

CORPVS CHRISTIANORVM

Series Graeca

29



CORPVS CHRISTIANORVM

Series Graeca

29

PETRI CALLINICENSIS
PATRIARCHAE
ANTIOCHENI

CONTRA DAMIANVM

BREPOLS - TURNHOUT

1994

PETRI CALLINICENSIS
PATRIARCHAE ANTIOCHENI
TRACTATVS CONTRA
DAMIANVM

I
QVAE SVPERVNT LIBRI SECVNDI

EDIDERVNT ET ANGLICE REDDIDERVNT

RIFAAT Y. EBIED,
ALBERT VAN ROEY,
LIONEL R. WICKHAM



TURNHOUT
BREPOLS

1994

LEUVEN
UNIVERSITY PRESS

EDITORES

E. DEKKERS
M. GEERARD
C. LAGA
M. PINNOY
C. STEEL
A. VAN ROEY
G. VERBEKE

ABBREVIATIONS

ACO	<i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i>
CPG	Mauritius GEERARD, <i>Clavis Patrum Graecorum</i> , 5 vols., Turnhout, 1974-1987
CSCO	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>
GNO	<i>Gregorii Nysseni Opera</i>
OCA	<i>Orientalia Christiana Analecta</i>
OLA	<i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta</i>
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus ... Series Graeca</i> accurante J.-P. MIGNE, 161 vols., Paris 1857-1866
PO	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>
PO	<i>Patristische Texte und Studien</i>
SChr	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i>

© Brepols 1994

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,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publisher.

INTRODUCTION

I. The author: Peter of Callinicus

1. *In previous study*

The principal literary achievement of Peter, patriarch (in the tradition stemming from Jacob Baradaeus) of Antioch from 581 to 591⁽¹⁾ is the rebuttal (numbered 7252 in the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*), directed against his co-religionist Damian, pope of Alexandria from 557/8 till 606/7⁽²⁾. It has waited a long time for publication in a modern edition. The reasons for that are not far to seek. The work survives not in its Greek original, but in Syriac translation; the theme is technical and complicated; and its author belongs to a period and to a communion unfamiliar to most students of Christian life and thought in the patristic era. The unfamiliarity is natural, inevitable even, when the history of the Church is read from the standard Greek sources. The imperial Church of Peter's own day did indeed take note of Peter and Damian and their controversy, but recorded little. Evagrius the Church historian, within whose period the controversy falls, keeps silent, apparently of set purpose, on the internal history of the non-conforming 'monophysites'⁽³⁾. There is perhaps an echo of the quarrel between Peter and Damian, though without mention of their names, in a letter by Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch, which Gregory the Great answered from Rome in September 597 (*Reg. VIII*, 2 ed. Dag Norberg [Corpus Christianorum, Ser. Lat. CXL A; Turnhout, 1982], p. 515). A few other scattered references in literature of the seventh century are to be found. Sophronius' *Epistola Synodica* ([CPG 7635] PG 87.III,

⁽¹⁾ For documentation of the dates of Peter's ordination and decease, see the editors' *Peter of Callinicum. Anti-Tritheist Dossier* [OLA 10] (Louvain, 1981) pp. 4 and 8.

⁽²⁾ The dates are those given by Caspar Detlef Gustav MÜLLER, 'Damian, Papst und Patriarch von Alexandrien' in *Oriens Christianus* 70 (1986) pp. 118-142, esp. 118.

⁽³⁾ See Pauline ALLEN, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian* [Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense. Études et Documents. Fascicule 41] (Louvain, 1981) where Evagrius' approach and limitations are fully analysed.

3148-3200 / ACO ser. sec. II,1 - Berlin, 1990 - pp. 410-494) knows of the tritheist controversy. He condemns (3193A/482) Peter the Syrian (= our Peter) and Sergius the Armenian (who does not figure directly in the controversy between Peter and Damian) who 'led the lesser tritheism and even so contradicted themselves and did not think the same things as each other', and Damian, 'the outstanding opponent of these but who appeared in our times as a new Sabellius'. Timothy of Constantinople's *On those who enter the Church* (CPG 7016) knows something of Peter's and Damian's views. He mentions (PG 86, 45B) 'the Petrianites who maintain the hypostases alone to be the properties (ἰδιώματα) apart from substance and quarrelled on this subject with the schism of the Damianites, so that many written contests (ἀγῶνας) have been set in motion on this subject'. Damian's doctrines are noted too (60A). The references are, thus, few and their tone is studiously depreciatory. No mention is made explicitly of the work we here edit⁽⁴⁾.

Not that Peter has been wholly neglected in modern scholarship. His name and his writings began to receive notice at least with the birth of Syriac studies in the West in the 16th century. Peter appears for the first time in scholarly literature in the *Bibliothecae ecclesiasticae seu commentariorum sacrorum de expositione et illustratione missalis et breviarum tomus quatuor* (Cologne, 1599), t. III, pp. 106-107 of Cornelius Schulting. Reproduced there is the list of anaphoras in use amongst the Jacobites of Syria. The list had been drawn up at Rome, between 1586 and 1590, by the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius Ni'matallāh and rendered into Latin by his interpreter Paulus Ursinius (Orsini)⁽⁵⁾. Under number XXV we find: *Sancti Petri Patriarchae Antiocheni chaldaice composita colonicae anno a nativitate Domini 563*⁽⁶⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ The 14th century Church historian Nicephorus Callistus (*Ecclesiastical History* xviii, 49 [PG 147, 429-434]) also carries a short account.

⁽⁵⁾ See G. GRAF, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* vol. iv [Studi e Testi 147] (Vatican, 1951) pp. 12-14, and G. LEVI DELLA VIDA, *Ricerche sulla formazione del più antico fondo dei manoscritti orientali della Biblioteca Vaticana* [Studi e Testi 92] (Vatican, 1939) p. 408 n. 4.

⁽⁶⁾ A. BAUMSTARK, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922) p. 178 lists two manuscripts. J.S. Assemani (*Bibliotheca Orientalis* II, p. 77) reports a misunderstanding of the authorship of this anaphora on the part of a certain Stephanus Edenensis in his commentary on the Syrian liturgy. We have not

Direct acquaintance with the rebuttal of Damian was at least made possible by the accession of two manuscripts to the library of the Collegio dei Neofiti, probably brought there by the Jacobite bishop Moses, teacher of Syriac at the college from 1581 till 1585. Thence they were taken, along with other manuscripts of the College, to the Vatican Library in the autumn of 1662, probably at the instigation of Abraham Ecchellensis (al-Ḥāqilāni) who listed them among the Oriental collection in his catalogue (completed by another Maronite, Matthaeus Naironus, and dated 1686) under the numbers 39 and 47(?). Further manuscripts of the work entered into libraries in London and Berlin in the 19th century (see below), though, apart from isolated forays into the work in search of fragments from distinguished authorities quoted as proof-texts by Peter⁽⁸⁾, almost nothing was done to investigate the text at first hand and for its own sake.

Indirect acquaintance with it, though, was advanced by study, in the first instance, of the Coptic-Arabic historians predictably hostile to the adversary of a distinguished Egyptian pope. The chronicles of Peter ibn Rāhib, published in Latin translation, by the Abraham Ecchellensis mentioned above, in 1651⁽⁹⁾, and of Severus ibn al-Muqaffa', summarized by Eusebius Renaudot in his *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum* (Paris, 1713), record a few details of Peter's personality and writings. The long notice of Peter of Callinicus by J.S. Assemani in tome II, pp. 69-82 and 332-333, of his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (4 vols.

succeeded in identifying further this Stephanus or in finding his book. According to Assemani, Stephen translated *Qhuniqoyo* as 'fuller' and identified the author with Peter the Fuller (bishop of Antioch between 471 and 488, celebrated for his supposed introduction of the 'theopaschite' addition to the Trishagion). Assemani corrected the error: the word means 'from Callinicus'.

⁽⁷⁾ On Abraham al-Ḥāqilāni, see G. GRAF (op. cit. n. 5) vol. iii [Studi e Testi 146] (Vatican, 1949) pp. 354-359; on J.M. Naironus, *ibid.* p. 361. For their catalogue, see G. LEVI DELLA VIDA (op. cit. n. 5) pp. 7, 374-397; on the transfer of the manuscripts from the Collegio dei Neofiti, *ibid.* pp. 410-420.

⁽⁸⁾ E.W. Brooks, tireless in his search for fragments of Severus, drew upon the work for his edition of Severus' letters in *Patrologia Orientalis*. An alleged fragment from Eustathius of Antioch, appearing in *Against Damian* III ch. 40, and curiously misread and mistranslated by B.H. COWPER, *Syriac Miscellanies etc.* (London, 1861) p. 60, has been a cause of puzzlement: see M. SPANNEUT, *Recherches sur les écrits d'Eustathe d'Antioche* (Lille, 1948) pp. 37-39 and L.R. WICKHAM, 'Translation Techniques Greek/Syriac and Syriac/English' in *V Symposium Syriacum. 1988* [OCA 236] (Rome, 1990) pp. 345-353, esp. 348.

⁽⁹⁾ See G. GRAF (op. cit. n. 5) vol. ii, pp. 434f., vol. iii, p. 356.

Rome, 1719-1728), the standard reference point of study of Peter for many years, makes use of this material. Moreover he added information he had found in the Vatican Library from the ancient Syriac sources: Ps-Denis of Tell-Mahre (Vat. Syr. 162), a fragment of the *History* by the genuine Denis (Vat. Syr. 144)⁽¹⁰⁾, the list of Jacobite patriarchs given by Denis Baršalībī in his *Against the Heresies*⁽¹¹⁾. Most importantly, he looked at the two Vatican manuscripts of *Against Damian*, mentioned above, and, with his nephew Stephan Evodius, provided a description of them with which there is, alas, much to find fault. The description is to be found in their volume *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus ... Tomus tertius complectens reliquos codices Chaldaicos sive Syriacos* (Rome, 1759), pp. 49-61 and 61-71. Le Quien's *Oriens Christianus* (3 vols. Paris, 1740; t. II, pp. 441, 1359) has also something to say of him. To these reports and fragments must be added the information on Peter and his work which became available through the publication in the second half of the last century and the early decades of the present, of the Syriac historians: John of Ephesus (in 1853, 1935), Barhebraeus (in 1872-1877), Michael the Syrian (in 1899ff.) and others. The more recent standard histories of Syriac literature and accounts of 'monophysites'⁽¹²⁾ in the 6th and 7th centuries treat of him; essays on aspects of his life and work have appeared; and some smaller pieces by him have been edited and translated. But though the outline of his controversy with Damian has been made visible, the text in which he conducted it has remained inaccessible. The present volume, all that remains of the second book of Peter's tri-partite treatise, is intended to initiate the process of remedying the defect. His book III, a good deal longer than book II, will follow in the series.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Published by J.S. Assemani (op. cit. n. 6) pp. 72-77, subsequently by J.-B. Chabot in E.W. BROOKS, *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae rhetori vulgo adscripta* [CSCO 84] (Paris, 1921) pp. 219-224; and by R. ABRAMOWSKI, *Dionysios von Tellmahre, jakobitischer Patriarch von 818-845* [Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XXV, 2] (Leipzig, 1940).

⁽¹¹⁾ Assemani also refers to a letter of Peter allegedly quoted by Barhebraeus - *locum non reperimus*.

⁽¹²⁾ The term, which gives offence nowadays to adherents of the tradition and was coined originally in opposition to the soubriquet "dyophysite" applied to the Chalcedonians, is difficult to avoid and remains widely current in the literature.

2. Peter's background and his career prior to the controversy with Damian

Little is known of Peter's early life and that little comes from external sources: mainly the Syriac historians Denis of Tell-Mahre as quoted by Michael the Syrian, Michael himself⁽¹³⁾ and Barhebraeus⁽¹⁴⁾. His birthplace was Callinicus, present day ar-Raqqah, on the left bank of the Euphrates close to the point where it is joined by the Balikh. His father's name was Paul. If we adopt the more probable reading of the historians' text and accept that he was still 'a young man' on his elevation to the patriarchate, we may guess that he was born in the 540s. Certainly, he embraced the religious life; his original monastery was perhaps close to Callinicus, Mar Hanīna, where he was ordained to the patriarchate in 581. As to his intellectual and spiritual formation we are thrown back upon what may be deduced from his writings, which at least bear out the observations of Michael the Syrian and Barhebraeus that he was eloquent and learned both in Greek and Syriac. The Greek eloquence and learning would seem to derive from education based on close reading of Greek patristic texts; the Syriac is evidenced by his *Poem on the Crucifixion*. There is no sign that he had studied non-Christian literature. Even the lighter passages of banter or sarcasm are repeated from the fathers.

The church communion to which he belonged was by no means negligible, though it had suffered attrition and the leakage of valued adherents to the state-church now irreversibly (as it was to turn out) committed to the dogmatic formulation of the council of Chalcedon. It was not the great Church Severus (patriarch of Antioch 512-518, died 538) had hoped and worked for, but it had its monastic centres, its episcopal sees in rivalry with the state-church and more than its share of intellectual vitality (as the controversy between Damian and Peter shows). It was a smaller communion, this connection of Syrian and Egyptian churches, committed to maintaining the legacy of Cyril of Alexandria by affirming the one incarnate nature of the Word and rejecting the Tome of Leo and the council of Chalcedon, tainted, it believed,

⁽¹³⁾ *Chronique* (ed. J.-B. Chabot, 4 vols. Paris, 1899ff.) Book X chs. 17ff.

⁽¹⁴⁾ *Chronicon* (ed. J.B. Abbeloos and Th.J. Lamy, 3 vols. Louvain, 1872-1897) I, pp. 250-260.

with the Nestorian teaching of two hypostases or prosopa. The union was fragile and liable to disruption, dissolved more than once through wrangles over rival candidates for office. The story will be told summarily.

Severus was deposed in 518 by the emperor Justin I and went into exile in Egypt. His following in the patriarchate of Antioch were exposed to harassment and persecution, and might have been brought to extinction but for their saviour Theodora, wife of Justin's nephew and successor, Justinian. Under her protection the archbishop of Alexandria, Theodosius, who had been made to live, in exile from his see, in Constantinople, ordained two new bishops, Jacob Baradaeus, archbishop of Edessa, and Theodore, bishop of the Arabs; these two, in turn, ordained a new hierarchy.

Not till 557, though, was a 'monophysite' successor appointed to Severus at Antioch⁽¹⁵⁾. In that year Jacob Baradaeus ordained to the patriarchate Sergius, a fellow-monk of the monastery of Phesilta, living with him in Constantinople. Sergius died in 561 and the throne of Antioch remained vacant. In 564 Theodosius called for the ordination to the patriarchate of his syncellus, an Alexandrian, Paul of Beth Ukkāmē. His tenure of office was brought to an end because, in 571, he bowed to the edict of Justin II and communicated with the Chalcedonians; and moreover he had ordained a Syrian archimandrite, Theodore, as successor to Theodosius (died June 19th 566), in defiance of the wishes of the Alexandrians, who demanded Peter as their pope. The first offence was atoned for by a three-year penance, the second proved more difficult to absolve. The aged Jacob Baradaeus wavered, sided first with Theodore and Paul, then with the Alexandrians and against Paul who retired into obscurity at Constantinople. Antioch was now once more effectively without a patriarch. Moves were made to secure one. Meanwhile in Alexandria in 578 Damian succeeded on Peter's death to the throne of St Mark. He was to accomplish much for the Egyptian

⁽¹⁵⁾ For the confusing list of pretenders to the sees of Antioch and Alexandria in the period see Adrian Fortescue's Appendice II pp. 356-357 in J. MASPERO, *Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie etc.* (Paris, 1923). The account by Maspero of the difficulties of the Egyptian church (chapters VI and VII) in this period is a masterpiece of subtle observation.

church, unifying the dissonant factions within it. So far as the sister church was concerned, matters were to be less happy. Of Syrian origin himself, with a brother who was Prefect of Edessa, he had a special concern with the affairs of Antioch. He encouraged the Eastern bishops to proceed to an election. A certain Severus was chosen and would have been properly consecrated by Damian but for the discovery of the illegal act by the state authorities who forced ordainers and ordinand into an undignified escape through the sewers.

It was in these inauspicious circumstances that Peter of Callinicus was asked to become patriarch of Antioch. Twice he refused the office, objecting that Paul was still alive; but in 581 he accepted and was ordained whether by Eastern bishops or by Damian (the authorities are divided over the matter)⁽¹⁶⁾. Paul's death, soon after, did not put an end to the disagreements over the legality of Peter's election.

Following his ordination Peter visited Alexandria, to resolve doubts about his standing with Damian, we may surmise, and to make contact with the large body of Syrian monks and 'monophysites' of his own persuasion near there. He took with him two learned experts, Proba and John Barbūr. These theologians made the acquaintance of the philosopher Stephen in Alexandria and were converted to his view that the difference between the two natures in Christ after the union can only be maintained if two natures in him after the union be conceded. This was considered incompatible with true 'monophysite' teaching. Proba and John were anathematized, and a schism, which lasted until Peter's death, was caused. If the documents belonging to the *Anti-Tritheist Dossier* are to be believed, the first four years of his patriarchate saw a cordial and harmonious relationship established between himself and Damian. Peter defers to Damian but without trace of animosity; Damian addressed him as a valued and admired colleague. The harmony was not to last. Its end was abrupt and, however predictable on other grounds, from the particular circumstances of the two men and the past history of their churches, arose from the doctrinal dispute with which the present work is concerned: the doctrine of God in Trinity.

⁽¹⁶⁾ For discussion of this and further details of the history see our *Peter of Callinicum. Anti-Tritheist Dossier* [OLA 10] (Louvain, 1981) pp. 1-8.

3. *Peter's writings*

Apart from the *Anaphora* mentioned above and the presently edited *Against Damian*, we have the following:

1. A *Poem on the Crucifixion* (edited and translated by R.Y. Ebied and L.R. Wickham in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S., vol. 26, 1975, pp. 23-37).

2. A Letter is preserved by Michael the Syrian (t. II, pp. 364-371; t. IV, pp. 383-384) — see below p. xviii; and in British Library Add. 12155 is a short fragment of another letter by Peter to some Eastern bishops, published in our edition of the next item, pp. 103-104.

3. *Anti-Tritheist Dossier*. The work is related to the controversy with Damian and so to the presently edited text from which it is apparently distinct. It contains an introduction and five letters, three of which are addressed to Damian, one to the church of Alexandria, and one to the monastery of the Antonines (or perhaps 'Enatonians', i.e. monks at the Enaton) and the administrators Isidore and Theodore. The dossier was composed by Peter to prove that he had always been an opponent of tritheism. It was published by the present editors under the title *Peter of Callinicum. Anti-Tritheist Dossier* [OLA 10], Louvain, 1981.

4. Besides these, Peter is known to have written a treatise against Proba and John Barbūr, in the name of the synod of Gūbba Barraya (584/585) which condemned the two. Nothing is known to survive of this treatise, which is mentioned by Denis of Tell-Mahre.

For the details here, we refer the reader to the Introduction to the *Anti-Tritheist Dossier*, pp. 7 and 11f.

II. The controversy with Damian

1. *Origins, narrative and postlude*

The starting point lies some 30 years before the writing of the present work, in the teaching of John Ascotzanges ('bottle-boots'), a theologian from Apamea who had been initiated into Greek philosophy at Constantinople by a certain Samuel of Reš'aina. Of John's literary work nothing survives, but we know he taught

that there are in the Trinity as many natures, substances and godheads as there are hypostases (Michael, t. II, pp. 251-253; t. IV, pp. 313-314). Whatever their content (no doubt partly *a priori* and epistemological, partly patristic) his arguments were sufficiently persuasive to win a following, and important enough to elicit, in about 560, a reasoned condemnation of the new 'tritheism', as its opponents called it. The condemnation was voiced by the exiled Theodosius, the authority for the 'monophysite' church. His short treatise *On the Trinity* (or *On Theology* — both titles are used)⁽¹⁷⁾ is an attempt to re-state what he views as the teaching of the fathers: each divine hypostasis viewed in itself is *a* substance or nature; but there are not *ipso facto* three substances or natures in the Trinity. To counter the extreme opponents of 'tritheism' he added the rider that the Word alone, and not the Father and the Spirit, was united to the flesh. No philosophical argument, only exegesis of patristic authorities, is offered. It is a mediating position, providing a formula which could be offered for written assent by the clergy of his church at Constantinople. Threat of disciplinary sanctions, and the esteem in which Theodosius was held, ensured the necessary signatures and unity was restored.

The unity was transient and illusory. On Theodosius' death, dissentient voices became louder and issues more sharply focused. In 569 the leaders of the 'tritheists', Conon of Tarsus and Eugenius of Seleucia, were anathematized and their heresy solemnly condemned by the Eastern episcopate.

Meanwhile the independent-minded and deeply learned philosopher, John Philoponus of Alexandria, entered the debate and threw his weight behind the 'tritheists' in a book, *On the Trinity* (rapidly translated into Syriac, of which only a few fragments have been preserved). His doctrine can be recovered from these and other fragments of his "tritheist" writings, and from his christological treatise, the *Arbiter*⁽¹⁸⁾, likewise extant in Syriac

⁽¹⁷⁾ CPG 7137. It is edited and translated by I.-B. Chabot, *Documenta ad originēs monophysitarum illustrandas* [CSCO 17, pp. 40-79; 103, pp. 26-55] and A. VAN ROEY - P. ALLEN, *Monophysite texts of the sixth century*, pp. 148-251.

⁽¹⁸⁾ See A. VAN ROEY, 'Les fragments trithéites de Jean Philopon' in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 11 (1980) pp. 135-163. The *Arbiter* (CPG 7260) was edited with Latin translation by A. SANDA, *Opuscula monophysitica Ioannis Philoponi*, Beirut, 1930, pp. 3-48; 35-88.

translation with a few lines of the original in John of Damascus' *On Heresies*⁽¹⁹⁾. It will be enough to say here that his teaching on the Trinity develops from his interpretation of the Aristotelian distinction between 'first' and 'second' substance: only first substance (πρώτη οὐσία), in the fullest sense of the particular, is, for John, actual; second substance (δευτέρα οὐσία) the generic concept, is a creation of the abstracting intellect ('a posterior fabrication and invention of the mind', in a phrase often repeated by Peter of Callinicus)⁽²⁰⁾. Applied to the doctrine of God in Trinity, this means that each divine hypostasis is equally God (the three are 'consubstantial' in this sense) but there is no actual Godhead distinct from the particular Godhead each is. Consequently we may indeed speak of three Gods and three Godheads, three substances and natures; the 'one' of the Godhead is in the viewing mind alone. Official condemnation, and an anathema from the pulpit of Alexandria by John of Cellia, ensued immediately. The effects, though, of John's teaching were to be lasting and to give considerable disquiet to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, Peter and Damian, a decade and a half later.

For both, 'tritheism' was a condemned heresy. Peter's disavowal of 'tritheism' and of John's theses, his success too in winning back 'tritheists' to the fold, are recorded in the vigorous rejection of Damian's allegation of covert 'tritheism' which constitutes the *Anti-Tritheist Dossier*. The allegation was made when the dispute between the two had become acute and scurrilous slander replaced balanced reporting.

As for the dispute itself, we know from what Peter himself says and what Michael the Syrian reproduces in book X ch. 22 of his *Chronicle* from Denis of Tell-Mahre (his 9th century predecessor as patriarch of Antioch) that it started with a book by Damian. Some time about 585 (the precise date is unknown) Damian was

⁽¹⁹⁾ B. KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos* IV [PTS 22], Berlin - New York, 1981, pp. 50-55.

⁽²⁰⁾ For the phrase see John Philoponus' Commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* (edited by Adolf Busse, Berlin, 1898) *Proemium* 9, 6-8: ταῦτα δὲ [viz. 10 genera] ἐπὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς θεωροῦνται καὶ εἰσὶν ὑστερογενῆ, ἀτινά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρῃ διανοίᾳ. P. 167, 13-14: ὁ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλης, φασί, γένη μόνα οἶδε τὰ ὑστερογενῆ καὶ ἐννοηματικά. P. 103, 18-19: περὶ δὲ τῆς ὑποστάσεως, ταῦτα φαμεν· τινὲς φασὶ μὴδὲν εἶναι τῶν πρὸς τι φύσει, ἀλλὰ ἀνάπλασμα εἶναι ταῦτα τῆς ἡμετέρας διανοίας.

asked by members of his community to write the rebuttal of a series of 'tritheist' *capitula*. He obliged in a book, entitled perhaps *Against the Tritheists*, and sent a copy, via 'some Byzantines', to Peter and invited comments and criticism. Peter found the formulation of Trinitarian teaching defective, especially in its treatment of the divine hypostases as 'properties', and responded 'in a meek note, full of praise' with a few points of hesitancy. This 'note' quoted in book III of the present work, contained a line reproduced by Michael: 'I have found in your book certain points which are ambiguous and I want you to make us clear on the matter'. The letter greatly irritated its recipient, who retorted with a long letter of justification: the *Long (πολύστιχος) Letter* or *Long Apology* frequently mentioned and cited by Peter.

Embarrassed by the turn of events, Peter tried to meet Damian and settle the business amicably. Only one letter, from what must have been several that were sent, remains and is to be found in the *Anti-Tritheist Dossier*, pp. 63-64; 92-94: an urgent request from Peter to the Egyptians for a meeting of the two patriarchs at an agreed place. A venue was appointed: Paralos, the present day Burlus on Egypt's Eastern borders three days march from Alexandria; but though Peter stayed there four months, no face to face discussion took place, Damian sending instead a second justification by the hand of one Zachariah and another by a certain Gerontius. Both are quoted in the present work. Peter claims to have been badly treated, prevented from going to Alexandria and finally hounded out of Egypt. He then returned, thwarted and irate, to Syria and his monastery at Gūbba Barraya (near Mabbūg, present day Menbij), his normal residence for he never set foot in Antioch. A letter of his to the monastery of the Antonines (or 'Enatonians'), the last item in the *Anti-Tritheist Dossier* (pp. 65-70; 94-102) complains of Damian and the miserable conditions at Paralos; it belongs to this period and was probably written *en route* for home.

Michael summarizes the rest of the narrative as follows: 'It was agreed that the two parties should go to Palestinian Arabia, and that the discussion should take place there. When they arrived there with the arbiters, Damian refused a personal debate and demanded that they should write to one another at a distance. Peter answered: «This is more a means of conflict than of peace. Let there be a debate before a synod at an agreed place.»

Damian, having accepted, made his departure, reached Arabia and then went to Egypt. Peter followed him and went to Alexandria in hopes that the discussion would take place there and that Damian would accept correction. But the business dragged on tediously; for Damian came neither to see nor to talk with him, but went about the monastic houses whereas Peter and his entourage stayed in the city. When Peter sent to summon him, he took flight and refused. Seeing him unwilling to come, Peter began to write a treatise in three books (*memrē*) against him. Thus Damian's teaching was rebutted. These things took place in the year 898 (= 586/7 A.D.).'

The account is terse, one-sided and leaves many things to be assumed. It can be filled out and corrected by Peter's own reports. In the first instance in a letter to some Syrians living in Alexandria, which Michael reproduces from Denis of Tell-Maḥre. Peter writes, so he says, to set the record straight in the face of lying rumours on the part of people who have no concern for peace but seek only a pretext to avoid discussion. Damian (making the initial move to resolve the deadlock) went with an entourage to the East in a secret and undignified fashion (to rally support there in a way that would not attract unwelcome publicity). A few days later the Syrians in Alexandria ('you') despatched a delegation headed by an archimandrite, which caught up with Damian at Gaza and then went on to Tyre (presumably to anticipate and foil Damian's attempts to influence opinion) where Damian and his party arrived soon afterwards. The archimandrite and his group had a meeting with Damian's bishops and invited them to make their way with them to Gūbba Barraya. The bishops declined the proposal (refusing to be detached from their patriarch to engage in unofficial conversations), but said that Damian was on the point of sending some of them to Peter's residence. The archimandrite and his party then made their way to Peter and told him to expect the arrival of the delegates. Peter sent two of his bishops to meet Damian's legates and the archimandrite with his associates went back to Gerra in Egypt (= present day Mahamdia) to tell the monasteries there of the arrival of the Egyptian bishops and 'to invite those of the country you had judged suitable to be present at the discussions, to be ready' (residents in Egypt — very probably Syrians — who would be sent by Peter's correspondents to join in the debates). Peter's

two bishops met Damian's two and together they arrived at Gūbba Barraya. Relations were friendly, though communion *in sanctis* was refused by the Egyptians. A letter from Damian which they brought showed, on the other hand, that Damian had not abandoned 'his usual obstinacy'. Peter asked for a delay of 12 days to consult a synod before replying. That was refused: the Pope could not be kept waiting so long. Peter suggested Arabia as a venue for a meeting (so Damian's letter had contained the offer of a meeting at a place to be decided) because it was under the control of the Ghassanid tribal ruler (phylarch) favourable to the 'monophysites'. The Egyptians countered with Antioch, though they knew that Peter was *persona non grata* there, but reached a compromise on Arabia. They then made their departure, without waiting for the arrival of Peter's synod. Afterwards Peter discovered that the pope had been distributing propaganda in an unsuccessful effort to win over the monks: 'his intention was to be a trouble-maker'.

A meeting of sorts, though, did take place at the monastery of Mar Sergius near the village of Gabīta (= present day Ġābiya). It was preceded by an incident. Damian refused to enter the monastery without Peter's express permission and Peter found him and his entourage standing outside it. Peter's response to Damian was the pointed retort that they had entered other monasteries without permission. In his letter he underlines to his correspondents the welcome he has given to the pope and the place of honour he has conceded to him (he has gone out of his way to be accommodating and it is not he — see above — who has refused communion *in sanctis*). But to no avail, according to Peter. An initial meeting came to grief over questions of procedure. Who was to be present? Where was the assembly to take place? Peter proposed Gūbba Barraya, where 'the majority of our fellow-believers are and which is close to Mabbūg, Aleppo and the region of Antioch where there are many capable brethren'. Damian refused to go to such an outlandish place (home ground, of course, for Peter), although he had passed by it not long before on his way to his brother at Edessa. Moreover, he did not really want to have a critical examination of the points at issue, but a discussion by correspondence where falsification was possible. These questions, then, were reserved to the phylarch to settle on his arrival from Mabbūg. Damian, according to Peter, was left in

a thoroughly humiliating position, which his party endeavoured to conceal with noisy agitation.

The phylarch arrived on Monday in Holy Week and Peter invited Damian to join in meeting him and arranging a venue. Damian pleaded the need to fix first the participants who should include the supporters he had collected at Tyre. The Ghassanid arbiter saw through the device and put pressure on Damian to appear at a second meeting held in the monastery of Mar Sergius. Both this and yet a third meeting failed to secure any agreement and neither touched on the doctrinal issue. The parties could not agree as to whose views were on trial; Damian objected to being told by Peter to stop chattering to his *periti*, and took the approach of one of Peter's entourage, John the Armenian, despatched in retaliation for Damian's constant interruption of Peter by unwanted messages, as a physical assault.

Clearly Peter and Damian were at cross-purposes over procedure, with Damian resentful of being entrapped in a public discussion unprepared and Peter anxious to settle the matter in an atmosphere favourable to his cause. At this stage, there was limited communion still between the two with the customary formal courtesies being studiously observed, despite the undignified behaviour of both parties. These outward gestures of unity ceased with Damian's departure for Egypt, Peter's pursuit of him, the failure yet again to secure a meeting to debate the doctrinal question, and the writing of *Against Damian*, whose last pages are an announcement that communion between the two is at an end and that those who value their religion should flee Damian's ministrations.

A further detail is to be added. In *Against Damian* III, 19 Peter tells us that whilst he was in the East, before making his journey to Arabia to discuss the points at issue with Damian, the Eastern bishops published a brief declaration on the faith with patristic testimonia, which Damian proceeded to misrepresent in successive *Festals*. Last year, he goes on, the seventh year (of his episcopate = 587/8), when he was 'in this big city' (= Alexandria, where evidently he wrote *Against Damian*) he begged Damian to come to a joint meeting. Damian refused and in his recent *Festal* 'in the eighth year' (= 588/9) had repeated his attack on Peter. The writing of *Against Damian* is to be dated after Easter 588.

The schism between Alexandria and Antioch lasted for about

30 years and was ended by the patriarchs Athanasius of Antioch (594-631) (successor to Julian who followed Peter) and Anastasius of Alexandria (606/7-618/9), Damian's immediate successor. Michael the Syrian (*Chronicle* X, chs. 26-27) reproduces four documents relative to the re-union: a joint letter announcing the end of the breach and setting forth a common profession of faith expressive of agreed certainties germane to the dispute; a letter of Athanasius to Cyriacus of Amida, giving a lively and partisan account of the negotiations conducted by *periti* from both sides, under the presidency of Nicetas the patricius, a layman, probably of the imperial church; a letter to Athanasius, declaring Anastasius' joy at the unanimity of faith achieved in the joint letter; and Athanasius' encyclical to the Eastern episcopate announcing the end of the schism. The re-union was not achieved without difficulties, and dissentients to it are named. The points disputed by Damian and Peter were debated, but no attempt is made in the joint letter to resolve in detail the question of the rights and wrongs of their respective positions. 'We decided not to make a comparative examination of the things done or written in the period of difficulties between the supporters of blessed pope Damian of this city of Alexandria, and those of blessed Peter formerly patriarch of Antioch, lest Christ's precious members fall anew into disputes on account of their discussion and logomachy ... If any heterodox person enquires «How do you interpret what was written in the time of difficulty between the blessed archbishops?», we respond: «The writers have gone to God; as for us, we are united in accord with the presently effected doctrinal agreement.»'

Officially, then, in 616⁽²¹⁾, when the schism was ended, the dispute between Damian and Peter was held to have led to a logomachy by their partisans, to be shrugged off as a temporary embarrassment to the underlying consensus. It was agreed in the joint declaration that there was much to regret in the behaviour of both sides, much to resent, however the blame be apportioned. The bare narrative, as we have given it, lends weight to this assessment: the doctrinal argument itself is but part of the story of the schism between the two churches, and the personal and church-political factors are all too evident. Doctrinal issues of

⁽²¹⁾ For the date see Maspero (op. cit. n. 15) pp. 321 ff.

considerable importance, however, were involved. To these we now turn.

2. *The doctrinal issues*

As we have seen, it was Damian's treatise refuting the doctrine of three substances, natures or Godheads in God which initiated the controversy. Peter read there that the three divine hypostases are 'properties': the characteristic properties of ingeneracy, generacy and procession. The details of Damian's thesis, as we read it in Peter's (selective) quotation will become clearer when all the fragments of Damian are before the reader in both books II and III. It will suffice to say here that for Damian the chief point to be established against the "tritheists" is the Church's tradition, as re-stated along strictly Nicene lines by Theodosius, that there is one divine substance, nature and Godhead: the one-ness of the substance is actual and not a figment of the mind; this one substance is the common nature of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. But 'Trinity' and 'Godhead' are not interchangeable terms: one of the Trinity, but not the 'one' of the Trinity, the whole substance but not Father and Spirit, became incarnate in Christ. Granted which, how is the relation of Father Son and Holy Ghost to the one substance to be construed, without making the real 'common' an independent entity? What is the content of 'hypostasis', as applied to Father Son and Holy Ghost, given that they are differentiated, or numerically separated, solely by their relationships to one another? If the one divine substance is each, then there is an end to differentiation and the names 'Father' 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' have no distinct bearers: 'they are mere names and relationships bereft of realities'. Conversely, if they are names of distinct, related realities, what is the 'one' that they substantially are? The tradition supplied no answer to these questions. Damian attempted one. The fathers use the term 'properties' of the three subsisting hypostases viewed in the one common substance. 'Characteristic', when added to the word 'properties', does not modify the sense. They therefore mean by 'properties', or 'hypostases', divine and substantial ingeneracy, generacy and procession. The content of e.g. the Son's 'hypostasis', then, is not the sum of two things, of Godhead and sonship (or 'generacy'), but is the unique and substantial subsistent divine

filiality; and the one substance of the Godhead is that in which each is viewed and participates. Timothy of Constantinople writes adherents of Damian's party down as 'tetradites', i.e. as maintaining that the divine substance, the 'one' of the Godhead, is an entity distinct from the three hypostases⁽²²⁾. It must be admitted that Damian comes close to saying this in passages quoted by Peter in book III chs. 41f. (perhaps indeed he does say it); but Peter spends relatively little time on the issue and does not breathe the word 'tetradite'. Damian had perhaps been betrayed into an indiscretion by the language of Pseudo-Dionysius' *On the divine names* which he had quoted, into speaking of a 'descent' from the ultimate Monad to the three divine hypostases. Certainly he has no intention to present the divine substance of the common Godhead as an independent being prior to a threefold differentiation. Damian has thus given his answer to the two questions: the one and common substance is actual in the three mutually participating hypostases; the three hypostases are the distinctive and substantial ingeneracy, generacy and procession. (Damian, of course, does not know a scholastic expression such as 'subsistent relationship'; but it would not be misapplied here, to explicate his understanding of 'divine hypostasis'). Now the fathers also speak of hypostasis as 'indicative of property'. That means, says Damian, that e.g. the hypostasis of the Holy Ghost is indicative of the divine procession: which is equivalent to saying that 'Holy Ghost' means 'divine procession'. Moreover, the names ('Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost') are incommunicable in the same way that properties are: the subsistent divine ingeneracy, generacy and procession participate *qua* divine but are unique *qua* ingeneracy, generacy and procession. From here it is but a short step for Damian to say (or appear to say) that the names 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Peter devotes most of the present book II to savaging Damian over this unfortunate way of putting the matter.

Now Peter had no objection to the use of the term 'property' (ιδιότης) in the sense of 'particular being' or hypostasis. It had indeed been so used by the fathers (meaning notably by Gregory

(22) Op. cit. PG 86, 60.

Nazianzen)⁽²³⁾. But this sense is distinct from the usage of 'property' (notably by Basil)⁽²⁴⁾ to designate the mode of being: the characterizing property or feature which uniquely distinguishes each hypostasis from the others. Damian, according to Peter, by muddling the two different senses has propounded a thesis to which there are a number of distinct objections. First, he has made nonsense of the teaching of the fathers; for there is no passage in their voluminous writings which identifies the characteristic property with the hypostasis so that Father, Son and Holy Ghost should be ingeneracy, generacy and procession. The places which Damian alleges have all been misread or misinterpreted. (It is a point which, as we shall see, was eventually conceded reluctantly by the experts who debated the matter later). A second objection moves beyond the simple historical point of the interpretation of the classic formulae. Damian's thesis is, according to Peter, simultaneously Arian and Sabellian. For since the characteristic properties characterize by mutual exclusion ('ingeneracy' precludes 'generacy' and 'procession'; 'procession' precludes 'generacy' and 'ingeneracy'; 'generacy' — or 'sonship' — precludes 'ingeneracy' and 'procession') Father, Son and Holy Ghost will, according to Damian, no longer be consubstantial but three different substances: the Arian conclusion. Or, if they are consubstantial, they will be appearances, successive manifestations, of a single substance: the Sabellian conclusion. There is, implicit in this, a third objection which shapes the structure of Peter's treatise as a whole: Damian has confounded names and things. If the Father is ingeneracy and conversely ingeneracy is the Father, the subject of predication has been made to disappear: the name has become a description without anything answering to it. This logical objection is the main theme of the present book II. Peter writes at the opening of book III: 'Now ... it was our task to prove by the fathers' teaching that the hypostases ... of

⁽²³⁾ Three passages are picked out in ch. I of Book III: *Or. 31* (PG 36, 164cd) '...the Father, God; the Son, God; the Spirit, God; three properties (τρεῖς ἰδιότητες), one Godhead undivided...'; *Or. 39* (PG 36, 345c) '... three in properties (κατὰ τὰς ἰδιότητας) or hypostases ... or prosopa...'; *Or. 33* (PG 36, 236a) '... one nature (φύσιν) in three properties (τριῶν ἰδιότησι)...'. For the standard modern discussion see K. HOLL, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern* (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1904) p. 171.

⁽²⁴⁾ The term comes to the fore in *Adversus Eunomium* from I,18 onwards.

the Trinity are by no means, as the excellent Damian falsely supposes, names and words but, rather, full and properly existing realities and ... we must examine these things in another essay to show that neither are they ingeneracy, generacy and procession, as, again, this author likes to think...' The proof that the hypostases are not names is given at length in book II, where the devastating consequences of Damian's denial of the distinction are drawn; the further proof that they are not the characteristic properties occupies most of book III.

The argument between Damian and Peter was complex and certainly productive of confusion in the minds of their followers. When matters were discussed at the re-union negotiations, the following articles were agreed: (1) that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are consubstantial, one God in word and reality; (2) ingeneracy, filiality and procession are not hypostases themselves, but their modes of being; (3) each hypostasis shares in the totality of the substance in such wise that the substance is the shared, the hypostasis the sharer (a point dealt with in Peter's book III, ch. 32); (4) God the Word, not the whole Godhead in Trinity, was incarnate, each hypostasis being in the full sense God, substance and nature. How these articles related to the arguments of Damian and Peter, how far each was in the right, was not adjudicated on. But it is at least clear that Peter's principal contention, expressed in (2), was, reluctantly, conceded.

A provisional placing of this controversy within the history of the Christian doctrine of God, might run as follows: the controversy concerns the answer of Christianity to the claim that it teaches three Gods. The claim on this occasion had been made not by opponents of, but by adherents to, Christianity; and that gives it an unusual interest. Moreover, there were good grounds for the claim in the standard authorities. For though the Cappadocian fathers, with Cyril and Severus, are not 'tritheists', still less are they unitarians. Damian produced an answer which exploited ambiguities in the terminology of the authorities. It drew forth a response from Peter strong in negative critique and demonstrating the impossibility of the proposed solution within the presumptions common to him and Damian. Peter's aim was limited: he sought only to show the consistence of the authorities against what he conceived to be Damian's distorted account of them. The discussions of particular cruxes are of special interest

here. For example in chapter VI he deals with the bewildering variety of ways in which *ἀναρχος*, *ἀγέννητος*, *γεννητός* are used by Gregory Nazianzen, and in chapter XIV with the notion of the substrate to which the properties belong. The close reading, the attention to detail, are admirable. Peter annotates, and in some measure clarifies, the intentions of his authorities; in some measure 'advances' upon them. It is not to be expected of him that he should challenge the terms in which they taught. More fundamental than this limitation is that he never explains how he would have answered the 'tritheists'. The divine hypostases may not be the characteristic properties, they must each have a substrate. But what is the substrate each has? They may not be names, they must be bearers of names; but what is left when the name is abstracted in thought? What is the one divine substance, when it is distinguished from the hypostases? And if it cannot be distinguished, how is it actual? To these questions Peter seems to return no answer.

III. The treatise against Damian

Of the three original books of the treatise only II (or most of it) and III (almost complete) survive. The torso we published under the title *Anti-Tritheist Dossier* might have formed part of I, but there is no evidence it did and we must assume that I is lost.

Six Syriac manuscripts preserve the 'direct' tradition (no Greek fragments are known): three belong to the British Library (Add. 7191, 7192 and 14603); two to the Vatican Library (Syriac 107 and 108); and one to the Berlin Library (Sachau 201). Of these manuscripts Add. 7191 (described below) is the most extensive and the only one to preserve book II (with lacunae).

1. The title

If Peter ever gave his treatise a full title, we do not know what it was. The manuscripts offer nothing more than designations of the work as 'against' (ܐܘܢܬܐ) or 'to' (ܕܐܘܢܬܐ) Damian. Both Syriac words might translate *πρός*, and the work is both addressed to, and in refutation of ('against') Damian. We follow the manuscripts and call the treatise *Against Damian*.

2. Division

The division into books has given rise to a misunderstanding which requires detailed consideration, since the error has occasioned misdescriptions of the work.

According to J.S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, t. II, p. 77: '*Liber adversus Damianum* in quatuor partes dividitur, et unaquaeque pars in capita quinque supra viginti.' It is not immediately apparent how he arrived at this conclusion. He had at his disposal Vat. Syr. 108, which bears the title 'Last (ܐܘܢܬܐ) part of the third book (ܕܐܘܢܬܐ) of Peter the archbishop of Antioch against (ܕܐܘܢܬܐ) Damian', and gives the last 25 chapters of book III; and also Vat. Syr. 107 where he claimed wrongly (l. c. p. 78) to have found fifteen fragments of chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 84, 88, which are not in Vat. Syr. 108. So Assemani could certainly have known that Peter's work had three books; but how he could assert that each part had 25 chapters, if he had found chapters numbered as 84 and 88, is quite obscure.

When, later on, the Assemanis wrote their catalogue of Syriac manuscripts in the Vatican Library, they knew that according to Barhebraeus Peter's work comprised three parts (see *Catalogus*, t. III, p. 58). However, they persisted in the earlier error: 'Vero similis videtur, *quatuor partibus* contineri, ita ut unaquaeque pars capitula XXV comprehendat: quemadmodum indicavimus Tom. I (*sic; lege* II) *Bibl. Orient.* pag. 77. Exstat enim opus illud, etsi mutilum, in codicibus syriacis XV et XVII (alias XXXIX et XLVII) et in altero quidem codice, quem postea recensebimus, continentur capita L, nimirum a XXVI ad L. In hoc vero, quem prae manibus habemus, codice, fragmenta quaedam exhibentur, nimirum capita II, III, IV, V, X, XI, XIV, XV, LXXXIV et LXXXVIII.'

W. Wright followed the Assemanis in their error in his *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since the year 1838. Part II* (London, 1871) under number DCC = Add. MS 14603 (p. 586). In that manuscript he found chapters 1-25 of book III of *Against Damian*. He read on f. 5^v: *Second ketobo of Saint Peter of Antioch against Damian of Alexandria*, and assumed that the manuscript contained the first 25 chapters of book II of *Against Damian*. But he did not take note of what follows the words quoted: *Third memro*. The title standing at the head in the

table of contents of the manuscript would have made the matter plain: *Chapters of a part of the third memro against Damian*. The colophon likewise runs: *There are given in this ketobo twenty-five chapters of the third memro of the saint and blessed Mar Peter, patriarch of Antioch, against the impious Damian; the whole memro comprises 50 chapters*. Wright went astray because he understood *ketobo* (as spoken of on f. 5^v) to refer to the books into which the whole work was divided, whereas it refers to volumes. 'We see, therefore,' (he writes, pp. 586f.) 'that the whole work was divided into two books, each containing 50 chapters, and each book into two discourses of 25 chapters (compare Assemani *Bibl. Or.*, t. II, p. 77, no. vii).' The error is repeated and compounded in the Appendix A of his *Catalogue* (t. III, p. 1206) where he corrects the description given by Forshall (Forshall and Rosen *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum qui in Museo Britannico asservantur. Pars prima* — London, 1838 — p. 83) of numbers L and LI (= Add. MSS 7191 and 7192). According to Wright, Peter's work comprised two books, Add. MS 7191 containing 'the second half of the first book' and all the second book and Add. MS 7192 'part of the second half of the second book of Peter's treatise against Damian'. Add. MS 7191 cannot contain the second half of a first book with 50 chapters in it, seeing that the relevant chapters are numbered from 6 to 22. A comparison with Vat. Syr. 108, had Wright been able to make it, would have shown that Add. MS 7192, contains nothing from a second book, since the corresponding section in the Vatican manuscript is headed 'from the latter half of the third *memro*'.

Now the division of the work into three *memrē* is settled by the clear testimony of Michael the Syrian (*Chronicle*, t. IV, p. 83; t. II, p. 367 — see above p. xviii). The text of the third *memro* and its identity as third are assured by the Vatican MSS 107 and 108, the Add. MSS 7191, 7192 and 14603 of the British Library and the Sachau MS 201 of the Berlin Library. What of the first and second *memrē*? The second is contained in Add. MS 7191, where a text comprising certain chapters numbered from 6 to 22, along with what are evidently fragments of the same work, precedes the third *memro*. There is no index of chapters, and though the heading *Of Saint Peter the patriarch against Damian* appears on f. 8^v, 13^v, 18^v, 24^v, 34^v and 40^v there is no other note of identity. That this is in fact what remains of book II (the

second *memro*) is evidenced by the appearance of extracts from the text in florilegia with lemmata attesting that the passages derive from Peter's second *memro* (see below). As for the first *memro* nothing of it appears to have survived either in manuscripts which preserve the other two or in florilegia.

The misunderstanding which attended Wright's description of the division is resolved as follows. Each *memro* was divided into chapters. The third certainly comprised 50 chapters. In some 'editions' this *memro* was divided out between two *ketobē* or volumes, as is the case with Vat. Syr. 108 and Add. MS 14603 which constitute the first and second volumes of such an arrangement; sometimes it was complete in a single volume, as with Add. MS 7191. The probability is (see below) that book II consisted of some 20-odd chapters and, with the first *memro*, constituted the first volume in the arrangement represented by Add. MS 14603 and Vat. Syr. 108.

IV. The textual tradition of book II *Against Damian*

A description of the MSS containing only book (*memro*) III will follow in the volume in this series devoted to its edition. Here we confine ourselves to the contents and provenance, so far as it can be determined, of Add. MS 7191 (which contains, on folios 1-41, what may be called the 'direct tradition' of the text here edited) and to a briefer account of florilegia extracts (the 'indirect tradition').

1. *The Direct Tradition*

British Library Add. MS 7191 is a large parchment volume of 175 folios (350 pages). The text, in two columns, measures 215 by 126 mm., each column being 58 mm. in length and comprising from 53 to 62 lines of writing. The manuscript has suffered some damage. Top corners are missing on folios 1, 113 and 170; a bottom corner on 134. On folio 75 the upper and middle portions have disappeared; and likewise almost all the middle of folio 173. Folios 84^{r-v}, 114^r, 121^{r-v}, 130^v and 131^r have been badly affected by damp.

The writing is in small estrangelo, by a single hand (apart from folios 36, 39 and perhaps some lines on 51^{va}) comparable with

that of Add. MS 7192⁽²⁵⁾. Forshall gave it a 10th century date⁽²⁶⁾. Wright found this too late and ascribed it to the 7th century⁽²⁷⁾. With E.W. Brooks⁽²⁸⁾, we follow Wright in the matter, with the proviso that none of the Syriac manuscripts has (so far as we know) been subject to physical tests and that differences of hand in dated Syriac manuscripts of widely divergent periods are hard for the unpractised eye to detect.

The manuscript formed part of the collection of 68 Syriac manuscripts acquired in the East by Claudius James Rich (1786-1821)⁽²⁹⁾, British Resident for the Honourable East India Company, from 1808 till his untimely death, at the court of the Pasha of Baghdad. In his catalogue of all his collection (which included, besides the Syriac, many Arabic, Persian and Turkish manuscripts) published in Vienna in 1813-1814, he promised a separate description of the Syriac. It was not written and we do not know where Rich found this particular manuscript. No doubt the colophon named scribe and monastic library to which it once belonged; the tear on folio 173 has, alas, deprived us of that information. It is unlikely that the manuscript comes from the depository, near the monastery of Rabban Hormuzd at Mosul, of, mostly damaged, books whose wretched state Rich describes in his *Narrative of a Residence in Koordistan* (London, 1836, II, pp. 95-97): he implies that he got none from there; moreover, it would be odd (though not impossible) to suppose that a 'monophysite' text had found entry there. We do not know if our manuscript was described in the continuation of the catalogue of Rich's collection made by his brother-in-law, William Erskine,

⁽²⁵⁾ See W.H.P. HATCH, *Album of dated Syriac Manuscripts* (Boston, Mass., 1946) for a conspectus of the styles of writing in manuscripts, from different collections, ranging in date from 460 to 1118.

⁽²⁶⁾ J. FORSHALL and F. ROSEN, *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum qui in Museo Britannico asservantur. Pars prima* (London, 1838) p. 83 under MS number L.

⁽²⁷⁾ W. WRIGHT, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since the year 1838. Part II* (London, 1871) p. 587 under manuscript number DCC = Add. MS 14603 (containing the first 25 chapters of book III); see also Appendix A (vol. III, London, 1872) p. 1206, where some details of Forshall's description are corrected.

⁽²⁸⁾ PO 12 (Paris, 1916), p. 172; 14 (Paris, 1920), p. 22.

⁽²⁹⁾ For Rich's career and his collection see J.R.F. THOMPSON, 'The Rich Manuscripts' in *British Museum Quarterly* vol. 28 (1964) pp. 88-95, and the British Library exhibition notes to an exhibition in 1986 *Claudius James Rich, diplomat, archaeologist and collector*.

probably between 1821 and 1825, the year his collection of 802 manuscripts was bought (though not paid for — that had to wait a year) from Rich's widow. A Parliamentary Grant of £7500 sufficed for the purchase price⁽³⁰⁾.

On acquisition by the British Museum the manuscript was in a bad state. Not only was it far from complete, but its remaining leaves were detached from one another, damaged and in disorder. Its preservation required immediate re-inforcement of the leaves with parchment, their proper ordering and pagination. Some time later, discrepancies in the order were noted; a new ordering and fresh pagination were given (perhaps by W. Wright); and the volume was re-bound. On re-binding, blank sheets of paper were intercalated between folios 2/3, 20/21, 22/23, 24/25, 37/38, 47/48, 61/62, 65/66, 73/74, 94/95, 102/103, 113/114, 119/120, 169/170, 171/172. They do not always mark a lacuna in the text.

There are no traces in the manuscript of a numbering of the quires. But there are three paginations: one in Syriac letters, written in ink by a hand other than that of the text and placed towards the middle or on top (ff. 41, 42, 43, 44...) of the outer margin; and two modern paginations in Arabic numerals, written in pencil at the top in the outer margin of each leaf. The present pagination of the manuscript runs from 1-173. The previous in Arabic numerals is as follows: 67-140 (133 seems to be missing), corresponding with ff. 1-74 of the present pagination: 1-29 corresponding with ff. 75-103 of the present pagination; 120, corresponding likewise with f. 104; 31-66 likewise with ff. 105-140. This older pagination goes no further.

The Syriac pagination is not preserved in its entirety; it has often disappeared or become illegible. The following can still be made out: f. 2: ܐ (3); f. 18: ܐ (19); f. 19: ܐ (21); f. 21: ܐ (22); f. 22: ܐ (23); f. 23: ܐ (24); f. 24: ܐ (25); f. 25: ܐ (26); f. 26: ܐ (27); f. 27: ܐ (28); f. 28: ܐ (29); f. 29: ܐ (30); f. 31: ܐ (32); f. 32: ܐ (33); f. 35: ܐ (36); f. 37:

⁽³⁰⁾ Erskine's catalogue has gone missing in the British Library. According to a communication of Yasin Safadi, who was responsible for drawing up the Rich exhibition in 1986, to Vrej Nersessian, Curator in charge of the Christian Middle East books and manuscripts, Erskine's catalogue starts from Add. 7200 and did not include Add. 7191 and 7192. (We are grateful to Dr. Nersessian for this information).

لد (38); f. 38: ܠܕ (39); f. 40: ܠܕ (41); f. 43: ܠܕ (45); f. 44: ܠܕ (46); f. 45: ܠܕ (47); f. 46: ܠܕ (48); f. 47: ܠܕ (49); f. 48: ܠܕ (50); f. 59: ܠܕ (61); f. 60: ܠܕ (62); f. 61: ܠܕ (63); f. 63: ܠܕ (65); f. 67: ܠܕ (70); f. 70: ܠܕ (73); f. 76: ܠܕ (80); f. 82: ܠܕ (86); f. 83: ܠܕ (87); f. 84: ܠܕ (88); f. 85: ܠܕ (89); f. 86: ܠܕ (90); f. 94: ܠܕ (98); f. 95: ܠܕ (100); f. 102: ܠܕ (107); f. 103: ܠܕ (109); f. 113: ܠܕ (119); f. 115: ܠܕ (121); f. 117: ܠܕ (123); f. 118: ܠܕ (124); f. 119: ܠܕ (125); f. 120: ܠܕ (126); f. 124: ܠܕ (130); f. 125: ܠܕ (131); f. 126: ܠܕ (132); f. 127: ܠܕ (133); f. 129: ܠܕ (135); f. 130: ܠܕ (136); f. 133: ܠܕ (139); f. 134: ܠܕ (140); f. 135: ܠܕ (141); f. 136: ܠܕ (142); f. 137: ܠܕ (143); f. 138: ܠܕ (144); f. 139: ܠܕ (145); f. 140: ܠܕ (146); f. 143: ܠܕ (149); f. 144: ܠܕ (150); f. 145: ܠܕ (151); f. 146: ܠܕ (152); f. 147: ܠܕ (153); f. 148: ܠܕ (154); f. 150: ܠܕ (156); f. 153: ܠܕ (159); f. 155: ܠܕ (161); f. 157: ܠܕ (163); f. 164: ܠܕ (170); f. 165: ܠܕ (171); f. 166: ܠܕ (172); f. 167: ܠܕ (173); f. 168: ܠܕ (174); f. 169: ܠܕ (175); f. 170: ܠܕ (176). As we can determine, this pagination corresponds with the present, but with the discrepancy of one folio, from f. 2 (= 3 in the Syriac pagination) up to f. 40 (= 41); of two folios for ff. 43 (= 45 Syriac) to 63 (= 65 Syriac); three folios for the ff. 67 (= 70) to 70 (= 73); of four folios for the ff. 76 (= 80) to 94 (= 98); of five folios from f. 95 (= 100) to 102 (= 107); and of six folios from ff. 103 (= 109) to 170 (= 176). From this correspondence it may be concluded that the Syriac pagination is not old, but was introduced (by Rich or by a Syrian collaborator) when the manuscript was already the wreck it became. The author of the present pagination followed the Syriac pagination, but removed six folios.

The contents of the manuscript are as follows:

F. 1: contains a part of an unidentified chapter. *Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ. *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ. The folio appears to be an isolated leaf.

Ff. 2-20: *Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ. These give the end of chapter 5 (ff. 2-3^{va}), chapters 6-11 (ff. 3^{va}-19^{ra}) and chapter 12 without its conclusion. *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ.

Ff. 21-22: provide us with a passage lacking beginning and end but identifiable, thanks to some extracts in the florilegium of

Add. MS 14533 (see below), as belonging to chapter 13. *Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ. *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ. These folios almost certainly make up the inner folio of a quire.

F. 23 is an isolated folio, containing the end of chapter 14 (*Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ) and the start of chapter 15. *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ.

Ff. 24-37: give the final phrase of chapter 15 (*Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ), the chapters 16-21 complete and chapter 22 without its conclusion (*Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ).

Ff. 38-41: yield a continuous text, lacking beginning and end. *Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ. *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ. (The text of book II, as transmitted by the manuscript, ends here).

Ff. 42-61: from ff. 42 to 44^{vb}, line 3, the manuscript gives a list, incomplete at the beginning, of the 50 chapters of book III. The list starts, in the title of chapter 13, with the words ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ. From f. 44^{vb} to f. 61 we have chapters 1-8 and the start of chapter 9. *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ (= Add. MS 14603, f. 28, line 14).

Ff. 62-65 give the last part of chapter 9 (*Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ), chapter 10 and the first part of chapter 11 (*Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ).

Ff. 66-73 give the end of chapter 11, followed by chapters 12-14 and a good part of chapter 15. *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ.

F. 74 seems to be an isolated folio. *Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ; *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ.

F. 75 is apparently another isolated folio. *Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ... ܠܕܘܢܐ; *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ.

Ff. 76-169 continue chapter 15 (*incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ) and give chapters 16-48, and a good part of chapter 49. *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ.

Ff. 170-171 appear to be stray leaves. *Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ; *Explicit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ.

Ff. 172-173 continue f. 169, giving the last lines of chapter 49 (*Incipit*: ܠܕܘܢܐ ܠܕܘܢܐ) and the last chapter, 50, but almost half of f. 173 has been torn, with the result that only a few words remain of f. 173^{rb} and so of the end of chapter 50. However, with the help of Vat. Syr. 108, containing chapters 26-50 of *Against Damian*, a doxology and an *explicit* can be read.

After a decorative strip there were four lines of writing whose first letters only are preserved, *ܟܠܗ* *ܡܝ ܢܝ* *ܡܠܗܟ* *ܕܟܝܢ*; they must have recorded the division of the work into three *memrē*. After another ornamental band the opening of two lines can still be read, giving a doxology: *ܟܘܨܥܐ* *ܟܘܨܥܐ ܟܘܨܥܐ*. Finally, after a rather larger strip, we read the two words introducing a request for prayer on the part of the scribe: *ܟܘܨܥܐ ܟܘܨܥܐ*. On f. 173^v is found a text written in another hand; the upper part has been completely effaced and the rest is almost entirely illegible.

Readers' notes are to be found on a large number of pages; most are in a careless hand, though others are more stylishly written.

Ornamental strips of various sizes, appear between most of the chapters on ff. 3^v, 10^r, 14^r, 19^r, 23^v, 24^r, 27^r, 29^v, 33^r, 34^v, 44^v, 46^r, 47^v, 49^r, 52^v, 55^v, 56^v, 57^r, 61^r, 63^r, 65^r, 66^v, 68^v, 76^r, 82^v, 84^v, 88^v, 91^r, 94^r, 95^v, 98^v, 101^r, 104^r, 107^r, 111^r, 116^r, 119^r, 123^v, 126^r, 129^r, 132^r, 135^r, 137^r, 139^v, 142^r, 146^v, 150^v, 152^v, 154^v, 160^r, 161^r, 165^v, 172^r. The titles of the chapters are rubricated.

2. The indirect Tradition

Fragments of Peter's treatise against Damian are preserved in three Syriac florilegia transmitted in Add. MSS 12155, 14532, 14533 and 14538 of the British Library.

1. A Trinitarian Florilegium drawn from Peter's refutation

A Syriac florilegium, dealing with the doctrine of God in Trinity and seemingly drawn largely from the Syriac translation of Peter's work, is transmitted in the 8th century Add. MS 12155, ff. 2^v-117^r; and, less extensively, in the eighth century Add. MS 14532, ff. 94^{vb}-133^{va}, the eighth or ninth century Add. MS 14533, ff. 73^{ra}-89^{rb} and the tenth century Add. MS 14538, ff. 119^v-133^r. The florilegium dates, at latest, from the 8th century, but was probably composed earlier when the controversy was still fresh.

This florilegium is made up of quotations from the fathers, the latest being from Theodosius of Alexandria, and also of some passages from Peter's *Against Damian*. So far as one can judge (seeing that *Against Damian* is known to us only in part) the corresponding patristic texts are quoted in the florilegium precisely as read in our work, often with the same introductions and

in the order they occur in *Against Damian*. We note them in the apparatus of the present edition.

A question, though, arises. Many of the florilegium's patristic proof-texts do not appear in *Against Damian* as we now have it. Were these likewise borrowed from some non-extant portions of the work? That is most probably the case and they therefore have to be added to the text transmitted by the manuscripts containing Peter's work. There being no certain indication of their place in the text, we will publish them at the end of our edition.

Besides the patristic texts quoted in Peter's work, the florilegium also reproduced passages from Peter and Damian. They do not add anything to the text known from the manuscripts and will be indicated in the apparatus.

2. Add. MS 12155

This manuscript reproduces also in its ninth section (f. 131^r and the following folios) along with various extracts taken from fathers and theologians of the 6th century, some passages, solely attested here, taken from the first chapter of book II *Against Damian*. They are printed below pp. 3-7.

3. Add. MS 14533

The section running from f. 147^{va} to f. 161^{ra} dates from the 9th/10th centuries, and bears the title: *Questions and counter-arguments etc. against the impious heresy of Damian, taken from the treatise against it by Saint Peter, patriarch of Antioch*. Various extracts, some of them extensive, are given of *Against Damian*. Five extracts from book II are not extant in MS Add. 7191 and are to be found below at the beginning of the present edition, pp. 9-13. The rest are indicated in the apparatus.

V. The Syriac translation: its date and character

The translation was made for Eastern Christians of the Jacobite succession, for the majority of whom Syriac, not Greek, was the normal language of discourse. The monks and educated clergy who read theological writings, read them in translation; so much is evident from the large body of surviving Syriac versions of classic patristic texts. When, though, was *Against Damian* rendered into Syriac? It is possible that our work, in Syriac, was available

early enough to be put to use during the negotiations between Athanasius and Anastasius (see above) which issued in the re-union of the two churches. If the discussions were conducted by Syrian and Greek *periti* before a Byzantine Patricius and on the basis of Greek patristic texts, and so by those for whom Syriac translations may be presumed otiose, yet the fellow clergy and monks consulted by Athanasius may have needed, or at least welcomed, a Syriac version. At any rate, the apparent age of Add. MS 7191 (7th century) and the Trinitarian florilegium which used the Syriac translation show that the translation was in existence soon after the re-union.

Some clues both as to the *terminus post quem* and the character of the translation might be furnished by the presence of evidence that the translator made use of earlier and datable versions of the patristic proof-texts. A comparison of passages shows close agreement between the Syriac translation of Basil's *Adversus Eunomium* in Add. MS 17145 (an eighth or ninth century manuscript, according to Wright) and passages reproduced in our text. That agreement might still be the effect of a school or taught style of rendering and so accidental. However some other explanation must be more likely in this case where successive complete lines at a time are identical. Unfortunately we have no date for that translation beyond its *terminus post quem* given by the manuscript. It is unlikely that Peter's translator made use of bishop Paul's version of Gregory Nazianzen extant in British Library Add. MS 12153 (the version — not the manuscript — is known to date from 624). Probably he did not use either the version of Severus made by Paul of Callinicus about 528: the evidence is inconclusive. In sum: though there is an indication that he may have used previous versions, we are brought no nearer to knowing when the translator worked.

VI. Observations

1. *Observations on the English translation*

It has not proved easy to put into tolerable English a text which is itself a straightforwardly literal translation from another language. The Syriac translator follows faithfully a syntax which is unnatural to his native tongue and transfers unusual phrases or

words directly. We have sought to provide a version which permits the original Greek in its Syriac rendering to disclose itself. The calques will be readily apparent and will not, we hope, trouble the reader. We have been conscious that this is also a piece of Syriac literature with, as it were, rights to be respected. Some particular recurrent points of rendering will be mentioned here:

1. οὐσία and πρόσωπον, respectively ܠܘܘܬܐ and ܠܘܘܘܝܐ ('usia' and 'parsupho') have been rendered as 'substance' and 'prosopon'.

2. φύσις and ὑπόστασις, respectively ܠܘܘܐ and ܠܘܘܘܡܐ ('kyono' and 'qnumo') as 'nature' and 'hypostasis'.

3. ιδιότητες χαρακτηριστικαί / ܠܘܘܘܘܝܐ ܠܘܘܘܝܐ ('diloyoto myaqhnoyoto') have been rendered as 'characteristic properties' and 'proper' appears wherever ἴδιος or its cognates are suspected.

4. Likewise 'subsist' and 'substrate' wherever ὑφίστημι and the related ὑποκείμενον were evidently in the original.

5. One rendering needs a note of explanation: ܠܘܘܬܐ ('lwot') especially in the phrase ܠܘܘܬܐ ܠܘܘܘܝܐ ('lwot usia'). The semantic field of 'lwot' is not the same as that of περί. We have therefore rendered the phrase as 'belonging with the substance' rather than 'around the substance', as best satisfying the intention both of the Greek and the Syriac. 'Belong to' and the like renders the verb 'to be' with a dative or possessive genitive.

We refer the reader to the *Index Analyticus* to follow, at the end of the work, for clarification of other correspondences.

2. *Observations on the presentation of the text*

The Syriac text here presented is intended to reproduce all the information provided by the manuscript. Two deviations from the original format have been allowed:

1. The chapter headings are not here in red.
2. The paragraphing is ours.

The marginal signs indicating, and discriminating between, orthodox and heterodox quotations have been reproduced as they are in the manuscript. Some few conjectural additions and emendations are noted in the apparatus to the text.

Select Bibliography

Coptic Sources:

These consist of two chronicles:

1. The chronicle of Ibn Rāhib edited most recently by L. Cheikho, *Petrus ibn Rahib. Chronicon Orientale. Interpretationem olim ab Abraham Ecchellensi institutam tum a I.S. Assemano revisam iterum ad fidem arabici textus recognovit* [CSCO 45/46] (Beirut, 1903). [The previous editions mentioned in the title are: Abraham Ecchellensis *Chronicon Orientale, nunc primum latinitate donatum* (Paris, 1651); Assemani, Jos. Sim. *Chronicon Orientale Petri Rahebi Aegyptii primum ex Arabico latine redditum ab Abrahamo Ecchellensi, nunc nova interpretatione donatum ...* (Venice, 1729)].

2. *A History of the patriarchs of Alexandria* by Severus Ibn al-Muqaffa', bishop of Ašmūnain, edited and translated by Chr. Fred. Seybold *Severus Ben el Moqaffa'. Historia patriarcharum Alexandrinorum t. I, fasc. 1-2* [CSCO 52/59] (Beirut and Paris, 1904/1910); see also *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria. Arabic text edited, translated and annotated* by B. Evetts PO I (Paris, 1904), pp. 99-214, 381-518; V, pp. 1-215; X, pp. 357-551.

Syriac Sources:

J.B. Abbeloos - Th.J. Lamy *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon ecclesiasticum*. 3 vols. (Louvain, 1872-1879).

Anonymi auctoris Chronicon ad A.C. 1234 pertinens. II. Traduit par A. Abouna. Introduction, notes et index de J.-M. Fiey [CSCO 354] (Louvain, 1974).

A. Barsaum - I.-B. Chabot *Chronicon anonymum ad annum 819 pertinens* [CSCO 81/109] (Paris, 1920 / Louvain, 1937).

E.W. Brooks *Iohannis Ephesini Historiae ecclesiasticae pars tertia* [CSCO 105/106] (Louvain, 1935/1936).

E.-W. Brooks - I.-B. Chabot *Chronicon miscellaneum ad annum Domini 724 pertinens*; in *Chronica Minora. Pars secunda* [CSCO 3/4] (Paris, 1903) pp. 77-155; 61-119.

E.-W. Brooks - I.-B. Chabot *Chronicon ad annum 846 pertinens* *ibid.* pp. 157-238; 121-180.

E.W. Brooks - I.-B. Chabot *Eliae Metropolitae Nisibeni Opus chronologicum*. 2 parts [CSCO 62/63] (Paris, 1909-1910).

I.-B. Chabot *Incerti auctoris Chronicon pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum*. 2 vols. [CSCO 91, 104 / 121, 507] (Paris 1927-1933, 1989).

J.-B. Chabot *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199)*. 4 vols. (Paris 1899-1910).

I.-B. Chabot *Anonymi auctoris Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* [CSCO 81-82/109] (Paris, 1920 / Louvain, 1937).

I.-B. Chabot *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas* [CSCO 17/103] (Paris, 1907 / Louvain, 1933).

Manuscript catalogues:

St. and J.S. Assemani *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus*. 3 vols. (Rome, 1756-1759).

J. Forshall and F. Rosen *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum qui in Museo Britannico asservantur. Pars prima* (London, 1838).

E. Sachau *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften* [Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, XXIII. Band] (Berlin, 1899).

W. Wright *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, acquired since the year 1838*. 3 vols. (London, 1870-1872).

Secondary Literature:

J. Maspero *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des Églises jacobites (518-616)* (Paris, 1923).

E. Honigmann *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle* [CSCO 127 Subsidia 2] (Louvain, 1951).

See also R. Devreesse *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe* (Paris, 1945), esp. pp. 93f. 119.

The following articles deal with Peter and aspects of the controversy with Damian:

A. Van Roey, 'L'œuvre littéraire de Pierre de Callinique, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche' in *Actes du XXIX^e Congrès International des Orientalistes. Section organisée par Frédéric Feydit* (Paris, 1975).

Id., 'Une controverse christologique sous le patriarcat de Pierre de Callinique' in *Symposium Syriacum 1976* [OCA 205] (Rome, 1978) pp. 349-357.

C.D.G. Müller, 'Damian, Papst und Patriarch von Alexandrien' in *Oriens Christianus* 70 (1986) pp. 118-142.

Acknowledgements

As with so many other patristic writings it is owing to the farsightedness and kindness of Marcel Richard that Peter of Callinicus' treatise now sees the light of day. He, it was, who in 1948 drew the attention of Albert Van Roey to the importance of the work and asked him to edit and translate it. At his request the Institut de Recherches et d'Histoire des Textes procured and made available photo-copies of the manuscripts.

The editors acknowledge with gratitude a subvention from the British Academy which made possible work at an early stage of this edition. They extend warm thanks to the librarians in London, the Vatican and Berlin for assistance in responding to queries, and to Jacques Noret for tireless help in compiling the apparatus to the translation.

ANALYSIS OF BOOK II

Chapter I

Of this only fragments remain unless folio 1 (pp. 15-23) be part of it. The chapter as a whole probably set out in general terms the nature of the dispute. The fragments in the order 2, 1, 3 yield a short statement of Peter's whole case. Jews (it says) and Pagans, Sabellians and Arians, Damianites and tritheists appear to have entirely contrary opinions. In fact they have a common error: either they do not believe in the Trinity at all or they think it a purely mental abstraction (fragment 2). Jews have no idea of God as Trinity; Pagans none of a single divine substance save as a mental abstraction. Sabellians make the Trinity merely verbal; Arians a triad of different substances. The followers of John Philoponus (Arian parasites) make the one substance a posterior concept by mental abstraction, and so make paganism respectable; Damian and his partisans make the hypostases and the divine substance different things: naturally, for a mental abstraction, and names and properties must be different from existing realities (fragment 1). A proof of some kind will have intervened, based perhaps on the texts given on fol. 1 (pp. 15f.) from which Peter draws together the conclusion that the 'three' and the 'one' are to be affirmed (fragment 3).

Chapter III

Three isolated passages set out objections to Damian:

1. If τὸ ἀναρχον and τὸ ἀγέννητον are simultaneously hypostasis and its characteristic property, by parity of argument the Godhead will also be its characteristic properties: which is absurd.

2. If the ὑπόστασις of the Father is an οὐσία/φύσις, then the difference of the hypostases entails the difference of their individual nature and Godhead.

3. Damian interprets the fathers as identifying the characteristic properties (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) and the hypostases (Father, Son and Holy Ghost). By transferring what the fathers say of the characteristic properties to the hypostases and *vice versa*, Father, Son and Holy Ghost on one hand lose

their consubstantiality and on the other hand are made to appear as attributes, or accompaniments, of the divine substance, not individually subsisting realities.

Chapter IV

The doctor (= perhaps Basil; cf. *Adv. Eun.* I, 14 — PG 29, 545A —: 'it remains to treat of ingeneracy itself, what it is and how it is viewed in the God of all') has said that ingeneracy is viewed in God. If ingeneracy is the hypostasis of the Father, the Father's hypostasis (according to Damian's argument) must be viewed mentally in the Father: which is absurd (fragment 1). — Peter points out that the fathers (according to Damian's interpretation, self-contradictorily) maintain both that the characteristic properties are not the substance and that each hypostasis is the substance.

Uncertain chapter

Folio 1 contains a portion from an unidentified chapter. Peter here responds to an argument of Damian, reproduced in ll. 73-77*, that it is surprising and contrary to patristic teaching to find oneself accused of disloyalty to the fathers precisely at points where the opponents are being accused of failing to follow them. It is not unusual, Peter writes, for somebody rebutting one heresy to fall into the opposite heresy. The fathers were aware of this peril and Peter quotes in support three texts by Gregory Nazianzen taken from *Or.* 20, 41 and 21 (ll. 18-42), in which Gregory urges his hearers to take the *via media* between Arianism and Sabellianism. Peter, following his regular practice, now goes on to underline the points made in these texts (ll. 43-77) and exhort his opponent to refute the Tritheists who profess three substances, natures and Godheads, without falling into Sabellianism by reducing the divine hypostases to their characteristic properties (ll. 77-122).

Chapter V

The end of ch. V gives two quotations drawn from the treatise *On the Trinity* by Theodosius of Alexandria and from the *Contra*

*The references are to the translation.

impium Grammaticum by Severus of Antioch, showing that the term οὐσία can signify not only the species but also an individual hypostasis (ll. 1-51). The passage seems to be an answer to Damian's accusation of self-contradiction (cf. l. 49). In what follows Peter deals with the contradiction Damian claims to have found in Gregory Nazianzen. The patriarch of Alexandria had quoted (almost certainly in his treatise against the Tritheists) a text taken from Gregory's *Or.* 31 where Gregory taught that the Spirit is a substance and not something round, or belonging with, the substance (οὐ τῶν περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν). But Damian quoted also another passage from Gregory's *Or.* 42 where he had affirmed that the Father's property of being without beginning and the properties of the Son and Holy Ghost of being beginning (ἀρχή) or with the beginning (μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς) are not the nature but around, or belonging with, the nature. Peter's answer to the charge of self-contradiction on the part of Gregory is twofold: Damian has mutilated the text of *Or.* 42 by cutting out the affirmation of the divine unity (εἰς θεός) and has given two differing versions of the text (ll. 99-131, 132-144); Peter goes on to offer a correct interpretation of the text; when Gregory speaks of the ἄναρχος, of the ἀρχή and the μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, he means the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; but when he speaks of τὸ ἄναρχον or when Damian himself speaks of the appellations of the Son and Holy Ghost, what are meant are not the hypostases but their distinguishing properties (ll. 145-201). So Damian has misinterpreted the Theologian.

Chapter VI

The title signals four points: 1. ingeneracy and generacy are not hypostases but belong to the hypostases; 2. each hypostasis, considered individually, can be called God, substance and nature, whereas ingeneracy and generacy only accompany the substance; 3. 'unbeginning', 'unbegotten' and 'begotten' can mean various different things; 4. fresh examination of the text of Gregory Nazianzen's *Or.* 42, 14, quoted by Damian.

1. In *Or.* 29, 10 Gregory says first that the begetter and the offspring are the same thing, and then that ingeneracy and generacy are not the same thing. Clearly then, for Gregory, the hypostases and the properties are not identical (ll. 24-43).

2. Gregory affirms that each hypostasis, considered individually, is *a* substance, God, and *a* nature; that does not hold of the characteristic properties, ingeneracy and generacy (ll. 44-49). In proof that Gregory calls Father, Son and Holy Ghost individually a 'substance', Peter quotes texts taken from *Or. 40*, 41, *Or. 33*, 16 and *Or. 31*, 6. These texts had been used before by Theodosius of Alexandria in his *On the Trinity*. In proof that Gregory recognized each divine person as a 'nature', following Theodosius he quotes *Or. 32*, 21. Damian cannot prove that the characteristic properties are named 'God', 'substance' or 'nature' (ll. 50-135).

Peter now comes back to the charge of contradiction between the quotation from *Or. 31* cited before (ll. 84-86) and a statement by Gregory in his *Or. 42*, 15 (cf. ll. 147-153). Peter recalls the earlier rebuttal given in ch. V, 52-131, citing the text from the *Farewell Oration* in its full form (ll. 165-172). As in ch. V, 106-107, he notes that Damian has omitted from the passage its affirmation of the divine unity (ll. 173-178), and that Gregory clearly distinguishes in the text between the Father and the Son, on the one hand, and their characteristic properties; Damian's explanation of the text identifies them, with the result that Father and Son become properties of a different substance (ll. 178-199). How could Gregory have said that the Spirit is both substance and not substance? He would have had to say that the Spirit is both God and not God (ll. 200-216). Damian must prove that he said that (ll. 216-234).

3. Gregory uses the expressions 'unbeginning' (ἀναρχος), 'unbegotten' (ἀγέννητος) and 'begotten' (γεννητός) in different senses: of the divine nature and as designating one of its properties viz. infinity and non-temporality; of the Father's hypostasis and as designating one of its characteristic property viz. ingeneracy; and finally as the name of the Father's hypostasis (ll. 235-245). In *Or. 42*, 'unbeginning' is used both for the Father's hypostasis and for its characteristic property. In *Or. 29* the expressions are used of natures (created and uncreated), and as designating the hypostases of Father and Son and their characteristic properties (ll. 246-306). Conclusion (ll. 307-320).

In the text quoted from *Or. 29*, Gregory says that we can predicate 'consubstantiality' of the hypostases, but not of the characteristic properties, since these do not belong to the sub-

stance. The point is confirmed by a text from Basil, *Adv. Eun.* II, 29, which affirms that ingeneracy is external to the substance. Damian, then, by identifying hypostases and properties, must admit that the hypostases are external to the substance (ll. 328-368). Gregory, though, has clearly distinguished properties from hypostases in the text cited (ll. 368-383).

In *Or. 45*, 4, Gregory uses 'unbeginning' to express the non-temporality and infinity of God i.e. a property of the divine nature (ll. 384-404). But the Theologian also uses 'unbeginning', 'unbegotten' and 'proceeding' to indicate the names of the hypostases. Peter cites in proof *Or. 31*, 23 and *Or. 42*, 17 (ll. 405-433). According to Peter, Gregory, in the first passage, when he points out that 'unbeginning' and 'unbegotten' are terms of human invention, is not rejecting the realities they indicate (ll. 434-467). Basil, *Adv. Eun.* I, 5 and Gregory of Nyssa *C. Eun.* I and III, 5 make the same distinction between realities and names, discrediting the term 'ingenerate' (ll. 468-517). Peter expounds the quotation from *Or. 42* similarly (ll. 518-526). Finally Peter remarks that God is always the same, but the words by which God is indicated change. Some are found in the Bible; others have been invented by us (ll. 527-543). The various meanings must be distinguished carefully (ll. 544-564).

4. Peter now interprets the passage from *Or. 42* used by Damian to show a contradiction in Gregory (ll. 565-602) and rebuts Damian's allegation (ll. 603-627).

Chapter VII

In the previous chapter Peter rebutted Damian's interpretation of a text from Gregory Nazianzen; here he will prove from texts of Severus and other fathers, that Damian's interpretation of Severus leads to the view that the divine hypostases and their characteristic properties are mere words and names.

In a passage from his Second Apology, sent to Paralos through Zachariah, Damian said that the τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως of the divine hypostases separates the *names* from mutual confusion; appealing to a text from Severus' *C. Imp. Gram.* (ll. 21-38).

Peter answers: if the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are ingeneracy, generacy and procession, and ingeneracy, generacy and procession are names, the divine hypostases will be human inven-

tions, since human beings invent and bestow names. Texts cited already in ch. VI are recalled: Gregory Nazianzen's *Or. 31, 23, Or. 42, 17*, Basil's *Adv. Eun. I, 5*, Gregory of Nyssa's *C. Eun. III, 5* and a new extract of the latter text is given (ll. 75-112). Will Damian cling to his sabellianism or will he acknowledge, with the fathers, that the hypostases are not names but subsisting realities? (ll. 113-132).

Peter goes on to ask for an explanation of the expressions Damian has used in the passage quoted from his *Second Apology* 'the freedom from confusion and separation of the names from mutual participation'. Since Damian holds that names, characteristic properties and hypostases are all the same thing, it makes sense, for him, to speak of names being separated and participating where the orthodox speak of hypostases mutually participating and characteristic properties separating. To be consistent Damian should therefore admit that we are the creators of the divine hypostases (ll. 132-178).

Peter promises to explain in the next chapter the meaning of the phrase, 'participation of names' (ll. 179-186).

Chapter VIII

What can be predicated of the hypostases cannot be predicated of the characteristic properties. Because: 1. properties and names by no means participate mutually, whereas hypostases are in many respects identical; 2. the characteristic properties are said to 'belong with' the hypostases.

Peter will show that the doctrine of a 'participation of names' has no place in the fathers (ll. 9-13). Basil, *Adv. Eun. II, 4* is quoted (ll. 14-33). The text is analysed (ll. 34-55) and it is argued that what Basil affirms of the hypostases cannot be predicated of the names and properties. How can the names and the properties of several hypostases be mutually identical? (ll. 56-72). If Damian answers that they are identical in their substance and in their substantial properties, that ignores the fact that the properties of the hypostases are external to their substance (ll. 72-78). If names and realities absolutely must be identified, then it is equally necessary to recognize that the hypostases must change with their names (ll. 78-84). How, on this absurd theory, could names be mutually separated, for there would have to be something else to separate them? (ll. 84-117). A passage from Basil *Ep. 38* clearly

shows that the characteristic properties are distinct from the nature or substance (ll. 118-156). The fathers spoke of the characteristic properties as 'belonging with the hypostases', an expression which demonstrates that for them properties and hypostases are not identical (ll. 157-171). The chapter title indicates that this was the last point to be dealt with in this chapter.

Chapter IX

If the characteristic properties of the divine hypostases are hypostases, two absurdities result: 1. the hypostases cannot be separated by their properties, as the fathers teach they are, but by their own being; 2. the hypostases will be external to the substance and to themselves (ll. 1-10).

1. The characteristic properties are separated by their very being. If, then, ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases, they too will be separated by their very being (ll. 11-18). The fathers, though, teach quite the contrary: the hypostases are united in their being (substance) and only separated by their characteristic properties (ll. 18-24). Peter quotes in support Athanasius, *C. Ar. III, 3*, Basil *Ep. 38* and Gregory Nazianzen *Or. 42* (ll. 25-73) and analyses the passages (ll. 74-87).

2. According to Damian the hypostases are external to what they are. A text from Gregory of Nyssa's *Against Eunomius' Statement* (ll. 88-150), commented upon by Peter (ll. 151-185), illustrates the absurdity of Damian's position.

For Damian (according to Peter) the divine persons are alien to their substance (ll. 186-194). The fathers teach that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are distinct from the substance and from the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. If, then, these properties constitute the hypostases, they too must be distinct from the substance and from themselves. But that is not the fathers' teaching. By their distinction between the characteristic properties, on the one hand, and the substance and the hypostases on the other, they mean to defend (against Eunomius) the consubstantiality of the divine persons (ll. 195-242). Basil *Adv. Eun. II, 29* (already quoted in ch. VI, 341-350) proves that for the fathers ingeneracy is distinct from the Father's substance (ll. 243-256); *Adv. Eun. I, 5* (ll. 257-291), expounded (ll. 292-324), proves that ingeneracy is distinct from the Father's hypostasis.

Chapter X

In the previous chapter Peter has quoted the phrase from Basil *Adv. Eun.* I, 5; 'For if ingeneracy follows God'. He will now prove that it expresses Basil's own teaching not Eunomius'.

Basil says that the affirmation that 'ingeneracy follows God' is 'a consequence of the truth of the realities' (ll. 5-15); and that it is because ingeneracy is external that it does not jeopardise the consubstantiality of Father and Son (ll. 15-30). Peter quotes in support of his interpretation Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 29, where it says, 'ingeneracy follows the life': an expression, indubitably, of Basil's own teaching (ll. 30-55).

Damian may perhaps reply that Basil does not affirm that ingeneracy is external to, or 'follows', the Father, but that it is external to the divine substance. In which case, Peter answers, the Father, being (according to Damian), identical with his characteristic property, must be external to his substance. The point is reinforced by a quotation from Gregory of Nyssa's *Against Eunomius' Statement* (ll. 56-87). In fact Basil means that ingeneracy is external to the Father only and not to the common substance of the Trinity (ll. 88-141).

An objection from Damian: Basil says that ingeneracy is external to, or 'follows', the life, and 'the life' means the common substance not a single hypostasis. Peter's answer: when to 'life' is added the characteristic property of the hypostasis, the hypostasis is indicated, as Severus teaches in *Cathedral Homily 109* (ll. 142-186). So when Basil speaks of 'the life' which ingeneracy 'follows', meaning 'to which it is added (attached)', he is talking of the Father's hypostasis, as is obviously the case in other passages too (ll. 186-222).

The conclusion from this discussion is that, according to Basil, ingeneracy is attached to the Father's hypostasis as his characteristic property and is not an additional hypostasis (ll. 223-230).

Chapter XI

Characteristic properties and names, because they are totally different from one another, are not hypostases; hypostases are mutually similar and differ only in their names and properties (ll. 1-7 and 8-18).

Peter appeals to Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 28 and IV, Gregory Nazianzen *Or. 29*, and Gregory of Nyssa *C. Eun.* III, 10 (ll. 19-98). These passages were directed against Arius and Eunomius, but they equally rebut the new error which turns the hypostases of Father and Son into ingeneracy and generacy. Moreover, Damian's error reduces the divine hypostases to unsubstantiating names and properties, as Cyril has observed *Ad Hermiam* II (ll. 99-194).

In fact, ingeneracy and generacy do not introduce any contrariety between the realities but solely between the names. Peter appeals to Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 26, Gregory of Nyssa *C. Eun.* III, 1 and III, 5 (ll. 195-243). So it is not we, Peter writes, who distinguish properties and hypostases, that oppose the hypostases mutually, but Damian who identifies them (ll. 244-258).

Damian's supporters may answer, perhaps: we too, on the basis of these texts, accept a difference between characteristic properties and substance in the generic sense, and therefore do not speak of opposed hypostases. Peter answers: Gregory of Nyssa, in the passage quoted, uses 'substance' as a synonym for 'hypostasis' and not in the generic sense (ll. 259-279).

Peter ends by observing that identification of characteristic properties and hypostases entails the transference of the contrariety between the properties to the hypostases (ll. 280-300). Two texts are quoted from Severus (*C. imp. Gramm.* II, 17 and 18), who says that the divine persons are not mutually opposed in their common substance but in their properties (ll. 301-335).

Chapter XII

Severus writes in *C. imp. Gramm.*: 'ingeneracy and generacy are not empty names.' Damian quoted the text in his *Second Apology* (see ch. VII, l. 31) as proof that Severus identified properties and hypostases. Peter will rebut the interpretation (ll. 1-47).

Heretics have often used, in alleged proof of their teachings, texts which, in fact, contradict them, as here happens (ll. 48-59). Damian wants to prove that Severus identifies hypostases and characteristic properties and makes both empty names; he attempts to do so by quoting a passage where sabellianism is refuted (ll. 60-75) and ingeneracy, generacy and procession are affirmed not to be empty names but characteristic properties of real hypostases (ll. 75-113). If the characteristic properties are not the properties

of real hypostases, they must be empty names. According to Damian, they are only relationships between relationships. Names and properties pre-suppose the existence of the realities whose names and properties they are (ll. 113-122). Proof follows from texts of Gregory Nazianzen *Or. 31*, and of Gregory of Nyssa *C. Eun.* III,1 (ll. 123-158) analysed *seriatim* (ll. 159-198, 198-208). Severus, in the passage adduced by Damian, teaches the same thing... (ll. 209-218). The manuscript breaks off here.

Chapter XIII

The beginning and the end of this chapter are missing (*vide supra*, p. xxxii). Here Peter rebuts Damian's interpretation, given in his *Letter to the Eastern Bishops*, of a passage from *C. imp. Gramm.* II, 17, in which Severus, on the basis of Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 4, teaches, allegedly, that the proper names are the hypostases. The surviving text begins in the middle of Damian's exegesis (ll. 1-33).

Where, Peter asks, could Severus have read in Basil any such teaching? When Basil speaks of 'Peter' and 'Paul', he means to speak not of their names but of their hypostases (ll. 34-87). These hypostases, clearly, can only be indicated by names, as some biblical quotations demonstrate (*Gen.* 2:19-20; 3:20; 4:25-26; 17:5 and 15; *Luke* 1:57-63) (ll. 88-152). Actually, Damian can find the false teaching he has espoused nowhere in Basil (ll. 153-193). On the contrary, some passages in Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 4, contradict it (ll. 194-236).

A fragment preserved in Add. 14533 belongs in this context.

Chapter XIV

Only the end of this chapter has been preserved. Damian had cited, in proof of his doctrine, Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 4 (see l. 77), already cited above ch. XIII, 4-5 and VIII, 17-21, 23-26 (ll. 1-9). Peter, on the contrary, finds here a rebuttal of Damian. For we read that the properties are seen, or appear, with each hypostasis (τοις δὲ ιδιώμασι μόνοις τοῖς περὶ ἕκαστον θεωρουμένοις). If the properties are, as Damian teaches, the hypostases, the hypostases appear with themselves (ll. 10-18). Besides, how could there be any idea of Peter's and Paul's properties, in the way Basil writes of, in the absence of any substrate for the properties? (ll. 19-31).

Texts by Basil, *Ep. 210*, and Gregory of Nyssa, *C. Eun.* III,5, confirm the point (ll. 32-76). Moreover, in Basil's text, cited by Damian, Basil never mentions Peter's and Paul's properties without mentioning their hypostases (ll. 77-96).

Chapter XV

Only a few lines from the beginning of this chapter survive. According to the title, Peter criticized the inconsistency of Damian's versions of patristic passages and argued, against Damian, that names follow realities and not the reverse (ll. 2-6).

In his *Against the Tritheists* Damian has quoted correctly Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 4: ὧν οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐσία, ὡς ἡ ὑπόστασις νοουμένη, but in his *Letter to the Eastern bishops*, he had used the same text minus its last four words: ὡς ἡ ὑπόστασις νοουμένη.

Chapter XVI

In this brief chapter Peter examines the next part of the text by Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 5 which Damian had adduced in favour of his thesis, in his letter to the Easterns (*vide supra* ch. XIII, 1-11). Basil says here that the names 'Peter' and 'Paul' indicate the properties of Peter and Paul not their substance. Similarly, he says, with Father and Son: though the Son must be consubstantial with his Father, the names 'Father' and 'Son' do not express this consubstantiality but merely affirm that one is unbegotten and the other begotten (ll. 1-28). A text from Gregory of Nyssa *C. Eun.* I confirms the point (ll. 29-69).

The names, then, indicate the hypostases. But that does not mean that the names *are* the hypostases. Basil himself makes the difference plain in the text quoted: he speaks first of 'Father and Son' and then of their 'names'. If hypostases and names were the same thing we should have to say (substituting 'names' for 'hypostases'): 'In the case of the hypostases of Father and Son, the *hypostases* (instead of the *names*) do not display the substance'; or 'In the case of Father's and Son's *names* (instead of *hypostases*), the names do not display the substance' (ll. 70-98).

Chapter XVII

Peter continues his examination of Damian's words in his letter to the Eastern bishops (*vide supra* ch. XIII, 1-27). In chs. XII-

XVI, he criticized Damian's interpretation of Basil, *Adv. Eun.* II, 4-5. He now follows this with a criticism of the exegesis of Severus *C. imp. Gramm.* II, 17 (ll. 1-15).

Damian's words about Severus are repeated (ll. 16-33) and his insidious method of proving his doctrine from the fathers is denounced (ll. 34-55). He claims that Severus had read in Basil that the names are hypostases. It has been shown, Peter answers, that this is not Basil's teaching (ll. 56-68). Damian has mutilated Severus' text (ll. 69-101). Even mutilated, and less comprehensible, it suffices to rebut Damian's interpretation (ll. 102-116).

Severus writes that 'with us' human beings, the concept of manhood comprises many hypostases i.e. Peter, Paul, John and all other human beings. When the patriarch says 'with us', he obviously does not mean to talk about names (ll. 117-125). What sense would talk of a substance comprising many *names* have (ll. 125-126)? If names and hypostases were identical, a single hypostasis could comprise several, since the same hypostasis can be called by different names, as Basil says, *Adv. Eun.* I, 7, in reference to Christ (ll. 127-143). Again, Severus affirms that the hypostases participate in the substance. Could *names* participate in the substance? If so, will not each entity participate twice in the substance; once *qua* reality and once *qua* its name? In which case each person is duplicated (ll. 143-153). Damian could respond: No, since I identify names and hypostases. To which Peter answers that Basil distinguishes the two, teaching that the names follow the realities; and Christ too, by declaring that 'heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away' (ll. 153-165).

Severus writes that Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing equally in the human substance. No reasonable person could say that the *names* of human beings participate in the human substance. Were that so, a new human being would be created every time anyone is given a new name (ll. 166-179). If Peter, Paul and John were only names, they would be mutually distinct only by the letters constituting the names (ll. 179-188); moreover the differences would be so great as to nullify the consubstantiality (ll. 189-202). It would be absurd to predicate of *names* the complete similarity Severus predicates of the divine hypostases (ll. 202-206).

Peter has thus proved that for Severus Peter, Paul and John are

individual realities, indicated by, but not being, simple names (ll. 207-226). Damian should attend to his own words in his treatise against the Tritheists, and bring forward patristic texts which genuinely teach his doctrine (ll. 227-261).

Chapter XVIII

Peter examines in this chapter a text by Severus, *Cathedral Homily 90*, adduced in support by Damian. The text is quoted and explained (ll. 1-23) and Peter calls attention to the rule that texts are to be interpreted in context. Here Severus says, 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are characteristic *titles*, whereas in the text quoted from *C. imp. Gramm.* II, 17, he wrote, 'Peter, Paul and John are *hypostases*' (ll. 23-39). The two passages are to be explained from their contexts.

First *C. imp. Gramm.* II, 17. It is part of a work against John the Grammarian who interpreted the Chalcedonian formula of 'two natures' in the sense of 'two substances', an interpretation which would lead to the conclusion that the whole Trinity is united to the whole of humanity. Severus in his critique insists upon the distinction between the divine hypostases. He means the hypostases, not their names, when he writes that they participate in the common substance (ll. 40-124).

Peter goes on to the second text, *Cathedral Homily 90*, quoting a long passage immediately preceding the extract quoted by Damian (ll. 125-183). Severus is here rebutting Arians who argue from the difference of names to a difference of substance between the divine persons. Clearly here Severus means the names 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' (ll. 184-207). It would make no sense to say of the *hypostases* that they are 'explanatory of, and characteristic of, the hypostases'; or that 'the *hypostases* do not divide the hypostases in terms of superiority and inferiority' (ll. 207-211). To produce that sense, Damian would have had to find a text in Severus which identified names and hypostases. Severus, on the contrary, in the passages from *C. imp. Gramm.* adduced earlier in the chapter, clearly distinguishes them, designating by 'Peter', 'Paul' and 'John' the *hypostases* of Peter, Paul and John, not their names (ll. 211-244); whereas in the passage from *Cathedral Homily 90* he says that 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are explanatory *titles* (ll. 245-254).

Peter declares that he will abide by this interpretation until proof is offered to the contrary from the words of Severus or any other doctor. Damian himself urged his readers, in chapter 13 of his book against the Tritheists, to stick to the straight-forward interpretation of the fathers (ll. 254-276). Peter, for his part, will follow Damian's advice; and that obliges him to repudiate Damian's theology (ll. 277-310).

Chapter XIX

This chapter continues the previous one, and is devoted to the interpretation offered by Damian of the words from *Cathedral Homily 90*: 'The titles "Father", "Son" and "Holy Ghost" are characteristic and explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion, without dividing the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority.' As he had said in the previous chapter, Peter is going to show from the fathers that this text of Severus is to be placed in the context of polemic against Arians who made the difference of names a ground for a difference of substance between the divine persons; it does not imply that the names are hypostases (ll. 1-15).

Peter adduces, first, the three Cappadocians: Basil *Adv. Eun.* II, 4 and II, 5 quoted previously, partially at least (chs. VIII, 15-23 and XVI, 2-5); Gregory Nazianzen *Or.* 29, 16; and Gregory of Nyssa *C. Eun.* III, 5 (ll. 15-86). Cyril of Alexandria *Thesaurus* IV and XIX (ll. 87-133) is quoted next. In this text Cyril asserts that the difference of names does not entail that the divine persons are not consubstantial. Cyril also implies that the names do not constitute the hypostases (ll. 134-164).

It must be maintained, then, that the names 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' do not indicate different substances, but only the Father's ingeneracy, the Son's generacy and the Spirit's procession; thus we cannot say that the names are hypostases, but must affirm that the names are 'characteristic titles, explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion' (ll. 165-190).

Severus himself proves that this is indeed the meaning of his words. Peter quotes some long passages from Severus' *Against Alexander's Codicils* and *Letter to Eupraxius* (ll. 191-255). In these passages, as in *Cathedral Homily 90*, Severus says throughout the same thing: the hypostases are not to be thought of as mere names but as individually subsisting realities (ll. 256-280).

Faced with this evidence, Damian must choose: either he must grant a contradiction between Severus' statements; or he must allow their agreement and so admit that 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' in *Cathedral Homily 90* designate the hypostases' names and not the hypostases themselves; or he must reject the authority of the fathers and simply follow his own absurd idea of reducing the hypostases to insubstantial names (ll. 281-308).

The application of Damian's theory to Severus' texts produces absurdities (ll. 309-367). But why prolong the argument? The error is self-refuting, as Basil says, *Adv. Eun.* I, 27, even if it is dressed up in texts from the fathers, as Cyril declares (*Thesaurus* Prologue), to be a common practice of heresy (ll. 368-398). Damian's readers are warned! (ll. 399-409).

Chapter XX

As he had announced at the end of the previous chapter, Peter proposes to prove that Damian has contradicted himself. The title, and the opening of the chapter, say that patristic proof will likewise be offered (ll. 1-11). This, though, does not appear in the present, but in the succeeding, chapter.

In proof of Damian's self-contradiction, Peter first quotes passages from Damian's treatise against the Tritheists, ch. 4; from his letter brought to Peter by Zachariah; and from his letter to the Eastern bishops (ll. 12-28). In these texts Damian identifies the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost with their names (ll. 29-40). Peter contrasts these passages with others taken from chs. 8, 9 and 14 of the same treatise in which the hypostases are spoken of as subsisting realities or the names are said to represent realities (ll. 41-68). Faced with these words of Damian, Peter quotes *Jas.* 3:7-12, on the dangers of the tongue (ll. 69-80). He goes on to show how Damian contradicts himself (ll. 81-101). Moreover, if the 'names' (كلمات), 'titles' (ألقاب), 'words' (كلمات), and 'expressions' (تعبيرات) (all apparently synonymous terms, as the various passages from Damian indicate) follow the hypostases, as Damian says, must we not admit that the names are not the same thing as the hypostases? (ll. 101-129). Besides, if Damian's theory is followed and 'titles' replaces 'realities' in Damian's texts, absurdities are produced (ll. 130-146). Peter will not labour the point (ll. 147-150).

Chapter XXI

If the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are only names, as Damian maintains, baptism, the sacrament of our regeneration, will be robbed of its value (ll. 1-21).

Basil, *De Spir. Sancto* 44 and *Ep. 210*, Gregory Nazianzen *Or. 42* and *Or. 6*, Severus *Cathedral Hom. 119*, and Theodosius of Alexandria *On the Trinity*, are cited (ll. 22-110) in proof of their teaching that we are not baptised into the names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but into the divine persons themselves (ll. 111-169). How then can it be maintained, with Sabellius, that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are only names? (ll. 170-186).

Chapter XXII

As he had promised (ch. XXI, 16-19), Peter will now show in more detail from the fathers that names and things ('the realities') are not identical, but that names mean, or indicate, things (ll. 1-12).

Athanasius *C. Ar.* II, 3-4, Basil *Adv. Eun.* I, 10, II, 7 and IV, Gregory Nazianzen *Or. 29*, 13 and *Or. 30*, 16-21 are quoted to this effect (ll. 13-243). The manuscript breaks off in this quotation. From the subsequent discussion it appears that in the lacuna of the manuscript there were other quotations (see below).

After quoting these passages, Peter, following his usual practice, discusses the points he judges rebut Damian's thesis. When the manuscript resumes, we are given the discussion of Basil *Adv. Eun.* IV (ll. 244-276). Analyses of the passages from Gregory Nazianzen *Or. 29* and *30* follow (ll. 277-311, 344-374), interrupted by Peter's apology, supported by Athanasius *Ep. ad episc. Aeg.*, 11 and 13, for labouring the obvious (ll. 312-343). Discussion of passages which have disappeared in the lacuna now follows: Gregory Nazianzen *Or. 31* (ll. 375-400); Gregory of Nyssa *C. Eun.* III, 5, *Against Eunomius' Statement* and *C. Eun.* III, 8 (ll. 401-486); John Chrysostom *In Phil.* hom. 6 (ll. 487-500); Cyril of Alexandria *Thes.* XII (ll. 501-512), XIX (ll. 512-537 and 538-581), XXIII (ll. 582-593), V (594-600), *Ad Hermiam* I (ll. 601-637); and Severus *C. imp. Gramm.* II, 28 (ll. 638-663).

In conclusion Peter apologizes for the length of the argument. Gregory of Nyssa, *C. Eun.* III, 2, III, 3 and Severus' *Letter to Oecumenius* are drawn upon as support for the excuse (ll. 664-

722). An error publicized by books requires extended rebuttal (ll. 723-741).

The manuscript breaks off here, but the chapter seems nearly complete. It leaves the impression of being the final chapter of the book.

ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ

PETRI CALLINICENSIS
CONTRA DAMIANVM
LIBER SECVNDVS

[Chapter I]

* By Saint Peter, patriarch of Antioch, from the first chapter of book II against Damian:

..... For the Jews profess what they worship as only one *
 hypostasis and have not the impress, even in mere phantasy, of
 the Trinity. The pagans, again, introduce a collection of gods and
 5 either do not concede at all the existence of the 'one' of the
 community or concede that it is viewed only in thought. And
 again, the Sabellians, by confining the Godhead to one hypostasis,
 preach a trinity only of mere names. And again, Arius' idle
 10 hornets, by thinking, in heathen fashion, of the three hypostases
 as different in substance, in all ways nullify their being one
 substance and nature. Likewise, their parasites too deceive by
 impiously and polytheistically prating of the three hypostases of
 Father, Son and Holy Ghost as 'consubstantial substances and
 15 natures' and consequently as 'Gods and Godheads', and by
 following their guides so as to say only verbally that the three are
 one, proclaiming that the one substance of the Godhead is a
 posterior fabrication and an invention of the mind and thereby
 rendering heathen myth-mongering very respectable. However,
 20 the leaders of this newly invented terminology too, by defining
 the Father, Son and Holy Ghost as the characteristic properties
 and names of the hypostases, are seen to be calling the one 'three'
 only in imagination and phantasy and they fall into equal, though
 opposite, absurdity. Hence, people mutually contrary in other

[מפלאו מן כנסת]

Add. 12155

Fol. 131rb

* מפלאו מן כנסת : כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא *
 * כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא

Fol. 131va

כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא * כנסתא דכנסתא
 5 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 10 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 15 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 20 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 25 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא
 כנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא דכנסתא : כנסתא דכנסתא

Line 21: כנסתא דכנסתא; Add. 12155 reads: כנסתא דכנסתא.

25 respects, arrive, by different modes of thought, at the same
 conclusion: they think the substance is one thing and the hypostases
 something else. And very fittingly! For how was it possible for
 those who, as they say, profess in the full sense that there are the
 three hypostases, but who in imagination and phantasy, and
 30 again by some posterior concept and invention of the mind,
 fabricate, from these, one substance and Godhead, not to sup-
 pose the hypostases one thing and the invention of their minds
 something else? Or again, for those who profess one substance
 and Godhead 'in fact and in truth', but who define the hypostases
 35 as being names and properties (I mean, ingeneracy, generacy and
 procession) not, of necessity, to teach the hypostases as one thing
 and the substance of the Godhead something else? For, as has
 been proved, ingeneracy, generacy and procession are not the
 substance, * and clearly not the Godhead either, but characteristic
 40 properties of the hypostases, whereby the hypostases are separated
 from one another in their mode of being.

From the same chapter before the preceding:

For what is common to them all is that either they do not
 profess the three as one and the one as three with true religion at
 45 all, or that they suppose it to exist in mere reason and only by
 mental imagination; though, on the contrary, they know that this
 is to utter blasphemous nonsense.

From the same chapter:

You see that the three are not different things but are one in
 50 Godhead, and this 'one' is three in properties; and that the united

25 ܕܥܠ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 30 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 35 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 40 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ

Fol. 131vb

45 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ

ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ

50 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ

ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ
 ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ

Line 36: ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ; Add. 12155 reads: ܕܗܘܬܘܬܗ.

is the divided, and that the truly existent is 'one' and 'not one'.
 For in the concept of the substance it is one, but in the properties
 indicative of hypostases it is divided into faith in Father, Son
 and Holy Ghost, being neither divided separately nor united
 55 confusedly.

55
 60
 65
 70
 75
 80
 85
 90
 95
 100

appear to be nothing but characteristic properties, he may there-
after, in accordance with his design, alienate the hypostases of
Father, Son and Holy Ghost along with the properties from all
25 the things which are truly and particularly said about them: I
mean, from their subsisting individually; from each of them, seen
individually, being in the full sense and truly * God, substance
and nature; from the fact that, being conceived of with one
another, they are God; and from the rest of the things which
30 cannot possibly be said about characteristic properties. But he
will say about them all the things which are said about character-
istic properties: for example, their not subsisting properly; their
belonging with the substance and with each one; their attaching,
being seen and accompanying, from outside; and similar things,
35 none of which do we find said of hypostases.

25
 30
 35

25
 30
 35

Fol. 147vb

[Chapter 4]

* Again, from the fourth chapter of the same book:

But let us also carefully consider the fact that the doctor ruled that 'the ingenerate' (to which the father added 'ingeneracy') is seen in thought in God i.e. in the Father. Therefore, let those who call ingeneracy the Father's hypostasis infer the shameless consequence for themselves that the Father's hypostasis is seen in thought in the Father.

Again, from the same:

For if 'the unbeginning' and 'the ingenerate' (i.e. ingeneracy) is the characteristic property of the Unbeginning (i.e. of the unbeginning and ingenerately existing Father) and the property characteristic of the Father is, as you maintain the doctors thought, the Father's hypostasis; must they not be found to be subverting their teachings, because sometimes they acknowledge each of the three hypostases of the Holy Trinity, when seen on its own, as substance and nature and also as God, but sometimes they rule that the characteristic properties i.e. ingeneracy, generacy or procession (what you are supposing hypostases) are not substance or nature?

[מפלה וקריאה]

* וסוד ה' מפלה וקריאה וכל וקריאה * Fol. 147vb

כל וסוד ה' מפלה וקריאה וכל וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה

* סוד ה'

כל וסוד ה' מפלה וקריאה וכל וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה
והוא שכל וקריאה וקריאה וקריאה

[Part of an uncertain chapter]

* prevail, inasmuch as not ... patristic teaching ... is secure ... patristic teaching ... we shall thus think; in these ... accuse; as not being patristic doctrine. Let us investigate because of the expressions ... sophistical. Why do you say, you subtle fellow, 5 that it is impossible ... that the perversion of the truth for example to censure others ... from the truth; so that in your struggle with the impious tritheists you could babble everything that came into the mind about the divine mystery without examining it, or do you think men released from those people's defiling disease cannot fall into other absurd heresies? It is time, then, 10 you acquitted all the heretics (as it were) who have ever existed, on the grounds that in many cases they lapsed into various lawless impieties when writing against heresies. You have, indeed, had proof of this already from the fathers' teachings in the 15 foregoing, nevertheless learn here, from other proof-texts as well, that those who do not stand firmly on the faith's true rock, lapse very easily, even when combating heresies.

GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN spoke as follows in his *First Oration on the doctrine of God*: We worship, then, the Father, the Son and the 20 Holy Ghost, separating the properties but uniting the Godhead, and neither merge the three into one (lest we fall sick with Sabellius' ailment) nor divide into three of different stock and foreign (lest we rave with Arianism). For why should we force, as it were, a plant very bent in one direction over to the other side and correct distortion with distortion, 25 instead of straightening it out half-way and taking our stand within the bounds of true religion? Moreover in the oration *On the arrival of the Bishops* he uses the same theological expressions, and says: To the contentious shifts of argument now this way now that, * and the counter-balances, let us, then, bid adieu, neither sabellianizing with the

19/26 Greg. Naz., Or. 20, 5 (PG 35, 1072A; SChr., vol. 270, pp. 66-68)
28/33 Greg. Naz., Or. 42, 16 (PG 36, 476C; SChr., vol. 384, p. 82)

Add. 7191
Fol. 1ra

..... *
: ...
: ...
5
10
15
20
25
30

20
25
30

Fol. 1rb

... those who lawfully ... For how can ... I example the confession fits ... the ... rejected one ... Therefore, since they hold godlessly to one ... in some concept of posteriority ... and figment of the imagination ... but they make the hypostases of the Holy Trinity in heathen fashion substances and natures, but necessarily also Gods and Godheads, we must eradicate their foul opinion lawfully, by acknowledging in accordance with the fathers' definitions, the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost as one Godhead, one substance, and one nature in both thought and reality. Now let us repudiate the stupidity which makes the divine substance an invention of the mind and somehow defines the hypostases of the Holy Trinity as Gods, Godheads, substances or natures. Let us not (as you, you accurate author, see fit to do) by heedlessly and godlessly defining them as the characteristic properties of the hypostases thereby also deprive them of being hypostases. This is the point the Theologian is alluding to when he says: For why should we force, as it were, a plant very bent in one direction over to the other side and correct distortion with distortion, instead of straightening it out half-way and taking our stand within the bounds of true religion? And again: Neither sabellianizing with the one over against the three (and dissolving the division by a mischievous confusion) nor arianizing with the three over against the one (and overthrowing the one by a pernicious division); for it is not our aim to exchange one evil for another, but to avoid missing the good.

Either, therefore, prove you were prevented by us from lawfully overthrowing polytheist and polyusiast doctrine and be justly astounded at our unreasonable criticism, for it is truly the

100 ...
 105 ...
 110 ...
 115 ...
 120 ...
 125 ...

...
 ...
 ...

Line 121: ... cf. p. 17, line 33 (...).

120 height of folly to reject polytheists and yet criticize those who
have skilfully eradicated their loathsome opinion; or, if you
cannot prove this

130 *ἄποδοξασθῆναι ἄποδοξασθῆναι ἄποδοξασθῆναι ἄποδοξασθῆναι ἄποδοξασθῆναι*
ἄποδοξασθῆναι ἄποδοξασθῆναι ἄποδοξασθῆναι ἄποδοξασθῆναι ἄποδοξασθῆναι
..... *ἄποδοξασθῆναι*

Lines 131-132: *ἄποδοξασθῆναι*. There is a break in the MS here. Cf. introduction, p. XXXII.

* taken as perceived and considered on its own. And see how his peer, the accurate guardian of the fathers' doctrines, holy THEODOSIUS, in his often quoted *On the Trinity* testified to this fact, writing as follows: These points being thus distinguished and explained, it is clear that the words 'substance' and 'nature' are applied sometimes by the holy fathers to the generic and common meaning, sometimes to a single hypostasis perceived and considered on its own. Be ready to oppose these words and say to them loudly and clearly: 'You are wrong, you who signify hypostasis by the term "substance" but do not rule that hypostasis is the common substance comprehending the hypostases'. But they will tell you the truth: 'Seemingly, clever fellow, you do not know how extremely ignorant you are. For the one who says that hypostasis, even though named "substance" (when the term "substance" is also applied to proper hypostases) is not substance comprehending many hypostases, does not think or teach a contradiction. But the one who confuses and indiscriminately merges the meanings of common substance, understood in the generic sense, and single, proper hypostasis, on account of the sharing of the term, is at odds with himself'. Saint SEVERUS, whom you complain of, shall bear witness. He wrote as follows in the 28th chapter of the second book of his treatise *Against the Grammarian*: But we recognize the Son and Word, begotten before the worlds, incorporeally, impassibly and eternally as the Father's Word, as a single hypostasis. And if we find him denominated 'substance' by the God-clad fathers and doctors of the holy Church, we recognize that they used the term 'substance' instead of hypostasis; and let us not, because the term 'substance' properly speaking indicates the generic meaning comprehending a plurality of hypostases, transfer and ascribe the generic sense to the

2 'his' i.e. of Sev. Ant.; see 20 and 47 4/8 Theod. Alex., *De Trin.* (CSCO 17, p. 64, 7-10; 103, p. 44, 10-13) 22/34 Sev. Ant., *C. imp. Gramm.*, II, 28 (CSCO 111, p. 218, 11-24; 112, pp. 170,33 - 171,10)

ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις *
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 5 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 10 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 15 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 20 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 25 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 30 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις
 ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις ἁπόφασις

30 hypostasis of the Only-begotten and think of him not as a single
 hypostasis but as substance comprehending the three * hypostases for
 the reason that he has been called 'substance'. We should also interpret
 the appellation of the names or their imposition in accordance with the
 subject. So when we hear the sentence: *Man has been made like*
 35 *vanity* we do not mentally comprehend a single man, Paul, say, or
 Timothy, but all men, because each of them both is, and is
 named, 'man'. Now in the same way in speaking the sentence:
There was a man in the land of Uz, we have not (because we also
 know and name the whole race of men 'man') indicated already
 40 at this point the whole substance comprehending each one, by the
 expression 'a man'. In the same way, then, even though we
 employ the term 'substance' both for the substance in its generic
 sense and also for the particular hypostasis, we speak the truth
 without self-contradiction, if we say that hypostasis is not common
 45 substance comprehending the hypostases, and conversely that
 substance understood in the generic sense is not one hypostasis.
 Either, therefore, prove that God-clad Severus professes hypostasis
 as comprehensive substance, for this would truly be an opposition
 between teachings and not your charge of contradiction; or, cease
 50 opposing the truth and publicly ascribing to God's teachers of
 mysteries the tumult and confusion of your thoughts.

But please may we take a look at the contradiction he thrusts
 the Theologian into. He says in the course of fabricating his
 fallacious defence: Let us ask those who divert thoughts from sense
 55 whether they think the Theologian contradicts himself or do they con-
 sider such a supposition blasphemy! For he declared here that the Spirit
 is not one of the things belonging with the substance by saying the
 following: 'But if a substance, and not one of the things belonging with
 the substance, he will be thought of either as a creature or as God'. But
 60 in the discourse entitled *On the arrival of the Bishops*, having said that
 the unbeginning, the beginning and the with the beginning are the

34/35 Ps. 143:4 38 Job 1:1 54/66 Dam. Alex., from an unspecified
 apology 58/59 Greg. Naz., Or. 31, 6 (PG 36, 140B; SChr., vol. 250, p. 286)

30 : *οτι ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* <
 35 *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* < Fol. 2rb
 40 *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* <
 45 *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* <
 50 *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* <
 55 *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* <
 60 *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* <

55 *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* <
 60 *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* : *ουκ εστιν ομοιοτης αλλ ομοιοτητα* <

Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, * he ruled that the unbeginning (that is, the Father) does not possess unbeginningness as his nature, neither do the beginning (the Son) nor the with the beginning (the Holy Ghost) possess their appellations as their nature; for belonging with the nature, these are not natures.

Let us look closely at the trickery of these words of his. For, having pretended to act as advocate of the Theologian, he has convincingly (as he supposed) concluded, by the pretence of a surmise, that the doctor contradicted himself; because here he declared that the Spirit is not one of the things belonging with the substance yet in the discourse entitled *On the arrival of the Bishops* he taught: for belonging with the nature these are not natures. Thereafter he inferred logical impossibilities, as he supposed, by the doctor, and added: Why then do they judge they possess cleverness in retorting: how can the Holy Ghost be substance and not substance? For this, he says, which is also truly a manifest contradiction is the inference from the Theologian's words if something like this (as he supposes by his cavilling) follows upon the father's exact teaching. Or else, how can the Holy Ghost be substance understood as hypostasis and again also not be substance understood (as has been said) as hypostasis? So, because it is blasphemy to imagine that the Theologian is at odds with himself, it is obvious (so he is attempting to conclude) that the Holy Ghost, is not substance at all, but has been proved to belong with the substance. Such are the slanderous misrepresentations (as will become clearer in later passages) he devises, but it would be as well to inspect very minutely his astonishing explanation and for the friend of truth to observe how clearly the wretch appears unable to corrupt the expression and thought of the divinely inspired father. For, as if thunder-struck by it he almost ... his tongue, and somehow does not even speak ... because, apparently, he has no plausible

62/66 cf. Greg. Naz., Or. 42, 15 (PG 36, 476AB; SChr., vol. 384, pp. 80-82) 66 'natures' (sic): edd. φύσις (sing.), without note of variant 70/72 cf. supra, 56-57 72/73 cf. supra, 60 et 65-66 75/76 Dam. Alex., from an unspecified apology

65 : ... * [] : ...
...
...
...
...
... * ...

70 ...
...
...
...
75 ...
...
...
...
80 ...
...
...
...
85 ...
...
...
...
90 ...
...
...
...
95 ...
...
...
...
...
...

method of condemning things perfect and * irreproachable. Which is why, in pursuit of his aim, he has to leave some of the text out and put in extra things. Having said that (I quote) the unbeginning, the beginning and the with the beginning, are the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, he ruled that the unbeginning (that is, the Father) does not possess unbeginningness as his nature etc.

Let us notice, here too, how he has committed sacrilege, despoiling the Theologian's text of the profession of the unbeginning, the beginning and the with the beginning, (that is the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost) as one God. For though the Theologian (as has been examined above) said the unbeginning, the beginning and the with the beginning one God, he, anxious to prove God to be one thing and Father, Son and Holy Ghost another thing, cut out from the beginning of the complete doctrine of God one God, so that he might easily damage the expression and devise himself a way for his evil and perverse interpretation, with the aim that we should suppose (contrary to what we have received) the Godhead to be one thing and the hypostases another. For he was aware that he had no ground at all for really professing as one God, the unbeginning, the beginning and with the beginning, that is, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost (as the Theologian has taught us) and yet making the Godhead and the hypostases of the Trinity different things (because he is also to be found godlessly writing that the holy fathers, by professing one Godhead and substance in three hypostases and, conversely, the hypostases in one Godhead and substance, recognize the Godhead or substance as one thing and the hypostases as another thing), and therefore, in pursuit of his goal, he cut from the Theologian's sentence the phrase one God. Having previously said that the unbeginning, the beginning and the with the beginning (that is, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost) are not expressions indicative of substance but of properties belonging with the one substance, whereas

... * ...
 ...
 100 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

...
 105 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 110 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 115 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 120 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 125 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

95/98 cf. supra, 60-63 103/104 Greg. Naz., Or. 42, 15 (PG 36, 476A; SChr., vol. 384, p. 80) 121 cf. supra, 104 121/125 Dam. Alex., from an unnamed work

125 here, having said that the unbeginning, the beginning * and the with the
beginning are the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, he ruled that the
unbeginning (that is, the Father) does not possess unbeginningness as his
nature, neither do the beginning (the Son) nor the with the beginning
(the Holy Ghost) possess their appellations as their nature; for belonging
130 with the nature, these are not natures. For the nature of the three is one
Godhead.

The mischief is really plain, none the less let us investigate
more closely the meaning of the deeper notions, to see if we can
somehow understand them! For he said: Having said that the
135 unbeginning, the beginning and the with the beginning are the Father,
the Son and the Holy Ghost, he ruled that the unbeginning (that is, the
Father) does not possess unbeginningness as his nature, neither do the
beginning (the Son) nor the with the beginning (the Holy Ghost) possess
their appellations as their nature; for belonging with the natures, these
140 are not natures. Yes, we tell him, we too, when we hear the
Theologian say the unbeginning, the beginning and the with the
beginning, one God, understand the Father, the Son and the Holy
Ghost and confess that they are one God, as we have been taught,
despite your obstinacy, to acknowledge.

145 But what do you say the 'unbeginningness' is, which the
Theologian declares the unbeginning (that is, the Father) does
not possess as his nature; and, again, what do you say are what
you have somehow or other described as the appellations of the
Son and Holy Ghost, and as things which belong with the nature
150 and are not natures? We have, you see, been incapable of getting
your point out of this brilliant and profound teaching (if I may
call it that) of yours! You have spouted words without giving any
explanation of them at all, except merely that the unbeginning (that
is, the Father) does not possess unbeginningness as his nature, neither do
155 the appellations belong to them (the Son and Holy Ghost) as their
nature and that for these belong with the nature and are not natures.

125/131 cf. supra, 60-66; *For ... Godhead*: Dam. perhaps read *μία θεότης*
instead of *μία, θεός*; see edd. 134/140 cf. supra, 60-66 141/142 cf. supra,
103-104 148/150 cf. supra, 65-66 153/156 cf. supra, 62-65 156 cf.
supra, 65-66

— Fol. 3ra
130
135

140
145

150
155

But you have not thereby explained at all how you interpret the unbeginningness which is not the Father's nature, and the appellations of * the Son and the Holy Ghost, and how you take these as belonging with the nature! But because, with a view to covering up the sense of what you write, you have avoided personal question and answer about them (not without skill, indeed with total cunning and diligence), we shall indicate their meaning for you, conjecturing it not from this passage but from what you wrote elsewhere. For if you recognize the Father's hypostasis as identical with his characteristic property (I mean, ingeneracy) and take the same view of the other hypostases of the Son and the Holy Ghost and of their characteristic properties, you must necessarily profess the unbeginningness of the unbeginning (i.e. the ingeneracy of the Father), and, again, (as you have expressed it) the appellations of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and what belongs with the nature as all of them *en bloc* hypostases. Nothing at all like this, though, is to be found in the words of the Theologian. For the doctor did not take the Father's not being from anything or by generation (i.e. ingeneracy) or the Son's being beginning as hypostases, but as characteristic properties of the hypostases. Hence he used the words belonging with the nature of them with acumen and considerable exactness, as has previously been proved extensively and shall be proved again if our Lord Jesus strengthens our feeble self.

As for you, what will you do if you are required to prove your misrepresentations of the God-clad father from his words and cannot? Will you be content to write yourself down as a false accuser? Or, will you wrest the truth even here, and using your superior power prove yourself the victor, as you think receiving the crown of victory not from the facts at all but from those who flatter, or rather deceive, you for their own ends? The result is that it is time now to proclaim also to you * what was declared of

177 cf. supra, 129-130

...
160 ...
...
165 ...
...
170 ...
...
175 ...
...
180 ...

...
185 ...
...
190 ...

old to Israel in the prophetic word of Isaiah by way of threat, for
190 he says: *O my people, your benefactors mislead you and pervert the
path of your feet. But now the Lord stands up for judgement and
will enter into judgement with his people. The Lord shall enter into
judgement with the elders of the people and with their chiefs. What
will you do when even the Theologian you charge with lies rebuts
195 you? Will you be quiet and stop your attacks against God? But I
do not think you will do that. For you have probably spoken
before, as it stands written: *I will walk in the error of my heart.*
And you have made your face harder than rock and refused to
receive instruction; and have become like those who say: 'Let us
200 wax strong to walk after our own perverted mind, and let us each
do what pleases his wicked heart'.*

וְאֵת מֹשֶׁה וְאֵת אֶלְיָהוּ וְאֵת אֵלֵי אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 ׀ וְכַתּוּב לֵב אֲנִי חֵלֵק חֶמְדָּתְכֶם וְחֶמְדָּתְכֶם
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ כִּמְשָׁל
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 195 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 200 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ
 ׀ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ וְנִלְכַדְנוּ אֶת אֵלֵינוּ לַחֵן לְאֵלֵינוּ

190/193 Is. 3:12-14 197 cf. Ps. 94:10

former because of the consubstantiality, the latter because of the
 60 monarchia'. In the discourse *Against the Arians* he says: 'We worship
 the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost: God the Father, God the Son
 and God (if you are not obdurate) the Holy Ghost'. Let the fact that
 the divinely inspired fathers gave us the tradition of acknowledging
 each hypostasis viewed separately as God be known hereby to
 65 everyone. Let us further take note how in a passage a little prior to
 this present one THEODOSIUS has quoted Gregory acknowledging
 clearly the Holy Ghost as 'substance'. He said: So much for these
 people! Gregory, styled the Theologian, on the other hand, is seen to
 have called the Holy Ghost 'a substance'; by this addition he introduced
 70 nothing into the meaning but simply was at pains to prove that the Spirit
 is substance so that no one should think him an unhypostatic energy or
 the accident of a substance, but should acknowledge him as something
 existing in his own right, as a vital force and hypostasis. It is pertinent
 that you should hear his teaching in the discourse *On the Holy Ghost*:
 75 'The Holy Ghost', he says, 'must be presumed to be either an individ-
 ually existing thing or something * viewed in something else: what
 experts in such matter call respectively "substance" and "accident". If
 the Holy Ghost is an "accident", he must be an energy of God. What
 else, whose else, could he be (for it is better thus, and avoids composi-
 80 tion)? If he is an energy, then clearly he is put into operation, does not
 operate himself and ceases as soon as he has been activated. This is the
 kind of thing an energy is. How, then, does he act, say such and such
 things, set apart, is grieved, is vexed (all things clearly, that belong to one
 who moves, not to a movement)? But if he is a substance, and not one of
 85 the things belonging with the substance, he will be thought of either as a
 creature or as God. For not even the inventors of goat-stags can think
 up what is half-way or anything sharing, or composed of, both. But if he
 is a creature, why do we believe in him or how are we perfected in him?

60/62 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 33, 16 (PG 36, 236A; *SChr.*, vol. 318, pp. 192-
 194) 67/102 Theod. Alex., *De Trin.* (CSCO 17, pp. 55,21 - 57,4; 103, pp. 37,31 -
 38,30) 75/90 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 31, 6 (PG 36, 140AB; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 286)
 84/86 cf. supra, ch. 5, 58-59

«...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 65 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 70 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 75 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 80 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 85 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 90 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»
 «...»

Fol. 4rb

150 is, the Father) does not possess unbeginningness as his nature, neither do
 the beginning (the Son) nor the with the beginning (the Holy Ghost)
 possess their appellations as their nature; for belonging with the nature,
 these are not natures. Who are 'these'? The Father, the Son and the
 Holy Ghost, as he teaches. For he acknowledges the unbeginning
 155 and the ingenerate as the same as the Father, and their appella-
 tions (as he says) as the same as the Son and Holy Ghost.

These are the means whereby he covertly hoped to compound a
 complaint of self-contradiction against the Theologian. For the
 doctor did not talk (as Damian supposes) of the Father, Son or
 160 Holy Ghost, but of the characteristic properties of the hypostases,
 'belonging with' the substance or nature. Indeed, this point has
 already been examined by us (I think) with sufficient clarity in the
 preceding; none the less we shall, to convince our readers, now
 confirm * that this is the way the matter stands, from the doctor's
 165 true text: Now (to summarize the particulars) the unbeginning, the
 beginning and the with the beginning, one God. Neither unbeginningness
 nor ingeneracy is the nature of the unbeginning, for no nature is because
 of various non-things, but because of things: the positing of an existent,
 not the negation of the non-existent. And the beginning is not separated,
 170 by being the beginning, from the unbeginning; for beginning is not its
 nature any more than unbeginning is the other's nature. For belonging
 with the nature, these are not natures.

This is the father's true and unadulterated text. Let us look
 closely at its falsification by the opponent of pure theology. For
 175 though the father clearly said: The unbeginning, the beginning and
 the with the beginning, one God (as we have previously mentioned
 above) he first cut the phrase one God out of the complete and

165/172 Greg. Naz., Or. 42, 15 (PG 36, 476A; SChr., vol. 384, pp. 80-82) 175/176 cf. supra, 165-166 177 'he': Damian 177/178 cf. supra, ch. 5, 106-107

— פה : ונאמר לל יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 160 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 165 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —

והוא יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 170 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 175 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 180 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —

Fol. 5ra

והוא יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 185 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —
 ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו —

Lines 174-181: ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו. Add. 12155, fol. 19ra.
 Lines 184-197: ונאמר לו יעזר לו ונאמר לו יעזר לו. Add. 12155, fol. 19ra.
 ונאמר לו (line 185) Add. 12155: ונאמר לו.

fully-sufficient statement of doctrine, and afterwards, despite the doctor's clear explanation that the unbeginningness or the ingenerate (which is the same as saying 'ingeneracy') are not the nature of the unbeginning (i.e. of the Father), nor again is being the beginning the beginning's (i.e. the Son's) nature, any more than existing without beginning and without generation is the unbeginning's nature, for these (i.e. the Father's existing without beginning and the Son's being the beginning) belonging with the nature are not natures: despite this, this adversary of the truth muddles and confuses everything with a murky cloud of verbal tricks, calling the Father, Son and Holy Ghost 'belonging with the substance and nature'; in order that subsequently he may easily not profess at all the hypostases of the Holy Trinity as one God, one substance and one nature, but rather define them as belonging somehow with another God, substance and nature (something which no Christian ever ventured to think) and thus prove that the Theologian contradicts himself. Otherwise prove how the same * divinely inspired father is not seen to be teaching conflicting things, since he has ruled here expressly that the Spirit does not belong with the substance, but previously (as he slanderously said) defined the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost as belonging with the nature! But he is incapable of doing so.

How, again, can a teacher be consistent who sometimes calls the Spirit 'substance' sometimes 'not substance'? For he has also disgorged from some sort of profanity of ideas, this accusation against the Theologian, and spouted the lie that he has deduced an absurdity from the divinely inspired words. He says as follows: Why, then, do they judge they possess cleverness in retorting: how can the Holy Ghost be substance and not substance? Say also, without shame, what follows: 'How can the Holy Ghost be God and not God?' For this is what you have to deduce, when you blather absurdities like these, because (as has, indeed, been

180
 190
 195
 200
 205

180
 190
 195
 200
 205

Fol. 5rb

210
 215

210 already proved previously) we find he teaches no difference between Godhead and substance in respect of the mystery of the Holy Trinity. You see what he presumes to give vent to against the Holy Ghost and his ministers; none the less, to make a useful repetition we shall cite the Theologian clearly and expressly
 215 proclaiming: the Holy Ghost is substance and not one of the things belonging with the substance. Either, therefore, let him prove, without possibility of further doubt or debate, and on the basis of the words of the doctor's divine utterance, his slanderous allegation that the Holy Ghost is both substance and not sub-
 220 stance, and again both belongs with the substance and does not belong with the substance; or, let him become sensible, even at this late stage, of the impiety of his blasphemy against the Holy Ghost and those he inspires.

Repudiating entirely these novel, filthy and blasphemous
 225 words, and casting them out of our minds, * let us cling with all our might to the pure, immaculate faith of the God-clad fathers. The schemes of this marvellous writer do not lead us astray for they are obvious despite all his nefarious efforts at covering them up to deceive; and we know that his whole endeavour is not so
 230 much to hand on to his dupes the teaching that each hypostasis of the holy, all-venerable and consubstantial Trinity is both substance and not substance, or God and not God, as to trouble himself with proving that the Father, the Son or the Holy Ghost are not God or substance or nature at all.

235 Now that this has been explained, it is time we reminded the listener that, as we promised previously, we would demonstrate how the Theologian applied 'unbeginning' and 'unbegotten' in differing senses. For (as has been said) he sometimes in his

215/216 cf. supra, 84-85 work

236 'we promised previously': in a lost part of his

220
 225
 230
 235

235
 240
 245

Fol. 5va

250

examinations put 'unbeginning' and 'unbegotten' for the uncreated
 240 nature, and again for its characteristic property (I mean its
 infinity and non-temporality); sometimes for the hypostasis of
 God the Father; sometimes, again, for his characteristic property
 (i.e. ingeneracy) he introduced 'unbeginning' and 'unbegotten'.
 On occasions he applied the titles, 'unbeginning' and 'unbegotten'
 245 as names indicative of the Father's hypostasis.

I think much proof has been given, and will be given again;
 that he used 'unbeginning' and 'unbegotten' for the hypostasis of
 the Father and again for his characteristic property (I mean
 ingeneracy) when saying: Neither unbeginningness nor ingeneracy is
 250 the nature of the unbeginning. So, we ought to show what he says of
 the divine nature when he discusses unbegotten and begotten and
 how he gave the name 'unbeginning' to a property of the divine
 nature, and then we shall adduce in due order places where he
 uses 'unbeginning' and 'begotten' as names indicative of the
 255 hypostasis.

Let GREGORY come forward for us, therefore, * and explain the
 accuracy of what has been stated by his true theology. He
 instructs us, then, in the *First Oration on the Son*, as follows:
 Then, why do you declare that ingenerate and generate are not the same
 260 thing? If you mean the uncreated and the created, I should be in
 agreement, for the unbeginning and the created are not the same thing in
 nature; but if you mean the begetter and the begotten, the statement is
 invalid, for it is absolutely necessary that they should be the same thing;
 indeed it is the nature of begetter and offspring that the offspring should
 265 be the same thing by nature as its begetter. Or thus again: what do you
 mean by 'the ingenerate' and 'the generate'? If you mean ingeneracy and
 generacy - no, these are not the same thing; but if you mean those who
 have these things, why should they not be the same thing? Let us
 observe here too how many senses he uses 'the unbeginning' or
 270 'ingenerate' in. He says: Why do you declare that ingenerate and
 generate are not the same thing? If you mean the uncreated and the

249/250 cf. supra, 166-167 259/268 Greg. Naz., Or. 29, 10 (PG 36, 88A;
 SChr., vol. 250, pp. 196-198) 270/273 cf. supra, 259-262

כאן נח שלפניו, ויבנה לו חכמה. אבות ופ. סוף ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך חכמה: אבות ופ. סוף ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ופ. סוף ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 אבות: אבות ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 255 אבות ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 אבות ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.

ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 260 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 265 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.

[כג] אבות ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. *
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 270 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 275 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 280 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.
 ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג. מלך ג.

Fol. 5vb

created, I should be in agreement, for the unbeginning and the created are not the same thing in nature. Clearly 'unbeginning' or 'ingenerate' and 'begotten' are here paralleled by the uncreated (i.e. the uncreated nature) and the created (i.e. the whole created nature). But see again how he used 'the ingenerate' and 'the generate' to stand for the begetter and the begotten (i.e. for the two hypostases of the Father and the Son). For he added: But if you mean the begetter and the begotten, the statement is invalid, for it is absolutely necessary that they should be the same thing; indeed it is the nature of begetter and offspring that the offspring should be the same thing by nature as its begetter.

Let us pay heed to what is being said. The doctor, having set down 'ingenerate' and 'generate' says to the follower of ill-famed Arius: 'If you mean by "ingenerate" and "generate" "uncreated" and "created", there is no identity of nature, for the unbeginning and the created are not the same thing in nature. * But if you mean the begetter and the begotten (i.e. the Father and the Son) the statement is invalid; for begetter and begotten must be the same thing in nature'. So, the doctor expressly applied 'ingenerate' and 'generate' to two, so to say, pairs: to 'uncreated' and 'created' and again to 'begetter' and 'begotten' and gives the explanation: If 'ingenerate' and 'generate' are taken to mean 'uncreated' and 'created', there is no identity in nature. But when standing for begetter and begotten, there is identity in nature. Notice how here too he instills in us the clear teaching of the divine doctrines by coming to a third meaning of ingenerate and generate, for he says: Or thus again: what do you mean by 'the ingenerate' and 'the generate'? If you mean ingeneracy and generacy, no, these are not the same thing; but if you mean those who have these things, why should they not be the same thing? You see that he has ruled ingeneracy and generacy (i.e. the characteristic properties of the hypostases of the Father and the Son) not to be identical, but the hypostases (or prosopa) which have these properties (i.e. ingeneracy and

278/282 cf. supra, 262-265 286/289 cf. supra, 261-263 298/301 cf. supra, 265-268

285
 290

295
 300
 305
 310

Fol. 6ra

305 generacy) he says are identical viz. identical in nature not in number.

With clarity, therefore, I think, and great lucidity the God-clad saint has set out for us in the previously given examination of 'ingenerate' and 'generate', three pairs of meanings: first, 'uncreated' and 'created' (not, he says, identical); secondly, 'begetter' and 'begotten' (which he attested as having identity in nature); thirdly, 'ingeneracy' and 'generacy' (viz. the characteristic properties which, we have been taught, are not to be taken as identical). But whereas above he predicated non-identity of the uncreated and created because they are different in substance (since the uncreated and the created must be different in nature), here, of the begetter and the begotten (i.e. the Father and the Son) he predicated identity because they are consubstantial: indeed, he says, it is the nature * of begetter and offspring that the offspring should be the same thing by nature as its begetter. Moreover, he asserted non-identity in the case of the characteristic properties, because, in the case of all things of the same kind, it is the hypostases we call 'consubstantial' and not the properties seen as attaching to them. For nobody, to my mind, is entitled to use 'consubstantiality' or 'difference in substance' of what, by their definition, are outside the substance, and with Truth's aid we shall sufficiently demonstrate later on that such things are apprehended as outside the substance. Nevertheless, at this point too, to convince readers, it will not, I think, be wrong to set down one text, from BASIL THE GREAT only, who says this, and clearly, (indeed, rather, expressly) explains in his second book *Against Eunomius*: But with regard to God's appearing to be composite unless ingeneracy and light are taken to be the same thing, we can say that if we took ingeneracy as part of the substance his argument (being that what is compounded of different things is composite) would have some ground. But if we assert God's

318/320 cf. supra, 280-282 331/350 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. II, 29 (PG 29, 640B - 641A; SChr., vol. 305, pp. 122-124)

315 ...

...
 320 ...
 325 ...
 330 ...
 335 ...
 340 ...
 345 ...

Fol. 6rb

Lines 342-363: [...] Add. 12155, fol. 17ra-rb.

substance to be light, life or goodness, if all of him, whatever he is, is life, all of him is light and all of him is goodness, and the ingeneracy follows the life, how can the simple in substance not be incomposite? For the modes indicative of his property will not damage the condition of simplicity; or, in that case, all statements about God prove God composite.

340 And, so it looks, if we are going to save the idea of simplicity and being without parts, we shall either say nothing about God except ingeneracy and shall refuse to call him 'invisible', 'incorruptible', 'immutable', 'creator', 'judge', and all the names we use now for his glory; or, if we

345 accept these names, what are we going to make of them? Are we to take them and apply them all to the substance? In that case, we shall prove him not only composite but also compounded from * dissimilar parts in virtue of the diversity of meanings of each of the names. But shall we take them as outside the substance? Whatever principle they hit on over

350 each of these, they must apply to the title 'ingenerate'.

Did not the wise father state with great clarity and lucidity the fact of ingeneracy's being an accompaniment of the life and of its being understood to go with the rest of the properties outside the substance? But that is a fact better recognized (to my mind) than

355 any other by everybody. Therefore those who without hesitation or shame acknowledge as hypostases the characteristic properties of the hypostases must say that the Father, the Son or the Holy Ghost is not light, life or goodness at all, but accompanies the light, because outside the substance.

352 cf. supra, 337-338 353/354 cf. supra, 349

340
345
350
355
360
365
370

⋄

Fol. 6va

365
370

Lines 349-350: MS trsp. these two words.
 (line 351) Add. 12155: (line 355) Add. 12155 adds:
 (line 362) Add. 12155:
 Lines 364-372: Add. 12155, fol. 17ra and Add. 14532, fol. 118rb. (line 370) Add. 12155:

360 For these reasons let this excellent fellow proclaim what he said
 in the above mentioned *Festal* and shout out boldly, without
 concealment, to his dupes: *Hear you deaf and see you blind!*
 Neither the Father, nor the Son nor the Holy Ghost is light, life
 or goodness; no, they are outside the substance, because they
 365 accompany the life! But when a man has got to this stage, let
 him duly enjoy his miserable sort of blasphemy against the Holy
 Trinity and get rich satisfaction from the madness of his dupes!
 But please let us not carelessly overlook this. For Gregory the
 Theologian demonstrated clearly, in his divinely inspired words,
 370 along with the different meanings of 'ingenerate' and 'generate',
 the further fact that the characteristic properties of the hypostases
 of the Holy Trinity are not hypostases. For when he said that the
 begetter and the begotten (i.e. the Father and the Son) were the
 same thing, but that ingeneracy and generacy were not the same
 375 thing, how did he not clearly teach that ingeneracy and generacy
 are not the Father and the Son at all but are the characteristic
 properties of the Father and the Son? Therefore it is plain to all
 friends * of truth that ingeneracy, generacy and, correspondingly,
 procession are not the hypostases of the Father, the Son and the
 380 Holy Ghost at all, but, instead, are characteristic properties of
 the hypostases. Let this excellent fellow then, desist from pro-
 pounding impossibilities to us and lawlessly unsettling not merely
 the orthodox Church but the whole world with his rubbish!

Moreover it is now time we showed how the Theologian, again
 385 by the same expression 'unbeginning', indicates to us that non-
 temporality and infinity which is a natural property of the
 Godhead's substance. He writes in thundering tones as follows in
 the oration *On Easter*: God, then, is infinite and hard to contemplate.
 The only thing that can be grasped about him at all is his infinity — even
 390 if one thinks that by his being a simple nature he is either wholly

361 'mentioned': in a lost part of the work supra, 262-267 362 Is. 42:18 372/375 cf. 386 'natural': cf. supra, 240 388/404 Greg. Naz., Or. 45, 3-4 (PG 36, 628AC)

375
 380
 385
 390
 395

Fol. 6vb

400
 405

incomprehensible or totally comprehensible; for let us further enquire what it means for him to be simple in nature. He does not have simplicity as his nature any more than compounds do the sole fact of their being composite. Now the infinite is contemplated in both directions, beginning and end (the infinite is what transcends, and does not lie within, these) and whenever the intellect surveys the deep past, having nowhere to stand, no mental imagery about God to lean on, it names the infinite and endless here, 'unbeginning'. When it looks at what lies below and is subsequent, it names him 'immortal' and 'imperishable'; but when it brings all together, 'eternal'. For eternity is neither time nor a part of time, for it is also not susceptible to measurement. But what time measured by the sun's course is to us, eternity is to eternal things, eternity, which is measured along with existents like a temporal movement and interval.

It remains, after this, for us to show that the divinely inspired Theologian took not only 'unbeginning' and 'unbegotten', but also * 'generate' and 'proceeding', not as mere empty names but as indicative of the hypostases. He spoke in the oration *On the Holy Spirit* as follows: Again, where did you get those citadels of yours, 'ingenerate' and 'unbeginning', or we 'immortal'? Show us the exact words or we shall reject them! And you will be killed by your own principles, because your terms will have been destroyed and the wall of the fortress you were relying on. Or is it not recognized that they are derived from things which imply them, though they are unmentioned? What are they? *I am the first and I am hereafter*; and: *Before me there was no other God and after me there shall be none*. For all 'is-ness' is mine; it did not begin and will not stop. You have taken these truths of there being nothing before him and of there being no cause more ancient than he is, and called him 'unbeginning' and 'ingenerate'. The fact that

409/420 Greg. Naz., Or. 31, 23 (PG 36, 157C - 160A; SChr., vol. 250, pp. 318-320) 415 Is. 41:4 415/416 Is. 43:10

410
 415
 420

425
 430
 435

Fol. 7ra

Lines 426-427: cf. p. 67, lines 457-458:

420 he will not cease to exist means he is 'immortal' and 'imperishable'.
Likewise in the oration *On the arrival of the Bishops* he wrote as
follows: But let me get back to the subject! Indeed let 'ingenerate',
'generate' and 'proceeding' be said and understood, if someone enjoys
425 creating names. For we are not afraid of things incorporeal being
thought of corporeally, as the despoilers of the Godhead have decided. A
creature should be called 'God's creature' (for this is a great thing for us)
but not 'God'. Or I shall admit that God is a creature, when I too
become God in the full sense of the word. It stands thus: if God, not a
430 creature - for a creature belongs along with us who are not gods. On the
other hand: if a creature, not God - for it began, and of what began in
time there was when it was not. That which has prior to itself the state of
non-existence, does not exist in the full sense of the word. How can what
does not, in the full sense, exist, be God?

Sufficient proof has been * provided by these divinely inspired
435 words that there are places where he teaches us to take 'unbegin-
ning' and 'ingenerate' as terms indicative of the realities rather
than as the realities themselves. It is clear from what the Theolog-
ian said in the previously quoted passage: Again, where did you
get those citadels of yours, 'ingenerate' and 'unbeginning', or we 'immor-
440 tal'? Or is it not recognized that they are derived from things which
imply them, though they are unmentioned. What are they? *I am the first
and I am hereafter*; and: *Before me there was no other God and after me
there shall be none*. You have taken these truths of there being nothing
before him and of there being no cause more ancient than he is, and
445 called him 'unbeginning' and 'ingenerate'. So, the doctor, you see,
said that people having applied their imagination to what was
known in the Bible devised and discovered (so to say) the terms
'unbeginning' and 'ingenerate'. That is the reason he said:
Show us the exact words or we shall reject them! And you will be killed
450 by your own principles, because your terms have been destroyed. This

422/433 Greg. Naz., Or. 42, 17 (PG 36, 477C; SChr., vol. 384, p. 86)
438/445 cf. supra, 409-419 449/450 cf. supra, 410-412

440
 445
 450

Fol. 7rb
 455
 460
 465

Line 438: These two words are trsp. in the MS.

amounts to saying: If, in accordance with your principles, nothing not written in the Bible can be used about God, prove that these terms for which you have such a special penchant (I mean 'unbeginning' and 'ingenerate') are in the Bible in those exact words or reject them; and you will be killed, because your terms have been destroyed by your own principles.

What, then, are we to say? If we think that Gregory said we should reject God the Father himself or his property (i.e. his being uncaused, from which they have derived the word 'unbeginning' and 'ingenerate' in application to the Father) shall we not be charging him (and very justly, I say) with great irreligion and folly? For one could have indicated God the Father and the fact of there being nothing before him and of there being no cause more ancient than he is, by other words, without the confession's then undergoing any damage whatsoever as a result. But to attempt in any way to alter any part of the true opinion about * God the Father is total negation of all religion.

BASIL THE GREAT explains this, writing as follows in the first discourse *Against Eunomius*: I, for my part, think the title 'ingenerate' harmonizes especially well with our notions. But inasmuch as it has no place in the Bible and is the starting-point for their blasphemy, I declare that it could rightly be suppressed, the word 'Father' being equivalent in meaning to 'ingenerate' besides bringing in the idea of the Son by the connected relationship. And again: Let us not, therefore, call him 'ingenerate' but 'Father', unless we are going to be wiser than the teachings of the Saviour, who said: *Go, baptize in the name of the Father* - not 'in the name of the ingenerate'.

469/474 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 5 (PG 29, 516D - 517A; *SChr.*, vol. 299, pp. 174-176) 474/477 *Ibid.* (PG 29, 517A; *SChr.*, vol. 299, p. 176) 476 Matth. 28:19

470
 475
 480
 485

475
 480
 485

Fol. 7va

490
 495

Line 487: *ⲕⲁⲗⲁ*, MS *ⲕⲁⲗⲁⲁ*, cf. p. 85, line 86.

But wise GREGORY, his brother, speaks as follows in his *Refutation of Eunomius* (which begins: To want to help everybody was not, apparently): This, then, is what the imitator of Paul does, having seen that the error of those who teach 'dissimilarity' is strengthened through the word 'ingenerate' (in the evil, heretical usage of the term). He advised that we should safeguard in our souls the truly religious idea of 'ingenerate' but that the word should not be an object of special concern, because it becomes a resource of sin to those who are perishing. For the title 'Father' in one sense is enough to produce for us the sense of 'ingenerate'. For having heard 'Father' we at once understand the one who is the cause of everything's existence, who, had he owned a cause transcending himself, would not be called 'Father' in the full sense of the word, because 'Father' (in the full sense) would have been attributed to the cause found to be prior. And similarly in the fifth of his books against impious Eunomius (the beginning goes: Because, he says, the word 'Lord') he writes as follows: For the things remain what they are by nature, but the mind, when it handles existing things, reveals its ideas by whatever words it discovers. Just as Peter's substance was not altered * along with the alteration of name, so no other visible object is altered by variations of name. This is the reason we say that the term 'ingenerate' was applied by us to the truly primal Father, the cause of all, no damage at all accruing to the meaning of the subject if we indicate it with a different, equivalent word. For it is permissible, instead of saying 'ingenerate', to call him 'First Cause' or 'Father of the Only-begotten' or 'Causeless Existent'.

Let us take careful note of how one of these true teachers says that the title 'ingenerate' should be suppressed as being the prime starting-point of mischievous people's blasphemy, and again

480/491 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 420C; Jaeger I, pp. 184,17 - 185,2) 493/502 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 5 (PG 45, 760CD; Jaeger II, p. 179, 9-21) 504/507 cf. supra, 470-474

497-500 : ⋆ ⋆
 500 : ⋆ ⋆
 505 : ⋆ ⋆
 510 : ⋆ ⋆
 515 : ⋆ ⋆
 520 : ⋆ ⋆
 525 : ⋆ ⋆
 ⋆ ⋆

Fol. 7vb

⋆ ⋆ ⋆
 ⋆ ⋆ ⋆
 ⋆ ⋆ ⋆

us, in order that he may draw us to him (as the Theologian puts it) by what is understood, for what is totally beyond understanding, is beyond hope and beyond endeavour. By being uncomprehended he is wonderful, and being wonderful he is loved the more. Some of the names we have ourselves established, according as our understanding has in slight measure handled the realities and imagined them, not creating the realities but indicating them by what we call them.

These distinctions, then, having been made in this way, how can we fail to fall entirely away from the truth and from the intention of the doctors who are leading us to the truth, if we muddle the meanings of 'unbeginning' or 'ingenerate' and 'generate'? So that, when the God-clad fathers put (to take an example) 'ingenerate' and 'generate' for the hypostases, we understand the characteristic properties or terms indicative of the realities; and again, conversely, when they put them for the characteristic properties, we interpret them as hypostases or names; and when they say 'the unbeginning' (as mentioned before) or 'the ingenerate' or 'the generate' in the sense of terms indicative of the realities, we think they mean the realities; and so we become guilty of blasphemy and deserve ridicule besides for not distinguishing the meanings, and being in contradiction with the nature of things: the fate this excellent fellow, who is our present object of interest, suffered (as his perverse explanation, which we have studied, of the Theologian's words will indicate or rather has already indicated). Let us set down at once the part of that explanation which has not been under investigation so far, cursorily reminding ourselves first of the * Theologian's arguments.

So let us, therefore, carefully examine again how the father, truly theologizing as a result of the illumination of the Spirit himself, has expounded for us the whole mystery of Godliness subtly but briefly and in comprehensible manner. Because he stated: The unbeginning, the beginning and the with the beginning, one God!, he indicated that in a wonderful way the monad and the triad are the same thing i.e. that one Godhead is in three

...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

Fol. 8rb

537/540 Greg. Naz., Or. 38, 7 (PG 36, 317C; SChr., vol. 358, p. 116); Or. 45, 3 (PG 36, 628A) 560 cf. infra, 606-610 569/570 cf. supra, 165-166

hypostases. On the other hand, because he stated: Neither unbeginningness nor ingeneracy is the nature of the unbeginning, for no nature is because of various non-things but because of things: the positing of an
 575 existent, not the negation of the non-existent. And the beginning is not separated, by being the beginning, from the unbeginning; for beginning is not its nature any more than unbeginning is the other's nature. For belonging with the nature these are not natures; by saying this, he clearly indicated to us the connection of the hypostases in the
 580 nature and their unconfused separation through the properties. Along with this the God-clad fathers said that the hypostases and the characteristic properties are not the same thing, for (as has been proved) 'the unbeginning' (the Father) does not have unbeginningness or ingeneracy as his nature or hypostasis any
 585 more than 'the beginning' (the Son) has beginningness as his nature or hypostasis. Instead they spoke of the characteristic properties as belonging with the substance and belonging with the nature and similarly belonging with each. He taught the same sort of thing about the Holy Ghost, and following that arrived at the
 590 doctrine of names indicative of the hypostases, saying: The name of the unbeginning is 'Father', of the beginning 'Son' and of the with the beginning 'Holy Ghost'. The doctor thus says that 'Father' is the name of the unbeginning i.e. of him who has no beginning; 'Son' is the name of the beginning i.e. the one who exists by generation;
 595 and, again, 'Holy Ghost' is the name of the one who exists by procession. Is it not obvious that the Theologian has here taken 'the unbeginning', 'the beginning' and 'the with the beginning', indubitably as hypostases whereas the appellations 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are the names of * the unbeginning, the one
 600 who exists by generation and likewise of the one who exists by procession? No right-minded man, I think, will be disposed to quarrel with this in any way.

572/578 cf. supra, 166-172 587 cf. supra, 141 587/588 cf. supra, 152
 588 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.*, II, 4 (PG 29, 577 C; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 18: *περι*
ἐκαστου); cf. *infra*, ch. 8, 20-21 590/592 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 42, 15 (PG 36, 476B;
SChr., vol. 384, p. 82)

595 :

 600

 605

 610

 615

 620

Fol. 8va

Line 602: MS reads:

Why, then, did this fellow (sick as he is with Sabellian witlessness) ascribe the source of his own imaginary fancies on the subject of the Holy Trinity to the divinely inspired and very clear words of the doctor? For he started by putting down the Theologian's words, which we have just recalled, and then said: 'Unbeginning', 'beginning' and 'with the beginning' (i.e. Father, Son and Holy Ghost) are not words indicative of substances, but of the properties belonging with the one substance. So he has defined Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the three hypostases of the Holy Trinity, as being words or names indicative of the properties belonging with the one substance, without recognizing any difference at all between the words or names, the hypostases and the properties. Shall we not be right to bemoan such a man on account of his blasphemy and bitterly bewail him as one already dead in soul? For once he has fallen into a *depth of wickedness* (as scripture has it) all thoughts and words of perdition must needs be poured into him and hasten to his mind so that he will wickedly say in his heart: 'there is no God'. For this inevitably follows upon his stupid novel utterance, when the three hypostases or prosopa of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, on the basis of his absurd syllogisms, amount for him to nothing but words and empty terms. Therefore let us pack up this blasphemous rubbish like a bundle of thorns, burn and destroy it in the cleansing flame of the fathers and theologians, so that even those possessed of small sense and prudence will in no way sustain any kind of injury from them.

625 ܠܚܘܕܐ ܕܡܘܨܐ ܕܡܘܨܐ ܕܡܘܨܐ ܕܡܘܨܐ ܕܡܘܨܐ ܕܡܘܨܐ
ܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
630 ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
635 ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
640 ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
645 ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
650 ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ
ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܝܢ

608/610 Dam. Alex., Adv. Trith., 4; cf. infra, ch. 20, 13-16 617 Prov. 18:3(?) 619/620 Ps. 13:1; 52:1

Treating of the fact that when our opponent impudently tries to prove from a text of holy Severus that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are names, he is clearly convicted of thinking the hypostases of the Holy Trinity, merely a phantasy, an imagination and a figment of the intellect.

And so, the Theologian's words having been examined, as far as the present time has permitted, and having proved that Damian's cavils are idle; it is appropriate that we should also introduce his attacks upon our holy God-clad father Severus, whereby he presumptuously attempts again to prove that Severus considers the hypostases of the Trinity and their characteristic properties to be nothing but words and names, and that we should rebut the attacks on the basis of the irreproachable teaching itself of the father and of the other divinely inspired doctors, so that his impious opinion may melt utterly away and come completely to naught, according to the saying: *The hope of the impious man is like chaff carried by the wind, and frozen ice routed by a storm; and is scattered like smoke by the wind, and passes away like the memory of a one-night guest.*

He wrote, then (as we have indeed already stated earlier) in the *Second Apology* sent to Paralos through Zachariah, as follows: For the concept of being, since it is unvaryingly the same for the three of them, shows us the commonness of the substance; but the mode of being, having freedom from confusion and separation of the names from

ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ

ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ

ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ
ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ

Line 1: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ. A note in the same hand at the top of the folio reads as follows: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ.
Line 17: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ, MS erroneously reads ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ.
Line 23: MS ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲓ, cf. p. 83, line 45; p. 89, line 151; p. 291, line 17.

55 Trinity, is it not clear that he is defining the properties and the hypostases as mere utterances and empty names and as the effect of our thought? For when he does not acknowledge that the realities themselves, which these names are indicative of, in fact and truth exist, but affirms that the mystery of the Holy Trinity depends
 60 solely on names, he must be convicted of holding views somehow more mischievous than the foul atheism of Sabellius. Either, then, let him clearly acknowledge that the three hypostases of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are not names at all * (though known to us by these terms) but are three actually
 65 complete and individually subsisting realities, mutually sharing in the substance and Godhead or, to put it more exactly, being the Godhead, but mutually distinct through the characteristic properties (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) and the different names; or let him learn that he has clearly fallen into a chasm
 70 equal to, or worse than that of the error of polytheism, by making the holy, adorable and consubstantial Trinity a product of our imagination or understanding (to reveal thus, as I must, a new insanity!). Now, we have previously heard the Theologian proclaiming at one point that the majority of names referring
 75 even to God are laid down by ourselves: You have taken these truths of there being nothing before him and of there being no cause more ancient than he is, and called him 'unbeginning' and 'ingenerate'. The fact that he will not cease to exist means he is immortal and imperishable. And somewhere he writes: Indeed let 'ingenerate',
 80 'generate' and 'proceeding' be said and understood, if someone enjoys creating names. And Basil, wise in divinity, declares: I, for my part, think the title 'ingenerate' harmonizes especially well with our notions. But inasmuch as it has no place in the Bible and is the starting-point for their blasphemy, I declare that it could rightly be suppressed. We have
 85 heard clearly GREGORY his brother, who had his throne at Nyssa,

75/79 cf. supra, ch. 6, 417-420 79/81 cf. supra, ch. 6, 422-424 81/84 cf. supra, ch. 6, 469-472

ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ : ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 60 ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 65 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 70 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 75 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 80 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 85 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 90 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ

Fol. 9rb

Line 80: ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ, cf. p. 67, line 461 (ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ).
 Line 88: MS om. ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ, cf. p. 69, line 489.

declaring: This is the reason we say that the term 'ingenerate' was applied by us to the truly primal Father.

Now if he says that these, being what they are, are insufficient to confirm the truth of our statements, let one, who (as he claims) speaks nothing but what the fathers spoke, bend his ears to this wise teacher, and hear again the kinds of thing he said to impious Eunomius (who had written cognate, blasphemous nonsense) in the fifth book (the beginning goes: Because, he says, the word * 'Lord'): But Peter and Paul, he says, were named by men, and therefore there was a possibility of their names being changed. But what existent is not named by men? I summon you, Eunomius, as a witness to the argument. For if you make changes of name a proof that things have been named by men, you must thereby agree that every name has been imposed on existents by us, because the same names of objects have not prevailed amongst everybody. For just as Paul was once Saul and Peter was Simon, so land, sky, air, ocean and all the parts of creation are not named alike by everybody, but one way by the Hebrews, another way by us and with different names by each nation. If, then, Eunomius has a valid objection to establish, I mean that Peter and Paul got new names because their names were given them by men, our argument (constructed from similar premisses and stating that everything has been given its name by us) must be confirmed, because the names of everything vary with different nations. Now if everything is of this kind, 'generate' and 'ingenerate' can be no different, for these also get fresh names. We have an idea about some object and reformulate it as a name. We say what has been thought in different words at different times, not creating the realities but indicating them by the names we call them.

Handwritten Coptic text at the top of the page.

Main body of handwritten Coptic text on page 87, with marginalia on the right side.

Fol. 9va

86/87 cf. supra, ch. 6, 497-498 94/112 Greg. Nyss., Contra Eun. III, 5 (PG 45, 760AC; Jaeger II, pp. 178,13 - 179,9)

What is your answer to this, you who in the power of your invincible sophisms seem to be creator of the realities themselves, for I dare say nothing higher? Do you reconcile yourself to the God-clad fathers and profess along with them that the three hypostases of the single Godhead are not names at all, but spiritual and perfect realities existing on their own? Or will you rely solely on your own notions, or (to speak more truly maybe) impiously * cling to the Jewish teachings of the Libyan and account the great mystery of Godliness names and mere utterances: which amounts to saying as an imagination, fancy and figment of your mind? Well then, do not lure the simple into error by cloaking your abominable book with a pelt of true religion (I mean with patristic texts) but plainly say what you think: that the divine nature is not three individually subsisting hypostases, but one and one only hypostasis taking shape in three ways and consequently obtaining the names Father, Son and Holy Ghost as it speaks and acts now in the person of the Father, now in the person of the Son and now again in the person of the Holy Ghost; which is what Sabellius the Libyan also saw fit to think, for his own damnation? But kindly explain for us more clearly the 'participation of the names' of ingeneracy and generacy (because, according to your argument, names and properties are mutually identical) so that (God forbid!) we may enjoy your remarkable wisdom more richly! For you stated, in the previous passage: For the concept of being, since it is unvaryingly the same for the three of them, shows us the commonness of the substance; but the mode of being, having freedom from confusion and separation of the names from mutual participation, indicates by such expressions the manner of existence and the properness of the hypostases or prosopa.

121 I Tim. 3:16 133 cf. supra, 25-26 137/141 cf. supra, 23-27

125 ...
 130 ...
 135 ...
 140 ...
 145 ...
 150 ...
 155 ...

Fol. 9vb

Line 155: ... cf. p. 83, lines 26 and 48 (...

My excellent fellow, what do you mean? Will you disclose the
 profundity of your ideas by telling us what you mean by the
 freedom from confusion and separation of the names from mutual
 145 participation? Or shall we, on the basis of many similar expres-
 sions of opinion, represent and state its meaning as best we can,
 because for some reason or another we have been looked on as
 representers of your remarkable ideas? Well you may, perhaps,
 be saying that because the hypostases of the Holy Trinity, the
 150 names indicative of them and furthermore the characteristic
 properties, are identical without any difference and * do not differ
 in anything, it is the more permissible for us to transfer what is
 said about e.g. the hypostases, to their properties and likewise to
 the names as well. In which case, if I say that the names mutually
 155 participate I appear to have said nothing incongruous, because
 we have been taught to acknowledge that the hypostases mutually
 participate. Conversely, therefore, on the basis of your suppositions,
 we can transfer what is said about the names to the hypostases
 and to their characteristic properties, and correspondingly transfer
 160 what is applicable to the properties to the hypostases and their
 names. If not, how arbitrary it would be (the hypostases and the
 characteristic properties being viewed according to your argu-
 ment, as the same, and the names indicative of them as well) for
 us to apply to the properties and the names what is said about the
 165 hypostases, yet not transfer to the hypostases what is said of
 them! So do not hold back, but rely on the conformity of words
 and realities, and readily declare that because the names are laid
 down by us and are an effect of our minds, we are obviously the
 creators also of the realities we have named (for you have also, so
 170 you imagine, proved by consistent and cogent demonstrations
 that the hypostases and their characteristic properties differ in
 nothing from their names) and you will rightly be victorious and
 prevail in the contest, far surpassing in blasphemy the most
 swaggering opponents of God. None the less, try, if you please,
 175 to prove from patristic and irreproachable teachings these very
 things which, as you see, follow necessarily for you and you will
 see the kinds of absurdity your argument falls into as a conse-
 quence.

...
 ...
 ...
 160 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 165 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 170 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 175 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 180 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 185 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 190 ...

Fol. 10ra

But if (and rightly so) it irks you to do that, we shall briefly
 180 examine with you the participation of names you spoke in a sort of
 dream about. By revealing patristic words and thought which will
 benefit you by correcting you (if you pity your soul at all) we
 shall prove that even by * this same presently set down thought
 the hypostases are not characteristic properties and names (as
 185 you absurdly suppose), but rather they are perfect, individually
 subsisting realities.

ⲓⲃⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 195 ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 200 ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ

Fol. 10rb

180 cf. supra, 25-26

* Chapter 8

Testimonies from the fathers whereby it is shown: that it is impossible for what is said about the hypostases to be said about the properties and the names as well, because neither the properties nor the names mutually participate, whereas the hypostases are mutually identical in many respects: and that whatever is said to belong with something must be different from what it is said to belong with.

Listen, then, to the sorts of thing they teach us about the hypostases. Investigate the matter with diligence and learn that it is totally impossible to find there any such thing in any way spoken about the characteristic properties or the names indicative of the hypostases.

BASIL, then, the standard of orthodox doctrine, wrote as follows in the second book *Against Eunomius*: Though what man in his right mind would go along with the argument that things whose names are different must also have different substances? Peter's, Paul's and, in a word, all men's names are different, but there is one substance of all of them. For which reason, in the majority of respects we are identical with one another, but only in the properties appearing with each individual are we different from one another. So titles are not indicative of substances, but of the properties which characterize each one. When, therefore, we hear 'Peter' we do not understand by the name his substance (I mean now by 'substance' the material substrate which the name does not indicate at all) but we receive mental impressions of the properties appearing with him. For from this word we immediately understand the son of Jonas, the one from Bethsaida, Andrew's brother, the one who was summoned from fishermen to the apostolic ministry,

ⲙⲟⲗⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ

ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ

ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ

ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓⲁⲛⲓ

15/33 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. II, 4 (PG 29, 577C - 580A; SChr., vol. 305, pp. 18-20) 27 cf. Matth. 16:17 Ioh. 1:44 27/28 Matth. 4:18-19; Marc. 1:16-17

the names of Peter, for example, Paul and each of the rest 'are identical with one another in the majority of respects but only in the properties appearing with each individual does one differ from another'? How can we fail to rouse great derision against ourselves, if we utter foolish and senseless rubbish like this? How, indeed, will not * serious observers of the nature of things rightly say to us: Men, you are mad; you babble impossibilities. Whom did you ever hear say that the characteristic properties of the hypostases or the names, 'are identical with one another in the majority of respects but only in the properties appearing with each individual does one differ from another'? What, then, are we to say to them, when they thus ridicule your sage doctrines? Give us an answer in defence of what you write! What are the 'majority of respects' in which the names and properties of Peter, Paul and other men are identical with one another? Yet maybe you will say: the substance and its properties, for we say also that in these the hypostases are mutually united. And how will what are completely separate from the concept of the substance, be identical with one another in the substance and its properties? But this is quite irrational as further study (or rather the irreproachable teaching of the fathers) will disclose. Now if *force majeure* compels us to reckon the names as entirely the same thing as the realities and we are therefore forced to say they mutually participate in the substance as the realities do, we shall again ask you quite politely how Peter's and Paul's hypostases stayed the same and underwent no change, though their names were altered, Peter's being formerly 'Simon', Paul's 'Saul'? But how, indeed, are the names to be mutually separated by the properties appearing with each, the names being one of the things which separate the

58/61 cf. supra, 53-55 66/68 cf. ibid. 71 cf. supra, 53 85/86 cf. supra, 54

60
 65
 70
 75
 80
 85
 90

Fol. 10vb

Lines 90-122: ... Add. 14533, fol. 147vb-148ra.

hypostases? For it is not so much names as hypostatically existing realities that the characteristic properties of the hypostases are there to separate, and the names especially exist for the separation
 90 of different things, not at all in order that they may be separated from different things.

Besides this, one must ask: if the characteristic properties of the hypostases (I mean ingeneracy, generacy and procession, which, as this * new-fangled expert teaches, are identical with the
 95 hypostases and prosopa) mutually participate like the hypostases themselves, how can those who attempt to establish this fail to fall by the constraints of logic into absurd ideas? One would, indeed, be right to attack them severely and say: If *per impossibile* what consubstantials are separated by mutually participate, by
 100 valid converse what they are joined by must be divided. Must they not need other properties appearing with them, by which they may be separated from one another? For what are mutually joined and also mutually separated are mutually joined and separated not by the same, but by some different things. For we
 105 say that the hypostases are united with one another not by the characteristic properties of the prosopa (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) but by the substance and the Godhead (i.e. by what they are) and, conversely, are separated not by the substance but by the properties belonging with each of them. There-
 110 fore, if the characteristic properties (i.e. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) are united by the substance (as the wisdom of utterers of absurdities teaches) they too would have to be divided by characteristic properties belonging with each of them, because the hypostases also differ from one another by the indicative
 115 properties belonging with them; and it will be necessary to teach what properties there are belonging with ingeneracy, generacy and procession by which they are mutually divided.

...
 95 ...

...
 100 ...
 105 ...
 110 ...
 115 ...
 120 ...

Fol. 11ra

Line 110: ... Add. 14533: ...

However, listen to BASIL THE GREAT, one of many, who on the issues presently under discussion, discourses, as follows, in the letter
 120 written to his brother Gregory *On Substance and Hypostasis*: This is the reason why we say that, in the commonness of substance, the marks appearing in the Trinity and delivered by the faith, by means of which the property of the prosopon is disclosed, are disparate and incommunicable, each prosopon being apprehended separately by his
 125 own marks. So that through the marks mentioned the separation of the hypostases will be discovered but in the infinity, incomprehensibility, * uncreated existence, freedom from local circumscription and in all similar things there will be no difference in the life-giving nature i.e. between the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, but instead there is contemplated in
 130 them a close and unbreakable participation. By the same ideas, from which one may see the grandeur of one of the Holy Trinity we believe in, gazing fixedly at the glory one reaches the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

You see: the separation of the hypostases is perceived by the marks
 135 which have been mentioned, but in the infinity, incomprehensibility and uncreated existence no difference is apprehended at all in the life-giving nature i.e. between the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Now along with this you have heard that, in the commonness of substance, the marks appearing in the Holy Trinity are disparate and incommunicable.
 140 Must not the doctor, then, if the properties are the hypostases, have strayed from the truth when he declared in the words set down previously for examination: For which reason, in the majority of respects we are identical with one another, but only in the properties appearing with each individual are we different from one another. And
 145 again in the present quotation: But in the infinity, incomprehensibility, uncreated existence, freedom from local circumscription and in all similar things there will be no difference in the life-giving nature i.e. between the

121/133 Bas. Caes., Ep. 38, 4 (PG 32, 332AB; Forlin Patrucco, p. 184) 134/
 137 cf. supra, 125-129 138/139 cf. supra, 121-124 142/144 cf. supra, 19-
 21 145/149 cf. supra, 126-130

125
 130
 Fol. 11rb
 135
 140

145
 150
 155

Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, but instead there is contemplated in them a close and unbreakable participation. For if the marks appearing in the Holy Trinity, in the commonness of substance, are disparate and incommunicable whereas the hypostases are in the majority of respects identical with one another, and only differ from one another in the properties appearing with each individual; let our clever author tell us how the indicative properties could be the hypostases and what the properties are, by means of which the properties differ from one another!

But maybe this daily (so to put it) vomiter of a * vain succession of frigid arguments will say that the characteristic properties are not mutually distinct at all by anything external appearing in them but rather by their being. But we too shall make him the apt retort: You sly fellow, the divinely inspired doctors of the Church specially spoke of the characteristic properties as 'belonging with' the hypostases, and it is clear (unless we are intoxicated) that what are said to 'belong with' something are by no means that something with which they are said to belong. How, then, can the characteristic properties belonging with the hypostases (according to you that is the same as saying belonging with ingeneracy, generacy and procreation) be identical with the hypostases and their properties, which they are said to belong with, as this new-fangled insanity intends and we cannot even imagine?

150
160
165

170
175

Fol. 11va

Lines 158-163: ... Add. 14533, fols. 148ra-rb.

Concerning the fact that if, according to the new-fangled insanity, ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases, they will not be mutually separate by the properties appearing on them but by their very being, because the characteristic properties are mutually separate not by other properties but by their very being. And besides this, the hypostases will be found outside their substance i.e. outside themselves, because the fathers taught that the properties belonging with them are outside the substance and outside the hypostases.

Now, in another way, in addition to the aforesaid, the three hypostases of the Holy, consubstantial and all-venerable Trinity will be found to be separated from one another by their very being, if they are (as this excellent fellow holds) the characteristic properties. For if the hypostases are identical with ingeneracy, generacy and procession, and ingeneracy, generacy and procession are divided from each other by their very being, the hypostases must also be separated from one another by their very being. But this is not at all the sort of teaching the company of the fathers gives us. By no means! They taught the contrary: that by the substance (i.e. by their very being) and by all the properties of the Godhead, the hypostases possess * mutual connexion, whereas only by the marks which are understood to belong properly to each of them (as has been demonstrated) do they have separateness.

Their divinely inspired teaching demonstrates that the hypostases are mutually united in the very being of the Holy Trinity. Mighty and apostolic ATHANASIUS, then, writes as follows in the *Fourth*

ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας

ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας

ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας
ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας

Fol. 11vb

Lines 2-10: ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας ἡλικίας. Add. 14533, fol. 148rb. ἡλικίας (line 7) Add. 14533: ἡλικίας.

soubriquet from his proven theology, has taught that the being of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost is the same.

What then, if we prove straight away that these present impudent, reckless and godless ravers against the divine mystery talk of the very being of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost (indeed, rather, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost themselves) as outside the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Should we not do right to bewail them or hold them in deep odium, as having completely lost their wits through reckless arrogance against God and deem them unworthy of any discussion whatsoever? For we should mourn people who fight the Holy Bible, those who taught us these things and the general consensus of mankind, rather than rebut them by argument. Otherwise who will not be amazed (indeed, it would be truer to say, will not make merry) on hearing that someone's being was outside himself; which is nothing but stupidly asserting that he is something outside himself?

Wise GREGORY, bishop of Nyssa, will bear witness that this is all measureless madness. He writes as follows in his discourse *Against Eunomius' Statement*, who uttered similar senseless nonsense (its beginning goes: The faith of Christians): 'He is not', he says. 'separated or divided into a plurality in the substance wherein he is one. nor does he become different at different times nor does he change from being what he is; nor is he transformed from one substance into three hypostases, for he is completely and entirely one, remaining likewise by the same respects unique'. The intelligent listener should first separate, from the passage quoted, the apparently sensible things and the empty verbiage thoughtlessly tossed into the discourse. Afterwards he should take notice of * the meaning of the residue of statement to see if it harmonizes with the Christian religion. The first words of the passage are

86/87 cf. supra. 72 105/150 Greg. Nyss., Refut. Conf. Eunomii (PG 45, 480C - 481C; Jaeger II, pp. 325.6 - 327.4)

... : ...

95 ... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
100 ... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
105 ... : ...
... : ...
... : ...

110 : ...
... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
115 ... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
120 ... : ...
... : ...
... : ...
... : ...

Fol. 12va

115 completely devoid of any meaning, good or bad. For what meaning 'not
 divided into a plurality in the substance wherein he is one, nor does he
 become different at different times nor does he change from being what
 he is' has, not even he will say, and I think none of his supporters can
 find any shadow of meaning in these statements either. 'He is not divided
 120 in the substance wherein he is one.' Does he say of him that he is not
 divided from his own substance or of the substance that it is not divided
 from him? This meaningless sentence is an empty verbal noise, a random
 concoction. Why should we waste time in track of this senseless ver-
 biage? For how can someone be separated from his own substance and
 remain in being? Or how can someone's substance be parted from him
 and looked at separately? Or how is it possible for someone having left
 his being to become someone else, while becoming outside himself? But,
 he says, 'he is not transformed from one substance into three hypostases;
 for he is completely and entirely one, remaining likewise by the same
 130 respects unique'. To my mind, then, the parts that are senseless in this
 statement will be obvious to everybody, even before our argument. Let
 the man who thinks there is some sense or meaning in this utterance
 oppose it; for one who knows how to weigh the force of an argument
 will disdain involving himself with the baseless things. For what force
 135 does it have against our teaching to say 'he is not divided or separated
 into a plurality in the substance wherein he is one, nor does he become
 different at different times nor does he change from being what he is, nor
 is he transformed from one substance into three hypostases', things not
 said or believed by Christians * nor logically deducible from our
 140 confessions? For who ever said, or heard anybody state in God's

125 < חַסְדָּא דְּמַלְכָא דְּיְהוָה וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 130 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 135 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 140 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 145 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 150 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 155 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :
 < וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל : וְיִשְׁרָאֵל וְיִשְׁרָאֵל :

Fol. 12vb

115/118 cf. supra, 105-108 119/120 cf. supra, 105-106 128/130 cf. supra, 108-110 135/138 cf. supra, 105-109

Line 140: MS om. *וְיִשְׁרָאֵל*, cf. p. 135, line 82.

Church, that the Father is separated or divided from his substance, or has become different at different times by becoming outside himself or is transformed into three hypostases? Eunomius says these things to himself, without entering into controversy with us; instead he babbles his own nonsense, mixing a good deal of senselessness into the blasphemy of these statements. We, for our part, say that it is equally blasphemous and godless to call the Lord of the Creation a creature as to think the Father is separated or sundered in his being, or leaves himself or is transformed into three hypostases like clay or wax transformed into various patterns.

You perceive with what good reason the doctor makes merry over the ignorance of that boaster because he thought we ought to reject such ludicrous and obvious blasphemies as if they were someone's meaning; he called the first passage, indeed, completely devoid of any meaning, good or bad. For what meaning 'not divided into a plurality in the substance wherein he is one, nor does he become different at different times nor does he change from being what he is' has, not even he will say, and I think none of his supporters can find any shadow of meaning in these statements either. So, if one who said that God the Father is not separated from his own substance was rightly found guilty of being full of so much ignorance and was seen to be imagining and devising empty, meaningless and wantonly fashioned verbiage, is there any impiety these people do not surpass who cherish as their doctrine such a blasphemy and who quite brazenly assert that not only the Father, but the Son and the Holy Ghost as well, are outside their own substance and Godhead? For, according to these absurd and satanic pronouncements, the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are found to be outside their being; * which is what this wonderful theologian also tries to establish by all ways and means? The doctor said furthermore:

155/159 cf. supra, 115-119

ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 160 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 165 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ

ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 170 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 — ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 — ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 175 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 180 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 185 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ : ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ

Fol. 13ra

For how can someone be separated from his own substance and remain in being? Or how can someone's substance be parted from him and looked at separately? Or how is it possible for someone having left his being to become someone else, while becoming outside himself?

175 It has, then, been demonstrated that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are not (as this empty novelty-monger thinks) outside themselves or their own substance and Godhead; rather, indeed, people who hold godless views like this are seen to abandon the whole company of Christians, not to say (more truly perhaps) 180 rational nature, because they teach things wholly alien, foreign and contradictory to God's Church. That same question by the wise father might ring out to them in loud tones: Who ever said, or heard anybody state in God's Church, that the Father is separated or divided from his substance, or has become different at different times by 185 becoming outside himself?

Must we (as was the doctor's view too) leave the point at issue and waste time on the examination of this senseless verbiage? Yet, because we shall reach the point after a brief digression out of necessity and at the instigation of the verbiage, it will be useful 190 to satisfy our readers and show too how our reckless author asserts that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are outside themselves and outside their own substance and Godhead, lest it should seem to anybody that we were concocting lying charges and empty slanders against him.

195 So let us investigate the matter as follows! The divinely inspired fathers defined ingeneracy sometimes as outside the substance, sometimes as outside the hypostasis of God the Father, as will now be shown, and clearly we must make the same kind of

171/174 cf. supra, 124-127 182/185 cf. supra, 140-142 186/187 cf. supra, 123-124

190 אָרָם, אָרָם : אַרְבֵּי מַלְאָכִים אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ בְּעֵינֵיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ

195 אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
200 אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
205 אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ

אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
210 אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
215 אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ

אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ
220 אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ : אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדוֹ אֵלֶּיךָ

acknowledgment in regard to generacy and procection. So if * the
 200 hypostases of the Holy Trinity are ingeneracy, generacy and
 procession (as this novelty-mongering writer affirms) and ingeneracy,
 generacy and procession, in virtue of being the characteristic
 properties of the hypostases, are rightly believed (in accordance
 with the divinely inspired teachers) to be outside the substance
 205 (because they are joined to and seen as belonging with the
 hypostases, and separate them from one another) the hypostases
 themselves will necessarily be found, according to right reasoning,
 to be outside the substance and outside themselves. How, indeed,
 can we avoid acknowledging the implication of this earth-sprung,
 210 or rather, hell-sprung theology? Now the patristic theologians
 talk of ingeneracy, generacy, and clearly procession, too, as
 outside the substance and the hypostases, not with the idea that
 God the Father is ever outside his being ingenerate or the Son
 outside his being generate or, again, the Holy Ghost outside his
 215 proceeding (let none despoil the principle of true religion and
 attack the divinely inspired teachers, for that would be to uproot
 the whole Christian mystery!) but meaning that these do not
 pertain to the concept of the substance, i.e. the Godhead, other-
 wise they would render different in substance the hypostases,
 220 whose characteristic properties they are. For if ingeneracy, generacy
 and procession pertained to the concept of substance, and
 Father, Son and Holy Ghost do not mutually participate (in
 virtue of the ingeneracy, generacy and procession) must not
 Father, Son and Holy Ghost differ from one another also by the
 225 very concept of substance? This is the reason why the champions
 of the truth, in rebutting impious Eunomius who wanted to
 devise a difference in substance between the hypostases of Father
 and Son on the basis of the mutual foreignness of ingeneracy and
 generacy, stood up to defend orthodox doctrine and ruled that
 230 ingeneracy and generacy are outside the substance and outside

200 *
 225
 230
 235
 240
 245
 250

Lines 232-246: Add. 14533, fol. 148rb. Add. 14533 erroneously adds: ... (line 235) Add. 14533: ... (line 239) Add. 14533: ...

the hypostases, because they are external accompaniments of the hypostases. Hence we say that ingeneracy and generacy do not differ from one another like the hypostases, but in toto. For the hypostases * of the Holy Trinity sharing equally in the substance and having no mutual difference at all, only differ from one another by the properties belonging with each of them whilst the property safeguards freedom from confusion for each of them; whereas this is not the case with ingeneracy and generacy. Why? Just because, contrariwise they differ mutually *in toto*, even though they ever pertain to what are in every respect united without confusion, showing the different mode of being of each and separating them from one another by this and this alone.

The orthodox and irreproachable teaching of the fathers corroborates this. We have already quoted BASIL, the champion of truth, above. In his second book *Against Eunomius* he wrote that the title 'ingenerate' was to be taken as outside the substance, in these words: And, so it looks, if we are going to save the idea of simplicity and being without parts, we shall either say nothing about God except ingeneracy and shall refuse to call him 'invisible', 'incorruptible', 'immutable', 'creator', 'judge' and all the names we use now for his glory; or, if we accept these names, what are we going to make of them? Are we to take them and apply them all to the substance? In that case, we shall prove him not only composite but compounded from dissimilar parts in virtue of the diversity of meanings of each of the names. But shall we take them as outside the substance? Whatever principle they hit on over each of these, they must apply to the title 'ingenerate'.

247/256 cf. supra, ch. 6, 341-350

...
 255 ...
 ...
 260 ...
 ...

Fol. 13va

...
 265 ...
 ...
 270 ...
 ...
 275 ...
 ...

Lines 253-263: ... Add. 12155, fol. 30va. ... (line 253) Add. 12155: ... (line 260) Add. 12155: ...

Line 254: ... A note in the same hand at the top of the folio reads as follows: ...

It has been demonstrated irrefragably that this divinely inspired father takes 'ingenerate' like the other titles too, as outside the substance. He shall teach us again too how ingeneracy, though following it, is said to be outside God the Father's hypostasis. He speaks as follows, then, when demolishing and deriding the feeble onslaughts of impious Eunomius by rebuttals in the first of the books addressed to him: Having declared that 'if he is not * prior to himself nor is there another to be prior to him, ingeneracy must follow him', he subsequently becomes aware that, as a consequence of the premisses, the argument has come out to the opposite conclusion. For if ingeneracy follows God, it evidently follows him externally; now what is outside God is not his substance and therefore the argument collapses. To avoid this fate what does he do? Paying scant attention to the derision he was likely to incur by uttering non-sequiturs, he corrected the argument and brought it to the desired end, by saying: 'Rather ingeneracy is the substance itself'. But this is quite out of key with the preceding words. For how can God have the ingeneracy, which both follows him and does not follow him but instead is based in the very concept of the substance? But yet he does not allow the sophism to be demolished entirely. For if, having said that ingeneracy follows him, he had let the argument rest here, he would have been unable to call 'ingeneracy' the substance of the God of all, or to prove that the Only-begotten Son is alien in respect of the substance to him, since no external accompaniment can separate the affinity of substance between Father and Son. But now by adding 'but rather ingeneracy is the substance itself', he has proved that whatever God is, is ingeneracy. That he is preparing all this as a course for the onslaught of his blasphemy he will show when he has progressed somewhat in the argument. His initial statement, indeed, has been seen to be a consequence of the truth of the realities, by following from the points conceded. But the final addition has been tossed in from heretical thought, our author having no compunction at all towards making a *volte face* to set the argument

280
285
290
295
300
305
310

— Fol. 13vb

263/291 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. I, 5 (PG 29, 517B - 520B; SChr., vol. 299, pp. 176-180) 271/272 Edd.: μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτό ἐστιν οὐσία ἀγέννητος 283/284 'he will show'. Edd.: ἐπιδειξῶ

320 Father's ingeneracy both accompanies and follows the Father
externally and is the Father? Should we not be rebuked by the
divinely inspired father (not to mention by the very nature of the
realities) who proclaimed his ruling out loud: * For how can the
same thing follow God and be God, when it is well-known to everybody
that what follows is different from what it follows?

345 *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ*
ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ,ⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 350 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ❖ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ

Fol. 14rb

Examination proving that to say ingeneracy follows God is Basil the Great's own view. How also he sometimes speaks of ingeneracy following the life. Discussion of this and other texts by fathers.

5 Any unbiddable champion of absurd doctrines, who says that the doctor referred to the thought of Eunomius and did not express his own views here, will very properly be rebutted by the wise father himself, who spoke carefully as follows: His initial statement, indeed (viz. that ingeneracy follows God) has been seen to be
 10 a consequence of the truth of the realities by following from the points conceded. But the final addition has been tossed in from heretical thought. Could anyone with the slightest concern for truth vitiate the father's words? For we heard that ingeneracy follows God is a
 15 consequence of the truth of the realities but learned that ingeneracy is the substance had been tossed in from heretical thought. But besides this, how can we abuse the words: since no external accompaniment can separate the affinity of substance between Father and Son? We are either therefore to accept that ingeneracy and generacy are not the Father and the Son at all but perpetually follow
 20 Father and Son externally as their characteristic properties, and we shall rightly safeguard to Father and Son their consubstantiality; or, contrariwise refusing to profess that ingeneracy and generacy follow Father and Son externally, we are to embrace a dissimilarity of substance between Father and Son and be convicted of
 25 uttering foolishly and ruinously the opinions of Arius and Eunomius. For if, according to the wise doctor, because ingeneracy

ⲛⲓⲙⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 5 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ

ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 10 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 15 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 20 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 25 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ

8/12 cf. supra, ch. 9, 284-287 9 cf. supra, ch. 9, 264-265 13/15 cf. supra, ch. 9, 267-272 16/17 cf. supra, ch. 9, 279-281

Lines 20-31: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ. Add. 14533, fol. 148va.

and generacy follow Father and Son externally they do not separate * the affinity of substance, then, clearly, if they do not follow externally they must procure a difference of substance between Father and Son. But in superabundant proof that God-clad Basil expressed his own view when he said that ingeneracy followed God the Father, we will cite him as a witness. He said as follows, in the second book *Against Eunomius* the execrable: But with regard to God's appearing to be composite unless light and ingeneracy are taken to be the same thing, we can say that, if we took ingeneracy as part of the substance, his argument (being that what is compounded of different things is composite) would have some ground. But if we assert God's substance to be light, life or goodness, if all of him, whatever he is, is life, all of him is light and all of him is goodness, and ingeneracy follows the life, how can the simple in substance not be incomposite?

What will the clever fellow concoct in reply to these words, what will he devise? Will he say that these too were introduced as Eunomius' opinion? Is it not the height of insanity to say so? For in this passage the doctor did not proceed to confirm the truth from the declaration of Eunomius when he says that ingeneracy follows God, but on the contrary, he refutes his stupidity for arguing and saying that unless one says ingeneracy is identical with the substance, God will appear composite. That is why, a little before this passage, he had said: But he here transfers the antithesis between the properties to the substance and thus deduces the ground for his blasphemy, scaring us, as if we were children, with his sophisms that if the light is something else beside the ingeneracy, God will necessarily be proved composite. What do I say? That unless the light is something else beside the ingeneracy, it cannot be used to refer to the Son any more than ingeneracy can.

33/40 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 29 (PG 29, 640B; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 122); cf. supra, ch. 6, 331-338 49/55 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 28-29 (PG 29, 637C - 640A; *SChr.*, vol. 305, pp. 120-122)

Fol. 14va

30
 35
 40
 45
 50
 55

45
 50
 55
 60

* I think that even the invincible Damian will concede this. But he will try to renew his attack on the basis of another feeble argument, which it would perhaps be profitable to examine. The doctor, he will say, said here not that ingeneracy followed the Father but that it followed the substance of God. For he wrote:
 60 Father but that it followed the substance of God. For he wrote: But if we assert God's substance to be light, life or goodness, if all of him, whatever he is, is life, all of him is light and all of him is goodness, and ingeneracy follows the life, how can the simple in substance not be
 65 incomposite? In which case (to concur with him), we are to know that even according to this clever author's argument, it has been proved that ingeneracy is an accompaniment and outside God's substance. But, if so, then God the Father is too because this excellent fellow thinks the Father is identical with ingeneracy. For the doctor also said: For if ingeneracy follows God, it evidently
 70 follows him externally.

But if he is outside his substance, obviously he will be alienated from what he is. For we have heard Saint Gregory, brother to this God-clad father, also give his ruling clearly as follows: How can someone be separated from his own substance and remain in being?
 75 Or how can someone's substance be parted from him and looked at separately? Or how is it possible for someone having left his being to become someone else, while becoming outside himself? One, then, who is separated from his own substance (which is the same as saying 'who becomes outside it') we have been taught by wise and
 80 accurate instruction, must necessarily altogether end up in non-being and become outside himself.

Let those, then, who confess ingeneracy, generacy and procession to be Father, Son and Holy Ghost, take their fill of the appropriate,

61/64 cf. supra, 37-40 69/70 cf. supra, ch. 9, 266-267 73/77 cf. supra, ch. 9, 124-127

אלוהים * כי יתגדף ויחשב כי הוא חסדו. כי
 ויבטח כי יבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 65 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 70 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 75 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח

כי יבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 80 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 85 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח

ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח
 ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח ויבטח

Line 80: ויבטח, cf. p. 115, line 137 (ויבטח).
 Lines 80-81: ויבטח ויבטח, cf. p. 115, line 138 (ויבטח ויבטח).
 Line 81: ויבטח, cf. p. 115, line 139 (ויבטח).

necessary and just, logical consequences. These must by all means be drawn even where we favour him with the concession that ingeneracy * follows the substance and Godhead comprehending the three hypostases, as he holds.

But let us note the true bearing of the matter. Eunomius, as has been shown before, considered 'the ingenerate' or ingeneracy as both the substance and the hypostasis of God the Father. The God-clad father eradicated this impious opinion, producing a proof based on true and incontrovertible deductions that ingeneracy was not the substance or hypostasis of God the Father. Hence sometimes he ruled that ingeneracy follows God the Father externally, sometimes that it follows the life, there being nothing else meant by the 'life', which ingeneracy follows, but the Father. We shall hear that he said that ingeneracy follows God the Father (i.e. the hypostasis of the Father) externally, because he wrote about Eunomius the following, as we have already indeed set down: If he is not prior to himself nor is there another to be prior to him, ingeneracy must follow him. With reference to whom do we think Eunomius said here that if he is not prior to himself nor is there another to be prior to him, ingeneracy must follow him? To the Father only or to the substance and common Godhead comprehending the three hypostases? But perhaps it may be a source of embarrassment to investigate things like this, not to mention arguing about them? For what person, who has ever savoured the fathers' doctrines, can be ignorant of the fact that Eunomius godlessly made the Father unbeginning (i.e. uncreated), uncaused and non-temporal but the Son and the Holy Ghost quite opposite: created, subject to cause like creatures, and to time? In which case it is plain that he is referring to God the Father only when he says: If he is not prior to himself nor is there another to be prior to him, ingeneracy must follow him. At whom, are we to say, does truth's champion aim, when having set down these words he

90 :

 *
 Fol. 15ra

90
 95
 100
 105
 110
 115
 120

goes on immediately to say: Subsequently he becomes aware that, as a consequence of the premisses, the argument has come out to the opposite conclusion. For if * ingeneracy follows God, it evidently follows him externally; now what is outside God is not his substance? Is this not directed at the same Eunomius? Obviously we must concede it is, unless we have gone quite out of our minds. In which case, if Eunomius refers ingeneracy must follow him only to God the Father, whereas the wise father thought he could put to good use Eunomius' pronouncement, it must follow that we are to understand that the doctor applied solely to God the Father's hypostasis the conclusion: For if ingeneracy follows God, it evidently follows him externally; now what is outside God is not his substance. Any other way, and we shall make his whole treatise on the matter against Eunomius vacuous if we do not so understand these things. For if Eunomius, when he said that ingeneracy follows God, meant only God the Father's hypostasis, but the doctor refers to Eunomius when he says: Subsequently he becomes aware that, as a consequence of the premisses, the argument has come out to the opposite conclusion; for if ingeneracy follows God it evidently follows him externally; now what is outside God is not his substance: the doctor must have missed the point and, by using 'substance' in the generic sense, have discussed not Eunomius but somebody else. For what need would there be for such an argument, when nobody till this truly modern writer (for the writer and exponent of novelties is truly modern) has made the portentous declaration that ingeneracy is the substance comprehending the three hypostases?

'But' (he will say) 'he said elsewhere that ingeneracy follows the life, and obviously the life is not one hypostasis but is the substance and Godhead comprehending the three hypostases viz.

116/119 cf. supra, ch. 9, 265-268 122 cf. supra, 114 126/127 cf. supra, 118-119 132/135 cf. supra, 116-119 142/143 cf. supra, 39-40

125 130 135 140 145 150

Fol. 15rb

155

with the same equally honourable names: not as if he were not from
 175 another, or were begotten, but as proceeding from the Father. Let the
 properties remain unshaken from the common indications and names,
 and likewise let what is common remain inseparable from the properties.
 You have spoken of three? Run uninterruptedly towards one! You have
 imagined one? Think separately of the three! 'Three' will put a brake
 180 upon Sabellius' Jewish confusion; 'one' upon Arius' heathen dissection.

What has been set down suffices to prove that when we use the
 term 'light', 'life', 'goodness' or anything similar, without joining
 or coupling the property, we are considering the Holy Trinity, but
 when we use the name 'unbegotten light', for example, 'begotten
 185 light' or 'proceeding light', we are signifying the hypostasis only
 of, as it may be, the Father, the Son or the Holy Ghost. From
 this it is clear that God-clad BASIL, in the words which have just
 been examined, also took the 'life', which ingeneracy follows, as
 nothing else but the hypostasis of God the Father; for he said in
 190 a slightly earlier passage: But if we assert God's substance to be light,
 life or goodness, if all of him, whatever he is, is life, all of him is light
 and all of him is goodness, and ingeneracy follows the life, how can the
 simple in substance not be incomposite? Can we possibly understand
 anything except the hypostasis of God the Father from these
 195 clear words? For whom did Eunomius, against whom these
 statements are directed, recognize as simple (in the full sense of
 the word and substantially) except God the Father alone, whom
 he even impiously misrepresented the God-clad fathers as pro-
 nouncing composite. Moreover, indeed, the same divinely inspired
 200 father's subsequent remark, which is as follows, even proves the
 point: And, so it looks, if we are going to save the idea of simplicity and
 being without parts, we shall either * say nothing about God except

190/193 cf. supra, 37-40 201/208 cf. supra, ch. 9, 247-254

190 *ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ* < Fol. 15vb
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 195 *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ

ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 200 *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 205 *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 210 *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 215 *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 220 *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ

< Fol. 16ra

ingeneracy, and shall refuse to call him 'invisible', 'incorruptible', 'immutable', 'creator', 'judge' and all the names we use now for his
 205 glory; or, if we accept these names, what are we going to make of them? Are we to take them and apply them all to the substance? In that case, not only shall we prove him composite but compounded from dissimilar parts in virtue of the diversity of meaning of each of the names. What is the doctor saying? That, 'if according to your absurd propositions,
 210 Eunomius, ingeneracy, by following God, proves him composite unless it be God's substance, either we shall say nothing about God except ingeneracy and reject in one breath all orthodox statements about him like 'invisible', 'incorruptible', 'immutable' and so on; or, if we do use them, not only shall we prove him composite but
 215 compounded from dissimilar parts in virtue of the diversity of meaning of each of the names. Of what, then, did Eunomius predicate ingeneracy or, rather, what did he suppose ingeneracy was? The substance comprehending the three hypostases or only the hypostasis of God the Father? But nobody of any sense will contest the point.
 220 It is, then, obvious that the doctor too said this about God the Father and not at all about the substance understood in its generic sense.

From all this it has therefore been proved that Basil the Great very correctly and by the illumination of the Spirit himself, taught
 225 us that ingeneracy follows the hypostasis of God the Father as his characteristic property and not as a hypostasis other than himself; and it has been demonstrated by abundant and clear patristic testimony and with fairly brief examination, that the characteristic properties are other than the hypostases because they follow and
 230 adhere to them from outside.

ⲙⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 225 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 230 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 235 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 240 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 245 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ

ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 250 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲉⲥⲓ

211/213 cf. supra, 202-204 214/216 cf. supra, 207-208

beginning goes: But let us see what follows the blasphemy) as follows:
 55 Again, let us investigate this point too: what defence does he offer of the things he was convicted of by mighty Basil, in separating off the Only-begotten God to the portion of darkness by saying: 'the difference between the lights is exactly proportionate to that between ingeneracy and generacy'? For having proved that the divergence between generacy and ingeneracy is not a matter of plus or minus but that there is a total
 60 opposition in * meanings, and drawn the deduction from the premisses, that if the Father's light differs over against the Son's correspondingly as ingeneracy and generacy, of entire necessity no diminution of light will be thought of in the Son, but instead a complete estrangement from it.
 65 For just as we cannot say that generacy is a diminished ingeneracy, but the meanings of 'ingeneracy' and 'generacy' are polar antitheses so, supposing the Father's light preserves the same difference from the light perceived in the Son, it necessarily follows that the Son can no longer be thought light, having been made equally outside both ingeneracy itself
 70 and the light in it. One who is something other than light must in consequence clearly be akin to light's opposite. Later on he says: But I would ask this representer of our words either to say our words (or to render a very close representation of the argument) or else, if he employs argument according to his education and ability, to speak in his own
 75 person and not ours. For none of our people could be so mistaken as to think that, ingeneracy and generacy being mutually opposed in meaning, the one is quantitatively less than the other. For no opposites are different from one another by way of smaller quantity, but are mutually contrary by their complete opposition in meaning. We say, for instance,
 80 that someone is asleep or not asleep, seated or not seated, begotten or not begotten and so on, along the same lines, where the denial of one thing becomes the assertion of its opposite. So, just as being alive is not a

60 : ...
 ...
 65 ...
 ...
 70 ...
 ...
 75 ...
 ...
 80 ...
 ...
 85 ...
 ...
 90 ...
 ...

Fol. 16vb

55/71 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 10 (PG 45, 892C - 893A; Jaeger II, p. 296, 4-25) 71/98 Ibid. (PG 45, 908AD; Jaeger II, pp. 309,23 - 310,25)

115 from the absurd profession by these profane men, the total
 opposition and remoteness between the * substances and hypostases
 thought of by the blasphemers, were proving that ingeneracy and
 generacy are not substances or hypostases (for, as we have been
 taught, if ingeneracy — and generacy likewise — is not a mode of
 120 being but is, as they think, a substance and a hypostasis, the
 Father must be completely opposite in substance to the Son) has
 not this mischievous, new-fangled nonsense too been utterly
 eradicated along with the old lunacy, when it makes the hypostases
 of Father and Son nothing but ingeneracy and generacy? Are
 125 they not falling into Arian and heathen blathering by thinking
 that the hypostases of Father and Son are as totally separate
 from each other as ingeneracy and generacy? And are they not
 embracing Sabellian and Jewish godlessness by making Father,
 Son and, likewise, Holy Ghost names and properties, which it is
 130 evident have no proper, individual subsistence? For who on
 hearing Basil the Great and his brother clearly proclaiming in the
 previous passages that ingeneracy and generacy are totally remote
 from each other, and wise CYRIL responding expressly, at one
 point in the second book of his *Dialogues with Hermias*: For
 135 'generacy' and 'ingeneracy' are not things existing individually and
 hypostatically but they only bring us the meanings of having been
 begotten or not having been begotten, and elsewhere: Ingeneracy, then,
 is by no means God's substance, but is indicative, as I have said, only of
 the fact that the Father has not been begotten; it does not subsist on its
 140 own; who on hearing this and wanting to be any kind of
 Christian at all, will ever submit to professing the Father and the
 Son to be ingeneracy and generacy like this word-spinner? For it
 will turn out, since he thinks (as Eunomius saw fit to suppose) that
 ingeneracy and likewise generacy are a substance and hypostasis,

131/133 cf. supra, 27-28 and 59-61 134/137 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. II*
 (PG 75, 741AB; SChr., vol. 231, p. 272) 137/140 Ibid. (PG 75, 741D; SChr.,
 vol. 231, p. 274)

127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155

127 : 128 : 129 : 130 : 131 : 132 : 133 : 134 : 135 : 136 : 137 : 138 : 139 : 140 : 141 : 142 : 143 : 144 : 145 : 146 : 147 : 148 : 149 : 150 : 151 : 152 : 153 : 154 : 155 :

Fol. 17rb

Lines 138-143: Add. 14533, fol. 148va.

145 that an opposite, i.e. the Son, is begotten by an opposite, i.e. the
 Father. For Basil the Great said, as set down above: * These
 absurdities, then, and more besides, will attend those who make generacy
 and ingeneracy substances; for it will turn out that contrary is begotten
 from contrary, and in place of natural kinship a civil war is necessitated
 150 and will be seen in the substance itself. Yet according to the teaching
 of the proven doctor Cyril, it will also turn out that the prosopa
 of the Father and the Son do not properly subsist. For, as we
 have just been taught, he said explicitly: 'Generacy' and 'ingeneracy'
 are not things existing individually and hypostatically. And Sabellius
 155 who makes the Holy Trinity imagination and fancy will enter in.
 Again, too, must not one who defines ingeneracy and generacy as
 hypostases, according to the Theologian concede that Father and
 Son are, to say the least, opposite hypostases? For if, according
 to these clever new theologians, ingenerate and generate, ingener-
 160 acy and generacy, are the hypostases of Father and Son, and if,
 on the other hand, we have listened to the Theologian declaring
 ingeneracy and generacy are mutually opposed as condition and priva-
 tion, then obviously also the hypostases of Father and Son will be
 mutually contrary. But, indeed, Basil's brother too testified to the
 165 fact that wise Basil had inferred a total opposition in their
 meanings between ingeneracy and generacy and therefore affirmed
 that there would be a complete estrangement between Father and
 Son were Father and Son, in accordance with their godless
 pronouncement, ingeneracy and generacy, by writing as follows:
 170 For having proved that the divergence between generacy and ingeneracy
 is not a matter of plus or minus but that there is a total opposition in
 meanings, and drawn the deduction from the premisses, that if the

160
 165
 170
 175
 180
 185
 < Fol. 17va >

Lines 171-185: *ἰε θεοῦ* *ἐκ πατρὸς*. Add. 14533, fois. 148va-
 vb.; *ὡς ὁ ἀρχαῖος* (line 171), Add. 14533: *ὡς ὁ ἀρχαῖος ὡς ὁ ἀρχαῖος*;
ἀρχαῖος (line 172), Add. 14533: *ἀρχαῖος*; *ἰε θεοῦ* (line 179). Add.
 14533: *ἰε θεοῦ*.

146/150 cf. supra, 28-31 153/154 cf. supra, 135-136 162/163 cf. supra,
 46-47 170/181 cf. supra, 59-70

200 This shall the Church's great doctor, BASIL, teach us, speaking as
 he does, as follows in the second of the books *Against Eunomius*
 the impious: There is a certain antithesis between unbegotten and
 begotten through the function of the terms (though not in the nature of
 the realities), a fact which they exploit. But no opposition between the
 205 lights can be found, either in the use of the term or in the idea.

Saint GREGORY, his brother, spoke * in his first book *Against*
Eunomius the impious and witless (its beginning runs: There is a
 limit to the labours of those who fight in contests) as follows: If, then,
 the meaning of 'substance' is one thing and the term 'generation' is
 210 established to mean something else, their sophistical tricks have collapsed
 all of a sudden, like earthenware pots, thrown together and shattering
 one another. For it will no longer be open to them to carry over the
 ingenerate - generate distinction to the substance of Father and Son and
 simultaneously transfer the mutual conflict of the names to the realities.
 215 Likewise in the fifth book of the same treatise *Against Eunomius*
 (its beginning goes: Because, he says, the word 'Lord') he spoke as
 follows: But if he asserts a difference of substance between generacy and
 ingeneracy like that between fire and water, and imagines the names as
 having the same mutual relation as his examples have, the awfulness of
 220 his blasphemy will be evident even if we stay silent. For fire and water
 have mutually destructive natures and when one happens to be in the
 other it is destroyed by the force of the more powerful. If, therefore, he
 teaches this sort of remoteness between the Ingenerate's nature and the
 Only-begotten's, he must consequently concede that this destructive
 225 contrariety too resides in the difference between the substances; so that
 their nature must thereby be incompatible and unshared, and one would

202/205 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 26 (PG 29, 632CD; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 110)

208/214 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (PG 45, 592AB; Jaeger II, p. 29, 12-19)

217/243 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 5 (PG 45, 757AC; Jaeger II, pp. 176.16 - 177.23)

ⲕⲉⲓⲛⲁⲥ ⲕⲉⲗⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲗ ⲛⲉⲗ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲥ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲗ ⲛⲉⲗ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲥ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 220 ⲛⲉⲗ ⲛⲉⲗ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲥ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 225 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ

ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 230 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 235 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 240 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 245 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ

Fol. 18ra

Line 223: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ. MS reads: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ.

the names, and the mutual estrangement between 'ingeneracy'
 285 and 'generacy', to the hypostases; whereas those who reckon it
 right not to think of the names, and ingeneracy and generacy, as
 hypostases, are not obliged by valid argument to accept any of
 these impious dogmas at all. For consistent with themselves and
 in obedience to the reasonings and orthodox words of the fathers,
 290 they will duly acknowledge that it is not the names and char-
 acteristic properties, but the hypostases themselves, of the Holy
 Trinity which possess, by the commonness of the substance, an
 absence of mutual difference, total likeness, unity and identity,
 and, * through participating in the same substance and Godhead
 295 are seen and recognized in one another, yet preserve by their
 particular marks (I mean fatherhood and sonship — ingeneracy
 and generacy — and procession) absence of confusion and
 mutual separateness. For we have not been taught by any wise
 doctor to apply any of these things to the names or the character-
 300 istic properties.

Therefore, pray let proven SEVERUS, the just balance of ortho-
 doxy, prove this clearly to us, drawing, as he does, upon the
 Spirit's treasures. For it would be as well to establish and
 corroborate even what seems clear, as best we can, through
 305 patristic testimony. He wrote as follows in the seventeenth chap-
 ter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian*:
 So, in the same way that with us manhood is the whole substance
 comprehending many hypostases (Peter's, Paul's, John's and each indi-
 vidual's) whereas Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing equally in
 310 the substance, for each of them shares fully and no less in the manhood,
 and is a man, separated by his own designation and grouped with the
 consubstantial hypostases because he resembles them unvaryingly in
 every thing common without being the whole substance and manhood
 comprehending all the individual hypostases. In this very way, in the
 315 case of the Holy Trinity too, the substance is the whole Godhead

307/321 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 17 (CSCO 111, p. 161, 6-24; 112, pp. 125,32 - 126,13)

315
 320
 325
 330
 335
 340
 345

Fol. 18vb

330
 335
 340
 345

comprehending the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but each of the hypostases shares also by the same substance in equality of honour, and is completely God, and has no difference at all from its consubstantial hypostases, but is separated and parted by its particular indication (ingeneracy, generacy or procession), the property safeguarding the absence of confusion. He writes to the same effect in the eighteenth chapter of the same book: So from this we learn that there is * no confusion of the hypostases within the Holy Trinity, but each hypostasis exists along with its indication in the substance of the Godhead; because through the community of substance, it possesses absence of difference, complete similarity, unity and identity with the consubstantial hypostases, whereas through its property it possesses absence of confusion. So that, because of complete equality in the community, the others also, who participate in the same substance, will be seen and recognized in each hypostasis.

Will those who read this with good intent and a little intelligence be ready to say that the proof given of the fact that ingeneracy, generacy, procession (moreover, indeed, the names themselves) are not the hypostases and prosopa of the Holy Trinity, lacks proper support? No, I think none will.

322/330 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 18 (CSCO 111, p. 169, 13-22; 112, p. 132, 12-21)

350
 355
 360

365
 370
 375
 380
 385
 390
 395
 400
 405
 410
 415
 420
 425
 430
 435
 440
 445
 450
 455
 460
 465
 470
 475
 480
 485
 490
 495
 500

Fol. 19ra

365
 370
 375
 380
 385
 390
 395
 400
 405
 410
 415
 420
 425
 430
 435
 440
 445
 450
 455
 460
 465
 470
 475
 480
 485
 490
 495
 500

Line 363: MS trsp. these two words.

Examination of God-clad Severus' misrepresented utterance where he says: 'We must also then recognize that fatherhood (i.e. ingeneracy), generacy or procession are not empty names'.

5 And a very clear demonstration that this was said in reply to the Grammarian because he intended to confuse the hypostases of the Holy Trinity, and not, as the slanderer supposes, in order to prove that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases.

10 What will those who in desperation, perhaps, use the same round of circuitous arguments and who will acknowledge anything rather than be defeated (what we define as true victory) say in reply to this point: 'The patriarch apparently not recognizing any difference between the names, the characteristic properties of the hypostases and the hypostases themselves, called not only 15 ingeneracy, generacy and procession, but also the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, "names"?'

It was all the more incumbent on those who * say this not to argue so presumptuously but, rather, to submit to all the testimonies and examinations which have proved, clearer than day, that prop- 20 erties and names are not identical with hypostases. Nevertheless, for the sake of a full defence and of a fair and unbiased hearing there will be some advantage in conducting a further brief examination and in washing away the slanderers' infidel and injurious mischief, like something briny and bitter, by the ever- 25 flowing spring of the doctors, and thus bringing an uncontaminated, drinkable draught to the Church's nurselings.

: ܐܕܡܳܘܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ

10 ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ

ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ
ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ ܐܳܠܳܘܢ

3/4 cf. supra, ch. 7, 30-31

Let us, therefore, consider even again the words complained of and trace out the doctor's meaning with exactitude, to see if (as back-sliders from the truth impudently say) the fathers' mouth himself opposes and contradicts orthodoxy and all the divinely inspired fathers, and not only that, but worst of all opposes himself, by teaching absurdly that the names and characteristic properties of the hypostases are the hypostases themselves of the Holy, all-adorable and consubstantial Trinity, as these slanderers blather. The begetter of this abominable heresy wrote as follows about him (as set out slightly earlier): We recall, indeed, that the wise patriarch also somewhere or other in the work *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea* quoted passages from proven doctors, ruling as follows on such names: 'We must also then recognize that fatherhood (i.e. ingeneracy) or generacy or procession are not empty names or relationships bereft of realities (as Gregory the Theologian somewhere says) but the fatherhood which exists in the Godhead, so that * God is Father, and the sonship or generacy which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Son or offspring, and likewise the procession which exists in the Godhead so that the Holy Ghost is God proceeding. If, again, you say "light", or any other common thing you will mean the ingenerate light, the generate light and the proceeding light: three lights in the hypostases'.

Who will not be astonished at the pernicious audacity of heresies? Aiming to seize on the naivety of uneducated folk they pretend that patristic texts, which uproot their impiety from its base, bring corroboration for their detestable view, so that in this mischievous way the texts may seem to make refutations grounded on them idle. 'For how', some superficial examiners of the facts may perhaps say, 'can anybody be refuted out of those texts he

36/47 Dam. Alex., *Apologia secunda*; cf. supra, ch. 7, 27-38

30
 35
 40
 45
 50
 Fol. 19va
 55
 60

30
 35
 40
 45
 50
 55
 60

55
 60

opinion by writing as follows: We must also then recognize that fatherhood (i.e. ingeneracy) or generacy or procession are not empty names or relationships bereft of realities (as Gregory the Theologian says somewhere) but the fatherhood which exists in the Godhead, so that
 90 God is Father, and the sonship or generacy which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Son or offspring, and likewise the procession which exists in the Godhead so that the Holy Ghost is God proceeding. If, again, you say 'light', or any other common thing you will mean the ingenerate light, the generate light and the proceeding light: three lights in the
 95 hypostases. For it is not one light in a triple-named hypostasis which changes at different times into what the Father is or is thought to be, into what the Son is or is thought to be and into what the Holy Ghost is or is thought to be.

It is clear from this proof-text he quoted that the doctor
 100 addressed someone who witlessly imagined, as in a dream, a confusion of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity and supposed that those who do not confess that the whole Godhead of the Holy Trinity became incarnate were making a division in the Godhead. * But similar words of the proven doctor and of his
 105 peers, quoted by the God-clad Severus (to use here your words, my fine friend!) will prove that he instructs us, very nobly as befits priests (as the Biblical phrase goes: *The lips of a priest shall preserve judgement, and they will seek the Law from his mouth because he is the angel of the Lord Almighty*) that fatherhood
 110 (i.e. ingeneracy), generacy and procession are not (somehow or other) empty names or relationships bereft of realities (as you are convicted of thinking) but characteristic properties of true hypostases and prosopa which have proper subsistence. Clearly

86/98 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 18 (CSCO 111, pp. 170,26 - 171,11; 112, p. 133, 17-31); cf. supra, ch. 7, 30-38 107/109 Mal. 2:7

95
 100
 105
 ✠

110
 115
 120

Fol. 20ra

Line 96: ἱερός, cf. p. 173, line 45 (ἱερός).

Line 100: ἁγίασμα ἁγίασμα ἁγίασμα, cf. p. 173, lines 48-49 (ἁγίασμα ἁγίασμα ἁγίασμα).

Line 103: ἁγίασμα, cf. p. 173, line 51 (ἁγίασμα).

the question whether it is the natural relationship which introduces the employment of these names. For he must be saying this: that affinity of substance enters with affinity of names. For he will not be saying that the mere names on their own, separated from a comprehension of their meanings, have any mutual relationship and affinity; no, we distinguish 145 affinity and alien-ness of appellations by the meanings signified by the words. Therefore, if he acknowledges a natural relationship between Father and Son, let us leave the appellations and scrutinize the force of the things indicated. And again: So if, as Eunomius says, the appellations prove affinity, and the affinity is perceptible in the realities conceived of as individual and not in the mere verbal expressions of the names (if it be not rash so to refer to the Son and the Father) who can deny that the champion of blasphemy too has been drawn over to the advocacy of true religion of his own accord, seeing that he demolishes his arguments 150 himself and preaches commonness of substance as divine doctrine? For the argument about this he involuntarily tossed out on the side of truth is no cheat: he would not have been called 'Son', if the natural meaning of the terms had not corroborated the appellation.

Admirable Sir, if you really and genuinely want to stick close 160 to the divinely inspired doctors, * grant those realities to whom belong the relationships and names and do not profess the impossible: that the properties and names of the hypostases are hypostases! For you have heard (if you have bent an obedient ear to these patristic teachings) the Theologian say their difference in 165 manifestation and mutual relationship (viz. on the part of the Son and of the Spirit) has also caused the difference in their appellations; and again: No, this gives no ground for any deficiency or subordination of substance, but the very fact of not being begotten, of being begotten and of proceeding has given them the names which are applied to them,

149/158 Ibid. (PG 45, 597D-600A; Jaeger II, p. 36, 1-13) 164/166 cf. supra, 126-128 167/170 cf. supra, 132-135

155 ἁποφασιστῶν ὅτι ἡ φύσις ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 160 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 165 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 170 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 175 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν

ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 180 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 185 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν
 ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν

Fol. 20va

Line 171: ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν. MS erroneously reads: ἡ ἁποφασιστῶν.

170 Father, Son and Holy Ghost, respectively. So that you are convicted of thinking the views of Sabellius and Arius who both godlessly and half-wittedly, with differing ideas of blasphemy, say that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are mere utterances, empty names and relationships bereft of realities. For if you affirm the names

175 'Father', 'Son' and 'Spirit' and, again, 'ingenerate', 'generate' and 'proceeding' to be hypostases and not the names and properties of hypostases, how can you justly condemn them for holding them to be mere utterances, empty terms and relationships bereft of realities? Must you not say instead that those who preach the

180 relationship and participation of individually subsisting realities and not of mere empty terms, are right in their thinking? For you will not refuse to acknowledge, in mere word alone, those very things, which you name, whatever they are, 'hypostases' as a plausible pretence, as individually subsisting realities. So, seeing

185 that Sabellians and Arians also 'out of reverence' (as they say) 'for the Bible' merely say the words 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' with their lips and, with some degree of consistency in the matter, also fashion in fancy and thinking (there being nothing for them which really begat or * was begotten or proceeds)

190 'begetter', 'begotten' and 'proceeding', your clever self ought to show in what respect you differ from them on the question, since you utter the terms 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' (and 'ingeneracy', 'generacy' and 'procession') merely with your mouth, without stating expressly that the realities indicated and characterized by

195 the names and properties exist. Which does not agree with the truth at all (far from it!), for we have learned to think that the relationship and affinity belong not to the names but to the realities indicated by the names. Hence GREGORY, namesake of the Theologian, gave us exact instruction in orthodox doctrines, writing (as we have set down in this chapter) at one point:

200 Therefore, if he acknowledges a natural relationship between Father and

< 182 : 201 : 202 : 203 : 204 : 205 : 206 : 207 : 208 : 209 : 210 : 211 : 212 : 213 : 214 : 215 : 216 : 217 : 218 : >

187 : 188 : 189 : 190 : 191 : 192 : 193 : 194 : 195 : 196 : 197 : 198 : 199 : 200 : 201 : 202 : 203 : 204 : 205 : 206 : 207 : 208 : 209 : 210 : 211 : 212 : 213 : 214 : 215 : 216 : 217 : 218 :

188 : 189 : 190 : 191 : 192 : 193 : 194 : 195 : 196 : 197 : 198 : 199 : 200 : 201 : 202 : 203 : 204 : 205 : 206 : 207 : 208 : 209 : 210 : 211 : 212 : 213 : 214 : 215 : 216 : 217 : 218 :

Fol. 20vb

Line 188: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁ*. Text is not certain.
 Line 218: *ⲉⲃ*, cf. p. 181, lines 162-163 (1 *ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲣ*).

Son, let us leave the appellations and scrutinize the force of the things indicated. And again at another point: So if, as Eunomius says, the appellations prove affinity, and the affinity is perceptible in the realities conceived of as individual and not in the mere verbal expressions of the names (if it be not rash so to refer to the Son and the Father) who can deny that the champion of blasphemy too has been drawn over to the advocacy of true religion of his own accord?

Our God-clad father and teacher SEVERUS also, we say, adhered to these orthodox and irreproachable teachings, because they resemble those of the Theologian; seeing the Grammarian from Caesarea gaping at the Libyan's wicked party he wrote: We must also then recognize that fatherhood (i.e. ingeneracy) or generacy or procession are not empty names and relationships bereft of realities, as Gregory the Theologian somewhere says. How, then, can you — no interpreter of the fathers' words at all, but utterly monstrous twister of them! — on the basis of the wise doctor's attempt to prove that not the names

220
 225

230
 235

Line 219: *ⲗⲁⲃⲉ*, cf. p. 181, line 164 (*ⲗⲁⲃⲉ*).

Line 232: *ⲁⲓ ⲁⲓ ⲁⲓ*, cf. pp. 175-177, lines 93-94 (*ⲁⲓ ⲁⲓ ⲁⲓ*).

Line 234: *ⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁⲓ*, cf. p. 177, lines 95-96 (*ⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁⲓ*).

Line 238: *ⲗⲁⲃⲉ*. There is a break in the MS here.

* pre-eminence of his faith, received the promise that the Church should be built upon him. None of these is the substance. So that the name separates for us the characteristic mark of Peter, but in no way displays the substance itself to us. Again, when we hear 'Paul', we understand a collection of other properties: the man from Tarsus, the Hebrew, legally a Pharisee, Gamaliel's pupil, the zealous persecutor of God's churches brought by an awe-inspiring vision to recognize the truth, the Apostle of the Gentiles. All these are defined by the single word 'Paul'. And a little later: It is obvious, then, from what has been said that in the case of Father and Son also, the names do not display the substance but are indicative of the properties. The distinguished patriarch Severus (Damian says) having read these passages with care and designated as hypostases sharing fully and no less in the common and all-transcending substance, the proper names which do not indicate the substance, said as follows in the seventeenth chapter of the first book *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea*: 'Whereas Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing equally in the substance, for each of them shares fully, and no less in the manhood; and being a man is separated by a proper designation and connected with the consubstantial hypostases by similarity and equality in everything generic and common'. And a little later: 'In this very way, in the case of the Holy Trinity too, the substance is the whole Godhead comprehending the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but each of the hypostases shares also by the same

1/27 Dam. Alex., *Letter to the Bishops of the East*. Cf. *infra*, ch. 15, 11-13 1/9 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 4 (PG 29, 580A; SChr., vol. 305, p. 20); cf. *supra*, ch. 8, 29-33 1/2 Matth. 16:18 2 Edd. add: ὡς ἡ ὑπόστασις νοουμένη. Cf. etiam *supra*, ch. 8, 31. See Peter's comment, *infra*, ch. 15, 8-13 9/11 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 5 (PG 29, 580C; SChr., vol. 305, p. 22) 15 'first' (sic); cf. *supra*, ch. 11, 306 16/20 Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 17 (CSCO 111, p. 161, 9-15; 112, pp. 125,34 - 126,4); cf. *supra*, ch. 11, 309-313; the Syriac translation is slightly different 21/27 Ibid. (CSCO 111, p. 161, 17-24; 112, p. 126, 5-13); cf. *supra*, ch. 11, 314-321

* * ← Fol. 21ra
 מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי
 ← מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי : מלכות השלישי

Line 15: מלכות השלישי, cf. p. 189, line 43; p. 197, line 170; p. 199, line 196; p. 223, line 18 (מלכות השלישי).
 Line 27: מלכות השלישי, MS מלכות, cf. p. 245, line 87.

substance in equality of honour and is completely God, and has no
25 difference at all from its consubstantial hypostases, but is separated and
parted by its proper indication (ingeneracy, generacy or procession), the
property safeguarding the absence of confusion.'

If these very words of the God-clad fathers which are misrep-
sented, had not, when quoted, placarded the * audacity of the
30 people who abuse them, we might well have needed a lengthy
treatise for the full rebuttal of this illogical accusation. However,
because clear rebuttals are contained in the very words they
misrepresent, their examination will be plain and easy.

We have set out in full the texts dealing with the point both
35 from the fathers' accuser and from the spiritual guides themselves,
which texts he attacked. The man, then, who said: The distinguished
patriarch Severus having read these passages with care and designated as
hypostases, sharing fully and no less in the common and all-transcending
substance, the proper names which do not indicate the substance,
40 should go ahead and show where the God-clad patriarch ever
found in them, or himself said, that the proper names were
hypostases sharing in the substance. But perhaps he may answer:
'In the text where BASIL the Great declares: Though what man in
his right mind would go along with the argument that things whose
45 names are different must also have different substances? Peter's, Paul's
and, in a word, all men's names are different, but there is one substance
of all of them; for which reason, in the majority of respects we are
identical with one another, Basil' (he may say) 'has clearly proved
that Peter's, Paul's and all men's names are hypostases sharing in
50 the substance, and this is the reason the patriarch adhered to this
and said: Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing equally in the
substance'.

36/39 cf. supra, 11-15 43/48 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. II, 4 (PG 29, 577C; SChr.,
vol. 305, p. 18); cf. supra, ch. 8, 15-20 51/52 cf. supra, 16-17

← ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
← ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
← ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
← ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ

ܐܠܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
35 ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ

Fol. 21rb

ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
40 ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
45 ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
50 ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
55 ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ
ܡܘܬܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܢܐ

Must not a man be lost to all feeling who does not shed copious warm tears for these outrageous, blasphemous lunacies and does not lament and bewail our folk with good reason, because the appointed high-priests and doctors are being made to wallow in such a stinking mire of words and ideas that from those, by whom they should be richly illumined and give light to others, our folk receive pretexts for a falsehood which links darkness and the extreme hopelessness arising from it * whose fruit is the total ruination of souls? Otherwise, in what words shall we say it was possible for wise Basil to prove that the names and characteristic properties of the hypostases are not the hypostases, if not in those divinely inspired ones? For he says: Peter's, Paul's and, in a word, all men's names are different, but there is one substance of all of them; for which reason, in the majority of respects we are identical with one another, but only in the properties appearing with each individual are we different from one another. Let us explain what we are to understand when he says: Peter's, Paul's and, in a word, all men's names are different, but there is one substance of all of them. Does he mean that Peter, Paul and (as it were) all men whose appellations differ, but who are one substance, are names? Who could submit to this boundless stupidity? It is not Peter's, Paul's and all men's names but Peter's, Paul's and all men's hypostases, he is saying, have different appellations and are one substance; though he has indicated the hypostases themselves by names because this kind of thing cannot be indicated except in this kind of way. Hence he went on: For which reason, in the majority of respects we are identical with one another. What then do we say? Are we, or our names, identical with one another? But he who says these things will answer readily that we too are names: which is utterly high-handed, nay more, ridiculous and shameful. For, grievous to say, the fact that people with even a small share

65/68 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. II, 4 (PG 29, 577C; SChr., vol. 305, p. 18); cf. supra, ch. 8, 17-21 69/71 cf. supra, 65-66 78/79 cf. supra, 66-67

60
65
70
75
80
85
90

Fol. 21va

65/68 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. II, 4 (PG 29, 577C; SChr., vol. 305, p. 18); cf. supra, ch. 8, 17-21 69/71 cf. supra, 65-66 78/79 cf. supra, 66-67

in understanding and knowledge utter such things at all, not to
85 mention think them, things to which men have been induced by
the truly outlandish and occult wisdom and culture of * new-
fangled teachers, is not free from shame.

Therefore, because these things please the advanced sophists by
whose sophistry men are put in jeopardy of losing all common-
90 sense, we must repeat what is obvious to men of sound mind:
that because we are unable to indicate to one another our
understanding of objects merely by mental impulses, we have
needed to use terms and words. Wanting, for example, to indicate
our thought concerning incorporeal forces to our neighbours, and
95 being incapable of expressing this to those to whom we want to
do so by mere idea, must we not necessarily require an explana-
tion by language which renders public our belief about their
existence? But such things do not owe their existence to the fact
that they have previously been indicated by our words; otherwise
100 (as has been shown earlier) we should be the creators of the
realities themselves.

However now, because the minds of rational men have reached
such a pitch of total irrationality that, to one's amazement, they
require proofs of such matters, we will endeavour to corroborate
105 our statements from absolutely indisputable things. It is written,
then, in the book of Genesis (to avoid too many words, we omit
other things which clearly received their names after their entry
into existence): *And God again created from the earth every animal
of the field and every bird of the sky and brought them to Adam to*
110 *see what he would call them. And whatever Adam called any living
soul, that was its name. And Adam gave names to all cattle, to
every bird of the sky and every animal of the field. The divine
Moses declares expressly that Adam imposed names on things
which came into existence through God. What then? Shall we say*

100 cf. e.g. supra, ch. 7, 166-169 108/112 Gen. 2:19-20

לְאֵלֹהִים וְלְכָל בְּרֵיאֵי הָאָדָם וְלְכָל הַבְּהֵמָה וְלְכָל הַצֹּרְעִים וְלְכָל הַחַיָּוִט וְלְכָל הַיְּרֵק וְלְכָל הַצֹּמַח וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה וְלְכָל הַחַיָּוִט וְלְכָל הַיְּרֵק וְלְכָל הַצֹּמַח וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
95 לְאֵלֹהִים וְלְכָל בְּרֵיאֵי הָאָדָם וְלְכָל הַבְּהֵמָה וְלְכָל הַצֹּרְעִים וְלְכָל הַחַיָּוִט וְלְכָל הַיְּרֵק וְלְכָל הַצֹּמַח וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה

Fol. 21vb

וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
100 וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
105 וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
110 וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה

וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
115 וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
120 וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה
וְלְכָל הַיְּבֵשֶׁת וְלְכָל הַיָּבֵשׁ וְלְכָל הַיָּם וְלְכָל הַיַּבָּשָׁה וְלְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה

him prove, as he now says, from wise Basil's words or our sainted father Severus' words that the proper names are hypostases sharing in the substance. Of course he cannot! Why, then, does he blow out his cheeks in pride, the demeanour matching the proud intellect, giving vent to such frigid words against the Church's doctors: The distinguished patriarch Severus having read these passages with care and designated as hypostases sharing fully and no less in the common and all-transcending substance, the proper names which do not indicate the substance. Show us clearly what these passages are, my fine fellow! It will not suffice us as a proof, your asserting by your authority and without examination that the distinguished patriarch or one of his peers thought such-and-such, if you do not give a clear proof using their own plain words, even were we stupider than the poor creatures who are absurdly amazed at the old and proud lunacy and say of wretched Pythagoras 'ipse dixit'.

Accordingly, since you cannot offer a proof, pay attention! For we shall weigh you down (despite your unwillingness) with the plain words of the fathers, in the hope that you may, at long last, also perceive the meaning of what they wrote, by frequent repetition of the words. For which reason (Basil, instructor in orthodox doctrines, says) in the majority of respects we are identical with one another, but only in the properties appearing with each individual are we different from one another. Tell us how names are identical with one another in the majority of respects and how they only differ in the properties appearing with each individual! Can you either prove that it is consistent with common sense or quote a single one of the company of the fathers who says that the proper names * are identical with one another in the majority of respects and are only different in the properties viewed with each individual? No, you cannot! For how could men illumined with God's light be

183/186 cf. supra, 158-161 198/201 cf. supra, 66-68 201/203 cf. supra, 199-201 206/207 cf. ibid.

190 :
 195 :
 200 :
 205 :

210 <
 215 <
 220 <

Fol. 22vb

held captive in such a murk of ideas and words, and so plainly
 210 contradict themselves? So we will shun your illogical doctrines and
 keep a firm grip on their irreproachable definitions, taking their
 words according to their orthodox and irreproachable meaning.

Let us hear, then, what follows! So, he says titles are not indica-
 tive of substances, but of the properties which characterize each one.
 215 For in reality we have been taught to take the titles of the
 hypostases as only the mark of their numerical separation not as
 the manifestation of the hypostases' being, as the doctor wrote in
 the immediate continuation of the passage: When, therefore, we
 hear 'Peter' we do not understand by the name his substance (I mean
 220 now by 'substance' the material substrate which the name does not
 indicate at all) but we receive mental impressions of the properties
 appearing with him. Now what is said means (so far as we have
 grasped it) this: when we hear 'Peter' (i.e. when we understand
 the name 'Peter' applied to his hypostasis) we are not told what
 225 Peter is in substance, but are instructed as to how he is separated
 from hypostases of the same genus. Now, he is separated from his
 fellow consubstantials by the properties belonging with him. In
 the same way, therefore, we do the converse when we apply the
 name 'man' to Peter's hypostasis. By the use of the name 'man'
 230 we do not separate him from hypostases of the same genus but
 unite him rather with them, recognizing him as identical in sub-
 stance with the rest.

213/214 cf. supra, ch. 8, 21-23 218/222 cf. supra, ch. 8, 23-26

225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247

230
 235
 240
 245

Lines 229-231: ... Add. 14533, fol. 148vb; (line 231) Add. 14533 adds: ...
 Lines 236-247: ... Add. 14533, fol. 148vb-149ra; (line 237) Add. 14533 repeats: ...
 (line 237) Add. 14533: ... (line 240) Add. 14533: ...
 (line 241) Add. 14533: ... (line 244) Add. 14533: ...

What of the remainder of the proof-text? We will investigate it very narrowly lest we mistake the place where this fellow asserts that the doctor took the proper names to be hypostases sharing in the substance

* So when we say 'Peter is a man' we bring our imagination to the concept of his substance, recognizing him as a rational, mortal animal capable of thought and knowledge, and not investigating by this notion the things which belong with him and are seen as properly his. But when we change the form of words about him and, as it were, point to him with a finger and say 'this man is Peter', we do not learn by the name 'Peter' what Peter is in substance but have been given the impress of the properties belonging with him, recognizing him as the son of Jonas, from Bethsaida and Andrew's brother, as a fisherman and chief of the apostles owing to the pre-eminence of his faith.

243/247 cf. Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 4 (PG 29, 577C - 580A; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 20); cf. supra, ch. 8, 23-30

235
250
.....

Add. 14533

Fol. 149ra

255
260

Line 251: There is a break in the MS here.

25 being from Bethsaida, being Andrew's brother etc.)? Could even
 an entirely serious and sober-minded man hear these nightmarish
 fantasies without uncontrollable laughter and would he not blame
 himself for not having borne it philosophically if he should
 chance to hear such concoctions? For how the mind can under-
 stand Peter's properties without resting on Peter himself, not even
 30 those who invent goat-stags can say.

And so not we, but the * divinely inspired word of Basil the
 Great, shall opportunely shout aloud to the deaf, *listen!*, and to the
 blind, *attend and see!* (to remind him rightly and frequently of his
 35 words). We must rest our mind upon some substrate, construct
 mental images of the marks belonging with it and thus come to
 understand the full meaning of the hypostases. BASIL wrote in the
 following manner in his *Letter to the town councillors of Neo-*
caesarea: For we must recognize that just as the one who does not
 40 profess the commonness of the substance lapses into polytheism, so also
 the one who will not admit the properties of the hypostases slips away
 into Judaism. For our mind must rest upon some substrate and have the
 impress of its clear marks and thus have imagination of the one loved.
 For if we had not conceived of the fatherhood or considered the one for
 45 whom this property was set aside, how could we have taken in the idea
 of God the Father? For it is not enough to itemize the differences of the
 prosopa; one must acknowledge each prosopon as existing in true
 hypostasis, as well. Since even Sabellius did not abstain from fabricating
 prosopa without hypostases by pronouncing the same God one in
 50 substrate, transformed as each need arose and speaking at different times
 as Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

GREGORY, bishop of Nyssa, Basil's brother is seen to have
 written in the fifth book *Against Eunomius* (its beginning is:

33/34 cf. Is. 42:18 39/51 Bas. Caes., Ep. 210, 5 (PG 32, 776BC; Courtonne,
 II, pp. 195-196)

25 ,תאמרו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 30 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :

ויהי כבודו כבודו * ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 35 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 40 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 45 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 50 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :

Fol. 23rb

55 : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :
 ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו : ויהי כבודו כבודו :

Because, he says, the word 'Lord') as follows: For when we say 'this
 55 one was begotten' or 'was not begotten', we are stamped with a two-fold
 conception by the statement: by the demonstrative part of the sentence
 we look at the substrate; by 'was begotten' or 'was not begotten' we
 learn what is viewed as pertaining to the substrate. So that we under-
 stand one thing concerning the being but another thing concerning what
 60 is viewed as pertaining to the being. Besides, along with each term used
 of the divine nature (e.g. 'just', * 'incorruptible', 'immortal', 'ingenerate'
 and any other expression) 'is' has to be understood. Even if the word
 happens not to accompany the statement, all the same the speaker's and
 listener's minds must complete the term by 'is'; so that the title lands in a
 65 vacuum unless the 'is' be supplied. For instance (for it is better to present
 the argument using an example) when David says: *God the righteous
 judge, mighty and patient*, unless 'is' were understood along with each
 term used, the itemizing of titles unsupported by any substrate would be
 thought vacuous and baseless. But when 'is' is understood along with
 70 each term, the expressions altogether gain significance as they are viewed
 belonging with that which is. Have you not learned, excellent fellow,
 that we must think of the properties (whether they be common
 and natural, or characteristic of the hypostases) as belonging with
 some substrate and not as being the substrate itself? Thus, then,
 75 we shall think of the collection of Peter's properties as belonging
 rather with his hypostasis and not being it.

See moreover how the doctor's text itself quoted by you has
 explained, as well as possible, the realities for you! For the
 divinely inspired doctor having by it itemized properly and, as it
 were, separately, each property of Peter and Paul, did not think it
 80 appropriate to mention any one of them apart from the under-
 lying hypostasis, but considered it prudent to indicate in the list
 each property on its own as being joined to the hypostasis. For he

54/71 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 5 (PG 45, 761BC; Jaeger II, pp. 180,19 -
 181,13) 66/67 Ps. 7:12 68/69 Edd.: *ματαία δόξει (vel δόξα PG) και ἀνο-*
πόστατος ἢ τῶν προσηγοριῶν ἀπαριθμησὶς 77 'quoted by you': in the lost lines
 before ch. 13, 1-27; cf. ch. 8, 23-30

ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 60 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 65 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 70 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 75 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 80 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ

Fol. 23va

ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 85 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ

did not say simply 'son of Jonas' or 'from Bethsaida' or 'brother
 85 of Andrew', but instead 'the son of Jonas, the one from Beth-
 saida, the brother of Andrew', presenting the hypostasis along
 with a property of it in every phrase. For who else can be thought
 the son of Jonas, the one from Bethsaida, the brother of Andrew,
 except Peter, the son of Jonas, the one from * Bethsaida, the
 90 brother of Andrew? For by saying the word 'the', he refers the
 listener's thought to Peter's hypostasis; by the accompanying 'son
 of Jonas' and 'from Bethsaida' and 'brother of Andrew', he
 guides our mind to the properties joined and viewed in Peter's
 hypostasis, arising from father, place and brother. Let us use this
 95 way of thinking about Paul's properties and we shall stray neither
 from the truth nor from the fathers' aim.

90 .כדן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 : דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 : דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 95 דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 : דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 : דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 100 : דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 : דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן
 : דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן דהוה יתן

Fol. 23vb

Dealing with the author's inconsistent presentation of patristic texts and their profanation; whereby even clearer proof is provided that the names are different from the realities, because the nature of the realities does not follow the names, but the names are subsequent to the realities.

But how, my good friend, do you intend us to understand your different presentation of the patristic proof-text? For you are seen (as we said previously) to have quoted the passage in full in chapter twelve of your book: None of these is the substance understood as the hypostasis. Whereas in the Letter to the Holy Bishops of the East you are seen to have cut out the phrase understood as the hypostasis.

You ought, even had you been consistent with yourself, so that we might concur with your complete accuracy in this too, either not to have put in the book what you later excised in the letter, or, having put it down, not to have removed whatever you put, in such a wicked and hypocritical way. But, as the facts themselves make plain, although you have been very rightly told that the man, who says of Peter's or anyone's properties none of these is the substance understood as the hypostasis, has altogether defined the hypostasis as being neither one of the properties nor the aggregate of them, you cut the proof-text, so that you might be thought

* we utter claptrap about the hypostases being different at different times prior and posterior; which is the peak of lunacy and demented.

10/11 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. II, 4 (PG 29, 580A; SChr., vol. 305, p. 20): cf. supra, ch. 8, 30-31 11/13 cf. supra, ch. 13, 2

ἵνα ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι.

ἵνα ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι.

ἵνα ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι.

ἵνα ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι. ὡς ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀληθεία ἴσῃ τῷ ὀνόματι.

Fol. 24ra

Line 23: ἵνα. MS breaks here; all the rest of this chapter is apparently lost except for the following concluding words.

5 Examination of the proof-text from Saint Basil where he said: 'It is obvious then from what has been said that, in the case of Father and Son also, the names do not display the substance but are indicative of the properties.'

Besides this we will investigate the subsequent words of Saint Basil concerning the hypostases of the Father and the Son and their properties and names in the same proof-text set down for examination. For after first expounding the principle in relation to Peter, Paul and the rest of men, he applied the teaching to the point of controversy between himself and impious Eunomius, saying: It is obvious then from what has been said that, in the case of Father and Son also, the names do not display the substance but are indicative of the properties.

15 This is similar to the previous statement. For in the case of Father and Son (i.e. the hypostases of the Father and the Son) the names of the Father and, obviously, of the Son are not revelatory of the being of the hypostases but indicative of their properties; because by calling God 'Father' and his Only-begotten Word 'Son', though we recognize the mutual relationship and consubstantiality of the hypostases by these titles (for one who is in the full sense and truly Son must also be consubstantial with the Father who begot him) we are by no means brought by these appellations to the very concept of the substance of the hypostases of Father and Son but are directed towards the properties, understanding the one as the Only-begotten's true Father who exists, ingenerate and uncaused, and the other as the Father's true Son who owes his being eternally to him by generation.

2/5 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 5 (PG 29, 580C; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 22); cf. *supra*, ch. 13, 9-11 12/14 *Ibid.*

καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα ἄρρηκτως ἑνωμένον τῷ πατρί, ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, ὁμοούσιον, ἁρμόδιον, ἀπαράστατον, ἀειγενῆ καὶ ἀειβιώνα. ἵνα ὁμοδόξως κατανοήσῃς τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπινοοῦμεν.

5 καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα ἄρρηκτως ἑνωμένον τῷ πατρί, ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, ὁμοούσιον, ἁρμόδιον, ἀπαράστατον, ἀειγενῆ καὶ ἀειβιώνα. ἵνα ὁμοδόξως κατανοήσῃς τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπινοοῦμεν.
 10 καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα ἄρρηκτως ἑνωμένον τῷ πατρί, ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, ὁμοούσιον, ἁρμόδιον, ἀπαράστατον, ἀειγενῆ καὶ ἀειβιώνα. ἵνα ὁμοδόξως κατανοήσῃς τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπινοοῦμεν.
 15 καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα ἄρρηκτως ἑνωμένον τῷ πατρί, ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, ὁμοούσιον, ἁρμόδιον, ἀπαράστατον, ἀειγενῆ καὶ ἀειβιώνα. ἵνα ὁμοδόξως κατανοήσῃς τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπινοοῦμεν.

ἵνα ὁμοδόξως κατανοήσῃς τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπινοοῦμεν.
 15 καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα ἄρρηκτως ἑνωμένον τῷ πατρί, ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, ὁμοούσιον, ἁρμόδιον, ἀπαράστατον, ἀειγενῆ καὶ ἀειβιώνα. ἵνα ὁμοδόξως κατανοήσῃς τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπινοοῦμεν.
 20 καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα ἄρρηκτως ἑνωμένον τῷ πατρί, ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, ὁμοούσιον, ἁρμόδιον, ἀπαράστατον, ἀειγενῆ καὶ ἀειβιώνα. ἵνα ὁμοδόξως κατανοήσῃς τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπινοοῦμεν.
 25 καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα ἄρρηκτως ἑνωμένον τῷ πατρί, ὅμοιον αὐτῷ, ὁμοούσιον, ἁρμόδιον, ἀπαράστατον, ἀειγενῆ καὶ ἀειβιώνα. ἵνα ὁμοδόξως κατανοήσῃς τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπινοοῦμεν.

GREGORY too, * the wise doctor's brother, shall confirm that this
 30 is so by consideration of God the Father. He wrote as follows in
 the thirty seventh chapter of the *Refutation of Eunomius* the
 impious (its beginning is: To want to help everybody was not,
 apparently): This, then, is what the imitator of Paul too does: having
 seen that the error of those who teach dissimilarity through the word
 35 'ingenerate' is strengthened by its evil, heretical usage, he advised that we
 should safeguard in our soul the truly religious idea of 'ingenerate', but
 that the word should not be an object of special concern, because it
 becomes food for sin to those who are perishing. For the name 'Father'
 is, by its meaning, enough to produce for us the sense of 'ingenerate'.
 40 For having heard 'Father' we at once understand the one who is the
 cause of everything's existence, who, had he owned another cause
 transcending himself, would not be called 'Father' in the full sense of the
 word, because the appellation 'Father' (in the full sense) would have
 been attributed to the cause found to be prior. But if he is the cause of
 45 all and *all is from him*, as the Apostle says, obviously nothing can be
 found to pre-exist his being. And this is ingenerate existence. And
 again: But we despise this puerile, superficial attack of theirs and will
 manfully acknowledge what is presented by them as an absurdity: that
 the name 'Father' is identical in meaning with 'ingenerate'; that 'ingener-
 50 ate' reveals the Father as not being from anything; and that the Father
 introduces connectedly along with himself, through the relationship, the
 idea of the Only-begotten. On this basis, as has been shown, there is
 clear confirmation that by the word 'Father' we recognize God as
 the Father of the Only-begotten and acknowledge that he exists
 55 ingenerately, and is the cause to all of their being. In the same
 way, then, the name 'Son' displays what particularly belong to
 the Only-begotten Son.

So when we hear BASIL * THE GREAT saying: It is obvious then

33/46 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 420CD; Jaeger I, pp. 184,17 - 185,5) 45 Rom. 11:36 47/52 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 424A; Jaeger I, p. 187, 13-19) 58/60 cf. supra 12-14

30 : 35 : 40 : 45 : 50 : 55

⊂

Fol. 24rb

⊂ Fol. 24va

Line 59: *⊂* *⊂* A note in the same hand at the top of the folio reads as

from what has been said that, in the case of Father and Son also, the names do not display the substance but are indicative of the properties, we will devoutly and sensibly interpret the statement as meaning: just as Peter's and Paul's names, the titles of the hypostases, do not display the concept of the being of Peter's and Paul's hypostases but their properties, so also, in the case of Father and Son (i.e. in the case of the hypostases of Father and Son), by the names (viz. 'Father' and 'Son') we are stamped (as said in the preceding words) not with the idea, produced in us by the concept of his being, but with the characteristic properties belonging with each hypostasis.

But no one should think that, because we designate the hypostases by names, the names must necessarily be the hypostases; for the difference between names and realities is immediately obvious from the father's text to every sincere and truth-loving investigator of it. For he said: It is obvious then from what has been said that, in the case of Father and Son also, the names do not display the substance but are indicative of the properties. We are to be precise in considering, in the case of Father and Son: for he has hereby clearly indicated to us the Father's and the Son's hypostases themselves whose names ('Father' and 'Son') are indicative not of the substance but of the properties. Otherwise, if we consider the Father's and the Son's names to be the same thing as the Father's and the Son's hypostases (according to the definitions of our opponents) we must, I think, say that, in the case of the Father and the Son (i.e. of the Father's and Son's hypostases), the hypostases do not display the substance; and, likewise, that in the case of the Father's and the Son's names, the names do not display the substance. For if Father and Son are both hypostases

60 ...
 65 ...
 70 ...

...
 75 ...
 80 ...
 85 ...

Examination again of a text by proven Severus, which clearly proves that the doctor by no means thinks of the proper names (as the slanderer supposes) as hypostases but only as titles applied to true hypostases.

These things being thus proved and it having been made clear to everybody as a result, that the proper names are by no means (as this excellent fellow says) hypostases sharing in the substance, but are, rather, the hypostases' titles, we will pass on to our father Saint Severus' text and consider how he truly follows Basil the Great and doctors like him, and has no thought at all (as their accuser slanderously alleges) of the proper names being hypostases sharing in the substance, neither did he, indeed, suppose them empty titles but titles applied to realities, through which titles we can indicate the realities to one another.

We will, then, make the ludicrous accusation, which runs as follows, our starting-point: The distinguished patriarch Severus having read these passages with care and designated as hypostases, sharing fully and no less in the common and all-transcending substance, the proper names which do not indicate the substance, said as follows in the seventeenth chapter of the first book *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea*: * 'Whereas Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing equally in the substance, for each of them shares fully and no less in the manhood; and being a man is separated by a proper designation and connected with the consubstantial hypostases by similarity and equality in everything generic and common'. And a little later: 'In this very way, in the case of the Holy Trinity too, the substance is the whole Godhead comprehending the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but

אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא

5

אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא

15

אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא
 אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא אדכחא

Fol. 25ra

25

each of the hypostases shares also by the same substance in equality of
 30 honour and is completely God, and has no difference at all from its
 consubstantial hypostases, and is separated and parted by its proper
 indication (ingeneracy, generacy or procession), the property safeguarding
 the absence of confusion'.

How can people wont to grieve for the truth's sake, who set
 35 some store by respect for the fathers, close their hearts to the
 pricks and goads of zeal, when such lying accusations are fabricated
 against orthodox teachings and their propounders? In making
 our examination of these things, it is fitting we should first notice
 how plausibly this doughty fellow weaves his web of sophistry
 40 against the truth. For he is aware that there is considerable
 prejudice (and rightly so), on the part of those who want to take
 the correct view, in favour of the divinely inspired fathers, and so
 he plans a mischievous device to trick out his evil opinion and
 conceal the fatal poison in something sweet. However his attempt
 45 has misfired, since he is rousing to arms a larger number of
 opponents than prisoners of his error, as a result of his insolence
 and his slanderous charges against the truth and its champions.
 Some simple folk may well become enmeshed in his concealed
 net, because the knavery has hitherto been cloaked in pretence
 50 and dissembling, and up till now the mischief in his teachings has
 not been publicly detected; but by obstinate opposition to the
 pillars of the Church * and attempted falsification of their
 immaculate and undeviating faith he can only be inviting all with
 a care for their lives who have learned to prefer virtue to vice, to
 55 give a wide berth to his impious fables.

30 ← ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ← ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ← ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ← ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 35 ← ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ

ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 40 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 45 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 50 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 55 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ
 ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ

Fol. 25rb

Line 31: ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ. MS ܩܘܪܕܐ ܩܘܪܕܐ. cf. p. 187, line 27; p. 245, line 87.

We will, then, investigate the pretended respect he displays towards our wise father and doctor, Severus. He wrote therefore: The distinguished patriarch Severus, having read these passages with care and designated as hypostases, sharing fully and no less in the common and all-transcending substance, the proper names which do not indicate the substance, said as follows in the seventeenth chapter of the first book *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea*. It has been abundantly demonstrated that what God-clad Severus read, by no means (as this fellow affirms) teaches that the proper names are hypostases sharing in the common substance, but quite the reverse (as has been already examined) and especially what the doctor emphatically stated: that the nature of the realities does not follow the names, but the names are subsequent to the realities.

Hence we will investigate proven Severus our father's text and not omit what seems to be a piece of mischief of this not expositor but accuser of the fathers: the way he monstrously abuses his patristic quotations. For his aim is, rather, to employ every device and trick to cloak and hide the divinely inspired doctors' views, lest the darkness which belongs with him be shown up and his statement of false belief become despised by everybody. For, as the Lord's word has it: *Every doer of odious deeds hates the light and does not approach the light so that his actions may not be shown up. But he who does the truth approaches the light, so that his actions may be recognized as wrought in God.* Hence it is that he attempts to counterfeit the beauty of the fathers' doctrines, now by misinterpretation and misrepresentation, now by different and inconsistent presentation of prooftexts, * now again, by outright felony from them: which is what he is seen to be doing in the present case. For the full text of our previously mentioned father SEVERUS goes as follows: So, in the

58/62 cf. supra, 17-22 67/68 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 4 (PG 29, 580B; SChr., vol. 305, p. 22) 76/79 Ioh. 3:20-21 85/93 Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 17 (CSCO 111, p. 161, 6-17; 112, pp. 125-32 - 126-6)

בְּחִפְּתֵי הַחֲמִידִים לִבְרָתָא דְּכֹהֵן אֱלֹהִים
 60 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 65 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 70 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים

בְּחִפְּתֵי הַחֲמִידִים לִבְרָתָא דְּכֹהֵן אֱלֹהִים
 75 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 80 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 85 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים
 90 כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים לְכַלּוֹת הַחֲמִידִים כִּי יֵשׁוּב לֵב הַחֲמִידִים

Fol. 25va

Lines 90-108: cf. p. 167, lines 335-345; p. 243, lines 34-38 (with many small variations)

will you declare that both realities and names participate in the substance? In that case each one of those listed will be duplicated.
 150 For if everybody who shares in the substance of manhood is fully and no less a man, and you say that the names and the realities share fully and no less in the common substance, it necessarily follows that each man will be duplicated. But perhaps you may say: 'I do not define the realities as not participating in the substance, nor am I forced to pronounce each duplicated; for I
 155 recognize names and realities as identical.' So, according to this argument, Saint Basil's words must be false, the words proclaiming in ringing tones that names are subsequent to realities. For how, if realities and names are identical, can names be subsequent to
 160 realities, nothing ever being able to be prior or posterior to itself? But this is emphatically not the case. Nor indeed will what has been set forth by him who is really true, through masters of theology, ever fail. For we hear the Saviour himself declare in the sacred Gospels: *Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words*
 165 *shall not pass away.*

But let us take up again the same statement and proceed to what follows. Whereas Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing *
 equally in the substance, for each of them shares fully and no less in the manhood. Is there anybody who does not find this statement
 170 completely indisputable and absolutely indubitable? For who has ever considered saying (and I do not now refer to Christians especially but to all with a rational nature) that a man's name shares fully and no less in the manhood and is a man? According to
 175 this folly whenever, for example, we give a name to a new-born child, we create a man who did not previously exist. And again, when we change one name for another we shall be getting rid of

158 cf. supra, 68 164/165 Luc. 21:33; Matth. 24:35 167/169 cf. supra, 87-89 173 cf. supra, 89, 168-169

160
 165
 170
 175
 < 175
 < 175

180
 185
 190

Fol. 26rb

Peter's, Paul's, John's and everybody else's names to be hypostases which share equally in the substance are totally (to put it thus) lost to human reasoning? 'But' (he says) 'the distinguished patriarch Severus teaches us to think this'. But you, man, are impudently slandering him. For when the doctor said 'Peter, Paul and John', although he indicated the hypostases of Peter, Paul and John by means of names (because things like this cannot be made known except in this way), he did not say so because he counted Peter, Paul and John as names. No, he recognizes them as full, individually subsisting realities but as made known by means of names. So do not deceive yourself, but take your stand on correct thought as a result of all these writings. For if the statement had been about names he would not have said: Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing equally in the substance etc. And indeed no man in his right mind ever said that each name shares equally, fully and no less in the substance; or that * being a man and separated by proper designations he is united with the other consubstantial hypostases by similarity and equality in everything generic and common.

If you propound this sort of sophistry, must you not then have good reason to be ashamed of your fine and orthodox statements against the polytheists in chapter twenty of your book? If, therefore, on the basis of all the father's writings, they could prove this sort of thing acknowledged in a declaration of faith or elsewhere, they must first establish the required point on the basis of clear affirmations and not on the basis of this debatable language, from which one could even suppose the statement belonged to Eunomius; lest we too should be obliged to make them the same retort (with a few altered words) which Gregory of

220/221 cf. supra, 22-23 223/226 cf. supra, 24-26. The Syriac translation is slightly different 229/252 Dam. Alex., Adv. Trith., 20

225 : 230 : 235 : 240 :
 : 245 :
 : 250 :
 : 255 :
 : 260 :
 : 265 :
 : 270 :
 : 275 :
 : 280 :
 : 285 :
 : 290 :
 : 295 :
 : 300 :

Fol. 26vb

245 : 250 :
 : 255 :
 : 260 :
 : 265 :
 : 270 :
 : 275 :
 : 280 :

Line 226: MS reads:

Line 243: MS reads:

Nyssa made to Eunomius: 'Why do you here put forward disputed points as if they were agreed on, supposing without proof that Gregory the Theologian said that the Son and Holy Ghost are not one and the same substance as the Father but instead two different substances apart from the Father's?' But nevertheless, if we do not address them in the very exact words, we will reproach them for the ancient transgression. For since they have not done what they ought hitherto, let them do it now! For our concern is not merely with order but with truth. Let them, then, prove clearly that the doctor used as *de fide* the term 'substances' of the Holy Trinity and they shall have the title 'victor'. But for the moment, whilst they search the texts hastening to tread on their own shadow, they shall have from us the father's testimonies set out in the previous passage, in which, on the contrary, he enquired of those who confessed three hypostases whether they supposed them to be three substances, and established that they loudly protested against those who took this view, even when they accepted the consubstantiality, as our father Theodosius has testified.

* By these words which you said with true appositeness (I will not deny it) correct yourself also, my excellent friend. If you can clearly prove (I will not go so far as to say from words by the doctor in a declaration of faith but from any statement of his whatever) that the names 'Peter', 'Paul', and 'John' are hypostases sharing in the substance, show it and you, even you, will have the title 'victor' — to use appositely your words for yourself. But if you can find nothing, know for certain the futility of your doctrines!

236/237 cf. Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 320A; Jaeger I, p. 92, 20-21) 252 'Theodosius has testified': locum non invenimus 258/259 cf. supra, 245

255
 260
 265
 270

Fol. 27ra

275
 280

Line 272: There is a break in the MS here.

Examination of another proof-text from the same Saint Severus mischievously cited by the opposition to prove that the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are names and titles.

5 But you will no doubt say that he did define the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost as being titles by speaking in his 90th Cathedral Sermon as follows: But this is stuff for myth-makers not theologians. For 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are characteristic titles explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion. For they do
10 not divide the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority. Everything belonging to Father and Son is to be seen in the Holy Ghost. For the prophet David, addressing the Father, made the following prediction: *In thy light shall we see light* - i.e. in the Son we shall see the Holy Ghost. For manifested to us in the flesh he revealed him and was himself also
15 revealed more gloriously by him.

Yet again you muddle the God-clad doctors' ideas, confusing the meaning of their writings. So, even where our spiritual guide gives clear teaching about the hypostases, * you claim that he calls the hypostases 'names'; and when, on the other hand, he
20 teaches about the names, you rule that he interpreted the names as hypostases, laying down a law contrary to the doctors, that there is absolutely no difference at all between names and realities. This is why we shall again and appositely proclaim the divine doctrines to you, and shall tell you that we ought not to
25 press such statements thoughtlessly or make them fit someone's preconceived opinion but represent their religious meaning altogether on the basis of what precedes and what follows them, if we

: κτὶ ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
κτὶ ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
5 ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα

ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
10 ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
15 ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα

ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
20 ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
25 ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα
: ὁ πατήρ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος ὁ πνεῦμα

Fol. 27rb

human genus. So our wise father, opposing this witlessness of Sabellius the Libyan with all the teaching contained in chapter seventeen and again in chapters eighteen and nineteen, says at one point in chapter seventeen: Each of the hypostases, then, which is included under the genus and the substance and under the common meaning (i.e. substance comprising many hypostases) shares equally in what is perceived to be within the common genus. For instance, Peter shares the common manhood and substance i.e. rationality, mortality, capacity for understanding and knowledge. Similarly, both Paul and John, though separated by unique marks and not being mutually confused, share too the common substance i.e. are rational, mortal, capable of understanding and knowledge. And again at another point he says (as has been set out before): So, in the same way that with us manhood is the whole substance comprising many hypostases (Peter's, Paul's, John's and all the rest) whereas Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing equally in the substance, for each of them shares fully and no less in the manhood and is a man and is separated by his own designation and connected with the consubstantial hypostases by similarity and equality in everything generic and common without being the total substance and manhood * which embraces all the hypostases; in this very way, in the case of the Holy Trinity too, the substance is the whole Godhead comprehending the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost; but each of the hypostases shares by the same substance in equality of honour and is completely God, and has no difference at all from its consubstantial hypostases, and is separated and parted by its particular indication (ingeneracy, generacy or procession), the property safeguarding the absence of confusion.

But (as we set down in the preceding) he wrote at one point too in the eighteenth chapter: Wherein he displays the Father, as an

64/72 Ibid. (CSCO 111, p. 156, 11-21; 112, pp. 121,35 - 122,10) 73/87 Ibid. (CSCO 111, p. 161, 6-24; 112, pp. 125,32 - 126,13); cf. supra, ch. 11, 307-321; ch. 17, 85-93 et 27-33 89/93 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 18 (CSCO 111, p. 167, 25-29; 112, p. 131, 7-11). The passage, in which this text was quoted before, is lost

65
 70
 75
 80
 85
 90

65
 70
 75
 80
 85
 90

Fol. 27vb

65
 70
 75
 80
 85
 90

90 image displays the original and as the hypostatic Word displays, with total exactness, the mind which begot him, and not as if the Father's hypostasis were poured out into him; for that is the blasphemous confusion of Sabellius and Marcellus. And again: So from this we learn that there is no confusion of the hypostases within the Holy Trinity, but each hypostasis exists along with its indication in the substance of the Godhead. And in chapter nineteen he taught in these words: You make a show, then, of satisfying true religion by empty mouthings, saying 'not as if the Father were the Son or the Son the Father', wherever you are caught out merging the hypostases by saying 'in Christ are the whole Godhead and the whole of manhood'; and thus drawing the blasphemous inference that Christ is in two substances in the common meaning, with the consequence that in this way, as a result of this subtle confusion of yours, the whole substance of the Godhead i.e. the Holy Trinity will be found to be incarnate in the whole substance of manhood and the whole human race.

All this has sufficiently proved that the doctor * was at pains to demonstrate the truth and certitude of the hypostases and prosopa believed on in the Holy Trinity, when he said all these things and not, contrariwise, to corroborate the Jewish doctrines of Sabellius by making the Holy Trinity consist only of names. For how can people, who are not lost to orthodox ideas, say of the names: For instance Peter shares the common manhood and substance i.e. rationality, mortality, capacity for understanding and knowledge. Similarly, both Paul and John, though separated by unique marks and not being mutually confused, share too the

93/96 Ibid. (CSCO 111, p. 169, 13-16; 112, p. 132, 12-14) 97/105 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 19 (CSCO 111, p. 174, 19-26; 112, p. 136, 11-19) 112/117 cf. supra, 67-72

95
 100
 105
 110

115
 120

Fol. 28ra

Line 110: חלב. MS reads: חלב.
 Line 120: MS רחמלכא רחמלכא, cf. p. 245, line 70; p. 255, line 233 (רחמלכא רחמלכא).
 Lines 120 and 124: רחמלכא, cf. p. 245, lines 70 and 74 (רחמלכא).

common substance i.e. are rational, mortal, capable of understanding and knowledge? Will the mind of anybody used to knowledgeable reading of such teachings admit the idea that Peter's, Paul's and John's names are mutually separated by unique marks, for they share the common substance by being rational, mortal, capable of understanding and knowledge? Will anyone accept such irrational claptrap, which is without any idea productive of correct thought, and not immediately condemn people who utter similar nonsense, as blasphemous as it is witless, against the divine mystery?

125 These words having been quoted and said, let us also now investigate the meaning of the proof-text by our divinely inspired father SEVERUS, just set down for examination. We will also, please, start some way before the text, so that we may, by the amplification, reach a full and unmutilated understanding of the words. He wrote, then (as we have, indeed, already mentioned previously) in the *90th Cathedral Sermon* at one point as follows: Yes, indeed, but he stated clearly in the Gospels: *My Father is greater than I*. But we must not be perfunctory in our attention to him who in those very Gospels says: *The Father who gave me them is greater than all and nobody * can snatch them from my Father's hand; the Father and I are one*. For because he became man for our sake without altering, he became one of the 'all', and was reckoned with the 'all' (meaning those thought of as inferior to God) without abandoning the divine majesty. Accordingly he called the Father greater than himself because his Father was greater than all. Consequently he calls the things he possessed and over which he was, as God, master, given him by the Father. But (in virtue of the identity of substance) he says: *The Father and I are one*. In this way *greater* belongs to the incarnate dispensation, *one* to the equality of honour in the Godhead. This is the reason why, when he was criticized for this remark, a spiteful crowd of Jews, hostile to God,

119/121 cf. supra, 114-117 132/183 Sev. Ant., Hom. cath. 90 (PO 23, pp. 139,3 - 142,9 [12]) 132/133 Ioh. 14:28 134/136 Ioh. 10:29-30 141 Matth. 28:18; Ioh. 3:35; 5:22, 26; 6:37, 39; 13:3; 17:2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 22, 24; 18:9 142 Ioh. 10:30 143 'greater': Ioh. 14,28; 10:29 'one': Ioh. 10:33

125
 130

135
 140
 145
 150
 155

Fol. 28rb

appropriate to God that he should have a co-eternal Son not one subsequently acquired. For were the Son to be thought the Father's inferior because he is not the Father, then the Father too must be defective through his not being the Son. But this is stuff for myth-makers not theologians. For 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are characteristic titles explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion. For they do not divide the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority.

Here there is clearly and abundantly disclosed the aim of the doctor, who exerted all his efforts against those who were set on proving, by various arguments and especially by the difference in names between Father, Son and Holy Ghost, a difference in substance between Father, Son and Holy Ghost, * especially when he said: For were the Son to be thought the Father's inferior because he is not the Father, then the Father too must be defective through his not being the Son. With regard to which he appropriately remarked: But this is stuff for myth-makers not theologians. For 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are characteristic titles explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion. For they do not divide the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority. How otherwise could he get rid of the profanity of people who foolishly imagined some inferiority for the Son through his not being the Father, except by writing and teaching that the title of 'Father' does not indicate any natural power superior to the Son and Holy Ghost at all, nor, again, do the names 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' have any inferiority, but, rather, are characteristic, explanatory of the freedom from confusion of the consubstantial hypostases completely equal in honour. Consequently he immediately continued: For they do not divide the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority. It is surely indisputable that this was said in reply to people devising a difference of substance in respect of Father, Son and

190 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה וְאֲבִיבְרָהָמָה : אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה וְאֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 : אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 195 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 * אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה

אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 200 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 205 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 210 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 215 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 220 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה
 אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה

Fol. 28vb

180/183 cf. supra, 7-10 189/191 cf. supra, 178-180 192/195 cf. supra, 180-183 204 cf. supra, 194-195

Line 204: אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה, cf. supra, line 193 (אֲבִיבְרָהָמָה).

Holy Ghost on the basis of a difference in appellations. But by what sequence of ideas can hypostases be explanatory of, and characteristic of, hypostases? What meaning does it have to say
 210 that the hypostases do not divide the hypostases in terms of superiority and inferiority? To substantiate that point we need from our author a clear text teaching the outlandish notions! Therefore let him either give clear proof of our God-clad patriarch and doctor Severus stating that the names 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost'
 215 are hypostases or, conversely, that the hypostases are names; or, let him understand that we ourselves shall never heed his obvious slanders. For * we have heard the previously noted clear and frank statement: For instance, Peter shares the common manhood and substance i.e. rationality, mortality, capacity for understanding and
 220 knowledge. Similarly both Paul and John, though separated by unique marks and not being mutually confused, share also the common substance i.e. are rational, mortal, capable of understanding and knowledge. And again: So, in the same way that with us manhood is the whole substance comprising many hypostases (Peter's, Paul's and John's)
 225 whereas Peter, Paul and John are hypostases sharing equally in the substance; for each of them shares fully and no less in the manhood and is a man and is separated by his own marks and is grouped with the consubstantial hypostases, by similarity and total equality in everything generic and common without being the total substance and manhood
 230 which embraces all the hypostases. Hereby we are precisely informed that the God-clad father referred not to the names 'Peter', 'Paul' and 'John' but instead to the realities, i.e. the hypostases of Peter, Paul and John. If not, let anyone with a mind to it, produce him or any other doctor there has been in the Church from the
 235 beginning, clearly stating that Peter's, Paul's and John's or some other man's names share in the common manhood and substance, are separated by proper marks, are rational, mortal and have a capacity for

225
 230
 235
 240
 245
 250

Fol. 29ra

218/222 cf. supra, 67-72 223/230 cf. supra, 73-80 236/238 cf. supra, 218-222

understanding and knowledge or, again, are grouped with the consubstantial names by similarity and total equality in everything generic and common. For all this (as has previously been set down) is clearly said explicitly with reference to the hypostases themselves by the God-clad spiritual guide, and none of it can be thought by anybody, not completely outside * the natural train of things, to apply to names.

245 But here too, again, when we read: 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are characteristic titles explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion; for they do not divide the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority, we shall not depart from the father's meaning, but interpret in a truly religious sense the mystery imparted to us by him in many other passages: that the terms 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are not (as ill-famed Arius' toadies imagine) appellations revelatory of a difference in nature between the hypostases of the Father and the Son and Holy Ghost, but indicative of the hypostases' freedom from confusion and distinctness. We shall not abandon this until somebody produces clear evidence, either from the irrefragable and expertly expressed teachings of our God-clad father Severus or from some peer of his, that the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the titles or terms explanatory and characteristic of the Father's, Son's and Holy Ghost's hypostases' freedom from confusion. For this great author himself has taken the trouble to do us good, by teaching us prudently and apparently much against himself, not to accept slanderous statements, made accidentally or otherwise, against the God-clad fathers; though he forgot his own teaching (as the facts prove) as a result of his superabundant and measureless erudition. He wrote as follows, in chapter thirteen of his book: We ought, then, to examine the truly religious thoughts of the fathers and willingly harmonize the words with them and not by, as it were, making them prisoners of war and mutilating them in combat, enslave them to our will. Not to prolong the discussion unduly by always

238/240 cf. supra, 227-229 Adv. Trith., 13 245/248 cf. supra, 8-10 267/276 Dam. Alex.,

255 ...
...
260 ...

Fol. 29rb

...
...
265 ...
...
270 ...
...
275 ...
...
280 ...
...
285 ...

examining the texts thus referred to, we give the general advice to readers that here especially they should follow the Spirit's guidance, pursue the intention of * true religion and distinguish undisputed and clear affirmations from those spoken in enigmas and a different style, without
 275 tearing the words out of context and changing them to an unsound meaning.

My dear fellow, when you come to the consideration of these words, would you not bring the just complaint against us, if we consented at all to holding something not plainly and clearly
 280 stated by the Church's divinely inspired doctors, that we show contempt not merely for their teachings but for themselves too? What ought we to do then? We take you for our counsellor on the point. For whilst we want to comply with your words, we do not know how we can possibly avoid spurning some of them.
 285 Either we follow your presently stated good advice and must despise your slanders upon the Church's doctors (or to put it truly, upon the truth itself); or, conversely, embrace your reprobate doctrines and suppress both your agreeable and good advice along with the fathers' teaching. For you were quite right to put
 290 it this way: Not to prolong the discussion unduly by always examining the texts thus referred to, we give the general advice to readers that here especially they should follow the Spirit's guidance, pursue the intention of true religion and distinguish undisputed and clear affirmations from those spoken in enigmas and a different style, without tearing the words
 295 out of context and changing them to an unsound meaning.

Which of your words, then, do you want us to respect and which to reject? As you will perceive, it is impossible for careful

290/295 cf. supra, 270-276

— בד לכתב קלם וכל מכלל וכלל קאמרי : לכת
 — מן חכמי דמימי קאמרי : חילתתו כללית לכת
 — דמימי : דמכלל וכלל וכלל : כחלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל * וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל * וכלל וכלל

295 דמימי וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 300 וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 305 וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 310 וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 — וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 315 וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל

Fol. 29va

כלל וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל
 וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל : וכלל וכלל וכלל וכלל

Line 313: וכלל, cf. supra, line 292 (וכלל).

students of all your writings not to poke fun at the contradictions! But we know you choose for your part to bid adieu to your
 300 helpful advice and hold instead to views offending vastly against
 the orthodox teachings of the Church. However, we shall not
 consent to following you on this last point and * we will cherish
 what you spoke well. No, we shall hold firm to the latter points
 and thereby require of you supports for your blasphemies, whilst we
 305 constantly drum into your ears as diligently and loudly as we can:
 Pursue the intention of true religion and distinguish undisputed and clear
 affirmations from those spoken in enigmas and a different style (if it be
 right at all to say anything of this sort in reference to things clear
 and obvious to everybody) without tearing the words out of context
 310 and changing them to an unsound meaning.

לשמה צלילת כן יבסדו מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 [ונחמת] אלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 320 אלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 אלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 325 אלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 330 אלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים ואלהים מן אלהים
 * אלהים מן אלהים

Fol. 29vb

Chapter 19

Dealing with the fact that the Arians were anxious to prove the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost different in substance on the basis of the difference in names too; and also that it was with them in view that our God-clad father Severus said: 'the titles "Father", "Son" and "Holy Ghost" are characteristic and explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion, without dividing the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority', and not to prove that the titles are hypostases; as is shown from many divinely inspired texts.

But until you do so, ponder also the exact words of the other fathers and learn the kind of struggle they had with the Arians who made impudent attempts to ground a difference in nature between the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost in their difference of names. Listen, then, to what BASIL THE GREAT teaches us on this point. In his second book *Against Eunomius* (as we have repeatedly quoted it) he said: Though what man in his right mind would go along with the argument that things whose names are different must also have different substances? Peter's, Paul's and, in a word, all men's names are different, but there is one substance of all of them. For which reason, in the majority of respects we are * identical with one another. But only in the properties appearing with each individual are we different from one another. So titles are not indicative of substances, but of the properties which characterize each one. Again: It is obvious, then, from what has been said, that in the case of Father and Son also, the names do not display the substance, but are indicative

5/8 cf. supra, ch. 18, 8-10 17/24 cf. supra, ch. 8, 15-23 19/23 cf. supra, ch. 13, 65-68 25/31 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 5 (PG 29, 580C; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 22) 25/27 cf. supra, ch. 13, 9-11; ch. 16, 2-5; 12-14

ἰσοουσια ὁμοουσια

ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν

ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν
 ἡμεῖς ἐκείνην ἰσοουσίαν ὁμοουσίαν

Fol. 30ra

Lines 18-26: cf. p. 95, lines 14-23 (with a few small variants).

of the properties. So there is no room for the argument to introduce a contrariety of substances on the ground of a difference in names. Indeed, that way Eunomius would demolish himself first. For if 'creature' and 'offspring' differ, there will be different substances belonging to the Only-begotten Son of God following the difference of the names.

GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN with the same invincible weapons of the Spirit subdued blasphemy when he wrote, as follows, in his *First Oration on the Son*: How could we pass over this next point of theirs which is no less remarkable than these last statements? 'Father', they say, is a term either for the substance or the activity, meaning to tie us down by the alternatives. If we say 'for the substance', we shall be agreeing that the Son is of a different substance, seeing that there is one substance of God and this (according to them) the Father has prior possession of. But if we say 'for the activity' we shall be admitting that the Son is a creature and not an offspring. For where there is an active producer, there must be a product of activity. And they will say, 'we wonder how the product can be the same as the producer'. I should have felt very abashed myself at your dilemma, had it been necessary to accept one of the alternatives instead of stating a third, truer possibility avoiding both. My subtle friends, 'Father' is not a term either for the substance or for the activity but for the relationship, the manner of being, which obtains between Son and Father or Father and Son. For just as with us, these appellations indicate close kindred and affinity, so also there * they signify the sameness of nature between begotten and begetter. But, to please you, suppose that the Father is some substance; he will certainly bring the inference of the Son and not alienate him, according to common-sense and the meaning of the appellations. Suppose, if you will, that it is a term for the activity, even so you will not catch us out that way either. For the very thing he will have been actively producing is the consubstantiality, even if the thought of this active production is otherwise absurd.

30/31 Gr. read: τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ
93C - 96B; *SChr.*, vol. 250, pp. 210-212)

34/57 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 29, 16 (PG 36,
36 'they say': Edd. φησὶν (sing.), but
δησοντες (plur.)

30
 31
 32
 33
 34

35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60

Fol. 30rb

Lines 39-40: MS: ~~καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν~~ but om is deleted.

What shall we say of this? Does it suffice for complete proof that men intoxicated with Arianism were perniciously claiming to wring a difference in substance out of a difference of names? Or should we discharge other shots from the doctors' words against the wrong-doers, in the hope that backsliders from the truth may come to a perception of divinely inspired writings with the help of assiduous and more efficacious chastisement? Or, if that does not happen, in the hope that as the error grows more obvious every God-fearing man will increasingly see what is orthodox. So let wise CYRIL, rich fountain of exact doctrines, explain in more abundance what we propose to prove. For he gives us much instruction, elevating us to an insight into the divine thoughts, writing as follows in the fourth chapter of the *Thesaurus*: We call God 'Father' but the Word 'Son and God' not that one is prior and the other posterior, according to the sequence amongst men (for God is above all time) but meaning that we worship the one as begetter (which is the property of the Father) and the other as true Son who has an ineffable generation from the Father's substance. Therefore, 'Father' because he has begotten, and 'Son' because he has been begotten, and only to this extent is there need of names and an indication through human resemblance. If, then, in the case of God, the name 'Father' is significant only of the fact that he begot, no argument obliges * God who begets non-temporally to pre-exist his offspring. And if no time intervened between begetter and begotten, the Son did not come into existence afterwards, but has been eternally co-eternal with the Father.

He said likewise in chapter nineteen of this very treatise as follows: The primary indeed and fullest names in sense are indicative of substances. But one may perceive considerable variety amongst them. For some give a general indication of entities, providing a generic

99/111 Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. IV (PG 75, 45D - 48A) 113/133 Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XIX (PG 75, 316AC)

95 ἡμεῖς οὖν ἡμεῖς τὸν θεὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἅμα
 ὁμοῦ καὶ ἰσότητι προσκυνούμεν καὶ λατρεύομεν ὡς
 90 ἑνὸς ἰσότητος καὶ ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 100 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 105 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 110 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 115 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 120 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου

Fol. 30vb

125 ἡμεῖς οὖν ἡμεῖς τὸν θεὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἅμα
 ὁμοῦ καὶ ἰσότητι προσκυνούμεν καὶ λατρεύομεν ὡς
 ἑνὸς ἰσότητος καὶ ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου
 ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ἑκείνου

'Father', then, because he has begotten and 'Son' because he has been begotten and only to this extent is there need of names. And again: If, then, in the case of God, the name 'Father' is significant only of the fact that he begot, no argument obliges God who begets non-temporally to pre-exist his offspring. Will you permit your disciples to blaspheme so presumptuously against God and say that the only need of God the Father himself is to indicate that he has begotten and the only need of the Only-begotten Son is to reveal that he has been begotten? Who will tolerate such blasphemy against God so abominable and thinking so crazy, as to say that what God the Father is, exists for the purpose of indicating that he begot, and what the Son is, for the purpose of indicating that he has been begotten? How can thinking like this not subject the Godhead of Father and Son to cause, if one chooses to disgorge such godless claptrap? Though, even if somebody blathered about a creature (to say nothing of the Creator of all creatures) that it existed or belonged amongst existents for the sole purpose of revealing how it exists, * he would have reached the nadir of craziness.

But bidding farewell to such nonsense and putting all the evil views of heretics completely beyond the pale, we ought to protect ourselves with the irreproachable armoury of our God-clad father Severus and of those doctors of the Church just mentioned, and along with them profess that the names 'Father' and 'Son' and the title 'Holy Ghost' do not, like indecent pagan myths, point to a difference of nature between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; nor again do they, like the proud Jewish godlessness of the fresh offspring of the Libyan, mean that the hypostases of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are names and titles; even if the one is and is termed 'Father', because he begot (in the full sense of the word and truly) the Only-begotten Son, and the other 'Son', because he has been begotten (in the full sense of the word and truly) of the Father, and, moreover the other likewise 'Holy Ghost', because

147/148 cf. supra, 104-106

148/151 cf. supra, 107-109

165
 170
 175
 180

* Fol. 31rb

185
 190

he proceeds (in the full sense of the word and truly) from God the
 180 Father. Therefore, interpreting our God-clad father SEVERUS' statement: For 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are characteristic titles explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion, for they do not divide the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority, in conformity with the fathers' thoughts, (seeing we do not want to stray from
 185 his correct and pure aim), we say that the term 'Father' and that of 'Son' and the appellation 'Holy Ghost' are by no means the hypostases of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost but, instead, characteristic titles, explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from confusion, for they do not divide the Trinity in terms of superiority and
 190 inferiority.

He himself shall be the first to testify that this is the meaning of this passage of his, writing, as he did, as follows in *Against Alexander's Codicils*: For the Holy Trinity exists in three hypostases and one substance. * 'Godhead' is the term indicating the substance and
 195 identity or commonness, for there is one substance of the three hypostases, and just as the Father is God, so is the Son, who has shone forth without beginning from the Father and has been eternally begotten from him, God; so too is the Holy Ghost, co-eternal with Father and Son, God; for he is *the Spirit of truth who proceeds non-temporally from the*
 200 *Father*. But each hypostasis has its own, non-common name; one has 'Father', one has 'Son' and one has 'Holy Ghost'. For fatherhood and not-being-from-something but existing ingenerately is the Father's particular and distinctive mark; the Son's fixed and immovable mark is Sonship and being-begotten-from-the-Father; as the Holy Ghost's proper,
 205 and incommunicable mark is procession from the Father, not being generate like the Son or being ingenerate like the Father. For the hypostases' properties and the names indicative of them, are immutable and fixed. They do not transfer, flow or alter into one another, but

181/183 cf. supra, ch. 18, 8-10; ch. 19, 5-8 188/190 cf. ibid. 193/221 Sev. Ant., *Contra codicillos Alexandri*, fragm. hucusque ineditum 199/200 Ioh. 15:26

195
 200
 205

210 Fol. 31va
 215
 220

Line 221: MS repeats $\alpha\mu$ but deleted it.

and eternity; for identity of substance implies equality in every respect. For when we hear 'Son', we immediately understand that he is consubstantial with the Father; for every father must beget a consubstantial
 240 son. In this way we infer notions about the Son, which are worthy of God, from every title: from 'Radiance' we infer his co-eternity with the Father; from 'Word', the impassibility of his generation; from 'Son', his consubstantiality. We cannot, indeed, define all that belongs to the divine
 245 nature by a single title or indication, seeing that he is incomparable and peerless. But taking from each term what is worthy of God, we reject all the rest * and let it stay beneath. But when we speak of the divine nature, we speak of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Though we distinguish the hypostases, we unite the Godhead. And as the term 'Father' and the
 250 fact of not being begotten by anything is the characteristic and the property of the Father's hypostasis, so the term 'Son' and the fact of being begotten by the Father is the characteristic and the property of the Son's hypostasis. In the same way too the title 'Holy Ghost' and the fact of not being begotten by the Father but proceeding from him is the
 255 characteristic and the property of the Holy Ghost's hypostasis.

What external advocacy will the plainly expressed words of this careful doctor require, when the truth of the divine doctrines shines out of them with such abundant clarity and fulness? For those endowed with knowledge and sound judgement, who want
 260 to comprehend these texts with an undistorted mind, may easily learn that, using the Spirit's guidance, he instructs us not one way here and a different way before, but always giving us the same precise and elevated theological insight; and he teaches that we should not think of the hypostases as names and titles but as
 265 individually subsisting realities. Otherwise what is the difference, indeed, between writing above: For 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are characteristic titles explanatory of the hypostases' freedom from

266/269 cf. supra, 181-183

ⲉⲩⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 260 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 265 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 270 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 275 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ

Fol. 32ra

ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 280 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 285 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 290 ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲣⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ

confusion, for they do not divide the Trinity in terms of superiority and inferiority, and saying here: But each hypostasis has its own, non-
 270 common name, one has 'Father', one has 'Son' and one has 'Holy Ghost'; and again: For the hypostases' properties and the names which indicate them are immutable and fixed, they do not transfer, flow or alter into one another but safeguard the stability of each hypostasis by their fixedness, without severing the unity and equality of honour of the substance and of the Godhead of the three; and at another point: For
 275 when we hear 'Son', we immediately understand that * he is consubstantial with the Father; for every father must beget a consubstantial son; in this way we infer notions about the Son, which are worthy of God, from every title; and again: But taking from each term what is worthy of
 280 God we reject all the rest and let it stay beneath?

What, then, is the clever fellow planning? How by the power of artifice will he identify contradictions, join falsehood to truth and light to darkness? He must, indeed, in my opinion, acknowledge one of three things: either, he must concede that these words are
 285 not consistent with one another and he will be found guilty of openly and undisguisedly condemning a doctor like this for self-contradiction; or, he must pronounce them mutually consistent and agree with the truth and the doctor's view, by confessing 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' as the hypostases' names and
 290 not as the hypostases themselves; or, (the remaining possibility) he must spurn the fathers' teachings and follow his own absurd view, must openly interpret the names here as hypostases and take lengthy fill of open blasphemy against God. So that he would have reason to hear from us that evil is truly blind and
 295 does not see the pit of destruction in front of its feet. For this reason, then, those in evil's train must needs be overwhelmed by severe misfortunes and end in total ruin. For what is more ruinous than blathering in this way against God and making the Holy, all-adorable and consubstantial Trinity consist of mere

269/271 cf. supra, 200-201 271/275 cf. supra, 206-211 275/279 cf. supra, 239-242 279/280 cf. supra, 246-247

290
 295
 300
 305
 * Fol. 32rb

310
 315
 320

300 names? For if the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are nothing but names, how, when the realities or prosopa, which properly and individually subsist and to which the titles belong, do not exist at all, will the names not be mere names? For we learned from the God-clad doctors that not the hypostases' names, but the hypostases themselves, subsist properly and individually. If not, let him who can, prove from a single father that these names * 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' subsist individually with a proper subsistence and we shall hold our peace.

Must not anyone who elects to think this, be ashamed when he hears names indicative of the hypostases? Will he substitute 'hypostases indicative of the hypostases' for names indicative of the hypostases? What, again, will he say when he reads neither does the name 'Father' ever leave the Father to transfer to the Son and Holy Ghost etc? Will he say: 'the Father never leaves the Father to transfer to the Son and the Holy Ghost, nor is the Son stripped from the Son, like clothing or a mask, to be applied to Father or Holy Ghost; nor again can the Holy Ghost be detached from himself to depart to another'? What can be madder than this wonderful cleverness? How can for what characterizes each hypostasis, fitting particularly only the hypostasis whose it is, abides, agree with correct ideas according to this folly? In that case, it is being said not only that the hypostasis characterizes itself, but also that it fits itself, and belongs to itself, which is more nightmarish than any dream!

325 But besides this, let us consider something still more astonishing. Our divinely inspired father SEVERUS declared: In this way we infer notions about the Son, which are worthy of God, from every title: from 'Radiance' we infer his co-eternity with the Father; from 'Word', the

310/312 cf. supra, 207 312/314 cf. supra, 211-212 314/318 cf. supra, 211-216
 319/320 cf. supra, 216-217 326/329 cf. supra, 241-244

325
 330
 335

Fol. 32va

340
 345
 350

355

Line 352: cf. p. 279, line 262 (350).

impassibility of his generation; from 'Son', his consubstantiality. Notice
 330 how he clearly mentions different titles of the Son: 'Radiance',
 'Word' and 'Son' are titles of the Only-begotten and unique.
 Therefore, were the titles hypostases, not only must there be
 many hypostases of the Son but they must also be different
 hypostases.

335 What will they say too about what follows: But taking from each
 term what is worthy of God, we reject the rest and let it stay beneath?
 Do they presume to confess openly that 'taking from each'
 hypostasis of the Holy Trinity (for example, from * the Son's)
 'what is worthy of God', they 'reject the rest and let it stay
 340 beneath'? But alas, for false doctrines and blasphemous impud-
 ence towards God, because these folk have reached such an
 extent of godlessness that they disdain the divine decrees and
 make a great show of the opinion they have of themselves or,
 shall we more properly say, of their own stupidity!

345 Let us consider the rest, which goes as follows: And as the term
 'Father' and the fact of not being begotten by anything is the character-
 istic and the property of the Father's hypostasis, so the term 'Son' and
 the fact of being begotten by the Father is the characteristic and the
 property of the Son's hypostasis. In the same way too the title 'Holy
 350 Ghost' and the fact of not being begotten by the Father but proceeding
 from him is the characteristic and the property of the Holy Ghost's
 hypostasis. But here too they will have to profess the term 'Father'
 and the term 'Son' and the title 'Holy Ghost' as hypostases. For
 how can they, once they have surrendered to falsehood and hired
 355 themselves out to blasphemy against the Holy Trinity, resist
 letting their mouths give vent to everything that comes into their
 hearts? For if the names characteristic of the hypostases are the
 hypostases themselves, must not the hypostases stand in need of
 further names to characterize and explain them? Or if they do not

355 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܘܢܚܘܢ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 360 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ

ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 365 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 370 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ

Fol. 32vb

ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 375 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 380 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 385 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ
 ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ ܠܠܟܘܢܗܘܢ

335/336 cf. supra, 246-247 345/352 cf. supra, 249-255

360 need them, all the fathers' wise teaching on the subject will have
 been proved vain and empty verbiage. Apparently, too, we shall
 ourselves have been in error because we shall have been led
 astray, rather than taught something useful, by the doctors of the
 Church. Moreover, how can the Father not be the Son in every
 365 respect and similarly the Son the Father, instead of being separate
 hypostases, if the properties and names which characterize them
 are not viewed in them?

Why should we tarry unduly long in refutations based on
 considerations of the obvious, when it is nearer to the point to
 370 cleanse and wash off the filth of impure and reprobate doctrines
 with further abundant testimonies? So before these are set out it
 will be of considerable * utility and great advantage to many that
 we should prove that the falsehood collapses of itself: which is of
 importance for proof and an evident rebuttal of the vicious
 mischief, as it were *in toto*. For BASIL THE GREAT said: Thus evil
 375 seems not only to oppose good but also itself. This cunning fellow
 too, indeed, when championing his totally crazy and feeble
 dogmas, is so perplexed and befuddled that he sometimes tosses
 out the heterodoxy of his drunken error unveiled, sometimes
 380 tricks out his deceptions of the readers with words from the
 theologians which are totally in contradiction to himself and
 incoherent, in order that the lethal present may be acceptable.

This, indeed, is a trick common to all heretics. The precise
 expression of proven CYRIL the wise shall confirm it. It has its
 385 place at the beginning of the *Thesaurus*, and goes as follows: The
 error of Arius' and Eunomius' dogmas is indeed complex and many-
 faceted (if I may use that word) and in complex fashion fabricates the
 shape of truth, like harlots meaning to conceal the ugliness of the deed
 by use of the devices they have discovered: they gild and dress them-
 390 selves up, putting on other items of adornment, and make ruin look

375/376 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 27 (PG 29, 572B; *SChr.*, vol. 299, p. 268) 385/398 Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, prol. (PG 75, 12BC)

390
 395
 400
 405
 410

395
 400
 405
 410

Fol. 33ra

415

Chapter 20

5 Comparison of the writer's words which plainly indicates the contradiction in his doctrines and a refutation from the fathers' teaching of his blasphemous folly which renders the hypostases of the Holy Trinity names.

Let us, then, compare the words of this excellent fellow with one another and, when we have come to know their inconsistency, we will then oppose to them the company of the Holy Church's dignitaries which is not only at war with them but totally destroys them, obliterates them and demonstrates the perfect nullity of their cleverness.

He wrote, then (as we have frequently set down in the preceding), in the fourth chapter of his notorious book, as follows: 'Unbeginning', 'beginning' and 'with the beginning' (i.e. Father, Son and Holy Ghost) are not words indicative of substances but of the properties belonging with the one substance. And in the letter delivered by Zachariah: For the concept 'being' since it is unvaryingly the same for the three of them, shows us the commonness of the substance, but the mode of being, having freedom from confusion, and separation of the names from mutual participation, indicates by such expressions the manner of existence and the properness of the hypostases or prosopa. We recall, indeed, that the wise patriarch also somewhere or other in the work *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea* quoted passages from proven doctors, ruling as follows on such names. And again too, in the *Letter to the Holy Bishops * of the East*, he said: The distinguished patriarch Severus, having read these passages with care and designated as

מלאך ו...
מלאך

5 כאלו...
כאלו...
כאלו...
כאלו...

6 לתורה...
לתורה...
לתורה...
לתורה...

הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...
הוא...

Fol. 33va

13/16 cf. supra, ch. 6, 608-610 17/24 cf. supra, ch. 7, 23-30 25/28 cf. supra, ch. 13, 11-15

Line 13: מלאך ו... MS א. cf. p. 31, ll. 100 and 126, but cf. also p. 79, l. 630.

hypostases sharing fully and no less in the common and all-transcending substance, the proper names which do not indicate the substance.

These are the precise doctrines of his heretical mind. For as has been abundantly demonstrated in the things already examined, he jumbles everything in a confused muddle with an eye to his goal of professing the names, the words, the properties and the hypostases as identical, not recognizing the least difference between them. Hence he does not forbear mischievously transferring statements about the hypostases, for example, to the properties, the words and the names; and conversely statements about the properties, names and expressions to the hypostases. In sum: every statement about each on the list he has seen fit to refer indiscriminately to the rest and confuse them all, so that he may, in this way, easily decree the non-subsistence of the Holy Trinity.

Let us consider, please, in addition to those quoted, these deceitful and hypocritical statements of his, and let us see if, through their inability to agree at all in any way, they do not completely exclude one another. He says, then (banishing the accusation made against him) in the eighth chapter of his remarkable book, the following: As, then, we repudiate their empty imputation of Sabellianism, making full and real acknowledgement, as we do, of the hypostatic existence of the prosopa and explaining the three who exist and subsist as hypostases and not substances (for sainted Severus does not identify the substrate of the substance with the hypostasis in the work against the Caesarean) so also should they cleanse their polytheisms by the acknowledgement that the community of the substance exists in reality. And again in the ninth chapter he wrote: And it is impossible for anyone, after the teaching of a separation of the names, to change and talk in the full sense of * hypostasis in the singular

— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος

30

οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἶναι ἢ τὸ κοινόν· ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος

35

40

ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος
— ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος ἵππος

55

and substances in the plural. For the names follow the nature of the realities and not the realities the names. He says similar things too in the fourteenth chapter of his same irreproachable book, when he expounds the words of Athanasius the Great in the following way: Terms, then, are consequent upon the realities and realities do not in the opposite way follow terms. This has been frequently proved in a multitude of passages by the saints. So, when blessed Athanasius declared that the titles do not change, he sought to give the reason for their not changing, viz. the fact that the meanings understood by the words cannot mutually transfer, but, since the realities are unchanging, the words, too, indicative of them, possess stability and immutability. The titles, therefore, do not change, because neither does the nature of the realities to which the words are applied.

Shall we not be doing the truth an injustice, if we fail to cry out against these inconsequential and mutually inconsistent words, especially at this present time, what was said by James in the Catholic Epistle: *For, he says, every nature of animals, birds, reptiles and sea creatures is tameable, and has been tamed by man. But the tongue nobody can tame; it is an uncontrollable evil, full of lethal poison. With it we bless the Lord and Father, and with it we curse men created in God's likeness; out of the same mouth comes blessing and cursing. It is not right, my brothers, that it should happen like this! Does a spring produce sweet and bitter from the same mouth? My brothers, can a fig tree yield olives or a vine figs? No, neither can sweet water be produced by salt water.*

We ourselves, then, when we hear this doughty and wise writer, telling us now that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are terms

60 — *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 65 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 70 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*

ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ
 75 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 80 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 85 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*
 — *ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ*

ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ

and words, now that they are three realities and that they subsist,
 have good reason to say to him: 'My dear man, you are mistaken
 85 and sick with the utmost folly, to propound things * so completely
 impossible and ill-considered; you are producing blessing and
 cursing out of the same mouth and making bitter and sweet flow
 from the same fount. For how can the three who exist, i.e. which
 subsist and are realities, be the same as the names they are
 90 indicated by? Or how can the names which follow the realities
 and, again, the realities themselves, which they follow them, be
 mutually identical? Do you not remember wise BASIL saying: For
 how can the same thing follow God and be God, when it is well-known
 to everybody that what follows is different from what it follows? And
 95 again: For the nature of the realities does not follow the names, but the
 names are subsequent to the realities. Teach us, then, the method by
 which we are to think these things of yours and mutually unite
 them! For above, you proclaim that the hypostases of the Holy
 Trinity are names and words, but here again you contradict
 100 yourself by saying of them that the three exist i.e. subsist and are
 realities. And not only that, but that the names follow the nature
 of the realities and not the realities the names; and again that
 terms are consequent upon the realities and realities do not in the
 opposite way follow the terms. And what is astonishing: you
 105 attempt to establish these mutual contradictions from the divinely
 inspired doctors. That you recognize the terms here as being
 nothing but the names and the titles, is indicated by what follows
 this quoted proof-text of yours. For you said: So, when blessed
 Athanasius declared that the titles do not change, he sought to give the
 110 reason for their not changing, viz. the fact that the meanings understood
 by the words cannot mutually transfer, but, since the realities are

88 cf. supra, 48-49 92/94 cf. supra, ch. 9, 289-291 95/96 cf. supra, ch. 17,
 67-68 98 cf. supra, 15, 20 100/101 cf. supra, 56-57 108/114 cf. supra,
 62-68

90 *ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 95 *ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 100 *ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 105 *ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 110 *ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 115 *ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ

Fol. 34ra

Line 101: ⲟⲩⲟⲩ, MS, ⲟⲩⲟⲩ, cf. p. 127, line 338; p. 299, line 134.
 Line 102: ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ (as p. 299, lines 134-135), cf. p. 127,
 lines 314-315 (ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ).
 Line 115: MS *ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ*.

unchanging, the words, too, indicative of them, possess stability and immutability. The titles, therefore, do not change, because neither does the nature of the realities to which the words are applied. It is therefore
 115 obvious and clear that you here took the terms as nothing but * words and names. Consequently, you are to tell us clearly how you interpret the realities and how the terms. But perhaps you may say that you do reckon the hypostases to be realities, but (as has been shown) the titles of the hypostases to be terms. So if the
 120 hypostases are realities and the titles terms, and (as you said) the terms follow the realities, must you not acknowledge with us that the names and titles are different from the hypostases they follow? For (as has been previously set out) BASIL THE GREAT taught us: How can the same thing follow God and be God, when it is
 125 well-known to everybody that what follows is different from what it follows? Cease then, even at this late stage, from opposing yourself and from making the God-clad fathers contradict themselves and one another; do not wrest statements like this out of their context for your own ends.

130 But prove this to us too: how you can be consistent in statement or thought! You wrote: But since the realities are unchanging, the words too, indicative of them, possess stability and immutability. The titles, therefore, do not change, because neither does the nature of the realities to which the words are applied. Will you say: 'But since the
 135 realities are unchanging, the realities, too, indicative of them, possess stability and immutability'? And, likewise, will you say: 'the realities, therefore, do not change because neither does the nature of the realities to which the names are applied' instead of: the titles, therefore, do not change? This is what your sophistical propositions force you to do, willy nilly. Who will accept your truly unparalleled and outlandish abyss of notions and words, for

124/126 cf. supra, 93-94 131/134 cf. supra, 65-68

120 — — — — —
 125 — — — — — Fol. 34rb
 130 — — — — —
 135 — — — — —
 140 — — — — —
 145 — — — — —
 150 — — — — —

the knowledge of your writings is seemingly too great for the
 comprehension of our world? So you will be requiring a different
 nature, or at least a world and society for whom you can
 145 establish these things by law, fabricating an imaginary city and
 dream-laws, as it were, through empty blather.

Why should we over-investigate * the rest of your statement
 and make a troublesome heap of words, when those who want
 to know may learn succinctly from this, the inanity and sense-
 150 lessness of the whole?

אשר ידעתם וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :
 וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :
 155 וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :
 וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :
 וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :

וידעו כל האדם * וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :
 160 וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :
 וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :
 וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם : וידעו כל האדם :

Fol. 34va

Line 159: וידעו כל האדם. A note in the same hand at the top of the folio reads as follows: וידעו כל האדם וידעו כל האדם.

Chapter 21

Concerning the fact that if according to the new-fangled blasphemy the hypostases of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are not realities subsisting individually with a proper subsistence but are names, the whole of our mystery is fantasy and our regeneration appears a fraud depending not on realities but solely on names. And clear teaching on the point by the fathers.

If, indeed, my good man, we accept your definitions, according to which the hypostases of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are names and words instead of being full realities existing individually with a proper subsistence, how shall we differ from the lovers of the Libyan's Jewish dogmas, who make a mocking profession not only of names but also prosopa? Must we not be rejecting *in toto* the faith we were baptized in and reckoning our whole mystery a fantasy, if we suppose our regeneration was accomplished only in names and not in realities? Having usefully set down a few divinely inspired fathers' texts about that, we will again nourish our listeners with their ample teaching which is extremely pertinent and relevant to the proposed purpose. Thus, indeed, we shall all of us tread securely the straight, unerring path of the divine doctrines.

Saint BASIL, then, shall come forward and from his spiritual treasures philosophize for us on the point in hand, with plainly expressed correct theology. He writes to Amphilochius *On the Holy Ghost* as follows: The Lord, in teaching the Father, the Son and Holy Ghost, did not teach a number with them, * for he did not say

25/30 Bas. Caes., *De Spir. Sancto*, 18 (44) (PG 32, 148CD; *SChr.*, vol. 17bis, p. 402)

ἄρθρον ἁγίου πνεύματος

καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·

καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·

καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα·

Line 27: ἁγίου, in the margin: καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ὡς τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα.

With these three invocations of hypostases there concurs an equal number of immersions, wherein there is another mysterious principle evidenced by the holy Scriptures. For because, as Paul, writing to the Romans, declares: *We are buried with Christ in baptism by being baptized into his death*, and because Christ's burial (after which the Resurrection occurred) was for three days, we display this fact by three immersions in the water and bury the old sins in a life-giving grave; we change into the new man, gaining therefrom an earnest of the resurrection. The distinguished THEODOSIUS, too, who follows him on every point, wrote, in his discourse *On Theology*, giving us the following teaching: Though, then, there are in the divinely inspired Scripture many names by which the Godhead is signified, our Lord Jesus Christ passed them all by and declared, in the summary of our faith which he was handing on to his disciples: *Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*. By these appellations he was not introducing to us any three, particular, Gods. Indeed through Moses, speaker of things sacred, he said: *Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord*. No, he teaches a clear and unconfused distinction of the prosopa, so that we may recognize that the Father is not the Son or the Spirit, neither is the Son the Spirit or the Father, nor the Holy Ghost the Son or the Father. But recognizing each one by the distinct marks of the hypostasis, we will also repudiate that pernicious confusion which Sabellius the Libyan began, and reject that severing of the Godhead, which is not far off it in absurdity and which most impious Arius introduced.

It has clearly been proved by all these texts that in baptism we are not perfected by mere names bereft of realities but, as we have been taught, through holy names and the realities signified by the names. * Anyone, indeed, who defines the names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost as being really mere empty names will say that

89/90 cf. Rom. 6:4 96/110 Theod. Alex., *De Trin.* (CSCO 17, pp. 44,12 - 45,1; 103, pp. 29,28 - 30,7) 99/101 Matth. 28:19 103 Deut. 6:4

ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 95 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 : ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 100 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 105 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 110 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 115 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 120 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ

: ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 125 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓ

Fol. 35va

they do not apply to realities or indicate properly and individually subsisting hypostases; but insofar as anyone makes them indicative of the realities, he will not lapse at all into the absurdity referred to. This is why wise Basil too said that we received from the Saviour the knowledge of the faith which brings us to salvation, through holy names. It is, therefore, obvious that when we are baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, we are not baptized into mere names (far be such blasphemy!) but we believe that we are baptized into the Father himself and into the Son and into the Holy Ghost, to whom the names belong and whom they indicate. See too how the teacher of truth shows this fact even more clearly by the subsequent words: One (he says) who states the name of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost, states three and connects them by the conjunction, teaching that under each name lies a proper meaning because the names are indicative of the realities. But nobody with even a slight share of intelligence doubts that the realities have full, proper being. Note that he says that under each name lies a proper meaning, telling us that by each name is made known to us a reality having full and proper being; for, he says, the names are indicative of the realities, names which display to us definite and complete ideas.

Basil's peer, GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN, also clearly proclaimed (as set out before) that the baptism of adoption is accomplished not only in the names but in the realities. For we believe, he says, in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Ghost, consubstantial and equal in glory, in whom baptism has its fulfilment, in the names and the realities. And again: For people who dispute this point shall not scheme to prate as if * religion for us consists in names and not in

120/121 cf. supra, 28 128/132 cf. supra, 37-41 133 cf. supra, 38-39;
 130 135 cf. supra, 39-40; 130-131 136 cf. supra, 42-43 139/142 cf.
 supra 57-50 142/144 cf. supra 63-64

120
 130
 135
 140
 145

150
 155

Line 153: *cf. p. 307, line 63*
 Line 154: *cf. p. 307, line 67*
 Line 154: *cf. p. 307, line 68*
 Line 155: *cf. p. 307, line 69*

Fol. 35vb

realities. And again in the other passage: We worship the Father,
 145 Son and Holy Ghost; we recognize the Father in the Son and the Son in
 the Holy Ghost, in whom we were baptized, in whom we have believed,
 whom we have confessed. Before uniting them we separate them, and
 before we separate them we unite them, not the three as one *unus* (for
 150 they are not unhypostatic names or applied to a single hypostasis, so
 that our wealth will reside in names and not realities). From this it will
 have become clear to everybody that unless we say that the names
 are indicative of three true, properly and individually subsisting
 hypostases and prosopa, we shall be thinking of them as mere
 non-subsistent names (which is the same as saying, bereft of
 155 hypostases and realities) and our wealth, the mystery of baptism or
 regeneration, will reside in 'empty' names and not in realities.

But those also who fought hard in their time for the churches
 by their martyr-suffering, in the overthrow and total uprooting of
 heresies, the famous SEVERUS and THEODOSIUS, recognized that
 160 the titles of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are indicative
 of true hypostases. The former said that the baptism of adoption is
 accomplished in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Ghost and
 taught that with these three invocations of hypostases there concurs an
 equal number of immersions. The latter taught that our Lord and
 165 God Jesus Christ omitted all the names by which the Godhead is
 signified and affirmed that he gave the disciples the tradition of
 baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the
 Holy Ghost, wherein he decreed that there resides the summary of
 our faith.

Why, then, when matters are made so plain by the divinely
 inspired fathers, do we devise such pernicious and mischievous
 things against our salvation, and why do we not acknowledge
 devoutly, following the rules and definitions of the fathers, that
 the names 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are indicative of
 175 realities having complete being; and why do we not free ourselves

144/150 cf. supra, 69-75 155/156 cf. supra, 74-75 161/162 cf. supra, 84-85
 163/164 cf. supra, 86-87 165/166 cf. supra, 97 168/169 cf. supra, 98

160
 165
 170
 175
 180

170
 175
 180

175
 180

Line 156: cf. p. 307, line 75 (
 Line 157: MS, cf. p. 307, line 76.
 Line 158: cf. p. 307, lines 76-77 (

from defining them as mere names, void of hypostases, and from being ensnared in Sabellius' Jewish nets? For he also * expressly professed the appellations 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' but, because he did not reckon them to be indicative of realities, was convicted of calling them mere empty appellations. Therefore now too, those who do not think that the names apply to properly subsisting realities having complete being, inasmuch as they call them mere empty names, as completely insubstantial as fabulous names, are not devoid of Sabellius' pollution but have been seen to be strangers to our (or to put it truly, the Lord's) portion.

185 : *ⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 * *ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ*
 190 *ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
 195 *ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ
ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲁ

Fol. 36ra

Chapter 22

More extended teaching from the divinely inspired fathers about names and realities whereby it will be clearly known that realities and names are not (as the author supposes) identical at all but that names are indicative of realities.

From here then, let us proceed, as we promised, to extended teaching from the fathers and besides all that has hitherto been set down in numerous passages in this study, we shall explain, from other passages as well, their view of names and realities so that everybody may know that we are revealing their view on this subject not on the basis of a few words by them but of expansive texts.

ATHANASIUS THE GREAT, then, shall delight us with his apostolic teaching and check the presumption of wrong-doers. He wrote, then, as follows in his discourse *Against Heresy*: But if the Lord is Son (as he is) and it has been agreed that a son is not external to his begetter but from him, they should not dispute over the terms (as I said before) if the saints use the words *who made him* instead of 'who begot him' in reference to the Word himself too, seeing that in a case like this the actual term is immaterial so long as what pertains to the nature is acknowledged. For the terms do not attract the nature, but, rather, the nature attracts the terms and changes them. For terms are not prior to substances but substances come first and terms are secondary to them. * Therefore also, when the substance is a work or a creature, then 'he made', 'he created' and 'he became' are used of them in their full sense

6 cf. ch. 21, 17-19 15/59 Athan. Alex., *C. Arian*, II, 3-4 (PG 26, 152B - 153C) 18 Hebr. 3:2 21 'attract': παρσιροῦνται

ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς

ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς

ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς [12]
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς

ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς
 ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς

Lines 18-64: ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς ... ἡσυχία καὶ ἡρεσὶς. Add. I2155, fol. 2va-b.

and mean a work. But when the substance is an offspring and son, then 'he made', 'he became' and 'he created' are not attributed to him in their full sense and do not indicate a work. Indeed one uses 'he made' instead of 'he begot' indiscriminately. Thus fathers often call the children sprung from them their 'slaves', without denying the genuineness of their nature. Often too, they affectionately call their slaves 'children' without concealing the initial purchase of them. For they say the former as fathers in authority, but the latter word out of affection. Thus Sarah called Abraham 'lord' though she was not a maidservant but a wife. The apostle united Onesimus the slave to Philemon, who owned him, as 'brother', whereas Bathsheba called her son a 'slave', though she was his mother, saying 'your slave Solomon' to Solomon's father. Again too, when Nathan the prophet entered, he said the same thing as she to David: 'your slave Solomon'. Nor did it trouble them to call a son a slave, for on hearing it David recognized the nature, whereas they, on using it, did not forget the truth. They were thus entreating David that the one whom they were calling 'slave' should become his father's heir, for he was David's son by nature. As, then, when we read this, we understand it well and, on hearing Solomon called 'slave', do not suppose him to be a slave but a true son by nature, so also if the saints speak of the Saviour, who is acknowledged to be truly the Son and the Word by nature, as being *faithful to him who made him*, or if he says of himself *The Lord created me and I am your slave and the son of your maidservant* and everything of that kind, certain people must not on that account deny his property of being from the Father, * but, as in the case of Solomon and David, must have a correct understanding of the Son and of the Father. Otherwise if, on hearing Solomon called 'slave', they acknowledge him as a son, must not people be worthy of perishing many times over who fail to keep the same understanding about the Lord and instead, when they hear 'Offspring', 'Word' and 'Wisdom', forcibly

30
 35
 40
 45
 50
 55

< 30
 < 35
 < 40
 < 45
 < 50
 < 55
 < Fol. 36va

33/34 Gen. 18:12 34/36 cf. Philem. 16 36/37 cf. III Regn. 1:19 38/39
 cf. III Regn. 1:26 47 Hebr. 3:2 48 Prov. 8:22 48/49 Ps. 115:7

misinterpret them and deny the nature and the Son's true generation from the Father, and, after hearing expressions and terms belonging to a work, they immediately descend to imagining the Son to be by nature a work and deny the Word?

60 Now it is especially worth noting in addition to this what wise BASIL says in a passage not quoted by us hitherto. He writes as follows in the first book *Against Eunomius* and shakes down his whole mischief: Amongst the names used of God, then, some are indicative of what belongs with God but some, on the contrary, of what
65 does not belong with him. From both these an impression, so to say, of God is created for us: from the denial of things inappropriate to him and from the acknowledgement of things belonging to him. For instance, when we name him 'incorruptible', we are potentially saying to ourselves or our listeners: 'Do not imagine God as subject to corruption'. When
70 too we name him 'invisible' we are saying: 'Do not imagine that he can be apprehended by the eye's sense'. Now in this way too when we name him 'ingenerate' we are saying: 'You should think of God's being as dependent on no cause or higher principle'. And in general from each of these we learn not to lapse into unseemly notions in our ideas about
75 God. Therefore, to recognize the special property of God, we forbid one another in talking about God to debase our notions to what is unfitting, so that men may never imagine God to be one of the corruptible beings or one of the visible or one of the created beings. And so through all these * negative terms there is a sort of denial of what is alien, our
80 understanding being illuminated and rejecting ideas of what does not belong to him. Again, we call God 'good', 'just', 'creator' and 'judge' and everything else of this kind. As, then, in the former case the expressions indicated a denial and negation of what is alien to God, so

56 Gr.: τὴν φύσει καὶ γνησίαν γέννησιν 63/98 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 10 (PG 29, 533C - 536C; *SChr.*, vol. 299, pp. 204-208) 71 Syr. om.: καὶ ὅταν ἀθάνατον - θεῷ 73 Gr.: μηδεμίᾳ αἰτίας μῆτε ἀρχῆς

< οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξ ἑκείνου γινώσκων ἐκείνην ἐξ ἑκείνου ἔκαστος ἐκείνην
< ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
< ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
65 < ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
< ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
70 < ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
< ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
75 < ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
< ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
80 < ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
< ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
85 < ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
< ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
90 < ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην
< ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην

Lines 68-109: καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ἐκείνην ... ἐκείνην ἐκείνην. Add. 12155, fol. 2vb-3rb.

Fol. 36vb

here they indicate the positing and the existence of what is God's own
 85 and viewed as fittingly belonging with him. From each of the two kinds
 of appellation we learn either about the existence of what belongs to him
 or about the non-existence of what does not belong to him. Now
 'ingenerate' is one of the non-existent things, for it indicates the fact that
 God has no generation. We shall not argue over whether one is to
 90 denominate this 'negation', 'prohibition' or 'denial' or whatever you like.
 But that 'ingenerate' does not indicate any of the things God has, has, I
 think, been sufficiently ascertained in what has been said. The substance,
 on the other hand, is not something God does not have, but is the very
 being of God, which it would be the height of folly to count amongst the
 95 non-existents. For if the substance were amongst the non-existents, how
 could any other of the things mentioned exist? But 'ingenerate' has been
 proved to be reckoned along with the non-existents. Therefore, he who
 states that this term is indicative of the substance is a fraud.

He wrote too in the second book: For we will not here allow him
 100 to reshape and remodel the expression 'he begot' (said of the Father) so
 as to call the Son of God an 'offspring'. It is wrong, indeed, for one
 trained in true religion to make a facile leap to something which a
 connexion of words requires; no, he should cherish the names laid down
 in the Bible and abide by them, so that with their help he may fulfil a
 105 doxology fit for God. For if those who originally translated the Hebrew
 language into Greek did not venture on an interpretation of certain
 names but carried over the same Hebrew expression (as for example,
 'Sabaoth', * 'Adonai', 'El' and whatever is of that kind) displaying this
 respect not only towards the divine names but also many others, how
 110 much reverence ought we not to have regarding the Lord's names? Yet
 when would they have tolerated fabricating any of these names, they

◀ קל : תחת קדושתו וקדושתו קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ כלל קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 95 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 100 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 105 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו

110 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 115 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 120 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו
 ◀ קדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו וקדושתו : קדושתו וקדושתו

Fol. 37ra

who lacked the confidence to translate certain words lest they destroy accuracy of ideas through failure to correspond with the meanings?

But in the book entitled *Refutation* he also speaks in the following fashion: 'Ingenerate', if it is a name, is not a substance. For names are indicative of substances and are not themselves substance. But if 'ingenerate' is substance itself, let them state the substance's name. For we do not get understanding from the substances but from the names and the operations, especially of things incorporeal. If 'ingenerate' is the name of the substance of God, either God, knowing his own substance, did not know the name of the substance or, knowing the name, he misled the hearers. For the Lord says: 'Omnipotent' is my name and, when asked by Moses what his name was, he said: I am 'He who is'; and again: *The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob - this is my name for ever*; and David said: *'The Lord' is thy name*. But the name 'ingenerate' he did not use of himself nor did any of the saints either. Now, if he did not mislead and was not ignorant (for it is blasphemy to speak this way) 'ingenerate' is not his name.

To this we also attach in due order words by GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN which will illuminate the minds of readers more clearly than the sun's beams and will totally disperse the darkness of heretical wrongthinking. He wrote as follows, then, in the *First Oration on the Son*: Our argument, then, is: just as horse, ox and man and each under the same species have one concept and whatever shares in the concept is called by that name in the full sense but * whatever does

115/128 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. IV (PG 29, 681C - 684A) 122 cf. Am. 5:27 123 Ex. 3:14 124/125 Ex. 3:15 125 Ps. 82:19 133/141 Greg. Naz., Or. 29, 13 (PG 36, 92A; Schr., vol. 250, pp. 202-204)

125 *Handwritten Coptic text lines 125-127*

Handwritten Coptic text lines 130-142

145 *Handwritten Coptic text lines 145-150*

Lines 128-142: *Handwritten Coptic text* ... Add. 12155, fol. 3rb-va.
Line 136: MS om. *Handwritten Coptic text*, cf. pp. 335-337, lines 298-299.
Line 136: *Handwritten Coptic text*. MS erroneously reads: *Handwritten Coptic text*.
Line 139: MS om. *Handwritten Coptic text*, cf. p. 337, line 302.
Lines 148-157: *Handwritten Coptic text* ... Add. 12155, fol. 3va.

of all the spiritual and God-regarding Israel; these pertain to providential ordering. For because we are providentially ordered by these three things, by fear of punishment, hope * of salvation and, besides these, by hope of glory and by the practice of the virtues, based on these, the term 'retributions' providentially ordains fear, whereas 'salvation' ordains hope and 'virtues' their practice. So that, as bearing God in himself, one who accomplishes some of these things will hasten the more towards perfection and the kinship which comes from virtues. These, then, so far, are the Godhead's common names. The proper names, on the other hand, are: of the unbeginning, 'Father'; of the one who was begotten without beginning, 'Son'; and of the one who has proceeded or proceeds ingenerately, 'Holy Ghost'. But let us proceed to the appellations of the Son, which is the starting-point of the argument. For I think he is called 'Son' as being the same thing in substance as the Father, and not only that, but as being also therefrom. Whereas he is also called 'Only-begotten', not only because he alone is from the only one, but also because he is so in a unique mode, unlike bodies. He is called 'Word' because he has the same relationship to the Father as word to mind, not only in respect to the impassibility of his generation but also because of his close connection and revelatory power; indeed, perhaps one might say, as definition to what is defined, seeing that a definition is also called a 'word'. For *he who has understood the Son* (for this is what 'seeing' means) *has understood the Father too* and the Son is the short and plain demonstration of the Father's nature; for every offspring is a silent 'definition' of its begetter. Indeed, were one to say too that it is because he is in what exists, he would not be astray in so saying, for is there anything which does not exist by the Word? He is called 'Wisdom' as the knowledge of divine and human realities; for how could the maker be ignorant of the principles of what he has made? He is called 'power' as

192 cf. I Cor. 6:19 201/202 'Only-begotten': Ioh. 1:18 203 'Word': Ioh. 1:1
 208/209 Ioh. 14:9

210 < 210 211 212 213 214 215 220 225 230 235 <

Fol. 37vb

Line 210: *κωσσι*, Add. 12155: *κωσσι*.
 Line 212: *κωσσι κωσσι κωσσι*, Add. 12155: *κωσσι κωσσι κωσσι*.
 Line 230: *κωσσι*, Add. 12155 om. *κωσσι*.
 Line 234: *κωσσι*, Add. 12155: *κωσσι*.
 Line 237: *κωσσι*, Add. 12155: *κωσσι*.

preserver of what have come into existence and giver of power that they should stand fast. He is called 'Truth', as being one, not many, in nature; for truth is one, whereas falsehood is much cloven; and as being the Father's pure 'seal' and most truthful impression. He is called 'Image' as being consubstantial and because he is from the Father but not the Father from him; for it is the nature of the image to be * an imitation of an archetype and of the one whose image it is said to be. But more so: for here unmoving of the moving, but there living of the alive. He has, too, more unvaryingness than Seth from Adam, and beyond that of begotten from begetter. For such is the nature of things simple: not, to be like in this respect and unlike in that, but to be a total representation of a totality and to be the same rather than a likeness. He is called 'Light', as being the brightness of souls made pure in word and conduct. For if ignorance and sin are darkness, light will be knowledge and divine living. He is called 'Life', because he is the stay and substantiation of all rational nature. For *in him we live and move and are*, according to the meaning of a twofold inspiration: the breath we all breathe; and the Holy Ghost all are pervaded by, so far as we open the mouth of our understanding. He is called 'Justice', because he is the one who justly apportions to those under the law and to those under grace, to soul and body: so that soul is ruler, body is in subjection; and the higher has rule over the inferior, lest the inferior rise up against the higher. He is called 'Sanctification', as being purification, so that the purifier may pervade in purity. He is called 'Redemption', because he frees us who are held by sin, and gave himself for us as a ransom cleansing the world. He is called 'Resurrection', because he raises us up hence and returns us, dead as we were from sin, to life. These, then, so far, are what we have in common with him who is above us and because of us.

217 'Truth': cf. Ioh. 14:6 219 'seal, impression': cf. Hebr. 1:3 'Image': cf. II Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15 228 'Light': cf. Ioh. 8:12 230 'Life': cf. Ioh. 14:6 231 Act. 17:28 234 'Justice': cf. I Cor. 1:30 238 'Sanctification': cf. ibid. 239 'Redemption': cf. ibid. 241 'Resurrection': cf. Ioh. 11:25

240
 245
 250
 255
 260
 265

< 240
 < 245
 < 250
 < 255
 < 260
 < 265

Add. 12155
Fol. 4rb

Line 243: ,תוהוה . There is a break in the MS here. Patristic quotations in the following lacuna of the MS can be supplemented from the trinitarian florilegium, Add. 12155, fol. 4rb-6vb.

..... * this treasury of sacred teachings, if it is a name, it is not a
 245 substance, for names are indicative of substances and are not themselves
 substance. How, then, can the name be the reality? For, as we have
 been taught, we do not get understanding from the substances, but
 from the names and the operations, especially of things incorporeal.
 Consequently, we will (according to what it pleases the new-
 250 fangled mania to think) be saying: 'For we do not get understanding
 from the substances, but from the substances and the operations
 especially of things incorporeal' instead of: For we do not get
 understanding from the substances, but from the names and the oper-
 ations, especially of things incorporeal. Will not even those forced to
 255 touch it, never mind those who (more accurately) take pleasure in
 it, almost risk both losing their wits and stupidly persisting in
 witless notions and concepts, as a result of this incomprehensible
 and cunning sophistry? But what again does the instructor of
 orthodoxy say? If 'ingenerate' is the name of the substance of God,
 260 either God, knowing his own substance, did not know the name of the
 substance or, knowing the name, he misled the hearers. How, if the
 name of God is the substance of God (according to the novelty
 mongerers) can we say that wise BASIL produced a logically
 coherent conclusion, when, in speaking about the substance and
 265 the substance's name, he clearly argued about different things and
 not the same thing? For he said: If 'ingenerate' is the name of the
 substance of God, either God, knowing his own substance, did not know
 the name of the substance or, knowing the name, he misled the hearers.
 But, to put it another way, supposing the name of God is God's
 270 substance, must not people who have learned the name of God's
 substance, declare that they have also learned the substance
 itself? For the teacher of truth added this to the words just
 quoted: For the Lord says: 'Omnipotent' is my name and, when asked

244 Quotations from Greg. Naz., Greg. Nyss., Ioh. Chrys., Sev. Ant., evidently
 existed in the lost passage 244/246 cf. supra, 115-116 246/248 et 252/254
 cf. supra, 117-119 259/261 et 266/268 cf. supra, 119-122 273/276 cf.
 supra, 122-125

Add. 7191
Fol. 38ra

..... *
 270
 275
 280
 285
 290
 295

Line 292:
 (

Line 293:
 (

again: But it is perhaps appropriate and relevant to the previous words
 305 that we should not pass the Son's titles by either, without inspection
 (titles which are numerous and applied to numerous aspects understood
 as belonging with him). So far, then, as we can comprehend, he says,
 'He who is' and 'God' stand especially as names of the substance; and of
 these especially 'He who is'. * What, then, do we say? Can we say
 310 that 'He who is' and 'God' stand as substances and of these
 especially 'He who is'?

But I entreat God that I may have pardon for being forced
 against my will to arrive at statements like these for the sake of
 showing up their blasphemy. For the audacity and the impetus
 315 here are not of my intention (God forbid!) but of theirs who have
 been able to think these damnable things. According to the
 Theologian, indeed, the words belong not so much to the speaker
 of them as to the one who compells him to speak. Yet (as those
 who have been persistent in patristic studies will be aware) the
 320 chief fathers themselves, who lived lives of total dedication, were
 compelled against their will to ridicule the godless claptrap of
 heretics and use absurd inferences like these against them. The
 illustrious ATHANASIUS shall bear witness as representative of
 many, Athanasius who, however exact and vigilant any other has
 325 been, was at all points more so.

He wrote as follows in the *First Oration against the Arians*: But
 why should lengthy statements be required, so long as they are them-
 selves accusers of the Arian heresy? For if they lack the confidence to
 speak out and instead hide the words of their blasphemy, they clearly know
 330 this heresy to be foreign and alien to the truth. But because they conceal
 it and are afraid of speaking out, we must strip off the veil of wickedness
 and expose the heresy, knowing as we do what the Arians were saying at
 that time, how they were expelled from the Church and deposed from
 the clergy. But we beg pardon first for the filthy statements we are about

304/307 cf. supra, 146-150, 283-286 307/309 cf. supra, 165-167, 288-290
 326/336 Athan Alex., Ep. ad episc. Aegypti et Libyae, 11 (PG 25, 564AB)

330 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 335 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ

Fol. 38va

ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 340 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 345 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 350 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ

ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 355 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 360 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲁ

335 to produce; we utter them not because we think them but in rebuttal of heretics. And a few lines later: Arius, by saying these and suchlike things, was proved a heretic. I for my part, even when simply writing them down, was cleansing myself, thinking his words whilst also holding fast a * religious intention. For all the bishops too, who assembled at the
 340 Council of Nicaea from all parts, held their ears because of these statements and with a common ruling condemned the heresy because of them, anathematizing it and declaring it foreign and alien to the Church's faith.

But let us bring the investigation back to the place the argu-
 345 ment had reached. The same teacher of theology wrote, then (as has previously been set down): These, then, so far, are the Godhead's common names. How then do those who reckon that realities and names are the same things judge? Will they clearly say: 'These, so far, are the Godhead's common substances'? But, as I myself
 350 think, they would never say that! Why, then, when they wrest the nature of the realities, did they lack the strength to reach such pernicious rubbish once they had agreed to think of the realities and their names as being the same?

But what, too, of the following statements of irreproachable
 355 teaching? The proper names, on the other hand, are: of the unbeginning, 'Father'; of the one who was begotten without beginning, 'Son'; and of the one who has proceeded or proceeds ingenerately, 'Holy Ghost'. Must it not be clear to everybody from the preceding and following words, that here too the doctor says the proper name of
 360 the unbeginning (i.e. of the Father) is 'Father' without identifying his hypostasis and name; and again, the Son's, 'Son'; and again the Holy Ghost's is what he is called, 'Holy Ghost'. But let us proceed to the appellations of the Son, he says. Will you proceed to the hypostases of the Son? And what could have revealed better

336/343 Athan. Alex., Ep. ad episc. Aegypti et Libyae, 13 (PG 25, 565C - 568A) 346/347 cf. supra, 291-292 355/358 cf. supra, 292-294 362/363 cf. supra, 294-295

365
 370
 Fol. 38vb

375
 380

385
 390

365 than this implausible misrepresentation, that on the basis of these
 indisputable words of his you would reach the truth? Therefore,
 what do you want? Shall we cease from discussion because the
 meaning of the matters under debate has become quite obvious
 from the previous quotations and the present explanations? Or
 shall we tarry a little longer with the rest of the theologians' texts
 370 and rid readers of much toil? We will, then, as concisely as
 possible * learn the meaning of the other texts of the Theologian
 and proceed to the testimony from the father which is quoted
 after that.

375 He wrote, then, about the Holy Ghost: If the fact that he is
 neither clearly nor very often named 'God' in the Bible (as the Father is
 earlier, and the Son is later) is made an occasion of your blasphemy and
 such excessive garrulity and impiety, we shall release you from this
 affliction, by philosophizing a little about realities and names mainly
 outside the Bible's practice. From this, too, the difference has been
 380 made plain to all who want to see it, between realities and names.
 If not, let the absurd advocates of folly say how they think we
 ought to interpret about realities and names! Or will they say that
 this is said periphrastically? But it is obvious that this is the way
 of nobody except people who make a habit of blathering old-
 wives' nonsense. But when, the Trumpet of Theology says, did you
 hear of God as a 'body'? This being non-existent, has been made up. For
 we have, so far as we can, named the things of God from our condition.
 So we have named the things of God, so far as we can, from our
 390 condition. If, then, we count names derived from us as identical
 with the things understood as belonging with God, is there any
 foul tongue of the old-time blasphemers against God we shall not
 surpass? Look, too, at what follows: There being, then, this whole
 difference between names and realities. Take note of this, you sophist,
 395 and consider the extremely apt way the Theologian proclaims to
 you: There being, then, this whole difference between names and real-
 ities, why are you so excessively servile to the letter, why do you mix with

375/380 Greg. Naz., Or. 31, 21 (PG 36, 157A; SChr., vol. 250, p. 316)
 386/388 Greg. Naz., Or. 31, 22 (PG 36, 157B; SChr., vol. 250, p. 316) 393/394
 Greg. Naz., Or. 31, 24 (PG 36, 160B; SChr., vol. 250, p. 320) 396/398 Ibid.
 (PG 36, 160B; SChr., vol. 250, p. 320)

395
 400
 405
 410
 415
 420
 425

Fol. 39ra

395
 400
 405
 410
 415
 420
 425

Jewish wisdom and follow the syllables and let the realities go, confining the great mystery of godliness, like Sabellius, only to names?

But let us pass on to the wise teaching of his namesake; he too, indeed, impelled by the same grace says: * Every name whatsoever you use belongs with the being and is not the being. And again: All the things existing within the creation are considered with the aid of the meaning of names. One who says 'sky' has brought the mind of his auditor to the created thing signified by this term, and one who mentions man or any other living thing by name immediately impresses his auditor with the appearance of the living thing. And again: Only the uncreated nature believed in of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost transcends every nameable meaning. Therefore when the Word referred to the name in handing over the Faith, he did not add what it was (for how could a name be found for a reality above every name ?) but gave power so that our mind, being stirred by piety, should be able to discover what the name, revelatory of the transcendent nature, is, which we should attach in like manner to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, whether it be 'the Good', or 'the Incorruptible', whatever name each man thinks fitting to be taken for the manifesting of the immortal nature.

What commentary will anybody need on these statements, seeing that the doctor has so clearly distinguished the names from the realities? We have heard him say in plain language that: Every name whatsoever you use belongs with the being and is not the being. And again: All the things existing within the creation are considered with the aid of the meaning of names. One who says 'sky' has brought the mind of his auditor to the created thing signified by this term etc. What then? Will this man who relies on gibberish urge us to say that the name of the sky is the sky itself? But are we to say in our

402/403 Greg. Nyss., Contra Eun. III, 5 (PG 45, 764A; Jaeger II, p. 182, 4-5) 403/408 Greg. Nyss., Refut. Conf. Eunomii (PG 45, 473A; Jaeger II, p. 318, 7-12) 408/417 Ibid. (PG 45, 473AB; Jaeger II, p. 318, 15-25) 410 cf. Matth. 28:19 412 Phil. 2:9 420/421 cf. supra, 402-403 422/424 cf. supra, 403-406

Handwritten text in Syriac script at the top of the page.

430 Handwritten text in Syriac script with a marginal note: < Fol. 39rb

450 Handwritten text in Syriac script at the bottom of the page.

ignorance: As the Word gave power so that our mind being stirred by piety, should be able to discover some substance revelatory of the transcendent nature and attach it to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost?
 430 Who would not be right forcefully to withstand * such godless nonsense, and entirely discarding all folly from his mind, to stop his ears lest any spectre of perdition dwell in his soul and disturb its serenity with an evil recollection?

But let us, also, examine the other statements of the doctor. For we know he says that from all the names by means of which God is known; and again: And such things he shows to be notions which demonstrate the transcendent power by means of these names. And what does he think all the names by means of which God is known are? Or the things whereby the notions which demonstrate the transcendent power are known? Are they substances or hypostases? Let this cunning fellow and expositor of deep notions tell us! What too are all the names which are to be found, by means of which the divine nature abides as it is, without indication? If they are substances, how many substances of the divine nature does this opponent of the polyousiasts deign to lay down? If they are hypostases, how does the divine nature abide as it is, without indication in all the hypostases which are to be found? Therefore, let him frankly acknowledge that the hypostases have been invented by us and let him not, for the purposes of deception, quote the wholesome expressions of the inspired father on the subject of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity.

But let us investigate and seek out the interpretation of this passage also: For when, the doctor says, someone gives an account of each of these names and of the nature with which the names belong, he does not give the same account of the two. But perhaps he will make the facile retort and say very easily, deceiving himself: 'The doctor clearly calls the hypostases "names" here, as is evident

427/429 cf. supra, 410-415 434/436 Greg. Nyss., *Refut. Conf. Eunomii* (PG 45, 524A; Jaeger II, p. 365, 7-8) 436/437 Ibid. (PG 45, 524A; Jaeger II, p. 365, 8-9) 438 cf. supra, 435-436 439/440 cf. supra, 436-437 442/443 Greg. Nyss. *Locum nondum invenimus* 446/447 cf. supra, 442-443 453/455 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 8 (PG 45, 848B; Jaeger II, p. 257, 20-22)

460
 465

Fol. 39va

470
 475
 480

485

from the fact that he says: For when someone gives an account of each of these names and of the nature with which the names belong, he does not give the same account of the two; for not even the account of each of the hypostases and of the nature with which the hypostases belong is the same'. And he supposes he has thereby fully got the better of us and boasts as if he had discovered * not only that the hypostases and the substance, or nature, are different things but also that the hypostases belong with the nature: which is an indication of his impious loquacity.

But he shall not get much enjoyment by his merriment. For at once there will be proclaimed to him the succeeding words of the doctor who says that things whose concept is different have also a different nature. Therefore the substance whose indicative concept has not hitherto been found, and the meaning of the names belonging with the substance, which are named from some activity or power, are different things. You hear, my admirable man, that things whose concept is different have also a different nature. Would you agree that the divine nature and the hypostases have different natures? How can you fail to be caught in toils far worse than those of Arius of foul repute, when you propound such absurdities, never ventured by anyone even of these exceedingly impious people, out of the darkness of your ideas, and when, at another time, you are tossed in a different direction by opposite winds? Or has it escaped your skill to take also as being hypostases, according to your usual practice, those names which are not the proper names of the hypostases but belong to the common nature? For we have learned that God is named 'helper', 'judge', 'good' and 'just', and all other such names, from the difference of activities.

From here we will proceed also to the clear teaching of Saint JOHN, who exposes the fantastic senselessness and want of patristic learning of this author, by writing: Therefore, let the Lybian Sabelius first be introduced. What, then, does he say? That 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Ghost' are mere names applied to a single prosopon. And

458/460 cf. supra, 453-455 465 cf. supra, 459 469/470 et 474 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 8 (PG 45, 848B; Jaeger II, p. 257, 22-23) 489/491 Ioh. Chrys., *In Ep. ad Phil. hom.* VI (PG 62, 219)

490 : *...*
 495 : *...*

Fol. 39vb

...
 500 : *...*
 505 : *...*
 510 : *...*
 515 : *...*

...
 520 : *...*

especially indicative of his substance? And where are we to look for his non-proper hypostasis not especially indicative of his substance? For the doctor, knowing the Only-begotten's other names, fittingly * ruled the title of 'Word' as more proper to him than the rest and as especially revelatory of his substance. The subsequent words prove this: And although divine scripture calls the Son by many other names nevertheless when it says 'the Word', it uttered something marvellous and exalted and added nothing further of him. You have learned, wise fellow, that the doctor called the title 'Word' his proper title especially indicative of the Son's substance in comparison with the other names. Contrive, therefore, knowing as you do that hypostases and titles are the same, and knowing other hypostases of the Son, how this hypostasis with the title 'Word' should be seen as more proper and more revelatory of the Son's substance than those! But it is impossible for you to escape the absurdity of what you have said and acknowledged.

So consider too the other statements by the instructor in orthodoxy. For cutting through the toils of the impious he writes as follows: Nevertheless, let us ask those who say things like this, whether the names which are accurately imposed on realities do not indicate their substances although they are something other than they. For the name 'man' too indicates man's nature but is something other than it. For man is a visible reality, whereas the name applied to him is audible only. Therefore if someone says 'man', according to their fatuous notion we are to understand something else and not constantly what the name signifies, because what the name signifies is by no means this. From these wise words we learn that when these impious people, because the names are not the same as the realities to which they are applied, foolishly attempt to conclude that we ought by no means to interpret of the realities to which the names are applied the things which are appropriately, and in logical sequence,

527/530 Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XIX (PG 75, 313D) 531 cf. supra, 513-515 540/547 Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XIX (PG 75, 321BC)

555 כְּכֹהֵן : חֲכָמִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 560 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 565 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 570 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים

Fol. 40rb

כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 575 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 580 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 585 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים
 כְּכֹהֵן לְמִשְׁכַּן מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים וְלֵבָבִים וְעֹלָמִים : מִלְּפָנֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים

known from the names, then these people will easily deprive the
 Only-begotten Son and God of what is known by the title
 555 'Word', * i.e. of his uncreated, impassible and eternal radiation
 from the Father, as the word proceeds from the mind of him who
 uttered it; for these and similar things we understand and believe
 from the title 'Word'. The doctor, indeed, agrees that the names
 and the realities are not identical and for this reason says: For the
 560 name 'man' too indicates man's nature but is something other than it.
 For man is a visible reality, whereas the name applied to him is audible
 only. Bridle the tongue which fights against God, since what is
 known from the title 'Word' reveals that he is the Son. Therefore,
 he also adds: Therefore if someone says 'man', according to their
 565 fatuous notion we are to understand something else and not constantly
 what the name signifies, because what the name signifies is by no means
 this.

What he is saying, then, is like this: if, according to their
 fatuous notion, what the name is applied to is by no means what
 570 is known from the name; someone saying 'man' will understand
 something different from 'man'. The meaning may be clarified
 further, thus: if, as these impious people lay it down, we under-
 stood that of which the name is predicated not as that which is
 fittingly signified by the name but as something other than it,
 575 then those who use the name 'man' would not have to understand
 from the title 'man' a rational mortal animal but a horse, for
 example, or some other thing to which the name 'man' has never
 been applied. But if, he says, this is full of insanity, we shall not reject

559/562 cf. supra, 543-545 564/567 cf. supra, 545-547 578/581 Cyr.
 Alex., Thesaurus, ass. XIX (PG 75, 321C)

590
 595
 600
 605

Fol. 40va

610
 615

Line 591: *ἰστοῦ*. A note in the same hand at the top of the folio reads as follows: *ἰστοῦ καὶ ἰστοῦ καὶ ἰστοῦ καὶ ἰστοῦ*.
 Line 604: *καὶ ἰστοῦ*, cf. p. 353, line 583 (*ἰστοῦ*).

the exactitude of names neither shall we understand something other
580 apart from what is signified by them. For thus the insanity of the heretics
is made void.

Moreover, what * will you say to this, admirable fellow: For, so
that no one, seeing the Son having all that belongs to the Father, should
suppose from the great likeness and unvarying sameness, that the same
585 one is both Father and Son and fall into the error of Sabellius, he
necessarily says that he *receives from the Father*, though he possesses it
by nature; so that the statement, by introducing one who gives and one
who receives, should disclose in separate hypostases, a duality which is
not separated solely by names? Will you say that the duality of
590 Father and Son, as it is not separated solely by names, likewise is
not separated by the differences of the single hypostases? In
which case, it is time you professed it separated by the concept of
the substance!

But how will you explain to us: But the name of 'Father' is more
595 proper to God than that of 'God', for the one is indicative of power
whereas the other of natural property. Or is it clear, according to
your irreproachable opinion, that the hypostasis whereby he is
Father is more proper to God than the hypostasis whereby he is
God and the one hypostasis is indicative of power, whereas the other
600 of his natural property?

But what again also of the statement: But the name which is most
proper and true for God is the name 'Father', which is more proper to
God and truer than those others? Is the name perhaps a hypostasis?
But he will refute this for us most philosophically. For, come he
605 says please, let us separate a little 'Father' both in thought and word
from the Father and again 'Son' from the Son; and let us understand,
my friend, how one may indicate to us the prosopon of each on his own.
Will you teach us your secret ideas incommunicable to the crowd,

582/589 Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XXIII (PG 75, 381A) 586 cf. Luc. 10:21;
Ioh. 3:35 594/596 Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. V (PG 75, 68B) 598/600 cf.
supra, 594-596 601/603 locum non invenimus 604/607 Cyr. Alex., *De SS.*
Trin. Dial. I (PG 75, 712C; *SChr.*, vol. 231, p. 218)

ⲉⲓ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
620 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ

ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
625 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
630 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ

ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
635 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
640 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ

ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
645 ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲱⲛ
ⲛⲓⲱⲛ

and boldly say: 'Let us separate a little the Father and the Son
 610 from their hypostases; indeed, the doctor commended us to
 separate them from themselves'? And how is something to be
 separated from itself, even if we set in motion all the subtlety of
 our ideas and inventions to that end? For when someone *
 separates a little in subtle thought the name which indicates it
 615 from a reality, he will fix his mind on the being of the reality
 itself. But to separate something from itself, by some sort of
 fantasy or notion, will be utterly impossible and unfeasible even
 for someone who tries hard. But that the wise father was speak-
 ing of the name alone and not of the hypostasis at all, the
 620 following words will prove, when he says: For, come please, let us
 separate a little 'Father' both in thought and word from the Father and
 again 'Son' from the Son; and let us understand, my friend, how one
 may indicate to us the prosopon of each on his own. He added: Is it by
 saying 'God' or 'life' or 'incorruptible' or 'invisible' or 'king', perhaps?
 625 But from this it will not be known to anybody who is being
 indicated. If, therefore, my friend, we separate 'Father' from the
 Father and again 'Son' from the Son, (or rather separate the
 hypostases themselves from themselves, according to your modest
 proposal), what will he be, he whom we seek to indicate without
 630 the appellation of 'Father' or 'Son' and name 'God' or 'life' or
 'incorruptible' or 'invisible'? For if the name 'Father' is the
 hypostasis of the Father, there will be nothing left for us to name
 'God' or 'life' or 'incorruptible' or 'invisible', once the name is
 separate from the Father? Why should we therefore deem these
 635 absurd and abominable fabrications worthy of such care and
 examination, seeing they are plainly rebutted by themselves and
 proclaim aloud to everybody their own feebleness?

Nevertheless, we will also expose the folly of the new teaching
 by the careful words of our God-clad father SEVERUS. We should,
 640 he says, interpret the appellation of the names or their imposition in
 accordance with the subject. And again: And thus, falsifying and

620/623 cf. supra, 604-607 623/624 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. I* (PG 75,
 712C: *SChr.*, vol. 231, p. 218) 639/641 cf. supra, ch. 5, 32-34 641/644 Sev.
 Ant. locum non invenimus

650
 655
 660
 665
 670
 675
 Fol. 41ra

680

altering the order of realities, and concluding some things instead of others, you add what is very absurd; and arbitrarily and violently you assail along with the realities also the names. Come then, wise sir, with all your interpretations ... we should (interpret) the appellation of the hypostases, the imposition of the hypostases or the substances. * I do not know. Tell us and teach us how it is possible, on hearing along with the realities also the names to think that the realities and the names are the same? But you could never do that. For how can any remnant of correctness of ideas or plausible defence (I do not say demonstration) be found for such witless constructions? Therefore, you are to understand, you who have erred as a result of heretical intoxication and pride, that you have completely lapsed from the truth and thereby, as the inventor and champion of perdition, have first procured a bitter torture for yourself especially, but also become the instigator of great danger to those misled by you. For if *it were better*, according to the saying of the Lord himself, *for him who causes one of these little ones who believe in our Saviour and God to stumble, that a millstone should be hung round his neck and that he should be drowned in the depths of the sea*, what punishment shall one devise for him who of himself entices such innumerable people and drowns them in such an utterly pernicious heresy?

We aim at full rebuttals of that heresy and urge diligent readers not to be irritated by the abundance of confirmation and demonstration from patristic teachings, nor to suppose that we have devised this gratuitously out of ambition. But let them know that it is dangerous for those who treat such matters to disregard anything whatever here, and let them pardon us for this (as perhaps it may be deemed) too careful investigation and examination, if I may put it thus, of things written imprudently; and unwearyingly, with all possible honesty, let them again toil, in what is to be examined

645 Text yields no sense. A small lacuna? 657/661 Matth. 18:6

685
 690
 695
 700

Fol. 41rb

705
 710

Line 686: ⲉⲩⲉⲩⲉⲛ , text corrupt. A small lacuna is suspected.

afterwards, for comprehension and precise assurance on the points
 in question. For GREGORY also who adorned the throne of Nyssa,
 675 says this in the second book *Against Eunomius* the abominable: I ask
 the readers not to be irritated by the exactitude of the examination which
 unwillingly extends the discourse to a large size. For it is not on unimport-
 ant matters * that we are in jeopardy, so that, if we pass by things that need
 more studied contemplation, we should suffer little damage, but we are
 680 endangered on the chief article of our hope. For it is set before us either
 that we should be Christians, not deluded by heretical perdition, or that we
 should be utterly swept away into Jewish and pagan opinions. And at the
 beginning of the third book of the same treatise he says as follows:
 But it is now time to examine more studiously what was said by Eunomius
 685 himself and by our father in connexion with the apostle Peter's words. But
 if a careful contemplation lengthens the discourse to a large extent, the
 right-thinking listener will completely pardon the fact, not blaming us but
 the one who caused it.

And now therefore, inasmuch as the undertaking is concerned
 690 with the same issues, (for it is truly here a question, as has been
 proved, and again with Christ our God helping us shall be proved,
 whether we should be Christians, not deluded by heretical perdition, or
 should be utterly swept away into Jewish and pagan opinions) let us urge
 ourselves on without slackening, and let us, with as much alacrity as
 695 we can, interpret with knowledge and very watchfully everything
 that has been said, without demanding in such matters at all an
 inappropriate conciseness. Indeed we prefer a fitting moderation, so
 that the thing may not issue in tedium by an unnecessary satiation,
 nor again, contrariwise, the truth be wanting. For it is not possible,
 700 either, for one to be as brief as one would wish in the examination
 of teachings. And again the God-clad SEVERUS shall testify, who in

673 'afterwards': in book III? 675/682 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 2 (PG 45, 644BC; Jaeger II, pp. 75,21 - 76,1) 684/688 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 3 (PG 45, 680A; Jaeger II, p. 107, 1-6) 692/693 cf. supra, 681-682

675
 715
 720
 725
 730

Fol. 41va

735
 740
 745

such matters is more experienced than most. For in the *Letter to Oecumenius*, (the beginning of which is: I was not unaware when I was writing the letter), speaking of these things he says: For those, therefore, who desire summarily and briefly to learn the intention of what was written by us, these things had to be expressed, but to those who yearn to know the reasons and the inner meaning herein the whole letter will be given. Clearly one who has been given the conclusions of statements also needs all the statements. For a conclusion is an abbreviation of the many details. So we must first know the many details in order that we may know what it is an abbreviation of, otherwise it may happen that we shall only utter * empty words devoid of meaning like those, perhaps, who longed only to speak in tongues, whom Paul rebukes, saying: *For if I were praying in a tongue, my spirit prays but my understanding is sterile*; adding subsequently, what he preferred, *I will pray with my spirit but I will also pray with my understanding, I will sing with my spirit but I will sing also with my understanding*. With a small alteration, therefore, I too may say that one ought to instruct in words but one ought also to instruct with the understanding. For I do not know if any of the God-clad fathers judged it right to speak briefly in his teachings. For it is a precious thing in these matters if, even when we expend the whole force of language which is in us, we say a small fraction, and that obscurely, of what is to be understood.

If, therefore, as we have learned from these divinely inspired words, it is not laudable for anyone to speak with utter brevity in teachings, for the reasons mentioned, must it not be very damaging to abbreviate the urgent refutation of all these novel and absurd teachings when they are set out in books, and to curtail it more than we ought? For if it is too short, many details of the heretical mischief will accordingly escape the readers. Therefore, our aim is

703/722 Sev. Ant., Ep. ad Oecumenium. PO 12, pp. 175-194, contains parts of two letters of Severus to the Count Oecumenius, but our quotation does not appear in them 713/716 I Cor. 14:14-15

705
 710
 715
 720
 725
 750
 755
 760
 765

Fol. 41vb

770
 775

Line 759: ,ϥ. MS erroneously reads: οϥ.

730 to make a complete defence to everybody through the doctors' words and to prove that we are producing a refutation of opposed teachings and a demonstration of our correct view, not from a few isolated statements by divinely inspired doctors, but by drawing upon their rich and abundant ever-flowing spring. So
 735 that when lovers of truth perceive the poverty and total absence of demonstrations by our opponents and the confirmation through all this of the truth on our side, they will rightly turn from plain unorthodoxy and will hasten rather towards the bright light of correct teachings, the bright light with which if we live and direct
 740 all our lives towards virtue, we shall end our sojourning here in peace and shall be worthy to be with Christ our God, who

ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 780 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 785 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 790 ἡ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπισημασθέντων ἡμῶν ἐκείνων
 ὅς ἐστις ὁ θεός

740 'sojourning': cf. I Petr. 1:17 741 'be with Christ': cf. Rom. 6:8

Line 790: ὅς. MS breaks here; the remainder of Book II is apparently lost.

INDICES

INDEX NOMINVM

INDEX LOCORVM S. SCRIPTVRAE

INDEX ALIORVM FONTIVM

INDEX NOMINVM
ET VOCVM QVARVNDAM EX EIS FORMATARVM(*)

- Abraham XIII, 123, 125, 127; XXII, 34, 124, 186, 275
Abram XIII, 125
Adam XIII, 109, 110, 111, 113, 120; XXII, 224
Alexander XIX, 193
Amphilochius XXI, 24
Andrew VIII, 27; XIII, 246; XIV, 25, 85, 86, 88, 90, 92
Antioch I, 1; III, 3
Apostle (the) XVI, 45 - cf. Paul
Arian Unc., 61, 85; VI, 60; IX, 28; XI, 125; XII, 185; XIX, 2, 12; XXII, 144, 326, 328, 332
Arianism Unc., 23; XIX, 88
Arius I, 9; Unc., 61; VI, 285; X, 25, 180; XI, 104; XII, 171; XVIII, 251; XIX, 386; XXI, 110; XXII, 336, 477
Athanasius Unc., 34, 63, 82; IX, 27, 79; XX, 59, 62, 109; XXII, 13, 323, 324
- Baptist (the) XIII, 132, 134 - cf. John (the Bapt.)
Basil VI, 329, 468; VII, 81; VIII, 14, 118; IX, 48, 82, 244; X, 2, 31, 187, 223; XI, 21, 56, 131, 146, 164, 165, 200; XIII, 43, 48, 62, 153, 159, 178, 198; XIV, 32, 37, 52; XVI, 2, 7, 58; XVII, 10, 130, 144, 157; XIX, 15, 375; XX, 92, 123; XXI, 22, 119, 137; XXII, 61, 263
Bathsheba XXII, 36
Bethsaida VIII, 27; XIII, 246; XIV, 25, 84, 85-86, 88, 89, 92
- Caesarea VII, 29; XII, 38, 63, 75, 212; XIII, 16; XVII, 22, 62; XVIII, 55; XX, 23
Caesarean XX, 51 - cf. Grammarian
- Cephas XIX, 120 - cf. Peter
Christ XII, 76, 80; XVII, 133; XVIII, 56, 100, 101, 157; XXI, 83, 89, 90, 97, 165; XXII, 691, 741 - cf. Jesus
Christian VI, 193; IX, 105, 114, 139, 179, 217; XI, 141; XVII, 171; XXII, 681, 692
Cyril XI, 133, 151; XIX, 96, 384; XXII, 501
- Damian I, 2; III, 2, 18; VI, 136, 145, 159; VII, 9; X, 56; XIII, 12; XVIII, 43
David XIV, 66; XVIII, 12; XXII, 39, 40, 41, 43, 51, 125, 276
- Easter VI, 388
Elizabeth XIII, 137
Enosh XIII, 122
Eunomius VI, 331, 469, 479, 492; VII, 92, 96, 103; VIII, 15; IX, 104, 143, 226, 245, 262; X, 6, 25-26, 33, 43, 45, 88, 99, 102, 108, 120, 122, 124, 129, 130, 132, 137, 196, 210, 216; XI, 23, 24, 53, 92, 104, 143, 201, 207, 215, 230, 251, 265, 270; XII, 139, 149, 203; XIV, 53; XVI, 11, 31; XVII, 132, 234, 236; XIX, 16, 29, 60, 69, 386; XXII, 62, 675, 684
Eupraxius XIX, 226, 227
Eve XIII, 121 - cf. Life
- Gamaliel XIII, 6
Genesis XIII, 106
Grammarian (the) V, 22; VII, 29; XI, 306; XII, 37-38, 63, 75, 211; XIII, 16; XVII, 21, 62; XVIII, 54; XX, 23 - cf. Caesarean
Greek (language) XXII, 106

(*) This index has been compiled by J. Noret.

- Gregory (of Nazianzus) Unc., 18; VI, 66, 68, 95, 117, 256, 368, 457; VII, 32; IX, 64; XI, 37; XII, 41, 88, 198, 215; XVII, 237; XIX, 32; XXI, 46, 137; XXII, 129, 277 - cf. Theologian (the)
- Gregory (of Nyssa) VI, 478; VII, 85; VIII, 120; IX, 49, 102; X, 72; XI, 52, 206; XII, 138; XIV, 52; XVI, 29; XVII, 235; XIX, 58; XXII, 674
- Hebrew VII, 102; XIII, 6; XXII, 105, 107, 153 - cf. Israel, Jew, Jewish
- Hermias XI, 134
- Isaac XXII, 124, 186, 275
- Isaiah V, 189
- Israel V, 189; XXI, 103; XXII, 187 - cf. Hebrew, Jew, Jewish
- Jacob XXII, 124, 186, 275
- James XIX, 120; XX, 71
- Jesus V, 180; XII, 76; XVII, 104, 132; XXI, 97, 165 - cf. Christ
- Jew I, 3; XVIII, 145; XXII, 499 - cf. Hebrew, Israel, Jewish
- Jewish Unc., 62, 70; VII, 120; X, 180; XI, 107, 128; XII, 74; XVIII, 109; XIX, 172; XXI, 12, 177; XXII, 398, 682, 693 - cf. Hebrew, Israel, Jew
- John (ap.) XI, 308, 309; XIII, 16, 51; XVII, 22, 87, 88, 96, 97, 111, 112, 118, 119, 121, 143, 145, 167, 186, 208, 213, 214, 216, 221, 257; XVIII, 34, 35, 70, 75 (bis), 114, 119, 220, 224, 225, 232, 233, 235; XXII, 513
- John (the Baptist) XIII, 134, 143, 146 - cf. Baptist
- John (Chrysostom) VI, 92; XXII, 488
- John the Grammarian - cf. Grammarian (the)
- Jonas VIII, 27; XIII, 245; XIV, 24, 84, 85, 88, 89, 92
- Judaism XIV, 42
- Libyan Unc., 70; VII, 120, 131; XII, 212; XVIII, 62; XIX, 173; XXI, 12, 108; XXII, 489 - cf. Sabellius
- Life XIII, 120 - cf. Eve
- Luke XIII, 137
- Marcellus XVIII, 93
- Moses X, 159; XIII, 113; XXI, 102; XXII, 123, 168, 274
- Nathan XXII, 38
- Nazianzus VI, 118
- Neocaesarea XIV, 38-39; XXI, 31
- Nicaea XXII, 340
- Nyssa VII, 85; IX, 102; XI, 52; XII, 138; XIV, 52; XVII, 236; XIX, 58; XXII, 674
- Oecumenius XXII, 703
- Onesimus XXII, 35
- Paralos VII, 22
- Paul V, 35; VI, 480; VII, 94, 100, 104; VIII, 17, 47, 58, 72, 82, 84; XI, 308, 309; XIII, 4, 9, 16, 45, 49, 51, 65, 69, 71, 74 (bis); XIV, 1, 20, 22, 80, 95; XVI, 10, 33, 62, 63; XVII, 22, 87 (bis), 96, 97, 111, 112, 118, 119, 121, 143, 145, 167, 186, 208, 212, 213, 216, 221, 257; XVIII, 34, 35, 69, 75 (bis), 114, 118, 163, 220, 224, 225, 231, 233, 235; XIX, 19, 119; XXI, 35, 88; XXII, 713 - cf. Apostle (the)
- Peter (ap.) VI, 495; VII, 94, 100, 104; VIII, 17, 23, 32, 47, 58, 71, 82, 83; XI, 308, 309; XIII, 3, 16, 45, 49, 51, 65, 69, 71, 74 (bis), 219, 223, 224, 225, 229, 237, 243 (ter); XIV, 6, 20, 22, 24, 30 (bis), 75, 80, 89, 91, 93; XV, 20; XVI, 10, 62, 63; XVII, 22, 87 (bis), 96, 97, 111, 112, 118, 119, 121, 143, 145, 167, 185 (bis), 208, 212, 213, 216, 220, 257; XVIII, 34, 35, 67, 74, 75, 112, 118, 218, 224, 225, 231, 232, 235; XIX, 19, 119; XXII, 685
- Peter (Callin.) I, 1; III, 2
- Philemon XXII, 35
- Pythagoras XIII, 192-193

- Roman XXI, 89
- Sabellian I, 8; VI, 603; XI, 128; XII, 185
- Sabellianism XX, 47
- Sabellius Unc., 21, 36, 60, 62, 86; VII, 61, 131; X, 180; XI, 154; XII, 74, 171; XIV, 48; XVIII, 62, 93, 110; XXI, 108, 177, 184; XXII, 399, 489-490, 492, 499, 512, 585 - cf. Libyan
- Sarah XIII, 123, 127, 128; XXII, 33
- Sarai XIII, 127, 128
- Saul VII, 100; VIII, 84 - cf. Paul
- Seth XIII, 121, 122; XXII, 224
- Severus V, 20, 47; VII, 3, 10, 11; X, 156; XI, 301; XII, 2, 105, 209; XIII, 12, 37, 158, 179, 183; XVII, 2, 10, 17, 57, 58, 63, 69, 85, 211; XVIII, 2, 50, 127, 214, 257; XIX, 5, 168, 180, 326; XX, 26, 50; XXI, 82, 159; XXII, 639, 701
- Silvanus XXI, 35
- Simon VII, 101; VIII, 84 - cf. Peter
- Solomon XXII, 37 (bis), 39, 44, 51, 52
- Tarsus XIII, 5
- Theodosius V, 3; VI, 51, 66, 116; XVII, 252; XXI, 94, 159
- Theologian (the) Unc., 18, 107-108; V, 53, 55, 68, 78, 83, 100, 103, 114, 120-121, 141, 146, 174, 194; VI, 2, 10, 11, 20, 21, 24, 32, 45, 57, 68, 105, 113, 124, 137, 158, 194, 203, 214, 237, 369, 384, 406, 437-438, 514, 537, 560, 563, 596, 607; VII, 7, 32, 73; IX, 64; XI, 157, 161; XII, 41, 88, 123, 164, 199, 211, 215; XVII, 238; XIX, 32; XXI, 47, 137; XXII, 130, 278, 300, 317, 372, 395 - the Trumpet of Theology XXII, 385 - cf. Gregory (of Nazianzus)
- Timothy V, 36; XXI, 35
- Uz V, 38
- Zachariah (father of John the Bapt.) XIII, 142
- Zachariah (messenger of Damian) VII, 22; XX, 17

INDEX LOCORVM SACRAE SCRIPTURAE(*)

Genesis	115, 7	XXII, 48-49
1, 26	XVIII, 166	
2, 19-20	XIII, 108-112	
3, 20	XIII, 119-121	
4, 25-26	XIII, 121-122	
17, 5	XIII, 124-126	
17, 15	XIII, 127-128	
18, 12	XXII, 33-34	
Exodus		
3, 6	XXII, 182-183 sqq.	
3, 14	XXII, 123, 169, 274	
3, 15	XXII, 124-125, 274-276	
15, 3	XXII, 176	
Deuteronomium		
4, 24	XXII, 174	
6, 4	XXI, 103	
10, 17	XXII, 182-183 sqq.	
III Regnorum		
1, 19	XXII, 36-37	
1, 26	XXII, 38-39	
Psalmi		
1, 4	XII, 74-75	
4, 2	XXII, 182-183 sqq.	
7, 12	XIV, 66-67	
13, 1	VI, 619-620	
23, 7	XXII, 182-183 sqq.	
23, 8	XXII, 182-183 sqq.	
23, 9	XXII, 182-183 sqq.	
23, 10	XXII, 182-183 sqq. (bis)	
32, 6	XIX, 235-236	
35, 10	XVIII, 12-13	
50, 14	XXII, 182-183 sqq.	
52, 1	VI, 619-620	
67, 5	XXII, 176	
67, 13	XXII, 182-183 sqq. (bis)	
82, 19	XXII, 125, 276	
93, 1	XXII, 182-183 sqq.	
94, 10	V, 197	
	123, 6	XIX, 398
	143, 4	V, 34-35
	Prouerbia	
	8, 22	XXII, 48
	18, 3	VI, 617 (?)
	Iob	
	1, 1	V, 38
	38, 3	VI, 11
	Sapientia	
	5, 14	VII, 17-20
	Amos	
	4, 13	XXII, 182
	5, 8	XXII, 182
	5, 27	XXII, 182
	9, 6	XXII, 182
	Malachias	
	2, 7	XII, 107-109
	Isaias	
	1, 9	XXII, 182-183 sqq.
	3, 12-14	V, 190-193
	6, 3	XXII, 182-183 sqq.
	41, 4	VI, 415, 441-442
	42, 8	XXII, 175-176
	42, 18	VI, 362; XIV, 33-34
	43, 10	VI, 415-416, 442-443
	Matthaeus	
	4, 18	XIII, 246; XIV, 25, 84-85, 86, 88, 90, 92
	4, 18-19	VIII, 27-28
	11, 27	XVIII, 148
	16, 17	VIII, 27; XIII, 245; XIV, 24, 84, 85, 88, 89, 91-92
	16, 17-18	VIII, 29-30; XIII, 246-247
	16, 18	XIII, 1-2
	18, 6	XXII, 657-661
	24, 35	XVII, 164-165

28, 18	XVIII, 141	10, 29	XVIII, 143
28, 19	VI, 476; XXI, 32-34, 99-101; XXII, 410	10, 29-30	XVIII, 134-136
		10, 30	XVIII, 142
		10, 33	XVIII, 143, 146-147
Marcus		11, 25	XXII, 241
1, 16	XIII, 246; XIV, 25, 84-85, 86, 88, 90, 92	11, 42	XVIII, 148
1, 16-17	VIII, 27-28	12, 44	XVIII, 148
		12, 45	XVIII, 148
Lucas		13, 3	XVIII, 141
1, 57-63	XIII, 137-146	14, 6	XVII, 135; XXII, 217, 230
10, 21	XXII, 586	14, 9	XXII, 208-209
10, 22	XVIII, 148	14, 10	IX, 30-31, 45; XI, 228-229
21, 33	XVII, 164-165	14, 24	XVIII, 148
		14, 28	XVIII, 132-133, 143, 154-155
Iohannes		15, 1	XVII, 136
1, 1	XXII, 203	15, 26	XIX, 199-200
1, 3	XI, 241-242	16, 5	XVIII, 148
1, 18	XXII, 201-202	17, 2	XVIII, 141
1, 44	VIII, 27; XIII, 245-246; XIV, 25, 84, 85-86, 88, 89, 92	17, 3	XVIII, 148
		17, 6	XVIII, 141
3, 17	XVIII, 148	17, 8	XVIII, 141, 148
3, 20-21	XVII, 76-79	17, 11	XVIII, 141
3, 34	XVIII, 148	17, 12	XVIII, 141
3, 35	XVIII, 141; XXII, 586	17, 18	XVIII, 148
4, 24	XIX, 61	17, 21	XVIII, 148
5, 19	XVIII, 149	17, 22	XVIII, 141
5, 22	XVIII, 141	17, 23	XVIII, 148
5, 26	XVIII, 141	17, 24	XVIII, 141
5, 30	XVIII, 149	17, 25	XVIII, 148
5, 37	XVIII, 148	18, 9	XVIII, 141
6, 35	XVII, 135	20, 21	XVIII, 148
6, 37	XVIII, 141		
6, 38	XVIII, 148	Actus Apostolorum	
6, 39	XVIII, 141, 148	17, 28	XXII, 231
6, 41	XVII, 135	Ad Romanos	
6, 44	XVIII, 148	1, 16	XI, 242-243
6, 48	XVII, 135	6, 4	XXI, 89-90
6, 51	XVII, 135	6, 8	XXII, 741
7, 28	XVIII, 148	9, 29	XXII, 182-183 sqq.
7, 33	XVIII, 148	11, 36	XVI, 45
8, 12	XVII, 136; XXII, 228	15, 33	XXII, 182-183 sqq.
8, 16	XVIII, 148	I ad Corinthios	
8, 28	XVIII, 149	1, 24	XVIII, 158
8, 29	XVIII, 148	1, 30	XXII, 234, 238, 239
8, 42	XVIII, 148	6, 19	XXII, 192
10, 7	XVII, 135	14, 14-15	XXII, 713-716
10, 14	XVII, 136		

(*) This index has been compiled by N. Dekeyzer.

II ad Corinthios	I ad Timotheum
4. 4 XXII, 219	1, 17 XXII, 182-183 sqq.
Ad Philippenses	3, 16 VII, 121
2. 6 IX, 44; XXII, 492-493	6. 15 XXII, 182-183 sqq.
2. 6-7 XVIII, 150	Ad Philemonem
2. 9 XXII, 412	16 XXII, 34-36
Ad Colossenses	Ad Hebraeos
1, 15 XVIII, 161-162, 164; XXII, 219	1, 3 XVIII, 161-162, 164, 167; XXII, 219
2, 9 IX, 46, 82	3, 2 XXII, 18, 47
I ad Thessalonicenses	Iacobi
1, 1 XXI, 35	3, 7-12 XX, 72-80
II ad Thessalonicenses	I Petri
1, 1 XXI, 35	1, 17 XXII, 740

INDEX ALIORVM FONTIVM(*)

ATHANASIUS ALEXANDRINUS

Contra Arianos orationes III (CPG 2093). PG 26, 12-468.

II, 3-4 (152 B - 153 C)	XXII, 15-59
III, 3 (328 AB)	IX, 28-42, (79-80), (80-81)
III, 5-6 (332 B)	IX, 42-47, (81-82)

Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae (CPG 2092). PG 25, 537-594.

11 (564 AB)	XXII, 326-336
13 (565 C - 568 A)	XXII, 336-343

Locum non invenimus XX, 62-63

BASILIUS CAESARIENSIS

Adversus Eunomium I. PG 29, 497-572. Ed. Bernard SESBOUÉ, *Basile de Césarée. Contre Eunome, suivi de Eunome, Apologie*. Tome I (SChr. 299), Paris, 1982, pp. 140-268.

5 (516 D - 517 A; pp. 174-176)	VI, 469-474, (504-507), (VII, 81-84)
5 (517 A; p. 176)	VI, 474-477
5 (517 B - 520 B; pp. 176-180)	IX, 263-291, (303-305), (305-307), (308-311), (312-314), (322-324); (X, 8-12), (13-15), (16-17), (69-70), (100-101), (102-103), (113-114), (116-119), (122), (126-127), (132-135); (XX, 92-94), (124-126)
7 (524 C - 525 A; pp. 188-190)	XVII, 132-143
10 (533 C - 536 C; pp. 204-208)	XXII, 63-98
27 (572 B; p. 268)	XIX, 375-376

Adversus Eunomium II. PG 29, 573-652. Ed. Bernard SESBOUÉ, *Basile de Césarée. Contre Eunome, suivi de Eunome, Apologie*. Tome II (SChr. 305), Paris, 1983, pp. 10-142.

4 (577 C; p. 18)	VI, 588
4 (577 C - 580 A; pp. 18-20)	VIII, 15-33, (45-48), (52-55), (58-61), (66-68), (71), (85-86), (142-144), (151-153); (XIII, 43-48), (65-68), (69-71), (78-79), (198-201), (201-203), (206-207), (213-214), (218-222), (243-247); (XIV, 3-6), (6-9), (24-25), (84-92); (XV, 10-11); (XIX, 17-24)

(*) This index has been compiled by J. Noret. - Peter of Callinicus' usual method being to give first a long quotation and then repeat elements of it in his argument, we have, in the present index, printed references to these repetitions in brackets: often abbreviated and sometimes inexact, these repetitions are relatively unimportant.

- 4 (580 A; p. 20) XIII, 1-9; (XIV, 1-2); (XV, 11-13)
 4 (580 B; p. 22) XVII, 67-68, (144-145), (158); (XX, 95-96)
 5 (580 C; p. 22) XIII, 9-11; (XVI, 2-5), (12-14), (58-60), (74-76), (77), (88-89)
 5 (580 C; p. 22) XIX, 25-31
 7 (584 D - 585 B; p. 30) XXII, 99-113
 26 (632 CD; p. 110) XI, 202-205
 28 (636 C - 637 A; p. 118) XI, 24-31, (131-133), (146-150)
 28-29 (637 C - 640 A; pp. 120-122) X, 49-55
 29 (640 B - 641 A; pp. 122-124) VI, 331-350, (352), (353-354); (IX, 247-256); (X, 33-40), (61-64), (142-143), (190-193), (201-208), (211-213), (214-216)
- Adversus Eunomium IV. PG 29, 672-709.*
 681 C XI, 32-36
 681 C - 684 A XXII, 115-128, (244-246), (246-248), (252-254), (259-261), (266-268), (273-276)
- De Spiritu Sancto (CPG 2839). PG 32, 68-217. Ed. Benoît PRUCHE, Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint-Esprit (SChr. 17 bis), Paris, 1968².*
 18 (44) [148 CD; p. 402] XXI, 25-30, (120-121)
- Epistula 38. PG 32, 325-340. Ed. Marcella FORLIN PATRUCCO, Basilio di Cesarea. Le lettere, I (Corona Patrum), Torino, 1983, pp. 178-194.*
 3 (328 C - 329 A; p. 182) IX, 49-63, (84-85)
 4 (332 AB; p. 184) VIII, 121-133, (134-137), (138-139), (145-149), (149-151)
- Epistula 210. PG 32, 768-777. Ed. Yves COURTONNE, Saint Basile. Lettres. Tome II (Collection des Universités de France), Paris, 1961, pp. 189-197.*
 4 (773 BC; pp. 193-194) XXI, 32-45, (128-132), (133), (135), (136)
 5 (776 BC; pp. 195-196) XIV, 39-51

CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS

De Sanctissima Trinitate dialogi (CPG 5216). PG 75, 657-1124. Ed. Georges Matthieu DE DURAND, Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Dialogues sur la Trinité, Tomes I-III (SChr. 231, 237, 246), Paris, 1976-1978.

- I (712 C; t. I, p. 218) XXII, 604-607, (620-623)
 I (712 C; t. I, p. 218) XXII, 623-624
 II (741 AB; t. I, p. 272) XI, 134-137, (153-154)
 II (741 D; t. I, p. 274) XI, 137-140

Thesaurus (CPG 5215). PG 75, 9-656.

- prol. (9) IX, 292-295
 prol. (12 BC) XIX, 385-398, (405-406)
 ass. IV (45 D - 48 A) XIX, 99-111, (147-148), (148-151)
 ass. V (68 B) XXII, 594-596, (598-600)
 ass. XII (181 D) XXII, 506-512, (515-517), (517-519)
 ass. XIX (313 B) XXII, 513-515, (520-522), (531)

- ass. XIX (313 D) XXII, 527-530
 ass. XIX (316 AC) XIX, 113-133
 ass. XIX (321 BC) XXII, 540-547, (559-562), (564-567)
 ass. XIX (321 C) XXII, 578-581
 ass. XXIII (381 A) XXII, 582-589

DAMIANUS ALEXANDRINUS

Adversus Tritheitas (CPG 7245).

- ch. 4 VI, 608-610; (XX, 13-16)
 ch. 8 XX, 46-53, (88)
 ch. 9 Unc., 76-77
 ch. 9 XX, 54-57, (100-101)
 ch. 13 XVIII, 267-276, (290-295), (306-307), (309-310)
 ch. 14 XX, 60-68, (108-114), (131-134)
 ch. 20 XVII, 229-252

Apologia secunda.

- VII, 23-28, (41-45), (50-51), (133), (137-141), (144-145), (180); (XII, 36-47), (61-64), (212-215); (XX, 17-24)

Epistula ad episcopos Orientis.

- XIII, 1-27, (36-39), (158-161), (183-186); (XVII, 17-33), (58-62); (XX, 25-28)

from an unspecified apology

- Unc., 73-77
 — V, 54-66, (70-72), (72-73), (95-98), (125-131), (134-140), (148-150), (153-156), (156), (177); (VI, 138-142), (147-153)
 — V, 75-76; (VI, 205-206)

from an unnamed work

- V, 121-125

GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSIS

Oratio 6 (De pace I). PG 35, 721-752.

- 21 (749 A) XXI, 66-68
 22 (749 BD) XXI, 68-81, (144-150), (155-156)

Oratio 20 (De dogmate et constitutione episcoporum). PG 35, 1065-1080. Ed. Justin MOSSAY and Guy LAFONTAINE, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 20-23 (SChr. 270), Paris, 1980, pp. 56-84.

- 5 (1072 A; pp. 66-68) Unc., 19-26, (44-47), (54-55), (79-80), (108-111)

Oratio 21 (In laudem Athanasii). PG 35, 1081-1128. Ed. Justin MOSSAY and Guy LAFONTAINE, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 20-23 (SChr. 270), Paris, 1980, pp. 110-192.

- 13 (1096 BC; p. 136) Unc., 35-42, (52-54), (64-65), (81-83)

Oratio 29 (Theologica III). PG 36, 73-104. Ed. Paul GALLAY and Maurice JOURJON, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques) (SChr. 250), Paris, 1978, pp. 176-224.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 5 (80 B; p. 184) | VII, 32-33 |
| 10 (88 A; pp. 196-198) | VI, 24-31, (33), (41-42) |
| 10 (88 A; pp. 196-198) | VI, 259-268, (270-273), (278-282), (286-289), (298-301), (318-320), (372-375) |
| 10 (88 A; p. 198) | VI, 34-37, (42-43) |
| 12 (89 BC; pp. 200-202) | XI, 39-51, (162-163) |
| 13 (92 A; pp. 202-204) | XXII, 133-141, (280-282), (282-283), (300-301) |
| 16 (93 C - 96 B; pp. 210-212) | XIX, 34-57 |

Oratio 30 (Theologica IV). PG 36, 104-133. Ed. Paul GALLAY and Maurice JOURJON, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques) (SChr. 250), Paris, 1978, pp. 226-274.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 16-21 (125 A - 132 A; pp. 260-270) | XXII, 144-243, (283-287), (288-290), (291-295), (304-307), (307-309), (346-347), (355-358), (362-363) |
|------------------------------------|---|

Oratio 31 (Theologica V). PG 36, 133-172. Ed. Paul GALLAY and Maurice JOURJON, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques) (SChr. 250), Paris, 1978, pp. 276-342.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 6 (140 AB; p. 286) | VI, 75-90, (96-97) |
| 6 (140 B; p. 286) | V, 58-59; (VI, 140-142), (215-216), (587) |
| 9 (141 C - 144 A; pp. 290-292) | XII, 124-137, (164-166), (167-170) |
| 21 (157 A; p. 316) | XXII, 375-380 |
| 22 (157 B; p. 316) | XXII, 386-388 |
| 23 (157 C - 160 A; pp. 318-320) | VI, 409-420, (438-445), (449-450), (512-513); (VII, 75-79) |
| 24 (160 B; p. 320) | XXII, 393-394 |
| 24 (160 B; p. 320) | XXII, 396-398 |

Oratio 32 (De moderatione in disputando). PG 36, 173-212. Ed. Claudio MORESCHINI, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 32-37 (SChr. 318), Paris, 1985, pp. 82-154.

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| 21 (197 C; pp. 128-130) | VI, 120-123 |
|-------------------------|-------------|

Oratio 33 (Contra Arianos et de seipso). PG 36, 213-237. Ed. Claudio MORESCHINI, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 32-37 (SChr. 318), Paris, 1985, pp. 156-196.

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| 16 (236 A; pp. 192-194) | VI, 60-62 |
|-------------------------|-----------|

Oratio 38 (In Theophania). PG 36, 312-333. Ed. Claudio MORESCHINI, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41 (SChr. 358), Paris, 1990, pp. 104-148.

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| 7 (317 C; p. 116) | VI, 537-540 |
|-------------------|-------------|

Oratio 40 (In sanctum Baptisma). PG 36, 360-425. Ed. Claudio MORESCHINI, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41 (SChr. 358), Paris, 1990, pp. 198-310.

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| 41 (417 B; p. 294) | VI, 57-60 |
|--------------------|-----------|

Oratio 42 (Supremum vale). PG 36, 457-492. Ed. Jean BERNARDI, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 42-43 (SChr. 384), Paris, 1992, pp. 48-114.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 15 (476 A; p. 80) | V, 103-104, (121), (141-142) |
| 15 (476 A; pp. 80-82) | VI, 165-172, (175-176), (249-250), (569-570), (572-578) |
| 15 (476 AB; pp. 80-82) | V, 62-66, (73), (97-98), (136-140), (148-150), (153-156), (156), (177); (VI, 149-153), (587-588) |
| 15 (476 B; p. 82) | VI, 590-592 |
| 15 (476 B; p. 82) | IX, 65-73, (86-87) |
| 16 (476 C; p. 82) | Unc., 28-33, (47-51), (55-59), (80-81), (112-116) |
| 16 (476 C - 477 A; pp. 82-84) | XXI, 48-64, (139-142), (142-144) |
| 17 (477 C; p. 86) | VI, 422-433, (519-521); (VII, 79-81) |

Oratio 45 (In sanctum Pascha). PG 36, 624-664.

- | | |
|--------------|-------------|
| 3 (628 A) | VI, 537-540 |
| 3-4 (628 AC) | VI, 388-404 |

GREGORIUS NYSSENUS

Contra Eunomium libri (CPG 3135). PG 45, 248-464 et 572-1121. Ed. Wernerus JAEGER, Contra Eunomium libri. 2 vols. (GNO I et II), Leiden, 1960², t. I, pp. 3-409; t. II, pp. 3-311.

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| I: 320 A; t. I, p. 92, 20-21 | XVII, 236-237 |
| I: 420 C; t. I, pp. 184,17 - 185,2 | VI, 480-491, (508-511) |
| I: 420 CD; t. I, pp. 184,17 - 185,5 | XVI, 33-46 |
| I: 424A; t. I, p. 187, 13-19 | XVI, 47-52 |
| III, 1: 592 A; t. II, p. 29, 8-12 | XI, 270-274 |
| III, 1: 592 AB; t. II, p. 29, 12-19 | XI, 208-214, (250-253), (253-255) |
| III, 1: 596 CD; t. II, pp. 33,25 - 34,8 | XII, 140-149, (201-203) |
| III, 1: 597 D-600 A; t. II, p. 36, 1-13 | XII, 149-158, (203-208) |
| III, 2: 644 BC; t. II, pp. 75,21 - 76,1 | XXII, 675-682, (692-693) |
| III, 3: 680 A; t. II, p. 107, 1-6 | XXII, 684-688 |
| III, 5: 745 AB; t. II, p. 166, 2-10 | XIX, 60-67 |
| III, 5: 745C; t. II, p. 166, 19-24 | XIX, 68-71 |
| III, 5: 756 BC; t. II, p. 175, 10-27 | XIX, 72-86 |
| III, 5: 757 AC; t. II, pp. 176,16 - 177,23 | XI, 217-243 |
| III, 5: 760 AC; t. II, pp. 178,13 - 179,9 | VII, 94-112 |
| III, 5: 760 CD; t. II, p. 179, 9-21 | VI, 493-502; (VII, 86-87) |
| III, 5: 761 BC; t. II, pp. 180,19 - 181,13 | XIV, 54-71 |
| III, 5: 764 A; t. II, p. 182, 4-5 | XXII, 402-403, (420-421) |
| III, 8: 848 B; t. II, p. 257, 20-22 | XXII, 453-455, (458-460), (465) |
| III, 8: 848 B; t. II, p. 257, 22-23 | XXII, 469-470, (474) |
| III, 10: 892 C - 893 A; t. II, p. 296, 4-25 | XI, 55-71, (131-133), (170-181) |

- III, 10: 908 AD; t. II, pp. 309,23 - 310,25
 XI, 71-98, (184-189)
- Refutatio Confessionis Eunomii* (CPG 3136). PG 45, 465-572. Ed. Wernerus JAEGER, *Contra Eunomium libri*. Pars altera (GNO II), Leiden, 1960², pp. 312-410.
 473 A; p. 318, 7-12 XXII, 403-408, (422-424)
 473 AB; p. 318, 15-25 XXII, 408-417, (427-429)
 480 C - 481 C; pp. 325,6 - 327,4 IX, 105-150, (155-159), (171-174), (182-185), (186-187); (X, 73-77)
 524 A; p. 365, 7-8 XXII, 434-436, (438)
 524 A; p. 365, 8-9 XXII, 436-437, (439-440)
 Locum non invenimus XXII, 442-443, (446-447)
- IOHANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS
- In Iohannem homiliae* (CPG 4425). PG 59, 23-482
 hom. IV (col. 47) VI, 93-94
- In epistulam ad Philippenses homiliae* (CPG 4432). PG 62, 177-298.
 hom. VI (col. 219) XXII, 489-491
 hom. VI (col. 219) XXII, 492-495
- SEVERUS ANTIOCHENUS
- Contra codicillos Alexandri*
 fragm. inedit. XIX, 193-221, (269-271), (271-275), (310-312), (312-314), (314-318), (319-320)
 fragm. inedit. XIX, 222-225
- Contra impium Grammaticum* (CPG 7024). Ed. Iosephus LEBON, *Severi Antiocheni Liber contra impium Grammaticum. Oratio prima et secunda. Textus* (CSCO 111). Versio (CSCO 112), Paris - Louvain, 1938.
 II, 17 (p. 144, 18-20; [p. 112, 22-24]) XVIII, 46-49
 II, 17 (p. 156, 11-21; [pp. 121,35 - 122,10]) XVIII, 64-72, (112-117), (119-121), (218-222), (236-238)
 II, 17 (p. 161, 6-24; [pp. 125,32 - 126,13]) XI, 307-321; (XIII, 51-52); (XVII, 85-93), (94-96), (97-98), (98-100), (100-101), (110-112), (112-113), (117-120), (167-169), (173), (192-195), (197), (198-199), (203-204); (XVIII, 33-36), (73-87), (223-230), (238-240)
 II, 17 (p. 161, 9-15; [pp. 125,34 - 126,4]) XIII, 16-20, (51-52); (XVII, 22-26), (97-98), (100-101), (167-169), (192-195), (197), (198-199), (220-221), (223-226)
 II, 17 (p. 161, 17-24; [p. 126, 5-13]) XIII, 21-27; (XVII, 26-33)
 II, 18 (p. 167, 25-29; [p. 131, 7-11]) XVIII, 89-93

- II, 18 (p. 169, 13-22; [p. 132, 12-21]) XI, 322-330; (XVIII, 93-96)
 II, 18 (pp. 170,26 - 171,7 [p. 133, 17-26]) VII, 30-38; (XII, 3-4), (39-47)
 II, 18 (pp. 170,26 - 171,11 [p. 133, 17-31]) XII, 86-98, (212-215)
 II, 19 (p. 174, 19-26; [p. 136, 11-19]) XVIII, 97-105
 II, 28 (p. 218, 11-24; [pp. 170,33 - 171,10]) V, 22-34; (XXII, 639-641)
- Epistula ad Eupraxium*. Ed. E.W. BROOKS, PO 14, Paris, 1920, pp. 6-68.
 pp. 10-13 XIX, 228-255, (275-279), (279-280), (326-329), (335-336), (345-352)
- Epistula ad Oecumenium*
 fragm. inedit. XXII, 703-722
- Homelia cathedralis 90*. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE, PO 23, Paris, 1932, pp. 120-165.
 pp. 139,3 - 142,9 [12] XVIII, 132-183, (189-191), (192-195), (204), (245-248); (XIX, 5-8), (181-183), (188-190), (266-269)
 p. 142, 5-12 [8-18] XVIII, 7-15, (36-39), (192-195), (204), (245-248); (XIX, 5-8), (181-183), (188-190), (266-269)
- Homelia cathedralis 109*. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE, PO 25, Paris, 1943, pp. 732-781.
 pp. 747,1 - 748,7 [12] X, 157-180
- Homelia cathedralis 119*. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE, PO 26, Paris, 1948, pp. 375-439.
 pp. 436,10 [12] - 437,4 [5] XXI, 83-93, (161-162), (163-164)
- Locum non invenimus XXII, 641-644
- Symbolum Nicaenum* (CPG 8512). Ed. Giuseppe Luigi DOSSETTI, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli*. Edizione critica (*Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose*, 2), Roma, 1967, pp. 226-240.
 II, 4-5 VI, 56
- THEODOSIUS ALEXANDRINUS
- De Trinitate* (CPG 7137). Ed. I.-B. CHABOT, *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas*. Textus (CSCO 17), Paris, 1903, pp. 40-79; Versio (CSCO 103), Louvain, 1965, pp. 26-55.
 p. 43, 9-13 (p. 28, 32-36) VI, 99-102
 pp. 44,12 - 45,1 (pp. 29,28 - 30,7) XXI, 96-110, (165-166), (168-169)
 pp. 55,21 - 57,4 (pp. 37,31 - 38,30) VI, 67-102
 p. 61, 22-30 (p. 42, 12-19) VI, 117-123
 p. 64, 7-10 (p. 44, 10-13) V, 4-8
 pp. 65,25 - 66,8 (p. 45, 14-25) VI, 53-62
- Locum non invenimus XVII, 252

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	V
INTRODUCTION	VII
I. The author: Peter of Callinicus	VII
II. The controversy with Damian	XIV
III. The treatise against Damian	XXVI
IV. The textual tradition of book II <i>Against Damian</i>	XXIX
V. The Syriac translation: its date and character	XXXV
VI. Observations	XXXVI
1. Observations on the English translation	XXXVI
2. Observations on the presentation of the text	XXXVII
Select Bibliography	XXXVIII
Acknowledgements	XL
ANALYSIS OF BOOK II	XLI
TEXT.	I
INDICES	369
Index nominum et vocum quarundam ex eis formata- rum	371
Index locorum Sacrae Scripturae	374
Index aliorum fontium	377