולמות
... , ויחיה

¹⁰¹ A om ויחיה בחזקתו ¹⁰² A om אשר לא יתעורר ¹⁰³ A om אשר לא יתעורר ¹⁰⁴ L א

¹⁰⁵ A prints 31 and 32 together in the version found in Severus *Phil.*, omitting both headings.

BD 27 (L 99.28–100)

[=SD 3; LD 4a; C5D 1a]

And after other <words>:

If any would improperly name the Son of God, the God Word, ‘son of David’, because of the God Word’s temple from David, let him name <him thus>; and let him also call the one from the seed of David ‘Son of God’ by grace and not by nature . . .

BD 28 (L 100.1–4)

And after other <words>:

The God Word did not undergo two births, nor did the body; and they do not have two fathers! Rather it is a single time that the Single One of God was born from the Father before the ages . . .

BD 29 (L 100.4–7)

And again:

Whence does one know that the God Word is Son by nature? From the fact that he is born of the Father before the ages. But are the body and the man of Mary from the nature of God the Father, or do they say the second thing: born from the seed of David?

BD 30 (L 100.7–10)

[a=TD 3]

And after other <words>:

[a] Therefore we do not say two <sons> of one Father,¹⁰⁶ but call the God Word one ‘Son of God by nature’, and him who is from Mary ‘by nature David’s but by grace God’s’. [b] But let us grant too that the pair are one Son, and abandon the logically impossible.

BD 31 (L 100.10–13)

[=TD 2a, SD 2a, LD 2a, C4T 46a, C5D 5a].

And after other <words>:

By grace the man from Mary is Son, by nature the God Word <is Son>; <and since> what is by grace is not by nature,¹⁰⁷ and what is by nature is not by grace, there are not two sons . . .¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ TD 3: ‘we no longer say Father of one’.¹⁰⁷ ‘There are not two sons’ is not in LD 2.

BD 32 (L 100.13–16)

[=TD 2c, SD 2c, LD 2c, C4T 46c, C5D 5c].

וְהוֹדוּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

וְלֹא תִהְיֶה כַּחַרְוֵנוּ אֵינֶנּוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
[83^v2] וְלֹא תִהְיֶה כַּחַרְוֵנוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ

BD 33 (L 100.16–18)

וְהוֹדוּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

וְלֹא תִהְיֶה כַּחַרְוֵנוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ

Theodore of Mopsuestia

[83^v2]

וְהוֹדוּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
וְלֹא תִהְיֶה כַּחַרְוֵנוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ

BT 1 (L 100.25–30)

[=C4T 25b]

וְהוֹדוּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

וְלֹא תִהְיֶה כַּחַרְוֵנוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ אֲנֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ

¹⁰⁸ B אָמַר; A אָמַר
¹¹⁰ L אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ

¹⁰⁹ L אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ
¹¹¹ As L; M אֵיןִ אֵלֵינוּ

BD 32 (L 100.13–16)

[=TD 2c, SD 2c, LD 2c, C4T 46c, C5D 5c].

And after other <words>:

But neither does the God Word require himself to be David's son but <his> Lord [cf. Matt. 22:41–5]. Not only did he not grudge the body to be called 'son of David', but for this he came.

BD 33 (L 100.16–18)

And after other <words>:

It is not we who say 'two sons'—we are those who say that the one from Mary received sonship through grace—but those who say rather that he is son by nature and not by grace . . .

Theodore of Mopsuestia

Blasphemies from the writings of Theodore.

From the book *On the Incarnation*. From the chapter of which the beginning is thus:

Because many have erred in various ways regarding the doctrine of the Incarnation.

BT 1 (L 100.25–30)

[=C4T 25b]

From section eleven:

After the resurrection, when the disciples were being led by the Spirit, they then received complete knowledge by revelation, that they might know his excellence, which is superior to other men of truth, not merely in respect of some honour from God, such as with the rest of human beings, but in respect of union with the God Word, which, with every honour, is communicated to him after his ascension into the heavens . . .

BT 2 (L 101.1–17)

From the beginning of section thirty-three:

The apostle having said, ‘As through one man sin entered the world, and through sin death’ [Rom. 5:12], so also by one man, Jesus Christ, grace abounded in many [cf. Rom. 5:17]: it is the common <right and> duty of everybody, if they truly profess obedience to the apostolic voices, to ask <questions> which arise from the words of the apostles if they are truly to understand and be persuaded by the apostolic sayings. But to those who are not persuaded, asking us ‘What is the solution to the query?’, to that we give our answer gladly, reckoning an apology on behalf of the apostolic words a matter of pride. And we say: it was right that man must by his conduct undo <his> disobedience; but because an ordinary man was not able, when struggling against sin, to overcome its power, for it was firmly rooted in our nature by its long previous antiquity, <the soul> of anyone who wanted to fight against it having become easily enslaved, for, alas, <sin> was victorious in its conflict with him, the indwelling of the God Word was needed so that good choice of conduct being preserved unimpaired by man but with the aid of the God Word who was completely enabling him to undo the disobedience wrought through the first of our fashioning . . .

BT 3 (L 101.18–102.3)

From section thirty-five:

‘But comparable are our Lord’s struggles which possess no superiority in relation to ours [*lit.* us] save in their somewhat greater openness [*lit.* visibility].’ But if it is impossible to state it (for clearly it was done for our sake) he was engaged in a great struggle with the passions arising from the soul but less with those of the flesh, in proportion to the much greater achievement of withstanding the former (that is, on account of their greater need of healing); and clearly, after he assumed flesh and soul, by both, for both, he was engaged in the struggle, mortifying sin in the flesh and subduing its lusts and making them easily conquered by the superior reasoning of the soul. Indeed he was training and instructing the soul so that it might enslave its passions and keep in check the lusts of the flesh. For with the indwelling of the divinity it began to control each of these things. And therefore the grace of the Holy Spirit is also assisting towards this <end>. As also

the blessed apostle said, ‘truly great is the mystery of the fear of God, who was manifested in the flesh and vindicated in the Spirit’ [cf. 1 Tim. 3:16], because we too are going to receive the aid of the Spirit for the consummation of righteousness . . .

BT 4 (L 102.4–6)

From section thirty-six:

For because he was going to give the Spirit’s aid to the human beings who would come later for the consummation of perfect virtue, he first effected it in the one who was assumed.

BT 5 (L 102.7–10)

And again:

As, when is speaking to his disciples about the gift of the Spirit, which was going to come upon them, he said, ‘he will glorify me, for he will take from what is mine and will show it to you’ [John 16:14], he did not say ‘from me’, but ‘mine’.

BT 6 (L 102.11–16)

From section thirty-seven:

But he also said that he had worked miracles by the Spirit of God. ‘For’, he said, ‘if, indeed, I, in the Spirit of God, I cast out devils, who is it that is so stupid that he will say of the God Word that he casts out demons by the Spirit of God, because this is [a property] of human beings, [that] they do not have power sufficient to effect miracles?’ But to speak thus of the one who was assumed is quite in order.

BT 7 (L 102.17-103.4)

כח זעק והללף מהלחנא
 כח זעק אי רפ חלמס ומנא זרמנא וליק הורמל כח רמל ומלל
 לעזירא לפעק ובי לך זענען לחמל ושל ובי טעזירע: כח זי
 ומענד וליפעק הליעזיר נובו כדמיק מחדק מנדל טעעק ולימס
 ופולק רעמס, זחממס מה חדא וליה זי טעק טקא ופעק: כח
 כומערהר רפ למענדער זעמירא חר ופעק: ונדזירא רענדע זחמ
 מ, וליק מסר מחדק רעמס: כח חדא זי טעק מסק זענדזירא, עס
 זי מנד רפ על חזירא וזי רלמל ליה טזיר: כח, וזי פללירע ליה
 טעזירע נהפ, מכל טזיר חזי כו כו רעק נעט: פלעק זכא מס
 למ וזי זעמירא זירמנא ליעזירא ומענדזיר, וזי נפעק לעזירא חסדא
 ולידזיר וליה טעק, הלחי פללירא וליה טעזירא, מחדק חדא זי
 זעמירא זי לפרמזירא [84'1] זי חדזיר ורעיר כח זירמ, זי נפעק:
 לעמנויא ונעק זיל, לך מסר כו למס לעק מליעק זירמ, מלי
 חדא כדזמס, חזמק למעק זפאנען, רלי כו ללמס, אבא: כח
 וזעיר וליק זעזירא ולעק לעק מס: כח, וליק זעזמזיר
 זמסר זעק וליק, מעללזירא ונעק זילק, טעזמ מוזק ומלי
 זרעמס, זעק לעזירא זי רפ א זי חדזיר זעמירא כחי פללירא
 וליה זילדזיר, כו זעמזירא כחזירא זירמס, ...

BT 8 (L 103.5-9)

כח זעק ומעק
 מכל זכנ כזעק מעזירא: מכלמל רפ כנ כזעק מעזירא זעזירא,
 רפיי זי ומלך: וליק זליק זעזירע מעזירא חלמס לקד רעק: רלי
 ר כו כח זמ זעזירא כעק, רפיי זכ זרעמס, מסר כעק: כח זמזיר
 חלזר לעזירא: זרפיי מנד אוף זמזירא: רפ כח זרעמס, חלזר
 ומעזירא...

BT 7 (L 102.17–103.4)

From section thirty-eight:

But the word of the Lord instructs us, which says ‘Do not fear those who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul. Fear rather the one who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna’ [Matt. 10:28]. In this way, then, is their foolish thought refuted; for that which has in view the will of the soul likewise also faults the assumption of flesh along with the additional soul. Not so! For virtue derives from the will, but <the will> needs also the aid which comes from God for this, because by its natural propensity it is drawn towards sin. And because of this, our Lord, when he assumed man, bestowed a great gift on him: he removed from his flesh the sin which had taken root, and from the soul the ready tendency towards the passions and the propensity to sin. In this way, he removed from the flesh the raging heat of desire which is in it; and from the soul, he brought to an end the hold of the passions. He did not remove the passions and motions themselves, for these are still now in motion; but, having sapped their strength and by his conduct given the soul fit instruction, he made it unconquerable by its passions and by the superiority of good thoughts made the army of those that are wicked to be driven out, and made the desires of the flesh repent in propensity towards the good supported by the aid of the Spirit. . . .

BT 8 (L 103.5–9)

From section fifty:

Because through man <came> death, on this account by man too <came> the resurrection of the dead, inasmuch as it is clear that it is inappropriate for resurrection to be bestowed upon men in any other way except through one similar in nature to him who was the cause of death: he who is the cause of resurrection had to be like him. . . .

BT 9 (L 103.10-16)

חַי וְעַד וְשֶׁעַם מִיָּד
 אֵלֶּיךָ לְהַגִּיב כְּפִיךָ לִּי וְחַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט
 כְּפִיךָ לְהַגִּיב וְחַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט [84^v2] מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ
 כְּפִיךָ לְהַגִּיב וְחַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ
 כְּפִיךָ לְהַגִּיב וְחַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ
 כְּפִיךָ לְהַגִּיב וְחַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ

BT 10 (L 103.16-20)

חַטָּאת
 חַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ
 חַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ
 חַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ

BT 11 (L 103.21-5)

חַי וְעַד וְשֶׁעַם מִיָּד
 חַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ
 חַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ

BT 12 (L 103.26-104.2)

[=LT 2b]

חַי וְעַד וְשֶׁעַם מִיָּד
 חַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ
 חַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ
 חַטָּאתֵי לִי אַתָּה יְהוָה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁפָּט מִן הַמִּצְוֹת וְהַלְּוִיָּהּ

117 L אָר

118 L חַטָּאתֵי

119 L אָר

BT 9 (L 103.10–16)

From section fifty-one:

God is not said to bear [i.e. wear] flesh—no one says ‘God bore flesh’. Let us say again: ‘the man in whom God dwelt’; that is, it is not absurd for him to have ‘borne God’—which is what they are anxious to eliminate as if it were obviously absurd. If he is called ‘man’, as we have shown from the divine Scriptures, then in this one the God Word dwelt. For if the God Word dwelt in this man, that is, ‘was in him’, as they chose to say, it is not absurd to say ‘the man bore God’ who dwelt in him!

BT 10 (L 103.16–20)

And again:

For they especially ask this: ‘Is Christ one and the Son of God another, or is this Christ, and this the Son of God?’ If anyone answers and says that he is the same, they immediately think to take this as a confirmation of their disease. . . .

BT 11 (L 103.21–5)

From section fifty-six:

‘For we speak wisdom among the perfect’ [1 Cor. 2:6]; he calls the whole proclamation concerning Christ the ‘wisdom’ by which all were educated; because this is how the God Word while sojourning in man governed all things; the crucifixion is valuable, not because his nature is passible, but because of the power of him who assumed.

BT 12 (L 103.26–104.2)

[=LT 2b]

From section fifty-nine:

Our Lord also, although in subsequent matters he completely possessed in himself the fully active God Word in inseparable possession of all action pertaining to himself, yet even before this he was very much in him and he [i.e. the man] performs much that was necessary in temporary abandonment <by the God Word>, before the crucifixion, on account of the necessity to accomplish by his own will <true> excellence for our sake, although even in these things he was urged by him [i.e. the Word] and strengthened for the perfect fulfilment of what was fitting. . . .

BT 13 (L 104.2-6)

[=LT 2f]

אבא דמתא אבא דמתא בן מתא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא

BT 14 (L 104.6-15)

[=LT 3b]

אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא

BT 15 (L 104.16-19)

[=ST 1a, LT 4a]

אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא
 אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא אבא דמתא

¹²⁰ L. אבא דמתא ¹²¹ Two letters erased following אבא דמתא

¹²² L (p. xiii; 104.4), 'fin. אבא דמתא fuerat, del.'.

¹²³ As L; M אבא דמתא

¹²⁴ As L; M אבא דמתא

¹²⁵ L אבא דמתא

BT 13 (L 104.2–6)

[=LT 2f]

And after other <words>, from the same section:

As ‘before the infant knows good or evil, he will resist evil because he will choose good’ [Isa. 7:16], for if he resists evil and chooses good, it is known that he clearly hates the former and loves the latter with discrimination, for the choice for evil undoubtedly occurs with discrimination . . .

BT 14 (L 104.6–15)

[=LT 3b]

And again:

Clearly therefore he accomplished excellence more accurately and easily than was possible for the rest of human beings; so much so that, in foreknowledge of his future, the God Word, having united him to himself at the beginning of his formation, provided from himself great assistance for the performance of what was necessary, for the salvation of all, governing his affairs and urging him on towards additional perfections, while lightening from him the greater part of <his> toils, whether of those concerning the soul or of those on account of the body, and in this way preparing for him a greater and lighter fulfilment of excellence . . .

BT 15 (L 104.16–19)

[=ST 1a, LT 4a]

From section sixty:

The one assumed in foreknowledge was united with the God Word from the beginning, as he received the beginning of the union in the very fashioning in the womb. Since he had been made worthy of the union, he received all that which could properly be received by a human. . . .

BT 16 (L 104.19–26)

בגוֹבַהּ יְהוָה

אָמַר, לֵאמֹר: הֲלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶלֶּל אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם וְיִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב: הֲיֵשׁ עִיר חַיָּה: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 וְהַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵי מְצֻרֵי הָאָדָם וְהַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵי הַגִּבּוֹרִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:

BT 17 (L 104.27–105.24);
 [a = LT 6c, JT 10b, C4T 29b, C6T 2; c = LT 7; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 10]

וְהַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵי מְצֻרֵי הָאָדָם

[85"2] הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵי מְצֻרֵי הָאָדָם

אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:
 אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים: אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים:

126 M אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים... וְהַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵי מְצֻרֵי הָאָדָם
 127 L אֲנִי חֵסֶד וְרַחֲמִים

BT 16 (L 104.19–26)

From the same section:

For when we speak of him as God and Creator of the universe, as consubstantial with the Father and glorified with him because of natural kinship, we mean the nature of the Word; but when <we speak of> the finite <man> who is now above the heavens yet is coming hither at the end, at the moment of transformation, then we mean the man who in union with him [i.e. the Word] received honour from all. And he was worthy of all this praise and is coming as judge of the whole world.

BT 17 (L 104.27–105.24);

[a=LT 6c, JT 10b, C4T 29b, C6T 2; c=LT 7; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 10]

From section sixty-three:

[a] What our Lord said of husband and wife that ‘they are no longer two, but one flesh’ [Matt. 19:6], we too may rightly say, in virtue of the concept of union: ‘they are no longer two *prosōpa* [*parsoḗpa*], but one’, it being recognized however that the natures are distinct. And as there the mention of ‘one flesh’ does not damage the duality—for it is clear in what <respect> ‘one’ is being used—so also here the unity of *prosōpon* is not harmed by the difference of natures: for when we distinguish the natures, we say that the nature of the God Word is complete and that the *prosōpon* is complete—for one cannot speak of a *hypostasis* [*gnoma*] without a *prosōpon*; and also that the nature of the man is complete, and his *prosōpon* likewise. But when we consider the conjunction, then we

מבשרו. וכל שאר כל מי שישמט את יו³ 85] יללה וחסד.
פתי עפר ילל וכל ארבו: מתוך חבה אפ כי אעל וכל עובד ילבו.
מא פאלמ ושלמט¹²⁸ כן כל מי שישמט את לשראם לעבדא וכל
אעל אשמו, ישר אפ וחס ושלמט א וכו', וכל ילבו: וכל חלם
עזר: לחל אשמו חכמי ירושלא ושלמט א שפחל. חסר אפ וכו' וחספ
חאירמט ושלמט וכל ארבו: כמ אפ חסר אפ מוירא לשראם¹²⁹
אכזב עם חסר ושלמט א חלם א. לשראם אפ אפ חס וכו' עפר עם
אעל חסר. מי אפ פתי עפר ושלמט א חלם ילבו: חסר אפ מוירא א חלם,
ולחשר לחפצא מי עפר עם: ושלמט א חלם, פתי עפר וכו' אעל
אכזב, שלמט אפ אפ חס ושלמט א חלם, וכל ושלמט א חלם
עזר עם: חסר אפ. פתי עפר ושלמט א חלם חסר חסר אפ כן
חסר: חסר אעל א חס ושלמט א חלם: אפ א וכל חלם כו' חסר א חלם.
אפ ושלמט א חס: חלם אעל ושלמט א חלם . . .

BT 18 (L 105.25-8)

מא ושלמט ושלמט א
חסר אפ חס ושלמט א חלם ושלמט א: חס ושלמט א [85^v 1] ושלמט א
והא חלם: חלם א: וכו' אעל חלם א חס ושלמט א חלם ל
חשוד אעל חס ושלמט א חלם א חלם א . . .

¹²⁸ L ששלמט א¹²⁹ LT 7: *ὀδία*

speak of one *prosōpon*. [b] For also in the case of a human being, when we distinguish the natures, we say that the nature of the soul is one <thing>, and <the nature> of the body another, a single *hypostasis* of the former and a single <*hypostasis*> of the latter. This is how we know that they are distinct: that when the soul is removed from the body, it is its own abode and remains in its own *prosōpon*, and therefore each one of them, by the definition of <its> nature, is said to be with its *prosōpon*: this is how the terms ‘the inner man’ and ‘the outer man’ are used by Paul, each of them singly meriting the denomination of the common whole. And it is clear that with the addition (of ‘inner’ and ‘outer’) he explicitly does not nullify the whole <man> altogether and <that he> understands <the whole man> in accordance with a reduced <scope> of the denomination <man> and to the extent that he pairs joined terms. [c] In the same way also here, we say that the nature of the God Word is single, and single that of the man, the natures being distinguished, but one *prosōpon* being effected in the union. So, then, also here, when we take care to distinguish the natures, we say that the *prosōpon* of the man is complete, and also complete is that of the divinity; but when we consider the union, then we proclaim that the *prosōpon* of both natures is one, humanity with divinity unitedly,¹³⁰ <humanity> receiving an honour beyond all creation, and divinity in it [i.e. humanity], accomplishing all things that were necessary . . .

BT 18 (L 105.25–8)

From section sixty-six:

Therefore both from the testimonies they put forward, and also from the train of those mentioned, it is demonstrated that the God Word with flesh cannot be honoured as man unless man is the sort of animal that . . .

¹³⁰ LT 7 takes the adverb with the preceding clause: ‘both natures are one *prosōpon* conjointly.’

BT 19 (L 105.28–106.3)

מכאן

חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו' . . .

BT 20 (L 106.4–8)
[cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 12^v2]

חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום

חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו' ¹³¹ . . .

BT 21 (L 106.8–14)
[b=C6T 1; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 13^v1]

מכאן

חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו' [85^v2] . . .

BT 22 (L 106.14–17)

חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום

חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו'. חזקו חכמינו למען כל יום יום: וישן פלגוסו וכו' . . .

¹³¹ L פלגוסו

BT 19 (L 105.28–106.3)

And again:

Therefore they are totally convicted of speaking foolishly. Because the God Word with flesh is not known by the designation ‘man’. But clearly Scripture constantly, in recording the designation of Christ as ‘man’, means man’s nature which was assumed by him complete for our salvation, and which Scripture is wont to call by that designation . . .

BT 20 (L 106.4–8)

[cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 12^v2]

From section seventy-three:

Therefore our Lord himself said ‘I have made known your name to men’ [John 17:6], then, that he said this regarding the one who was assumed, to whom was given glory from all creation, and confession of lordship and adoration from all, from the celestial and the terrestrial and from those under the whole earth. This is the grace [which] he who was assumed received.

BT 21 (L 106.8–14)

[b=C6T 1; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 13^v1]

And again:

[a] Sometimes they ask, ‘Is he one and another, or the same?’ And sometimes, ‘Is he the Saviour or needing salvation? A helper or one who is helped?’ [b] Regarding these, what has been said is sufficient, where we demonstrated the difference of natures and unity of *prosōpon* [*parsofa*]. And *qua* natures, one was helped while one was helper: union from honour evidently being indistinguishable from <the union to be shared by> all perfected creation.

BT 22 (L 106.14–17)

And after other <words>:

And, indeed, that the discussion might not be too extended, enough has been said regarding the natures and regarding our demonstrating that it is clearly proved from divine Scriptures that while one is helping but this one is being helped . . .

BT 23 (L 106.18–21)

ܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ

BT 24 (L 106.21–4)

ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ

BT 25 (L 106.24–7)

ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ

BT 26 (L 106.28–107.11)¹³²

ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ
 ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܘܒܢ ܘܝܥܝܘܒܢ ܘܥܝܘܒܢ

¹³² A Greek version of this creed is preserved in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, as part of the plaint submitted by the presbyter Charisius (*Collect. Athen.* 76.4–11; *ACO* 1.1.7, pp. 97.26–100.4). The parts corresponding to BT 26 are (pp. 98.27–99.4): *Καὶ οὕτε δύο φημέν υἱοὺς οὕτε δύο κυρίους, ἐπειδὴ εἰς Υἱὸς κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, ὁ μονογενῆς Υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὡπερ οὗτος συνημμένους τε καὶ μετέχων υἰότητος κοινωνεῖ τῆς υἰοῦ προσηγορίας τε καὶ τιμῆς, καὶ κύριος κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, ὃ συνημμένους οὗτος κοινωνεῖ τῆς τιμῆς. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτε δύο φημέν υἱοὺς οὕτε δύο κυρίους, ἐπειδὴ, δήλου τοῦ κατ' οὐσίαν ὄντος κυρίου τε καὶ υἱοῦ, ἀχώριστον ἔχων πρὸς αὐτὸν τὴν συνάφειαν ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας ληφθεὶς σωτηρίας [ἐνεκεν] συναφέρεται τῇ τε ὀνομασίᾳ καὶ τῇ τιμῇ τοῦ τε υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ κυρίου, . . .* (p. 99.10–13): *Ἐνα τοίνυν τὸν υἱὸν φημέν καὶ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, πρωτοτύπως μὲν τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον νοοῦντες τὸν κατ' οὐσίαν υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ κύριον, συνεπινοοῦντες δε τὸ ληφθέν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, ὃν ἔχρισεν ὁ Θεὸς πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει, ὡς ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον συναφείᾳ υἰότητός τε μετέχοντα καὶ κυριότητος.* For a list of the various Latin versions, see *ACO* 4.1, p. 70. An extract from this creed also appears in Severus (ST 9).

BT 23 (L 106.18–21)

From section seventy-seven:

And now therefore, those <words> are to be repudiated; and it will be demonstrated with God's help that the assumed man has been proved by us, through what has been clearly said, to be other than the God Word in nature

BT 24 (L 106.21–4)

And after other <words>:

'For it befitted him by whom all things are and on account of whom all things are' means the God Word; and 'bringing up many sons into glory', those who have been made worthy of adoption as sons, 'the author of whose salvation he will perfect with suffering' <means> the man assumed by <the God Word> [cf. Heb. 2:10].

BT 25 (L 106.24–7)

And after other <words>:

Therefore it is also sufficiently demonstrated from this that the man assumed by the God Word is called 'son of God' by him and in reference to him . . .

BT 26 (L 106.28–107.11)

From *The Exposition of the Faith*:

Neither do we say two sons, nor two lordships, since the Son is one by nature—the God Word, the only-begotten Son of the Father,

by whom he who is conjoined and shares in sonship shares in the name and honour of Son; and <one> Lord by nature—the God Word, by whom he who is conjoined shares in the honour. And therefore we do not say two sons, nor two lordships, since it is clear that he is Son and Lord by nature, <while> he who for our salvation was assumed has an inseparable conjunction with him, being raised together to the title and honour of son and lord . . .

One, therefore, we say is the Son and Lord Jesus Christ, through whom all things came to be, first considering the God Word, he who by nature is Son of God, then considering with him the assumed, Jesus from Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Spirit of holiness and power [Acts 10:38], who in the conjunction with the God Word partook of sonship and lordship . . .

BT 27 (L 107.12–16)

From the *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*:

‘This one’, he says, ‘is wholly superior to me, such that I am not sufficient to carry his sandals’ [Matt. 3:11]. And lest we should suppose that he said this to flatter him, he says ‘he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire’; he will give you the grace of the Spirit. That which I am not able to give, he gives to you—not because of his nature, but because of the power which is in him . . .

BT 28 (L 107.17–22)

And after other <words>:

For also this, ‘this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased’ [Matt. 3:17]: it is manifest insanity to suppose that he says this about the God Word. For he who said, ‘this is my beloved Son’, and added ‘in whom I am well pleased’, made known that clearly he said this in comparison to other sons, whom are neither beloved like him nor were they able to please him greatly . . .

BT 29 (L 107.22–7)

וּבְיָמֵינוּ אֵיבָרְכָה
 בְּכָרְתָהּ וּנְסֻחָהּ וְנִסְחָהּ כִּי שָׂמָנוּ לֵב אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ הַנֶּגְוֹן אֶת
 הַמֶּלֶךְ הַנֶּגְוֹן לְדֹכַחַת לְיָדֵינוּ אֲנִי אֲרֹמְלָה לְ
 נִסְחָהּ כִּי לְחֵן לְהַמְרִיט לְהַמְרִיט לְהַמְרִיט לְהַמְרִיט
 כִּי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ אֲנִי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ לְ
 חֵן אֲנִי

BT 30 (L 107.27–9)

וּבְיָמֵינוּ אֵיבָרְכָה
 [86^r2] אֲנִי מִן הַמְרִיט לְיָדֵינוּ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ . . .

BT 31 (L 108.1–6)

[=C5T 4]

כִּי פִּעְמָרְתָּ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 אֲנִי מִן הַמְרִיט לְיָדֵינוּ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 כִּי חַסְדֵי מִלְכֵּךְ אֲנִי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 כִּי חַסְדֵי מִלְכֵּךְ אֲנִי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 חֵן אֲנִי . . .

BT 32 (L 108.7–12)

[cf. C4T 40]

כִּי כַּתְּיֵבְתָּ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 אֲנִי מִן הַמְרִיט לְיָדֵינוּ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 חַסְדֵי מִלְכֵּךְ אֲנִי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 חַסְדֵי מִלְכֵּךְ אֲנִי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 חַסְדֵי מִלְכֵּךְ אֲנִי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 חַסְדֵי מִלְכֵּךְ אֲנִי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ
 חַסְדֵי מִלְכֵּךְ אֲנִי וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ . . .

¹³⁶ As L. M follows. כַּתְּיֵבְתָּ with (dittography):

כַּתְּיֵבְתָּ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ וְאִלְמָלֶךְ חַסְדֵי מִלְכֵּךְ אֲנִי

BT 29 (L 107.22–7)

And after other <words>:

‘The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, son of David’ [Matt. 1:1]. Agreeing with this, Paul also said, ‘of his Son, who was of the seed of David according to the flesh’ [Rom. 1:3]. For he did not say to them that what is proclaimed to you concerns the one who indwelt – either the God Word or the Son of God, the one born of him, to whom ‘of David’ is inapplicable.

BT 30 (L 107.27–9)

And after other <words>:

Therefore he says this, ‘who was of the seed of David according to the flesh’ [Rom. 1:3], because he will say that the assumed <man> was born and was shown to be truly the son of God, when he rose ‘according to the power of the Spirit of holiness [Rom. 1:4] . . .

BT 31 (L 108.1–6)

[=C5T 4]

From the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* [on Heb. 1:6]:

Who is that enters the world and receives lordship over it from the fact that it belongs to him to be worshipped even by angels. For not even a madman will say that the God Word is the one who entered, he who made all things that were not, and in his ineffable power gave them their existence . . .

BT 32 (L 108.7–12)

[cf. C4T 40]

From the discourse *To Those Being Baptized*:

For Jesus, it says, of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit and power [Acts 10:38], having been accounted worthy of the unction was made totally and spotlessly perfect. For it says that he who by the eternal Spirit offered himself spotless to God was also accounted worthy of conjunction with the divine nature. For he could not receive that conjunction without first being made spotlessly perfect.

BT 33 (L 108.12-18)

וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 לְמַלְאָכָיו כִּי יֵאָמַר: עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: ¹³⁷ וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: . . .

BT 34 (L 108.19-24)

וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: ¹³⁸ וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: ¹³⁹ וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: וְכִי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים
 עַל כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים: . . .

¹³⁷ L. רמא¹³⁸ M, L. עי¹³⁹ L. ויעבד

BT 33 (L 108.12–18)

And after other <words>:¹⁴⁰

To him, therefore, he said: ‘we confess one Lord who is from the nature which is single and divine which is from his Father; who assumed man for our salvation, and being in him gave the knowledge of himself to everyone; whose right name an angel spoke of [cf. Luke 1:32]; who was anointed with the Holy Spirit, who by being without fault was declared righteous, according to the saying of the blessed Paul [cf. 1 Tim. 3:16].

BT 34 (L 108.19–24)

From the *Commentary on Matthew*:

But because the expected time of fulfilment drew near, he sent for our guidance the one who, from us and for us, was assumed; the one who was also in the rank of a son by the conjunction he manifested with the God Word; the one who when born of a woman because it was necessary for him to be a man in nature, made himself under the law [cf. Gal. 4:4] . . .

¹⁴⁰ Taken from *Cat. Hom.* 3.5 (ed. Tonneau, p. 59).

III. TIMOTHY AELURUS

Although *Cod. Add.* 12156 preserves for us the immensely valuable florilegium known as *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius*, the versions of Timothy's works included there, despite citing many and diverse earlier writers, do not contain any passage from either Diodore or Theodore. The longer, Armenian version of his work *Against Those Who Affirm Two Natures*,¹⁴¹ on the other hand, contains four extracts from Diodore, each of which is also given in *The Blasphemies*.¹⁴² However, as TD 2 contains both BD 21 and BD 31, together with the connecting sentence (as also does SD 2, LD 2, C5D 5), Timothy cannot be dependent on the *Blasphemies*, but on the threefold common florilegium whose existence we conjectured in Chapter 4. Timothy's *Against Those who Affirm Two Natures* was written during the period in which Timothy was in exile. He had been consecrated as 'the secret bishop of Alexandria' in 451, when Dioscoros, with whom he had attended the Council of Ephesus in 449, was deposed and Proterius, another priest of Dioscoros, but one prepared to accept Chalcedon, was appointed as bishop of the city.¹⁴³ After the emperor Marcian died in 457 a riot broke out in Alexandria, culminating in the murder of Proterius during his celebration of the Divine Liturgy on Holy Thursday. Such was the shadow cast over Timothy by these events that the attempts by the new emperor, Leo I (457–74), to reconcile the divided church in Alexandria proved fruitless. So he took the unusual step of canvassing the entire episcopate throughout the empire, who almost unanimously decided against Timothy and in favour of Chalcedon. Timothy remained firm in his rejection of Chalcedon, and despite a huge popular demonstration in his support, he was eventually exiled by force in 460, with, it is reported, some 10,000 supporters losing their lives. His replacement, Timothy Salofaciol, never gained the trust of the people,

¹⁴¹ CG 5475; ed. K. Ter-Mekerttschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz with the title *Timotheus Aelurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien: Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzten Lehre* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908).

¹⁴² For a list of the extracts preserved in the Armenian and Syriac florilegia, see E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus*, 98–117 and 117–26 respectively.

¹⁴³ Leontius, *De sectis* (PG 86A.1228c): 'In Alexandria, Proterius was bishop in public, but Timothy in secret.' See Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity*, 188–90, who places Timothy's consecration in 457; Leontius' words implies, however, a simultaneity.

who referred to him as 'the emperor's man' ('Melkite' in Semitic languages). After Basiliscus usurped the Emperor Zeno in January 475, he sent an encyclical to the exiled Timothy, affirming that the faith had been sufficiently defined by Nicaea and Ephesus, and that the *Tome* of Leo was an innovation.¹⁴⁴ Timothy was received in Constantinople and then returned to Alexandria. But when Zeno regained the imperial throne in September 476 he issued an edict deposing Timothy and his supporters, Peter the Fuller of Antioch and Paul of Ephesus, although this probably arrived after Timothy's death in 477. With his broad popular appeal, Timothy became a hero figure for those opposed to Chalcedon throughout the East, providing an important link of continuity and transition from Cyril and Dioscorus to Severus of Antioch, the most important of the non-Chalcedonian theologians, and also beginning to lay the foundations of a church and hierarchy separate from that of the imperial church, which would later be completed by Jacob Baradaeus.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity*, 194-7.

¹⁴⁵ For a full survey of these developments, see *ibid.* 254-92.

Text

K. Ter-Mekerttschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz, *Timotheus Älurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien: Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzten Lehre* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908).

TD 1 (Mekerttschian–Minassiantz (eds.), 115.16–22)

[=BD 1]

Դիողորայ հերձուածողի Տարսացոյ հայհոյութիւնք.
 ՋՏէրն մեր Յիսուս Քրիստոս Աստուած
 խոստովանելով ոմանք և նախ քան գլաւիտեանս ի Հաւրէ
 ծնիցեալն և ի վերջինս ծամանակս ի ձեռն մարմնոյ իւրոյ
 յայտնութեան, որոյ երանելին Մարիամ եղև մայր. ոչ
 խոստելով, որպէս նոքայն ասեն, պղտորել
 ըզճմարտութեանն բան ձեռնարկեցին,
 նորածայնութեամբք ոչ ուղղովք:

TD 2 (Mekerttschian–Minassiantz (eds.), 115.24–34)

[=SD 2; LD 2; C4T 46; C5D 5; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

Եւ յետ այդոց.

Շնորհիւ Որդի ի Մարեմայն մարդ, իսկ բնութեամբ
 Աստուածն Բան. իսկ շնորհիւ և ոչ բնութեամբ, և
 բնութեամբ այդ ոչ շնորհիւ. ոչ երկու որդիք, բաւական
 եղիցի առ ի մէնջն ըստ շնորհի որդութեանն, փառացն
 անմահութեանն, զի բագին Աստուծոյ եղև. մի՛ ի վեր քան
 զբնութիւնն աճցի, և Աստուածն Բան փոխանակ առ ի
 մէնջ պարտեցելոյ գոհութեանն մի՛ թշնամանեցի. և
 զի՛նչ թշնամանք. շարադրել զնա ընդ մարմնոյ և
 կարաւտանալ կարծիլ ի կատարելութիւն որդութեան
 մարմնոյ. այդ և ոչ ինքն Աստուածն Բան կամի Որդի
 Դաւթի գոլ, այդ Տէր. իսկ զմարմինն կոչիլ Դաւթի Որդի:

TD 1 (Mekerttschian–Minassiantz (eds.), 115.16–22)
[=BD 1]

Blasphemies of Diodore, the heretic, of Tarsus.

There are some who confess that our Lord Lord Jesus Christ is God both before the ages when he was begotten of the Father, yet not, so they say, denying his manifestation in the last times through the body whose mother was the blessed Mary, they seek to confuse the word of truth with unorthodox innovations.

TD 2 (Mekerttschian–Minassiantz (eds.), 115.24–34)
[=SD 2; LD 2; C4T 46; C5D 5; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

And after other <words>

[a] By grace the man from Mary is Son, but by nature the God Word <is Son>. What is by grace is not by nature and what is by nature is not by grace. There are not two sons;¹⁴⁶ [b] the <property> of sonship by grace, of glory, of immortality, would be sufficient for what was from us, for it was made the temple of God. Let it not be set above nature and let not the God Word, instead of the thanksgiving due from us, be insulted. And what is the insult? To combine him with a body and to suppose that he needed a body for perfect sonship. [c] However the God Word does not require himself to be David's son, but <his> Lord [cf. Matt. 22:41–5], and the body to be called 'son of David'.

¹⁴⁶ 'There are not two sons' is not in LD 2.

TD 3 (Mekerttschian–Minassiantz (eds.), 128.9–14)
[=BD 30a]

*Դիողորայ հերձուածողի հայիոյութիւնք ի բանէն որ
յաղագս ներմարդութեան.*

*Սակս որոյ այսուհետև միոյ Հաւր ոչ ասեմք. իսկ մի
Աստուծոյ բնութեամբ գոլ Որդի գԱստուածն Բան, իսկ գ ‘
ի Մարեմայն բնութեամբ Դաւթի, իսկ շնորհիւ Աստուծոյ:*

TD 4 (Mekerttschian–Minassiantz (eds.), 128.15–18)
[=BD 7a]

Եւ յետ այդոցն.

*Քանզի նախ քան զլուծանիլ սևեռագոյն տակաւին և
անապական յարեաւ, և ոչ երիս բոլորովին աւուրս ի
գերեզմանի թողաւ:*

TD 3 (Mekerttschian–Minassiantz (eds.), 128.9–14)
[=BD 30a]

Blasphemies from Diodore the heretic from his discourse on the Incarnation:

For this reason, we no longer say Father of one,¹⁴⁷ but <call> the God Word one ‘Son of God by nature’, and him who is from Mary ‘by nature David’s but by grace God’s’.

TD 4 (Mekerttschian–Minassiantz (eds.), 128.15–18)
[=BD 7a]

And after other <words>:

Since before <the body> decomposed, while it was still intact and incorrupt, he arose, not having been left in the tomb three full days.

¹⁴⁷ BD 30: ‘we do not say two [sons] of one Father.’

EXTRACTS FROM THE EARLY SIXTH CENTURY

I. 'PSEUDO-NESTORIUS'

In 1958 Luise Abramowski drew attention to a previously unnoticed passage from Theodore's *Against Eunomius* preserved in Syriac.¹ Her subsequent publication, translation, and analysis, together with Alan E. Goodman, of the manuscript in which the extract is preserved enables us to place the original source with some confidence.² The extract is from a late-nineteenth-century manuscript, housed in Cambridge University Library (*Or.* 1319). This manuscript, written in a clear East Syrian hand, fully vocalized with East Syrian vowels and rubricated, was made for the Revd David Jenks, a member of the archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians in Urmia, Persia, who also compared the transcript with the original. It is not clear what happened to the original. The transcript, however, includes two inscriptions, which indicate that the manuscript from which it was copied was 'made' by Rabban Mar Cyriacus, that is, either actually composed or itself copied, in AD 1333/4. If the latter, which is more likely, then this text has a longer prehistory which is no longer directly accessible to us.

The text is a florilegium, compiled in defence of non-Ephesian Christology, with its teaching of two natures, two hypostases, and one person in Christ. The heretics addressed are not only Chalcedonians, but also some non-Chalcedonians, especially those asserting the teaching of 'one composite hypostasis', which appears also to have been taught by 'the Henana School'. Thus

¹ L. Abramowski, 'Ein unbekanntes Zitat aus *Contra Eunomium* des Theodors von Mopsuestia', *Le Muséon*, 71 (1958), 97-104.

² ed. and trans. Luise Abramowski and Alan E. Goodman, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts: Cambridge University Library Ms. Oriental 1319*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 18 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 2 vols.: I. Introduction, Translation, Indexes; II. Syriac Text.

this document provides a fascinating 'witness to the Nestorian dogmatical war on two or three fronts, within their own church and against neighbouring churches'.³ The extract from Theodore is presented within a passage attributed to Nestorius. Abramowski and Goodman contend that the section (IX) containing thirty-six chapters attributed to Nestorius can be dated with some certainty. Prior to the translation of Nestorius' works into Syriac (the *Liber Heraclides* being translated in 539/40), Syriac-speaking diophysites had to resort to precisely the kind of collection attributed to Nestorius that we find here; thus the Syriac form of this section most likely dates to the early sixth century, with the possibility that a Greek version lay behind it, 'but not too far'.⁴

³ *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. xix.

⁴ *Ibid.*, xlvi.

From Theodore’s *Against Eunomius*, bk. 18

Prosōpon is used in a twofold way; for either it signifies the *hypostasis*, and that which each one of us is, or it is conferred upon honour, greatness, and worship; for example: ‘Paul’ and ‘Peter’ signify the *hypostasis* and the *prosōpon* of each one of them, but the *prosōpon* of our Lord Christ means honour, greatness, and worship. For because the God Word was revealed in humanity, he was causing the glory of his *hypostasis* to cleave to the visible one; and for this reason, the *prosōpon* of Christ declares it [i.e. the *prosōpon*] to be <a *prosōpon*> of honour, not of the *ousia* of the two natures. {For the honour is neither nature nor *hypostasis*, but an elevation to great dignity which is awarded as a due for the cause of the revelation.}⁶ What purple garments or royal apparel are for the king is for the God Word the beginning which was taken from us without separation, alienation, or distance in worship. Therefore, as it is not by nature that a king has purple robes, so also neither is it by nature that the God Word has flesh. For anyone who affirms the God Word to have flesh by nature <predicates that> he has something foreign to the divine substance by undergoing alteration by the addition of a nature. But if he has not flesh by nature, how does Apollinarius say that the same one is in part consubstantial with the Father in his divinity, and the same <in part> consubstantial with us in the flesh, so that he may make him composite? For he who is thus divided into natures becomes and is found <to be> something composite, by nature.

⁶ The words in { } are taken by Abramowski and Goodman as an ancient gloss to Theodore’s text.

II. SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH

Unlike Timothy Aelurus earlier, Severus of Antioch provides extracts from Theodore as well as Diodore, though like Timothy he quotes them only occasionally: for both, Diodore and Theodore are the teachers of Nestorius, and it is the apparent Nestorianism of the Council of Chalcedon that is their concern, not the two earlier Antiochenes themselves. Severus was born of pagan parents around 456 and, after the death of his father in 485, was sent by his mother to study in Alexandria and then to further his study in law in Beirut.⁷ He converted to Christianity, and around 490 entered the monastery of the famous anti-Chalcedonian Peter the Iberian near Gaza. Ordained to the priesthood some time before 500, Severus went to Constantinople in 508 to plead his case before the emperor Anastasius, having been expelled from Jerusalem after his first conflict with Nephalius. This Alexandrian monk, who had formerly been of an anti-Chalcedon persuasion, also journeyed to Constantinople and there wrote his *Apology for the Council of Chalcedon*, an early exposition of what has come to be called ‘neo-Chalcedonianism’, that is, the attempt to present the Definition of Chalcedon in Cyrillian terms, demonstrating that its ‘in two natures’ formula could be reconciled with ‘one nature’ statements of Cyril. During this period a florilegium of Cyril’s texts marshalled in support of Chalcedon, probably compiled in Alexandria around 482, also came to Severus’ attention in Constantinople. He immediately replied with his *Philalethes*, arguing that this ‘Friend of Truth’ (i.e. Cyril) defended a theology firmly against the line taken by Chalcedon and that his passages were taken out of context, although the very debate indicates the ambiguity of Cyril on this matter.⁸ Largely through the work of Philoxenus of Mabbug, Severus was consecrated bishop of Antioch on 16 November 512, a seat he held for only six years, escaping to Egypt when Justin became emperor on 9 July 518. Already before his exile Severus

⁷ For Severus, see P. Allen’s survey in P. Allen and C. T. R. Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*, The Early Church Fathers (London: Routledge, 2004), 3–55, and A. Grillmeier, with T. Hainthaler, *CCT*, vol. 2, pt. 2, *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, trans. J. Cawte and P. Allen (London: Mowbray, 1995), 21–79.

⁸ For the florilegium, see R. Hespel, *Le Florilège cyrillien réfuté par Sévère d’Antioche: étude et édition critique* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires and Institute Orientaliste, 1955).

had become concerned with the theological views held by the anti-Chalcedonian Sergius, who seems to have been influenced by Apollinarian ideas.⁹ Severus continued his correspondence with Sergius from his exile, and also turned his attention to the more developed presentation of 'neo-Chalcedonianism' given by John of Caesarea, a presbyter and grammarian, in his *Apology for the Council of Chalcedon* written at the beginning of that decade. Although Severus presented his rebuttal, *Against the Impious Grammarian*, as if it were written while he was still patriarch of Antioch, and so that it would not be prejudiced by his exiled status,¹⁰ the work was completed in the first year of his exile, with all the difficulties that this brought.¹¹ In the following decade his attention was directed once again to an opponent within the anti-Chalcedonian party, this time his former ally, Julian of Halicarnassus. Severus quotes Diodore and Theodore occasionally in all the works mentioned, almost certainly using, as we have seen in Chapter 4, Cyril's book *Against Diodore* and the two *Against Theodore* as his sources. When Justinian acceded to the imperial throne in 527, he recognized Severus as an important factor in his attempts to reconcile the divisions within Eastern Christianity. Severus declined, on the grounds of his old age, Justinian's guarantee of safe passage to Constantinople in 532, along with five other important anti-Chalcedonian bishops for negotiations with six Chalcedonian bishops, though after repeated invitations Severus eventually accepted, arriving in Constantinople in the winter of 534/5. For a brief moment, largely through the work of the empress Theodora, the anti-Chalcedonians seemed set to enjoy a reversal of fortune: Theodosius, a deacon of Severus' party, was appointed to the episcopal throne in Alexandria; and Anthimus, who was prepared to enter into communion with Severus, was installed as patriarch of Constantinople. However, Theodosius

⁹ See I. Torrance, *Christology after Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988).

¹⁰ Cf. Severus *Ep.* 34 (PO 12.2, p. 276).

¹¹ Cf. *ibid.* (PO 12.2, pp. 272–3): 'It was a very difficult task and needed a great store of books, and it was so to speak difficult for me to correct, because I am moving from place to place, and I have not everywhere at hand fitting testimonies and demonstrations from the Scriptures. For I thought it right to meet not only the lamentable babblings of the grammarian, but also the whole web of impiety contained in what was defined and done by way of innovation at Chalcedon by the synod which met there, and the impious *Tōme* of Leo, taking occasion from the very things stated by him (I mean the grammarian) to expose the dishonesty of the adversaries . . .'

was soon driven out of Alexandria by the supporters of Julian of Halicarnassus, and Anthimus was forced to step down after Palestinian and Syrian monks denounced him to Pope Agapetus of Rome; Justinian's need for an alliance with Rome outweighed the desire to reconcile the anti-Chalcedonians. Finally, a synod of Constantinople, meeting from May to June in 536, condemned both Anthimus and Severus, and was confirmed in August of that year by an imperial edict. Severus once again fled to Egypt, where he died on 8 February 538.

From Diodore

SD 1 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 140.2–12)

= *Against the Impious Grammarian* 2.21 (CSCO 111, p. 182.11–20),
cited from Cyril's writings *Against Diodore*

= *Letter II to Sergius* (CSCO 119, p. 110.3–11), given as Cyril quoting
Diodore

b = *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.15 (CSCO 93,
pp. 252.23–253.2), given as Cyril quoting Diodore

[a] As that body was of Mary, thus not assumed, it was of the ground, in no way different from other bodies. For as Levi was tithed while he was in the loins, and being born assumed the

honour [cf. Heb. 7:9–10], [b] so also the Lord, while being in the womb of the Virgin, did not have the honour of sonship from her essence. But when it was formed, it became the temple for the God Word; and receiving the Only-begotten, it assumed the honour of the Name and assumed also the One from whom the honour is.

SD 2 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 144.8–21), attributed to ‘Theodoret’ [=TD 2, LD 2, C4T 46, C5D 5; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

[a] By grace that man from Mary is Son, by nature the God Word <is Son>; what is by grace is not by nature, and what is by nature is not by grace, <thus> there are not two sons.¹² [b] The <property> of sonship by grace, of glory, of immortality will suffice for the body from us, for it became the temple of the God Word; let it not be raised above its own nature and let not the God Word be insulted instead of the thanksgiving due from us. And what is the insult? To be framed with a body and to suppose that he needed a body for perfect sonship. [c] The God Word did not seek to be son of David, but his Lord [cf. Matt. 22:41–5]. Not only did he not grudge the body to be called ‘son of David’, but for this he came.

SD 3 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 144.21–5) attributed to ‘Theodoret’ [=BD 27, LD 4a, C5D 1a]

If any would, in a <mis>use of word,¹³ also name the Son of God, the God Word, ‘son of David’, because the Word’s temple was from David, let him name him [the Word] <so>; and let him call the one who is from the seed of David ‘Son of God’ by grace and not by nature,

SD 4 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 153.3–11)
= *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.15 (CSCO 93, p. 253.12–21), cited from Cyril’s writings *Against Diodore*

The one from the seed of David, who, from the moment he was being formed, was formed for the God Word, belongs to the God Word. First of all, the temple is constructed from our presence [i.e. ‘from us’], and then the one who dwells enters it; but the one

¹² ‘There are not two sons’ is not in LD 2. ¹³ LD 4: *καταχρηστικῶς*.

וְיַחֲזִיק אֶת הַיָּד לְמִלְכָּהּ . וְלֹא יִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .

SD 5 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 153.12–21)

b = *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.15 (CSCO 93, p. 253.22–4),

cited from Cyril's writings *Against Diodore*

b = *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.26 (CSCO 101, p. 63.20–3),

given as Cyril quoting Diodore

[=PD 1]

וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .

SD 6 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 2.7 (CSCO 111, p. 89.12–15),

given as Cyril quoting Diodore

וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .

SD 7 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.23 (CSCO 101, p. 13.6–7),

cited from Cyril's writings *Against Diodore*

וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .

SD 8 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.25 (CSCO 101, p. 41.27–42:5),
given as Cyril quoting Diodore

a = *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.25 (CSCO 101, p. 58.29)

[=PD 6b]

וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .
 וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ . וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכַוְנָתָהּ .

who dwelt in the womb of the virgin was he who formed the temple, and he did not depart from the temple. He filled it with his glory and his wisdom, not as in the case of the prophets, where there was no knowledge until the Spirit revealed <it>.

SD 5 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 153.12–21)

b=*Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.15 (CSCO 93, p. 253.22–4),
cited from Cyril's writings *Against Diodore*

b=*Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.26 (CSCO 101, p. 63.20–3),
given as Cyril quoting Diodore

[=PD 1]

[a] Jesus grew in age and wisdom [cf. Luke 2:52]. It is not possible for this to be said concerning the God Word, for he is God, a Perfect One begotten from the Perfect One, Wisdom from Wisdom, Power from Power. He, therefore, grew not, for he is not imperfect such that he would grow to that which is perfect, but that which grew in age and wisdom was the flesh. [b] Neither did the divinity, after it [i.e. the flesh] was formed or born, place immediately its entire wisdom in it, but rather little by little it gave <it> to the body.

SD 6 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 2.7 (CSCO 111, p. 89.12–15),
given as Cyril quoting Diodore

Is that which is of the seed of David of the essence of God? Is not the God Word from the essence of the Father, and that which is from the seed of David from the essence of David?

SD 7 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.23 (CSCO 101, p. 13.6–7),
cited from Cyril's writings *Against Diodore*

The perfect form of the God Word, <and> the perfect form of the servant which it assumed.

SD 8 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.25 (CSCO 101, p. 41.27–42:5),
given as Cyril quoting Diodore

a=*Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.25 (CSCO 101, p. 58.29)

[=PD 6b]

[a] We adore the purple robes because of the one clothed, [b] the temple because of the one indwelling, the form of a servant

חלל מן הנפש: למן וראוי לכל כבודו וטובו להלל מן חסדו
 וכל מיניו ששערתם פתח עני אפוא. לה שפיר עניו שפיר עניו
 וטובו עניו וטובו עניו. לה לה עניו. לה לה עניו.
 שפיר עניו: חלל עניו. לה עניו. לה עניו. לה עניו.

✠

SD 9 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.25 (CSCO 101, p. 46.25–30),
given as Cyril quoting Diodore

ראה רחוק עניו שפיר עניו חלל עניו. לה עניו ולפניו עניו
 וכלל: עניו עניו עניו לה עניו. עניו עניו, לה עניו.
 ראה עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו. לה עניו עניו עניו עניו.
 עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו. ✠

SD 10 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.26 (CSCO 101, p. 63.14–20),
given as Cyril quoting Diodore

עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו. לה עניו עניו עניו
 עניו עניו: לה עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו
 עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו
 עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו. ✠

SD 11 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.33 (CSCO 101, p. 153.27–8),
given as Cyril quoting Diodore
[=LD 5a]

עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו. לה עניו עניו עניו עניו
 עניו. ✠

SD 12 *An Apology for the Philalethes* 101 (CSCO 318, p. 66.13–21)

ראה עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו. לה עניו עניו עניו עניו
 עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו
 עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו
 עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו
 עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו עניו. ✠

because of the form of God, the lamb because of the High Priest, the one assumed because of the one who assumed, the one who was formed in the womb of the virgin because of the creator of all. One acknowledges these things, also offering a single glory. A single adoration, together with the acknowledgement of these things, is not harmful. ‘Single’, you say, ‘in adoration’, but through the single adoration you introduce the blasphemy that, if there is a single adoration, <Christ> is in a single essence.

SD 9 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.25 (CSCO 101, p. 46.25–30), given as Cyril quoting Diodore

But how do you offer a single adoration? As in the case of the reigning soul and body? For the soul by itself does not rule, neither does the body by itself rule; but the God Word, before the flesh, is King. Therefore <the relationship between> the God Word and the flesh is not as in the case of soul and body.

SD 10 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.26 (CSCO 101, p. 63.14–20), given as Cyril quoting Diodore

‘The Lord God will raise up for you a prophet like me from your brothers’ [Deut. 18:15]. Why something inferior to Moses the prophet? Was he not fully man? Well then, neither was the Nazarene, the one from the seed of David, less than a man, but full God from full God assuming full man.

SD 11 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.33 (CSCO 101, p. 153.27–8), given as Cyril quoting Diodore
[=LD 5a]

Son of God, not on account of something, for he is <this> naturally; the flesh is son, because of the Son.

SD 12 *An Apology for the Philalethes* 101 (CSCO 318, p. 66.13–21)

But again they say to me: ‘So, then, you divide <the Christ> and you say that the flesh is one, and the God Word another!’ But, I am convinced <that> if I were to make this distinction and speak <thus>, I would ask every one of those who stand opposed to give an answer: Is it the case that the God Word is the seed

ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ

SD 13 *An Apology for the Philalethes* 101 (CSCO 318, p. 69.1–7)

ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ

From Theodore

ST 1 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 156.7–20)

ab = *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.15 (CSCO 93, p. 254.14–22),
 cited from Cyril's second book *Against Theodore*

[=LT 4ab; a=BT15]

ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ
 ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ ܘܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ ܠܢ

¹⁴ Suppression of the clause 'and that he who is from the seed of David is from the essence of God' is suggested by a second hand, as noted in the critical apparatus of the text in CSCO; ܠܢܠܚܘܩܘܢ suggested by Hespel.

of David? Tell <me>, who would wish to say this? Is he the seed of Abraham? Is he a prophet like Moses? Is he the temple which was destroyed? Have you not heard what was proclaimed, as was said by the Lord, 'Destroy this temple!?' Is it he himself who is the temple which was destroyed?

SD 13 *An Apology for the Philalethes* 101 (CSCO 318, p. 69.1–7)

Is the God Word at the end of time? Is he who is from the seed of David before the ages? Is the God Word a mortal from mortals? Is he who is from the seed of David from the essence of God? It is not that the God Word is from the essence of David and that he who is from the seed of David is from the essence of God: it is he who is from the seed of David that is of the essence of David!

From Theodore

ST 1 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 156.7–20)

ab=*Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.15 (CSCO 93, p. 254.14–22),
cited from Cyril's second book *Against Theodore*

[=LT 4ab; a=BT15]

[a] The one who was assumed was united to the God Word from the beginning, receiving by foreknowledge, in the very formation in the womb, the beginning of union; but when he was esteemed worthy of the union, receiving all those things which it was possible to obtain for a man [b] united to the Only-begotten and to the Lord of the universe, he was made worthy of great things, more than the rest, as much as the advantage of the union fell to him. He was also esteemed worthy of the first indwelling of the Spirit, beyond all other human beings; and he was deemed worthy of this not in the manner of the rest, for he received in himself the whole gift of the Spirit, while to the others he gave a partial communion of the Spirit. In this way then, also, the completeness of the Spirit was at work in him.

ST 2 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 156.21–8)
 = *Against the Impious Grammarian* 2.15 (CSCO 111, p. 134.25–5.2),
 cited from Cyril's book *Against Theodore*
 [=LT 28, C4T 45, C5T 3b]

When they ask, 'Is Mary the mother of man or Mother of God?' let us say, 'both of them', the one by the nature of the case, the other by transference:¹⁵ 'mother of man' by nature, as a man was in the womb of Mary, the one who also came out from there; 'Mother of God', since God was in the man who was born, not being confined in him by nature, but in him by a bond of intention.

ST 3 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 157.1–10)

'When Jesus was baptized, he immediately went up from the water, and behold, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending from the heavens and alighting upon him' [Matt. 3:16]. This does not accurately apply to the divinity, since the Holy Spirit came upon him as in the order of a gift, as also the blessed Peter says, 'Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power' [Acts 10:38], and also, by means of his assistance, conferring upon him what he lacked, in the struggles against the Calumniator and all the others.

ST 4 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 157.10–20)
 [=LT 2d]

There was, in his case, no emission of human seed, but he was formed from the working of the divine Spirit. There was also in him an inclination to whatever tends to the virtues, on account of the union to the God Word, of which he was counted worthy in the foreknowledge of the God Word, when he united him to himself from on high. Therefore, for all these reasons, immediately upon <the age of> discernment he had a great hatred of evil, and when in unrestrainable love he drew near according to the measure of his intention, he also received assistance from the God Word.

¹⁵ LT 28: τῆ ἀναφορῆ.

ST 5 *Philalethes* (CSCO 133, p. 158.15–22)
[=C5T 6b]

Because the blessed Paul also speaks thus: ‘Of them is the Christ according to the flesh, he who is God over all’ [Rom. 9:5]. He says this <first clause> not because the God over all is from the Jews according to the flesh, but as an indication of his human nature, being persuaded that he is of the race of Israel, and that <second clause> as an expression of the expression of the divine nature—he who is above all things and the universe—he knows that he is the Lord.

ST 6 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.17 (CSCO 93, p. 294.5–8), cited from Theodore’s *Commentary on Hebrews*

He is speaking to us through the man who was assumed, both working the things which are his as God, and speaking to us things of righteousness.

ST 7 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.26 (CSCO 101, p. 64.5–7), cited from the seventh book of the work of Theodore *To Patrophilus, Concerning the Spirit*, regarding ‘Christ in the flesh’

But also of things to come, according to that which was useful, he would receive knowledge from the Holy Spirit.

ST 8 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.29 (CSCO 101, p. 95.23–6), cited from Cyril’s books *Against Theodore*

But he [Theodore], however, says: ‘For just as, while it is good to be from Bethlehem, he is called a “Nazarene”, because of his remaining and his upbringing there, so also “man”, because he dwelt in man.’

ST 9 *Against the Impious Grammarian* 3.29 (CSCO 101, pp. 98.24–99.4), cited from Theodore’s *Symbol of Faith*

We confess: the Father, perfect in *prosōpon* [*parsopa*], and the Son in like manner, and the Holy Spirit likewise, preserving the rule of right piety, in that [*fem.* Trinity] of Father and Son and Holy

Spirit, not supposing three diverse essences, but one, known in the identity of divinity. It is right also, because of the economy which, for our salvation, God directed in the economy of our Lord Christ, to know that the God Word assumed a complete man, who was from the seed of Abraham and David.¹⁶

ST 10 *An Apology for the Philalethes 101* (CSCO 318, pp. 67.26–68.1), from Cyril's writings *Against Theodore*

But on the one hand the body would be honoured with the names of God, because it received God; on the other hand, the God Word would be called by the <names> of the body, because it dwelt in it.

¹⁶ A Greek version of this creed is preserved in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, as part of the plaint submitted by the presbyter Charisius (*Collect. Athen.* 76.4–11; *ACO* 1.1.7, pp. 97.26–100.4). The part corresponding to ST 9 is as follows: Ὁμολογοῦμεν δὲ Πατέρα τέλειον προσώπων καὶ Υἱὸν ὁμοίως, καὶ Πνεῦμα δὲ Ἅγιον ὡσαύτως, σφριζομένου τοῦ λόγου τῆς εὐσεβείας ἡμῖν τῷ Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον μὴ τρεῖς τινὰς οὐσίας διαφόρους νομίζειν, ἀλλὰ μίαν τῇ ταυτότητι τῆς θεότητος γνωριζομένην. Χρῆ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἦν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν οἰκονομίᾳ ὁ δεσπότης ἐξετέλεσε Θεός, εἶδέναι ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἀνθρωπὸν εἴληφε τέλειον ἐκ σπέρματος ὄντα Ἀβραάμ καὶ Δαυὶδ κατὰ τὴν διαγόρευσιν τῶν θείων γραφῶν, . . . For a list of the various Latin versions, see *ACO* 4.1, p. 70. An extract from this creed also appears in *The Blasphemies of Diodore, Theodore, and the Impious Nestorius* (BT 26).

III. THE PALATINE COLLECTION

The compilation of texts known as the *Collectio Palatina* contains seven extracts attributed to Theodore and six to Diodore (one of which, PD 4, is attributed by Leontius to Paul of Samosata). This collection consists largely of works and translations by Marius Mercator, a friend and disciple of Augustine, who wrote, between 418 and 431, against both Pelagians and Nestorians. Although the *Collectio Palatina* used to be attributed to Marius himself, Schwartz, in his edition of the work for *ACO*, definitively established that the collection dates in fact to the early sixth century, and argued persuasively that the reference, concluding the primary collection, to 'our most blessed father John, bishop of the City of Tomi in the province of Scythia' refers to John Maxentius, the leader of the Scythian monks.¹⁷ Because of the two opening documents (a letter from Pope Anastasius I to Bishop John of Jerusalem which criticizes the sympathy shown by Rufinus towards Origen in his translation of his works; and a confession of faith made by one who now anathematizes his former Origenist errors), Schwartz concluded that the 'Sitz im Leben' of the document was the resurgence of Origenism in Palestine which escalated into the Three Chapters controversy. However, given that the vast bulk of material in the collection is directed rather against Pelagianism, it seems more likely, as William Bark argued, that the collection derives from a couple of decades earlier, soon after John became bishop of his home province in 520. The purpose of the supposedly anti-Origenist documents is instead to vilify Rufinus, the one who disseminated the Pelagian teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the West. As Bark concludes: 'The close relationship shown to exist between the Palatine Collector and John Maxentius, the primary concern with Nestorianism, and the great interest in Pelagianism indicate rather that the collection dates from the period just before the Three Chapters controversy when the Scythian monks were fighting for doctrinal unity.'¹⁸

¹⁷ *ACO* 1.5, p. 181.

¹⁸ W. C. Bark, 'John Maxentius and the *Collectio Palatina*', *HTR* 36.2 (1943), 93-107, at 107.

Text

Concilium Vniuersale Ephesenum, ed. E. Schwartz, *ACO* 1.5, *Collectio Palatina siue qui fertur Marius Mercator* (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1924–5), 173–9.

From Theodore

PT 1 ‘From Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, from the second codex, book four, folio ten, against St. Augustine, a defender of original sin and a proponent generally that Adam became mortal by the transgression’

Tantis extantibus quae demonstrent Adam sic ex terra formatum ut mortalis prorsus existeret, erga cibum proprium uoluit occupare sermonem, nec exinde ualens aduertere ueritatem, pro dogmate uero seductorio ex mendacio aduocationem iungens. Non ait ‘mortales eritis’, sed ‘morte moriemini’, prorsus existentibus natura mortalibus inferre mortis experientiam comminatus, quam etiam iuxta morem propriae benignitatis ad effectum perducere distulit. Sicut enim cum dicit ‘qui effuderit hominis sanguinem, sanguis eius pro eo fundetur’, non hoc dicit quia qui occiderit hominem, erit mortalis, sed quia dignus est huiusmodi morte damnari, sic et in praesentiarum dixit ‘morte moriemini’, non quod tunc mortales fierent, sed quod digni essent qui mortis sententiam pro transgressione referrent. Sed et diuinam sententiam quam post peccatum Deus Adae inferre uidetur, aduerte. Sic enim dicit: ‘quia audisti uocem uxoris tuae et comedisti de ligno de quo praeceperam tibi de hoc solo non comedere, ex eo comedisti, maledicta terra in operibus tuis; in tristitia comedes eam omnibus diebus uitae tuae. Spinas et tribulos proferet tibi et comedes fenum agri et in sudore uultus tui comedes panem tuum, donec reuertaris in terram, <de qua sumptus es, quia terra es et in terram> reuerteris.’ Hoc autem per haec comminatus est quod aerumnosam uitam habiturus esset, cum labore deinceps fructus de terra sumpturus, quibus aleretur atque subsisteret, nequaquam habens, ut pridem, tantam

From Theodore

PT 1 'From Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, from the second codex, book four, folio ten, against St. Augustine, a defender of original sin and a proponent generally that Adam became mortal by the transgression'

While there is so much that shows that Adam, formed in this way from the earth, was certainly mortal, he [i.e. Augustine] wanted instead to occupy his discourse with the subject of <Adam's> proper food, whence instead of the true doctrine, he connects the summons [to eat] by a lie to the Seducer. For he did not say 'you will be mortal', but 'you will die by death' [Gen. 2:17], threatening to inflict the experience of death on those who were certainly mortal by nature, which he even deferred bringing to effect by the custom of his own goodness. For just as when he says, 'whoever sheds the blood of a man, for him will his blood be shed' [Gen. 9:6], he does not say that the one who killed a man shall become mortal, but that he deserves to be punished in this way by death; thus also in the present case he says 'you shall die by death', <it does not mean> that they then became mortal, but because they, who would bear the sentence of death for their transgression, were deserving <of this>. But notice also that God is seen to impose the divine sentence upon Adam after this sin. For he says, 'Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree, of which I commanded you of this alone not to eat, of which you have eaten, cursed is the ground because of your deed; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life. Thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you and you shall eat the plants of the field, and in the sweat of your face you shall eat your bread, until you return to the earth, from which you were taken, for you are earth and to earth you will return [Gen. 3:17-19].' That is, by means of these he threatened <Adam> with a miserable life, <that only> with hard work would he take the fruit of the earth, with which he would be nourished and subsist, in no way having, as in the past, such great abundance

propositam largitatem quanta ex paradisi copia fruebatur. Non enim operari terram pro supplicio dedit Deus, quasi ex immortalis natura <in> mortalitatem homines transferens, quando quidem et paradisi ei, ut operaretur et custodiret, indixit: pro tanta uero pristina largitate et uoluptate paradisi aerumnosam eius fore sustentationem de terrae fructibus comminatur. Nam prorsus ut mortalis factus, et tunc paradisi fructibus indigebat, sicut nunc terrae fructus inquit, et pro supplicio pristinis fraudatus deliciis, hac aerumnosissima laboriosissimaque conuersatione multatur. Vnde ad postremum consequenter adiecit ‘quia terra es et reuerteris in terram’, hinc etiam mortalitatem naturae significans. Non enim <ut> immortalis et nunc primum incipienti sententiam mortis excipere, sicut sapientissimi defensores peccati originalis, immo potius patres peccati mirabiles adseuerant, uocabulum huic terrae composuit, sed ut ab exordio naturaliter effecto mortali appellationem hanc congruere iudicauit, diuina scribtura hoc de hominibus uocabulum ad ostensionem corruptibilis et resolubilis eorum naturae saepius assumente. Nam ‘recordatus est’, inquit, ‘quia puluis sumus. Homo, sicut fenum dies eius, et sicut flos agri, ita florebit, quia spiritus pertransiuit in eo et non erit amplius locus eius.’ Vult autem dicere quod corruptibiles et resolubiles omnes sumus in modum feni parumper florentis pereuntisque post paululum. Nam ad breue quidem tempus uitam ducimus, ad non existendum uero deinceps omni modo peruenimus. Sic et Abraham ‘ego sum’, inquit, ‘terra et cinis’ pro eo ac si diceret: non sumus dignus cum tanto Deo conloqui, homo factus e terra et omnimodis hoc futurus. Magis ergo dicere debuit quia terra eris et ‘in terram reuerteris’, si quidem nunc primum feret natura mortalis.

PT 2 ‘From the second codex, book three, four folia before the end of the book’

Sed nihil horum perspicere potuit mirabilis peccati originalis assertor, quippe qui in diuinas scribturas nequaquam fuerit exercitatus nec ab infantia iuxta beati Pauli uocem sacras didicerit litteras, sed siue de scribturae sensibus siue de dogmate saepe declamans multa frequenter inepta proprie communiterue de ipsis

available as he enjoyed copiously from paradise. For God did not give him to work the earth as a punishment, as if transferring men from an immortal nature to mortality, since he indeed directed him to till and keep paradise [cf. Gen. 2:15]; for <maintaining> such pristine abundance and delight of paradise, indeed, he was forewarned that sustaining himself from the fruits of the earth would be miserable. For created as straightforwardly mortal, even then he needed the fruits of paradise, just as now he searches for the fruit of the earth, and as punishment he was deprived of the pristine delights, being punished with this most miserable and most laborious way of life. Whence, at the end is consequently added, 'for you are earth and to earth you will return', thereby signifying the mortality of <his> nature. For he did not apply this term 'earth' as to an immortal being for the first time now beginning to receive the sentence of death, as the most wise defenders of original sin, or rather the wonderful fathers of sin, assert, but he determines that this term suits the naturally mortal state from the beginning, the divine Scripture often using this term of human beings to show their corruptible nature, subject to decay. For 'He remembers', it says, 'that we are dust! As for man, his days are like grass; he will bloom like the flower of the field; but the wind passes over it and it is gone [Ps. 102:14–16].' He wants to say that we are all corruptible and subject to decay, in the manner of grass, blooming for a moment and passing away after a while. For a short time, indeed, we live our life, but in every way we indeed arrive in succession at non-existence. Thus also Abraham says 'I am earth and ashes' before him [Gen. 18:27], as if he were saying: I am not worthy to speak with such a God, being a man made from the earth and will wholly <remain mortal> in the future. Therefore he ought rather to say: 'because you will be earth "to the earth will you" also "return";' if indeed now for the first time he became mortal by nature.

PT 2 'From the second codex, book three, four folia before the end of the book'

But the marvellous proponent of original sin could perceive none of these points, inasmuch as he had never been trained in the divine Scriptures nor 'from infancy', in the saying of the blessed Paul, 'was he devoted to the sacred writings' [2 Tim. 3:15], but speaking often, whether on the meaning of Scripture or on

scribituris dogmatibusque plurimis impudenter exprompsit. Nam potentiae metus nullum contra sinebat effari, sed tantummodo taciti, qui diuinarum scribaturarum habebant notitiam, detrahebant. Nouissime uero in hanc dogmatis reccidit nouitatem qua diceret quod ira atque furore Deus Adam mortalem esse praeceperit et propter eius unum delictum cunctos et necdum natos homines morte multauerit. Sic autem disputans non ueretur nec confunditur ea sentire de Deo quae nec hominibus sanum sapientibus et aliquam iustitiae curam gerentibus umquam quis aestimare temptauit. Sed nec illius diuinae uocis recordatus est quod ‘non diceretur ulterius ista parabole in Israhel: patres manducauerunt uuam acerbam et filiorum dentes obstupuerunt’, quia haec dicit Adonai dominus: dentes eorum qui manducauerunt uuam acerbam, obstupescent’, ostendens per haec quod alterum pro altero iuxta quorundam errorum Deus omnino non puniat, sed unusquisque pro delictis suis redditurus est rationem. His consona beatus quoque Paulus adnectit: ‘Deus’, inquit, ‘qui reddet unicuique secundum opera sua’ et ‘unusquisque nostrum onus suum portabit’ et ‘tu quid iudicas fratrem tuum? Aut tu quare spernis fratrem tuum? Omnes enim adstabimus ante tribunal Christi.’ Sed uir mirabilis propter unum peccatum Adae tanto furore commotum arbitratus est Deum, ut et illum atrocissimae poenae subderet et ad uniuersos omnes posteros eius parem sententiam promulgaret <et>, inter quos quanti iusti fuerint, non facile numerare quis poterit. Ex quibus eum maxime considerare conuenerat quod ualde uideretur incongruum Noe Abraham Dauid Moysen et reliquos innumerabiles iustos obnoxios poenae redditos ob eius delictum et unum atque ex gustu arboris adprobatum et quod sic ultra modum iustitiae iram suam Deus extenderit, ita ut tot iustorum uirtutes cuntas abiceret eosque propter unius peccatum Adae tanto supplicio manciparet. Nam etsi nihil aliud, saltem de Abel mente perpendens conuenienter aestimare debuerat, qui primus iustus existens, primus est mortuus. Et si quidem mortem Deus ad

doctrine, he impudently and frequently expatiated to large numbers many absurdities, peculiar <to him> or common <with others>, regarding the Scriptures themselves and <their> teachings. For fear of <his> ability allowed nothing contrary to be expressed, but those who had knowledge of the divine Scriptures disparaged <him> in silence only. But most recently he has happened upon the novelty in this teaching, which would say that God, in anger and rage, would have commanded Adam to be mortal and on account of his one fault would have punished all together by death, even those humans not yet born. Arguing thus, he is not ashamed nor confounded by the fact that he supposes of God what none of the wise men or of those caring for justice would ever be tempted to reckon sane. But he has not remembered that divine saying: 'this proverb shall no more be said in Israel: the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the teeth of the children are set on edge', because the Lord Adonai said this: the teeth of those who have eaten sour grapes shall be set on edge [cf. Ezek. 18:2-4], showing by this that God does not in any way punish someone for the error of another, but whoever it is should render a reckoning for his own fault. In accord with this the blessed Paul also adds: 'God', he said, 'who will render to each according to his works' [Rom. 2:6] and 'each one of us will bear his own burden' [Gal. 6:5] and 'why do you pass judgement on your brother? Or you, why do you despise your brother? For we shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ' [Rom. 14:10]. But the marvellous man has determined that because of the one sin of Adam God was agitated by such a rage that he subjected him to the most atrocious penalties, and he promulgated the same sentence upon absolutely all following him, even though one would not easily be able to count how many were righteous amongst them. Of them one ought to consider especially (which seems extremely absurd) Noah, Abraham, David, Moses, and countless other righteous people, who were liable to the punishment rendered for his fault and the single sin of eating from a tree, and that God would have extended his anger beyond the measure of justice, such that he would have rejected all the virtues of so many righteous and given them over, solely because of the sin of Adam, to such punishment. Notwithstanding anything else, he ought to have determined to consider carefully, with intelligence, at least Abel, who was the first to be righteous, and the first to die. And if indeed God had consigned man to death,

poenam statuaret hominum, quomodo non impietatis erat extremae uiuere quidem eum qui fuit causa peccati, uiuere etiam cum illo et Euam malitiae repertricem (praetermitto autem diabolum in immortalitate hanc tenens perdurantem), primum uero iustum repertoremque uirtutis primumque diuini cultus curam gerentem ante omnes poena peccantium fuisse perculsum? Oportebat autem sapientissimum uirum et de Enoch, qui non est mortuus, diligenter expendere. Non enim tanta uirtute uel pietate praeditus fuit, ut melior omnibus existeret, Moysae dico et prophetis apostolisque uel <de> reliquis omnibus de quibus ait beatissimus Paulus quibus dignus non erat mundus, ita ut illis mortuis ipse solus sine mortis experientia perduraret. Sed iam ab initio Deus hoc habuit apud se definitum ut primum quidem mortales fierent, postmodum uero immortalitate gauderent, sic ad utilitatem nostram fieri ipse disponens.

PT 3 'After a little'

Manifestius haec eadem Deus ostendit, cum transfert Enoch et immortalem facit. Nam si per peccatum causa supplicii Deus intulit mortem nec olim definitum hoc habuit apud se, ineffabiliter pro nobis iuxta propriam sapientiam cuncta dispensans, nequaquam Enoch quidem immortalis existeret, Dominus autem Christus ad mortis experientiam perueniret.

PT 4 'After a little'

Idcirco Dominus auctor omnium bonorum hominibus factus est, ut sicut Adam primi et mortalis status extitit inchoator, ita et ipse secundi et immortalis status initiator existens, primitus Adae prioris naturalia custodiret, dum nascitur ex muliere, dum pannis inuoluitur et paulatim aetatis incrementa sortitur (Iesus enim inquit, 'proficiebat aetate et sapientia et gratia coram Deo et hominibus', dum circumcisionem suscipit, dum iuxta legalem consuetudinem Deo adsistit in templo parentibusque subicitur et conuersationi legitimae mancipatur. Sic etiam ad expletionem reliquorum et mortem, utpote naturae tributam, postremo suscipit ut secundum legem humanae naturae moriens et a mortuis diuina uirtute resurgens, initium cunctis hominibus, qui mortem secundum propriam naturam suscipiunt, fieret ut a

how was it not of extreme impiety that he who was the cause of sin should live, and even Eve, the contriver of evil, should live with him (I pass over the devil's continuance in immortality to this day), but that the first just man, the discoverer of virtue, and the first to take care of the divine cult, should before all be subjected to the punishment for sinners? It was necessary for the most wise of men to examine carefully also the case of Enoch, who is not dead. For he was not endowed with such great virtue or piety that he was the best of all who existed, I mean of Moses and the prophets and the apostles, or of all the others of whom, the most blessed Paul says, 'of whom the world was not worthy' [Heb. 11:38], such that, compared to these who died, he alone continued without the experience of death. But already from the beginning God had this planned in himself, that being at first mortal, they would later rejoice in immortality, himself thus arranging things for our benefit.

PT 3 'After a little'

In a clearer way, God showed these things, when he transferred Enoch and made him immortal. For if God introduced death, as a punishment because of sin, not having formerly planned this in himself, arranging all things for us according to his own wisdom, by no means would Enoch have been immortal; but the Lord Christ came for the experience of death.

PT 4 'After a little'

Therefore the Lord has become the author of all good things for men, so that as Adam was the beginning of the first and mortal state, so also he himself is the initiator of the second and immortal state; as the first-fruits he possessed the natural properties of Adam, as he was born of a woman, was swaddled in clothes, and the stages of growth were gradually attained (for Jesus, it says, 'grew in age and wisdom and grace before God and man' [Luke 2:52]), while he received circumcision, was presented to God in the temple, according to the legal custom, became subject to his parents and was emancipated for a lawful mode of life. Then for the satisfaction on behalf of all others, he underwent death, as the payment owed by our nature, in order that by dying according to the law of human nature, and then by rising from the dead by divine power, he might be the beginning for all men, who have

mortuis surgant <et> ad immortalem substantiam commutentur. Sicut enim conformes Adae secundum statum praesentem sumus omnes effecti, sic Christo Domino iuxta carnem conformes efficiemur in posterum. 'Transfigurabit', enim, 'corpus humilitatis nostrae conformes fieri corpori gloria suae', et 'qualis terrenus tales et terreni, et qualis caelestis, tales et caelestes, et sicut portauimus imaginem terreni, portemus etiam imaginem caelestis', ostendens quod primi status Adae participes facti, necessario etiam secundi Adae Christi Domini secundum carnem futuri status participium consequemur, utpote qui ex hac eadem natura constet exortus et cuncta quae fuerant naturae, susceperit et ideo sustinuerit mortem, ut mortem naturae suscipiens et a mortuis resurgens, naturam liberam morte perficeret. Et mortem quidem propterea suscepit, peccatum uero nequaquam, sed ab hoc immunis omnino permansit. Quod enim erat naturae, id est mortem, indubitanter assumpsit; peccatum uero, quod non erat naturae, sed uoluntatis, nullo pacto suscepit. Quod si fuisset in natura peccatum iuxta sapientissimi huius eloquium, peccatum in natura prorsus existens necessario suscepisset.

PT 5 'Of the same Theodore, from the second codex, book three, folio eighteen'

Si peccatum Deus nesciebat Adam, sit horum sapientia sapientissimorum et ista responsio. Quod hoc insanissimum est uel in cogitatione percipere, manifestum est quod et peccatum eum nouerat et propter hoc procul dubio moriturum. Quomodo ergo non est extremae dementiae credere quod primitus eum immortalem in sex horis fecerit (nam tantae fuerunt a conditione eius usque ad comestionem, quoniam quidem sexto die factus e terra et comedens contra diuinum mandatum, de paradiso pulsus est), mortalem uero post peccatum monstrauerit? Certum est enim quia si eum immortalem esse uoluisset, nec intercedens peccatum Dei sententiam commutasset, quia nec diabolus fecit sex <horis> ex immortalis mortalem, <et> quidem cunctorum malorum existentem principium.

received death according to the property of nature, that they might rise from the dead <and> be changed into an immortal existence. For just as we are all conformed to Adam in our present state, we shall all be conformed to the Lord Christ according to the flesh at the end. For 'he will change the body of our humiliation to be made conformed to the body of his glory' [Phil. 3:21], and 'as was the earthly, such also are they that are earthly, and as is the heavenly, so also are they that are heavenly, and just as we have borne the image of the earthy, so we shall bear the image of the heavenly' [1 Cor. 15:48-9], showing that, having been made partakers of the first state of Adam, we will by necessity also follow the participation of the second Adam, Christ the Lord, according to the flesh, in the future state, inasmuch as he who possesses this same nature <as ours> has risen, and taken up all that is of this nature, and therefore underwent death, that undergoing a natural death and rising from the dead, he might effect a nature free from death. He therefore indeed underwent death, but in no way sin, for he remained immune from this in every way. For what is of nature, that is, death, he unquestionably assumed; but sin, because it is not of nature, but of the will, he in no way received. For if there had been sin in nature, according to the eloquence of that extremely wise man, then, with sin being certainly in nature, he would by necessity have received this.

PT 5 'Of the same Theodore, from the second codex, book three, folio eighteen'

If God did not know that Adam was going to sin, even that response would be the wisdom of the most wise. As it is most insane to consider this even in thought, it is clear that he knew that he would sin and because of this would certainly die. How, then, is it not of extreme madness to believe that first he would have made him immortal for six hours (for they were so many, from his making to the eating, since on the sixth day he was made from the earth and, eating against the divine commandment, was expelled from paradise), but after the sin ordained <him to be> mortal? For it is certain that if he had wished him to be immortal, the occurrence of sin would not have changed the decision of God, because neither did he make the devil mortal, from immortal, after six <hours>, even though he was the origin of all evils.

PT 6 'From the same Theodore, from the second codex, from book three, folio twenty-five'

Non enim his qui ab Adam usque ad aduentum Christi Domini in tantis fuerunt impietatibus et iniquitatibus quantas beatus Paulus propriis uerbis expressit, ut in superioribus <est> ex eius declaratum uocibus, tamquam magnum quiddam resurrectionis collaturus est praemium, si eos suppliciis quibusdam sine fine et sine correctione tradiderit. Nam ubi iam loco muneris resurrectio computabitur, si poena sine correctione resurgentibus inferetur?

PT 7 'After a little'

Quis ita demens, ut tantum bonum credat materiam fieri resurgentibus infiniti supplicii, quibus utilius erat omnino non surgere quam tantorum et talium malorum post resurrectionem sub infinitis poenis experientiam sustinere?

PT 8 'Of the same Theodore, from the Eighth Catechetical Discourse, folio seven'

Nec enim si duas dicimus in Christo naturas, necessario fiet ut duos Filios aut duos Dominos asseramus, quia hoc arbitrari extremae probatur amentiae. Omnia enim quaecumque secundum aliquid duo sunt, secundum aliquid unum, non interimunt per unitatem utriusque diuisionem. 'Ego', enim, 'et Pater unum sumus'; sed non quia unum, neganda utriusque proprietates. Et alibi de uiro et uxore pronuntians ait: 'iam non sunt duo, sed una caro'; sed non quia una caro uir et uxor, iam non sunt duo. Manent enim duo iuxta quod duo sunt, ut unum iuxta quod unum. Secundum hunc modum et hic duo sunt natura, sed unum coniunctione: duo natura, quia multa naturarum diuersitas; sed unum coniunctione, quia indiuisam uenerationem, quod sumptum est, cum suscipiente sortitur, uelut templum eius indiuiduum perseuerans. Omnia enim quaecumque duo dicuntur, tunc duorum continent usian, quando alterum alteri indifferens creditur, iuxta quod duorum uocabulum connumerationemque sortitur. Verbi gratia, quattuor bestias diuina scriptura commemorat, ursum pardum leonem et aliam

PT 6 'From the same Theodore, from the second codex, from book three, folio twenty-five'

For to those who from Adam until the advent of Christ were <afflicted> in such great impieties and iniquities which the blessed Paul described with characteristic words, as declared by him in the comments above [cf. Heb. 11:32–8], the reward of joining the resurrection is not such a great thing, if he will have rendered them over to torments without end and without improvement. For in what place of reward is the resurrection now reckoned <to occur> if pain without improvement will be imposed on the resurrected?

PT 7 'After a little'

Who is so mad that he would believe <to be> so great a good that material of endless torment is being prepared for those who arise, for whom it would be more useful not to rise at all, than to endure, after the resurrection, the experience of such great evils of such kind, in endless pains?

PT 8 'Of the same Theodore, from the Eighth Catechetical Discourse, folio seven'¹⁹

It is not the case that if we say two natures in Christ, we would by necessity assert two Sons or two Lords, since it is proved to be extreme folly to think this? For all things whatsoever which are two in one respect, and one in another, do not destroy the division between them by the unity. For 'I and my Father are one' [John 10:30]; but not, because one, negating the properties of each. And, in another place, speaking of husband and wife: 'They are not two, but one flesh' [Matt. 19:6]; but it is not the case that because husband and wife are one flesh, they are no longer two. For they remain two, because they are two, and are one, because they are one. In the same way here: they are two by nature, but one by conjunction: two by nature, because of the great difference between the natures; but one by conjunction, because of the indivisible veneration that is received by the one assumed together with the one assuming, just as he remains in his own temple. For all things whatsoever which are said to be two, thereupon involve the essence of two, <even> when one is believed to be not

¹⁹ Cf. *Cat. Hom.* 8.14–16 (ed. Tonneau, pp. 207–11; trans. Mingana, pp. 90–1).

quae has inmanitate praecellat, et ideo sunt quattuor, quod unaquaeque bestia nihil minus iuxta substantiam reliquis bestiis existere conprobatur. ‘Duorum’, inquit, ‘hominum testimonium uerum est’, quia hoc uterque natura quod alter est. Sic et illud ‘nemo potest duobus dominis seruire’, quia praebenti seruitium tamquam domino nihil minus uterque est dominus. Ita et hic, si uterque secundum substantiam esset Filius et Dominus, possent aliquo modo duo filii et domini nuncupari secundum numerum personarum; quoniam uero hic quidem secundum substantiam Filius existit et Dominus, hic autem secundum essentiam nec Filius nec Dominus approbatur, coniunctione uero quae ei facta cum illos est, isdem participasse cognoscitur, idcirco unum Filium et Dominum dicimus, principaliter quidem intelligentes eum Filium et Dominum qui secundum substantiam utrumque uere esse creditur et uocatur, complectentes autem cogitatione et illum qui inseparabiliter ei coniungitur et per ineffabilem cum eo copulam Filii et Domini particeps aestimatur. Itaque sicubi Filium hunc qui sumptus est, diuina scriptura commemorat, relatione suscipientis iuxta unitatem dicimus eum Filium nuncupari. Cum enim dicit de ‘Filio suo, qui factus est ex semine Dauid secundum carnem’, non Deum Verbum dicat, sed formam serui susceptam. Non enim Deus secundum carnem, nec Deus ex semine Dauid factus est, quem filium beatus Paulus euidenter appellat. Intellegimus autem eum filium, non quod per se dicatur filius, sed quod illa coniunctione quam habet cum eo qui uere est Filius, taliter nuncupetur. Misertus est creator perditae creaturae et sine conmixtione format infantem, perducit ad aetatem uirilem, incrementorum quidem processu naturae similitudinem pro modo credulitatis insinuans, occulte uero eidem copulatus

differentiated from the other, because it receives the term 'two' and the connumeration. By means of the word, the divine Scripture mentions four beasts: a bear, a panther, a lion, and another surpassing those in savageness, and therefore there are four, because each of them is a beast lacking nothing in its substance which is acknowledged to exist in other beasts. He says, 'the testimony of two men is true' [John 8:17], because each of them is by nature what the other is. Likewise also this: 'No one can serve two masters' [Matt. 6:24], because offering service as though to the Lord, lacking nothing the other is a lord. Thus also here, if each of them were by nature Son and Lord, they could be called, in a certain manner, two sons and lords, according to the number of persons; but since this one is indeed by substance Son and Lord, that one is acknowledged to be neither Son nor Lord by substance; but by the conjunction which he had with him, he is known to have participated in the same, and therefore we say one Son and Lord, principally understanding him to be Son and Lord who by substance is believed and said to be both truly, but embracing in thought the one also who is inseparably conjoined to him and by an ineffable union with him is reckoned to participate in the Son and Lord. And so, wheresoever the divine Scripture calls him who was assumed 'Son', it is to be said that we call him 'Son' because of the relationship of union to the one who assumed. When he says 'concerning his Son who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh' [Rom. 1:3], he does not say the God Word, but the assumed form of a servant.²⁰ For God is not according to the flesh, nor was God made from the seed of David,²¹ whom the blessed Paul clearly calls 'Son'. We understand him to be Son, not because he is called Son in himself, but because of that union which he has with the one who is truly Son such a thing is said.²² The Creator had pity on the lost creature and forms the infant without a commixture <of himself>, leads him to the adult state, introducing, in a believable way, the appearance of growth belonging to the process of nature, but invisibly being united with

²⁰ The Syriac version has: 'it is evident that it calls here Son the one who was made of the seed of David in the flesh and not the God Word but the form of the servant which was assumed'.

²¹ The Syriac version adds: 'but the man who was assumed for us'.

²² What follows does not correspond with the subsequent text in the Syriac version.

existens. Non aberat, cum formaretur, non diuidebatur, cum nasceretur, loquenti coniunctus et praesens in eius actibus perseuerans atque ubique sua conexione sine peccato custodiens.

Extracts from Diodore

'From Diodore bishop of Tarsus dividing the divinity of Christ from his humanity'

PD 1

[=SD 5]

'Iesus proficiebat et aetate et sapientia'. Hoc autem de Verbo Dei non potest dici, quia Deus perfectus natus est de perfecto, sapientia de sapientia, uirtus de uirtute. Ipse igitur non proficit; nec enim imperfectus est, ut ad perfectionem incrementis indigeat. Non enim ei mox formato uel edito omnem propriam sapientiam deitas contulit, sed hanc particulatim corpori tribuebat.

PD 2

Dicite eis: 'prophetam uobis suscitabit Dominus Deus uester ex fratribus uestris tamquam me.' Ex fratribus non est Deus Verbum; propheta namque est, qui gratiam Spiritus accipit et futura praedicit, ministrans Spiritui ad pronuntiandum ea quae uentura sunt. Deus igitur Verbum cui ministerium praebuit aut cuius propheta monstratus est? Vides ergo quia diuina scribtura caute pronuntiat.

PD 3

Precor attendite. Dicunt ad nos: 'ut quid separatis?' Ergo uos respondete, qui non separatis: numquid Deus Verbum in nouissimis est temporibus? 'Quid', aiunt, 'putasne hoc dicunt?' Nequaquam, sed <quod qui in nouissimis temporibus natus est> ante saecula est. Et si ante saecula est quod est ex semine Dauid,

him. He was not absent, when he was formed; he was not separated, when he was born, speaking of the conjunction, being both present in his acts and also perservering <with him> wherever he guards, without sin, his connection.

Extracts from Diodore

‘From Diodore bishop of Tarsus dividing the divinity of Christ from his humanity’

PD 1

[=SD 5]

‘Jesus grew in age and wisdom’ [Luke 2:52]. It is not possible for this to be said of the God Word, for he was begotten perfect God from the Perfect, Wisdom from Wisdom, Power from Power. He, therefore, grew not; for he is not imperfect such that he would grow by steps to perfection.²³ For the divinity did not, immediately upon his being formed or born, place in him its entire wisdom, but little by little conferred it upon the body.

PD 2

Say to them: ‘The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your brethren’ [Deut. 18:15]. The God Word is not ‘from brethren’; indeed a prophet is one who receives the grace of the Spirit and foretells the future, serving by the Spirit in announcing things that are to come. The God Word therefore: to whom did he offer service, or whose prophet was he shown to be? You see, therefore, that the divine Scripture speaks carefully.

PD 3

Attend, I beseech you. They say to us, ‘Why do you separate <them>?’ Therefore, you who do not separate, reply <to this>, whether the God Word is in the last times? ‘What’, they say, ‘do you think they say?’ Not at all, but <that he who was born in the last times> is before the ages. And if that which is of the seed of David is before the ages, he is much greater than David, from

²³ SD 5 adds: ‘but that which grew in age and wisdom was the flesh’.

multo magis ipse Dauid, ex quo est semen. Sed non est Dauid ante saecula; nam multis hominibus probatur esse posterior et post uiginti octo generationes a Dauid id quod est ex semine Dauid. Si autem ante saecula est quod in uulua formatum est, non est ex semine Dauid et diuina scribtura mentitur.

PD 4²⁴

Homo ungitur Iesus, dominus noster Verbum non ungitur. Verbum namque maius est Christo, quia Christus per sapientiam magnus effectus est. Verbum enim de sursum est, Iesus autem Christus homo hinc est. Maria non peperit Verbum (nec enim erat <ante saecula> Maria), sed hominem nobis similem genuit, meliorem uero per omnia, quia de Spiritu Sancto.

PD 5

[=LD 1]

Ad diligens cautumque dogmatum uos examen euehimus; laboramus propter uos, ne rationem Domino reddamus pro nostro silentio. Perfectus ante saecula Filius perfectum eum qui ex Dauid probatur, adsumpsit, Filius Dei filium Dauid. Dices ergo mihi; duos filios praedicas? Non dico duos filios Dauid; numquid Deum Verbum filium Dauid asserui? Sed nec duos Filios Dei secundum substatiā dico: numquid enim duos filios assero de Dei substantia genitos? Ante saecula autem Dei Verbum habitasse dico in eo quod ex Dauid semine comprobatur.

PD 6

[b=SD 8]

Non sic in eo qui est ex semine Dauid, sicut in prophetis habitauit Deus Verbum. Illi enim particulari quadam et modicata quantitate sancti Spiritus gratia fruebantur, hic autem in his quibus interdum erant illi, iugiter permanebat et gloria Verbi ac

²⁴ Leontius (*Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos*, test. 43; ed. Daley, 'Leontius', 191–2) attributes this fragment to Paul of Samosata: Ἄνθρωπος χρίεται, ὁ Λόγος οὐ χρίεται· ὁ Ναζωραῖος χρίεται, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Λόγος μείζων ἦν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Χριστὸς γὰρ διὰ σοφίας μέγας ἐγένετο. Λόγος μὲν γὰρ ἄνωθεν, Ἰησοῦς δὲ Χριστὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐντεῦθεν. Μαρία τὸν Λόγον οὐκ ἔτεκεν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν πρὸ αἰῶνων ἢ Μαρία· οὐκ ἔστι πρεσβυτέρα τοῦ Λόγου Μαρία, ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπον ἡμῖν ἴσον ἔτεκεν, κρείττονα δὲ κατὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ Πνεύματος ἀγίου.

whom is the seed. But David is not before the ages; for he is attested by many men to be later, and that which is from the seed of David <came> twenty-eight generations after David. But if what is formed in the womb is before the ages, it is not from the seed of David and the divine Scriptures lie.

PD 4

The man Jesus is anointed, our Lord, the Word, is not anointed. For the Word is greater than Christ, because Christ became great through wisdom. The Word is from above; Jesus Christ is a man from hence. Mary did not bear the Word (for Mary was not before the ages), but she bore a man like us, yet better in all things, because from the Holy Spirit.

PD 5

[=LD 1]

We urge you to a diligent and careful examination of the teachings; we labour on your behalf, lest we render an account to the Lord by our silence.²⁵ The perfect, pre-eternal Son assumed the perfect one who is proved to be from David, the Son of God the son of David. You therefore say to me: 'Do you proclaim two sons?' I do not speak of two sons of David; did I call the God Word a son of David? But neither do I speak of two Sons of God by essence; did I assert that two sons are begotten from the substance of God? I say that the pre-eternal Word of God dwelt in the one who is acknowledged to be from the seed of David.

PD 6

[b=SD 8]

[a] The God Word did not dwell in him who is from the seed of David as he did in the prophets. For by grace they enjoyed a certain and a moderate measure of the Holy Spirit, but this one continually remained in the things in which they were sometimes, and he was filled with the glory of the Lord and <his> wisdom.

²⁵ The second half of this sentence is not in LD 1.

sapientia replebatur. Alter intellegendus procul dubio praeter eum et subsistens proprie filius ac seorsum; non enim Verbum semet ipsum sapientia replebat et gloria, sed alteri potius haec quae sunt insignia, conferebat. Adoramus purpuram propter indutum et templum propter habitatorem, formam serui <propter> formam dei, agnum propter pontificem, assumptum propter assumentem, formatum in utero uirginali propter omnium conditorem. His confessis rebus, unam offer uenerationem; non nocebit adoratio una, si res fueris ante confessus. [Etiam non confessus] unam dicis uenerationem; sed per unam uenerationem introduces blasphemiam, ut si una est adoratio, sit et una substantia.

Doubtless another is to be understood besides him, and subsisting properly as son and separately; for the Word did not fill himself with wisdom and glory, but rather he conferred these, which are signs, on another. [b] We adore the purple <garment> because of the one clothed <in it>, and the temple because of the one who dwells <in it>; the form of the servant because of the form of God; the lamb because of the high priest; the one assumed because of the one who assumes; the one formed in the virginal womb because of the creator of all. Once these things have been confessed, offer one veneration; a single adoration will not be harmful, if you have first <these> things. Even <if you have not confessed these things> you say one veneration; but by the one veneration you will introduce blasphemy, as, if there is one adoration, so also there is one substance.

IV. LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM

Appended to the work known as *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* is a florilegium containing thirty-six passages from Theodore and five from Diodore. This is our most important source for the extracts of Diodore and Theodore in Greek, though identifying the author is a difficult task. The treatise is the third of a three-part work usually known by the title of the first treatise in the collection, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, written before the condemnation of the Three Chapters (for it does not mention either Theodoret or Ibas nor does it know of a condemnation of Theodore and Diodore) and attributed in the manuscripts to 'Leontius the hermit', the 'monk', or simply 'Abba Leontius'.²⁶ It is now generally accepted that this Leontius is to be differentiated from a number of other Leontii writing in the sixth century, but can be identified with the Leontius of Byzantium mentioned in Cyril of Scythopolis' *Life of Sabas*.²⁷ However, Cyril's description of Leontius as an 'Origenist' has led much scholarship astray, tying it up in convoluted knots that have only recently been unravelled.²⁸

Unlike his other works, Leontius' *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos*, is 'an angry and venomous diatribe', directed against Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus, and his own contemporaries who hold them in honour, cloaking their 'Nestorian' teaching under the names of these two figures whom,

²⁶ The works are found in PG 86.1268–1396. The relation between the texts was worked out, and the texts themselves newly edited, by B. Daley in his unpublished dissertation, 'Leontius', pp. xxv–lxxix; see also id., 'The Origenism of Leontius', 333, n. 2. His analysis is followed by Grillmeier, *CCT*, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 181–4. The florilegium is not printed in Migne (the fragments of Diodore and Theodore it contains are printed in PG 66.969 ff. and PG 33.1560–1 respectively); in the mss. the florilegium also seems to have an independent life, perhaps reflecting its character as an 'afterthought'. Cf. Daley, 'Leontius', p. liii.

²⁷ Cf. various ancient writers, such as the author of the *Doctrina patrum*, John of Damascus, and Euthymius Zigabenus, cite passages from the works of Leontius the monk, speaking of him as Leontius of Byzantium. Cf. Daley, 'Leontius', p. xv; 'Origenism', 334–5.

²⁸ Beginning with F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche* 1. *Das Leben und die polemischen Werke des Leontius von Byzanz*, TU 3.1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1887), and continuing to D. B. Evans, *Leontius of Byzantium: An Origenist Christology* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1970). The unravelling began with Daley's article 'Origenism', and was further carried out by Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*.

Leontius notes, 'no one has condemned'.²⁹ In this work Leontius admits that he too had formerly belonged to this party, ensnared by their teaching, but that he had been saved by divine grace, inspiring him to embrace the life of a stranger in the desert until he came into the hands of godly men who filled his mind with divine light by the writings of the lovers of wisdom.³⁰ Already in antiquity scribes had identified these enlightened teachers as Nonnus and his followers, and identified an unattributed quotation in his writings as coming from Evagrius.³¹ Leontius most likely joined Nonnus and his followers during their own exile just prior to the forming of the New Laura around 519.

Cyril first mentions Leontius in the context of Sabas' mission to Constantinople in 530/1. During the course of the debates with the non-Chalcedonians in the imperial palace, Sabas 'discovered' that some of his party admired Theodore of Mopsuestia and that Leontius of Byzantium was in fact an adherent of the teaching of Origen.³² Although Cyril continues by saying that Sabas expelled them from his company, asking the emperor also to expel them, and then returned to Palestine without them, it seems that the reality was somewhat different. Innocent of Maronea mentions as attending the discussions between the Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians in 532 a 'Leontius, a venerable monk and *apocrisarius* of the fathers assembled in the holy city'.³³ Four years later, at the discussions held in 536, a Leontius was again present, this time described as 'the superior and representative of all the desert'.³⁴ As the works attributed to the monk Leontius are directed primarily against the non-Chalcedonian theology of Severus of Antioch, and clearly demonstrate significant experience of debate with the non-Chalcedonians, it is virtually certain that he is to be identified with the Leontius who participated in these

²⁹ Daley, 'Leontius', p. xlvi; PG 86.1381a.

³⁰ See the passage PG 86A.1357c3–1360b5; the Greek text and a translation can also be found in Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*, 153 (trans.), 373 (text). See also the references given by Daley, 'Leontius', p. i.

³¹ Scribal notes to the tenth-century *Codex Vaticanus Gr.* 2195, on fol. 5, referring to Nonnus, and fol. 12, identifying the quotation in PG 86A.1285ab. These notes seem to have been copied along with the text from its source. See Daley, 'Origenism', 335.

³² Cyril of Scythopolis, *V. Sab.* 72.

³³ *ACO* 4.2, p. 170, line 5. Cf. Daley, 'Leontius', pp. xvi–xviii; Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors*, 252.

³⁴ *ACO* 3, pp. 37.1, 50.30, 145.34. Cf. Daley, 'Leontius', pp. xviii–xxi; Binns, *Ascetics and Ambassadors*, 252–3.

discussions in Constantinople during the 530s. Cyril himself is forced to admit that Leontius actually thrived in Constantinople, becoming friends with a certain 'father' (πάππας) Eusebius who had access to the palace and the emperor himself, and receiving his colleagues Domitian and Theodore Askidas, superiors of other monasteries in Palestine, who were then granted episcopal appointments.³⁵ We must conclude that Leontius arrived in Constantinople with Sabas not as part of his entourage but as the representative of the patriarchate of Jerusalem, and that far from being expelled and abandoned by Sabas and the emperor, he flourished in the capital. His stature grew from that of a simple 'monk' to a 'superior', even if he had no monastery over which he was the superior.

According to Cyril, it was soon after Leontius returned to Palestine that Gelasius, Sabas' second successor, began his campaign against 'Origenism'.³⁶ In 537 Gelasius had read out to his monks the work of Antipatrus against Origen. Riots erupted and some forty monks were expelled from the Great Laura, only to be received by Nonnus and Leontius into the New Laura. After a failed attempt to storm the Great Laura, Leontius appealed to 'father' Eusebius, who forced Gelasius either to receive back the protestors or to expel their opponents. Six anti-'Origenist' monks accepted voluntary exile; they went to Antioch to present their case to the patriarch Ephrem, who convoked his synod and issued an anathema against the doctrines of Origen. When Nonnus and his party heard of this they joined forces again with Leontius, who was now back in Constantinople, and together with Domitian and Theodore Askidas they pressed Peter of Jerusalem to drop Ephrem from the diptychs. Peter, however, commissioned Gelasius and Sophronius to compose a petition against the Origenists, which he then presented to the emperor, resulting in the imperial edict against Origenism published in Jerusalem in February 543. But by this time Leontius and 'father' Eusebius had died, and so it was left to Theodore Askidas to orchestrate a response, which came in the following year with the condemnation of the Three Chapters, an event passed over in silence by Cyril.

Placing Leontius' writings more specifically within this general framework is difficult. Given the claim made by Liberatus, Facundus, and Evagrius, that the condemnation of Theodore was

³⁵ *V. Sab.* 83.

³⁶ For what follows, see *V. Sab.* 84–6.

a retaliatory action for the edict against Origen, and also given the violent and personal tone of the work *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos*, it would make good sense to place this treatise at least, together with the common prologue to the three-part work, to the very last year of Leontius' life.³⁷ However, for it to be a retaliatory action implies that Theodore was indeed held in honour by his opponents, and this then suggests that Cyril's depiction of Sabas, in 530/1, as distancing himself from both Theodore and Origenism, betrays the hand of hagiography, retrospectively casting his hero in the mould of a 'neo-Chalcedonian' according to the standards of Orthodoxy after the council of 553.³⁸ In fact, a high respect for Theodore seems to have been endemic within Sabaite monasticism; even after the condemnation of the Three Chapters in 544/5, Gelasius was still willing to sign a petition protesting the condemnation of Theodore, an action that Cyril later presents him as regretting.³⁹

On the other hand, Leontius' work *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* is not an attempt to justify 'Origenism', and in fact lists Origen amongst the heretics.⁴⁰ It is clear that Leontius had read the writings of Evagrius, and also that there were indeed speculative thinkers in the Palestinian desert, such as Stephen Bar Sudaili, discussing ideas related to those condemned as 'Origenist'. But it remains the case that there is no trace of any such ideas in the writings of Leontius himself.⁴¹ There is, in fact, more evidence indicating that Sabas' followers and successors, and probably Sabas himself, were far more committed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, and openly so, than there is to conclude that Leontius ever adhered to 'Origenism'. Thus it is possible that the *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos* should be placed earlier, to the 530s, the time after Sabas broke with Leontius, and Leontius found himself in the capital, involved in discussions with

³⁷ So Daley, 'Leontius', pp. xxv, liii.

³⁸ For a full analysis of Cyril's work, its hagiographical rewriting of history, and the figures involved, see Hombergen, *Second Origenist Controversy*. Daley assumes that Sabas was a 'neo-Chalcedonian'. However, as Hombergen (*Second Origenist Controversy*, 198) observes: 'In this struggle we may well distinguish "Origenists" and "Antiochenes" as reciprocal enemies, but there is poor evidence for the existence of a third party of "Neochalcedonians" who, as the common opponents of the former two, rigidly lumped these two together.'

³⁹ *V. Sab.* 87. ⁴⁰ PG 86A.1377c.

⁴¹ That Leontius was no 'Origenist' was definitively established by Daley in his article 'Origenism'.

the non-Chalcedonians and trying to make sense of his own allegiances. This would more than account for the personal and violent tone of the work. In this case, then, it was Leontius, a former associate of those who promoted Theodore and Diodore, but now illumined by Nonnus and reading Evagrius, who, after his break with Sabas in Constantinople in 530/1, first attacked the theological allegiances of his former colleagues, so inciting, in return, Gelasius' campaign against 'Origenism', and all the intrigues that led to the condemnation of both.

Text

Brian E. Daley, S.J., 'Leontius of Byzantium: A Critical Edition of His Works, with Prolegomena,' D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University (1978).

Extracts LT 6, 30–6 note variations compared to the text provided by Justinian.

Fragments from Theodore

LT 1 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[b=C4T 30]

Εἰ γὰρ μάθωμεν ὅπως ἡ ἐνοίκησις γίνεται, εἰσόμεθα καὶ τὸν τρόπον καὶ τίς ἡ τοῦ τρόπου διαφορά. Τὴν τοίνυν ἐνοίκησιν οἱ μὲν οὐσία γεγενῆσθαι ἀπεφήναντο, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐνεργεία· ἐξεταζέσθω τοίνυν εἴ τι τούτων ἐστὶν ἀληθές. Καὶ πρότερον ἡμῖν ἐκεῖνο ὁμολογείσθω, πρότερον πᾶσι ἐνοικεῖ ἢ μὴ. Ἄλλ' ὅτι μὲν οὐ πᾶσι, δῆλον. Τοῦτο γὰρ ὡσπερ τι ἐξαίρετον τοῖς ἁγίοις ὁ Θεὸς ὑπισχνεῖται, ἢ ὅλως τούτοις οὐς ἀνακεῖσθαι αὐτῷ ἐθέλει· ἢ τί ποτε ἄρα ὑπισχνεῖτο λέγων τὸ ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν Θεός, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι λαός, ὡς τι χαριούμενος αὐτοῖς ἐξαίρετον, εἶπερ δὴ τούτου πάντες κοινῇ μετέχουσιν ἄνθρωποι; Οὐκοῦν εἰ μὴ πᾶσιν ἐνοικεῖ (τούτο γὰρ δῆλον), οὐ λέγω τοῖς οὐσι μόνον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀνθρώποις, ἰδιάζοντά τινα δεῖ εἶναι τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐνοικήσεως, καθ' ὃν ἐκεῖνοις πάρεστι μόνον οἷς ἂν ἐνοικεῖν λέγεται. Οὐσία μὲν οὖν λέγειν ἐνοικεῖν τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ἀπρεπεστάτων ἐστίν. Ἡ γὰρ ἀνάγκη τούτοις μόνοις τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ περικλείειν, οἷς ἂν ἐνοικεῖν λέγηται, καὶ ἔσται τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἐκτός, ὅπερ ἄτοπον εἶπεν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπείρου φύσεως τῆς ἀπανταχοῦ παρουσίας καὶ οὐδενὶ τόπῳ περιγραφομένης· ἢ λέγοντας ἀπανταχοῦ παρεῖναι τὸν Θεὸν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς οὐσίας, ἅπασιν αὐτοῦ μεταδιδόναι καὶ τῆς ἐνοικήσεως, οὐκέτι μόνον ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλόγοις ἤδη δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀψύχοις, εἶπερ οὐσία τὴν ἐνοίκησιν αὐτὸν ποιεῖσθαι φήσομεν. Ἀμφότερα δὲ ταῦτα ἀπρεπῆ δηλονότι· τό τε γὰρ ἅπασιν ἐνοικεῖν λέγω τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ἀτόπων ἄντικρυς ὁμολόγηται, καὶ τὸ τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτῷ περιγράφειν, ἀπρεπές, μᾶλλον δε δυσσεβές. Οὐκοῦν οὐσία τὴν ἐνοίκησιν λέγειν γίνεσθαι τῶν εὐθηεστάτων ἂν εἴη. Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ ἂν τις εἴποι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας. Ἡ γὰρ ἀνάγκη πάλιν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τούτοις περιγράφειν μόνοις· καὶ ποῦ στήσεται ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ πάντων προνοεῖν τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ἅπαντα διοικεῖν καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸν ἐνεργεῖν τὰ προσήκοντα; Ἡ πᾶσιν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐνεργείας

Fragments from Theodore

LT 1 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[b=C4T 30]

[a] If we can learn how the indwelling occurs, we will know both the mode and the distinction of the mode. Some declare that the indwelling occurred by essence, others by activity. Let there be, then, an investigation whether one of these is correct. First, let us agree on this, whether <God> dwells in everyone or not. But that he is not in everyone is evident. For God promises this, as something exceptional, for the saints or, generally, for those whom he wishes to be set apart for him, or why else then did he once promise, saying, ‘I will dwell in them and walk among them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people’ [2 Cor. 6:16; Lev. 26:11], as granting them something exceptional, if all human beings shared in this in common? Therefore, if he does not dwell in everyone (as is evident)—I do not only mean in <all> beings but not even in <all> human beings—there must be some particularizing principle of indwelling by which he is present only to those in whom he is said to indwell. To say God indwells by essence is most inappropriate. For either his essence would be restricted by necessity to those alone in whom he is said to indwell, and outside all others, which it is absurd to say of the infinite nature present everywhere and not circumscribed by any place; or else, saying that God is everywhere present by the principle of essence, all things would participate in his indwelling, not only human beings, but also animals and even lifeless things—if we say that it is by essence that he makes his indwelling. Both alternatives are clearly improper: for to say that God indwells in all things is acknowledged to be outright absurdity, and to circumscribe his essence is improper, or rather impious. Therefore, to say that the indwelling takes place by essence would be extremely silly. One could say the same thing regarding activity. Either, by necessity

μεταδιδόντες—ὅπερ οὖν πρόπον τε καὶ ἀκόλουθον· ἅπαντα γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δυναμοῦται πρὸς τὸ συνεστάναι τε ἕκαστον καὶ κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν ἐνεργεῖν—πᾶσιν αὐτὸν ἐνοικεῖν ἐροῦμεν. Οὐκοῦν οὔτε οὐσία λέγειν οὔτε μὴν ἐνεργεῖα οἶόν τε ποιεῖσθαι τὸν Θεὸν τὴν ἐνοίκησιν.

Τί οὖν ἄρα ὑπολείπεται; Τίνι χρησόμεθα λόγῳ ὃς ἐπὶ τούτων <τὸ> ἰδιάζον φανεῖται φυλαττόμενος; Δῆλον οὖν ὡς εὐδοκία λέγειν γίνεσθαι τὴν ἐνοίκησιν προσήκει· εὐδοκία δὲ λέγεται ἢ ἀρίστη καὶ καλλίστη θέλησις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ ἂν ποιήσῃται, ἀρεσθεῖς τοῖς ἀνακεῖσθαι αὐτῷ ἐσπουδακόσιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ εὖ καὶ καλὰ δοκεῖν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῶν—τούτου συνηθῶς ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς εἰλημμένου τε καὶ κειμένου παρ' αὐτῇ. Οὕτω γοῦν ὁ μακάριος Δαυὶδ φησιν· Οὐκ ἐν τῇ δυναστεία τοῦ ἵππου θελήσει, οὐδὲ ἐν ταῖς κνήμαις τοῦ ἀνδρὸς εὐδοκεῖ. Εὐδοκεῖ Κύριος ἐν τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐλπίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ—τούτο λέγων, ὅτι οὐχ ἑτέροις συμπράττειν δοκιμάζει οὐδὲ ἑτέροις συνεργεῖν ἐθέλει, ἀλλὰ τούτοις, φησὶν, τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν· τούτους ποιεῖται περὶ πολλοῦ, τούτοις συνεργεῖν καὶ ἐπαμύνειν αὐτῷ δοκητόν. Οὕτω τοίνυν καὶ λέγειν προσήκον τὴν ἐνοίκησιν. Ἄπειρος μὲν γὰρ ὢν καὶ ἀπερίγραφος τὴν φύσιν, πάρεστι τοῖς πᾶσιν· τῇ δὲ εὐδοκία, τῶν μὲν ἐστι μακράν, τῶν δὲ ἐγγύς. Κατὰ γὰρ ταύτην τὴν ἔννοιαν λέγεται τὸ ἐγγύς Κύριος τοῖς συντετριμμένοις τὴν καρδίαν, καὶ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς τῷ πνεύματι σώσει· καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ· μὴ ἀπορρίψῃς με ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον μὴ ἀντανέλῃς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. Ἐγγύς τε γὰρ γίνεται τῇ διαθέσει τῶν ἀξίων ταύτης τῆς ἐγγύτητος, καὶ πόρρωθεν πάλιν τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων γίνεται, οὔτε τῇ φύσει χωριζόμενος οὔτε ταύτη πλησιαίτερον καθιστάμενος, τῇ δὲ σχέσει τῆς γνώμης ἀμφότερα ἐργαζόμενος. Ὡσπερ τοίνυν τῇ εὐδοκία ἐγγύς τε καὶ μακράν γίνεται—πρόδηλον γὰρ ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ὅ τι ποτέ φάμεν τὴν εὐδοκίαν, τούτου γε ἕνεκεν καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν τῆς προσηγορίας μετὰ πάσης ἐπελθόντες τῆς ἀκριβείας—οὕτω τῇ εὐδοκία καὶ τὴν ἐνοίκησιν ἀποτελεῖ, οὐκ ἐν τούτοις μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν περιγράφων ἢ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν κεχωρισμένος, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι μὲν παρῶν τῇ οὐσίᾳ, κεχωρισμένος δὲ τῶν ἀναξίων τῇ σχέσει τῆς διαθέσεως.

again, his activity is restricted to those alone <in whom he dwells>, and <then> how will our account stand, that God foreknows everything and governs everything and works in all things that which is proper? Or else, with everything sharing in his activity—which is fitting and logical, for all things are empowered by him to exist and each is activated according to its proper nature—we would say that he indwells in all things. [b] Therefore we do not say that God makes his indwelling either by essence or by activity.

What, then, is left? What account shall we use which seems to preserve the particular <mode of indwelling> in these matters? It is clear that it is fitting to speak of the indwelling as occurring by 'good pleasure'. 'Good pleasure' means the best and noblest will of God, which he exercises when pleased with those who strive to devote themselves to him, from his good and excellent pleasure regarding them [c]—receiving this as the customary usage from Scripture and finding support from it. For thus the blessed David says: 'He does not will in the strength of the horse, nor does he find good pleasure in the legs of a man; but the Lord has good pleasure in those who fear him and in those who hope in his mercy' [Ps. 146:10–11], saying this, because <God> does not think fit to work together with others, nor does he will to cooperate with others, but with those, he says, who 'fear him'; these he regards highly, approved for him to cooperate with and to assist. In this way, then, it is proper to speak of 'indwelling'. For being infinite and boundless by nature, he is present to all; but by good pleasure he is far from some and near others. It is said, following this notion, 'the Lord is near to the broken-hearted and will save the humble in spirit' [Ps. 33:19]. And elsewhere, 'Do not cast me away from your presence and take not your Holy Spirit from me' [Ps. 50:13]. By disposition he is near to those who are worthy of such nearness, and is far, again, from sinners, neither separated by nature nor by nature being settled closer, but effecting both by a relationship of intention. In this way, then, by good pleasure he is both near and far—for it is clear from what has been said what we mean by good pleasure, treating, for this reason, the intent of the word with all accuracy: by good pleasure he perfects the indwelling, not circumscribing his essence or his activity in those <in whom he dwells>, remaining separated from the rest, but being present to all by essence, yet separated from the unworthy

Οὕτω γὰρ αὐτῷ μειζόνως τὸ ἀπερίγραφον σώζεται, ὅταν φαίνεται μὴ ὡς ἀνάγκη τῶν δουλεύων τῷ ἀπεριγράφῳ τῆς φύσεως. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀπανταχοῦ παρὼν τῇ οὐσίᾳ, παρῆν καὶ τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ, ἐτέρως πάλιν ἀνάγκη δουλεύων εὐρίσκετο, οὐκέτι κατὰ γνώμην τὴν παρουσίαν ποιούμενος ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀπείρῳ τῆς φύσεως, καὶ τὴν γνώμην ἐπομένην ἔχων· ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ ἅσασι πάρεστι τῇ φύσει καὶ κεχώρισται ὧν ἐθέλει τῇ γνώμῃ, οὐδὲν τῶν ἀναξίων ἀπὸ τοῦ παρεῖναι τὸν Θεὸν ὠφελουμένων, ἀληθὲς αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκέραιον τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀπερίγραφον διασώζεται. Οὕτω γοῦν τοῖς μὲν πάρεστι τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ, τῶν δὲ κεχώρισται, ὡσπερανεὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ τῶν λοιπῶν χωριζόμενος, τούτοις συνῆν.

Ὅνπερ τοίνυν τρόπον τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ ἢ ἐνοίκησις γίνεται, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἢ εὐδοκία καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐνοικήσεως τρόπον ἐναλλάττει. Ὅ γὰρ τὴν ἐνοίκησιν ἐργάζεται τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς οὐσίας ἀπανταχοῦ πάροντα, τισὶ καὶ σφόδρα εὐαριθμήτοις ἐκ τῶν ἀπάντων ἐνοικούντα γνωρίζει—ἢ εὐδοκία, λέγω—τούτο πάντως καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐνοικήσεως τρόπον χαρακτηρίζει. Ὅσπερ γὰρ πᾶσι τῇ οὐσίᾳ παρῶν, οὐ πᾶσιν ἐνοικεῖν λέγεται, ἀλλὰ τούτοις οἷς ἂν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ παρῆ, οὕτω καὶ ἐνοικεῖν λέγεται, οὐκ ἴσον τὸ τῆς ἐνοικήσεως πάντως εὐρίσκεται, ἀλλ' ἀκόλουθον ἔξει τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐνοικήσεως τρόπον. Ὅταν τοίνυν ἢ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἢ ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἢ ὄλως ἐν τοῖς δικαίοις ἐνοικεῖν λέγεται, ὡς ἐν δικαίοις εὐδοκῶν ποιεῖται τὴν ἐνοίκησιν, ὡς ἐναρέτοις κατὰ τὸν τρόπον ἀρεσκόμενος.

Ἐν αὐτῷ μέντοι τὴν ἐνοίκησιν οὐχ οὕτω φαμὲν γεγενῆσθαι—μὴ γὰρ ἂν τοσοῦτο μακροχρόνως ποτε—ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν νύκτι. Οὕτω γὰρ εὐδοκήσας ἐνώκησεν. Τί δέ ἐστι τὸ ὡς ἐν νύκτι; Ὅστε ἐνοικήσας ὄλον μὲν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λαμβανόμενον ἦνωσε, παρεσκεύασε δὲ αὐτὸν συμμετασχεῖν αὐτῷ πάσης τῆς τιμῆς ἧς αὐτὸς ὁ ἐνοικῶν, Υἱὸς ὧν φύσει, μετέχει, ὡς συντελεῖν μὲν εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον, κατὰ γε τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔνωσιν, πάσης δὲ αὐτῷ κοινωνεῖν τῆς ἀρχῆς, οὕτω δὲ πάντα κατεργάζεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς καὶ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς κρίσιν τε καὶ ἐξέτασιν, δι' αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, ἐπιτελεῖν, τῆς διαφοράς ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν φύσιν χαρακτηρίζουσι δηλονότι νοουμένης.

by a relationship of disposition. In this way then his boundlessness is better preserved, for it can be seen that the boundlessness of his nature is not subjected to some necessity. For if he were everywhere present by essence, and was everywhere by good pleasure, he would again in a different way be subject to necessity, no longer effecting his presence by his intention but by the infinity of <his> nature, and the intention would but follow. But since he is present to all by nature and separated from those he wishes by will, none of the unworthy benefit from the presence of God, and the boundlessness of nature is preserved true and intact for him. In this way, then, he is present to some by good pleasure, and separated from others, even though separated from the others, he is with them by essence.

Just as the indwelling takes place by good pleasure, in the same way the good pleasure varies the mode of indwelling. That which effects the indwelling of God, and which makes him known as everywhere present by the principle of essence, while indwelling—I mean by good pleasure—in an exceedingly small number of the total, this completely characterizes the mode of the indwelling. Just as he is present to all by essence, but is said to indwell not in all, but in those to whom he is present by good pleasure, so also, even if he is said to indwell, this indwelling is not found to be completely identical, but the mode of indwelling will be consequent upon his good pleasure. When, then, he is said to dwell in the prophets or in the apostles, or generally in the righteous, he accomplishes his indwelling as one who takes pleasure in the righteous, according to the mode of pleasure he has in the virtuous.

In him [i.e. Christ], on the other hand, we do not say that the indwelling took place in this way—let us never be so insane!—but ‘as in a son’ [cf. Heb. 1:2]. Being thus well pleased, he indwelt. What is this ‘as in a son’? It is this: indwelling, he united as a whole the one assumed to himself, and equipped him to share with himself all the honour in which he, the one indwelling, being Son by nature, participates, so as to bring about one *prosōpon*, according to the union with him, and to share with him all the dominion, and thus to effect everything in him, so that even the judgement and examination of all and his advent shall be completed through him, the natural characteristics clearly being borne in mind.

LT 2 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[b=BT 12; d=ST 4; f=BT 13]

Ὡσπερ τοίνην ἡμεῖς, εἰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι τελείως ἐσόμεθα τῷ Πνεύματι τό τε σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κυβερνώμενοι, ἀλλ' οὖν γε μερικὴν τινα ἐντεῦθεν ὥσπερ ἀπαρχὴν ἔχομεν, καθ' ὃ καὶ βοηθούμενοι τῷ Πνεύματι οὐχὶ κατακολουθεῖν τοῖς λογισμοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀναγκαζόμεθα, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Κύριος, εἰ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα παντελῶς ἔσχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ καθόλου τὸν Θεὸν ἐνεργοῦντα Λόγον, ἀχώριστον ἔχων πρὸς αὐτὸν πάσαν ἐνέργειαν, ἀλλ' οὖν γε καὶ πρὸ τούτου πλείστον ὅσον εἶχεν ἐπιτελοῦντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ πλείστα τῶν δεόντων, συγχωρούμενος μὲν τέως πρὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, διὰ τὴν χρεῖαν, οἰκεία προθέσει τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀρετὴν πληροῦν, παρορμώμενος δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τούτοις καὶ ῥωννύμενος πρὸς τὴν παντελεῖαν τῶν προσηκόντων ἐκπλήρωσιν. Ἔσχε μὲν γὰρ εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν μήτραν διαπλάσει, τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔνωσιν, ἐφ' ἡλικίας δὲ γεγονῶς καθ' ἣν ἡ διάκρισις ἐγγίνεσθαι πέφυκε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῶν τε καλῶν καὶ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων—μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἐκείνης—συντομώτερόν τε πολλῶ καὶ ταχύτερον τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν διακριτικὴν τῶν τοιούτων δύναμιν ἐπεδείξατο· ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐ πάσιν ὁμοίως κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ἢ τῆς διακρίσεως ἐγγίνεται δύναμις, τῶν μὲν ταχύτερον πλείονι τῇ φρονήσει τοῖς δέουσιν ἐπιβαλλόντων, τῶν δὲ πλείονι τῷ χρόνῳ τῇ γυμνασίᾳ τοῦτο προσκτωμένων. Ὅπερ δὴ ἐξαιρέτως αὐτῷ παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ὀξύτερον ἢ κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν ἡλικίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων προσγένονεν, εἰκότως καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἔχειν τι πλεόν ὀφείλοντι, ὅσω περ οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν φύσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐτέτεκτο ἐκ συνδυασμοῦ ἀνδρός τε καὶ γυναικός, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς θείας τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργείας διεπέπλαστο. Εἶχέ τε καὶ ῥοπήν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν πρὸς τὰ κρείττω τῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον ἐνώσει, ἧς καὶ ἠξίωτο κατὰ πρόγνωσιν, τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ἄνωθεν αὐτὸν ἐνώσαντος ἑαυτῷ. Οὕτω δὴ τούτων ἀπάντων ἔνεκεν εὐθὺς μετὰ τῆς διακρίσεως ἔσχε μὲν πολλὴν πρὸς τὸ κακὸν ἀπέχθειαν, ἀσχέτω δὲ στοργῇ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ἑαυτὸν συνάψας, ἀνάλογον δὲ τῇ οἰκείᾳ προθέσει καὶ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου συνεργίαν δεχόμενος, ἄτρεπτος λοιπὸν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον μεταβολῆς διετηρεῖτο· τοῦτο μὲν αὐτὸς οὕτως ἔχων γνώμης, τοῦτο δὲ τῆς προθέσεως οὕτω διατηρουμένης αὐτῷ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου συνεργίᾳ. Καὶ μετῆι μὲν σὺν εὐμαρείᾳ πλείστη ἐπ' ἀκριβεστάτην ἀρετὴν, εἴτε τὸν νόμον φυλάττων πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, εἴτε τὴν ἐν τῇ χάριτι μετιῶν πολιτείαν μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα· ἧς δὴ καὶ ἡμῖν τὸν τύπον παρείχετο, ὁδὸς τις ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τοῦτο καθιστάμενος. Οὕτω δὲ

LT 2 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[b=BT 12; d=ST 4; f=BT 13]

[a] Therefore, just even if in the future we will be perfectly governed by the Spirit in both body and soul, yet even now possess a certain partial first-fruits <of this>, by which we, being aided by the Spirit, are not compelled to succumb to the reasonings of the soul, [b] so also the Lord, while after these things [i.e. the saving economy] he completely had the God Word working entirely in himself, being inseparable from the Word in every activity, yet even before this he had as much as possible for completing in himself most of what was needed, being permitted, before the crucifixion, because it was needed, to fulfil by his own resolve the virtuous act for our sake, being urged on by him [i.e. the Word] and being strengthened by these things towards the perfect fulfilment of those things which were fitting. [c] For he had union with him [i.e. the Word] immediately from the beginning, in the formation in the womb; and when he arrived at the age at which there naturally comes to human beings the discernment between what is good and what is not such—or rather, even before this age—he demonstrated far more rapidly and acutely than other human beings the power to discern such things. Even among other human beings, this power of discernment does not arise in the same way and the same time in all; some, by greater intelligence, achieve what is needed more quickly, others acquire this only with greater time by training. This very thing came to him exceptionally in comparison with others and sooner than the usual age for human beings; he was naturally bound to have something extra in his human qualities [d] in as much as he was not born according to the common nature of human beings from the union of a male and female, but was fashioned by the divine activity of the Spirit. He had an uncommon inclination towards the nobler things because of the union with the God Word, of which he was deemed worthy by foreknowledge, when the God Word united him to himself from above. So, for all these reasons, he immediately possessed, together with discernment, a great hatred for evil and attaching himself to the good with an indissoluble affection, receiving cooperation from the God Word in proportion to his own purpose, [e] from that point on he was preserved immovably from change to the worse. On the one hand he held to this by his will, on the other hand this purpose was guarded in him by the cooperation of the God Word. He

λοιπὸν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν ἐπιδείξας ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας γνώμης τῆς ἐνώσεως ἄξιον, προσειληφῶς δὲ ταύτην καὶ πρὸ τούτου, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ διαπλάσει, τῇ τοῦ δεσπότου εὐδοκίᾳ, ἀκριβῆ λοιπὸν καὶ τῆς ἐνώσεως παρέχεται τὴν ἀπόδειξιν, οὐδεμίαν ἔχων κεχωρισμένην καὶ ἀποτεμημένην ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, ἔχων δὲ ἅπαντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ διαπραττόμενον τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἔνωσιν. Οὕτω γοῦν πρὸ μὲν τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ πεινῶντα ὀρώμεν, καὶ διψῶντα γνωρίζωμεν, καὶ δειλιῶντα μαθάνομεν, καὶ ἀγνοοῦντα εὐρίσκομεν, ἐπεὶ περ καὶ τὴν πρόθεσιν τῆς ἀρετῆς παρ' ἑαυτοῦ συνεισεφέρετο. Καὶ μάρτυς τῶν λεγομένων Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης, λέγων, Διότι πρὶν ἢ γινῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν, ἀπειθεὶ πονηρία τοῦ ἐκλέξασθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν· δηλονότι διακρίσει μισήσας μὲν ἐκείνο, τοῦτο δὲ ἀγαπήσας· διακρίσει γὰρ ἡ ἐκλογή πάντως τῇ πρὸς τὰ χεῖρω γίνεται. Πῶς οὖν πρὶν ἢ γινῶναι τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο διαπράττεται; Τουτέστι, πρὶν ἐπ' ἐκείνης γενέσθαι τῆς ἡλικίας ἐν ἣ σὺνηθες τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀνθρώποις ποιεῖσθαι τῶν πρακτέων τὴν διάκρισιν, ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ τι πλεόν καὶ ἐξαιρέτον παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους. Εἰ γὰρ ἔτι καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν εὐρίσκεται πολλάκις νήπια μὲν τὴν ἡλικίαν, πολλῆς δὲ συνέσεως ἐπίδειξιν παρεχόμενα, ὡς εἰς θαῦμα ἄγειν τοὺς ὀρώντας διὰ τὸ μείζονα τῆς ἡλικίας τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι φρόνησιν, πολλῶ δὴ πούθεν ἐκείνον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἅπαντας ὑπερβαίνειν ἐχρῆν τοὺς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπους.

LT 3 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[b=BT 14]

Ἰησοῦς δὲ προέκοπτεν ἡλικία καὶ σοφία καὶ χάριτι παρὰ τε Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις. Ἡλικία μὲν γὰρ προέκοπτε, τῶν χρόνων προβαιόντων· σοφία δέ, κατὰ τὴν τῶν χρόνων πρόοδον, τὴν σύνεσιν προσκτώμενος· χάριτι δέ, ἀκόλουθον τῇ συνέσει καὶ τῇ γνώσει τὴν ἀρετὴν μετιών, ἐξ ἧς ἡ παρὰ Θεῷ χάρις αὐτῷ τὴν προσθήκην ἐλάμβανεν· καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις προέκοπτε παρὰ τε Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις, τῶν μὲν ὀρώντων τὴν προκοπὴν, τοῦ δὲ οὐχ ὀρώντος μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιμαρτυροῦντος καὶ συνεργοῦντος τοῖς γινομένοις. Δῆλον δὲ ἄρα κάκεινο, ὡς τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀκριβέστερόν τε καὶ μετὰ πλείονος ἐπλήρου τῆς εὐχερείας ἢ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀνθρώποις ἦν δυνατὸν, ὅσω καὶ κατὰ πρόγνωσιν τοῦ

progressed with the utmost ease towards the highest peak of virtue, whether in keeping the law before his baptism, or in pursuing a pattern of life in grace after, of which he provides us with a type, becoming a kind of path for us in this. Then, later, after the resurrection and ascension into heaven, he showed himself worthy by his own will of that union—having received it even before this, in his very fashioning, by the good pleasure of the Lord—he finally provides an exact demonstration of the union, having no activity separated or cut off from the God Word, but having the God Word accomplishing everything in him by the union with himself. In this way, indeed, before the cross we see him hunger and know him thirsting and learn of him fearing and find him ignorant, since the inclination to virtue was contributed from himself. And Isaiah the prophet is a witness of what was said, saying [f], ‘For before the child knows good or bad, he refuses evil to choose the good’ [Isa. 7:16], clearly with discrimination hating the one, but loving the other, for the choice for what is worse at any rate occurs with discrimination. [g] How then ‘before the child knows’ is this brought about? It is that before that age came about in which it is customary for other human beings to discern between actions, he had something extra and exceptional compared to other human beings. For if even amongst us, children of that age are often found providing evidence of great conscientiousness, so as to lead onlookers to wonder because they manifest an innate intelligence greater than their age, by much more doubtless that man must have surpassed all human beings like him.

LT 3 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[b=BT 14]

[a] ‘And Jesus increased in age and wisdom and in grace before God and men’ [Luke 2:52]. He increased ‘in age’ as time moved on; and ‘in wisdom’, following the advance of time, acquiring understanding; but ‘in grace’ by pursuing the virtue which is consequent upon understanding and knowledge, by which the grace which was his from God received addition, and in all these ways he advanced ‘before God and men’, they observing this growth and he [i.e. God] not only seeing it, but also bearing witness to it and cooperating with that which took place. [b] Therefore it is clear that he fulfilled virtue more exactly and with greater ease than was possible for other human beings, as much as

ὁποῖός τις ἔσται, ἐνώσας αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ τῆς διαπλάσεως ἀρχῇ, μείζονα περιείχε τὴν παρ' ἑαυτοῦ συνεργίαν πρὸς τὴν τῶν δεόντων κατόρθωσιν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπάντων σωτηρίας τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν οἰκονομῶν, καὶ παρορμῶν μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ τελώτερα, ἐπικουφίζων δὲ αὐτῷ τῶν κόπων τὸ πλεόν, εἴτε τῶν κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν, εἴτε καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ οὕτως αὐτῷ μείζονά τε καὶ κουφοτέρην τῆς ἀρετῆς κατασκευάζων τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν.

LT 4 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[ab=ST 1; a=BT 15]

Ἦνωτο μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τῷ Θεῷ ὁ ληφθεὶς κατὰ πρόγνωσιν, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ διαπλάσει τῆς μήτρος τὴν καταρχὴν τῆς ἐνώσεως δεξιόμενος. Ἦδη δὲ τῆς ἐνώσεως ἠξιωμένος, ἀπάντων ἐτύγχανεν ὅσον εἰκὸς ἦν ἀνθρωπῶν τυχεῖν ἠνωμένον τῷ Μονογενεῖ καὶ τῶν ὄλων Δεσπότη, μειζόνων ἀξιούμενος παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ὅσῳπερ αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως ἐξαιρέτον συνέβαιεν. Ἠξιώθη γοῦν καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνοικήσεως πρῶτος παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἠξιώθη ταύτης οὐχ ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς· οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ὄλην τὴν χάριν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐδέξατο, ἑτέροις δὲ μερικὴν παρέιχε τοῦ παντός Πνεύματος τὴν μετουσίαν. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐνεργεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ ἅπαν τὸ Πνεῦμα συνέβαιεν· τὸ μὲν οὖν φθεγγόμενον, κατ' αὐτὴν τῆς φωνῆς τὴν προφοράν, ἀνθρωπος ἦν, ἡ δὲ γε τῶν λεγομένων δύναμις πολλή τις καὶ διάφορος.

LT 5 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8

Κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς. Ποίαν ταύτην; Τοῦ τῆς υἰοθεσίας μεταλαβεῖν. Ταύτην γὰρ ἔλαβεν αὐτὸς κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, βαπτισθεὶς πρότερον ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, ἔνθα δὴ καὶ προετυπούτο ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἡμέτερον βάπτισμα, ἢ τε γινομένη ἀναγέννησις ἐμαρτυρεῖτο τῇ πατρικῇ φωνῇ λέγοντος, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα. Καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα κατελθὼν ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καθὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τούτου μετέχειν ἐμέλλομεν· ὅπερ λοιπὸν ἐξαιρέτως αὐτῷ παρ' ἡμᾶς προσγένε, διὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον ἐνώσεως τούτων μετέχοντι ὧν ὁ κατὰ φύσιν Υἱός.

by the foreknowledge which he had of what kind of person he would be, the God Word, uniting him [i.e. Jesus] with himself from the very beginning of his fashioning, furnished him with a greater cooperation from himself for the accomplishment of what was necessary, arranging that which concerned him for the salvation of all, and urging him on towards a greater perfection while lightening for him the greater part of his toils, whether of the soul or of the body. And in this way he prepared him for a greater and easier fulfilment of virtue.

LT 4 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[ab=ST 1; a=BT 15]

[a] The one assumed according to foreknowledge was united from the very beginning to God, receiving the beginning of the union in his very fashioning in the womb. And since he had already been found worthy of the union, he obtained everything that it was proper to obtain for a human being [b] united to the Only-begotten and Master of the universe, and being found worthy of greater gifts than the rest, there came about the exceptional gift of the union. Indeed, he was found worthy of the indwelling of the Spirit first before other human beings, and worthy of it in a way not like the rest: he received the whole grace of the Spirit in himself, and furnished others with a partial participation in the whole Spirit. In this way the whole Spirit was active in him. [c] What then was spoken, in the utterance of the voice, was human, but the force of what was said was something great and different.

LT 5 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8

‘The glory which you have given me, I have given to them’ [John 17:22]. What kind is this <glory>? To participate in adoption. He received this according to his humanity, first being baptized in the Jordan, whence he also foreshadowed in himself our own baptism, which is rebirth, borne witness by the paternal voice, saying, ‘This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased’ [Matt. 3:17]. And having descended, the Spirit remained on him, just as we also in baptism come to participate in this; which very thing henceforth is exceptionally his compared to us, through union to the God Word by participating in those things which the Son is by nature.

LT 6 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8

[bc=C4T 29, JT 10; c=BT 17a, C6T 2; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 10^r]

Πανταχόθεν ἄρα δῆλον ὡς περιττὸν μὲν τὸ τῆς κράσεως καὶ ἀπρεπὲς καὶ ἀφαρμόζον, ἐκάστης τῶν φύσεων ἀδιαλύτως ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς μειάσης. Πρόδηλον δὲ ὡς τὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως ἐφαρμόζον· διὰ γὰρ ταύτης συναχθεῖσαι αἱ φύσεις ἐν πρόσωπον κατὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀπετέλεσαν. Ὡστε ὅπερ ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ τε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς φησιν, Ὡστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία, εἵπομεν ἂν καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰκότως κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐνώσεως λόγον, Ὡστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο πρόσωπα ἀλλ' ἓν, δηλονότι τῶν φύσεων διακεκριμένων· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖ οὐ λυμαίνεται τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῆς δυάδος τὸ μίαν λέγεσθαι τὴν σάρκα—πρόδηλον γὰρ καθ' ὃ μία λέγονται⁴²—οὕτω κἀνταῦθα οὐ λυμαίνεται τῇ τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾷ τοῦ προσώπου ἢ ἔνωσις. Ὅταν μὲν γὰρ τὰς φύσεις διακρίνωμεν, τελείαν τὴν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου φαμέν, καὶ τέλειον τὸ πρόσωπον—οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπρόσωπον ἔστιν ὑπόστασιν εἰπεῖν—τελείαν δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὁμοίως· ὅταν μέντοι ἐπὶ τὴν συνάφειαν ἀπίδωμεν,⁴³ ἐν πρόσωπον τότε φαμέν.

LT 7 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8

[=BT 17c]

Τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον κἀνταῦθα ἰδίαν φαμέν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου τὴν οὐσίαν, ἰδίαν δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· διακεκριμένοι γὰρ αἱ φύσεις, ἐν δὲ τὸ πρόσωπον τῇ ἐνώσει ἀποτελούμενον. Ὡστε κἀνταῦθα ὅταν μὲν τὰς φύσεις διακρίνειν πειρώμεθα, τέλειον τὸ πρόσωπον φαμέν εἶναι τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τέλειον δὲ καὶ τὸ τῆς θεότητος· ὅταν δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀποβλέψωμεν, τότε ἐν εἶναι τὸ πρόσωπον ἄμφω τὰς φύσεις κηρύττομεν συνημμένως, τῆς τε ἀνθρωπότητος τῇ θεότητι τὴν παρὰ τῆς κτίσεως τιμὴν δεχομένης, καὶ τῆς θεότητος ἐν αὐτῇ πάντα ἐπιτελοῦσης τὰ δέοντα.

⁴² λέγονται—JT 10 λέγεται

⁴³ ἀπίδωμεν—JT 10 ἰδωμεν

LT 6 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8

[bc=C4T 29, JT 10; c=BT 17a, C6T 2; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 10^r]

[a]Therefore it is clear that in every respect the concept of ‘mixture’ is especially improper and incongruous, for each of the natures remains indissolubly with regard to itself. [b] But it is manifest that the concept of ‘union’ is congruous, for by it the natures, being brought together, bring about one *prosōpon* according to the union. [c] Therefore the very thing which the Lord said regarding the man and the woman, ‘so they are no longer two, but one flesh’ [Matt. 19:6], we also may reasonably say, with regard to the principle of union <in Christ>, ‘so they are no longer two *prosōpa* but one’, with the natures being clearly distinguished. For just as there [i.e. in marriage], the mention of ‘the one flesh’ is not harmed by the duality—for it is clear with respect to what ‘one’ is said—so also here, the unity of *prosōpon* is not harmed by the difference of natures. For when we distinguish the natures, we speak of the nature of the God Word as complete and the *prosōpon* as complete—for one does not speak of a *hypostasis* without a *prosōpon*—and the nature of the man as complete, and the *prosōpon* likewise. But when we consider the conjunction, then we speak of one *prosōpon*.

LT 7 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8

[=BT 17c]

In the same way also here, we say that the essence of the God Word is his own, and that of the man is his own, for the natures are distinguished, but the *prosōpon* brought about by the union is one. In this way, also here, when we try to distinguish the natures, we say the *prosōpon* of the man is complete, and that of the divinity is complete; but when we consider the union, then we proclaim that both natures are one *prosōpon* conjointly,⁴⁴ the humanity receiving, by the divinity, honour from <all> creation and the divinity bringing to completion in the humanity everything that is wanting.

⁴⁴ BT 17 takes the adverb with the following clause: ‘humanity with divinity unitedly’.

LT 8 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 9

Ἐνταῦθα τοίνυν τὸ ἐγένετο οὐδαμῶς ἐτέρως λέγεσθαι δυνάμενον εὐρήκαμεν ἢ κατὰ τὸ δοκεῖν ὃ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου δι' ἐτέρων, ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω ἀκριβέστερον ἐδιδάξαμεν. Τὸ γὰρ δοκεῖν ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο· τὸ δὲ δοκεῖν, οὐ κατὰ τὸ μὴ εἰληφέναι σάρκα ἀληθῆ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μὴ γεγενῆσθαι. Ὅταν μὲν γὰρ ἔλαβεν λέγη, οὐ κατὰ τὸ δοκεῖν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ἀληθὲς λέγει· ὅταν δὲ ἐγένετο, τότε κατὰ τὸ δοκεῖν· οὐ γὰρ μετεποιήθη εἰς σάρκα. Προσεκτέον οὖν τὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ· οὕτω γὰρ γνωσόμεθα τοῦ λεγομένου τὴν δύναμιν.

LT 9 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 9

Ὅπερ γὰρ ἐφ' ἡμῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐν τόπῳ λέγεται σχέσιν, τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὴν τῆς γνώμης. Ὡς γὰρ φαμεν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐν τῷδε γέγονα τῷ τόπῳ, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ Θεοῦ ὅτι γέγονεν ἐν τῷδε· ἐπειδὴ ὅπερ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἢ μετάβασις ἐργάζεται, τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ γνώμη, ἀπανταχοῦ τῇ φύσει τυγχάνοντος.

LT 10 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 10

Ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. Καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνία ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Οὐκοῦν τὸν μὲν ἀγῶνα, καὶ τοῦτον οὐ τὸν τυχόντα, φανερώς ὑπομεμενηκότα τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων μανθάνομεν.

LT 11 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 10

Ποίαν δὲ καὶ ἔξει ἀκολουθίαν τὸ λεγόμενον ὃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, καὶ ὃ ὦν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ; Ἀναιρείται γὰρ θατέρῳ τὸ ἕτερον, τὸ μὲν καταβεβηκέναι ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τῷ εἶναι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, τὸ δὲ εἶναι τῷ καταβεβηκέναι. Ἀλλὰ καταβέβηκε μὲν τῇ εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐνοικίσει· ἔστι δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ τῷ ἀπεριγράφῳ τῆς φύσεως πᾶσι παρών.

LT 8 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 9

In this way we have found that ‘he became’ can in no way be said otherwise than according to <what is meant by> ‘to appear’, which indeed is what is said in the divine Scripture, and especially by other <writers> regarding the Lord, in the things we have most accurately taught above. ‘The Word became flesh’ [John 1:14] <means> ‘to appear’: ‘to appear’, not because he did not take real flesh, but because he did not become such. For when ‘he took’ is said [Phil. 2:7], it is not <in the sense of> ‘to appear’ but said in truth; but when ‘he became’ is said, then it <should be understood as> ‘to appear’, for he was not changed into flesh. One must thus acquire the mind of the evangelist, for in this way we will know the intent of what is said.

LT 9 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 9

For what with us is said according to the relationship of place, is said of God with respect to the relationship of intention. As we say of ourselves that ‘I was in this place’, so we also say of God that he was in this place, since what movement brings about with us, this is effected by intention with God, who is by nature everywhere present.

LT 10 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 10

‘And there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him. And being in agony he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling down upon the ground’ [Luke 22:43–4]. From what is said, then, we do not learn that the contest never happened, <but> clearly that Christ remained steadfast.

LT 11 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 10

What kind of consistency does what is said have, that ‘he descended from heaven’ [John 3:13] and ‘he is in heaven’? For the one contradicts the other: that he descended from heaven by his being in heaven; his being <there> by his descending. It is, instead, that he descended, on the one hand, by his dwelling in the man; and on the other, he is in heaven, yet present to all by the boundlessness of his nature.

LT 12 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 10

[=C5T 1b]

Σκοπῶμεν τοίνυν τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος περὶ οὗ ἐκπλήττεται καὶ θαυμάζει ὁ προφήτης, ὅτι δὴ ὁ Μονογενῆς κατηξίωσεν αὐτοῦ μνησθῆναι τε καὶ ἐπισκοπῆν ποιήσασθαι. Ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν οὐ <περὶ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου> εἴρηται, ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω δέδεικται· ὅτι δὲ οὐδὲ περὶ ἑνὸς τινος τῶν τυχόντων, καὶ τοῦτο εἶδηλον. Ἵνα δὲ ἅπαντα παριῶμεν, τὸ πάντων ἀξιοπιστότερον, τὴν ἀποστολικὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἐκδεξώμεθα.

LT 13 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ εἶπεν ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ, ἀλλ' ἐν υἱῷ, ὃ δὴ καὶ λεγόμενον ἀπολύτως ἀμφότερα κατὰ ταῦτόν σημαίνειν ἡδύνατο, πρωτοτύπως μὲν σημαίνειν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Υἱόν—ἀληθῆ δὲ Υἱὸν λέγω τὸν τῇ φυσικῇ γεννήσει τὴν υἰότητα κεκτημένον—ἐπομένως δὲ συνεπιδεχόμενον τῇ σημασίᾳ καὶ τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν τῆς ἀξίας μετέχοντα τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐνώσει.

LT 14 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

[ab=C5T 2; a=C4T 48]

Ἄρα παύσονται λοιπὸν τῆς ἀναισχύντου μάχης, ἀποστήσοντα δὲ τῆς ματαίας φιλονεικίας, αἰδεσθέντες τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ προφανές; Πολλοὺς γὰρ, φησὶν, υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα. Ἰδοὺ τοίνυν ἐν τῷ τῆς υἰότητος λόγῳ καὶ συγκατατάπτων ὁ ἀπόστολος φαίνεται τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον τοῖς πολλοῖς, οὐ <καθ' ὃ> καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἐκείνοις τῆς υἰότητος μετέχων, ἀλλὰ {καθ' ὁμοίωσιν} καθ' ὃ χάριτι προσείληφε τὴν υἰότητα, τῆς θεότητος μόνης τὴν φυσικὴν υἰότητα κεκτημένης. Πρόδηλον γὰρ ἐκεῖνο, ὡς τῆς υἰότητος αὐτῷ παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους πρόσεστι τὸ ἐξαιρέτον, τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐνώσει· ὅθεν καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ Υἱοῦ φωνῇ συνεπινοουμένως παραλαμβάνεται. Ἀλλὰ λογοποιοῦνται πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὅτι εἰ δύο τέλεια φάσκομεν, πάντως δύο καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς ἐροῦμεν. Ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ καὶ Υἱὸς εἴρηται ἐν τῇ γραφῇ καθ' αὐτό, τῆς θεότητος ὑπεξηρημένης, τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀνθρώποις συντεταγμένος, καὶ οὐκ ἤδη δύο φαμέν τοὺς υἱοὺς. Εἰς δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ὁμολογεῖται δικαίως, ἐπέπερ ἡ τῶν φύσεων διαίρεσις ἀναγκαίως ὀφείλει διαμένειν, καὶ ἡ τοῦ προσώπου ἕνωσις ἀδιάσπαστος φυλάττεσθαι. Καὶ εἰρηκῶς πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, ἐπάγει τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας

LT 12 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 10
[=C5T 1b]

Let us consider then who the man is about whom the prophet is astonished and amazed that the Only-begotten deigned to remember and visit him [cf. Ps. 8:5]. But that it is not said of every human being has been shown above; that it is neither about any one in general who exists, this too is certain. That we might omit everything else, let us take the apostolic witness, which is more trustworthy than everything.

LT 13 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

For this reason he did not say, ‘he spoke to us in the Son’, but ‘in a son’ [Heb. 1:2], which indeed being stated absolutely is capable of signifying both things by the same expression, primarily indicating the true Son—by ‘true Son’ I mean the one possessing sonship by a natural birth—and subsequently co-signifying by the expression the one participating in reality in the honour <of sonship> by the union with him.

LT 14 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12
[ab=C5T 2; a=C4T 48]

[a] Will they henceforth cease from their impudent war, giving over vain contention, shamed by the clarity of what has been said? For it says ‘leading many sons into glory’ [Heb. 2:10]. Notice, then, how the Apostle classifies, by the principle of sonship, the man assumed along with the many, not <because> he participates in sonship in a similar manner to them, but {according to likeness}⁴⁵ because by grace he assumed sonship, divinity alone possessing natural sonship. [b] It is certain that the exceptional note of sonship is his, beyond other human beings, by the union with him [i.e. the Word]; whence also he is conceptually included in the word ‘Son’. But, they argue against us: if you say ‘two complete things’, we will certainly also say ‘two sons’. But, note, in Scripture he is called ‘son’ by itself, being classified with other men without reference to the divinity, and we do not now say ‘two sons’. But one Son is rightly confessed, since it is necessary that the division of natures remain, and the union of the *prosōpon* be preserved indivisible. [c] Saying ‘leading many sons into glory’, it adds, ‘the

⁴⁵ Daley would omit the words in { }, and add those in <> a little earlier.

αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι. Ὅρατε πῶς φανερώς τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον φησὶ διὰ παθημάτων τετελειωκέναι τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον, ὃν καὶ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας ἐκάλεσεν, ὡς αὐτόν τε πρῶτον ταύτης ἀξιωθέντα καὶ ἑτέροις αἴτιον καταστάνατα.

LT 15 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

Ἄπασι γὰρ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις, κατὰ τὴν ἐξήγησιν, τὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τιθέντες ὄνομα διατελοῦσιν· ἀνθρωπινωτέρων γὰρ ὄντων τῶν λεγομένων ἐδικαίουν ταύτη κεχρηῆσθαι τῇ φωνῇ, ἥντινα καὶ εἶναι αὐτῷ τὴν προσηγορίαν συνέβαιεν· καὶ ὅτι τὸ Ἰησοῦς ὄνομα τοῦ ἀναληφθέντος ἦν προσηγορία, ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸ Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, ἢ εἴ τι τοιοῦτο λεγόμενον, οὕτω τε ἐπικληθὲν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν τὴν ἐκ Μαρίας < . . . >

LT 16 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

[=C4T 49]

Ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοῦτό φασιν ὅτι τὸ Ἰησοῦς ὄνομα σωτήρα σημαίνει· σωτήρ δέ, φασί, πῶς ἂν ὁ ἄνθρωπος λέγοιτο; Ἐπιλελησμένοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐλέγετο καὶ ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ· καὶ τὸ δὴ θαυμαστόν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τινος οὕτω κληθεὶς συντυχίας ἐν τῇ γεννήσει, ἀλλὰ μετονομασθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Μωϋσέως. Δῆλον δέ ὡς οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸ θεῖναι ἀπ' ἀνθρώπου ἠνέσχετο, εἴπερ θείας ἦν πάντως φύσεως σημαντικόν.

LT 17 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

[=C5T 5a]

Πολυμερώς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ. Φανερώς γὰρ ἐνταῦθα ἐν υἱῷ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ λέγων δείκνυται.

LT 18 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

[=C4T 50]

< . . . > ὥστε οὐ μόνον Υἱὸν αὐτὸν ἀποκαλεῖ, τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ἀφορίσας, ἀλλὰ καὶ συντάττων κατὰ τὸν τῆς υἰότητος λόγον τοῖς λοιποῖς μετεσχηκόσι τῆς υἰότητος ἐλέγχεται· ἐπεὶπερ χάριτι καὶ αὐτὸς μετέσχηκε τῆς υἰότητος, οὐ φυσικῶς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς

pioneer of their salvation was made perfect through suffering' [Heb. 2:10]. Behold how clearly it says the God Word perfected 'through suffering' the assumed man, whom he also calls 'the pioneer of salvation', as he was first counted worthy of this and became the cause of it for others.

LT 15 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

For all who are such, according to the explanation, they continue using the word 'son'; while on a more human level of speaking they think it right to use the word which happens to be their name. And because the word 'Jesus' was the name of the one assumed, just as 'Peter' and 'Paul' were for the apostles, or some such thing being said, then he was called by this after the birth from Mary <...>

LT 16 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

[=C4T 49]

But, against this they say that the word 'Jesus' means 'Saviour'; and how, they say, could a man be called 'Saviour'? They have forgotten that the <son> of Nun was called 'Jesus' [i.e. Joshua], and, what is indeed surprising, that he was not called thus from some accidental circumstance at birth, but by a change of name made by Moses [cf. Num. 13:16]. It is clear that he would not have permitted this name to be given to a human being if it were only indicative of divine nature.

LT 17 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

[=C5T 5a]

'In many and various ways God spoke of old to the fathers in the prophets, but in these last days he spoke to us in a son' [Heb. 1:2]. It is thus clearly shown from this that 'in a son' means 'a man'.

LT 18 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

[=C4T 50]

<...> so that he [i.e. Paul] not only calls him [i.e. Jesus] 'Son', distinguishing him from the God Word, but he is also proved to classify him, according to the principle of sonship, with others who share in sonship, since by grace he himself shared in sonship, not being begotten naturally from the Father, but having, however,

γεγεννημένος, ἔχων μέντοι παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς τὴν ὑπεροχὴν, ὅτι τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐνώσει κέκτηται τὴν υἰότητα, ὃ δὴ κυριωτέραν αὐτῷ τοῦ πράγματος χαρίζεται τὴν μετουσίαν.

LT 19 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

<...> καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. Οὗτος ἔσται μέγας, καὶ Υἱὸς Ὑψίστου κληθήσεται. Ἰδοὺ τοίνυν ὅπως τὸν ἐκ Μαρίας εὐαγγελιζόμενος τοκετόν, τὸν κατὰ σάρκα λέγω, Ἰησοῦν μὲν αὐτὸν κληθῆναι κελεύει, Υἱὸν δὲ Ὑψίστου κληθήσεσθαι προαγορεύει· εἰκότως τὸ μὲν τεθῆναι κελεύων ὡς προσηγορίαν τοῦ τικτομένου, τὸ δὲ κληθήσεσθαι προαγορεύων, ἐπειδὴ τιμῆς ἦν σύμβολον τὸ ὄνομα, ἦν ἐξῆς ἐβεβαίου τοῦ πράγματος ἡ μετουσία.

LT 20 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

Δῆλον δὲ ὅτι περ ἐν τῇ τῶν φύσεων διακρίσει πάντως ἡμῖν ἐπιτετήρηται τὸ εἰδέναι ὡς ὁ μὲν Θεὸς Λόγος κατὰ τὴν φυσικὴν γέννησιν Υἱὸς εἶναι λέγεται, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος πολλῶ γε μείζονος οὐσης ἢ κατ' αὐτὸν τοῦ Υἱοῦ τῆς ἀξίας ἀπολαύειν, διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνον συνάφειαν.

LT 21 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

[=C4T 55b; cf. *Cod Add.* 14669, fol. 17^v, col. 2]

<...> ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν Πνεύματι· δεδικαιῶσθαι ἐν Πνεύματι λέγων αὐτόν, εἴτε ὡς πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης ἀκριβείας τὸν νόμον φυλάξαντα, εἴτε ὡς καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνο τὴν τῆς χάριτος πολιτείαν, τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος συνεργίᾳ, μετὰ πολλῆς πληροῦντα τῆς ἀκριβείας.

LT 22 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

Οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰρημένον, ὅτι ἐγὼ χρεῖαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σου βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς με;—οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀναιρήσει τὸ τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι τὸν βαπτιζόμενον. Ἀρμόσει γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος λόγον, ἐπέειπε κατὰ τε αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρετὴν πολλὴν εἶχε τὴν ὑπεροχὴν πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐνοικοῦσαν αὐτῷ τῆς θεότητος φύσιν οὐχ ὑπὲρ Ἰωάννην μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ἥδη δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὴν κτίσιν ἔχων τὸ ἀξίωμα δικαίως ἐγνωρίζετο.

pre-eminence over the others because he possesses sonship through union with him [i.e. the Word], who grants to him a superior participation in the reality.

LT 19 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

‘And you shall call his name Jesus. He will be great, and will be called Son of the Most High’ [Luke 1:31]. Note, then, how he preaches as good news the one born from Mary, the one in the flesh, I mean: he commands that he be called ‘Jesus’, but foretells that he will be called ‘Son of the Most High’; he rightly orders what will be given as the name of the one born, but foretells what he will be called, since the name is a symbol of the honour which thereafter participation in the reality would confirm.

LT 20 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

It is clear that it is altogether incumbent upon us to know that, in the division of natures, the God Word is said to be Son by virtue of the natural birth, but the man, being far greater indeed than what he is in himself, is said to enjoy the dignity of being Son through the conjunction with that one.

LT 21 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

[=C4T 55b; cf. *Cod Add.* 14669, fol. 17^v, col. 2]

‘<. . . he> who was manifested in the flesh was made righteous in the Spirit’ [1 Tim. 3:16]; saying he was made righteous in the Spirit, either because before baptism he kept the law with befitting accuracy, or because even after it he fulfilled, by the cooperation of the Spirit, a life of grace with great accuracy.

LT 22 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

For neither what is said by John to him, that ‘I have need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?’ [Matt. 3:14]—neither will this annul that the one being baptized was human. For it is appropriate for him, even according to the definition of humanity, seeing that according to it he had great virtue, surpassing John, and, by the indwelling of nature of divinity in him he is rightly acknowledged to possess the dignity not only beyond John, but beyond all human beings, and beyond creation.

LT 23 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

Διόπερ καὶ ὁ Κύριος, βουλόμενος ἐν τῇ χρεία τῆς τροφῆς τό τε καρτερικὸν καὶ ἐμφιλόσοφον ἐπιδείξασθαι, τοῦτο μὲν γενέσθαι οὐκ αἰτεῖ. δεικνὺς δὲ ὅτι ἔλαττον αὐτῷ μέλει τῆς τροφῆς καὶ προτιμότερον αὐτῷ τῆς ἀρετῆς οὐδέν, φησὶν πρὸς αὐτόν· οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτω μόνῳ ζήσεται ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος Θεοῦ.

LT 24 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

Τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ διάβολος ἐσπούδασε, πείσαι μὲν αὐτόν ὡς οὐδαμῶς αὐτοῦ φροντὶς τῷ Θεῷ· διὸ καὶ ἔλεγεν, *Εἰ Υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ποιήσον τόδε, τουτέστιν ἔργῳ δεῖξον ὅτι μέλει σου τῷ Θεῷ*. Αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπισχνεῖτο μεγάλα, ὡς δι' ἐκείνου μὲν ἀποστήσων τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ δὲ τῶν ὑποσχέσεων οἰκειώσων ἑαυτῷ. Καὶ τῇ μὲν προτέρᾳ πείρᾳ τὸν ἄρτον προβάλλεται, τῇ ἡδονῇ γαργαλίζων ἐπὶ τὴν πείραν ἔλθειν.

LT 25 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

Διόπερ ὁ Κύριος, ἐν τοῖς τρίσιν ἡττήσας αὐτόν, ἡμῖν τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ νίκην ἐχαρίσατο. Οὐκ αἰτήσας μὲν γὰρ τὸ τὸν ἄρτον γενέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔδειξεν ἑαυτὸν ἡδονῆς κρατοῦντα· μὴ βαλὼν δὲ ἑαυτὸν κάτω, δόξης ὑπερείδε, πείσας ἅπαντας ὡς οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ ταύτης· διὰ δὲ τοῦ τρίτου κρατήσας τῶν τοῦ κόσμου ἀγαθῶν, ἔδειξεν ἑαυτὸν οὐδενὶ τούτων ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἡττώμενον.

LT 26 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 14

Ἐντεῦθεν οὖν καὶ τοσαύτη γέγονε περὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἡ τιμὴ, καταξιωθέντα θείας ἐνοικήσεως, τοῦ τε καθῆσθαι ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι παρὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ὁ Θεὸς οὕτως ἀπλῶς καὶ ἄνευ τινὸς χρησίμου λόγου ἄνθρωπον μὲν ἀνελάμβανε καὶ ἡῶν πρὸς ἑαυτόν, προσκυνεῖσθαι παρὰ τῆς κτίσεως παρασκευάζων ἀπάσης, τὰς δὲ γε νοητὰς φύσεις προσκυνεῖν ἐδικαίου, εἰ μὴ τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν γεγονότα κοινῇ πάσης ἦν εὐεργεσία τῆς κτίσεως.

LT 23 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

Therefore the Lord, wishing to demonstrate the masterly and philosophical manner of using of food, does ask for this to be, but shows that he cares less for food and that nothing is more important to him than virtues, says to him, ‘man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes out of the mouth of God’ [Matt. 4:4].

LT 24 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

The devil endeavoured to persuade him that God has no care for him whatsoever; therefore he said, ‘If you are the Son of God, do this’, that is, ‘show by deed that God cares for you’ [cf. Matt. 4:6]. He undertook great things: through that one [i.e. the first temptation], putting God aside, and through the promises, appropriating <what is God’s> to himself. In the first temptation he offers bread, by pleasure enticing him to come unto temptation.

LT 25 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

Defeating him in the three <temptations>, the Lord bestowed upon us the victory against him. Not asking God that <the stones> become bread, he showed himself to be stronger than pleasure; not throwing himself down, he despised glory, convincing all that he does not care for this; by the third, being stronger than worldly goods, he showed himself yielding to none of these beyond piety.

LT 26 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 14

Whence, then, there was such honour for the man, deemed worthy of divine indwelling, to be seated at the right hand of the Father and to be adored by all creation. God did not simply and without useful purpose assume a man and unite <him> to himself, preparing <him> to be adored by all creation, <and> deem it right for intellectual natures to adore <him>, unless what happened with him was a common benefit to all creation.

LT 27 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 14

[=C4T 56]

Ταῦτό δὴ τοῦτο φήσομεν δικαίως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὅτιπερ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἐπιστάμενος αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρετὴν, καὶ δὴ κατὰ πρόγνωσιν εὐθὺς ἄνωθεν, ἐν τῇ τῆς διαπλάσεως ἀρχῇ, ἐνοικῆσαί τε εὐδοκήσας καὶ ἐνώσας αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ τῇ σχέσει τῆς γνώμης, μείζονά τινα παρείχεν αὐτῷ τὴν χάριν, ὡς τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν χάριτος εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐξῆς διαδοθησομένης ἀνθρώπους. Ὅθεν καὶ τὴν περὶ τὰ καλὰ πρόθεσιν ἀκέραιον αὐτῷ διεφύλαττεν. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο φήσομεν, ὅτιπερ ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρόθεσιν εἶχεν οὐδεμίαν, ἀλλ' ὅτι προὔθεθείτο μὲν αὐτῷ τὸ καλόν, μᾶλλον δὲ πλείστη αὐτῷ τις κατὰ πρόθεσιν προσῆν ἢ τε τοῦ καλοῦ στοργὴ καὶ τὸ τοῦ ἐναντίου μῖσος· διεφυλάττετο δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς προθέσεως ἀκέραια ὑπὸ τῆς θείας χάριτος ἄνωθεν, τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁποῖός τις ἔσται ἀκριβῶς ἐπισταμένους, καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὴν τούτου βεβαίωσιν πολλὴν αὐτοῦ παρέχοντος τῇ οἰκειᾷ ἐνοικῆσαι τὴν συνεργίαν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπάντων ἡμῶν σωτηρίας. Ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἀδικίας εἶποι τις ἂν εἶναι τὸ παρὰ πάντος ἐξαίρετόν τι παρεσχῆσθαι τῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ληφθέντι ἀνθρώπῳ.

LT 28 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 15

[=ST 2; C4T 45; C5T 3b]

Ὅταν τοίνυν ἐρωτῶσιν, ἀνθρωποτόκος ἢ θεοτόκος ἡ Μαρία; λεγέσθω παρ' ἡμῶν, ἀμφότερα—τὸ μὲν τῇ φύσει τοῦ πράγματος, τὸ δὲ τῇ ἀναφορᾷ. Ἀνθρωποτόκος μὲν γὰρ τῇ φύσει, ἐπεὶπερ ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁ ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τῆς Μαρίας, ὃς καὶ προῆλθεν ἐκείθεν· θεοτόκος δὲ, ἐπεὶπερ Θεὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ τεχθέντι ἀνθρώπῳ, οὐκ ἐν αὐτῷ περιγραφόμενος κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ ὢν κατὰ τὴν σχέσιν τῆς γνώμης.

LT 29 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 15

[=C4T 27a]

Πλέον γὰρ ὠχλείτο ὁ Κύριος καὶ ἠγωνίζετο πρὸς τὰ ψυχικὰ πάθη ὑπὲρ τὰ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ τῷ κρείττονι λογισμῷ τὰς ἡδονὰς ἐχειροῦτο, τῆς θεότητος δηλαδὴ μεσιτευούσης καὶ βοηθοῦσης αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν κατόρθωσιν.

LT 27 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 14
[=C4T 56]

We shall rightly say the same thing regarding the Lord, that the God Word, knowing his virtue, even indeed by foreknowledge immediately from the beginning, at the initial moment of his formation [i.e. in the womb], being well pleased to indwell <in him>, and having united him to himself by a relationship of intention, gave him a certain greater grace, as the grace given to him was going to be passed on to all subsequent human beings. Whence also he preserved intact his choice for the good. For we will not say that the man had no choice, but that the good was set before him, or rather that by choice he had a great affection for the good and hatred of its opposite; the integrity of his choice was preserved by divine grace from the beginning, God accurately knowing what kind of person he would be, and for the confirmation of this he gave him, by his own indwelling, a greater cooperation for the salvation of us all. Therefore, no one could claim that it was unjust that the man assumed by the Lord should receive something exceptional, beyond all <others>.

LT 28 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 15
[=ST 2; C4T 45; C5T 3b]

When, then, they ask, 'Is Mary a mother of man or mother of God?' let us say: 'Both'—the one by the nature of the case, the other by transference.⁴⁶ 'Mother of man' by nature, since the one in the womb of Mary was a man, who also came out from there; 'Mother of God' since God was in the man born, not circumscribed in him by nature, but being in him by the relationship of intention.

LT 29 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 15
[=C4T 27a]

The Lord was more troubled by and struggled with the passions of the soul than those of the body, and he subdued the pleasures with his stronger reasoning power, clearly with the divinity mediating and aiding him towards the successful accomplishment.

⁴⁶ C4T 45, C5T 3: 'relatione'

LT 30 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 4

[=JT 1]

Δεδωκέναί σοί τινας τῶν ἡμετέρων εἶπας τὰ οὐκ ἂν⁴⁷ δοθέντα παρά τινος τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀντέχεσθαι δόξης ἐσπουδακότων. Ἐπυθανόμεθα γάρ εἰ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον ὁμολογοῦσιν ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι, ἢ πῶς⁴⁸ ἐπήγαγες, ἐδίδοσαν. Καὶ τίς ἂν ἔχων νοῦν ἄνθρωπον εἴποι τὸν Θεὸν γεγενῆσθαι Λόγον, ὡς ὑμεῖς φατε, εἰ μὴ ἄρα τὴν αὐτὴν ὑμῖν πρότερον νοσήσειεν ἄνοια; Ἡμεῖς γὰρ εἰληφέναι μὲν⁴⁹ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον καὶ σφόδρα φαμέν, γεγενῆσθαι δὲ ἄνθρωπον, καθ' ὑμᾶς, οὐκ ἂν ποτε εἰπεῖν ἀνασχοίμεθα.

LT 31 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 3

[=C4T 10, JT 2]

Ἐγὼ μὲν, ὃν ὁράτε, δύναμαι μὲν ποιεῖν οὐδὲν κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν, ἄτε ἄνθρωπος ὢν ἐργάζομαι δὲ, ἐπειδὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ὁ Πατὴρ ἅπαντα ποιεῖ. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐγὼ τε, φησὶν, ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί, Θεὸς δὲ Λόγος ἐν ἐμοί, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Μονογενῆς, δηλονότι⁵⁰ καὶ Πατὴρ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν ἐμοί τε μένων καὶ τὰ ἔργα ποιῶν. Καὶ θαυμαστόν γε οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτο νομίζειν, σαφῶς αὐτοῦ περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν λέγοντος ἀνθρώπων· ὁ ἀγαπῶν με τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτόν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν. Εἰ γὰρ παρ' ἐκάστῳ τῶν τοιούτων ὃ τε Πατὴρ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς τὴν μονὴν ποιοῦνται, τί θαυμαστόν εἰ ἐν τῷ κατὰ σάρκα Δεσπότη Χριστῷ ἄμφω κατὰ ταῦτόν νομίζοιτο μένειν, τῆς κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν κοινωνίας προσιεμένης, ὡς εἰκός, καὶ τὴν τῆς μονῆς κοινωνίαν;

LT 32 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 4

[=C4T 8a, JT 3]

Ὁ πρὸ αἰώνων, φησί, γέγονεν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων—πάλιν ὡς τινῶν δεδωκότων καὶ τοῦτο λεγόντων⁵¹—οὐδένης⁵² τῶν εὐσεβεῖν ἐσπουδακότων ταύτην ἐλομένου νοσήσαι τὴν ἄνοιαν, ὥστε τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων εἰπεῖν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων γεγενῆσθαι.

⁴⁷ JT 1 adds ποτε

⁴⁸ ἢ πῶς—JT 1 εἰπὼν

⁴⁹ μὲν—JT 1 ἄνθρωπον

⁵⁰ δηλονότι—JT 2 δηλον ὅτι

⁵¹ JT 3 λέγων

⁵² JT 3 adds ἂν

LT 30 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 4
[=JT 1]

Some among us have given in to you, saying what should not be said by any one endeavouring to adhere to the ecclesiastical opinion. For we enquired if they confess that the God Word became man and how, and they answered ‘granted’. But which intelligent person would say that the God Word ‘became’, as you say, unless they were first plagued by your madness? Now we most certainly say that the God Word assumed <a man>, but that he became man we would never allow ourselves, as you do, to say.

LT 31 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 3
[=C4T 10, JT 2]

‘I, whom you see, can do nothing by my own nature, inasmuch as I am human; but I do work, since “abiding in me is the Father” who works all. For since’, he says, “I am in the Father and the Father in me”, the God Word, the Only-begotten Son, is in me, and clearly the Father also, with him [i.e. the Word], abides in me and performs the works’ [cf. John 5:19, 30; 14:10–11]. It is not strange to think this of Christ, who clearly says this of other human beings: ‘The one who loves me will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our abode with him’ [John 14:23]. If the Father and the Son make their abode with each person, what is so strange if both are thought to dwell in the same manner in Christ, the Lord according to the flesh, <their> communion in essence taking on, as it seems, communion of abode?’

LT 32 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 4
[=C4T 8a, JT 3]

‘He who was before the ages’, he says, ‘came to be in the last days’—again as some have taken and explained this saying—no one who endeavours to be pious would choose this affliction of madness, to say that he who was before the ages has begun to exist in the last days.

LT 33 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 4
[=C4T 8c, JT 4]

Οὐκοῦν τοῖς ὑμετέροις ἐπόμενοι νόμοις καὶ τὴν ὑπὸ τῆς σῆς ἀγχινοίας νομοθετουμένην ἀντιστροφὴν, μᾶλλον δὲ καταστροφὴν, δεξάμενοι, φέρε δὴ, πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν⁵³ συγγέωμεν, καὶ μηδεμίᾳ λοιπὸν ἔστω διάκρισις, μὴ θεοῦ μορφῆς, μὴ δούλου μορφῆς· μὴ ναοῦ ληφθέντος, μὴ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν τῷ ναῷ· μὴ τοῦ λυθέντος, μὴ τοῦ ἐγείραντος· μὴ τοῦ τελειωθέντος ἐν πάθει, μὴ τοῦ τελειώσαντος· μὴ τοῦ μνημονευθέντος, μὴ τοῦ μνημονεύσαντος· μὴ τοῦ ἐπισκεφθέντος, μὴ τοῦ ἐπισκεψαμένου· μὴ τοῦ βραχὺ τι⁵⁴ παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένου,⁵⁵ μὴ τοῦ ἐλαττώσαντος· μὴ τοῦ δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένου,⁵⁶ μὴ τοῦ στεφανώσαντος· μὴ τοῦ καταστάντος ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μὴ τοῦ καταστήσαντος· μὴ τοῦ λαβόντος αὐτὰ ἐν ὑποταγῇ, μὴ τοῦ δώσαντος⁵⁷ τὴν ὑποταγὴν.

LT 34 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 3
[=C4T 1bJT 5]

< . . . > ἀλλ' ὁ γε Θεὸς καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ τῷ μὲν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου γεννηθέντι, ὧ θαυμάσιε, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος κατὰ τὰς θείας ἀναπλασθέντι⁵⁸ γραφάς, καὶ τὴν γε σύστασιν ἐπὶ τῆς γυναικείας δεξαμένῳ γαστρός, ἐνήν, ὡς εἰκός, ἐπειδὴ ἅμα τῷ διαπλασθῆναι καὶ τὸ εἶναι ναὸς Θεοῦ⁵⁹ εἰλήφει. Οὐ μὴν τὸν Θεὸν γεγενῆσθαι ἡγητέον ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου, εἰ μὴ ἄρα ταῦτ' ἡγητέον ἡμῖν τό τε γεννηθῆναι καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ γεννηθέντι, τὸν ναὸν καὶ τὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ Θεὸν Λόγον· οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν σὴν φωνὴν ἀποφαντέον πάντῃ⁶⁰ τὸν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου γεννηθέντα Θεὸν εἶναι ἐκ Θεοῦ, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ. Εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστίν, ὡς φῆς, ἀναληφθεὶς ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου, Θεὸς δὲ σαρκωθείς, πῶς ὁ γεννηθεὶς Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ ὁμοούσιος λέγοιτο ἂν τῷ Πατρὶ, τῆς σαρκὸς οὐ δυναμένης ταύτην προῖεσθαι⁶¹ τὴν φωνήν; Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ἀνόητον τὸ τὸν Θεὸν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου γεγενῆσθαι λέγειν. Τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ ἐκ σπέρματος αὐτὸν λέγειν Δαυὶδ, ἐκ τῆς

⁵³ αὐτὸν—JT 4 ταυτὸν

⁵⁴ JT 4 omits. ⁵⁵ ἠλαττωμένου—JT 4 ἐλαττωθέντος

⁵⁶ ἐστεφανωμένου—JT 4 στεφανωθέντος ⁵⁷ δώσαντος—JT 4 δόντος

⁵⁸ ἀναπλασθέντι—JT 5 διαπλασθέντι ⁵⁹ ναὸς Θεοῦ—JT 5 Θεοῦ ναὸς

⁶⁰ πάντῃ—JT 5 πάντῃ ⁶¹ προῖεσθαι—JT 5 προῖεσθαι

LT 33 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 4

[=C₄T 8c, JT 4]

So then, following your rules and accepting the principle of reversal laid down by your sagacity—or rather the subversion—come, let us mix everything together into the same and let there be no distinction whatsoever forthwith: neither the form of God, nor the form of a servant; neither the temple assumed, nor the one indwelling in the temple; neither the one who was dissolved, nor the one who raised <him>; neither the one perfected by suffering,⁶² nor the one who perfected; neither the one who is remembered, nor the one who remembers; neither the one who was visited, nor the one who visited; neither the one ‘made a little lower than the angels’, nor the one who lowers; neither the one crowned with glory and honour, nor the one who crowns; neither the one set over the works of God’s hands, nor the one who sets; neither the one who received these things in subjection, nor the one who gives subjection.

LT 34 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 3

[=C₄T 1bJT 5]

< . . . > but he who is ‘God and from God and consubstantial with the Father’ was united—Oh wonder!—to the one born from the Virgin and fashioned by the Holy Spirit according to the divine Scriptures, and received his constitution in the womb of the woman, as is fitting, since at the same time as being fashioned he received <the dignity> to be a temple of God. But we should not suppose that God was born from the Virgin, unless we suppose that what was born and what was in the one born is the same, the temple and the God Word in the temple; indeed, following your statement, one should in no way declare that the the one born from the Virgin is ‘God from God, consubstantial with the Father’. For if, as you say, the one born from the Virgin is not an assumed man, but God incarnate, how can the one who was born be called ‘God from God, consubstantial with the Father’, since the flesh is not able to accept this description? It is madness to say that God was born from the Virgin. For this is nothing other than to say that he is from the seed of David, born from the essence of

⁶² Cf. Heb. 2:10; the rest of this passage alludes to Heb. 2:6–8 and its quotation of Ps. 8:5–7.

ουσίας τῆς Παρθένου τετεγμένον καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ διαπεπλασμένον· ἐπεὶ γε τὸ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς Παρθένου συστάν ἐν τῇ μητρῶα γαστρὶ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος διαπλασθὲν δυνάμει, γεγενῆσθαί φαμεν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου.

LT 35 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 4
[=JT 7]

Τὸν δὲ ἄνθρωπον, περὶ οὗ ταῦτά φησιν ὁ προφήτης, σαφῶς ὁ μακάριος δηλοῖ Παῦλος τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς εἰλημμένον ἄνθρωπον εἶναι. Εἰρηκῶς γὰρ ὅτι διεμαρτύρατο⁶³ πού τις λέγων· τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὅτι μιμνήσκη αὐτοῦ, ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὅτι ἐπισκέπτη αὐτόν; Ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχὺ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους, δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν, καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου· πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, ἐπάγει· τὸν δὲ βραχὺ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον· σαφῶς δεικνὺς ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἄνθρωπος περὶ οὗ ὁ μακάριος Δαυὶδ φησιν,⁶⁴ ἐκπληττόμενος ὅτι ἡ θεία φύσις ἠγέσχετό τε αὐτοῦ ποιήσασθαι μνήμην, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐπισκέψεως ἀξιῶσαι⁶⁵ οἰκείας, βραχὺ μὲν τι παρὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτὸν ἐλαττώσαι τὸ⁶⁶ γεύσασθαι ποιῆσαι θανάτου, δόξη δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τιμῇ πάση περιβαλεῖν, ὥστε καὶ Κύριον αὐτὸν⁶⁷ ἀποφῆναι τῶν ἀπάντων, διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν συναφείας.

LT 36 From the *Commentary on Psalm 8*
[=C4T 19; JT 8]

Διὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν τὴν μὲν διαφορὰν τοῦ τε Θεοῦ Λόγου καὶ τοῦ ἀναληφθέντος ἀνθρώπου τοσαύτην ἡμῖν δείκνυσιν ὁ ψαλμός, διηρημένα δὲ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ εὐρίσκεται. Τοῦ μὲν Κυρίου ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν λαμβάνοντος τὰ πρότερα τοῦ ψαλμοῦ, ἐν οἷς ποιητὴν τε αὐτὸν εἶναι φησὶ τῆς κτίσεως καὶ ἐπηρμένην ἔχειν ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ τεθουμαστώσθαι ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ, τοῦ δὲ ἀποστόλου τὰ δεύτερα περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ τῆς τοσαύτης εὐεργεσίας ἀξιωθέντος⁶⁸ ἐπὶ

⁶³ JT 7 adds δέ ⁶⁴ Δαυὶδ φησιν—JT 7 φησι Δαυὶδ

⁶⁵ ἀξιῶσαι—JT 7 ἀξιῶσασα ⁶⁶ τὸ—JT 7 τῷ ⁶⁷ JT 7 omits αὐτὸν

⁶⁸ καταξιούμενος—JT 8 ἀξιούμενος

the Virgin and fashioned in her, since that which is from the seed of David and constituted of the essence of the Virgin in the maternal womb, and fashioned by the power of the Holy Spirit, is what we say was born of the Virgin.

LT 35 From *Against the Apollinarians*, bk. 4
[=JT 7]

The blessed Paul clearly makes known that the man about whom the prophet said these things is the man who was assumed by the Only-Begotten. For having said, ‘Someone somewhere has testified saying, “What is man that you are mindful of him, or the son of man that you visit him? You made him a little lower than the angels, and crowned him with glory and honour, and did set him over the works of your hands, putting everything in subjection under his feet”’, he goes on, ‘but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, by the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour’ [Heb. 2:6–9, quoting Ps. 8:5–7]. This clearly shows that it was the man Jesus about whom the blessed David spoke, being amazed that the divine nature would forbear to remember and to consider worthy of his own visitation him ‘who was made a little lower than the angels’, to make him taste of death, to clothe him with honour and all glory, so as to manifest him Lord of all, through his conjunction with himself.

LT 36 From the *Commentary on Psalm 8*
[=C4T 19; JT 8]

Therefore, then, the psalm shows us such a difference between the God Word and the assumed man; they are <also> found separated in the New Testament. With the Lord referring the first parts of the psalm to himself, in which it says that he is the Creator of the creation, that <his> ‘majesty’ is exalted ‘high above the heavens’ and admired ‘in all the earth’,⁶⁹ and the apostle referring the second part concerning the man who was deemed worthy of such great beneficence to Jesus,⁷⁰ how is it not evident that the divine Scripture clearly teaches us that the God Word is one, and

⁶⁹ Cf. Matt. 21:26, where Jesus cites Ps. 8:3a, though Theodore refers to Ps. 8:2, 10.

⁷⁰ Cf. Heb. 2:6–8, citing Ps. 8:5–7. These verses are echoed throughout the rest of the extract.

τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λαμβάνοντος, πῶς οὐ πρόδηλον ὅτι ἕτερον μὲν ἡμᾶς ἢ θεία γραφή διδάσκει σαφῶς εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον, ἕτερον δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, πολλήν τε αὐτῶν οὖσαν δείκνυσιν ἡμῖν τὴν διαφοράν; Ὁ μὲν γὰρ μνημονεύει, ὁ δὲ τῆς μνήμης ἀξιούται.⁷¹ καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπισκέπτεται, ὁ δὲ καὶ ταύτης ἀξιούμενος⁷² μακαρίζεται· καὶ ὁ μὲν εὐεργετῶν ἐλαττοῖ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους, ὁ δὲ εὐεργετῆται καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἐλαττώσει· καὶ ὁ μὲν δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ στεφανοῖ, ὁ δὲ στεφανοῦται, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις μακαρίζεται· καὶ ὁ μὲν κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, ὁ δὲ ἡξιώθη⁷³ τοῦ δεσπόζειν τούτων, ὧν πρότερον οὐκ εἶχε τὴν ἐξουσίαν.

Fragments from Diodore

LD 1 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1

[=PD 5]

Ἀσφαλίζεσθαι εἰς τὴν ἀκρίβειαν τῶν δογματῶν ὑμᾶς ἐνάγομεν. Τέλειος πρὸ αἰῶνων ὁ Υἱὸς τέλειον τὸν ἐκ Δαυὶδ ἀνείληφεν, Υἱὸς Θεοῦ υἱὸν Δαυὶδ. Ἐρεῖς μοι, δύο οὖν υἱοὺς κηρύττεῖς; Δύο υἱοὺς τοῦ Δαυὶδ οὐ λέγω· μὴ γὰρ εἶπον τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον υἱὸν Δαυὶδ; Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δύο Υἱοὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ κατ' οὐσίαν λέγω· μὴ γὰρ δύο φημι ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐσίας; Τὸν πρὸ αἰῶνων Θεὸν Λόγον λέγω κατωκηκέναι ἐν τῷ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ.

LD 2 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1

[=TD 2, SD 2, C4T 46, C5D 5; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

Χάριτι Υἱὸς ὁ ἐκ Μαρίας ἄνθρωπος, φύσει δὲ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος· τὸ μὲν χάριτι καὶ οὐ φύσει, τὸ δὲ φύσει καὶ οὐ χάριτι. Ἀρκέσει τῷ ἐξ ἡμῶν σώματι τὸ τῆς κατὰ χάριν υἰότητος, τὸ τῆς δόξης, τὸ τῆς ἀθανασίας, ὅτι ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου γέγονε· μὴ ὑπὲρ φύσιν ἀναγέσθω, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἀντὶ τῆς παρ' ἡμῶν ὀφειλομένης εὐχαριστίας μὴ ὑβριζέσθω. Καὶ τίς ἢ ὕβρις; Τοῦ συντιθέναι αὐτὸν μετὰ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ δεῖσθαι νομίζειν εἰς τελείαν υἰότητα τοῦ

⁷¹ καταξιοθέντος—JT 8 ἀξιοθέντος

⁷³ κατηξιώθη—JT 8 ἡξιώθη

⁷² καταξιοῦται—JT 8 ἀξιοῦται

the man another, for it shows us the great difference existing between them? For the one remembers, while the other is deemed worthy of remembrance; and the one visits, while the other is deemed worthy to be blessed with this; and the one, giving a benefit, makes 'a little lower than the angels', while the other by such lowering accepts the benefit; and the one 'crowns with glory and honour', while the other is crowned and is blessed by this; and the one 'set him over the works of his hands and subjected all things under his feet', while the other is deemed worthy to rule those things over which he did not formerly possess authority.

Fragments from Diodore

LD 1 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1
[=PD 5]

We urge you to be secure in the precision of the teachings.⁷⁴ The perfect, pre-eternal Son assumed the perfect son of David; the Son of God, the son of David. You say to me, 'Do you thus proclaim two sons?' I do not speak of two sons of David; did I call the God Word a son of David? But neither do I speak of two Sons of God by essence; did I say there are two from the essence of God? I say that the pre-eternal God Word dwelt in the one from the seed of David.

LD 2 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1
[=TD 2, SD 2, C4T 46, C5D 5; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

[a] By grace the man from Mary is Son, by nature the God Word <is Son>; the former by grace and not by nature, the latter by nature and not by grace.⁷⁵ [b] The <property> of sonship by grace, of glory, of immortality will suffice the body from us, for it became the temple of the God Word; let it not be raised above nature, and let the God Word not receive insults instead of the thanksgiving due from us. And what is the insult? To combine him with the body, and to suppose that he needed the body for perfect

⁷⁴ PD 5 adds: 'we labour on your behalf, so that we do not give cause to the Lord by our silence'.

⁷⁵ BD 31, TD 2, SD 2, C4T 46, and C5D 5 add 'there are not two sons'.

σώματος. Οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος βούλεται ἑαυτὸν τοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱὸν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ Κύριον· τὸ δὲ σῶμα καλεῖσθαι τοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱόν, οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐφθόνησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παραγέγονεν.

LD 3 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1

[=BD 22a, C4T 47, C5D 2b]

Καὶ περὶ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν γεννήσεων ὅταν ἦ λόγος, μὴ τῆς Μαρίας υἱὸς ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ὑποπτευέσθω. Θνητὸς γὰρ θνητὸν γεννᾷ κατὰ φύσιν, καὶ σῶμα τὸ ὁμοούσιον· καὶ δύο γεννήσεις ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος οὐχ ὑπέμεινε, τὴν μὲν πρὸ αἰώνων, τὴν δὲ ἐν ὑστέροις.

LD 4 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1

[=C5D 1ab; a=BD 27, SD 3]

Εἴ τις βούλοιο καταχρηστικῶς καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον, υἱὸν Δαυὶδ ὀνομάζειν, διὰ τὸν ἐκ Δαυὶδ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου ναὸν, ὀνομαζέτω· καὶ τὸν ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, χάριτι καὶ οὐ φύσει, προσαγορευέτω, τοὺς φυσικοὺς πατέρας οὐκ ἀγνοῶν, οὐδὲ τὴν τάξιν ἀνατρέπων, οὐδὲ τὸν ἀσώματον λέγων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐκ Δαυὶδ, καὶ πεπονθότα καὶ ἀπαθῆ.

LD 5 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1

[a=SD 11]

[a] Ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, δι' οὐδένα – φύσει γὰρ Υἱός· ἡ σὰρξ Υἱὸς, διὰ τὸν Υἱόν. [b] Καὶ τί λέγω διὰ τὸν Υἱόν; Δι' ἡμᾶς ἡ σὰρξ· καὶ μὴ νομίσητε βλάσφημον τὸ ῥῆμα, ἀλλὰ ἀπαιτήσατε τὰς ἀποδείξεις. Εἰ μὴ ἔπταισαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, μὴ χρεία ἦν νόμου; Δικαίῳ γὰρ νόμος οὐ κείται. Εἰ μὴ ἐπέτειναν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οἱ ἐν νόμῳ, μὴ χρεία ἦν τῆς χάριτος; Οὐκ, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ὁ νόμος ἀποκτεῖναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, οὐχὶ δι' ἡμᾶς <σάρκα> ἔλαβεν, ἵνα καὶ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἀπόφασιν τοῦ θανάτου ἀνακαλέσῃται, σταυρωθεῖς καὶ ἀποθανὼν καὶ ἀναστάς; Εἰ μὴ ἀπάτη προῦκεχωρήκει, καὶ ἡ ἀπόφασιν τοῦ θανάτου καθ' ἡμῶν, τίς χρεία ἦν τῆς οἰκονομίας ταύτης τοῦ Σωτήρος; Τίς χρεία τῆς ἐνσωματώσεως; Οὐ δι' ἡμᾶς ἔλαβε τὴν σάρκα;

sonship. [c] Neither does the God Word himself wish to be the son of David, but Lord [cf. Matt. 22:41–5]; not only did he not grudge this but for this he came, that the body is to be called ‘the son of David’.

LD 3 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1
[=BD 22a, C4T 47, C5D 2b]

And when the discussion is about natural births, neither should the God Word be considered <to be> a son of Mary. For a mortal bears what is mortal according to nature, and a body that which is consubstantial.⁷⁶ The God Word did not undergo two births, one before the ages, the other in the latter times.

LD 4 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1
[=C5D 1ab; a=BD 27, SD 3]

[a] If any wishes improperly to name the Son of God, the God Word, ‘son of David’, because of the God Word’s temple from David, let him name <him thus>; and let him also call the one from the seed of David ‘Son of God’ by grace and not by nature, [b] not ignoring the natural parents, nor overturning the <right> order, nor saying that the incorporeal one⁷⁷ is both before the ages from God and from David, and that he both suffered and is impassible.

LD 5 From *Against the Synousiasts*, bk. 1
[a=SD 11]

[a] The Son of God <is so> not because of anything <else>—by nature he is Son; the flesh is son through the Son. [b] And why do I say ‘through the Son’? The flesh is because of us; do not think this saying blasphemous, but demand proofs. If human beings had not fallen, would there be a need for the law? ‘The law is not laid down for the just’ [1 Tim. 1:9]. If those under the law had not increased sin, would there be a need for grace? No! Since the law was not able to kill sin, is it not for us that he took <flesh>, being crucified and dying and rising, that both death and the sentence of death might be recalled? For if deceit and the sentence of death against us had not advanced, what need was there for this economy of the Saviour? What need for the Incarnation? Is it not for us that he took flesh?

⁷⁶ BD 22, C4T 47, C5D 2 have ‘that which is like it’.

⁷⁷ C5D 1 adds ‘is a body’.

V. EMPEROR JUSTINIAN

The final stages of the controversy leading to the condemnation of Theodore, and Diodore thereafter, that we traced in Chapter 3, unfolded very much under the direction of the emperor Justinian, one of the most important figures from late antiquity. His involvement in imperial life began in 518, at the age of 35, when his uncle Justin became emperor. Justinian played an increasingly important role as advisor to his uncle, leading to his appointment as consul in 521, associate emperor on 1 April 527, and sole emperor on 1 August of that year. The first fifteen years of his reign were an incredibly productive period in many different areas: with the military, recovering large regions of Africa and Italy; in the field of legislation, editing and publishing the Code, the Digest, and the Institutes; and in construction, not least building the magnificent edifice of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. This golden age came to an end, however, in the 540s, when he began to lose the territories that he had regained and bubonic plague swept across the empire with devastating effect.

More so than any other previous emperor, Justinian was also personally interested and involved in matters theological and ecclesial. Although he initially seems to have sympathized with the Roman position that Chalcedon was a fully adequate and sufficient statement of theology, Justinian soon became convinced of the need for Chalcedon to be understood in terms of a Cyrillian understanding of the unity of the one subject in Christ and the theopaschism that follows on from this. Much has been made of the apparent changes of direction in Justinian's religious policy, but his conviction regarding this point is a continuous thread throughout his reign, even if sometimes circumstances required otherwise. It was on this basis that Justinian began his dialogues with the non-Chalcedonians in the early 530s, reaching a high point in 535/6 when communion was restored between Severus of Antioch, Theodosius of Alexandria, and Anthimus of Constantinople. However, the hostility of the clergy and the people of Constantinople towards the non-Chalcedonians was such that when Pope Agapetus came to Constantinople in March 536 Justinian was forced to expel Anthimus and Severus from the city, leaving Agapetus to consecrate Menas as the new patriarch of Constantinople. Nevertheless, together with his

consort Theodora, Justinian continued to work for the unification of Eastern Christians.

In 544/5 Justinian issued an edict condemning the 'Three Chapters', that is, the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus against Cyril, and the letter of Ibas to Mari, also criticizing Cyril and praising Theodore.⁷⁸ Liberatus, Facundus, and Evagrius claim that Justinian's edict against the Three Chapters resulted from pressure put on the emperor by 'Origenists' out to exact revenge for the condemnation of 'Origenism' in the previous year. Justinian's edict against the Three Chapters, however, needs to be understood in a broader perspective. He had already raised the possibility of condemning Theodore and Diodore with the non-Chalcedonians in the discussions a decade earlier.⁷⁹ Moreover, in the context of losing many lands and great cities, and being himself afflicted by the plague but surviving, there was a greater urgency for, and personal stake in, accomplishing his long-cherished ambition to restore the unity of the Christians in his empire. This task, however, could not be brought about by compromising on theological issues, but only by a resolute affirmation of Orthodoxy.⁸⁰ To suggest that Justinian capitulated to pressure put on him by the supporters of 'Origenism' severely underestimates the strength of character, theological conviction, and determination that he clearly possessed, as is evident from his dealings with Pope Vigilius and the running of the Council of Constantinople in 553.

Justinian also distinguished himself by being the first emperor to compose several theological treatises, demonstrating a thoughtful and mature understanding of the issues at stake. In these writings, especially his edict *On the Orthodox Faith* issued in mid-July 551, he develops a constructive Christological position, presenting the notion of 'one composite hypostasis' and dealing with the issues of differentiating in thought alone between the divinity and humanity, so that the unity of the one subject that is Christ,

⁷⁸ The actual text of the edict condemning the Three Chapters has not survived, but its content is clear from the many references to it. For the Three Chapters controversy, and further literature, see above, Ch. 3.

⁷⁹ Brock, 'Conversations', 116–17.

⁸⁰ A point made by Price, *Constantinople*, 1.16.

the eternal Word of God, can be emphatically affirmed.⁸¹ In his 'Letter on the Three Chapters', Justinian clearly utilized the florilegium of extracts from Theodore also used by Leontius, with whom he has eight passages in common. He is also an important witness in his own right, in that he provides us with two further extracts from Theodore's work against Apollinarius. Regarding the dating of this particular work, it appears to have been provoked by a letter sent to Justinian protesting the edict condemning the Three Chapters. Justinian affirms that he has not acted simply to appease those already separated from the Church, that is, the non-Chalcedonians, but rather because there are some who, by means of these Chapters, have introduced Nestorius' teaching into the Church. It is possible that Justinian's statement that he has asked the priests of the Church of God to inquire into the heresy of the Three Chapters refers to the Council of Constantinople, so placing the letter shortly after the event.⁸²

Alternatively, his reference to a region known for having always held the true faith in purity, but which has recently fallen into error, might be taken, perhaps more securely, to refer the synod meeting in Illyricum around the year 549; the letter to which Justinian is replying would then be a letter issued by that synod, and Justinian's own letter would then be placed late in 549 or early 550.⁸³

⁸¹ Justinian, *On the Orthodox Faith*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians*, 72–110; trans. in Price, *Constantinople*, 1.129–59.

⁸² As argued by A. Gerostergios, *Justinian the Great: The Emperor and Saint* (Belmont, Mass.: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1982), 45, referring to Justinian's Letter, ed. Schwartz, p. 47:34–5.

⁸³ So Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften*, 115, referring to Justinian's Letter, p. 48.16.

Text

E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians*, 2nd edn. by M. Amelotti, R. Albertella, and L. Migliardi, *Legum Iustiniani Imperatoris Vocabularium*, subsidia II (Milan, Dott. A. Giuffrè Editore, 1973), reprinting (with original pagination given in []) ABAW.PH NF 18 (Munich: Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1939).

As the text of eight of these extracts is largely similar to that of Leontius, the text has not been reproduced here; any variations are noted in the texts of Leontius.

JT 1 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§9; p. 50.10–15)
[=LT 30]

JT 2 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3 (§11; pp. 50.36–51.5)
[=LT 31]

JT 3 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§14; p. 51.19–21)
[=LT 32]

JT 4 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§15; p. 51.22–30)
[=LT 33]

JT 5 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3 (§19; p. 53.12–24)
[=LT 34]

JT 6 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3 (§21; p. 54.1–7)
[=C4T 1d]

Ἄλλ' οὐχ ἡ θεία φύσις ἐκ παρθένου γεγέννηται, γεγέννηται δὲ ἐκ τῆς παρθένου ὁ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς παρθένου συστάς· οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας γεγέννηται, γεγέννηται δὲ ἐκ Μαρίας ὁ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ· οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἐκ γυναικὸς γεγέννηται, γεγέννηται δὲ ἐκ γυναικὸς ὁ τῆ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος δυνάμει διαπλασθεὶς ἐν αὐτῇ· οὐκ ἐκ μήτρας τέτεκται ὁ ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρί, ἀμήτωρ γὰρ οὗτος κατὰ τὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου φωνήν, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἐν τῇ μητρὶ γαστρὶ τῆ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος δυνάμει διαπλασθεὶς ἅτε καὶ ἀπάτωρ διὰ τοῦτο λεγόμενος.

JT 1 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§9; p. 50.10–15)
[=LT 30]

JT 2 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3 (§11; pp. 50.36–51.5)
[=LT 31]

JT 3 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§14; p. 51.19–21)
[=LT 32]

JT 4 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§15; p. 51.22–30)
[=LT 33]

JT 5 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3 (§19; p. 53.12–24)
[=LT 34]

JT 6 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3 (§21; p. 54.1–7)
[=C4T 1d]

But the divine nature was not born of the Virgin, rather the one constituted from the essence of the Virgin was born of the Virgin; the God Word was not born of Mary, rather the one of the seed of David was born of Mary. The God Word was not born of a woman, rather the one fashioned in her by the power of the Holy Spirit was born of the woman; from a mother was born, not the one consubstantial with the Father, for he is ‘without mother’ according to the saying of the blessed Paul [Heb. 7:3], but the one who in the latter times was formed in the maternal womb by the power of the Holy Spirit, so that for this reason he is also said to be ‘without father’ [Heb. 7:3].

JT 7 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§33; p. 55.28–38)
[=LT 35]

JT 8 From the *Commentary on Psalm 8* (§34; p. 56.1–13)
[=LT 36; C4T 19]

JT 9 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§50; p. 60.3–10)

Αὐτάρκως δὴ τὸ διάφορον τῶν φύσεων ἡμῖν ὑποδείκνυσι διὰ τούτων, εἴ γε τὸν μὲν ἐκπλήττεται ὡς δι' ὑπερβολὴν φιλανθρωπίας ἐλόμενον μνήμην τε καὶ ἐπίσκεψιν ποιήσασθαι τοῦ οὕτως εὐτελοῦς, τὸν δὲ μακαριστὸν ἡγείται ὡς τοιούτων ἡξιωμένον. ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὕτω μὲν τὴν τε διαίρεσιν τῶν φύσεων ποιεῖται καὶ μὴν καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς τε τοῦ λαβόντος φύσεως καὶ τῆς τοῦ ληφθέντος ἡμῖν ὑποδείκνυσιν ἡ θεῖα γραφή· φροντίζουσα δὲ τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν ἡμῖν ὑποδεικνύουσι ἢ τῷ ληφθέντι πρὸς τὸν λαβόντα προσγέγονεν, λέγει πολλάκις καθ' ἔνωσιν τὰ ἐκάτερα τῶν φύσεων ἰδιαζόντως προσόντα ὡς ἂν τὴν πρὸς τὸν λαβόντα ἔνωσιν τοῦ ληφθέντος ἡμῖν παραδηλώσειεν ὅσα τε τούτῳ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνον γέγονεν συναφείας.

JT 10 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8 (§52; p. 60.14–23)
[=LT 6bc]

JT 7 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§33; p. 55.28–38)
[=LT 35]

JT 8 From the *Commentary on Psalm 8* (§34; p. 56.1–13)
[=LT 36; C4T 19]

JT 9 From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4 (§50; p. 60.3–10)

Indeed, the difference of the natures is sufficiently demonstrated for us from these <considerations>: if one is struck by him, on the one hand, choosing, through abounding love of humanity, to remember and visit one so lowly, one considers him, on the other hand, blessed as being deemed worthy of such things. But in this way, on the one hand, the divine Scripture shows us the divine and the distinction of natures that is made between the nature that assumed and the nature that was assumed; and on the other hand, being concerned to show us the union which unites the one assumed to the one who assumes, it often speaks of each of the natures, which have come together in union, particularly, so as to make clear to us the union of the one assumed to the one who assumed, inasmuch as this happens to this one from the conjunction to that one.

JT 10 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8 (§52; p. 60.14–23)
[=LT 6bc]

VI. FACUNDUS OF HERMIANE

Facundus of Hermiane's *In Defence of the Three Chapters* is our most important source for extracts from Theodore compiled in his defence.⁸⁴ Facundus was a bishop of Hermiane, a village in the southern region of Byzacena in Africa. He travelled to Constantinople, and took part in the discussions held there under Pope Vigilius during 547–8 regarding the recent edict of Justinian against the Three Chapters. Wanting to maintain the status quo established by Chalcedon, Facundus argued vigorously in their support. When the discussions were suspended for a feast (likely Pascha in 548), Facundus was given seven days to prepare a written text.⁸⁵ He fulfilled this commission, composing more than 3,000 lines for a document which has not survived. After Pope Vigilius finally acquiesced in the condemnation of the Three Chapters, Facundus returned to Africa, where, with more texts to hand, he was able to revise, extend, and present more coherently his defence of the Three Chapters. The resulting work was completed probably in 550. Consisting of twelve books, it is a monumental accomplishment on both a historical and theological level of argumentation. In some manuscripts the work bears the inscription *To the Emperor*, but it is now commonly known as *In Defence of the Three Chapters*. In this work, Facundus provides twenty-six quotations from Theodore of Mopsuestia, almost certainly taken from the *Apology for Diodore and Theodore*, no longer extant, by Theodoret of Cyrus.⁸⁶ A few years later Facundus wrote *Against Mocianus*, to counter the efforts of this converted Arian to produce compliant bishops in preparation for the council. His final work, the *Letter on the Catholic Faith in Defence of the Three Chapters*, was written in 568–9, a few years before his death. Facundus is mentioned by Victor

⁸⁴ Facundus, *Defence*, Preface, 3. For an examination of the sparse details of Facundus' life (pp. 11–13), and an analysis of the work and its place within the controversy over the Three Chapters, see the introduction by A. Fraisse-Bétoulières, *Facundus d'Hermiane: Défense des Trois Chapitres (à Justinien)*, SC 471 (Paris: Cerf, 2002), 11–132; E. Chrysos, 'Zur Datierung und Tendenz des Werke des Facundus von Hermiane', *Klèronomia*, 1 (1969), 311–24.

⁸⁵ Cf. Fraisse-Bétoulières, *Facundus*, 143, n. 3.

⁸⁶ L. Abramowski, 'Reste von Theodorets Apologie für Diodore und Theodore bei Facundus', *StP* 1, TU 63 (Berlin, 1957), 61–9.

of Tunnuna, another advocate of the Three Chapters, and his work was used explicitly by Pelagius the Deacon in his own writing on the topic, and seems to have been used, though not cited, by Liberatus.

Text

CCSL I.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse (eds.), *Facundi episcopi ecclesiae hermianensis opera omnia*, CCSL 90a (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974).

SC CCSL text reprinted, with French translation by A. Fraïsse-Bétoulières, *Facundus d'Hermiane: Défense des Trois Chapitres (à Justinien)*, SC 471, 478, 479, 484, 499 (Paris : Cerf, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006).

FT 1 *Defence* 3.2.4; from *Catechetical Homilies*, 13.8 (ed. Tonneau, 381) Angelus diaboli est Samosatenus Paulus, qui purum hominem dicere praesumpsit Dominum Christum et negavit existentiam diuinitatis Vnigeniti, quae est ante saecula.

FT 2 *Defence* 3.2.4; from *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Manifestum est enim quod Samosatenus Paulus episcopus quidem fuit Antiochenae Ecclesiae Domini Dei et Theodoti autem et Artemonis errore aegrotans, qui primi purum hominem dixerunt esse Dominum Christum, non eum cognoscentes Dominum Verbum et in substantia propria Filium Dei ante saecula ex Deo Patre aeterno exstantem.

FT 3 *Defence* 3.2.13 (b=11.7.25); from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

Bonum est in hoc loco maxime concludere quid uirtutis habeant ea quae dicta sunt, siue conuersari, siue baptizari, siue crucifigi, siue mori, siue sepeliri et resurgere. Non puro alicui haec coaptantes homini dicimus; hoc enim in unaquaque dictorum demonstratione addere non moramur, ut nullam calumniantibus praebeamus male loquendi occasionem, sed inhabitatio quidem a Deo Verbo ab ipsa in utero matris plasmatione; inhabitatio uero, non secundum communem inhabitationem, neque iuxta eam quae in multis intellegitur gratiam, sed iuxta quandam excellentem, secundum quam etiam adunari dicimus utrasque naturas et unam iuxta adunationem effectam esse personam.

FT 4 *Defence* 3.4.1; from *Commentary on Matthew*

Quia Christum, non tamquam Filium Dei et ante omnem existentem creaturam et eorum quae sunt opificem, adiit centurio pro pueri sui salute.

FT 1 *Defence* 3.2.4; from *Catechetical Homilies*, 13.8 (ed. Tonneau, 381)
Paul of Samosata, who presumed to say that the Lord Christ is a mere man and denied the existence of the divinity of the Only-begotten, which is before the ages, is an angel of the devil.

FT 2 *Defence* 3.2.4; from *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

For it is evident that Paul of Samosata was in fact bishop of the Church of the Lord God in Antioch, but that he was sick with the error of both Theodotus and Artemon, who first said that the Lord Christ was a mere man, not recognizing him as the Lord Word and, in his own substance, Son of God, existing from God the Father before the ages.

FT 3 *Defence* 3.2.13 (b=11.7.25); from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13

It is good, especially in this case, to conclude what force the things that have been said may have: that he lived among us, was baptized, was crucified, died, was buried and rose again. We do not say these things as applying to some mere man; for each of these sayings we will not hesitate to add an account, so as to give no occasion to the calumniators for speaking evilly, [b] but that in fact <each concerns> the indwelling of the God Word from the very formation in the maternal womb—indwelling, not by a common indwelling, nor like the grace known in many, but in a certain superior mode, by which we also say that both natures are united and that by this union one *persona* is wrought.

FT 4 *Defence* 3.4.1; from *Commentary on Matthew*

Because it was not as the Son of God who existed before every creature and the maker of all that is, that the centurion approached Christ for the healing of his servant.

FT 5 *Defence* 3.4.7–8; from *Commentary on Matthew*⁸⁷

Supplicabat autem ei ut curaret puerum. Ad quem Dominus dicit, ‘Ego ueniens curabo eum’. Propterea maxime ipse promptius ire promisit, ut uirtus centurionis cum refugit appareret. ‘Etenim non sum dignus’, dicit, ‘ut intres sub tectum meum; igitur uerbo tantum dic et hoc curare sufficient.’ Primum igitur reuerentiam multam, secundum autem maximam fidem ostendit. Deinde et cum prudentia fidem propriam monstrans: ‘Nam et ego homo sum sub potestate, habens sub me milites, et dico huic: Vade, et uadit; et alio: Veni, et uenit; et seruo meo: Fac hoc, et facit.’ [8] Prudentiae enim erat, secundum rationem quae ei uidebatur, talia credere de Christo. Homo enim et ego; sed tamen quorum accepi potestatem, horum sum dominus, quae mihi uidentur, ea fiunt a meis subiectis. Ergo nihil ab re est, et te hanc sumentem a Deo potestatem, uerbo tantum iubente expelli passiones. Neque enim tamquam Dei Filium et ante omnem creaturam subsistentem, et omnium quae sunt opificem, adierat centurio. Haec enim neque discipulorum erat tunc scire ante crucem, sicut in reliquis ostendemus, Domino adiuuante, subtilius, sed tamquam hominem per uirtutem adeptum a Deo maiorem quam est hominis potestatem. Vnde ei dixit: ‘Nam et ego homo sum.’

FT 6 *Defence* 3.5.8–10; from Theodore’s second letter to Artemius of Alexandria

Quos oportuit scire quia Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum adoramus, in istis diuinam et aeternam et increatam compleri dicentes Trinitatem. Quoniam eiusdem essentiae est unumquidque horum, hoc est aeternae omnium factorum causae, et reuera

⁸⁷ *Defence* 3.4.8 also survives in Greek; ed. J. Reuss, *Matthäus-kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, TU 61 (Berlin: Akademie, 1957), 109–10 (no. 41a): Συνέσεως δέ, φησίν, ἦν τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν καθ’ ἑαυτὸν εἰκότων λογισμῶν τοιαῦτα αὐτὸν πιστεύσαι περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἄνθρωπος γάρ, φησίν, καὶ γὰρ, ἀλλ’ ὅμως ὦν ἔλαβον τὴν ἐξουσίαν, τούτων κύριός εἰμι. Ὡστε οὐδὲ ἀπεικὸς καὶ σὲ ταύτην εἰληφότα παρὰ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν λόγῳ μόνῳ κελεύοντα ἀπελαύνειν τὰ πάθη. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὡς Υἱὸς Θεοῦ καὶ πάσης ὄντι κυρίῳ τῆς κτίσεως προσῆλθεν ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος (τούτο γὰρ οὐδὲ τῶν μαθητῶν τότε ἦν εἰδέναι πρὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ), ἀλλ’ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ δι’ ἀρετὴν εἰληφότι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μείζονα ἢ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἐξουσίαν. Ὅθεν οὕτω φησίν· Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος εἰμι.

FT 5 *Defence 3.4.7–8; from Commentary on Matthew*

He asked him to heal his servant. The Lord said to him, 'I will come and will heal him' [Matt. 8:7]. He promised that he would go with the utmost haste, that the virtue of the centurion would be apparent when he refused: 'I am not indeed worthy', he said, 'that you should come under my roof; therefore only say the word, and this will suffice to heal <him>' [cf. Matt. 8:8]. Firstly, then, he demonstrated great reverence, and secondly a great faith. Then, showing his own faith, with prudence, <he said> 'For I myself am a man under authority, having soldiers under me, and I say to one, "Go", and he goes, and to another, "Come", and he comes, and to my slave, "Do this", and he does it' [Matt. 8:10]. [8] For it was prudent, by what seemed reasonable to him, to have such faith in Christ. <As if saying> 'For I also am a man; yet for those who receive authority, I am their master; those things which I see fit, those subject to me do. Therefore it is nothing aberrant that you also, who assume this authority from God, by a word alone expel sufferings.' The centurion did not approach him as the Son of God existing before every creature and the creator of all that is. Neither was it for the disciples to know these things before the cross, as we will show in what follows, with the aid of the Lord, in a precise manner, but as a man obtaining from God, by virtue, a greater power than is human. Hence he said to him, 'for I also am a man'.

FT 6 *Defence 3.5.8–10; from Theodore's second letter to Artemius of Alexandria*

It is necessary that they know that we worship the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, in saying that the Trinity is complete in them, divine and eternal and uncreated. For each of them is of the same essence, that is, of the eternal cause of all created things,

diuinae. [9] Et Pater non propter aliud, sed propter propriam essentiam adorandus est. Ita etiam et Filius, non pro alio hoc accipiens sed quia illius et talis essentiae est, circa quam congruebat haec impleri. Similiter etiam et Spiritum sanctum eiusdem essentiae cognoscentes, propter propriam essentiam adoramus. Sic et tres personas dicimus, unamquamque perfectam et eiusdem essentiae, aeternae ac diuinae et eorum quae facta sunt causam arbitrantes esse, et tres adoramus personas, unius eas essentiae credentes reuera diuinae. [10] Quomodo itaque possibile est quartam personam super has addere illam quae assumpta est serui formam, quam neque eiusdem substantiae arbitramur esse, cui neque propter se cultus debetur, neque propter propriam essentiam debere suscipere adorationem agnoscimus, neque ipsam solam apud se diuise in propria persona adoramus, sicuti diuidi eam putant?

FT 7 *Defence* 3.6.6–8; from *Commentary on Romans*⁸⁸

Et quoniam nouum quodammodo esse uidebatur quod ab eis de Christo dicebatur, adiungit: ‘Quod ante promiserat per prophetas suos’, ex prophetia uolens doctrinae antiquitatem ostendere. Vnde et magnificans prophetiam, bene adiunxit ‘in scripturis sanctis’. Neque enim litteram, uel characterem sanctum uolebat dicere, sed prophetiam ipsam, quae erat Spiritu sancto reuelationem eis donante. [7] Ipsam ergo prophetiam recte sic appellauit, sicut et alibi dixit: ‘Omnis scriptura diuinitus inspirata utilis est.’ Quid itaque istae dicunt? ‘De Filio eius.’ Et quoniam commune est filii nomen, et cum diuinitate dicitur, etiam de humanitate accipitur; manifestius aperire uolens unde ei nunc dicere propositum sit, uel cuius rei gratia prophetarum testimonium adiunxit: ‘Qui factus est ex semine Dauid secundum carnem’, aperte quidem ostendens quoniam de assumpto homine sermonem inducit; tamen nec diuinitatis indicium non significatum reliquit. [8] In eo enim quod addidit ‘secundum carnem’, sufficienter ostendit quia et aliter filii significationem⁸⁹ nouit accipere, siquidem secundum hoc scit eum

⁸⁸ A Syriac version of this extract is preserved in cod. *Vat. Syr.* 494, fol. 32^v; cf. J.-M. Vosté, ‘Le Gannat Bussame’, *RB* 37 (1928), 221–32, 386–419, at 415.

⁸⁹ As SC; CCSL significatione

and truly divine. [9] And the Father is to be worshipped not because of something else, but because of his own essence. And likewise also the Son, not as receiving this from another but because he is also of such an essence regarding which it is fitting that this <adoration> should be fulfilled. And similarly also knowing that the Holy Spirit is of the same essence, we adore <the Spirit> because of his own essence. Thus we say three *personae*, each one perfect and of the same eternal and divine essence, considering it to be the cause of those things that have been made, and we adore three *personae*, believing that they are of a single essence, truly divine. [10] And so, how is it possible to add a fourth *persona* beyond these, that form of a servant which is assumed, which we do not consider to be of the same substance, to whom reverence is not due for itself, nor do we acknowledge that because of its own essence it is right <for it> to receive adoration, nor do we adore it alone, by itself, separated in its own *persona*, as those who think it divided?

FT 7 *Defence* 3.6.6–8; from *Commentary on Romans*

And because what was said by them about Christ seemed in some manner to be a novelty, he added, ‘which was promised beforehand though his prophets’, wanting to show, from the prophecy, the antiquity of the teaching. Whence also exalting the prophecy, he rightly added ‘in the Holy Scriptures’ [Rom. 1:2]. For he did not want to call either the letter or the mark holy, but the prophecy itself, which was from the Holy Spirit who gave revelation to them. [7] Therefore in this way he correctly named it prophecy, as he also said in another place: ‘All Scripture inspired by God is useful for teaching’ [2 Tim. 3:16]. Of whom, then, do they speak? ‘Of his Son.’ And as the name ‘son’ is common, while it is said with respect to the divinity, it is also accepted of the humanity; wanting to disclose more clearly on what basis he now intends to speak, or rather on account of what are the prophetic testimonies, he added: ‘who was made from the seed of David according to the flesh’ [Rom. 1:3], openly demonstrating that he is beginning to speak about the assumed man; nevertheless, he did not pass over, without significance, the proof of divinity. [8] For in that which he added—‘according to the flesh’—he has sufficiently demonstrated that he recognizes that one can take another sense of the word ‘son’, inasmuch as he knows that it is according to

ex semine Dauid factum, tamquam secundum aliud non ita eum cognoscens. Duae enim naturae, unum autem quiddam conexione intelleguntur; altera quidem est assumpti hominis, altera uero Dei Verbi. Concurrunt autem in unum ambae propter assumptionem et propter adunationem quae ex assumptione facta est, quam ad Deum Verbum habet serui forma.

FT 8 *Defence* 3.6.13–14 (3.6.14= 10.1.29); from *To Cerdo: On Allegory and History*⁹⁰

Ego quidem, quod nostra sic laudes, non alii cuiquam imputo, quam amicitiae quam circa nos habes quam etiam in magnis et multis rebus semper ostendisti, et maxime quando ea quae scripta sunt in psalmos miraris, quae etiam prima ceterorum omnium scripsimus. [14] Non autem quantam oportuerat habuimus circa istam rem diligentiam; passi enim sumus quaecumque incipientes, ut euenit, in imperitia scribendi constituti. Siquidem et multas immutationes illo tempore quae nostra sunt susceperunt, quas non est praesentis temporibus enarrare, ex qua causa magis neglegenter a nobis composita sunt plurima et maxime illa quae prima sunt.

FT 9 *Defence* 9.1.6; from *Commentary on the Psalms* 44⁹¹

Quid itaque inuenietur maius his quae a Christo facta sunt in tanta mundi commutatione omnibus agnoscentibus, Deum uniuersorum et pietatis atque uirtutis diligentiam habere festinantium, et glorificantium quidem Dei Vnigenitum, exhibentium uero sancto Spiritui condignam adorationem, pro quibus beatus Dauid ait ‘Eructauit cor meum uerbum bonum’?

⁹⁰ Another version of this extract is preserved by Pelagius, *Def.* 2 (ed. R. Devreesse, *Pelagii diaconi ecclesiae Romanae: In defensione trium capitulorum*, Studi e Testi, 57 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica, 1932), 3–4).

⁹¹ This passage also survives in Greek (ed. R. Devreesse, *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I–LXXX)*, Studi e Testi, 93 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica, 1939), 278): *Τί δ' ἂν εἴη μείζον τῶν κατὰ τὸν Χριστόν, δι' οὐπερ τοσαύτη μεταβολὴ τῆς οἰκουμένης γέγνηται, πάντων ἐπεγνωκότων τὸν τῶν ὄλων Θεόν, καὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελείσθαι ἐσπουδακότων, καὶ δοξαζόντων μὲν τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Μονογενῆ, ἀποδιδόντων δὲ καὶ τὴν πρέπουσαν προσκύνησιν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι· ἐφ' οἷς ὁ μακάριος Δαυὶδ ἔφασκεν Ἐξηρέυξατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν;*

this [i.e. the flesh] that he is made from the seed of David, not knowing him thus according to another manner. For there are two natures, but they are known as one by a certain connection; one indeed is of the assumed man, the other in fact of the God Word. But both concur in one because of the assumption and because of the union, which results from the assumption, which the form of the servant has with the God Word.

FT 8 *Defence* 3.6.13–14 (3.6.14 = 10.1.29); from *To Cerdo: On Allegory and History*

That you praise our <works> so, I impute to no other reason than the friendship you have towards us, which you have always shown, even on important and numerous occasions, and especially when you admired the work on the Psalms, which we wrote first of all the others. [14] But we did not employ as much due care as was necessary for this task; for, as it transpired, we experienced whatever beginners do who are inexperienced in writing. On this account also our <works> from this period have received many alterations, which we will not relate at the present time, because they were frequently composed by us with great negligence, especially those which were first.

FT 9 *Defence* 9.1.6; from *Commentary on the Psalms 44*

And so, what can be found greater than those things effected by Christ in such a great transformation of the world: everyone knowing the God of all, endeavouring to have diligence in piety and virtue, and glorifying the Only-begotten of God and rendering an appropriate adoration to the Holy Spirit, regarding which the blessed David says, 'My heart utters a good word' [Ps. 44:2]?

FT 10 *Defence* 9.1.9–12; from *Commentary on the Psalms* 44⁹²

Quoniam quidem prius ait regna, postea autem memoratus est inimicorum perditionem et reliquorum subiectionem, ne aliquis existimet nuper ei accessisse regnum, uel certe posse eum denuo priuari eadem potestate. [. . .] ‘Sedes tua, Deus, in saeculum saeculi’, hoc est consequenter quidem interimentur inimici, reliqui uero omnes subicientur. Quoniam quidem non subintromissum habes, regnum, sed ex sempiterno omnium regnas et in aeternum regnas et regnum tuum manet in perpetuum. Haec Iudaei ut fabulas inanes intellegunt, existimantes de homine rege dicta. [11] Cui enim hominum tantum hoc insigne uirtutum, aut talium magnitudo dictorum? Cui uero conueniet: ‘Et deducet te mirabiliter dextera tua’? Diuina scriptura de omnibus iustis semper ita loquente, quia ex diuino adiutorio uirtutem possideant. Manifestum autem hic et illud est, quia non de aliquo impio loquatur in propria uirtute fidente. Ad quem itaque loquens hominum infert: ‘Sedes tua, Deus in saeculum saeculi’? [12] Si autem de rege Deo dicit, manifestum quoniam et de regina non muliere, sed Ecclesia, quam sibi Christus per fidem desponsauit, per affectum animae scilicet sibi iungendam. Etenim moris est scripturae diuinae, eos qui per scientiam adiunguntur Deo, coniugem eius uocare, ad ostendendam eorum cum Deo plenissimam copulationem et unitatem.

⁹² Ibid. 286–7: Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν πρότερον μὲν εἶπε Βασίλεινε, ὕστερον δὲ ἐμνημόνευσεν ἐχθρῶν ἀνηρημένων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὑποτεταγμένων, ἵνα μὴ τις οἰηθῆ πρόσφατον αὐτῷ γεγενῆσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν ἢ καὶ δύνασθαι πάλιν αὐτῆς ἀποπεσεῖν, ἐπάγει Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεός, εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος. Τοῦτέστι καὶ εἰκότως ἀναρεθῆσονται μὲν οἱ ἐχθροί, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ πάντες ὑποταγήσονται, ἐπεὶ περ οὐκ ἐπέσακτον ἔχεις τὴν βασιλείαν, ἀλλ’ ἐξ αἰδίου πάντων βασιλεύεις, καὶ εἰς αἰεὶ βασιλεύσεις, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία σου μένει διηκεκῆς. Μυθεύουσι δὴτα Ἰουδαῖοι τολμώντες ταῦτα νομίζου εἰρήσθαι περὶ ἀνθρώπου. Τίνι γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ἀρμόσει τοῦτο κατόρθωμα ἢ τῶν λεγομένων τὸ μέγεθος; Τίνι δὲ καὶ ἀρμόσει τὸ Ὁδηγήσει σε θαυμαστώως ἢ δεξιὰ σου; τῆς θείας γραφῆς οὕτως αἰεὶ περὶ πάντων λεγούσης τῶν δικαίων ὡς τῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ βοηθεία τὴν σὴν κεκτημένων. Δῆλον γὰρ ἐνταῦθα κάκεινο, ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἀσεβοῦς ποιεῖται τὸν λόγον καὶ τῆ οἰκεία πεποιθότος ἰσχυῖ. Πρὸς τίνα δὲ ἂν καὶ λέγων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπήγαγεν Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος; Εἰ δὲ περὶ βασιλέως λέγει τοῦ Θεοῦ, δῆλον ὅτι καὶ περὶ βασιλίδος οὐ γυναικός, ἀλλὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, ἣν ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἡρμόσατο ἐπὶ τῆ κατὰ τὴν διάθεσιν τῆς ψυχῆς συναφεία. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἔθος τῆ θείας γραφῆς τῶν οἰκειωμένων αἰεὶ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τῆς γνώσεως τὴν συναγωγὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καλεῖν, ὥστε δεῖξαι τὴν ἄκραν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν οἰκειώσιν τε καὶ ἔνωσιν, [. . .]

FT 10 *Defence* 9.1.9–12; from *Commentary on the Psalms 44*

He says, first of all, ‘Reign!’ [Ps. 44:5]; afterwards he recalled the destruction of the enemies and the submission of the others, so that no one would reckon that he acceded to the throne recently or even that he could be deprived again of that power. [. . .] ‘Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever’ [Ps. 44:7]; that is, naturally, that the enemies will be destroyed and the rest be brought into submission. For you have your kingdom, not as something additional, but you reign over all from eternity, and you reign for ever and your kingdom remains continually. The Jews understand these things as empty fables, thinking that they are said of a human king. [11] To whom among men belongs such extraordinary power as this or the magnitude of such words? Whom does this fit: ‘Your right hand will guide you marvellously’ [Ps. 44:5]? The divine Scriptures always speak thus of all the just, since they possess virtue from divine assistance. But here and there it is clear that it is not speaking of some impious person confident in his own virtue. To whom, then, among men, is it speaking when it adds, ‘Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever’? [12] But if it speaks regarding the King God, it is clear that it also speaks of a queen, not a woman, but the Church, whom Christ has espoused to himself through faith, that is to say, being united to him through the affection of the soul. For it is the custom of the divine Scriptures to call those who are united to God through knowledge ‘his spouse’, to show their superlatively full coupling and union with God.

FT 11 *Defence* 9.1.12–13; from *Commentary on the Psalms* 44⁹³

Sicut et Iohannes Baptista dicit: ‘Qui habet sponsam sponsus est.’ [13] Quoniam igitur semper Dei coniux dicitur congregatio hominum qui ei per scientiam copulantur, regem autem Christum conuenienter appellauit necessario ergo regina sit quae regis uxor est, non alia promotione circa illam procedente, quam ea quam de uiri dignitate communicat. Consequenter ergo reginam uocat ecclesiam, ostendens quantam sortita sit ex Christi adiunctione⁹⁴ dignitatem, quae ei accessit ex fide. Quoniam autem de Deo et Patre haec dici non possunt, quae sequuntur astruunt manifeste.

FT 12 *Defence* 9.1.18; *Commentary on the Psalms* 44⁹⁵

Sed quia haec Deo et Patri non conueniant: ‘Propterea unxit te Deus, Deus tuus’, claret de reliquo quod haec de Christo dicantur. In quo mirabiliter et naturas diuisit et personae unitatem demonstrat; et naturas quidem diuisit in eo, quod diuersarum intellegentiarum declaratiuas uoces emisit. Multum enim differt ab inuicem: ‘Sed tua, Deus, in saeculum saeculi’, et ‘Propterea unxit te Deus, Deus tuus’. Vnitatem uero ostendit personae, ea quae diuersa sunt colligens in unitatem personae.

⁹³ Devreesse, *ibid.* 288: καθὼς Ἰωάννης ὁ Βαπτιστὴς φησιν Ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην νυμφίος ἐστίν. Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν αἰεὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ γυνὴ λέγεται ἡ οἰκειωμένη αὐτῷ συναγωγὴ κατὰ τὴν γνώσιν, βασιλέα ἐκάλεσε τὸν Χριστὸν εἰκότως. Ἀνάγκη δὲ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως γυναῖκα βασιλίσσαν εἶναι, οὐχ ἑτέρου προχειρισμοῦ γινομένου ἀπ’ ἐκείνης, ἀλλὰ κοινωνούσης τῷ ἀνδρὶ τῆς ἀξίας· εἰκότως βασιλίσσαν καλεῖ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, δεικνύς ὅσης ἔτυχεν ἀξίας ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνώσεως, ἥτις αὐτῇ προσγέγονε διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Ὅτι γὰρ οὔτε περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς λέγεσθαι τοῦτο δύναται, τὰ ἐξῆς σαφῶς παρίστησιν.

⁹⁴ As SC; CCSL adnuntiatione

⁹⁵ Devreesse, *Le Commentaire de Théodore . . . Sur les Psaumes*, 289–90: Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι μὴ δυνατὸν ἀρμόττειν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεὸς σου, φανερόν ὑπόλοιπον ἄρα περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ταῦτα λέγεσθαι, ἐφ’ οὗ θαυμαστῶς ἡμῖν καὶ τὰς φύσεις διεῖλε καὶ τοῦ προσώπου τὴν ἔνωσιν ὑπέδειξε. Καὶ τὰς μὲν φύσεις διεῖλε τῷ διαφόρῳ τῶν νοημάτων ἐμφαντικὰς ἀφείναι φωνάς, — πολλὴ γὰρ διαφορὰ πρὸς τὸ Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος τὸ Διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεός σου, — τὴν δὲ ἔνωσιν ὑπέδειξε τῷ περὶ ἐνὸς προσώπου ταῦτα εἰπεῖν.

FT 11 *Defence 9.1.12–13; from Commentary on the Psalms 44*

Thus also John the Baptist said: ‘One who has a bride is a bridegroom’ [John 3:29]. [13] Therefore, since the assembly of human beings who are united to him by knowledge is always called the bride of God, and Christ is naturally called king, it necessarily follows that the wife of the king would be the queen, not resulting from any other promotion for her than that which comes from the dignity of her husband. Consequently, therefore, he calls the Church a queen, showing what great dignity comes from the union with Christ, which comes to her through faith. The words which follow clearly add to the fact that these things cannot be said of the God and Father.

FT 12 *Defence 9.1.18; Commentary on the Psalms 44*

But as the words ‘Therefore God, your God, has anointed you’ [Ps. 44:8] do not apply to the God and Father, it is clear in what remains that these things are said of Christ. In this passage, he has admirably divided the natures in him and demonstrated the unity of *persona*. He has divided the natures in so far as he has uttered words indicating the diversity of comprehension—for <these two expressions> differ much from each other: ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever’ and ‘Therefore God, your God, has anointed you’—but he has shown the unity of *persona*, by gathering these diverse statements in the unity of *persona*.

FT 13 *Defence* 9.2.2–3; from *Commentary on Matthew* (Matt. 16:3)

Dominus enim Christus erat quidem et Deus et homo, utrumque secundum naturam similiter; ex altero quidem apparens, ex altero uero, utpote secundum naturam diuinam, inuisibilis exstans. Erat autem unum quidem omnibus manifestum, utpote quod apparebat; hominem enim eum omnes tunc temporis aestimabant esse et amplius nihil. [3] Quod enim in illo latebat, omnibus erat incredibile priore tempore, sed ex magnitudine eorum quae circa illum agebantur, et nouitate miraculorum, quaecumque ad doctrinam uidentium efficiebat et ex gratia sancti Spiritus quae super apostolos uenit, intellectus est postea et creditus uerus Deus, essentialiter exstans Filius uerus Dei aeterni. Quoniam uero in priore tempore ignorabatur hoc secundum essentiam exstare, ex eo autem quod apparebat uidentibus homo purus putabatur, secundum hominem pleraque et secundum eam quae apparebat naturam loquebatur. Et haec ex his quae in euangelio scripta sunt quiuis inueniet animaduertens attentius.

FT 14 *Defence* 9.2.8–14; from *Commentary on Matthew*

Proximus etiam passioni ad discipulos Dominus dixit: ‘Si me sciretis, utique et Patrem meum sciretis’, et ad Philippum: ‘Tanto tempore uobiscum sum, et non cognouistis me, Philippe? Qui uidet me, uidet et Patrem meum.’ [9] Ostendens quoniam neque diuinam naturam sciebant Vnigeniti, neque Deum sciebant uerum Patrem. Vnde neque dicentem de proprio Patre ueluti de Deo dicentem aliquatenus aduertebant, sed diuisa intellegentia eadem ipsa putabant etiam illa. Hinc etiam adductus est Philippus ad dicendum: ‘Ostende nobis Patrem tuum et sufficit nobis’. Si enim sciret integre quia Patrem suum Deum dicebat eum qui reuera eius esset Pater, ex quo erat uere sicut Deus ex Deo, numquam dixisset: ‘Ostende nobis Patrem tuum’, bene sciens quia inuisibilis est hominibus diuina natura. [10] Consequenter itaque et Dominus dixit ad illum: ‘Tanto tempore uobiscum sum, et non cognouistis me, Philippe?’ Velle enim Patrem uidere, indicium erat eo quod neque ipsum sciret quis esset secundum naturam, neque quem diceret Patrem esse, Filius ex eo exstans. Et aperiens hoc ipsum addidit: ‘Qui uidet me uidet et Patrem.’ Si enim cognoueris, inquit, quis sim, cognosces et illum, secundum

FT 13 *Defence* 9.2.2–3; from *Commentary on Matthew* (Matt. 16:3)

For the Lord Christ was certainly both God and man, both likewise by nature; being visible from the one, while from the other, according to the divine nature, he was invisible. But there was in fact a single thing manifest to all, inasmuch as it was apparent; for everyone at that time reckoned him to be a human being and nothing more. [3] For what hid in him was unbelievable to all at an earlier time, but from the grandeur of those things which occurred regarding him, and the novelty of the miracles which he accomplished for the instruction of those who saw them, and by the grace of the Holy Spirit which came upon the apostles, he was afterwards understood and believed to be true God, existing by essence as the true Son of the eternal God. But because, in the earlier period, he was not known to be this according to essence, from the fact that he appeared he was reckoned, by those who saw him, as a mere man, for the most part speaking as a man and according to the nature which appeared. Whoever considers more attentively will find these things amongst those that are written in the gospel.

FT 14 *Defence* 9.2.8–14; from *Commentary on Matthew*

Shortly before the Passion, the Lord said to the disciples, ‘If you knew me, you would surely know my Father also’ [John 8:19], and to Philip, ‘Have I been with you so long, and you do not know me, Philip? He who has seen me, has also seen my Father’ [John 14:9], [9] showing that they neither knew the divine nature of the Only-begotten, nor did they know God, the true Father. Whence neither did they notice to some extent that he speaks of his own Father as he speaks of God, but they considered him and that one, in the same way, by a divided understanding. This is why Philip was led to say, ‘Show us your Father and it will suffice us’ [John 14:8]. For if he had fully understood that he [i.e. Christ] had called his Father God, him who truly is his Father, from who he truly was, as God from God, never would he have said ‘show us your Father’, knowing well that the divine nature is invisible to human beings. [10] Therefore, consequently, the Lord said to him, ‘Have I been with you so long, and you do not know me, Philip?’ For wanting to see the Father was a sign that he knew neither him, who he is according to nature, nor the one whom he says is the Father, being the Son from him. And explaining this very thing, he added, ‘he

quod possibile est, per me contemplans Patris naturam, cuius sum Filius ex ipso exstans secundum essentiam, et eiusdem cum illo exstans essentiae. [11] Quoniam uero nescis me, neque Patrem meum scis quem dico; cognoscens autem me, cognosces et Patrem quem dixi: me uidens contemplatione intellegentiae, per me uidebis omnino etiam illum. Addidit etiam: 'Vsque nunc nihil petistis in nomine meo'. Et aperiens quoniam necdum diuinam eius naturam intellegentes, neque orationes ei offerebant ut Deo, neque petitiones aliquas in eius nomine faciebant, sicut eos oportebat facere in nomine Dei exstantis et Filii Dei omnium; et quia propter hanc eorum infirmitatem in similitudinibus de Patre loquebatur, eo quod neque illi potuerant integre scire ea quae dicerentur, uel de quo diceret Patre, uel qualiter exstante, adhuc apertius indicatur. [12] Dixit enim: 'Hoc in parabolis locutus sum uobis sed ueniet hora quando non iam in parabolis loquar uobis, sed manifeste de Patre annuntiem uobis.' Quid autem erat quod de Patre non manifeste dixerat, nisi quia reuera diuinam naturam Vnigeniti nesciebant, ex quo possent discere Deum Patrem, qui ex certo eius esset Pater, ut Deus Dei ex eo nati secundum essentiam? Cuius rei gratia per similitudines eis de Patre loquebatur nunc quidem nomine tantum apud eos utens, eius autem ueram intellegentiam in posterum illis reseruans se discere, quando eos gratia Spiritus sancti quae super eos uenit, instituens perceptibiles tantae doctrinae perficeret. [13] Propter hoc etiam ipse Dominus in eodem ipso sermone proximus passioni, ut infirmitatem eorum ostenderet, unde possent doctrinam perfectiorem assumere, dicebat: 'Multa habeo uobis dicere.' Cuius ergo rei gratia modo non dicis? Quia 'non potestis modo portare'; non inuidens, sed quia non sufficitis ad maiorem rerum perceptionem, infirmius adhuc affecti, quam ut horum dogmatum integritatem possitis edoceri. Quando ergo poterunt, uel unde? 'Quando uenerit ille Spiritus ueritatis, inducet uos in omnem ueritatem.' [14] Superueniet enim super uos Spiritus

who sees me also sees the Father'. If you knew, he says, who I am, you would also know him, as far as it is possible, contemplating through me the nature of the Father, of whom I am the Son, existing from him according to essence, and existing with him <as> of the same essence. [11] But because you do not know me, neither do you know the one I call my Father; but knowing me, you also know the one I call Father; seeing me, by the contemplation of the mind, through me you will also see him completely. He also added, 'Until now you have asked nothing in my name' [John 16:24]. And explaining that because they did not yet understand his divine nature, neither did they offer prayers to him as to God, nor make other petitions in his name as it was proper for them to make in the name of the existing God and Son of the God of all; and that because of this weakness of theirs he spoke of the Father in similitudes, for they were neither able to understand fully the things that were said, or of which Father he spoke, nor how he exists, he shows more clearly still. [12] For he said, 'I have said this to you in parables, but the hour will come when I no longer speak to you in parables, but declare to you openly concerning the Father' [John 16:25]. But why was it that he had not spoken openly concerning the Father, except that in very fact they did not know the divine nature of the Only-begotten, from whom they might be able to come to know the God and Father, who was certainly his Father, as <he was> God of God, born of him according to essence? For the sake of this thing he used to speak to them in similitudes concerning the Father, now indeed using the name alone before them, but reserving for himself to teach them at a later time the true knowledge of him [i.e. the Father] when he [i.e. Christ] would make them participants in so great a doctrine, by the grace of the Holy Spirit which came upon them. [13] For this reason also, the Lord himself, in the same speech before the passion, to show their weakness, from which they would be able to receive a more perfect teaching, said, 'I have many things to say to you'. Why, then, do you not say them now? Because 'you cannot bear them now' [John 16:12]: not grudging them, but because you are not sufficiently ready for a greater understanding of these things, being until now in a too weak state to be able to be instructed in these teachings in their fulness. When, then, will they be able, and whence? 'When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all truth' [John 16:13], [14] for the grace of the Holy Spirit will

sancti gratia, ex qua cunctam dogmatum subtilitatem cognoscitis. Proinde si diuinitatem Vnigenti docerentur et Patrem Deum utique docerentur, utpote Dei Filii Patrem, et quid perfectius ad dogmatum scientiam eis remaneret?

FT 15 *Defence* 9.3.5–6; from *Commentary on John* (John 1:10)⁹⁶

‘In mundo erat, et mundus per eum factus est, et mundus eum non cognouit.’ Dicens ‘uenientem in hunc mundum’ de Domino Christo bene intulit, ‘in mundo erat’, ut ostenderet quia ‘uenientem’ ad manifestationem retulit. Substantia enim et natura ‘erat in mundo’ et antea. [6] Et ueluti hoc parum esset, intulit: ‘Et mundus per eum factus est’, hoc est et quid mirum si ‘erat in mundo’, qui non esset, nisi ille uoluisset? Sed tamen ‘erat’ quidem ‘in mundo’ et antea, et fecit etiam mundum ipse, ‘et mundus eum non cognouit’. Bene hic ‘et non cognouit’ dixit, uelut si diceret: Et non cognouerunt proprium Dominum.

FT 16 *Defence* 9.3.9; from *Catechetical Homilies* 8.14 (ed. Tonneau, 207)

Neque enim, si duas naturas dicamus, necessitas nos ulla constringit aut duos dicere filios, aut duos dominos, aut duos Christos, quoniam hoc putare extremae est amentiae.

FT 17 *Defence* 9.3.10–12; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 5.52

Quando naturas quisque discernit, alterum et alterum necessario inuenit; et huic rei neque ipsos puto repugnare, quia alterum

⁹⁶ This passage survives in Greek (ed. R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, Studi e Testi, 141 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica, 1948), 314–15): *Εἰπὼν τὸ ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον περὶ τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ, καλῶς ἐπήγαγε τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, ὥστε δεῖξαι ὅτι τὸ ἐρχόμενον πρὸς τὴν διὰ σαρκὸς εἶπε φανέρωσιν. Τῇ γὰρ ὑποστάσει, φησί, καὶ τῇ φύσει ἦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ πρὸ τούτου. Καὶ ὡς καὶ τούτου μικροῦ τινος ὄντος ἐπήγαγε καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, τουτέστι καὶ τί θαυμαστὸν εἶ ἦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅς οὐκ ἂν ἦν, εἰ μὴ ἐκεῖνος ἐβουλήθη; Ἀλλ’ ὁμῶς ἦν μὲν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πεποιήκε δὲ αὐτὸς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω, τουτέστι τὸν οἰκείον δεσπότην. A Syriac version has also been preserved, ed. J.-M. Vosté, *Theodori Mopsuesteni: Commentarius in Evangelium Iohannis Apostoli*, CSCO 115 (text), 116 (trans.) (Louvain: CSCO 1940), text, p. 32; trans. p. 22.*

come upon you, by which you will know all the subtlety of the teachings. So, if they will be taught the divinity of the Only-begotten, they will also certainly be taught God the Father, as Father of God the Son, and what more perfect thing would there remain to them to know in the teachings?

FT 15 *Defence* 9.3.5–6; from *Commentary on John* (John 1:10)

‘He was in the world, and the world was made through him, and the world knew him not’ [John 1:10]. In saying ‘coming into this world’ [John 1:9] of the Lord Christ, he rightly adds ‘he was in the world’, to show that he relates the ‘coming’ to his manifestation. For by substance and nature ‘he was in the world’ and before <it>. [6] And in case this was not enough, he adds, ‘and the world was made through him’; that is, what would be astonishing if ‘he was in the world’ which would not have been if he himself had not willed <it>? But, however, ‘he was’ certainly ‘in the world’ and before <it>, and he himself also made this world, ‘and the world knew him not’. This ‘and it knew <him> not’ he said well, just as if he said, ‘and they knew not their own Lord’.

FT 16 *Defence* 9.3.9; from *Catechetical Homilies* 8.14 (ed. Tonneau, 207)

If we speak of two natures, no necessity constrains us to speak of either two sons, or two lords, or two Christs, since to think thus is of extreme folly.

FT 17 *Defence* 9.3.10–12; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 5.52

When one distinguishes the natures, he will of necessity find one and another; I think that not even they will reject this fact, since

Deus Verbum natura, alterum autem quod assumptum est, quidquid illud sit, concedatur; hoc interim item persona idem ipse inuenitur, nequaquam confusis naturis, sed propter adunationem quae facta est assumpti ad assumentem. [11] Si enim integre conceditur hoc alterum esse ab illo natura et manifestum quia aequale non est quod assumptum est assumenti, neque simile hoc illi, neque idem quod assumptum est assumenti, manifestum quia idem ipse inuenietur adunatione personae. Sic igitur oportuit diuidere quae circa Christum sunt: istis enim diuisionibus contrarium nihil est, haec enim multam etiam cum diuinis litteris consonantiam habent. [12] Sic neque naturarum fiet confusio, neque personae quaedam praua diuisio. Maneat enim et naturarum ratio inconfusa et indiuisa cognoscatur esse persona. Illud quidem proprietate naturae, diuiso quod assumptum est ab assumente; illud autem adunatione personae in una appellatione totius considerata siue assumentis, siue etiam assumpti natura ut ueluti sic dicam in Filii appellatione simul et Deum Verbum appellamus et assumptam naturam quaecumque illa sit, consignificamus propter adunationem quam ad illum habet.

FT 18 *Defence* 9.3.21–3; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 6.54

Si igitur hominem dicentes Christum hominicolae uocari iuste eis uidemur, hoc antequam nos diceremus scriptura edocuit omnes homines per ea quibus hominem uocare non recusat, sicut superius in plerisque locis uocari hoc nomine Christum ostendimus. [22] Sed hominem, inquit, purum dicentes esse Christum homincolas oportet uocari; hoc iam apertum mendacium est, siquidem hoc dicere uoluerint. Nullus enim aliquando haec nos dicere audiuit, et puto neque istos suscipere posse mentiri mendacium tam apertum, non quia non cognite se habeant ad mendacium, sed quia redargui se posse facillime uident, quamquam si minus eis curet et hoc forsitan contingat. [23] Nos enim haec dicere, id est Vnigeniti negare diuinitatem, summae furiae esse arbitramur, aut quid iam restat cur ab haereticis separemur? Cuius rei gratia et tales et tantas persecutiones sustinuimus? Aut quis ignorat semper aduersum

it is conceded that by nature the God Word is one, and another is that which was assumed, whatever it may be; nevertheless he is likewise found to be the same in *persona*, by no means from a confusion of natures, but because of the union which occurred of the one assumed to the One who assumes. [11] For if it is rightly granted that this one is other than that in nature, and it is clear that what is assumed is not equal to the One who assumes, nor is this thing like that One, nor is what is assumed the same as the One who assumes, it is manifest that he will be found to be the very same by the union of *persona*. It is therefore proper to divide the things concerning Christ: there is nothing contrary to these divisions, for they are in fact in great accord with the divine Scriptures. [12] In this way, there will be neither a confusion of natures, nor a perverse division of the *persona*. Let the principle of the natures stand unconfused and let the *persona* be known to be undivided. The former indeed by the property of nature, since the what is assumed is distinct from the One who assumes; the latter by the union of *persona*, considering in a single name for all both the One who assumes and the nature of what is assumed, so that, for instance, in saying the name of 'Son' we both call upon the God Word and co-signify the assumed nature, whatever it may be, because of the union it has with him.

FT 18 *Defence* 9.3.21–3; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 6.54

If, then, we seem right to name those calling Christ man 'man-worshippers', we would say, before this, that Scripture teaches all men by the <passages> in which it does not reject calling him a man, just as we have shown above in many places that Christ is called by this name. [22] But, they say, those who say that Christ is a mere man should be called 'man-worshippers'; this is already clearly a lie, if indeed they would want to say this. For no one has at any time heard us say those things, and I think that not even they themselves are able to undertake to feign such an evident lie, not because they do not have the aptitude for lying, but because they see that one can very easily refute them, although if one cared about them a little, one might come to this. [23] For we reckon that to say this, that is to deny the divinity of the Only-begotten, is the height of madness, or what reason would now remain why we are separated from the heretics? For what reason have we endured so many and such great persecutions?

nos ab haereticis bellum agi? Omne metallum et omne locum desertum repletum est ex nostris hominibus propter doctrinam pietatis.

FT 19 *Defence* 9.3.24; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 6.54

Haec autem omnia quando beatus Meletius sustinuit primus et cum illo deinde multi per prouincias et ciuitates et loca ab haereticis, cuius rei gratia? Nonne quia Deum uerum Christum confitebantur? Nonne quia uerum praedicabant Filium Dei, de essentia paterna genitum, semper simul exstantem cum generante Patre, addentes etiam de Spiritu sancto piam confessionem? Qualiter itaque, qui tanta propter hanc confessionem passi sumus, calumniam pati ab ipsis possumus, ueluti hominem purum dicentes, ipsis rebus hanc calumniam manifestam redarguentibus?

FT 20 *Defence* 9.3.29–31; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 10.70

Sicut enim per tales uoces ex scriptura diuina naturarum differentiam edocemur, sic et adunationem dicimus, quotiens ambarum naturarum proprietates in unum conduit et sicut de uno quodam eloquitur. Hoc enim est simul ostendere et naturas differentes et personae adunationem; ex differentia quidem eorum quae dicuntur, differentia intellegitur naturarum; cum autem in unum rediguntur, manifestam suspicimus adunationem. [30] Beatus itaque Iohannes euangelista dicit: ‘Altera die uidit Iesum uenientem ad se et dicit: “Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi. Iste est de quo ego dixi, quia post me uenit uir qui ante me factus est, quia prior me erat et ego nesciebam eum”.’ Hic enim dicendo: ‘Vidit Iesum uenientem ad se, et dicit, “Ecce Agnus Dei”’, manifeste humanitatem significare mihi uidetur. [31] Hoc enim uidebat Baptista Iohannes, hoc erat quod susceperat mortem, corpus uidelicet quod pro omni oblatum est mundo. Quod uero sequitur: ‘Qui tollit peccata mundi’, nequaquam iam conuenit carni. Non enim illius erat totius mundi peccatum auferre, sed erat hoc pro certo diuinitatis opus.

Or who does not know of the wars always waged against us by the heretics? Every mine and every deserted place is filled with our people because of the teaching of piety.

FT 19 *Defence* 9.3.24; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 6.54

And when the blessed Meletius endured all these things from the heretics first, and thereafter many others with him throughout the provinces and the cities and the places, what was the reason? Was it not that they confessed that Christ was true God? Was it not that they preached that he was the true Son of God, begotten from the paternal essence, always existing at the same time together with the generating Father, adding also the pious confession regarding the Holy Spirit? How, then, are we, who have suffered such great things because of this confession, able to suffer this calumny from them, as if we said that Christ was a mere man, when the facts themselves refute this evident calumny?

FT 20 *Defence* 9.3.29–31; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 10.70

For just as we are taught, by such words from the divine Scripture, the difference of natures, so also we affirm the union each time that it combines the properties of both natures into one and speaks thus of ‘one’. For this is to show at the same time both the different natures and the union of *persona*; from the difference of the things said, the difference of natures is understood; but when they are brought back to one, we accept the evident union. [30] Thus the blessed evangelist John said, ‘The next day, he saw Jesus coming towards him and said, “Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world! This is he of whom I said, After me comes comes a man who ranks before he, for he was before me”’. [John 1: 29–30]. For in saying, ‘He saw Jesus coming towards him and said, “Behold, the Lamb of God”’, it seems to me that he clearly signifies the humanity. [31] For this which John the Baptist saw was that which would accept death, that is to say the body which was offered for the whole world. But that which follows, ‘who takes away the sins of the world’, in no way applies to the flesh. For it was not flesh that takes away the sins of the whole world, but this was certainly the work of divinity.

FT 21 *Defence* 9.3.34; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

Si uero aliquis interrogare uoluerit, quid tandem esse dicam Iesum Christum, dico Deum et Filium Dei.

FT 22 *Defence* 9.3.40; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 15

Propter quod utrumque iuste Filius uocatur, una exstante persona, quam adunatio naturarum effecit.

FT 23 *Defence* 9.3.44; from *Against Eunomium*, bk. 10

Omnes enim Iudaei uenturum Christum ex propheticis uocibus exspectabant, magnum quemdam et multorum bonorum eis auctorem futurum. Quapropter interrogante Herode post magorum praesentiam scribas et pharisaeos, ubi Christus nasceretur, responderunt illi et locum dixerunt, quia in Bethleem Iudae. Sed non propterea Christum Filium Dei Deum sciebant, hominem autem purum arbitrati sunt Christum secundum probatissimos prophetarum futurum, licet parum aliquid his meliorem, quod etiam nunc putantes Iudaeos quilibet uidebit.

FT 24 *Defence* 9.4.4–9; from *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4

Quoniam autem et iuxta nos homo dicitur ex anima et corpore constare et duas quidem has dicimus naturas, animam et corpus, unum uero hominem ex ambobus compositum; ut conseruemus unum esse utrumque, oportet confundere naturas et reconuertentes dicere, quoniam anima caro est, et caro anima. Et quoniam illa quidem immortalis est et rationalis, caro uero mortalis et irrationalis, reconuertentes dicamus, quia immortalis est mortalis, et mortalis immortalis; et rationalis irrationalis et irrationalis rationalis. [5] Sed neque ex diuina scriptura hoc edocti sumus, o sapientissime omnium, neque alius quisquam hoc dicit, usque in hodiernum diem, eorum qui sanam humanam habent mentem, praeter uos qui per omnia estis dementes; qui dispensationem quae propter nos facta est auferentes, ablatione assumptionis mentis in ipsam mentem iudicium recepistis totius insipientiae plena loquentes et cum multa irreuerentia leges constituentes. [6] Quaecumque enim secundum aliquid discreta,

FT 21 *Defence* 9.3.34; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

But if anyone should want to ask what, finally, I would say Jesus Christ is, I say that he is God and Son of God.

FT 22 *Defence* 9.3.40; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 15

On account of which each is rightly called 'son', there being one *persona* which the union of natures effects.

FT 23 *Defence* 9.3.44; from *Against Eunomium*, bk. 10

From the prophetic sayings, all the Jews were expecting that the coming Christ would be somebody great and the author of numerous benefits for them. Because of this, with Herod, after the visit of the wise men, asking the scribes and Pharisees where the Christ would be born, they answered him and said 'in Bethlehem of Judaea' [Matt 1: 5]. But they did not therefore know that Christ was God, the Son of God, but they thought Christ would be a mere man, according to the most sure prophecies, even though a little better than they, as anyone can see the Jews think even now.

FT 24 *Defence* 9.4.4–9; from *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4

Since in our case also man is said to be constituted from body and soul, say that they, body and soul, are two natures, but that one man is composed from both; for us to maintain that both are one <nature>, it is necessary to confuse the natures and, turning <things> round, to say that the flesh is soul and the soul flesh. And since the former is immortal and rational, but the flesh is mortal and irrational, turning <things> round we would say that the immortal is mortal and the mortal immortal; the rational irrational and the irrational rational. [5] But neither have we been taught this from the divine Scripture, O Wisest of all, nor has anyone at all said this until this very day from those who have a healthy human mind, except you who are demented in all things; you who, destroying the economy which happened on our account, by a removal of the assumption of the mind into the Mind itself, have received judgement, saying things full of all folly and establishing laws with great irreverence. [6] For things which

secundum aliquid acceperunt unitatem, seruant suam qua discreta sunt incolumem rationem et unitatem integram habent. Vnum est aliquid natura, sicuti filius et pater; manet autem personarum discretio; essentia quidem inseparabiliter una existente, personae propriam habent discretionem, ut neque pater dicatur filius, neque filius pater. [7] Similiter etsi natura quaedam diuersa sint, secundum aliud uero adunari contigerit ea, neque naturalem perdunt diuisionem, et unitatem propriam habent, sicut anima adunata est corpori et unus ex ambobus effectus est homo. Manet naturarum diuisio; alia quidem anima est, alia uero caro; et illud quidem immortale est, illud autem mortale; et illud quidem rationale, illud autem irrationale. [8] Vnus autem homo utrumque; alterutrum uero in seipso homo numquam dicitur absolute et proprie, nisi forte cum aliquo additamento, sicut interior homo et exterior homo, non absolute homo, sed interior et exterior, ut appareat aliud quidem interius hominis, aliud uero exterius. [9] Ita et in Domino Christo dicimus: O mirabilis, quoniam in forma Dei exstans, formam serui forma Dei, neque assumens quod assumptum est, neque quod assumptum est assumens. Unitas autem assumpti circa assumentem inseparabilis est, secundum nullum modum incidi ualens.

FT 25 *Defence* 9.5.21; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 9

Si utique quod dictum est: ‘Verbum caro factum est’, secundum aliquam conuersionem dictum est, quomodo ‘inhabitauit’ suscipiendum est? Palam est enim omnibus, quia quod inhabitat, aliud est quam quod inhabitatur. [. . .] Inhabitauit enim in nobis nostram naturam sumens et habitans et in ea omnia salutis nostrae dispensans. Quomodo ergo inhabitans caro factus est Dei Verbum? Palam est quia non conuersus, neque translatus; non enim inhabitare diceretur.

are distinguished in one respect, receive unity in another respect, they preserve intact the principle by which they are distinguished and they have an unimpaired unity. Some things are one by nature, such as the Father and the Son; but the distinction of *personae* remains; the essence is inseparably one, yet the *personae* have their proper distinctions, so that Father is not called Son, nor the Son Father. [7] Likewise, even if certain things are diverse in nature, it happens that they are united on a different level; they neither lose their natural distinction and they have their proper unity, just as the soul is united to the body, and one man results from both. The division of natures remains: the soul is one, the flesh another; one is immortal, the other mortal; one rational, the other irrational. [8] There is one man from both; but one never says that one of the two is in itself the man in the absolute and in particular, except perhaps with some other addition, such as the interior man and the exterior man—not man in the absolute, but interior and exterior, that it is clear that the interior man is one thing, and the exterior man another. [9] Thus also in the case of the Lord Christ we say: Oh Wonder! Being in the form of God, the form of God <took> the form of a servant [Phil. 2:6–7]; he who assumed is not what was assumed, nor is what was assumed he who assumed. But the unity of him who was assumed with him who assumed is inseparable, and can in no way be ruptured.

FT 25 *Defence* 9.5.21; from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 9

At any rate, if the saying ‘the Word became flesh’ is said with respect to some alteration, what is to be understood by ‘he dwelt’ [John 1:14]? For it is clear to everyone that that which indwells is different from that which is indwelt. [. . .] For ‘he dwelt among us’, assuming and indwelling our nature, and arranging in it everything pertaining to our salvation. How, then, did the God Word become flesh by indwelling? Clearly not because he was altered or transformed; for then it would not be said that he indwelt.

FT 26 *Defence* 10.1.20–4; From the beginning of *On Apollinarius and His Heresy*

Ante XXX enim iam hos annos de incarnatione domini codicem conscripsimus usque ad XV millia uersuum pertingentem, in quo Arii et Eunomii de hac re delicta, nec non etiam Apollinarii uanam praesumptionem, per totum illud opus examinauimus, ut nihil, sicut mea fert opinio, praeterirem ex his quae et ad firmitatem ecclesiasticae orthodoxiae pertinerent et ad conuincendam eorum impietatem. [21] Sed hi qui omnia facillime praesumunt, et praeterea rursus ab Apollinario, qui princeps huius haeresis fuerat, instituti, omnibus quidem similiter sentientibus opus nostrum manifestum fecerunt, si quo modo aliqua inuenirent ualentia ad conuincendum ea quae in eo sunt scripta. Quoniam uero nullus contra certamen scriptis suscipere praesumebat, imitati sunt infirmos athletas et callidos, qui, dum non possunt contra fortiores certare, insidiis eos et machinamentis quibus possunt conantur euertere. [22] Scripserunt enim ipsi inter se procul dubio quaedam inepta, quae a nobis umquam minime dicerentur. Denique haec ipsa in medio nostrorum scriptorum in quadam parte interposuerunt et suis familiaribus demonstraerunt, aliquando autem et nostris, qui per facilitatem suam omnia pronis animis audiebant; et hoc quasi documentum, sicut putabant, nostrae impietatis uidentibus praebebant. [23] Vnum autem ex his scriptis erat, duos filios dicere. Sic enim nos fecerunt in hoc opere dicentes, quod oporteat putare et dicere duos filios, et uehementer nos istum sermonem defendere, dum nos in illa scriptura manifeste diceremus, quod non oporteat duos filios dicere. Necesse erat ergo, non solum inepta, sed etiam infirma illa scripta audientibus apparere, quoniam neque firma ratione, neque conuenienti hoc possibile erat ostendi: et ab illis idcirco infirmius erat conscriptum, quatenus ille qui scripserat facilius inde conuinci potuisset. [24] Vnus ergo ex nostris propter multam facilitatem haec nostra esse credit scripta et huius rei gratia dignus fide ab illis creditus est qui ista perlegeret et renuntiauit nobis ea quae fuerant scripta. Cum igitur audissemus, culpauimus quidem illum, quod contra nos dictis sermonibus credidisset et de his rebus, quas saepius et in Ecclesia et priuatim dicentes nos audiuit, cum fidiorem scriptis nostram uocem iudicare debuerit, ad documentum nostrae sententiae, quam in dogmatibus uotum nostrum est conseruare.

FT 26 *Defence* 10.1.20–4; From the beginning of *On Apollinarius and His Heresy*

Thirty years ago we wrote the book *On the Incarnation of the Lord*, comprising of up to 15,000 lines, in which we examined the entire work of Arius and Eunomius, at fault in this matter, besides also the vain presumption of Apollinarius, so that I should pass over nothing of those things that, in my opinion, pertain to the firmness of ecclesial orthodoxy and to the refuting of their impiety. [21] But those who suppose everything with great ease, and in addition were taught otherwise by Apollinarius, who had been the leader of this heresy, made our work known to all of a similar mind, if by some way they might find some things strong <enough> to refute the things written in them. But because none dared to take up a counter-attack in writing, they imitated weak and cunning athletes who, when unable to fight against stronger <competitors>, try to overthrow them by whatever traps and tricks they can. [22] For they wrote, amongst themselves no doubt, certain absurdities, which were by no means ever said by us. They then interpolated these very things in the midst of our writings at a certain part, and pointed them out to their friends, and sometimes also to ours, who through their naivety listened to everything eagerly; and they presented this, to those who would look, as if <it were> proof, as they thought, of our impiety. [23] But one of these writings was <made> to say ‘two sons’. For they represented us in these writings <as> saying that it is necessary to think and to say ‘two sons’, and <that we> vehemently defended this statement, while we in that writing clearly said that it is not proper to say two sons. It was inevitable, therefore, that these writings would appear to those who listened not only absurd but also weak, since it was not possible for this to be demonstrated either by a solid argument or by an appropriate one; what therefore was written by them was weaker inasmuch as he who wrote could more easily be refuted from there. [24] One of ours, because of great naivety, believing these writings to be ours and, because of this, trustworthy, believed the things he read from them, and related to us what was written. When we heard him, therefore, we reproached him for having believed words said against us, on things which he heard us speak frequently, both in the Church and in private, since he should have considered our voice more faithful than writings as a proof of our intention, which it is our vow to maintain in matters concerning the teachings.

EXTRACTS FROM THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE AND POPE VIGILIUS

The Acts of the Council of Constantinople in 553, the Fifth Ecumenical Council, contain several important collections of extracts from the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and, as we have seen in Chapter 4, a few extracts from Diodore of Tarsus given under the name of Theodore.¹ As we saw in Chapter 3, the Council, from its calling to its conclusion and reception, was a stormy affair. However, as the formal condemnation of Theodore at the level of an ecumenical council, it marks the end of our survey and study. The council was not interested in the figure of Diodore; indeed, his name is dropped even where the original material cited by the council mentioned him.² Together with Theodore, Diodore had been condemned by various synods and writers over the previous century, but unlike the case of Theodore, there was no one prepared to speak in his defense, at least amongst the churches who had accepted the Council of Ephesus, 431. Diodore does, however, come to be routinely condemned, along with Theodore and Nestorius, thereafter.

The fourth session of the council, meeting on 12 May, was devoted to the reading of a florilegium of seventy-three extracts from the writings of Theodore and concluded with the creed attributed to him, which had been condemned at the Council of Ephesus in 431.³ At two points during the reading of these extracts

¹ For a full and sensitive analysis of the council, together with a translation of the Acts (to which the present translation is indebted), see Price, *Constantinople*. My thanks to Richard Price for making available to me his translation and commentary prior to publication.

² Price (*Constantinople*, 1.312–13) notes the instance of a letter from Theodoret to Irenaeus, in the Greek text of which (*Ep.* 16) both Diodore and Theodore are mentioned, but in the Latin version given in the Acts of Constantinople (*ACO* 4.1, session 5, §35, p. 95) only Theodore.

³ Past editions have, in two cases, combined two extracts, to number 71 extracts in total: C4T 30 and C4T 31 (both from *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7) have been numbered as

the bishops assembled in council burst out in indignation, probably not spontaneously, against Theodore, likening him to Judas and describing his creed as being the composition of Satan.⁴ The session concluded with the chairman acknowledging that ‘the multitude of heresies that have been read out which Theodore of Mopsuestia belched forth’ clearly calls for his condemnation, and that the fathers, the imperial laws, and the writers of history are also unambiguous about this, but that it is necessary first to review that material formally. Closely related to the florilegium used by the council are the sixty extracts from Theodore presented in the *Constitutum* issued by Pope Vigilius on 14 May. All but one are included in the dossier presented to the council; the pope does not, however, indicate the source for the extracts as the council had done. Rather than duplicating these texts, we have provided numeration for both series below, including the additional extract given by Vigilius between C4T 12 and 13. The relation between the florilegium employed by the council and Vigilius and other earlier collections of extracts from Diodore and Theodore has been analysed in Chapter 4.

The fifth session of the council met on Saturday, 17 May 553, and began by reading material pertaining to Theodore from ‘what the holy fathers said about him and what is contained in imperial

30a and 30b, and C4T 43 and C4T 44 (from the *Cat. Hom.* 5.19 and 5.21 respectively) as 42a and 42b; yet in other cases extracts given in sequence from the same book have been numbered separately (eg. C4T 1–7, from *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3). It seems best to be consistent in numbering all the extracts sequentially, noting the variation in numeration in [].

The creed attributed to Theodore first appears, anonymously, at the Council of Ephesus, where it accompanies the plaint submitted by Charisius of Philadelphia, regarding various Nestorians who advocated the use of this creed rather than that of Nicaea; this material was reproduced at the second council held in Ephesus in 449, and then, as part of this larger unit, at Chalcedon in 451 (for the various other places where the text is found see *ACO* 4.1, p. 70; a translation can be found in Gaddis and Price, *Chalcedon*, 1.311–13). Cyril of Alexandria attributes the creed to Theodore and says that it was by discretion that his name was not mentioned when the creed was condemned at the council (*Ep.* 72.3; Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus*, 18.13–19). The *Blasphemies* (BT 26) also cite a passage from the creed as a text of Theodore. Devreese (*Essai*, 257) points out that the ‘Criminal Creed’ is quite different to the one commented on by Theodore in his *Catechetical Homilies*. Although clearly belonging to the theological tradition of Theodore, it lies slightly outside the scope of this present work and requires further study into its origin and transmission, and so has not been included here.

⁴ Fourth Session, §§34 and 82 (*ACO* 4.1, pp. 56, 72).

laws and historical writings'. The first part of this material comes from the writings of Cyril of Alexandria, and contains eleven extracts attributed to Theodore, although, as has long been known and we have seen in Chapter 4, the first five extracts, all of which are said to come from Cyril's first book *Against Theodore*, in fact come from Diodore (and are given as Diodorean extracts here). The sixth session of the council, held on 19 May, was given over to examining the case of the letter of Ibas of Edessa to Mari the Persian. Towards the end of the proceedings, the council turned to compare this letter to the Chalcedonian Definition, as Justinian had requested in his letter to the council read at the first session. After reading the Definition, a short text was read which may well have been prepared by Theodore Askidas, comparing the letter of Ibas to the Definition. In this text there are three extracts from Theodore, one of which is identical with an extract read at the fourth session.

Text

Concilium universale Constantinopolitanum sub Iustiniano habitum, ACO 4.1, ed. J. Straub (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971). Extracts from the fourth session are on pp. 44–70; from the fifth session on pp. 74–82; and the sixth on pp. 180–1.

Vigilius, *First Constitutum*. Ed. O. Günther, *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab A. CCCLXVII usque ad A. DLIII datae. Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, CSEL 35.1 (Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig: Tempsky, 1895), 230–320.

I. THE FOURTH SESSION

C₄T I (VT I) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

[b=LT 34, JT 5; d=JT 6]

Quomodo igitur tu cui super omnes maxime decet dementium regimen, illum qui ex uirgine natus est, Deum esse ex Deo consubstantialem Patri existimari dicis, nisi forte sancto Spiritui imputare illius creationem nos iubes? Sed qui Deus est ex Deo consubstantialis Patri? Ei quidem, qui ex uirgine natus erat, o mirande, et qui per Spiritum sanctum secundum diuinas scripturas plasmatus est et confectionem in muliebri accepit uentre, inerat forsitan, quia mox quam plasmatus est, et ut templum Dei esset, accepit; non tamen existimandum nobis est Deum de uirgine natum esse, nisi forte idem existimandum nobis est et quod natum est, et quod est in nato, templum et qui in templo est Deus Verbum. Non tamen nec secundum tuam uocem pronuntiandum est omnino ex uirgine natum Deum esse et ex Deo et consubstantialem Patri. Nam si non homo est, sicut dicis, adsumptus qui natus est ex uirgine, Deus uero incarnatus, quomodo qui natus est, Deus ex Deo et consubstantialis diceretur Patri, carne non potente hanc uocem suscipere? Nam est quidem dementia Deum ex uirgine natum esse dicere; hoc enim nihil aliud est quam ex semine eum dicere Dauid de substantia uirginis genitum et in ipsa plasmatum, quia quod ex semine Dauid et

I. THE FOURTH SESSION

C4T 1 (VT 1) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

[b=LT 34, JT 5; d=JT 6]

[a] How then do you, who more than anyone are especially suited for governing the demented, say that he who was born from the Virgin is to be reckoned ‘God from God, consubstantial with the Father’, unless perhaps you order us to ascribe his creation to the Holy Spirit? [b] But what God is ‘from God, consubstantial with the Father’? He was indeed present, it seems,⁵ in the one who was born from the Virgin, O admirable one, and who, according to the divine Scriptures, was formed by the Holy Spirit and received composition in the woman’s womb, since directly upon being formed he became the temple of God; we are not, however, to suppose that God was born from the Virgin, unless perhaps we suppose that what was born and what was in the one born is the same, the temple and the God Word in the temple. However, not even according to your saying is it at all to be asserted that the one born from the Virgin is ‘God from God, consubstantial with the Father’. For if, as you say, the one born from the Virgin is not an adopted man, but God incarnate, how can the one who was born be called ‘God from God, consubstantial with the Father’, since flesh is not able to accept this description. It is assuredly madness to say that God was born from the Virgin; for this is nothing other than to say that he was begotten from the seed of David, from the substance of the Virgin and fashioned in her, since that which

⁵ As Price notes (*Constantinople*, 1.236, n. 27), ‘forsitan’ and ‘forte’, meaning ‘perhaps’, have occasionally been used to translate *ὡς οἰκὸς*, ‘it seems’, ‘presumably’, as here and C4T 10 (where there exists a parallel extract in Greek) and presumably in C4T 2.

de substantia uirginis est, in materno uentre constitit et sancti Spiritus plasmatum uirtute natum fuisse dicimus de uirgine. Ut autem aliquis et hoc concedat dicere ipsis quod Deus et ex Deo et consubstantialis Patri natus est ex uirgine eo quod est in templo, nato, sed non per se natus est Deus Verbum, incarnatus uero, sicut dicit iste sapiens. Si igitur cum carne eum natum esse dicunt, quod autem natum est, Deus et ex Deo et consubstantialis Patri est, necesse est hoc et carnem dicere. Quod si non id caro est, quoniam nec Deus nec ex Deo nec consubstantialis Patri, sed ex semine Daudid et consubstantialis ei cuius semen est, non id quod natum est ex uirgine, Deus et ex Deo et consubstantialis Patri, nisi forte pars nati, prout ipse in inferioribus partem Christi nominat deitatem. Sed non diuina natura ex uirgine nata est; natus autem est ex uirgine, qui ex substantia uirginis constat. Non Deus Verbum ex Maria natus est, natus autem est ex Maria, qui ex semine est Daudid. Non Deus Verbum ex muliere natus est, sed natus est ex muliere, qui uirtute sancti Spiritus plasmatus est in ea; non ex matre natus est consubstantialis Patri, ('sine matre' enim iste secundum beati Pauli uocem), sed qui in posterioribus temporibus in materno uentre sancti Spiritus uirtute plasmatus est, utpote 'sine Patre' propter hoc dictus.

C4T 2 (VT 2) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Mox autem in ipso plasmato Deus Verbum factus est. Nec enim in caelum ascendentem solum inerat, sed etiam ex mortuis resurgenti, utpote et resuscitans eum secundum suam promissionem; nec resurgenti solum inerat, sed etiam crucifixo et baptizato et euangelicam post baptismum conuersionem peragenti nec non etiam ante baptismum legalem adimplenti constitutionem et praesentato secundum legem et circumciso et partus pannis obuoluto. Erat autem forte in ipso et nascente et cum in materno utero esset a prima statim plasmatione; dispensationi enim quae

is from the seed of David and the substance of the Virgin, constituted in the maternal womb and fashioned by the power of the Holy Spirit, is what we say is born from the Virgin. [c] If anyone conceded this to them, that the one who is 'God from God, consubstantial with the Father' was born from the Virgin, as he is in the temple, in the one born, yet the God Word, in himself, is still not born, but incarnate, as this wise man says. If, therefore, they say that he was born together with his flesh, and that what is born is 'God from God, consubstantial with the Father', it would be necessary to say this also of the flesh. But if the flesh is not this, since it is neither God nor from God nor consubstantial with the Father, but from the seed of David and consubstantial with him whose seed it is, then the one born from the Virgin is not this, 'God from God and consubstantial with the Father', unless perhaps it is a part of what is born, just as he himself later on calls the divinity a part of Christ. [d] But it is not the divine nature that was born from the Virgin; there was born from the Virgin the one who exists from the substance of the Virgin. It is not the God Word who was born from Mary; there was born from Mary one who is from the seed of David. It is not the God Word who was born from a woman; there was born of a woman one formed in her by the power of the Holy Spirit. From a mother was born, not the one consubstantial with the Father (for he is 'without mother' according to the saying of the blessed Paul [Heb. 7:3]), but the one who in the latter times was formed in the maternal womb by the power of the Holy Spirit, so that for this reason he is said to be 'without father' [Heb. 7:3].

C4T 2 (VT 2) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Directly in the very fashioning, the God Word came to be. For he was not only in the one ascending into the heavens, but also in the one rising from the dead, inasmuch as he was also raising him, according to his promise; nor only in the one rising, but also in the one crucified and baptized, and, after baptism, living an evangelical life, and, even before baptism, fulfilling the legal regulations, being presented according to the law and circumcised and bound with infants' swaddling clothes. He was, it seems,⁶ in him when he was born and when he was in the maternal womb from the very first moment of his formation; for he imposed an

⁶ For this translation of 'forte' see n. 5 above.

circa eum erat, ordinem imponebat, utpote et particulatim ipsum ad perfectionem producens.

C4T 3 (VT 3) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Et per tempus quidem ad baptisma ducens, post illud autem ad mortem, deinde secundum suam pronuntiationem resuscitans, ducens in caelum, conlocans eum ad dexteram Dei per suam coniunctionem, ex qua sede et adoratur ab omnibus et omnes iudicabit. Istorum autem omnium finem apud se habebat Deus Verbum, cum in eo erat, et omnia per ordinem complebat; quem ordinem ipse arbitrabatur bene habere praefinitione quidem et uoluntate quam antea statuit pro his quae euentura erant. Et bona uoluntate quam circa eum habebat, ab initio similiter inerat ei, per ordinem autem sibi placitum ad perfectionem ducebat ipsum.

C4T 4 (VT 4) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Suam autem cooperationem ad proposita opera praestabat ei qui adsumptus est. Ubi hoc facit in loco sensus fuisse deitatem illi qui adsumptus est? Nec enim deitas, quibuscumque suam donauit cooperationem, sensus locum illis obtinebat. Si autem et modo praecipuam quandam cooperationem donauit illi qui adsumptus est, non hoc faciebat locum sensus deitatem obtinere. Sed si deitas pro sensu fiebat illi qui adsumptus est, secundum uestra uerba, quo modo timorem in passione suscipiebat? Quid uehementioribus orationibus ad imminentem necessitatem indigebat, quas cum magna quidem et clamosa uoce, cum plurimis autem lacrimis secundum beatum Paulum referebat Deo? Quomodo timore tanto detinebatur, ut ex immensa trepidatione fontes sudoris dimitteret, euangelista aperte dicente quod globis sanguinis similis sudor descendebat? Quid autem et angeli aduentu et uisitatione egebat animam reficientis in experimento malorum, confortantis eius alacritatem, excitantis eum ad imminentem passionis necessitatem, tolerare fortiter mala suadentis, unguentis ad patientiam et tolerantiam malorum, ostendentis praesentium malorum fructum, ex passione mutatione

order upon the economy regarding him, just as he led him little by little to perfection.

C₄T 3 (VT 3) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

And leading him, in time, to baptism, and after that to death, then raising him according to his promise, leading him to heaven, and placing him at the right hand of God through his conjunction <to the Word>, from which throne he is both worshipped by all and will judge all. The God Word had the end of all these things from himself,⁷ as he was in him, and accomplished all in order, an order that he himself judged to be right, by a predetermination and volition that he formerly ordained, before the things that were to take place. By the good will that he had regarding him, he was similarly in him from the beginning, and through an order that pleased him he led him to perfection.

C₄T 4 (VT 4) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

He provided his own cooperation towards the proposed works to him who was assumed. When he does this, is the divinity in the place of the mind in him who was assumed? For the divinity did not take the place of the mind in any of those to whom he gave his cooperation. If indeed he gave, in some way, a particular cooperation to him who was assumed, this did not make the divinity take the place of the mind. But if the divinity was in the one assumed in place of a mind, according to your words, how did he undergo fear at the passion? Why, at the imminent fate,⁸ did he need more vehement prayers, which with a loud and clamorous voice, with the most tears, according to the blessed Paul, he offered to God [Heb. 5:7]? How was he seized by such fear, that in immense agitation he shed streams of sweat, the evangelist clearly saying that his sweat fell down like drops of blood [Luke 22:44]? Why did he need the coming and visitation of the angel, refreshing his soul in the experience of ills, strengthening his eagerness, encouraging him for the imminent fate of the passion, persuading him to bear the ills bravely, anointing him to endure and bear ills, and revealing the fruit of the present ills, the future glory in exchange for the passion, and the good things that would

⁷ Price (*Constantinople*, 1.237): 'In all these things God the Word possessed in himself the final authority', taking 'finem habebat' as a translation of *τέλος εἶχεν*.

⁸ Price (*ibid.*): 'the imminence of pain', taking 'necessitas' as translating *ἀνάγκη*.

futuram gloriam, bona circa eum post passionem futura? Qui enim secundum euangelistae uocem confortabat eum, angelus scilicet, uerbis istis fortem eum faciebat et infirmitate naturae superiores fieri hortabatur et conroborendo cogitationes eius fortem eum faciebat.

C4T 5 (VT 5) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3: Theodore, speaking in the *persona* of Christ as if replying to Peter saying to Christ about the passion of the cross, 'Mercy on you, Lord! This will not happen to you' (Matt. 16:22)

'Vade post me, satana; scandalum mihi es, quod non sapis ea quae Dei sunt, sed ea quae hominum.' Non est confusio mihi mors, non fugiam ipsam ut indecentum ad humanam gloriam respiciens; sustinebo autem meliore animo experimentum mortis pro pluribus bonis futurae, in quibus et ipse fuero et per me omnes. Ne mihi animum laedas neque turbes tamquam confusione dignum fugere admonens mortis experimentum.

C4T 6 (VT 6) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Quod enim dictum est, 'ducebatur a Spiritu', aperte hoc significat quod ab eo regebatur, ab eo ad uirtutem propositorum confortabatur, ab eo ad haec quae oportebat, ducebatur, ab eo quod decebat, docebatur, ab eo cogitationibus corroborabatur, ut ad tantum certamen sufficeret, sicut et beatus dicit Paulus, 'quicumque enim Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi sunt filii Dei', duci Spiritu dicens illos qui ab eo gubernantur, ab eo docentur, ab eo ad melius constituuntur, ab eo competentium doctrinam accipiunt. Cum dixisset autem euangelista quod 'Spiritu sancto plenus regressus est ab Iordane', aperte demonstrauit quod huius causa sancti Spiritus habitationem in baptisate suscepit, ut inde ad proposita caperet uirtutem. Vnde et ad certamen illud quod pro nobis erat ad diabolum effecturus, Spiritu ducebatur.

C4T 7 (VT 7) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Dicant igitur nobis omnium sapientissimi, si pro sensu domino Christo qui est secundum carnem, deitas facta esset, sicut dicunt, quid sancti Spiritus cooperatione ad haec Christus indigebat. Nec

happen to him after the passion? For he who, according to the words of the evangelist [Luke 22:43], strengthened him, that is, the angel, by his words made him strong, exhorted him to rise above the weakness of nature, and, bolstering his thoughts, made him strong.

C4T 5 (VT 5) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3: Theodore, speaking in the *persona* of Christ as if replying to Peter saying to Christ about the passion of the cross, ‘Mercy on you, Lord! This will not happen to you’ (Matt. 16:22)

‘Get behind me, Satan; you are a stumbling-block to me, for you do not understand the things of God, but the things of men’ [Matt. 16:23]. Death is not disturbing to me, I shall not flee it, as if thinking it indecent for human glory; but with a better spirit I will endure the experience of death for the sake of the many good things to come, in which I shall be and through me everyone. Do not afflict or trouble my soul by urging me to flee from the experience of death as something worthy of disturbance.

C4T 6 (VT 6) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

For that which is said, ‘he was led by the Spirit’ [Matt. 4:1] clearly indicates that he was governed by him, strengthened by him for valour in the things proposed, was led by him to what had to be, was taught by him what was fitting, bolstered by him in his thoughts, so that he would be equal to so great a contest, as also the blessed Paul says, ‘all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God’ [Rom. 8:14], calling ‘led by the Spirit’ those governed by him, taught by him, established by him towards what is better, receiving from him the teaching of things suitable. When the Evangelist said ‘he returned from the Jordan full of the Holy Spirit’ [Luke 4:1], he clearly showed that he received the indwelling of the Holy Spirit at baptism for this purpose, that he should take valour from this for the things proposed. Whence he was led by the Spirit to that contest which he was to wage with the devil on our behalf.

C4T 7 (VT 7) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Therefore, let the wisest of all tell us why, if, as they say, the divinity took the place of the mind in the Lord Christ, who is according to the flesh, Christ needed the cooperation of the Holy

enim Vnigeniti deitas Spiritu indigebat ad iustificationem, Spiritu indigebat ad uincendum diabolum, Spiritu indigebat ad operanda miracula, Spiritu indigebat, ut doceretur ea quae decebat, peragere, Spiritu indigebat, ut immaculatus appareret. Si enim pro sensu quidem deitas, sufficebat autem ad omnia eius uirtus, necesse erat inde omnia fieri, ut superflua esset sancti Spiritus habitatio. Sed nunc unctum esse dicit ipsum Spiritu et habitasse in eo Spiritum et ad omnia adiutasse proposita et doctrinam inde ipsum accepisse et uirtutem et inde impetrasse iustificationem et inde immaculatum factum esse.

C₄T 8 (VT 8) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4

[a=LT 32, JT 3; c=LT 33, JT 4]

Hoc quod ante saecula erat, dicit in ultimis factum esse temporibus, utpote quibusdam hoc confitentibus, cum nemo ex his qui pietatis curam habet, istum patitur morbum habere dementiae, ut dicat eum qui ante saecula est, in ultimis factum esse. Et his infert quod necesse est et hoc quod in ultimis est, ante saecula esse, et accusat eos, qui non omnia similiter cum obuersione dicunt, quasi his qui unum esse filium confitentur, necessitatem habentibus cum obuersione omnia dicere. Et quis non beatificet uestram dementiae? Quis autem non optet tales impetrare doctores tantam confusionem rationi pietatis introducentes, ut dicerent quod hoc quod ante saecula est, factum est in ultimis, et hoc alienarent sua natura et ad deterius deducerent, deinde obuernerent quod et hoc quod est in ultimis, ante saecula est, cum oporteret forte dicere quod, qui ante saecula erat, adsumpsit hunc qui in ultimis erat secundum beati Pauli uocem? Vestras igitur leges sequentes et a tua sapientia constitutam obuersionem, immo magis subuersionem suscipientes age omnia simul confundamus et nulla iam sit discretio nec Dei formae nec serui formae nec templi sumpti nec eius qui in templo habitauit, nec eius qui solutus est, nec eius qui suscitauit, nec

Spirit for these. For it was not the case that the divinity of the Only-begotten needed the Spirit for righteousness, needed the Spirit for conquering the devil, needed the Spirit for effecting miracles, needed the Spirit to be taught to accomplish what was fitting, needed the Spirit to appear without blemish. For if the divinity had indeed replaced the mind, its power would have sufficed for everything, everything would necessarily have been done by it, so that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit would have been superfluous. But, as matters are, it says that he was anointed by the Spirit, and that the Spirit indwelt in him, and assisted him in all that was proposed, and he received teaching and vigour from this, and from this he acquired righteousness and became blameless.

C4T 8 (VT 8) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 4

[a=LT 32, JT 3; c=LT 33, JT 4]

[a] ‘He⁹ who was before the ages’, he says, ‘came to be in the last days’, as some have confessed this, although none of those who are diligent for piety have suffered from such an affliction of madness as to say that he who was before the ages came to be in the last days. [b] From this he infers that it is necessary that he who is in the last days was before the ages, and accuses those who do not similarly say everything in reverse, as if those who confess the Son to be one have the necessity to say everything in reverse. Who would not bless your madness? Who would not wish to obtain such teachers, introducing such confusion into the reason of piety, that they say ‘what was before the ages came to be in the last days’, that they estrange him from his nature and reduce him to a worse state, then they reverse it, <saying> ‘he who is in the last days was before the ages,’ when one ought presumably to say that ‘he who was before the ages assumed him who was in the last days’, according to the saying of the blessed Paul [cf. Heb. 1:2]? [c] Therefore, following your rules and accepting your principle of reversal, or rather the subversion, decreed by your wisdom, come, let us mix everything together and let there be no distinction forthwith: neither the form of God, nor the form of a servant; neither the temple assumed, nor the one who dwelt in the temple; neither the one who was dissolved, nor the one who raised

⁹ Following the masculine pronoun given in LT 32 and JT 3.

eius qui perfectus est in passionibus, nec eius qui perfecit, nec eius qui memoriam meritus est, nec eius qui memor factus est, nec eius qui uisitatus est, nec eius qui uisitauit, nec eius ‘qui paulo minus ab angelis minoratus est’, nec eius qui minorauit, nec eius ‘qui gloria et honore coronatus est’, nec eius qui coronauit, nec eius qui constitutus est super opera manuum Dei, nec eius qui constituit, nec eius qui accepit ista ad subiectionem, nec eius qui dedit subiectionem.

C₄T 9 (VT 9) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Istum igitur uirum in quo statuit omnium facere iudicium ad fidem futurorum, cum resuscitasset eum ex mortuis et iudicem omnium demonstrasset secundum beati Pauli uocem, merito unitate ad se ipsum dignatus est et per coniunctionem ad se factum talium participem eum fecit, ut et adorationis communionem haberet, omnibus quidem diuinae naturae debitam adorationem reddentibus, comprehendentibus autem adoratione et illum quem inseparabiliter scit sibi coniunctum. Ex quo manifestum est quod ad maiora eum perduxit.

C₄T 10 (VT 10) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3
[=LT 31, JT 2]

‘Ego quidem quem uidetis, nihil quidem facere possum secundum meam naturam, cum homo sim; operor autem, quia “in me manens Pater” omnia facit. Quoniam enim et “ego in Patre et Pater in me”, Deus autem Verbum Vnigenitus Dei in me est, certum est quod et Pater cum ipso in me manet et opera facit.’ Et non est mirandum de Christo haec existimari, cum euidenter ipse de ceteris hominibus dicit: ‘qui diligit me, meum uerbum obseruet, et Pater meus diligit eum, et ad eum ueniemus et mansionem apud eum faciemus.’ Si enim apud unumquemque huiusmodi hominum et Pater et Filius mansionem faciunt, quid mirandum est, si in Domino secundum carnem Christo ambo simul putarentur manere, communionem eorum secundum substantiam communionem etiam mansionis forsitan suscipiente?’

<him>; neither the one who was perfected by suffering,¹⁰ nor the one who perfected; neither the one who earned to be remembered, nor the one who was made mindful; neither the one who was visited, nor the one who visited; neither the one ‘who was made a little lower than the angels’, nor the one who lowered; neither the one who was crowned with glory and honor, nor the one who crowned; neither the one who was set over the work of God’s hands, nor the one who set; neither the one who received these things in subjection, nor the one who gave subjection.

C4T 9 (VT 9) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

When, therefore, he had raised from the dead the man in whom he determined to effect the judgement of all, as an assurance of things to come, and had shown him judge of all, according to the saying of the blessed Paul [cf. Acts 17:31], he was deservedly made worthy of union with himself, and through the conjunction with himself he made him a participant in such great things that he has a share also in worship, with all those who render due worship to the divine nature including in their worship the one whom he knows to be inseparably conjoined to himself. From this it is clear that he led him to greater things

C4T 10 (VT 10) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

[=LT 31, JT 2]

‘I, indeed, whom you see, can do nothing by my own nature, since I am human; but I do work, since “the Father abiding in me” does all things. Since “I am in the Father and the Father is in me”, and the God Word, the Only-begotten of God, is in me, it is certain that the Father with him both abides in me and performs the works [cf. John 5:19, 30; 14:10–11].’ It is not strange to think these things of Christ, since he himself clearly says about other human beings: ‘Let the one who loves me observe my word, and my Father loves him, and we will come to him and make our abode with him [John 14:23].’ If the Father and the Son make their abode with each one of this kind of human being, what is so strange if both are thought to dwell at the same time in Christ, the Lord according to the flesh, their communion in essence taking on, as it seems,¹¹ a communion of abode?

¹⁰ Cf. Heb. 2:10; the remainder of this extract alludes to Heb. 2:6–8 and its quotation of Ps. 8:5–7.

¹¹ For this translation of ‘forsitan’ see n. 5 above.

C₄T 11 (VT 11) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Ita et animam utpote humanam et immortalem constitutam et sensus participem prius accipiens et per resurrectionem in immutabilitatem constituens sic et nobis eorundem istorum per resurrectionem praebuit communionem. Ideo ante resurrectionem ex mortuis increpat quidem Petrum ut suis eum uocibus scandalizantem et in magna trepidatione per tempus passionis constitutus apparitione angeli indiget confortantis eum ad patientiam et ad tolerantiam imminentium malorum. Post resurrectionem autem ex mortuis et in caelos ascensum impassibilis factus et immutabilis omnino et ad dexteram Dei sedens iudex uniuersi est orbis terrarum, utpote in eo diuina natura faciente iudicium.

C₄T 12 (VT 12) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

Sic igitur et hic, sapientissime omnium, habere nos doces Christi sensum ut sanctum Spiritum habentes illum qui sensus Christo aliquam uirtutem adimplebat, prudentiam ei praestans ad omnia quae agenda erant, sicut et in praecedentibus demonstrauius quod ab ipso quidem in heremum ad certamina quae contra diabolum erat, ducebatur, unctione autem illius et scientiam et uim eorum quae agenda erant, accipiebat et illius particeps factus non solum miracula faciebat, sed etiam, quomodo uti oportebat miraculis, sciebat subtiliter, ut notam quidem faceret gentibus pietatem, pateretur autem laborantium infirmitates et sic ad effectum suam uoluntatem educeret. Et iustificabatur inde et immaculatus ostendebatur siue separatione peiorum siue custodia meliorum siue etiam paulatim ad meliora profectibus.

VT 13

Quomodo igitur sequentiam habet eo, quod homo factus est Deus, istum hominem Deum Verbum esse dicere? Si enim homo est Deus Verbum, ut ipse dicis, omnimodo de homine dicimus ea, quae de Deo Verbo euangelista dicit. Quid autem dicit? 'In principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum et Deus erat Verbum. Iste erat in principio ad Deum. Omnia per ipsum facta sunt et sine eo factum est nihil, quod factum est'. Ergo si homo est Deus Verbum, dicimus de ipso: 'In principio erat homo et homo

C₄T 11 (VT 11) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

First receiving thus a human soul, made both immortal and participating in mind, and through the resurrection making it immutable, so also he offers us through the resurrection communion in these same things. Therefore, before the resurrection from the dead, he indeed rebukes Peter, as being a stumbling-block to him by his words [cf. Matt. 16:23], and being in great trepidation at the time of the passion he needs the vision of an angel strengthening him to endure and bear the imminent evils. But after the resurrection from the dead and the ascension into heaven he became impassible, and completely immutable, and, sitting at the right hand of God, he is the judge of the whole world, as in him the divine nature effects judgement.

C₄T 12 (VT 12) From *Against Apollinarius*, bk. 3

So, then, also here, O wisest of all, you teach that we have the mind of Christ, since we have the Holy Spirit who furnished Christ with a certain vigour of mind, providing him with prudence regarding everything that was to be accomplished, just as we have shown in the above that he was led by him into the desert for contests against the devil, from his anointing he received both knowledge and strength for the things to be accomplished, and participating in him not only performed miracles but also knew accurately how it was necessary to use miracles to make piety known to the gentiles, to bear the infirmity of those who labour, and in this way to bring his will to effect. And from this he was made righteous and shown to be without blemish, whether by separation from worse things, or by keeping better things, or by gradually advancing to better things.

VT 13

How therefore does it follow, from the fact that God was made man, that one may say that that man is the God Word? For if the man is the God Word, as you yourself say, we would in every respect say about the man what the evangelist says about the God Word. What does he say? 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him nothing was made which was made [John 1:1-3].'⁷ Therefore, if the man is the God Word, we would say of him: 'In

erat ad Deum et Deus erat homo. Erat homo in principio ad Deum. Omnia per ipsum facta sunt et sine ipso factum est nihil, quod factum est'. Si enim homo est Deus Verbum, sicut dicis, conuenient omnia ipsi, quae de Deo Verbo dicit euangelista.

C4T 13 (VT 14) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 7¹²

Hoc quidem quod est 'ad Patrem meum et Patrem uestrum et Deum meum et Deum uestrum', nemo sic demens est, ut alii cuidam conuenire diceret nisi templo Dei Verbi, adsumpto pro nostra salute homini, qui et mortuus est et resurrexit et ascensurus esset in caelos et Patrem sibi adscripsit cum discipulis Deum et ipse gratia adoptionem meritus et Deum suum appellat, quia cum ceteris hominibus similiter ut esset, accepit. Vnde propter communitatem quidem naturae 'Patrem meum et Patrem uestrum' dicit et 'Deum meum et Deum uestrum'; diuisit autem iterum suam personam ab ipsis praecipuum gratiae significans, propter quam ad Deum Verbum coniunctione in loco ueri Filii ab omnibus honoratur hominibus.

C4T 14 (VT 15) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 7¹³

Hoc quod dictum est 'accipite', pro 'accipietis' dicit. Si enim, cum insufflasset, Spiritum dedisset discipulis, quod ualde quidam stulte existimauerunt, superfluum erat dicere postea his, et maxime in tempore ascensus ad caelos, non separari ad Hierusalem, sed exspectare promissionem Spiritus et in sequentibus: 'sed accipietis uirtutem superueniente Spiritu sancto in uos.' Et aduentum autem ipsum sancti Spiritus super discipulos aperte Lucas factum esse dicit quinquagesimo die resurrectionis post ascensum. Et illud autem animaduertendum est quod, si ab insufflatu suscepissent Spiritum, non diceret 'accipite', sed quoniam 'accepistis'; hoc enim quod dictum est 'accipite', his conuenit, qui nondum acceperunt.

¹² A Syriac version has also been preserved, ed. J.-M. Vosté, *Theodori Mopsuesteni: Commentarius in Euangelium Iohannis Apostoli*, CSCO 115 (script. Syr. 62) text; 116 (script. Syr. 63) trans. (Louvain: CSCO, 1940), text 350.10–22; trans. 251.6–17.

¹³ Cf. *ibid.*, text 355.16–27; trans. 254.29–255.4.

the beginning was the man, and the man was with God, and the man was God. The man was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was nothing made that was made.' For if the man is the God Word, as you say, everything that the evangelist says about the God Word will apply to him.

C4T 13 (VT 14) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 7

Regarding this, 'to my Father and your Father; to my God and your God' [John 20:17], no one is so demented as to say that they apply to anyone else except the temple of the God Word, the man assumed for our salvation, who died and rose and would ascend into heaven, and with the disciples counted God as his Father, and had himself merited adoption by grace, and calls him his God, as he received existence like all other men. Whence, because of the community of nature, he says 'my Father and your Father' and 'my God and your God'; on the other hand, he distinguished his own *persona* from them, signifying the special grace by which, in conjunction with the God Word, he is honoured by all men in the place of the true Son.

C4T 14 (VT 15) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 7

He says that which is said, 'receive' [John 20:22], instead of 'you will receive'. For if, when he breathed on his disciples, he gave them the Spirit, as some have very foolishly supposed, it would have been superfluous to tell them afterwards, especially at the time of his ascension into heaven, not to depart from Jerusalem, but to await the promise of the Spirit [Acts 1:4], and in what follows: 'But you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit comes upon you [Acts 1:8]'. And the actual coming of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples, Luke clearly says, was on the fiftieth day of the resurrection, after the ascension [Acts 2:1]. This should also be noted, that if they had received the Spirit by the breathing, he would not have said 'receive', but 'you have received'; that which is said, 'receive', is fitting for those who have not yet received.

C4T 15 (VT 16) From the *Commentary on John*¹⁴

Dixit ad Thomam: 'infer digitum tuum huc et uide manus meas et porrige manum tuam et mitte in latus meum et noli esse incredulus, sed fidelis.' Quoniam, dicit, non credis et tactum solum sufficere tibi ad credendum putas (haec enim dicens non me latuisti), tange manu et cape experimentum et disce credere et non diffidere. Thomas quidem cum sic credidisset, 'dominus meus et Deus meus' dicit, non ipsum dominum et Deum dicens, (non enim resurrectionis scientia docebat et Deum esse eum qui resurrexit), sed quasi pro miraculo facto Deum conlaudat.

C4T 16 (VT 17) From the *Commentary on Acts*, bk. 1

Ille autem dixit oportere paenitentiam agentes eos pro crucis iniquitate et agnoscentes saluatorem et dominum et omnium auctorem bonorum Iesum Christum, quoniam propter ista peruenit et adsumptus est de diuina natura, in ipsum quidem fidem suscipere et eius discipulos fieri, ante omnia ad baptismum accedentes, quod et ipse tradidit nobis, praeformationem quidem habens sperationis futurorum, 'in nomine' autem celebrandum 'Patris et Filii et sancti Spiritus'. Hoc enim quod est 'ut baptizetur unusquisque in nomine Iesu Christi', non hoc dicit, ut uocationem quae in nomine Patris et Filii et sancti Spiritus est, relinquentes Iesum Christum in baptisate uocent; sed quale est hoc quod 'in Moysen baptizati sunt in nube et in mari', ut diceret quia sub nube et <in> mari Aegyptiorum separati sunt, liberati eorum seruitute, ut Moysi leges adtenderent, tales est 'ut baptizetur unusquisque in nomine Iesu Christi', ut cum ad ipsum accessissent tamquam saluatorem et omnium bonorum auctorem et doctorem ueritatis, ab ipso utpote auctore bonorum et doctore ueritatis uocarentur, sicut omnibus hominibus quamcumque sectam sequentibus consuetudo est ab ipso dogmatis inuentore uocari ut Platonici et Epicurei, Manichaei et Marcionistae et si quidam tales dicuntur.¹⁵

¹⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, text 357.20–2, 358.2–11; trans. 256.15–17, 27–35.

¹⁵ A Syriac version of this sentence, beginning at 'Hoc enim quod', is found in the ninth-century exegete Isho'dad of Merv, who regarded Theodore as the Interpreter par excellence. M. D. Gibson, *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hadatha (c. 850 A.D.) in Syriac and English*, *Horae Semiticae*, 10 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913), text p. 15.18–16.5; trans. p. 11; J.-M. Vosté, 'Le Gannat Bussame', *RB* 37 (1928), 221–32, 386–419, at 398–9 (with the parallel texts). Cf. Sullivan, *Christology*, 133–4.

C4T 15 (VT 16) From the *Commentary on John*

He said to Thomas: 'Put your finger here and see my hands, and put out your hand and place it in my side; do not be unbelieving but believing [John 20:27].' Since, he says, you do not believe and think that touch alone will be sufficient for you to believe (for you did not hide from me in saying this [cf. John 20:25]), touch with your hand and take the experience, and learn to believe and not doubt. Thomas, when he thus believed, says 'My Lord and my God', not calling him Lord and God (for knowledge of the resurrection does not teach that the one who was raised is also God), but as if he praises God for the miracle worked.

C4T 16 (VT 17) From the *Commentary on Acts*, bk. 1

He [i.e. Peter] said that it was necessary for them to do penance for the iniquity of the cross and to acknowledge Jesus Christ to be the Saviour and Lord and author of all good things [cf. Acts 2:38], since for this he came and was assumed by the divine nature, to take up faith in him and become his disciples, before everything coming to baptism, which he delivered to us, as a prefiguration of the hope of things to come, to be celebrated 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' [Matt. 28:19]. For this, 'that each one may be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ', does not mean that, abandoning the invocation in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, they should invoke Jesus Christ in baptism; but just as 'they were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea' [1 Cor. 10:2], meaning that, as they were separated in the cloud and in the sea from the Egyptians, being freed from their servitude, to attend to the laws of Moses, such is 'that each one may be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ', that when they came to him as Saviour and author of all good things and the teacher of truth, they were to be called after him, as the author of good things and the teacher of truth, just as it is the custom for all men, whatever sect they follow, to be called after the founder of the teaching, as Platonists and Epicureans, Manichees and Marcionites, and whatever else they are called. For in the same way, the apostles determined that we also should

Eodem enim modo et nos nominari Christianos iudicauerunt apostoli tamquam per hoc certum facientes quod istius doctrinam oportet adtendere; sic et quod ab ipso datum est, susciperent baptisma in ipso quidem primo constitutum, qui et primus baptizatus est, ab ipso autem et ceteris traditum, ut secundum praeformationem futurorum celebretur.

C₄T 17 (VT 18) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 14

Et secundum duas rationes locum imaginis obtinet. Qui enim amant quosdam, post mortem eorum saepius imagines statuentes hoc sufficiens mortis solatium habere arbitrantur et eum qui non uidetur nec praesens est, tamquam in imagine aspicientes putant uidere, ita flammam desiderii et uigorem placantes. Sed etiam illi qui per ciuitates habent imperatorum imagines, tamquam praesentes et uidendos honorare uidentur eos qui non sunt praesentes, cultu et adoratione imaginum. Ista autem utraque per illum adimplentur. Omnes enim qui cum illo sunt, et uirtutem sequuntur et debitorum Dei parati redditores diligunt eum et ualde honorant, et caritatem quidem ei diuina natura, licet non aspicitur, adimplet in illo qui ab omnibus uidetur, sic omnibus existimantibus ut ipsum uidentibus per illum et illi semper praesentibus; et honorem uero omnem sic adtribuunt tamquam imagini imperiali, cum quasi in ipso sit diuina natura et in ipso spectatur. Si enim et Filius est, qui inhabitare dicitur, sed cum eo est etiam Pater, et inseparabiliter omnimodo ad Filium esse ab omni creditur creatura. Et Spiritus autem non abest, utpote etiam [in] loco unctionis factus ei, et cum eo est semper, qui adsumptus est; et non mirandum est, cum etiam in quibuslibet hominibus uirtutem sequentibus cum Filio et Pater esse dicitur: ‘ueniemus enim et ego et Pater et mansionem apud eum faciemus.’ Quod autem et Spiritus eiusmodi hominum inseparabilis est, certum est omnibus.

C₄T 18 (VT 19) From the *Commentary on Luke*

‘Hoc enim quod hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacuit’ [*sic*], in baptisate adoptionem demonstrat secundum comparationem Iudaicae adoptionis, quia et ad illos dictum erat: ‘ego dixit: dii estis et filii excelsi omnes’, et: ‘filios genui et exaltaui’, eius adoptionis praecipuum eo quod dixit: ‘dilectus’, et: ‘in quo mihi complacuit’, ostendens. Propter hoc et

be called Christians, making it clear, as it were, by this that it is necessary to attend to his teaching; thus also they should receive baptism, which was given by him and indeed first instituted in him, who was the first to be baptized, and delivered by him to others, that it might be celebrated as a prefiguration of things to come.

C4T 17 (VT 18) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 14

<Something> holds the place of an image for two reasons. Those who love someone, after their death, setting up images of them, more often reckon that this provides sufficient solace for death and think that they see him who is neither seen nor present, as if beholding him in the image, so calming the flame and strength of longing. And again, those who have images of the emperors in the cities, honour as present and to be seen those who are not present, by the cult and veneration of the images. Both of these are fulfilled in him. For all who are with him, and pursue virtue and are exercised in repaying the debt due to God, love him and honour him greatly, and the divine nature, although it is not seen, perfects love for him in the one seen by all, everyone thus supposing that they are seeing him [i.e. God] through him and are always present to him; and thus they render every honour <to him> as if to an imperial image, since the divine nature is, as it were, in him and is contemplated in him. For although it is the Son who is said to indwell, yet the Father is also with him, and is believed by every creature to be inseparably with the Son in every way. And the Spirit is not absent, as also being the anointing for him, and is always with him who was assumed. This is not astonishing, since the Father is also said to be with the Son in all men who pursue virtue: 'I and the Father will come and make our abode with him [John 14:23].' And that the Spirit is inseparable from such men is clear to all.

C4T 18 (VT 19) From the *Commentary on Luke*

'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased' [Matt. 3:17] indicates his adoption in baptism in comparison with the adoption of the Jews, since it was said to them 'I have said, you are all gods, sons of the Most High' [Ps. 81:6] and 'I have begotten and raised up sons' [Isa. 1:2], showing the superiority of his adoption by what was said: 'beloved' and 'in whom I am well pleased'. Because of

uox Patris fiebat adoptionem confirmans et Filii nominatione per adoptionem secundum gratiam eum qui uere Filius est demonstrabat; cuius coniunctio ad ueram et firmam adoptionem istum constituabat et Spiritus sanctus in specie columbae descendens permansit super eum, quatenus in coniunctione ad eum, qui uere Filius est, eius cooperatione tentus maneat firmam adoptionis habens dignitatem. Per omnia autem, in quo primo adoptionis praeformabatur baptisma, dico autem domini Christi ex Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto, hoc quod fiebat, complebatur.

C4T 19 (VT 20) From the *Commentary on Psalm 8*
[=LT 36, JT 8]

Ideo ergo differentiam quidem Dei Verbi et recepti hominis tantam nobis ostendit psalmus, diuisa uero haec in nouo testamento inueniuntur, domino quidem in se accipiente primordia psalmi, in quibus factorem eum dicit esse creaturae et 'eleuatam' habere 'super caelos' 'magnificentiam' et mirificari 'in omni terra', apostolo autem secunda quae de homine sunt, qui tantum beneficium meruit, in Iesu accipiente. Quomodo non manifestum quod alterum quidem nos diuina scriptura docet euidenter esse Deum Verbum, alterum uero hominem et multam eorum esse ostendit nobis differentiam? Nam iste quidem memorat, ille autem memoriam meretur; et iste quidem uisitat, alter autem, cum uisitationem meretur, beatus dicitur; et iste quidem beneficium dando minuit 'paulo minus ab angelis', ille autem et per talem minutionem beneficium accepit; et iste quidem 'gloria et honore coronat', alter autem coronatur et pro his beatus dicitur; et iste quidem 'constituit ipsum supra omnia opera manuum eius et omnia subiecit sub pedibus eius', alter autem meritis est dominari eis quorum antea non habebat potestatem.

this, the voice of the Father confirmed his adoption and, by calling him Son through adoption by grace, indicated him who is truly Son, conjunction with whom made his adoption true and firm, and the Holy Spirit, descending in the form of a dove, remained over him, so that, in conjunction with him who is truly Son, he might remain steadfast by his cooperation, having a firm dignity of adoption. Through all these things, in the one in whom the baptism of adoption was first prefigured, I mean the baptism of the Lord Christ by the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, that which was done was accomplished.

C₄T 19 (VT 20) From the *Commentary on Psalm 8*
[=LT 36, JT 8]

Therefore, then, the psalm indeed shows us a difference between the God Word and the assumed man; they are <also> found separated in the New Testament, with the Lord referring the first parts of the psalm to himself, in which it says that he is the Creator of the creation, that <his> ‘majesty’ is exalted ‘high above the heavens’ and admired ‘in all the earth’,¹⁶ and the apostle referring the second part concerning the man who was deemed worthy of such beneficence to Jesus.¹⁷ How is it not evident that the divine Scripture clearly teaches us that the God Word is one, and the man another, and shows us that the difference between them is great? For one remembers, while the other is deemed worthy of remembrance; and one visits, while the other, deemed worthy of visitation, is said to be blessed; and one, giving a benefit, makes ‘a little lower than the angels’, while the other by such lowering accepts the benefit; and one ‘crowns with glory and honour’, while the other is crowned and for this is said to be blessed; and one ‘set him over the works of his hands and subjected all things under his feet’, while the other is deemed worthy to rule those things over which he did not formerly possess authority.

¹⁶ Cf. Matt. 21:16, where Jesus cites Ps. 8:3a, though Theodore refers to Ps. 8:2 and 10.

¹⁷ Heb. 2:6–8, citing Ps. 8:5–7. These verses are echoed throughout the rest of the extract.

C4T 20 (VT 21) From the *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*¹⁸

Sed non uolentes ista considerare uoces omnes trahere ad dominum temptant Christum, ut et quae de populo factae sunt, simili modo intellegerent et risum praestarent Iudaeis, quando ex scriptorum sequentia nihil ad dominum Christum pertinentes ostendunt uoces.

C4T 21 (VT 22) From the *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*¹⁹

Tale est et: ‘quod non derelicta est anima eius in inferno nec caro eius uidit corruptionem.’ Nam propheta quidem supra modum ipsum ponit circa populum prouidentiam dicens, uolens dicere quoniam inextemptabiles eos ab omnibus conseruauit malis. Quoniam autem hoc uerum et ex ipsis rebus euentum accepit in domino Christo, sequentissime de eo loquens beatus Petrus utitur uoce ostendens quoniam quod de populo supra modum dictum est, ex quadam ratione utente uoce propheta, hoc uerum euentum in ipsis rebus accepit nunc in domino Christo.

C4T 22 (VT 23) From the *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*²⁰

Eundem intellectum habet et illud: ‘diuiserunt sibi uestimenta mea et super uestimentum meum miserunt sortem.’ Quod enim psalmus nullatenus conuenit domino, certum est. Neque enim erat domini Christi ‘qui peccatum non fecit, nec dolus inuentus est in ore eius’, dicere: ‘longe a salute mea uerba delictorum meorum.’ Sed et ipse dominus secundum communem hominum legem,

¹⁸ The Greek version of the *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* exists complete in Greek: PG 66.124–632; H. N. Sprenger (ed.), *Theodori Mopsuesteni Commentarius in XII Prophetas*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, V. Reihe: Biblica et Patristica, 1 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977); R. C. Hill (trans.), *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, FC 108 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2004). This passage, and also C4T 22 (VT 23), have not been located, although the ideas expressed in them are characteristic of the *Commentary*.

¹⁹ Cf. *Com. on Joel* 11 (PG 66.232bc, Sprenger, 96–7; trans. Hill, 119), *Com. on Zach.* 9 (PG 66.557ab, Sprenger 368; trans. Hill, 368); see also R. Devreesse (ed.), *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I–LXXX)*, Studi e Testi, 93 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica, 1939), 99–100.

²⁰ There are close parallels to C4T 22 and 23 in the ninth-century Syrian exegete in the Theodorean tradition, Isho’dad of Merv. J.-M. Vosté, ‘L’Oeuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste au II^e Concile de Constantinople’, *RB* 38 (1929), 382–95, 542–54, at 550–3. Cf. Sullivan, *Christology*, 140.

C₄T 20 (VT 21) From the *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*

But not wanting to consider this, they attempt to apply all the words to the Lord Christ, with the result that they also understand those which are said about the people in a like manner, provoking mockery among the Jews, when they appeal to words, in the sequence of the Scriptures, not at all pertaining to the Lord Christ.

C₄T 21 (VT 22) From the *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*

Such also is: 'His soul was not abandoned to hell nor did his flesh see corruption [cf. Acts 2:31; Ps. 15:10].' For the prophet indeed posits this of the people by way of hyperbole, speaking of providence, wishing to say that he [i.e. God] preserved them unharmed from every ill. But because this was true and occurred in actual deed in the Lord Christ, most consequentially the blessed Peter uses these words when speaking of him, showing that since what was said of the people by way of hyperbole (the prophet using these words for a particular reason), this has now occurred in actual deed in the Lord Christ.

C₄T 22 (VT 23) From the *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*

This also has the same meaning: 'They divided my garments among themselves and for my clothing they cast lots [Ps. 21:19].' For it is certain that the psalm in no way applies to the Lord. For it was not for the Lord Christ, 'who did not commit sin nor was deceit found in his mouth' [1 Pet. 2:22; Isa. 53:9], to say: 'Far from my salvation are the words of my trespasses [Ps. 21:2b].' But the Lord himself, according to the common law of men, when he was

dum in passione opprimeretur, ‘Deus meus, Deus meus, quare me dereliquistis?’ emisit uocem et apostoli ‘diuiserunt sibi uestimenta mea et super uestimentum meum miserunt sortem’ ad eum traxerunt manifeste, quoniam quod supra modum dictum fuerat prius a Dauid propter inlata ei mala, hoc ex operibus euenit in domino Christo, cuius et uestimenta diuiserunt et sorti tunicam subiecerunt.

C4T 23 (VT 24) From the *Commentary on Psalm 21*²¹

‘Foderunt manus meas et pedes’: et omnia perscrutabantur, et quae agebam et quae conabar; nam ‘foderunt’ ex translatione dixit eorum qui per effossionem scrutari quae in profundo sunt, temptant. ‘Dinumerauerunt omnia ossa mea’: totius meae fortitudinis et totius meae substantiae detentatores facti sunt, ut etiam numero mea subicerent. Istud autem ex consuetudine quam habent hostes, dixit, qui quando optinuerint, numero et tali[bu]s subtilem notitiam inuentorum faciunt. Propterea et sequenter dicens: ‘ipsi uero considerauerunt me et conspexerunt me’, intulit: ‘diuiserunt sibi uestimenta mea et supra uestimenta mea miserunt sortem.’ Considerantes enim me ait et conspicientes, quod omnia eis euenerunt in me desiderata, (conspicere enim ita et apud nos dicitur pro eo quod est: uidit in eum, quae uolebat pati eum), iam tamquam me omnino malis dedito sicut hostes mea post uastationem et captiuitatem diuiserunt, sorte diuisionem eorum facientes. Et euangelista quidem in domino uerba ex rebus adsumens eis usus est, sicut et in aliis diximus; nam quod non pertinet ad dominum psalmus, in superioribus euidenter ostendimus. At uero beatus Dauid supra modum ista magis ex his quae ab Abessalom facta sunt, dixit, quoniam dum recessisset Dauid, iure belli metropolim ingressus omnes quidem optinuit res regales, non piguit autem etiam patris cubile inquinare.

²¹ The opening lines, to ‘temptant’, are found in another Latin translation in Theodore’s *Commentary on the Psalms* (ed. Devresse, 122.1–5).

crushed by the passion, uttered the words ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’ [Matt. 27:46; Ps. 21:2a], and ‘they divided my garments among themselves and for my clothing they cast lots’ was clearly applied to him by the apostles [Matt. 27:35], since what had first been said by David by way of hyperbole, because of the ills laid upon him, this happened in actuality in the Lord Christ, whose garments they divided and whose tunic they subjected to lots.

C4T 23 (VT 24) From the *Commentary on Psalm 21*

‘They gouged my hands and feet’ [Ps. 21:17b]: they scrutinized everything, both what I was doing and what I was attempting; for ‘they gouged’ by transference speaks of those who through gouging try to scrutinize things that are profound. ‘They have counted all my bones’ [Ps. 21:18a]: they have become possessors of all my strength and all my substance, so that they have even subjected to counting what is mine. He said this from the custom which enemies have, who when they obtain something make an accurate inventory by counting and suchlike. Because of this, after saying ‘they observed and looked at me’ [Ps. 21:18b], he added, ‘they divided my clothes among themselves and for my garments they cast lots’ [Ps. 21:18]. He speaks of them as observing and looking at me, since everything they desired happened in me (for ‘to look’ is thus said, as also with us, for this: ‘he saw in him what he wanted him to suffer’), and now as if I were completely consigned to ills, they as enemies, after ravaging and taking captive my possessions, make division of them by lot. And the evangelist employed the words referring them, from the event, to the Lord, just as we have said in other cases; for we clearly showed above that the psalm does not pertain to the Lord. The blessed David rather said these things by way of hyperbole regarding what was done by Absalom, because when David withdrew, entering the capital he took, by right of war, all the royal property, and was not even ashamed to pollute his father’s bed [cf. 2 Kgs (2 Sam.) 16:22].

C4T 24 (VT 25) From the *Commentary on Psalm 68*²²

Quoniam cibi et potus suaves quidem fiunt in tempore gaudii, insuavia autem et amara in tristitia, talia erant, inquit, quae ab illis fiebant, ut ex tristitia et ira esset quidem mihi in locum fellis cibus, esset autem et potio aceto nihil differens. Maxime autem hoc fit in iracundiis quae cum tribulatione fiunt, quod uerisimile erat pati eos contra suos. Usus autem est euangelista hoc testimonio in domino et ipse autem dominus: ‘zelus domus tuae comedit me’, de se ipso dicens, et beatus Paulus de Iudaeis loquens: ‘fiat mensa eorum’ et cetera, et beatus Petrus de Iuda: ‘fiat habitatio eius deserta’. Et certe diuersis constitutis rebus non quasi psalmo modo quidem pro his dicto, iterum autem de illo et iterum de alio, sed quia de Iudaeis dicta sunt plura, qui se separauerunt de deo et lege, conuinentia illorum indeuotionem, necessarius et testimoniorum usus simul et ex rebus captus, quale est: ‘dederunt in esca mea fel et in siti mea potauerunt me acetum.’

C4T 25 (VT 26) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 1

[b=BT 1]

Sicit igitur per huiusmodi confessionem non deitatis Nathanael habens scientiam ostenditur (Iudaei et Samaritae talia sperantes plurimum quantum Dei Verbi a scientia longe erant), sic et Martha per confessionem illam non deitatis habens tunc scientiam

²² This extract is extant in Greek (ed. Devreesse, 454.11–455.20): Ἐπειδὴ τὰ βρώματα καὶ τὰ πόματα ἡδέα μὲν γίνεται ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ, σκληρώδη δὲ καὶ πικρὰ ἐν ταῖς λύπαις—τοιαῦτα ἦν φησι τὰ παρ’ ἐκείνων, ὡς ὑπὸ τῆς ἀθυμίας καὶ τῆς ὀργῆς εἶναι μὲν μοι ἐν τάξει τροφῆς τὴν χολήν, εἶναι δὲ καὶ τὸ ποτὸν ὄξους οὐδὲν διαλλάττον,—μάλιστα δὲ τοῦτο γίνεται ἐν ταῖς μετὰ ἀθυμίας ὀργαῖς, ὅπερ εἰκὸς ἦν πάσχειν αὐτοὺς κατὰ τῶν οἰκείων. Ἐχρήσατο δὲ ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ταύτῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου τῆ μαρτυρία, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Κύριος ὅτι Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου κατέφαγέν με περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγων, καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων διαλεγόμενος τὸ Γενηθῆτω ἢ τράπεζα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, καὶ πάλιν Γενηθῆτω ἢ ἔπαυλις αὐτῶν ἔρημος, καίτοι διαφόρων ὄντων τῶν πραγμάτων. Οὐχ ὡς τοῦ ψαλμοῦ νῦν μὲν περὶ τούτων εἰρημένου, αὐθις δὲ περὶ ἐκείνου καὶ πάλιν περὶ ἐτέρου, ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ περὶ Ἰουδαίων εἴρηται τὰ πολλὰ ἀποστάντων τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ νόμου ἔλεγχον ἔχοντα τῆς ἐκείνων ἀγνωμοσύνης, ἀναγκαῖα τῶν μαρτυριῶν ἢ χρῆσις, ὁμοῦ τε ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων λαμβανομένη—ὄον τὸ Ἐδωκαν εἰς τὸ βρώμά μου χολήν καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν με ὄξος—καὶ ἔλεγχον ἔχουσα τῆς ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀγνωμοσύνης ὡς τῇ θεῖα γραφῇ κηρυττομένης.

C4T 24 (VT 25) From the *Commentary on Psalm 68*

Because food and drink are pleasant in time of gladness, but unpleasant and bitter in time of sadness, such were, he said, the things done by them, so that from sadness and anger, gall took the place of food for me and the drink was no different from vinegar. This especially happens with the wrath that occurs with distress, which they were likely to feel towards their own people. The evangelist utilized this testimony for the Lord [Matt. 27:34, 48], and the Lord himself said, 'Zeal for your house has consumed me' [John 2:17; Ps. 68:10]; and the blessed Paul said of the Jews, 'Let their table become' and the rest [Rom. 11:9; Ps. 68:23]; and the blessed Peter of Judas, 'Let his habitation become desolate' [Acts 1:20; Ps. 68:26]. Surely the diversity of realities does not imply that the psalm was said in a certain way about these, then again about one man, and again about another, but because many things had been said about the Jews who had separated from God and the law, convicting them of impiety, the use of these testimonies was both necessary and derived from the reality, as is: 'They gave me gall for food and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink [Ps. 68:22].'

C4T 25 (VT 26) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 1

[b=BT 1]

[a] Therefore, just as Nathanael is not shown, by confession of this kind [cf. John 1:49], to have knowledge of his divinity (having this hope, Jews and Samaritans were as far as possible from the knowledge of the God Word), so also Martha by her confession is not proved to have knowledge, at that time, of his divinity

probatur, manifeste autem nec beatus Petrus. Adhuc etenim ipsis sufficiebat tunc reuelationem illam suscipientibus praecipuum aliquid et maius de ipso praeter ceterorum hominum phantasiam accipere; post resurrectionem autem Spiritu producti ad scientiam tunc et reuelationis perfectam scientiam suscipiebant, ut scirent quia praecipuum ipsi praeter ceteros homines non aliquo puro honore ex Deo peruenit sicut et in ceteris hominibus, sed per unitatem ad Deum Verbum, per quam omnis honoris ei particeps est post in caelos ascensum.

C₄T 26 (VT 27) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 1²³

Matthaeus quidem euangelista post temptationes dicit quod ‘accedentes angeli ministrabant ei’, scilicet cum eo constituti et cooperantes et <in> omnibus circa eum Deo ministrantes, quod iam per certamina ad diabolum ostensus est clarior. Sed et quod passura ei aderant angeli, ex euangeliiis discimus et, cum resurrexit, in monumento uisi sunt. Per omnia etenim ista monstrabatur dignitas Christi, quod inseparate ei angeli aderant et <in> omnibus circa eum ministrabant; sicut enim a peccantibus separantur, sic et per meritum honoratis subueniunt. Propter quod bene dominus ait quod maius uidebitis, quod et caelum aperietur omnibus per me et omnes angeli semper mecum erunt, nunc quidem ascendentes, nunc uero descendentes sicut ad domesticum Dei et amicum.

C₄T 27 (VT 28) From *On the Incarnation*

[a=LT 29]

Plus inquietabatur dominus et certamen habebat ad animae passiones quam corporis et meliore animo libidines uincebat, mediante <ei> deitate ad perfectionem. Unde et dominus ad haec

²³ Cf. Syriac version, ed. Vosté: text pp. 54–5; trans. p. 38.18–30.

[cf. John 11:27], nor clearly is the blessed Peter. For to this point, it was sufficient for those receiving that revelation to accept something pre-eminent and greater about him than imagined by other men; [b] but after the resurrection, being led by the Spirit to knowledge, they received perfect knowledge of the revelation, such that they knew that something pre-eminent had come to him, beyond other men, from God, not something merely by honour as with other men, but through union with the God Word, through which every honour is communicated to him after his ascension into heaven.

C₄T 26 (VT 27) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 1

Indeed, the evangelist Matthew says that after the temptations ‘angels came and ministered to him’ [Matt. 4:11], namely, were with him and cooperating and ministering to God in everything concerning him, because already through his struggles against the devil he had been shown to be more glorious. Yet the angels were with him when he was about to suffer, we also learn from the gospels, and at the resurrection they were seen in the tomb. Through all of this, indeed, the dignity of Christ was displayed, as the angels were inseparably with him and ministered in everything concerning him. For just as they are separate from sinners, so also they come to the aid of those honoured for their merit.²⁴ Because of this, the Lord rightly said ‘you will see something greater, because heaven will be opened to all through me and all the angels will always be with me, now ascending, now descending as to the servant and friend of God’ [cf. John 1:50–1].

C₄T 27 (VT 28) From *On the Incarnation*

[a=LT 29]

[a] The Lord was more troubled by and struggled with the passions of the soul than those of the body, and he conquered the desires with his stronger reasoning power, with the divinity aiding him towards perfection. [b] Whence the Lord is seen

²⁴ This sentence is absent from the Syriac text; and likewise with C₄T 40, which speaks of the same idea. For this reason Devreesse (*Essai*, 248–9) suspected an interpolation. However, Price (*Constantinople*, 1.249, n. 97) points out that, ‘Theodore could speak of Christ cooperating perfectly with the divine will and thereby *meriting* union with the Word from the moment of his creation according to the foreknowledge of God’.

maxime instituens uidetur certamen. Cupiditate enim pecuniarum non deceptus et gloriae desiderio non tentus carni quidem praebuit nihil; nec enim illius erat talibus uinci. Animam autem si non recepisset, sed <si> deitas est, quae ea uicerat, nullatenus eorum quae facta sunt, ad nos respicit lucrum—quae enim ad conuersionis perfectionem similitudo deitatis et animae humanae?—et uidentur domini certamina non ad nos respiciens habere lucrum, sed ostentationis cuiusdam gratia fuisse. Quod si hoc dicere non est possibile, (certum etenim est, quod illa propter nos facta sunt), et maius certamen instituit ad animae passiones, minus autem ad carnis, quanto et amplius et magis inquietare illas continebat et magis illa erat, quae et amplioris indigebat medicinae, uidelicet quod et carnem et animam adsumens per utraque pro utrisque certabat, mortificans quidem in carne peccatum et mansuetans eius libidines et facile capiendas meliore ratione animae faciens, erudiens autem animam et exercitans et suas passiones uincere et carnis refrenare libidines. Haec enim deitas inhabitans operabatur, haec inhabitans mediabat utriusque eorum.

C4T 28 (VT 29) ‘From the book *Against the Sunouisiasts or Apollinarians*, a passage which the blessed Cyril quoted and refuted’ [=BD 17b; C5D 4]

Sed si caro erat, inquit, crucifixa, quomodo sol radios auertit et tenebrae occupauerunt terram omnem et terrae motus et petrae disrumpebantur et mortui surrexerunt? Quid igitur dicant et de tenebris in Aegypto factis in temporibus Moysi non per tres horas, sed per tres dies? Quid autem propter alia per Moysen facta miracula et quae per Iesum Naue qui solum stare fecit, qui sol in temporibus Ezechiae regis et contra naturam retro uersus est, et de Helisaei reliquiis quae mortuum suscitauerunt?²⁵ Si enim Verbum Deum passum demonstrant quae in cruce facta sunt, et propter hominem non concedunt haec facta esse, et, quae in temporibus Moysi, propter genus Abraham non erant et quae in temporibus Iesu Naue et quae in Ezechiae regis; quod si illa

²⁵ Another Latin version of this extract, to this point, can be found in Pelagius II, *Ep.* 3 (*ACO* 4.2, p. 122.1–7).

undertaking combat especially against these. For not being deceived by desire for money nor tempted by longing for glory, he conceded nothing to the flesh; it was not in him to be conquered by such. If he had not received a soul, but it was the divinity which conquered them, the gain of what had occurred would in no way relate to us—for what similarity is there between divinity and the human soul in perfection of conduct?—and the Lord's struggles would seem to have a gain not relating to us, but to have been for the sake of some display. But if it is not possible to say this, (for it is certain that these things were undertaken for our sake), and if he undertook a greater struggle against the passions of the soul, and a lesser one against those of the flesh—by as much as it happened that those troubled him to a fuller and greater degree, the greater was that which needed a fuller remedy—it is clear that, assuming both flesh and soul, he struggled in both for the sake of both, mortifying sin in the flesh and taming its desires and making them easy to control by the higher reason of the soul, while teaching and exercising the soul to both conquer its own passions and to bridle the desires of the flesh. These things were effected by the indwelling divinity; indwelling it gave this aid to each of them.

C4T 28 (VT 29) 'From the book *Against the Sunouisiasts or Apollinarians*, a passage which the blessed Cyril quoted and refuted' [=BD 17b; C5D 4]

But if it were the flesh, he says, which was crucified, how was it that the sun turned away its rays [cf. Luke 23:45], and darkness covered the whole earth, and the earth shook, and rocks shattered, and the dead arose? [cf. Matt. 27:45, 51–3] What then do they say of the darkness that occurred in Egypt in the times of Moses, not for three hours, but for three days [cf. Exod. 10:21 ff.]? What indeed of the other miracles wrought by Moses [cf. Exod. 7:8 ff.], and those by Jesus, son of Nave [Joshua, son of Nun], who made the sun stand [cf. Jos. 10:12 ff.], the sun which in the time of King Hezekiah turned backwards contrary to nature [cf. 4 Kgs 20:11], and of the remains of Elisha which raised a dead man [4 Kgs 13:21]? For if those which occurred at the time of the cross show that the God Word suffered, and they do not grant that they happened because of a man, then also those in the times of Moses were not because of the race of Abraham, and <similarly> those in the times of Jesus, son of Nave, and in that of King Hezekiah;

propter Iudaeorum populum mirabiliter facta sunt, quomodo non magis quae in cruce facta sunt, propter Dei Verbi templum?

C4T 29 (VT 30) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8

[=LT 6bc, JT 10; b=BT 17a, C6T 2; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 10^r]

Manifestum autem est quod unitas conuenit; per eam enim collectae naturae unam personam secundum unitatem effecerunt. Sicut enim de uiro et muliere dicitur quod iam ‘non sunt duo, sed una caro’, dicamus et nos rationabiliter secundum unitatis rationem quoniam non sunt duae personae, sed una, scilicet naturis discretis. Sicut enim ibi non nocet numero duorum unam dici carnem (certum est enim secundum quod una dicitur), ita et hic non nocet naturarum differentiae personae unitas. Quando etenim naturas discernimus, perfectam naturam Dei Verbi dicimus et perfectam personam (nec enim sine persona est subsistentiam dicere), perfectam autem et hominis naturam et personam similiter; quando autem ad coniunctionem respiciamus, unam personam tunc dicimus.

C4T 30 [30a] From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[=LT 1b]

Neque igitur substantia dicere neque operationis possibile est habitionem Deum Verbum facere. Quid itaque superest, qua utamur ratione quae in his propria uidebitur seruari? Certum igitur est quod bona uoluntate oportet dicere inhabitationem factam esse; bona autem uoluntas dicitur bona et optima Dei uoluntas quam faciat illis placitus, qui ei adhaerere festinant, eo quod bona uisa sunt ei de ipsis.

C4T 31 [30b] From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

Cognosci autem personae unitatem eo quod omnia per eum perfecit; quae unitas facta est ex inhabitatione quae est secundum bonam uoluntatem. Vnde dicentes Filium Dei iudicem uenturum esse de caelis simul hominis et Dei Verbi aduentum intellegimus, non quod similiter ei Deus Verbum traducitur secundum

but if those were miraculously wrought for the sake of the Jewish people, how much more is it that those at the time of the cross were for the sake of the temple of the God Word?

C4T 29 (VT 30) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8

[=LT 6bc, JT 10; b=BT 17a, C6T 2; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 10']

[a] It is clear that 'unity' is suitable, for through it, the natures, being brought conjoined, effect one *persona* according to the union.

[b] For just as it is said with husband and wife, that 'they are no longer two, but one flesh' [Matt. 19:6], we also may reasonably say, with regard to the principle of union <in Christ>, 'they are not two *personae*, but one', with the natures clearly being distinguished. For just as there [i.e. in marriage], the mention of one flesh does not harm the number of duality (for it is clear with respect to what 'one' is said), so also here, the unity of *persona* does not harm the difference of natures. For when we distinguish the natures, we speak of the nature of the God Word as complete and the *persona* as complete (for one does not speak of a *hypostasis* without a *persona*), and the nature of the man as complete and the *persona* likewise; but when we consider the conjunction, then we speak of one *persona*.

C4T 30 [30a] From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

[=LT 1b]

Therefore neither in terms of essence nor activity can one speak of the God Word indwelling. What, then, is left? What account shall we use which seems to preserve the particular <mode of indwelling> in these matters? It is clear, therefore, that it is fitting to speak of the indwelling occurring by 'good pleasure'; by 'good pleasure' is meant the good and best will of God, which he would accomplish when pleased with those who hasten to cleave to him, from his good and excellent <pleasure> regarding them.

C4T 31 [30b] From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 7

Unity of *persona* is recognized because he accomplished all things through him, a unity which occurred from an indwelling according to 'good pleasure'. Whence, saying that the Son of God will come as judge, we understand a simultaneous coming of both the man and the God Word, not that the God Word, like the man,

naturam, sed quod bona uoluntate unius omni modo cum eo erit, ubicumque fuerit, eo quod et omnia per eum perfecit.

C4T 32 [31] (VT 31) From the *Commentary on the Creed of the 318 Fathers*²⁶

Sed Christum quidem secundum carnem adsumptam serui formam, eum autem, qui eam adsumpsit, super omnia nominans Deum intulit tamen hoc secundum coniunctionem, ut per significationem nominum naturarum manifestam diuisionem faciat. Nemo igitur neque eum qui secundum carnem ex Iudaeis est, dicat Deum nec iterum Deum qui est super omnia, secundum carnem ex Iudaeis.

C4T 33 [32] (VT 32) From the *Commentary on Hebrews*

‘Iesum’ enim dicit ‘a Nazareth’, quem ‘unxit Deus Spiritu sancto et uirtute’; qui autem De<i> Spiritu unctus est, omnimodo aliquid inde adsumpsit. Quis autem furens dicat de Spiritu aliquid adsumpsisse diuinam naturam nec non et participium? Participes enim eius uidelicet uocat, qui et ipsi uncti sunt; qui autem uncti sunt et in hoc participes eius iuste facti, non aliter unctionis communicare dicantur nisi ei qui adsumptus est. Et hoc ipsum autem demonstratur quod mercedem iustam accepit; pro hoc enim, inquit, quod ‘dilexisti iustitiam et odisti iniquitatem’, pro his praecipuam unctionem meruisti.

C4T 34 [33] (VT 33) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 1²⁷

‘Rabbi tu es Filius Dei, tu es rex Israel’; hoc est: tu es ille qui de longe praedicatus est Christus; haec enim scilicet de Christo sperabant sicut de domestico constituto praeter omnes Deo.

²⁶ Cf. *Cat. Hom.* 6.4 (ed. Tonneau, 136.24–138.2).

²⁷ This extract is extant in Greek (Devreesse, *Essai*, 318.12–14, frag. 16): Παββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Ταῦτα δηλονότι περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσεδόκων ὡς οἰκειωμένου παρὰ πάντας Θεῶν, . . . Cf. Syriac version, ed. Vosté, text p. 53.10–14; trans. p. 37.17–20.

is transferred by nature, but that being united in every way by his good pleasure, he will be with him, wherever he is, because he accomplished everything through him.

C4T 32 [31] (VT 31) From the *Commentary on the Creed of the 318 Fathers*

But he added this in respect of the conjunction—naming the assumed form of a servant ‘Christ in respect of the flesh’, and he who assumed ‘God over all’ [cf. Rom. 9:5]—to make clear the distinction between the natures through the meaning of the names. Therefore no one should say that the one from the Jews according to the flesh is God, nor that ‘the God who is over all’ is from the Jews according to the flesh.

C4T 33 [32] (VT 32) From the *Commentary on Hebrews*

For it speaks of ‘Jesus of Nazareth’ whom ‘God anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power’ [Acts 10:38]; the one anointed by the Spirit of God certainly received something from this. But who is so insane to say that the divine nature received something from the Spirit, even participation <in him>? Clearly those who have themselves been anointed are said to participate in him; those who have been anointed and, by this, have rightly been made to participate in him, are said to share in the anointing in no other way than he who was assumed. And this is also shown by the fact that he received a just reward; for on this account, it says, ‘you have loved justice and hated iniquity’, you merited a special anointing for this [cf. Heb. 1:9; Ps. 44:8]

C4T 34 [33] (VT 33) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 1

‘Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are the King of Israel’ [John 1:49]; this is: you are the one who long ago was predicted as the Christ; clearly they hoped for these things from Christ as from one who had become familiar to God²⁸ beyond all others.

²⁸ Though the Latin word ‘domesticus’ is usually used in a more servile sense, it is here a rather wooden rendering of the Greek *οἰκειωμένος*, meaning ‘to take into one’s house’, hence ‘domestic’ but also someone made familiar. Cf. Devreesse, *Essai*, 250.

C4T 35 [34] (VT 34) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 1²⁹

Certus quidem et ipse erat Filium Dei non secundum deitatis dicens natiuitatem, sed secundum quod domesticus Deo erat, per quod filii Dei per uirtutem domestici Deo constituti homines interim uocabantur.

C4T 36 [35] (VT 35) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*³⁰

Quando enim dixerit: ‘de Filio suo, qui factus est ex semine Dauid secundum carnem’, certum quidem quod Filium hic eum qui ex semine Dauid factus est secundum carnem, non Deum dicit Verbum, sed adsumptam serui formam. Nec enim Deus secundum carnem nec Deus ex semine factus est Dauid, sed sumptus pro nobis homo, quem Filium beatus apostolus manifeste uocat.

C4T 37 [36] (VT 36) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*³¹

Renatus alter factus est pro altero, non iam pars Adam mutabilis et peccatis circumfusi, sed Christi qui omnino inculpabilis per resurrectionem factus est.

C4T 38 [37] (VT 37) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*³²

. . . ut multam quidem eius faceret diligentiam, omnia autem illius propria faceret et toleraret per omnes eo ducto passiones, per quas eum secundum suam uirtutem perfectum fecit, nec a mortuo secundum suae naturae legem recedens, sed sua praesentia et operatione et gratia liberans quidem eum de morte et malis quae inde sunt, resuscitans autem eum de mortuis et ad meliorem finem perducens.

C4T 39 [38] (VT 38) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*³³

Deinde ostendens cuius gratia passus est, diminutionem infert quatenus ‘citra Deum pro omnibus gustaret mortem’, quia, diuina

²⁹ Cf. Syriac version, ed. Vosté, text p. 53.18–20; trans. P. 37.22–5.

³⁰ *Cat. Hom.* 8.16 (ed. Tonneau, 208.21–210.1).

³¹ *Ibid.* 14.25 (ed. Tonneau, 454.13–17).

³² *Ibid.* 5.5 (ed. Tonneau, 106.8–10).

³³ *Ibid.* 8.9 (ed. Tonneau, 198.5–10).

C₄T 35 [34] (VT 34) From the *Commentary on John*, bk. 1

It is indeed certain that he called him ‘Son of God’ not according to the generation of the divinity, but because he was familiar to God, as human beings who through virtue become friends of God were sometimes called ‘sons of God’.

C₄T 36 [35] (VT 35) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*

For when he said ‘Concerning his Son, who was from the seed of David according to the flesh’ [Rom. 1:3], it is certain indeed that here he calls ‘Son’ the one who ‘was from the seed of David according to the flesh’, not the God Word but the assumed form of a servant. For God was not according to the flesh, nor was God from the seed of David, but the man assumed for our sake, whom the blessed apostle clearly calls ‘Son’.

C₄T 37 [36] (VT 36) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*

Reborn, one becomes other for the other, no longer a part of Adam, mutable and overwhelmed by sin, but of Christ, who became completely impeccable by the resurrection.

C₄T 38 [37] (VT 37) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*

... that he should take great care of him, appropriate and undergo everything of his while he was being led through all the sufferings, through which he was made perfect according to his own virtue [cf. Heb. 2:10], not departing from the dead man by the law of his own nature, but by his presence and activity and grace freeing him from death and the ills which occur thence, reviving him from the dead and leading him to a better end.

C₄T 39 [38] (VT 38) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*

Then, having shown for whose sake he suffered, he introduces the one made lower ‘in order that without God he might taste death

natura ita uolunte, separata illa ipse per se pro omnium utilitate gustauit mortem; et ostendens quod deitas separata quidem erat illo qui passus est, secundum mortis experimentum, quia nec possibile erat illam mortis experimentum accipere, non tamen illo qui passus est, afuerat secundum diligentiam.

C4T 40 [39] (VT 39) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*³⁴
[Cf. BT 32]

‘Iesum’ enim ait ‘a Nazareth’, quem ‘unxit Deus Spiritu et uirtute’; eius unctionem meritis et immaculatus effectus est per omnia et ad diuinam naturam meruit coniunctionem. Neque enim coniunctionem suscepisset illam, nisi prius immaculatus factus fuisset, ut sic condeceat illius unitatem.

C4T 41 [40] (VT 40) From the *Commentary on Matthew*

Nam et illud: ‘hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacuit’ [*sic*], insania euidens est de Deo Verbo putare dicere eum; qui enim dixit: ‘hic est Filius meus dilectus’, et intulit: ‘in quo mihi complacuit’ [*sic*], significauit quod aperte ad comparisonem hoc dixit aliorum filiorum qui nec dilecti ei facti sunt nec placere nimis potuerunt ei.

C4T 42 [41] (VT 41) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*³⁵

Permanens autem, donec secundum suam creaturam et uirtutem soluens mortis dolores liberauit eum ineffabilibus illis uinculis, et de mortuis resuscitans transtulit quidem in inmortalem uitam, incorruptum autem eum et inmortalem et inmutabilem efficiens in caelum duxit.

³⁴ There is nothing corresponding to this in our text of the *Catechetical Homilies*, though a similar passage is preserved in BT 32.

³⁵ *Cat. Hom.* 5.6 (ed. Tonneau, 106.17–21).

on behalf of all',³⁶ because the divine nature being separated, as it thus willed, he tasted death in himself for the benefit of all; and showing that the divinity was separated from the one who suffered by the experience of death, because it was not possible for it to admit the experience of death, he was not, however, absent in care from the one who suffered.

C₄T 40 [39] (VT 39) From the book *To Those Being Baptized* [Cf. BT 32]

For it says 'Jesus of Nazareth' whom 'God anointed with the Spirit and power' [Acts 10:38]; having merited the anointing and made without blemish in everything and merited the conjunction with the divine nature. For he would not have received that conjunction, unless he had first become without blemish, such that unity with him was proper.

C₄T 41 [40] (VT 40) From the *Commentary on Matthew*

Also regarding that saying, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' [Matt. 3:17], it is evident insanity to think that he is speaking of the God Word; for he who said 'This is my beloved Son', and added 'in whom I am well pleased' indicated that he clearly said this in comparison with other sons who did not become beloved to him and were not able to please him as much.

C₄T 42 [41] (VT 41) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*

[The Word] remaining [in Christ], until, loosening the pains of death by his creative power, he freed him from those unspeakable³⁷ bonds, and raising him from the dead transferred him to immortal life, making him incorruptible and immortal and immutable, and led him into heaven.

³⁶ Heb. 2:9; Theodore reads *χωρίς Θεοῦ* rather than *χάριτι Θεοῦ*.

³⁷ As A. Mingana notes, the Syriac version here has 'indissoluble', suggesting that a confusion of perhaps *ἄρρηκτος* and *ἄρρητος*; Mingana thinks that the Latin translator misread the Greek; Price points out that a corruption of the Greek is also possible. Cf. A. Mingana, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*, Woodbrooke Studies, 5 (Cambridge: Heffer & Sons, 1932), 15; Price, *Constantinople*, 1.255, n. 129.

C4T 43 [42a] (VT 42) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*³⁸

Christum iustificatum et immaculatum factum uirtute sancti Spiritus, sicut beatus Paulus modo quidem dicit: ‘quod iustificatus est in Spiritu’, modo uero: ‘qui per Spiritum aeternum immaculatum se optulit Deo’, mori quidem fecit secundum legem hominum, utpote autem inpeccabilem uirtute sancti Spiritus factum resuscitauit de mortuis et ad uitam constituit meliorem, inmutabilem quidem animae cogitationibus, incorruptum autem et indissolutum et carne faciens.

C4T 44 [42b] (VT 43) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*³⁹

‘Deo autem gratias, qui nobis dedit uictoriam per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum’, istorum causam fuisse nobis dicens Deum qui contra omnes aduersarios nobis dedit uictoriam siue mortis siue peccati siue cuiuscumque hinc nascendi mali, qui dominum nostrum Iesum Christum pro nobis hominem sumens et ipsum per resurrectionem de mortuis ad meliorem transtulit finem et in dextera sua sedere fecit et nobis ad eum donauit communionem.

C4T 45 [43] (VT 44) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12
[=ST 2, LT 28, C5T 3b]

Cum ergo interrogent, hominis genetrix aut Dei genetrix Maria, dicatur a nobis: utraque, unum quidem natura rei, alterum autem relatione. Hominis enim genetrix natura, quia homo erat in uentre Mariae, qui et processit inde; Dei autem genetrix, quia Deus erat in homine nato, non in illo circumscriptus secundum naturam, sed quod in eo erat adfectu uoluntatis.

C4T 46 [44] (VT 45) ‘A statement that Cyril quoted and refuted’

[=TD 2, SD 2, LD 2, C5D 5; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

Gratia Filius qui ex Maria est homo, natura autem Deus Verbum. Quod autem secundum gratiam, non natura, et quod secundum naturam, non gratia: non duo Filii. Sufficiat corpori quod ex nobis est, secundum gratiam filiatio, gloria, immortalitas; quia templum

³⁸ *Cat. Hom.* 5.19 (ed. Tonneau, 126.20–128.1).

³⁹ *Ibid.* 5.21 (ed. Tonneau, 128.21–130.3).

C₄T 43 [42a] (VT 42) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*

While Christ was justified and made without blemish by the power of the Holy Spirit, as the blessed Paul says in one place, ‘he was justified in the Spirit’ [1 Tim. 3:16], and in another, ‘who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God’ [Heb. 9:14], he was made to die according to the law of man, so that, becoming impeccable by the power of the Holy Spirit, he raised him from the dead and set him in a better life, making him immutable in the thoughts of his mind, and incorruptible and indissoluble even in the flesh.

C₄T 44 [42b] (VT 43) From the book *To Those Being Baptized*

‘But thanks be to God, who has given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ’ [1 Cor. 15:57], saying that the cause of this for us is God, who against all our adversaries has given us victory over death or sin or whatever ills arise from this, who, taking our Lord Jesus Christ, a man for our sake, both transferred him through the resurrection from the dead to a better end and made him to sit at his right hand, and also gave us communion with him.

C₄T 45 [43] (VT 44) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12
[=ST 2, LT 28, C₅T 3b]

When, then, they ask, ‘Is Mary the mother of a man or the mother of God?’ let us say: ‘Both’—the one by the nature of the case, the other by relation.⁴⁰ ‘Mother of a man’ by nature, since a man was in the womb of Mary, who also came out from there; ‘Mother of God’ since God was in the man born, not circumscribed in him by nature, but being in him by the disposition of the will.

C₄T 46 [44] (VT 45) ‘A statement that Cyril quoted and refuted’

[=TD 2, SD 2, LD 2, C₅D 5; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

[a] By grace the man from Mary is Son, by nature the God Word <is Son>. But what <is> by grace <is> not by nature, and what <is> by nature <is> not by grace: there are not two Sons.⁴¹ [b] The glory of sonship by grace, immortality, would suffice the body

⁴⁰ LT 28: τῆ ἀναφορᾶ

⁴¹ ‘There are not two sons’ is not in LD 2.

Dei Verbi factum est, non supra naturam eleuetur et Deus Verbum pro debita a nobis gratiarum actione non iniurietur. Et quae est iniuria? Conponere eum cum corpore et putare indigere corporis ad perfectam filiationem. Nec ipse Deus Verbum uult se Daudid filium esse, sed Deum; corpus autem hoc uocari Daudid filium non solum non inuidit, sed et propter hoc adfuit.

C4T 47 [45] (VT 46) 'From statements that Cyril refuted'
[=BD 22a, LD 3, C5D 2b]

Quando erit quaestio de natiuitatibus secundum naturam, nec Mariae filius Deus Verbum existimetur; mortalis enim mortalem generat secundum naturam et corpus simile sibi et duas natiuitates Deus Verbum non sustinuit, unam quidem ante saecula, alteram autem in posterioribus temporibus.

C4T 48 [46] (VT 47) From the *Commentary on Hebrews*
[=LT 14a, C5T 2a]

Ergo iam cessabunt ad impudente pugna, desistent autem uana contentione erubescences euidenciam praedictorum? 'Plurimos' enim dicit 'filios in gloriam ducentem'. Ecce igitur in filiationis ratione apostolus apparet adsumptum hominem ceteris connumerans non secundum quod similiter illis filiationis particeps est, sed secundum quod similiter gratia filiationem adsumpsit, deitate sola naturalem filiationem possidente.

C4T 49 [47] (VT 48) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12
[=LT 16]

Sed ad hoc dicunt quod Iesus nomen saluatorem significat; saluator autem, dicunt, quomodo ille homo dicatur? Obliti quod Iesus dicebatur etiam et filius Naue et, quod mirandum est, quia non sic uocatus est fortuito in generatione, sed transnominatus a Moyse. Certum autem est quod non hoc imponere homini patiebatur, si diuinam naturam omnimodo significabat.

from us; since it became the temple of the God Word, let it not be raised above nature, and let not the God Word, instead of the thanksgiving due from us, be insulted. And what is the insult? To combine him with the body, and to suppose that he needed the body for perfect sonship. [c] Neither does the God Word himself wish to be the son of David, but God [cf. Matt. 22:41–5]; not only did he not grudge this but for this he came, that the body is to be called the son of David.

C4T 47 [45] (VT 46) 'From statements that Cyril refuted'
[=BD 22a, LD 3, C5D 2b]

When the the discussion is about natural births, neither should the God Word be considered <to be> the son of Mary; for a mortal bears what is mortal according to nature, and a body that is like itself,⁴² and the God Word did not undergo two births, one before the ages, the other in the latter times.

C4T 48 [46] (VT 47) From the *Commentary on Hebrews*
[=LT 14a, C5T 2a]

Will they now cease from their impudent fight, will they desist from vain contention, shamed by the clarity of what has been said? For it says, 'bringing many sons into glory' [Heb. 2:10]. Notice, then, how the Apostle classifies, by the principle of sonship, the man assumed along with the many, not because he participates in sonship in a similar manner to them, but because he assumed sonship in the same way—by grace—divinity alone possessing natural sonship.

C4T 49 [47] (VT 48) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12
[=LT 16]

But against this they say that the word 'Jesus' means 'Saviour'; and how, they say, could a man be called 'Saviour'? They have forgotten that the son of Nun was called 'Jesus' [i.e. Joshua], and, what is surprising, that he was not called thus from some accidental circumstance at birth but by a change of name made by Moses [cf. Num. 13:16]. It is clear that he would not have permitted this name to be given to a human being if it were only indicative of divine nature.

⁴² LD 3: 'that which is consubstantial with it'.

C4T 50 [48] (VT 49) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12
[=LT 18]

Itaque non solum filium ipsum uocat a Deo Verbo separans, sed etiam secundum filiationis rationem connumerans ceteris participibus filiationis conuincitur, quoniam gratia et ipse particeps fuit filiationis, non naturaliter ex Patre natus, habens tamen ad ceteros excellentiam, quia unitate ad ipsum filiationem possidet, quod ei firmiorem ipsius rei donat participationem.

C4T 51 [49] (VT 50) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 2⁴³

Homo Iesus similiter omnibus hominibus nihil differens connaturalibus hominibus quam quae ipsi gratia dedit; gratia autem data naturam non inmutat, sed post mortis destructionem ‘donauit ei Deus nomen supra omne nomen’.

C4T 52 [50] (VT 51) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 2

Sed mei fratres, qui eiusdem mihi matris sunt filii, dicunt mihi: non separa hominem et Deum, sed unum eundemque dic. Hominem dicens connaturalem mihi dico; Deum si dicam, connaturalem Deo dico. Quomodo homo et Deus unum est? Numquid una natura hominis et Dei, domini et serui, factoris et facturae? Homo homini consubstantialis est, Deus autem Deo consubstantialis est. Quomodo igitur homo et Deus unus per unitatem esse potest, qui saluificat et qui saluificatur, qui ante saecula est et qui ex Maria apparuit?

C4T 53 [51] (VT 52) From the *Commentary on Matthew*, bk. 4⁴⁴

Bene intulit: ‘namque et ego homo sum’, ut dicat: nihil mirandum, si hoc potes, cum sis homo accipiens a Deo, quoniam

⁴³ Although C4T 51–2 are said here to be from Theodore’s *On the Incarnation*, elsewhere in the Acts (V.14.3–4; ACO 4.1, pp. 83–3) they form part of a sermon said to have been given by Theodore at Antioch, as reported by a diatribe attributed to the Armenians sent to Proclus in 435, but which seems to be based on a passage by Innocent of Maronea (ACO 4.2, p. 70.4–8, 17–24). Cf. Price, *Constantinople*, 1.258, 296–7.

⁴⁴ This passage survives in Greek; ed. J. Reuss, *Matthäus-kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, TU 61 (Berlin: Akademie 1957), 110.24–30: καλῶς ἐπήγαγε τὸ καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος εἰμι, ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, εἰ τοῦτο δύνῃ ἄνθρωπος ὢν, λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπεὶ καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο ὢν λαμβάνω ὑπηκόους ὑπερέχειν τῷ κελεύειν ὡς βούλομαι.

C₄T 50 [48] (VT 49) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12
[=LT 18]

So that he not only calls him ‘Son’, distinguishing him from the God Word, but also is proved to classify him, according to the principle of sonship, with others who share in sonship, since by grace he himself shared in sonship, not being born naturally from the Father, but having, however, pre-eminence over others because he possesses sonship through unity with him [i.e. the Word], which grants to him a firmer participation in the reality.

C₄T 51 [49] (VT 50) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 2

The man Jesus <was> like all men, differing in nothing from men of the same nature, except from what he gave him by grace; the gift of grace does not change nature, but after the destruction of death ‘God bestowed on him the name above every name’ [Phil. 2:9].

C₄T 52 [50] (VT 51) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 2

But my brothers, who are sons of the same mother as I, say to me: ‘Do not separate the man and God, but say “one and the same”.’ Speaking of the man, I speak of the one co-natural with me; if I speak of God, I speak of one co-natural with God. How are the man and God one? Is there one nature of God and man, of Lord and servant, of Creator and creature? Man is consubstantial with man; God is consubstantial with God. How then can the man and God be one through the unity, he who saves and he who is saved, he who is before the ages and he who appeared from Mary?

C₄T 53 [51] (VT 52) From the *Commentary on Matthew*, bk. 4

He rightly added, ‘for I too am a man’, to say: there is nothing astonishing if you are able to do this, as you are a man receiving

et ego, cum hoc sim, accipio oboedientes, semel habens iubendi potestatem propter datoris indulgentiam.

C4T 54 [52] (VT 53) From the *Commentary on Matthew*, bk. 4⁴⁵
[=FT 5b]

‘Quapropter nec incongruum est et te accepta ista a Deo potestate uerbo solo iubentem abigere passiones.’ Nec enim tamquam Filio Dei et ante uniuersam creaturam existenti et creatori eorum quae sunt, accessit centurio.

C4T 55 [53] (VT 54) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13
[b=LT 21; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 17^v, col. 2]

Consonantia et apostolus dicit: ‘et manifeste magnum est pietatis mysterium; qui manifestatus est in carne, iustificatus est in Spiritu’, iustificatum esse in Spiritu dicens ipsum siue quod ante baptismum cum subtilitate competente legem custodiuit, siue quod etiam post illud gratiae conuersionem cooperatione Spiritus cum magna compleuit subtilitate.

C4T 56 [54] (VT 55) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 14
[=LT 27]

Idem hoc dicimus iuste et de domino quod Deus Verbum sciens eius uirtutem et secundum praescientiam statim in ipso initio conplasmationis inhabitare bene uoluit et uniens eum sibi affectu uoluntatis maiorem quandam praestabat ei gratiam, utpote gratia quae in eum est, in omnes homines diuidenda; unde et circa bona uoluntatem integram ei custodiebat. Non enim hoc dicemus quod ille homo uoluntatem habebat nullam, sed quod uolebat quidem bonum, magis autem ei uoluntarie plurimum aderat et boni desiderium et contrarii odium; conseruabatur uero a diuina gratia illi uoluntas integra ab initio Deo, qualis erit, subtiliter sciente, qui et ad confirmandum eum magnam illi cooperationem habitatione

⁴⁵ The Greek text for this passage also survives (Reuss, *Matthäus-kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 109.9–15), and is given above in connection with FT 5; the Greek passage continues with the preceding extract, C4T 53, which is not included by Facundus (and for this reason the Latin text of C4T 53 is not included by Reuss in his edition).

<this power> from God, because I also, since I am this, have received those who obey me, once having the power to give orders by the indulgence of the giver.

C4T 54 [52] (VT 53) From the *Commentary on Matthew*, bk. 4
[=FT 5b]

‘Therefore it is not incongruous that you also, having received that power from God, by a word alone should order the passions to depart.’ For the centurion did not approach him as the Son of God, existing before the whole creation and the creator of the things that are.

C4T 55 [53] (VT 54) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 13
[b=LT 21; cf. *Cod. Add.* 14669, fol. 17^v, col. 2]

[a] The apostle also says, consonant <with this>: ‘and confessedly great is the mystery of our religion; [b] he who was manifested in the flesh was made righteous in the Spirit’ [1 Tim. 3:16], saying he was made righteous in the Spirit, either because before baptism he kept the law with suitable accuracy, or because even after it he fulfilled, by the cooperation of the Spirit, a life of grace with great accuracy.

C4T 56 [54] (VT 55) From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 14
[=LT 27]

We rightly say the same regarding the Lord, that the God Word, knowing his virtue, even by foreknowledge immediately at the very beginning of his formation, was well pleased to indwell <in him>, and uniting him to himself by a disposition of will, gave him a certain greater grace, as the grace that is in him was to be distributed to all human beings; whence also he preserved his choice for the good intact. For we will not say this, that the man had no choice, but that he chose the good, or rather that he had, by choice, a very great desire for the good and hatred of its opposite; the integrity of his choice was preserved by divine grace from the beginning, God knowing precisely what kind of person he would be, and for the confirmation of this he gave him, by his own indwelling, a greater cooperation for the salvation of us all.

sua praestabat pro omnium nostrum salute. Vnde nec iniustum dicat aliquis esse, quod praeter omnes praecipuum aliquid datum est illi homini qui a domino adsumptus est.

C4T 57 [55] (VT 56) From the *Commentary on Matthew*

Nam rationalis quidem proprium est discretio bonorum et malorum. Cum uero non essent contraria, non erat ei possibile aliquid discernere. Primum igitur in his quae creata sunt, magnam contrarietatem fecit.

C4T 58 [56] (VT 57) From the *Commentary on Matthew*

Quoniam autem non obaudiuit Adam, deinde subditus est morti. Et factum est hoc propter inoboedientiam, quod et citra inoboedientiam propter utilitatem nostram a creatore factum est; edocti sumus omnes peccatum.

C4T 59 [57] (VT 58) From the *Commentary on Creation*, bk. 5⁴⁶

Nec igitur mortem non sponte et praeter iudicium suum intulit hominibus neque peccato aditum ad nullam utilitatem dedit (nec enim hoc fieri nolens non poterat), sed quoniam sciebat utile esse nobis, magis autem omnibus rationabilibus, prius quidem malorum et deteriorum fieri aditum, postea autem deleri quidem haec, introduci autem meliora, ideo in duos status diuisit Deus creaturam, praesentem et futurum, in illo quidem ad immortalitatem et immutabilitatem omnia ducturus, in praesenti uero creatura in mortem et mutabilitatem interim nos dimittens. Nam si quidem statim ab initio immortales nos fecerit et inmutabiles, nullam differentiam ad inrationabilia haberemus, proprium nescientes bonum; ignorantes enim mutabilitatem inmutabilitatis ignorabamus bonum, nescientes mortem immortalitatis lucrum nesciebamus, ignorantes corruptionem non laudabamus incorruptionem, nescientes passionum grauamen impassibilitatem non mirabamur. Conpendiose dicere, ne longum sermonem faciam: nescientes malorum experimentum bonorum illorum non poteramus scientiam mereri.

⁴⁶ On C4T 59–63 see Devreesse, *Essai*, 22, n. 2.

Therefore no one could claim that it was unjust that the man who was assumed by the Lord should receive something exceptional, beyond all <others>.

C4T 57 [55] (VT 56) From the *Commentary on Matthew*

Discernment between good things and bad is proper for a rational being. If opposites did not exist, it would not have been possible for him to distinguish anything. First, therefore, among the things which were created, he made a great opposition.

C4T 58 [56] (VT 57) From the *Commentary on Matthew*

Because Adam did not obey, he was then subjected to death. And because of disobedience there came about that which even without disobedience would have been wrought by the Creator for our benefit: we have all been taught sin.

C4T 59 [57] (VT 58) From the *Commentary on Creation*, bk. 5

Therefore neither unwillingly and against his judgement did he impose death upon men, nor did he give sin entry for no purpose (for this could not have happened if he did not so will), but because he knew that it was beneficial for us, or rather for all rational beings, for evil and worse things to first have entry, and then for these things to be destroyed, and for better things to be introduced, God therefore divided creation into two states, the present and the future, leading us in the latter to immortality and immutability, while in the present delivering us meanwhile to death and mutability. For if, right from the beginning, he had made us immortal and immutable, we would have had no difference from the irrational animals, as not knowing the good: for being ignorant of mutability, we would have been ignorant of the good of immutability; not knowing death, we would not have known the advantage of immortality; being ignorant of corruption, we would not have praised incorruption; not knowing the burden of the passions, we would not have admired impassibility. To speak concisely and not make a long speech: not knowing the experience of evils, we would not have been able to obtain a knowledge of these goods.

C4T 60 [58] (VT 59) ‘Likewise by the same about the same’

Necesse est autem omnia simul rationabilia, inuisibilia dico, et nos ipsos quibus mortale quidem est corpus, anima autem per omnia eiusdem generis inuisibilibus et rationabilibus substantiis, hic quidem praesentem mutabilitatem pati, ut optimam erudiamur doctrinam religiositatis et ad beniuolentiam constituamur.

C4T 61 [59] ‘Likewise by the same’

Quod quidem placuit Deo, hoc erat in duos status diuidere creaturam, unum quidem qui praesens est, in quo mutabilia omnia fecit, alterum autem qui futurus est, cum renouans omnia ad inmutabilitatem transferet. Quorum principium nobis ostendit in dispensatione domini Christi quem ex nobis existentem resuscitauit ex mortuis et inmortalem corpore et inmutabilem fecit anima, per quod demonstrauit quia circa uniuersam creaturam hoc futurum est.

C4T 62 [60] From *On the Creation*, bk. 4

Illo certo constituto quod, quemadmodum nobis per resurrectionem et corpus incorruptum et inmutabilis anima erit, eodem modo et inuisibilibus et rationabilibus naturis tunc inmutabilitatem mereri continget, nunc quidem accipientibus conuersionem, sicut uersa multotiens decem milia daemonum ostendunt, tunc autem in inmutabilitatem nobiscum futuris.

C4T 63 [61] (VT 60) From *On the Creation*, bk. 5

Nam sciebat quidem quod peccabunt omnino; concedebat uero hoc fieri expedire eis cognoscens, quoniam nec erat possibile eum, qui cum fecerit non extantes et tantorum quidem demonstrauerit dominos, tanta uero bona proposuerit, ut eis fruantur, non prohibere peccati aditum, si expedire eis hoc cognosceret. Sed enim non erat possibile nos aliter discere peccatum et passionum molestiam et deteriora et nostram infirmitatem in his demonstrandum ad ostendendam magnitudinem inmutabilitatis quam postea nobis esset donaturus, nisi sic ab initio haec fuissent a Deo dispensata, ut collatione et experimento infinitorum illorum bonorum possemus scire magnitudinem; et huius gratia utpote profuturum nobis peccatum intrare dimittens magnum in eius bello auxilium inuenit.

C₄T 60 [58] (VT 59) ‘Likewise by the same about the same’

It was necessary that all rational beings together—I mean both the invisible and we ourselves, whose body indeed is mortal, but whose soul in all respects is of the same kind as the invisible and rational beings—should here undergo the present mutability, that we should learn the best teaching of piety and attain benevolence.

C₄T 61 [59] ‘Likewise by the same’

What pleased God was to divide creation into two states, one that is present, in which he made everything mutable, and the other that is future, when, renewing all things, he will transform them to immutability. He showed us the beginning of these things in the economy of the Lord Christ, whom, existing from us, he raised from the dead and made immortal in body and immutable in soul, through which he showed that this would happen to the entire creation.

C₄T 62 [60] From *On the Creation*, bk. 4

It is certain that, just as our body will be incorrupt and our soul immutable through the resurrection, in the same way it will also happen that the invisible and rational natures will then obtain immutability; they now admit change, as the twists of ten thousand demons frequently show, but then they will be with us in immutability.

C₄T 63 [61] (VT 60) From *On the Creation*, bk. 5

For he knew indeed that they would assuredly sin; but he allowed this to happen, knowing it to be expedient for them, as it was not possible that he who had created those who were not, declared them lords of so much, and given such great goods for them to enjoy, would not have denied sin access, unless he had known this to be expedient for them. But it was not possible for us to learn of sin and the vexation of the passions, and worse things, and for our weakness in these things to be demonstrated so as to show the greatness of the immutability that he was going to give us afterwards, in any other way except by these things having been thus arranged by God from the beginning, that by comparison and experience we could know the greatness of those infinite blessings; and for the sake of this, that it would profit us, he let sin enter and devised a great aid in the battle against it.

C4T 64 [62] ‘Likewise by the same Theodore, distorting the saying about the flaming sword and the cherubim’⁴⁷

[a] Nam flammeam quidem frameam dicit, ut dicat quia ignis est terribilis coruscans in habitu gladii extensus, ut bifariam terribilis quidam uisus esset uidentium, et ex natura et ex habitu eius quod ostendebatur; quam et uerti dixit, ut adsiduitate motus coruscans terribilem et maiorem uidenti timorem faceret. Cherubim uero animalium dicit quasdam formas terribiles et potentes tremefacere uidentem. [b] Sicut enim nos animalia quaedam forsitan ianuis constituimus, sic Deus flammeam frameam constituit et cherubim, ut per ea Adam cum timore, qui est terribili de uisu, prohibitus introitu paradisi merito castigaretur. [c] Non enim inuisibiles quasdam uirtutes dicit cherubim hic, sicut quidam arbitrantur, quoniam non aliquid ualebat inuisibilis natura ibi, cum sensibilis uisus esse deberet et quae Adam castigaret. Nec igitur flammea framea natura erat ignis, sed talis uisus, nec cherubim animalia, sed uisus talis.

C4T 65 [63] ‘Likewise by the same Theodore, denigrating the book of Job . . .’

His quae pro doctrina hominum scripta sunt, et Salomonis libri connumerandi sunt, id est prouerbia et ecclesiasta, quae ipse ex sua persona ad aliorum utilitatem composuit, cum prophetiae quidem gratiam non accepisset, prudentiae uero gratiam quae euidenter altera est praeter illam secundum beati Pauli uocem.

⁴⁷ There is a Syriac version of this extract; ed. R. Tonneau, ‘Theodore Mopsueste, Interpretation (du Livre) de la Genèse (*Vat. Syr.* 120. ff. I–V)’, *Le Muséeon*, 66 (1953), 45–64, text at p. 56.6–25, trans. on p. 63. There also survives the Greek text of two parts of this extract. [a] is found in *Cod. Barb.* 569, fol. 79 (ed. Devreese, *Essai*, 23–4, n. 4): *Τὴν μὲν γὰρ φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν λέγει ἀντὶ τοῦ φοβερὸν πῦρ ἐξαστράπτων ἐν σχήματι ξίφους ἐκτεταμένον, ὡς ἂν δειχθῆ φοβερά τις ἢ τῶν ὀρώτων ὄψις ἕκ τε τῆς φύσεως, ἕκ τε τοῦ σχήματος τοῦ δεικνυμένου· ἢ γὰρ καὶ στρεφομένην εἶπεν, ὡς ἂν τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῆς κινήσεως ἐξαστράπτουσιν, φοβερὰν καὶ μείζονα τῷ θεομένῳ τὸν φόβον ἐμποιοῦσαν. Τὰ χερουβίμ δὲ ζῶων λέγει τινὰς μορφὰς καταπληκτικὰς ἰκανὰς φοβεῖν τὸν ὀρώτα. See also Procopius of Gaza, *Comm. In Gen.* (PG 87.228d). [c] is found in *Cod. Coisl.* 113, fol. 313^r (ed. Devreese, *Essai*, 23–4, n. 4): *Οὐκ ἀόρατους τινὰς δυνάμεις λέγει τὰ Χερουβίμ, ὡς τινας οἶονται, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ συνετέλει τι ἀόρατος φύσις ἐκεῖ, αἰσθητῆς ὄψεως ὀφειλοῦσης εἶναι τῆς τὸν Ἀδὰμ παιδεύσεως. Οὕτε οὖν ἡ φλογίνη ῥομφαία φύσις ἦν πυρός, ἀλλ’ ὄψις τοιαύτη, οὔτε τὰ Χερουβίμ ζῶα, ἀλλ’ ὄψις τοιαύτη. See also Theodore, *Fragm. In Gen.* (PG 66.641c) and Theodoret, *Quaest. In Gen.* (PG 80.141c).**

C4T 64 [62] 'Likewise by the same Theodore, distorting the saying about the flaming sword and the cherubim'

[a] For it mentions 'a flaming sword' [Gen. 3:24] to say that there was a terrifying flashing fire extended in the form of a sword, so that those looking on beheld something doubly terrifying, both from the nature and from the form of what was displayed; it was also said to turn, so that by its relentlessness the flashing movement might produce a terrifying and greater fear in the beholder. It says that the cherubim had a kind of terrifying animal form, able to effect fear in the beholder. [b] For just as we would perhaps place certain animal <forms at our door>, so God placed a flaming sword and the cherubim, so that by them Adam, with fear from a terrifying sight, might be deservedly punished, being denied entry to paradise. [c] It does not say that the cherubim were certain invisible powers, as some suppose, because an invisible nature would have been of no effect there, as what was needed was a perceptible sight such as would punish Adam. Therefore neither was the flaming sword fire by nature, but looked such, nor were the cherubim animals, but looked such.

C4T 65 [63] 'Likewise by the same Theodore, denigrating the book of Job . . .'

The books of Solomon are to be counted among the things written for the instruction of humans, that is Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, which he composed in his own person for the benefit of others, since he had not received the grace of prophecy, but the grace of wisdom, which is clearly other than the former, according to the words of the blessed Paul [cf. 1 Cor. 12:8–10].

C4T 66 [64] ‘And after other <words>’

Erat igitur satis idoneum superuacua quidem omnia uerba auferre scripturae, quae autem ad significationem uitae eius necessaria erant, exponere; quae omnia sufficiebant quemlibet ad meliora conuertere et aemulatorem facere boni. Nunc uero cum hoc non fecisset, ad uani honoris amorem non necessarium respiciens, non in minimis aestimationi iusti nocuit apud eos qui diuinas scripturas non cum debita deuotione iudicare solent, et ex hoc multos fecit scripta inculpare et ad accusationem ea trahere beati Iob.

C4T 67 [65] ‘And after other <words>’

Ipsa statim uerba, ex quibus incipere eum dicit conscriptor, cum peruenissent amici, quis consideranter omnia uidens uel dicens putet aut dicat iusti umquam menti conuenire? Maledicta enim tam multa colligere statim ab initio et rebus ea imponere, quae maledictum suscipere non possunt, quia nec subsistere creduntur, quis existimet uiro conuenire, qui cum tanta sapientia et uirtute et reuerentia uitam suam gubernasset?

C4T 68 [66] ‘Consistently denigrating the book of Job’

Paruum autem et istud flagitium ad hoc quod in fine positum est. Hoc enim quod dixit tertiam filiam suam Amaltheae cornu eum uocasse, nihil aliud est quam ostendere eum paganis fabulis adsentientem et idolatriae figmenta diligentem, certo quidem constituto quod nescire quidem de Ioue et Saturno et Iunone paganicas fabulas poterat beatus Iob, homo barbarus et Edomitanus genere. Quod si et sciret, sed non filiae suae mirabiliter diuinitas natae ex idolatriae paganis fabulis nomen imponderet decorare eam existimans, si ita nominata fuisset. Hoc enim erat paganis fabulis consentientis et idolatriae diligentis figmenta et filiam decorare per ea uolentis et desiderantis et sibi et filiae suae ad fabularum figmenta communionem esse uidere. Sed quod omne hoc figmentum est, omnibus certum est.

C₄T 66 [64] ‘And after other <words>’

It would therefore have been quite proper to exclude all superfluous words from Scripture, but to publish what was necessary for showing his life, all the things that would be sufficient to convert someone to what is better and to make him an imitator of what is good. As it is, however, since he did not do this, attending to the unnecessary from a love of vain honour, he injured in no small respect the reputation of the just man for those who are wont to judge the divine Scriptures without due devotion, and from this he led many to blame the text and use it for accusing the blessed Job.

C₄T 67 [65] ‘And after other <words>’

Regarding those words at the beginning, from which the writer says he began, when his friends arrived—who, seeing or commenting on everything in a considered fashion, would think or say that they were ever appropriate for the mind of a just man? Assembling so many curses at the very beginning and placing them on things that cannot be cursed, because they are not believed to <still> exist [cf. Job 3:3–10], who would reckon this appropriate for a man who had governed his life with so much wisdom, virtue, and reverence?

C₄T 68 [66] ‘Consistently denigrating the book of Job’

But this outrage is a trifle compared to that which is placed at the end. For the verse that says that he called his third daughter the ‘horn of Amalthea’ [Job 42:14] shows nothing else than his assent to pagan fables and his love of the figments of idolatry, even though it is certain the blessed Job, a barbarian man and an Edomite by race, could not have known the pagan fables about Jupiter and Saturn and Juno. Even if he had known them, he would not have given his own daughter, born by a divine miracle, a name taken from the pagan fables of idolatry, thinking to adorn her if she were so named. For this was <the action> of one assenting to pagan fables, loving the figments of idolatry, wanting to adorn his daughter by means of them, and desiring that both himself and his daughter be seen as participants in mythical figments. But that all this is a figment is clear to all.

C4T 69 [67] ‘And after other <words>’

Et conscriptor quidem manifestus est ex amore magno et importuno uani honoris hoc passus. Vt enim semetipsum ostenderet et extranea eruditum esse doctrina et paganorum fabularum scientiam habuisse, quas de illis quos deos putabant, firmas habebant, minimum existimauit nominationem istam inde acceptam iusto imponere quasi per eam filiam suam decorare uolenti. Mihi uero ex tota libri conscriptione certus est conscriptor paganica scientia esse eruditus, ad cuius imitationem praesentem uolens scripturam componere nocuit historiae pulchritudini. Qui enim apud illos tragoedias componunt, causas quidem accipiunt ab his quae multi loquuntur, quando etiam eas contigerit quodammodo apud plurimos opinionem ueritatis habere; pura autem causa utentes suam artem et sapientiam in compositione fabularum ostendere festinant et personas introducentes sibi placitas et uoces circumponentes eis, a quibus clariores fieri arbitrantur et decorari, ut et querimoniam et laudem quae a scriptis infertur, siue per intellectum siue per ipsa uerba scriptor peccauerit, non ad personas quarum uerba confingit, legentes referant, sed ad fabulae conscriptorem. Et iste autem cum inuenisset et de beato Iob historiam maximam et claram, quae in ore omnium similiter ferebatur non solum Israhelitici generis, sed et aliorum, quam etiam clariorem Dei testimonium faciebat, quod factum est ad prophetam, gloriam ex magnitudine causae uolens suscipere hanc scripturam composuit, non cogitans quod multa differentia est inter historiam iusti secundum diuinae scripturae et simplicitatem et subtilitatem propositam et inter uerba superflua et ad probationem conflictata. Inde et illas plasmationes fecit, in quibus certantem ad Deum fecit diabolium, et uoces, sicut uoluit, circumposuit alias quidem iusto, alias uero amicis; in quibus uocibus quantum competenti excessit, dictum est etiam in superioribus. Illum autem Helium in postremo introduxit tantae iniuriae plena dicentem aduersus iustum et in fine personae magnitudinis diuinae naturae circumposuit talem dictionem, in qua non piguit etiam figmentum coetus addere. Ex hoc autem inportuno uani honoris amore et nominationem hanc ex fabulis paganis arreptam beato Iob applicauit.

C4T 69 [67] ‘And after other <words>’

And it is clear that the writer submitted to this from a great and unsuitable love of vain honour. To show himself as learned in external learning and having a knowledge of pagan fables, which they held to be reliable about those they reckoned gods, he thought little of ascribing to a just man the use of a name from thence, as if wishing to adorn his daughter by it. To me it is clear, from the whole composition of the book, that the writer was learned in pagan knowledge and, wishing to compose the present text in imitation of it, ruined the beauty of the narrative. Those among them who compose tragedies take subjects from those which are recounted by many, even if in some way it happens that in the opinion of most they are held to be true; but using the mere story, they seek to show their art and sagacity in the composition of fables, introducing characters pleasing to them and composing speeches for them, by which they think to attain fame and to be honoured, with the result that readers ascribe the blame and praise brought by the writing (whether the writer has erred by his intention or by the words themselves) not to the characters whose words he contrives but to the writer of the fable. And so when he found a great and renowned narrative about the blessed Job, which circulated orally among all alike, not only those of the Israelite race, but also of others, which the testimony of God delivered to the prophet made even more famous [Ezek. 14:14–20], he composed this text wanting to receive glory from the greatness of the subject, not knowing that there is a great difference between the story of the just man according to the simplicity and subtlety of the divine Scriptures, and superfluous words concocted for approval. For this reason he also made those fictions in which he made the devil contend with God [Job 2:1–6] and ascribed speeches, as he wished, some to the just man and others to his friends; that a large amount in these speeches exceeds what is appropriate, has already been said above. Near the end he introduced Elihu, whose words are full of huge insults against the just man [Job 32–7], and at the end he ascribed to a figure <representative> of the greatness of the divine nature such a speech in which he was not ashamed to include even the myth of the sea-monster [Job 40:25–41:26]. From this improper love of vain honour he attributed to the blessed Job the use of this name snatched from pagan fables.

C4T 70 [68] ‘In addition the same Theodore denigrates the Song of Songs . . .’⁴⁸

Cum me piguisset cantica canticorum perlegere, quoniam neque secundum propheticam speciem exposita sunt neque secundum historiae traditionem, sicut scriptura regnorum, neque demonstratiua admonitione studii utuntur, nescio quomodo tuarum litterarum praeceptum, de cantico canticorum exigens a nobis inrecusabiliter causam, fecit me circa eam diligentiolem, uiolenter quidem et sic. Nec enim cessauit et in initio ipso lectionis quasi studiosa alacritate oscitans frequenter et dormitans, sicut conuiuio codicis nuptiali, et hoc regali, percantatus.

C4T 71 [69] ‘And after other <words>’⁴⁹

Sed sic per sapientiam gentilibus et Iudaeis praedicabilem et terribilem existentem ut sollertem, unde et pax ei firmior quam in anterioribus temporibus erat timore summae circa eum prudentiae frenatis gentibus bella amantibus, Aegyptiacum conuiuium facit Salomonem apud Iudaeos uitiosum, tamquam legum paternarum praeuaricatorem abdicantium alienigenas nuptias. Et ad puellae conuiuium cecidit fugiendae quidem etiam ipso patrio deformi colore (nocturnorum eim colorum Aegyptus genetrix), magis uero fugiendae, quoniam genus habebat ex Cham, qui heres fuit antiquae maledictionis Noae. Ex quibus passus est aliquid Salomon circa coniugis desiderium et obprobrio praeuaricationis irritatus componit canticam excusationem, ut gratior etiam uxori sit canticis delectatus pro ea factis, et inproperantes sapienter percussit tamquam conscripti causam illi dantes laetitiarum non paenitentiae propter nuptias tanquam prauas. Vnde ab osculis nuptialibus statim ei et initium est tamquam sistenti nouam nuptam reclamantem uituperantibus: ‘osculetur me sponsus ab osculis oris eius et uestrum mihi cura nulla obprobrium latrantium.’ Et iterum irritatio ad uituperationes pro sponsa sua calidior: ‘nigra sum et bona, filiae Hierusalem, sicut tabernacula Cedar, sicut pellis Salomonis.’ Ne mihi, dicit, colorem ad uituperationem proponite, nisi forte etiam bene compositarum aedificationum ex nigro lapide Arabiae miraculum uituperationem esse putetis; quorum lapidum mihi

⁴⁸ Cf. *Theodoret's explanation in Canticum canticorum* (PG 81.29a)

⁴⁹ PG 66.699b-700a.

C₄T 70 [68] ‘In addition the same Theodore denigrates the Song of Songs . . .’

While it vexed me to read the Song of Songs, as it is presented neither in the prophetic genre nor in the tradition of history, such as the book of Kingdoms, nor do they employ demonstrative exhortation to practice, yet the injunction of your letter, I know not how, demanding from us, without refusal, a treatment of the Song of Songs, made me more diligent regarding it, indeed forcefully thus. At the very beginning of the reading, although with eager studiousness, I could not cease yawning and dozing, as if lulled by the book’s nuptial banquet, and this a royal one.

C₄T 71 [69] ‘And after other <words>’

But, in this way, being lauded by the gentiles and Jews for his wisdom, and fearsome for his adroitness, so that he enjoyed a more secure peace than existed in earlier times, with the nations who love war being restrained by fear of his supreme wisdom, an Egyptian banquet made Solomon appear depraved to the Jews, as a transgressor of the ancestral laws forbidding foreign marriages [cf. Exod. 34:16]. And this occurred at the banquet for a girl who should have been shunned because of her hideous native colour [cf. S. of S. 1:5] (for Egypt is the mother of dark colours) and should have been shunned the more because she was of the race descended from Ham, which was the heir of the ancient curse of Noah [cf. Gen. 9:22–5]. From which, Solomon, somewhat exasperated by his desire for his wife and the reproaches for his transgression, composed an explanatory song, to please his wife yet more, delighting her with songs composed for her, and cleverly disarmed the taunters by the fact that the composition of songs, for a marriage, albeit perverse, gave him a reason for celebration not repentance. Hence he begins immediately with nuptial kisses, making the new bride cry out to the critics: ‘Let the bridegroom “kiss me with the kisses of his mouth” and the reproaches of you who grumble are nothing to me [cf. S. of S. 1:2].’ And then his irritation with those who denigrate his bride become more heated: ‘I am black and comely, O daughters of Jerusalem, like the tents of Kedar, like the curtain of Solomon [S. of S. 1:5].’ Do not, she says, mention my colour as an insult, unless perhaps you also think that the wonder of the well-constructed buildings from the black stone of Arabia is an insult; my limbs are similar those stones and

membra similia sunt sicut quidam lapides preciosi. Caeruleo enim ipso coloris, quod uituperantes canitis, similitudo est talium lapidum et regalis purpurae, et regalis non simpliciter, sed qualem Salomon circumdatur, qui plus omnibus regibus ornamenta amat. Sed et ceteri cantici expositio irritatio est uituperationum tamquam insipientium et sine causa alienigena uocantium ea quae cognata sunt.

C4T 72 [70] ‘And after other <words>’

Qui enim canit omnem cantationem, se delectat. Ego uero cano quidem propositam cantationem; quibus uero cano, non cum illis me delectans cano. Nolebam enim mearum nuptiarum detractionis esse in saecula conscriptor. Necessitate autem excusationis uolens canere, quorum non uolo cantationem canere cogor, ut sit mihi canticum super morem cantici. Canere enim modo cum sponsa cogor quae uituperant, publicam excusationem et clamare ea quae abscondere nubentibus decet. Quoniam enim conflagrare nos uituperationibus putant et reprehensionum obprobriis diuidere, audiant nos nostros amplexus canentes calidius et nuptialium nostrorum unguentorum amplius odorem accipiant; circumsonentur canticis tragicis nostrorum osculorum. Clama tuam nigritudinem, sponsa purpurea, gratiosa, clama tuum genus: uituperatur laudabilis originis Israhel congentile. Incipe initio responsionis ad eos: ‘Ex calidis oculis meis cognoscant quod amatorii sermonibus adinuicem fruimur; discant percutientes uituperationibus tacitam citharam nuptias amantem; cognoscant maledictionibus quod saltare in meis nuptiis a nobis putati sunt. Non maledicere sciant, quod excitauerunt amorem resonantem iucundiora uituperationibus; intret per aures eorum amarus aliquis in corde stimulus nostrorum osculorum.’ Sed intellectus quidem conscriptori eiusmodi est, hebetat uero intellectum eo quod sine nomine conscriptionem fecit, tantummodo non clamans ad Israel, quod non ipsius Salomonis est conscriptum, sed necessitate aemulationis.

are like precious stones. The dark colour itself, about which you sing insultingly, is a likeness of such stones and the royal purple, and not merely royal, but such as clothes Solomon, who more than every king loves adornment. The exposition of the other song is also an incitement for the insults of fools and for the calling foreign, without cause, things which are native.

C₄T 72 [70] ‘And after other <words>’

He who sings every song delights himself. Yet I am singing a song indeed imposed <on me>; I do not sing to delight myself as well as those for whom I sing. For I did not wish to record for the ages the criticism of my marriage. But choosing to sing, because of the necessity for explanation, I am compelled to sing a song of things I did not choose, so that my song is beyond the custom of songs. For I am compelled to sing with my spouse about the things they insult, as a public explanation, and to proclaim those things which it is proper for married people to conceal. But because they think to inflict us with insults and to separate us through reproachful censure, let them hear us singing hotly of our embraces and let them fully absorb the fragrance of our nuptial unguents [S. of S. 1:3]; let them be surrounded by the dramatic songs of our kisses. Proclaim your blackness, bride, born-to-the-purple, gracious, proclaim your race! A race kin to the honourable origins of Israel is being insulted. As a beginning of a reply to them, start: ‘From my hot kisses let them learn that we delight in amorous words with each other; let those who wound with insults discover the silent lyre that loves a wedding; let them learn, in their curses, that they are considered by us to dance at my wedding. Let them learn not to curse, since they have aroused a love that resounds more joyfully because of the insults; let some bitter sting of our kisses enter through their ears in the heart.’ But, while this is the meaning of the writer, that he wrote anonymously blunts the meaning, all but proclaiming to Israel that it was not written by Solomon himself, but by the constraint of emulation.

C4T 73 [71] 'And after other <words>'

Quae omnia oportet legentes librum cogitando nec ad impudicitiae hortationem putare esse conscriptionem sapientissimi et propter hoc odisse—qualis enim esset utilitas Salomoni festinare ad conscriptionem impudicitiae, cui et sine conscriptione potestas erat impudicitiae?—nec collaudare codicem sicut habentem prophetica dictionem bonorum ecclesiae. Si enim prophetica gratiam meruisset, mentionem alicubi Dei fecisset; in nulla enim prophetica scriptura Deus non memoratur. Sed scire debent omnes aemulationis nuptialis codicem mensale canticum esse, sicut et de amore postea conuiuuium Plato conscripsit. Vnde nec Iudaeis nec nobis publica lectio umquam cantici canticorum facta est, tamquam domesticus et nuptialis Salomonis conuiuuii cantus obprobria sponsae sonans.

II. THE FIFTH SESSION

C5D 1 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1
[a=BD 27; ab=LD 4]

Si quis uelit abusiue Filium Dei, Deum Verbum, filium Dauid nominare, propter Dei Verbi templum quod ex Dauid est, nominet et illum qui est ex semine Dauid, Filium Dei gratia, non natura appellet, naturales patres non ignorans neque ordinem subuertens neque eum qui incorporalis est, etiam corpus dicens et ante saecula ex Deo et ex Dauid et passum et impassibilem. Corpus non est incorporale; quod est deorsum, non est desursum; quod est ante saecula, non est ex semine Dauid; quod passum est, non est impassibile. Nec enim ista ad eundem intellectum obuertuntur; quae sunt corporis, non sunt Dei Verbi, et quae sunt Dei Verbi propria, non habet corpus. Naturas confiteamur et dispensationes non abnegemus.

C4T 73 [71] ‘And after other <words>’

Reflecting on all this, readers of the book ought neither to consider the writing of the most wise man to be an exhortation to impurity and to hate it for this—for what benefit would it be to Solomon to strive to write of impurity, when without writing he could be impure?—nor to praise the book as if it contained prophetic words about the blessings of the Church. For if he had merited the grace of prophecy, he would have made mention of God somewhere; for in no prophetic Scriptures is God not recalled. But all ought to recognize that a book of nuptial emulation is a song for the table, just as Plato later wrote *The Symposium* about love. Hence neither by the Jews nor by ourselves has there ever been a public reading of the Song of Songs, as it is a domestic and nuptial song for the banquets of Solomon, mentioning the insults against the bride.

II. THE FIFTH SESSION

C5D 1 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1

[a=BD 27; ab=LD 4]

[a] If any wishes improperly to name the Son of God, the God Word, ‘son of David’, because the temple of the God Word which is from David, let him name <him thus>; and let him also call the one from the seed of David ‘Son of God’ by grace not by nature, [b] not ignoring the natural parents, nor overturning the <right> order, nor saying that he who is incorporeal is a body⁵⁰ and that he is both before the ages from God and from David, and that he both suffered and is impassible. [c] A body is not incorporeal; what is from below is not from above; what is before the ages is not from the seed of David; what suffered is not impassible. Neither are these things to be ascribed to the same concept; things pertaining to the body do not pertain to the God Word, and what is proper to the God Word, the body does not have. Let us acknowledge the natures and not deny the economies.

⁵⁰ ‘Is a body’ is not in LD 4.

C5D 2 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1

[bc=BD 22; b=LD 3; C4T 47]

Et conuenit eos qui bene sapiunt, quandoquidem naturales patres quaerimus, neque Deum Verbum Daudid uel Abrahae filium nominare, sed factorem, neque corpus ante saecula ex Patre, sed semen Abrahae et David ex Maria natum. Et cum de naturalibus natiuitatibus sit ratio, neque Mariae Filius Deus esse Verbum existimetur; mortalis enim mortalem generat secundum naturam et corpus quod sibi simile est. Duas natiuitates Deus Verbum non sustinuit, unam quidem ante saecula, alteram autem in ultimis temporibus; sed ex Patre quidem natura genitus est, templum uero quod ex Maria natum est, ex ipso utero sibi fabricauit.

C5D 3 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1

[a=BD 23]

Cum uero de salutari dispensatione ratio mouetur, et Deus uocetur homo non quod hoc factus est, sed quod hoc assumpsit, et homo Deus non tamquam incircumscribibilis factus nec ubique existens; corpus enim erat et post resurrectionem palpabile et tale receptum est in caelum et sic ueniet, sicut receptum est.

C5D 4 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1

[=BD 17b, C4T 28]

Sed si caro, dicit, erat quae crucifixa est, quomodo sol radios auertit et tenebrae occupauerunt totam terram et terrae motus et petrae disrumpebantur et mortui resurgebant? Quid igitur dicant et de tenebris in Aegypto factis sub tempore Moysei non in tribus horis, sed in tribus diebus? Quid uero de aliis per Moysen factis miraculis et per Iesum Naue qui solem stare fecit, qui sol sub rege Ezechia et praeter naturam retrouersus est, et de Helisaei reliquiis, quae mortuum resuscitauerunt? Si enim Deum Verbum passum

C5D 2 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1
[bc=BD 22; b=LD 3; C4T 47]

[a] And it befits those who think aright, when we are investigating the natural forefathers, not to call the God Word ‘Son of David’ or ‘of Abraham’, but Creator; nor the body ‘before the ages from the Father’, but ‘the seed of Abraham and David, born of Mary’. [b] And when the discussion is about natural births, neither should the God Word be considered to be the son of Mary; for a mortal bears what is mortal according to nature, and a body that which is similar to it.⁵¹ The God Word did not undergo two births, one before the ages, the other in the last times, [c] but he was begotten of the Father by nature, while the temple that was born from Mary he fashioned for himself from her very womb.

C5D 3 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1
[a=BD 23]

[a] But when discussion moves to the saving economy, let both God be called ‘man’, not because he became so but he assumed this, and man ‘God’ [b] not as if he had become uncircumscribed nor existing everywhere; for the body was palpable even after the resurrection, and was such when taken up into heaven, and thus it will come again just as it was taken up [cf. Acts 1:11].

C5D 4 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1
[=BD 17b, C4T 28]

But if it were the flesh, he says, which was crucified, why did the sun turn away its rays [cf. Luke 23:45], and darkness and earthquakes seize the whole earth, and the rocks get smashed and the dead arise [cf. Matt. 27:45, 51–3]? What, then, do they say of the darkness that occurred in Egypt in the time of Moses, not for three hours, but three days [cf. Exod. 10:21ff.]? What indeed of those other miracles wrought by Moses [cf. Exod. 7:8ff.] and by Jesus, son of Nave [Joshua, son of Nun], who made the sun stand [cf. Jos. 10:21ff.], the sun that in the days of King Hezekiah turned backwards contrary to nature [cf. 4 Kgs 20:11], of the remains of Elisha which raised a dead man [4 Kgs 13:21]?⁵² For if

⁵¹ LD 3: ‘that which is consubstantial with it’.

⁵² The text of this extract, to this point, also exists in another Latin version in Pelagius II, *Ep.* 3 (*ACO* 4.2, p. 22.1–7).

est ostendunt quae in tempore crucis facta sunt, et propter hominem non concedent ea facta esse, et, quae sub tempore Moysei propter genus Abrahae et quae sub tempore Iesu Naue et Ezechiae regis, non erunt. Si uero illa propter Iudaeorum populum miracula facta sunt, multo magis quae in cruce propter Dei Verbi templum.

C₅D 5 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1

[=SD 2, TD 2, LD 2, C₄T 46; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

Gratia Filius qui ex Maria est homo, natura uero Deus Verbum. Quod uero est gratia, non natura est; et quod est natura, non gratia: non duo Filii. Sufficiat corpori quod ex nobis est, secundum gratiam filiationis gloria, immortalitas; quod templum Dei Verbi factum est, non supra naturam eleuetur et Deus Verbum pro debita a nobis gratiarum actione non iniurietur. Et quae est iniuria? Componere ipsum cum corpore et putare eum ad perfectam filiationem corporis indigere. Neque ipse Deus Verbum uult seipsum filium Dauid esse, sed Deum; corpus uero uocari filium Dauid non solum non inuidit, sed etiam propter hoc peruenit.

C₅T 1 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2

[b=LT 12]

‘Quid est homo, quod memor es eius, aut filius hominis quod uisitas eum?’ Consideremus igitur, quis homo sit, de quo stupescit et miratur quod Unigenitus dignatus est eius memoriam uisitationemque facere. Sed quod quidem non dictum est de omni <homine>, in superioribus demonstratum est; quod autem non de uno quolibet, et hoc certum est. Vt autem omnia praetermittamus, quod omnibus credibilius est, apostolicum testimonium excipiamus. Scribit igitur apostolus ad Hebraeos, narrans de Christo personamque suam non acceptabilem apud eos confirmans ita dicit: ‘testificatus est uero alicubi quidam dicens: quid est homo, quod memor es eius, aut filius hominis,

those that occurred at the time of the crucifixion show that the God Word suffered, and they do not grant that they happened because of a man, then also those in the time of Moses will not have been for the sake of the race of Abraham, nor <those> in the time of Jesus, son of Nave, and in that of King Hezekiah. But if these miracles were wrought for the sake of the people of the Jews, much more were those at the time of the cross because of the temple of the God Word.

C5D 5 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 1

[=SD 2, TD 2, LD 2, C4T 46; a=BD 31; c=BD 32]

[a] By grace the man from Mary is Son, by nature the God Word <is Son>. But what is by grace is not by nature; and what is by nature is not by grace: there are not two Sons.⁵³ [b] The glory of sonship by grace, immortality, would suffice the body from us; since it became the temple of the God Word, let it not be raised above nature, and let not the God Word, instead of the thanksgiving due from us, be insulted. And what is the insult? To combine him with the body, and to suppose that he needed the body for perfect sonship. [c] Neither does the God Word himself wish to be the son of David, but God [cf. Matt. 22:41–5]; not only did he not grudge this but for this he came, that the body is to be called the son of David.

C5T 1 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2

[b=LT 12]

[a] ‘What is man that you are mindful of him, or the son of man that you visit him? [Ps. 8:5; Heb. 2:6]’ [b] Let us consider then who the man is about whom he is astonished and amazed that the Only-begotten deigned to remember and visit him. But that it is not said of every <human being> has been shown above; that it is neither about any one you please, this too is certain. That we might omit everything else, let us take the apostolic witness, which is more trustworthy than everything. [c] The Apostle, then, writes to the Hebrews, telling of Christ and confirming his person, which was not acceptable to them, he thus says: ‘It has been testified somewhere by someone saying: “what is man that you are

⁵³ ‘There are not two sons’ is not in LD 2.

quod uisitas eum? Minorasti eum paulo minus ab angelis, gloria et honore coronasti eum, et constituisti eum super opera manuum tuarum; omnia subiecisti sub pedibus eius.’ Et cum testimonium dixisset, interpretans ipsum intulit: ‘subiciendo autem omnia nihil dimisit non subiectum. Modo autem nondum uidemus omnia ei subiecta.’ Et quis homo est, docens nos, quoniam dubium erat a uoce posita apud beatum Dauid, intulit: ‘paulo autem minus ab angelis minoratum uidemus Iesum propter passionem mortis gloria et honore coronatum.’ Si igitur ex euangeliiis quidem erudimur ad dominum dixisse beatum Dauid omnia quae sunt psalmi et cetera et quod ‘memor es et uisitas et minorasti et subiecisti’, ex apostolo uero Iesum esse discimus, de quo loquens Dauid dicit et quod eius memor est et quod eum uisitauit, sed etiam quod omnia subiecit ei, cum paulo minus ab angelis minorasset eum, cessate uel uix aliquando a uestra impudentia cognoscentes quod oportet. Videtis enim, omnium hominum sceleratissimi, quanta naturarum est differentia, quod hic quidem stupefactus est, quia et memor esse hominis dignatur et uisitare eum ceterorumque participem facere, quorum eum participem fecit, ille uero e contrario miratur quod tantorum particeps esse supra suam naturam meruit, et hic quidem tamquam beneficium dans mirificatur et magna praestans et supra naturam eius qui consequitur beneficium, ille uero tamquam beneficium consequens et maiora quam est <dignus>, ab eo suscipiens.

C5T 2 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2
[=LT 14ab; a=C4T 48]

Cessabuntne iam ab impudente pugna, desistent uero uana contentione, erubescetes dicatorum euidentiam? ‘Multos’ enim dicit ‘filios in gloriam ducentem.’ Ecce igitur in ratione filiationis connumerans apostolus apparet adsumptum hominem ceteris, non secundum quod similiter illis filiationis particeps est, sed secundum quod similiter gratia adsumpsit filiationem, deitate sola

mindful of him, or the son of man that you visit him? You made him a little lower than the angels, you crowned him with glory and honour, and set him over the works of your hands; you placed all things under his feet” [Heb. 2:6–8a; Ps. 8].’ And when he had quoted the testimony, he added, explaining it: ‘in subjecting all things, he left nothing not subjected. But we do not yet see all things subjected to him [Heb. 2:8b].’ And teaching us who the man is, as it was doubtful in the saying recorded from the blessed David, he added: ‘But we see Jesus lowered a little below the angels, crowned with glory and honour because of the suffering of death [Heb. 2:9].’ If, then, we are taught by the gospels that it was of the Lord that the blessed David said everything that is in the psalm—both the rest and that ‘you remember’ and ‘you visit’ and ‘you lowered’ and ‘you subjected’—and from the Apostle we learn that it is Jesus of whom David was speaking when he says both that he remembered him and visited him, and also that he subjected all things to him, even though he made him a little lower than the angels, cease, even if with some difficulty, from your shamelessness, knowing what is proper. For you see, most wicked of all men, how great is the difference of natures, in that the one [i.e. David] is astonished because he [i.e. the Lord] deigns to be mindful of man and to visit him and to make him partake in the other things of which he made him a partaker; the other [i.e. the Apostle], on the contrary, marvels that he [i.e. Jesus] was vouchsafed to partake of so great things above his nature: the one is marvelled at as bestowing a privilege and giving great things that surpass the nature of him who obtains the privilege; the other <is marvelled at> as obtaining the privilege and receiving from him things greater than he deserves.

C5T 2 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2

[=LT 14ab; a=C4T 48]

[a] Will they now cease from their impudent fight, will they desist from vain contention, shamed by the clarity of what has been said? For it says, ‘bringing many sons into glory’ [Heb. 2:10]. Notice, then, how the Apostle classifies, by the principle of sonship, the man assumed along with the many, not because he participates in sonship in a similar manner to them, but because he assumed sonship in the same way—by grace—divinity alone

naturalem filiationem possidente. Certum est enim illud quod filiationis gloria praeter ceteros homines inest ei praecipue per unitatem quae est ad illum; unde et in ipsa uoce significante filium similiter etiam ille comprehenditur. Sed sermocinantur ad nos: Si duo perfecta dicitis, omni modo et duos filios dicemus. Sed ecce et Filius dictus est in diuina scriptura per seipsum, deitate excepta ceteris hominibus connumeratus. Et non iam duos dicimus filios; unus uero Filius in confessione est iuste, quoniam naturarum diuisio necessario debet permanere et personae unitio indissipabilis custodiri.

C5T 3 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2

[b=ST 2, LT 28, C4T 45]

Nemo artificio interrogationum decipiatur. Flagitiosum enim est deponere quidem ‘tantam testium nubem’, secundum quod apostolus dixit, astutis autem interrogationibus deceptos aduersariorum parti coniungi. Quae uero sunt, quae cum arte interrogant? Hominis genetrix Maria an Dei genetrix? Et quis crucifixus est, utrum Deus an homo? Sed istorum quidem certa est absolutio et ex his quae praediximus in responsis quae ad interrogationes fuerunt; tamen uero dicatur etiam nunc, quae compendiose respondere oportet, ut nulla eis occasio astutiae relinquatur. Cum igitur interrogant, hominis genetrix an Dei genetrix est Maria, dicatur a nobis: utraque, unum quidem natura rei, alterum uero relatione. Hominis enim genetrix est naturaliter, quoniam homo erat in utero Mariae, qui et inde processit; Dei autem genetrix, quoniam Deus erat in homine nato, non in eo circumscriptus secundum naturam, sed quod in eo est secundum adfectum uoluntatis. Itaque utraque quidem dici iustum est, non autem secundum similem rationem: nec enim sicut homo, in utero ut esset, suscepit initium, sic et Deus Verbum; erat enim ante omnem creaturam. Itaque et utraque dici iustum est et utrumque eorum secundum propriam rationem. Idem autem respondendum est et si interrogant: Deus crucifixus est an homo? Quod utraque quidem, non autem secundum similem rationem; nam hic quidem crucifixus est utpote et passionem suscipiens et ligno adfixus et ab Iudaeis detentus, ille autem, quod erat cum ipso secundum praedictam causam.

possessing natural sonship. [b] For it is certain that the glory of sonship is especially his, beyond other human beings, by the union with him [i.e. the Word]; whence he is likewise conceptually comprehended in the very word 'son'. But they argue with us: if you say 'two perfect things', we will certainly also say 'two sons'. But, note, in the divine Scripture he is called 'son' by itself, being classified with other men without reference to the divinity. And yet we do not now say 'two sons'; but one Son is rightly confessed, since the division of natures ought necessarily to remain and the unity of the *persona* be preserved indivisible.

C5T 3 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2
[b=ST 2, LT 28, C4T 45]

Let no one be deceived by the artifice of their questions. For it is disgraceful to set aside 'so great a cloud of witness', as the Apostle says [Heb. 21:1], and, deceived by their crafty questions, join the party of our adversaries. What are the questions that they cunningly ask? 'Is Mary the mother of a man or the mother of God?' And then, 'Who was crucified, God or man?' But the solution to these questions is clear even from what we previously said in response to their questions; nevertheless, let us right now say what ought to be said summarily by way of reply, so that no opportunity may be left for their cunning. [b] When, then, they ask, 'Is Mary the mother of a man or the mother of God?' let us say: 'Both'—the one by the nature of the case, the other by relation.⁵⁴ 'Mother of a man' by nature, since a man was in the womb of Mary, who also came out from there; 'Mother of God' since God was in the man born, not circumscribed in him by nature, but being in him by the disposition of the will. [c] Therefore it is right to say both, but not in the same sense: for the God Word did not, like the man, begin to exist in the womb, for he existed before the whole creation. Therefore it is right to say both, and each of them according to its own sense. And the same answer is to be given if they ask, 'Was God crucified or a man?' the answer is 'both', but not in the same sense; for latter was crucified in that he underwent the passion and was nailed to the cross and was held captive by the Jews, but the former in that he was with him for the reason described above.

⁵⁴ LT 28: τῆ ἀναφορᾶ

C5T 4 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2, commenting on Heb. 1:6 [=BT 31]

Quis est igitur, qui in orbem terrarum introducitur et dominationem eius accipit, de qua ei et adorari ab angelis adquiritur? Nec enim insaniens aliquis dicat Deum Verbum esse introductum, qui omnia non extantia fecit, ineffabili eius uirtute donans eius ut essent.

C5T 5 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2⁵⁵
[a=LT 17]

‘Multifarie multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in prophetis, in nouissimis diebus his locutus est nobis in filio’; per filium enim locutus est nobis, certum est uero quod de adsumpto homine. ‘Cui enim dixit aliquando angelorum: Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te?’ Nullum, dicit, angelorum participem fecit dignitatis Filii. Hoc enim quod dixit: ‘genui te’, quasi per hoc participationem filiationis dedit, omnino uero aperte nullam habens ad Deum Verbum communionem, apparet hoc quod dictum est.

C5T 6 From Cyril, quoting from Theodore’s *To Those Being Baptized*⁵⁶
[b=ST 5]

Hoc uero non ex nobis ipsis inuenimus testimonium, sed ex diuina edocti sumus scriptura, quoniam et beatus Paulus ita dicit: ‘ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus.’ Non quod ex Iudaeis et secundum carnem est, qui super omnia Deus est, sed hoc quidem ad significandam humanam naturam dixit, quam ab Israelitico genere esse sciebat, illud autem ad ostendendam diuina naturam, quam supra omnia et omnibus dominantem sciebat.

⁵⁵ Cf. E. Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni: Fragmenta Syriaca* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1869), 70, where it is described as from the *Commentary on Hebrews*.

⁵⁶ *Cat. Hom.* 3.6 (ed. Tonneau, 60.4–12).

C5T 4 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2, commenting on Heb. 1:6
[=BT 31]

Who is it that is brought into the world and receives its lordship, because of which even adoration from the angels is acquired? For no one would be so insane as to say that the entry is that of the God Word, who created all things that were not and by his ineffable power gave that they should be.

C5T 5 From Cyril, *Against Theodore*, bk. 2
[a=LT 17]

[a] ‘In many and various ways God spoke of old to the fathers in the prophets, but in these last days he spoke to us in a Son’ [Heb. 1:2]; ‘he spoke to us through a Son’—it is clear that this refers to the man assumed. [b] ‘For to which of the angels did he ever say, “You are my Son, today have I begotten you”?’ [Heb. 1:5]. He says that that he made none of the angels to be a participant in the dignity of the Son. As for that which is said, ‘I begot you’, as if by this he gave a participation in sonship, it is clear from what is said, completely and explicitly, that it has no connection to the God Word.

C5T 6 From Cyril, quoting from Theodore’s *To Those Being Baptized*
[b=ST 5]

[a] This testimony we did not invent of ourselves, but were taught by the divine scripture, [b] since the blessed Paul also speaks thus: ‘from whom is Christ according to the flesh, who is God over all [Rom. 9:5].’ He said this <first clause> not because the one who is God over all is from the Jews according to the flesh, but to signify the human nature, which he knew to be from the race of Israel, and <he said> that <second clause> to indicate the divine nature, which he knew to be above all and rules over all.

III. THE SIXTH SESSION

C6T 1 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 11
[=BT 21b]

Ad haec itaque sufficiunt quidem et quae diximus, ubi et naturarum differentiam ostendimus et personae unitatem et quod secundum naturas iste quidem beneficium accipit, ille autem beneficium dat, certa constituta unitate ex qua indivisa ab uniuersa creatura honor impletur.

C6T 2 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8
[=BT 17a, LT 6c, JT 10b, C4T 29b]

C6T 3 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

Ad haec autem beatus apostolus respondens conatur ostendere quomodo particeps est diuini honoris et quod eo fruitur non propter suam naturam, sed propter inhabitantem uirtutem.

III. THE SIXTH SESSION

C6T 1 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 11
[=BT 21b]

Regarding this, what we have said, therefore, indeed suffices, where we showed both the difference of natures and the unity of *persona*, and that in respect of natures, one receives a benefit, and the other bestows a benefit, there being a firm unity from which inseparably honour is paid by the whole creation.

C6T 2 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 8
[=BT 17a, LT 6c, JT 10b, C4T 29b]

C6T 3 From *On the Incarnation*, bk. 12

Replying to this, the blessed Apostle tries to show how he is a participant in divine honour and that he enjoys not because of his own nature but because of the indwelling power.

APPENDIX

COD. ADD. 14669: A SYRIAC TRANSLATION OF THEODORE'S *ON THE INCARNATION*

Theodore's work *On the Incarnation* was, without doubt, his most important dogmatic treatise, and also his most extensive, comprised, according to Gennadius, of 'fifteen books, containing as many as fifteen thousand verses'.¹ It was also one of his most controversial writings. Given the author's eventual condemnation, it is not surprising that the work suffered the fate of so many others from antiquity. Although it no longer survives intact in Greek, a near-complete Syriac version was discovered at the beginning of the twentieth century by Addai Scher, the Chaldean archbishop of Seert.² Unfortunately, however, during the First World War, before an edition could be published, the manuscript disappeared, apparently for good, though the circumstances of this loss remain unclear.

Nevertheless, besides the extracts provided by later polemicists, we also have the remains of a Syriac translation of this work in British Library *Cod. Add. 14669*. W. Wright described the manuscript as follows: 'Eighteen vellum leaves, about 10³/₄ in by 8³/₈, nearly all more or less stained, torn and mutilated. The quires are signed with letters (fol 6v Δ). Each page is divided into two columns of from 34 to 37 lines. The writing is a small, elegant, Edessene Estrangela, of the vth or vith century.'³ It must also be noted that while the original text is indeed in an early, clear Edessene Estrangela script, written in brown ink, a second hand has added in black ink, sporadically and rather erratically, vowel and punctuation points, together with the smaller 'two-point' signs, both above and below the line, that would seem to fall under

¹ Gennadius, *Vit. ill.* 12.

² *Cod. Seert 88*; Addai Scher, *Catalogue des manuscrits syriaques et arabes conservés dans la Bibliothèque épiscopale de Séert* (Mossoul: Impr. des Pères Dominicains, 1905).

³ W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired since the year 1838* (London: Longmans, 1870-2), 2.483 (item DCVII).

the ‘small vowel point’ size mentioned by Bar Hebraeus (rather than the large accent points or the medium points used for other purposes). Such additions, following Segal’s analysis of their historical development, would seem to date to the late sixth to seventh century.⁴

All but two (12–13) of the leaves are discontinuous. However, as Wright notes, there are certain indications on several folia that point to their place within the fifteen books of *On the Incarnation*:

4^v the beginning of the 43rd section (✠ ܘܢܝܘܢ).

6^v the conclusion of book 6, with subscription ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ

7^v the beginning of chapter 50 (ܩ).

10^v the beginning of book 9, ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ, listing three chapters ܘܫܘܒ, ܡܫܘܒ, and ܡܫܘܒ, which have been subsequently altered into ܡܫܘܒ, ܡܫܘܒ, and ܡܫܘܒ

11^v, column one, of which only the left half remains, marks the end of book 10, .ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ [ܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܟܘܢܝܘܢ], and gives the chapter titles of book 11 . . . ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ [ܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܟܘܢܝܘܢ] and begins book 11 ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ

12^v has the heading Book Eleven’ . . . ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ ✠ ܠܟܘܢܝܘܢ . . .

17^v marks chapters 78 (ܚܘܢ) and, in the margin, 79 (ܚܘܢ)

Given the range of extant passages, it seems pretty certain that the manuscript had originally contained a complete translation of *On the Incarnation*. A note between the columns on fol. 11^v, written in a later hand, mentions the name of a John of Damascus, and between the columns on fol. 8^v, also in a later hand, there are given the titles of a number of works which Wright ascribes to Jacob of Batnae (i.e. of Sarug), suggesting that this folio had been used for binding.

The only printed edition of this text is that by Eduard Sachau in the mid-nineteenth century, in a collection of Syriac texts of Theodore found in the British Museum, printed together with a Latin translation.⁵ His edition and translation are not altogether satisfactory, and his arrangement of the material only increased

⁴ Cf. J. B. Segal, *The Diacritical Point and the Accents in Syriac* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953; facs. reprint, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2004), esp. 6, 22–3, 26–30.

⁵ Ed. Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni fragmenta syriaca e codicibus musei britannici nitriacis edita atque in latinum sermonem* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1869).

the disarray.⁶ His order, with the headings he assigned, is as follows:

Folio

- 3 Explicatur Galat. 3,13: *γερόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα*; de usu vocis *γενέσθαι* in Scriptura S.
- 5, 6, 8 Judaei ad fidem in Christum adduci et debebant et poterant; propter pertinaciam suam justo poenam gravem luunt.
- 2 Universali rei nomine speciem non indicari.
- 4 Adversus Apollinaris doctrinam de cognitione (*νοῦς*) tertia in Christo natura; explicatur Luk. 2,52.
- 7^r Adversus Apollinarim; de assumptione; non dicendum 'duo filii'; de cognitione natura tertia.
- 7^v, 14 Sententia Apollinaris 'Christum non vocandum hominem' refutatur 1. ex Scriptura S. 2. ex Jacobi testimonio, quod tradidit Hegesippus.
- 10 De adunatione naturarum (*ἔνωσις τῶν φύσεων*).
- 12, 13 De assumptione; explicatur Philipp. 2,6 squ.
- 11^r De visionibus Dei et angelorum.
- 11^v Adversus eos, qui interrogant nos, utrum misericors sit an misericordia egens, adjutor an auxilio egens.
- 9 Refutantur interrogationes 'utrum misericors sit an misericordia egens, resuscitans an resuscitatione egens' ctr.
- 16^r De adunatione personae.
- 16^v, 17^r De genealogia et nativitate Christi.
- 17^v Explicatur Luk. 2,40.
- 1^r Naturae inter se separatae sunt.
- 1^r, col.2 De conditionibus germinandi.
- 1^v De conditionibus mixtionis; vox 'mixtura' in Scriptura S.
- 15 De Melito Episcopo Antiocheno ejusque contra Arianos certamine.

As the remains of Theodore's *On the Incarnation* preserved here can only be cited by folio, it has seemed best to present the text below in the order that the folia are arranged in the manuscript as now bound.

Sachau suggested that the translation into Syriac was the work of Ibas of Edessa (432–57) and his colleagues, Pruba, Koumi, and Ma'nae, and that this work was completed not long after the death of Theodore.⁷ Addai Scher, in the article which announced the

⁶ Cf. R. Abramowski, 'Neue Schriften Theodors von Mopsuestia', *ZNTW* (1934), 66–84, at 67.

⁷ Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni*, vi. On their activity, see A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis*, CSCO 266, subs. 26 (Louvain, CSCO 1965), 15–24.

existence of a Syriac translation of Theodore's *On the Incarnation*, provides some passages from the *Questions and Answers* of the eighth-century Joseph Hazzâyâ relating to the translation of Greek texts into Syriac in the preceding centuries which give further insight into the Syriac version of Theodore's works.⁸ Noting that copyists, especially those engaged in translation, often interpolate their works, most notably in the case of Dionysius the Areopagite (though this is based on his conviction that 'the style of this saint was certainly simple as that of the Apostles of whom he was a disciple'), Hazzâyâ adds:

His companion Koumi also, for his part, interpolated the writings of the blessed Interpreter, when translating them from Greek into Syriac. In the book *On the Incarnation* and in that *On the Faith*, whenever the Interpreter had written that there are in Christ two *hypostases*, Koumi, one of the partisans of the emperor Justinian, wrote 'one *hypostasis*'. For the Interpreter, whenever he spoke of the union in Christ, always wrote 'two natures, two *hypostases*, and one person'. In fact, it is impossible that the Interpreter, the light of the world, would have contradicted the formula of two natures and two *hypostases*, of which he was himself the father.⁹

Hazzâyâ continues by relating that Sourin, an exegete of the school of Nisibis, in his Eulogy on the Fathers of the Monastery of (Babai) bar Nsibnâyê, said that he received his knowledge from Gabriel, the superior of the same monastery, who had himself received it from Narsai, the superior of the monastery at Izlâ, whom Scher places in the mid-seventh century.¹⁰

Acknowledging that this account, coming a century-and-a-half after Koumi, is confused (for Koumi was no more a contemporary of Justinian than the Emperor is likely to have endorsed a translation of Theodore), Scher also claimed to find an exact correspondence between his text and the extracts edited by

⁸ Addai Scher, 'Joseph Hazzâyâ, écrivain syriaque du VIII^e siècle', in *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1909), 300–7; repr. in *Revista degli Studi Orientali*, 3 (1910), 45–63. The *Questions and Answers* of Joseph remains unpublished; Scher refers to *Cod. Seert* 79, dated to 1532, noting also its preservation in *Cod. Diarbekir* 100. On Hazzâyâ see Robert Beulay, *DSp* 8 (1974), 1341–9.

⁹ Scher, 'Joseph Hazzâyâ', 61 (my translation); of whom Koumi was a companion is not stated in the extracts provided by Scher.

¹⁰ Scher (*ibid.* 62) identifies Narsai as a contemporary of Išôyahb of Adiabene, consecrated patriarch in 651; Gabriel, surnamed Tawertâ, as a contemporary of Hnânišô'I, who occupied the patriarchal throne in 686; and Sourin as the Sourin who was named patriarch in 754.

P. Lagarde (i.e. from *Cod. Add.* 12156), and concluded that his translation was none other than that made by Koumi:

I have said that this version of the Book of Theodore is the same as that which was made by Koumi, because his version, according to the testimony of Joseph Hazzâyâ, said that there is in Jesus Christ one *hypostasis*. And our manuscript also, whenever it speaks of the union, says that there is in Christ a single *hypostasis* (ܚܘܨܬܐ).¹¹

Comparing this description to Sachau's edition (i.e. *Cod. Add.* 14669), Marcel Richard argued that, as they both speak of one *hypostasis* in Christ, the Seert manuscript and *Cod. Add.* 14669 must preserve the same Syriac translation, and that therefore 'the name of Koumi really guarantees the seriousness of the Syriac version' of Theodore's *On the Incarnation* contained in what remains of *Cod. Add.* 14669.¹² Hazzâyâ's 'rather mediocre sense of history', evident in his account of Koumi, also accounts, for Richard, for his charge of interpolation: this accusation does not have great historical value, but rather indicates only how 'Chalcedonian' Theodore must have sounded to certain seventh-century 'Nestorians zealots'. And as any falsification of the text would have been readily noticed in Edessene circles in the fifth century, Richard concludes that the 'one *hypostasis*' formula ubiquitously contained in the Syriac version, according to Hazzâyâ and Scher, must be Theodore's own, and any evidence to the contrary in other witnesses must be the result of falsification.

Nevertheless, accepting that Koumi did translate *On the Incarnation* into Syriac does not necessarily entail that it is his version that we have in *Add.* 14669. Sullivan points out that in the case of *On Faith*, also translated by Koumi according to Hazzâyâ, we have evidence of two different Syriac versions—*Mingana Syr.* 561, published with the title *Catechetical Homilies*, and quotations from the eighth-century Nestorian Theodore bar Koni—which differ precisely in the point made by Hazzâyâ.¹³ Theodore bar Koni provides three extracts from the *Catechetical Homilies* which touch on the issue of the union of the two natures. In the version of *Mingana Syr.* 561, two of these cases describe this union as 'in one

¹¹ Scher, 'Joseph Hazzâyâ', 63 (my trans.).

¹² M. Richard, 'La Tradition', 68–9. It is possible that Richard simply mistook Scher's claims regarding Lagarde's edition (i.e. of *Cod. Add.* 12156) for Sachau's edition (of *Cod. Add.* 14669).

¹³ Sullivan, *Christology*, 60–4.

parsopa' (the original Greek clearly being *πρόσωπον*), and the third simply says that the Scriptures predicate 'as of one only' what belongs to both natures.¹⁴ Theodore bar Koni's extracts, however, have 'one *qnoma*', the usual translation of *ὑπόστασις*.¹⁵ Thus the version used by Theodore bar Koni must be other than that contained in *Mingana Syr.* 561, and, following the reports of Hazzâyâ and Scher, we can attribute it to Koumi.

With regard to *On the Incarnation*, Sullivan argues that we find a similar situation. There are eight instances in *Cod. Add.* 14669 which present Theodore as using 'one *parsopa*' formulae for the union in Christ and two instances of the doublet 'one *prosopon* and one *qnoma*'.¹⁶ Yet Scher claimed of the text in his possession that 'whenever it speaks of the union, it says that there is in the Christ a single *hypostasis* (ܚܘܨܬܐ)'. Thus, Scher's manuscript cannot have contained the same Syriac version as that in *Cod. Add.* 14669. Again, if we accept Hazzâyâ's report of Koumi's translation, it would seem that Scher's version is indeed that of Koumi. But then we must also conclude that *Cod. Add.* 14669 is not Koumi's version, just as *Mingana syr.* 561 is another version of the *Catechetical Homilies* than the version, most likely by Koumi, cited by Theodore bar Koni. Even if we accept, with Richard, that Koumi did in fact faithfully reproduce the original Greek text, and that Hazzâyâ's claims about Koumi's interpolations reflect later sensibilities, the authority of Koumi in his historical setting cannot be used to assert the reliability of *Cod. Add.* 14669, as Richard presumed, for the version we have in our sole extant manuscript is the work of another translator.

It is also extremely unlikely that Theodore did consistently and comprehensively use 'one *hypostasis*' formulae. Leontius, for one, provides a number of extracts from *On the Incarnation* in which

¹⁴ Raymond Tonneau and Robert Devreesse (trans. and intro.), *Les Homélie cathédriques de Théodore de Mopsueste: reproduction phototypique du ms. Mingana Syr. 561*, Studi e Testi 145 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1949), 3.10 (p. 65, lines 27–8); 6.3 (p. 135, line 19); 8.10 (p. 201, line 5).

¹⁵ Theodore bar Koni, *Liber Scholiorum*, ed. Addai Scher, *CSCO* script. syr., ser. II, t.66 (1922), p. 189, line 21–p. 190, line 12; trans. R. Hespel and R. Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni: Livre des scolies (recension de Séert)*, II. *Memrè VI–XI*, *CSCO* 432, script. syr. 188 (Louvain: Peeters, 1982), 140–1.

¹⁶ The doublet occurs in fol. 10^r, col. 2 and fol. 10^v, col. 1; the instances of 'one *parsopa*' or 'unity of *parsopa*' are fol. 10^r, col. 1 (twice), fol. 10^v, col. 2, fol. 12^r, col. 1, fol. 13^v, col. 1 (twice), fol. 16^r, col. 1 (twice).

'one *πρόσωπον*' formulae are used.¹⁷ That he wilfully substituted the word *πρόσωπον* for *ὑπόστασις* would have been much more immediately obvious, and so much more unlikely, than the possibility, ruled out by Richard, that Koumi had altered the text in the process of translation. More importantly, Facundus, writing in Theodore's defence, also provides extracts from *On the Incarnation* which speak of union in one *persona*, his translation of the term *πρόσωπον*.¹⁸ Thus, whatever we make of Hazzâyâ's and Scher's claims that their text of *On the Incarnation* contained only 'one *hypostasis*' formulae for describing the union of natures in Christ, which, given the length of the work, is rather dubious, any discrepancy between *Cod. Add.* 14669 and other witnesses to *On the Incarnation* cannot be resolved by an appeal to the authority of Koumi and his now lost translation. Sullivan's arguments regarding the external witnesses to the Syriac translations of Theodore seem solid: there are no external factors which would warrant privileging a supposedly 'friendly' Syriac translation over other textual witnesses.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The text presented has benefited considerably from Sachau's edition, especially in regards to the many lacunae. However, his reproduction of the punctuation and pointing of *Cod. Add.* 14669 is rather erratic, and so differences in such matters have not been noted here. As already mentioned, a second hand has sporadically added various various vowel and punctuation points (e.g. fol. 2^r, col. 2, ܠܗܘܘܬܐ, fol. 7^r, col. 1 ܠܘܠܐܘܬܐ) and *s'yāmê* or 'double dots' (e.g. fol. 17^r, col. 2 ܐܢܩܘܐ); these have been included in the text, but not specifically noted as they are readily evident. Only additions or corrections of material (i.e. consonantal) difference between M¹ and M² or S have been noted.

¹⁷ Cf. LT 1, 6 (twice), 7 (twice), 14.

¹⁸ Cf. FT 3, 18, 21, 23. That *persona* is Facundus' translation of *πρόσωπον* is shown by the parallel texts given in Robert Devreesse, *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les psaumes (I-LXXX)*, Studi e Testi, 93 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939), 289–90.

Folio 1**Fol. 1^r, col. 1, lines 5 ff. (S ١٥-١٦; 54)**

In this way, then, the natures cannot enter into mutual opposition and that is why the Lord separated the natures from one another, put the fire on high and the earth below, and fenced off the waters by a wall of sand, as it were. And he separated them one from another; and he commanded that the waters should form a single group lest the waters, by intermingling with the nature of the earth, should swamp it and destroy those natures by their merger in it; and moreover lest <the waters> being vanquished by <earth> through their proximity to it should be annihilated because of its bulk, or the former, by prevailing over the fire, should consume its nature, and, again, lest the earth should vanquish the fire so as to lift it off in it [. . .]

Fol. 1^r, col. 2, lines 9 ff. (S ١٦; 54)

the earth and to allow for the germination of fruits. The fruits, then, if the heat becomes too intense, perish more quickly than kindling, for the fruits dry up as a result of hot and cold breezes. Because each of these things is a <divine> operation: the moisture of the breezes is at hand to make them flourish; likewise, again too, if seeds are immersed in too much water they perish in the ground, but if too much warmth accompanies them it makes them grow too swiftly, unprofitable, useless to the farmer, because the root could not become settled deep down or held tight in the earth as the partner it should be to it; and again, if the frost becomes intense the sprouting seeds will wither and perish. That, then, is why these natures cannot approach one another. For before

Fol. 1^v, col. 1, line 4–col. 2, line 29 (S 5-54; 54-5)

For this is why we say that hot things are mixed with cold things, water with wine, and regarding the air we often speak of it being ‘mixed’: when coolness is said to accompany its heat it is mixed and becomes a commixture. And nobody says that oil is mixed with oil or water with water but <that> dry, hot, or cold <are mixed>: this is because of their acquired change of operation, a change which rightly enjoys the name <‘mixture’>. And we also find that the divine Scriptures calls these things ‘mixture’, for blessed David said ‘in the hand of the Lord is a cup, well mixed, of foaming wine’ [Ps. 74:9], that is, ‘mixed’. The wise Solomon said, ‘Wisdom has built her house, and she has slaughtered her beasts, and she has mixed her bowls of wine’ [Prov. 9:1]. In these <passages> of the Scriptures we find the word ‘mixture’. And it is even said regarding us. For we often use the word ‘mixture’ of the human being who results from a mixture constituting a body, of the four elements although no visible feature of earth is present nor is exhaled [**col. 2**] air perceived in it nor fluid water. But their mixed operation results in the subsistence of our body when the force of their operation is mixed—that is, of heat and of cold and of dryness and of dampness—in accord with the wisdom of their Blender, and constituted for the maintenance of bodies. This does not happen by their natures—of fire and earth and air and water—being mixed. For if this were to occur, the elements would disappear for ever because existing entities would be receiving only partial natural subsistence. For the natures cannot stick together because they possess mutual contrariety of operations. No, in their intermingling indeed they would be destroyed

Folio 2**Fol. 2^r, col. 1 (S 5-35; 35)**

Furthermore the mode of indwelling also corresponds with the indweller. But they should know that the word ‘indwelling’ does no damage, just by being a general term, to the specific mode of indwelling, for many things have a general name, nor do we find this to be the case only here. No, many other things have a general name but their different specific features are recognized too. For because man shares the name ‘animal’ with an ass, a bull, a sheep, a lion, a wolf, and a reptile he evidently does not share with them

his specific feature. No, in this way there is also preserved a note of the specific features of each one of them. For these

Fol. 2^r, col. 2 (S 𐌆-𐌆; 35-6)

the common [name] of animal and irrational, in the specific features which each possesses separately from its fellows. But why do we need to corroborate our argument with these trivial examples when we have an important example for the refutation of the stupidity of those who suppose that in the case of something general total similarity is necessarily implied. For we say that God 'is' and that 'everything' that is 'is', without going through them all one by one. Nor again by our saying that they 'are' <do we say that they 'are'> in the way that he 'is'

Fol. 2^v, col. 1 (S 𐌆-𐌆; 36)

because if something is general in its nomenclature it does not damage its specificity; but contrariwise <particular things> are very remote from one another in nature and in rank. And this is why we are to distinguish them correspondingly to how God and his creation admit of distinction. For there is no greater distinction than this. In the common principle <things> are together, but from the specific features we learn <their> precise glory. Thus also here: the word 'indwelling' is general; but the mode of indwelling applies to each <specifically>. Nor does homonymity of 'indwelling' mean equivalence of mode but <the term> is even used in opposite <senses> in logical investigations. But being divided regarding the term 'indwelling', a simple word . . .

Fol. 2^v, col. 2 (S 𐌆-𐌆; 36)

For our Lord in giving us the direction that when we fast we are to wash our face and anoint our head [Matt. 6.17] also says to the one who prays 'Go inside and pray on your own!' [Matt. 6.6]. And we do not see these things being taught by our predecessors, neither to those who fast nor to those who pray. For if this custom had prevailed with those who pray the congregation of the Church would have been larger. And by all our praying congregationally <the text> 'God inside and pray!' is negated, and also 'when anyone prays, he is to anoint his head', which is the contrary of 'Possess nothing!' [Luke 9:3]. For where was he likely to have oil from, if

Folio 3

Fol. 3^r, col. 1–fol. 3^v, col. 2 (S 330–332; 28–30)²⁸

‘I have become [*γέγονα*] a fool because you forced me’ [2 Cor. 12:11]. We do not say that the Apostle became a fool, but that this is said by him on account of the boasting of those who do not understand the purpose of the boasting: that he did not say it in order to make use of boasting, but for the nullification of boasting. Now, as regards Christ, Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, and became [*γενόμενος*] a curse on our behalf because by the Law he who is hanged upon a tree is accursed [cf. Gal. 3:13; Deut. 21:23], and he accepted hanging upon a tree. Our Lord is called a ‘curse’, not through being changed into a curse, but by being deemed <a curse>. For the apostle said that Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law and became a curse on our behalf; and after this he quotes ‘it is written “cursed is everyone who is hanged upon a tree”’. Therefore he became a curse by <so> being deemed, in that he accepted the punishment which the Law inflicts on those condemned to death, that by this he might undo the curses upon us—he who, by those who do not understand [col. 2] the grandeur of the economy and by the sinful Jews, was deemed a curse. But <‘became’ is used> of local occupancy as when Joshua son of Nun says to his warriors: ‘Behold you are surrounding the city, and are not to become [*γίνεσθαι*] parted from the city’ [Jos. 8:4], for they became distant, being parted from him. But <the word ‘became’> is understood in a mental sense as when the Apostle says of our Lord that he ‘became’ [*γενόμενος*] ‘in the likeness of man’ [Phil. 2:7], for ‘he became’ mentally, as when he is said to have dwelt in the saints too when he surrounded [lit. ‘became around’] them them in love and not separated by nature.²⁹ <‘Become’ is used> of parenthood as when it says ‘and Abraham was a hundred years old when Isaac was born [*ἐγένετο*] to him’ [Gen. 21:5]. <It is used> in the sense of financial acquisitions: as it is said of Isaac, ‘There was [*ἐγένετο*] to him oxen and sheep and many workers’ [Gen. 26:14]; and in respect of comparative honour, in the way that it is said of him,

²⁸ A number of the scriptural allusions in this passage are not exact quotations, but I have given the Greek word used in the LXX or the New Testament in [] to indicate the common topic, the idea of ‘becoming’ and how it relates to Christ.

²⁹ The ‘dwelt in the saints’ is perhaps an allusion to Isa. 57:15, though the ‘surrounding them in love’ remains unidentified.

‘the Lord blessed him and the man became exalted, and he went and he increased until he became [ἐγένετο] very great’ [Gen. 26:13]; and in respect of health as when he said ‘This was [ἐγένετο] [3¹] for the destruction of the flesh’ [1 Cor. 5:5]. ‘Became’, therefore, is many-faceted in the Scriptures; it is also many-faceted in our day-to-day speech. It is used sometimes in the active, and sometimes in the passive, sometimes of changes of events and of mental behaviour. And, again, it is presently being used in the thought of many who do not adhere to the real truth, of local occupancy; it is also used of the acceptance of <honour?> or the acquisition of property or <health?>. It is used too of *hypostasis* [*gnoma*]. Such, indeed, is exactly the opinion of many. It is used of two aspects [*parsofa*] of *hypostasis*, either as initial existence or as change into something else in the active sense as when he said, ‘God has become my helper, and a place of refuge and my saviour’ [Ps. 17:3] and in another place, ‘the Lord became [ἐγένετο] my place of refuge and God my helper’ [Ps. 93:22]. For God became a helper and saviour not by being changed, but in taking pity and helping—something pertaining to action. In the same way too that in the Acts of the Apostles, <when> the blessed Peter said ‘Men, brothers, [col. 2] it is fitting that the Scriptures should be fulfilled which the Spirit predicted by the mouth of David regarding Judas that he would become [γενομένου] the leader of the betrayers’ [Acts 1:16], <the word> is therefore also used in the active sense; for in actual fact he became a leader. But <it is used> in the passive sense as when it says: ‘I became [ἐγενόμην] as a man who does not hear and in whose mouth is no reproof’ [Ps. 37:15], and again, ‘I became a proverb to them’ [Ps. 68:12]. Not, indeed, that by a change he became ‘as one who does not hear’, but as a result of the great number of his pains he now became ‘someone who does not hear’. Therefore in his many pains ‘he became’ ‘like someone who does not hear’ is meant in the passive sense; but metaphorically, or morally, as when it says of Christ ‘he became [γενομένου] under the Law, to redeem those under the law’ [Gal. 4.4–5],³² for he is said to have ‘become under the law’, because he was guided by it and in his life fulfilled everything. And again ‘become [γίνεσθε] imitators of me’ [1 Cor. 11:1]: that is, <become imitators> of <my> course of life. But as many suppose, as if it were not actual <imitation>, as when he says of

³² S suggests 1 Cor. 9:20: ‘to those under the law, I [Paul] became (ἐγενόμην) as one under the law . . . that I might win those under the law.’

Folio 4**Fol. 4^r, col. 1–fol. 4^v, col. 2 (S ∞-∞; 36–8)**

by all means it is spiritual. For if in their own life, mortals have natural movements, much more do immortals, whose life is immortal, have a free and controlling mind. But perhaps they say ‘we do not say that the soul is not intelligent’. Well then, let them tell us, why a third nature, which they call ‘mind’, is needed, and how its subsistence [*qôyāmā*] is made known, either what [purpose] it serves or [how] it completes the human being. For if the life of the body is supplied by the soul and, again, in it is the mind by which <the human being> perceives the divine nature and the working of all <God’s> activity, the oversight of the whole economy, of those things which have been and those things which are to come (for all these things attach to spiritual nature), what then do the heretics say is the intellect, which they feign to be a third nature and call ‘mind’? For the soul does not naturally make use of things in the way that the body does. For it naturally befits the eye that it should see, and it naturally befits the ear that it should hear, and it naturally befits the tongue that it should be moved to voice words, [col. 2] and every single one of our members has natural impulses which are activated. If the soul too were like this, then it would need something else for its subsistence and its life, as also these members need the soul, by which they consist and are activated. For with the departure of the soul, not only do the members of the body remain inactive, but they are finally dissolved and are insufficient for the cohesion and subsistence of their soul. And if the soul is not like this, as indeed it is not (for it lives naturally in its *hypostasis* [*gnoma*] by the grace of God and provides life and subsistence to the body) it is obvious, then, that it is immortal and does not have natural movements. No, it is by the mind that <the human being> perverts a choice of the will. But these heretics who grant all this neither understand right, nor do they consider the mind of the Holy Scriptures, but for a proof of their argument, according to which the human being consists of three natures, they produce a quotation from the blessed Paul which says [4^v] ‘May the God of peace sanctify you wholly, your whole spirit and soul and body, without fault, until the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ’ [1 Thess. 5:23]. And they misinterpret this testimony to produce for us a problem. Here is another: Jesus ‘grew in stature and in wisdom and in favour before

God and before men' [Luke 2:52]. Neither the Apollinarians, who deny the mind of the soul, nor the Eunomians and their ilk, who reject the assumption of a soul, want to consider this and understand it; both sides recognize that this quotation is contrary to their doctrine. For if, according to the argument of the latter, he did not assume a soul or say as the former do that he assumed a soul but not a mind—if there really is anyone who would say that he had a human soul but not a mind—how did Jesus grow in wisdom? Not even they in their madness would venture to say that the divinity grew in wisdom. That the body did not grow in wisdom is clear. So, then, [col. 2] it is obvious that he assumed an intelligent soul, for thus he was able to grow in wisdom by receiving into <his> mind the teaching of wisdom. But they blasphemously claim that he grew, by seeming <to do so> as people thought [cf. Luke 2:47?], without considering the words 'in stature, wisdom, and grace' or 'before God and before men'. For if they confess that he truly 'grew in stature and in wisdom and in grace', it is evident that just as he did truly grow in stature and that he was not <merely> thought to have done so, so also he truly grew in wisdom. For the evangelist had already guarded his words carefully and had given no scope for their pernicious fabrications, by saying 'before God and before men'. Let us examine their argument that he was <only> 'thought' to grow 'before men', to see if he could be 'thought' to grow before God. For if he grew and increased [cf. Gen. 1:27] 'before God', it is evident

Folio 5

Fol. 5^r, col. 1–fol. 5^v, col. 2 (S ۛۛۛ; 30–2)

also with the arrival of the Magi which increasingly spread the news of Christ's birth and who came from a far country to worship him, as their words bear witness [cf. Matt. 2:2]. And that this was revealed before many, the evangelist testified when he said 'Herod was troubled and all Jerusalem with him' [Matt. 2:3] and <mentioned> many other manifestations which were performed after John's witness: first, those miracles performed by the Lord himself were exceedingly novel and amazing; and <then> secondly, even greater than this, that his disciples themselves, in his name, openly performed great miracles. He gave them this power, saying 'cast out demons, cleanse the lepers, heal the sick; you have

received freely, give freely' [Matt. 10:8]. That the blessed apostles would openly do these things in his name is much greater than that he would do <them> himself. For never in the name of a human being were such miracles seen done, neither Joshua son of Nun in the name of Moses, nor Elisha in the name of Elijah, although the gift of the Spirit he received in himself was two-fold [4 Kgs 2:9]. Because, therefore, the Lord was recognized by all these things to be the Christ even by the Jews, [col. 2] being more exalted than Moses and all the prophets, they justly have no excuse for their audacity nor their lack of trust in the Lord. For they ought to have trusted him, as one much greater and better than Moses and all the prophets, who came before him. He deserved to be believed from all the things said by him. But they forsook these duties and determined to crucify him, without there being a just pretext for their impudence. But for them the severer guilt and punishment is this: that after the crucifixion and death of our Lord, the apostles openly worked signs before them, to the extent that the shadow of blessed Peter would heal the sick before their sight [Acts 5:14-16]. And in the midst of all this the Jews stayed ill-willed, seeing all these wonderful works and often handing over the apostles to ignominy and prison. For if, after the crucifixion, they had wished to repent, their repentance would have been accepted. For we see that the blessed Peter³⁶ [5^v] not only witnessed to his being manifest, to those in Judaea (scribes, and Pharisees along with the Sadducees and the whole Jewish people) but also confessed that he was much greater than himself, so much greater that 'I am not worthy to untie the straps of his sandals' [Luke 3:16]; <we do> not <see> that thereupon they unhesitatingly receive John's testimony. For if this John, whose exceptional trustworthiness was well known to the Jews, witnessed to him in so much indubitable testimony they ought to have believed in him and trusted him. And this was not only proclaimed, but, following the testimony of John, the voice of his father from heaven clearly confirmed the testimony of John: 'this is my Son and my beloved, in whom I am well pleased' [Matt. 3:17]; and again the testimony was abundantly visible and confirmed in the manifest descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove. What greater testimonies than these were needed? For John,

³⁶ Although the Syriac text says Peter, the remaining part of the sentence would seem to indicate John the Baptist.

who was more exalted than all men of the time, bore witness from men, and God from heaven: who was confessed as Lord of all by the Jews; and the Holy Spirit, who, it was written in the Old Testament, [col. 2] is God, and gave to all the prophets the gift of prophecy. Neither are the things that happened before those lesser. For before John <was born>, Zechariah his father received from the angel the message regarding the birth of John that was immediately revealed also to the whole race of the Jews, for thus it was said to them regarding John: 'He shall be great before the Lord and be filled with the Holy Spirit, and he shall go before him in power and in the spirit of Elijah' the prophet to prepare a perfect people for the Lord [cf. Luke 1:15-17]. These things clearly give rise to an exalted understanding of Christ. The greater John became in the eyes of the Jews the more clearly his testimony to our Lord was confirmed by his witnessing to our Lord's being immeasurably more exalted than himself. And besides all this the angel had borne witness to the birth of our Lord by appearing to the shepherds and saying 'Today is born to you the Saviour, who is the Lord Christ' [Luke 2:11]. And the shepherds immediately went to the town, and discussed <it> before everyone. And it is clear that these things were spoken about in all Judaea, for the news was so delightful that it was told and repeated by many a mouth.

Folio 6

Fol. 6^r, col. 1, lines 7 ff. (S ٣٢-٣٣; 32)

in him, their faith and repentance would be accepted. Because of all these things, therefore, justly is there a judgement appropriate for them and their punishment, which matched their audacity, prepared, because amid all this they remained obstinate and unconvinced by the mighty miracles, by the appearance of angels, by the arrival of the Magi, who were of a foreign race and who came from a distant place and would not have known about the birth of our Lord, if they had not been notified by astral revelation. And again, <they were not persuaded> by the voice of his Father, the coming of the Spirit, the testimony of John, the mighty miracles which our Lord openly performed, together with those which the disciples also performed in his name, before the crucifixion and after the crucifixion; nor by all those great signs which happened at the same time as the crucifixion: the very things which make their guilt especially severe and the punishment which shortly

Fol. 6^r, col. 2, lines 6 ff. (S 33) (33) זנת-יבד

מהלכות [כ] אלהא מעשה אלהים . בעשרה עסקיה ער רעפעה לא מעשה סוף
 ויראיה מהו ויראעה [א] כל מעלות סונו בלה . סכרניה . והלחנה
 ראה אבשה, חלקה . סוף אי חלמי . שפע מהו ונוי לח ער
 למעשה רהויה . והכל מה רב תר מעשה סוף נשך חלמי . ונהער
 מה ונהלמתי ככרלה ונחנה עהחלה . סוף בחאי . ומעשהו ; חללה מלה
 מתי לחי מהו למעלה מהו . הרלה ער עהר ער חלמי ונלמי חר
 עירנה ומעשה כמ . ונהויה ער סחל למעשה ער סוף חלמי ונמי לה
 ראהפעשה נחנה . סוף סוף סוף ונהויה חחלה . ויהי ונהי ונהי ונהי
 מעשה כיר ער זכר . וירלה סוף לה כנו מעשה מה כנו עירנה
 ונחנה . ותר כתי מעשה . חנה לכה רמה ונהי . ונחנה ונהויה
 ונמי חלמה עהויה מעשה מה . ונהי פער תר מעשה סוף נשך
 חלמי . חלה מה ער . זעמה

Fol. 6^v, col. 1, lines 4 ff. (S 33) (33) זנת-יבד

ערלה סוף [א] ונחנה אנהפעשה . כנו . ער תר [סוף לה סוניה ער [לה] ערניה
 ויהי . כירנה א [מה] לה עהעננה כוניה . ערמי [וכן ו] רופה ערלה
 ומלה [זענה] עהעננה ערמי מה ונהי חהרתי ונחלה . נחמה
 [כיר ער] ערלה ורעה [וי] חיר לנלמי נלחנה . ותר מעשה ונהי
 חלמה מלה סוף . ורעה ונחלה נחמה כיר ער ערנה ונחנה כתי
 עהחלה . סוף ער מה . ותי חנה מה ענה לנלמי נלחנה . נחלה
 [וירנה מעשה רה . מעלה [מה] א ערמי מר ונחלה [ל] חירנה ערנה
 ערנה ונעשה נמי . סחלה נחלה ער חירנה עהויה ער [לה] ער ערלה
 ונלמי נחנה רעהנה מהו חלה [מה] אי כו ערמי חלמה [סחלה]
 מה תר ונחנה . נחלה [ל] מה נחלה מהו תר [ו] לה נחלה נחלה לחי
 [נע] אינה . סנהחנה ער עהויה ער [ער] חירנה . מה לה נחנה ונהויה . למה תר
 סוף ונהויה [תר] מעלה . כו לה מה [כח] ונהי מה ערמי וכר ונהי
 [כ] ונהויה . למה תר סוף [אנה ער] לה מה לה חנהויה .

Fol. 6^r, col. 2, lines 6 ff. (S ٤٣; 33)

And again in their arrogance, with many bribes they persuaded the Roman guards to conceal his resurrection, and to lie and to say 'the disciples came by night to steal him' [Matt. 28:13]. All these things <could have> sufficed to move them to the belief that he was much more exalted than Moses and all the prophets, and that he was worth trusting in all he said. And after they believed him, they would have gradually advanced to the understanding and knowledge of the God Word, just as the apostles together with the rest of those who trusted him. All the <mighty> things, therefore, by which the Jews were unpersuaded are trivialities to the heretics; and because of that they rightly receive a sentence of guilt and severe punishment. Because we do not find such things done either by Moses or by the rest of the prophets after Moses until the coming of our Lord; things whereby Christ our Lord is clearly seen to be incomparably more exalted than Moses and all the prophets.

Fol. 6^v, col. 1, lines 4 ff. (S ٤٣; 33)

But <as for> those who in their crude ignorance consider none of these things but say that if it was a human being they crucified they are not liable to condemnation on the grounds that those who did the killing were not guilty of a sacrilegious act, just as those who treated the blessed apostles with ignominy are not going to receive punishment: we are taught clearly by Christ our Lord that just as anyone who offended our Lord will receive punishment, so too those who abused and vexed the blessed apostles will receive a judgement and condemnation, and so again, just as the one who honours Christ will receive a good reward, so those who receive and honour the apostles sent by him will receive recompense and a good reward; for he clearly spoke thus: 'he who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me' [Matt. 10:40], and in another place he said, 'that indeed which you did to one of the least of those who believe in me, you did to me; and if you did it not for one of the least, you did it not for me' [Matt. 25:40, 46].

Fol. 6^v, col. 2, lines 7 ff. (S υ- Ϛ; 33-4)

to Sodom and Gomorrah on the day of judgement or to them. If this threat of judgement is appointed for those who wantonly dishonoured his believers, <then> those who wantonly wronged him will receive their due. How, then, if when someone sins against a human being he is sentenced as guilty to punishment, how do the heretics say that if the Jews had crucified a man they would not be liable to punishment? But the truth of the things said is clear: they have neither knowledge of the God Word nor do they comprehend the divine nature which dwelt in a human being. And that the Jews rightly receive a punishment equal to their audacity, we have sufficiently demonstrated. These are the many things by which they are able to be led to a knowledge of the truth and to faith in Christ. But those who scorned and refused to be persaued, however, have therefore no excuse for the wicked deed which they performed in their audacity.

The sixth chapter has finished.

Folio 7**Fol. 7^r, col. 1-fol. 7^v, col. 2 (S ω- Ϛ; 38-40)**

Or lest, because he is not complete, he is not called by the name of 'Son'. If, therefore, they call the God Word 'Son', but that other, whether body alone or body and soul, cannot be called 'Son of God' apart from the divine nature, nor, again, is he a complete human being, what, then, according to their argument, are we to say that he is? Indeed the discussion has brought us fittingly to these very considerations. If they say 'he who is assumed' (whether they mean his is a body or a body together with a soul) 'conjoins to and completes one Son', how can they not recognize that this very argument is also suitable and fitting for us, as we confess that a complete human being was assumed? But if the God Word is the complete Son of God by nature, existing begottenly from the Father, then he who is outside that nature is not called it [i.e. 'the God Word'] separately in his own *prosōpon* [*parsopa*], but, because of the exact conjunction <he> has with [col. 2] the God Word, he is acknowledged by name as 'Son of God' and what is said of the Son of God is <self->evidently also understood of the one assumed although he is complete. Neither are we compelled on that account to say 'two sons'. For the soul and body are

two mutually dissimilar natures: a clear <fact> even they acknowledge. For if the two assumed natures are dissimilar mutually and to the God Word and do not constitute by themselves another *prosōpon* because of their conjunction with the God Word, obviously neither will a third nature (which mind is, according to their argument), if added, do so. For the pair (soul and body), being constituents of the God Word who assumed them and he being truly Son, if they are named and confessed along with him because of the exact conjunction, it is evident that even if there were a third nature it will do no damage to our argument in this matter. For just as those two natures [i.e. soul and body], are named and confessed by the name of the stronger nature, that is of the one [7^v] which assumed them, because of the exact conjunction <with the Son>, so also even if there is a third nature, it is called and said <to be> ‘Son of God’, not being separated from the God Word. Neither do we allow anything besides the divine nature to be recognized separately in its own *prosōpon* and named from itself and by itself ‘Son of God’. No, by the ‘Son of God’ we also signify the one who was assumed, even though he is a complete man. But if in their madness they say ‘the mind will be superior to the divinity peculiar to that human being and from it, as from its superior, the other *prosōpon* of the human being’s nature ought to take its name’, this is said to us, when we reject their statement that ‘the mind is another nature besides the soul and body’. And that these things are not so we have earlier demonstrated above with the help of God.

50 But they say: ‘neither ought Christ to be called by the name “human being”, nor is it fitting for him to be called by this term.’ This opinion of theirs is a demonstration of their ignorance and lack of training [**col. 2**] in the divine Scriptures, for it is plain and obvious, to all who seek to understand, that we find this name in many passages in the divine Scriptures. For our Lord himself said to the Jews, ‘Why do you seek to kill me, a human being who spoke the truth with you?’ [John 8:40]; and in another place, when the Devil was tempting him, he said, ‘<command> these stones to become bread’, and he replied to him, ‘it is written, “A human being shall not live by bread alone”’ [Matt. 4:4]. Obviously unless what was assumed was a human being and he struggled with the devil, <the devil> would not have engaged to tempt him. For he was reckoned to be something visible whilst

being imperceptible in the divine nature which dwelt in him. And if he had known, he would not have dared to tempt him. For, of course, if he [the devil] had perceived the divine nature, he would have known this too that he [Christ] was beyond all temptation. Therefore, he suitably replied

Folio 8

Fol. 8^r, col. 1 (S ๓-๙; 34)

which were said. As also the Apostle said, ‘we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, which was veiled and which God foreordained, before the foundations of world, for our glorification, which none of the rulers of this age understood; for if they had understood this, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But, as it is written, “the eye has not seen, nor the ear heard, nor has it arisen in the heart of man, what God has prepared for those who love him” [1 Cor. 2:7–9].’ They had a revelation of the glory surrounding the exalted human being, victorious over the whole human race, but did not gain that precise knowledge of it which we have demonstrated even the apostles <only> obtained at the end. For this was the great thing: that he should be revealed to the human race at that time, and it was not possible, because of the profundity of the things which were said, that it [i.e. this knowledge] should be divulged to others [cf. 2 Cor. 12:4?]. He remembered the magnificence of <your> glory, but fell silent at the things that were greater, at that time, than nature, and being mindful humbly said of this: ‘You have placed him a little lower than <the angels>’ [Heb. 2:7; Ps. 8:6].

Fol. 8^v, col. 2, lines 2 ff. (S ๓-๑๐; 34–5)

so that they should receive those things which, at that time, they could, what was spoken [*lacunose*]. But their successors after passing to the limits of matters knowable would receive confirmation both from the miracles then performed and from the testimonies foretold, with these final deeds conferring upon them accurate knowledge. But why do I say these things, when it is easy for us to make our demonstrations from Scripture, according to

108. 110. 112. 114. 116. 118. 120. 122. 124. 126. 128. 130. 132. 134. 136. 138. 140. 142. 144. 146. 148. 150. 152. 154. 156. 158. 160. 162. 164. 166. 168. 170. 172. 174. 176. 178. 180. 182. 184. 186. 188. 190. 192. 194. 196. 198. 200. 202. 204. 206. 208. 210. 212. 214. 216. 218. 220. 222. 224. 226. 228. 230. 232. 234. 236. 238. 240. 242. 244. 246. 248. 250. 252. 254. 256. 258. 260. 262. 264. 266. 268. 270. 272. 274. 276. 278. 280. 282. 284. 286. 288. 290. 292. 294. 296. 298. 300. 302. 304. 306. 308. 310. 312. 314. 316. 318. 320. 322. 324. 326. 328. 330. 332. 334. 336. 338. 340. 342. 344. 346. 348. 350. 352. 354. 356. 358. 360. 362. 364. 366. 368. 370. 372. 374. 376. 378. 380. 382. 384. 386. 388. 390. 392. 394. 396. 398. 400. 402. 404. 406. 408. 410. 412. 414. 416. 418. 420. 422. 424. 426. 428. 430. 432. 434. 436. 438. 440. 442. 444. 446. 448. 450. 452. 454. 456. 458. 460. 462. 464. 466. 468. 470. 472. 474. 476. 478. 480. 482. 484. 486. 488. 490. 492. 494. 496. 498. 500. 502. 504. 506. 508. 510. 512. 514. 516. 518. 520. 522. 524. 526. 528. 530. 532. 534. 536. 538. 540. 542. 544. 546. 548. 550. 552. 554. 556. 558. 560. 562. 564. 566. 568. 570. 572. 574. 576. 578. 580. 582. 584. 586. 588. 590. 592. 594. 596. 598. 600. 602. 604. 606. 608. 610. 612. 614. 616. 618. 620. 622. 624. 626. 628. 630. 632. 634. 636. 638. 640. 642. 644. 646. 648. 650. 652. 654. 656. 658. 660. 662. 664. 666. 668. 670. 672. 674. 676. 678. 680. 682. 684. 686. 688. 690. 692. 694. 696. 698. 700. 702. 704. 706. 708. 710. 712. 714. 716. 718. 720. 722. 724. 726. 728. 730. 732. 734. 736. 738. 740. 742. 744. 746. 748. 750. 752. 754. 756. 758. 760. 762. 764. 766. 768. 770. 772. 774. 776. 778. 780. 782. 784. 786. 788. 790. 792. 794. 796. 798. 800. 802. 804. 806. 808. 810. 812. 814. 816. 818. 820. 822. 824. 826. 828. 830. 832. 834. 836. 838. 840. 842. 844. 846. 848. 850. 852. 854. 856. 858. 860. 862. 864. 866. 868. 870. 872. 874. 876. 878. 880. 882. 884. 886. 888. 890. 892. 894. 896. 898. 900. 902. 904. 906. 908. 910. 912. 914. 916. 918. 920. 922. 924. 926. 928. 930. 932. 934. 936. 938. 940. 942. 944. 946. 948. 950. 952. 954. 956. 958. 960. 962. 964. 966. 968. 970. 972. 974. 976. 978. 980. 982. 984. 986. 988. 990. 992. 994. 996. 998. 1000.

Folio 9

Fol. 9^r, col. 2–fol. 9^v, col. 2, line 7 (S 50-1)

108. 110. 112. 114. 116. 118. 120. 122. 124. 126. 128. 130. 132. 134. 136. 138. 140. 142. 144. 146. 148. 150. 152. 154. 156. 158. 160. 162. 164. 166. 168. 170. 172. 174. 176. 178. 180. 182. 184. 186. 188. 190. 192. 194. 196. 198. 200. 202. 204. 206. 208. 210. 212. 214. 216. 218. 220. 222. 224. 226. 228. 230. 232. 234. 236. 238. 240. 242. 244. 246. 248. 250. 252. 254. 256. 258. 260. 262. 264. 266. 268. 270. 272. 274. 276. 278. 280. 282. 284. 286. 288. 290. 292. 294. 296. 298. 300. 302. 304. 306. 308. 310. 312. 314. 316. 318. 320. 322. 324. 326. 328. 330. 332. 334. 336. 338. 340. 342. 344. 346. 348. 350. 352. 354. 356. 358. 360. 362. 364. 366. 368. 370. 372. 374. 376. 378. 380. 382. 384. 386. 388. 390. 392. 394. 396. 398. 400. 402. 404. 406. 408. 410. 412. 414. 416. 418. 420. 422. 424. 426. 428. 430. 432. 434. 436. 438. 440. 442. 444. 446. 448. 450. 452. 454. 456. 458. 460. 462. 464. 466. 468. 470. 472. 474. 476. 478. 480. 482. 484. 486. 488. 490. 492. 494. 496. 498. 500. 502. 504. 506. 508. 510. 512. 514. 516. 518. 520. 522. 524. 526. 528. 530. 532. 534. 536. 538. 540. 542. 544. 546. 548. 550. 552. 554. 556. 558. 560. 562. 564. 566. 568. 570. 572. 574. 576. 578. 580. 582. 584. 586. 588. 590. 592. 594. 596. 598. 600. 602. 604. 606. 608. 610. 612. 614. 616. 618. 620. 622. 624. 626. 628. 630. 632. 634. 636. 638. 640. 642. 644. 646. 648. 650. 652. 654. 656. 658. 660. 662. 664. 666. 668. 670. 672. 674. 676. 678. 680. 682. 684. 686. 688. 690. 692. 694. 696. 698. 700. 702. 704. 706. 708. 710. 712. 714. 716. 718. 720. 722. 724. 726. 728. 730. 732. 734. 736. 738. 740. 742. 744. 746. 748. 750. 752. 754. 756. 758. 760. 762. 764. 766. 768. 770. 772. 774. 776. 778. 780. 782. 784. 786. 788. 790. 792. 794. 796. 798. 800. 802. 804. 806. 808. 810. 812. 814. 816. 818. 820. 822. 824. 826. 828. 830. 832. 834. 836. 838. 840. 842. 844. 846. 848. 850. 852. 854. 856. 858. 860. 862. 864. 866. 868. 870. 872. 874. 876. 878. 880. 882. 884. 886. 888. 890. 892. 894. 896. 898. 900. 902. 904. 906. 908. 910. 912. 914. 916. 918. 920. 922. 924. 926. 928. 930. 932. 934. 936. 938. 940. 942. 944. 946. 948. 950. 952. 954. 956. 958. 960. 962. 964. 966. 968. 970. 972. 974. 976. 978. 980. 982. 984. 986. 988. 990. 992. 994. 996. 998. 1000.

³⁹ S [1,]Δ

said to them, 'this house is for prayer and not to be dedicated to commerce'. And they asked a sign of him, that he might demonstrate his greatness [9^v], that being confirmed by it he might command that the custom which had taken hold for a long time be abandoned. However, he did not show them anything, but said to them, 'destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up', and explaining this the evangelist said, 'he said this regarding the temple of his body'. Let them come and say to us (it is pleasing to use their words against them): 'Is he the raiser or the raised? Does he raise the destroyed or undergo dissolution <himself>?', which are opposites of one another and are not compatible. For one subject to dissolution needs one who raises him, who is beyond suffering and has the power to raise him who is undergoing dissolution. They then ask us whether it is right to ask this question. But we can indeed easily answer and say that we have sufficient knowledge of this from Scripture. One undergoes dissolution, another raises. This one is the temple, which receives dissolution; and that one, who raises it, the God Word, [col. 2] who promised to raise his temple which would undergo dissolution. How can they fail to learn from this the distinction of natures and accept the knowledge of truth, but with sly questions seek to disturb the simple

Folio 10

Fol. 10^r, col. 1—fol. 10^v, col. 2 (S α - β ; 43-4)

to the disciples of him who was being taken up into the heavens, the angels said, 'Men of Galilee, why do you stand and gaze into the heavens? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into the heavens, will come in the same way as he was seen ascending into heaven' [Acts 1:9, 11]. From all this, therefore, it is clear that the concept of mixture is idle talk, useless and inept, but that there is a union, the natures remaining without dissolution. For by this <union> the natures joined and made one *prosōpon* [*parsofa*] in unity. Just as the Lord said of husband and wife that henceforth they are not two but one flesh [cf. Matt. 19:5-6], so we too say, in virtue of the concept of union, 'they are no longer two but one', despite clearly being different natures. And as there the mention of 'one flesh' does not damage the duality—for it is clear in what <respect> these things are said—so also here the unity of *prosōpon*

is not harmed by the difference in natures: for when we consider the natures, we recognize the divine nature in its own *hypostasis* [*gnoma*] and the human nature <in its own *hypostasis*> but when we look at the conjunction [**col. 2**], we say one *prosōpon* and one *hypostasis*. For in the same way that, when we separate <out> the nature of the human being, we say that the nature of the soul is one thing and that of the body another, knowing, as we do, that each of them singly is a *hypostasis* and a nature, and convinced, as we are, that when the soul is separated from the body, it remains in its nature and *hypostasis*, and that each of them singly [i.e. each soul and body] is a nature and a *hypostasis*. For this too is why we are taught by the Apostle of ‘the inner human being’ and ‘the outer human being’ [cf. 2 Cor. 4:16], and in the sum of inner and outer to name their particular features on the basis of something common [i.e. ‘human being’], <but> not to name them [i.e. the ‘inner’ and the ‘outer’ human being] by the ordinary word [i.e. ‘a human being’]. For to the extent that they are conjoined in one, we call them ‘one *hypostasis* and one *prosōpon*’, and call both of them by one <name>, in the same way also here, we say that there is divine nature and human nature, and while <two> natures are recognized there is one *prosōpon* of union. And therefore when we wish to consider the natures <separately>, we say that the man is complete in his *hypostasis* and we also say that complete [**10^v, col. 1**] is God; but when we wish to consider the union, we proclaim one *prosōpon* and one *hypostasis* with respect to both natures, knowing that because of the union to divinity, the humanity receives honour from creation and the divinity in him effecting all things

Chapters of Book Nine

- 63** How the heretics allege against us this: the Word became flesh . . .
- 64** How the heretics allege against us this: he assumed the form of a servant . . .
- 65** That it is not possible, according to the arguments of the heretics, that the God Word, together with the human body, be called a human being.

Book Nine

63 By these words, which we have spoken thus far, we have made known the strength and superiority of the teaching of the Church; and that 'indwelling' is suitably said we have sufficiently demonstrated from the words of Scripture previously recounted; and we have shown from the Scriptures that we are right to eschew the term 'mixture'. But although we [**col. 2**] have given a very useful exposé of these [points] let us not weaken here, on some <texts> they adduce to nullify their duality. For they say that they have two testimonies which are sufficiently strong to establish their rubbishy innovations. They are, from the gospel, that 'the Word became flesh' [John 1:14], and from the Apostle, that 'he emptied himself and took the form of a servant' [Phil. 2:7]. Oh! The profusion of witlessness! How are they not able to understand even the things to which they assent, but frequently say that which contradicts themselves! For in what does 'he became flesh' resemble 'he assumed the form of a servant', which according to their opinion is what is intended? For it is clear that something that 'becomes' is nought else after it 'became' but what was said to be 'becoming' when the 'becoming' was perceived in the *hypostasis* which 'became'. But assuming means assuming something different from the assumer, as in the way that God fashioned a body from <the earth> [Gen. 2:7]

Folio 11**Fol. 11^r, cols. 1-2 (S ۷۳-۷۴; 49)**

that to two things one might assent, by one to chrysolite and by the other to fire. And from Isaiah, 'He puts on garments' and 'reddened from the blood of enemies' [cf. Isa. 63.1-6?]. And again in another place, that he is in a human body, sitting upon a throne and surrounded by Seraphim [cf. Isa. 6:2]. We are obliged, indeed, if we pursue <the subject of> visions, to consider this also, that they are not human bodies, but are novelties and beyond what is usual for created beings in general, and that they have feathers and, with them, they have wings. And we say that the God and Father assumed one body, the Son another, and the angels different and diverse, because the one who appeared to Balaam was like a human being, holding a sword in his hands

[cf. Num. 23:23], and again to Joshua in the likeness of one armed [cf. Jos. 5:13]. But that we should not expend many words on these things, let us say ‘and many bodies’, if we follow the train of visions that are <reliably> precise. If that is not possible, for these visions appeared on account of their usefulness, for the aid of those who see them—it is clear that even the vision to Abraham appeared to him opportunely [**col. 2**] from God—<then>

Fol. 11^v, col. 1, lines 13 ff. (S 𐤒𐤁-𐤅; 49-50)

Book Ten [has concluded]

[Chapters of Book] Eleven

[Book] Eleven

- [] the treatises prepared
- [] is said
- [] the division of natures
- [] the unity of *prosōpon* [*parsoḡa*].⁴⁴

[**col. 2**] Regarding the soul and mind, we have employed sufficient demonstrations for the confirmation of the things at issue. This alone we seek to show here. Yet we will also abundantly demonstrate that we do not learn from the Scriptures simply the

⁴⁴ These fragments here are almost certainly related to C6T 1, though reconstruction would be rather speculative: ‘He said in the eleventh book *On the Incarnation*: “What we have said, therefore, indeed suffices, where we showed both the difference of natures and the unity of person, and that in respect of natures, one receives a benefit, and the other bestows a benefit, there being a firm unity from which honour is paid inseparably by the whole creation.”’

division of natures, but the indication of the body and of the intelligent soul, from which [i.e. soul and body] he manifestly is complete human being. In connection with the issue in question we will keep to an orderly arrangement of argument. To abolish the truth they confront us with many and varied questions: sometimes they say, 'if we say "two compete <ones>" we must necessarily say "two sons"', and sometimes 'it is not right to say one and another', and again, 'it is right to say "the God Word is crucified, he who is Christ, not something else"'. In reply to these problems we mounted an appropriate response and <said> that we promised to explain the Church's truth in an exposé. But in order not to go back on our promise and because we have <already> mounted a full response to the problem <posed> we shall be forced to make <it> again in the precise words used and previously

Between the two columns is written:

ܣܘܦ ܕܢܘܨܘܚܘܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܚܘܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܚܘܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܚܘܢ
 ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܚܘܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܚܘܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܚܘܢ

John of Damascus, a lowly sinner saw all these words. They will bring him woe. For God's sake pray for him.

Folios 12, 13

'Book Eleven'

Fol. 12^r, col. 1–fol. 13^v, col. 2 (S ܚܕ – ܚܕ; 45–9)

he assumed or he is assumed, the form of God or the form of a servant. Yet you say the form of God is what he assumed, but the form of a servant is what was assumed. Why, then, do you need the artifice of questions? And why do you not accept, from the divine Scriptures, the distinction between these things, and with a pure mind to fix in your soul an understanding of true religion. For how is the one who assumed like the one who is assumed? Or what equality is there between God and man, between a servant and the Lord, between the form of God and the form of a servant? You see how emphatically he [i.e. Paul] has demonstrated to us the distinction of natures, and calls one 'the form of a servant' and the other '<the form> of God', one 'the assumer' and the other 'the assumed'. And he produced a collection of

diversities and explained to us the unity of *prosōpon* [*parsoḡa*], for he said ‘but he emptied himself and assumed the form of a servant, and became in the form of a human being and in figure was found as a human being’. And, after he mentioned his embodiment, he transitioned to human matters, indicating, by his revelation, the conjunction with the God Word, for he said, ‘he humbled himself [**col. 2**] and was obedient unto death, even death on a cross’ [Phil. 2:7–8]. Manifestly these things are congruent with the nature of the human being who was affixed to the cross and accepted death according to his nature. But ‘he humbled himself’ in itself indicates the union, for it did not belong to a human being that, in taking upon himself that death which was extended over nature from the beginning by the judgement of God, he who was assumed by the God Word and was able because of his connection to transcend death, ‘humbled himself and was obedient unto death’ and more <than to death> ‘on a cross’. But by his own will he endured the Passion for the sake of our salvation. And, continuing, <the Apostle> says things which are suitable for and accord with human nature. For he adds to these things, saying ‘and because of this God also exalted and honoured him, and bestowed on him the name which is above every name’ [Phil. 2:9]. But who do we say is exalted? The God Word? And how did the one who is the ‘form’ of God and was the ‘likeness’ of God—and this was not as a piece of ‘robbery’ but as something befitting his nature—[**12**^v] <how did he>, his Father’s trusted equal, having voluntarily willed to conceal his glory and to appear in the form of a servant for our salvation, receive elevation to grandeur, for this is what Paul said of him? How could he have received more exaltation than these words say he did? Or how did God exalt him who was equal to himself, or <how can> one greater than he be his servant, which it is absurd to call him? For of necessity, in the case of equals, when one stays quantitatively the same but the other is raised beyond the quantitative equality, equality vanishes and what had earlier possessed exact coequality has thereafter grown manifestly bigger. And, again, between equals, how is one able to give, and another is in need of grace? And what indeed is given to him? Indeed, let us look at this point too: he says ‘the name’. And who is this of whom he says, ‘at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, in the heavens and the earth and under the earth, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God his Father’ [Phil. 2:10]. And

this gift the creator of all received after death, he [**col. 2**] 'by whom everything was created and without whom there was nothing of those things that are and exist' [John 1:3]. But if someone says that this was given to the God Word himself because many blasphemed him but finally turned to to the comprehension of truth and they worshipped him, the Father too manifestly received this benefit [lit. grace] no less, for there were many who spoke impiously and after the advent of Christ turned to understanding. But if it is right to speak accurately, according to their opinion the Father received more benefit. For he, who by his advent and his passion enabled all human beings to be brought to the knowledge of the Father, and is our Lord with his Father, said 'I have made known your name to <all> human beings' [John 17:6]: clearly, indeed, these words were spoken of the assumed, to whom glory was given from the whole creation, and whose Lordship is confessed, and worship <given> from all, in the heavens and the earth and under the earth. He who is assumed received this grace, not as being only an ordinary <human being>, but in union with the God Word. For because all glory is due [**13**'] to the only-begotten God Word from his creation, because all things were created through him, those who offer him worship, knowing that there is with him the one who is the form of a servant that was assumed, also worship in their praise the form of a servant that was assumed, knowing the union of the form of a servant with the God Word. Anyone, therefore, who wants to predicate 'God' of the God Word, of him who exalted him [i.e. the form of the servant], it seems to me he speaks well, and this thought also conforms to the mind of the Word. For he assumed the form of a servant and elevated him in union with himself, and exalted him, and gave him to be worshipped by all creation. What, then, follows from this? Did the form of God *take up* or was he *assumed*? The Creator of all? Or did he [word missing] receive worship by grace? But let every blasphemous tongue cease! For the blessed Apostle shall teach us clearly what the distinction of natures is, what the glory of the nature which assumed is, and what that of the assumed is: that the former [**col. 2**] is the form of God, the latter the form of the servant. The former in his tender love took it upon himself to descend from his glory but the latter was by grace assumed by him; and by grace is he worshipped by all creation. And he shall add to this by teaching us about the union. For this is what he

teaches us in summary: after saying about the God Word that he was the form of God, and the rest—that ‘he was in the form of a human and in figure was found as a human’—he also added that ‘he humbled himself and was obedient even unto death, death on a cross’, which is the mark of things human; saying again ‘because of this God exalted him’, and all the things he said about him following these. They seem to be opposites. But by this I am especially amazed: the precision of the words of the Apostle! I mean that he first speaks of the one who assumed, and then of the one who was assumed; and he called the one ‘the form of God’, and the other ‘the form of a servant’. And, after making a precise distinction between their natures, then he also recalled [13^v] his embodiment and the death by crucifixion, and the things which happened to him after death (I mean the glory which he received from the whole creation) and by these <words> he is indicating the union. For in the assumption, by this one’s assumed and that one’s being assumed, by this one’s being the form of God and that one’s being form of a servant, we distinguish the natures. But by the glory, which was communicated to the God Word in the death and crucifixion, we understand the unity of the *prosōpon*. They, however, refuse to consider these words, and they scorn teaching the truth from the Scriptures, and they sometimes ask: ‘is he one and another, or the same?’ and again: ‘is he merciful or receives mercy, a helper or helped?’ In reply to this what we have said will suffice, where we have demonstrated the distinction of natures and the unity of the *prosōpon* and that by nature the one is manifest as the helped and the other helper: the union of both being understood, <a unity> which receives worship from the whole of creation. So now we will show in precise terms and especially from the words of the blessed David, who bore witness about these things which were said or expounded by him, as they were quoted by our Lord and by [col. 2] the apostles, that is, by our Lord, for it is he who was speaking also in the Apostle [cf. Acts 1:16]. Blessed David foresaw, by the grace of the Holy Spirit the whole economy which was to come, and that God, the creator of all, would will to dwell in man for our salvation and to assume the form of a servant and to make it one with himself and by his union with it should hold sway over all. Wonderful is he in his compassion and awesome in the greatness of this honour amongst men, because he has deemed us worthy of his dwelling in our nature. He foreknew this too, by a revelation of the Spirit, that the God and

creator of all is known to everybody and his name is praised by everybody and everybody knows his creator, who before was not known to them. And be amazed at two things: first, at his converting to goodness those who had turned aside to evil; and second, at his doing this thing by <a> man, as it were by a tool, whom he assumed as, so to say, the first-fruit of our whole human race and prepared everything in him for the salvation of our lives. And being subjected to him

Folio 14

Fol. 14^r, col. 1, line 6–fol. 14^v, col. 1 (S ๓๗-๓๘; 40–2)

And because of this they are outside the Church of God, and our fathers have rightly cut them off as putrid members from a healthy body. Nevertheless, although I endeavoured to explain these matters since such things were indeed said by the fathers and they were accustomed to the name ‘man’; and, having found the usage in many, I wanted, of course to fortify my argument from their testimony also; and on all sides I took note, both from the order of the facts, from the correctness of the ideas, from the proof of the Scriptures and from the common usage of what were believed of Christ, <and saw> that they are arguing with us blasphemously and in the face of all these <proofs>, and are justifying their teaching which they have armed from irrational novel invention, not mentioned by the Word, and they have all preferred their own distemper, endeavouring, as they do everywhere to pervert others too from the truth. So now, let Hegesippus, worthy witness in proof of our words come forward, who lived in the days of the apostles.⁵² [col. 2] The brother of our Lord Christ, that is James whose words Hegesippus wrote down in the fifth book, relating what his end was, and how the Pharisees killed him. Having related his way of life and in what fashion he conducted himself, and what was his clothing, and what the suspicion about him was that many had because of his virtuous conduct, and that he encouraged many Jews to have faith in Christ, he also said that on the day of unleavened bread many Jews had gathered in the capital city, and the scribes and Pharisees said to him [i.e. James], ‘There are many who have gone astray in Christ. But you, because

⁵² For what follows see Eusebius *H.e.* 2.23.

the whole nation trusts you on account of your virtuous conduct, ascend and stand on the pinnacle of the temple, and turn all people from this opinion.’ And he spoke thus (I will set down his very words), for the scribes and Pharisees placed James on the pinnacle of the temple and cried out and said to him, ‘O just one, to whom it is right that we all give obedience, since the people stray after Jesus who was crucified, make known to us: what is the gate of Jesus?’ And he said to them with a loud voice, ‘why do you ask me about [14^v] the human being, Jesus?’ He has therefore proved here that he called some other than the God Word ‘human being’ and declined to answer about the Crucified; but he goes on, ‘and he sat down in the heavens on the right hand of the Great Power and he will come upon the clouds of heaven’. No one says that the omnipresent divinity ‘will come upon the clouds’. ‘To come upon the clouds’ befits a human being, even if he is not separated from the divinity, for this is not impaired by the particularity of the humanity. Eusebius of Caesarea quotes this account of Hegesippus in the book of ecclesiastical histories which he composed. There are, therefore, three witnesses to these words [‘human being’]: the blessed and excellent James, brother of our Lord, and Hegesippus, who mentioned him in his book, and Eusebius, who quoted in his own words the testimony of Hegesippus, which he would never have quoted in his own words were there any doubt about its harmony with the mind of the apostles. He mentioned him because it is proper <to distinguish between> him who said this and him who recalled it. But wanting [. . .] also in the history and Justin

Fol. 14^v, col. 2, lines 5 ff. (S ٤٢-٤٣; 42)

he said that of Simon and after him Menander, the magicians, and those who called our Lord a mere man—from there they received their origin, and not because they called <him> a mere man. He spoke thus: ‘after the words of Menander, another wretch <arose>, trying to expel them from the true love of God. He chose to approach the Ebionites (who were the first to say openly that they confessed Christ in a low and poverty-stricken fashion, for they say that he was a mere man and was only righteous in the ordinary human way) <whom> he called, in an out-of-the-ordinary way, the earliest <heretics or> ‘choosers of other things’. But because he mentioned Simon’s and Menander’s

associates, who annulled the corporeality of our Lord, by saying he appeared in phantoms, he rightly called them 'choosers of other things' inasmuch as they were foolishly in the wrong about the divinity but these denied the divinity in another way. They proclaim him to be a mere man, from this blaming them

Folio 15

Fol. 15^r, col. 1–fol. 15^v, col. 2 (S \searrow $\overline{\text{S}}$ $\overline{\text{S}}$; 55–7)

many were seized, and the danger lessened a little that the whole mass of people would perish in this error. And the whole of the East was being put into confusion by this opinion, and some of those who were thought to have a full understanding of faith regarding the Son of God but did not take a valid view of the Holy Spirit were afterwards made perfectly sound in the knowledge of truth: at the very time when the blessed bishop Melitos, forgoing the high esteem which belonged to him before the emperor and the great, preached with great boldness on this matter of faith. And knowing that after his preaching he would be cast down from the honour and the love which the emperor and the great had for him, he despised it all, and boldly and loudly proclaimed the faith of the Church. It is our duty to set down the precise wording of his sermon, to explain and confirm our words. For he said this: 'We think of them as three, but speak of them as one'.⁵⁷ [col. 2] And immediately there was a great commotion in the church, and the clamor of the people was overpowering. Everyone was amazed at the boldness of his teaching, and the grace of God was bestowed upon the mind of the whole people. But the enemies of the truth received a very serious put-down, seeing in a brief moment all their strategems in ruins. For the frankness of <his> preaching and the boldness of <his> teaching were the confirmation of true religion and a grand rebuttal of those who little by little were undermining solid faith. His doctrinal sermon became inaudible because of the popular clamour; not even a trumpeter could have been heard because the noise of the clamour was too great. And then the blessed bishop Melitos completed the office of his tongue by his holy hands,

⁵⁷ Cf. Theodoret, *H.e.* 2.27.

intending that all his members should be patterned by his tongue and it should proclaim the truth amongst all. And the blessed one was sanctified by the confession of his mouth. Though even prior to the profession of [15^v] the Church they had been violently persecuted under threat of death and not allowed to gather together in the same place to serve the ministry of prayer and to offer thanksgiving to the Lord God of all. For in Antioch of Syria the emperors had frequently threatened and ordered that they be thrown into the river. For they customarily used then to gather beside the river. No, the deeds themselves proclaim before our words such as they are [. . .] As for the blessed bishop Melitos, of hallowed memory, who was in truth divine, and held in great love and high esteem by the emperor: what pretext drove him from the city of Antioch and sent him into exile? Was it not the boldness of his preaching true religious doctrine? For with the whole of the East being in confusion on a subject of faith (for at that time the sectarians were not separated off, but there mingled in one congregation both those who were careful about the teaching [col. 2] of the faith of the true religion, and those who in their minds hid the guile of their error), with the orthodox faithful being fearful of preaching the truth of their faith with boldness, because at that time their doctrinal opponents, officials known at court, were stronger than they and were the very people who controlled the emperor's will according to their own will and moreover by lavish bribes from the property of the Church enslaved to their opinion many leading folk and all the infirm of opinion; because the people were not yet accustomed to understand the blasphemy against the Son of God. For they did not dare to show their opinion openly, but were hiding their guileful error and were gradually and subtly despoiling the faith of the simple and attracting them to damnable doctrine. And thus little by little this error

Folio 16

Fol. 16^r, col. 1 (S ٥١-٥٢; 51-2)

And again the difference of natures is to be acknowledged by us. [. . .] also men frequently doubt these things in their perversity. Henceforth it is clear, which things are said suitably of the humanity, and which things in application to the divinity change

this separateness of theirs, falling, as these things do, in the unique <and specific> conjunction of all the things said about our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, because when the natures are examined separately in their signification they are congruent at some points with one, at some points with the other, according to the rank of the things spoken of each nature, but when they conjoin in the unity of *prosōpon* [*parsofa*] the two of them are spoken of in partnership and as something congruent with the *prosōpon* because of the union. For in this way too, something, by nature separate, again appears spoken of jointly because of the unity of *prosōpon*.

Fol. 16^v, col. 2 (S 15-19; 52)

who begat and whom he begat from him. In the narration of the generation he arrived at David and from there in order of the succession he finished up with Christ, saying as follows: 'Matthan begot Jacob, and Jacob begot Joseph, the husband of Mary, from whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ' [Matt. 1:15-16]. And clearly by these he demonstrates that he composed this account of Christ in the flesh, who he said was born from Mary. For through not composing an account of the divinity, he had to show that Christ was born of Abraham's seed. And thereafter he made a division into three complete groups of fourteen; he says that Christ should not be thought to have been born in the same class: 'But the birth of Christ was thus: when his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child by the Holy Spirit [Matt. 1:18].'

Folio 17

Fol. 17^r, col. 1, lines 2 ff. (S 19-19; 52-3)

he made this, because also 'conceived by the Holy Spirit' fits <the humanity> but is incongruent with the divinity. And afterwards, he [Matthew] said, the angel said to Joseph, 'Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary for your wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit' [Matt. 1:20]. Which things one also finds in the blessed Luke. For having spoken of how the angel came to Mary and announced to her that she would conceive, saying, 'Behold, you will conceive and bear a son', and the rest, and that Mary doubted this and said, 'How shall this be, since I know not a man?' [Luke] said that the angel

אֵלֵינוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ לְמַעַן אֵלֵינוּ לְמַעַן אֵלֵינוּ לְמַעַן אֵלֵינוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ

Fol. 17^v, col. 2 (S 19-20; 53)

חַדְשֵׁי שָׁנָה וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ
 וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ וְיִשְׁמַחַתְּנוּ

⁵⁸ אֵל added by M² in margin

answered and said to her, 'The Holy Spirit shall come and the power of the Most High shall descend upon you; therefore the one who is born from you shall be called holy and the Son of the Most High' [Luke 1.31-5]. It is clear that amongst these things not one [. . .] is of the divinity.

Fol. 17^v, col. 2 (S ١٣-١٤; 53)

78 In these ways, then, we expound the nativity. But what follows is like them, that is, that he conducted himself according to the law and was diligent with all exactness to observe it. We learn [this] sufficiently from the divine Scriptures, where the evangelist says 'the child grew and was strengthened in the Spirit, filled with wisdom and the grace of God was upon him' [Luke 2:40]. And another, 'And he went down with his parents, and came to Nazareth, and was obedient to them' [Luke 2:51]. And the Apostle said, 'Truly this is a great mystery, that he was manifested in the flesh and vindicated in the Spirit' [1 Tim. 3:16]. He says of him, 'vindicated in the Spirit', either as before the baptism he kept the law with all exactness, or after it was perfected in his behaviour by the grace and encouragement of the Holy Spirit.⁵⁹ But let us move on too to the baptism. It is also right to mention this briefly, not to lengthen our discourse

⁵⁹ This sentence is found, slightly differently, in LT 21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Material

- Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. Ed. E. Schwartz *et al.* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1914–).
- Acts of the Second Council of Ephesus (449)*. Ed. J. Flemming, *Akten der ephesischen Synode vom Jahre 449: Syrisch*, AAWG NF 15.1 (Berlin, 1917; repr. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970). Trans. S. G. F. Perry, *The Second Synod of Ephesus* (Dartford: Orient Press, 1881). Section on Ibas translated in R. Doran, *Stewards of the Poor: The Man of God, Rabbula, and Hiba in Fifth-Century Edessa*, CS 208 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 2006), 133–88.
- Acts of the Council of Chalcedon (451)*. ACO 2.1. Trans. R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of Chalcedon*, TTH 45, 3 vols. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005).
- Acts of the Council of Constantinople (553)*. ACO 4.1. Trans. R. Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553 with Related Texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*, TTH 51, 2 vols. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009).
- Apollinarius of Laodicea. H. Lietzmann (ed.), *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Tübingen: Möhr, 1904).
- Aristotle, *Rhetorica*. Ed. and trans. J. H. Reese, LCL, Aristotle, vol. 22 (London: Heineman, 1926).
- Athanasius of Alexandria, *Letter to Adelphius*. PG 26.1072–84. Trans. in NPNF 4.
- *Letter to Epictetus*. PG 26.1049–69. Trans. in NPNF 4.
- *On the Council of Nicaea*. Ed. H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, 2.1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1935–41), 1–45. Trans. in NPNF 4.
- *On the Incarnation*. Ed. and trans. R. W. Thomson, *Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*, OECT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971). Trans. also in NPNF 4.
- *Orations Against the Arians*. *Orations* 1 and 2 in K. Metzler and K. Savvidis (eds.), *Athanasius Werke*, 1.1.2 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1998). *Oration* 3 in K. Metzler and K. Savvidis (eds.), *Athanasius Werke*, 1.1.3 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2000). Trans. in NPNF 4.
- *Tome to the Antiochenes*. Ed. H. C. Brennecke, U. Heil, and A. von

- Stockhausen, Athanasius Werke, 2.8 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2006), 340–51. Trans. in NPNF 4.
- Barhadbešabba *Foundation of the Schools*. Ed. A. Scher, PO 4.4.
— *History*. Ed. F. Nau, PO 9.5.
- Basil of Caesarea, *Epistles*. Ed. and French trans. Y. Courtonne, *Sainte Basile: Lettres*, 3 vols. (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1957, 1961, 1966). Ed. and trans. R. J. Deferrari, LCL 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926–34). Trans. also in NPNF 8.
- Gregory Barhebraeus, *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*. Ed. J. B. Abeloos and T. J. Lamy (Leuven: Peeters, 1872).
- Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD*. Trans. Michael Whitby and Mary Whitby, TTH 7 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989).
- Cicero, *De inventione*. Ed. and trans. H. M. Hubbell, LCL Cicero 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968).
- Collectio Avellana*. Ed. O. Günther, *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab A. CCCLXVII usque ad A. DLIII datae. Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, CSEL 35.2 (Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig: Tempsky, 1898).
- Collectio Casinensis sive Synodici a Rustico Diacono compositae*. ACO 1.3–4.
- Collectio Palatina*. ACO 1.5.
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Letters*. Greek text in PG 77, ACO 1.1, and E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1421: Eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, ABAW.PPH 32.6 (Munich, 1927). Trans. J. I. McEnerney, 2 vols., FC 76–7 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1987); also L. R. Wickham (ed. and trans.), *Select Letters*, OECT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).
- Cyril of Scythopolis, *Lives*. Ed. Schwartz, *Kyryllos von Skythopolis*, TU 49.2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939). Trans. by R. Price, with introduction by John Binns, *Cyril of Scythopolis: The Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, CS 144 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1991).
- Damasus, *Exemplum synodi* (including *Confidimus*, *Ea gratia*, *Illud sane miramur* and *Non nobis quidquam*). Ed. L. L. Field, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius: Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis LX, with a Critical Edition and Translation*, Studies and Texts, 145 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004), 7–21.
- Diodore of Tarsus, *Commentary on the Psalms*, 1–50. Ed. J.-M. Olivier, CCSG 6 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1980). Trans. R. C. Hill, WGRW 9 (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2005).
- *Commentary on Ps 118, Prologue*. Ed. L. Mariès, ‘Extraits du commentaire de Diodore de Tarse sur les Psaume: Preface du commentaire—Prologue du Psaume CXVIII’, *RechSR* 9 (1919), 79–101. Trans. in K. Froehlich, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 87–94.
- Fragments. Ed. and trans. P. E. Pusey, *Sancti patris nos Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Ioannis Evangelium* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872; repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965), 3.492–538;

- trans. in S. Cyril, *Archbishop of Alexandria, Five Tomes Against Nestorius; Scholia on the Incarnation; Christ is One; Fragments Against Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Synousiasts*, Library of the Fathers of the Church, 46 (Oxford: James Parker, 1881). See also M. Brière, 'Quelques fragments syriaques de Diodore de Tarse, évêque de Tarse (378–394?)', *ROC* 10 (1946), 231–83, and R. Abramowski, 'Der theologische Nachlass der Diodore von Tarsus', *ZNTW* 42 (1949), 19–69.
- Epiphanius, *Panarion*. Ed. K. Holl: Epiphanius I, *Ancoratus, Panarion* (heresies 1–33), GCS 25 (Leipzig: Hinrichs Verlag, 1915); Epiphanius II, *Panarion* (heresies 34–64), rev. J. Dummer, GCS 31 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1980); Epiphanius III, *Panarion* (heresies 65–80), rev. J. Dummer, GCS 37 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1985). Selective English trans., P. R. Amidon, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Selected Passages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica*. Ed. and trans. K. Lake, LCL, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989).
- *Ecclesiastical Theology and Against Marcellus*. Ed. E. Klostermann, 3rd edn., rev. G. C. Hansen, *Gegen Marcell, Über die kirchliche Theologie, Die Fragmente Marcellis*, GCS 14, Eusebius Werke, 4 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972).
- Eustathius of Antioch, Fragments. M. Spanneut, *Recherches sur les Écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioche, avec une édition nouvelle des fragments dogmatiques et exégétiques* (Lille: Facultés Catholiques, 1948).
- Eutherios of Tyana. Ed. M. Tetz, *Eine Antilogie des Eutherios von Tyana*, PTS 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964).
- Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*. Ed. J. Bidez and J. Parmentier, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia* (London, 1898). Trans. M. Whitby, TTH 33 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000).
- Facundus, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* and *Contra Mocianum*. Ed. J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaeste, CCSL 90A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974); *Défense des Trois Chapitres (à Justinien)*, ed. A. Fraisse-Bétoulières, 5 vols., SC 471, 478, 479, 484, 499 (Paris: Cerf, 2002–6).
- Gennadius of Marseilles, *De viris illustribus*. PL 58.1059–1120.
- Gregory of Nazianzus, *Letters*. Ed. P. Gallay, *Gregor von Nazianz: Briefe*, GCS 53 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969). Ed. and French trans. P. Gallay, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres*, 2 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964, 1967). Selected trans. in NPNF 7.
- *Letters to Cledonius* (=Epp. 101, 102). Ed. and French trans. P. Gallay with M. Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres théologiques*, SC 208 (Paris: Cerf, 1974). Trans. in NPNF 7, and in L. Wickham and F. Williams (trans.), *St Gregory of Nazianzus, On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002).

- *On His Own Life*. Ed. and trans. C. White, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Autobiographical Poems*, Cambridge Medieval Classics, 6 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- *Orations 20–3*. Ed. J. Mossay with G. Lafontaine, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 20–23*, SC 270 (Paris: Cerf, 1980). Trans. M. Vincent, FC 107 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003).
- *Orations 27–32*. Ed. and French trans. P. Gallay, with M. Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 27–31 (Discours théologiques)*, SC 250 (Paris: Cerf, 1978). Trans. in NPNF 7, and in Wickham and Williams (trans.), *St Gregory of Nazianzus, On God and Christ*.
- *Orations 42–3*. Ed. and French trans. J. Bernardi, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 42–43*, SC 384 (Paris: Cerf, 1992). Trans. in NPNF 7.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius*. Ed. W. Jaeger, *Contra Eunomium libri*, GNO 1–2 (Leiden: Brill, 2002 [1921, 1960]). Trans. in NPNF 5.
- *Antirrheticus Against Apollinarius*. Ed. F. Müller, in W. Jaeger (ed.), *Opera dogmatica minora*, GNO 3.1 (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 131–233.
- *To Peter, On the Difference Between Ousia and Hypostasis*. See Basil of Caesarea *Ep.* 38.
- *To Theophilus, Against Apollinarius*. Ed. W. Jaeger, *Opera dogmatica minora*, GNO 3.1 (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 119–28.
- Hippolytus, *On the Christ and the Antichrist*. Ed. H. Achelis, GCS 1.2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs Verlag, 1897), 1–47; trans. in ANF 5.
- Innocent of Maronea, *Epistula de collatione cum Severianis*, ACO 4.2, 169–84.
- Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adversus haereses*. *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies, Livre I, Livre II, and Livre III*, ed. and French trans. A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, SC 263–4, 293–4, 210–11 (Paris: Cerf, 1979, 1982, 1974); *Livre IV*, ed. and French trans. A. Rousseau, B. Hemmerdinger, L. Doutreleau, and C. Mercier, SC 100 (Paris: Cerf, 1965); *Livre V*, ed. and French trans. A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau, and C. Mercier, SC 152–3 (Paris: Cerf, 1969); English trans. in ANF 1.
- Isho'dad of Merv, *Commentaries*. Ed. and trans. M. D. Gibson, *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hadatha (c. 850 A.D.) in Syriac and English*, *Horae Semiticae*, 10 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913).
- John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in principium Actorum Apostolorum*. PG 51.65–112.
- *In laus Diodore*. PG 52.761–6.
- *Letters*. PG 52.527–760.
- *Panegyricum in Lucianum martyrem*. PG 50.519–26. Trans. in W. Mayer with B. Neil (trans.), *St John Chrysostom: The Cult of the Saints* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006), 63–73.
- John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*. Ed. E. W. Brooks, PO 17–19.
- Julian, *Contra Galilaeos*. Ed. and trans. W. C. Wright, LCL, Emperor Julian, vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1911), following K. J. Neumann (ed.), *Juliani Imperatoris librorum contra Christianos quae supersunt* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1880).

- Julian, *Letters*. Ed. and trans. W. C. Wright, LCL, Emperor Julian, vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1911).
- *Orations*. Ed. and trans. W. C. Wright, LCL, Emperor Julian, vols. 1–2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1913).
- Justinian, *Letter on the Three Chapters*. Ed. E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians*, ABAW-PH NF 18 (Munich: Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1939); 2nd edn., M. Amelotti, R. Albertella, and L. Migliardi, *Legum Iustiniani imperatoris vocabularium*, subsidia II (Milan: Dott. A. Giuffrè Editore, 1973), 82 [47]–127 [69]. Trans. in K. Wesche, *On the Person of Christ: The Christology of Emperor Justinian* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991), 115–58.
- *On the Orthodox Faith*. E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften*, 130 [72]–169 [111]. Trans. in Wesche, *On the Person of Christ*, 163–98; Price, *Constantinople*, 1.129–59.
- Leontius of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*. PG 86A.1273a–1309; and B. E. Daley, 'Leontius of Byzantium: A Critical Edition of His Works, with Prolegomena', D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University (1978), 1–76.
- *Contra Aphthartodocetas*, PG 86A.1316d–1356c; Daley, 'Leontius', 109–44.
- *Deprehensio et triumphus super Nestorianos*, PG 86A.1357b–1385b; Daley, 'Leontius', 145–200.
- *Adversus fraudes Apollinaristarum*, PG 86A.1972d–1973a; Daley, 'Leontius', 201–23.
- Leontius Scholasticus, *De sectis*. PG 86A.1193–1268.
- Libanius, *Orations*. Ed. and trans. A. F. Norman, *Selected Orations 1: Julianic Orations*, LCL (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969).
- Liberatus, *Breviarium*. ACO 2.5, 98–141.
- Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicle*. Trans. B. Coke, with reproduction of Mommsen's edition of the text (Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1995).
- Marcellus of Ancyra, Fragments. Ed. E. Klostermann, 3rd edn., rev. G. C. Hansen, *Gegen Marcell, Über die kirchliche Theologie, Die Fragmente Marcells*, GCS 14, Eusebius Werke, 4 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972). Also ed., with German trans., M. Vinzent, *Markell von Ankyra: Die Fragmente; Der Briefe an Julius von Rom*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, 39 (Leiden: Brill, 1997). Trans. in M. J. Dowling, 'Marcellus of Ancyra: Problems of Christology and the Doctrine of the Trinity', Ph.D. Diss., Queen's University, Belfast (1987).
- Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*. Ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–99)* (Paris, 1901; rep. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1963).
- Nestorius, Fragments. Ed. F. Loofs, *Nestoriana: Die Fragmenta des Nestorius gesammelt, untersucht und herausgegeben* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905).
- *Book of Heraclides*. Ed. P. Bedjan, *Nestorius: Le Livre d'Héraclide de*

- Damas (Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1910; Piscataway, NJ: Georgias Press, 2007).
- Origen, *Commentary on John*. Ed. and French trans. C. Blanc, *Origène: Commentaire sur Saint Jean*, SC 120, 157, 222, 290, 385 (Paris: Cerf, 1966, 1970, 1975, 1982, 1992); English trans., R. E. Heine, *Origen: Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint John*, FC 80, 89 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1989, 1993).
- *Commentary on Matthew*. Ed. E. Benz and E. Klostermann, *Origenes Matthäuserklärung*, I, *Die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*, GCS 40, Origenes Werke, 10 (Leipzig: Hinrichs Verlag, 1935, 1937); partial trans. in ANF 10.
- *On First Principles*. Ed. and German trans. by H. Görgemanns and H. Karpp, *Origenes: Vier Bücher von den Prinzipien*, 3rd edn. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992); English trans. G. W. Butterworth (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973).
- Pamphilus of Caesarea, *Apology for Origen*. Ed. and French trans. R. Amacker and E. Junod, *Pamphile, Eusèbe de Césarée: Apologie pour Origène, suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée Sur la falsification des livres d'Origène*, SC 464, 465 (Paris: Cerf, 2002).
- Paul of Samosata, Fragments. H. de Riedmatten, *Les Acts du Procès de Paul de Samosate: Étude sur la Christologie du III^e au IV^e siècle*, Paradosis 6 (Fribourg en Suisse: St Paul, 1952).
- Pelagius [Pope Pelagius I], *In defensione trium capitulorum*. Ed. R. Devreesse, *Studi e Testi* 57 (Vatican City, 1932).
- Philostorgius, *Historia ecclesiastica*. Ed. J. Bidez, rev. F. Winkelmann, *Philostorgius: Kirchengeschichte mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines arianischen Historiographen*, GCS 21 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972). Trans. by P. R. Amidon, WGRW 23 (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2007).
- Philoxenus, *Letters*. Ed. A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog: Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, CSCO 232, script. Syr. 99 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1963).
- 'Letter to Abraham and Orestes Concerning Stephen Bar Sudaili the Edessene'. A. L. Frothingham, *Stephen Bar Suhaili: The Syrian Mystic (c.500 A.D.) and the Book of Hierotheos on the Hidden Treasures of the Divinity with Original Syriac Documents, Edited and Translated* (Leiden: 1886; repr. Amsterdam: APA-Philo Press, 1981), 28–48.
- Procopius, *Anecdota*. Ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, *The Anecdota or Secret History*, LCL, Procopius, vol. 6 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935).
- Severus of Antioch, *Against the Impious Grammarian*. Ed. J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium Grammaticum, Oratio primo et secunda*, CSCO 111, script. Syr. 58 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1965); *Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis tertiae pars prior*, CSCO 93, script. Syr. 45 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1929); *Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium Grammaticum, Orationis tertiae pars*

- posterior*, CSCO 101, script. Syr. 50 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1933).
- Severus of Antioch, *Apology for the Philalethes*. Ed. R. Hespel, *Sévère d'Antioche, La Polémique antijulianiste III*, CSCO 318, script. Syr. 136 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1971).
- *Contra Additiones Juliani*. Ed. and trans. R. Hespel, *La Polémique antijulianiste, 2a Le Contra additions*, CSCO 295–6, script. Syr. 124–5 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1968).
- *Letters*. Ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch in the Syriac Version of Athanasius of Nisibis*, 2 vols. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1902–4).
- *Letters to Sergius*. Ed. J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni orationes ad Nephaliū, eiusdem ac Sergii grammatici epistulae mutuae*, CSCO 119, script. syr. 64 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1949); trans. in I. Torrance, *Christology after Chalcedon*.
- *Orationes ad Nephaliū*. Ed. J. Lebon, *Severi Antiocheni orationes ad Nephaliū, eiusdem ac Sergii grammatici epistulae mutuae*, CSCO 119, script. syr. 64 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1949).
- *Philalethes*. Ed. R. Hespel, *Sévère d'Antioche, Le Philaléthe*, CSCO 133, script. syr. 68 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1952).
- Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Professors*. Ed. and trans. R.G. Bury, LCL, Sextus Empiricus, vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949).
- Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica*. Ed. G. C. Hansen, with M. Širinjan, *Sokrates: Kirchengeschichte*, GCS NF 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995). Trans. in NPNF 2.
- Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica*. Ed. J. Bidez, rev. G. C. Hansen, *Sozomenus: Kirchengeschichte*, GCS 50 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960). Trans. in NPNF 2.
- Stephen Bar Sudaili, *Book of the Holy Hierotheos*. Ed. and trans. F. S. Marsh (London, 1927; repr. Amsterdam: APA-Philo, 1979).
- Theodore Bar Koni, *Liber Scholiorum*. Ed. A. Scher, CSCO script. syr. II.66 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1922); trans. R. Hespel and R. Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni: Livre des scolies (recension de Séert)*, II. Memrè VI–XI, CSCO 432, script. syr. 188 (Louvain: Peeters, 1982).
- Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Against Julian*. Ed. A. Guida, *Teodoro di Mopsuestia: Replica a Giuliano Imperatore adversus criminationes in Christianos Iuliani Imperatoris* (Florence: Nardini, 1994).
- *Catechetical Orations*. Ed. and Trans. A. Mingana, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*, Woodbrooke Studies, 5 (Cambridge: Heffer & Sons, 1932) and *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*, Woodbrooke Studies 6 (Cambridge: Heffer & Sons, 1933). Trans. with facsimile, Raymond Tonneau and Robert Devreesse, *Les Homélie cathédétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste: Reproduction phototypique du ms.*

- Mingana Syr. 561*, Studi e Testi 145 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1949).
- *Commentary on John*. Ed. J.-M. Vosté, CSCO 115–16, script. syr. 62–3 (Louvain: CSCO 1940). Trans. G. Kalantzis, *Early Christian Studies*, 7 (Strathfield, NSW, Australia: St Pauls Publications, 2004).
- *Commentary on the Pauline Epistles*. Ed. H. B. Swete, *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli commentarii*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1880, 1882).
- *Commentary on the Psalms*. Ed. R. Devreesse, *Commentaire sur les Psaumes (I–LXXX)*, Studi e Testi, 93 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939); trans. R. C. Hill, *Commentary on Psalms 1–81* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2006).
- *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*. Ed. H. N. Sprenger, *Göttinger Orientforschungen*, 5, *Biblia et Patristica*, 1 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977). Trans. R. C. Hill, FC 108 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2004).
- Fragments. Ed. and trans. E. Sachau, *Theodori Mopsuesteni, fragmenta syriaca e codicibus musei britannici nitriacis edidit atque in latinum sermonem* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1869).
- Fragments of the Dogmatic Works. Appendix A in Swete, *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni*, 2.289–339.
- *A Treatise against the Allegorists*. Ed. and French trans. in Lucas von Rompay (ed.), *Théodore de Mopsueste: Fragments syriaque du Commentaire des Psaumes*, CSCO 435 [text], 436 [trans.], script. syr. 189/90 (Leuven: Peeters, 1982), 1–18 [text], 1–15 [trans.].
- Theodoret of Cyrhus, *Historia ecclesiastica*. Ed. L. Parmentier, rev. F. Scheidweiler, *Theodoret: Kirchengeschichte*, GCS 44 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954). Trans. in NPNF 3.
- Theodosius II, Emperor, *Codex Theodosianus*. Ed. T. Mommsen and P. T. Meyer, *Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Simondianis et Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum Pertinentes*, 2nd edn., 2 vols. in 3 parts (Berlin: Weidmann, 1954); translations can be found in P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church: A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535*, 3 vols. (London: SPCK, 1966).
- Theophanes, *Chronicle*. Trans. C. Mango and R. Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).
- Timothy Aelurus, *Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon*. Ed. K. Ter-Mekertschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz, *Timotheus Aelurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien: Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzten Lehre* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908).
- Victor of Tunnuna, *Chronicle*. Ed. C. Cardelle de Hartmann, with Roger Collins, *Victoris Tunnunensis Chronicon cum reliquiis ex Consularibus Caesaraugustanis et Iohannis Biclarensis Chronicon*, CCSL 173A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 1–55.

- Vigilius, First *Constitutum*. Ed. O. Günther, *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab A. CCCLXVII usque ad A. DLIII datae. Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, CSEL 35.1 (Prague, Vienna, and Leipzig: Tempsky, 1895), 230–320. Trans. in Price, *Constantinople*, 1.145–213.
- Second *Constitutum*. *ACO* 4.2, 138–68.
- *Letters*. Ed. E. Schwartz, *Vigiliusbriefe; Zur Kirchenpolitik Iustiniens* SBAWPH 2 (Munich: Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., 1940).
- (Ps.-)Zachariah Rhetor, *Life of Severus*. Ed. M.-A. Kugener, PO 2.1.
- *The Syriac Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene*, trans. F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks (London: Methuen & Co., 1899; repr. New York, AMS 1979).

Secondary Material

- Abramowski, L., *Formula and Context: Studies in Early Christian Thought*, Variorum Collected Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992).
- ‘Der Streit um Diodor und Theodor zwischen den beiden ephesinischen Konzilien’, *ZKG* 67.3 (1955–6), 252–87; Eng. trans. in ead., *Formula and Context*, no. 1
- ‘Reste von Theodoret’s Apologie für Diodor und Theodor bei Facundus’, *StP* 1, TU 63 (Berlin, 1957), 61–9.
- ‘Ein unbekanntes Zitat aus *Contra Eunomium* des Theodors von Mopsuestia’, *Le Muséon*, 71 (1958), 97–104.
- ‘Zur Theologie Theodors von Mopsuestia’, *ZKG* 72.3–4 (1961), 263–93. Eng. trans. in ead., *Formula and Context*, no. 2.
- ‘La Prétendue Condamnation de Diodore de Tarsé in 499’, *RHE* 60 (1965), 64–5.
- ‘Die Anakephalaiosis zum Panarion des Epiphanius in der Handschrift Brit. Mus. Add. 12156’, *Le Muséon*, 96 (1983), 217–30.
- ‘Ein Text des Johannes Chrysostomus über die Auferstehung in den Belegsammlungen des Timotheus Älurus’, in Laga, Munitiz, and van Rompay, *After Chalcedon*, 1–10.
- ‘Zur geplanten Ausgabe von Brit. Mus. add. 12156’, in J. Irmscher (ed.), *Texte und Textkritik: Eine Aufsatzsammlung*, TU 133 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987), 23–8.
- ‘On the Fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia in Brit. Lib. Add. 12.156 and the Christological Fragment in Double Tradition’, *The Harp*, 6.3 (1993), 199–206. German version in *Oriens Christianus*, 79 (1995), 1–8.
- ‘Die Reste der syrischen Übersetzung von Theodor von Mopsuestia, *De Incarnatione*, in Add. 14.669’, *Aram*, 5 (1993), 23–32.
- and A. E. Goodman, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts: Cambridge University Library Ms. Oriental 1319*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 18–19 (Cambridge University Press, 1972), vol. 1, Syriac Text; vol. 2, Introduction, Translation, and Indices.

- 'Neue Schriften Theodors von Mopsuestia', *ZNW* (1934), 66–84.
- 'Der theologische Nachlaß der Diodore von Tarsus', *ZNW* 42 (1949), 19–69.
- Alès, A. d', 'La Lettre d'Ibas à Marès le Persan', *RechSR* 22 (1932), 5–25.
- Alexakis, A., *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and its Archetype*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 34 (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996).
- Allen, P., 'The "Justinianic" Plague', *Byzantion*, 49 (1979), 5–20.
- and C. T. R. Hayward, *Severus of Antioch, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2004).
- Amman, É., 'Théodore de Mopsueste', *DTC* 15.1 (Paris, 1946), 235–79.
- 'Trois-Chartres (Affaire des)', *DTC* 15.2 (Paris, 1951), 1868–1924.
- Arthur, R.A., *Pseudo-Dionysius as Polemicist: The Development and Purpose of the Angelic Hierarchy in Sixth Century Syria* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).
- Ayres, L., *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Bark, W. C., 'John Maxentius and the Collectio Palatina', *HTR* 36.2 (1943): 93–107.
- Barkhuizen, J. H., 'Justinian's Hymn', *BZ* 77 (1984): 3–5.
- Barnes, M. R., and D. H. Williams (eds.), *Arius After Arianism: Essays on the Development of Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993).
- Barnes, T. D., 'Emperors and Bishops, A.D. 324–34: Some Problems', *AJAH* 3 (1978), 53–75.
- *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994).
- Beeley, C. A., *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God: In Your Light Shall We See Light*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- 'Apollinarius, Diodore, and Gregory of Nyssa', forthcoming in *VC*.
- Behr, J., *The Way to Nicaea, The Formation of Christian Theology*, 1 (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001).
- *The Nicene Faith, The Formation of Christian Theology*, 2 (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004).
- *The Mystery of Christ: Life in Death* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006).
- Beulay, R., 'Joseph Hazzâyâ', *DSp* 8 (1974), 1341–9.
- Binns, J., *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ: The Monasteries of Palestine, 314–631*, OPCS (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
- Birnie, M. J., 'L'Église de l'Orient et la question de Théodore de Mopsueste', *Istina*, 43.1 (1998), 90–6.
- Blum, G. G., *Rabbula von Edessa. Der Christ, der Bischof, der Theologe*, CSCO 300, subs. 34 (Louvain: CSCO, 1969).
- Bois, J., 'Constantinople (II^e concile de)', *DTC* 3.1 (Paris, 1908), 1231–59.

- Brière, M., 'Quelques fragments syriaques de Diodore de Tarse, évêque de Tarse (378–394?)', *ROC* 10 (1946), 231–83.
- Brightman, F. E., *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896).
- Brock, S., 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox Under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47 (1981), 87–121.
- Brown, R., 'The *Sensus Plenior* in the Last Ten Years', *CBQ* 25 (1963), 262–85.
- Bruns, P., 'Das Offenbarungsverständnis Theodors von Mopsuestia im Zwölfprophetenkommentar', *StP* 32 (Louvain: Pecters, 1997), 272–7.
- Bühning, G., and S. Uhlig, 'Antiochenisches und Justinianisches im Hymnus "Eingeborener Sohn"', *ÖKS* 37 (1988), 297–307.
- Bundy, D. D., 'Jacob Baradaeus: The State of Research, a Review of Sources, and a New Approach', *Le Muséon*, 91 (1978), 45–86.
- Carter, R. E., 'Chrysostom's *Ad Theodorum lapsum* and the Early Chronology of Theodore of Mopsuestia', *VC* 16.2 (1962), 87–101.
- Cavallera, F., *Le Schisme d'Antioche (IV^e–V^e siècle)* (Paris: Picard et fils, 1905).
— 'Le Dossier patristique de Timothée Aelure', *BLE* 4.1 (1909), 342–59.
- Caspari, C. P., *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols* (Christiania: P. T. Mallings, 1866).
- Chadwick, H., 'The Fall of Eusthatius of Antioch', *JTS* 49 (1948), 27–35.
- Charanis, P., *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491–518*, 2nd edn. (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1939; repr. Thessalonica: Kentron Vyzantinon Ereunon, 1974).
- Chazelle, C., and C. Cubitt, *The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).
- Chediath, G., 'La Controverse des Trois Chapitres: Histoire de la controverse', *Istina*, 43.1 (1998), 75–90.
- Chrysos, E., *Hè ekklesiastikè politikè tou Ioustinianou kata tèn erin peri ta tria kephalaia kai tèn e'oikoumenikèn sunodon*, *Analekta Blatadon*, 3 (Thessalonika, 1969).
— 'Zur Datierung und Tendenz des Werke des Facundus von Hermiane', *Kléronomia*, 1 (1969), 311–24.
- Clayton, P. B., *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus: Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*, OECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Coleman-Norton, P. R., *Roman State and Christian Church: A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535*, 3 vols. (London: SPCK, 1966).
- Constans, N., *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Homilies 1–5, Texts and Translations*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

- Crouzel, H., 'La Passion de l'impassible: un essai apologétique et polémique du III^e siècle', in *L'Homme devant Dieu: Mélanges H. de Lubac*, I (Paris: Aubier, 1963), 269–79.
- Cubitt, C., 'The Lateran Council of 640', in Price and Whitby, *Chalcedon in Context*, 133–47.
- Dagron, G., *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Bibliothèque Byzantine, 7 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974).
- 'Two Documents Concerning Mid-Sixth-Century Mopsuestia', in id., *La Romanité chrétienne en Orient* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1984), no. 6.
- Daley, B. E., 'The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium', *JTS* NS 27.2 (1976), 333–69.
- 'Leontius of Byzantium: A Critical Edition of His Works, with Prolegomena', D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University (1978).
- "'Heavenly Man" and "Eternal Christ": Apollinarius and Gregory of Nyssa on the Personal Identity of the Savior', *J ECS* 10.4 (2002), 469–88.
- 'Divine Transcendence and Human Transformation: Gregory of Nyssa's Anti-Apollinarian Christology', *SP* 32 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 87–95, repr. in S. Coakley (ed.), *Rethinking Gregory of Nyssa* (Oxford: Blackwells, 2003), 67–76.
- Davids, A., 'La Personne et l'enseignement de Théodore de Mopsueste dans la controverse des Trois Chapitres', *Istina*, 43.2 (1998), 133–50.
- Dawson, D., *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).
- Dawson, J. D., *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
- De Halleux, A., *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie* (Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1963).
- De Margerie, B., *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse* (Paris: Cerf, 1980).
- Denzinger, H. (ed.), rev. A. Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum*, 34th edn. (Freiburg im Bresgau: Herder, 1967).
- De Riedmatten, H., *Les Acts du procès de Paul de Samosate: étude sur la Christologie du III^e au IV^e siècle*, Paradosis, 6 (Fribourg en Suisse: St Paul, 1952).
- Devreesse, R., 'Le Florilège de Léonce de Byzance', *RevSR* 10 (1930), 545–76.
- 'Le Début de la querelle des Trois-Chapitres: la letter d'Ibas et le tome de Proclus', *RevSR* 11 (1931), 543–65.
- *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, Studi e Testi, 141 (Rome: Biblioteca Vaticana, 1948).
- Dewart, J. M., *The Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1971).

- Dewart, J. M., 'The Notion of "Person" Underlying the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia', *StP* 12 (Berlin: Akademie, 1975), 199–207.
- Diehl, C., *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1901).
- Diekamp, F., *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil* (Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1899).
- Diepen, H.-M., *Les Trois Chapitres au Concile de Chalcédoine: une étude de la Christologie de l'Anatolie ancienne* (Oosterhout: Saint Michel, 1953).
- Doran, R., *Stewards of the Poor: The Man of God, Rabbula, and Hiba in Fifth-Century Edessa*, CS 208 (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 2006).
- Duchesne, L., *L'Église au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1925).
- Ebied, R. Y., and L. R. Wickham, 'Timothy Aelurus: Against the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon', in Laga, Munitiz, and van Rompay, *After Chalcedon*, 115–66.
- 'A Collection of Unpublished Syriac Letters of Timothy Aelurus', *JTS* NS 31.2 (1970), 321–69.
- Ensslin, W., 'Theodulus (28)', in *RE* 10 [5], 1967.
- Evans, D. B., *Leontius of Byzantium: An Origenist Controversy* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1970).
- Van Esbroeck, M., 'Who is Mari, the Addressee of Ibas' Letter?' *JTS* NS 38.1 (1987), 129–35.
- Fairbairn, D., *Grace and Christology in the Early Church*, OECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Ficker, G., *Eutherius von Tyana: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ephesinischen Konzils vom Jahre 431* (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1908).
- Field, L. L., *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius: Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis LX, with a Critical Edition and Translation*, Studies and Texts 145 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004).
- Flemming, J., *Akten der ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449*, AAWG.PH NF 15.1 (Berlin, 1917; repr. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970).
- Frank, G. L. C., 'The Council of Constantinople II as a Model Reconciliation Council', *TS* 52 (1991), 636–58.
- Frend, W. H. C., *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).
- Froehlich, K., *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Frothingham, A. L., *Stephen Bar Suhaili: The Syrian Mystic (c.500 A.D.) and the Book of Hierotheos on the Hidden Treasures of the Divinity with Original Syriac Documents, Edited and Translated* (Leiden: 1886; repr. Amsterdam: APA-Philo Press, 1981).
- Galtier, P., 'Le "Tome de Damase", date et origine', *RechSR* 26 (1936), 385–418, 563–78.

- 'Théodore de Mopsuestie: sa vraie pensée sur l'incarnation', *RechSR* 45 (1957), 161–86, 338–60.
- Garsoïan, N., *L'Église arménienne et le grand schisme d'orient*, CSCO 547, subs. 100 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999).
- Gavrilyuk, P., *The Sufferings of the Impassible God: The Dialectics of Patristic Thought*, OECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Gerber, S., *Theodor von Mopsuestia und das Nicänum: Studien zu den katechetischen Homilien*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Gerostergios, A., *Justinian the Great, the Emperor and Saint* (Belmont, Mass.: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1982).
- Graumann, T., '“Reading” the First Council of Ephesus (431)', in Price and Whitby, *Chalcedon in Context*, 27–44.
- Gray, P. T. R., *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1979).
- 'Theodoret on the “One Hypostasis”: An Antiochene Reading of Chalcedon', *StP* 15, TU 128 (Berlin, 1984), 301–4.
- 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress: Reconstructing the Theological Tradition in the Sixth Century', *BZ* 81 (1988), 284–9.
- '“The Select Fathers”: Canonizing the Patristic Past', *StP* 23 (1989), 21–36.
- 'Covering the Nakedness of Noah: Reconstruction and Denial in the Age of Justinian', *BF* 24 (1997), 193–205.
- 'The Legacy of Chalcedon: Christological Problems and their Significance', in Maas, *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*, 215–38.
- Greer, R. A., *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Exegete and Theologian* (London: Faith Press, 1961).
- 'The Antiochene Christology of Diodore of Tarsus', *JTS* NS 17 (1966), 327–42.
- 'The Man from Heaven: Paul's Last Adam and Apollinarius' Christ', in W. S. Babcock (ed.), *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (Dallas, Tex.: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 165–182, 358–60 (endnotes).
- Grillmeier, A., *CCT* 1, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, 2nd rev. edn., trans. J. Bowden (London: Mowbray, 1975).
- *CCT* 2, *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604)*, Part 1, *Reception and Contradiction: The Development of the Discussion about Chalcedon from 451 to the Beginning of the Reign of Justinian*, trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte (London: Mowbray, 1987).
- with T. Hainthaler, *CCT* 2, pt. 2, *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte (London: Mowbray, 1995).
- with T. Hainthaler, *CCT* 2, pt. 4, *The Church of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451*, trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte (London: Mowbray, 1987).

- Grillmeier, A., with T. Hainthaler, T. B. Mansour, and L. Abramowski, *CCT* 2, pt. 3, *Die Kirche von Jerusalem und Antiochien nach 451 bis 600* (Freiburg: Herder, 2004).
- and H. Bracht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3 vols. (Würzburg, 1951).
- Guillaumont, A., *Les 'Képhalia gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, *Patristica Sorbonensia*, 5 (Paris: Seuil, 1962).
- Haarer, F. K., *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs, 46 (Cambridge: Francis Cairns, 2006).
- Hanson, R. P. C., 'The Fate of Eustathius', *ZKG* 95 (1984), 171–9.
- *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988).
- Harnack, A. von, *History of Dogma*, trans. from 3rd German edn. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1989).
- Hausherr, I., 'L'Influence du 'Livre de Saint Hiérothée', *Orientalia Christiania*, 30 (1933), 176–211.
- Hespel, R., *Le Florilège Cyrillien réfuté par Sévère d'Antioche. Étude et édition critique*, *Bibliothèque du Muséon*, 37 (Louvain: Publications Universitaires—Institut Orientaliste, 1955).
- Hill, R. C., 'His Master's Voice: Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Psalms', *HJ* 45 (2004), 40–53.
- Hombergen, D., *The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism*, *Studia Anselmiana*, 132 (Rome: S. Anselmo, 2001).
- Ismiriantz, J., *Book of Letters* (Tiflis, 1901).
- Jones, A. H. M., *The Later Roman Empire 284–602: A Social Economic and Administrative Survey* (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1964).
- Kalantzis, G., 'Duo Filii and the *Homo Assumptus* in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia: The Greek Fragments of the Commentary on John', *ETL* 78 (2002), 57–78.
- *Theodore of Mopsuestia: Commentary on the Gospel of John*, *Early Christian Studies*, 7 (Strathfield NSW, Australia: St Pauls Publications, 2004).
- Kelly, J. N. D., *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th edn. (San Francisco: Harper, 1978).
- Kerrigan, A., *St Cyril, Interpreter of the Old Testament* (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1952).
- Kondoleon, C. (ed.), *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- Kopecek, T. A., *A History of Neo-Arianism*, PMS 8 (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979).
- Laga, C., J. A. Munitiz, and L. van Rompay, *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History offered to Professor Albert van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday* (Leuven: Peeters, 1985).

- Lagarde, P., *Analecta Syriaca* (1858; repr. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1967).
- Lamberton, R., *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
- Lang, U. M., *John Philoponus and the Controversies over Chalcedon in the Sixth Century: A Study and Translation of the Arbiter*, *Specilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Études et Documents*, 47 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001).
- Lebon, J., *Le Monophysisme Sévérien: étude historique, littéraire et théologique sur la résistance Monophysite au concile de Chalcédoine jusqu'à la constitution de l'église Jacobite* (Louvain: Josephus van Linthout, 1909).
- 'Version arménienne et version syriaque de Timothée Élure', *Handes Amsorya: Monatsschrift für Armenische Philologie*, 11–12 (1927), 713–22.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G., *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
- Lienhard, J., *Contra Marcellus: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1999).
- Lietzmann, H. (ed.), *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Tübingen: Möhr, 1904).
- Logan, A. H. B., 'Marcellus of Ancyra and the Councils of AD 325: Antioch, Ancyra, and Nicaea', *JTS* ns 43.2 (1992), 428–46.
- Loofs, F., *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche. I, Das Leben und die polemischen Werke des Leontius von Byzanz*, *TU* 3.1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1887).
- Louth, A., 'Why Did the Syrians Reject the Council of Chalcedon?', in Price and Whitby, *Chalcedon in Context*, 107–16.
- 'The Reception of Dionysius up to Maximus the Confessor', *MT* 24.4 (2008), 573–83.
- Maas, M. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Macdonald, J. F., 'The Christological Works of Justinian', Ph.D. thesis, Catholic University of America; Washington, DC (1995).
- McGuckin, J., *Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001).
- *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy* (Leiden: Brill, 1994; repr. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004).
- McKenzie, J. L., 'A New Study of Theodore of Mopsuestia', *TS* 10 (1949), 394–408.
- 'The Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on John 1:46–51', *TS* 14 (1953), 73–84.
- 'Annotations on the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia', *TS* 19 (1958), 345–73.

- McLeod, F. G., 'Theodore of Mopsuestia Revisited', *TS* 61.3 (2000), 447–80.
- *The Roles of Christ's Humanity in Salvation: Insights from Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005).
- *Theodore of Mopsuestia, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2009).
- Marsh, F. S. (ed., trans., and intro.), *The Book of the Holy Hierotheos Ascribed to Stephen Bar Sudaili (c.500 A.D.)* (London, 1927; repr. Amsterdam: APA-Philo, 1979).
- Martindale, J. R., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2: *A.D. 395–527*, and vol. 3: *A.D. 527–641* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980, 1992).
- Meier, M., *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians. Kontingenzerfahrung und Kontingenzbewältigung im 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).
- Menze, V. L., *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, OECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Meyendorff, J., *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church 450–680* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989).
- Millar, F., 'Rome, Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church Under Justinian: Two Synods of 536', *JRS* 98 (2008), 62–82.
- Mitchell, M. M., 'Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory: Origin and Eustathius Put 1 Samuel 28 on Trial', *JR* 85 (2005), 414–45; revised in R. A. Greer and M. M. Mitchell (trans. and intro.), *The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*, WGRW 16 (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2007), pp. lxxxix–xc.
- Moeller, C., 'Le Chalcedonisme et le néo-chalcedonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI^{ème} siècle', in Grillmeier and Bracht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, 1.637–720.
- 'Le Cinquième Concile oecuménique et le magistère ordinaire au VI^e siècle', *RSPHTh* 34 (1951), 413–23.
- Moberg, A., *On Some Syriac Fragments of Timotheos Ailuros Against the Synod of Chalcedon, with Two Facsimiles* (Lund: K. Ohlsson, 1928).
- Moorhead, J., *Justinian* (London: Longman, 1994).
- Mühlenberg, E., *Apollinaris von Laodicea* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969).
- Murphy, F.-X., and P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III* (Paris: Orante, 1973).
- Nassif, B., '“Spiritual Exegesis” in the School of Antioch', in id. (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996), 343–77.
- Nau, F. (ed.), *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'église Nestorienne*, PO 13.2.
- Norris, R. A., *Manhood and Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963).

- 'Christological Models in Cyril of Alexandria', *StP* 13.2, TU 116 (Berlin, 1975), 255–68.
- *The Christological Controversy* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).
- O'Connell, P., 'Equal Representation for Each Patriarchate at Constantinople II', *OCP* 29 (1963), 238–46.
- O'Keefe, J. J., 'Impassible Suffering? Divine Passion and Fifth-Century Christology', *TS* 58 (1997), 39–60.
- 'Kenosis or Impassibility?', *StP* 32 (1997), 358–65.
- "'A Letter that Killeth": Towards a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms', *J ECS* 8.1 (2000), 83–104.
- Overbeck, J. J. (ed.), *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabbulae episc. Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1865).
- Parvis, P. M., 'The Commentary on Hebrews and the Contra Theodorum of Cyril of Alexandria', *JTS* NS 26.2 (1975): 415–19.
- Patrich, J., *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1995).
- (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, 98 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001).
- Perzel, I., 'Pseudo-Dionysius and Palestinian Origenism', in Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaite Heritage*, 261–82.
- 'The Earliest Syriac Reception of Dionysius', *MT* 24.4 (2008), 557–71.
- Pericoli-Ridolfini, F., 'Lettera di Andrea di Samosata a Rabbula de Edessa', *Revista degli Studi Orientali*, 28 (1953), 153–69.
- Perrone, L., *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche, Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Costantinopoli (553)* (Brescia: Paideia, 1980).
- Perry, S. G. F., *The Second Synod of Ephesus* (Dartford: Orient Press, 1881).
- Pinggéra, K., *All-Erlösung und All-Einheit: Studien zum 'Buch des heiligen Hierotheos' und seiner Rezeption in der syrisch-orthodoxen Theologie*, *Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients*, 10 (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2002).
- Poggi, V., 'The Three Chapters Controversy', in Stirnemann and Wilffinger, *Syriac Dialogue*, 142–50.
- Price, R. M., 'Marian Piety and the Nestorian Controversy', *SCH* 39 (2004), 31–8.
- 'The Three Chapters Controversy and the Council of Chalcedon', in Chazelle and Cubit, *Crisis of the Oikoumene*, 17–37.
- *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553, with Related Texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*, *TTH* 51, 2 vols. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009).
- and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, *TTH* 45, 3 vols. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005, 2007).

- Price, R. M., and M. Whitby (eds.), *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400–700* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009).
- Quasten, J., *Patrology*, vol. 3: *The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature: From the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1960).
- Raven, C. E., *Apollinarianism: An Essay in the Christology of the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923).
- Reinink, G. J., 'The Quotations from the Lost Works of Theodoret of Cyrus and Theodore of Mopsuestia in an Unpublished East Syrian Work on Christology', *StP* 33 (Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 562–7.
- Reuss, J., *Mattäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, TU 61 (Berlin: Akademie, 1957).
- Richard, M., *Opera Minora*, 3 vols. (Turnhout and Leuven: Brepols, 1976–7).
- 'Proclus de Constantinople et le théopaschisme', *RHE* 38 (1942), 303–31; repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §52.
- 'La Tradition des fragments du traité *Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως* de Théodore de Mopsueste', *Le Muséon*, 56 (1943), 55–75; repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §41.
- 'L'Introduction du mot "hypostase" dans la théologie de l'incarnation', *MSR* 2 (1945), 5–32, 243–70; repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §42.
- 'Les Traités de Cyrille d'Alexandrie contre Diodore et Théodore et les fragments dogmatiques de Diodore de Tarse', in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Félix Grat*, I (Paris: Pecqueur-Grat, 1946), 99–116; repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §51.
- 'Le Néo-Chalcédonisme', *MSR* 2 (1946), 5–32, 243–70; repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §56.
- 'Acace de Mélitène, Proclus de Constantinople et la Grande Arménie', *Mémorial Louis Pétit: Mélanges d'histoire et d'archéologie byzantines*, Archives de l'orient chrétien, 1 (Bucarest: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1948), 393–412; repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §50.
- 'Les Florilèges diphyssites du V^e et du VI^e siècles', in Grillmeier and Bracht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, 1.721–48; repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 1, §3.
- 'Le Traité de Georges hiéromoine sur les hérésies', *REByz* 28 (1970), 250–69; repr. in id., *Opera Minora*, vol. 2, §62.
- Riedel, W., and W. E. Crum, *The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1904, repr. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1973).
- Riedmatten, H. de, *Les Act du procès de Paul de Samosate: étude sur la Christologie du III^e au IV^e siècle*, Paradosis 6 (Fribourg en Suisse: St Paul, 1952).
- Roey, A. van, and P. Allen, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century* (Leuven, 1994).
- Romanides, J. S., 'Highlights in the Debate Over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology and Some Suggestions for a Fresh Approach', *GOTR* 5.2 (Winter, 1959–60), 140–85.

- Rompay, L. van, 'Proclus of Constantinople's "Tomus ad Armenios" in the Post-Chalcedonian Tradition', in Laga, Munitiz, and van Rompay, *After Chalcedon*, 425–49.
- Rondeau, J.-M., 'Le Commentaire des Psaumes de Diodore de Tarse et l'exégèse antique du Psaume 109/110', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 176.1 (1969), 5–33; 176.2 (1969), 153–88; 177.1 (1970), 5–33.
- Rousseau, P., *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
- Rucker, I., *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum (Syriace ante 562)*, SBAW.PH 1933.5 (Munich: Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1933).
- Schäublin, C., *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophaneia: Beiträge zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums, 23 (Cologne–Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1974).
- Scher, A., *Catalogue des manuscrits syriaques et arabes conservés dans la Bibliothèque épiscopale de Séert* (Mossoul: Impr. des Pères Dominicains, 1905).
- 'Joseph Hazzâyâ, écrivain syriaque du VIII^e siècle', in *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1909), 300–7; repr. in *Revista degli Studi Orientali*, 3 (1910), 45–63.
- Schwartz, E., *Konzilstudien*, Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg, 20 (Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1914).
- *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1421: Eine antichalcedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, ABAW.PPH 32.6 (Munich: Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1927).
- *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma*, ABAW NF 10 (Munich: Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1934).
- *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians*, ABAW.PH NF 18 (Munich: Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., 1939); 2nd edn., M. Amelotti, R. Albertella, and L. Migliardi, *Legum Iustiniani imperatoris vocabularium*, subsidia II (Milan: Dott. A. Giuffrè Editore, 1973).
- *Vigiliusbriefe; Zur Kirchenpolitik Iustinians* SBAW.PH 2 (Munich: Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., 1940).
- Segal, J. B., *The Diacritical Point and the Accents in Syriac* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953; facs reprint Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2004).
- Sellers, R. V., *Eustathius of Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928).
- *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey* (London: SPCK, 1953).
- Sieben, H. J., *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1979).
- Simonetti, M., 'Lucian of Antioch', in A. di Berardino (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. A. Walford (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 507.
- Smith, R., *Julian's Gods: Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate* (London: Routledge, 1995).

- Soro, A. B., 'La Personne et l'enseignement de Théodore de Mopsueste dans la tradition de l'Église de l'Orient', *Istina*, 43.2 (1998), 151–65.
- Spanneut, M., *Recherches sur les Écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioche, avec une édition nouvelle des fragments dogmatiques et exégétiques* (Lille: Facultés Catholiques, 1948).
- Spoerl, K. M., 'A Study of the *Karà Mépos Πίστις* by Apollinarius of Laodicea', Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto (1991).
- 'The Schism at Antioch Since Cavallera', in Barnes and Williams (eds.), *Arianism after Arius*, 101–26.
- 'Apollinarian Christology and the Anti-Marcellan Tradition', *JTS* NS 43.2 (1994), 545–68.
- Stathakopoulos, D., 'The Justinianic Plague Revisited', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 24 (2000), 256–76.
- Stirnemann, A., and G. Wilflinger, *Syriac Dialogue: Second Non-Official Consultation within the Syriac Tradition* (Vienna, 1996).
- Straub, J., 'Die Verurteilung der Drei Kapital durch Vigilius (Vigilii Epistula II ad Eutyrium)', *Klérnomia*, 2 (1970), 347–75.
- Sullivan, F. A., 'Some Reactions to Devresse's New Study of Theodore of Mopsuestia', *TS* 12 (1951), 179–207.
- *The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, *Analecta Gregoriana*, 82 (Rome: Gregoriana, 1956).
- 'Further Notes on Theodore of Mopsuestia: A Reply to Fr McKenzie', *TS* 20 (1959), 264–79.
- [Swete, H. B.], 'Theodorus', in W. Smith and H. Wace (eds.) *A Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century A.D.* (London: J. Murray, 1877), 971–2.
- Talley, T., *The Origins of the Christian Year*, 2nd edn. (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991).
- Thome, F., *Historia contra Mythos: Die Schriftauslegung Diodors von Tarsus und Theodore von Mopsuestia im Widerstreit zu Kaiser Julians und Salustius' allegorischem Mythenverständnis*, *Hereditas: Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte*, 24 (Bonn: Borengässer, 2004).
- Tonneau, R., 'Theodore Mopsueste, Interpretation (du Livre) de la Genèse (Vat. Syr. 120. ff. I–V)', *La Museón*, 66 (1953), 45–64.
- Torrance, I. R., *Christology after Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988).
- Uthemann, K.-H., 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', *Augustinianum*, 39 (1999), 5–83.
- 'History of Christology to the Seventh Century', in A. Casiday and F. W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 2: *Constantine to c.600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 460–500.
- Vaggione, R. P., 'Some Neglected Fragments of Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Contra Eunomium*', *JTS* NS 31.2 (1980), 403–70.
- *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

- Vogt, H. J., 'Unterschiedliche Exegese der Alexandriner und der Antiochener: Cyrillische Umdeutung christologischer Texte des Theodor von Mopsuestia', in G. Schöllgen and C. Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli: Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum: Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1996), 357–69.
- 'Bemerkungen zu Exegese und Christologie des Theodore von Mopsuestia', in R. Bäumer (ed.), *Synodus: Beiträge zur Konzilien- und allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte: Festschrift für Walter Brandmüller* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997), 5–27.
- Vööbus, A., *History of the School of Nisibis*, CSCO 266, subs. 26 (Louvain: CSCO 1965).
- Vosté, J.-M., 'Le Gannat Bussame', *RB* 37 (1928), 221–32, 386–419.
- 'L'Oeuvre exégetique de Théodore de Mopsueste au II^e Concile de Constantinople', *RB* 38 (1929), 382–95, 542–54.
- Weinandy, T. G., and D. Keating (eds.), *The Theology of St Cyril of Alexandria* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2003).
- Wesche, K. P., *On the Person of Christ: The Christology of Emperor Justinian* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991).
- Wessel, S., *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*, OECS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Whitby, M., 'The Church Historians and Chalcedon', in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 449–95.
- Williams, R., *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 2nd edn. (London: SCM Press, 2001 [1987]).
- Winkler, D. W., 'Miaphysitism: A New Term for Use in the History of Dogma and Ecumenical Theology', *The Harp*, 10 (1997), 33–40.
- Winkler, G., 'An Obscure Chapter in Armenian Church History (428–439)', *REArm* 17 (1985), 85–179; repr. in ead., *Studies in Early Christian Liturgy and Its Context*, Variorum Collected Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), no. 7.
- Wright, W., *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the year 1838*, 3 vols. (Longmans, London: 1870–2).
- Young, F., *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background* (London: SCM Press, 1983).
- 'The Rhetorical Schools and Their Influence on Patristic Exegesis', in R. Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 182–99.
- *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- 'The Fourth Century Reaction Against Allegory', *StP* 30 (1997), 120–5.
- Zaharopoulos, D. Z., *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible: A Study of His Old Testament Exegesis* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989).

GENERAL INDEX

- Abramowski, L. 31-32 n. 88, 88 n. 18,
93 n. 35, 94 n. 39, 101 n. 64,
136 n. 10, 160 n. 7, 162 n. 13, 165,
166, 226-7, 322 n. 86
- Abramowski, R. 164 n. 20, 434 n. 6
- Acacius of Caesarea 49
- Acacius of Constantinople 100
- Acacius of Melitene 91, 92, 93, 97
- Aetius 49, 65
- Agapetus, Pope of Rome 106, 314
- Alexandria, Council of (362) 50-1, 83-4
- allegory 35, 70
- Allen, P. 107 n. 81, 230 n. 7
- Anastasius I, Emperor 101, 103
- Andrew of Samosata 90 n. 24
- Apollinarius of Laodicea 9-11, 15-16,
44, 45, 50, 53-4, 59, 60, 83-4,
85-6, 190, 351
- Arius 6-7, 351
- Aristotle 38 n. 112
- Arthur, R. A. 111 n. 96
- Aštišat, Council of 92-3 n. 33
- Athanasius of Alexandria 9, 24-6, 38,
51, 61, 84-5
- Auerbach, E. 41
- Ayres, L. 3 n. 2, 48 n. 1
- Barhadbešabba 58 n. 46, 90 n. 22,
90 n. 23, 96 n. 46, 99 n. 58,
156 n. 32
- Bark, W. 250
- Barkhuizen, J. H. 106 n. 77
- Barnes, T. D. 8 n. 14, 48 n. 2, 51 n. 11
- Barsanuphius 116
- Basil of Caesarea 51 n. 13, 52, 53
- Basil, the deacon 94
- Beeley, C. E. 11 n. 28, 55 n. 33, 56 n. 36,
86 n. 10,
- Behr, J. 3 n. 2, 5 n. 3, 6 n. 5, 8 n. 13,
9 n. 19, 20 n. 53, 38 n. 111, 48 n. 1,
53 n. 21, 61 n. 54, 61 n. 55,
64 n. 72, 86 n. 7,
- Binns, J. 113 n. 101, 113 n. 102, 273 n. 33,
273 n. 34
- Blasphemies, The* 136, 137-8, 153-4,
160-219, 352-3 n. 3
- Blum, G. G. 90 n. 22
- Brière, M. 164 n. 20
- Brock, S. 105 n. 74, 106 n. 76
- Brown, R. 36 n. 104
- Bühning, G. 106 n. 77
- Bundy, D. D. 108 n. 82
- Cavallera, F. 48 n. 1, 161-2 n. 10
- Chadwick, H. 8 n. 14, 48 n. 2
- Chalcedon, Council of (451) 83, 99, 100,
102, 106
- Christ
identity of 5-6, 9, 12, 14, 20, 84,
soul of 6, 23-24, 61 n. 58, 79-82, 303,
385-7
- Christology 3-5,
Antioch/Alexandria 3, 28, 30, 59, 129
"two sons", problem of 5-7, 9, 12-14,
55-6, 62-3, 69, 81, 84, 86-8,
169-70, 171-3, 195, 223, 237,
241-3, 267-9, 311, 397, 423,
461-3, 477
- Chrysostom, John 47 n. 131, 52-3, 58, 122
- Cicero 38
- Clayton, P. B. 29 n. 80
- Collectio Palatina* 75 n. 106, 136, 139, 250
- communicatio idiomatum* 10, 14, 30, 31
- Conon 118, 119, 124
- Constans, N. 88 n. 18, 92-3 n. 33,
94 n. 39, 99 n. 58
- Constantinople
Conference of (532, 535/6) 105-7,
231, 314
First Council of (381) 3, 56-7
Second Council of (553) 29, 94,
99 n. 60, 109, 121-9, 136, 139-40,
352-4
Synod (507) 101

- Constantius, Emperor 49
 cross 12, 12, 14, 16, 22, 25, 26, 27, 80, 82
 Cyril of Alexandria 32, 34, 88, 89, 90-1,
 94, 96-8, 99, 100, 104, 122, 133-7,
 147-8, 151, 154-7, 167
 Cyril of Scythopolis 108-19, 124, 272-4
- Dagron, G. 48 n. 2
 Daley, B. E. 9 n. 21, 11 n. 31, 112 n. 100,
 113 n. 102, 114 n. 105, 272-3, 275
 n. 37, 275 n. 41
 Damasus, Pope 53-5
 Dawson, D. 36-7 n. 105, 67 n. 80
 Devreesse, R. 29, 37 n. 107, 88 n. 18,
 91 n. 27, 352-3 n. 3, 385 n. 24,
 391 n. 28, 404 n. 46
 Diekamp, F. 109 n. 87
 Dionysius the Areopagite 111, 435
 Doran R. 89 n. 21, 90 n. 24
- Elias of Jerusalem 101-2, 103, 110
 Ensslin, W. 58 n. 46
 Ephesus,
 Council of (431) 83, 88, 92
 Council of (449) 99
 Epiphanius 54, 64 n. 73
 Esbroeck, M. van 89 n. 21
 Eunomius 7, 12, 351
 Eusebius of Caesarea 8, 9, 65, 485-7
 Eusebius of Dorylaeum 64 n. 72, 151
 Eusebius of Vercelli 50-51
 Eustathius of Antioch 8, 9, 30, 38-40,
 46, 48, 64-5
 Eutherius of Tyana 31 n. 86, 87 n. 12,
 158-9
 Euzoius of Antioch 49, 54
 Evans, D. B. 272 n. 28
 exegesis 8-9, 27, 35-47, 60-63, 66-82
- Facundus of Hermiana 53 n. 19, 57 n.
 42, 58 n. 45, 94 n. 36, 95 n. 44,
 96 n. 46, 96 n. 47, 98 n. 55,
 98 n. 56, 98 n. 57, 116, 120, 136,
 155, 274-5, 322-3, 402 n. 45,
 438
 Field, L. L. 55 n. 30
 Flavian I, of Antioch 49, 53-4, 57
 Flavian II, of Antioch 101-2
- Galtier, R. 31 n. 88
 Garsoian, N. 91 n. 30, 92 n. 31, 92 n. 32,
 92-3 n. 33
- Gelasius 115, 117, 274-6
 Gennadius of Marseilles 57, 58 n. 46,
 146 n. 18, 432
 George of Alexandria 49
 George of Laodicea 28 n. 79
 Goodman, A. E. 226-7
 Greer, R. A. 9 n. 21, 36 n. 103, 37 n. 107,
 60 n. 49
 Gregory of Nazianzus 26-7, 53 n. 22,
 26-8, 54, 55-7, 86-8, 122
 Gregory of Nyssa 11-19, 28, 43-44
 Grillmeier, A. 3 n. 1, 59 n. 48, 100 n. 62,
 101 n. 64, 106 n. 78, 108 n. 93,
 113 n. 102, 230 n. 7
 Guillaumont, A. 109 n. 87, 110 n. 92,
 118 n. 118
- Haarer, F. K. 101 n. 64, 102 n. 66,
 103 n. 69
 Halleux, A. de 102 n. 65, 102 n. 67
 Hanson, R. P. C. 3 n. 1, 8 n. 14, 25 n. 71,
 48 n. 1, 48 n. 2, 57 n. 41, 64 n. 73,
 82 n. 124
 Harnack, A. von 32
 Hazzâyâ, Joseph 435-8
 Hegesippus 485-7
Henotikon, the 100-2, 103
 Hespel, R. 136 n. 9, 138 n. 12,
 230 n. 8
 Hesychius of Jerusalem 58 n. 44
 Hill, R. C. 38 n. 109, 75 n. 109
 Hippolytus 22-3
historia 35, 37, 39, 40-1, 42-3, 45, 70-72,
 78-80, 82
 Hombergen, D. 109 n. 87, 110 n. 89,
 111 n. 97, 112 n. 100, 113 n. 102,
 114 n. 104, 114 n. 107, 118 n. 116,
 124 n. 142, 272 n. 28, 275 n. 38
 Hormisdas, Pope of Rome 104-5, 106
hypostasis 28, 191, 207-9, 229, 291, 437-8,
 449, 451, 469-71
- Iamblichus 67 n. 80
 Ibas of Edessa 58, 89-90, 94-5, 99-100,
 101, 102, 105, 106, 108, 116, 122,
 126, 127, 128, 155, 354, 434
 Ignatius of Antioch 21
 Incarnation 17-18, 19-28, 43, 44-45,
 68-9, 79-82
 as ensouling 6, 7, 9, 64
 Innocent of Maronea 93 n. 34, 94 n. 39,
 105 n. 74, 146 n. 19, 273, 400 n. 43

- Irenaeus of Lyons 38, 42, 87
 Isho'dad of Merv 372 n. 15, 378 n. 20

 Jacob Baradaeus 107, 221
 Jansen, T. 7,
 Jerome 23, 59 n. 47
 John of Antioch 89, 90, 94, 95, 98,
 158-9
 John of Damascus 433, 477
 John Maxentius 104, 250
 John Philoponus 122 n. 131
 John of Scythopolis 111 n. 97
 Julian, Emperor 45-6, 51-2, 59, 66-9,
 81
 Justin I, Emperor 104
 Justinian, Emperor 104, 105-8, 116,
 119-28, 314-16

 Keefe, J. J. O' 37, 40-1
 Kelly, J. N. D. 3 n. 1, 59-60
 Kondoleon, C. 48 n. 1
 Kopecek, T. A. 49 n. 4
 Koumi 434, 435-8

 Lagarde, P. 164 n. 20, 436
 Lamberton, R. 67 n. 80
 Lang, U. M. 122 n. 131
 Lebon, J. 161-2 n. 10
 Leo, Pope of Rome 101, 104, 106
 Leontius of Antioch 49, 65
 Leontius of Byzantium 29, 35, 37, 74,
 111, 112, 113-16, 119, 136, 138-9,
 191, 272-6
Letter of the Churches in Vienne and Lyons
 21-2
 Liberatus of Carthage 108, 116, 118 n.
 116, 119 n. 122, 274-5, 323
 Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 48 n. 1
 Lienhard, J. 60 n. 51, 60 n. 52, 61 n. 57
 Lietzmann, H. 85 n. 4
 Logan, A. H. B., 8 n. 15
 Loofs, F. 153, 164 n. 20, 272 n. 28
 Louth, A. 111 n. 96
 Lucian of Antioch 6-7, 64
 Lucifer of Cagliari 50-1

 Macedonius II of Constantinople 101,
 102, 103
 Marcellus of Ancyra 8-9, 60-5, 84
 Marcion 79
 Margerie, B. de 36 n. 104
 Marius Mercator 250

 Mary the Theotokos 6, 15, 17, 18,
 20 n. 54, 30-1, 44, 46, 68, 80,
 86-7, 90, 159, 169, 187, 195, 223,
 237, 245, 269, 303, 311-13, 397,
 427
 Maximus, Deacon of Antioch 91, 96,
 97, 98, 156
 Maximus the Confessor 129
 Maximus of Seleucia 52
 McGuckin, J. 56 n. 35, 57 n. 41, 88 n. 18
 McKenzie, J. L. 31 n. 88
 McLeod, F. G. 44, 75 n. 106, 81 n. 122,
 82
 Meier, M. 107 n. 80
 Meletius of Antioch 49, 50, 51, 53, 55,
 56, 65, 83-4, 345, 489-91
 Menze, V. L. 100 n. 62, 103 n. 68,
 104 n. 71, 104 n. 72, 105 n. 74,
 107 n. 79
 Mesrop Maštoc' 92
 Meyendorff, J. 119 n. 121, 220 n. 143
 Millar, F. 106 n. 78, 107 n. 79
 Mingana, A. 395 n. 37
 Mitchell, M. 38-40, 67 n. 77
 Moberg, A. 160 n. 8
 Mühlenberg, E. 84 n. 2

 Narcissus of Neronias 61 n. 56
 Nassif, B. 35 n. 101
 "Neo-Chalcedonianism" 109, 129
 Nestorius 58, 88, 96, 105, 112, 151, 153-4
 Nicaea
 Creed of, 50
 First Council of (325) 7, 8
 Nonnus 110, 112, 114, 115, 273, 274
 Norris, R. A. 29 n. 80, 32-4, 75 n. 106

 Origen 6, 23-4, 37, 38-40, 46, 61 n. 54,
 112, 116, 119, 127
 "Origenism" 108-15, 118-19, 124,
 274-6, 315

 Parvis, P. M. 133 n. 1, 134 n. 3
 passion of Christ 12-15, 18, 21, 23, 43,
 79-80
 Patrich, J. 109 n. 86, 110 n. 90
 Paul of Samosata 5-6, 9, 48, 64, 102,
 151, 166, 268 n. 24, 325
 Paulinus of Antioch 50-1, 54-5, 56
 Pelagianism 32, 45, 58, 118 n. 116, 250
 Pelagius, Pope of Rome 117, 120, 128,
 323

- Perczel, I. 111 n. 96
persona see *prosōpon*
 Peter the Fuller, of Antioch 102-3
 Peter Mongus, of Alexandria 101
 Philoxenus of Mabbug 101-2, 103,
 110-11, 164
 Pinggéra, K. 110 n. 92
 Price, R. 88 n. 18, 91 n. 27, 93 n. 35,
 94 n. 39, 99 n. 60, 99 n. 61,
 100 n. 62, 105 n. 75, 108 n. 93,
 109 n. 87, 119 n. 121, 120 n. 123,
 122 n. 131, 122 n. 132, 122 n. 133,
 124 n. 139, 125, 128 n. 151,
 129 n. 153, 146 n. 19, 147 n. 20,
 155, 315 n. 80, 352 n. 1, 352 n. 2,
 357 n. 5, 361 n. 7, 361 n. 8,
 385 n. 24, 395 n. 37, 400 n. 43
 Proclus of Constantinople 92-5, 97,
 98-9
prosōpon
 (*persona*) 31, 33-4, 38, 44, 81-2,
 191, 207-9, 211, 229, 283, 291,
 329, 335, 341-3, 371, 389, 427,
 431, 437-8, 461-3, 469-71, 483,
 493
 Pusey, P. E. 136 n. 9

 Rabbula of Edessa 88, 90-1, 93, 166
 Raven, C. E. 48 n. 2
 Richard, M. 29, 64 n. 71, 88 n. 18, 93 n.
 35, 99 n. 58, 124 n. 141, 135, 136,
 140-41, 148, 151-2, 154-7, 436-7
 Romanides, J. S. 29 n. 80
 Rompay, L. van 92-3 n. 33
 Rousseau, P. 53 n. 21
 Rucker, I. 164 n. 19, 166

 Sabas 103, 109-10, 112-13, 114, 117,
 273-6
 Sachau, E. 164 n. 20, 428 n. 55, 433-4,
 436, 438
 Sahak I of Armenia 92
 Schäublin, C. 35 n. 100, 35 n. 101, 36
 Scher, Addai 432, 433-8
 Schwartz, E. 88 n. 18, 93, 109 n. 86,
 160 n. 8, 166, 250, 316 n. 83
 Segal, J. B. 433
 Sellers, R. V. 48 n. 2
 Sergius of Reshaina 111

 Severus of Antioch 101-2, 103, 104, 106,
 136, 138, 141, 230-2
 Sextus Empiricus 38-9 n. 112
 Silvanus of Tarsus 49, 59 n. 47
 Smith, R. 67 n. 78
 Spoerl, K. M. 9 n. 20, 9 n. 21, 49 n. 5,
 49 n. 6, 50 n. 10, 51 n. 12, 60 n. 51,
 63 n. 66
 Stathakopoulos, D. 107 n. 81
 Stephen Bar Sudaili 110-11, 275
 Sullivan, F. 29-31, 31 n. 88, 136, 140-41,
 155-7, 372 n. 15, 378 n. 20, 436-8
 Swete, H. B. 35
 "Synousiasts" 63-5

 Talley, T. 47 n. 131
 Theodore Askidas 108, 115, 116, 119, 121,
 126, 274, 354
 Theodore bar Koni 436-7
 Theodoret of Cyrus 49, 83, 89, 101, 102,
 105, 106, 108, 110 n. 89, 116, 122,
 126, 127, 128, 136
 Theodosius, Emperor 11, 57, 58, 88
 Thome, F. 46
 "Three Chapters" 59, 83, 100, 107, 108,
 116, 119-28, 250, 315
 Timothy Aelurus 136, 138, 161-5, 220-1
 Trinitarian theology 3-5, 11
Týpos, the 102

 Vigilus, Pope of Rome 116, 119-28, 353
 Virgin, the 20, 21-3, 26
 see also Mary
 Vitalian 104
 Vitalis of Antioch 53-4, 85-6
 Vööbus, A. 434 n. 7
 Vosté, J.-M. 372 n. 15, 378 n. 20

 Wessel, S. 88 n. 18
 Wickham, L. 28 n. 79, 135 n. 4,
 161-2 n. 10, 163 n. 14
 Williams, R. 24 n. 69
 Winkler, D. W. 100 n. 62
 Winkler, G. 91 n. 30, 92 n. 31, 92 n. 33,
 92-3 n. 33
 Wright, W. 160-1, 432, 433

 Young, F. 36, 37 n. 106, 38 n. 110, 40, 41,
 70 n. 89

BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS

Genesis

| | |
|---------|----------|
| 1:27 | 453 |
| 2:7 | 253, 473 |
| 2:15 | 255 |
| 3:17-19 | 253 |
| 3:24 | 409 |
| 9:6 | 253 |
| 9:22-5 | 415 |
| 18:27 | 255 |
| 19:9-11 | 175-7 |
| 21:5 | 447 |
| 26:13 | 447 |
| 26:14 | 447 |

Exodus

| | |
|-------|---------------|
| 7:8 | 181, 387, 421 |
| 10:21 | 181, 387, 421 |
| 12:46 | 73 n. 99 |
| 34:16 | 415 |

Leviticus

| | |
|-------|-----|
| 26:11 | 279 |
|-------|-----|

Numbers

| | |
|-------|----------|
| 13:16 | 297, 399 |
| 23:23 | 473-5 |

Deuteronomy

| | |
|-------|----------|
| 18:15 | 241, 267 |
| 21:23 | 447 |

Joshua

| | |
|-------|---------------|
| 5:13 | 473 |
| 8:4 | 447 |
| 10:12 | 181, 387, 421 |

1 Kingdoms [1 Samuel]

| | |
|----|----|
| 28 | 39 |
|----|----|

2 Kingdoms [2 Samuel]

| | |
|-------|-----|
| 16:22 | 381 |
|-------|-----|

4 Kingdoms [2 Kings]

| | |
|---------|---------------|
| 2:9 | 455 |
| 6:18-20 | 177 |
| 13:21 | 181, 387, 421 |
| 20:11 | 181, 387, 421 |

Job

| | |
|-------------|-----|
| 2:1-6 | 413 |
| 3:3-10 | 411 |
| 32-37 | 413 |
| 40:25-41:26 | 413 |
| 42:14 | 411 |

Psalms

| | |
|----------|----------------------------|
| 2:7 | 73 |
| 8:2-4 | 467 |
| 8:2-3 | 377 n. 16 |
| 8:5-7 | 307, 309-11, 367, 377, 425 |
| 8:5 | 295, 423 |
| 8:6 | 465 |
| 15:10 | 76, 173, 175, 379 |
| 17:3 | 449 |
| 21 | 72-3 |
| 21:2 | 379, 381 |
| 21:17-18 | 381 |
| 21:19 | 379 |
| 29:3-4 | 76 n. 111 |
| 33:19 | 281 |
| 37:15 | 449 |
| 44 | 73 |
| 44:2 | 331 |
| 44:5 | 333 |
| 44:7 | 333 |
| 44:8 | 335, 391 |
| 50:13 | 77, 281 |
| 68:10 | 383 |
| 68:12 | 449 |
| 68:22 | 383 |
| 68:23 | 383 |
| 68:26 | 383 |
| 74:9 | 443 |

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|
| 8:16 | 375 | 6:6 | 445 |
| 93:22 | 449 | 6:17 | 445 |
| 102:14-16 | 255 | 6:24 | 265 |
| 103:24 | 24 | 8:6-10 | 327 |
| 110:1 | 187 | 10:8 | 453-5 |
| | | 10: 28 | 201 |
| Proverbs | | 10:40 | 459 |
| 8:22-3 | 49, 63, 79 | 16:16 | 19 |
| 9:1 | 433 | 16:21-3 | 19, 183, 363, 369 |
| | | 19:5-6 | 469 |
| Song of Songs | | 19:6 | 207, 263, 291, 389 |
| 1:2 | 415 | 21:7-10 | 467 |
| 1:3 | 417 | 21:16 | 377 |
| 1:5 | 415 | 21:26 | 209 |
| | | 22:41-5 | 173, 187, 195, 223, 237, 313,
399, 423 |
| Isaiah | | 25:40 | 459 |
| 1:2 | 375 | 25:46 | 459 |
| 6:2 | 473 | 26:39 | 62 |
| 7:14 | 68 | 27:34 | 383 |
| 7:16 | 205, 287 | 27:35 | 381 |
| 53:9 | 379 | 27:45 | 181, 387, 421 |
| 54:1 | 20 | 27:46 | 72, 183, 381 |
| 57:15 | 447 n. 29 | 27:48 | 383 |
| 63:1-6 | 473 | 27: 51-3 | 181, 387, 421 |
| | | 28:13 | 459 |
| Ezekiel | | 28:19 | 373 |
| 14:14-20 | 413 | | |
| 18:2-4 | 257 | Mark | |
| | | 3:22 | 185 |
| Amos | | 3:30 | 185 |
| 9:7 | 37 | 5:7 | 26 n. 75 |
| | | 15:34 | 72 |
| Zechariah | | 16:14 | 177 |
| 1:8-11 | 77 | | |
| | | Luke | |
| Matthew | | 1:15-17 | 457 |
| 1:1 | 217 | 1:31-5 | 495 |
| 1:5 | 347 | 1:31 | 299 |
| 1:15-16 | 493 | 1:32 | 219 |
| 1:18 | 493 | 1:35 | 185 |
| 1:20 | 493 | 2:11 | 457 |
| 1:21 | 171 | 2:40 | 495 |
| 2:3 | 453 | 2:47 | 453 |
| 3:11 | 215 | 2:51 | 495 |
| 3:14 | 299 | 2:52 | 80, 239, 259, 267, 287,
451-3 |
| 3:17 | 62, 215, 289, 375, 395,
455 | 3:16 | 455 |
| 4:1 | 363 | 4:1 | 363 |
| 4:4 | 301, 463 | 4:30 | 175 |
| 4:6 | 301 | 4:34 | 26 n. 75 |
| 4:11 | 385 | | |

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 9:3 | 445 | 20:22 | 371 |
| 12:10 | 185 | 20:25 | 373 |
| 22:43-4 | 293, 361-3 | 20:27 | 373 |
| 23:45 | 181, 387, 421 | | |
| 24:28-35 | 20, 42 | Acts | |
| 24:43 | 179 | 1:4 | 371 |
| John | | 1:8 | 371 |
| 1:1-3 | 369 | 1:9 | 469 |
| 1:3 | 24, 48 ¹ | 1:11 | 421, 469 |
| 1:5 | 12 | 1:16 | 449, 483 |
| 1:9-10 | 34 ¹ | 1:20 | 383 |
| 1:14 | 12, 62, 69, 293, 349, | 2:1 | 371 |
| | 473 | 2:27-31 | 171, 175 |
| 1:18 | 68, 69 | 2:31 | 379 |
| 1:19 | 69 | 2:33 | 13 |
| 1:29-30 | 345 | 2:36 | 7, 12 |
| 1:49 | 383, 391 | 2:38 | 373 |
| 1:50-1 | 385 | 5:14-16 | 455 |
| 2:14 | 467-9 | 10:38 | 215, 217, 245, 391, 395 |
| 2:17 | 383 | 13:35-7 | 175 |
| 3:13 | 179, 189, 293 | 17:31 | 367 |
| 3:29 | 335 | Romans | |
| 5:19 | 305, 367 | 1:2 | 329 |
| 5:30 | 305, 367 | 1:3-4 | 217 |
| 5:46 | 42, 79 | 1:3 | 265, 329, 393 |
| 8:17 | 265 | 2:6 | 257 |
| 8:19 | 337 | 5:12 | 197 |
| 8:28 | 20 n. 54 | 5:17 | 197 |
| 8:40 | 463 | 8:14 | 363 |
| 8:44 | 71 | 8:15 | 21 |
| 8:58 | 10, 27, 189 | 8:23 | 179 |
| 10:18 | 23 | 9:5 | 247, 391, 429 |
| 10:30 | 62, 263 | 11:9 | 383 |
| 10:37-8 | 26 n. 75 | 14:10 | 257 |
| 11:27 | 383-5 | 1 Corinthians | |
| 12:30 | 33 | 1:23 | 25 |
| 14:8-9 | 337 | 2:2 | 23 |
| 14:10-11 | 305, 367 | 2:6 | 203 |
| 14:20 | 17 | 2:7-9 | 465 |
| 14:23 | 305, 367 | 2:8 | 179, 181, 189 |
| 14:8-9 | 77-8 | 3:11 | 63 |
| 16:12-13 | 78, 339 | 5:5 | 449 |
| 16:14 | 199 | 8:6 | 5, 17, 171 |
| 16:15 | 62 | 9:20 | 449 |
| 16:24-5 | 339 | 10:2 | 373 |
| 16:25 | 78 | 11:1 | 449 |
| 17:5 | 10 | 12:8-10 | 409 |
| 17:6 | 211 | 12:13 | 21 |
| 17:22 | 289 | 12:27 | 21 |
| 19:36 | 73 n. 99 | | |
| 20:17 | 371 | | |

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|------------|--|
| 15:3-5 | 42 | Colossians | |
| 15:24 | 63 | 1:15 | 62, 63 |
| 15:47 | 10-11 | 1:18 | 63 |
| 15:48-9 | 261 | 1 Timothy | |
| 15:57 | 395 | 3:16 | 12, 199, 219, 299, 397, 403, 495 |
| 2 Corinthians | | 2 Timothy | |
| 4:16 | 471 | 2:8 | 181 |
| 5:16 | 19 | 3:15 | 255 |
| 12:4 | 465 | 3:16 | 329 |
| 12:11 | 447 | Hebrews | |
| Galatians | | 1:2 | 283, 295, 297, 365, 429 |
| 2:20 | 21 | 1:5 | 429 |
| 3:13 | 447 | 1:6 | 217 |
| 4:4-5 | 177, 219, 449 | 1:9 | 391 |
| 4:6 | 21 | 2:6-9 | 307, 309-11, 367, 377, 423-5 |
| 4:19 | 21 | 2:7 | 465 |
| 4:21-31 | 20, 70 | 2:9 | 12, 133, 395 |
| 6:5 | 257 | 2:10 | 213, 295, 297, 307, 367, 393, 399, 425 |
| 6:16 | 279 | 5:7 | 361 |
| Ephesians | | 7:3 | 319, 359 |
| 1:10 | 63 | 7:9-10 | 235-7 |
| 2:15 | 63 | 9:14 | 397 |
| Philippians | | 11:32-8 | 263 |
| 2:6-10 | 477-85 | 11:38 | 259 |
| 2:6-8 | 23, 24, 179, 349 | 21:1 | 427 |
| 2:7 | 293, 447, 473 | 1 Peter | |
| 2:9 | 401 | 2:22 | 379 |
| 2:10 | 24 | | |
| 3:21 | 261 | | |