CORPVS CHRISTIANORVM

*Series Graeca*

32

# PETRI CALLINICENSIS PATRIARCHAE ANTIOCHENI

CONTRA DAMIANVM

BREPOLS - TURNHOUT

1996

# PETRI CALLINICENSIS PATRIARCHAE ANTIOCHENI TRACTATVS CONTRA DAMIANVM

II

LIBRI TERTII CAPITA I-XIX

EDIDERVNT ET ANGLICE REDDIDERVNT

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

TURNHOUT
BREPOLS

LEUVEN
UNIVERSITY PRESS

1996

EDITORES

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

This book has been printed on paper
according to the prevailing
ISO-NORMS.

© Brepols 1996

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.

# ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| ACO | *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* |
| CPG | Mauritius GEERARD, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 5 vols., Turnhout, 1974-1987 |
| CSCO | *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* |
| GCS | *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* |
| GNO | *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* |
| OLA | *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* |
| PG | *Patrologiae cursus completus ... Series Graeca* accurante J.-P. MIGNE, 161 vols., Paris, 1857-1866 |
| PO | *Patrologia Orientalis* |
| SChr | *Sources Chrétiennes* |

ASSEMANI, *Catalogus* = St. EV. ASSEMANUS and J.S. ASSEMANUS, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus*, III, Roma, 1759.

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

# INTRODUCTION

## The textual tradition of Book III

Book III of Peter's *Contra Damianum* is transmitted in the MSS Add. 7191, 7192, 14603 of the British Library, the Syriac MSS 107 and 108 of the Vatican Library and the MS Sachau 201 of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek of Berlin. As we shall see, Add. MS 14603 and Vaticanus Syriacus 107 are but parts of what was once a single manuscript; and the same is true of Add. MS 7192 and Sachau 201. We have, therefore, at our disposal for the edition of Book III only four, more or less complete, manuscripts.

Apart from these manuscripts there are to be found many, sometimes long, fragments of Peter's work in two florilegia, composed to defend his views. The sources for the excerpts were in Syriac. The first of these florilegia, which we name the *Trinitarian Florilegium* is transmitted in the four very large manuscripts of 'collected works' in the British Library: Add. 12155 (**W**), 14532 (**X**), 14533 (**Y**) and 14538 (**Z**). In about a hundred chapters, it defends with texts, some from Peter himself but most of them from the Fathers, Peter's theses against Damian. Most, if not all these *testimonia*, are drawn from *Contra Damianum*(1). The second florilegium is transmitted in only one MS, the Add. MS 14533 of the British Library, where it is found on ff. 147va-161ra. It contains only extracts of the *Contra Damianum* by Peter, given in the order of the treatise itself.

### I. *The direct tradition*

1. British Library, Add. MS 7191 (**A**).

We have already described Add. MS 7191, the nearest to complete of our manuscripts, in the introduction to the edition of Book

(1) Cf. A. Van Roey, *Un florilège trinitaire syriaque tiré du* Contra Damianum *de Pierre de Callinique, patriarche d'Antioche (581-591)* in Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica, 23, 1992, pp. 189-203.

II (pp. XXIX-XXXIV). It will suffice to recall, supplement and, in some places, correct the description given there of what that manuscript contains of Book III.

In Add. MS 7191 Book III takes up folios 42-173r. Heading the text are the titles of the 50 chapters. In its present state the list (ff. 42-44vb) is incomplete in the beginning; it starts only in the middle of the title of chapter XIII with the words ܘܠܐ ܠܡܫܬܐܠܬܐ ܐܬܬܗܝܡ (Headings, l. 120).

Ff. 44vb-47vb: chapters I-II and the beginning of chapter III (*explicit:* ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ = III, 11). The text of the *lacuna* between f. 47 and f. 48 is given in f. 1 and has been reproduced already erroneously in vol. I, p. 15-23 as 'part of an uncertain chapter'. The editors apologise and plead *incuria*, with the mitigation that the mistake was not easy to see!

Ff. 48-61: the last part of chapter III (*incipit:* ܚܙܐ ܐܢܬ = III, 144), chapters IV-VIII and the beginning of chapter IX (*explicit:* ܕܡܚܒܐ ܘܡܫܠܠ = IX, 78).

Ff. 62-63: the last part of chapter IX (*incipit:* ܒܐܢܫܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܢܝܐ = IX, 216), and the first part of chapter X (*explicit:* ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܥܒ̈ܕܝܢ = X, 90).

Ff. 64-65: the last part of chapter X (*incipit:* ܬܗܠܟܘܢ = X, 231) and the beginning of chapter XI (*explicit:* ܠܬܐܬܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܐܪܝܘܣ = XI, 106). The text of the *lacuna* between f. 65 and f. 66 is partly given in f. 120.

Ff. 66-73: the end of chapter XI (*incipit:* ܗܢܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܟܠܬܐ = XI, 243), chapters XII-XIV and the first part of chapter XV (*explicit:* ܕܠܐ ܐܡܪ : ܐܚܪܝܢܐ = XV, 284).

F. 74 gives a part of chapter XV (*incipit:* ܘܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܗ ܡܚܪܝܐ = XV, 302; *explicit:* ܐܝܟ ܕܐܒܕ = XV, 443)(2). Three extracts of this fragment are quoted in the florilegium II in the Add. 14533, ff. 154vb-155ra as taken from chapter XV (XV, 315-329, 338-350, 358-369), and also a fourth extract (444-493) which is not represented in the other MSS.

F. 75 gives a part of chapter XXXI, corresponding with Vat. Syr. 108, ff. 56vb-59va. It should come between f. 119 and 121(3).

Ff. 76-94: the end of chapter XV (*incipit:* ܘܡܩܒܠܘܬܐ ܡܬܘܡܐ ܡܬܢܣܒܝܢ = XV, 500), chapters XVI-XXI and the first part of chapter XXII (*explicit:* ܐܡܪ ܕܝܢ ܕܢܦܫ).

(2) Cf. vol. I, p. XXXIII.
(3) Cf. ibid.



Ff. 95-102: the end of chapter XXII (*incipit:* ܠܪܘܪܒܢܘܣ ܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܝ ܬܠܡܝܕܐ), chapters XXIII-XXIV and the first part of chapter XXV (*explicit:* ܘܐܠܗܐ ܐܢܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘܐ).

Ff. 103-113: the last part of chapter XXV (*incipit:* ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܒܐ : ܐܢܫܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܪܐ), chapters XXVI-XXVII, chapter XXVIII without the end (*explicit:* ܡܚܪܒ ܠܝ).

Ff. 114-119: chapter XXIX without the beginning (*incipit:* ܡܫܒܚܐ ܗܘܬ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ), chapter XXX and the beginning of chapter XXXI (*explicit:* ܐܢܚܢܐ ܕܐܢ). See above f. 75.

Ff. 120 gives a part of chapter XI. See above ff. 64-65.

Ff. 121-169: the last part of chapter XXXI (*incipit:* ܐܢ ܠܒܪ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ), chapters XXXII-XLVIII, chapter XLIX without the last lines (*explicit:* ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܚܝܢܐ).

F. 170-171: part of an unidentified chapter (*incipit:* ܕܠܐ ܪܥܝܐ ܘܪܥܝܐ ܘܢܩܡ ܪܥܝܐ; *explicit:* ܘܡܬܚܠܦܝܢ ܠܣܝܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܚܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ).

F. 172-173: the last lines of chapter XLIX and chapter L. Half of f. 173 has been torn, with the result that of the end of chapter L only a few words remain.

2. British Library Add. MS 14603 and Vaticanus Syriacus 107.

British Library, Add. MS 14603 (**B**).

The manuscript is described in WRIGHT, *Catalogue*, part II, pp. 586-587 (no. DCC). It is a parchment volume of 85 folios (170 pages) about 26 cms by 16,5 cms. The text, in two columns, measures 18 cms in length, each column being 5 cms in width and comprising between 39 to 44 lines of writing. The quires were originally 15 in number, signed with Syriac letters and also with Greek letters or Syriac arithmetical figures. But quires 6, 9, 11 are lost and several others are very imperfect. Leaves are wanting after ff. 8, 9, 10, 21, 31, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47 and 56. At the top of the last folio of each quire there is ܕܡܪܝ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ, *Of Saint Peter of Antioch against Damian* (ff. 8v, 20v, 22v, 41v, 43v, 47v and 66v) or ܕܡܪܝ ܩܕܝܫܐ

ܦܛܪܘܣ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܪܫܝܥܐ ܕܡܝܢܐ *Of Saint Peter of Antioch against impious Damian* (f. 76v).

When the manuscript entered the British Museum, it was in complete disorder. At least three attempts were made to restore the correct order before Wright, comparing this manuscript with Add. MS 7191, succeeded in doing so. The effect of this was to provide the manuscript with four different paginations, noted in pencil in the upper left corners of the folios. Wright's pagination runs from 1 to 85. Some of the leaves are much stained and torn, especially ff. 6, 8, 9, 22, 23, 32, 40, 41, 43 and 48. The manuscript is written in a fine regular estrangelo of the VIIth century, by a single hand.

This manuscript was one of the many manuscripts which the Venerable Henry Tattam bought at the Monastery of the Syrians in Egypt and which were deposited in the British Museum in March 1843(4).

The contents of the manuscript are as follows:

Ff. 1va - 5rb: the titles of the first 25 chapters of Book III, indicated with Syriac letters from ܐ to ܟܗ. Above the list we read: ܩ̈ܦܠܐܐ ܕܦܠܓܗ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ. *Chapters of a half of the third book against Damian.* On the outside margin of f. 2r there is a note by another more recent hand:

ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܚܢܢܝ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܡܐܡܪܐ ܥܠ ܙܟܝ ܡܟܣܐ. ܘܥܠ ܡܦܘܠܬܐ ܕܦܬܟܪ̈ܐ. ܘܥܠ ܨܠܘ̈ܬܐ. ܘܥܠ ܫܡܪܝܬܐ. ܘܥܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܘܝܕ ܕܩܕܡܬ ܠܡܪܝܐ ܠܘܩܒܠܝ. ܘܥܠ ܡܪܬܝܢܘܬܐ. ܘܐܓܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܠܘܬ ܒܬܘ[ܠܬܐ] ܕܢܦܠ (sic). ܘܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܢܫ̈ܐ ܕܬܒ̈ܘ.

*Explanation of 'Have mercy on me, O God'* (Ps. 51:1); *Discourse on Zacchaeus the publican; On the fall of idols; On prayers; On the Samaritan woman; On the word of David 'I put the Lord before'* (Ps. 16:8); *On admonition; Letters of Basil to a fallen virgin*(5) *and of a doctor to women who repented*(6). This note seems

(4) Wright, *Catalogue*, part III, p. XIII. See also William Cureton, *British Museum – MSS. from the Egyptian Monasteries* in *The Quarterly Review*, vol. 77, no. 153, 1846 (1845), pp. 39-69 and his preface to *Festal Letters of Athanasius*, London, 1848 (Add. MS 14569) and T.-J. Lamy, *Les manuscrits syriaques du Musée Britannique*, in Bulletin de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, sér. 2, t. 49, 1880, pp. 223-253).

(5) See Wright, *Catalogue*, part II, no. 747, 4; CPG 2900, ep. 46.

(6) See Wright, *Catalogue*, part II, no. 747, 5.



to indicate that sermons of John Chrysostom and Jacob of Sarug, together with letters by Basil and other doctors were included in the same volume. Add. MS 14607 contains a collection of such writings(7).

Ff. 5va-8vb: On the top of f. 5v: ܟܬܒܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܟܣܢܕܪܝܐ, *Second volume* (ktobo) *of Saint Peter of Antioch against Damian of Alexandria;* and at the beginning of f. 5va: ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠ̈ܬܐ, *Third book* (memro). There follow chapter I and the beginning of chapter II (*explicit:* [ܒܐ]ܡܪ ܫܘܬܐܬܐ = II, 38). *Lacuna of one folio.*

F. 9: part of chapter II (*incipit:* ܥܠ ܝܠܕܐ ܥܒܕ = II, 101; *explicit:* ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܠܡ = II, 169). *Lacuna.* Chapter III is totally lost.

F. 10: part of chapter IV (*incipit:* ܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܠܥܢܝܢܐ = IV, 44; *explicit:* ܠܫ̈ܢܕܕܐ ܥܡ = IV, 110). *Lacuna of four pages.*

Ff. 11-21: the last part of chapter IV (*incipit:* ܕܠܥܠܡ ܘܡ̈ܬܚܢܢܘܬܐ = IV, 179) and almost the whole chapter V (*explicit:* ܘܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܓܠܒ = V, 364). On f. 11ra there is a blank space of three lines but nothing of the text is omitted. *Lacuna.* Chapters VI and VII are completely lost.

Ff. 22-31 (a complete quire): chapter VIII without the beginning (*incipit:* ܬܗܕܪܐ ܘܡܫܒܚܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܪܘܫ = VIII, 248) and the first part of chapter IX (*explicit:* ܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܕܐܦܝܣܬܐ ܢܦܫ, = IX, 293). *Lacuna.* Chapter X is totally lost.

Ff. 32-42: chapter XI without the beginning (*incipit:* ܘܡܫܚ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܚܠܦܬܐ = XI, 192), chapters XII-XIII and the first part of chapter XIV (*explicit:* ܘܗܘܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܡܪܝܫܘܬܐ = XIV, 92). *Lacuna.*

F. 43 there remain only 14 lines on each page. The lines on f. 43r contain part of a text of Damian quoted in XV, 266-268 and 287-289 so that we can assume that the two fragments belong to chapter XV.

F. 44: the end of chapter XVI (*incipit:* ܐܡܬܝ, ܕܗܘ ܐܦ ܬܓܠܝ = XVI, 247) and the beginning of chapter XVII (*explicit:* ܕܐܢܫܐ ܒܪ ܢܫܐ ܗܘܐ = XVII, 39). *Lacuna.*

F. 45: part of chapter XVII (*incipit:* ܕܐܢܫܐ ܒܪ ܒܪܬ ܡܠܟܐ

(7) See Wright, *Catalogue*, part II, pp. 683-684.

= XVII, 101; *explicit:* ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܡܘܕܥܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܘܣ = XVII, 166). *Lacuna.*

F. 46: part of chapter XVII (*incipit:* ܕܠܐ ܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܣܢܝܐ = XVII, 421; *explicit:* ܚܠܦܗ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܪܓܡܐ ܠܝ = XVII, 484). *Lacuna.*

F. 47: the end part of chapter XVII (*incipit:* ܠܠܐ ܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܣܢܝܘܗܝ = XVII, 549). *Lacuna*. Chapter XVIII is completely lost.

Ff. 48-56: the end of chapter XIX (*incipit:* ܢܬܒܥܬܗ ܠܚܝܠܬܐ ܕܡܬܒܥܬܐ = XIX, 327), chapter XX (ff. 51vb-52va) and the beginning of chapter XXI (*explicit:* ܚܡ ܬܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܘܬܐ = Add. 7191, f. 91rb, l. 12 from the bottom). *Lacuna*.

Ff. 57-85: the last part of chapter XXI, chapters XXII-XXV, but between f. 75rb (*explicit:* ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ = Add. 7191, f. 99va, l. 27 from the bottom) and 75va (*incipit:* ܐܝܬ ܕܡܥܡܕܘܬܐ = Add. 7191, f. 100va, l. 24) the copyist omitted part of chapter XXIV.

After chapter XXV we read f. 85va: ܐܫܬܠܡܘ ܒܟܬܒܐ ܗܢܐ ܩܦܠܐܐ ܥܣܪܝܢ ܘܚܡܫܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܘܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܡܪܝ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ ܪܫܝܥܐ. ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܠܗ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܦܠܐܐ ܚܡܫܝܢ ܒܟܠܗ ܡܢܝܢܐܝܬ.

*In this volume* (ktobo) *are complete the twenty-five chapters of the third book* (memro) *of the sainted and blessed Mar Peter, patriarch of Antioch, against the impious Damian. The whole book* (memro) *has fifty chapters in total*. After a blank space there follow five lines of arithmetical figures which Wright reads as: *The sinner David, son of the priest Denha, from the city of Arzun* (Erzerum): *Brethren, pray for me. Amen.*

On f. 85vb the original note has been carefully erased and also a later one which was written over it. At the bottom of the column there is a double note, written by the same hand as the arithmetical figures: .... ܕܕܝܪܐ ܡܩܕܫܬܐ ܕܝܠܕܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܪܝܡ ܕܒܡܕܒܪܐ ܕܐܣܩܝܛܐ ܠܓܘܝܐ. — ܕܘܝܕ ܚܛܝܐ ܘܡܣܟܢܐ ܕܐܘܣ ܒܪ ܕܝܢܚܐ ܩܫܝܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܪܙܘܢ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܩܪܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܚܘܙܐ ܕܦܪܣܝܐ ܒܝܘܡ .. ܒܪܟܡܪܝ. ܐܒܗܝ̈ ܘܐܚܝ̈ ܨܠܘ ܥܠ ܡܣܟܢܘܬܝ.



*. . . . the holy monastery of Mary, mother of God, in the desert of inner (?) Scete — The humble and sinful David, the deacon, son of the priest* (ἱερεύς) *Denha from the city of Arzun, a town or moḥūz of the Persians, in the time of . . . Bless O my Lord. My fathers and brethren, pray for my humble self.*

Vaticanus Syriacus 107 (C).

Cf. ASSEMANI, *Catalogus*, pp. 49-61; J.S. ASSEMANUS, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, II, Roma, 1721, pp. 77-78; G. LEVI DELLA VIDA, *Ricerche sulla formazione del più antico fondo dei manoscritti orientali della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Studi e Testi 92), Città del Vaticano, 1939, p. 9, 209, 412-413, 416.

The manuscript is of parchment, 16,5 x 24,5 cm. Each page is divided into two columns of 5,5 cm. Each column in the part of the manuscript containing portions of *Contra Damianum* has 40-41 lines. The manuscript comes from the Monastery of the Syrians in Egypt. It was in the possession of the Jacobite bishop Moses of Sur who came to Rome with his patriarch Na'matallah and was a professor of Syriac in the Collegio dei Neofiti from 1581 until 1585. There are notes by him in the manuscript(8). The manuscript was among the 31 manuscripts given to the Vatican Library by the Collegio dei Neofiti in 1662. The list of these manuscripts, preserved in the Vatican Archives (Archivio della Biblioteca, X, f. 88), mentions it under no. 12: *Diversi diversorum auctorum tractatus theologici, nec non Canones Apostolorum ac variae controversiae. Chaldaice*. It is listed in the catalogue of Ecchellensis and Naironi in 1686 (Vat. Lat. 13201, ff. 2-45v), not as no. 15 as the Assemani erroneously write, but as no. 39(9).

Vat. Syr. 107 is an assemblage of five incomplete manuscripts(10). The first, ff. 1-62, gives several homilies of S. John Chrysostom (ASSEMANI, *Catalogus, loc cit.*, nos. 1-8), two letters of James of Sarug to the monks of Mar Bassus and Bar Sudayli

(8) Cf. LEVI DELLA VIDA, *op. cit.*, p. 420.
(9) Ibid., p. 9.
(10) Ibid., p. 419, n. 5.

(ASSEMANI, ibid., nos. 9-10)([11]) and the letter of Philoxenus of Mabbug to the priests of Edessa, Abraham and Orestes, on Stephen bar-Sudayli (ASSEMANI, ibid., no. 11)([12]); the following part of this first manuscript is Add. 14555([13]). The second manuscript included in Vat. Syr. 107 (ff. 63-70) gives two letters of Cyril of Alexandria: the first (ASSEMANI, ibid., no. 12) to Rabbula of Edessa([14]); the second letter (ASSEMANI, ibid., no. 13), is a part of the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius([15]). It continues with a letter of Paphnutius to Moses of Agel (ASSEMANI, ibid., no. 14)([16]), Moses' answer to Paphnutius (no. 15) and (ASSEMANI, ibid., no. 16) part of Moses' translation of the *Glaphyra* of Cyril of Alexandria (the other part is given in Add. 14555). The third manuscript of Vat. Syr. 107 (ff. 71-79) gives fragments of the pseudonymous *Apostolic Constitutions* (ASSEMANI, ibid., nos. 17-28). In the fourth manuscript (ff. 80-113) we have a long fragment of the treatise of Dionysius the Areopagite, *On the divine names*([17]).

The fifth manuscript of the volume (ff. 114-134) has exactly the same codicological features as Add. MS 14603. It has a double pagination, one in the right corner (115-135) and the other (114-134) at the bottom of each folio. It is the latter that we employ in this edition.

According to the Assemani, *Catalogus*, III, p. 58, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, II, p. 78 and Levi della Vida, *Ricerche*, p. 419, n. 5, this manuscript contains parts of Peter of Callinicus' work against Damian, as is indicated in a note by one of the Assemani on the top of f. 114r: *Petri iunioris Patriarchae Antiocheni*. The Assemani say that these extracts are taken from chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 84 and 88 of Peter's treatise against Damian. All this is inaccurate. Actually the contents of the manuscript are as follows:

([11]) Cf. G. OLINDER, *Iacobi Sarugensis epistulae quotquot supersunt*, CSCO 110, Paris, 1937, p. V, letters 1 and 13.

([12]) Cf. A.L. FROTHINGHAM, *Stephen Bar Sudayli, the Syrian Mystic, and the Book of Hierotheos*, Leiden, 1886, pp. 28-48; A. DE HALLEUX, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Louvain, 1963, pp. 259-262.

([13]) Cf. LEVI DELLA VIDA, *op. cit.*, p. 419, n. 5.

([14]) See CPG 5334 and 5374. J.J. OVERBECK, *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabbulae episc. Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta*, Oxford, 1865, pp. 226-229.

([15]) ACO I, I, 1, p. 37, 25-42.

([16]) A. BAUMSTARK, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn, 1922, pp. 160-161.

([17]) Cf. ibid., p. 268, n. 2.



Ff. 114-119: Extracts from a commentary on biblical texts, numbered 2-5 in the margin. No. 2 (f. 114ra-rb): Basil, *In psalmum LXI*, PG 29, 481 (῞Απαξ γάρ, φησίν ... καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐλεήμων), and Basil, In psalmum CXXV (*sic*, but actually CXV, 2): Ἐγὼ εἶπα ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου· Πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης([18]). No. 3 (ff. 114rb-117ra): John Chrysostom, *In illud, Domine non est in homine via eius*, PG 56, 159-162 (ἀλλ' ἀγαγόντες ... εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν). No. 4 (ff. 117ra-119vb): Scholia on Jer. 38, 2-4 from Severus of Antioch, Letter 27 of book 9 written after his exile, addressed to Thomas of Germanicia: *Thus saith the Lord ... and urging it to speak*([19]). No. 5 (f. 119vb): Scholia on Is. 61, 2 from Severus of Antioch, Letter 250 of the first book written before his episcopate, addressed to Theognostus: *But now it is time ... But this I say*([20]).

Ff. 120-126: chapter X without the beginning (*incipit:* ܕܡܢ ܡܘܡܐ ܡܬܓܕܪܢܐ = X, 21) and the beginning of chapter XI (*explicit:* ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܬܘܕܝܢܐ = XI, 67).

F. 127: part of chapter XIV (*incipit:* ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܪܫܝܬܐ = XIV, 92; *explicit:* ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ، = XIV, 153).

Ff. 128-131: the end of chapter XIV (*incipit:* ܠܚܡܪ ܡܚܕܪܐ ܠܟ = XIV, 217) and the beginning of chapter XV (*explicit:* ܡܢ ܕܝܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ = XV, 179).

F. 132: another part of chapter XV (*incipit:* ܠܚܠܩܝܐ ܕܐܚܠܦܬ ܚܕܒܝܢ = XV, 239; *explicit:* ܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܚܠ ܢܥܒܕ = XV, 301).

Ff. 133-134: Contrary to the description given by the Assemani these folios do not contain anything of *Contra Damianum*. They give the continuation of the patristic commentaries on ff. 114-119. F. 133 gives two lines of chapter 83 of these commentaries (*incipit:* ܬܚܝܬ ܫܘܒ ܫܠܝܛܘܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ) and the beginning of chapter 84 (*explicit:* ܕܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܟ ܡܚܫܚܝܢ). The initial part of chapter 84 deals with the status of Christ after the resurrection. It contains extracts from Severus, *Against Julian of Halicarnassus*, I([21]); Gregory of Nazianzus, Epist. 101, ad Cledonium I: Εἴ τις

([18]) Not in PG 29 but see CPG 2836.

([19]) PO 14, pp. 264-272.

([20]) Ibid., p. 273.

([21]) Cf. *Critique du Tome*, in R. HESPEL, *Sévère d'Antioche. La polémique antijulianiste*, I, CSCO 245, Louvain, 1964, p. 85, 19-24.

ἀποτεθεῖσθαι ... τὸ σαρκίον τῆς Θεότητος(22); John Chrysostom, *In II Cor.*, hom. 11: Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ... τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ(23); Severus of Antioch, from a letter to the orthodox in Emesa, beginning *To those who are not wise...*(24). F. 134 contains the end of chapter 87 giving a part of a quotation from John Chrysostom, *In Rom.* argum. : πρὸς αὐτοὺς κινήσας λόγον ὅτε ἔλεγε ... τῷ χρόνῳ διεστήκασι(25), and the beginning of chapter 88 giving a commentary on Rom. 2, 10 from John Chrysostom, *In Rom.*, hom. 5 : Δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ ... λοιπὸν εἰπεῖν λόγον(26).

In sum then, Vat. Syr. 107 supplies some fragments of the third book of Peter's *Contra Damianum*. All these fragments fall in lacunae of Add. MS 14603. The fragment given on f. 127 continues immediately from Add. 14603, f. 42vb. This confirms what was suggested by the codicological characteristics of both manuscripts: that the fifth portion of Vat. Syr. 107 is part of Add. MS 14603.

3. Vaticanus Syriacus 108 (**D**).

Assemani, *Catalogus*, pp. 61-71; J.S. Assemanus, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, II, Roma, 1721, pp. 77-78; G. Levi Della Vida, *Ricerche sulla formazione del più antico fondo dei manoscritti orientali della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Studi e Testi 92), Città del Vaticano, 1939, pp. 9, 209, 417-419.

Parchment. 16x23 cm. Each page is divided into two columns of 5 cm. Each column has 30-31 lines. The manuscript has a double pagination: one of the pages (1-429) starting on f. 3v and another of 219 folios. After two folios of modern parchment, which are not numbered, the manuscript starts with a quire of two folios (ff. 1-2) pasted together, presenting texts in a different script and presentation. Ff. 7-214 are composed of 22 quires. At the top of the last page of each quire is the title: ܕܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܡܪܝ، ܦܛܪܘܣ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ *Of patriarch Mar Peter against Damian*. Apart

(22) PG 37, 181A; *SChr.*, vol. 208, pp. 46,25 - 48,29.
(23) PG 61, 475.
(24) PO 12, p. 222, 8-10; p. 223, 4-8.
(25) PG 60, 392-393.
(26) Ibid., 426.



from the first, the quires are signed at their beginning with the old Syriac numbers and with estrangelo characters from ܒ to ܟܒ. The first quire (ff. 3-6) is incomplete and has only the four exterior folios. The following 200 folios (ff. 7-206) are made up not of quires but 'quinions' i.e. five sheets folded twice. The last quire (ff. 207-214) is incomplete. Ff. 215-216 are part of the same manuscript as f. 2. F. 216 being signed ܙ, is the first folio of its seventh quire. At the bottom of f. 215r there is a note by one of the Assemani: *In hoc et sequenti folio habetur fragmentum tractatus Philoxeni Mabugensis de uno ex Trinitate incarnato et passo*(27). Ff. 217-218 belong again to the same manuscript as ff. 7-214. On f. 219r there is a note in a more recent handwriting:

ܐܬܚܦܛ ܘܣܡ ܣܝܡܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܒܝܕ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܘܡܢ
ܕܝܠܗ: ܪܚܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܩܦܝܨܐ ܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܕܥܡܪܝܢ ܒܪܘܡܬܐ
ܕܡܓܕܠܝܬܐ ܀ ܒܝܘܡܝ ܛܘܒܢܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ ܡܪܝ. ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ
ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܘܡܪܝ ܬܐܘܡܐ ܐܦܝܣܩܦܐ ܘܒܝܘܨܦܬܐ ܕܫܡܥܘܢ
ܩܫܝܫܐ ܘܪܝܫܕܝܪܐ ܘܓܝܘܪܓܝ ܩܫܝܫܐ. ܘܒܪܚܕܒܫܒܐ (sic)
ܩܫܝܫܐ. ܘܕܢܝܐܝܠ ܩܫܝܫܐ. ܘܐܒܪܗܡ ܩܫܝܫܐ. ܘܡܩܝܡ
ܩܫܝܫܐ. ܥܡ ܫܪܟܐ ܕܩܫܝܫܐ ܘܡܫܡܫܢܐ. ܘܐܚܝܘܬܐ ܟܠܗ
ܢܛܪܬ ܒܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܟܠ ܡܢ ܕܩܪܐ ܠܗ ܠܦܘܚܡܬܐ (sic) ܗܕܐ
ܢܨܠܐ ܥܠ ܩܦܝܨ: ܘܠܐ ܢܫܒܘܩ ܠܗ ܠܚܛܝܬܗ: ܬܗܘܐ ܠܗ
ܚܘܠܩܐ ܥܡ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܡܬܢܛܪܝܢ. ܐܡܝܢ ܘܐܡܝܢ ܀

*The God-loving Qafiṣa took care to place this spiritual volume* (syomto) *at the disposal of the blessed (monks) living on the summit of the Magdalenes*(28) *with (the assistance) of God and from his own (resources), in the days of the blessed Saint Athanasius the patriarch*(29), *and Mar Thomas the bishop, and by the diligence of Simon the priest and archimandrite, George the priest, Barhadbesabbo the priest, Daniel the priest, Abraham the priest, and Maqaym the priest, together with the other priests and dea-*

(27) Cf. Assemani, *Catalogus*, p. 70.
(28) *Magdalenes*: see R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, I (Oxford, 1879), coll. 655-656; II (Oxford, 1901), col. 2002. I.-B. Chabot, *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas*, CSCO 17, Paris, 1908, p. 216, 1; CSCO 103, Paris, 1933, p. 150, 4.
(29) According to J.S. Assemani: Athanasius III (724-740). See *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, II, p. 78; J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, II (Paris, 1901), pp. 491-496, 503; III (Paris, 1905), p. 34, 450.

*cons and the whole divinely protected fraternity. Anyone who has requested this book* (penqīto) *in any way or other and does not return it to its owner, let his lot be with Judas Iscariot. Amen. Amen.* Another note on f. 219r has become illegible.

F. 219v has a note: ܠܐܝܩܪܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܩܘܪܝܩܘܣ ܘܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܡܪܝ ܬܐܘܡܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܥܝܐ ܩܫܝܫܐ ܒܪ ܝܩܝܪܐ ܛܓܪܝܬܝܐ ܡܢ ܬܓܪܝܬ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܕܡܬܩܪܝܢ ܒܢܝ ܦܫܝܩܬܐ ܐܫܬܘܬܦܘ ܘܝܗܒܘ ܠܟܬܒܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܡܪܝ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܠܕܝܪܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܝܠܕܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܒܡܕܒܪܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܐܣܩܝܛܝܣ ܕܡܨܪܝܢ ܕܒܗ ܥܡܪܝܢ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܣܘܪܝܝܐ ܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܥܠ ܦܘܪܩܢ ܢܦܫܬܗܘܢ ܘܕܟܠܗ ܒܝܬܗܘܢ ܘܐܦ ܠܘܟܪܢܐ ܕܡܥܢܕܝܗܘܢ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ: ܘܗܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܪܐ ܕܟܠ ܗܘ ܕܒܫܡܗ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܣܡܘ ܗܢܐ ܣܝܘܡܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܒܗܢܐ ܐܬܪܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܢܢܝܚ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܥܘܒܗ ܕܐܒܪܗܡ ܒܒܘܣܡܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܐ ܕܦܪܕܝܣܐ ܕܥܕܝܢ. ܘܟܠ ܡܢ ܕܩܪܐ ܒܟܬܒܐ ܗܢܐ ܘܡܬܗܢܐ ܒܗ ܢܨܠܐ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ. ܘܠܐ ܫܠܝܛ ܠܐܢܫ ܒܡܠܬܗ ܕܡܪܢ ܕܢܠܚܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܗܢܐ ܟܬܒܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܪܐ. ܐܢ ܐܝܬ ܕܡܡܪܚ ܘܥܒܪ ܥܠ ܗܢܐ: ܢܗܘܐ ܚܪܡ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ.

*In honour of the Holy Trinity, Cyriacus, Paul and Mar Thomas, sons of Yāyā the priest, son of Jaqira, Tagritians from Tagrit, the metropolitan city, known as the sons of Phašīkta, have given and donated this volume* (ktobo) *of saint Mar Peter the patriarch, to the holy monastery of the Mother of God in the holy desert of Scete in Egypt, wherein are living the sainted fathers, the Syriac monks. They have done this for the salvation of their souls and of their whole family, and to the memory of their faithful departed. May God, the master of all things, to whose holy name they placed this spiritual volume* (syomto) *in that holy place, cause them to rejoice in the bosom of Abraham, in the spiritual joys of the paradise of Eden. Anyone who reads in this book* (ktobo) *and takes pleasure in it, let him pray for them. By the word of the Lord, it is forbidden to anyone to erase this note or to take away this book* (ktobo) *from the monastery. Anyone who ventures to transgress this will be anathematized by the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.* As the Assemani remark, this note is written by the same hand as those of Vat. Syr. 105 and 106, namely by Moses of Nisibis, the abbot of the Monastery of the Syrians at Scete, who took it from Mesopotamia in 932 along with many other Syriac manuscripts(30). This manuscript, which by its script belongs to the seventh century, was evidently a gift, from the family in Tikrit named in the colophon, to the monastery. It seems not to have stayed there, since Moses of Sur (see above p. XIII) probably acquired it in the Orient(31). He gave it, as he did Vat. 107, to the Collegio dei Neofiti. From there it was transferred to the Vatican Library in 1662. It is mentioned among the manuscripts transferred from the Collegio to the Vatican Library under number 7: *Petri Archiepiscopi Antiocheni, pars postrema libri tertii de divinis notionibus. Chaldaice*(32). In the catalogue of Abraham Ecchellensis and I.M. Naironi, of 1686, it has the number 47. The Assemani, for an unknown reason, give it also the number *decimus septimus*(33).



The contents of the manuscript are as follows:

On the end-paper there is a note in the hand of one of the Assemani: *CVIII. Inter antiquos Vaticanos Syriacos 47 alias 17. Petri Iunioris cognomine Callinicensis opus adversus Damianum a cap. 26 ad 50. Nov. 108* and in another handwriting: *siriaco*.

F. 1: fragment of a spiritual work, identified by the Assemani at the bottom of f. 1v as a *Fragmentum S. Isaac Ninivitae monachi*. It is written in two columns, in a fine estrangelo similar to that of the main part of the manuscript. On f. 1r there is the seal of the Bibliothèque nationale de Paris.

F. 2: according to a note by one of the Assemani on f. 2v: *Fragmentum commentarii evangeliorum*.

F. 3r: blank. Some almost illegible Syriac words in a more recent hand. The seal of the Vatican Library.

Ff. 3va-5rb: At the top of f. 3v there is the title of the whole volume: ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܪܫܐ ܕܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ

(30) See Assemani, *Catalogus*, pp. 31, 39-40, 48-49 and index, p. 582; J. Leroy, *Moïse de Nisibe*, in *Symposium Syriacum 1972* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 197), Rome, 1974, pp. 457-470.

(31) Levi Della Vida, *op. cit.*, pp. 417-418.

(32) Ibid., p. 413.

(33) Cf. infra and Levi Della Vida, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

... ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܕܡܝܢܐ. *Of Peter, archbishop of Antioch, the latter half of the third book* (memro) *against Damian.* There follows the list of the last 25 chapters of Book III of *Contra Damianum*. The list is incomplete: f. 3v gives the titles of chapters XXVI-XXVII and three words of the title of chapter XXVIII; after a lacuna, the list resumes, f. 4r, after a few words of the title of chapter XLIV (*incipit:* ܡܢ ܕܠܗ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ). After the list: ܫܠܡ ܩܦܠܐܐ ܚܡܫܝܢ. *End of the fifty chapters.*

Ff. 5va-218va: At the top of f. 5v again the title of the whole volume as at the top of f. 3v. Chapters XXVI-L of Book III of *Contra Damianum*: chapter XXVI (ff. 5va-13vb), chapter XXVII (ff. 13vb-26vb), chapter XXVIII (ff. 26vb-36va), chapter XXIX (ff. 36va-44vb), chapter XXX (ff. 44vb-54va), chapter XXXI (ff. 54va-70vb), chapter XXXII (ff. 70vb-78ra), chapter XXXIII (ff. 78ra-88ra), chapter XXXIV (ff. 88ra-97ra), chapter XXXV (ff. 97ra-106va), chapter XXXVI (ff. 106va-112vb), chapter XXXVII (ff. 112vb-119vb), chapter XXXVIII (ff. 119vb-126vb), chapter XXXIX (ff. 126vb-136rb), chapter XL (ff. 136rb-141va), chapter XLI (ff. 141va-153va), chapter XLII (ff. 153va-160rb), chapter XLIII (ff. 160rb-165vb), chapter XLIV (ff. 165vb-174vb), chapter XLV (ff. 174vb-183rb), chapter XLVI (ff. 183rb-185vb), chapter XLVII (ff. 185vb-199vb), chapter XLVIII (ff. 199vb-207ra), chapter XLIX (ff. 207ra-212va), chapter L (ff. 212va-214vb and 217ra-218va). The last chapter is interrupted (ff. 215-216) by an unidentified text in another hand. The note at the bottom of f. 215r in the hand of one of the Assemani: *In hoc et sequenti folio habetur fragmentum tractatus Philoxeni Mabugensis de uno ex Trinitate incarnato et passo,* is inexact. The commentary given in this fragment on Ps. 22:2 and Matth. 27:46 is not in this work of Philoxenus nor in his *De Trinitate et Incarnatione*(34). After chapter L (f. 218va): ܫܠܡܬ ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܝܬܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܡܪܝ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ. *The latter half of the second volume* (ktobo) *of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian*

(34) A. de Halleux (*Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Louvain, 1963, p. 225, n. 1) thinks that the fragment comes from a monophysite work of Evagrian inspiration giving a mystical interpretation of the 'four fruits' of the tree of life (Gen. 2:9; 3:22) in the form of a dialogue between a master and his disciple.



*is finished;* and after a decorative strip: ܫܘܒܚܐ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܐܡܝܢ *Glory to the Holy Trinity. Amen.*

At the top of the last page of each quire and sometimes at the verso of the fifth folio, or, for the last quire, of the fourth folio (ff. 26v, 36v, 46v, 56v, 66v, 71v, 76v, 86v, 96v, 106v, 111v, 116v, 121v, 126v, 131v, 136v, 141v, 146v, 151v, 156v, 161v, 166v, 171v, 176v, 181v, 186v, 191v, 196v, 201v, 206v, 210v, 214v): ܕܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܡܪܝ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ. *Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.*

4. British Library, Add. 7192 and Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Sachau 201.

This manuscript contains only chapters 40 to 48 of Peter's work. It will be described in the introduction to the fourth volume of this edition.

Conclusion. For the edition of Book III, ch. I-XIX we have at our disposal, apart from the indirect tradition, only two witnesses: the Add. MS 7191, containing, with some lacunae, the whole of Book III, and the Add. MS 14603 - Vat. syr. 107, giving its first 25 chapters almost complete.

## II. *The indirect tradition.*

### 1. The *Florilegium Trinitarium* (***Flor. I***).

As we said before, this florilegium is drawn largely from the Syriac translation of Peter's *Contra Damianum*. The extent of this dependence cannot be determined exactly, because the whole of Book I and a large part of Book II of *Contra Damianum* are missing. Instead of giving a complete edition of the florilegium or a list of all its quotations — which would be very long — we will indicate here only the extracts relevant to our edition.

In vol. I of this edition references were given to this florilegium. Two of them were incomplete referring only to one (W) or two (W and X) of the four manuscripts transmitting the florilegium, when the text

occurs also in the others. It seems appropriate to repair these omissions and give a list of all the extracts from Books II and III. We may note that almost all the extracts from Book II are taken from the chapters 1-29 of the florilegium which are transmitted only in W (ff. 2va-13ra).

Book II

VI, 174-181 (165-172): W, f. 19ra
184-197 (175-189): W, f. 19ra
342-363 (331-350): W, f. 17ra-rb; X, ff. 117vb-118ra; Y, f. 82vb; Z, f. 127v.
364-372 (351-359): W, f. 17rb; X, f. 118rb; Y, ff. 82vb-83ra; Z, ff. 127v-128r.
439-451 (422-433): W, f. 10ra
493-496 (474-477): W, f. 10ra
500-512 (480-491): W, f. 10ra-rb
515-526 (493-502): W, f. 10va-vb
VII, 100-124 (94-112): W, f. 10vb
IX, 28-43 (28-42): W, f. 9va-vb
43-49 (42-47): W, f. 9vb
52-68 (49-63): W, f. 9vb
70-79 (65-73): W, ff. 9vb-10ra
111-166 (102-150): W, f. 10rb-va
253-263 (232-242): W, f. 30va
XI, 61-80 (55-71): W, f. 11ra
80-110 (71-98): W, f. 11ra-rb
239-269 (217-243): W, f. 11rb-va
XII, 138-150 (124-137): W, ff. 11vb-12ra
165-175 (149-158): W, f. 12ra
XVIII, 141-197 (132-183): W, f. 9ra-va
XIX, 18-26 (17-24): W, f. 7va
27-33 (25-31): W, f. 7va
36-60 (34-57): W, f. 7va-vb
64-73 (60-67): W, f. 7vb
73-77 (68-71): W, ff. 7vb-8ra
78-94 (72-86): W, f. 8ra
108-122 (99-111): W, f. 8ra
124-148 (113-133): W, f. 8ra-rb
208-240 (193-221): W, f. 8rb-va
240-243 (222-225): W, f. 8va



246-277 (228-255): W, f. 8va-vb
XXI, 26-32 (25-30): W, f. 6vb
34-49 (32-45): W, ff. 6vb-7ra
52-70 (48-64): W, f. 7ra-rb
72-73 (66-68): W, f. 7rb
74-89 (68-81): W, f. 7rb
92-103 (83-93): W, f. 7rb
105-120 (96-110): W, f. 7rb-va
XXII, 18-64 (17-59): W, f. 2va-vb
68-109 (63-98): W, ff. 2vb-3ra
110-126 (99-113): W, f. 3rb
128-142 (115-128): W, f. 3rb-va
148-157 (133-141): W, f. 3va
161-267 (144-243): W, ff. 3va-4rb
403-409, 415-418, 422-423, 425-428 (375-380, 386-388, 393-394, 396-398): W, f. 4va-vb
431-433 (402-403): W, f. 5ra
433-438, 438-448 (403-408, 408-417): W, f. 5rb
467-469, 469-470 (434-436, 436-437): W, f. 5va
474-476 (441-443): W, f. 5va-vb
519-522 (489-491): W, f. 5vb
522-526 (492-495): W, f. 6ra
538-545 (506-512): W, f. 6ra
545-548 (513-515): W, f. 6ra-rb
574-584 (540-547): W, f. 6rb-va
621-628 (582-589): W, f. 6va
633-635 (594-596): W, f. 6va
644-648, 663-665 (604-607, 623-624): W, f. 6vb

Book III

I, 44-50 (42-47): W, f. 21vb; X, f. 128rb-va; Y, f. 87rb; Z, f. 131v
76-81 (72-76): W, f. 13rb-va; X, ff. 95vb-96ra; Y, f. 73rb-va; Z, f. 120r
138-173 (125-157): W, f. 23ra-rb; X, ff. 131vb-132vb; Y, ff. 88vb-89ra; Z, f. 133r
IV, 49-102 (46-89): W, f. 31ra-va
114-152 (100-135): W, f. 31va

205-219 (185-198): W, f. 31ra
237-280 (213-249): W, f. 31vb
281-289 (250-288): W, f. 32ra
342-370 (303-328): W, f. 32ra
387-419 (343-369): W, f. 32ra-rb
429-437 (378-384): W, f. 14va; X, f. 99ra; Y, f. 74vb; Z, f. 121r
VIII, 101-103(95-97): W, f. 17va; X, f. 118vb; Y, f. 83ra; Z, f. 128r
104-110 (98-103): W, f. 17va; X, f. 118vb; Y, f. 83ra; Z, f. 128r
110-115 (103-107): W, f. 3ra
117-122 (108-113): W, f. 17va; Y, f. 83ra; Z, f. 128r
131-136 (121-126): W, f. 17va; Y, f. 83rb; Z, f. 128r
138-152 (128-141): W, f. 7ra
140-150 (131-139): W, f. 17va; Y, f. 83rb; Z, f. 128r
215-223 (201-209): W, f. 17va-vb; Y, f. 83rb; Z, f. 128r
251-261 (234-243): W, ff. 12ra, 17vb; Y, f. 83rb; Z, f. 128r
266-273 (249-254): W, f. 17vb; Y, f. 83rb-va; Z, f. 128r-v
306-307 (286-287): W, f. 17vb; Y, f. 83va; Z, f. 128v
308-313 (287-291): W, f. 17vb; X, f. 119ra; Y, f. 83va; Z, f. 128v
314-322 (292-298): W, f. 17vb; X, f. 119ra; Y, f. 83va; Z, f. 128v
323-328 (299-303): W, f. 17vb; X, f. 119ra-rb; Y, f. 83va; Z, f. 128v
392-399 (362-367): W, ff. 17vb-18ra; X, f. 119rb; Y, f. 83va; Z, f. 128v
512-521 (469-477): W, f. 30rb
524-529 (479-485): W, ff. 24ra, 26ra; X, ff. 107rb-va, 112vb; Y, ff. 78rb, 80va; Z, ff. 124r, 126r
556-562 (506-510): W, f. 24rb; X, ff. 107vb-108ra; Y, f. 78va; Z, f. 124r
IX, 60-62 (56-58): W, f. 24rb; X, f. 108ra; Y, f. 78va; Z, f. 124r
X, 286-289 (271-273): W, f. 26rb; X, f. 113va; Y, f. 80vb; Z, f. 126r
XIII, 18-50 (20-54): W, f. 28rb-va



59-86 (64-88): W, f. 28va-vb
99-101 (100-103): W, f. 28vb
112-120 (114-122): W, f. 28vb
XV, 320-321 (280-281): W, f. 25ra; X, f. 110ra; Y, f. 79rb; Z, f. 125r
330-332 (289-291): W, f. 27ra; X, f. 115rb; Y, f. 81va-vb; Z, f. 127r
465-471 (413-419): W, f. 28ra-rb
474-477 (421-424): W, f. 25vb; X, f. 112ra-rb; Y, f. 80rb; Z, f. 125v
495-500 (441-445): W, f. 28rb
XVI, 181-183 (167-169): W, f. 7va
XVII, 126-130 (117-120): W, f. 30va
126-132 (117-122): W, f. 7va
167-174 (157-163): W, f. 30rb
192-198 (178-184): W, f. 30rb-va
262-266 (241-245): W, f. 24va; X, f. 108va-vb; Y, f. 78vb; Z, f. 124v
323-341 (293-307): W, f. 24vb; X, f. 109ra-rb; Y, f. 79ra; Z, f. 124v
472-476 (419-423): W, f. 16vb; X, f. 105ra-rb; Y, f. 77va; Z, f. 123r-v
XVIII, 49-51 (43-44): W, f. 15rb; X, ff. 100vb-101ra; Y, f. 75va; Z, f. 121v
156-159 (133-135): W, f. 24ra-rb; X, ff. 106vb-107ra; Y, f. 78ra; Z, f. 124r
159-162 (136-138): W, f. 24rb; X, f. 107ra; Y, f. 78ra; Z, f. 124r
XIX, 49-52 (47-51): W, f. 15va; X, f. 101rb; Y, f. 75vb; Z, f. 122r

2. The florilegium of texts by Peter in Add. MS 14533, ff. 147va-161ra (**Flor. II**).

In the first volume of this edition of the *Contra Damianum* (pp. 9-13 and p. 203) were reproduced six extracts from Book II, taken from this florilegium, which are not to be found in the main manuscript, Add. MS 7191. Twelve others were mentioned in the apparatus (pp. 99, 105, 107, 121, 131, 147, 155, 157, 201, 205,

219). Of Book III the florilegium gives 59 extracts. They do not add anything to the text transmitted in the direct tradition, except in the case of chapter XV, 444-493 (noted above, p. VIII and marked in the list below with an asterisk). We list them here with the indication of their place in the chapters I-XIX edited in this volume, or, for the following chapters, their place in Add. MS 7191 or, when their are lacking in this manuscript, in Add. MS 14603 or Vat. syr. 108.

III, 105-128 (96-117): Y, f. 149rb (already printed erroneously in vol. I, Unc., 94-116).
180-188 (161-169): Y, f. 149rb-va
V, 129-192 (118-177): Y, ff. 149va-150ra
VII, 105-116 (98-110): Y, f. 150ra
VIII, 62-97 (58-91): Y, f. 150ra-rb
154-170 (143-158): Y, f. 150rb-va
203-207 (189-193): Y, f. 150va
IX, 228-254 (218-240): Y, f. 150va-vb
X, 24-47 (25-51): Y, ff. 150vb-151ra
144-225 (145-215): Y, f. 151ra-151vb
XI, 76-89 (69-81): Y, f. 151vb
207-304 (185-269): Y, ff. 151vb-152va
XII, 60-70 (59-68): Y, f. 152va-vb
145-215 (143-211): Y, ff. 152vb-153rb
XIII, 18-146 (20-147): Y, ff. 153rb-154va
XV, 315-329 (276-288): Y, f. 154va
338-350 (296-306): Y, f. 154va-vb
358-369 (313-322): Y, f. 154vb
444-493 (393-440): Y, ff. 154vb-155ra *
XVIII, 258-264 (225-230): Y, f. 155rb
284-293 (250-257): Y, f. 155rb
XXII, Add. 7191, f. 94rb: Y, f. 155rb-va
Add. 7191, f. 94va-vb: Y, f. 155va-vb
Add. 14603, ff. 62vb-63va: Y, ff. 155vb-156rb
Add. 7191, f. 95rb-va: Y, f. 156rb-va
XXIII, Add. 7191, f. 96va-vb: Y, f. 156va-vb
Add. 7191, f. 98rb-va: Y, ff. 156vb-157ra
Add. 7191, f. 98va: Y, f. 157ra-rb
XXIV, Add. 7191, f. 100rb-vb: Y, ff. 157rb-158ra
XXV, Add. 7191, f. 101ra-rb: Y, f. 158ra
Add. 7191, f. 102vb: Y, f. 158ra



XXVI, Add. 7191, f. 106vb: Y, f. 158ra-rb
XXVII, Add.7191, f. 107rb-va: Y, f. 158rb
Add. 7191, f. 107vb: Y, f. 158rb
Add. 7191, f. 108rb: Y, f. 158rb-va
XXIX, Add. 7191, f. 114vb: Y, f. 158va
XXX, Add. 7191, f. 116va: Y, f. 158va
Add. 7191, f. 117rb-va: Y, f. 158va-vb
Add. 7191, f. 117va-vb: Y, f. 158vb
XXXI, Vat. syr. 108, f. 57va-vb: Y, f. 158vb
Add. 7191, f. 121ra: Y, ff. 158vb-159ra
XXXII, Add. 7191, f. 124ra: Y, f. 159ra
Add. 7191, f. 124rb-va: Y, f. 159ra-rb
XXXIII, Add. 7191, f. 126ra-rb: Y, f. 159rb-va
Add. 7191, f. 126rb-va: Y, f. 159va
Add. 7191, f. 126vb: Y, f. 159va
XXXIV, Add. 7191, f. 129vb: Y, f. 159va
Add. 7191, f. 131ra-rb: Y, f. 159va-vb
XXXV, Add. 7191, f. 133vb: Y, ff. 159vb-160ra
Add. 7191, f. 134ra: Y, f. 160ra
Add. 7191, f. 134rb: Y, f. 160ra-rb
Add. 7191, f. 134rb-va: Y, f. 160rb
XXXVI, Add. 7191, f. 135rb: Y, f. 160rb-va
Add. 7191, f. 136vb: Y, f. 160va
XXXIX, Add. 7191, f. 143ra: Y, f. 160va
XLIII, Add. 7191, f. 154ra-rb: Y, f. 160va-vb
XLIV, Add. 7191, f. 157ra: Y, ff. 160vb-161ra

## Acknowledgements

R.Y. Ebied is grateful to the Australian Research Council for generous financial support which enabled him to travel to Berlin, London and Rome in order to examine manuscripts preserved in library collections. He also wishes to express his gratitude to the Masters and Fellows of Trinity Hall, University of Cambridge, for granting him a Visiting Fellowship in 1993/94 during which this and subsequent volumes were completed.

The editors owe a special debt of gratitude to Jacques Noret, whose vigilant eye and attention to detail have detected many blemishes they had overlooked. For those that remain they are of course responsible solely.

## ANALYSIS OF BOOK III, CHAPTERS 1-19

Most of Book III published in this volume (ch. 1-19) contains a critique of the arguments put forward by Damian in his *Many-lined Letter* to prove that the divine hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are identical with their characteristic properties, viz. ingeneracy, generacy (fatherhood and sonship) and procession. Only in ch. 19 does Peter attack Damian's *Festal letters* of 586 and 587. In this analysis we repeat the extracts from Damian and give a summary of Peter's responses.

### *Chapter I*

Damian attempts to negate the proper and individual subsistence of the divine hypostases; sometimes he confesses them to be names and terms; sometimes to be characteristic properties of the prosopa; sometimes to belong with the substance and innate in it. In the preceding pages, says Peter, it has been sufficiently demonstrated that the hypostases of the Trinity are not names or terms but realities. Now he will show that the hypostases are not merely the characteristic properties, ingeneracy, generacy and procession, as Damian claims. The Patriarch of Alexandria wrote in the ninth chapter of his treatise *Against the Tritheists*:

> However, seeing that the matter has been explained by the previous statements, let us quickly recall that it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance 'hypostases' and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert that they characterize the prosopa or hypostases, and use certain wordy expressions of this kind about them.
>
> For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius, writing against heresies and saying: 'The term "hypostases" shall not disturb people, for the reason the Easterns say "hypostases" is to indicate the subsisting and existing properties of the prosopa' and again: 'They have good grounds for denominating the properties of the prosopa "subsisting hypostases", as we said before, because the Holy Ghost also subsists'?
>
> And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea: 'For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the

two: the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property'? Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis 'indicative of the property' (ll. 40-60).

No orthodox thinker will deny that the hypostases can be *named* 'properties'. Gregory the Theologian in his oration *On the Holy Ghost* names Father, Son and Holy Ghost 'properties'; in his oration *On the Lights* he has the expression 'properties or hypostases' and in his oration *Against the Arians* he defines the Trinity as being 'one nature in three spiritual, perfect properties' (ll. 61-80). But Damian claims that according to the fathers the divine hypostases *are* the characteristic properties, viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession. That is the doctrine he has to prove with patristic testimonies (ll. 81-91).

That Damian actually defined ingenerary, generacy and procession as the divine hypostases is manifest from the words just quoted from his treatise *Against the Tritheists* and even more clearly from what he wrote in his *Many-lined Letter*:

For the Father being the Father and not the Son or the Holy Ghost has the unique indication of the fatherhood, which is called his 'hypostasis' or 'property' without distinction. Likewise the Son, being the Son and not the Father or the Holy Ghost has the unique and incommunicable indication of the sonship, which is his hypostasis and property. Take the same view of the Holy Ghost's procession, which indicates his existence without being the Father or the Son.

And again, towards the conclusion of the same letter, he speaks as follows:

For if you thought of the property only as being a hypostasis when it subsists in the substance and has reality in the community, but that property as being substantial which fully participates in the substance and is not the aggregate of substance and property, we shall say that this doctrine belongs to your orthodox teaching and no right-thinking man will dispute the fact.

And again:

Hence being led a little further towards the aim of the matter proposed to my humble self, I said that he who is glorified is not mere ingeneracy, generacy and procession because the terms do not indicate the substance; no, it is the fullness of the preaching of the mystery that we reckon that these things are substantial: three perfect hypostases and three prosopa in the one substance of the Godhead (ll. 92-124).

Damian, then, must prove that the fathers take his view *expressis verbis*. For he wrote again in the same *Many-lined Letter*:



Reverend brother, it has clearly been proved from this that our humble selves have not innovated so much as a jot or a tittle; no, we have drawn from the well of the fathers and brought therefrom the pure water of their teaching.

And after a few lines:

Surely, therefore, nobody can indicate a word of ours or syllable, thought, mode of discussion or logical deduction, which is not gathered and gleaned from collecting the crumbs which fall from the loaf of doctrine. Let anyone, then, who will, show what things in our previous passages are not the *ipsissima verba* of the holy fathers, and not condemn us without reason with a pretence of charity (ll. 125-157).

That is emptiness and vain glory. Peter invites the reader to see whether in his apologies Damian has been able to confirm his opinion by the fathers. In what follows Peter will examine whether his opponent has shown indeed that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are fatherhood, sonship and procession (ll. 158-183).

*Chapter II*

Indeed, he has not, and Damian himself confesses his uncertainty when he writes that the fathers frequently assert that the properties characterize the prosopa or the hypostases, intimating that properties and hypostases are not the same thing (ll. 11-17).

In his refutation Peter will not follow human wisdom as does Damian, but only the inspired doctors of the Church. Severus also in his *Letter to Eustathius the Scholasticus* confesses to be of a very rustic disposition and content to follow only the orthodox doctors (ll. 18-62). If Damian had done the same, he would not have needed to rely on snippets but would have adduced valid texts of the fathers (ll. 62-74).

Perhaps Damian will say that he has already done this in the response he gave Peter in his *Many-lined Letter*, in which he accuses his opponents of empty and fatuous criticism, writing:

Such are their views. What are we to say to them, if not that those who, according to what you said, are aflame with warm zeal for orthodoxy ought not just to offer mere disparagement and censure but ought also to correct, and say how these things can be taken by the opponents in another way and which of my views are not fortified with patristic confirmation? For we ought not only to take account of wrongful action or statement but also re-introduce right action and due statement. Because it is not simply the combatant but the lawful combatant who is crowned;

and not all zeal is good – only zeal with knowledge. The Apostle, indeed, bade us to be zealous for great spiritual gifts. For I declare with Truth himself in audience: I should have defined such people as my teachers and helpers. But as it is, having merely asserted that my words are capable of being taken by the opponents in a different sense without saying how and without mention in a brotherly way of their not being patristic, they have smeared them with empty, fatuous criticism. And it is surprising that one should be convicted of failing to adhere to the fathers' teaching in the very passages where one condemns the statements of one's opponents for failing to accord with the fathers' teaching and declared that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to take such a view' (ll. 75-105).

Peter will not respond to Damian's criticism, but only pull up the roots of his heretical opinion by the divinely inspired fathers' teaching, as Gregory of Nyssa undertakes to do in his *Refutation of Eunomius*. Such was his behaviour with Damian from the beginning when he made some remarks on his *Against the Tritheists* in an irenic and submissive note full of praises and later sent him humble petitions from Paralos. Damian reacted to them like a wild animal. In another passage of his *Refutation*, Gregory relates that Saint Basil showed the same sort of sympathy to Eunomius but was also treated brutally by the heretic. Severus suffered a similar fate from Julian, as he declares in his treatise *Against the additions* (ll. 106-199).

*Chapter III*

Damian in his *Many-lined Letter*, as quoted in ch. II, ll. 101-105, has claimed that it is absurd to be criticized for disloyalty to the fathers at those points on which he had, in his treatise *Against the Tritheists*, ch. IX, declared his intention to follow them in rebutting his opponents (ll. 8-14). Peter responds that it is fully possible while rebutting one heresy to fall into the opposite heresy (ll. 14-27). The fathers were aware of this peril and Peter quotes in support three texts by Gregory Nazianzen from *Orr. 20, 4* and *21* (ll. 28-52), in which Gregory urges his hearers to take the *via media* between Arianism and Sabellianism. Peter, following his usual practice, now goes on to underline the points made in these texts and exhorts 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. 53-125).



Peter, he says, never criticized Damian for refuting tritheism, as Damian pretends, but because he teaches that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases. The Alexandrine Patriarch, in his *Many-lined Letter*, has obscured Peter's true reproach by transcribing the remark in his *Against the Tritheists* incompletely. Here he wrote: 'It is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance "hypostases" and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert they "characterize" the prosopa or hypostases'; whereas in his *Many-lined Letter* he put it vaguely: 'It is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching *to take such a view*'. The error of the tritheists Damian had to refute was not that they did not consider the characteristic properties hypostases but that they made the one divine substance a fiction and a fantasy and professed three substances, three natures and three godheads. If Damian had proved that his view of the hypostases is patristic, he would be entitled to surprise at Peter's criticism (ll. 126-175).

In his *Many-lined Letter* Damian claims that he produced this proof in his treatise *Against the Tritheists*. He writes:

> Had I not written this down earlier, I should not be free from just rebuke. But if the refutation of opponents derived from the ideas and words of the fathers, let us banish the aspersion on the teaching of inspired men. Let us examine the passage, then, in detail. For I briefly mentioned there that it was 'hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance "hypostases"'. If, therefore, the statement is false and the God-clad teachers of truth did not call either the properties of the prosopa viewed in the Godhead and the one identical substance, or the properties of the substance, 'hypostases', let someone prove the fact and he shall gain me as a fellow-critic of my statement. For I am not dismayed by a rebuttal but feel the hurt done to the truth because though it did not rebut anything it came as a rebuttal. But if in that very chapter and place were adduced testimonies from the fathers which confirm the statement, let no one fault the truth. For after the passage not one word interrupted the testimony adduced, for the very reason that it terminated the section it stood in, as follows: 'Let us quickly recall that it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance "hypostases" and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert that they characterize the prosopa or hypostases, and use certain wordy expressions of this kind about them. For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius writing against heresies and saying: "The term 'hypostases' shall not disturb people, for

the reason the Easterns say 'hypostases' is to indicate the subsisting and existing properties of the prosopa", and again: "They have good grounds for denominating the properties of the prosopa 'subsisting hypostases', as we said before, because the Holy Ghost subsists"? And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea: "For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property"? Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostases "indicative of the property"' (ll. 176-211).

Peter analyses Damian's text phrase by phrase, finding many points to criticize. Damian cunningly pretends to confirm his orthodoxy by the fathers and makes it appear that he is fighting against strangers to the Church of the orthodox; in his repetition of what he said in *Against the Tritheists*, he omits the phrase expressing his uncertainty: 'Even though the doctors frequently assert that they characterize the prosopa or hypostases'; he was not criticized for only *calling* the hypostases 'properties'; what does it matter that the properties of the substance are not hypostases? Peter's rebuttal of his *Against the Tritheists* was graver than he says (ll. 212-263). The testimonies of Epiphanius and Severus quoted by Damian in the text will be examined in the following chapter (ll. 264-277).

*Chapter IV*

First Peter picks up the two proof-texts of Epiphanius. Damian himself, Peter writes, considered them as inadequate and removed them from a second redaction of the passage in his *Against the Tritheists* and in his *Many-lined Letter* and substituted for them a proof-text from Gregory Nazianzen (ll. 14-37). Nevertheless he will explain why the fathers used the term 'properties' to indicate the hypostases. The reason was not a divergence of doctrine but only a different meaning given to the term 'hypostasis'. The fact is illustrated with quotations from Athanasius' *Tome to the Antiochenes* and the Theologian's *Oration on the burial of the famous Athanasius* (ll. 38-135).

But, contrary to the quarrel between the followers of Paulinus and those of Meletius, the present controversy is not at all verbal:



Peter will happily *name* the hypostases 'properties', as also the fathers did, in the sense of perfect, individually subsisting properties, but will not define them as only their names or their characteristic properties (ll. 136-207). Not only the Theologian but also Basil in his *Letter to Count Terentius* and Acacius in a *Letter to Cyril*, relating the dissension between Easterns and Westerns about the term 'hypostasis', show that the fathers did not decline the use of terms unfamiliar to them to establish peace and harmony (ll. 208-319). The dissension had been removed for the most part in the days of Athanasius, but lasted till the time of the Cappadocians and even of Severus, as quotations from Basil, Acacius, Gregory Nazianzen and Severus show (ll. 320-396). Extracts from a letter of Liberius to Athanasius and from a decree of a Roman synod confirm that the Italians professed the Trinity only one hypostasis (ll. 397-418). A survey of the controversy teaches that the Eastern fathers by using the expression 'properties' sought to convince the Westerns that they were of a common mind. That is what Gregory Nazianzen explains in his *Oration on the burial of the famous Athanasius*. In this context the term 'properties' is synonymous with 'hypostases' and 'prosopa' (e.g. in Damasus' blessing in his *Third oration against the Arians*) and does not indicate ingeneracy, generacy and procession (ll. 419-493).

*Chapter V*

As was said at the end of the preceding chapter, the term 'properties' does not always indicate the characteristic properties of the hypostases. In the ninth chapter of his *Against the Tritheists*, Damian demands clear and frequent testimonies when proofs are drawn from the fathers, but he himself does not comply with this demand. The obscure and occasional statements he produces prove only that in rare instances did the fathers *call* the divine hypostases 'properties'; such statements do not prove that they are their characteristic properties. That is the sort of evidence Athanasius pilloried in his *Encyclical letter* and Gregory of Nyssa in his *Refutation of Eunomius* (ll. 14-95).

Perhaps Damian will reply that the Theologian, by saying in his *Oration on the burial of the famous Athanasius* (IV, ll. 111-112) that the expression 'three hypostases' indicates 'the properties of the three', ruled absolutely that the hypostases are ingeneracy,

generacy and procession. But no proof of this was offered and nothing will stop us maintaining that the 'properties' are the same thing as the three hypostases: e.g. in the expression 'the hypostases of Peter, Paul and John', the term 'hypostases' indicates the same as 'Peter, Paul and John', and when we speak of 'manhood's substance', we do not mean something other than manhood. The use of the genitive is ambiguous. Only the context can determine whether the expression 'the properties of Father, Son and Holy Ghost' means the characteristic properties or the hypostases themselves (ll. 96-177). Therefore also the phrases of Epiphanius, quoted by Damian, saying that the hypostases indicate 'the properties of the prosopa' does not necessarily imply that the doctor speaks of the characteristic properties of the prosopa and not of the prosopa themselves (ll. 178-190).

As for these proof-texts from Epiphanius, Peter discovered that Damian, having evidently become apprised of the fact that they are not the fathers's words but quotations from a text of dubious orthodoxy, had removed them from later copies of his *Against the Tritheists* and his *Many-lined Letter* and substituted a proof-text from Gregory Nazianzen's *On the Lights* (ll. 191-281). After this 'falsification' he had to change two other passages. When quoting the Theologian's text a second time he added in the second redaction: 'as we have already said', and instead of saying, as in the first redaction: 'as Saint Epiphanius testified when defending the Easterns', he put: 'as we have adduced God-clad fathers teaching in many other passages' (ll. 282-346).

### *Chapter VI*

In this short chapter Peter says that Damian's last resort against the assaults will be the sort of countercharge of falsification that Julian of Halicarnassus devised against Severus, according to a declaration of the patriarch in his treatise *Against Julian's additions* (ll. 7-45). But the larger part of the chapter deals with an anomaly in the passage of the *Many-lined Letter* quoted in V, ll. 300-313. Here Damian promises further testimonies but actually repeats only the passage of the Theologian given a little earlier without even recording the proof-text of Severus annexed to it. In an unidentified text, Severus condemns such behaviour (ll. 46-125).



### *Chapter VII*

Having criticized in the preceding chapters Damian's proof-texts from Epiphanius and Gregory the Theologian, Peter passes on in this chapter to the third testimony Damian invoked in his treatise *Against the Tritheists*, namely a passage of Severus of Antioch saying that 'hypostasis' is 'indicative of the property' (ll. 10-23).

Peter rebukes Damian for carelessness in his references. He did not specify the source of Severus' statement; neither had he done so previously in the case of Epiphanius' phrases. Severus himself was always very accurate in quoting the fathers and reproached Julian of Halicarnassus and Felicissimus for their negligence (ll. 24-69).

After this remark which might be considered trifling, Peter elucidates the meaning of Severus' statement, taken in fact from his *Contra impium Grammaticum*, II, 17. If Damian interprets it as meaning that the hypostasis can be *called* 'property', he will not contradict him, as he has already declared many times; but he claims that it is improper to reckon the hypostases of the Holy Trinity as characteristic properties (ll. 70-94). Why, indeed, is the term 'property' in Severus' phrase taken by Damian as indicating the characteristic property of the hypostasis and not a single prosopon? (ll. 95-103). Moreover, even if it is granted that 'property' here indicates the characteristic property, Severus' statement does not mean necessarily that the hypostasis is the characteristic property, because indicator and indicated are not always the same (ll. 104-110).

### *Chapter VIII*

As the heading says, the chapter has two sections: (i) If, as Damian claims, the characteristic property is the same thing as the hypostasis, the phrase of Severus 'the hypostasis is indicative of the property' means that indicator and indicated are one and the same thing. This is not always the case. (ii) This is proved from the fathers.

(i) Damian tried to prove the identity of indicator and indicated from Gregory Nazianzen, Proclus and Severus (ll. 12-50). From these texts he has deduced 'a general canon that *all* indicators, signifiers and characterizers are the same as the indicated, signified

and characterized' and that consequently Severus' phrase 'the hypostasis is indicative of the property' means that, the hypostasis and the property are identical. Peter replies that Damian's canon is not general, is true only in some cases and not in others and that, consequently, Damian must prove that it has to be applied to the hypostasis and the property (ll. 51-91).

(ii) From texts of Basil (ll. 91-193), Gregory Nazianzen (ll. 194-231), Gregory of Nyssa (ll. 232-282), Cyril (ll. 283-358), Severus (ll. 359-375) and Theodosius (ll. 376-408) it is clear that the fathers do not admit the general canon of Damian but distinguish sometimes between indicators and indicated. Theodosius e.g. says that the characteristic properties of the Godhead characterize the Godhead but does not mean that these characteristic properties are the same thing as the Godhead (ll. 409-438). Indeed, Basil (ll. 439-477), Gregory Nazianzen (ll. 478-487), Cyril (ll. 488-504) and Severus (ll. 505-517) teach the contrary. Consequently, just as Gregory of Nyssa demanded proof from Eunomius instead of mere assertions, so Damian must prove his identification of characteristic properties and hypostases (ll. 518-542). He has also to explain why while, according to Theodosius, the characteristic properties of the Godhead are indicative of the Godhead and are not identical with it, the characteristic properties of the hypostases are identical with them (ll. 543-548).

*Chapter IX*

This chapter continues the reasoning and even the sentence of the previous chapter: Peter asks Damian to prove that his canon about the identity of the characteristic properties with what is characterized by them is applicable within the created order (ll. 11-24). Cyril and Severus clearly distinguish between the natural properties and the substance even in the case of created nature (ll. 25-71); and Severus clearly distinguishes the characteristic properties of the hypostases from the hypostases themselves, when in a passage of his *Contra impium Grammaticum* he describes the characteristic properties of Job and Elkanah. Nobody of sane mind will say that the characteristic properties he enumerates or the collection of these properties *are* Job or Elkanah themselves. Moreover, how can these characteristic properties concur, make up a collection, there not being given an hypostasis with which they are



capable of concurring? And how can the characteristic properties of Job and Elkanah rehearsed by Severus constitute their hypostases, seeing that they were not innate in them but came to belong to them latterly? (ll. 72-175).

Perhaps Damian will answer to the last consideration that only the permanent and inseparable characteristics of Job and Elkanah constitute their hypostases. That will lead to absurd ideas (ll. 176-196). Maybe Damian will argue that in man, a creature, characteristic properties cannot be hypostases but that in the Holy Trinity we must profess the characteristic properties as hypostases, because here nothing is accidental, imperfect, non-subsisting or imaginary. Peter, evidently, agrees with the second part of the claim but retorts that not he but the theologians who consider the hypostases to be characteristic properties, make the whole mystery of Godhead something imperfect, non-subsisting and imaginary and even negate completely the Holy Trinity, because the divine hypostases, if identified with the characteristic properties, which do not subsist individually, will not be real hypostases (ll. 196-224). This retort of Peter does not imply that he considers the characteristic properties in God imperfect; no, in his view they are perfect but perfect only as characteristic properties (ll. 224-230). If to be perfect the characteristic properties of the *hypostases* must be the hypostases themselves, we have to say also that the characteristic properties of the divine *nature* are the nature itself (ll. 230-240).

It remains to be considered, someone may say, that Basil defines the hypostasis as the collection of properties. A full explanation of this definition will be given afterwards. For the moment it will suffice to remark that Basil did not define the hypostasis merely as the collection of properties but as the collection of properties *belonging with each of the hypostases* (ll. 241-256).

Peter reverts to the explanation of Severus' phrase, quoted in chapter IX of the treatise *Against the Tritheists*, that 'the hypostasis is indicative of the property'. For Damian, this phrase means that the characteristic properties are not accidents or natural indications (Severus in his *Against Felicissimus* opposes hypostases to natural indications) (ll. 257-277). Damian, says Peter, did not prove his interpretation (ll. 278-298). Moreover he fought shy of enunciating his thesis openly and instead of mentioning the *characteristic* properties of the prosopa, he spoke simply of the prop-

erties (ll. 299-312). His interpretation of Severus' text is not proved from the fathers, who never, even in created things, identify the characteristic properties with the object characterized by them. If the characteristic properties are the hypostases, because they indicate one another, we must also identify the nature of God with its characteristic properties (ll. 313-385).

*Chapter X*

In this chapter Peter continues to refute the interpretation given by Damian of Severus' affirmation that 'the hypostasis is indicative of the property'. Even if we allow, Peter says, that Severus understood here 'the property' in the sense of 'the characteristic property', his phrase does not mean that for him the hypostasis *is* the characteristic property; 'hypostasis' and 'property' are different terms for one and the same thing: as e.g. in the phrases 'Godhead's nature is signified by substance', 'substance is indicated by Godhead', 'hypostasis is characteristic of a single substrate', the terms 'Godhead', 'nature', 'substance' and also the terms 'hypostasis' and 'a single substrate' indicate the same thing. From Severus' statement one cannot conclude that the hypostasis is only a characteristic property so that it could be said that 'the hypostasis is a property of a single substrate' (ll. 15-51). Peter repeats parts of the texts of Gregory Nazianzen, Proclus and Severus, which were adduced by Damian to prove his opinion and quoted already in ch. VIII, ll. 16-50, in which the phrases mentioned above, are used (ll. 52-74).

Damian in his letter to the bishops of the Eastern province argued from Severus' assertion 'hypostasis is characteristic of a substrate', that his opponents, because they do not admit the identity of the characteristic properties with the characterized hypostases, have to think necessarily of hypostases of hypostases (ll. 75-97). Peter retorts that the fathers ruled that characterizers and characterized cannot be identical; and that, as is the case in such expressions as 'the nature of God is indicated by "substance"', the terms 'hypostasis' and 'substrate' in Severus' assertion must be understood as meaning the same thing. As the first phrase does not force us to think of substances of the divine substance, the second does not compell us to speak of hypostases of hypostases (ll. 98-151).

Does Peter's explanation not contradict what Cyril wrote in the third chapter of his *Thesaurus* — the text was already quoted in ch. VIII, ll. 287-291 — that the indicated is not the same thing as the indicator, a principle admitted also by Peter himself? Peter replies that there can be no question of indicator and indicated when there is no difference at all between the words; e.g. one cannot say: 'the Godhead signifies Godhead'. The fathers use different terms for the same thing when they say: 'The Godhead indicates the substance'. The different names 'Godhead' and 'substance' in this phrase are synonyms. Severus' assertion that 'hypostasis is characteristic of a substrate' explains that the names 'hypostasis' and 'substrate' are also synonyms (ll. 152-243). The texts of Gregory Nazianzen, Proclus and Severus previously quoted are produced to show the need for making synonyms plain (ll. 244-257); and quotations from Basil's letter to his brother *On Substance and Hypostasis* and another to Amphilochius, and quotations from Gregory's oration on Athanasius and his *Farewell Address to the bishops* (the last quoted by Damian in his *Many-lined Letter*) show also that the same reality can be indicated by different names (ll. 257-361). These texts moreover indicate that realities are not the same thing as terms (ll. 362-376).

*Chapter XI*

This chapter concerns the same point as had been made in chapter X: even when the fathers do not say it expressly, 'Godhead', 'substance', 'nature' and also 'hypostases', 'properties' do not mean the realities but the terms. Peter will prove this from the passage of Damian's *Letter to the Bishops of the East*, part of which has already been quoted in ch. VIII, ll. 35-50, where he gives two quotations from Severus' *Against the impious Grammarian* II, 4 and II, 1, containing the phrases, discussed already in previous chapters: 'Substance is indicative of the community and the generic sense, whereas hypostasis is characteristic of a single separate substrate' and 'Substance is indicative of the genus and the sense inclusive of many species, whereas hypostasis is a determination of some one species, i.e. it is indicative of the prosopon, having by its property non-participation with the fellow-members of the genus and embracing the substrate in its proper mark' (ll. 8-52).

Peter complains of Damian's lack of accuracy in quoting Severus' texts. First, his references are wrong; the quotations are

not taken from the *first* book of the *Against the impious Grammarian*, but from the first chapter of the second book. Secondly, in the second text Damian inserted, Peter says, the explanation: 'i.e. it is indicative of the prosopon' (N.B. Lebon's text has something similar to Damian's: 'Hypostasis ... is indicative of one form, i.e. of one prosopon'. Here Peter himself seems not quite accurate) (ll. 53-68).

After this remark on Damian's carelessness in quoting Severus, Peter proceeds to the examination of his argument. It reposes entirely, Peter explains, on Damian's presupposition that *all* characterizers are identical with what they characterize. But this postulate is wrong, because it has been proved in what precedes that the characteristic properties of the nature are not identical with the nature, neither those of the hypostases with the hypostases, nor again — what is important to remark in this chapter — the terms identical with the realities they signify. Nevertheless, Peter will make an examination of the statements of Severus and show their genuine meaning from the context (ll. 69-91).

There follow many quotations from Severus. The manuscripts have a lacuna here, but in what remains Peter quotes several texts from the *Against the impious Grammarian* II, 1, II, 2 and II, 5, to conclude that in the definitions of 'substance', 'nature' and 'hypostasis' given there, Severus intends to teach us what the *terms* not the realities are indicative of (ll. 92-169).

Perhaps Damian will retort that Severus sometimes speaks, in the same sense, of the 'substance', the 'nature' and sometimes of the 'term substance', the 'term nature', indicating that for him terms do not differ from realities nor do characterizers and indicators from characterized and indicated (ll. 170-179). To prove the total witlessness of this idea Peter quotes from *Against the impious Grammarian* II, 2: 'The term "nature" ... is sometimes indicative of the common and the genus like "substance", sometimes of the species and of a single substrate like "hypostasis" too'. If the expression 'the term "nature"' means here the substance itself or the hypostasis itself, the phrase will be completely absurd (ll. 179-211).

One could object: in this text Severus speaks expressly of 'the *term* nature' and it is, indeed, impossible that the doctor means the nature itself; but when he simply mentions 'nature', 'substance', or 'being', we cannot but understand that he is speaking of the realities and identifies characterizers and characterized (ll. 212-



225). To show that Severus uses these expressions sometimes to indicate the realities, sometimes the terms, leaving it to the reader to determine their exact meaning by the context, Peter quotes texts from Severus' refutation of the Grammarian in which these expressions certainly do not indicate the realities but the terms (ll. 226-306).

The author concludes that in the definitions given by Severus, the subject of the phrases is merely a term, but the predicate a reality, and that, consequently characterizers and characterized are sometimes identical but sometimes are not: Cyril, saying on one occasion that indicated and indicators are not identical, and Gregory Nazianzen, identifying them in another context, do not contradict one another (ll. 307-334).

*Chapter XII*

Peter continues his critique of Damian's *Many-lined Letter*. After his defence of the use he made in his treatise *Against the Tritheists* of the quotations from Epiphanius and Severus, the Patriarch of Alexandria concluded:

> Has it not then been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases but accidents or certain natural indications? (ll. 15-23).

Rather pretentiously Damian claims that he has proved what he had to prove. First, we are not opposed at all to calling the divine hypostases 'subsisting properties', but to identifying them with the characteristic properties of ingeneracy, generacy and procession. And we reject the dilemma that by refusing this identification we have to think of the hypostases as accidents and natural indications (γνωρίσματα). If this were true, even our opponents, if they do not call the natural properties of the divine substance 'substances' or, at least, 'substance', would be forced to define them as accidents or characteristic properties of their hypostases (ll. 24-68).

Peter then proceeds to what Damian writes after that in his *Many-lined Letter*:

> Unless, therefore, the Unbeginning, the Beginning, and the With the Beginning, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the three properties of

the Holy Trinity, when viewed in the common substance, are conceived of, in the way we say, as three hypostases, it will turn out that Fatherhood, Sonship and Procession will belong to a single hypostasis like natural properties (uncreatedness, I mean, invisibility, eternity and the rest) which is plain Sabellianism; or, that we shall attribute substantial differences and substance itself to each hypostasis, which is the diametrically opposite evil and, evidently, clear Arianism (ll. 69-78).

Damian in this passage explains what he said immediately before: If Peter does not admit his theory that the characteristic properties are the hypostases, he must consider them as accidents or natural properties. If they are mere accidents, the Trinity will be only one hypostasis; if they are natural properties, each divine hypostasis will have its own substance.

Actually, Peter answers, nobody says that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are not three hypostases or three properties, if this term is taken as a synonym of 'hypostasis'. But that is not the question. What Damian has to prove is that the characteristic properties of the divine hypostases, i.e. ingeneracy, generacy and procession, are the hypostases (ll. 79-128).

Nevertheless, Peter will refute Damian's argumentation. Damian takes it as a principle that what exist in the common substance, are hypostases or natural properties. If the characteristic properties of the divine hypostases subsisting in the common substance are not three hypostases, we have to think of the substance common to the Three as one hypostasis, which is Sabellianism, or consider them as natural properties different from one another and agree with Arius. The same reproach, Peter retorts, can be made also to Damian and his followers by parity of argument about the characteristic properties of the *substance* i.e. the natural properties, seen in the hypostases: if they do not think of them as substances, they will propound Sabellianism or Arianism (ll. 129-211).

*Chapter XIII*

This chapter deals with the problem, raised in the last chapter, of how we are to conceive of the natural properties in the hypostases and again of the properties of the hypostases in the substance, without our admitting either the confusion of the hypostases or the division of the substance, which follow, as shown in the last chapter, from Damian's views.



Peter's doctrine can be expressed in one phrase: the Church's doctors spoke of the Godhead and its properties as being in the three hypostases, and likewise of the three hypostases and their properties as being in the Godhead (ll. 19-31). But this does not mean the identity of the hypostases with their properties, or the identity of the divine substance with its properties, nor the division of the substance or the merging of the hypostases. The one substance does not produce a contraction of the hypostases, nor do the three hypostases produce any cleavage of the substance (ll. 31-44). Basil proves this clearly in his letter *On Substance and Hypostasis* (ll. 45-59).

The fathers teach — Peter cites again two texts from the same letter and a passage from Severus' *Against the impious Grammarian* — that the three hypostases along with their characteristic properties are in the divine substance, but that the characteristics are to be distinguished from the hypostases and exist in the common substance not as hypostases but as their characteristic properties. The hypostases are united in the common substance but their hypostatic characters remain distinct, as is said in two other quotations from Basil's letter (ll. 59-188).

Peter's refutation might seem too long. But his silence could be interpreted as acknowledging the foundation of Damian's claims. Therefore he will also examine the rest of his words (ll. 189-194).

*Chapter XIV*

In this chapter Peter goes on with his criticism of the *Many-lined Letter* and examines three passages which follow immediately the extract given in ch. XII, ll. 16-23 and ll. 69-78 containing Damian's conclusion from the texts of Epiphanius and Severus.

I. The first passage of the *Many-lined Letter* (ll. 7-85):

Therefore, either let someone prove that the words are not patristic and those who spoke them unworthy of credence in their testimony and we shall be silent; or, if the words are patristic and their authors' testimony is true, how can it not be an obvious misrepresentation to excerpt from them the phrase which was the reason for their quotation and to condemn it as an innovation? For if this phrase does not have the same meaning as the testimonies, it will rightly be condemned. But, until anyone proves this, he is to understand that he not only condemns the phrase but also criticizes the patristic teaching which confirmed it. My sole desire, in fact, was to use it to show first the sense of the testimonies quoted. But if

the aim went astray and did not find expression, someone should explain the lapse and we will owe him a debt for his learning. If, too, because the proof-texts were explained by us earlier and the reason for their quotation was made known previously by other words, the phrase is criticized on the grounds that those proof-texts ought only to appear in express quotation without any interpretation or preface, it is obvious that I am being condemned for no other reason but that I did not make my little exposition a collection of proof-texts. But we have been taught not to fight truth's enemies so simply, because they too quote us often the same testimonies, giving them a wrong interpretation and because one who responds with discernment to challenges like these, besides being anchored in the biblical and patristic tradition, should endeavour to explain and harmonize the fathers' meaning in its entirety from all their expositions and to record the disputations they were variously engaged in and all the other things which compell those who oppose them to write works of refutation.

Apparently Peter, in the letter he wrote to Damian after receiving his treatise, mentioned the texts of Epiphanius and Severus quoted by Damian for his doctrine, but did not repeat the phrase in which Damian gave his interpretation of these texts (ch. XII, ll. 19-23 and ll. 69-78). Why, asks Damian, did not his colleague reproduce the words which give the reason for the quotation of these fathers? If Peter thought they did not render the exact meaning of the testimonies, he had to prove it. If he considered that patristic testimonies must be quoted without any commentary, Damian disagrees: heretics often quote the same texts as the orthodox; therefore one has to give their exact interpretation in harmony with the entirety of all the expositions of the fathers (ll. 7-35).

Actually, Damian did not prove that the texts of Epiphanius and Severus corroborate his opinion (ll. 36-71) nor did he take into account all their testimonies (ll. 72-85).

II. The second passage of the *Many-lined letter* (ll. 86-160):

Perhaps then, we may be criticized on the grounds that the proof is defective, and constructed with only a couple of testimonies. But it would be wrong to take much offence at this. The law of apostolic teaching affirms that by two or three witnesses every word shall be established. Nevertheless, critics of the statement may, if they like, have further testimonies in which the holy fathers recognize the properties as identical with the hypostases.

In the oration *On the Lights*, then, Gregory the Theologian clarifies our ideas and shows the single meaning in the terms by saying: 'But when I say "God", be illumined by one light and by three; by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead'.

Those who say, then, that the terms 'hypostasis', 'property', and 'prosopon' here do not bring the hearers to the very same idea, stand confounded and are in disaccord with this teaching of accurate theology, as it is here set down. Who, therefore, having read this will fault the statement that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the properties' (a review of which we have previously conducted) 'viewed in the common substance, "hypostases"'? (ll. 86-105).

In response to Peter's remark on the deficiency of Damian's patristic argument, the Alexandrian appeals to Saint Paul's rule in II Cor. 13:1 and quotes a text of Gregory of Nazianzen in his oration *On the Lights*, already quoted in the second redaction of the treatise *Against the Tritheists* instead of Epiphanius' text (see supra ch. V, ll. 269-281), in which the Cappadocian father has the expression 'in properties or hypostases', indicating that he considered the two terms as synonymous (ll. 86-105). But this expression, answers Peter, only indicates that hypostases can be *called* 'properties'; it does not prove at all that Gregory considered the divine hypostases as identical with the characteristic properties of ingeneracy, generacy and procession (ll. 106-151). Perhaps Damian himself was conscious that his argument was not *ad rem* and therefore wrote at the end of the quoted text that 'it is at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the *properties* viewed in the common substance, "hypostases"', and not that 'it is at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the *characteristic properties* viewed in the common substance, "hypostases"' (ll. 152-160).

III. The third passage of the *Many-lined Letter* (ll. 161-258):

Thus in the second chapter I quoted careful readers the same Theologian, cited by the thoroughly distinguished Theodosius, saying in his oration *On Athanasius*, as follows: 'For when we say "one substance" and "three hypostases" with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three)'. So he clearly said that the properties of the three are signified by the term 'hypostases'. Thus it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose the terms do not indicate the same thing here.

The same doctor gave teaching similar to this also in the *Farewell Address to the Bishops* saying: 'What, then, do hypostases mean to you,

or prosopa to you, for I put the question? They mean that those divided not in natures but in properties are three'. Here too, after first inquiring about the view of those in dispute over the terms 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis', to reconcile the two and unite them to one mind, he said to each side that the same thing is indicated by the different appellations and took the unambiguous word 'property', signifying the same things as 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis', and said that 'those divided not in natures but in properties are three' i.e. that 'prosopa' and 'hypostases' seek to indicate nothing else but subsisting properties, as Saint Epiphanius also testified when defending the Easterns (ll. 164-182).

Damian quoted the text of Gregory's oration *On Athanasius* without its context which rejects his interpretation (ll. 183-201). Nobody will contest that in this phrase the Theologian takes the terms 'properties' and 'hypostases' as indicating the same thing. But in other places, as in the expressions 'natural properties' or 'characteristic properties', the term 'properties' may have another sense than the term 'hypostases' (ll. 202-225).

Where in the words of the *Farewell Address* 'that those divided not in natures but in properties are three', did Damian find that the hypostases and prosopa are the characteristic properties ingeneracy, generacy and procession? (ll. 226-258).

*Chapter XV*

In his commentary on Gregory's words in his *Farewell Address*, quoted in the preceding chapter, Damian wrote that the fathers preferred the unambiguous term 'property' to the terms 'hypostasis' and 'prosopon'. Peter agrees that the fathers sometimes used 'properties' in reference to the hypostases. But this does not mean that they considered that the divine hypostases are ingeneracy, generacy and procession. The fathers used the terms 'hypostases' and 'prosopa' more frequently and when using the term 'properties' to indicate the hypostases, they often added 'individually subsisting properties' or another expression to avoid all ambiguity (ll. 11-43).

After the passage just examined, Damian wrote in his *Many-lined Letter*:

For it is unusual to say that the union has been effected from the properties; whereas such a union has been handed down to us by the clear and unambiguous word 'hypostases'. But we shall not reckon the two as not the same thing, though I myself in my book (in order that the hypostases should not be thought of as non-substantial) referred the concept to the properties indicating the prosopa.



And some lines later Damian wrote:

So my mention of the Patriarch here and my assertion 'the Patriarch says' are a sort of summary addressed to men who know the father's words, but one has to add: 'concerning the natural properties'. So we also, in the case of the substrates, profess the Saviour's union as being not a union of properties, but, more accurately, of hypostases, lest anyone think that the concurrence is simply a concurrence of non-substantial properties, and that it is mere sonship and not the Son's Godhead (i.e. his nature) which was incarnate. In answer, then, to that objection I was saying that 'the hypostasis of the Only-begotten' was clearer as a full indication of the mystery of his becoming man, because it can better disclose the subsistence of the substantial property in its own being without confusion, or when it is mentally separated from the substance in which it is seen as naturally existing (ll. 44-64).

In these extracts Damian speaks of the term 'hypostases' as unambiguous and more accurate than the term 'properties' and so contradicts what he asserted before. It is, indeed, as Severus wrote in the fifteenth chapter of the second book of his *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea*, an evil trick of heretics to mix intentionally into their expositions heretical and orthodox statements. Why, then, should we not prefer the unambiguous term 'hypostases' to the term 'properties', which is ambiguous and may indicate hypostases but also may indicate properties which do not subsist individually? (ll. 65-105).

In the last quotation from the *Many-lined Letter*, Damian wrote that speaking of the incarnation as a union of properties could be interpreted by some people as meaning that it is only 'a concurrence of non-substantial properties' and that only the sonship of the Son and not the Son himself became flesh. 'Who are these people?', Peter asks. Since Damian reduces the Holy Trinity to names, one has to think of heretics who do not even put forward the names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost and therefore are more impious than the Sabellians who, as Basil testifies in his *Letter to Terentius*, though teaching that God is only one hypostasis, recognize Father, Son and Holy Ghost as three prosopa (ll. 106-136).

At the end of his commentary on the extract from the *Farewell Address*, Damian in the first redaction of his *Many-lined Letter* (ch. XIV, l. 182) wrote: 'as Saint Epiphanius also testified when

defending the Easterns'. He changed and 'falsified' his text in the second redaction and set down: 'as we have adduced God-clad fathers teaching in many other passages'. But it has already been proved that the fragment he adduced from the Theologian's oration *On the Lights* (ch. V, ll. 273-277) in no way assists his false opinion (ll. 137-147).

To show the true teaching of the Theologian, Peter quotes fragments of his oration *On the Nativity*, his *Second Oration on the Son* and his oration *On Baptism*. In these texts the Theologian mentions two generations of the Son, the one from God the Father, the second from the Holy Virgin. Damian himself spoke of these two generations in a passage of his *Enthronement Sermon* which he repeated in the *Synodical Letter* to James Baradaeus. If generacy were an hypostasis, as Damian teaches, we should consequently admit the Nestorian heresy of two hypostases in Christ (ll. 148-263).

After a lacuna in the manuscript, Peter repeats that it is not because the fathers term the hypostases 'properties', that we have to think of them as characteristic properties. And after this remark, Peter quotes a subsequent text from the *Many-lined Letter*:

> For if one does not take such words in this way one will not think either that a prosopon is the same as a hypostasis because Basil professed the prosopon as being *in* the hypostasis.

It seems that Peter is refuting here an argument of Damian in his *Many-lined Letter*, based on the text from the Theologian's oration *On Theology*: 'Because we must preserve one God and profess three hypostases or prosopa and each of them *along with* its property'. In this text, Damian argued, 'property' is synonymous with 'hypostasis' and 'prosopon'; as is evidently 'prosopon' with 'hypostasis' in Basil's assertion in his *Letter to the Neocaesareans*: 'We must acknowledge each prosopon as existing *in* true hypostasis'. Peter answers that because in the text of Basil the preposition indicates a synonymy, we do not have to admit that it always does. It clearly does not when Theodosius in his discourse *On Theology* writes: 'We worship and glorify one God *in* one substance and nature but *in* three hypostases' and 'We have learned to believe one God *in* one substance and nature but *in* three hypostases or prosopa' (ll. 264-296).

In the expressions 'characteristic properties of hypostases' and 'hypostases with properties', Damian has to take the terms 'characteristic properties' or 'properties' as synonymous with the term 'hypostases'. If this were true, we should also consider the terms 'nature', 'substance' as the same thing as its characteristic properties, because we speak also of 'the characteristic properties of the nature or the substance' (ll. 297-306).



Because, Peter repeats, in Basil's phrase 'each prosopon exists in true hypostasis' the terms 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis' indicate the same thing, we are not to conclude that we are our accidents or all the things belonging with us or to us from outside (ll. 306-324). If Damian replies that we ought not to apply these reasonings to created things, he has to remember that the fathers when giving teaching about the characteristic properties of the Holy Trinity used human conditions to do so (ll. 324-332).

In the *Many-lined Letter* Damian wrote, quoting a passage from Gregory Nazianzen's Oration *On Theology*:

> And again, in a later passage he called the Son's generation a hypostasis, thus: 'But if you do not investigate, whether we should speak of the Son's generation or hypostasis or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense than these.'

How, Peter asks, can Damian prove from this text that the doctor thought of generacy as a hypostasis? What he means here, as is clear from the whole context and a similar passage in his *First Oration on the Son*, is that we are not to investigate how the Son exists by generation from the Father (ll. 332-392).

Two extracts from the *Adversus Damianum* in the florilegia partially fill a lacuna in the direct tradition. The first, taken from *flor. II*, gives a quotation from Gregory Nazianzen's *First Oration on the Son*: 'The one who has a different fleshly generation has also a different spiritual generation.' If, says Peter, we think of generation as a hypostasis (as was already suggested by Damian in the just quoted passage of his *Many-lined Letter*) we have to give the Son two hypostases, and also the Father two hypostases, because, according to Damian, his ingeneracy constitutes a hypostasis and we can speak also, as Basil does in his discourse *In the beginning was the Word*, of the generation of (by) the Father (ll. 393-440). — The second extract, taken from the *Florilegium Trinitarium*, belongs to the same context of Damian's work and gives the conclusion that generation cannot be a hypostasis (ll. 441-445).

After the lacuna in the manuscripts, Peter concludes from an assertion of Gregory Nazianzen in his *First oration on the Son* (already quoted in VIII, ll. 479-487) that those who profess ingeneracy and generacy as hypostases are not only Sabellians but they also deny, as did Eunomius, the consubstantiality of Father and Son (ll. 446-464). If Damian retorts that ingeneracy and generacy must be consubstantial, he will be forgetting that consubstantiality is said of hypostases but not of things viewed with the hypostases (ll. 465-486).

*Chapter XVI*

After Gregory Nazianzen Damian, in his *Many-lined Letter*, invoked support for his theory from Amphilochius, Damasus and John II of Jerusalem. First Amphilochius and Damasus:

> Hence wise Amphilochius, roused, yet, rather, instructed by, the Holy Ghost, gives, in the third book *On the Holy Ghost*, a tradition similar to the foregoing and accompanies it with a statement to the effect that the terms 'hypostases' and 'properties' indicate the same things; which passage I also set down in the discourse. He said the following: 'But we do not call those three hypostases and three properties "substances" or "natures", nor "three powers", for the three hypostases have one substance and nature and the three properties have one power'. Thus the father. But if someone were to say that the terms are not set down in direct connection, let him distinguish their different meanings and tell us what the statement then amounts to. For we cannot now speak on these points in detail, but shall simply set down the father's words.
>
> For holy Damasus too, bishop of Rome, in his *Third Oration against the Arians* pronounced a blessing on those who think of the properties of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, as three subsisting prosopa, saying as follows: 'Blessed is he who confesses one Godhead and that all the Godhead's fullness belongs to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Blessed is he who confesses that the properties of the names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are three subsisting prosopa'.
>
> Therefore it is not only hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose that the properties of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are not three subsisting prosopa, but it is also foreign to the foregoing blessing (ll. 13-35).

We have no quarrel at all, says Peter again, with those who *term* the divine hypostases 'properties' but only with those who make these hypostases nothing but names and characteristic properties. This opinion cannot be proved from the testimony of Amphilochius (ll. 36-62). If one concludes from the fact that the father termed the hypostases 'properties', that he considered ingeneracy, generacy and procession as hypostases, one has to define the characteristic properties of the *substances* also as 'hypostases' (ll. 62-67). Damian has to prove that Amphilochius here understood 'properties' as indicating ingeneracy, generacy and procession (ll. 68-94).



Damasus blesses those who confess that 'the properties of the names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are three subsisting prosopa.' Damian did not render these words of the bishop of Rome correctly, writing 'the properties of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost', instead of 'the properties *of the names* of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost'. How can Damian quote Damasus as a support for his thesis, since the Romans in general did not speak of 'three *hypostases*'? But, even when it is conceded that Damasus' expression 'three prosopa' is synonymous with the term 'three hypostases', his phrase only means that the term 'properties' can indicate subsisting properties (ll. 95-146).

John of Jerusalem has the expression 'in the three hypostases or properties', using 'hypostasis' and 'property' as synonyms, as did also Basil and Gregory the Theologian. But, as has been said already many times, this does not prove that they considered the *characteristic* properties to be hypostases. The term 'property', indeed, has several meanings; sometimes it indicates hypostases but more often the characteristic properties of the hypostases or the marks of the divine nature (ll. 147-223). Why, then, does Damian understand it always in the sense of 'hypostasis'? It is as ridiculous as was the misuse of the homonymy of the term 'nature', for which Severus reproached the Grammarian of Caesarea (ll. 224-244).

*Chapter XVII*

Peter repeats the three fragments of Basil Damian quoted in the preceding chapter, when he explained the text of John of Jerusalem (ch. XVI, ll. 162-179). They are the last patristic testimonies produced by Damian in his *Many-lined Letter* to prove his thesis (ll. 8-36). He concluded from them not that it is patristic to name the *characteristic properties (ingeneracy, generacy and procession)* 'hypostases', which is what he had to prove; but that it is patristic to name the *subsisting properties* 'hypostases', about which there never was a dispute (ll. 37-47).

Of the three fragments of Basil, only his definition of an hypostasis as 'the collection of properties belonging with each' is

worth examining (ll. 48-58). That Basil says 'belonging with each' shows that he considered the hypostasis as an individually subsisting reality with whom the particular characteristic properties belong (ll. 58-65). Furthermore, Basil defines the hypostasis as a *collection* of properties, whereas in Damian's view the hypostasis is only one property: ingeneracy, generacy or procession (ll. 65-79). Perhaps, Damian will object that, as he wrote in his treatise *Against the Tritheists* and again in his *Many-lined Letter*, Basil has defined the hypostasis not only as 'a collection of properties' (Damian omits the words 'belonging with each'), but also 'each one's indicative note' *or* 'the subsisting property'. But in his expositions, Damian seems to know the hypostasis only as 'a collection of properties'. Using this definition, he has to show how a single property can be an hypostasis and how a collection of properties can be a single substrate subsisting particularly and individually (ll. 80-111).

In a commentary on a text from Basil's *Against Eunomius*, Damian, instead of calling the hypostasis 'the collection of properties belonging with *each*', writes 'the collection of properties belonging with *the substance*'; but, clearly, 'each' is not said of what is common but of a single substrate among a plurality (ll. 112-155).

In a passage of the first book *Against Eunomius*, Basil explains that ingeneracy is not the Father's hypostasis but that it follows his hypostasis as its characteristic property (ll. 156-226). Similarly, he writes in his second book *Against Eunomius* that generacy follows life: meaning here by 'life' not the whole Trinity but the hypostasis of God the Father alone, as Basil himself explains in this text and also Severus in his *109th Cathedral Homily* (ll. 227-317). In both texts Basil teaches that ingeneracy is something external to the Father's substance; if, then, the Father's hypostasis is the same as his ingeneracy, it follows that the Father — and also the Son and the Holy Ghost — are not God (ll. 318-360).

In another passage from the first book of his *Against Eunomius*, Basil names 'ingeneracy' a product of 'inventive thought', expressing the Father's not having a cause of being. How, then, will those who make the Father ingeneracy, not deprive him of any real existence? Actually, 'ingeneracy' presupposes that the Father is a reality and only expresses the truth that he is without beginning (ll. 361-490).



Damian's false opinion has already been entirely demolished. It will nevertheless be useful to look at what Basil said in the text quoted above on ll. 378-381. What can it mean, according to Damian's theory that 'ingeneracy' (i.e. the Father's hypostasis) 'is perceived in the God of all'? And that Basil, after saying that God's substance is incomprehensible, endeavours to define ingeneracy? Actually, Basil writes that ingeneracy is not the Father's hypostasis but only the mode of his hypostasis (ll. 491-545).

### *Chapter XVIII*

Continuing his last remark of the preceding chapter, Peter asks: How can ingeneracy be a hypostasis if hypostasis means subsisting, which is the same as being and existing, whereas ingeneracy discloses only the mode of being of the substrate? The synonymy of 'hypostasis' with 'subsisting', 'being' and 'existing' is confirmed by two quotations of Severus' *Against the Grammarian*; Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril are quoted as saying that ingeneracy does not indicate the being of God but only his mode of existing (ll. 10-113). Peter, by making ingeneracy a hypostasis, mixes up the two notions (ll. 114-138).

In the second book of his *Against Eunomius* Basil defends the eternity of God the Father's fatherhood against the heretic and says that the Father *has* his fatherhood co-extensive with his eternity. How, then, can one claim that the Father *is* his fatherhood? And is it not absurd to say that the Father has his *hypostasis* co-extensive with his eternity? In the letter to his brother *On Substance and Hypostasis* the same Basil writes that in the Son we see the ingenerate beauty of the Father not his ingeneracy, clearly indicating that ingeneracy is not the Father's hypostasis (ll. 139-235).

In his address *To those who say the Son is unlike the Father*, Basil wrote that ingeneracy is the negation of God's being begotten. Will Damian assert that the Father's hypostasis is a negation? (ll. 235-263).

### *Chapter XIX*

In a long quotation from the first book of his *Against Eunomius*, Gregory of Nyssa argues from the fact that Eunomius called the

Son 'a begotten substance', that generacy is not the Son's substance. Indeed, he says, one who says: 'the substance has been begotten' understands 'begotten' as something other than substance, just as when the Lord speaks of a man 'who has been born into the world' (John 16:21), expresses two different ideas: the idea of generation by birth and the idea of the one who has come into existence by generation (ll. 11-74).

This text of Gregory has been quoted by Peter and his bishops in the *Syndocticon* they composed when they went to Arabia to meet the Patriarch of Alexandria. It was criticized by him in his *Festal Letter* of 587 (ll. 75-174). As the same Gregory advises in his *Refutation of Eunomius*, Peter will not answer Damian's insults with insults but investigate the force of his arguments (ll. 175-213). Actually Peter's retort is purely a formal one. Damian, he says, did not read Gregory's book but borrowed the text from the *Syndocticon* (ll. 213-223). Damian has criticized Peter because he wrote that the quotation was taken from the *first* book of the *Against Eunomius*, whereas it belongs in fact to the *third* book. But Peter proves with quotations from Severus' *Against Felicissimus* and the *Annotations* Severus wrote with his own hand, that not he but Damian is mistaken; he sets down the right numbering of Gregory's ten books (ll. 223-406) and, describing their origin, as did Severus in the 101st *Hypomnesticon to Caesaria*, he indicates the reason for Damian's error (ll. 407-484). Damian's mistake in non-doctrinal matters must, as Gregory of Nyssa writes in his *Refutation of Eunomius*, inspire mistrust of his expositions of patristic doctrines (ll. 484-500).

## SIGLA

A London, British Library, Add. 7191
B London, British Library, Add. 14603
C Vatican Library, Syriac Manuscript 107
D Vatican Library, Syriac Manuscript 108

Flor. I (florilegium on the Trinity):
- W London, British Library, Add. 12155, fols. 2va-32va
- X London, British Library, Add. 14532, fols. 94vb-133va
- Y London, British Library, Add. 14533, fols. 73ra-89rb
- Z London, British Library, Add. 14538, fols. 119v-138v

Flor. II (florilegium of texts of Peter):
London, British Library, Add. 14533, fols. 147va-161ra

[ ] As a general rule the text presented here follows the readings of A, except where they are clearly false. We print in square brackets words and portions of words illegible in A which can be restored from other witnesses (see, for example, p. 81).

ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܣܝܡܐ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ
ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ.

[ܟܦܠܐܐ ܐ - ܢܛ]

* CHAPTERS
OF A HALF OF THE THIRD BOOK AGAINST DAMIAN.

*Chapter 1*

Concerning the fact that although already in the examination of the difference between names and things there has been a by no means perfunctory investigation of properties and hypostases, nevertheless there will now be a more careful examination as to whether, as the author holds, the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are ingeneracy, generacy and procession. For it was this he ought to prove clearly and not what he repeats vainly everywhere for deception and proves, as if it were dubious: that the hypostases are named properties.

*Chapter 2*

Rebuttal of statements devised by him against the fathers wherein he says that it is hazardous not to profess the characteristic properties viewed in the common substance as hypostases. And examination of the beginning of the strong, as he supposes, proof in his *Many-lined Letter*, where he also shows himself annoyed because at the start we did not write to him by way of dispute but peacefully called his attention to points we were in doubt over. And proof drawn from statements of the fathers that only the modest can bear rebuttals in a peaceful manner.

*Chapter 3*

That * this distinguished man wrests the truth by affirming that it is impossible to depart from orthodoxy when censuring polytheists for transgressing divine doctrines, and a clear rebuttal of this from the doctors. And again, a manifest demonstration that we were obliged to criticize him not because he wrote against polytheists but because he leaned towards Jewish atheism.

* ܩܦܠܐܐ ܕܦܠܓܗ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ : B, f. Iva

ܐ ܥܠ ܕܐܦܢ ܗܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܒܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡܨܥܬ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܘܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ ܘܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܠܐ ܡܥܒܪܢܐܝܬ ܐܬܒܥܝܬ ܥܠ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܘܥܠ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ: ܐܠܐ ܗܫܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܒܥܝܠ ܠܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ ܡܬܒܩܝܢܐ: ܐܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܣܒܪ ܠܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܗܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ: ܘܠܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܢ ܠܐ ܦܘܪܫܐ ܠܛܠܝܘܬܐ ܒܟܠܕܘܟ ܡܬܢܐ: ܘܡܚܘܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܦܩܦܩܐ: ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܐܬܩܪܝܘ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ.

ܒ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܐܨܛܢܥ ܠܗ. ܕܒܐܝܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ: ܕܠܐ ܙܗܝܪܐ ܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܠܡܬܘܕܝܘ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܚܙܝ̈ܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܢܗܘܢ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܪܫܝܬܐ ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ ܚܝܠܬܢܝܬܐ: ܕܒܐܓܪܬܗ ܡܣܓܝܐܬ ܣܘܪ̈ܓܐ. ܕܒܗ̇ ܐܦ ܡܚܘܐ ܕܡܬܥܝܩ ܡܛܠ ܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܒܕܘܪܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܐܓܘܢܐ ܠܘܬܗ ܟܬܒܢ: ܐܠܐ ܒܫܝܢܐܝܬ ܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܦܠܓܢ ܠܢ ܥܗܕܢܝܗ. ܘܡܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܩܪ̈ܝܬ ܩܠ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ: ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܢܟܦܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܢܘܢ: ܗܢܝ ܕܒܫܝܢܐܝܬ ܢܣܝܒܪܘܢ ܡܟ̈ܣܢܘܬܐ.

ܓ ܥܠ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܬܝܠܕ ܠܫܪܪܐ * ܗܢܐ ܡܫܘܬܐ ܡܥܩܪ: ܕܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܢܦܩ ܠܩܛܝܓܐ، ܐ̈ܠܗܐ ܒܟܒܘܪܐ ܕܦ̈ܠܚܝ ܐ̈ܠܗܐ: ܕܒܪ ܡܢ ܬܘܪܚܬܐ. ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܢܗܝܪܬܐ: ܕܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܟܬܒ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܦܠ̈ܚܝ ܐ̈ܠܗܐ: ܐܠܐ ܒܗ ܕܐܨܛܠܠ ܠܘܬ ܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܝܗܘܕܝܬܐ ܐܠܨܐܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܡܟܣܘ. f. Ivb

B

### *Chapter 4*

Investigations of testimonies which have been put forward by him without examination to confirm his impure doctrines. And *exposé* of the old disagreement between Latins and Easterns over the terms 'substance', 'hypostasis' and 'prosopon' and upon the wise economy of the fathers who called the hypostases 'properties'. From whom we have learned not to dispute with those who, in simple fashion, have called the hypostases 'properties' without impiously taking the hypostases for characteristic properties; although we by no means consider the characteristic properties, *qua* characteristic properties, to be imperfect but consider them to be perfect and, as the fathers saw fit, call the hypostases 'properties'.

### *Chapter 5*

Concerning the fact that when he thinks of * the hypostases as the properties of the hypostases, viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession, and was required to prove this by clear statements from the divinely inspired fathers, this excellent fellow vainly goes round and investigates the writings of the doctors. Rightly deprived of any true defence, he puts forward, without examination and without understanding or distinguishing them, all the unclear and obscure texts he can where mention is made of properties. This is why he tries also to remove by stealth certain things he had previously put in his writing and reveals himself plainly as an agent of sacrilege, bringing on his own head charges of committing illegal acts of this kind in addition to heresy.

### *Chapter 6*

Concerning the fact that he did not venture otherwise upon such attacks until he had judged fit to accuse us too of being forgers when we published his exact words, in the same way that Julian – who in many things was his teacher and master – accused our God-clad father Severus in his *Additions*.



ܕ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܒܚܢܐܝܬ ܠܫܘܪܪܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܗܝ، ܡܛ̈ܢܦܐ ܡܬܬܦܝܣ ܗܘܐ. ܘܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܥܠ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܚܪ̈ܝܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܕܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ ܘܡܕ̈ܢܚܝܐ : ܡܛܠ ܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܚܟܝܡܬܐ ܕܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ : ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܩܪܘ ܗܘܘ : ܕܡܢܗܘܢ ܝܠܦܢ : ܕܐܦܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܢܬܚܪܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܪܫܝܥܐܝܬ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܢܣܒ : ܐܦ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܗܝ ܠܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ : ܘܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܫܦܪ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ.

ܗ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܬܐ * ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܢܚܫܒ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܠܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܢܦܘܩܘܬܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܠܡܚܘܝܘ ܗܘܐ ܡܚܘܪܐ : ܘܣܢܝܩ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܢ ܒ̈ܢܬ ܩܠܐ ܓ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܢܫܝ̈ܡܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܫܡܐ : ܡܬܟܪܟ ܗܢܐ ܝܩܝܪܐܝܬ ܘܡܒܨܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܡܟܬ̈ܒܢ. ܘܟܕ ܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ ܡܬܓܠܠ : ܒܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܟܚ ܕܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܘܡܦܩܗܘܢ : ܐܝܬ ܒܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܥܘܗܕܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܡܦܩܝܢ. ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܣܬܟܠ : ܘܠܐ ܦܪܫ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܬܦܝܣܝܢ. ܡܠܠ̈ܝܢܐ : ܘܡܣܟܦܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܡܢܗ ܐܬܬܦܝܣ : ܓܢܒܐܝܬ ܢܫܩ. ܘܡܬܚܘܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܫܠܛ ܒܗ ܡܡܪܕܐ. ܟܕ ܥܡ ܗܪܣܝܣ : ܘܪ̈ܫܝܢܐ ܕܡܥܒܪ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܬܐ ܡܟܬܒ ܥܠ ܪܫܗ.

ܘ ܥܠ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܚܪܝܬ ܥܠ ܩܛܪ̈ܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܡܪܚ : ܥܕܡܐ ܕܙܕ ܕܐܦ ܠܢ ܢܚܘܒ ܕܟܕ ܡ̈ܠܝܬܗ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܙܝܦܝܢ : ܐܝܟ ܦܠܣܪܐ ܢܦܩܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܐܒܘܢ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܣܐܘܝܪܐ ܒܬܘܣܦܬܗ ܢܓ̈ܕܬܐ : ܝܘܠܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܒܣܓܝܐ̈ܬܐ ܡܠܦܢܗ ܘܪܒܗ.

f. 2ra

B

*Chapter 7*

*Examination of Saint Severus' statement in which he says that substance is indicative of the community but hypostasis of the property. And demonstration of the fact that in his aim of utterly concealing the truth and so avoiding rebuttals, the author avoids saying where the majority of the proof-texts, he puts forward, came from, whereas the holy fathers for each proof-text proclaim clearly not only the author of the work but also the themes of the writings, and thereby make the truth manifest.

*Chapter 8*

Concerning the fact that in attempting to prove from the above-mentioned statement by our father Severus that the hypostasis is the characteristic property, because the doctor said that the hypostasis indicates the property, the excellent fellow is plainly refuted on the ground that he understands indicator and indicated, characterizer and characterized, signifier and signified as being throughout the same thing. And sufficient examination of the fathers' words on this point; from which it is again demonstrated that it is highly impious, as well as senseless, to profess * the characteristic properties of the substance as substance.

*Chapter 9*

Concerning the fact that it is impossible, even in the case of creatures, to profess either the characteristic properties of the substance, or those of the hypostases, as being substances or hypostases. And clear demonstration which proves that we do not, by refusing to think of the characteristic properties of the hypostases as hypostases, profess an accident or something imperfect in the Holy Trinity; whereas those who define the hypostases as ingeneracy, generacy and procession are obliged to think of the hypostases as imperfect, or, rather, to deny them completely.

*Chapter 10*

Concerning the fact that it is in dealing with the difference of terms (and not as though they seek to prove that Godhead, substance and nature are several different things, or that the char-



f. 2rb ܙ* ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ: ܕܒܗ ܐܡܪ
ܕܕܟܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ: ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ. ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܘ، ܕܟܕ ܢܣܒܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ
ܠܡܟܬܒܢܐ: ܕܟܕ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܢܟܣܐ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܘܗܘܒܢܐ ܢܥܪܘܩ ܡܢ
ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ: ܦܪܐ ܠܗ، ܕܢܐܡܪ ܕܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
ܣܓܝܐܬܗܝܢ ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܡܩܪܒ. ܟܕ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܥܠ ܟܠ
ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ: ܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܐܒܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ: ܐܠܐ
ܘܠܫܪܒܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ ܢܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܟܪܙܝܢ: ܘܟܕ ܟܠܗܝܢ
ܓܠܝܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܫܪܪܐ.

ܚ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܡܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܐܬܡܠܠܬ ܕܐܒܘܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ:
ܡܬܚܪܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ:
ܡܛܠ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ: ܡܬܟܬܫ
ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ: ܕܟܕ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܢܕܥ ܗܘ
ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܘܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ. ܘܗܘ ܕܡܚܝܠ ܘܗܘ ܕܡܬܚܝܠ: ܘܗܘ
ܕܡܣܡܢ ܘܗܘ ܕܡܬܣܡܢ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܣܦܩ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܕܐܒܗܬ
ܩܠܐ ܐܒܗܬܐ. ܕܡܢܗ ܬܘܒ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ: ܕܐܦ ܗܝ، ܕܢܘܕܐ
f. 2va ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ * ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ: ܛܒ ܪܫܝܥܬܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ ܘܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ.

ܛ ܥܠ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ: ܕܐܘ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ: ܐܘ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܘܕܐ.
ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܚܘܝܐ: ܕܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܚܢܢ ܒܗ، ܕܠܐ
ܪܢܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܬܪܥܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ:
ܓܕܫܐ ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܥܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ
ܡܘܕܝܢ: ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ: ܕܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ
ܢܬܪܥܘܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ: ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܘܕܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܟܦܪܘܢ
ܒܗܘܢ.

ܝ ܥܠ ܕܡܛܠ ܚܘܠܦܐ ܕܫܡܗܐ: ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܒܥܝܢ ܢܚܘܘܢ
ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ: ܘܟܝܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܝܗ

B

acterizers are the same things as the characterized, and signifiers and indicators as the objects signified and indicated) that the teachers of mysteries said that substance signifies the Godhead's nature whereas Godhead * is indicative of the substance and that the hypostasis characterizes a single substrate and similar things. And refutation of the facile sophism whereby this cunning fellow attempts to argue that those who do not consider the characteristic properties of hypostases as being hypostases are bound to profess hypostases of hypostases, because wise Severus said that the hypostasis characterizes a single substrate.

*Chapter 11*

Clear demonstration which lucidly makes known by many means that it was in teaching people who were mistaken as to the meanings of terms, that the God-clad fathers declared that substance indicates the Godhead's nature and Godhead signifies the substance, and that hypostasis is characteristic of a single substrate etc.

*Chapter 12*

Concerning the fact that though he was under an obligation to examine the proof-texts quoted by him and show in what way they assisted him, he declined to do so, but only praises and congratulates himself in a ridiculous fashion accompanied by much bragging, on the grounds that he has, he says, proved that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the characteristic * properties of the prosopa. Besides this, indeed, he also tries to conclude that if we do not accept his views we shall be forced, of necessity, to call the characteristic properties of the prosopa 'accidents' or 'certain natural indications'. For this reason the discussion at once, clearly and briefly, reduces him to absurdity, and passes on to the rebuttal of his other despicable ineptitudes.

*Chapter 13*

Concerning the question how we are to conceive of the natural properties in the hypostases and again those of the hypostases in the substance without our admitting either the confusion of



ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܚܝܠܐ : ܐܘ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܘܢ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܪܫܡܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ : ܘܗܠܝܢ
ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ :
ܐܡܪܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܘܕܥܐ :
f.2vb ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ * ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ :
ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܪܫܡܢܐ. ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܚܕ ܕܪܫܝܡ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ.
ܘܬܘܪܐ ܕܣܘܦܣܛܐ ܦܫܝܩܐ ܕܒܗ̇ ܢܟܝܠܐ ܗܢܐ
ܢܣܒܐ : ܕܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܚܫܒܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܘܕܘܢ : ܡܛܠ ܠܡ
ܕܐܡܪ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܪܫܡܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܣܝܡ
ܕܪܫܝܡ.

ܝܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܦܘܫܩܐܬܐ
ܡܘܕܥܐ : ܕܟܕ ܬܪܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܛܥܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܫܡܗܐ :
ܐܡܪܘ ܠܒ̈ܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ : ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ
ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܘܕܥܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ : ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ
ܡܪܫܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܚܕ ܣܝܡ ܕܪܫܝܡ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ.

ܝܒ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܚܝܒ ܗܘܐ : ܕܐܬܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܝ : ܢܒܨܐ
ܘܢܚܘܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܥܕܪܢ ܗܘܝ̈ ܠܗ : ܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܕܢܥܒܕ
ܡܫܬܐܠ. ܡܬܩܠܣܢܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܥܡ ܫܘܒܗܪܐ
ܡܓܚܟܢܝܬܐ ܡܫܒܚ ܠܢܦܫܗ ܘܡܛܝܒ : ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܠܗ ܕܝܢܗ :
f. 3ra ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : * ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ
ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܢܩܦܐ ܕܢܚܬܘܡ : ܕܐܢ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܪܥܝ̈ܢܘܗܝ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܡܩܒܠܝܢ : ܡܢ ܐܘܠܨܢܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ : ܠܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܐܘ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܟܝܢܝܐ
ܕܢܐܡܪ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ. ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܘܒܪ ܫܥܬܗ ܡܠܬܐ ܚܠܝܛܐܝܬ
ܘܦܣܝܩܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܐ ܠܗ ܡܠܬܐ : ܠܘܬ ܡܣܟܠܘܬܐ
ܕܫܪܟܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܫܝܛܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܥܒܪܐ.

ܝܓ ܥܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܣܬܟܠ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ
ܒܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ : ܘܠܐ

B

the hypostases or the division of the substance. And that if, as the author sees fit, the characteristic properties of the prosopa are the hypostases of the Holy Trinity, illustrious Basil and Saint Severus plainly appear to contradict each other; the one saying that the characteristic properties of the hypostases do not participate in, * and do not accord with, the community of the substance, and again, that it is not ingeneracy but ingenerate beauty which is viewed in the generate; but the other writing that each hypostasis, through the community of the substance, has absence of difference and total likeness with respect to the consubstantial hypostases, and, on account of the total equality of the community, the others too, who participate in the very same substance, are seen and known in each hypostasis. And close examination of these matters.

*Chapter 14*

Clear demonstration whereby it will be plainly recognized that even the author's supposedly strong proofs are nothing but old-wives' tales. And examination of statements by Gregory the Theologian, which he puts forward, which are of no help at all to him in establishing his absurd and despicable doctrines.

*Chapter 15*

Concerning the fact that, having said in his *Many-lined Letter* that the term 'property' is unambiguous, a little later, forgetting himself, so to say, he declared that the term 'hypostasis' is more accurate than the term 'property'. And due examination of this point. And subsequently quotation of proof-texts from Gregory the Theologian, who proves that he by no means proposed, as the author falsely accuses him of doing, the generation of the Son as a hypostasis when he says: 'But if you do not investigate



ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܘܫܚܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ
ܢܦܠ. ܘܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܫܦܪ ܠܡܟܬܒܢܐ : ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܠܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܕܡܣܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ : ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ
ܦܨܝܚܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ. ܟܕ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܐܡܪ : ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ : ܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܐ
ܡܫܬܘܬܦܢ * ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܫܬܘܝܘ : ܘܬܘܒ : ܕܠܐ A, f. 42ra
ܗܝ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܕܝܠܝܕ
ܡܬܒܚܪܐ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܟܬܒ : ܕܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܝܕ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܘܬܐ ܘܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܠܡܕܡ ܐܝܬ
ܠܗ : ܠܘܬ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܫܘܝܘܬܐ
ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ : ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܘܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ ܒܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ :
ܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܒܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܝܢ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ
ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ.

ܝܕ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܐܝܕܝܗ ܢܬܝܕܥ ܡܬܝܕܥܢܐ :
ܕܐܦ ܗܢܝܢ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܕܡܣܬܒܪ̈ܢ ܚܣܝܢܬܐ :
ܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܬܘܪ̈ܥܐ ܡܪܝܪ̈ܐ
ܕܣܒ̈ܬܐ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡܠܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܬܩܪܒܝܢ ܕܟܠ ܠܗ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܥܕܪ̈ܝܢ
ܠܗ : ܠܘܬ ܗܝ ܕܢܫܠܡܘܗܝ، ܫܒܝܪܐ ܘܡܣܠܝܐ ܢܓܪܪ.

ܝܗ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܣܘܪ̈ܓܐ : ܕܕܠܐ
ܦܠܓܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܫܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܒܬܪ ܙܥܘܪܝܬܐ ܟܕ
ܛܥܐ ܢܦܫܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ : ܕܝܬܝܪ ܚܬܝܬ ܫܡܐ
ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܙܕܩ ܕܥܠ
ܗܕܐ. ܘܒܬܪܟܢ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܬܘ̈ܬܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܡܚܘܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܟܠ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ
< ܡܩܝܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܒܗ، ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ

A from l. 120 on B

whether one should speak of the Son's generation or hypostasis etc.'

*Chapter 16*

Concerning the fact that in attempting to prove by texts he quotes from Saints Amphilochius, Damasus and John of Jerusalem that the characteristic properties of the hypostases are hypostases, he shows himself plainly to be falsifying truth and incapable of disclosing any valid defence at all for his absurd doctrines from what the doctors said. For, by simply denominating the hypostases 'properties', they did not at the same time define them as being ingeneracy, generacy and procession.

*Chapter 17*

Examination of the testimonies from Saint Basil on which this excellent fellow prides himself as perfectly proving that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are either some sort of collections of properties or are ingeneracy, generacy and procession. And rebuttal of the aspersion on the doctor from many brilliant and divinely inspired words of his.

*Chapter 18*

Concerning the fact that since hypostasis is indicative of subsisting which is the same as being and existing, whereas * ingeneracy discloses only the mode of being of the substrate, ingeneracy cannot be the Father's hypostasis. But this is proved again also from the fact that wise Basil said that the Father possesses his



< ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܘ
< ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ ܀

ܝܘ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܒܥܐ ܒ̈ܢܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ : ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܦܝܠܟܝܘܣ ܘܕܡܣܘܣ ܘܝܘܚܢܢ ܕܐܘܪܫܠܡ : ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܬܟܚܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܕܡܙܝܦ ܫܪܪܐ. ܘܕܠܐ ܫܟܚ ܡܕܡ ܕܫܠܝܡ ܠܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܗ, ܫܒܝܫܬܐ : ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܠܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܫܡܗܐ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܗܝ, ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܫܡܗܘ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܗܐ ܡܢ ܒܗ ܒܙܒܢ ܘܠܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܢܦܘܩܘܬܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܘ ܬܚܡܘܗ.

ܝܙ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ : ܕܡܫܬܒܗܪ ܡܫܬܒܗܪ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ ܕܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܚܘܐ : ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܐܘ ܟܢܘ̈ܫܝܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ : ܐܘ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܢܦܘܩܘܬܐ. ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܨܥܪܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܡܠܦܢܐ : ܡܢ ܒ̈ܢܬ ܩܠܘܗܝ, ܡܝ̈ܬܪܬܐ ܢܨܝ̈ܚܬܐ ܘܢܦܝ̈ܚܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ.

ܝܚ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܕܗ̇ܝ, ܕܡܩܝܡ : ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܗ̣ܝ, ܒܗ̇ ܗ̣ܝ, ܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܘܕܡܫܬܟܚ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ * ܕܝܢ ܕܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܝܡ f. 42rb
ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ : ܠܐ ܡܨܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܬܗܘܐ. ܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ ܘܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܡܪ

AB

Line 142: ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ, B: ܕܥܒܪܐ.

Line 143: ܐܡܦܝܠܟܝܘܣ, A: ܐܡܦܝܠܘܟܝܘܣ (cf. ch. 16, lines 2, 14, 64), B: ܐܡܦܝܠܘܟܝܣ.

Line 144: ܘܕܡܣܘܣ, A: ܘܕܘܡܣܘܣ. ܕܐܘܪܫܠܡ, A: ܕܐܪܫܠܡ.

Line 147: ܠܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ, B: ܠܡܠܦܢܐ.

Line 156: ܘܢܦܝ̈ܚܬܐ, B: ܘܢܦܝܚܬ.

Line 159: ܕܝܢ, B om.

fatherhood co-extensively with his eternity and that it is not ingeneracy but ingenerate beauty that is perceived in the offspring; along with this also that generation is not a denial of the ingeneracy of God.

*Chapter 19*

Examination of Saint Gregory of Nyssa's statement (parts of which we quoted in our *Joint Confession and Agreement* concerning the present affair) which the good Damian has shown he attacked in that previously mentioned *Festal Epistle*. And rebuttal of the same ludicrous blather against us in the same *Festal Epistle*, whereby he reveals himself to be an imitator of women of ill-fame by publicizing his revilings against us and as exceedingly ignorant in accusing us of ignorance because, he says, we did not know from what book we had quoted Saint Gregory's testimony.

*Chapter 20*

Concerning the fact that in having said that the begotten is not the same as generacy, we, so this admirable fellow says, were ignorant of the point of importance in it. Therefore it will also be shown that he is not blathering against us but plainly against Saint Gregory, who said this. For the teacher of mysteries did not intend to prove anything else in his numerous works against Eunomius but that generacy and the begotten are different things, as his divinely inspired words themselves will bear witness. Moreover by making an absurd application to the Holy Trinity of the exam-



ܣܓܝܐܐ ܒܫܘܠܡܗ : ܕܕܡܬܡܬܚܐ ܥܡ ܡܬܡܫܚܘܬܗ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܐܒܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܠܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܕܗܘ ܒܝܠܝܕܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ. ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܝ, ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܟܦܘܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܗ̇ܝ, ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕ ܐܠܗܐ.

ܝܛ ܒܥܘܩܒܐ ܕܬܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܣܐ : ܕܡܢܗ̇ ܘܡܢܗ̇ ܣܡܢ ܒܡܘܕܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܓܒܝܐ ܘܫܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܥܒܕܐ ܕܗܫܐ. ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܠܡܘܟܠܗ̇ ܢܘ, ܕܟܬܒ ܠܛܒܐ ܕܡܝܢܐ ܒܗ̇, ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܥܠܗ. ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܥܠܝܗ̇ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܒܣܒܣܢܐܝܬ ܦܩܩ ܥܠܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ. ܕܒܐܝܕܗ̇ ܡܬܚܘܐ ܘܡܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܢܫ̈ܐ ܡܢܒܪܢܝܬܐ : ܒܗ̇, ܕܫܘܕܥܗܘܢ, ܥܠܝܢ ܡܠ̈ܟ : ܘܣܓܝ ܠܐ ܠܦܩܐ ܟܕ ܠܝ ܡܥܕܠܢ ܥܠܝܢ ܠܝܕܘܥܬܐ : ܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܝܬܝܢ.

ܟ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪܢ ܕܠܗ ܗܘ ܒܗ̇ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܗܢܐ ܬܡܝܗܐ : ܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܚܫܝܚܐ. ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܘܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܥܡܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܦܩܩ : ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܕܗܢܐ ܐܡܪ. ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ : ܒܝܕ ܟܬܒܘܗܝ, ܣ̈ܓܝܐܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܥܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܚܠܦ ܐܪܙܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܗܝ, ܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ : ܐܝܟ ܕܗ̇ܘܝܢ ܩ̈ܠܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܦܫ̈ܬܗ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܪܢ. ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܟܕ

AB

Line 162: ܒܫܘܠܡܗ, B: ܒܫܘܠܡ.
Line 175: ܝܕܥܝܢ, B: ܝܕܥ ܗܘܝܢ.
Line 183: ܠܚܠܦ ܐܪܙܐ, B: ܠܚܐܠܦ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ.
Line 185: ܢܦܫ̈ܬܗ, B: ܢܦܫܬܗ.

ple of accidents he covertly attacks Saint Gregory for not, as he says, having taken aright the example of man and generacy in relation to the divine mystery.

*Chapter 21*

Examination of the author's arguments whence it is proved that it is not we, as he slanderously alleges, who belittle the divine generation but, rather, he, by eradicating the Son's hypostasis and merely substituting for it divine generacy. And again he is clearly rebutted for declaring without examination and with exceeding ignorance that we, by not acknowledging the characteristic properties to be hypostases, maltreat the properties because we term them, as he says, non-subsisting marks and make them appellations bereft of realities, whereas we favour * the hypostases by considering them to be substances; and he shows himself a complete ignoramus since he did not have any presentiment of the ruin into which his audacious slanders plunge him.

*Chapter 22*

Concerning the fact that in making the ignorant ruling that if ingeneracy, generacy and procession are not spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties, ingeneracy, generacy and procession must be imperfect, he is manifestly convicted of making all things which differ from one another in some respect entirely dissimilar to one another in any respect and conversely those which resemble one another in some respect not different from one another in any respect. And again by saying that it is impossible for things which subsist (i.e. subsist individually) to be characterized by what do not subsist individually and by showing thereby



ܥܒܝܪܐܝܬ ܥܠ ܡܘܬܒܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܫܬܐ ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܕܒܢܝܢܫܐ ܐܬܚܫܒ. ܡܠܝܠܐܝܬ ܓܝܪ ܒܠܗܘ, ܕܪܘܫܐ
ܠܐܒܢܘܗܝ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܠܐ ܢܘܩܐܝܬ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪ
ܐܝܟܐ ܘܕܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܥܠ ܐܪܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܢܫܒ.

ܟܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܐ. ܕܡܢܗܘܢ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ : ܕܠܘ ܚܢܢ
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܡܥܠ ܐܡܪ ܡܒܨܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܠܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ̈ ܗܘ. ܒܕ ܥܩܪ ܡܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ
ܕܒܪܐ : ܥܒܝܕܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܗܕܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡ.
ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܕ ܠܐ ܡܒܚܢܐܝܬ ܘܥܡ ܠܐ ܡܠܦܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ :
ܕܡܛܠ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ :
ܡܨܥܪܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܒܕ ܢܩܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܐ
ܡܩܝܡܐ ܪܘܫܡܝܢ ܚܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܘܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܡܪܚܩܝܢ ܡܢ
ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܝܢ : ܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܕܝܢ * ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܒܕ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ f. 42va
ܡܚܫܒܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ̈ : ܠܓܡܪܝܬ ܡܬܚܙܐ : ܘܡܬܚܫܒܐ
ܡܫܟܠܢܝܬ ܠܐ ܪܓܫ : ܒܕ ܠܐ ܩܕܡ ܐܪܓܫ ܕܠܐܝܕܐ
ܐܒܕܢܐ ܒܨܘܩܒܗ, ܡܪܚܐ ܥܩܒܝ ܠܗ.

ܟܒ ܥܠ ܕܒܕ ܠܐ ܡܠܦܐܝܬ ܦܣܩ : ܕܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܝ̈ܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܫܬܟܠܠܢܝܬܐ ܘܕܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܡܩܝܡܢ̈ :
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܠܐ
ܡܫܬܟܠܠܢܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܪܘܣ : ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܝܒܝܢ : ܒܠܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܟܣܢ̈ܘܢ : ܕܢܗܘܐ
ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܟܕܡ ܡܢ ܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܫܘܝܢ
ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܒܟܠܡ. ܘܗ̇ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ : ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܟܕܡ ܕܫ̈ܘܝܢ
ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ : ܠܐ ܒܟܕܡ ܡܢ ܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ. ܘܬܘܒ ܒܕ ܐܡܪ
ܕܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܐܘ ܒܩܢܘܡܗܘܢ̱ ܘܠܗܘܢ̱
ܡܩܝܡܝܢ : ܕܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢܘܡܝܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܡܩܝܡܝܢ

AB

Line 186: ܘܡܫܬܐ, B om.
Line 191: ܡܒܨܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ, B: ܡܒܨܪܝܢ.
Line 195: ܡܨܥܪܝܢ, B: ܡܨܥܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ.

that he thinks the characterized and the characterizers are the same, he is clearly found guilty of thinking that the divine substance and the characteristic properties of the Godhead are the same thing. And that in having to give proofs of these and suchlike things, he is reduced to the absurd device of proving that God is not defective. And again by saying that if the characteristic properties of the hypostases are perfect and there is no difference between perfect and perfect *qua* perfection, the hypostases and their characteristic properties must be the same, he is convicted of supposing all the latter to be mutually identical: which is both blasphemy and the height of lunacy.

## *Chapter 23*

Restatement and clear rebuttal of the words already previously quoted from the *Festal Epistle*, where this wise fellow says that because we do not think the characteristic properties of the hypostases are hypostases, we maltreat the properties, by making them, as he says, unsubsisting marks and appellations bereft of realities, and that we favour the hypostases by defining them, as he slanderously says, as substances. And examination of the Theologian's statements which proves that the master of mysteries uses the term 'properties' in different senses (viz. of the hypostases and of the characteristic properties) and that the writer uses the homonymity of natural properties and hypostases to accuse us falsely of making the properties of the hypostases imperfect by this * homonymity. Moreover he is also plainly convicted of completely negating the hypostases and thereby of thinking the properties and names of the hypostases to be mere names which is, on the contrary, what he falsely accuses us of thinking.



ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܡܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܡܬܚܫܒ
ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܡܝܢ ܘܡܚܡܝܢ. ܡܬܬܚܝܒ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ :
ܕܗܝ ܟܕ ܗܝ ܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܬܗ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ
ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܘܟܕ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ
ܕܬܘܚܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܘܕܐܝܟ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ ܢܦܠ : ܒܐܣܟܡܐ
ܥܒܝܕܐ ܓܢܝܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܠܐ ܚܣܝܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܠܗܐ. ܬܘܒ
ܕܝܢ ܘܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܠܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܒܗ
ܒܗܕܐ ܕܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܕ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܐܝܬ : ܡܢ ܐܠܨܐ
ܗܢܘܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ : ܡܬܟܣܣ : ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ :
ܗܢܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܠܚܕܕܐ ܡܣܒܪ. ܗܝ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܓܘܕܦܐ ܘܫܢܝܘܬܐ
ܪܫܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇.

ܟܓ ܢܘܚܡܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܪܫ ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܝܬ ܩܠܐ
ܕܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܬܬܣܝܡ ܡܢ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ. ܕܒܗ̇ ܐܡܪ
ܗܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܕܡܛܠ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܠܐ
ܡܬܪܥܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܥܘܠܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܟܕ ܢܩ̈ܝܠܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܡܬܩ̈ܝܡܢܐ : ܘܦܘܪ̈ܫܢܐ ܕܡܣܪ̈ܩܝܢ ܡܢ
ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ. ܡܥܩܒܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܟܕ
ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܥܒܘ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܝܬ
ܩܠܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܡܚܘܝܐ : ܕܒܠ ܥܘܪ̈ܒܢܐ
ܡܫܬܠܦܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܒܠ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܠܫܡܗܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܢܩܝܒ ܥܠܝ ܐܪܢܐ. ܘܟܕ
ܡܬܟܬܒܐ ܒܥܘܬ ܫܡܗܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܘܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܐܬܚܫܒ : ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܬܪܝܒ ܠܝ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܟܕ
* ܒܥܘܬ ܫܡܗܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ f. 42vb
ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ : ܘܟܕ ܡܫܟܠܐܝܬ ܟܦܪ
ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܠܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܡܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܣܪܝܩܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܗܦܟܐ : ܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܡܥܒܕܝܢ
ܚܢܢ : ܘܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܣܣ.

AB

Line 230: ܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ, B: ܨܒܘܬܐ.

*Chapter 24*

Concerning the fact that by decreeing in an ill-considered way and without proof that if a hypostasis is not a characteristic property, it is a proper Godhead, he resembles someone who says that if a man is not a horse he is an angel. And, again, by ignorantly alleging against us what was said by the fathers against those who declared that the Son was an activity, he also attempts to argue that ingeneracy cannot subsist unless it is a hypostasis; and by supposing that what does not subsist does not exist and that what subsists must subsist individually, he is convicted either of thinking that the properties of the divine substance subsist properly and individually or of making them non-existent.

*Chapter 25*

Concerning the fact that the patriarch, when he compared what exists and subsists with what does not subsist or does not exist, said the divine generacy subsists because it truly exists but not that it subsists individually. And close examination of the statement of our God-clad father Severus where he calls the generacy 'subsistent', without, though, defining it as a hypostasis, as is evident from his abundant teaching.

* OF PETER, ARCHBISHOP OF ANTIOCH, THE LATTER HALF OF THE THIRD BOOK AGAINST DAMIAN.

* *Chapter 26*

Concerning the fact that since the author promised to state Saint Gregory of Nyssa's and impious Eunomius' view of generacy and



ܟܕ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܕܠܐ ܒܚܘܝܐ ܐܚܫܒܐ ܘܦܣܩ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܩܢܘܡܘܬܐ ܦܣܩ : ܕܐܡܪ ܕܠܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܫܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܕܐܡܪ ܠܘܬ ܕܐܡܪ : ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܣܘܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܒܪܢܫܐ : ܡܠܐܟܐ ܗܘ، ܕܡܠܐܟܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܟܕ ܡܦܩܢ ܥܠܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܠܦܢܐܝܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ : ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܒܪܐ : ܘܡܬܢܟܦܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܐܡܪ ܕܠܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܡܢ ܥܠ ܦܘܪܫ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܩܢܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ : ܘܟܕ ܡܫܟܚ ܠܗ، ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܩܢܡܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ : ܠܗ، ܕܝܢ ܕܡܬܩܢܡܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܘܠܗ ܡܢ ܥܠ ܦܘܪܫ ܡܬܩܢܡܐ : ܡܬܚܝܒ ܕܡܬܪܬܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܐܘ ܕܕܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܡܬܩܢܡܝܢ ܘܠܗܝܢ ܡܣܝܡ : ܐܘ ܕܐܝܟܢ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ.

ܟܗ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܠܘܬ ܗ، ܕܠܐ ܡܬܩܢܡܐ ܐܘ ܟܠܗ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܡܦܚܡ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܗ، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܡܬܩܢܡܐ : ܕܡܬܩܢܡܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܟܕ ܗܝ، ܕܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܘܠܗ ܡܬܩܢܡܐ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܐܡܠܝ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܒܪ ܠܐ ܕܠܗ ܕܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܘܢ ܣܐܘܝܪܐ : ܕܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܡܬܩܢܡܢܝܬܐ. ܟܕ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܡ ܠܗ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܗ ܡܥܬܪܬܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ.

* ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܪܫ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ : ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܕܡܝܢܐ. D, f. 3va

ܟܘ * ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܫܬܘܝ، ܡܡܠܠܢܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܣܘܟܠܗ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܣܐ ܘܕܪܫܝܥܐ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ : ܕܝܠܕ A, f. 42vb

AB up to l. 262 D from l. 263 on

Line 254: ܕܐܝܟܢ, B om.

Line 260: ܣܐܘܝܪܐ, B: ܣܐܘܪܐ.

Line 266: ܟܘ, D: ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܝܢ ܘܫܬܐ.

the begotten and put forward empty and idle blathering, we ourselves ought, for the full assurance of readers, to do that clearly and to show by a full examination and demonstration that the doctor proffered the illustration concerning generacy and that which exists by generation with a view to showing that property and hypostasis are different things.

*Chapter 27*

Resumption and detailed explanation of every word of our *Joint Confession and Agreement* which was drawn up by us on the basis of statements by Saint Gregory of Nyssa; also of intervening words which were left out then for the sake of brevity. And refutation of points on which this author slandered us. And examination which shows * that Eunomius, by the substance he called 'begotten' meant nothing else but the hypostasis of the Son. Again, presentation of various statements of the author whereby the wretched and ludicrous folly of his chatter will be known more clearly. For though he was under obligation to prove, as he promised, that the offspring is the same thing as generacy, he shamelessly passed on to showing that the divine generation must not be subjected to notions of passibility and time.

*Chapter 28*

Concerning the fact that in ignorantly stating that the generation of God is a hypostasis because it is non-temporal and free from division and separation, he is convicted of thinking the characteristic properties of the divine substance also to be substances, because they too are non-temporal and exist without division and separation from the Godhead; and again, too, that though he



ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܕܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ : ܘܠܦܘܣܩܢܐ ܬܢܝܢܐ ܘܫܪ̈ܝܪܐ
ܐܦܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ : ܙܕܩ ܕܢܣܒ ܠܥܘܡܩܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܕܒܘܚܢܐ
ܕܦܚܡܝܢ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܒܥܐ. ܘܢܫܘܐ ܟܕ ܒܡܫܟܢܐ
ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ : ܕܐܝܬܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܛܠ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܗܘ ܕܟܕ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ : ܠܘܬ ܗܝ ܕܢܫܘܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܗܝ
ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܐܝܬܝܐ ܗܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܡܠܦܢܐ.

ܟܙ ܢܘܩܡܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܪܫ : ܘܡܦܫܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܐܢܐ ܟܐܢܐ
ܕܟܠ ܡܠܬܐ : ܕܒܬܘܕܝܬ ܘܫܠܡܘܬ ܕܓܒܐ ܡܢ
ܐܬܬܦܝܣܬ : ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܣܐ :
ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܡܨܥܝܬܐ ܫܒܝܩܢ : ܘܗܝܕܝܢ ܡܛܠ
ܦܣܝܩܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܫܬܒܩܘ. ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ
ܚܒܫ ܠܢ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ : ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡܚܘܐ * ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ f. 43ra
ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ : ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢܐ
ܡܫܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ : ܐܠܐ ܩܢܘܡܗ ܕܒܪܐ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ
ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܐ : ܕܡܢܗܝܢ
ܢܬܝܕܥ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬ ܡܬܝܕܥܢܐ ܫܛܝܘܬܐ ܕܒܘܬܐ ܘܡܬܓܚܟܢܝܬܐ
ܕܦܠܦܠܘܬܗ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܝܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ
ܐܫܬܘܕܝ : ܕܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ :
ܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܚܢܐܝܬ ܥܒܪ ܠܘܬ ܗܝ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܠܘܬ
ܡܚܫ̈ܒܬܐ ܚܫ̈ܐ ܘܙܒܢܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܢܬܩܪܒ.

ܟܚ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬ ܐܡܪ : ܕܒܗ̇ ܕܕܠܐ ܙܒܢܐ ܘܠܐ
ܦܘܠܓܐ ܘܠܐ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ :
ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܡܬܟܣܣ ܕܐܦ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܚܘ̈ܝܢܝܬܐ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܐܣ ܡܣܒܪ. ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܗܢܝܢ
ܕܠܐ ܙܒܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܘܕܠܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܘܠܐ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܟܕ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܕܢܬܘܒ ܒܡܠܝܢ

AD up to ܠܐ (l. 288)

Line 277: ܫܒܝܩܢ, D: ܫܒܝܩ.
Line 279: ܡܟܬܒܢܐ, D: ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܗܢܐ.
Line 286: ܥܒܪ, D: ܥܒܪ̈.

proposed to write, in the *Festal Letters* mentioned, against what we said in our *Joint Confession*, he omitted all the patristic statements which we there quoted against his impiety and their examination, and he is seen to be manipulating the truth; and specially when various things left out by him are here set down and many statements by Cyril are examined.

*Chapter 29*

Concerning the fact that the author, in mischievously attacking the truth, carefully leaves out those statements which are clear and rebut plainly his wrong belief, and quotes any rare and obscure statement he finds because of its having some seeming plausibility for confirming his abominable heresies; which was also the practice of all the ancient promoters of absurd heresies. He is convicted of imitating them by having quoted also with very mischievous design Saint Cyril's statement that 'divine generacy is preserved in its own hypostasis', though without gaining therefrom any advantage in the defence of his false view.

*Chapter 30*

Rebuttal of the author's brazen false explanation when he attempts to prove that Saint Cyril in declaring that ingeneracy is not the Father's hypostasis meant by 'hypostasis' the common substance. And examination of hypostasis understood, according to him, as substance, whereby it is shown that in reality he thinks there is only one hypostasis of Father, Son and Holy Ghost but names four hypostases; and that in carefully teaching * the difference between the hypostasis and the common substance Saint Cyril shows that he does not at all interpret, as he is falsely accused of doing, God the Father's hypostasis as the common substance.



ܕܡܬܐܡܪܢ ܒܐܓܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܠܗ : ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܠܢ ܒܬܘܕܝܬܢ ܕܓܘܐ : ܘܫܒܩ ܠܟܠܗܝܢ ܦ̈ܢܝܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܒܗܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܪܘܫܥܗ ܘܠܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ : ܡܬܚܙܐ ܕܡܨܠܐ ܠܫܪܪܐ : ܘܡܝܬܪܐܝܬ ܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܫܬܒܩ ܠܗ ܗܪܟܐ ܡܬܬܣܝܡ : ܘܣ̈ܓܝܐܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܦܬܓ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܠܠܘܣ ܡܬܒ̈ܚܢܢ.

ܟܛ ܥܠ ܕܗܘ ܒܢܟܝܠܘܬ ܒܥܘܬܐ ܦܫܘܛ ܥܠ ܫܪܪܐ ܡܬܚܬܢܐ : ܒܥܡܠ ܛܒܐ ܡܢ ܫܒܩ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܓ̈ܠܝܢ ܘܡܘܕܥܢܝܬ ܡܟܣ̈ܢ ܠܛܥܝܘܬ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ : ܘܡܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܗܘ ܐܢ ܡܫܟܚ ܕܙܥܘܪܐܝܬ ܘܡܟܣܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܝܪ : ܡܛܠ ܗܿܝ ܕܐܝܟ ܐܢ ܕܡܦܝܣܬܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܘܡܫܪܪܢܘܬܐ ܬܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܫܘܪܪܐ ܕܗܪ̈ܣܝܣܘܗܝ ܡܣܠܝ̈ܬܐ. ܗܿܝ ܕܐܦ ܕܩܕܡ̈ܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܗܘܘ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢܐ ܕܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܫܛܝܪ̈ܬܐ. ܒܗܢܘܢ ܘܟܕ ܡܬܕܡܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ : ܕܐܦ ܡܢ ܒܒܝܫܘܬ ܝܬܝܪܬܐ ܐܦ ܠܗܕܐ ܕܠܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܠܘܣ ܐܡܪ : ܗܿܝ ܕܐܡܪܐ ܕܒܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܬܢܛܪܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܕܡ ܡܢܗ ܠܘܬ ܡܥܕܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܥܝܘܬ ܛܥܝܘܬܗ ܐܝܬܪ.

ܠ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܥܝܘܬ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܓܠܙܢܝܐ ܕܡܬܚܬܢܐ. ܕܡܢܫܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܠܘܣ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ : ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܐܣܬܟܠ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܠܗ ܡܣܬܟܠ ܐܝܟ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܕܒܗ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ : ܕܚܕ ܡܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܪܪܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܐܪ̈ܒܥܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܫܡܗ. ܘܕܟܕ * ܒܥܠܝܠܘܬܐ ܡܫܠܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܚܠܦ f. 43rb
ܡܕܥܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܠܘܣ : ܡܚܘܐ ܕܠܘ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܬܥܒܨ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܦܫܩ.

A

*Chapter 31*

After investigation of the said *Festals* an examination which proves that a hypostasis is neither a single characteristic property nor a collection of properties but the substrate, it being understood that the characteristic properties appear on it. And investigation of the statement of our father Severus who says: 'And we must recognize, indeed, another thing: that fatherhood or ingeneracy, or generacy or procession are not empty names and relationships bereft of realities'; whereby this cunning fellow, on being obliged to prove clearly how, by negating the hypostases because he thinks they are characteristic properties, he does not make them mere properties, has, in his mischievous design, reached the point of teaching what absurdities a man who thinks them mere properties falls into. And again, on being required to prove that the fatherhood or ingeneracy existing in the Godhead is God the Father, he fraudulently declares, 'I do not in this way call the fatherhood God the Father'.

*Chapter 32*

Concerning the fact that the author, by sometimes saying that God the Father is not only the hypostasis of the Father but is both participant and participated (i.e. is both a hypostasis and the substance which comprehends the hypostases) and sometimes that the fatherhood or ingeneracy existing in the Godhead is God the Father, is convicted of thinking things which are mutually inconsistent and by each of them teaching very impious things.

*Chapter 33*

Concerning the fact that by speaking of his substantial and unsubstantial hypostasis he has ended up by teaching very absurd and crazy things. For either he calls it substantial and according to his argument it is found to be both hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases: for because he thinks of God the Father as participant and participated he defines him, as he says, as a substantial hypostasis; or, again, he will call the hypostasis



ܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܥܐܕܢܝ̈ܐ
ܐܓܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܡܚܘܝܐ : ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܚܕܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ
ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܢܫܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܐܠܐ
ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܒܗ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܗܘ، ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܥܠܘܗܝ، ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝ̈ܬܐ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡܠܬ ܐܒܘܢ ܣܐܘܪܐ
ܕܐܡܪ : ܘܗ̇ܝ، ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܢܕܥ : ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ
ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܠܘ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܐܘ
ܣܩܘܒܠܝܐ : ܘܐܝܟ̈ܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܛܪ̈ܩܢ ܡܢ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ. ܕܒܐܠܨܘ
ܘܟܕ ܚܪܝܦܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܢܝܚܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ :
ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܟܕ ܟܦܪ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ
ܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܠܗܘܢ : ܠܘ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܫܚܝܡܬܐ ܥܒܕ :
ܒܢܟܝܠܘܬ ܨܒܝܢܘܬܗ : ܡܛܐ ܠܡ̇ܠܦ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܫܒ̈ܝܫܘܬܐ ܢܦܠ ܗܘ
ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܫܚܝܡܬܐ ܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܢܐ. ܘܬܘܒ ܟܕ
ܡܬܬܒܥ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܕܗܝ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܕܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ :
ܡܬܛܠܡܢܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ ܕܠܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܐܒܗܘܬܐ
ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ.

ܠܒ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܡܡܠܠܢܐ ܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ : ܕܠܘ
ܒܠܚܘܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܐܒܐ : ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ
ܐܟܚܕܐ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ : ܗ̣ܘ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܗ̣ܘ، ܢܐܡܪ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ
ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܝܕܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܐܘ
ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܡܬܟܣܣ : ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܫ̈ܠܡܢ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܡܣܬܒܪܐ :
ܘܒܟܠ ܚܕܐ ܡܢܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܛܒ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܢ ܡ̇ܠܦ.

ܠܓ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܦ ܡܡܠܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܐ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܡܠܠ : ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܛܒ ܫܢܝ̈ܢ ܘܦ̈ܩܝܥܢ ܢܦܩ
ܥܪܩ. ܐܘ ܓܝܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܗ : ܘܡܫܬܟܚ ܐܝܟ
ܡܠܬܗ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܝܕܬ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܟܕ
ܓܝܪ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ
ܡܣܬܒܪܐ : ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܬܚܡ : ܐܘ

A

unsubstantial, and it will plainly be found to be non-existent; for the divinely-inspired teachers have said that what is not substantial is non-existent.

*Chapter 34*

Concerning the fact that God the Father (and clearly God the Son and Word also), is not, as this good fellow supposes, participant and participated i.e. * hypostasis and substance comprehending hypostases, but one only hypostasis, as will be proved from the quoted statements of theologians. For if God the Father is both participant and participated, God the Word accordingly too will be both participant and participated, and it will be found in consequence that the whole Godhead or Holy Trinity was incarnate – to think which is complete lunacy and impiety. But if God the Word is one only hypostasis, of necessity God the Father is also one only hypostasis and the author's argument therefrom is proved empty.

*Chapter 35*

Concerning the fact that it was with a view to proving, that each of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity is also a characteristic property and is named God, substance and nature not in the full sense and truly but because it participates in the substance and in the Godhead, that the author said that God the Father is participant and participated (i.e. is hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases); and that to be called 'God' by adoption and participation is the property of rational creatures, but to be God in the full sense and truly belongs to each of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity; a point which, as if he were refuting impiety, he forced, to pervert the words of true religion and draw them towards his evil doctrine.



ܗܘܬ ܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܐܡܪ : ܘܡܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܫܬܟܚ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܠܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܕܠܐ ܥܒܝܕ : ܐܡܪܘ ܢܦܫܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ.

ܠܕ ܥܠ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ : ܡܢܒܥܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܒܪܐ ܘܡܠܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܣܒܪ ܠܗܢܐ ܛܒܐ : ܡܫܘܬܦܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܘܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ : ܗܢܘ * ܕܝܢ (f.43va) ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܡܢ ܬܢܝܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕ̈ܬܐܬܝ، ܕܡܡܠܠ̈ܝ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ : ܠܡܟܐܝܬ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ : ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܢܗܘܐ ܘܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ. ܘܡܫܬܟܚܐ ܡܚܝܠ ܕܟܠܗ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܐܬܓܫܡܬ. ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܕܢܬܪܥܐ ܕܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܓܡܝܪܬܐ ܘܕܪܘܫܥܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ : ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܘܣܪܝܩܐ ܐܬܚܘܝ، ܡܠܬܗ ܕܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܕܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ.

ܠܗ ܥܠ ܕܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ، ܠܡ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܡܗܝܢܘܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܦ̇ܢ ܡܪܝܐܝܬ ܘܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ : ܒܗ̇، ܕܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܡܫܬܡܗ ܐܡܪ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ : ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ : ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܘܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ : ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܕܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܒܣܝܡܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܘܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܢܬܐܡܪ ܐܠܗܐ : ܕܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܝܢ ܕܡܪܝܐܝܬ ܘܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ : ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ. ܠܗ̇، ܕܗܕܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܘܥܕܝܐ ܥܒܕ ܕܪܫ ܒܥܠܝܢܐ : ܕܠܡܠ̈ܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܥܘܠ : ܘܢܓܕ ܠܘܬ ܒܝܫܘܬ ܥܒܘܕܗ.

A

*Chapter 36*

Concerning the fact that not only by his sophism about participation but also by calling the hypostasis 'substance', 'nature' and, clearly also 'God' in a metaphorical sense, he is scheming covertly to prove that each of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity is not God. Hence he alleged that each hypostasis is not God by its own concept with a view to concealing the impiety of his words: a proposition which is not at all evident to the majority of people but which for him signifies nothing other than that each hypostasis is not God at all, though, to deceive again, he calls each prosopon God in the full sense, in this also resembling the Arians who painstakingly alienate God the Word from the Godhead but hypocritically call him God in the full sense.

*Chapter 37*

Concerning the fact that insatiable in his blasphemy against God he says that it is polytheistic to profess * each prosopon of the Holy Trinity as God Himself, indicating thereby also that he does not think of each hypostasis of the Holy Trinity as God in the full sense and truly but rather in a metaphorical sense; and he is clearly refuted since the divinely-inspired masters of mysteries expressly proclaim the Son and the Holy Ghost as God himself in their various writings.

*Chapter 38*

Refutation of other falsifications by this agent of sacrilege whereby are clearly shown the impudence of his audacity and the great evil of his absurd teachings, which fact, because of its unacceptability to the majority, he seeks to conceal and enters upon unlawful ventures, the examination of some of which will clearly prove the falsifications on the part of this profane man.



ܠܘ ܥܠ ܕܠܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܒܝܕ ܣܘܦܝܣܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܥܠ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ
ܘܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܫܐܠܐܝܬ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ : ܢܩܪܐ ܗܘ
ܕܝܢ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ : ܡܬܛܟܢܐܝܬ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܠܐ
ܗܘ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܗܘ̇, ܕܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ : ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ̣ܢ : ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܢܟܣܐ ܪܘܫܥܐ
ܕܡܠܘ ܕܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܗ. ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܠܐ ܠܓܡܪ ܗ̇ܝ ܠܡܦܪ̈ܣܝܐ
ܢܕܝܥܐ : ܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܠܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ,
ܕܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ : ܐܦ
ܠܡܛܠܝܘܬܐ ܬܘܒ ܡܪܢܐܝܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܟܠ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ
ܐܡܪ. ܒܗ ܡܬܕܡܝܐ ܐܦ ܒܗܕܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܝܬ ܐܪܝܘܣ
ܕܒܥܡܠܛܢܐ ܗ̇ ܡܢܟܪܝܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ :
ܒܢܟܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܪܢܐܝܬ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܠܗ.

ܠܙ ܥܠ ܕܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܣܒܥ ܡܨܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܢܒܥ ܕܓܘܕܦܐ ܕܥܠ
f.43vb ܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ : ܕܕܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ, ܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܕܠܟܠ * ܚܕ ܡܢ
ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܗ̣ܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܘܕܐ̣. ܒܗ
ܡܫܘܕܥ ܐܦ ܒܗ ܗܕܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܡܪܢܐܝܬ ܐܦ
ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ : ܡܫܐܠܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܘ̣ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ. ܘܡܬܟܣܣ
ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܒܗ̇ ܕܟܠܗ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܢܦܫ̈ܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ
ܡܟܪܙܝܢ : ܗ̣ܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ
ܒܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܘܬܗܘܢ ܡܟܬܒ̈ܢܘܬܐ.

ܠܚ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܦܠܣܛܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܚܒܠ ܒܝܬ
ܡܩܕܫܐ. ܕܡܢܗܝܢ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ : ܘܚܨܝܦܘܬܐ
ܕܡܪܚܘܬܗ ܘܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܘܗܝ, ܫܪܝ̈ܪܐ. ܠܗ̇,
ܕܐܦ ܒܗ ܢܝܫ ܕܢܛܫܝܗ̇ : ܒܗ̇, ܕܠܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܩܒܠܢܝܬܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܠܦܩܚܐ ܐܬܐ ܠܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܐ. ܕܡܢܗܘܢ ܘܗܘܝܐ
ܒܘܚܢܗ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܡܢܘܝܐ ܦܠܣܛܪ̈ܘܬܗ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܚܒܠ ܒܝܬ
ܩܘܕܫܬܐ.

A

*Chapter 39*

Concerning the fact that by supposing ingeneracy, generacy and procession to be the hypostases of the Holy Trinity he is convicted of grossly absurd assaults upon divine doctrines. For either he embraces the Arian or Manichean madness by professing each of the hypostases, or, rather, each of the properties, as God himself, substance and nature and expressly opposes the God-clad fathers, who often affirm that ingeneracy or generacy is not substance; or, by refusing to say that each hypostasis is truly God himself, substance and nature, he slips the opposite way into atheism and plainly opposes the same doctors. Indeed, he has already proved to be their adversary in both ways: embracing the Jewish doctrines of the Libyan and the polytheistic and pagan error of Eunomius.

*Chapter 40*

Concerning the fact that though often at war both with himself and with the truth by teaching Sabellianism and Eunomianism, nevertheless he is quite in accord with himself in saying that the hypostases (which he understands as characteristic properties) and the divine substance are different things. For how can he consider the hypostases to be divine substance and nature, in accordance with the teaching of the fathers, when he thinks ingeneracy, generacy and procession are the hypostases? Consequently when he writes: 'The prosopa of the Godhead are not indicative of the Godhead', he means nothing but that the prosopa of the Holy Trinity * are not the Godhead.

*Chapter 41*

Examination of that 'one' said by him in the full sense from whom, as he blasphemously says, we come to those in it in some order when descending to creation. For it will be shown that also when he speaks of the Holy Trinity he professes the common substance (which according to his argument is different from the



ܠܛ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܡܣܝܡ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܡܬܟܣܣ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܪ̈ܒ ܥܫܝ̈ܢ ܒܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܗܝ̈ܐ ܦܪܝܫ. ܐܘ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܡܠܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܘܕܐ: ܠܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܐܪܝܢܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܢܝ ܡܩܒܠܬܐ ܡܢܟܣ: ܘܒܗ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܠܩܘܒܠ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܠܒ̈ܝܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܩܐܡ ܕܟܕ ܣܓܝܐ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܪ̈ܪܝܢ: ܕܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܐܘܣܝܐ: ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܬܐܠ ܕܢܐܡܪ: ܠܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܣܩܘܒܠܐܝܬ ܥܒܪ: ܘܠܩܘܒܠܐܝܬ ܠܡܩܒܠܗܘܢ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܩܐܡ. ܡܠܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܣܩܒܠܢܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܬܚܙܝ: ܟܕ ܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܝܗܘܕܝ̈ܐ ܕܠܘܒܝܐ ܘܛܥܝܘܬܐ ܣܓܝ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܚܢܦܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܡܩܒܠ.

ܡ ܥܠ ܕܐܦ ܒܣܓܝܐ̈ܬܐ ܠܩܘܒܠ ܢܦܫܗ ܘܠܩܘܒܠ ܫܪܪܐ ܢܩܫ: ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܘܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܡܠܦ̈ܢܐ: ܐܠܐ ܗܘ̇ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܫܘܝܐ ܥܡ ܢܦܫܗ: ܠܗܘܢ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܢܕܥ ܡܩܢܘܡܝ̈ܬܐ: ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ: ܦܫܝܩ ܢܦܩ ܠܢܦܫܗ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܡܣܒܪ ܕܐܝܟ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ: ܢܩܒܠ ܐܢܘܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܟܕ ܟܬܒ: ܕܠܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ: ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܡܫܬܥܠ: ܐܠܐ ܕܠܐ * ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ. f.44ra

ܡܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܕܡܫܪܪܐܝܬ ܡܢܗ ܡܬܐܡܪ. ܗܘ ܕܡܢܗ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܟܕ ܡܓܕܦ ܐܡܪ: ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܗ ܒܗ ܒܛܟܣܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܬܝܢ: ܢܚܬܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܒܪܝܬܐ. ܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܦ ܟܕ ܡܛܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܡܠܠ: ܡܘܕܐ ܗܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܓܘܢܝܬܐ: ܕܐܝܟ

A

hypostases) as, in the true sense, God, substance and nature; but that he only calls each of the three hypostases God, substance and nature in a metaphorical sense and by participation; which is why here too he places the 'one' in the full sense somewhere above but abases the hypostases to another humbler rank.

*Chapter 42*

Rebuttal of the author's blasphemy in making the hypostases of the Holy Trinity and the divine substance different things. And explanation of various points set down in our first *Memorandum* to him where, on his shamelessly accusing us of defining the substance of the Godhead or the hypostases of the Holy Trinity and also their characteristic properties as mere appellations, he is clearly proved by these ignorant claims, to be saying that the divine substance, viewed in the hypostases, is an accident; and again, contrariwise, that the hypostases existing in the one substance of the Godhead, are accidents.

*Chapter 43*

Concerning the fact that having promised to show that the prosopa of the Godhead are one thing and the Godhead another, he has mischievously passed on to showing that one prosopon and the divine nature are different things. And again, wanting to claim that the divine nature is something different from the three hypostases because it is viewed in them, he is convicted of saying that God is one thing and the single substance and Godhead another, because the God-clad fathers say that God is viewed in three hypostases and one substance and Godhead. But besides this, he makes the Father, Son and Holy Ghost something different from their three hypostases, as a consequence * of his laughable definitions, the masters of mysteries having said that the three hypostases are viewed in Father, Son and Holy Ghost.



ܡܠܬܗ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܘܕܐ : ܐܫܬܐܠܬ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܡܫܡܗ. ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ : ܠܗ̇ܘ ܚܕ ܡ̇ܢ ܡܫܪܝܪܐ : ܠܥܠ ܒܕܘܟ ܣܐܡ : ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܬܚܬܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܟܝܟܐ ܡܟܝܟ.

ܡܒ ܡܟܣܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܓܘܕܦܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܐ : ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܣܐܡ : ܘܡܦܫܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܣܝ̈ܡܢ ܒܡܥܗܕܢܘܬܐ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܗܘܬ ܡܢܢ ܠܘܬܗ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܕ ܗܘ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܣܕܐܝܬ ܡܦܠܚ ܠܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܠܡ ܕܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ ܫܚܝܡܬܐ ܡܬܬܚܡܝܢ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܘ ܚܝܠ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܫܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ : ܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܒܗ̈ܕܝܘܛܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܦܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ : ܕܓܕܫܐ ܐܡ̈ܪ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܟܕ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ. ܘܬܘܒ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܗܦܟܐ : ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܟܕ ܒܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ.

ܡܓ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܫܬܘܕܝ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܢܥܡܬ ܒܫܐܝܬ ܥܒܪ : ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܢܚܘܐ ܚܕ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ. ܘܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܨ̈ܒܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ : ܕܡܛܠ ܕܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ : ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܡܬܬܟܣܣ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܐܠܗܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܠܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ. ܡܛܠ ܕܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܢ ܘܒܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܠܒ̈ܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܐܠܗܐ. ܒܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ : ܘܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܣܐܡ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ : ܐܝܟ * ܕܡܢ ܬܚܘ̈ܡܘܗܝ ܡܬܓܚܟܢܐ f. 44rb ܟܕ ܡܪ̈ܝ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܒܐܒܐ ܘܒܒܪܐ ܘܒܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܪܘ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ.

A

## Chapter 44

Concerning the fact that in attempting to claim, from the fact that one hypostasis is not the same as the substance comprehending the hypostases, that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are one thing and the divine substance another thing, he is necessarily obliged to think that renowned Basil and proven Severus contradicted themselves, when they clearly taught that each of the three hypostases is not the same as the common substance of the Godhead and said in plain terms and expressly that the three hypostases are one substance and nature of the Godhead. Also that in calling the hypostases one thing and the substance something else from the fact that the hypostases exist in the common substance and the substance in the hypostases, he lapsed into many absurdities, as the examination itself clearly reveals too.

## Chapter 45

Examination of wise Gregory of Nyssa's statement whereby the impiety of this excellent fellow is further rebutted, when he wants to prove that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are something other than the substance of the Godhead from the fact that the master of mysteries declared 'ingeneracy and generacy are something other in their own concept than the substrate'. because he in no way considers either the three hypostases of the Holy Trinity, conceived of together, or each of them viewed on its own, as God.

## Chapter 46

Concerning the fact that by misinterpretation and falsification of this same patristic text and by his saying 'the hypostases in their own concept are one thing and the divine substance another thing', he is clearly convicted of completely denying profession of the Father as God, the Son as God and the Holy Ghost as God.



ܡܒ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܡܬܚܦܛ ܕܐܡܪ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܘ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܘܕܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܚܬ : ܕܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܡܬܐܠܨ ܡܢ ܠܦܪܘܣܗ : ܕܢܣܒܪ ܠܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܡܫܡܗܐ ܘܠܣܐܘܪܐ ܒܚܝܪܐ : ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܠܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܐܬܚܪܝܘ. ܟܕ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܦܝ ܕܠܘ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܠܦܘ. ܒܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܐܡܪܘ. ܘܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܕܝܢ : ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܕܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ : ܒܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܦܟܝܗܬܐ ܢܦܠ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܚܘܐ.

ܡܓ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡܠܬ݀ ܡܠܐ ܕܚܟܝܡܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܣܐ : ܕܒܗ̇ ܬܘܒ ܡܬܟܣܣ ܕܘܝܫܘܬܗ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ : ܕܒܓܪܐ ܕܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܠܦ ܐ̈ܪܙܐ : ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ : ܕܢܣܒܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܒܢܝܐ ܡܕܡ : ܐܘ ܠܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܟܕ ܥܡ ܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ : ܐܘ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܟܐ ܕܒܢܘܗܝ ܘܠܗ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܣܐܡ.

ܡܕ ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܘܦܠܣܘܪܘܬܐ ܕܠܗ̇ ܕܗܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܘܟܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ : ܕܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܣܣ : ܕܡܫܬܠܡܐܝܬ ܟܦܪ : ܒܗ̇, ܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܪܐ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ.

---

AD from ܦܝ ܕܠܘ (l. 476) on

---

Line 479: ܘܟܕ, D: ܟܕ.

Lines 487-488: ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ, D trsp.

*Chapter 47*

Concerning the fact that, in attempting to claim, from the doctor's saying that ingeneracy and generacy in their own concept are one thing and the substrate in which they are viewed is another thing, that the substance of the Godhead is one thing and the hypostases of the Godhead another thing, he, for his part, proves the master of mysteries in contradiction both with himself and with the other fathers when they (as has often been proved) make ingeneracy and generacy (and clearly too procession) something other than the substance * of the Godhead but, as will be proved immediately, expressly teach that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the divine substance.

*Chapter 48*

Concerning the fact that, considering the patristic tradition more authoritative than our own expression and understanding, (as the doctors of the Church frequently testify to us) we avoid leaning over to either side, not putting forward pagan polytheism against Jewish atheism by defining in any word or way the three hypostases of the Godhead as 'Gods', 'godheads', 'substances' or 'natures', nor yet resisting pagan polytheism with Jewish atheism by contrariwise professing the Father, Son and Holy Ghost as names or characteristic properties of hypostases. And examination of patristic statements which lay it down that the same divine mystery is at once united and divided, both one and not one.



ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܡܢܣܐ ܕܢܬܠܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ ܕܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ : ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܩܐܡ ܥܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܕܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܕܡܣܬܒܠ ܠܢܦܫܗ ܘܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܐܝܕܘܗܝ ܡܚܘܐ ܠܪܒ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ. ܟܕ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܡܕܡ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܘܓܠܝܐ ܗ̄ܝ ܕܐܦ ܘܠܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ * ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܟܕ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܚܘܝܐ ܡܚܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ : ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܠܦܝܢ. ܡܙ f. 44va

ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܠܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܡܫܪܪܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܘܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܣܥܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܠܦܢ̈ܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܟܢܫ ܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܡܣܗܕܝܢ ܠܢ : ܡܢ ܠܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܓܒ̈ܝܢ ܒܢܘܣܐ ܚܢܦܐ. ܟܕ ܠܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܝܗܘܕܝܬܐ : ܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܢܦܝܬܐ ܡܩܪܒܝܢ : ܟܕ ܒܟܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܘ ܕܢܐ ܠܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܐܘ ܐܠܗܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܘ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ ܐܘ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ ܚܢ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܢܦܝܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܝܗܘܕܝܬܐ ܡܩܪܒܝܢ : ܟܕ ܗܦܟܐܝܬ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܐܘ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܬܢܝܬ ܩܠ̈ܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ : ܕܠܗ ܒܗ ܠܗ ܕܐܚܝܕ ܘܡܦܠܓ : ܘܚܕ ܘܠܐ ܚܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܪܐܙܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ. ܡܚ

AD

Line 510: ܘܬܪܬܝܢܘܬܐ, D: ܘܬܪ̈ܬܝܢܘܬܐ.
Line 516: ܡܬܚܡܝܢ ܚܢ, D: ܡܬܚܡܝܢܢ.
Line 517: ܡܩܪܒܝܢܢ, D: ܡܩܪܒܝܢ ܚܢ.
Line 519: ܡܘܕܝܢܢ, D: ܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢ.
Line 521: ܗܢܘܢ, D: ܗܢܘ.

*Chapter 49*

Concerning the fact that the faith which teaches the united and divided mystery transcends the comprehension of reasonings. Therefore it is more fitting to collaborate in thought with the fathers' laws and the Spirit's guidance than to blaspheme in easy manner by following a seeming train of arguments. For it is not studious but vain and utterly proud minds which investigate incomprehensible and sublime teachings.

*Chapter 50*

Anathematization of the previously rebutted detestable teachings. And repudiation of those who blather them impiously. And admonition which charges those who undertake ecclesiastical office to fight for their spiritual sheep, and those who are grieved over truth not unreasonably to join men who have once and for all been done to death by disbelief and stripped, through denial of the fathers' confession, of all spiritual grace; nor are they to suppose that there will be any forgiveness for them if they foolishly follow those whose lot it has been to shepherd them: but let them wisely consider what will profit them, investigate the truth * and account only those as pastors who are guides and teachers of orthodox doctrines.



ܡܛ ܥܠ ܕܡܠܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܪܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ : ܗܝ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܕܡܚܝܕ ܘܡܦܠܓ ܡܠܦܐ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܘܕܢܚܡܠ ܒܣܘܟܠܐ ܥܡ ܢܡܘܣܐ ܐܒܗܝܐ ܘܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܦܩܚܐ : ܐܘ ܕܒܕܠܝܠܘܬܐ ܢܓܕܦ ܒܪ ܒܬܪ ܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܪܗܝܒ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ ܪ̈ܥܝܢܬ ܘܠܦܢܐ : ܣܪܝܩܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪ̈ܟܢܐ ܘܪ̈ܡܐ ܡ̈ܥܠܝܢ. ܕܪܚܡܬ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܝܢ ܘܕܡܫܬܥܠܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܢܫܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝ ܗܦܟܢܐ.

ܢ ܡܚܪܡܘܬܐ ܕܚܕ ܣܢܝܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܡܩ̈ܒܚܐ ܕܦܪܡܘ ܐܬܟܣܣܘ. ܘܡܫܬܠܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܗܠܝܢ ܪܫܝܥܐܝܬ ܦܩܩܘ. ܘܡܪܬܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܦܩܕܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܗ̇ܢ ܕܥܡܠܝܢ ܣܘܥܪܢܘܬܐ ܥܕܬܢܝܬܐ : ܕܢܟܬܫ ܚܠܦ ܥ̈ܢܐ ܡ̈ܠܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ. ܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܟܐܒ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܛܠ ܫܪܪܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܢܬܢܩܦܘܢ ܥܠ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܚܕܐ ܙܒܢ ܟܠܗ ܡܝܬܘܬܐ ܐܬܬܡܝܬܘ : ܘܒܝܕ ܟܦܘܪܝܐ ܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ̇ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܐܬܦܫܛܘ : ܐܘ ܢܣܒܪܘܢ ܕܫܘܒܩܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ : ܐܢܗܘ ܕܕܠܐ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܢܩܦܝܢ ܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܕܒܪܘܢ ܡܛܠܬ ܐܢܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ ܢܬܒܝܢܘܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܘܬܪܐ. ܘܒܗ̇ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܢܒܨܘܢ : ܠܗܘܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ * ܢܚܫܒܘܢ ܪ̈ܥܘܬܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܐ. f.44vb

AD

Line 526: ܕܪܗܝܒ, D: ܕܪܗܒ.

Lines 530-531: ܐܬܟܣܣܘ ܕܦܪܡܘ, D: ܕܐܬܟܣܣܘ.

Line 542: ܬܪ̈ܝܨܐ, a scribal note in D adds: ܫܠܡ ܩܦ̈ܠܐܐ ܚܡܫܝܢ. *End of the fifty chapters.*

*The Third Book against Damian by Saint Peter, patriarch of Antioch.*

*Chapter 1*

*Concerning the fact that although already in the examination of the difference between names and things there has been a by no means perfunctory investigation of properties and hypostases, nevertheless there will now be a more careful examination as to whether, as the author holds, the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are ingeneracy, generacy and procession. For it was this he ought to prove clearly and not what he repeats vainly everywhere for deception and proves, as if it were dubious: that the hypostases are named properties.*

Now it has, I think, been sufficiently proved already to right-minded people, as it was our necessary task to prove by the fathers' teaching, that the hypostases of the holy, adorable and consubstantial Trinity are by no means, as the excellent Damian falsely supposes, names and terms but, rather, full and properly existing realities; and to show in another essay that neither are they ingeneracy, generacy and procession (as, again, this author likes to think), we will examine and rebut the feebleness of the other absurdities of his teaching. We pray, indeed, that God the true Son of the true God, may, by the guidance of the Holy Ghost, direct our words towards the truth and may strip away falsehood

ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ: ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܕܡܝܢܐ.

ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ.

ܥܠ ܕܐܦ ܗܐ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܒܗܘ ܒܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܫܘܚܠܦ ܫܡܗܐ ܘܨܒܘܬܐ ܘܕܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܒܣܬܪܢܐܝܬ ܐܬܒܨܝܬ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܡܛܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ: ܐܠܐ ܗܫܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܒܢܛܝܪܘܬܐ ܡܬܒܚܢܐ: ܐܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܠܡܟܬܒܢܐ: ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܝܗܘܢ. ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܒܦܪܝܫܘ: ܘܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܢ ܠܐ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܠܛܠܝܡܘܬܐ ܒܟܠܕܘܟ ܡܟܪܟ: ܘܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܡܬܦܩܦܩܐ: ܡܚܘܐ ܕܐܬܟܪܝܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ :·

ܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܕܪܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ ܟܕ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܥܡܠܛܢܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ: ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦܝܣܐܝܬ ܫܦܝܪ ܠܕܡܝܢܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܐ: ܫܡܗܐ ܘܟܢܘܬ ܩܠܐ: ܗܘܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܘܕܝܠܢܐܝܬ ܡܩܝܡܢ: ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܨܒܘܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܘܣܓܝܕܬܐ ܘܫܘܝܬ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ: ܘܐܝܟ ܕܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܢܚܘܐ ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܢܝܫܐ: ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܬܘܒ ܗܘ̇ ܡܬܚܒܒܐ ܗ̄ܢܐ: ܘܢܒܚܘܢ ܢܫܡܫܘܬܐ ܘܢܣܬܪܝܘܗ̇ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܕܬ̈ܠܝܬܐ: ܡܦܝܣܝܢܢ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܬܪܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܠܡܦܢܝܘ ܗ̇ܝ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ. ܡܬܟܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܒܪܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ: ܒܝܕ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܢܬܪܘܨ ܠܝ ܐܦ

AB

Line 1: At the top of fol. 5v B reads as follows: ܟܘܪܟܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ: ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܟܣܢܕܪܝܐ. *Second volume of Saint Peter of Antioch against Damian of Alexandria* and on the first line of f. 5va: ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ. *Third book.*

Line 4: ܕܐܝܟ, B: ܕܐܝܟ.

from hypocrisy, so that as the correctness of the divine doctrines shines out in the minds of the hearers the Church of God may acquire its former glory.

Let us proceed, then, in due order to the other statements of the author, in which he attempts to prove that the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the same as the characteristic properties of the hypostases. * For seeing that he attempts by so many evil arguments to negate even their subsisting properly and individually, sometimes confessing them to be names and terms sometimes to be the characteristic properties of the prosopa, sometimes, again, to be subsisting as belonging with the substance, and in many places defining them as innate in the substance and viewed in it, by all this he is convicted of engaging in a proof that they are not hypostases at all. For the divinely inspired doctors of the Church never said anything like this about the hypostases, as will be revealed to all truth-loving readers by the very same patristic proof-texts quoted by him in support of his novel doctrines.

For he wrote in the ninth chapter of that notorious book as follows: However, seeing that the matter has been explained by the previous statements, let us quickly recall that it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance 'hypostases' and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert that they characterize

41/60 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (n° 14)



ܘܠܝ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܠܘܬ ܫܪܪܐ. ܘܠܒܢ̈ܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܣܟܡܬܢܘܬܐ ܢܓܠܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܕ ܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ ܒܬܪ̈ܥܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܡܥܝܢ ܡܕܢܚܐ: ܥܕܡܢܗ̇ ܘܩܢܝܐ ܒܥܕܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܬܫܒ.

ܢܐܬܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܛܟܣܐ ܕܠܢܝܢ: ܘܠܘܬ ܫܪܟܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܣܛܘܢܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܒܛܐ: ܕܒܐܬܪ̈ܝܢܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܬܚܫܒܐ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ.* ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܕܠܐܝܬ ܘܕܡܬܢܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ: ܟܕ ܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܦܫܝ̈ܩܐ ܬ̈ܚܘܡܐ: ܕܢܒܥܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܢܗܘܢ: ܘܒܬܪ ܗܝ ܥ̈ܡܒܐ ܘܩ̈ܢܘܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ: ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢ ܕܥ̈ܠܬܐ ܡܫܬܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܗܘ̈ܘ ܘܕܐܢܐ: ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܬܡܠܝܢ: ܒܕܘܟ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ ܘܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܚܫܒܝܢ ܘܒܓܘܗ̇ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ: ܟܕ ܒܠܗܝܢ ܡܬܬܚܝܕ: ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܡܬܬܒܪܢ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢ ܡܛܠ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ: ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܢܒܥܘ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܒܕܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܐܡܪܘ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܡܫܪܪܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ: ܕܡܢܗ ܠܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܗܝ, ܫ̈ܪܝܪܐ ܡܬܬܚܙܝܢ: ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܪܚܡܝ ܫܪܪܐ ܦܪܝܫܝܢ ܡܬܓܠܝܐ. A, f. 45ra

ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܫܥܐ ܕܒܟܬܒܗ ܗ̇ܘ ܦܪܣܘܡܐ ܗܟܢ:
— ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ ܐܬܦܫܩܬ ܠܝ ܨܒܘܬܐ ܒܡܐ ܕܠܝ
— ܕܩܕܝܡ ܩܘܡ: ܢܟܬܘܒ ܡܠܠܬܐ: ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܕܪܬܐ ܘܠܐ
— ܠܢܚܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܫܒܘܩ: ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ
— ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܒܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ:
— ܘܢܫܒܘܩ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ: ܘܐܦ ܕܣܓܝܐܬܐ

AB flor. I from ܢܟܬܘܒ (l. 44) on

Line 26: ܒܥܕܬܐ, B: ܕܒܥܕܬܐ.

Line 30: ܐܦ ܓܝܪ, A: four lines erroneously written are erased by the scribe.

Line 47: ܘܐܦ (as ch. 2, line 19), cf. infra, line 105, ch. 2, line 33, ch. 3, line 219 (ܐܦ).

the prosopa or hypostases, and use certain wordy expressions of this kind about them. For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius, writing against heresies and saying: 'The term "hypostases" shall not disturb people, for the reason the Easterns say "hypostases" is to indicate the subsisting and existing properties of the prosopa'; and again: 'They have good grounds for denominating the properties of the prosopa "subsisting hypostases", as we said before, because the Holy Ghost also subsists'? And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea: 'For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property'? * Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis 'indicative of the property'.

Before the close examination of this, readers must know that no orthodox thinker disagrees with people who simply term the hypostases of the Holy Trinity 'properties'. For we find some of our God-clad fathers using this expression in relation to the hypostases, and especially GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN. For exam-

---

**48/50** Epiph. Const., *Panar.*, Haer. 73 (*PG* 42, 432-433; Holl, III, p. 288, 20-22) **50/52** Ibid. (*PG* 42, 433A; Holl, III, p. 288, 27-29) **54/58** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, loco non reperto **59/60** cf. supra, 58



— ܗ̈ܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
— ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ : ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܩܠ̈ܝܠܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ
— ܗܠܝܢ ܡܫܬܡܫܝܢ ܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ. ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ
← ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ : ܟܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ : ܘܠܐ ܢܫܓܘܫ
← ܠܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ : ܡܛܠܗܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܢܚܝ̈ܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
← ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ ܘܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
← ܢܚܘܘܢ. ܘܬܘܒ : ܕܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܒܕܡܫܡܗ ܐܦ ܙܘܕܩܐ ܡܕܡܐ :
← ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܩܕܡܢ ܐܡܪܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
← ܕܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ : ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܕܢܬܚܫܒ ܠܘܬ
← ܠܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܡܦܢܐ ܘܐܡܪ : ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
← ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܟܠܗ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ :
← ܡܠܠܬܐ ܘܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܠܝ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ :
← ܘܠܝܬ ܡܕܡ ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܦܘܪܫܢܗܘܢ ܘܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ : ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ
← ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ *ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܚܙܝ f. 45rb
— ܠܘܬܟ ܚܒܝܒܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܐܡܪܗ
— ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܀

ܩܕܡ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܚܬܝܬܐ ܘܫܬܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܢܕܥܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܦܓܥܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܨܐܝܬ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܡܬܚܪܐ : ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ. ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܡܢ ܠܐ̈ܒܗܝܢ ܠܒܝܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ : ܕܒܗܕܐ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܥܠ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ. ܘܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܐܝܟ

---

AB flor. I [up to l. 50]

---

Line 48: ܕܫ̈ܡܗܝܢ, WY: ܕܡܫܡܗܝܢ.
Line 51: ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ, B: ܐܦܝܦܢܘܣ.
Line 52: ܠܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ, A: ܠܐܢܫܝܢ.
Line 54: ܐܦ ܙܘܕܩܐ, cf. ch. 3, line 226 and note.
Line 55: ܐܡܪܢ ..... ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ, cf. ch. 5, line 197 and note.
Line 56: ܦܘܪܣܐ, B: ܦܪܘܣܐ.
Lines 60-61: ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ..... ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ, cf. ch. 3, lines 233-234 (..... ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܥܒܕܢܐ) and note.
Line 67: ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ, B: ܦܫ̈ܝܛܐܝܬ. ܠܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ, A: ܠܐܢܫܝܢ.

ple, at one point in the oration *On the Holy Ghost* he says: Thus do I stand on these matters and will stand and would have it so for everyone who loves me, that we should confess the Father as God, the Son as God, the Holy Ghost as God, three properties, one Godhead undivided in glory, honour, substance and sovereignty as a fairly recent God-clad saint philosophized. In the oration *On the Lights*, he said at one point: But when I say 'God', be illumined by one light and by three; by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead. In the oration *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; one nature in three spiritual, perfect properties subsisting of themselves, divided in number and undivided in Godhead.

But everybody educated in things divine will take issue with those who are at pains to innovate upon and falsify the orthodox doctrines of the Church and who dare to suppose the characteristic properties (I mean ingeneracy, generacy and procession) to be the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Therefore, if this admirable fellow were really able to give proofs on these matters, correct and not twisted proofs, he ought not to produce for deception utterances by the doctors which no way assist his thesis, but instead such as clearly prove * that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the characteristic properties of the hypostases viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession.

**66/71** Greg. Naz., *Or. 31*, 28 (*PG* 36, 164CD; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 330)
**72/76** Greg. Naz., *Or. 39*, 11 (*PG* 36, 345C; *SChr.*, vol. 358, pp. 170-172)
**76/80** Greg. Naz., *Or. 33*, 16 (*PG* 36, 236A; *SChr.*, vol. 318, pp. 192-194)



> ܐܡܬܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܀ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ
> ܡܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܘܠܟܠ ܡܢ ܕܠܝ ܪܚܡ ܆
> ܕܢܘܕܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܆ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܪܐ ܆ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܪܘܚܐ
> ܩܕܝܫܐ ܆ ܬܠܬ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܆ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܕܐ ܆ ܕܒܫܘܒܚܘܬܐ
> ܘܒܐܝܩܪܐ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܒܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܐ ܆ ܐܝܟ
> ܕܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܦܝܠܣܘܦܐ
> ܚܟܡ. ܒܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܀ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܬܝ ܕܐܡܪ
> ܐܢܐ ܆ ܒܚܕ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ ܘܒܬܠܬܐ ܆ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܡܢ
> ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܆ ܐܢ ܪܚܡ ܐܢܫ ܠܗܢ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܘ
> ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܆ ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢܢ ܆ ܟܡܐ
> ܕܐ̈ܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܗ̇ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܫ̈ܘܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܆ ܒܚܕ ܕܝܢ
> ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܘܒܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ
> ܐܪ̈ܝܘܣ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܣܓܕܝܢܢ ܕܝܢ ܣܓܕܝܢ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ
> ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐܒܐ. ܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܪܐ. ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܐ
> ܡܬܩܫܝܬ ܐܢܬ ܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܒܬܠܬ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
> ܡܬܝ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܩܝܡܝܢ ܒܠܗܝܢ ܡܦܠ̈ܓܢ. ܒܡܢܝܢܐ
> ܡܬܦܠ̈ܓܢ ܆ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܠ̈ܓܢ ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀

ܐܠܐ ܟܠܢܫ ܕܝܕܥ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܡܬܚܬܫ ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ ܕܒܥܕܬܐ ܚܕܬܐܝܬ ܢܥܩܡܘܢ ܘܢܙܝܦܘܢ ܣܘܦܩ ܆ ܘܡܡܪܚܝܢ ܕܢܬܪܥܘܢ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܆ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܆ ܠܐ ܡܬܝܠܕܢܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܡܬܝܠܕܢܘܬܐ. ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ. ܡܕܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܐ ܆ ܠܬܚܘ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܆ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܥ̈ܩܠܬܐ ܕܢܬܠ ܡܬܕܡܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܡܨܝܢܐ ܆ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܆ ܕܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܡܛܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܆ ܢܩܒܠ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܗܕܐ ܕܣܝܡܐ ܡܥܕܪ̈ܢ ܠܗ̇ ܆ ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܚܘ̈ܝܢ ܆ * ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܆ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ f. 45va
ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܆ ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܬܝܠܕܢܘܬܐ ܘܡܬܝܠܕܢܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ.

AB flor. I [from l. 76 to l. 81]

Line 75: ܦܝܠܣܘܦܐ, B: ܦܝܠܘܣܘܦܐ.
Line 79: ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ, WY: ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܡܬܚܪܝܢܢ, flor. I: ܡܬܚܪܝܢ.

That he defines ingeneracy, generacy and procession as the hypostases of the Holy Trinity is evident from his very words just set down, for he says: It is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance 'hypostases' and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert that they 'characterize' the prosopa or hypostases, and use certain wordy expressions of this kind about them. Notice he has decreed that it is hazardous not to reckon the characteristic properties of the prosopa and of the hypostases as not hypostases. Which, then, are the properties which characterize the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Is it not evident that they are fatherhood, sonship (i.e. ingeneracy and generacy) and procession? Listen to him, who writes more plainly in the *Many-lined Letter* to us what is here said timidly *sotto voce* as follows: For the Father, he says, being the Father and not the Son or the Holy Ghost has the unique indication of the fatherhood which is called his 'hypostasis' or 'property' without distinction. Likewise the Son, being the Son and not the Father or the Holy Ghost has the unique and incommunicable indication of the sonship, which is his hypostasis and property. Take the same view of the Holy Ghost's procession which indicates his existence without being the Father or the Son. Again, towards the conclusion of the same letter, he speaks as follows: For if you thought of the property only as being a hypostasis when it subsists in the substance and has reality in the community, but that property as being substantial which fully participates in the substance and is not the aggregate of substance and property, we shall say that this doctrine belongs to

**94/98** cf. supra, 42-47 **106/112** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* **113/118** Ibid.



ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܘܡܢܗ ܕܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܩܕܡ ܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ : ܠܚܠܝܨ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܘܡܚܬܐ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ
— ܐܡܪܢܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܫܡܝܐ ܀ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܚܫܝܒܬܐ : ܘܠܐ
— ܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝ̈ ܬܠܬ
— ܕܐܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܢܦܩܐ ܡܢܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ :
— ܘܢܩܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܗܘܝ̈ܢܐ : ܐܦ ܕܬܢܝܬܐ
— ܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܚܬܡܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܚܢܬ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
— ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܘܡܠ̈ܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܩܠܝܠܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ
— ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܡܠܠܬܗܝܢ ܀ ܗܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܠܝܨܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܦܣܩ : ܗ̇ܘ
ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܩܠܝܢܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܠܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܢܚܫܘܒ. ܐܝܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܚܬܡܝܢ
ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܝܕܝܥܐ ܗܝ
ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܘܒܪܘܬܐ : ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ. ܫܡܥܝܗܝ، ܕܦܫܝܩ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܪܡܙܐ
ܒܚܫܝܐܝܬ ܘܒܚܘܒܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܡܪ ܐܡܪܢܐ :
ܕܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬܢ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܦܘܪ̈ܓܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܟܬܒ ܀
— ܐܒܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܟܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܒܐ : ܘܠܐ ܒܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܪܘܚܐ
— ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܝܚܝܕܝܬܐ ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ. ܗ̇ܝ
— ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܠܐ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܡܬܩܪܝܐ. ܒܗ̇
— ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܒܪܐ : ܟܕ ܒܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܠܐ ܐܒܐ ܘܠܐ ܪܘܚܐ
— ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܝܚܝܕܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇
— ܕܒܪܘܬܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܗ̇ܝ ܗܕܐ
— ܐܣܬܟܠ ܘܡܛܠ ܢܦܩܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܗ̇ ܠܐ
— ܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܠܐ ܒܪܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܝܠܗ̇ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܀ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ
ܘܠܐܘܩ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇ ܒܗ̇ ܕܝܠܗ̇ ܕܐܓܪܬܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀
— ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܩܝܡܐ ܘܒܓܘܐ
— ܡܬܢܬܐ : ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܣܬܟܠܬܘܢ : ܐܘܣܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ :
— ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܡܫܬܠܡܐܝܬ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ : ܘܠܐ
— ܒܘܢܝܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܬܪܝܨܬ

AB

Line 105: ܐܦ, cf. supra, line 47 (ܘܐܦ) and note.
Line 116: ܐܡܪ, B om.

your orthodox teaching and no * right-thinking man will dispute the fact. And again: Hence being led a little further towards the aim of the matter proposed to my humble self, I said that he who is glorified is not mere ingeneracy, generacy and procession, because the terms do not indicate the substance; no, it is the fullness of the preaching of the mystery that we reckon that these things are substantial: three perfect hypostases and three prosopa in the one substance of the Godhead.

That being thus established and it being clear that this excellent fellow thinks the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the characteristic properties of the prosopa (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession), we may rightly require him not to take refuge in arguments that are irrelevant to the dispute or occupy himself in profitless labours, attempting to prove by patristic proof-texts what are common points of agreement between us and him as if they were something grand and strange. No, let him show plainly and *expressis verbis* from the fathers' utterances that the hypostases are the characteristic properties of the prosopa. For as we have written elsewhere he has strenuously laid it down that nobody can indicate a word of his or syllable, thought, mode of discussion or logical deduction, which is not said *expressis verbis* by the holy fathers. Either, then, he should confirm from patristic teaching *expressis verbis* as he said, what has just been quoted from his writings; or, the readers are to understand that the arrogance of his statements is as idle and empty as his doctrines.

**119/124** Ibid. **135/137** cf. infra, 152-153



— ܫܘܒܚܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܘܠܦܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ܇ ܘܠܐ ܐܢܫ * ܡܢ f.45vb
— ܗܘܢ ܕܫܦܝܪ ܡܬܪܥܝܢ ܡܬܚܪܐ܀ ܘܬܘܒ܀ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܟܕ
— ܐܬܕܒܪܬ ܐܢܐ ܩܠܝܠ ܠܘܬ ܢܝܫܐ ܕܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܕܣܝܡ ܠܝ
— ܐܡܪܬ܆ ܕܠܘ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܫܒܝܚܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ
— ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܡܥܢ܆ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
— ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ܆ ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܚܫܘܒ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
— ܗܠܝܢ܆ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܡܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܪܘܙܘܬܐ ܕܐܪܙܐ. ܬܠܬܐ
— ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܐ܆ ܒܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
— ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ܀

ܟܕ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܫܬܪܪܬ܆ ܘܓܠܝܐ ܗܘܬ܆ ܕܠܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܝܫܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ܆ ܗܘܝܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܝܬܪܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܣܬܒܪ ܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܬܒܥܝܢܝܗܝ܆ ܕܠܐ ܢܥܘܩ ܠܘܬ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܐܓܘܢܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ. ܘܠܐ ܒܕ ܒܥܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܘܬܪܢ ܡܬܒܥܐ܆ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܓܘܢܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܘܡܢܗ ܡܬܬܘܕܝܢ܆ ܐܝܟ ܡܕܡ ܪܒܐ ܘܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܢܚܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܦܪܗܣܝܐܝܬ ܐܟܘܬܐ ܢܣܒܐ. ܐܠܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܘܟܕ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܒ̈ܢܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܢܚܘܐ܆ ܕܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܝܫܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܟܬܒܢ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܗܟܢ ܙܪܝܙܐܝܬ ܦܣܩ܆ ܕܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܡܫܟܚ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܗ܆ ܐܘ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܐܘ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܐܘ ܐܕܫܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܐ ܐܘ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ܆ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܟܕ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܐܡܝܪ. ܐܘ ܗܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܢܫܪܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܝܒܢ ܠܗ ܐܬܬܚܡܬ܆ ܗ̇ܝ ܟܕ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܝܪܐ ܕܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܢܫܪܪ܆ ܐܘ ܢܕܥܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܦܓܥܝܢ܆ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܗ܆ ܗܟܢܐ ܘܫܘܥܠܝܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܣܪܝܩܐ ܘܣܦܝܩܐ ܠܓܒܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ.

AB flor. I from l. 138 on

Line 133: ܕܡܫܬܡܥܢ, B: ܕܡܫܬܡܥܢܘܬܐ.
Line 148: ܡܫܟܚ, WY: ܕܡܫܟܚ, XZ: ܕܡܫܟܚܝܢ.

But it would be as well to quote a few of his words here as a reminder, words set down in what has previously been examined, so that the listener, seeing the grandeur of his promises and the feebleness of his proofs, may easily avoid the bedizened error and hasten, the more fervently, towards truth and correctness of doctrines. He wrote, then, in the *Many-lined Letter* I have mentioned, in the following fashion: Reverend brother, it has clearly been proved from this that our humble selves have not innovated so much as a jot or a tittle; no, we have drawn from the well of the fathers and brought therefrom * the pure water of their teaching. And after a few lines: Surely, therefore, nobody can indicate a word of ours or syllable, thought, mode of discussion or logical deduction, which is not gathered and gleaned from collecting the crumbs which fall from the loaf of doctrine. Let anyone, then, who will, show what things in our previous passages are not the *ipsissima verba* of the holy fathers, and not condemn us without reason with a pretence of charity.

You see the emptiness and vain glory! It has clearly been proved from this, he says, that our humble selves have not innovated so much as a jot or a tittle; and again: Surely nobody can show a word of ours or syllable, thought, mode of discussion or logical deduction, which is not gathered and gleaned from collecting the crumbs which fall from the loaf of doctrine. He says this in vain self-glorying, but we invite the more diligent brethren to read with special care the *Apology*, the

**148/151** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* **151/157** Ibid. **158/160** cf. supra, 148-150 **160/163** cf. supra, 151-154



ܥܒܝܕܐ ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܡܥܗܕܢܘܬܐ ܘܡܪܐܝܐ ܕܫܡܘܥܬܐ
ܢܬܐܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܐܠܝ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܬܒܚܢ
ܐܬܬܣܝܡ. ܕܟܕ ܢܚܙܐ ܫܡܘܥܐ ܠܪܒܘܬܐ ܕܫܘ̈ܘܕܝܘܗܝ
ܘܠܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܦܫܝܩܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܢܥܘܪ ܡܢ
ܠܛܥܝܘܬܐ ܡܨܒܬܬܐ: ܝܬܝܪ ܚܡܝܡܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܢܪܗܛ ܠܘܬ
ܫܪܪܐ ܘܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܐ. ܟܬܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ
ܡܣܓܝܐܬ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܕܐܬܕܟܪܬ: ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܐܡܪ ܀
— ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܐܚܐ ܡܝܩܪܐ: ܕܐܦܠܐ ܚܕ
— ܝܘܕ ܐܘ ܣܪܛܐ ܚܕ ܒܙܥܘܪܘܬܢ ܚܕܬܢ. ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܒܘܥܐ
— ܐܒܗܬܐ ܕܠܒܢ: ܘܡܢ ܬܡܢ * ܢܓܕܢ ܥܩܒܐ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ — f. 46ra
— ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܀ ܘܒܬܪ ܕܣܘܪ̈ܛܐ ܀ ܠܐ ܐܪܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܐܢܫ
— ܕܢܚܘܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ: ܐܘ ܦܣܘܩܐ ܐܘ ܡܚܫܒܬܐ: ܐܘ
— ܐܕܫܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܐ ܐܘ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ: ܗܘ ܕܠܘ ܡܢ
— ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܦܬ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܢܦܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܦܬܬܐ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܡܠܩܛܐ
— ܡܟܢܫ ܘܡܠܩܛ. ܐܝܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܬܚܙܝܘܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܦܬܓܡܐ
— ܕܠܝ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ ܣܡܝܢ: ܗ̇ܘܝܢ ܕܠܘ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ
— ܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ: ܢܠܦ ܟܠ ܡܢ ܕܨܒܐ: ܘܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ
— ܢܚܝܒ ܠܝ ܒܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܚܘܒܐ ܀

— ܚܙܝ ܐܝܟܘ ܣܦܝܩܘܬܐ ܕܫܘܒܗܪܐ ܣܪܝܩܐ ܀ ܠܓܠܝܐܝܬ
— ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ: ܕܐܦܠܐ ܚܕ ܝܘܕ ܐܘ
— ܣܪܛܐ ܚܕ ܒܙܥܘܪܘܬܢ ܚܕܬܢ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܠܐ ܐܪܐ ܐܝܬ
— ܠܐܢܫ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܐܘ ܦܣܘܩܐ ܐܘ ܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܐܘ
— ܐܕܫܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܐ ܐܘ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ: ܗܘ ܕܠܘ ܡܢ
— ܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܦܬ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܢܦܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܦܬܬܐ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܡܠܩܛܐ
— ܡܟܢܫ ܘܡܠܩܛ ܀ ܘܗܘ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܕ ܣܪܝܩܘܬ ܫܘܒܗܪܗ
ܐܡܪ. ܚܢܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܦܝܣܝܢ ܠܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܚܦܝܛܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܚ̈ܐ:

AB flor. I up to l. 173

Line 156: ܡܥܗܕܢܘܬܐ, W: ܡܥܬܗܕܢܘܬܐ.
Line 166: ܐܪܐ, B, flor. I: ܗܟܝܠ.
Line 169: ܕܢܦܠܝܢ, Y: ܕܢܦܠܝܢ.
Line 171: ܗܘܝܢ, flor. I: ܗ̈ܘܝܢ.
Line 176: ܐܪܐ, B: ܗܟܝܠ.

*Many-lined Plerophoria*, and all the rest of his apologies for apologies and investigate whether up till now he has been able to confirm in any way by the divinely inspired statements of the fathers a single one of those chapters of his we have criticized. For we should have liked, had time permitted and had it not gone well beyond the compass of the discussion, to quote the utter nonsense in all his apologies and demonstrate that he has been unable to prove from the fathers' teaching any of the matters criticized, as has been said, by us; and moreover *inter alia* thereby convince everyone of how, without investigation or understanding, he writes whatever he pleases, not discoursing on anything not looked at in a superficial manner. Because of its immoderate abundance, as I said, we now abstain from a task too lengthy for the present. However, in regard to what is now set down for examination, let us investigate and scrutinize it as far as possible, to see whether he has shown with any kind of proof at all that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are fatherhood and sonship * (ingeneracy and generacy) and procession. For that is specially why he made a long examination of them.



ܕܟܕ ܒܡܠܠܓܢܝܐ ܣܛܪ̈ܐ ܕܡܟܡ ܒܪܘܫܐ ܠܗ ܘܦܠܝܪܘܦܘܪܝܐ
ܡܦܩܬ ܡܘܪ̈ܓܢܐ : ܘܡܠܘܗܝ ܡܟܡ ܒܪܘܫܐ ܕܡܟܡ
ܒܪܘܫܘܗܝ، ܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܦܩܚܝܢ ܠܡܟܡ : ܐܝܟ ܕܒܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܕܡ
ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܦ̈ܠܐܐ ܕܠܗ ܗܘܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܬܒܕܩܘ : ܟܕ ܐܠܘ
ܕܢܦܣܘܩ ܐܠܗܝܬ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܠܐܘܪܚܬܐ ܕܢܫܪܪ ܒܡܠܬܐ
ܠܗܡܐ ܐܡܝܢ. ܘܢܚܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܠܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܫܒܩ ܗܘܐ :
ܘܠܐ ܣܓܝ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܙܠܐ ܗܘܬ :
ܠܗܘܦܐ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܕܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܟܡ ܒܪܘܫܘܗܝ، ܠܐ ܢܫܡ
ܘܢܚܘܐ : ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܟܝܠ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ
ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ ܐܬܒܕܠ : ܕܢܫܘܐ ܡܢ ܬܚܠܘܦܬܐ ܐܡܬܗܘܬܐ
ܐܬܚܙܝ. ܘܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܘܚܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܟܠܢܫ ܢܚܘܐ :
ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܣܘܟܠܐ : ܗܘ ܡܐ ܕܨܒܐ
ܕܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܟܬܒ : ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܡܕܡ : ܐܠܐ ܕܗܝ، ܕܠܐ ܦܠܐܬ
ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ ܟܕ ܡܠܬܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܫܘܦܥܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܬ : ܕܫܒܩܢܐ ܡܢ ܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܐܪܝܟܐ ܡܢ
ܕܒܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܫܬܐܠܝܢ. ܒܪܡ ܡܛܠ ܗܝ، ܕܗܫܐ ܣܝܡܐ
ܠܒܘܚܢܐ : ܢܒܩܐ ܘܡܒܚܢܐ ܕܡܫܟܚܢܐ ܢܚܙܐ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܒܢܐ
ܡܕܡ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܚܘܝ، : ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܘܒܪܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܠܐ
* ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ f. 46rb
ܓܝܪ ܡܬܢܐܬ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܡܣܓܝܐܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ.

AB

*Rebuttal of statements devised by him against the fathers wherein he says that it is hazardous not to profess the characteristic properties viewed in the common substance as hypostases. And examination of the beginning of the strong, as he supposes, proof in his* Many-lined Letter, *where he also shows himself annoyed because at the start we did not write to him by way of dispute but peacefully called his attention to points we were in doubt over. And proof drawn from statements of the fathers that only the modest can bear rebuttals in a peaceful manner.*

Therefore, presently taking this task with both hands and only examining briefly the purport of the main points, we shall show, so far as is possible, the wicked nonsense of his scattered and absurd statements.

He said, then, in what has previously been set down: It is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties, viewed in the common substance 'hypostases' and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert that they 'characterize' the prosopa or hypostases.

Let us take note how, apparently aware that the divinely inspired spiritual guides do not allow us to profess the characteristic properties of the prosopa as hypostases, he accordingly becomes confused and, to deceive the simple audience, makes the

15/19 cf. supra, ch. 1, 42-46



ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܡ̈ܬܚܫܒܢ ܠܗ. ܕܒܗܝܢ ܐܡ̈ܪ : ܕܠܐ ܙܗܝܪܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܬ̈ܚܡܝܣܝܬܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡ̈ܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܐ ܢܘܕܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܡܬܚܣܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ : ܕܒܐܓܪܬܗ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܦܬܓ̈ܡܐ : ܕܒܗ̇ ܐܦ ܡܚܘܐ ܕܡܬܥܝܩ ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܐܓܘܢܐ ܠܘܬܗ ܟܬܒܢ : ܐܠܐ ܒܫܝܢܐܝܬ ܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܦܠܓܢ ܠ ܒܗܘܢܗܝ، ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܬ̈ܢܐ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ : ܕܕܐܠܝܢ ܕܢܟܦܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܒܫܝܢܐܝܬ ܢܣܝܒܪܘܢ ܡܟ̈ܣܢܘܬܐ ܀

ܒ ܡܕܝܢ ܕܫܩܠܢܢ ܒܗ̇ ܠܥܣܩܘܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܒܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܐܝ̈ܕܝܢ : ܘܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܪ̈ܫܝܬܐ ܒܦܣܝܩܬܐ ܡܒܩܝܢ : ܟܡܐ ܕܡܨܝܐ : ܠܦܩܝܩܘܬܐ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܘܝܢ ܕܡܒܕ̈ܪܬܐ ܘܡܣܪ̈ܚܬܐ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܠܗ ܡܚܘܝܢ.

— ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡ ܣܝܡܢ ܀ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
— ܙܗܝܪܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܝܢܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܢܣܒܪ :
— ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ
— ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܘܢܣܒܪ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ : ܐܦܢ
— ܙܒ̈ܢܬܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܬ̈ܚܡܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܠܘܬ
— ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ ܀

ܢܬܚܙܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܗ̇ ܝܕܥ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܚܝܠܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܫܒܩܝܢ ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܐ ܢܦ̈ܫܢܝܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܬ̈ܚܡܝܣܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܘܕܐ : ܠܡܟܐܝܬ ܫܓ̈ܪ : ܘܠܘܬ

AB

Line 19: ܘܐܦ, cf. ch. 1, line 47 and note.

impossible attempt to mingle cavills against the God-clad saints with respect for them. By saying, it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties, viewed in the common substance 'hypostases' and to suppose they are not three realities, he seems to have been at great pains to show them good will and to advocate orthodox teachings. But by saying what he immediately goes on to do, even though the doctors frequently assert that they 'characterize' the prosopa or hypostases, and use certain wordy expressions of this kind * about them, he faintly hints that although the doctors said (not, as one might say, accurately and carefully, but, rather, negligently or wordily) that the properties (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) characterize the hypostases, nevertheless I recognize and define them as the hypostases of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

However, since we recollect his own wordiness and have seen in many places that the whole force of his reprobate view depends mainly on it, let us consider what an ordinary person like myself ought to do, who cannot, as it seems, without it, become cognizant of the knowledge of the true doctrines of his theology. Are we to abandon the irreproachable teaching of the Church's pastors and be taught by him, on the grounds that he teaches more accurately by human wisdom the inerrant understanding of divine doctrines, because he who hired out his tongue to him for this new theology, as they say, ended his life first? How shall we not offend exceedingly against our God-clad fathers and accordingly, by doing so, stray from the truth? For we have learned that we should entrust

**25/28** cf. supra, ch. 1, 42-45 **30/32** cf. supra, ch. 1, 45-47



ܡܠܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܡܫܬܐ ܦܫܝܛܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܡܨܝܢܘܬܐ
ܡܢܗܐ : ܕܒܥܩܘܡܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܠܒܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܚܠܛ ܒܝܩܪܐ
— ܕܠܐܒܗ̈ܘܢ. ܘܟܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ÷ ܕܠܐ ܐܣܬܘܢ ܕܡܘܢܬܐ ܘܠܐ
— ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܣܒܪ : ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ
— ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܒܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ :
— ܘܢܣܒܪ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܣܘܒ̈ܪܢܐ ÷ ܡܣܬܒܪ
ܕܒܣܘܓܦܐ ܚܫܝܚܬܐ ܠܡ ܚܒܒ ܥܛܦܘܬ ܪ̈ܚܡܐ
ܕܠܗܘܢ : ܘܡܣܟܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ. ܟܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ
— ܕܠܒܬܪܟܢ ܡܫܡܫ ÷ ܐܦ ܕܟܒ̈ܝܪܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ
— ܕܬܚܝܡܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ * ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ : — A, f. 46va
— ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܩ̈ܠܝܠܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܫܚܝܢ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ ÷
ܒܡܪܡܙܢܘܬ ܙܥܘܪ ܕܐܦ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܢܒܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܠܐ
ܠܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ ܘܠܚܦܝܛܘܬܐ ܘܢܛܝܪܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܡܪ
ܫܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܘܠܐ ܒܥܡܠ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ : ܡܦܚܙܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܝܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ
ܒܦܬܓܡ ܡܠܬܐ : ܕܬܚܝܡܝܢ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܘ : ܐܠܐ ܐܢܐ :
ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܝܕܥ ܐܢܐ
ܘܡܬܚܡ ܐܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ.

ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܦܬܝܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܬܕܟܪܢ : ܘܚܙܝܢ
ܕܘܟܝ̈ܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܢ : ܕܟܠܗ ܡܘܪܬܐ ܠܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܗ
ܠܐ ܒܚܝܪܬܐ ܫܩܠܐ : ܬܟܝܠܐ ܕܡܟܢܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܥܒܕ
ܗܕܝܘܛܐ ܕܝܠܝ : ܕܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܡܢ
ܗܕܐ : ܒܝܕܥܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ ܕܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ
ܡܬܚܡܟܐ ܕܬܗܘܐ. ܐܪܐ ܕܢܫܒܘܩ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܒܕܝܠܬܐ
ܕܪ̈ܥܘܬܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ : ܘܢܬܠܡܕ ܠܗ : ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܠܦ
ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܐܢܫܝܬܐ ܫܘܠܦ ܡܕܥܐ ܕܠܐ ܛܥܝܐ
ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܓܪ ܠܫܢܗ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܗ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܘܓܪ ܠܗ ܠܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ܗܕܐ ܚܕܬܐ :
ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܢܪܓܙ ܠܠܒܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܢ ܡܚܡܠܝܢ :
ܘܠܣܟܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܗܕܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ ܢܦܩ. ܝܠܦܢ ܓܝܪ : ܕܠܐ

AB up to ܫܬܝܬܐܝܬ (l. 38)

Line 33: ܐܦ, cf. ch. 1, line 47 and note.

our minds to the divinely inspired doctors of the Church and to no others.

Let us see what our wise and exact father and doctor SEVERUS teaches us on this point, writing, as he does, as follows in the *Letter to Eustathius the Scholasticus* (the beginning of which is, If ministering, as you do, the divine commandment which he has commanded): Your wisdom has, I think, seen therefore, by these statements that the doctor designated as 'sufferings' both the partial and the complete corruptions and changes. You are to understand clearly that we follow him therefore and the doctors who are like him, being ourselves of a very rustic disposition and not accurately instructed in profane matters, in order that we may be able therefrom to meet the tangles and objections expressed by certain parties.

Had he too followed these divinely inspired words * and thought he ought to produce proofs, from the fathers' expositions, of his controversial statements, he would not have needed to rely on frigid snippets and blather such things against the doctors of the Church. No, he would have taken pains either to prove clearly from their irreproachable teaching that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the properties (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) viewed in the common substance and that they are spoken of wordily as characterizing the prosopa or hypostases; or, if he could not prove this, he should have bade adieu to his whole feeble notion and simply grasped the rectitude of the Church's teaching.

Perhaps he will say he has already done this in the said, oft-mentioned, *Many-lined Plerophoria*, where, on having been asked by us, for supports for his evil statements he produced these 'power-

56/62 Sev. Ant., *Ep. ad Eustath. Schol.*, hucusque incognita



ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢ ܠܐܣܘܬܐ : ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܢܦܫܢ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ : ܠܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܢܘܣܦ.

ܘܢܚܙܐ ܐܝܟܢ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܪܪܐ ܠܢ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܘܚܬܝܬܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܘܡܠܦܢܐ ܣܐܘܝܪܐ : ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܟܬܒ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܣܛܐܬܝܘܣ ܐܣܟܘܠܣܛܝܩܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܪܫܗ̇ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ :

> ܐܢܘ ܕܟܕ ܠܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܕܦܩܕ ܡܫܡܫ ܐܢܬ ❖ ܚܙܬ ܠܗ̇
> ܗܟܝܠ ܦܪܫ ܐܢܐ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܚܟܡܬܟ : ܕܡܠܦܢܐ :
> ܠܚ̈ܒܠܐ ܘܫܘ̈ܚܠܦܐ ܬ̈ܡܝܡܬܐ : ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܡܨ̈ܥܝܢܝܐ ܟܢܗ̇
> ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܫܡܐ ܩܪܐ. ܠܗܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܘܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܡܝܢ
> ܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܚܠܝܐܝܬ ܕܢܦܩܝܢ : ܟܕ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܩܘܪܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܕܒܪܝܢ : ܘܠܐ
> ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܒܪ ܪܕܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܫܟܚ ܕܐܦ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ :
> ܠܘܬ ܥܘܪ̈ܩܠܐ ܘܣܘܦ̈ܩܬܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܡܬܬܐܡ̈ܪܝܢ
> ܢܦܓܥ ❖

ܠܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܢܦܝ̈ܫܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܘ ܢܦܩ ܗܘܐ ܐܦ ܗܘ : * ܘܣܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܙܕܩ ܕܢܦܩ ܕܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܢܘܩܪܐ ܐܬܐܡܪ : ܡܢ ܦܘܫܩ̈ܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ ܕܚܪ̈ܝܢܘܬܗܘܢ : ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ : ܕܒܐܬܬܟܠ ܥܠ ܡܦܣ̈ܩܬܐ ܩܪ̈ܝܪܬܐ ܠܗܡܠܠ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܦܩ. ܐܠܐ ܕܢܫܪܪ ܡܠܗ̇ : ܐܘ ܕܡܢ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܡܬܓܢܝܢܬܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܚܘܐ : ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܬܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܝܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܕܦܪܨ̈ܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܡܬܡܠܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐܝܬ. ܐܘ ܐܢ ܗܕܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܠܐ ܡܨܐ ܗܘܐ : ܠܟܠܗ̇ ܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܢܦܫܢܝܬܐ ܫܠܡ ܗܘܐ : ܘܠܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܥܕ̈ܬܢܝܐ ܢܐܚܘܕ.

ܘܟܒܪ ܐܡܪ ܕܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܗܘܐ ܥܒܕ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܘܬܢ̈ܝܢ ܩ̈ܛܝܢܐ ܐܬܕܟܪܬ ܦܠܪܘܦܘܪܝܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܣܘܪ̈ܓܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܟܕ ܡܢ ܡܬܬܒܥ ܗܘܐ ܡܢܢ ܪܫܝܥܬܐ ܐܡܝ̈ܪܬܗ ܠܣܘܟܠܐ ܠܗ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܫܪ̈ܝܪܬܐ

A

ful and lengthy apologies' on the point with all diligence and care. We shall, so far as we are able, examine, and by the fathers' testimony more plainly rebut, these, so that the friends of right doctrines may easily and effortlessly hasten to the truth. Truth we shall honour more than anything, because it is the beginning and end of the good works which especially conduce to salvation.

He says, therefore, as he begins his invincible 'demonstrations' and as if he were setting right and addressing the argument to those who, along with us, had read his book, as follows: Such are their views. What are we to say to them, if not that those who, according to what you said, are aflame with warm zeal for orthodoxy ought not just to offer mere disparagement and censure but ought also to correct, and say how these things can be taken by the opponents in another way and which of my views are not fortified with patristic confirmation? For we ought not only to take account of wrongful action or statement but also * re-introduce right action and due statement. Because it is not simply the combatant but the lawful combatant who is crowned; and not all zeal is good - only *zeal with knowledge*. The Apostle, indeed, bade us *be zealous for great spiritual gifts*. For I declare with Truth Himself in audience: I should have defined such people as my teachers and helpers. But as it is, having merely asserted that my words are capable of being taken by the opponents in a different sense without saying how and without mention in a brotherly way of their not being patristic, they have smeared them with empty, fatuous criticism. And it is surprising that one should be convicted of failing to adhere to the fathers' teaching in the very passages where one condemns the statements of one's opponents for failing to accord with the fathers' teaching and declared that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to take such a view'.

**86/105** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* **94** cf. II Tim. 2:5 **95** Rom. 10:2
**95/96** I Cor. 12:31 **104/105** cf. supra, 15-16



ܘܐܪ̈ܝܟܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ : ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܚܦܝܛܘܬܐ ܘܒܛܝܠܐ ܥܒܕ. ܠܗܠܝܢ ܘܐܝܟ ܚܝܠ ܢܚܢܢ. ܘܒܝܕ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܢܒܨܐ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܢܟܣ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܪ̈ܚܡܝܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ ܕܘܓ̈ܡܐ : ܕܠܒܠܝܘܬ ܘܕܠܐ ܥܡܠܐ : ܠܘܬ ܫܪܪܐ ܢܪܗܛܘܢ. ܘܠܫܪܪ ܡܢ ܟܠܡܕܡ ܠܗܘܐ ܢܝܩܪ. ܗܘ ܕܪܫܐ ܘܫܘܠܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܛܒ̈ܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܡ̈ܟܠܝܢ.

ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܟܕ ܡܫܪܐ ܒܬܚܘܝ̈ܬܗ ܠܡ ܠܐ ܡܬܙܟ̈ܝܢܝܬܐ ܡܥܢܐ : ܘܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܥܡܢ ܩܪܘ
— ܬܪ̈ܨ ܘܡܬܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܕܝܢܐ ⁘ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܗ̈ܝ ܕܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ
— ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ. ܣܝ ܕܝܢ ܡܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܕܠܘ̈
— ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܬܘܢ ܒܛܢܢܐ ܚܡܝܡܐ
— ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ ܡܬܚܡܨܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܥܫܝܩܐܝܬ
— ܢܠܘܡܘܢ ܘܢܒܣܪܘܢ : ܐܠܐ ܕܢܬܪ̈ܨܘܢ ܘܢܐܡܪܘܢ :
— ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܡܫܟܚܢܐ ܕܢܬܢܣܒܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ
— ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ : ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ : ܠܐ ܒܫܘܪܪܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܐ
— ܡܚܣܢܝܢ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܠܡܥܒܕ ܐܘ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܘܠܐ
— ܒܠܚܘܕ ܢܬܒܥ : ܐܠܐ ܘܢܦܩܘܢ ܬܘܒ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܙܕܩ * ܕܢܥܒܕ f. 47ra
— ܘܗ̇ܘ ܡܐ ܕܘܠܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ. ܡܛܠ ܕܠܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܬܟܬܫ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܐܠܐ
— ܗ̇ܘ ܕܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ ܐܬܟܬܫ ܡܬܟܠܠ. ܘܠܐ ܟܠ ܛܢܢܐ ܫܦܝܪ :
— ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܐܝܕܥܬܐ. ܠܡܛܢ ܓܝܪ ܦܩܕ ܫܠܝܚܐ ܒܡܘܗ̈ܒܬܐ
— ܪ̈ܘܪܒܬܐ ܪ̈ܘܚܢܝܬܐ. ܡܘܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܡ
— ܐܝܟ ܕܗܘ ܫܪܪܐ ܫܡܥ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܕܠܡܠܦܢ̈ܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܘܡܥܕܪ̈ܢܐ
— ܗ̇ܘܝܬ ܡܣܒܪܢ̈ܐ. ܗܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܕܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܡܪܘ :
— ܕܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܡܫܟܚܢܐ ܕܢܬܢܣܒܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ ܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ
— ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ : ܘܠܐ ܐܡܪܘ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ : ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܥܗܕܘ
— ܐܚܝܐܝܬ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ : ܒܕܠܝܠܐ ܪܫܝܡܐ ܘܠܐ
— ܡܦܫܢܐ ܫܦܘ ܒܗܘܢ. ܘܐܬܡܗܐ ܕܢܦܫܐ ܠܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ : ܕܐ
— ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܗܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ ܡܚܝܒ : ܐܝܟ
— ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܫ̈ܠܡܢ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܘܐܡܪ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇
— ܡܪܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܩܦܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܕܐܝܟ
— ܗܟܢ ܢܣܒܪ : ܒܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܦܠܓܐ : ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܢܦܩ
— ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ⁘

AB from ܟܠ (l. 101) on

These things we have set down, not because we think that they contain anything worthwhile, nor again because we are concerned out of vanity to write down much that is unnecessary, but because we are seeking to prove even from his uncontroversial statements the turmoil and instability of his mind. For our sole aim now is to pull up the causes, as it were, the roots, of his heretical opinion by the divinely inspired fathers' teachings; and to rebut, so far as we can, what is supposed to import some powerful defence of impiety. For it is obvious that if that is brought about through him who said, *I am the truth*, the other senseless rubbish will be easily reduced to nothing. For we find our teachers did this too, and, out of many, we show wise GREGORY OF NYSSA, who in the fourth chapter of his *Refutation of Eunomius* (which begins: It is not possible, it seems, to want to help everybody) says as follows: I omit all such as being an empty multitude of things which introduce nothing useful. But if any defence * of heretical opinion is made by him, towards this I consider it would be as well for me to devote more effort. For this is how the leader of divine doctrines acted in his own discourse, he who, though there were many points capable of broadening the argument, runs through only the essentials and shortens most of the subject-matter, selecting from all the statements in that book of impiety, the main points of the blasphemies. These things the master of mysteries says.

But let us take note with how much intensity whether in jest or with mischievous intention, the cunning author abuses us (us, indeed, no one else, even though his statement is made to look as if it were directed to other people), because at the start of this affair we wrote to him in irenic, submissive terms, with no hostil-

**115** Ioh. 14:6 **119/127** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (*PG* 45, 256AB; Jaeger I, p. 29, 11-20)



ܘܗܠܝܢ ܣܡܢ. ܘܠܐ ܒܕ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗܝܢ ܡܕܡ ܕܥܘܕܪܐ ܠܝܘܬܪܢܘܬܐ: ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܒܕ ܟܠܝܠ ܠܢ ܐܘ ܗܝ ܐܝܬ ܠܢ ܣܪܝܩܘܬܐ: ܕܣܘܓܐܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܨ ܢܟܬܘܒ. ܐܠܐ ܒܕ ܒܥܝܢ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܘܡܚܘܝܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܚܪܝܢܐ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܠܗ: ܫܓܘܫܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܩܘܝܡܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܗ. ܚܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬ ܠܢ ܗܫܐ: ܕܠܥܠܠܬܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܥܩܪ̈ܐ ܠܥܩܪܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ: ܒܝܕ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܢܫ̈ܝܡܬ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܐܦܣ̈ܬܐ ܢܬܠܘܫ. ܘܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܣܬܒܪ̈ܢ ܕܡܥܒܪ ܫܠܝܛܬܐ ܡܚܠܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܡܦܩܒܪܘܚܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܫܥܐ: ܐܝܟ ܚܝܠܢ ܢܒܛܠ. ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܗܝܪܐ: ܕܐܢ ܗܢܐ ܒܝܕ ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ ܫܪܪܐ ܗܘܐ: ܦܫܝܩܐܝܬ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܩܩܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܗܘܝܐ ܠܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܥܬܝܕ. ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܕܥܒܕܘ ܡܠܦ̈ܢܝܢ. ܘܡܢ ܣ̈ܓܝܐܐ ܢܚܘܐ: ܠܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܕܢܘܣܐ. ܕܒܦܬܓܡܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ. ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܣܘܩܒܠܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ: ܗܘ ܕܫܘܪܝܗ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܠܘܬ ܐܝܟ

< ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܗܘ. ܕܠܟܠ ܐܢܫ ܢܥܕܪ ܕܢܨܒܐ: ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܘܟܠܗܝܢ
< ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ: ܐܝܟ ܣܓܝܐܘܬܐ ܣܪܝܩܬܐ ܘܕܠܐ
< ܠܡܕܡ ܕܡܥܕܪ ܡܥܠܝܢ ܫܒܩ ܐܢܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܡܦܩܒܪܘܚܘܬܐ ܡܕܡ * ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ ܒܝܕܗ ܗܘܐ f. 47rb
< ܠܗ: ܠܘܬ ܗܕܐ ܕܫܦܝܪܐ ܠܝ ܣܓܝ ܐܝܟܢܐ: ܕܐܘܣܦ ܚܦܝܛܘܬܐ
< ܬܬܢܬܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܗܘ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܕܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܗܝ̈ܐ:
< ܒܡܡܠܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܥܒܕ. ܗܘ ܕܟܕ ܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ: ܐܝܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܣܦ̈ܩܝܢ ܕܠܦܘܬܝܘܬܐ ܢܬܦܬܚܘܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ: ܒܕ ܒܝܕ ܐܠܝܨ̈ܬܐ ܪܗܛ
< ܒܠܚܘܕ. ܦܣܩ ܠܣܘܓܐܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܐ. ܒܕ ܠܪ̈ܫܝܬܐ ܕܓܘܕܦܐ
< ܡܢ ܒܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܒܟܬܒܐ ܕܪܘܫܥܐ ܓܒܐ ܀ ܘܗܠܝܢ
ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ.

ܢܬܒܩܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܟܡ ܚܝܠܐ ܬܘܩܦܐ ܐܘ ܒܓܘܚܟܐ ܐܘ ܒܪܥܝܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܪܫܝܥܐ ܕܠܘܚܫܐ: ܦܟܐ ܒܠܝܢ ܡܚܬܟܢܐ ܫܝܛܐ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܥܠ ܐܚܪ ܐܚܪܝܢ: ܐܦ ܠܘܬ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܢܫܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܠܗ: ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܒܗ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܡܬܬܥܝܕܢܐ: ܒܫܝܢܐܝܬ ܟܬܒܢ ܠܗ

AB

ity towards him. But everybody knows that here too (unless he wrote this by way of pretence and to deceive) he is in the wrong: from the fact that he could not endure even a meek note, full of praises, without irritation, and did not accept the very humble petitions made when we were close by him at Paralos, but raged from then on like a wild animal and became our open enemy. How was a man, who had repudiated the darling, tender shoots of love unfeigned, prepared to endure careful reasoned rebuttals with a calm mind? It is even impossible for him to tolerate the useful advice of the majority, never mind rebuttals!

Saint GREGORY teaches us this again in the second chapter of the *Refutation* just mentioned, writing as follows: It has occurred to me to say these things on considering one who shared his good things unsparingly with everybody, Basil, I mean, the man of God, the mouth of blessing, who often in the abundance of spiritual treasures pours out the grace of wisdom without investigation even on souls who devise evil, even on Eunomius ungrateful to those who have taken pains to benefit him. For he, because of his soul's immeasurable disease with which it sickened as regards the faith, was considered pitiable by all participants in the Church (for who * is so lacking in compassion as not to pity the perishing?) but him alone did he move to undertake the cure, him alone who in the abundance of his philanthropy ventures upon an impossible cure; who, pained by the loss of the man, due to his natural sympathy

**145/165** Ibid. (*PG* 45, 249AB; Jaeger I, pp. 23,8 - 24,7)



ܘܢܝܚܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܣܝܢ ܡܡܠܠܐܝܬ ܠܘܬܗ ܟܬܒܢ. ܕܐܦ
ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܦܠܓܐ ܗܘ ܠܗ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܘ ܒܐܣܟܡܬܘܬܐ
ܘܡܛܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܬܒ : ܕܢܕܥܐ ܠܚܠܝܨ : ܡܢ ܗܿܝ ܕܐܦܠܐ
ܠܗܿ ܠܡܟܝܟܘܬܐ ܢܝܚܬܐ ܡܫܒܚܬܐ ܘܡܠܝܬܐ ܩܘܠܣܐ
ܕܠܐ ܪܘܓܙܐ ܐܫܟܚ ܕܢܣܝܒܪ : ܘܠܐ ܠܡܬܦܝܣܬܐ
ܕܡܟܝܟܘܬ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܕܥܒܕܢܢ : ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܩܪܝܒ ܗܘܝܢ
ܗܿܘ، ܡܟܝܠ : ܐܠܐ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܐܬܚܡܬ :
ܘܒܥܠܕܒܒܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܢ. ܗܿܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܠܚܘܒܐ
ܫܪܝܪܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܚܐ ܘܢܠܒܘܗܝ ܕܢܘܒܐ ܪܟܝܟܐ ܐܫܠܝ : ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܒܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܡܫܝܢܬܐ ܒܠܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܬ̈ܬܛܝܒܬܐ
ܢܣܝܒܪ. ܐܦ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܡܠܟܐ ܡܘܬܪܢܐ ܕܣ̈ܓܝܐܐ ܐܬܡܨܝ
ܠܡܣܝܒܪܘ : ܠܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ.

ܘܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ ܡܠܦ ܠܢ : ܗܿܘ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ :
ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܗܫܐ ܐܬܡܢܝ. ܕܗܦܘܟܠܘܬ
< ܡܠܬܗ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܬܒ ✧ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܬܬ ܠܝ : ܟܕ
< ܐܬܚܫܒܬ : ܘܠܗܘ ܕܠܟܠܢܫ ܕܠܐ ܚܣܝܢܐ ܡܫܘܬܦ ܒܛ̈ܒܬܐ
< ܕܐܠܗ : ܠܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܠܦܘܡܐ ܕܒܘܪܟܬܐ
< ܒܥܘܬܪܗ : ܠܗܘ ܕܒܡܣܓܝܐܘܬܐ ܕܣܝ̈ܡܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ :
< ܘܒܙܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ ܒܢ̈ܦܫܬܐ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܒܥܘܩܒ ܕܚ̈ܫܒܢ
< ܒ̈ܝܫܬܐ ܠܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܕܚܟܡܬܐ ܡܫܦܥ : ܘܠܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ
< ܠܟܦܘܪܐ ܕܛܝܒܘ̈ܬܗ ܕܐܢܝܢ ܕܥܡܠܘ ܕܢܗܢܘܢ ܠܗ. ܗܢܐ
< ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܟܘܪܗܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܕܢܦܫܗ : ܗܿܘ ܕܠܘܬ
< ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܟܪܗ : ܦܝܐ ܠܡܚܘܣܐ ܡܢ ܐܬܚܫܒ :
< ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦܝܢ ܒܥܕܬܐ : ܡܢܘ * ܓܝܪ ܗܟܢܐ f. 47va
< ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܦܐ ܒܚܫܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܚܘܣ ܠܗܘ ܕܐܒܕ.
< ܠܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ، ܠܘܬ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܕܐܣܝܘܬܐ ܐܙܝܥ : ܠܗܘ
< ܕܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ، ܒܡܣܓܝܐܘܬܐ ܕܪܚܡܬ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ : ܘܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܠܝܬ ܠܗܝܢ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܣܝܘܬܐ ܡܬܡܪܚ. ܗܿܘ ܕܟܕ ܥܠ

AB up to ܐܝܠܝܢ (l. 169)

Line 147: ܠܗ ܗܘ, B: ܗܢܝܐ.
Line 171: ܕܐܣܝܘܬܐ. This word is supplied in the margin in A.

towards those in misery, devised, as an antidote to the evil, lethal poisons, a refutation of heresy having as its aim to save and restore him thereby to the Church. But he, as if mentally distraught by madness, rages against the physician, fights and battles with, and counts an enemy him who battles to draw him from the gulf of evil. And he babbles in this way not simply casually before just anyone, but he has erected a written monument to his own madness, and, having obtained in a long period, as much leisure as he desired, he travailed with the discourse longer than the large, big-bodied animals, in all the intervening time.

But proven SEVERUS, writing against Julian, who suffered a fate similar to our author, says this at the beginning of the treatise *Against the additions:* For, knowing as I did, from the start, that the enduring of a rebuttal is not the part of just anybody but of those whose way of life runs in divine wisdom, and having read his tome sent to me for scrutiny, I reminded his Reverence in a humble letter: 'I have read some of what you wrote but have felt certain hesitations, for I see proven masters of piety who give us different spiritual guidance'. I did this without engaging in anything here except that he should correct himself and compare the holy fathers' statements with his writings. This he did not do but only became upset and angered because, as he said: 'You did not straight away dispatch brief memoranda on such matters' but, more truly, because he was bitterly annoyed at my failure to concur with his ill thought out writings, and I was like someone *consorting with a thief* * *and making his portion with an adulterer* (as David says in psalm at one

**168/185** Sev. Ant., *C. Add. Iul.*, 1 (*CSCO* 295, pp. 1,22 - 2,16; *296*, pp. 1,24 - 2,13) **179/180** Ps. 49:18



< ܐܟܘܬܗ ܕܠܚܒܪܐ ܥܒܕ ܠܗ : ܡܛܠ ܡܫܬܐܣܝܘܬ ܢܦܫܗ
< ܚܫܝܫܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܕܘ̈ܘܝܐ : ܐܝܟ ܣܡܪܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܬܐܣܝܢܐ
< ܕܡܚܒܠܢܐ ܚܡ̈ܬܐ ܘܩܛܘܠܬܐ : ܠܡܠܬܐ ܚܣܘܪܬܐ ܕܗܪܣܝܣ
< ܐܬܦܪܘܩ : ܟܕ ܢܝܫܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܕܢܦܪܘܩ ܗܘܒܐ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܘܢܦܢܐ ܠܥܕܬܐ ܠܚܒܪܐ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܟܘܗܪܢܐ
< ܕܫܛܝܘܬܐ ܥܠܝܠ ܒܬܪܝܘܬܗ : ܡܬܟܬܫ ܠܐܣܝܐ ܗܘ
< ܕܡܟܐܒܐ : ܘܡܬܟܬܫ ܘܡܬܟܬܫ. ܘܒܥܠܕܒܒܐ ܚܫܒ ܠܗܘ ܕܡܢ
< ܦܘܬܐ ܕܒܝܫܬܐ ܕܢܦܩܘܗܝ ܡܬܟܬܫ. ܘܗܟܢ ܠܗ ܡܦܟܐ
< ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܝܐ ܩܕܡ ܐܢܫ ܕܗܘ ܥܕܪ. ܐܠܐ
< ܦܘܚܡܐ ܟܬܝܒܐ ܕܫܛܝܘܬ ܫܛܝܘܬܗ ܠܥܡܠܐ ܢܩܫ ܐܩܝܡ.
< ܘܟܕ ܙܒܢܐ ܢܓܝܪܐ ܦܢܝܐܝܬܐ ܐܫܟܚ ܗܘ، ܕܨܒܐ ܗܘܐ :
< ܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܪܘܪܒܬܐ ܘܦܓܪܢܝܬܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܙܒܢܐ ܗܢܐ ܚܒܠ :
< ܒܚܠܩ ܒܝܢܬܐ ܕܒܡܨܥܬܐ ܀

ܘܣܘܝܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܩܝܐ : ܟܕ ܟܬܒ ܡܛܠ ܝܘܠܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܗܠܝܢ
ܕܐܚܝܕ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܚܫ : ܗܟܢ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܘ
< ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܘܡܢ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ
< ܝܕܥ ܐܢܐ ܕܗܝ، ܕܡܣܝܒܪܢܘܬ ܡܚܣܢܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܝܗ̇ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ
< ܕܗܘ : ܐܠܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܕܒܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܒܚܟܡܬܐ
< ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܟܕ ܠܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܠܗ ܦܢܝܬ ܗܘ ܕܐܫܬܕܪ ܠܝ
< ܠܒܘܚܢܐ : ܟܕ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܡܟܝܟܬܐ ܚܕܐ ܠܢܟܦܘܬܗ
< ܘܐܡܪܬ : ܕܩܪܝܬ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܒܬ : ܐܬܦܩܥܬ ܠܝ
< ܕܝܢ ܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ. ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܚܣܝܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ :
< ܕܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܡܕܒܪܝܢ ܠܝ ܚܙܐ ܐܢܐ. ܠܗ ܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ
< ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܡܬܬܓܪܢ ܐܢܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܗܘ ܠܗ ܢܬܪܨ :
< ܘܢܦܚܡ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܡܠܝ̈ܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ : ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܟܬܒ̈ܝ ܠܗ. ܘܗܕܐ ܠܐ ܥܒܕ. ܐܬܚܡܬ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ
< ܘܐܬܚܡܬ : ܡܛܠ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ : ܠܐ ܡܚܝܢܐ ܡܥܕܪܢܘܬܐ
< ܕܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܟܢ : ܒܥܓܠܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܦܩܕܬ
< ܘܥܕܪܬ. ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܝܢ ܕܫܪܝܪ ܝܬܝܪܐ ܐܬܬܚܝܒ ܡܢ ܐܬܪܢܐ : ܡܛܠ
< ܕܠܐ ܓܠܚܬ ܠܦܘܢ ܕܠܗ ܠܟܬܒܐ ܒܠܒܒܝ ܠܗ : ܘܐܬܕܡܝܬ
f. 47vb < ܠܗܘ ܕܪܗܛ ܥܡ ܓܢܒܐ ܘܥܡ * ܓܝܪܐ ܘܐܣܡ ܡܢܬܗ :

A

point). And again I bore it patiently and wanted to keep silence unlawfully (for *it was a time to speak*) but cherishing, as I ought not to have done, affection towards him. Nevertheless he assailed me, silent and remote though I am, and having armed a letter with abusive remarks, he wanted, as it were, to murder me.

This will suffice people to know the vain and truly empty arrogance of the author's arid arguments and how, in a furious rage over a note simply fraternal in its praises in order that I might speak as he desires, he pretends to be vexed and angered because he did not receive a 'rejoinder' with rebuttals: people who, to understand the meaning of these writings, need also only the reason. For *give*, says the proverb, *a reason to the wise and he will become wiser still*. For what else but this is shown by, those who are in doubt ought not just to offer mere disparagement and censure but should correct; and, I declare with Truth in audience I should have defined as my teachers and helpers; and, they have smeared what was written with empty, fatuous criticism; and along with this too, for I am not dismayed by a rebuttal but feel the hurt done to the truth because though it did not rebut anything it came as a rebuttal.

**182** Eccle. 3:7 **192/193** Prov. 9:9 **193/195** cf. supra, 87-89 **195/196** cf. supra, 96-97 **196/197** cf. supra, 100-101 **197/199** cf. infra, ch. 3, 188-189



< ܐܝܟ ܕܒܕܘܟ ܕܘܒ ܒܗ ܡܢܗܪ ܐܢܬ. ܘܬܘܒ ܦܢܝܬ
< ܫܠܡܐܝܬ : ܘܐܬܬܥܝܪܘ ܥܝܢܐ ܗܘܝܬ. ܠܐ ܢܬܡܣܟܐܝܬ ܡܢ
< ܘܚܠܐ ܚܪ ܐܢܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘܐ ܠܡܚܠܠܘ. ܒܗ ܢܟܝܢ ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐ ܙܒܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܫܬܝܩܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬܗ. ܘܒܙܒܢ ܦܬܚܢ
< ܗܘܐ ܠܝ : ܘܒܗ ܥܠܝܡ ܐܢܐ ܘܡܢܒܥ ܐܢܐ ܠܙܘܢܐ. ܘܒܗ
< ܒܡܠܐ ܡܪܘܚܬܐ ܐܢ ܐܪܬܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ
< ܘܕܢܛܠܠ ܪܒܐ ܗܘܐ ❖

ܘܠܘܬ ܗܢ ܗܘ، ܕܢܢܒܒ ܡܢܘܪܘܬܐ ܦܪܝܫܬܐ ܘܐܝܟ
ܕܫܪܪܐ ܦܫܝܛܬܐ ܕܡܠܠܐ ܫܒܚܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܐ :
ܘܕܐܡܪܐ ܒܗ ܙܪܥ ܘܒܬܪܗ، ܡܛܠ ܡܡܕܢܘܬܐ ܐܣܝܬܐ
ܒܠܫܢܗ : ܗܘ، ܕܒܥܐ ܡܬܠܡܐ ܐܡܪܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܪܒܐ ܐܡܪ :
ܒܟܢ ܐܫܬܡܥܬ ܕܫܡܥܬܗ ܘܡܬܡܢܥܬ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܩܒܠ
ܠܗ ܦܘܩܕܢܗ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܒܥܐ ܡܒܩܘܬܐ : ܩܦܘܚ ܗܠܝܢ
ܠܗܘܢ ܕܒܠ ܒܠܬܐ ܘܒܠܫܢܗ ܦܫܝܛ : ܕܢܒܥܘܢ ܗܘܢܐ
< ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟ ❖ ܗܒ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܡܬܠܐ ܥܠܬܐ ܠܚܟܝܡܐ
< ܘܬܘܣܦ ܢܬܚܟܡ ❖ ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܗܕܐ
— ܡܚܘܝܐ : ܗܘ، ܕܦܠܓܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܐܬܦܫܩܘ ܕܠܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ
— ܥܫܝܢܐܝܬ ܢܠܐܡܘܢ ܘܢܒܣܪܘܢ : ܐܠܐ ܢܬܪܨܘܢ : ܘܗܘ،
— ܕܐܝܟ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܫܡܥܬ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܡܥܕܪܢܝ
— ܗܘܝܬ ܘܡܥܕܪܢܐ ❖ ܘܗܘ، ܕܒܠܝܐ ܦܪܝܫܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܦܝܫܐ
— ܒܐܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟ ܥܦܘ : ܒܗ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܗܘ، ❖ ܠܐ
— ܚܪ ܐܢܬܐ ܢܦܫ ܠܘܬ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܒܗ ܒܕܒܢ ܠܐ
— ܐܬܦܫܬ : ܐܝܟ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܬ : ܒܗ ܣܠܩ ܥܙܪܐ ܠܡ
— ܒܐܬܪ ܠܗ ❖

A

## Chapter 3

*That this distinguished man wrests the truth by affirming that it is impossible to depart from orthodoxy when censuring polytheists for transgressing divine doctrines, and a clear rebuttal of this from the doctors. And again, a manifest demonstration that we were obliged to criticize him not because he wrote against polytheists but because he leaned towards Jewish atheism.*

But let us examine what he said with surprise and a certain wonderment to see if it has any sense in it whatever. And it is surprising that one should be convicted of failing to adhere to the fathers' teaching in the very passages where one condemns the statements of one's opponents for failing to accord with the fathers' teaching and declared that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to take such a view'. * Let us investigate the clever words. Why do you say, you subtle fellow, 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, 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 foregoing, nevertheless learn here, from other proof-texts as well,

9/14 cf. supra, ch. 2, 101-105

## ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ.

ܥܠ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܬܛܠܡ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܡܥܩܡ : ܕܠܐ ܡܨܝܐ ܕܟܕ ܪܕܐ ܠܦ̈ܓܢܐ، ܐ̈ܠܗܐ ܒܥܒܘܪܐ ܕܝ̈ܘܠܦܢܐ ܐ̈ܠܗܝܐ : ܕܢܦܩ ܡܢ ܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܢܗܝܪܬܐ : ܕܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܟܬܒ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܦ̈ܓܢܐ، ܐ̈ܠܗܐ : ܐܠܐ ܒܗ، ܕܐܨܛܠܠ ܠܘܬ ܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܝܗܘܕܝܬܐ ܐܠܨܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܡܬܚܝܒܠ ܀

ܐܠܐ ܗܘ، ܕܒܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܘܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܒܬܗܪܐ ܢܒܚܘܪ ܐܬܡܗܪܐ ܠܗ ܢܚܙܐ : ܐܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܀ ܘܐܬܬܗܝ ܠܢ ܕܢܦܩܐ ܠܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ : ܐܝܟ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܗܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܡܠܟܐ ܕܐ̈ܒܗܐ *[ܕܠܡܘܠܟܢܐ] ܡܣܬܟܠ : ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐ [ܓ̈ܠܝܢ ܠܡܠܦ]ܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ : [ܘܐܡܪ ܕܠܐ] ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܚܫܝܫܬܐ [ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ] ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ : [ܗܝ، ܕܕܐܝܟ] ܗܢܐ ܢܒܨܐ : ܗܢܝܢ [ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬ]ܚܟܡܢ : ܐܡܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ [ܢܦܩ ܠܡܠ]ܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܀ ܗ.... ܢܚܙܐ ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ [ܩ̈ܠܐ] ܬܚܡܝܬܐ. ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ [ܐܢܬ] ܐܘ ܚܪܝܦܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ... ܕܡܬܗܦܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܐ[ܝܟ]ܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܕܢܦܩ ܠܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ [ܡ]ܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܗܘܐ [ܫ]ܠܝܛ ܠܟ ܕܟܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܠܝܬܝ ܐ̈ܠܗܐ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܐ ܡܬܟܬܫ ܐܢܬ : ܟܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܐ ܣ̈ܠܩܝ : ܠܐ ܡܒܨܝܐܝܬ ܥܠ ܪܙܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܬܦܩܦܩ : ܐܘ ܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܬ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ ܕܡܫܪܝܢ ܡܢ ܟܘܪܗܢܐ ܛܢܦܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ : ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܕܠܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܫܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܢܦܠܘܢ. ܙܒܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܘ ܠܟ ܕܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܗܪ̈ܛܝܩܐ ܗܢܘܢ، ܕܡܢ ܥܠܡ ܗܘܘ ܬܙܟܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܒܣܘܓܐܐ ܗܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܟܕ ܟܬܒܝܢ : ܒܕ̈ܫܠܝܬܐ ܡܥܫܩܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܬܐ ܢܦܠܘ. ܘܗܕܐ ܦܫ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܝܬ ܠܟ

A, f. 1ra

A

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 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, 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 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. But in the oration *On the illustrious Athanasius*, too, he wrote as follows: But aware that contracting the three to an arithmetical unit is atheism and an innovation by Sabellius (who was the first to invent a contraction of the Godhead) yet that separation of the three by natures is outlandish mutilation of the Godhead, he both safeguarded well the one in Godhead and also taught with true religion the three in properties, neither confounding, by the one, nor dividing, through the three, but remaining within the bounds of true religion by avoiding immoderate inclination to, or aversion from, either side.

---

**29/36** Greg. Naz., *Or. 20*, 5 (*PG* 35, 1072A; *SChr.*, vol. 270, pp. 66-68) **37/43** Greg. Naz., *Or. 42*, 16 (*PG* 36, 476C; *SChr.*, vol. 384, p. 82) **44/52** Greg. Naz., *Or. 21*, 13 (*PG* 35, 1096BC; *SChr.*, vol. 270, p. 136)



ܡܬܚܣܝܢܘܬܐ. ܒܪܡ ܗܘܕܝܐ ܟܕ ܡܣܬܕܪܬܐ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܠܟ : ܕܦܠܓܝ ܦܫܝܩܐܝܬ ܗܘܘ ܕܠܐ ܥܠ ܟܐܦܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܡܫܪܪܐܝܬ ܩܝܡܝܢ ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ ܢܦܠܝܢ : ܘܟܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪܣܝܣ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ.

ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ : ܐܡܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܡ ܡܕܒܪܐ ܕܡܗܠܠ ܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ❖ ܦܓܪܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܒܕ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܡܦܪܫܝܢ ܡܚܝܕܝܢ ܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܘܠܐ ܠܚܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܡܠܒܟܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܒܟܘܪܗܢܐ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܢܬܟܪܗ : ܘܠܐ ܡܦܠܓܝܢ ܠܬܠܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܫܪܒܬܐ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܘܢܘܟܪܝܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܥܠܝܢ ܕܐܪܝܘܣ ܢܫܢܐ. ܡܛܠ ܓܝܪ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܢܨܒܬܐ ܕܠܐܣܛܪܐ ܚܕ ܦܠܝܓܐ : ܒܩܛܝܪܐ ܢܚܠܘܢ ܠܓܒܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ : ܘܥܘܩܡܬܐ ܠܥܘܩܡܬܐ ܢܬܪܨ : ܘܠܐ ܠܡܨܥܬܐ ܢܬܪܘܨ ܒܗ ܘܢܩܘܡ ܒܬܚܘܡܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ❖ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܡܐܬܝܬܐ ܕܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܫܚ ܘܐܡܪ ܗܠܝܢ ❖ ܡܬܚܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܣܪܝܩܬܐ ܕܠܟܐ ܘܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ : *ܘܬܩ̈ܠܐ ܡܩܒܠܢ̈ܐ ܒܗ ܫܠܡ ܢܥܒܕ ܒܗ ܘܠܐ ܟܕ ܚܕ ܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ f. 1rb ܟܕ ܒܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܠܬܐ : ܘܒܣܘܪܚܢܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܠܦܘܠܓܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܐܪܝܣܐ ܟܕ ܒܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܚܕ : ܘܡܦܘܠܓܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܠܚܕ ܡܗܦܟܝܢ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܗܕܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܬܒܥܝܐ ܕܒܒܝܫܬܐ ܠܒܝܫܬܐ ܢܫܠܦ : ܐܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܚܛܐ ܡܢ ܛܒܬܐ ❖ ܘܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܥܠ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ ܛܒܝܒܐ ܟܬܒ ܒܗ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܐܠܐ ܟܕ ܝܕܥ ܕܗܝ، ܡܢ ܕܠܚܘܫܒܐ ܚܕ ܢܩܦܘܢ ܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ : ܕܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗܝ، ܘܚܘܕܬܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ : ܗܘ ܕܩܕܡܝܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܥܒܕ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܢܦܪܫ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ : ܦܫܡܐ ܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܠܚܕ ܫܦܝܪ ܢܛܪ : ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ : ܘܠܬܠܬܐ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܦ : ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܓܝܪ : ܒܕ ܘܠܐ ܒܚܕ ܒܠܒܠ : ܘܠܐ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܦܪܫ. ܐܠܐ ܒܕ ܒܬܚܘܡܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܦܘܫ : ܒܗ ܕܓܪܘܡ ܡܢ ܡܨܛܠܝܢܘܬܐ ܘܡܗܦܟܢܘܬ ܡܢܗ ܕܠܐ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܚܕ ܡܢ ܓܒ̈ܝܢ ❖

---

A

My admirable fellow, you have heard the great doctor proclaim: 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. And again: Neither confounding, by the one, nor dividing, through the three, but remaining within the bounds of true religion by avoiding immoderate inclination to, or aversion from, either side. So how can he correct distortion with distortion either by sabellianizing with the one over against the three and dissolving the division by a mischievous confusion or conversely by arianizing with the three over against the one and overthrowing the one by a pernicious division and exchanging one evil for another, if (as you have seen fit to say) the opponent of Sabellius, for example, cannot incline towards the * heathen polytheism of Arius or again the adversary of Arians bring down the scales on the side of the Jewish atheism of Sabellius? What is the excellence and vigilance of renowned Athanasius who remained within the bounds of true religion by avoiding inclination to, or aversion from, either side, if you are convicted of saying that these things are as you say they are. If, however, things so clear have been overlooked by your learned mind, I will ask you to learn things you do not know and not to be surprised (as you pretend to be) if, even during your campaign against polytheists, you have lapsed into the Libyan's Jewish and godless profanity at the instigation of some arbitrary impulse. But if you do know them, why, to mislead the innocent, do you utter

---

**54/57** cf. supra, 33-36 **57/61** cf. supra, 39-43 **61/64** cf. supra, 49-52
**64/65** cf. supra, 55 **65/68** cf. supra, 57-61 **73/74** cf. supra, 50-52



< ܫܡܥܬ ܐܘ ܬܡܝܗܐ : ܕܐܪܥܡ ܗܘܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܪܒܐ : ܕܡܢܐ
< ܓܝܪ ܙܕܩ ܕܐܝܟ ܢܨܒܬܐ ܕܠܐܣܪܛܐ ܦܝܫ ܥܠܝܗ : ܒܡܠܘܐܐ
< ܢܬܠܝܗ ܠܓܒܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ : ܘܥܘܬܠܐ ܠܥܘܬܠܐ ܢܬܪܨ : ܘܠܐ
< ܠܡܨܥܬܐ ܢܬܪܘܨ ܒܗ ܢܩܘܡ ܒܬܚܘܡܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ :
< ܘܬܘܒ : ܒܚ ܘܠܐ ܒܚܕ ܡܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܠܬܐ :
< ܘܡܫܪܝܢܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܠܚܘܠܛܢܐ ܥܢܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܒܬܠܬܐ
< ܐܪܝܘܣܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܚܕ : ܘܡܦܠܓܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܠܚܕ
< ܦܠܓܝܢ : ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܕܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܬܚܠܦܢܐ ܕܒܝܫܬܐ ܠܒܝܫܬܐ
< ܢܬܠܦ : ܐܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܦܠ ܡܢ ܛܒܬܐ : ܘܬܘܒ : ܗܘ, ܕܐܦ ܠܐ
< ܒܚܕ ܚܠܛ ܘܠܐ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܦܪܫ : ܐܠܐ ܒܗ ܒܬܚܘܡܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ
< ܐܠܗܐ ܩܘܝ : ܒܗ, ܕܥܪܩ ܡܢ ܡܪܓܠܝܘܬܐ ܘܡܣܩܠܢܘܬ
< ܩܢܘܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܩܢܬܐ ܕܠܚܕ ܡܢ ܓܒܝܢ ÷ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ

ܥܘܝܐ ܕܒܥܘܬܠܐ ܠܥܘܬܠܐ ܢܬܪܨ ܐܘ ܒܗ, ܕܚܕ ܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ ܒܚܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܠܬܐ : ܘܡܫܪܝܢܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܠܚܘܠܛܢܐ ܒܝܫܐ : ܐܘ ܒܗܦܟܐ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܐܪܝܘܣܐ ܒܚܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܚܕ : ܘܡܦܠܓܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܠܚܕ ܢܦܘܠ. ܘܡܒܝܫܬܐ ܠܒܝܫܬܐ ܢܚܠܦ ܐܢܘ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܢܬ ܙܕܩܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܡܬܚܬܫ ܐܝܬܐ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܢܨܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ * ܚܢܦܬܐ ܕܐܪܝܘܣ : ܘܬܘܒ ܗܘ f. Iva ܕܣܢܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܘܢ ܕܐܪܝܘܣ ܡܬܟܪܝܢ : ܠܘܬ ܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܝܗܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܢܛܐ ܠܡܬܩܠܬܐ. ܡܢܐ ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܡܝܬܪܘܬܐ ܘܥܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܗܘ ܢܨܝܚ ܟܠ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ ܕܒܬܚܘܡܐ ܩܘܝ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܒܗ, ܕܥܪܩ ܡܢ ܡܪܓܠܝܘܬܐ ܘܡܣܩܠܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܩܢܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܓܒܝܢ : ܐܢܘ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܢܬ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ ܐܢܬ ܠܗܝܢ ܚܝܒ ܐܢܬ ܕܬܐܡܪ. ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܓܠܝܢ ܛܠܝܢ ܠܚܟܡܬܘܬܟ ܡܝܬܪܬܐ ܘܠܦܝܠܐ ܐܣܒܪܐ ܕܬܐܠܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܐܢܬ ܘܠܐ ܬܬܕܡܪ : ܐܢܘ ܘܒܗ ܩܪܒܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܣܓܝܐܝ ܐܠܗܐ, ܡܣܬܟܠ ܠܟ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܡܣܡܟܐ ܡܢܘܐ ܐܢܬ : ܠܘܬ ܠܝܗܘܕܝܘܬܐ ܣܪܝܩܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܘܒܝܐ ܒܬܐܘܬ ܡܕܡ ܕܨܒܝܢܐ ܥܒܕܬ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܝܕܥ ܐܢܬ : ܠܡܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܡܛܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܡܝܡܐ ܡܠܐ ܕܗܟܢ ܒܠ ܥܘܩܒܐ ܬܠܝܢ

---

A

words devoid of any sense and proclaim: And it is surprising that one should be convicted of failing to adhere to the fathers' teaching in the very passages where one condemns the statements of one's opponents for failing to accord with the fathers' teaching and declared that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to take such a view'. So if your sophism has now been exposed and you can no longer take advantage of the simplicity of the guileless, desist from correcting distortion with distortion and sabellianizing against the three and dissolving the division by a mischievous confusion! So that, avoiding immoderate inclination to, or aversion from, either side, you may, like mighty Athanasius, remain within the bounds of true religion. For, indeed, you have been taught clearly (the herald of truth proclaiming it to you) that one can (as some do) both dissolve the Arian division with mischievous confusion and, again, overthrow Sabellius' one by a pernicious division. Now if you say 'I did not understand those things in this way, but am rather seeking to prove I am unjustly censured, because I have rejected the polytheists' error as out of accord with the fathers' teaching', we will honestly say that it is truly wrong for those * who censure the false opinion of polyusiasts and tritheists to condemn those who subvert it lawfully. For how can the due uprooting of a profession, for example, as well as the profession itself be rejected? Therefore since they godlessly maintain one substance in some concept of posteriority and as a figment of the imagination, and 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

**82/86** cf. supra, 9-14 **88/89** cf. supra, 64-65 **89/90** cf. supra, 65-66
**90/92** cf. supra, 50-52



— ܡܡܠܠ ܐܢܬ ܘܡܟܪܙ ܐܢܬ ܀ ܘܐܬܕܡܘܬܗ ܕܢܬܟܫܐ ܠܕܡܒܪܘܬܐ
— ܐܝܟ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܡܠܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ ܡܚܝܒ
— ܐܝܟ ܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܫܠܡܝܢ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܘܐܡܪ ܕܠܐ
— ܐܬܝܗ ܕܣܘܪܚܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܢܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗܝ
— ܕܢܐܡܪ ܗܟܢ ܢܦܩ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܡܛܠ : ܐܝܟ ܗܝ
— ܕܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܀ ܐܦ ܗܫܐ ܗܘ ܡܛܠ
ܕܣܘܦܣܡܝܢ ܐܬܦܪܣ : ܘܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܡܫܟܚ ܕܠܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ
ܕܬܡܟܟܐ ܣܓܠܦ ܦܘܫ ܡܢ ܗܝ ܕܠܦܘܬܠܐ ܒܦܘܬܠܐ ܡܬܩܢ
ܐܢܬ : ܘܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ ܥܒܕ ܐܢܬ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܠܬܐ : ܘܡܫܪܝܢܐ
ܒܒܝܫܐ ܠܦܘܠܓܐ ܫܪܐ ܐܢܬ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܗ ܡܢ ܡܪܓܠܝܘܬܐ
ܕܠܐ ܡܣܘܫܬܐ ܕܠܣܛ ܡܢ ܓܒܝܐ ܚܕ ܐܢܬ ܐܝܟ
ܐܬܢܐܣܝܘܣ ܓܢܒܪܐ : ܒܬܚܘܡܐ ܕܫܪܝܪܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܬܩܘܐ. ܗܐ ܓܝܪ
ܠܟܝܐܘܬ ܒܕ ܟܪܘܙܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܐܟܪܙ ܠܟ ܐܬܝܠܦܬ : ܕܐܦ
ܒܫܘܓܫܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܢܫܝܢ : ܐܢܬ ܠܡܫܪܐ ܠܦܘܠܓܐ
ܐܪܝܢܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܒܦܘܠܓܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܠܚܕ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܠܡܣܚܦܘ.
ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ : ܕܠܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܣܬܟܠܬ : ܐܠܐ
ܡܠܘܢ ܒܕ ܚܒܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܚܘܝܐ : ܕܠܘ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܡܬܓܥܪܐ
ܐܢܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܐܫܠܝܬ ܠܛܘܥܝܝ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ
ܠܫܢܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܒܬܪܝܨܘܬ ܫܪܪܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ :
ܕܐܝܟ ܕܒܫܪܪܐ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܠܗܘܢ * ܕܒܕܠܝܢ ܠܚܫܒܘܬ f. 1vb
ܬܫܒܘܚ]ܬܐ ܕܦܘܠܘܣܝ[ܬܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܐ[ܠܗܐ]
[ܢܩܠܩܘܢ] ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܗܦܟܝܢ ܠܗ[ܕܐ ܗܝ ܦܩܚܝܢ] ܐܡܪܝܢܐ
ܒܢܡܘܣܐ : ... [ܘܕܗܝ] ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܐ ܠܒܐ[ܬܪ] :
[ܘܡܘܬܪܢܐ] ܕܠܝܬ ܕܗܕܐ ܡܫܠܡܐ [ܗܘܐ]. ܡܛܠ ܒܕ ܗܢܘܢ :
ܣܝܡܐ ܗܝ [ܐܘܣܝܐ] ܒܡܠܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܚܪܝܘܬ [ܒܚܣܝܐ]
ܘܒܡܠܝܐ ܕܦܠܣܡܐ ܠܐ ܐܠܗ[ܝܬ] ܡܚܘܝܢ : ܠܩܢܘܡܐ
ܕܝܢ ܕܬܠܝܬܝ[ܘܬܐ] ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܚܢܦܐܝܬ ܐܘܣ[ܝܣ] ܘܟܝܢܐ :
ܡܢ ܐܢܣܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܠܗ[ܐ] ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܦܢܚܝܢ : ܕܢܥܩܘܪ
ܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ ܬܪܝܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܠܛܢܦܬܐ ܐܬܬܗ : ܒܗ، ܕܐܝܟ
ܬܚܘܡܐ ܐܒܗܝܐ : ܬܠܬܐ ܗܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܘܒܣܘܥܪܢܐ : ܚܕ

A flor. II from l. 105 on

Line 98: ܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ, A: ܡܣܒܠܐ (wrongly), cf. lines 44, 62, 70, 133.
Line 108: ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ, flor. II: ܐܡܪܝܢ.

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 height of folly to reject polytheists and yet criticize those who have skilfully eradicated their loathsome opinion; or, if you cannot prove this * do not be surprised if, when you think the thoughts of Sabellius, you have a pleasant meed of censure and condemnation even though you pretend a host of times to be writing against tritheists.

**118/121** cf. supra, 54-57 **121/125** cf. supra, 57-61



ܐܠܗܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܒܪ ܟܝܢܐ : ܠܗܘܢ
ܠܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܢܣܩܘܢ
ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܣܘܥܪܢܘܬ ܗܘܢܐ : ܗܝ ܕܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ
ܕܥܒܕܬܐ ܕܐܬܚܒܪܬ ܐܬܬܝܗ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܚܝܒ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ
ܐܘ ܐܠܗܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܘ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܐܘ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܐ : ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܟ
ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܚܬܝܬܐ ܣܦܪܐ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܒܚܘܪܐܝܬ ܘܕܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ
ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܬܚܡ ܐܢܘܢ : ܘܒܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܢܗܘܢ ܗܘܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܣܪܘܩ ܐܢܘܢ. ܠܗܕܐ
< ܪܡܙ ܘܡܡܠܠ ܬܐܘܠܘܓܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܐܡܪ ⁘ ܡܛܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܪܒ
< ܕܐܝܟ ܢܨܒܬܐ ܕܠܣܛܪܐ ܛܒ ܪܟܝܢܐ : ܒܡܦܢܝܢ ܠܣܛܪܐ ܢܬܪܘܨܝܗ̇
< ܠܣܛܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ : ܘܡܥܩܡܘܬܐ ܠܥܩܡܘܬܐ ܢܬܪܘܨ : ܘܠܐ
< ܠܡܨܥܬܐ ܢܬܪܘܨܝ ܟܕ ܩܝܡܝܢ ܒܬܚܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ⁘
< ܘܬܘܒ ⁘ ܟܕ ܘܠܐ ܥܡ ܚܕ ܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܠܬܐ :
< ܘܦܘܠܓܢܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܠܒܘܠܒܠܐ ܫܪܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܒܬܠܬܐ
< ܐܪܝܘܣܐ ܫܪܝܢ ܚܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܚܕ : ܘܦܘܠܓܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܠܚܕ
< ܗܦܟܝܢ : ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܗܕܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܬܟܘܢܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܝܫܬܐ ܠܒܝܫܬܐ
< ܢܫܚܠܦ : ܐܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܥܕܐ ܡܢ ܛܒܬܐ ⁘

ܐܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܚܘܝ : ܕܡܢ ܗܝ ܕܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ ܠܦܘܠܚܢܐ
ܕܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܘܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܬܬܦܣܘܢ ܡܢ
ܐܬܟܠܝܬ : ܘܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܐܬܕܡܪ ܒܟܕܠܝܢ ܕܠܟܪ ܡܢ ܡܠܬܐ :
ܒܫܪܪܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܗܘܠ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܫܛܝܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܗܝ
ܕܐܦ ܠܡܣܓܝ̈ܐܝ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܢܣܠܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܕܠܗ̇ܘܢ
ܕܠܬܚܫܒܬܗܘܢ ܡܣܪܚܬܐ ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ ܒܥܩܪܗ̇ ܥܩܪܘܗ̇ : ܐܘ
ܐܢ ܗܕܐ ܕܬܚܘܐ ܠܐ * ܡܨܝܐ ܐܢܬ : ܠܐ ܬܬܕܡܪ : ܐܢ A, f. 48ra
ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܡܬܪܥܐ ܐܢܬ : ܒܟܕܠܝܢܐ
ܘܡܦܣܩܘܬܐ ܕܠܒܣܡܐ ܡܬܦܪܢܣ ܐܢܬ : ܘܐܦܢ ܙܒ̈ܢܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܢ
ܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܠܬܝܬܐ ܕܟܬܒ ܐܢܬ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܐܢܬ ܐܡܣܟܡܐ.

A flor. II up to l. 128

Line 133: ܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ, A: ܡܣܒܠܢܐ (wrongly), cf. supra, lines 44, 62, 70, 98.

But just what you said 'in surprise' has shown, to those who are able to appreciate such things, that you were not criticized by us for refuting the doctrine of the polytheists. For you said: And it is surprising that one should be convicted of failing to adhere to the fathers' teaching in the very passages where one condemns the statements of one's opponents for failing to accord with the fathers' teaching and declared that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to take such a view'.

Note the cunning and the shiftiness of this truth-loving writer! For, observing that his trick does not then proceed aright if the point on which, as he says, he judges and is judged connects with this scheme of argument; quite in accordance with his purpose, he excises from the section of the text the point at issue, saying: It is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to take such a view. For had he put down and said here also his own words as they were, it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance 'hypostases' and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert that they 'characterize' the prosopa or hypostases, he could have said with justice: And it is surprising that one should be convicted of failing to adhere to the fathers' teaching in the very passages where one condemns the statements of one's opponents for failing to accord with the fathers' teaching and declared that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to take such a view'. For from every right-thinking person whatsoever, he would have heard the appropriate remark: My dear man, you are talking nonsense, for where do you get the

---

**136/141** cf. supra, 9-14 **146/147** cf. supra, 140-141 **148/152** cf. supra, ch. 2, 15-19 **153/157** cf. supra, 136-141



ܕܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܿܝ ܕܬܡܗܬ ܐܚܘܬ ܠܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܕܦ̈ܪܫܢܐ،
ܐ̈ܠܗܐ ܐܣܓܝܐܬ ܡܢ: ܘܗܝ، ܗܿܝ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܠܟ ܡܢܢ
ܐܡܪܬ : ܠܗܿܘܢ ܕܬܪܝܨܘܬ ܠܡܠܦܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ
— ܢܬܟܠܘܢ ܢܕܚܠ ܣܘܓܐܬ. ܐܠܗܘܬ ܓܒܪ ✤ ܘܐܦܢܝܢ ܕܥܡܐ
— ܠܬܘܕܝܬܐ : ܐܦ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܗܿܢܘܢ
— ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ ܡܣܝܒ : ܐܝܟ ܗܿܝ ܕܠܐ ܫ̈ܠܝܚܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ
— ܐܒܗܘܬܐ : ܘܐܡܪ : ܕܠܐ ܐܬܘܬܐ ܙܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܪܟܐ
— ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܗܿܝ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ : ܒܗܝܢ
— ܒܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܐܝܟ ܗܿܝ ܕܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ
— ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ✤

ܘܐܬܒܣܘ ܒܪܢܫܘܬܐ ܘܡܬܦܟܬܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܚܒܒܐ
ܫܪܪܐ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܙܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܠ ܫܘܟܝܡܗ ܬܪܝܨܐܝܬ
ܕܪܐ : ܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܠܒܘܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܗܿܝ، ܕܡܬܕܝܢ ܘܕܐܢ
ܐܡܪ ܕܐܢ ܘܡܬܬܕܝܢ ܢܦܩܐ : ܠܐ ܠܐ ܠܫܒܝܐܘܬ ܠܢܝܫܐ
ܕܠܗ : ܦܣܩ ܡܢ ܦܘܪܫܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܗܿܝ ܕܡܬܟܬܒܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ✤
— ܕܠܐ ܐܬܘܬܐ ܙܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܪܟܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ
— ܗܿܝ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ ✤ ܐܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܐܦܢܐ ܕܐܬܘܬܗܘܢ
— ܗܘ، ܘܪܡܐ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܗܫ ܘܐܡܪ ✤ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܘܬܗ
— ܙܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܪܟܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܗܿܝ، ܕܢܚܫܘܒ :
— ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ
— ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ : ܘܢܚܫܘܒ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܘܬܗܘܢ ܬܠܬ ܗܘܝ̈ܬܐ : ܐܦ
— ܕܟܕ ܐܦ̈ܝܢܝܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ
170 — ܚܢܬ ܠܡ̈ܩܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ ✤ ܠܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܟ ܗܿܘ ܕܬܐܡܪ
— ܒܐܝܢܐ ܘܐܬܬܗܿܝ ܕܥܡܐ ܠܬܘܕܝܬܐ : ܐܦ ܒܗܠܝܢ
— ܕܒܗܘܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܗܿܢܘܢ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ ܡܣܝܒ : ܐܝܟ ܗܿܝ
— ܕܠܐ ܫ̈ܠܝܚܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ : ܘܐܡܪ : ܕܠܐ ܐܬܘܬܗ
— ܙܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܪܟܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ : ܗܿܝ،
— ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ : ܒܗܝܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܿܝ
— ܕܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ✤ ܠܫܒܝܐܘܬ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܟܠ
ܐܢܫ ܕܗܘ ܡܢ ܗܿܘܢ ܕܬܪܝܨܘܬ ܡܬܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ ܫܡܥ ܗܘܐ :
ܕܦܩܘܬܐ ܡܦܩܡ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܒܪܢܫܐ. ܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܠܟ ܓܝܪ

---

A

idea from that it is at odds with the fathers' teaching not to suppose that the characteristic properties are the hypostases, or which of the proven orthodox will you produce who has criticized those who are sick with the error of polytheism for not professing as hypostases the characteristic properties of the hypostases? No, it was not for this that they were thrown out of the Church, but for wickedly * and paganly supposing the one substance of the Godhead a fiction and fantasy and for professing substances and natures in plurality, and hence necessarily the hypostases as Gods and Godheads. Either prove, then, my valiant friend, that this is the fathers' opinion and be justly surprised and vastly astonished that you are convicted of mistreating the fathers' laws in those points where you are pained on behalf of the fathers' maltreated teaching; or, understand that trampling on the doctors' definitions, you are pretending, for deceit, to avenge the fathers' teaching.

Therefore, let us investigate this more exactly by what you wrote later. For you wrote the following lines: Had I not written this down earlier, I should not be free from just rebuke. But if the refutation of opponents derived from the ideas and words of the fathers, let us banish the aspersion on the teaching of inspired men. Let us examine the passage, then, in detail. For I briefly mentioned there that it was 'hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance "hypostases"'. If, therefore, the statement is false and the God-clad teachers of truth did not call either the properties of the prosopa viewed in the Godhead and the one identical substance, or the properties of the substance, 'hypostases', let some-

177/211 Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* 181/183 cf. supra, ch. 1, 42-44



ܕܠܐ ܠܡܣܒܪ ܠܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܐܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܢܦܩܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܚܬܝܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܐܘ ܠܡܢܘ ܡܢ ܬ̈ܪܝܨܝ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܒܚܝܪ̈ܐ ܡܢܘ ܐܝܬ ܕܓܒܠ : ܠܟ̈ܪܝܗܐ ܕܒܛܥܝܘܬܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܒ̈ܗܬܝܢ : ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐ ܕܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܚܬܝܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܠܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ :. ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܗ ܪܫܝܥܐܝܬ * ܘܚܢܦܐܝܬ f. 48rb ܠܡܓܠܬܐ ܘܦܠܣܛܝܐ ܠܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ : ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܡܣܓܝܐܐܝܬ ܘܟܝ̈ܢܐ : ܡܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܘܐܠܗܘ̈ܬܐ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܡܢ ܚܕܬܐ ܐܚܘܝܘ. ܐܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܘ ܙܪܝܙܐ : ܕܗܕܐ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܐܬܕܡܪ ܘܪܘܪܒܐܝܬ ܬܬܗܪ : ܕܗܘܠܝܢ ܕܟܐܒ ܠܟ ܥܠ ܡܛܠܦܘܬܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܕܡܬܛܠܡܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܛܠܡܐ ܕܢ̈ܡܘܣܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܡܬܚܝܒ ܐܢܬ : ܐܘ ܕܟܕ ܕܟܕ ܡܕܘܫ ܐܢܬ ܠܬ̈ܚܘܡܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ : ܠܡܬܒܥܢܘܬܐ ܡܢܝܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܒܢܟܠܐ ܚܒܪ ܐܢܬ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ.

ܡܕܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܟܬܒܬ ܠܟ ܢܬܒܥ ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܢܚܙܐ. ܟܬܒܬ ܓܝܪ ܟܗܢܐ ܟܕ ܗܘܢܐ ܐܦܓܢܬ ÷
— ܐܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܗܕܐ ܟܕ ܩܕܡܬ ܩܕܡܬ ܠܐ ܟܬܒܬ : ܡܢ
— ܥܕܠܐ ܟܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܪܪ ܐܢܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܣܘܟ̈ܠܐ
— ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ : ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ
— ܕܪܬ : ܠܪܘܫܡܐ ܢܥܒܕ ܡܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܒܝ̈ܫܝ ܪܘܚܐ.
— ܒܐܝܕܐ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܗܟܝܠ. ܢܚܙܐ ܦܬܓܡܐ. ܚܕܪܬ ܓܝܪ
— ܒܦܣܝܩܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܐܬܡܢ ܗܪܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܡܣܒܪܐ
— ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܦܩܐ ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܒ
— ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ. ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ
— ܕܓܠܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܡܠܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܗܠܝܢ
— ܕܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܗܝ ܘܗ̇ܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ : ܘܠܐ

A flor. II from l. 180 to l. 188

Line 186: ܡܣܓܝܐܐܝܬ, flor. II: ܡܣܓܝܐܝܬ.
Line 187: ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ, flor. II om.

one prove the fact and he shall gain me as a fellow-critic of my statement. For I am not dismayed by a rebuttal but feel the hurt done to the truth because though it did not rebut anything it came as a rebuttal. But if in that very chapter and place were adduced testimonies from the fathers which confirm the statement, let no one fault the truth. For after the passage not one word interrupted the testimony adduced, for the very reason that it terminated the section it stood in, as follows: 'Let us quickly recall that it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance "hypostases" and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert that they characterize the prosopa or hypostases, and use certain wordy expressions of this kind about them. * For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius, writing against heresies and saying: "The term 'hypostases' shall not disturb people, for the reason the Easterns say 'hypostases' is to indicate the subsisting and existing properties of the prosopa"; and again: "They have good grounds for denominating the properties of the prosopa 'subsisting hypostases', as we said before, because the Holy Ghost subsists"? And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea: "For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative

193/211 cf. supra, ch. 1, 42-60



— ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܠ̈ܦܢܐ ܗܘ : ܩ̈ܠܝܠܐ ܠܟܢܫ
— ܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܙܪܐ : ܢܫܘܐ ܐܝܟ : ܘܢܩܒܠܐ ܘܐܦ ܠܝ ܚܕܡܗ
— ܡܬܦܪܟܢܐ ܕܡܠܬܝ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܢܐ ܢܦܫ ܠܗܝ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ :
— ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܐܟܣܬ ܐܝܟ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ
— ܐܬܬ݂ : ܟܕ ܠܡ ܣܠܩ ܥܙܪܐ ܟܐܕ ܠܗ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ
— ܒܦܣܩܐ ܘܒܗ ܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܐܬܬܝ̈ܗ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ
— ܕܡܫܪ̈ܪܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܡܐܟ ܠܫܪܪܐ. ܘܠܐ ܓܝܪ
— ܚܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܐܬܬܦܣܩܬ ܒܣܗܕܘܬܐ
— ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܬܝܬܝܬܗ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܬܬܬܢܝܬ : ܕܒܣܘܦܗ ܦܣܩܬ ܠܦܣܘܩܐ
— ܕܐܝܬ ܗܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܀ ܢܥܗܕ ܡܠܝܠܐܝܬ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
— ܙܗܝܪܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܫܟܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܢܣܒܪ :
— ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ
— ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܢܣܒܪ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ : ܐܦ
— ܙܒ̈ܢܬܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ ܡܠ̈ܦܢܐ ܕܪ̈ܫܡܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ
— ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܘܡܠ̈ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܩܠ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ
— ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܫܚܝܢ ܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ. ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ * ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ f. 48va
← ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ : ܟܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ : ܘܠܐ ܢܫܓܘܫ
← ܠܐܢܫ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܢܚ̈ܝܐ
← ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܕܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ
← ܘܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܢܣܒܪܘܢ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܕܐܘܟܝܬ ܒܕܡܘܣܝܢ ܪܘܚܐ
← ܡܫܟܚܐ : ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܢܩܪܘܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ :
← ܡܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܀ ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܢ ܕܩܕܝܫ
← ܠܗܬ ܒܪܘܚܩܘܕܫܐ ܡܩܝܡܐ ܐܡܪܢ ܀ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ
← ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܒܓܘܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܟܠܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ
← ܢܬܚܫܒ : ܡܬܠܒܠܐ ܘܡܬܚܒܠܐ ܠܝ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ
← ܘܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܠܝܬ ܡܕܡ ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܘܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ :

A

Line 219: ܐܦ, cf. ch. 1, line 47 and note.

Line 226: ܪܘܚܐ (as ch. 4, line 18 and ch. 5, line 235), cf. ch. 1, line 54 (ܐܝܬ ܪܘܚܐ) and ch. 5, line 196 (ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܪܘܚܐ).

Line 231: ܢܬܚܫܒ, cf. ch. 1, line 58 (ܡܬܚܫܒ).

of the community, the latter of the property"? Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis "indicative of the property"'.

Let us note this excellent fellow's promises, and let us keep hold of them until we see if they correspond with deeds or whether, like his doctrines, they too are filled with empty words. He says, then: Had I not written this down earlier, I should not be free from just rebuke. But if the refutation of opponents derived from the ideas and words of the fathers, let us banish the aspersion on the teaching of inspired men.

It will have escaped no one, I think, how, mindful only of everywhere catching the simple and devising a persuasive sophistry which seems evidently good to himself, he employs a double deception. First, by pretending to confirm his heterodoxy by the fathers' thoughts and words; secondly, by making it appear that he fights against opponents and total strangers to the Church of the orthodox. For each of these things too, is a trick to seduce the inexperienced; the falser it becomes, the more cunning it becomes.

So let us investigate the meaning of these statements on the basis of what follows: Let us examine the passage, then, in detail. For I briefly mentioned there that it was 'hazardous and at odds with the

**215/218** cf. supra, 177-180 **229/232** cf. supra, 180-183



← ܘܠܬܠܬܗܘܢ، ܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܕܟܘܢܝܘܬܐ : ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ
← ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܀ ܚܘܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܪ ܦܫܬ ܩܪܗ̇ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ
— ܘܐܡܪܬ. ܟܕ ܗܘ ܠܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܣܦܝܩܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ
— ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܀

ܢܬܒܩܐ ܒܫܘ̈ܕܝܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܛܝܒܐ. ܘܢܐܚܘܕ ܐܢܘܢ :
ܥܕܡܐ ܕܢܚܙܐ ܐܢ ܐܘ ܐܢ ܫܠܡܝܢ ܠܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ : ܐܘ ܐܢ
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܘܗܝ ܐܦ ܗܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܣܦܝ̈ܩܬܐ
— ܡܠܝܢ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܀ ܐܢ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘܐ ܟܕ ܩܕܡܬ ܦܫܩܬ
— ܠܐ ܟܬܒܬ : ܡܢ ܟܘܕܢܐ ܟܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܪܪ ܐܢܐ. ܐܢ
— ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܘ̈ܢܝܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ : ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܥܠ
— ܗ̇ܘܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܙܕܩ : ܠܙܘܚܡܐ ܢܥܒܕ ܡܘܡܐ ܡܢ
— ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܒܝܫܝ ܪܘܚܐ ܀

ܘܠܐ ܠܐܢܫ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܛܥܝܬ : ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܟܕ
ܕܨܝܕܐ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܕܦܫܝܛܐ ܒܟܠܕܘܟ ܐܝܟ : ܘܡܦܝܣܢܘܬܐ
ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܘܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܠܢܦܫܗ ܡܬܛܝܒܘ : ܒܠܚܘܕܘܬܐ
ܒܥܦܝܦܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܫܚ. ܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܡܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ
ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܠܫܘܪܪܘܬ ܥܡܘܣܗ ܕܢܟܪܐ ܟܕ ܐܣܟܡܐ. ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ
ܘܟܕ ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܘܡܫܬܟܠܢܘܬ ܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ
ܕܐܪܬܘܕܘܟܣܘ ܡܚܘܐ ܕܡܟܬܫ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕܐ ܡܢܗܝܢ
ܨܝܕܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܠܗܘ ܥܛܘܡܐ ܠܐ ܡܕܪܫܐ ܠܬܒܪ.
ܘܟܠܗ ܗܢܐ ܟܡܐ ܕܡܬܓܪܬ ܥܡ ܐܣܟܡܐ ܨܝܕܐ
ܗܘܐ.

ܡܟܝܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܢܩܦܢ ܢܒܥܐ ܀
— ܒܐܝܕܐ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܠܗ ܗܘܒܠ ܢܬܒܥܐ ܦܬܓܡܐ. ܟܪܝܬ ܓܝܪ
— ܒܗ̇ܝ ܒܦܣܝܩܘܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝ ܗܝܪܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ

A

Lines 233-234: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ..... ܘܠܬܠܬܗܘܢ، (as ch. 7, lines 21-22 and 87-88, ch. 9, lines 336-337 and 363-364, ch. 10, lines 20-21, ch. 11, lines 321-322 and 344-345), cf. ch. 1, lines 60-61 (ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ..... ܘܠܬܠܬܗܘܢ،).

fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance "hypostases"'.

Let us note that here too having omitted even though the doctors frequently assert that they characterize the prosopa or hypostases * (which was the reason for all, so to say, of our uncertainty about him) he bears down upon us in all his pride, saying as follows: If, therefore, the statement is false and the God-clad teachers of truth did not call either the properties of the prosopa viewed in the Godhead and the one identical substance, or the properties of the substance, 'hypostases', let someone prove the fact and he shall gain me as a fellow-critic of my statement. For I am not dismayed by a rebuttal but feel the hurt done to the truth because though it did not rebut anything it came as a rebuttal.

Here again, carefully omitting the reason he is being judged, he expends his clear and proven 'proof' in idle and empty nonsense. For we never criticized him for naming the hypostases 'properties' but because he sees fit to make ingeneracy, generacy and procession the hypostases of the Holy Trinity. So let him prove this and he will have no need of all these circuitous, empty devices. For what is madder than attempting to prove that the hypostases are not the properties of the substance if it does not procure him a forceful argument that those who do not call the characteristic properties of the hypostases 'hypostases' must of necessity acknowledge the properties of the substance as hypostases – which is quite absurd? So he should not stray from the point of the debate and become confused, go on repeating to us what has no relevance whatever to the subject by saying ludicrously, let someone prove that they called neither the properties of the substance, nor those of the prosopa, 'hypostases'; and thereby stealthily and, as

**233/234** cf. supra, 196-197 **236/242** cf. supra, 183-189 **256/258** cf. supra, 237-240



— ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܣܒܪ : ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܟܕ
— ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܀

— ܢܬܒܩܐ : ܕܟܕ ܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܫܒܩ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܦܢ ܙܒܢܬܐ
— ܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܬܚܘܡܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܀
* ܕܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܟܠܗ ܦܘܫܟܢ ܕܠܘܬܗ f. 48vb
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܒܗ ܟܠܗ ܪܡܘܬܐ ܡܬܥܫܢ ܥܠܝܢ : ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ
— ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܗ̇ܟܝܠ ܕܓܠܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܡܠܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ
— ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܝ، ܟܕ ܚ̇ܝ،
— ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܬܘܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
— ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܠܒ̈ܫܝ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ : ܢܚܘܐ ܐܢܫ : ܘܢܩܢܐ
— ܐܦ ܠܝ ܒܗܘ ܡܗܦܟܢܐ ܕܡܠܬܝ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܬܪܐ ܢܦܫ ܠܘܬ
— ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܐܟܣܬ ܐܝܟ
— ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܬ : ܟܕ ܠܡ ܥܠ ܫܪܪܐ ܟܐܒ ܠܝ ܀

ܘܗܟܢܐ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܒܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܫܒܩ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܛܠܬܗ̇
ܡܬܕܝܢ : ܘܠܗ̇ ܠܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܗ ܠܡ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܘܡܚܘܝܬܐ :
ܒܡܘܩܡܐ ܣ̈ܪܝܩܐ ܘܣܪ̈ܝܩܐ ܡܬܠܠ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ
ܕܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܫܡܗ ܡܢ ܡܟܣܝܢ ܐܢܚܢܢ : ܐܠܐ
ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܡܚܫܒ
ܕܢܥܒܕ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ. ܗܕܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܚܘܐ
ܘܥܠ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܒ̈ܪܘܟܝܐ ܘܣܪ̈ܝܩܐ ܠܐ
ܡܣܬܢܩ. ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬ ܕܫܦܝܠܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܢܚܘܐ
ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܠܘ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܐܢ
ܠܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܬܬܠܕ ܠܗ ܡܠܬܐ ܥܫܝܢܬܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ
ܩܪܝܢ ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢ̈ܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܢ
ܐܢܢܩܐ ܙܕܩ ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܒܟܠ ܥܠܡ ܠܡܘܕܝܘ. ܘܗܘ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܨܚܝܩ ܥܡܝܩ̈ܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܠܐ ܗܟܝܠ
ܟܕ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܕܘܟܬܐ ܕܐܬܓܘܫܐ ܛܥܝܐ ܘܡܬܕܠܚ : ܘܗܠܝܢ
ܕܡܕܡ ܥܡܗ ܡܢ ܦܘܪܫܢ ܠܐ ܠܐܬܝܢ ܠܗܕܐ ܕܫܘܐܠܐ ܢܬܢܐ
— ܠܝ : ܘܡܬܓܚܟܢܐܝܬ ܢܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ
— ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܡܪܘ ܀ ܘܒܗܕܐ

A

it were silently, avoid proofs of his statements. But what I am not dismayed by a rebuttal but feel the hurt done to the truth because though it did not rebut anything it came as a rebuttal expressed, let those, who confirm that we received his pamphlets at the outset, remember with care!

But let us hear also what the subsequent lines are: But if in that very chapter and place were adduced testimonies from the fathers which confirm the statement, let no one fault the truth. For after the passage not one word interrupted the testimony adduced, for the very reason that it * terminated the section it stood in, as follows: 'Let us quickly recall that it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance "hypostases" and to suppose they are not three realities even though the doctors frequently assert that they "characterize" the prosopa or hypostases, and use certain wordy expressions of this kind about them'.

So, he bids us profess the characteristic properties of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity (I mean fatherhood – or ingeneracy – generacy and procession) as hypostases and affirms that he has proved this from the fathers' doctrines.

259/261 cf. supra, 241-242 264/273 cf. supra, 189-198



ܡܛܠܥܐܝܬ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܥܠܝܐܝܬ : ܢܚܙܐ ܡܢ
— ܡܬܚܫܒܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܠܗ. ܘܠܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܀ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܪܐ
— ܢܦܩ ܠܘܬ ܡܣܗܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܚܕ ܒܚܕܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܦܣܩܬ
— ܐܝܟ ܡܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ ܀ ܗܘ ܕܠܡܫܬܠܡܢܘܬܗ
ܡܢ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܕܡܟܠܝܢ ܡܫܪܪܝܢ : ܒܥܠ ܠܚܝܐ ܠܐ ܢܬܗܘܢ.

— ܐܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܬܬܣܝܡܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܝܢ ܢܫܡܥ ܀ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ
— ܒܗ ܒܦܣܘܩܐ : ܘܒܗ ܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܐܬܬܝܬܝ ܣ̈ܗܕܘܬܐ
— ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܕܡܫܪܪ̈ܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܦܠܘܓ ܠܫܪܪܐ.
— ܘܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܐܬܬܦܣܩܬ
— ܒܡܨܥܬ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܛܠܬܗ ܐܬܬܝܬܝܬ : ܘܦܣܩܬ
— * ܠܦܘܪܣܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘܝܐ. ܢܥܗܕ ܡܠܠܐܝܬ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ f. 49ra
— ܘܣܪܝܩܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܢܣܒܪ :
— ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܒܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ
— ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܢܣܒܪ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܨܒܘܬܐ : ܐܦ
— ܕܙܒܢܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܡܠܦܢ̈ܐ ܕܡܨܝܪܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܒܗ
— ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܘܡܠܠ̈ܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܦܬܓ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܝܟ
— ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܦܫܩܝܢ ܡܛܠܬܗܝܢ ܀

ܗܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܘܕܐ ܦܩܕ ܠܢ : ܘܕܡܢ
ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܐ ܗܘܕܐ ܗܢܘ ܡܚܘܝ.

A

*[Chapter 4]*

*Investigations of testimonies which have been put forward by him without examination to confirm his impure doctrines. And* exposé *of the old disagreement between Latins and Easterns over the terms 'substance', 'hypostasis' and 'prosopon' and upon the wise economy of the fathers who called the hypostases 'properties'. From whom we have learned not to dispute with those who, in simple fashion, have called the hypostases 'properties' without impiously taking the hypostases for characteristic properties; although we by no means consider the characteristic properties,* qua *characteristic properties, to be imperfect but consider them to be perfect and, as the fathers saw fit, call the hypostases 'properties'.*

So let us examine with a love for truth the words he quoted. He says, then: For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius, writing against heresies and saying: 'The term "hypostases" shall not disturb people, for the reason the Easterns say "hypostases" is to indicate the subsisting and existing properties of the prosopa'; and again: 'They have good grounds for denominating the properties of the prosopa "subsisting hypostases", as we said before, because the Holy Ghost subsists'?

This is the first of the proof-texts quoted by this excellent fellow in 'proof' that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the characteristic properties of the hypostases. But readers should know that having set down the quoted text in a different way in the copies of his books which were given out at the beginning

---

**14/19** cf. supra, ch. 3, 198-204

[ܦܘܠܓܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ].

ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܒܘܚܢܐܝܬ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܕܛܢܦܘܬܗ، ܡܩܪܒܐ ܡܬܬܩܝܡܝܢ ܡܢܗ. ܘܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܥܠ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܫܢܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܩܕܝܡ ܕܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ ܘܕܡܕ̈ܢܚܝܐ : ܥܠ ܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ. ܘܥܠ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܚܟܝܡܬܐ ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ : ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܩܪܘ ܗܘܘ. ܕܡܢܗܘܢ ܝܠܦܢ : ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܢܬܚܪܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܪܫܝܥܐܝܬ : ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܢܣܒܝܢ : ܐܦ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܪܥܝܢ : ܘܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܫܦܪܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ✤

[ܐ.] ܢܒܚܘܪ ܒܚܘܒܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ : ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܡܬܬܦܝܣ ܢܟܝܣ.

— ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ✤ ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ :

— ܕܟܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ : ܘܠܐ ܢܕܘܫ ܠܐܢܫ

— ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕ̈ܢܚܝܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ

— ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܢ ܘܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ

— ܢܫܘܕܥܘܢ ✤ ܘܬܘܒ ✤ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܙܕܩܝܢ ܙܘܕܩܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ :

— ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܩܕܡܢ ܐܡܪܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ

— ܡܩܝܡܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ✤

ܘܗܕܐ ܚܕ ܗܝ ܡܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܝܬܪܐ ܡܬܬܦܝܣܢ : ܠܡܚܘܝܘܬܐ ܠܗ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܩܪܘܝܬܐ. ܕܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܕܝܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܠܓܝܢ : ܕܟܕ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܕܡܬܬܦܣܘܗܝ ܕܡܢ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܐܬܝܗܒܘ ܡܢܗ : ܕܡܬܬܦܝܣܘܢ ܐܦ

---

A

---

Line 18: ܙܘܕܩܐ, cf. ch. 3, line 226 and note.

(some of which he sent me), later on, * on being accused by certain persons of misrepresenting Saint Epiphanius and of quoting as evidence in defence of his doctrines a heretic, he removed it from all his new books, not in an open manner at all but, rather, furtively, and substituted for it a proof-text of Gregory the Theologian. In view of what he has done, it might have been right merely to mock these acts of sacrilege and shift the discussion to other matters, but lest, from the absurdities he has put forward, his abominable doctrines might seem to somebody to have some kind of defence, we prefer, after setting down a few words from the divinely inspired spiritual masters and thereby showing clearly the real intention of the fathers' words, to expose the sophist's evil design against the truth.

It must be understood, then, that when certain persons in days of old were arguing against one another, not about the doctrine but about certain names and expressions, the pillars of the churches (like physicians, and using the means of economy) were at pains to try to remove such dissension by summoning together those who in their simplicity were in mutual disagreement to meet them. Apostolic ATHANASIUS is the first witness. He sent a letter to Eusebius, Lucifer, Asterius, Cymatius and Anatolius, and said as follows: So even though someone publishes this or another document, silence such folk and make them quieten down. For we see nothing more in them than mere contentiousness. For we urged those, whom some criticize for saying 'three hypostases' because the words are un-biblical and

46/84 Athan. Alex., *Tom. ad Antioch.*, 5-6 (*PG* 26, 800D - 804A)



ܠܝ ܫܕܪ : ܡܫܬܐܠܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܕܝܢ : ܠܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ
* ܡܬܠܬܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܐܬܐܟܠܘ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܥܒܪ ܗܘ ܗܘ A, f. 49rb
ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ : ܕܐܢܫ ܐܝܬ ܗܪܛܝܩܐ : ܠܣܗܕܐ ܠܥܘܕܪܢܘܬܐ
ܕܝܘܠܦܢܘܗܝ ܐܝܬܝ ܡܣܡܘܕܢܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܡܢ ܒܦܪܗܣܝܐ :
ܡܣܠܩܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܗ : ܡܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܟܬ̈ܒܘܗܝ ܕܚܕܬܐܝܬ
ܐܬܬܟܠܘ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܐܝܟ. ܘܣܠܩܗܘܢ ܗܢ : ܬܚܘܝܬܐ
ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܪܘܡ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܕܒܗ ܗܕܐ ܗܘ
ܒܓܕ : ܠܡܘܟܢ ܢܦܫ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܢܠܝܘܬܗ ܕܒܝܫܬ ܡܒܕܩܐ : ܘܠܘܬ
ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܢܥܒܪ ܠܡܠܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܥܒܕܐܝܬ ܡܢܗ ܡܬܬܘܬܝܢ. ܢܣܬܒܪܘܢ ܠܐܢܫ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܘܗܝ
ܡܣ̈ܝܒܐ : ܕܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܕܐ ܕܗܝ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ : ܫܦܝܪܐ
ܟܕ ܕܒܫܝܢܬܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܝ ܙܥܘܪܐ ܢܦܫܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܦܫܝܩܝܢ :
ܘܟܕ ܢܚܘܝܢ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܢܗܘܢ : ܠܣܘܟܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܕܒܬ̈ ܩܠܐ
ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ : ܢܦܪܣܐ ܠܒܝܫܘܬ ܡܫܟܢܬܐ : ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܫܪܪܐ
ܕܣܘܦܣܛܐ.

ܙܕܩ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܡܕܥ : ܕܟܕ ܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܢܫܝܢ
ܠܘܬ ܚܕ̈ܕܐ : ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܥܠ ܬܘܠܡܕܬܐ : ܥܠ ܫܡܗ̈ܐ ܕܝܢ
ܡܕܡ ܘܒܬ̈ ܩܠܐ : ܥܡܘ̈ܕܐ ܡܬܦܪܣܝܢ ܗܘܘ : ܕܡܢ
ܕܥܕ̈ܬܐ ܐܣ̈ܝܐ ܢܝܚܘܗܝ ܠܫܪܝܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘܐ ܦܘܣ̈ܩܐ ܕܡܕ̈ܒܪܢܘܬܐ.
ܒܗ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܬ ܙܢܐ ܕܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ : ܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܢ
ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ : ܡܠܘܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܠܘܬܗܘܢ
ܢܩܪܒܝܢ. ܘܡܩܕܡܐ ܣܗܕ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ ܫܠܝܚܝܐ. ܟܕ ܠܘܬ
ܐܘܣܒܝܘܣ ܘܠܘܩܝܦܪ ܘܐܣܛܪܝܘܣ ܘܩܘܡܛܝܘܣ ܘܐܢܛܘܠܝܘܣ
< ܫܠܚ ܘܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ : ܕܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܐܦ ܗܢܐ ܐܘ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܢܫ
< ܢܦܪܣ : ܫܬܩܘ ܠܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܟܢܐ : ܘܡܫܬܝܢܐܝܬ ܕܢܫܬܩܘܢ
< ܢܚܬܘ. ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ ܚܙܝܢܢ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܠܗ ܒܗܠܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܐܢ
< ܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ. ܠܗܠܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܒܥܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܐܢܫ̈ܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ
< ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܟܬܒܢ̈ܝܬܐ ܐܢܝܢ

AB from ܢܝܚܘܗܝ (l. 44) on W from l. 49 on

Line 47: ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ, B: ܐܬܢܣܝܣ.
Line 52: ܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ, W: ܐܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ. ܐܢܫ̈ܝܢ, A: ܐܢܫܝܢ.

under suspicion, to require nothing more than the confession of Nicaea. Nevertheless, owing to the contentiousness, we examined them as to whether they too said, as Arians say, that the three hypostases are mutually alien, foreign and different and that each hypostasis is as distinct and separate as the other creatures and as the offspring of men or as e.g. different substances such as gold, * silver and bronze are; or whether they think of them in the way that other heretics speak of them as three beginnings and three gods, when talking of three hypostases. They confirmed that they did not, nor had they ever held that view. But on our asking them 'What then do you mean when you say these things or why do you use these words?', they answered 'Because we believe in the Holy Trinity which is and subsists as Trinity not merely in name but in reality. For we recognize that the Father truly is and subsists, and that the Son is truly substantial and subsists and that the Holy Ghost truly subsists and is. Nor do we, on the other hand, say 'three gods' or 'three beginnings' or tolerate at all those who say this – no, we say that we recognise the Holy Trinity but the single Godhead and single beginning, and the Son consubstantial with the Father (as the fathers said) and the Holy Ghost not a creature and not alien to, but belonging to, the very substance of the Son and inseparable from it'. So having praised the explanation of these words and the defence, we judged also those whom they had criticized



< ܟ̈ܠܐ : ܘܬܘܣܦܬ ܡܥܒܪܢܘܬܐ : ܡܦܣܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ : ܕܠܐ
< ܡܕܡ ܢܬܒܥܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܢܝܩܝܐ. ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢ
< ܒܦܪܥܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ : ܕܠܡܐ ܐܦ ܐܢܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܐܪ̈ܝܢܘ
< ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܐ ܘܐܟ̈ܣܢܝܐ ܘܡܫܬܢܝܢ ܠܚܕ̈ܕܐ : ܘܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ
< ܡܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܡܢܗ ܘܠܗ ܦܪܝܫ : ܐܝܟ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܐܚܪܢܝܬܗܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܬܐ
< ܐܢܫܝܬܐ : ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܦ̈ܫܛܐ ܡܬܝܠܕܝܢ : ܐܘ ܐܝܟܢܐ
< ܕܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܬܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܗܒܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܗܟܢܐ
< * ܘܣܐܡܐ ܘܢܚܫܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܘܗܘܘ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܐܘ ܐܝܟ f. 49va
< ܗܪ̈ܛܝܩܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܬܠܬ ܪ̈ܫܢܘܬܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܐ̈ܠܗܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ :
< ܗܟܢܐ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ : ܟܕ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܘܟܦܪܘ ܕܠܐ
< ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܦܠܐ ܐܬܪܥܝܘ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ. ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܐܠܝܢ
< ܗܘܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܚܢܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ : ܐܘ
< ܡܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܫܚܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ : ܡܦܢܝܢ
< ܗܘܘ ܦܬܓܡܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ :
< ܕܠܘ ܒܫܡܐ ܗܝ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܒܫܪܪܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
< ܘܡܩܝܡܐ. ܐܒܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܡܩܝܡ : ܘܒܪܐ
< ܕܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܘܣܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܡܩܝܡ : ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ
< ܕܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܡܩܝܡ ܘܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܝܕܥܝܢ. ܐܦܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢܢ
< ܬܠܬܐ ܐ̈ܠܗܐ ܐܘ ܬܠܬ ܪ̈ܫܢܘܬܐ. ܐܦ ܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܐܬܪܥܝܢܢ
< ܠܗܘܢ ܕܗܕܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܘ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܕܝܕܥܝܢ ܡܢ
< ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ. ܚܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܪܫܢܘܬܐ.
< ܘܒܪܐ ܗܘ ܚܕܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܐܒܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܘ
< ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ. ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܠܐ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ
< ܐܠܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܪܫܢܐ. ܟܕ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܠܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܒܚܢ : ܘܠܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܝܢ :

AB W

Line 67: ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ, W: ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 71: ܐܡܪܝܢܢ, B and W: ܐܡܪܝܢ.
Line 72: ܐܬܪܥܝܢܢ, W: ܐܬܪܥܝܢ.
Line 75: ܠܐܒܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܚܕܐ, B and W: ܕܐܒܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܒܪ.
Line 78: ܫܒܚܢ, W: ܫܒܚ ܚܢܢ. ܕܝܢ, W: ܕܢܝܢ.

for saying 'one hypostasis', asking whether they too expressed a similar view to Sabellius, intending the negation of the Son and the Holy Ghost. But these also confirmed that they neither said, nor ever had thought, that, but 'We say "hypostasis" supposing that it means the same thing to say "hypostasis" and "substance", whilst we think there is one hypostasis because the Son is from the Father's substance and because the nature is the same, for we believe there is a single Godhead and that its nature is one: the nature of the Father is not different, and the nature of the Son and Holy Ghost alien to it'. So those former people criticized for saying 'three hypostases' agreed with these latter and these latter who said 'one substance' confessed the former's view as they had interpreted it. Arius was anathematized by both sides as an enemy of Christ, Sabellius and Paul of Samosata as impious, Valentinus and Basilides as aliens to the truth, and Manes as an inventor of evils. And a little later: So, this profession being made * we urge you not to condemn or rashly reject those who make this profession and explain the words they say in this way, but, rather, take them to yourselves as they explain and defend their words; but such as refuse to profess and explain the words in this way you are to restrain and abash because they are suspect in their opinion. Hereby it is clearly shown that when those who reckoned on one hypostasis of the Holy Trinity and those who asserted three were violently accusing one another of Arianism and Sabellianism, and each side was in battle against the other, the great Athanasius, at that time the wise pilot of the Church, removed their division over a word

84/89 Athan. Alex., *Tom. ad Antioch.*, 8 (*PG* 26, 805AB)



< ܘܠܗܘܢ ܕܐܬܚܒܠܘ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܗ̇، ܕܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ :
< ܕܠܡܐ ܐܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ : ܗܢܘܢ ܘܗܢܘܢ
< ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܬܪܥܝܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܐܦ
< ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܫܪܪܘ : ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܐܡܪܘ ܘܠܐ ܐܬܪܥܝܘ
< ܗܕܐ ܡܬܘܡ. ܐܠܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܟܕ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ :
< ܕܗ̇ܘ، ܟܕ ܗ̣ܘ، ܐܡܝܪ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ. ܚܕ ܕܝܢ
< ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ : ܡܛܠ ܕܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܒܪܐ :
< ܘܡܛܠ ܗ̇، ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܟܕ ܗ̣ܝ، ܕܟܝܢܐ. ܚܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܚܕܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗ̇، ܟܝܢܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ
< ܕܐܒܐ : ܐܟܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ.
< ܗܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܥܕܠܘ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
< ܐܡܪܘ : ܫܠܡܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܗ̇ܢܘܢ. ܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܘ ܚܕܐ
< ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܦܫܩܘ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ.
< ܘܡܬܚܪܡ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܢ̈ܝܬܐ : ܐܪܝܘܣ ܐܝܟ ܒܥܠ
< ܕܒܒܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ : ܘܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܘܦܘܠܐ ܫܡܫܛܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܐ.
< ܘܘܠܢܛܝܢܘܣ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܣܝܠܝܕܝܣ : ܐܝܟ ܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ. ܡܐܢܝ
< ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܫܟܚܢܐ ܕܒܝ̈ܫܬܐ ✤ ܘܒܬܪ ܩܠܝܠ ✤ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܬܕ̈ܝܢ، : * ܡܦܝܣܝܢ ܠܟܘܢ : ܕܠܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܕܗܟܢܐ f. 49vb
< ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܘܗܟܢܐ ܡܦܫܩܝܢ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ : ܠܐ
< ܬܚܝܒܘܢ ܘܠܐ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܬܫܕܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܟܕ
< ܡܦܫܩܝܢ ܘܡܦܩܝܢ ܒܪܘܚܐ : ܗܦܟܘ ܠܘܬܟܘܢ. ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ
< ܨ̈ܒܝܢ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܢܘܕܘܢ ܘܢܦܫܩܘܢ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܟܠܘ.
< ܐܒܗܬܘ. ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܚܫܝܕܝܢ ܡܣܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ
< ܐܬܚܘܝܘ ✤ ܒܗ̇ ܗܠܝܢ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܕܟܕ ܡܫܐܠܬ
ܒܐܪܝܘܣܝܢܘܬܐ ܘܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܡܥܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ :
ܗܢܘܢ ܕܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܚܫܒܝܢ : ܘܗܢܘܢ
ܕܬܠܬܐ ܦܣܩܝܢ : ܘܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܦܢ̈ܝܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܩܪܒܐܝܬ
ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ : ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ ܪܒܐ : ܗܘ ܕܗܘܐ ܗܝܕܝܢ
ܗܘܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ : ܡܢ ܡܨܥܬܐ

AB W up to l. 102

Lines 79-80: ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܠܡܐ ܐܪܐ ܐܝܟ, W om.

Line 94: ܘܘܠܢܛܝܢܘܣ, B and W: ܘܠܢܛܝܢܘܣ. ܘܒܣܝܠܝܕܝܣ, W: ܘܒܣܝܠܝܕܣ.

Line 96: ܡܦܝܣܝܢ, W: ܡܦܝܣܝܢ ܚܢܢ.

by showing up their dissension as being about names rather than realities, and, having thus put them at peace with one another, he joined together the limbs, so to say, which had till then been sundered.

Again, GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN attests this too in the *Oration on the burial of the famous Athanasius*, saying as follows: But what I find especially to marvel at in the man and what it would be damaging to keep silent on because the hour brings forth especially schisms in plenty, this I shall add to what has been said. His action will be instructive to our contemporaries too, if we look towards him. Just as not only what the hand has let go as it draws it off is cut off from the water but also what is shed as it drips between the fingers, so also not only the impious is sundered from us but also the very religious, not over merely trifling and negligible doctrines (for that would be a slight evil) but heretofore also over words that convey the same meaning. For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three) the Italians understand them in the same way as we, but they were unable, owing to the constraints of their language and its poverty of terms, to distinguish 'substance' and 'hypostasis' and therefore 'prosopa' was introduced so that three substances * might not be accepted. What happens? Something ridiculous and pitiable; the verbal triviality was thought a difference of faith. And consequently Sabellianism was fabricated in

---

**100/135** Greg. Naz., *Or. 21*, 35-36 (*PG* 35, 1124C - 1125C; *SChr.*, vol. 270, pp. 184-188)



ܐܘܕܥ ܠܦܠܝܓܘܬܐ ܕܫܡܗ̈ܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܒܢܬ ܩܠܐ: ܒܪ ܐܚܕܗ
ܠܫܝܢܐ ܕܡܦܠܓܠ ܥܒܕܗ ܟܠܗ ܘܠܘ ܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ ܕܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ
ܐܬܚܘܝ، ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ. ܘܒܪ ܗܕܡܐ ܠܫܝܢܐ ܥܡ: ܠܗܕܡ̈ܐ
ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܬܦܠܓܘ ܐܚܕ.

ܘܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ ܡܣܗܕ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ:
ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܡܥܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܩܒܘܪܐ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ: ܟܕ
ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ✤ ܗܿ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܕܐܬܕܡܪ ܒܓܒܪܐ: <
ܘܚܘܣܪܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܢܫܬܩ: ܡܛܠܠ ܕܒܢܝܐ ܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܣܕ̈ܩܐ <
ܣܓܝܐ̈ܐ ܡܛܒܥ: ܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ ܐܘܣܦ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ̈ܝ. <
ܬܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܦܢܝܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܫܐ ܣܘܥܪܢܗ̇ ܐܢ <
ܘܗܘ ܬܘܒ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܢܚܘܪ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܬܦܣܩ: ܠܘ ܗܢܐ <
ܒܠܚܘܕ ܗܘ ܡܢܐ ܕܫܒܩܬ ܐܝܕܐ ܟܕ ܕܠܝܐ: ܐܠܐ ܘܗܘ ܡܢܐ <
ܕܐܬܐܫܕ ܟܕ ܕܐܠܝ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܨ̈ܒܥܬܐ: ܗܟܢܐ ܘܐܦ: ܠܘ ܗܘ <
ܡܢܐ ܕܪܫܝܥܐ ܡܬܦܣܩ ܡܢܢ: ܐܠܐ ܘܗܘ ܡܢܐ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܕܚܠ <
ܐܠܗܐ. ܠܘ ܡܛܠܠ ܫ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܙܥܘܪܐ ܘܕܫܝܛܝܢ <
ܡܬܥܩܠܢ: ܒܝܫܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܙܥܘܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ ܗܕܐ: <
ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ: ܘܡܛܠ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܠܗܿ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܡ̈ܘܕܥܢ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ <
ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܿ ܡܢܢ ܒܕܚܠܬ <
ܐܠܗܐ: ܗܿ, ܡܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ: ܗܿ, ܕܝܢ <
ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ: ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܐܝܛܠܝܐ ܒܗ̇ <
ܒܕܡܘܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܛܠ ܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ <
ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܫܡܗ̈ܐ: ܕܢܦܪܫܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ: <
ܘܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܡܥܠ ܗܘܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ: ܕܠܐ ܬܠܬ * ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ < f. 50ra
ܢܬܩܒܠܢ: ܡܢܐ ܗܿܘܐ: ܡܕܡ ܕܓܘܚܟܐ ܠܚܘܣܢܐ ܘܠܣܘܚܠܐ. <
ܟܣܠܝܐ ܕܡܫܚܘܬܐ ܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܕܚܘܪܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܬܪܬ <

---

AB up to ܥܡ (l. 110)   W from l. 114 on

---

Line 115: ܡܛܠܠ, W: ܡܛܠ.
Line 119: ܘܗܘ ܡܢܐ, W om. ܡܢܐ.
Line 121: ܕܪܫܝܥܐ, W: ܕܪܫܝܥ; cf. infra, line 327 and note.
Line 122: ܡܛܠܠ, W: ܡܛܠ.
Line 123: ܢܬܥܩܠܢ, W: ܢܬܬܥܩܠܢ.
Line 130: ܡܥܠ ܗܘܐ, W: ܡܥܠܐ ܗܘܬ.

'three prosopa' and Arianism in 'three hypostases' – contentious fabrications. But what after that? By the constant addition of small annoyances (the annoyance produced the quarrel) the ends of the earth were in danger of being rent asunder along with the words. So the saint, truly a man of God and great steward of souls, on seeing and hearing this, did not feel it appropriate to disregard so absurd and irrational a dissection of the word, but applies his own remedy to the ailment. How, then, does he do this? Inviting both sides to come to him, so gently and humanely, he carefully investigated the meaning of their statements and, because he found both sides of one mind and not removed from one another on any point of principle, indulgent to the terms, he bound them by the realities. This was more beneficial for them than the exercises and lengthy discourses which everybody is writing nowadays and to which is coupled a certain ambitiousness, and, therefore, perhaps, some innovation is made with regard to doctrine – this, I say, is more valuable than the many vigils and prostrations on the ground, things profitable only to those who accomplish them. This was of worth equal to the man's exile and famous flights.

These words would have been our instruction and in these matters we would have accordingly imitated the wise and true stewards of the Spirit (though it goes without saying, that we are insignificant in comparison with them and remote from them) if the doubt in our midst had been simply over the term 'properties' and not over the Godhead itself. For, as we have frequently said,



< ܡܠܐ. ܘܡܬܘܪܝ ܡܫܠܡܘܬܐ ܗܘܪܐ ܐܬܓܠܝܬ ܒܐܠܗܐ
< ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܘܐܪܝܘܣܢܘܬܐ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܓܒ̈ܘܠܝܐ
< ܕܚܪܝܢܐ. ܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܢܐ. ܒܗ ܒܡܕܡ ܕܒܘܪܐ ܕܡܟܝܟ
< ܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ ܡܬܬܘܣܦ : ܗܘ ܕܡܟܝܟܘܬܐ ܚܪܝܢܐ ܥܒܕ :
< ܣܘܦܘ̈ܗܝ ܕܐܪܥܐ ܒܙܒܢ ܕܢܣܬܕܩܘܢ ܥܡ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܣܩܘܦܐ. ܗܘܝܘ
< ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܘܓܒܪ ܗܘ ܠܐܠܗܐ : ܘܪܒܝܢܐ ܒܢ̈ܦܫܬܐ
< ܕܐܠܗܐ ܘܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܪܒܐ ܕܢܦ̈ܫܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܫܦܪ ܕܢܫܠܐ
< ܕܢܦܫܐ ܒܦܣܩܐ ܕܠܡܠܬܐ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܥܒܝܪ ܘܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ.
< ܐܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܣܝܐ ܠܟܘܪܗܢܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܕܐ
< ܥܒܕ. ܟܕ ܩܪܐ ܠܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܓܒ̈ܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܢܝܚܐܝܬ
< ܘܪܚܡܬ ܐܢܫܐܝܬ : ܘܗܘܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ̈ ܚܦܝܛܐܝܬ
< ܒܥܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܢܩܦܝ ܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܐܫܟܚ ܐܢܘܢ. ܘܡܚܕܝܢ ܠܐ
< ܪܚܝܩܝܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ : ܟܕ ܠܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܐܫܒܩ : ܐܣܪ ܒܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ. ܗܕܐ
< ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܘܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܐܪ̈ܝܟܐ : ܝܬܝܪ ܡܘܬܪܢܝܬܐ ܗܝ :
< ܠܗܘܢ ܕܟܠܢܫ ܗܫܐ ܡܢ ܟܬܒ ܘܟܬܒ : ܥܡ ܗܘ̇ ܕܐܦ ܪܚܡܬ
< ܐܝܩܪܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܘܠܟܐ : ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܟܒܪ ܘܡܬܚܕܬܝܢ
< ܚܕܬܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ. ܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܥܘܕܪܐ ܗܘ̈ܢܝܐ
< ܘܫ̈ܗܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ : ܝܬܝܪ ܡܣܬܪܐ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܡܬܪܕܝܢܘܗܝ
< ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܬܟܪܝܢ. ܗܕܐ ܫܘܝܐ ܠܐܟܣܢܝܘܬܗ
< ܘܠܥܪ̈ܘܩܝܐ ܝܕ̈ܝܥܐ ܕܓܒܪܐ ❖

ܘܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܡܪܕܘܬܐ ܗ̈ܘܝ ܗܘܝ : ܘܒܗܠܝܢ ܚ̈ܟܝܡܐ ܘܐܝܟܢ ܕܫܪ̈ܝܪܐ ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܠܘ ܠܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܡܬܕܡܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ : ܐܦ ܘܐܝܟܢ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܗܢܘܢ ܙ̈ܥܘܪܝܢ ܘܪܚܝܩܝܢ : ܐܢ ܗܘ̇ ܕܡܛܠ ܫܡܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ : ܘܠܘ ܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܦܘܫܟܐ

A W up to l. 152

Line 133: ܡܫܠܡܘܬܐ, W: ܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ.
Line 136: ܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ, W: ܐܡܝܢܬ.
Line 137: ܣܘܦܘ̈ܗܝ, W: ܣܘܦ̈ܘܗܝ.
Line 142: ܩܪܐ, W: ܩܪ̈ܐ.
Line 144: ܘܡܚܕܝܢ, cf. infra, line 519 (ܒܚܕܝܢ).
Line 151: ܕܡܬܟܪܝܢ, W: ܕܡܬܬܟܪܝܢ.

we are not in disagreement with those who name the hypostases 'properties', but with those who, for their part, attempt to eradicate entirely the whole mystery of the Holy Trinity by the term 'properties', because they profess that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are nothing but ingeneracy, generacy and procession and thereby * make the confession of Christians empty names and mere properties. For if the realities, of which the names are predicated and whose characteristic properties are ingeneracy, generacy and procession, are not professed by them at all, how can both the names and the properties not be for them empty and mere names? Therefore, as we have said a host of times (for I say the same thing many times over) were these masters of new-fangled doctrines disturbing the churches of God because the hypostases are named 'properties', we should accordingly have said to them, 'come, let us agree with one another for in this we are content with your opinion as also with that of our divinely inspired fathers of former days and down to the present. And now, along with you, we shall name the hypostases "properties" as much as you like – but perfect, spiritual and individually subsisting properties, as we have been taught'. We said 'perfect', not as contrasting them with imperfect properties (for let us banish afar the misrepresentation of those who despoil the truth) because we have accepted that we should not conceive of anything imperfect in the Holy Trinity. Hence we recognize the properties which characterize the divine nature and those which characterize the hypostases as perfect but perfect *qua* characteristic properties of the substance and of the hypostases. Therefore we do not recognize the properties characteristic of the substance as substances or substance, nor again



ܒܡܚܠܦܘܬܐ. ܐܦܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܪ̈ܘܫܥܬܐ ܡܚ̈ܠܦܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܥܩܪܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܐܝܕܝܗܘܢ : ܕܟܝܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܠܟܠܗ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ [ܠ]ܡܥܩܪ ܢܣܒܘ : ܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܘܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܘ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘ[ܪ]ܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܘܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܣܦܝ̈ܩܐ ܘܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ * ܥܪ̈ܛܠܝܬܐ f. 50rb ܠܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܟܪ̈ܣܛܝܢܐ ܢܥܒܕܘܢ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܡܗܝܗܘܢ ܗܒܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܘܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܗܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܗܝ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܡܬܬܘܕܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܣܦܝ̈ܩܐ ܘܥܪ̈ܛܠܝܐ ܗܘܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܘܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ. ܡܕܝܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܙ̈ܒܢ ܙܒܢܝܢ ܐܡܪܢ : ܗ̇ܝ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܙܒܢܝܢ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܢ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܐܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܫܬܡܗܝܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ : ܡܥܝܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܠܥܕ̈ܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܝ̈ܘܠܦܢܐ ܚ̈ܕܬܐ : ܠܡܟܐܝܬ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ : ܬܘ ܘܢܫܠܡ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ. ܡܣܬܦܩܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܒܗܕܐ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܟܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܕܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܢ ܢܫ̈ܝܡܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ. ܘܐܝܟ ܕܒܙܒܢܐ ܠܗܢܐ : ܘܗܫܐ ܥܡܟܘܢ ܟܡܐ ܕܪܓܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ. ܒܪܡ ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܠܦܢ ܚܢܢ ܘܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܘܪ̈ܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܢ. ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܢܢ : ܠܘ ܟܕ ܣܘܩܒܠܐܝܬ ܡܦܣܩܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܬܐ. ܠܪܘܚܩܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܥܒܐ ܥܘܩܒܐ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܒܙܝܢ ܠܫܪܪܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܢܣܬܟܠ ܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܩܒܠܢ. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ : ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܬܐ ܢܕܥܝܢ ܚܢܢ. ܒܪܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ ܐܘ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܘ

AB from ܕܐܠܦܢ (l. 179) on

Line 179: ܕܐܠܦܢ ܚܢܢ, B: ܕܐܠܦܢ.
Line 185: ܢܕܥܝܢ ܚܢܢ, B: ܢܕܥܝܢܢ.

those which characterize the hypostases as hypostases. For to think this is the part of those who refuse to recognize the difference between characterizers and characterized and who absolutely identify what make known, and what are known, signifier and signified, characterizers and characterized, and who muddle everything absurdly. But because this contention of theirs does not stop at the term 'properties' but they define the hypostases of the Holy Trinity as the names of the hypostases and as the properties characteristic of the prosopa and thereby negate their being hypostases, *let them walk*, as it says in the Bible, *by the light of their fire and by that flame which they kindled*. For we will never accept these Jewish and heathen doctrines or any of their absurd conclusions. For we have been taught clearly to profess as three hypostases * not the characteristic properties of the hypostases but the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost themselves.

But to come to the point presently set before us, let us see how our theologians acquired a suspicion of Arianism on account of the orthodox profession of three hypostases, when the Italians, as we have been taught, were unable, owing to the constraints of their language and its poverty of terms, to distinguish substance and hypostasis, and therefore introduced those 'prosopa' which Sabellius did not entirely refrain from using (though he did not recognize or accept the idea and the term 'prosopa' in the correct sense but only in a wrong sense) and were, hence, thought to be holding the Jewish doctrines of this impious man. However that steward of souls, as the

**179/180** Is. 50:11 **187/190** cf. supra, 112-114 **194** cf. supra, 122



ܬܘܒ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܚܝܕܝܢ ܒܕܝܠܝܬ. ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܬܪܥܘܢ ܕܢ̈ܦܫܗܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܪ̈ܚܡܝܢ: ܕܢܕܥܘܢ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܝܕܝܢ ܘܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܝܕܝܢ: ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܪܘܣ: ܗܘܝܢ ܚܕ ܗܘܝܢ ܚܫܒܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܘ̈ܕܥܢ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬ̈ܝܕܥܢ: ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘ̈ܕܥܢ: ܘܬܘܒ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܝܕܝܢ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܝܕܝܢ: ܘܡܫܓܢܝܐܝܬ ܟܠܡܕܡ ܡܚܠܛܝܢ. ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܘ ܒܗܕܐ ܠܚܘܕܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܩܝܡܝܢ ܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܚܪܝܢܐ: ܐܠܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ: ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ: ܘܒܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܗܝ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܟܦܪܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ: ܒܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܢܘܪܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܟܬܒܐ ܢܗܠܟܘܢ: <
ܘܒܫܠܗܒܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܓܙܪܘܗ̇. ܚܢܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܝ̈ܘܠܦܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ <
ܝ̈ܗܘܕܝܐ ܘܚ̈ܢܦܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܘܡ ܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܚܢ: ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܥܢܝ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܣܟܠܐ ܢܩܦ̈ܢ ܠܗܘܢ. ܐܠܦܢ ܓܝܪ ܚܠܝܨܐܝܬ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܘܕܐ: * ܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ f. 50va
ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܗ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ.

ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܝ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ ܣܝܡܐ ܠܢ ܢܐܬܐ: ܢܚܙܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܡ̈ܠܠܝ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܚܫܕܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܪܝܘܣܝܢܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ: ܟܕ ܐ̈ܝܛܠܝܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܠܦܢ ܡܛܠ ܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ: ܠܐ ܐܫܟܚܘ ܕܢܦܪܫܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ: ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܡܥܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܟܠܝܘܣ ܠܡܬܚܫܚܘ ܗܘܐ: ܟܕ ܠܐ ܗܘ ܬܪܝܨܐܝܬ: ܐܠܐ ܒܡܫܟܢܐܝܬ ܝܕܥ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܩܒܠ ܠܣܘܟܠܐ ܘܫܡܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܐܦ ܗܢܘܢ: ܩܠܝܠܐ ܚܫ̈ܘܕܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܪܫܝܥܐ ܕܡܬܚܒܪܝܢ ܐܣܛܪܘ.

AB W from l. 205 on

Line 188: ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ, B: ܩܢܘܡܐ.
Line 191: ܕܡܬ̈ܝܕܥܢ, A: ܕܡܘܕܥܢ (wrongly).
Line 200: ܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܚܢ, B: ܡܩܒܠܝܢ.
Line 211: ܡܟܠܝܘܣ, W: ܡܟܠܝܘܣ.

Theologian says, did not feel it right to discount such a senseless dissection of the word. Having found both sides holding the same view and not in contention over the idea, indulgent to the terms he bound them by the realities. By showing our humble selves as followers of this wise steward, had the dispute been over the term 'properties' and not over the faith itself and the profession of divine doctrines, we should have justly been curing feeble men's thinking and not been in any dissension at all over the words. For as often as they like we shall say, along with the Theologian and those like him who cured such illnesses that when we hear 'God' we are illumined by one light and by three, by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa; for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought.

Because of a fraternal dispute between the Easterns and the Romans, related to this, wise Basil, hating the wicked heresies of the accursed Sabellius and Arius equally and to the same degree, completely defeated them. He wrote in the *Letter to Count Terentius* (the beginning of which is: When we heard that your Reverence had again been forced) and said as follows: But along with this news a report has reached us that the brothers too, of Paulinus' side, are speaking to your Rectitude about their union with us, us, I mean, who are of the party of the man * of God, Bishop Meletius. These, I hear, are presently circulating a letter from the Westerns which entrusts the bish-

**197/198** cf. supra, 128 **205/207** cf. supra, ch. 1, 72-75 **213/219** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 214*, 2 (*PG* 32, 785B; Courtonne, II, pp. 202-203)



ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܕܢܦܫܬܐ ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܬܐܘܠܘܓܘܣ : ܠܐ ܐܫܦܪ ܕܢܕܘܫ ܢܣܡܟܐ ܒܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܟܕ ܠܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ ܓܒܝܐ ܐܫܟܚ ܕܗܝ ܟܕ ܗܝ ܡܬܪܥܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܗܘ ܠܘܬ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ : ܐܫܦܪ ܒܗ ܒܨܒܘܬܐ : ܟܕ ܐܦܣ ܐܢܘܢ. ܟܕ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܘܫܡ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܢܦܫ ܫܡܥܢܝܢ : ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܥܠ ܫܡܗܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܥܠ ܗܝ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܘܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܐܬܘܬܗܘܢ ܗܘܐ ܚܙܝܢܐ : ܕܢܐܬܐ ܠܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܕܡܚܝܠܝܢ ܡܟܐܒܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ. ܘܡܛܠ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ. ܒܟܡܐ ܕܨܒܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܥܡ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗ : ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܣܝܘ ܟܘܪܗܢܐ ܕܐܝܟܢ
< ܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ❖ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܬܝ ܕܫܡܥܝܢ : ܒܚܕ
< ܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܬܬܢܗܪܝܢ ܘܒܬܠܬܐ. ܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ
< ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܪܚܡ ܠܡܩܪܝܘ ܐܘ ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ.
< ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܡ ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ : ܒܟܡܐ ܕܐ̈ܢܘܢ ܒܗ̇
< ܐ̈ܢܘܢ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܝܬܝܢ ❖

ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܐܚܝܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܝܐ ܘܕܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ : ܘܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܘ ܟܕ ܒܟܡܐ ܐܬܐ ܫܘܝܬܐ ܘܣܢܐ ܠܗ ܠܡܪ̈ܥܝܬܐ : ܣܢܐ ܠܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܒܝ̈ܫܬܐ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܘܕܐܪܝܘܣ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܝ̈ܛܐ ܘܡܫܪܝܐܝܬ ܕܟܐ : ܟܠܗ̇ ܠܐܪ̈ܥܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܦܘܪܩܢܗܘܢ ܡܦܩܘܢ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܬܘܗܝ ܫܪܝܗ̇ : ܟܕ ܫܡܥܢ ܕܢܦܫܘܬܟ ܬܘܒ ܐܬܩܛܝܪܬ : ܘܗܟܢܐ
< ܕܠܐ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܥܡ ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܛܒܐ ܐܕܪܟܢ ܠܝ ܫܡܥܐ : ܕܐܦ
< ܐܚ̈ܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܦܘܠܝܢܐ : ܡܡܠܠܝܢ ܠܬܪܝܨܘܬܟ ܡܛܠ
< ܚܘܝܕܐ ܕܠܘܬܢ. ܕܠܝ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܢܬܐ
< ܕܓܒܪܐ * ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܛܝܘܣ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ. ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܦ f. 50vb
< ܠܐ̈ܓܪܬܐ ܕܡܥܪ̈ܒܝܐ ܫܩܠ ܐܢܐ ܕܫܡܥܐ ܡܟܪܟܝܢ : ܕܠܗܘܢ

AB W up to l. 219 and from l. 237 on

Line 232: ܘܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ, B: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ.
Line 236: ܫܡܥܢ, B: ܫܡܥܢ.
Line 240: ܡܠܛܝܘܣ, B: ܡܠܝܛܘܣ, W: ܡܠܛܝܘܣ.

opric of the Church of Antioch to them but rejects the admirable Meletius bishop of God's true Church. And a little later: For I for my part, if a certain man receives a letter of men and thinks grand things because of it, shall not consent to stand in awe of him on that account; not even if he comes from heaven itself, but does not agree with the sound word of faith, shall I be able to count him a participant in holy things. For consider, my admirable friend, that the falsifiers of the truth, those who import the Arian schism into the sound faith of the fathers, proffer no other excuse for not accepting the religious doctrine of the fathers, except the idea of consubstantiality which they interpret wickedly and as a slander against the whole faith, saying that the Son is declared by us to be consubstantial in hypostasis. If we yield them that as a pretext, as a result of our agreeing with those who out of simplicity rather than wickedness say this or similar things, nothing will prevent our giving an indisputable handle against ourselves and strengthening the heresy of those whose sole exercise in addresses to the Church is not to equip their own arguments but to slander ours. But what could be a worse slander, more capable of unsettling the majority of folk, than if some of us should be seen to speak of one hypostasis of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, some who despite fre-

219/249 Bas. Caes., *Ep. 214*, 2-3 (*PG* 32, 788A - 789A; Courtonne, II, pp. 203-205)



< ܐܦܣܩܘܦܘܬܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ ܝܗܒ ܠܗܘܢ: ܡܣܠܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܠܬܡܝܗܐ ܡܠܛܝܘܣ ܐܦܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ
< ܕܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܘܒܬܪ ܩܠܝܠܬܐ ܀ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܐܢ ܐܢܫ
< ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܢܣܒ: ܘܡܬܠܬܗ ܪܘܪܒܬܐ
< ܡܬܪܥܐ: ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܕܐܬܕܚܠ ܡܬܘܡ ܡܫܡܠ ܐܢܐ: ܐܠܐ
< ܘܠܐ ܐܢ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܢܐܬܐ: ܠܐ ܢܫܠܡ ܕܝܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ
< ܚܠܝܡܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ: ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܐ ܕܫܘܬܦܐ
< ܐܚܫܒܝܘܗܝ ܒܩܘܕܫܐ. ܐܬܚܫܒ ܓܝܪ ܐܘ ܬܡܝܗܐ: ܕܗܠܝܢ
< ܙܝܦܝ ܠܫܪܪܐ: ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܗܪܣܐ ܐܪܝܢܐ ܥܠ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ
< ܚܠܝܡܬܐ ܕܐܒܗܬܐ ܡܥܠܝܢ: ܘܠܐ ܚܕܐ ܥܠܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ
< ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܕܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܠܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ
< ܕܐܒܗܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܝ ܕܫܘܝܘܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܗܝ
< ܕܗܢܘܢ ܒܒܝܫܘܬ ܘܠܡܐܟܠܩܪܨܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܡܦܩܝܢ ܟܕ
< ܐܡܪܝܢ: ܕܒܪܐ ܒܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܥܡܢ ܒܪܐܘܣܝܐ.
< ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܢܝܢܘ ܕܒܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܢܬܠ ܠܗܘܢ: ܡܢ ܗܝ ܕܢܫܠܡ
< ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܡܠܘܢ ܘܠܘ ܡܢ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ: ܗܠܝܢ
< ܐܘ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ: ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܟܠܐ ܕܐܦ ܚܢܢ
< ܠܒܝܫܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܚܘܪܐ ܢܬܠ ܟܠܝܢ: ܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܚܠܬܝܬܐ ܢܬܠ ܠܗܪܣܝܣ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܚܕ ܗܘ ܚܘܒܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ
< ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܒܥܕܬܐ: ܕܠܘ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܢܬܕܢܘܢ:
< ܐܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܢ ܢܨܝܕܘܢ. ܐܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܪܘܚܩܘܬܐ ܕܒܝܫܬܐ
< ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܬܗܘܐ: ܘܕܡܬܬܪܐܝܬ ܡܚܝܠܐ ܕܠܡܙܝܥܘܬܐ ܠܣܘܓܐܐ:
< ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܕܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܡܢܢ: ܕܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ
< ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܦ ܟܕ

AB W

Line 242: ܐܦܣܩܘܦܘܬܐ, W: ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܘܬܐ. ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ, W: ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ.

Line 243: ܡܠܛܝܘܣ, B and W: ܡܠܝܛܝܘܣ. ܐܦܣܩܘܦܐ, W: ܐܦܣܩܦܐ.

Line 246: ܡܬܘܡ ܡܫܡܠ, cf. infra, line 291 (ܡܫܡܠ) and note.

Line 249: ܐܚܫܒܝܘܗܝ, W: ܐܚܫܒܘܗܝ.

Line 258: ܠܗܝܢ, cf. infra, line 381 (ܠܗܠܝܢ).

Line 259: ܠܒܝܫܬܐ, cf. infra, line 381 (ܠܒܝ̈ܫܬܐ).

Line 263: ܘܡܬܬܪܐܝܬ, B and W: ܘܡܬܬܪܐ; cf. infra, line 384.

Line 264: ܐܢ, W om.

quent clear confession of the difference between the prosopa nevertheless confess what was accepted by Sabellius formerly who says this very thing: 'God is one in hypostasis but is presented by Scripture in the guise of prosopa in various fashions to suit the particularity of the subject-matter, sometimes taking upon itself the Father's words whenever there is occasion for this prosopon, sometimes those which are fitting for the Son whenever he condescends to a concern for us or to other actions of the scheme of salvation, and sometimes he wears the prosopon of the Spirit whenever the occasion demands words of such a kind from such a prosopon'? If, therefore, some of our people are seen to say that * Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one in the substrate but to profess three perfect prosopa, how can they not be supposed to be giving a clear and irrefutable proof of the truth of what is said about us?

From this it is clear to us that there was no little dissension between the Westerns and those of Basil the Great's party over the profession of the hypostases when the former, out of simplicity and not with evil intention, were maintaining a single hypostasis of the Holy Trinity, but the exact teachers wisely proclaimed three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Hence this divinely inspired father, not surrendering the words of true religion but



< ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܠܒܠܚܘܕܝܬ ܡܘܕܝܢ: ܐܠܐ ܒܪܡ: ܒܗ̇ܝ
< ܕܡܢ ܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܩܕܝܡܐ ܢܣܝܒܐ: ܕܗܘ̇ ܗܕܐ ܐܡܪ: ܕܚܕ ܗ̇ܘ
< ܒܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ: ܡܬܬܚܙܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܢ
< ܟܬ̈ܒܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐܝܬ ܠܦܘܬ ܝܚܝܕܘܬ ܕܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ
< ܕܡܫܒܚܐ: ܘܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܡܣܐܡ ܒܠܗܘܝ ܠܡ̈ܠܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܒܗܝ̈ܬܐ:
< ܐܡܬܝ ܕܒܥܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ: ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܠܒܪܐ ܦܐܝܢ: ܐܡܬܝ ܕܢܓܚ ܠܝܨܦܘܬܐ ܕܥܠܝܢ ܐܘ ܢܓܚ
< ܡܥܒ̈ܕܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܢܚܬ: ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܠܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܠܒܫ: ܐܡܬܝ ܕܒܥܝܐ ܠܟܝܢܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ
< ܕܡܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܗܟܢ. ܐܢܗܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܐܦ
< ܐܢܫܝܢ ܕܝܠܢ ܡܬ̈ܚܙܝܢ: ܕܚܕ ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ * ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ f. 51ra
< ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ: ܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܐ
< ܡܘܕܝܢ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ ܒܓܠܝܬܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܣܬܪܐ ܢܫܬܪܪܘܢ
< ܕܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ: ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܫܪܝܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܥܠܝܢ ܀

ܘܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܢ: ܕܠܘ ܚܪܝܢܐ ܙܥܘܪܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܡܥܪܒܐ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܝܬ ܪܒܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ: ܡܛܠ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ. ܟܕ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܡܢ ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܘܠܘ ܒܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܪܥܝܢܐ: ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܚܒܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ: ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܚܬܝ̈ܬܐ ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܡܟܪܙܝܢ ܗܘܘ. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܐܡܪ ܗܢܐ ܐܒܐ ܢܫܝܩ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ: ܟܕ ܠܡ̈ܠܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܠܡ: ܐܠܐ

AB W

Line 266: ܫܘܠܡܐ, W: ܠܫܘܠܡܐ, as ch. 15, line 140.
Line 267: ܣܒܠܝܘܣ, W: ܣܒܝܠܝܘܣ. ܩܕܝܡܐ, W: ܩܕܡܐ.
Line 270: ܒܠܗܘܝ, cf. ch. 15, line 144 (ܠܗ).
Line 272: ܢܓܚ, W: ܕܢܓܚ, as ch. 15, line 146.
Line 274: ܠܒܫ, cf. ch. 15, line 148 (ܡܬܠܒܫ).
Line 275: ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ, B: ܦܪܨܘܦܐ.
Line 276-277: ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ..... ܠܐܒܐ, cf. ch. 15, lines 150-151 (..... ܐܒܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ).
Line 287: ܡܢ, W om.
Line 288: ܠܐ, W om.

manfully fighting on their behalf, at one point says: For I for my part, if a certain man receives a letter of men and thinks grand things because of it, shall not consent to stand in awe of him on that account; not even if he comes from heaven itself, but does not agree with the sound word of faith, shall I be able to count him a participant in holy things. Again at one point he says: But what could be a worse slander, more capable of unsettling the majority of folk, than if some of us should be seen to speak of one hypostasis of Father, Son and Holy Ghost?

ACACIUS, too, archbishop of Aleppo, clearly shows this when he says in the *Letter to proven Cyril* (the beginning of which is: I have read your Holiness' letter): But those who wish to produce a defence of what they have presumed to think and preach, say they have suffered a fate similar to what befell the blessed Bishop Paulinus, who declined to speak expressly of three hypostases (though he was implicitly and really thinking the same things and meaning the same things) but he followed the God-loving Western bishops because the Latin vocabulary was limited and could not speak, like the language of us Greeks, of 'three hypostases'.

This we have thus set down, demonstrating abundantly that the doctors of the Church, using the guidance of the Holy Ghost, had as their aim * to administer to the souls of all men manifold varieties of healing when no injury is sustained by the divine

**257/261** cf. supra, 219-223 **262/264** cf. supra, 234-236 **267/274** Acac. Ber., *Ep. ad Cyrill.* (*PG* 77, 100CD; *ACO* I, I, 1, p. 99, 23-28)



< ܘܓܢܒܪܐܝܬ ܚܠܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܟܬܫ ❖ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܐܢ ܐܢܫ
< ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܩܒܠ : ܘܡܬܛܠܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܪ̈ܘܪܒܬܐ
< ܡܛܠܬܗ̇ : ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܕܐܙܝܥ ܡܡܛܠ ܐܢܐ : ܐܠܐ ܐܦܠܐ
< ܐܢ ܡܢ ܫܡܝܐ ܗܘ ܕܢܐܬܐ : ܠܐ ܢܫܠܡ ܕܝܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ
< ܚܠܝܡܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ : ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܡܢܐ
< ܐܫܬܡܥܘܗܝ، ܒܦܘܕܩܢܐ ❖ ܒܟܢ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ❖ ܐܡܪ ܕܝܢ
< ܡܪܘܡܘܬܐ ܕܫܒܥܐ ܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܗܘܬ : ܘܕܡܬܪܬܐܝܬ ܒܓܠܝܐ
< ܕܠܡܓܢܝܢܐ ܠܐܘܪܚܐ : ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܕܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܐܢܫ̈ܝܢ ܡܢܢ
< ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܚܕ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ❖

ܗܢܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܚܘܐ : ܘܐܩܩܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܪܝܫ ܡܬܒܘܬܐ
ܕܚܠܒ : ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܒܚܝܪܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܠܘܣ : ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܪܫܗ̇ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܦܓܥܬ ܒܟܬܒܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܘܬܟ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ
< ܐܡܪ ❖ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܨܒܝܢ ܕܢܥܒܕܘܢ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ : ܥܠ
< ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܬܪܥܘܢ ܘܢܟܪܙܘܢ ܗܟܘ : ܡܪܝܢ ܕܕܡܐ
< ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܚܫܘ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܓܕܫ ܠܗ ܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܦܘܠܝܢܘܣ
< ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ : ܗܘ ܕܐܫܬܐܠ ܗܘܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
< ܢܐܡܪ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ : ܟܕ ܒܣܘܟܠܐ ܘܒܫܪܪܐ ܚܫܝܒ ܟܕ ܚܫܝܒ
< ܡܬܪܥܐ : ܚܫܝܒ ܟܕ ܚܫܝܒ ܡܬܬܦܝܣ ܗܘܐ : ܢܩܦ ܕܝܢ ܠܪ̈ܚܡܝ
< ܐܠܗܐ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܡܥܪ̈ܒܝܐ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܠܝܨܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܪܬ
< ܩܠܐ ܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ : ܘܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ
< ܝ̈ܘܢܝܐ : ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܬܐܡܪ ❖

ܘܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܣܡܢ ܟܕ ܡܢ ܡܘܬܪܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ : ܕܠܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܟܕ ܒܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܘܕܫܐ ܡܬܚܫܚܝܢ : ܢܝܫܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ : ܕܟܕ ܦ̈ܠܓܐ f.51rb ܐܠܗܝܐ ܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܬܢܟܝܢ : * ܕܟܐܣܝܘܬܐ ܦ̈ܓܢܐܝܬ

AB W up to l. 289

Line 291: ܡܡܛܠ (as infra, line 376), cf. supra, line 246 (ܡܬܛܥܡ ܡܡܛܠ).
Line 295: ܘܕܡܬܪܬܐܝܬ, B: ܘܕܡܬܪܬ.
Line 298: ܘܐܩܩܝܘܣ, B: ܘܐܩܩܝܘܦ.
Line 303: ܦܘܠܝܢܘܣ, B: ܦܘܠܝܢܣ.
Line 313: ܡܬܢܟܝܢ, B: ܡܬܢ̈ܟܝܢ.

doctrines. So when the Westerns, from no heretical intention but rather from simplicity and the constraints of their language, were faltering not a little over the phrase 'three hypostases of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost', and were unwilling to attribute number or difference to the hypostases of the Holy Trinity and supposing that they were being drawn towards the impious Arians who said this very thing, the champions of truth did not decline to cure their opinion by expressions and words which were welcome and apparently customary to them, and thus to establish and settle peace and harmony with them.

The words of the Theologian, quoted shortly before, prove this clearly. They are: So also not only the impious is sundered from us but also the very religious, not over merely trifling and negligible doctrines (for that would be a slight evil) but heretofore also over words that convey the same meaning. For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three) the Italians understand them in the same way as we, but they were unable, owing to the constraints of their language and its poverty of terms, to distinguish 'substance' and 'hypostasis' and therefore 'prosopa' was introduced so that three substances might not be accepted. What happens? Something ridiculous and pitiable; the verbal triviality was thought a difference of faith. And consequently Sabellianism was fabricated in 'three prosopa' and Arianism in 'three hypostases' – contentious fabrications.

**290/302** cf. supra, 106-119



ܘܬܢܐ ܢܦܩܬܐ ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܒܕܚܢܘܢ. ܡܢ ܗܘܟܐ ܘܚܕ ܚܘܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܡܚܘܝܐ: ܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܓܝܪ ܒܪܕܝܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܐ: ܒܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܘܢ ܘܐܠܝܨܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ: ܡܛܠ ܟܢܬ ܠܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܠܐ ܙܥܘܪܐܝܬ ܡܫܬܓܫܝܢ ܗܘܘ: ܘܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܨܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܡܢܝܢܐ ܐܘ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܥܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܢܬܠܘܢ: ܘܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܠܘܬ ܪܫܝܥܐ ܐܪܝܢܐ ܡܬܢܓܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܗܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ: ܠܐ ܐܫܬܐܠܘ ܡܬܟܬܫܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܥܙܝܙܐ: ܘܐܣܝܘ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܘܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܩܠܐ ܕܪ̈ܚܝܡܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܥ̈ܝܕܝܢ ܗ̈ܘܝ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܗܘܢ ܢܐܣܘܢ: ܘܗܟܢܐ ܠܫܝܢܐ ܘܐܘܝܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬܗܘܢ ܢܫܪܪܘܢ ܘܢܩܝܡܘܢ.

ܘܗܕܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ ܒܓܠܝܐܝܬ: ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܢܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܬܬܣܝܡ ܘܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܝܢ ܀ ܗܟܢܐ
< ܘܡܢܢ: ܠܘ ܗܘ ܗܢܐ ܕܪܫܝܥ ܡܬܦܪܫ ܒܠܚܘܕ: ܐܠܐ ܐܦ ܗܘ
< ܡܢ ܕܣܓܝ ܕܕܚܠ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܡ̈ܠܝܠܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܘܫܝܛܬܐ
< ܘܕܫܝܛܝܢ ܡܬܒܣܪܢ: ܒܝܫܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܙܥܘܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܗܘܬ
< ܗܕܐ: ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ: ܡܛܠ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܠܗ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ
< ܡܫܠܡܝܢ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ
< ܡܢ ܡܢ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ: ܗܝ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܐ: ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ: ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܗ̈ܘ ܕܝܢ
< ܘܡܢ ܐܝܛܠܝܐ ܗܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܗܘܘ
< ܡܛܠ ܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ:
< ܕܢܦܪܫܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ: ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܥܠ ܗܘܐ
< ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ: ܕܠܐ ܬܠܬ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܢܬܩܒܠܢ: ܡܢܐ ܗܘܐ. ܡܕܡ
< ܕܓܚܟܐ ܠܡܚܣ ܘܠܡܣܟܢܐ. ܫܘܠܩܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܘܬܐ
< ܐܣܬܒܪܬ ܦܘܪܫܢ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ. ܘܒܬܪܟܢ ܣܒܠܝܘܢܘܬܐ
< ܗܪܟܐ ܐܬܓܒܠܬ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ: ܘܐܪܝܢܘܣܝܘܬܐ
< ܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܓܒ̈ܝܠܬܐ ܕܚܪܝܢܐ ܀

AB

Line 327: ܒܠܚܘܕ (as infra, line 525), cf. supra, line 121 (ܒܠܚܘܕܐ).

Let us look carefully into the profundity of these texts and examine how apparently even at that time, there being much for the Italians to find fault with in the plural word 'hypostases' on the ground that it sundered the divine nature and introduced along with itself a number of substances (for they did not know the distinction between hypostasis and substance) the Theologian relieves them by the expression 'properties' and, so to say, pacifies them by an interpretation of the idea involved in hypostases, and says: For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with * true religion, for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three. He as it were exclaims: 'As for you, do not think that we, because we profess three hypostases, agree with Arius' pagan madness; for it by no means follows that those who speak in the full sense and truly of the three consubstantial hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost as one God, one substance and one nature, also profess three substances, as you have incautiously decided'.

But perhaps someone may say that the Theologian says this in regard to the matters mooted in the days of Athanasius the Great, for there was no need at that time for any 'economy' with regard to the Romans once the dissension had been removed by the wise 'economy' of Saint Athanasius. To which we reply that although the dissension had for the most part been removed at that time, nevertheless, there remained latterly a residue of hostility and dissension over words. We can easily see this from the previously

**311/313** cf. supra, 293-295



ܣܦܝܠܐܝܬ ܒܥܘܡܩܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܝ̈ܒܢ ܢܚܙܐ ܘܢܬܒܩܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܘܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܒܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܙܒܢܐ : ܟܕ ܠܐܝܛܠܝ̈ܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܥܠܬ ܠܐ ܣܓܝܐܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܐܝܟ ܗܝ ܕܦܣܩܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ : ܘܡܥܠܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝ̈ܐ ܡܟܠܐ ܥܡܗ̇ : ܐܦ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܦܘܪܫܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ : ܟܕ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܫܪܐ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܘܒܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܡܣܬܟܠܐ ܕܡܠܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܫܝܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܀
< ܟܕ ܚܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܘ
< ܡܢ ܒܛܝܠܬ * ܐܠܗܝܐ : ܗܘ̇ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ f. 51va
< ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܗܘ̇ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܀ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܡܟܪܙ : ܕܠܐ ܬܣܒܪܘܢ ܥܠܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ : ܕܒܗ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ : ܠܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܚܢܦܝܬܐ ܕܐܪܝܘܣ ܫܠܡܝܢ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܟܢ ܢܦܩܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܫܪܪܐܝܬ ܘܫܪܝܪܐ : ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ : ܠܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܫܘ̈ܝܝ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܗܘ̇ ܘܬܠܬ ܐܘܣܝ̈ܐ ܢܘܕܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܟܘܢ ܠܐ ܒܙܗܝܪܘܬ ܫܦܪܐ.

ܐܠܐ ܟܒܪ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܫ : ܕܗܠܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܗܢܝܢ ܕܒܝܘ̈ܡܝ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ ܪܒܐ ܐܬܬܙܝܥ : ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܨܛܪܟ ܗܘܬ ܗܝܕܝܢ : ܥܠ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ : ܟܕ ܫܪܐ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܚܟܝܡܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ : ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܐܬܬܙܝܥ ܚܪܝܢܐ ܕܒܝܬܝܗ̇. ܠܘܬ ܗܝ̇ ܘܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܐܦܢ ܣܘܓܐܗ ܕܚܪܝܢܐ ܗܝܕܝܢ ܐܬܬܙܝܥ : ܐܠܐ ܒܪܡ ܘܒܬܪ̈ܝܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܐ : ܦܫ ܗܘܐ ܫܪܟܢܐ ܩܠܝܠ ܕܒܥܠܕܒܒܘܬܐ ܘܕܚܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܡ̈ܠܐ.

AB W

Line 349: ܡܫܝ̈ܢܐ, W: ܡܫܝܢܐ.
Line 350: ܚܕܐ ܓܝܪ, W trsp.
Line 354: ܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ, W: ܡܘܕܝܢܢ. ܫܠܡܝܢ, W: ܫܠܡܝܢ.
Line 365: ܘܐܡܪܝܢ, B: ܘܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 366: ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܐ, W: ܐܚܪܢܝܐ. ܦܫ, W: ܦܐܫ.

quoted words of the wise and famous Basil and of holy Acacius, when Basil the Great says of the Paulinists and the Romans: These, I hear, are presently circulating a letter from the Westerns which entrusts the bishopric of the Church of Antioch to them; and after some other matters: For I for my part, if a certain man receives a letter of men and thinks grand things because of it, shall not consent to stand in awe of him on that account; not even if he comes from heaven itself, but does not agree with the sound word of faith, shall I be able to count him a participant in holy things; and again: If we yield them that as a pretext, as a result of our agreeing with those who out of simplicity rather than wickedness say this or similar things, nothing will prevent our giving an indisputable handle against ourselves and strengthening the heresy; and again: But what could be a worse slander, * more capable of unsettling the majority of folk, than if some of us should be seen to speak of one hypostasis of Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Acacius, on the other hand, wrote: But those who wish to produce a defence of what they have presumed to think and preach, say they have suffered a fate similar to what befell the blessed Bishop Paulinus, who declined to speak expressly of three hypostases (though he was implicitly and really thinking the same things and meaning the same things) but he followed the God-loving

**329/331** cf. supra, 216-218 **332/336** cf. supra, 219-223 **336/339** cf. supra, 229-232 **340/342** cf. supra, 234-236 **343/349** cf. supra, 267-274



ܘܦܫܝܩܐ ܗܘ ܕܗܕܐ ܢܒܝܐ : ܘܡܢ ܩܢܘܬ ܩܠܐ ܐܠܝܢ
ܕܡܕܢܚ̈ܝ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܚܟܝܡܐ ܘܡܦܪܣܝܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܘܕܐܩܩܝܘܣ
ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܟܕ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܪܒܐ ܡܠܠ ܗܟܢ ܕܥܠ
< ܦܘܠܝܢܝ̈ܐ ܘܥܠ ܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܦ
< ܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܕܡܥܪ̈ܒܝܐ ܥܛܦܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܡܥ ܐܢܐ ܡܥܒܪܝܢ :
< ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܘܬܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ ܡܫ̈ܠܡܝܢ ܀ ܘܒܬܪ
< ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܀ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ
< ܢܣܒ : ܘܡܛܠܬܗ ܪܘܪܒܬܐ ܡܬܪܥܐ : ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܕܐܕܚܠ
< ܡܡܠܠ ܐܢܐ : ܐܦܠܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܢ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܢܐܬܐ :
< ܠܐ ܢܫܠܡ ܕܝܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܚܠܝܡܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ : ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܐ
< ܕܐܬܚܫܒ ܐܫܬܘܬܦܘܗܝ ܒܩܘܕ̈ܫܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܢܘܢ
< ܕܥܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܢܬܠ ܠܗܘܢ : ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܢܫܠܡ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܢ
< ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܡܠܠܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ
< ܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܟܠܐ ܕܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܠܬܘܟ̈ܠܢܐ ܡܢ
< ܕܠܐ ܚܪܝܢܐ ܢܬܠ ܥܠܝܢ : ܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܚܝܠܬܢܘܬܐ ܢܬܠ
< ܠܗܪܣܝܣ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܪܫܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܝܫܐ ܡܢ
< ܗܕܐ ܗܘܬ : ܘܕܡܙܝܥܢܐ ܝܬܝܪ ܕܠܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܬܘܒ : ܐܠܐ
< ܐܢ ܕܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܡܢܢ : ܕܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ
< * ܩܕܝܫܐ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܀ ܐܩܩܝܣ ܕܝܢ ܕܟܬܒ ܀ f. 51vb
< ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܨܒܝܢ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܢܦܫ : ܚܠܦ ܐܝܠܝܢ
< ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܣܬܟܠܘܢ ܘܢܟܪܙܘܢ ܗܘܘ : ܡܕܡ ܕܕܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ
< ܕܚܫܘ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܓܕܫ ܠܗ ܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܦܘܠܝܢܘܣ ܐܦܝܣܩܦܐ :
< ܗܘ ܕܐܫܬܐܠ ܗܘܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܒܗ ܒܡܠܬܐ :
< ܟܕ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܘܫܪܝܪܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܡܬܪܥܐ : ܗܢܝܢ ܟܕ

AB W up to l. 370 and from l. 387 on

Line 373: ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ, B: ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ.
Line 376: ܡܡܠܠ, cf. supra, line 291 and note.
Line 381: ܠܗܠܝܢ, B: ܠܗܘܢ; cf. supra, line 258. ܠܬܘܟ̈ܠܢܐ, cf. supra, line 259 (ܠܬܘܟܠܢܐ).
Line 384: ܘܕܡܙܝܥܢܐ, cf. supra, line 263 (ܘܕܡܙܝܥܢܝܬ).
Line 385: ܕܕܐܒܐ, B: ܕܐܒܐ.
Line 386: ܐܩܩܝܣ, B: ܐܩܩܝܘܣ.
Line 389: ܐܦܝܣܩܦܐ, B: ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ.

Western bishops because the Latin vocabulary was limited and could not speak, like the language of us Greeks, of 'three hypostases'. The Theologian too shows that in his time the formula 'three hypostases' was a matter of uncertainty for the Romans. Listen to what he says in his *Farewell Address*: For what do you say, you who introduce three hypostases? Do you say this, thinking three substances? I am fully persuaded that you would loudly protest against those who do, for you teach that the substance of the three is one and the same. What of those who introduce prosopa? Do you imagine some one composite thing, with three prosopa, or anthropomorphic? Of course not! You would protest against them that anybody who talks like this will not see the prosopon of God, whatever it may be. What, then, do hypostases mean to you, or prosopa to you, for I put the question? They mean that those divided not in natures but in properties are three. Very good. How could people more think the same thing or say the same thing than those who hold to these things? Even though they differ in words. You see how I am your reconciler, drawing you away from the letter to the meaning, as from the Old Testament to the New.

Is it surprising that these things were mooted in the days of those saints Basil and Gregory, when the Italians were found

352/365 Greg. Naz., *Or. 42*, 16 (*PG* 36, 477AB; *SChr.*, vol. 384, p. 84)



ܗܢܝܢ ܡܬܦܪܫ ܗܘܐ܆ ܢܒܥ ܕܝܢ ܠܬܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ
ܡܥܪܒܝܐ܆ ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܠܝܨܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܪܗܘܡܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ
ܡܫܟܚܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܝܘ̈ܢܝܐ܆ ܕܬܠܬܐ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܀ ܘܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܚܘܐ܆
ܕܒܙܒܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ܆ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܛܠ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܠܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ
ܡܬܦܠܓܐ ܗܘܬ. ܘܫܡܥ ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ
ܕܫܘܠܡܐ ܀ ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ܆ ܐܝܠܝܢ
ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܥܠܝܢ. ܠܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܠܬ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ
ܐܢܬܘܢ܆ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ܆ ܠܗ ܡܣܟܐ ܐܢܐ
ܕܢܘܪܒܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܠܟܘܢ ܠܡܩܥܐ܆ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܟܢܐ
ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܚܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܗ̇ܝ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ
ܡܠܦܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ. ܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܠܡܐ ܚܕ
ܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܪܟܒ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܒܟܠܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ܆ ܘܬܠܬܝ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ
ܐܘ ܗܟܢ ܕܕܡܘܬ ܐܢܫܝܬܐ܆ ܓ̇ܢܐ ܠܟܠ. ܕܐܝܟ ܐܢܬܘܢ
ܬܩܥܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ܆ ܕܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ
ܡܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܢܚܙܐ܆ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ.
ܡܢܐ ܗܘ ܡܟܝܠ ܢܚܡ ܠܟܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘ ܠܟܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ.
ܡܫܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ. ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ.
ܠܘ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܒܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ. ܛܒ ܫܦܝܪܐܝܬ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ
ܣ̈ܓܝܐܐ ܚܕܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܢܬܪܥܘܢ ܘܗ̇ܝ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ܆
ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܐܚܝܕܝܢ ܘܐܦܢ ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ. ܚܙܝ
ܐܢܬܘܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ ܡܪܥܝܢܟܘܢ܆ ܟܕ ܢܓܕ ܐܢܐ
ܠܘܬ ܗܘܢܐ ܡܢ ܟܬܝܒܬܐ܆ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܥܬܝܩܬܐ ܠܘܬ
ܚܕܬܐ ܀

ܘܡܒܢܐ ܬܡܝܗܐ ܐܝܟܘ ܕܒܝܘ̈ܡܝ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ
ܘܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܗܢܘܢ ܩܕܝ̈ܫܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܬܪܓܡܢ ܗܘܝ܆ ܐܝܟܢܐ

AB W

Line 405: ܓ̇ܢܐ, W: ܓ̣ܢܐ.
Line 407: ܡܢ, W: ܡ̇ܢ.
Line 413: ܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ, W trsp.
Line 416: ܘܡܒܢܐ, W: ܘܡܢܐ. ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ, W: ܒܣܝܠܝܣ.

guilty of faltering over the profession of three hypostases even in the time of proven SEVERUS? So the teacher of truth says in the *Letter to the priests and archimandrites John and John and the rest* (whose beginning runs: After I had written this in reply to what your Holiness sent): But I hear that the Romans are saying: 'We are afraid of calling him who suffered for us in the flesh "one of the Trinity", because we should not subject the Holy Trinity to number'. But all this * is replete with ignorance and impiety and is an opportunity for those who lay hold of pretexts for sins or those who *do not know what they are talking about or what they are making assertions about* as the apostle Paul says of certain persons. For the Trinity is numerable in the hypostases but subsists outside number because it is one and the same substance. And a little later: Therefore these very subtle Romans are sick with a profound error, not knowing that the Trinity is, in the substance, not numerable or divisible, but in the hypostases is divided and separated in order that the unconfusedness may be preserved to the proper marks of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. But I am very surprised at the Jebusites who resemble the Romans, both in impiety and ignorance, because they have termed the Holy Trinity 'tri-hypostate' in a rustic manner using a new and exceedingly crude expression. For I have never before today heard this compound word. Indeed it presents us with the idea that they do not hold to three individually subsisting hypostases but a single hypostasis which takes shape in three ways and alters, sometimes into the Father's hypostasis, sometimes into the Son's and sometimes into the Holy Ghost's: and that it is one hypostasis, but that it changes

**372/380** Sev. Ant., *Ep. ad presb. et archim.* (*PO* 12, pp. 214-215) **376/377** I Tim. 1:7 **380/396** Sev. Ant., *Ep. ad presb. et archim.* (*PO* 12, pp. 215-216)



ܘܒܘܠܒܠܐ ܕܚܣܝܪܐ ܣܐܘܪܐ : ܕܡܬܚܝܒܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ
ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܬܠܠܝܐ ܐܬܬܚܕܘ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܘ̣
ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ : ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܝܘܚܢܢ ܘܝܘܚܢܢ ܘܫܪܟܐ
ܘܩ̈ܫܝܫܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܘܪܝܫܕܝܪ̈ܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܪܫܗ̇ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܀ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ
ܕܟܬܒܬ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܢܝܬ ܐܫܬܠܚ ܡܢ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܟܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ :
< ܐܠܐ ܫܡܥ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ : ܕܕܚܠܝܢ ܕܚܕ ܡܢ
< ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܗܘ ܕܚܫ ܚܠܦܝܢ ܒܒܣܪ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ
< ܢܓܒܐ ܬܚܝܬ ܡܢܝܢܐ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ. ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ *
< ܟܠܗ̇ ܠܐ ܣܘܟܠܘܬܐ ܘܪܘܫܥܐ ܡܠܝܐ ܘܥܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ f. 52ra
< ܕܐܚܝܕܝܢ ܥܠܠܬܐ ܒܚܛܗ̈ܐ : ܐܘ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܘܡܛܠ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܡܫܪܪܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܢܫܝܢ
< ܦܘܠܘܣ ܫܠܝܚܐ ܐܡܪ. ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܢܝܢܬܐ :
< ܡܬܡܢܝܢܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܒܪ̇ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢܐ ܗ̣ܝ
< ܒܕ ܗ̣ܝ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܢܝܢܐ ܩܝܡܐ ܀ ܘܒܬܪ
< ܙܥܘܪܬܐ ܀ ܡܟܝܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ ܕܦܫܝܩܝܢ ܣܓܝܐܝܬ :
< ܟܪܝܗܝܢ ܒܛܥܝܘܬܐ ܥܡܝܩܬܐ : ܟܕ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ :
< ܘܠܐ ܡܬܡܢܝܢܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
< ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ : ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܦܠܓܐ ܘܡܬܦܪܫܐ :
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ :
< ܠܐ ܒܘܠܒܠܘܬܐ ܬܬܢܛܪ : ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ
< ܘܒܪܘܫܥܐ ܘܒܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܝܒܘ̈ܣܝܐ : ܛܒ ܐܬܕܡܪܬ :
< ܕܩܪܐܘܬ ܘܟܪܝܬ ܘܠܐ ܫܦܝܪܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢ ܚܕܬܐ ܥܒܝܕܘ
< ܬܠܝܬܝܬ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ. ܠܪܘܟܒܐ ܒܪ
< ܕܗܪܟܐ ܡܠܬܐ : ܠܐ ܒܙܒܢ ܕܗܫܐ ܠܡܫܡܥܐ ܥܒܕܬ.
< ܢܗܘܐ ܒܪ ܕܫܬܐܠ : ܕܠܐ ܕܡܚܝܢܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܡܦܝܣܝܢ
< ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܝܚܕܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܕܬܠܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܡܬܦܐܪ
< ܘܡܫܬܚܠܦ : ܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܠܗܘ ܕܐܒܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܘ ܕܒܪܐ :
< ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܘܝܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܘܚܕ ܡܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ :

AB W up to l. 419 flor. I from l. 429 to l. 437

Line 418: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܪܐܘܐ.
Line 423: ܕܕܚܠܝܢ, B: ܕܕܚܠܝܢ ܚܢ.
Line 432: ܗܠܝܢ, flor. I: ܗܢܘܢ.
Line 434: ܡܬܦܠܓܢܝܬܐ, W: ܡܬܦܠܓܝܢܬܐ.

prosopa as if it were on the stage and sometimes speaks and acts in the prosopon of the Father, sometimes in the Son's prosopon and sometimes in the Holy Ghost's prosopon, as witless Sabellius, the Libyan, saw fit to suppose.

Along with this, someone may ask us to prove from some texts by the holy Roman bishops that they did not profess the all-adorable Trinity as three but as one hypostasis. So we shall be glad to confirm this too by what this excellent fellow also quoted in his book. For he spoke in the following manner in chapter 12: Holy Liberius, then, when occupying the archiepiscopal throne of the Romans wrote to renowned Athanasius and expounded to him the faith, saying in the letter (beginning 'Our confession, beloved Athanasius') as follows: 'The Word of God, the Son by nature, was begotten of God the Father, with the result that the Trinity exists in one Godhead, in one power, in one substance and in one hypostasis. For the Son is not divided from the paternal hypostasis * which fills heaven and earth. The Trinity, therefore, as I previously said, exists in one hypostasis, one in substance, one in Godhead, one in power, one in sovereignty, one in image and one in spirit, for the Spirit is not divided'. And later: And in the letter of the Roman synod of 90 holy fathers, at whose head was Saint Damasus and which decreed that adherence should be given solely to the faith laid down at Nicaea, the letter beginning 'The bishops who assembled in a holy synod at Rome', we find a similar phrase, thus: 'So that the Father,

**402/411** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 12 **405/411** Liberii papae *Ep. ad Athan.*, hucusque incognita **411/418** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 12 **415/418** Syn. Rom., *Ep. ad episc. Illyr.* (*PG* 82, 1053AB)



« ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܬܐܛܪܘܢ ܡܫܠܦ : ܘܙܒܢ ܗܘ
« ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܦ ܥܒܕ : ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ
« ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܒܪܐ : ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ
« ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܕܠܘܒ̈ܝܐ ܥܦܪܐ :
« ܠܣܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܠܗܘܢܐ ܃

ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܥܐ ܢܒܥܐ ܐܢܫ : ܘܢܚܘܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܝܒܢ
ܠܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܣܩܘ̈ܦܐ ܕܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ ܢܚܘܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘ
ܬܠܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܣܓܝܕܬ ܟܠ
ܡܘܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ. ܡܕܝܢ ܢܚܕܘܢ ܕܐܦ ܠܗܕܐ ܢܫܪܪ : ܒܐܝ̈ܠܝܢ
ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ ܒܟܬܒܘܬܗ ܐܝܬܝ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ
— ܒܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܪܬܥܣܪ ܒܗܢܐ ܙܢܐ ܃ ܠܒܪܝܘܣ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܘ
— ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܟܕ ܐܚܝܕ ܡܘܬܒܐ ܕܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ ܡܠܟ : ܘܠܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ
— ܠܡܫܒܚܐ ܟܬܒ : ܘܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܠܘܬܗ ܣܐܡ : ܐܡܪ
« ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܪܝܫܗ̇ ܗܢܐ : ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܚܒܝܒܐ
« ܐܬܢܣܝܐ : ܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܒܪܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ : ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ
« ܘܐܒܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܬܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
« ܒܚܕܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܒܚܕ ܚܝܠܐ. ܘܒܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܘܒܚܕ
« ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܬܦܠܓ ܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܒܗܝܐ :
« * ܗܘ ܕܡܠܐ ܠܫܡܝܐ ܘܠܐܪܥܐ. ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܟܢܐ f. 52rb
« ܕܩܕܡܬ ܐܡܪܬ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ : ܒܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ.
« ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܚܕ. ܘܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܕ. ܘܒܚܝܠܐ ܚܕ.
« ܘܒܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܚܕ. ܘܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܚܕ. ܘܒܪܘܚܐ ܚܕ. ܪܘܚܐ ܓܝܪ
« ܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓ ܃ ܘܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܃ ܘܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ
— ܕܣܢܘܗܕܘܣ ܕܪ̈ܗܘܡܝܐ ܗܘ̇ܬ ܕܬܫܥܝܢ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܩܕܝ̈ܫܐ :
— ܗ̇ܝ ܕܪܝܫܗ̇ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܣܘܣ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܘܕܐܬܦܣܬ
— ܕܠܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܒܢܝܩܐ ܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ ܢܬܠܘܐ :
— ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܪܝܫܗ̇ : ܐܦܝܣܩܘ̈ܦܐ ܕܒܪܗܘܡܐ ܐܬܟܢܫܘ

AB

Line 451: ܕܟܬܝܒܢ, B: ܕܟܬ̈ܝܒܢ.
Line 457: ܡܠܟ, B: ܐܡܠܟ.
Line 471: ܕܒܢܝܩܐ, B: ܕܒܢܝܩܝܐ.

the Son and the Holy Ghost are to be believed to be one power, one image and one hypostasis. Him who thinks otherwise we judge estranged from our communion'.

By all this we learn that the divinely inspired rulers of the Church sought perforce to convince the Westerns (who professed one hypostasis of Father, Son and Holy Ghost and wrongly suspected those who religiously proclaimed three hypostases of the Holy Trinity) by means of expressions which seem to contain their cure, that because they cherish the appellation 'properties', they are of a common mind.

The point we are given to understand is that the Theologian in speaking of them took care to alleviate their suspicion diplomatically by his appellation 'properties'. He says, then: For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three) the Italians understand them in the same way as we, but they were unable, owing to the constraints of their language and its poverty of terms, to distinguish 'substance' and 'hypostasis' and therefore 'prosopa' was introduced so that three substances might not be accepted.

Thus he says that the three hypostases indicate the properties of the three, aware, as it seems, that those who are weak on the confession of three hypostases might be relieved by the term 'properties'. For he wisely regarded it as right to indicate the same orthodox understanding of the faith by a different term for the benefit of those faltering over the words, lest people of identical views

**428/434** cf. supra, 109-115



— ܒܩܢܘܡܘܗܝ ܡܬܝܕܥܐ : ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܡܫܡܫܢ
< ܕܗܘܝܐ ܒܠܒܬܐ ܀ ܐܡܪܝܢܢ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ :
< ܕܚܕܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܕܚܕ ܚܝܠܐ. ܕܚܕ ܢܡܘܣܐ. ܕܚܕ ܡܘܗܒܬܐ
< ܘܕܚܕ ܕܬܫܒܘܚܬܗ. ܠܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܡܬܪܥܐ :
< ܕܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܫܘܬܦܘܬܢ ܕܝܢܝܢ ܀

ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܝܠܦܝܢ : ܕܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܣܝ
ܡܘܗܒܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܘܪܫܐ ܘܪܘܚܢܝܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܐ ܡܬܕܪܫ ܗܘܘ :
ܘܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܥܩܪܐ ܐܫܬܕܠ ܗܘܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ
ܡܘܕܝܢܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܬܐ ܒܪܘܚܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܕܪܫ :
ܐܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܕܢܗ ܢܦܫܗ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܕܒܕܬܐ :
ܐܡܪܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܫܝܢ :
ܟܕ ܦܬܐ ܩܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܬܦܝܢ ܒܗܝܢ ܐܝܟ
ܓܒܝ ܒܬܪܒܝܬܐ ܢܦܫܗܘܢ.

ܘܗܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܢܡܪ : ܗܿܝ ܕܡܬܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܟܕ
ܡܬܠܠܗܘܢ ܡܡܠܠ : ܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܘܐܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
< ܡܬܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܢܢܝܚ ܠܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܗܘܢ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܀ ܟܕ
< ܚܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܿ ܡܢ
< ܒܪܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܗܿܝ ܗܿ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܐ. ܗܿܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ. ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܐܦ ܐܝܛܠܝܐ ܒܗܿ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܛܠ
< ܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܫܡܗܐ : ܢܦܪܫܘܢ ܡܢ
< ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܐܬܥܠ ܗܘܐ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ :
< ܕܠܐ ܬܠܬ ܐܘܣܝܣ ܢܬܩܒܠܢ ܀

ܗܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܡܪ
ܕܫܘܕܥܘ. ܟܕ ܝܕܥ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ : ܕܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܬܪܘܚܝܢ : ܗܿܘܢ ܕܠܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ
ܐܬܒܪܝܗܘܢ. ܕܗܘܐ ܓܝܪ ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ ܐܫܦܪ : ܕܗܿܝ ܟܕ ܗܿܝ
ܬܪܝܨܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ : ܟܕ ܥܡ ܫܡܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܬܟܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦ ܢܫܘܕܥ : ܕܠܐ ܢܬܦܪܫܘܢ

AB

should suppose they were arguing about the realities. No, * those who are sound in their understanding must be in dispute with one another only over an expression. For in proof of this, in the rest of what has previously been quoted, he says: What, then, do hypostases mean to you, or prosopa to you, for I put the question? They mean that those divided not in natures but in properties are three. Very good. How could people more think the same thing or say the same thing than those who hold to these things? Even though they differ in words. And in another passage: But when I say 'God' be illumined by one light and by three; by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought). Again, writing about the famous Athanasius, he says: How, then, does he do this? Inviting both sides to come to him, so gently and humanely, he carefully investigated the meaning of their statements and, because he found both sides of one mind and not removed from one another on any point of principle, indulgent to the terms, he bound them by the realities.

Here too in this fashion taking special care for a correct and sound understanding of the realities and seeing the Westerns stumbling over the term 'hypostases', he cures their suspicion by the appellation 'properties', saying: So also not only the impious is sundered from us but also the very religious, not over merely trifling and negligible doctrines (for that would be a slight evil) but heretofore also

**444/448** cf. supra, 359-363 **449/452** cf. supra, ch. 1, 72-75 **453/457** cf. supra, 124-128 **461/472** cf. supra, 106-117



ܕܥܠ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ܆ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܚܠܝܡܐ ܗ̣ܘ̣ ܒܗ̇ ܗ̣ܘ̣
ܡܬܚܪܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܐܢܘ̇ܢ * ܕܐܢܫܐ܆ ܒܚܕܐ ܡܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ f. 52va
ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܬܘܚܡܬܐ ܣܠܩܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܬܢܝܢܐ ܢܛܪܘܢ. ܒܗ ܓܝܪ
ܗܕܐ ܡܢܘܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܩܕܡܐ ܩܒܝܠܐ
< ܐܡܪ܀ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܨܒܝܢ ܠܟܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘ ܠܟܘܢ
< ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܡܫܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ. ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ. ܠܘ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܒܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ. ܫܦܝܪ ܠܚܕܐܝܬ.
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܬܪܥܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܒܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ ܢܬܪܥܘܢ ܐܘ ܗ̇ܝ ܒܗ̇
< ܗ̇ܝ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ܆ ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܝܕܝܢ܆ ܘܐܦ
< ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ܀ ܘܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ܀ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܐܡܬܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ܆ ܒܚܕ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܢܗܪܘ ܘܒܬܠܬܐ.
< ܒܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܘܟܝܬ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܪܚܡ
< ܠܗܝܢ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܐܘ ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ
< ܡܬܚܬܢܝܢ܆ ܟܡܐ ܕܐܝܟܘܬܗ̇ ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܝܟܘܬܗ̇ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܡ̈ܬܛܝܢ
< ܡ̈ܠܐ܀ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܛܠ ܠܡܫܒܚܐ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ ܟܬܒ ܟܕ
< ܐܡܪ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܕܐ ܥܒܕ.. ܟܕ ܩ̇ܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܬܪ̈ܘܝܗܘܢ
< ܠܘܬܗ ܢܐܬܘܢ ܟܝܢܐ܆ ܗܟܢܐ ܢܝܚܐܝܬ ܘܪܚܡܬ ܐܢܫܐܝܬ܆
< ܘܗܘܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܚܦܝܛܐܝܬ ܒܥܐ܆ ܡܛܠ ܕܫܟܚ
< ܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܚܝܕܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܘܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܪ̈ܚܝܩܝܢ ܒܡܬܚܠܦܬܐ܆ ܟܕ
< ܠܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܐܚܝܣ܆ ܐܣܪ ܒܨ̈ܒܘܬܐ܀

ܗܟܢܐ ܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ܆ ܟܕ ܕܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ
ܘܚܠܝܡܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܚܫܒ܆ ܘܚܙܐ ܠܗܢܘܢ
ܕܡܢ ܡܥܪ̈ܒܐ ܕܒܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܬܩܠܝܢ܆ ܟܕ ܒܫܘܡܗܐ
< ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܐܣܐ ܠܚܫܕܢܘܬܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ܀ ܗܟܢܐ ܘܡܟܝܠ܆
< ܠܘ ܗܘ ܡܢܐ ܕܪܫܝܥ ܡܬܦܪܫ ܒܠܚܘܕ܆ ܐܠܐ ܘܗܘ ܡܢܐ
< ܕܕܚܠ ܕܚܠ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܩ̈ܠܝܠܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܘܕܒܨܝܪܐ
< ܘܕܫܝܛܝܢ ܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܐ܆ ܒܫܝܛܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܒܨܝܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ

AB

Line 517: ܐܢܫܐܝܬ, A: ܐܢܫܝܐܝܬ.
Line 519: ܘܡܕܡ, cf. supra, line 144 (ܘܡܕܡܕܡ).
Line 525: ܕܪܫܝܥ, cf. supra, line 327 and note.

over words that convey the same meaning. For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three) the Italians understand them in the same way as we, but they were unable, owing to the constraints of their language and its poverty of terms, to distinguish 'substance' and 'hypostasis' and therefore 'prosopa' was introduced so that three substances might not be accepted. What happens? Something ridiculous and pitiable; the verbal triviality was thought a difference of faith.

You will perceive how * the doctors of the Church were greatly concerned that their fellow-thinkers should not be considered as faltering in faith on account of a difference of terms. For that is why, recognizing Father, Son and Holy Ghost as three perfect and properly subsisting individual realities, they sometimes designated them as three 'hypostases', sometimes as three 'prosopa', sometimes as three 'properties'; by no manner of means recognizing the hypostases as 'Gods', 'Godheads', 'substances' or 'natures'; nor saying that the three prosopa are a single composite prosopon, as it were, with three prosopa, or a single hypostasis, of three-fold shape, changing now into the hypostasis of the Father now into the Son's now into the Holy Ghost's, altering the prosopon as on the stage; nor, again from the fact that they name the hypostases of the Holy Trinity 'properties' do they suppose them to be ingeneracy, generacy and procession. It was, we say, with this fully correct and sound intention that Saint DAMASUS spoke, his precise words (quoted by this excellent fellow in 'confirmation' of



ܗܘܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܘ : ܘܡܛܠ ܬܚܠܐ ܕܠܗ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ
ܬܚܠܝܢ. ܒܪ ܟܢܫ ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ
ܗ̇ܝ ܡܢ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܡܢ ܟܢܫ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ : ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܗ̈ܘܘ، ܕܝܢ
ܘܡܢ ܐܝܛܠܝܐ ܗ̇ܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ
ܡܛܠ ܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ :
ܕܢܦܪ̈ܫܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܥܐܠ ܗܘܐ
ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܕܠܐ ܬܠܬ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܢܬܩܒܠܢ : ܡܢܐ ܗ̇ܘܐ. ܡܕܡ
ܕܓܚܟܐ ܠܚܘܫܒܐ ܘܠܐܘܠܝܐ. ܫܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ
ܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܕܒܘܪܢܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܫܘܢܝ ܗܠܐ ❖

f. 52vb ܚܙܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܝܨܝܦܘܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܝܬܐ * ܐܬܬܢܝܚܘ
ܗܘܬ ܠܡܠܦ̈ܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ
ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܢܬܚܫܒܘܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ ܒ̈ܢܝ ܬܪܥܝܬܗܘܢ.
ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܟܕ ܒܪ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ :
ܬܠܬܐ ܫܡ̈ܠܝܐ ܡܬܩ̈ܝܡܢܐ ܘܕܝܕܝܠܝܬ ܡܕܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܠܗܘܢ
ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܗܘܘ : ܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ
ܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܐܡܬ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܬܝ، ܘܬܠܬ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܟܢܝܢ
ܗܘܘ : ܟܕ ܠܐ ܗܟܝܢ ܒܟܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܘܠܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ
ܐܘ ܐܠܗܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܘ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܐܘ ܟ̈ܝܢܐ ܢܕܥܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ
ܠܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܚܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܘܬܠܬܝ،
ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܐܘ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܬܐܝܬ ܡܫܬܚܠܦ
ܘܡܫܢܝܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܒܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܘ̇
ܕܒܪܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܘ̇ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܘܐܝܟ
ܕܒܐܬܐܛܪܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܫܚܠܦ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ : ܠܐ
ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ.
ܒܗܕܐ ܢܝܫܐ ܬܪܝܨܐ ܘܕܒܠܗܘܢ ܚܠܝܡܐ : ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ
ܘܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܡܣܘܣ ܒܪ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܬܬܝܬܝܢ :
ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܫܘܪܪܐ ܠܒ ܕܠܚܘܫܒܬܐ ܡ̈ܬܬܬܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܢܐ

AB

Line 556: ܡ̈ܬܬܬܝܢ, B: ܡܬܬܬܝܢ.

error) being clearly shown as saying: Blessed is he who confesses that the properties of the names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are three prosopa, even though he happens to say it in this way owing to the constraints of his language.

490/492 Damas. p., *Or. 3 contra Arianos*, cit. a Dam. Alex. in *Ep. prolixa;* cf. infra, ch. 16, 30-32



→ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܀ ܛܘܒܘܗܝ ܠܗܘ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ
→ ܕܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ
→ ܐܬܝܗܝܢ ܡܘܕܐ ܀ ܐܦ ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܬܓܕܫ ܕܡܛܠܬܗ
ܕܠܗ ܕܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ.

AB

## Chapter 5

*Concerning the fact that when he thinks of the hypostases as the properties of the hypostases, viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession, and was required to prove this by clear statements from the divinely inspired fathers, this excellent fellow vainly goes round and investigates the writings of the doctors. Rightly deprived of any true defence, he puts forward, without examination and without understanding or distinguishing them, all the unclear and obscure texts he can where mention is made of properties. This is why he tries also to remove by stealth certain things he had previously put in his writing and reveals himself plainly as an agent of sacrilege, bringing on his own head charges of committing illegal acts of this kind in addition to heresy.*

* Why, therefore, does this excellent fellow, saying, as he does, that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the characteristic properties of the prosopa (ingeneracy, I mean, generacy and procession) and needing to prove this plainly from patristic teachings which are very clear and evident to everybody, why, I say, does the wise fellow vainly labour so multifariously, dancing and exulting in ignorance of the good whenever he finds the term 'property', supposing that he will thereby have a victory in the proposed contest? Does he not judge it fair, in obedience to his own rules, to give

ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܐ.

ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܣܒܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܡܬܒܥܐ ܠܡܘܚ̈ܘܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ : ܘܣܢܕ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܢ ܩܢܬ ܩܠܐ ܟ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܢܫ̈ܝܩܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܕܐ ܢܫܘܐ : ܡܬܟܪܟ ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ ܘܡܬܒܥܐ ܕܡܠ̈ܦܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢ. ܘܟܕ ܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܟܘܠܗ ܡܦܩܬ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ ܡܬܓܠܙ : ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܨܐ ܕܠܐ ܟ̈ܠܝ ܘܡܣܬܟܠ : ܐܝܬ ܒܗܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܥܘܗܕܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܡܦܪܫ. ܒܗ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܬܠ ܘܠܐ ܦܪܫ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܬܗܦܟ. ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܘܡܦܩܐ : ܕܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܟܬܒ̈ܢܘܬܗ ܡܢ ܒܗ ܘܗܢܘܢ ܐܬܬܣܝܡ ܓܢܒܐܝܬ ܢܣܒ. ܘܡܬܚܘܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܦܠܚ ܒܗ ܡܬܕܥܝܐ. ܒܗ ܒܗ ܗܪܣܝܣ ܘܦܘܪ̈ܥܢܐ ܕܡܣܪܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܝܢ ܠܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܬܐ ܡܬܚܬܒ ܥܠ ܪܫܗ ܀

ܗ A, f. 53ra

* ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ : ܟܕ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩ̈ܝܡܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܘܕܪܫ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܗܪܟܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܫܘܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܒܠܝܢ ܢܗܝܪ̈ܢ ܘܠܟܠ ܐܢܫ ܓ̈ܠܝܢ : ܡܛܠܡܐܬ ܚܒܠ ܒܡܣܓܝܐܐܝܬ ܐܘܪܚܬܗ : ܘܐܡܪܐ ܕܡܫܬܥܐ ܥܡܟܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܬ ܠܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܘܡܥܢܪ : ܟܕ ܡܣܒܪ ܢܨܚܢܐ ܕܒܗܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܒܗܕܐ ܕܐܓܘܢܐ ܕܣܝܡ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܕܒܟܐܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕ ܠܢܡܘܣ ܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܡܬܛܦܝܣ : ܕܢܬܠ ܥܢܝܐ ܛܒ ܡܬܦܢܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܣܒ ܗܘ ܐܬܐܡܪ :

AB

Line 2: ܠܐ, B: ܠܠܐ.

Line 11: ܕܡܟܬܒ̈ܢܘܬܗ, B: ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ.

Line 12: ܗܪܣܝܣ, B: ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ.

proofs in equal measure of his own statements when he very rightly demands from others detailed proofs of their statements?

Let him recollect even now that he wrote as follows in the ninth chapter of his book, against those who attempted to establish polytheism from the divinely-inspired fathers: If, therefore, at the behest of time, person and literary form or when the matter was urgent, the holy fathers temporarily employed their opponents' phrases to refute them with, we should not rashly exult over such phrases, disregarding those clearly uttered many times for the exposition of the faith in all their books with complete freedom, plainness and clarity for the benefit and salvation of us, their readers, lest we seem to be driving truth away while catching only at trifles.

Do you recognize these words, my admirable fellow, and confess that you were right to say them? You will, I think, say 'yes', if you do not oppose yourself besides the nature of the realities. Consider, therefore, that, in accordance with these fine principles of yours, even if someone allowed that the holy fathers, for some reason or other, on rare occasions used the words quoted by you in support of your detestable opinion, you ought not to have exulted senselessly over such expressions, disregarding those clearly uttered many times in all their books with complete freedom, plainness and clarity for the exposition of the faith, lest you be convicted, as you yourself said, of driving truth away while catching at trifles.

**27/34** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (n° 15) **42/45** cf. supra, 30-34



ܒܗܘ ܕܠܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܒܗ ܦܩܕ ܥܡܝܪ ܟܬܒ ܡܬܦܢܝܢܘܬܐ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܬܒܥ : ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ.

ܢܬܕܟܪ ܕܝܢ ܘܗܫܐ : ܕܕܐܟܢܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܟܬܒ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܠܡ ܢܦܫ̈ܘ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܬܐܘܦܢܣܛܐ ܕܡܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܐܠܗ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܢܩܝܡܘܢ ܗܟܢ : ܒܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܬܫܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܀
— ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܡ ܒܗ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܙܒܢܐ : ܘܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܐܣܟܡܐ
— ܕܡܠܬܐ : ܐܘ ܡܐ ܕܣܢܝܩܐ ܐܠܝܨ : ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܕ̈ܫܐ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ
— ܕܥܒܕܬܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܩ̈ܢܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ : ܐܡܪ̈ܢܐ
— ܕܡܢܗܘܢ ܢܟܣܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ : ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܫܬܒܗܪܝܢ ܒܗ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ
— ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܢܗܪ : ܒܗ ܓܡܝܪܝܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܒܟܠܗ ܦܪܗܣܝܐ
— ܘܓܠܝܘܬܐ ܘܢܗܝܪܘܬܐ : ܒܡܦܩܢܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ
— ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܐܬܐܡܪ̈ܝ ܩ̈ܠܝܠܢ ܐܡܪ̈ܢܐ : ܠܘܬ
— ܘܝܬܪܢܐ ܘܦܘܪܩܢܐ ܕܠܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ. ܕܠܐ ܢܬܚܙܐ ܕܒܗ
— ܒܨܝܕ ܡܠܘܩܫܬܐ ܡܛܪܕܝܢ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܠܒܪܪܐ ܀

ܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܐܢܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܘ ܬܘܕܐ : ܘܕܕܘܡܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ̈ܬ ܠܝ ܡܘܕܐ ܐܢܬ : ܐܠܐ ܘܦܩܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܬܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ : ܐܝܢ ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܒܗ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܘܠܘܩܒܠ ܢܦܫܟ ܬܩܘܡ. ܚܙܝ ܗܟܝܠ : ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܦܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܥܩܪ̈ܝܟ ܐܦ : ܢܫܠ ܐܢܫ ܕܡܢ ܒܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ : ܕܠܒܠܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ ܒܡ̈ܠܝܢ ܩܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܠܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܕܪܥܝܢܟ ܡܣܠܝܬܐ ܬܫܬܒܗܪ : ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܟ ܕܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܢ ܗܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܬܫܬܒܗܪ : ܒܗ ܥܒܕ ܐܢܬ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܒܟܠܗ ܦܪܗܣܝܐ ܘܓܠܝܘܬܐ ܘܢܗܝܪܘܬܐ : ܒܡܦܩܢܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܐܬܐܡܪ̈ܝ ܩ̈ܠܝܠܢ ܐܡܪ̈ܢܐ : ܕܠܐ ܬܬܚܣܕ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ : ܕܒܕ ܡܠܘܩܫܬܐ ܡܛܪܕ ܐܢܬ ܕܫܪܐ ܐܢܬ ܠܒܪܪܐ.

AB

Line 39: ܘܕܕܘܡܐܝܬ, B: ܘܕܘܡܐܝܬ.

But if this is true, what are you to do if * you are deprived of confirmation of your wicked view even by these rare and occasional statements with an unusual meaning? Perhaps you will say: 'the doctors did call the hypostases "properties"'. What advantage is yours from that fact? For, as has been said frequently, we have no quarrel with you over that but over your defining the hypostases of the Holy Trinity as the characteristic properties viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession. When you put forward such things and produce them in justification, you are (as ATHANASIUS THE GREAT said) acting like someone charged with adultery, it may be, or murder, who defends himself against a charge of theft or lying.

But it would be as well to listen to the father's very words written in the *Encyclical Letter* or *First Oration against the Arians*. They are as follows: Nobody charged with adultery defends himself against a charge of theft, nor again would the complainant in a murder suit permit the accused were they to defend themselves, to say 'we have not cheated but have kept what was entrusted to us safe'. That would be more like a joke than an invalidation of the charge or a proof of the truth. And again: For a defence against one charge will not invalidate a different charge; but if we ought to do everything lawfully and justly, then a man ought to defend himself against the charges he is accused of and either prove that he has not committed the offence, or promise, if he is proved in the wrong, not to commit or do these things again. If he has committed and done them and will not make the promise but, instead, conceals some acts by speaking in defence of others, it is clear that he has not done right, but, indeed, is aware of his own wrongdoing.

**60/64** Athan. Alex., *Ep. ad episc. Aegypti et Libyae*, 11 (*PG* 25, 561B)
**65/72** Ibid. (*PG* 25, 561C - 564A)



ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ: ܡܢܐ ܬܥܒܕ ܐܢܬܘܢ * ܕܠܘܬ ܫܘܪܪܐ f. 53rb
ܕܪܫܝܥܘܬ ܬܫܬܒܩܘܢ: ܘܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܠܝܠܐܝܬ ܘܡܫܟܚܐ
ܐܣܝܢܐ ܐܢ ܬܐܡܪ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܢܬ. ܐܠܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ
ܩܪܘ : ܕܗܘܝ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܩܪܘ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ. ܘܡܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܟ
ܝܘܬܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܚܪܝܢܐ ܕܒܬܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ
ܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܗ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܐܠܐ
ܡܛܠ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܦܪܝܫܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܡܬܚܦܛ ܐܢܬ ܠܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܘܬܐ
ܡܥܬܐ. ܕܕܚܝܐ ܗܝܟܠ ܚܪܒ ܐܢܬ : ܒܕ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܡܫܬܪܝܐ
ܐܢܬ : ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܓܘܪܐ ܡܫܡ ܐܢܬ : ܐܡܪܐ ܕܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟ
ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ ܒܕ ܡܛܠ ܓܘܪܐ ܐܢ ܐܬܚܙܝ ܐܘ
ܡܛܠ ܩܛܠܐ : ܢܦܩ ܡܫܡ ܒܪܘܚܐ : ܡܛܠ ܓܢܒܘܬܐ
ܘܒܕܓܠܘܬܐ.

ܫܦܝܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܕܠܗܘܢ ܠܡܠܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܢܫܡܥ. ܕܒܐܓܪܬܐ
ܐܢܘܢܩܠܝܘܢ : ܐܘ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܪܝܢܘܣ :
< ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܀ ܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܒܕ ܡܛܠ
< ܓܘܪܐ ܡܬܚܝܒܐ : ܢܦܩ ܪܘܚܐ ܡܛܠ ܓܢܒܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܒܕ
< ܐܢܫ ܒܕܝܢܐ ܕܩܛܠܐ ܗܘܐ : ܡܬܦܝܣ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܪܥܝܢ :
< ܐܢܬܘܢ ܕܢܫܡܥܘܢ ܪܘܚܐ ܘܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܕܓܠܝܢ : ܐܠܐ
< ܘܡܫܠܡܢܐ ܢܛܪܢ. ܡܛܐܪܬ ܓܝܪ ܥܒܕܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܗܕܐ : ܘܠܐ
< ܫܪܝܐ ܕܡܪܫܥܘܬܐ : ܘܡܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܠܐ
< ܓܝܪ ܡܫܡ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ : ܫܪܐ ܠܡܫܪܝܢܘܬܐ
< ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܗܝ. ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܪܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܡܫܡܠܐܝܬ
< ܘܡܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܠܟܠܡ ܠܡܥܒܕ. ܘܠܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܪܫܐ
< ܐܢܫ ܡܛܠܗܘܢ ܢܦܩ ܪܘܚܐ. ܐܘ ܢܚܘܐ ܕܠܐ ܥܒܕ : ܐܘ
< ܕܢܘܕܐ ܐܢ ܡܬܚܣܢ ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܢܥܒܕ ܘܠܐ ܢܥܒܕ ܗܠܝܢ. ܐܢ
< ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬ ܥܒܕ ܘܥܒܕ ܘܠܐ ܢܘܕܐ : ܐܠܐ ܘܒܕ ܡܛܠܥܐ
< ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܡܠܦ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܢܥܒܪ : ܓܠܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܠܘ
< ܬܪܝܨܐܝܬ ܥܒܕ : ܐܠܐ ܘܝܕܥ ܒܢܦܫܗ ܕܡܪܫܥ ܀

AB

Wise Gregory, who occupied with sanctity the throne of Nyssa, is seen to have said as follows in the 29th chapter of the *Refutation of Eunomius* (whose beginning is: To want to help everybody was not, apparently): If, therefore, the concept of the energy indicates the substance, one nature of the two will be seen, energy and substance being found in the same equal marks and properties. If, however, the concepts of substance and energy are not the same but the meaning of * each is different, how can proofs of the points in question be given by things alien and foreign? It is just as if, when the substance of manhood is being inquired into and it is being discussed whether man is a laughing animal or an animal capable of grammar, someone should take, as proof of the former subject, the construction of a house or ship which a builder or shipwright has effected.

Knowing this, you ought as an exact expositor of the fathers' words to have produced the relevant proofs for what you wrote and, instead of filling your books with absolutely unavailing patristic testimonies, with the sole aim of seeming to speak learnedly and thereby to subvert the faith of the simple, you ought to have proved from clear and indisputable words by the divinely inspired fathers that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are ingeneracy, generacy and procession. For that way your proof would be seen to carry conviction with all lovers of truth.

Perhaps you will say that the Theologian ruled absolutely that the hypostases are ingeneracy, generacy and procession, when he said: For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the

---

**76/85** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (*PG* 45, 381AB; Jaeger I, p. 149, 1-11)
**98/100** cf. supra, ch. 4, 464-466



ܘܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܝܢ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܗܘ ܕܒܢܘܙ ܡܘܬܒܐ ܕܢܘܣܐ
ܡܬܚܙܐ ܐܡܪ ܗܟܢ: ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܥܣܪܝܢ ܘܬܫܥܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ
ܕܡܘܟܠܝܬ ܐܠܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ: ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܫܘܪܝܗ:
ܠܒܬ ܐܢܫ ܕܕܨܒܐ ܗܘ، ܕܠܟܠܢ ܢܥܕܪ ܕܢܐܡܪ: ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ
< ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܡܚܘܝܐ: ܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ ܢܬܚܙܐ: ܟܕ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ
< ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܒܗ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܫ̈ܘܕܥܐ ܫ̈ܘܝܐ ܘܕܝܠ̈ܝܬܐ
< ܡܫ̈ܬܟܚܝܢ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܘܕܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ ܗܘ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܚܕ * ܚܕ
< ܚܕܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܝܕ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܘܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܬܐ: ܐ̈ܬܘܬܐ
< ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܒ̈ܥܝܢ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܢ ܐܟܙ ܟܕ
< ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܡܬܒܥܝܐ ܘܡܬܕܪܫܐ: ܕܐܢ ܗܘ
< ܕܚܝܘܬܐ ܓܚܘܟܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܒܪܢܫܐ: ܐܘ ܡܦܠܠܢܐ
< ܕܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܬܐ: ܠܚܝܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ، ܕܦܪܫܬ ܐܬܬܐܘܡܣܬ: ܢܣܒ
< ܬܘܩܢܐ ܕܒܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܕܐܠܦܐ: ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܒܢܝܐ ܐܘ ܦܚܪ ܐ̈ܠܦܐ
< ܥܒܕ ܀

ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܕܥ ܐܢܬ: ܐܝܟ ܡܦܫܩܢܐ ܚܬܝܬܐ ܕܩ̈ܠܐ
ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ: ܕܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܒܬ ܐܬܘܬܐ ܦ̈ܐܝܬܐ
ܠܡܬܠܐ ܬܚܘܐ: ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܡ
ܠܓܡܪ ܠܐ ܡܥܕܪ̈ܢ ܠܝܟ ܠܡܟܬ̈ܒܢܘܬܟ ܬܡܠܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܕܬܬܚܙܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܡܠܦܢܐܝܬ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܢܬ: ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ
ܠܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܦܫ̈ܝܛܐ ܬܗܦܘܟ: ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܒܢ̈ܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ
ܢܗܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܚܠܘܡܝܢ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܢܫ̈ܝܡܝ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܐ ܬܚܘܐ: ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܗܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ
ܡܦܝܣܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ: ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܪ̈ܚܡܝ
ܫܪܪܐ.

< ܘܟܒܪ ܬܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ: ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܓܙܪ
< ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܢ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܫܠܡܬ
< ܐܠܗܐ: ܗ̇ܘ، ܗ̇ܝ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ: ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܝܢ

f. 53va

---

AB

properties of the three)! 'How do you get that idea, clever fellow?', we shall retort. Have we not the same right as you to use your 'wordiness' and say that by talking of 'the properties of the three' the doctor by no means meant the characteristic properties of the prosopa but the prosopa themselves? For if you maintain that the patristic theologians, whenever they clearly mention the non-properly-subsistent characteristic properties of the prosopa, are speaking 'wordily' of the individually subsistent hypostases themselves, what is to stop us too maintaining that the doctor did not speak of the properties of the three as 'ingeneracy', 'generacy' and 'procession' but of the hypostases themselves? Either, then, prove clearly, with other statements by the Theologian, that the characteristic properties of the prosopa (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) are the same as the hypostases and then we shall say that you have gained the point in question; or, if you cannot * prove this, you must plainly understand that you found nothing of help to your new-fangled teachings through these quotations of yours.

But to explain this point more clearly to readers by acquainting them briefly with an example, we shall observe that when, for instance, we say that the hypostases of Peter, Paul and John are consubstantial, we do not foolishly suppose, because we know certain functions etc. of, say, Peter, Paul and John, which we cannot think of as being Peter, Paul and John themselves, that *ipso facto* their hypostases too are other than they. For we knew before-



ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ❖ ܒܟܠ ܗܘܢ ܚܠܦܘܗܝ : ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܘܕܥܐ ܦܫܩ. ܘܡܢ
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܢ ܗܘܐ ܐܘ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܐܝܟܘܬܟ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܫܠܝܛ ܠܢ
ܐܚܢܢ ܕܐܦ ܠܢ : ܕܒܗ ܒܡܠܬܢܘܬܐ ܡܠܬܟ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܕܢܐܡܪ :
ܕܠܐ ܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܗܘܢ
ܠܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܥܕܬܢ : ܟܕ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ. ܐܢ
ܚܢܢ ܐܡܪܬ, ܕܩܢܘܡܐܝܬ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ :
ܡܢܘ ܕܕܠܐܝܬ ܠܢ ܡܟܣܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܐܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܡܡܠܠ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܒܦܬܓܡܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܗܢܘܢ
ܕܩܢܘܡܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܡܬܦܢܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܐܡܪܬ : ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܐܠܐ
ܕܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ : ܠܐ ܗܦܟܝܢ ܚܢ ܠܗ ܐܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܕܐܡܪܢ
ܡܠܦܢܐ ܢܦܪܪ. ܐܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܝܕ ܬܢ̈ܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܢܘܕܥܬ ܫܘܐ : ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ :
ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܗܢܝܢ ܒܗ
ܗܢܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܠܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ : ܘܗܝܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܗ̇ܝ, ܕܡܬܒܥܝܐ
ܐܚܕܬ ܠܟ : ܐܘ ܐܢ ܗܕܐ ܕܬܚܘܐ * ܠܝܬ ܠܟ : ܕܥ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ : f. 53vb
ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܡܥܕܪ ܠܚܕܬܘܬ ܝܘܠܦܢܝܟ ܐܫܟܚܬ ܒܝܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܢ̈ܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ
ܕܡܬܐܬܝܢ ܡܢܟ ܐܥܒܕܬ.

ܕܠܘܩܒܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܢܦܪܫ :
ܟܕ ܒܡܫܘܕܥܘܬܐ ܒܝܕ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܟܪܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܕܐܡܬܝ,
ܐܝܟ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܕܦܘܠܘܣ
ܘܕܝܘܚܢܢ ܫܘܝܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܕܥܝܢ ܚܢ
ܕܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܐܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܕܦܘܠܘܣ
ܘܕܝܘܚܢܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ : ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܠܗ ܠܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܦܘܠܘܣ
ܘܝܘܚܢܢ ܕܢܣܒܘܢ ܠܐ ܡܨܝܐ : ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܗ ܘܠܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ
ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܫܟܠܐܝܬ ܡܦܩܕܝܢ. ܦܕܡܝܢ

AB flor. II from l. 129 on

Line 130: ܐܡܪܝܢ, B: ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢ.
Line 131: ܕܐܡܪܝܢ, B: ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢ.
Line 132: ܕܝܕܥܝܢ ܚܢ, flor. II: ܕܝܕܥܝܢ.
Line 136: ܡܦܩܕܝܢ, B: ܡܦܩܕܝܢ ܚܢ. ܦܕܡܝܢ, B: ܦܕܡܝܢ ܚܢ.

hand with certainty by many means that the hypostases of Peter, Paul and John are nothing other than Peter, Paul and John themselves, even though we said they are Peter's, Paul's and John's, because otherwise we should not have been able to separate them in any respects from the hypostases of the rest of men. The same is to be said of 'manhood's substance'; we do not recognize manhood's substance as something other than manhood itself, even though we say 'manhood's substance'. But because there are many other different substances of creatures, if we want to talk particularly about the human race, we make a distinction and say 'manhood's substance'. Again, if we say that there are many things, be it virtues, upright deeds or the like, of Peter, Paul and John, we shall not perforce be witlessly saying that their virtues, or whatnot, are the same as themselves, because we have laid it down that Peter's, Paul's and John's hypostases are Peter himself, Paul and John.

These distinctions, then, being made, what reason do you have, my excellent fellow, for using forms of speech to muddle the meaning of the precise statements by the divinely inspired fathers? Why are you ashamed of not admitting: that if we simply affirm that something is, e.g., Peter's, Paul's and John's (something not commonly agreed on by everybody whether as being the same or not the same as Peter, Paul and John), we are quite unable as



ܒܙ̈ܢܝܢ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ ܡܫܪܪܐܝܬ ܠܡܕܥ: ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܕܝܘܚܢܢ: ܠܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ: ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܝܘܚܢܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ: ܘܐܦ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܕܝܘܚܢܢ ܐܡܪܢ ܐܢܘܢ: ܒܕܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܫܪܟܐ ܕܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ ܒܐܝܕܐ ܕܢܦܪܘܫ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܫܟܚܢ. ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܗܝ. ܐܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܘܥܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ. ܕܠܘ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܢܕܥܝܢ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܣܛܪ ܡܢܗ̇ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ: ܘܐܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ: ܟܕ ܢܨܒܐ ܕܢܡܠܠ ܥܠ ܓܢܣܐ ܐܢܫܝܐ ܕܝܠܢܐܝܬ: ܦܪܫܝܢ ܘܐܡܪܝܢ: ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ: ܐܘ ܡܝܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܬܘܪ̈ܨܐ: ܐܘ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ: ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܕܝܘܚܢܢ: ܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܡܘ̈ܢܐ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܕܝܘܚܢܢ: ܗܘ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܝܘܚܢܢ ܬܣܟܡܢ: ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܡܝܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܐܘ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܢ ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ: ܕܗܢܘܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ. ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܐܡܪ.

ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܬܦܪܫ: ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܣܟ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢ ܕܡܠ̈ܬܐ: ܡܒܠܒܠ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܡܝܬܪܐ ܠܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܕܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܠܦܣܝ̈ܩܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ: ܘܒܗܬ ܐܢܬ ܒܕܠܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܐܢܬ: ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܡܕܡ ܗܕܝܐ ܫܚܝܡܐܝܬ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܘܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܕܝܘܚܢܢ: ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܘܝܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܢܫ ܠܐ ܡܬܛܪ̈ܝܢ: ܐܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܘܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܠܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܠܝܘܚܢܢ: ܘܐܢ ܠܘ ܗܘܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܘܝܢ: ܠܐ ܫܟܚ

AB flor. II

Line 141: ܐܫܟܚܢ, B: ܐܫܟܚܢ.
Line 143: ܢܕܥܝܢ, B: ܢܕܥ ܚܢ.
Line 145: ܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܬܐ, flor. II: ܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܐ.
Line 151: ܬܣܟܡܢ, flor. II: ܬܣܟܡ ܚܢ.
Line 155: ܐܣܟ̈ܡܐ, B: ܐܣܟܡܐ.

a result of * saying that they are Peter's, Paul's and John's, to determine whether they are Peter, Paul and John themselves or things other than they, until we show by further indisputable proofs either that they are, or that they are not, the same as they, because, by true investigation of the wording we have discovered that some of the things affirmed of Peter, Paul and John are the same as they whereas some are not the same? In this way too in the proposed question, if we find the holy fathers to have thought the hypostases of the Holy Trinity to be the characteristic properties of the prosopa (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) and conversely these latter to be hypostases, clearly whenever they said 'the properties' or 'the idiomata' 'of the prosopa' or 'of the hypostases' they meant the hypostases or the prosopa themselves. But if, contrariwise, we have learned from their many divinely inspired teachings that the characteristic properties of the prosopa are not hypostases, it is imprudent, simply on hearing 'the properties of Father, Son and Holy Ghost', to understand, without discrimination or inspection, either hypostases, or, again, characteristic properties of the hypostases, until we have clearly learned the sense of the phrase from the preceding and following words. Because on hearing the indeterminate 'the properties of Father, Son and Holy Ghost' we can understand it both as meaning the characteristic properties of the prosopa (if the sense of the written words leads us to that interpretation) and, again, as meaning the hypostases (if the sense of the context discloses such an interpretation to us) seeing that the God-clad doctors (as



f. 54ra [illegible]

AB flor. II

Line 162: [illegible], flor. II: [illegible]. [illegible], B: [illegible].
Line 163: [illegible], B: [illegible].
Line 173: [illegible], B: [illegible].
Line 176: [illegible], B: [illegible].
Line 178: [illegible], B, flor. II: [illegible].

has been proved and will be proved again) by no means used the term 'properties' for the same signification but for different significations: for the hypostases and the characteristic properties of the hypostases.

Therefore, my clever fellow, it is pointless for you to produce in support of your opinion: The term 'hypostases' shall not disturb people, for the reason the Easterns say 'hypostases' is to indicate the subsisting and existing properties of the prosopa; and again: They have good grounds for denominating the properties of the prosopa 'subsisting hypostases', as we said before, because the Holy Ghost subsists and is; * even were the words unanimously admitted to be by Saint Epiphanius. For anyone making due use of the previous examination will say that Saint Epiphanius by no means understood ingeneracy, generacy and procession, but the three hypostases of the Holy Trinity themselves, as the subsisting properties of the prosopa. Hence your rock, and the inexpugnable refuge of your invincible fortress are hereby destroyed.

So much for this! We need no further argument because at this point the excellent fellow, exhibiting priestly good manners, removed the previously quoted text, as we have stated it above, from his recently written volumes, convinced, apparently, of the truth of the objections raised against him because of it.

---

179/183 cf. supra, ch. 3, 200-204



ܠܒܢ̈ܝ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܝܕܘܬ ܘܢܦܩܘܬ ܡܬܝܠܕܢܘܬܐ : ܘܟܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܟܠ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܩܕܫܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ: ܕܒܗܕܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܟܠܗ, ܟܕ ܟܠܗ, ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܚܠ ܐܣܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܣܝܢܐ ܐܬܚܪܒܘ.

← ÷ ܡܕܝܢ ܗܝܡܢܘܬ ܗܘ, ܕܠܐ ܢܫܓܫ ܠܐܢ̈ܫܝܢ ܫܡܐ
← ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܢܚܝ̈ܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ :
← ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ ܘܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
← ܢܫܘܕܥܘܢ ÷ ܘܬܘܒ ÷ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܒܫܪܝܪ ܘܐܝܬܝܗܝ, ܪܘܚܐ
← ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ
← ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܡܩܝ̈ܡܝܢ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ÷ ܠܫܘܐܝܘܬܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܟ
ܐܘ ܣܒܝܚܐ ܐܬܬܬ : * ܐܦ ܐܫܬܘܕܝܬ ܡܢ ܟܠܢ ܡܠ̈ܘܗܝ f. 54rb
ܕܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗ̈ܠܝܢ. ܠܣܟܐܬ ܓܝܪ ܐܢܫ ܟܕ ܡܬܚܫܚ ܒܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܐܡܪ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܐܟܘܬ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܘܐܬܬܗܕܪ ܠܟ ܡܟܝܠ ܐܦ ܟܐܦ ܗܘܐ ܫܘܪܐ ܘܒܝܬ ܓܘܣܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܬܦܪܢܝܐ ܕܚܣܢܟ ܠܐ ܡܬܙܟܝܢܐ.

ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܕܡܐ ܠܗܪܟܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܙܕܩ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܪܟܐ ܛܒ ܢܛܘܫܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܕ ܚܐܪܘܬܐ ܕܦܐܝܐ ܠܟܗܢܘܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܛܝܒܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ : ܠܒܪܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡܝܐ ܣܝܡܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܐܡܪܢ : ܡܢ ܟܬܒ̈ܘܗܝ, ܗܠܝܢ ܕܚܕܬܐܝܬ ܐܬܟܬܒܘ ܐܡܪ : ܟܕ ܐܬܦܝܣ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ : ܕܫܪ̈ܝܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܠܗ, ܡܛܠܬܗ ܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ.

---

AB flor. II up to l. 192

---

Line 193: ܠܐܢ̈ܫܝܢ, A: ܠܐܢܫܝܢ.

Line 196: ܘܐܝܬܝܗܝ, cf. ch. 1, line 54 (ܐܝܬ) and note.

Line 197: ܐܝܟ ... ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ (as infra, line 236), cf. ch. 1, line 55 (ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܩܕܡܢ ܐܡܪܢ).

Line 198: ܠܫܘܐܝܘܬܐ, A: ܠܫܘܝܘܬܐ.

Line 199: ܡܠ̈ܘܗܝ, B: ܡܠܘܗܝ.

For after a neighbour had disclosed to us his really outlandish impudence, his total want of respect and civility, we sent to the bookshop of the Museum of this great Christian city of the Alexandrians and, after inquiry, we found it completely removed from his book. Consequently, in great surprise and near incredulity at the attempted outrage, we thought we should examine the *Many-lined Apology* where he again quoted the same proof-text. So, having observed that the *Many-lined Apology* was also a product of his mischief, we deemed that a proper prudence required us to obtain a copy of both his expositions from his usual scribe. Reading these very carefully and comparing the falsified passages with the volumes prepared by him, in the great city I have mentioned, and sent to us by him in the beginning when we were living in the East, 'for judgement and correction' (as was shown at the start of this treatise) we found the precise volume of his book which he had sent us, containing in chapter 9: For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius, writing against heresies and saying: 'The term "hypostases" shall not disturb people, for the reason the Easterns say "hypostases" is to indicate the subsisting and existing properties of the prosopa'; and again: 'They have good grounds for denominating the

---

**211/218** cf. supra, ch. 3, 198-205



ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܩܪܝܒܐ : ܐܘܕܥ ܠܢ ܡܪܚܘܬܗ ܕܐܝܟ
ܕܫܪܝܪܐ ܐܟܣܢܝܬܐ ܘܡܚܣܪܘܬܐ ܕܟܠܗ̇ ܢܟܦܘܬܐ
ܘܐܝܩܪܘܬܐ : ܫܕܪܢ ܠܒܝܬ ܡܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܡܘܣܐ ܕܗܕܐ
ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܘܡܫܝܚܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܟܣܢܕܪ̈ܝܐ : ܘܟܕ
ܒܥܝܢ ܐܫܟܚܢܗ̇ : ܕܡܢܟܪܐ ܡܫܬܩܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܬܒܘܬܗ.
ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܟܕ ܦܝܫ ܬܗܪܢ : ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܐ
ܡܗܝܡܢ ܠܗܕܐ ܥܒܝܪܐ : ܕܢܦܩܕ ܙܕܩ : ܘܠܡܚܙܐ ܒܐܘܣܐ
ܠܡ ܗܘ ܦܝܫ ܗܘܦܪܓܐ : ܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܘܒ ܕܠܗ ܠܒܪܘܣܐ
ܐܬܚܙܝ. ܟܕ ܚܙܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܘܐܦ، ܗܘܦܪܓܐ ܡܣܓܝܐ ܗܢܘܢ
ܗܘܬ ܕܡܘܪܕܬ ܒܝܫܘܬܗ : ܡܢ ܐܠܨܬܐ ܚܫܒܢ ܡܛܠ
ܗܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܙܕܩܐ : ܕܢܣܒ ܕܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܘܫܩ̈ܘܗܝ، ܡܢ
ܟܬܘܒܐ ܡܥܝܕܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܣܒ. ܟܕ ܗܘ ܘܟܕ ܩܪܝ ܒܥܡܠܐ
ܦܓܥܢ : ܘܠܕܘܟ̈ܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܦܠܣܪ ܦܫܩܢ ܥܡ ܟܬܒ̈ܐ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢܗ ܐܬܬܩܢܘ ܒܗܕܐ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܕܐܬܡܠܟܬ :
ܘܠܢ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܟܕ ܒܡܕܢܚܐ ܡܕܝܪܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢܗ ܐܫܬܕܪܘ :
ܠܕܝܢܐ ܠܡ ܘܠܬܘܪ̈ܨܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ
ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܐܫܟܚܢ ܗܘ ܠܟܬܒܐ ܗܢ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ
ܗܘ ܕܫܕܪܗ ܐܫܕܪ ܠܢ : ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܒܦܘܢ ܐܝܬ ܗܘ ܒܦܣܩܐ ܛ
— ܕܬܫܥܐ ✣ ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ : ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
← ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ ✣ ܘܠܐ ܢܫܓܫ ܠܒ̈ܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ
← ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܠܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܢܚܝ̈ܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ :
← ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ ܘܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
← ܢܫܘܕܥܘܢ . ܘܬܘܒ : ܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܒܫܡܗܝܢ ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ :

---

AB

---

Line 220: ܒܘܬ, B: ܕܒܘܬ.
Line 221: ܚܙܝܢ, B: ܚܙܝ ܚܢ.
Line 222: ܚܫܒܢ, B: ܚܫܒ ܚܢ.
Line 225: ܦܓܥܢ, B: ܦܓܥ ܚܢ. ܟܬ̈ܒܐ, B: ܟܬܒܐ.
Line 232: ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ, B: ܗܪܣܝܣ.
Line 234: ܕܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ, B: ܕܡܩܝܡܢ.
Line 235: ܪܘܚܐ, cf. ch. 3, line 226 and note.

properties of the prosopa "subsisting hypostases", * as we said before, because the Holy Ghost subsists'? And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea etc. And: Hence, confessing that Immanuel's union was effected from two hypostases, or natures, we do not likewise state that he is thus from two properties, because the term 'hypostasis' is clearer and indicates the property subsisting in the substance. For this is the point of our previous quotation from Saint Epiphanius who says: 'For, they denominate the properties of the prosopa "subsisting hypostases", as we said before'. Now, in the newly written and falsified text instead of this there stands here: For what are we to say of Saint Gregory the Theologian who says in his oration *On the Lights:* 'But when I say "God", be illumined by one light and by three, by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead'? And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea etc. And a little later: Hence, confessing that Immanuel's union was effected from two hypostases, or natures, we do not likewise state that he is thus from two properties, because the term 'hypostasis' is clearer and indicates the prop-

**218/224** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (ed. prima; n° 16) **223/224** cf. supra, 215-216 **226/232** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (ed. secunda; n° 17) **227/231** Greg. Naz., *Or. 39*, 11 (*PG* 36, 345C; *SChr.*, vol. 358, pp. 170-172); cf. supra, ch. 1, 72-76 **233/238** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (ed. secunda; n° 18)



← ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡܢ * ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ f. 54va
← ܕܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܡܬܩܢܡܝܢ ܀ ܘܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܣܐܘܪܐ ܕܦܢܐ ܠܘܬ
— ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܩܣܪܝܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܘܫܪܟܐ. ܘܬܘܒ ܕܝ. ܡܢ
— ܗܪܟܐ ܕܝ ܡܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘ ܡܢ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܕܗܘܬ
— ܚܕܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܡܢܘܐܝܠ : ܠܐ ܡܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܗܟܢ
— ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܛܠ
— ܕܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܢܗܝܪ ܝܬܝܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܡܫܘܕܥ
— ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ. ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢ
← ܠܥܠ ܣܡܢ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܕܐܡܪ : ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܓܝܪ
← ܐܡܪ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܝܢ
← ܡܬܩܢܡܝܢ ܀ ܒܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܚܕܬܐܝܬ ܟܬܝܒ ܘܡܙܝܦ : ܚܠܦ
— ܗܠܝܢ : ܗܪܟܐ ܗܟܢ ܐܝܬ ܗܘ ܀ ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ
— ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܬܐܘܠܘܓܘܣ : ܕܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪܐ
← ܓܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ، ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܒܚܕ
← ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ ܘܒܬܠܬܐ : ܒܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ
← ܒܗܠ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܪܚܡ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܐܘ
← ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܬܚܬܝܢܢ :
← ܥܕܡܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܚܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܛܝ̈ܢ : ܒܚܕ
← ܕܝ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܠܛܘܒܢܐ
← ܣܐܘܪܐ ܕܦܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܩܣܪܝܐ ܘܐܡܪ
← ܘܫܪܟܐ ܀ ܒܬܪ ܙܥܘܪܬܐ ܕܝ ܀ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܕܝ ܡܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ
— ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘ ܡܢ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܕܗܘܬ ܚܕܝܘܬܐ
— ܕܥܡܢܘܐܝܠ : ܠܐ ܡܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܗܟܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘ
— ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܡܛܠ ܕܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ
— ܢܗܝܪ ܝܬܝܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܡܫܘܕܥ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܐ

AB

Line 236: ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ... ܐܝܟ, cf. supra, line 197 and note. ܕܩܕܡܢ, B: ܕܩܕܡܢ ܚܢ. ܐܡܪܝܢ, B: ܐܡܪ̈ ܚܢ.
Line 239: ܡܘܕܝܢ, B: ܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢ.
Line 245: ܕܩܕܡܢ, B: ܕܩܕܡܢ ܚܢ.
Line 248: ܬܐܘܠܘܓܘܣ, B: ܬܐܠܘܓܘܣ.
Line 252: ܡܬܚܬܝܢܢ, B: ܡܬܚܬܝܢ ܚܢ.
Line 253: ܡ̈ܛܝܢ, B: ܡܛܝܢ.

erty subsisting in the substance. For this is the point of our previous quotation from Saint Gregory who says: 'Be illumined by one light and by three, by three in properties or hypostases'.

These things in the book, which offend against divine laws and even human laws, are the work of an impudent and falsifying hand. But please may we also observe the additions and omissions he has embellished his *Many-lined Apology* with. For having attempted to imitate in many respects, indeed greatly to outdo, crazy Julian, he considered he would be at fault unless he made, as it were, an unforgettable and deathless memorial of his model * by corrupting and falsifying texts; hence having introduced, for examination, statements of his previously put in the *Many-lined Letter* spoken of, he made even more lavish use in it, so to say, of his lawless arguments. In that small volume of his *Many-lined Letter*, the volume which he himself got ready and despatched to us at the outset is this: For I am not dismayed by a rebuttal, but feel the hurt done to the truth because though it did not rebut anything it came as a rebuttal. But if in that very chapter and place were adduced testimonies from the fathers which confirm the statement, let no one fault the truth. For after the passage not one word interrupted the testimony adduced, for the very reason that it terminated the section it stood in, as follows: 'Let us quickly recall that it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching, to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance "hypostases" and to suppose they are not three realities even

**237/238** cf. supra, 227-228 **251/268** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* (ed. prima); cf. supra, ch. 3, 188-205



— ܒܐܘܣܝܐ: ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ. ܕܡܢ ܠܒܠ ܗܟܢ ܣܡ
← ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܒܚܕ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ
← ܘܒܬܠܬܐ: ܒܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܀

ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܟܬܒܐ: ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܢܡ̈ܘܣܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ
ܘܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܢܡ̈ܘܣܐ ܐܢܫ̈ܝܐ: ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ ܠܐܝܕܐ ܡܪܝܚܬ ܟܕܒ
ܘܬܘܣܦܬܐ̈ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܬܘܣܦܘ. ܢܚܙܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܥܘܕܪܐ:
ܘܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܘܒܡܚܣܪ̈ܐ: ܨܒܬ ܘܠܗ̇ ܕܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ
ܣܓܝ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܦܝܣ ܡܦܠܓܐ ܕܠܗ. ܒܗ ܒܩܢ̈ܝܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܓܝܪ
ܠܗܪܛܝܩܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܦܝܣ ܢܟܒ ܠܥܠܡܐ ܘܠܝܘܠܝܢܐ
ܐܬܚܙܝ: ܕܢܥܒܕ ܐܦܣܪ: ܐܝܟ ܠܗ ܘܚܢ̇ ܕܚܪܝܦ ܘܡܦܠܫܪ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܒܝܢ: ܒܡܟܪܒܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܡܬܛܠܝܢܐ
ܘܠܐ ܡܬܡܬܐ ܕܗܘ̇ ܢܛܪ ܬܦܢܝܬܗ * ܢܒܕܐ. ܡܢ ܗܘ̣ܕܐ ܘܒܕ
ܐܝܟ, ܠܡܘܣܝܐ ܠܡ: ܠܬܚܬ ܩܠܝܐ ܕܠܗ ܕܩܕܝܡܝܢ ܫܒܩܝܢ
ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܣܘܪ̈ܓܕܐ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܡܪܢܐ: ܬܘܒ
ܡܬܥܬܕܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܦ ܒܗ̇: ܒܦܩܝܕܘܬܗ ܠܐ
ܢܡ̈ܘܣܝܐ ܐܬܚܫܒ. ܐܝܬ ܡܟܠ ܒܗ̇ ܘܡܢ ܒܬܘܟܐ
ܕܐܓܪܬܗ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܣܘܪ̈ܓܕܐ: ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܢ ܥܘܪܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ̇ܬ
— ܘܡܕܪ ܠܝ ܗܘܐ ܘܐܢܐ ܀ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܚܙܐ ܢܟܝܢ ܠܘܬ
— ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܗ ܟܣܝܡ ܠܐ ܐܬܟܣܝܬ ܐܝܟ
— ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܬ: ܒܗ ܠܡ ܣܠܩ ܥܕܪܐ ܟܐܒ ܠܗ: ܐܢ ܕܝܢ
— ܒܗ ܒܦܣܘܩܐ ܘܒܗ̇ ܒܕܘܟܬܐ: ܐܬܬܝ̈ܬ ܣܗܕ̈ܘܬܐ
— ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܕܡܫܪܪ̈ܢ ܠܡܠܬܐ: ܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܡܐܟ ܠܫܪܪܐ.
— ܘܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ
— ܒܡܨܥܬ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܡܬܠܝܬܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܬܬܬܬ ܘܦܣܩܬ
— ܠܡܦܪܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܡܢܟܐ. ܢܥܗܕ ܡܠܠܐܝܬ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ
— ܘܕܚܝܠܬܐ: ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ,
— ܕܢܚܫܘܒ: ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ
— ܢܩܪܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܘܢܚܫܘܒ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܬܠܬ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ:

AB

Line 261: ܗܟܢ ܣܡ, B: ܗܟܢ.
Line 264: ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ, B: ܐܠܗܝܐ.

though the doctors frequently assert that they "characterize" the prosopa or hypostases, and use certain wordy expressions of this kind about them. For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius, writing against heresies and saying: "The term 'hypostases' shall not disturb people, for the reason the Easterns say 'hypostases' is to indicate the subsisting and existing properties of the prosopa"; and again: "They have good grounds for denominating the properties of the prosopa 'subsisting hypostases', as we said before, because the Holy Ghost subsists"? And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea etc.' But in the later version he falsified and published in this great city, there is this: For I am not dismayed by a rebuttal but feel the hurt done to the truth because though it did not rebut anything it came as a rebuttal. And a little later: For what are we to say of Saint Gregory the Theologian who says clearly in his oration *On the Lights:* 'But when I say "God", be illumined by one light and by three, by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not * disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead'? And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea etc. This shows how in chapter 9 of his book and in the quotations from chapter 9 in the many-lined letter he completely removed some passages and added others.

**270/271** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* (ed. secunda); cf. supra, 251-253
**272/279** Ibid.; cf. supra, 262-268 et 225-232



— ܐܦ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܝܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ
— ܒܗܕ ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ : ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܩ̈ܛܝܢܬܐ
— ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ. ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܐܡܪ
— ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܟܕ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ ܀
← ܘܠܐ ܢܥܝܩ ܠܐܢܫܝܢ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ : ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ
← ܡܕܢܚܝܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ
← ܕܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܘܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܢܚܘܘܢ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܕܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܒܕܡܟܢܝܢ
← ܙܘܢܐ ܡܕܥܐ : ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ
← ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܝܢ ܡܫܬܡܗܝܢ ܀ ܘܠܛܘܒܢܐ
— ܣܐܘܪܐ ܕܬܚܘܒ ܠܗ ܠܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܡܦܫܩܐ ܘܐܡܪ
— ܘܕܩܣܪܝܐ ܀ ܒܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܦܠܓܐ : ܘܗܕܐ ܒܗܝܢܐ
— ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܀ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܒܙܐ ܢܦܫ ܠܗ
— ܡܬܟܣܝܢܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܒ ܒܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܙܝܬ ܐܝܟ
— ܡܬܟܣܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܬ : ܟܕ ܠܡ ܣܠܩ. ܥܕܪܐ ܚܫܒ ܠܗ. ܘܟܕ
— ܠܗܪ̈ܬܐ ܀ ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ
— ܬܐܘܠܘܓܘܣ : ܕܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪ̈ܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ ܀
← ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ، ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܒܚܕ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ
← ܘܒܬܠܬܐ : ܒܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܗܝ ܒܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ : ܐܢ
← ܪܚܡܐ ܠܐܢܫ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܐܘ ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ
← ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ * ܡܬܚܪܝܢ : ܒܡܐ ܕܐܝܟܘܬܗ ܒܗ ܐܝܟܘܬܗ f. 55ra
← ܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܚܫܒܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ : ܒܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ
← ܒܗ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀ ܘܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܣܐܘܪܐ ܕܬܚܘܒ ܠܗ
— ܠܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܡܦܫܩܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܣܪܝܐ ܀ ܘܐܡܪܝܢܐ ܡܢ
ܘܒܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܬܫܥܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ : ܘܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢܗ
ܕܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܬܫܥܐ ܐܬ̈ܘܬܐ، ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ
ܗܦ̈ܟܬܐ : ܡܢܗܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܫܠܡܐܝܬ ܐܒܕ : ܡܢܗܝܢ ܕܝܢ
ܘܐܘܣܦ : ܒܚܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܘܬ ܢܒܝܚܬܐ.

AB

Line 308: ܡܬܚܪܝܢ, B: ܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܢܚܢ.
Line 310: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܐܪܘܐ.
Line 313: ܐܬ̈ܘܬܐ، , B: ܐܬܘܬܐ، .

Accordingly we will also point out what he falsified by an examination of the passages he had removed and added. He says this too, then, for confirmation of what he originally said in his book: Perhaps, then, we may be criticized on the grounds that the proof is defective and constructed with only a couple of testimonies. But it would be wrong to take much offence at this. The law of apostolic teaching affirms that *by two or three witnesses every word shall be established.* Nevertheless, critics of the statement may, if they like, have further testimonies in which the holy fathers recognize the properties as identical with the hypostases. In the oration *On the Lights*, then, Gregory the Theologian clarifies our ideas and shows the single meaning in the terms by saying: 'But when I say "God", be illumined by one light and by three; by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead'.

These are the precise words which escaped his mischievous and audacious hand. Let us, indeed, compare the text of the falsification with them: Perhaps, then, we may be criticized on the grounds that the proof is defective and constructed with only a couple of testimonies. But it would be wrong to take much offence at this. The law of apostolic teaching affirms that *by two or three witnesses every word shall be established*. Nevertheless, critics of the statement may, if they like, have further testimonies in which the holy fathers recognize the properties as identical with the hypostases. In the oration *On the Lights*,

**285/297** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* (ed. prima) **288/289** II Cor. 13:1 **293/297** cf. supra, 227-231 **300/313** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* (ed. secunda); cf. supra, 285-297



ܕܢܣܒܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܢܫܘܐ : ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܦܠܣܪ ܒܗ
ܒܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܗܢܝܢ ܕܢܣܒ ܐܬܬܪܝܡ ܘܐܬܬܘܣܦ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ
ܠܘܬ ܫܘܪܪܐ ܠܡ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܩܕܡܬܘܗ ܒܕܪܫܐ ܐܡܪ
— ܠܗ ܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܀ ܒܪܡ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܪܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
— ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ : ܘܒܨܝܪ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܒܒܢܝܐ
— ܐܬܪܥܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܗܕܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܦܓܥ
← ܠܡܪܓܙ. ܕܒܠ ܬܪܝܢ ܓܒܪ ܐܘ ܬܠܬܐ ܣܗܕܝܢ ܬܩܘܡ ܟܠ
← ܡܠܐ : ܢܡܘܣܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܫܠܝܚܝܬܐ ܡܫܪܪ. ܒܪܡ
— ܘܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܝܬܝܪܬܐ ܐܢ ܨܒܝܢ ܢܣܒܘܢ ܡܬܚܪܝܢܐ
— ܕܦܬܓܡܐ : ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܗܘܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܚܕ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ
— ܢܕܥܝܢ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪܐ :
— ܒܗ ܠܚܫܒܬܢ ܡܢܗܪ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ : ܘܠܚܕ
← ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܫܡܗܐ ܡܚܘܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ،
← ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܒܚܕ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ ܘܒܬܠܬܐ. ܒܬܠܬܐ
← ܕܝܢ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܩܢܘܡܐ. ܐܢ ܪܚܡ ܐܢܫ ܠܡܩܪܐ
← ܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܘ ܒܦܪܨܘܦܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܫܡܗܐ
← ܡܬܚܪܝܢܢ : ܒܡܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܝ ܒܗ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܕܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܫܡܗܐ
← ܡܠܐ. ܒܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀

ܘܗܠܝܢ ܗܢ ܬܐܬܘܬܐ ܘܥܒܪܘ ܡܢ ܐܝܕܗ ܡܚܒܠܬ ܒܫܬܐ
ܘܡܪܚܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܢܦܩܘܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܗܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ
— ܕܦܠܣܪܘܬܐ ܀ ܒܪܡ ܠܡ ܗܟܝܠ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܪܝܐ
— ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ : ܘܒܨܝܪ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ
— ܒܒܢܝܐ ܐܬܪܥܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܗܕܐ ܗܘܢܐ
← ܦܓܥ ܠܡܪܓܙ. ܕܒܠ ܬܪܝܢ ܓܒܪ ܐܘ ܬܠܬܐ ܣܗܕܝܢ ܬܩܘܡ ܟܠ
← ܡܠܐ : ܢܡܘܣܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܫܠܝܚܝܬܐ ܡܫܪܪ. ܒܪܡ
— ܘܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܝܬܝܪܬܐ ܐܢ ܨܒܝܢ ܢܣܒܘܢ ܡܬܚܪܝܢܐ
— ܕܦܬܓܡܐ : ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܗܘܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܚܕ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ
— ܢܕܥܝܢ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪܐ :

AB

Line 321: ܐܬܪܥܝܢ, B: ܐܬܪܥܝܢ ܗܝ.
Line 332: ܡܬܚܬܥܝܢ, B: ܡܬܚܬܥܝܢ ܗܝ. ܐܝܕܝܗ bis, A: ܐܝܕܗ (wrongly). ܡܬܥܬܝܢ, B: ܡܬܥܬܝܢ.

then, as we have already said, Gregory the Theologian clarifies our ideas and * shows the single meaning in the terms by saying: 'But when I say "God", be illumined by one light and by three; by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead'.

Let us observe the addition of as we have already said. For our hero having adduced in the *Many-lined Letter* those words from chapter nine of his book (amongst which were initially both the passage he earlier thought to be by Saint Epiphanius and the proof-text of proven Severus) a little later made the statement given above in the *Many-lined Letter*: Nevertheless, critics of the statement may, if they like, have further testimonies, and for 'confirmation' of the pair of proof-texts he put the previously quoted statement of the Theologian. Latterly, frightened, I suppose, of criticism, he rejected the proof-text, previously adduced by him as the *ipsissima verba* of Saint Epiphanius, and surreptitiously removed it, substituting for it the passage from the Theologian just quoted. Inevitably, therefore, to avoid the suspicion of adding anything new to the earlier text, he was obliged to make a fresh join between the quotation from the Theologian and its repetition in the same passage: as we have already said.

**314** cf. supra, 307 **319/320** cf. supra, 304-305 **329** cf. supra, 307



— ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ : ܟܕ ܠܡܬܪܥܝܢܘܬܢ ܡܢܗܪ ܡܡܠܠ
— ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܠܦܪܨܘܦܐ : ܘܠܚܕ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܒܡ̈ܠܝܢ * ܡܚܘܐ ܗܘܐ f. 55rb
< ܟܢܘܫܐ ܐܡܪ ܁ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ، ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܒܚܕ
< ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ ܘܒܬܠܬܐ. ܒܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ
< ܒܬܠܬ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܐܢ ܕܪܚܡ ܐܢܫ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܐܘ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ.
< ܘܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܥܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢܢ : ܟܡܐ ܕܫܘܝܢ
< ܟܕ ܠܚܕܐ ܕܪܥܝܬܐ ܫܘ̈ܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ. ܒܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ
< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀

ܢܬܒܩܐ : ܕܗܝ، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ : ܫܘܐܬ ܐܬܬܘܣܦܬ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܝ، ܗܢܐ ܓܢܒܪܐ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܦܬܓ̈ܡܐ : ܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܫܥܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ : ܕܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܘܬܪܬ ܐܠܐ ܗܝ، ܕܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܣܬܒܪܬ ܡܢܗ : ܘܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܕܒܚܝܪܐ ܣܐܘܪܐ : ܘܒܬܪ ܙܥܘܪܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܢܝܐ ܡܒܕܩܐ ܐܡܝܪ ܗܘ
— ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܦܬܓ̈ܡܐ ܀ ܒܪܡ ܘܡܗܕܪܢܘܬܐ
— ܡܬܢܝܬܐ ܐܢ ܨܒܝܢ ܢܡܠܘܢ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܕܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܀ ܘܠܫܘܪܪܐ ܠܗ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܕܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܦܬܓ̈ܡܐ : ܗܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܩܕܡܐ ܡܒܥܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗܘ : ܠܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܚܠ ܕܠܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܡܘܟܣܢܐ ܐܫܠܝ : ܘܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܝܬܒ ܡܢܗ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܝܪ : ܠܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܗܝ، ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܫܬܝܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܡܢܗ ܐܬܬܬܬ : ܘܣܡ ܗܘܐ ܚܠܦܝܗ ܠܗܝ ܗܕܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܗܫܐ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܗܘ : ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܐܬܐܠܨ ܕܚܕܬܐܝܬ ܢܕܒܩ ܠܚܘܪܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ :
— ܠܗܝ، ܕܬܢܝܢܘܬ ܒܗ ܒܗܘܬܐ ܡܒܥܐ : ܗܝ، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ
— ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ ܀ ܕܢܬܦܪܫ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܐܬܘܣܦܬ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܩܕܡܝܬܐ.

AB up to ܕܐܬܝܬܒ (l. 364)

Line 354: ܣܓܝܐܬ, B: ܣܓܝܬ.
Line 357: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܘܐܪܐ.

Besides these let us observe a third impudent fabrication in the same *Many-lined Letter* in connection with Saint Epiphanius. For having spoken, shortly after what has just been quoted, about the Theologian in these very words: Having taken the term 'property' over which there was no dissension as meaning the same things as 'hypostasis' and 'prosopon', and said that those divided not in natures but in properties are three i.e. that 'prosopa' and 'hypostases' signify nothing else but subsisting properties, he goes on immediately to add * as Saint Epiphanius testified when defending the Easterns. In the falsified version he has excised as Saint Epiphanius testified when defending the Easterns and substituted as we have adduced God-clad fathers teaching in many other passages. The sentence runs in its entirety as follows: Having taken the term 'property' over which there was no dissension as meaning the same things as 'hypostasis' and 'prosopon', and said that those divided not in natures but in properties are three i.e. that 'prosopa' and 'hypostases' signify nothing else but properties, as we have adduced God-clad fathers teaching in many other passages.

**333/338** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* (ed. prima) **339/340** cf. supra, 337-338
**340/341** cf. infra, 345-346 **342/346** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* (ed. secunda)



ܒܬܪ ܗܠܝܢ : ܘܡܬܒܘܠܬܐ ܠܡܚܙܝܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܕܚܘܫ ܒܗ̇ ܒܗ̇
ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܫܘܪ̈ܝܐ ܡܛܠ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ
ܢܬܒܩܐ. ܒܬܪ ܙܥܘܪ ܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܕܒܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܟܚܐ
ܐܬܬܘܣܦ : ܡܛܠ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܀
— ܟܕ ܫܡܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܢܣܒ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ : ܗ̇ܝ
— ܕܗܘܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ : ܘܐܡܪ :
— ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ : ܠܐ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܐ
— ܒܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ : ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܢܚܘܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ
— ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܢ ܀ ܘܟܠ
— ܗܠܝܢ ܡܠܘܬܐܬܝܢ ܐܘܣܦ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܩܕܝܫܐ
— ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܟܕ ܥܒܕ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܚܠܦ ܡܕܢܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܣܗܕ ܀
— ܢܦܩ ܒܗ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܠܫܪܬܐ ܡܢܗ ܐܬܦܠܡܪ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ
— * ܕܐܝܟ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܟܕ ܥܒܕ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܚܠܦ f. 55va
— ܡܕܢܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܣܗܕ ܀ ܘܚܠܦ ܗܕܐ ܣܡ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ
— ܘܕܐܝܬܝܢܢ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܠܒܝ̈ܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ
— ܕܡܠܦܝܢ ܀ ܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܓܝܪ ܟܠܗ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܗܢܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܀
— ܟܕ ܫܡܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܢܣܒ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ : ܗ̇ܝ
— ܕܗܘܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ. ܘܐܡܪ ܀
< ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ. ܠܐ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ. ܐܠܐ
< ܒܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܀ ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܢܚܘܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ
— ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܐܠܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ
— ܘܕܐܝܬܝܢܢ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܠܒܝ̈ܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ
— ܕܡܠܦܝܢ ܀

A

*Concerning the fact that he did not venture otherwise upon such attacks until he had judged fit to accuse us too of being forgers when we published his exact words, in the same way that Julian – who in many things was his teacher and master – accused our God-clad father Severus in his* Additions.

These texts, having been set out distinctly and having, by their clear comparison with one another, unmasked the malice of truth's enemies, let us try to refute clearly the mischief of the absurd falsification on the basis of their sense or, rather, senselessness. For besides the falsification there will be entirely visible the scheme for misrepresentations and false accusations based on it. For since the total defamer of truth acted furtively and slavishly, and is convicted of not frankly correcting himself, it is clear that he will altogether deny the attempt too. But if he does even this, the last resort will be for him to reach the very crowning-point of wickedness, and attempt a counter-charge of falsification against those who publish his true and unfalsified texts, to end up being seen not only as a falsifier but also as a lying defamer, a villain and a slanderer. None the less, this will not succeed when the very examination of the fabricated texts, alongside the books he published, rebuts his mischief and his godless, slanderous design.

As we said above, did not his master in many matters, crazy Julian, plan this device against our God-clad father Severus? In the treatise * *Against Julian's additions* SEVERUS clearly proved to everybody the lawlessness and wickedness of hidden slander, when he spoke as follows: For, had he cared for truth, he should have

27/32 Sev. Ant., *C. Add. Iul.*, 3 (*CSCO* 295, p. 9, 3-9; *296*, p. 7, 9-15)



ܥܠ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܡܪܚ ܥܠ ܩܪ̈ܒܐ ܕܐܟܢ ܗܟܢ ܐܚܪܢ : ܥܕܡܐ ܕܕ݂ܢ ܕܐܦ ܠܢ ܚܝܒ ܕܗܘܝܢ ܙܝ̈ܦܢܐ ܕܠܗ ܡܦܪܣܝܢ : ܐܝܟ ܦܠܣܛܐ ܢܥܡܘ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܐܒܘܢ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ : ܒܝܕ ܬܘܣ̈ܦܬܗ ܝܬܝܪ̈ܬܐ : ܝܘܠܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܒܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܡܠܦܢܗ ܘܪܒܗ ܀

ܘ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܠܐ ܐܬܦܪܫ : ܘܟܕ ܦܘܚܡܗܘܢ ܓܠܝܐ ܕܥܡ ܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܦܪܣܘ ܠܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܒܥܠܕܒ̈ܒܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ : ܢܢܣܐ ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܘܡܢ ܗܘܢܗܘܢ ܡܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܣܟܠܘܬܐ ܗܘܝܐ : ܠܡܒܛܠܘܬ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܦܠܣܛܘܬܐ ܣܟܠܬܐ ܢܥܡ. ܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܓܝܪ ܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܦܪܘܣ : ܘܡܥܒܕܬܐ : ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܥܩܒ̈ܬܐ ܘܡܠܐܟܝ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܕܢܟܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ. ܐܝܟܢ ܗܘܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܡܢ ܚܝܬܐ ܕܦܐܐ ܠܚܒܪܐ ܓܒܪ ܡܠܗ : ܘܠܐ ܕܥܡ ܦܪܗܣܝܐ ܕܬܪܨ ܢܦܫܗ ܡܬܚܬܢ : ܗܘ ܕܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܟܪܙܢܘܬܐ ܕܢܟܠܐ : ܢܕܟܐ ܘܢܟܦܪ ܡܢ ܒܠܦܪܘܣ ܒܡܣܟܢܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܗܕܐ ܢܥܒܕ : ܫܪܟܐ ܠܗ ܕܠܗ ܠܡܫܠܡܐ ܕܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܢܬܐܬܐ. ܘܥܠ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܫܪܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܦܠܣܛ̈ܬܐ ܕܠܗ ܡܦܪܣܝܢ : ܒܗܦܟܐ ܢܢܣܐ ܕܡܠܐܟܝ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܕܦܠܣܛܘܬܐ ܢܥܒܕ. ܕܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܦܠܣܛܐ : ܐܠܐ ܘܡܟܪܙܢܐ ܕܢܟܠܐ ܘܡܥܒܪܢܐ ܘܒܝܫܐ ܢܬܚܙܐ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܗܘܐ ܢܦܩܐ ܠܗ : ܟܕ ܗܝ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡܢܗܝܢ ܐܬܡܠܝܘ : ܘܗܘ ܒܡܫܢܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ ܕܦܪܣ ܡܟܣ ܠܒܝܫܘܬ ܒܥܝܪܘܬܗ : ܘܠܡܬܕܡܘܪܘܬܗ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܗ ܕܠܘܬ ܥܒܩܘܬܐ.

ܐܘ ܠܘ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܬܡܨܚ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܐܡܪܢ : ܘܗܘ ܕܦܠܣܛܘܬܐ ܡܠܦܢܗ ܦܢܝܐ ܝܘܠܝܢܐ : ܥܠ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܘܢ ܕܠܝ ܣܘܝܪܐ. ܗܘ ܕܒܟܬܒܐ *ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܘܣ̈ܦܬܐ ܕܠܗ ܕܝܘܠܝܢܐ : ܟܕ ܐܠܝܨܐ ܠܟܠܢ ܡܚܘܐ ܠܐ ܢܡܘܣܘܬܐ A, f. 55vb
< ܘܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܒܡܟܣܝܐ ܡܠܫܢܐ ܗܘܝܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܝܨܦ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ

A

written a pure defence of his Tome and have aided his arguments, and he should not have added other things from time to time covertly, like beaten slaves speaking through clenched teeth, to make it look as if we, who had reminded him of these things at the outset, had falsified words by cutting them short. And again: Are these, then, not acts of perfidy? Me, who reminded him fraternally of correct thought about God, he tries, by an ambush, to prove a slanderer and falsifier, by devising his additions without abandoning his opinion or heeding the wise counsellor who says, *Sow not a lie against your brother*, nor reverencing the divine book of Proverbs which foretells what will be the end of those who labour emptily in lying, when it says, *He who gets treasures by a lying tongue pursues vanities and comes to the snares of death*.

Who will not marvel at the similarity of these cases? For the doctor exactly prefigured, so to say, the murderous attack by this recent author (or, more appropriately, falsifier). And this attack too, when canonically condemned, will suffice, quite apart from his profane heresy, to strip him entirely of the order and rank of the priesthood.

However, let us leave this aside for the present! Let us again listen to his words. Perhaps, then, he says, we may be criticized on the grounds that the proof is defective and constructed with only a couple of testimonies. But it would be wrong to take much offence at this. The law of apostolic teaching affirms that *by two or three witnesses every word shall be established*. Nevertheless, critics of the statement may, if they like, have further testimonies in which the holy fathers recognize the properties as identical with the hypostases. In the oration *On the Lights*, then, as we have already said, Gregory the Theologian clarifies our ideas

---

**32/39** Sev. Ant., *C. Add. Iul.*, 4 (*CSCO* 295, p. 11, 1-15; *296*, p. 8, 22-32)
**36** Sir. 7:12 **38/39** Prov. 21:6 **47/59** cf. supra, ch. 5, 300-313



< ܟܬܒ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܕܟܝܐ ܡܦܩ ܗܘܐ : ܕܡܦܩ ܒܛܘܡܣܐ ܕܝܠܗ
< ܢܬܠ ܚܠܦ ܛܘܡܣܗ ܘܠܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܢܥܕܪ : ܘܠܐ ܢܘܣܦ ܒܙܒܢܐܝܬ
< ܐܝܟ ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܡ̈ܚܝܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܚܝܫܬ ܫܢܐ ܡܡܠܠܝܢ :
< ܘܬܩܦܬܐ ܟܕܢ ܐܢ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ : ܕܢܦܛܪ ܚܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ
< ܫܘܪܝܐ ܥܗܕܢܢܗܝ : ܕܡܠܘܢܐ ܦܣܩܢ ܚܠܦ ܩܠܝܠ ܀
< ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܗܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܦܫܥܬܐ ܕܡܣܝܒܪܢܘܬܐ : ܕܐܢܐ ܠܗ ܐܝܟ
< ܕܡܬܠ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܚܝܐܝܬ ܥܗܕܬܗ :
< ܒܟܡܐܢܐ ܘܡܓܠܙܢܐ ܒܕ ܒܕܝܐ ܡܚܫܒܐ ܕܒܝܫܐ : ܒܕ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܬܘܣܦ̈ܬܐ ܐܬܠܝܦ : ܐܦܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܐܪܝܫ ܡܢ ܬܪܥܝܬܗ :
< ܘܠܐ ܐܬܛܦܣ ܠܐܝܟ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܚܟܝܡ ܘܐܡܪ : ܠܐ ܬܕܪܘܥ
< ܕܓܠܬܐ ܥܠ ܐܚܘܟ : ܘܠܐ ܕܚܠ ܡܢ ܟܬܒܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ
< ܕܡ̈ܬܠܐ : ܕܩܕܡ ܡܟܪܙ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܥܘܠܒܢܐ ܕܗ̈ܢܘܢ
≪ ܕܒܓܠܬܐ ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ ܠܐܝܢ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ : ܗܘ ܕܡܟܢܫ ܣܝ̈ܡܬܐ
≪ ܒܠܫܢܐ ܕܓܠܐ ܒܣܪܝܩܬܐ ܪܕܦ : ܘܐܬܐ ܠܦܚ̈ܐ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܀

ܘܡܢܘ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܡܪ ܒܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ. ܠܐ ܡܫܠܡܐܝܬ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܩܕܡ ܨܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܩܛܘܠܝܐ ܘܠܗܢܐ ܕܡܬܬܒܢܐ ܗܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ : ܐܘ ܕܦܠܘܛܝܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܝܬܝܪ ܓܠܙܢܐ. ܗܘ ܘܒܕ ܡܬܬܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܢܐܝܬ : ܣܦܩ ܘܦܫܛ ܡܢ ܗܪܣܝܣ ܕܝܠܗ ܛܡܐܬܐ : ܕܢܫܠܚܝܘܗܝ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܛܟܣܐ ܘܕܪܓܐ ܕܟܗܢܘܬܐ.

ܐܠܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܫܒܘܩ ܢܫܒܘܩ. ܢܫܡܥ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܠܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܕܝܠܗ ܀
— ܟܒܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܡܪ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܚܣܝܪܬܐ ܐܬܚܘܝ
— ܬܚܘܝܬܐ : ܘܒܕ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܣܗܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܒܢܝܐ
— ܐܬܪܫܡ : ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܪܘܒ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܬܠܒܟܐ ܗܕܐ ܥܠ
← ܠܡܐܡܪ. ܕܥܠ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܘ ܬܠܬܐ ܣܗ̈ܕܝܢ ܬܩܘܡ ܟܠ ܡܠܐ :
— ܢܡܘܣܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܫܠܝܚܝܬܐ ܡܟܪܙ. ܒܪܡ ܘܣܗܕ̈ܘܬܐ
— ܝܬܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܐܢ ܨܒܝܢ ܢܩܒܠܘܢ ܡܩܛܓܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܩܛܓܪܝܢ :
— ܕܒܗܝܢ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܒܗ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܕܥܝܢ
— ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ. ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪܐ : ܐܡܪܢܐ
— ܘܐܦ ܒܗ ܐܡܪܢܢ : ܒܕ ܠܡܬܢܝܐܘ̈ܬܢ ܡܢܗܪ ܡܟܝܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ

---

A

and shows the single meaning in the terms by saying: 'But when I say "God", be illumined by one light and by three; by three in properties or hypostases, * if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead'.

Who can worthily extoll Christ our true God who, in his constant care for truth, frees those who love him from all hurt in many ways, especially in the heat of trials, but frustrates the evil plans of those wont to fight with him, who have set their hope upon a lie, so that one needs no extensive contest to make an easy escape from their machinations and ruses? For is there anybody, save the very simple and naive, who will not recognize the villainy of this cunning sophist? For had this passage by the Theologian really been quoted earlier, by what sequence of thought could one who says with such pride and drunken exaltation perhaps we may be criticized on the grounds that the proof is defective and constructed with only a couple of testimonies and again nevertheless critics of the statement may, if they like, have further testimonies leave aside the quotation of many testimonies, as he says, yet, on the other hand, repeat himself by quoting the very passage of the Theologian given a little earlier as if it were something strange and quite unquoted hitherto? Will not everybody rightly laugh at one who pretends that he will be criticized by others for introducing, in confirmation of his opinion, only a couple of testimonies and who with so much loftiness, promises immediately to produce other patristic statements, yet who, before the quotation of the other testimonies,

**63** cf. Is. 28:15; 30:12; Ier. 13:25 **69/71** cf. supra, 47-49 **71/72** cf. supra, 51-52



— ܒܪ̈ܒܘܗܝ : ܘܠܚܕ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܚܘܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ :
← ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ، ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܒܚܕ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ
← ܘܒܬܠܬܐ. ܒܬܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܒܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܐܢ
← ܐܢܫ ܪܚܡܐ * ܠܗܟܢ ܠܡܩܪܝܘ ܐܘ ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ f. 56ra
← ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܚܢܢ : ܟܡܐ ܕܐ̈ܝܕܗ ܒܗ ܕ̈ܐܝܕܗ
← ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܡܫܬܘܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ. ܒܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܒܚܕ
← ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ⁘

ܡܢܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܘܐ ܢܫܒܚ ܕܢܥܒܕ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܢ ܫܪܝܪܐ. ܗܘ ܕܒܝܕ ܒܛܝܠܘܬ ܢܝܦ ܕܫܪܪܐ : ܕܒܢܝܐ ܦ̈ܓܥܢܐ ܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܒܚܘܡܐ ܕܢܣܝܘܢܐ : ܠܐܘܚܕܘܗܝ، ܗܘ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܣܘܓܐܐܝܬ ܡܢܝܪ. ܠܬܘܥܟܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܢ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܗܘܢ ܕܥܡܗ ܡܥܕܝܢ ܕܢܬܟܬܫܘܢ : ܘܥܠ ܕܓܠܬܐ ܠܣܒܪܗܘܢ ܣܡܘ ܡܛܠ : ܐܡܬܝ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܢܫ ܥܠ ܐܓܘܢܐ ܣܓܝܐܐ ܢܣܬܢܩ : ܠܡܦܠܛ ܗܝ، ܕܡܢ ܡܚ̈ܫܒܬܗܘܢ ܘܡܟ̈ܐܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܦܫܝܩܐܝܬ ܢܥܪܘܩ. ܠܡܢܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܦܫܝܛ ܦܫܝܛܝܢ ܘܬܡܝܡܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ : ܠܐ ܗܘܬ ܝܕܝܥܐ ܡܬܛܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܣܘܦܝܣܛܐ ܢܟܝܠܐ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܒܩܕܡܐ ܗܕܐ ܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܝܬܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܫܒܝܠܐ : ܐܝܕܐ ܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ : ܠܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ
— ܒܫܘܒܗܪܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܘܪܘܡܘܬܐ ܡܪܘܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ⁘ ܕܟܒܪ
— ܡܛܠ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܚܣܝܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ : ܘܟܕ
— ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܒܡܒܢܝܐ ܐܬܬܩܢܬ ⁘ ܘܬܘܒ ⁘ ܒܪܡ
— ܘܣ̈ܗܕܘܬܐ ܝܬܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܐܢ ܨܒܝܢ ܢܣܒܘܢ ܡܥܩ̈ܒܢܐ
— ܕܦܬܓܡܐ ⁘ ܕܢܫܒܘܩ ܡܢ ܣܝܡܐ ܕܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܗܘ ܐܡܪ : ܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܠܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ ܣܝܡܐ : ܐܝܟ ܐܟܣܢܝܬܐ ܠܡ ܡܕܡ ܘܕܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܠܐ ܒܕܒܝܠ ܐܬܬܝܬܝܬ ܬܘܒ ܢܓܚܟ ܢܬܐ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܟܠܢ ܢܬܓܚܟ : ܗܘ ܕܢܒܣܪ ܡܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ : ܕܟܕ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܬܩܛܪܓ : ܡܛܠ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܣ̈ܗܕܘܬܐ ܘܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܫܘܪܪܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܐܝܬܝ، : ܘܟܕ ܒܟܠܗ ܗܕܐ ܡܥܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܐ ܕܐܦ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܒܬܪ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ ܡܝܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܬܐ : ܘܩܕܡ ܣܝܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܒ̈ܪܘܫܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ : ܚܕܐ ܙܒܢ ܡܢ

A

repeats again one of the couple of earlier testimonies, introducing it and stating it in settlement of the point at issue? Yet why, if he judged it right to recall, before the quotation of the other testimonies he promised, the statement by the Theologian which had already been quoted previously, as he said in the very passage, did he not also recall the proof-text, annexed to it, from the God-clad patriarch?

It is marvellous how God, who ever unmasks the mischief of wicked thoughts and unlawful doings, has wisely * darkened his counsels and mocked his furtive acts. For although the benefit of the majority did not require him to be mocked so absurdly, and although no shame would have been attached to him on the part of men of sound sense if he had corrected himself with frankness and civility, and had done with candour what he did with a shame befitting evil slaves and slanderers (for being men and endued with natural weakness we are unable not to err daily, as it were). No, it is clear that he was so swollen and inflated with boundless vanity that he judged it more expedient to besmear himself with the stain of falsification and godless calumny as well as with wicked and filthy heresy, than to escape a severe condemnation by confessing and rectifying his faults with a humble mind. Therefore to this presumptuous, sacrilegious author too let our God-clad SEVERUS' plain trumpet of doctrine resound aright with what he said also to someone who so reprehensibly ventured similar things: Therefore, what penalty would this good fellow not have endured if, on being in contention over some question in a lawsuit, he concealed or excised a text of the documents produced for examination? Would not both his hands and his very tongue have been cut off? But because the

105/113 Sev. Ant., loco non reperto



ܘܠܡ ܬܐܘܡܝܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܡܢܬܚܝܬܐ ܗܦܟܝܢ ܡܒܪܟܝܢ : ܘܠܦܘܢܝܐ ܕܗܘ، ܕܐܬܬ ܠܘܬܗ ܣܘܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܘܥܡܗ. ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܢ ܗܘ ܘܕܘܪܘܩܐ ܕ : ܕܢܩܘܡ ܡܬܢܝܬܐ ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܡ ܕܐܡܪܬܘܢ : ܢܬܒܥܘܢ ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܗܝ، ܕܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܒܗ ܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܬܬܬܬ : ܠܐ ܘܠܬܚܘܬܐ ܗܝ، ܕܢܩܦܐܬ ܡܘܟܐ ܠܗ ܕܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܐܬܚܡܝ.

ܘܠܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܕܟܠܝܘܡ ܠܡܦܪܣܝܘ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܘܕܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܠܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܐ ܡܦܪܣܐ : ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ * ܘܠܡܚܫܟܘ ܕܗܢܐ ܐܘܥܕܢܝ : ܘܠܓܢܝܒܬܐ ܒܡܓܚܟܘܬܐ ܒܙܚ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܒܡܘܬܪܢܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ ܕܗܘܝܢܐ ܫܒܪܐܝܬ ܢܬܓܚܟ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ : ܘܠܐ ܚܕܐ ܒܗܬܬܐ ܡܢܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ. ܡܢ ܓܒܪ̈ܐ ܗܘܢܢܐ ܕܫܠܡܢ ܒܦܪܗܣܝܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܦܪܗܣܝܐ ܘܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ ܢܩܢܘܗܝ ܬܪܝܨ : ܘܗܕܝܐ ܗܝ، ܕܥܡ ܒܗܬܬܐ ܕܦܐܝܐ ܠܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܒܝܫ̈ܐ ܘܡܠܫ̈ܢܐ ܥܒܪ ܒܦܪ̈ܘܓܝܐ ܢܚܐ ܒܗ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܟܚܝܢܢ ܕܒ ܒܢܝ̈ܐ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܘܠܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܟܝܢܐ ܡܩܠܦܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܠܡܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܢܫܦܠ. ܐܠܐ ܢܒܝܚܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ : ܕܒ ܒܡܛܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܡܚܒܠ ܘܢܦܝܚ : ܕܦܩܚܐ ܠܗ ܡܠܬܐ ܕ : ܕܢܗܡܐ ܡܪܕܘܬܐ ܒܫܘܝܬܐ ܘܡܥܠܝܬܐ : ܐܦ ܠܗ ܠܛܘܠܫܬܐ ܕܙܝܦܘܬܐ ܘܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܣܒ ܒܢܦܫܗ : ܐܘ ܒܪ ܬܘܪܥܘܬܐ ܡܚܒܠܬܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܝܢܐ ܘܬܪܝܨܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܩܒܠܘܬܗ : ܡܢ ܫܘܒܚܐ ܡܟܝܟܐ ܒܗܘܢܐ. ܡܛܠ ܐܦ ܠܗ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܬܚܬܢܐ ܡܪܘܚܐ ܘܡܚܠܠ ܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ : ܣܘܝܪܐ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܘܡܠܦܢܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܝܫ ܠܡܪܝ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܒܐܝܬܝܬ ܢܩܘܫ : ܐܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܠܘܬ ܐܢܫ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ ܡܫܟܚܢܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ ÷ ܐܝܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܣܘܡܟܐ ܠܐ ܫܒܩ ܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܛܒܐ : ܐܢ ܗ̈ܘ ܒܕܝܢܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܡܘܕܥܢܐ : ܟܬܒܐ ܐܘ ܦܣܩ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܒܐ f. 56rb

A

discussion concerns divine doctrines and he has ventured to do this very thing in connection with the faith than which there is nothing higher for believers and those who perceive the truth, no condemnation can be laid down for him by men, but we abandon it to him who said *Vengeance is mine, I will repay!*

These words of the doctor are aimed at him. But our humble selves earnestly beseech sober-minded readers not to spurn their redemption but to use these and similar arguments (which clearly guide them to the truth), with intelligence and the right vigilance, so that, deriving sustenance from them for the rebuttal of error, they may (ere their minds are enmeshed and enslaved in falsehood by the weight of sufferings, long habit and time), easily and very wisely illumine their souls with orthodox, patristic doctrines and become entirely free from participation in blasphemies against God, the wickedness of which has been made clear frequently and shall be again, with our Lord Jesus Christ, directing our discourse to examine * the rest of the doctors' words.

112/113 Rom. 12:19



‹ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܡܠܬܐ : ܘܥܠ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܠܝܬ ܡܕܡ
‹ ܠܥܠ ܡܢܗ : ܠܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܫܪܪܐ : ܗܝ
‹ ܗܕܐ ܐܡܪܢ ܕܢܫܬܪܐ : ܠܐ ܡܢ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܡܬܚܝܒܘ
« ܥܠܘܗܝ ܫܘܒܩܢܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܫܠܡܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ : ܕܕܝܠܝ ܗܝ
« ܬܒܥܬܐ ܘܐܢܐ ܐܦܪܘܥ ܀

ܘܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܠܦܢܐ. ܠܘܬܗ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܨܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܦܓܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܠܡܝܢ ܥܡ ܒܝܢܬܐ ܡܦܝܣܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܢܫܘܛܘܢ ܒܦܘܪܩܢܗܘܢ ܢܒܣܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܕܒܗ ܒܗܢ ܡܫܟܠܢܘܬܐ ܘܫܪܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܙܕܩܐ : ܡܬܬܪܣܝܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܛܠܠܐ ܕܡܠܐܟܐ ܠܘܬ ܥܙܝܙܐ ܡܬܕܪܝܢ ܘܒܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܘܕܒܪܐ ܢܗܝܪܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܠܘܬ ܡܫܡܫܢܘܬܐ ܕܫܘܠܡܐ : ܘܠܘܩܒܠܗ ܘܦܓܪ ܡܬܚܟܡܝܢ : ܡܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܕܚܫܐ ܘܡܬܚܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܘܝܕܥܐ : ܬܚܘܬ ܘܬܬܕܒܪ ܬܪܥܝܬܗܘܢ ܒܕܝܠܗܘܢ : ܒܡܠܦܢܐ ܬܪܝܨܐ ܘܐܒܗܝܐ ܢܫܒܘܢ ܢܦܫܗܘܢ. ܘܢܦܪܩܘܢ ܠܗ ܡܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܒܓܘܕܦܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܝܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܒܙܒ̈ܢܐ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܗܘܬ. ܘܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܢܗܘܐ : ܥܡ ܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܘܬ ܒܘܚܢܐ * ܕܫܪܟܐ ܕܒܢܝ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܡܠܟܢ ܬܪܝܨܐ.

f. 56va

A

## Chapter 7

*Examination of Saint Severus' statement in which he says that substance is indicative of the community but hypostasis of the property. And demonstration of the fact that in his aim of utterly concealing the truth and so avoiding rebuttals, the author avoids saying where the majority of the proof-texts, he puts forward, came from, whereas the holy fathers for each proof-text proclaim clearly not only the author of the work but also the themes of the writings, and thereby make the truth manifest.*

So let us pass on to the statement of our God-clad father Severus which is set out next, from which this author attempts to establish something or other of his evil opinion again. Having said, indeed, as previously set down, For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius writing against heresies and saying such-and-such, without anything intervening he adds: And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea: 'For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property'? Having set this down, therefore, I reminded the listener and said: 'Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis "indicative of the property"'.

13/14 Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa*, ubi iteratur *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (n° 14); cf. supra, ch. 3, 198-200 **15/23** Ibid.; cf. supra, ch. 3, 204-211

## ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܫܒܥܐ.

ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ : ܕܒܗ̇ ܐܡܪ
ܕܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ. ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܒܕ ܢܝܫܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ
ܠܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ : ܕܒܥܐ ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܢܚܦܐ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܘܗܟܢܐ ܢܥܪܘܩ ܡܢ
ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ : ܐܡܪ ܠܗ̇، ܕܐܝܡܟܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
ܣܓܝܐܬܗܝܢ ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܕܡܩܪܒ. ܟܕ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܥܠ
ܟܠ ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܐܒܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ :
ܐܠܐ ܘܠܨ̈ܒܝܢܐ ܕܡܟܬ̈ܒܢܘܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܐܝܬ ܡܟܪܙܝܢ : ܘܒܕ
ܟܠܗܘܢ ܓܠܝܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܀

ܥܒܪܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܘܢ 1
ܣܘܝܪܐ ܕܣܝܡܐܝܬ ܩܕܡܝܬ ܢܚܪܐ. ܕܡܢܗ̇ ܡܚܝܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܡܢ
ܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ ܕܢܩܝܡ ܡܬܬܪܨܐ ܠܐ
— ܡܬܚܝܠ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܩܕܡ ܣܝܡܐ : ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ
— ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ
— ܗܟܢ ܀ ܘܠܐ ܡܨܥܝܘܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܘܣܦ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܀
— ܘܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܕܦܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܩܣܪܝܐ
← ܘܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ
← ܒܓܘܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ : ܡܬܒܠܒܠܐ
← ܘܡܬܚܒܠܐ ܠܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܠܝܬ
← ܡܕܡ ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܚܘܠܦܗܘܢ ܘܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ : ܘܠܘܬܗܘܢ، ܗܢܐ ܡܢ
← ܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ : ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܀ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ
— ܟܕ ܣܡܬ : ܐܥܗܕܬ ܠܫܡܘܥܐ ܘܐܡܪܬ : ܚܘܪ ܗܘ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ
— ܚܒܝܒܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܀

A

Lines 21-22: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ..... ܘܠܘܬܗܘܢ, cf. ch. 3, lines 233-234 and note.

Even though it be considered trifling, nevertheless, it will suffice to demonstrate the writer's perverse approach to the points under discussion, that he is unwilling to indicate clearly where the majority of the proof-texts he sets down come from. For there are various volumes written by Saint Epiphanius against heresies containing, correspondingly, many tomes, and he took the above words from the first tome of the third volume *Against Heresies* without indicating either the volume or the tome from which they come. He only said For what are we to say of Saint Epiphanius, writing against heresies and saying. And again here, though there are various books against the Grammarian of Caesarea * and chapters not few in number (for which reason he ought to have indicated the book and the chapter from which he has quoted the proof-text by our holy father Severus, for the sake of those intending to examine the documents closely), negligent of all this, he wrote: And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea? What could be easier than saying, 'And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea and says in the 17th chapter of the second book against him?' if, as we said before, his sole aim was not to try to conceal the truth of what he says and quotes, in ways both great and small?

So, with the aim that readers may understand the plainness and exactitude in every detail on the part of the divinely inspired fathers and this novel author's carelessness and want of judgement, it will not be profitless to recall a few words by the same proven father SEVERUS, which are set down in the first chapter of the fifth book of his treatise *Against Felicissimus* and are as follows: But by usefully repeating these things to you, I have made

---

**32/33** cf. supra, 13-14 **38/39** cf. supra, 15-16 **51/69** Sev. Ant., *C. Feliciss.*, V, 1 (fragm. hucusque incognitum)



ܐܦܢ ܕܒܙܘܪܬܐ ܡܣܬܒܪܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܣܦܩܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ
ܠܡܥܩܡܘܬܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܐ : ܕܠܘܬ ܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܠܝܢ
ܕܡܬܒ̈ܥܝܢ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܐ ܨ̇ܒܐ ܕܬܫܘܕܥܬܐ ܦܣܝܩܐܝܬ ܡܢ
ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܣܐܡ : ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܘܕܥ ܕܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܒܪ
ܓܝܪ ܕܟܬ̈ܒܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ
ܠܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܡܟܬܒܢ : ܦ̈ܢܩܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܣܘܓܐܐܝܬ
ܘܛܘܡ̈ܣܐ ܕܗܘܘ̈ܢ : ܣܡ ܡܢ ܛܘܡܣܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ
ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܣܝܡ̈ܢ : ܟܕ
ܠܐ ܚܘܝ ܐܘ ܠܟܬܒܐ ܐܘ ܠܛܘܡܣܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܢܗ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
— ܥܒܕ. ܐܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܡ̣ܪ ❖ ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ
— ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ ❖ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܕܝܢ
ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܡܐܡ̈ܪܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܩܣܪܝܐ : * ܘܩܦ̈ܠܐܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܡܢܝܢ A, f. 56vb
ܒܡܢܝܢܐ : ܘܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܠܡܐܡܪܐ
ܘܠܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܢܫܘܕܥ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܢܗ ܐܝܬܝ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ
ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܡܫܬܐܠܝܢ ܠܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܟܬ̈ܒܐ
ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܕܢܒܨܘܢ : ܟܕ ܒܟܠܗܝܢ ܦܫܥ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ ❖
— ܘܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܕܦܬܓܡ ܠܘܬ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܩܣܪܝܐ
— ܘܐܡܪ ❖ ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܦܫܝܩ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܐܡܪ :
ܘܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܕܦܬܓܡ ܠܘܬ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܩܣܪܝܐ :
ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܫܒܥܬܥܣܪ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܐܡܪ :
ܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ : ܚܕܐ ܣܘܟܐ ܐܝܬ
ܠܗ̇ ܘܒܙܥܘܪ̈ܬܐ ܘܒܪ̈ܘܪܒܬܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܠܡܛܫܝܘ ܠܫܪܪܐ
ܕܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܗ ܡܬܐܡܪܢ ܘܡܬܬܝܬܝܢ.

ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܢܕܥܘܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܩܪ̈ܝܢ : ܒܪܝܪܘܬܐ
ܘܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ ܕܒܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܢܦܝ̈ܚܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ :
ܘܡܡܣܡܣܢܘܬܗ ܘܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܗ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ : ܠܐ
ܕܠܐ ܝܘܬܪܢܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܬܕܟܪܘܢ ܩܠܝܠ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܘܚܪܢܐ ܐܒܐ
ܕܝܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ : ܕܣܝ̈ܡܢ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ
ܕܚܡܫܐ ܕܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܦܠܝܩܣܝܡܘܣ ܕܗܟܢܐ
< ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ❖ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܡܥܗܕܐܝܬ ܠܟ ܐܡܪܢܐ : ܠܚܢ̈ܬ

---

A

known the doctor's words, put to shame the asinine and contentious ears of the impious, and demonstrated with clarity to the listeners the soundness of his profession, which takes no delight in the heretical, unsound and implausible fabrications which they have wickedly ventured to publish against him. Julian fabricates the name only (I mean, of Saint Peter the martyr) whereas Felicissimus has encompassed holy Timothy too, in his fabrication, falsely quoting his book to make the deception of his pen plausible, and this despite our making known the author of the discourse at every testimony, and clearly announcing the intentions of the writings and the number of the books which are devoted to the intentions and the long-standing causes which each quoted testimony has been concerned with. For this is the way with truth and the words of the wisdom from on high which goes forth and has free expression, and shows the light to everyone. For according to the sacred word of Proverbs: *Wisdom is honoured in the streets and in the market-places she lifts up her voice, on the walls, indeed, is she proclaimed.* But slander and falsehood are fond of hiding under the covering of tricks, just as thieves and bandits love to hide behind walls and darkness.

* These things being thus said by the wise and careful doctor, come now, let us rely upon his prayers and elucidate the meaning of this careful statement of his which is set down for examination, so that captious criticism and lying slander against him may be dispersed like smoke and the discussion lead us rightly to the destruction of the schemes devised by this clever writer against other divinely-inspired doctors.

So what does this cunning fellow want to claim from the fact that the doctor says: For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the sub-

---

**65/67** Prov. 1:20-21 **78/83** cf. supra, 16-21



› ܩܠܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܘܕܥܬ: ܟܕ ܠܡܫܡܥܬܐ ܚܡܪܢܝܬܐ
› ܘܚܪܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܪ̈ܫܝܥܐ ܡܟܣܕ ܐܢܐ: ܘܗ̇ܝ ܕܬܘܕܝܬܗ ܚܠܝܡܘܬܐ
› ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܡܚܘܐ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܫܡܥܝܢ: ܕܠܐ ܪ̈ܓܝܓܐ
› ܒܦܘܠܚܢ̈ܐ ܗܪ̈ܛܝܩܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܪ̈ܝܪܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܦܝܣܐ: ܗܠܝܢ
› ܕܪܫܝܥܐܝܬ ܕܐܡܪܚܘ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܐܦܪܣܘ. ܝܘܠܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܟܕ
› ܠܫܡܗ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܣܗܕܐ
› ܓܒܠ: ܦܠܝܩܣܝܣܝܡܘܣ ܕܝܢ: ܘܠܛܝܡܬܐܘܣ ܩܕܝܫܐ
› ܒܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܚܒܩ: ܟܕ ܠܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܐܬܚܒܪ ܕܓܠܐܝܬ:
› ܕܠܡܓܠܝܘܢܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܝܐ ܦܝܣܐ ܢܣܒ. ܘܗܕܐ ܟܕ ܚܢܢ ܒܟܠ
› ܣܗܕܘܬܐ: ܘܠܡܪܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܡܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܟܪܙܝܢ
› ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ: ܘܨܒܝܢܐ ܕܡܟܬ̈ܒܢܘܬܐ: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܐܡ̈ܪܐ
› ܕܡܛܝܢ ܠܨܒܝܢܐ: ܘܥܠ̈ܠܬܐ ܥܬ̈ܝܩܬܐ ܕܡܬܬܠܝܗܝܢ
› ܒܠܫܢܐ ܡܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܬܬܬܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܫܪܪܐ:
› ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܚܟܡܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ: ܕܢܦܩܐ ܘܦܪܝܣܐ ܠܗ̇
› ܦܪܗܣܝܐ: ܘܡܚܘܝܐ ܠܟܠ ܐܢܫ ܢܘܗܪܐ: ܐܝܟ ܡܐ ܕܒܪ
» ܡܠܬܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܡܬܠܐ: ܚܟܡܬܐ ܒܫܘܩ̈ܐ ܡܫܬܒܚܐ
» ܘܒܦܠܛܝܐ ܡܪܝܡܐ ܩܠܗ̇. ܥܠ ܫܘܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܟܪܙܐ ❖
› ܠܥܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܕܓܠܘܬܐ ܪܚܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܛܫܢ ܒܬܘܦܐ
› ܕܢܟ̈ܠܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܓܢ̈ܒܐ ܘܠܓܝ̈ܣܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܛܫܘܢ
› ܒܫܘܪ̈ܐ ܘܒܚܫܘܟܐ ܢܛܫܘܢ ❖ * f. 57ra

ܗܠܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܘܚܦܝܛܐ ܐܬܐܡܪ̈ܝ:
ܐܬܐ ܕܟܕ ܥܠ ܨܠܘ̈ܬܗ ܬܬܟܠܝܢ: ܘܗܘܢܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܡܠܬܗ ܚܦܝܛܬܐ
ܕܣܝܡܐ ܠܒܘܚܢܐ ܢܦܫܩ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܟܕ ܒܥܘܩܐ
ܘܡܦܪܣܘܬܐ ܕܓܠܬܐ ܥܠܘܗܝ، ܐܝܟ ܬܢܢܐ ܢܬܒܕܪ:
ܘܡܫܩܠܛܐ ܒܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܠܡܬܠ ܚܘܫܒ̈ܐ ܕܪܘܡܢܐ: ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܠܒ̈ܢܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܦ̈ܢܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ: ܠܗܢܐ
ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ.

ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܨܒܐ ܗܢܐ ܢܟܝܠܐ ܕܢܬܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܗܝ ܕܐܡܪ
› ܡܠܦܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ❖ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܟܠܗ
› ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܒܓܘܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܟܠܗ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ:

---

A

stance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property? It is that he calls the hypostasis indicative of the property. For the holy patriarch by saying the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property, has declared that hypostasis, being indicative of the property, is the property!

First, then, let the fair-minded listener remember what we said, and understand that this excellent fellow does not make the defence, just uttered, against us but against those, rather, who do not call the hypostasis 'property' at all. For, as we have said hosts of times, we have no quarrel over whether we may term the hypostases simply 'properties', but over our affirmation that it is improper to reckon the hypostases of the Holy Trinity (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) as characteristic properties. Later on we shall examine more closely the meaning of those texts and scrutinize the senselessness of the unwholesome doctrines. For, notice, the clever fellow says: The father called the hypostasis 'indicative of the property' – meaning the characteristic property. 'Why', someone will ask him, 'should the doctor be defining the hypostasis as indicative of the characteristic property and not be using the term "property" as indicative of a single substrate and prosopon, because not only the characteristic property but also a single prosopon is, as has been said, termed "property" by the fathers?' However, let it be the case (if he likes) that hypostasis is indicative of the characteristic property; why then should the hypostasis be the characteristic property? Is it * because it indicates the characteristic property (to grant this point by way of concession)? But why must it be inferred, since indicator and indicated are not neces-

**83** cf. supra, 23 **84/85** cf. supra, 82-83 **97/98** cf. supra, 23



[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
— [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] f. 57rb
[illegible]

A flor. II from l. 105 on

Lines 87-88: [illegible] ….. [illegible], cf. ch. 3, lines 233-234 and note.

sarily always the same, that because the hypostasis is indicative of the characteristic property it must be the characteristic property?



ܘܡܢ ܠܦܢܘܗ܆ ܗ̇ܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܂ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܡܬܝܕܥܐ܆ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܘܣܡܐ܆ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܂

A flor. II

Line 115: ܡܛܠ, flor. II: ܕܡܛܠ.

## Chapter 8

*Concerning the fact that in attempting to prove from the above-mentioned statement by our father Severus that the hypostasis is the characteristic property, because the doctor said that the hypostasis indicates the property, the excellent fellow is plainly refuted on the ground that he understands indicator and indicated, characterizer and characterized, signifier and signified as being throughout the same thing. And sufficient examination of the fathers' words on this point; from which it is again demonstrated that it is highly impious, as well as senseless, to profess the characteristic properties of the substance as substance.*

But perhaps he will say that indicator and indicated, characterizer and characterized, signifier and signified, are the same thing and that it is appropriate for him to quote, as patristic testimonies in 'confirmation' of it, this one by the Theologian, who says, as has been shown in the preceding, For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three); and that one as he set it out in chapter 15 of his book, by holy PROCLUS, who wrote, By confessing the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, we do not, by means of the number, import three Gods into the faith, for the Godhead is indicative of the substance. However, he also adduces wise and proven Severus, who, as he supposes, confirms his opinion. He says this, in fact, about Severus in the letter written by his wise self and by certain of his bishops to the holy bishops of the Eastern province: As you are yourselves aware, the patriarch Severus, like him, distinguished substance and hypostasis for us by defining the former

---

**16/18** cf. supra, ch. 5, 98-100 **20/22** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 15; Procl. Constantinop., *Ep. uniform.* (*ACO* IV, 2, p. 65, 27-28) **26/43** Dam. Alex., *Ep. ad episc. Orientis*

## ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܡܝܢܝܐ.

ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܡܠܐ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ ܕܐܒܘܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ: ܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܡܛܠ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ: ܡܬܟܣܣ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ: ܕܟܕ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܝܕܥ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ: ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܪܫܡ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܬܪܫܡ: ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܚܘܐ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܬܚܘܐ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܣܦܩ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܕܒܢܬ ܩܠܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ. ܕܡܢܗ ܬܘܒ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ: ܕܐܦ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܘܕܐ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ: ܣܓܝ ܪܫܝܥܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܘܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܀

ܝ ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܟܒܪ ܗܘ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ: ܘܕܡܪܫܡ ܘܡܬܪܫܡ: ܘܡܚܘܐ ܘܡܬܚܘܐ. ܘܠܘܬ ܫܘܪܪܐ ܠܗ ܕܗܕܐ: ܠܡܝܬܝܘ ܠܗ ܕܘܟܪܢܐ: ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ. ܗܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ

< ܕܒܡܠܝ ܕܩܕܡܝ̈ܢ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܀ ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ

< ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܗ̇ܢ ܡܢ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ

< ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܀

ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܬܥܣܪ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ

< ܗܘ: ܕܦܪܘܩܠܘܣ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܟܬܒ ܀ ܕܟܕ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ

< ܩܕܝܫܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ: ܠܘ ܬܠܬܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܢܝܢܐ ܡܥܠܝܢ ܥܠ

< ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ: ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇

< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܘܠܗ ܠܚܟܝܡܐ ܘܒܚܝܪܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ

ܠܡܝܬܝܐ ܡܢܬܐ: ܘܠܬܘܕܝܬܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܡܫܪܪ. ܗܠܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܐܡܪ: ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܩ̈ܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܦܪܘܟܝܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ ܕܐܬܟܬܒܬ ܡܢ ܚܟܡܬܗ: ܘܡܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܡܢ

— ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܘܗܝ ܀ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܣܒܝܒܐ

— ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ: ܟܕ ܡܦܪܫ ܠܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ: ܘܗ̇ܝ

---

A

as indicative of the community * but the latter as indicative of the property. For that reason, we set out only this short selection of the many passages as a reminder for you. Now, if certain parties elaborate upon these quotations, asserting that the properties they recognize as hypostases also, are one thing, and the characteristic properties of those hypostases are another thing, and are fearful about the form of speech, let them tell us how the wise patriarch said that hypostasis is characteristic of a substrate, and let them admit hypostases of hypostases. To make the point clear for readers, we will quote expressly the very text of the doctor from the fourth chapter of the second book of the work *Against the Caesarean*, which contains the following: 'This, then, to sum up, is what we are saying: that substance is indicative of the community and the generic sense, whereas hypostasis is characteristic of a single separate substrate which we term also 'prosopon' when it exists in its own proper subsistence, whether it be simple or brought together into indivisible union by composition'. And again, he writes a few lines later concerning our same divinely inspired father: The same doctor instructs us again in what follows, by saying: 'But in that other there is a great and wide difference. For substance is indicative of the genus and the sense inclusive of many species, whereas hypostasis is a determination of some one species i.e. it is indicative of the prosopon which has by its property non-participation with the fellow-members of the genus, and embraces the substrate in its proper mark'.

**38/43** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 4 (*CSCO* 111, pp. 80,26 - 81,4; *112*, p. 63, 26-31) **44/50** Dam. Alex., *Ep. ad episc. Orientis* **45/50** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (*CSCO* 111, p. 57, 14-20; *112*, p. 45, 22-29)



ܗ̇ܝ ܕܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܚܘܝܢܐ: ܗ̇ܝ * ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ — A, f. 57va
ܕܐܦ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ. ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ
ܗܠܝܢ ܙܥܘܪ̈ܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܥܘܗܕܢܐ ܕܝܠܟܘܢ ܣܡܢ ܗܟܝܠ. ܐܢ
ܕܝܢ ܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܬ̈ܢܝܢ ܩܠܐ ܐܘܣܦܐܝܬ ܡܡܠܠܝܢ:
ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܕܥܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ: ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܬܐ
ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ: ܘܡܛܠ ܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܚܠܝܢ: ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܠܢ
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ: ܕܕܝܠܢܝ ܕܩܢܘܡ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܣܘܡܟܐ ܡܣܝܡܐ: ܘܢܬܠܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܕܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ
ܬܗܘܐ ܠܩܪ̈ܘܝܐ ܕܦܫܝܩܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ: ܠܗ̇ ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ
ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܗ̇ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܬܢܝܢܐ: ܕܡܢ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ
ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܩܣܪܝܐ: ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ̇
ܗܟܢܐ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܣܘܟܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ
ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܘܕܓܢܣܢܝܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܦܪܝܫ ܕܣܝܡ
ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ. ܠܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢܢ ܐܡܬܝ،
ܕܒܕܝܠܝܬ ܩܘܝܡܐ ܐܬܩܝܡ: ܘܐܢ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܘܐܢ
ܡܢ ܪܘܟܒܐ ܠܚܕܝܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܢܝܬܐ ܡܟܢܫ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܟܬܒ ܒܬܪ
ܙܥܘܪ̈ܬܐ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܕܠܗ ܕܢܫܝܡ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ
ܚܠܦ ܗܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܬܘܒ ܗܘ ܗ̣ܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܪܕܐ ܠܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ
ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܗܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ: ܒܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܘܡܣܓܝܐ
ܫܘܚܠܦܐ. ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ: ܕܓܢܣܐ ܘܕܓܢܣܢܝܐ ܐܚܝܕܐ
ܕܐܕ̈ܫܐ ܣ̈ܓܝܐܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ
ܬܚܘܡܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ. ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ. ܕܠܘܬ ܥܒܘܪ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ: ܗ̇ܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ: ܘܥܡ ܒ̈ܢܝ ܓܢܣܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ
ܢܣܒ ܀

A

Line 32: ܡܢ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ, cf. ch. 10, line 81 (ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ).
Line 37: ܕܦܫܝܩܝܢ ..... ܬܗܘܐ, cf. ch. 11, line 26 (ܬܗܘܐ ..... ܠܗ̇ܘܢ).
Line 44: ܐܬܩܝܡ, cf. ch. 11, line 33 (ܩܝܡ).
Line 52: ܕܠܘܬ, cf. ch. 11, line 50 (ܠܘܬ ܒܕ). ܗ̇ܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ, cf. ch. 11, line 51 (ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ).

When Damian says this and quotes these words, what are we to say, except that his heresy obtains all its supposed force, by mixing up and muddling the various senses through the similarity or sameness of the terms and words? For above, in the matters previously examined, the excellent fellow muddlingly mixes up the names and the properties and the hypostases, and defines them as mutually identical, compounding, so to say, a single cup of impious confusion; * whereas here he battles against the truth insatiably, and, as it were filled full with falsehood, tries by these absurd attacks, to decree with a general canon, as it were, that all indicators, signifiers and characterizers are the same as the indicated, signified and characterized. Otherwise, by what necessity of valid reasonings does he struggle to prove (if it so happens that the characteristic property is indicated by the hypostasis and the hypostasis is characterized by the property) that the hypostasis and its characteristic property are mutually identical, unless he reckons as absolutely identical all characterizers and characterized, indicators and indicated, and all signifiers and signified? For were he to posit as absolutely different from one another indicators and indicated, characterizers and characterized, and likewise signifiers and signified, his aim would have the opposite conclusion. He would be compelled to acknowledge that the characteristic properties of the hypostases are one thing, and the hypostases characterized by them another thing. But if, again, he defines some of the characterizers and characterized, signifiers and signified, and again, some indicators and indicated as being identical, but some as not being identical, it will thus be impossible for him to prove from the God-clad patriarch's speaking of the hypostasis as 'characterizing the property', that the hypostasis is the characteristic property (even were one to grant him that the hypostasis is indicative of the characteristic property) until he gives a grounding to this



ܒܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܘܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ : ܡܢܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܚܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢ : ܐܠܐ ܕܗܪܣܝܣ ܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܚܒܠܐ ܘܡܒܠܒܠܐ
ܒܝܕ ܕܡܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܒܗ̇ ܗ̣ܝ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܘܕܡ̈ܠܐ :
ܠܣ̈ܘܟܠܐ ܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܐ : ܠܟܠܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܣܬܒܪ ܩܢܝܐ. ܠܥܠ ܡܢ
ܓܝܪ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡ ܐܬܒܚܢ : ܒܪ ܚܒܝܒܐܝܬ ܫܦܝܪ ܗܘܐ
ܡܚܬܪܐ : ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܘܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܘܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܬܚܘܡ ܒܗ
ܗܘܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܙܓ : ܚܕ ܟܣܐ ܐܝܟ
ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܕܒܘܠܒܠܐ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܐ ܡܠܝܐ. * ܗܪܟܐ ܕܝܢ : ܒܗ̇ ܠܐ f. 57vb
ܡܣܒܥܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܫܪܪܐ ܡܬܟܬܫ : ܘܡܢ
ܕܓܠܘܬܐ ܡܣܒܥܐܝܬ ܡܬܡܠܝܐ : ܒܡܘܢܝܐ ܣܪܝܩܐ ܐܝܟ
ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܡܦܣܩܐ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܩܢܘܢܐ ܥܡܘܡܝܐ ܕܢܦܣܘܩ :
ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܫܡܥܝܢ ܘܡܦܪܫܝܢ : ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ
ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܫܡܥܝܢ
ܘܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ. ܘܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ : ܡܢ ܐܝܕܐ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ
ܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ : ܐܢ ܡܬܟܬܫ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ
ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ : ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܦܪܫ : ܕܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ
ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ
ܕܝܠܗ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ : ܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܒܪ ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܡܢ
ܟܠܦܘܣ ܢܚܫܘܒ : ܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܦܪܫܝܢ ܘܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ :
ܘܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܡܫܡܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܫܡܥܝܢ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ
ܓܡܪ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܣ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܢܣܝܡ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ
ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܦܪܫܝܢ ܘܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ
ܕܡܫܡܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܫܡܥܝܢ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܡܣܟܠܐ ܡܬܗܦܟܢܐ ܢܩܝܫܗ. ܘܡܢ
ܟܠܗ̇ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܢܘܕܐ : ܕܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ : ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܡܢ
ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܡܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܫܡܥܝܢ :
ܘܡܦܪܫܝܢ ܘܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ : ܘܬܘܒ ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܗܠܝܢ
ܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܡܬܚܡ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ
ܗܢܘܢ : ܘܠܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ
ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܢܫܟܚ : ܕܩܢܘܡܐ
ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܐܦܢ ܢܬܠ ܠܗ ܐܢܫ ܕܕܝܠܗ̇
ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܘܕܥܢܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ : ܥܕܡܐ

A flor. II from l. 62 on

from other demonstrations. For on conceding that some indicators and indicated are different from one another, he would have good cause to learn that the ones under discussion are some of those that are different from one another. So, the upshot is that since it is his endeavour to prove (from the stated fact that the teacher of truth spoke of the hypostasis as characterizing the property) that the hypostasis is the characteristic property of the hypostasis, then he must acknowledge (as we said before), as mutually identical, indicators and indicated, characterizers and characterized, and likewise, signifiers and signified.

Therefore, let us investigate this matter before those others. Let us * clarify our understanding on this point with the help of the fathers' words and thoughts. BASIL, then wise in things divine, wrote in the *Refutation*, instructing us as follows: 'Ingenerate', if it is a name, is not a substance, for names are indicative of substances, and are not themselves substance. Again, in the first book *Against Eunomius* he also says the following: Amongst the names used of God, then, some are indicative of what belongs with God but some, on the contrary, of what 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 with him. And later on, 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

**95/97** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* IV (*PG* 29, 681 C); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 22, 115-116 **98/103** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 10 (*PG* 29, 533C; *SChr.*, vol. 299, p. 204); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 22, 63-67 **103/107** Ibid. (*PG* 29, 536B; *SChr.*, vol. 299, p. 206); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 22, 81-85



ܕܡܢ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܘܡܘܕܝܢܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܢܠܦ. ܒܐܝܢܐܝܬ ܓܝܪ ܫܦܝܪ ܗܘ ܡܘܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܕܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ ܡܢ ܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܢܗܘܐ : ܕܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܡܠܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܠܬܐ : ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ ܡܢ ܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܡܛܠ ܥܩܒܐ ܠܗ : ܕܟܕ ܡܢ ܗ̇، ܕܐܡܝܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܝܪܐ : ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ : ܐܠܨܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܕܢܘܕܐ : ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܚܡܣܢܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇، : ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܐܡܪܢܐ ܕܦܪܡܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܫܘܝ̈ܢ ܒܗ ܫܘܝ̈ܢ ܠܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܢܗܘܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܝܢܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܝܢܝܢ : ܦܘ ܗܟܘܬ ܕܝ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܣܡܢܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܣܡܢܝܢ.

ܗܟܝܠ ܩܕܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܠܗܕܐ ܢܒܥܐ. ܘܡܢ ܩ̈ܢܬ f. 58ra ܩ̈ܠܐ * ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܘܡܕܥ̈ܝܬܐ : ܢܒܗܪ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܕܡܬܡܠܠܐ ܗ̇ ܗܫܐ. ܒܣܝܠ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܗܦܘܟܝܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܚܟܝܡ ܒܐܠܗ̈ܝܬܐ
< ܒܥܠܝܘܦ : ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܡܠܦ ܗ̇، ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܫܡܐ
< ܗ، : ܠܘ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗ̇. ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
< ܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܘܠܘ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܀ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܡܐܡܪܐ
< ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܒܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ : ܡܢܗܘܢ ܡܢ
< ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ. ܡܢܗܘܢ
< ܕܝܢ ܗ̇، ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܘܬܗ. ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܝܢ
< ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܢܘܫܡܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܠܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܡܢ
< ܟܦܘܪܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܠܫܡܝ ܠܗ : ܘܡܢ ܡܘܕܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܀ ܘܒܬܪܟ ܀ ܬܘܒ ܛܒܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܐܠܗܐ
< ܘܟܐܢܐ. ܘܒܪܘܝܐ ܘܕܝܢܐ. ܘܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ.
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܒܗ̇ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ : ܟܦܘܪܐ ܡܕܡ ܘܡܪܚܩܘܬܐ
< ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢ ܗܘ̈ܝ، ܩ̈ܢܬ ܩܠܐ : ܗܟܢܐ

A flor. I for lines 101-103 and from l. 104 on (without XYZ from l. 110 on) flor. II up to l. 97

Lines 102-103: ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ..... ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 22, line 129 (ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ).

Line 109: ܕܗܠܝܢ$^{2}$, cf. Book II, ch. 22, line 73 (ܕܐܝܠܝܢ).

Line 110: ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ, cf. Book II, ch. 22, lines 88-89 (ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ).

here they indicate the positing and the existence of what is God's own and viewed as fittingly belonging with him. In the letter, too, written to his brother Gregory *On Substance and Hypostasis*, he says: One who says 'man' has effected a vague understanding in the ear by the indefiniteness of the meaning, so that the nature is signified by the term whereas the reality itself, which subsists and is signified properly, is not indicated by the term. But one who says 'Paul' has shown that the nature subsists in the reality which is signified by the name. This then is the hypostasis: not the indefinite thought of the substance, which, as a result of the generality of the object indicated, obtains no stability; but that thought which presents and delimits the common and unbounded in some reality by means of the properties appearing on it; such a thing as Scripture is wont to do too in the narrative about Job and in many other places. For because it was about to relate Job's circumstances, it first recalled what was common and said '*man*', and immediately defined him in his particularity by the addition '*a certain*'. Yet with regard to the description of the substance, since that would bring no benefit * to the proposed aim of the discourse, it was silent, whereas it characterizes '*a certain*' by its own features stating the place and the features of his mode of life and all the externals which, being taken together, would distinguish him and set him apart from the general meaning.

In similar fashion, when corresponding with the town councillors of Neocaesarea, he wrote as follows: But if it is said: *Go and baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,* we should not think on that account that a single name has been entrusted

**108/126** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 38*, 3 (*PG* 32, 328AC; Forlin Patrucco, p. 180) **120/121** cf. Iob 1:1 **123/126** cf. Iob 1:1sq. **128/141** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 210*, 4 (*PG* 32, 773BC; Courtonne, II, pp. 193-194); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 21, 32-45 **128/129** Matth. 28:19



< ܗܪܟܐ : ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܘܩܝܡܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ. ܕܒܝܬܝܢ ܠܐܠܗܐ
< ܘܦܐܝܐܝܬ ܠܘܬܗ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܡܩ̈ܘܝܢ ܀ ܘܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ
ܕܠܘܬ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܚܘܗܝ، ܕܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ
< ܐܬܟܬܒܬ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܡܪ : ܬܪܥܝܬܐ
< ܡܒܕܪܬܐ ܠܐܕܢܐ ܡܫܡܥܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܒܠܐܡܬܚܡܢܘܬܐ
< ܚܕ̈ܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܢܬܪܫܡ. ܗܘ ܨܒܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ
< ܕܡܩܝܡ ܘܡܬܐܡܪ ܕܝܠܝܐܝܬ : ܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ. ܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܢ
< ܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܐܡܪ : ܚܘܝ، ܕܒܨܒܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ
< ܡܩܝܡ ܟܝܢܐ. ܗܢܐ ܗܘ ܡܟܝܠ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܠܘ ܡܣܬܟܠܢܘܬܐ
< ܠܐ ܡܬܚܡܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܕܠܐ ܚܕ ܡܘܡܬܐ ܡܢ ܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ
< ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܡܫܬܟܚܐ. ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܓܘܢܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܣܬܝܟܐ :
< ܒܨܒܘܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܝܕ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܠܘܗܝ، ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ
< ܡܦܣܩܐ ܘܡܬܚܡܢܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܟܬܒܐ ܐܝܬ ܥܝܕܐ ܕܗܘܐ
< ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܒܐܝܘܒ. ܘܒܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܦ̈ܢܝܬܐ :
< ܘܒܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܐܢܫ. ܡܛܠ ܓܝܪ ܕܥܬܝܕ ܗܘܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܛܠܬܗ ܢܫܬܥܐ : ܩܕܡܝܬ ܥܗܕ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܓܘܢܝܐ ܐܬܐܡܪ :
< ܘܐܡܪ ܒܪܢܫܐ : ܡܚܕܐ ܦܣܩ ܠܗ̇، ܕܝܚܝܕܝܘܬܐ ܒܬܘܣܦܬܐ
< ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܢܫ. ܐܠܐ ܠܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܡ̇ܢ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܝܟ ܡܢ
< ܕܝܘܬܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܗܘܐ ܠܢܝܫܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ * ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ f. 58rb
< ܫܬܩ. ܠܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܫ ܟܕ ܥܘܗܕܢ̈ܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܐ ܡܫܘܕܥ. ܟܕ ܕܘܟܬܐ
< ܐܡܪ ܘܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܕܘܒܪܐ. ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܕܟܕ
< ܐܟܚܕܐ ܡܬܢܩ̈ܦܢ : ܦܪܫ̈ܢ ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܢܦܪܫܢܝܗܝ، ܘܢܚܝܕܢܝܗܝ، ܡܢ
< ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܘܢܝܐ ܀

ܗ̇ܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܟܬܒ ܠܘܬ ܒܘ̈ܠܘܛܐ ܕܢܐܘܩܣܪܝܐ :
< ܟܬܒ ܗܟܢܐ ܀ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܝܪܐ ܕܙܠܘ ܐܥܡܕܘ ܒܫܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ
< ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܠܘ ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܢܣܒܪ ܕܫܡܐ ܚܕ

A W up to l. 115 and from l. 138 on flor. I (without X) for lines 117-122 and 131-136

Line 114: ܗܪܟܐ, W: ܘܗܪܟܐ.
Line 119: ܗ̇ܝ, W om.
Line 132: ܗ̇ܘ, YZ: ܕܗ̇ܘ.
Line 133: ܕܘܟܬܐ, Z: ܘܕܘܟܬܐ.
Line 136: ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܘܢܝܐ, Z: ܫܘܕ̈ܥܐ ܓܘܢ̈ܝܐ.

to us. For just as one who says *Paul and Silvanus and Timothy* has mentioned three names but linked them together with the word '*and*', so one who states the name of 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. Father and Son and Holy Ghost have the same nature and one Godhead but different names, which display to us definite and complete ideas. For it is impossible for a mind which has not been made aware of the properties of each, to perform an unconfused doxology to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

What is evident from these divinely inspired words of the doctors? For the teacher of truth stated expressly that the indicators are not the same as the indicated, by saying: for names are indicative of substances, and are not themselves substance. Are we not to understand this likewise through the subsequent words of the same doctor? Unless we witlessly assert that the names are identical both with what belongs with God and with what does not belong with him, on the ground that he called the names indicative of what belongs with God, and of what does not belong with him. Who will not

**131** et **132** I Thess. 1:1; II Thess. 1:1 **144/145** cf. supra, 96-97
**149/150** cf. supra, 99-100



ܫܡܗܐ ܡܫܠܡ ܠܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܣܝܠܘܢܘܣ
ܘܛܝܡܬܐܘܣ : ܬܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܗܐ ܐܡܪ : ܐܣܪ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܝܕ
ܒܫܘܕܐܐ ܚܕ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܗܘ ܕܘܘ : ܗܟܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܫܡܗܐ
ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܒܗ ܬܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܘܐܣܪ
ܐܢܘܢ ܒܝܕ ܐܣܘܪܐ : ܟܕ ܡܠܦ ܕܬܚܝܬ ܟܠ ܫܡܐ ܫܡܐ ܐܝܬ
ܕܝܠܗ ܪܢܝܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܐ ܕܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
ܫܡ̈ܗܐ. ܕܠܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬ
ܠܗܘܢ : ܘܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܦ ܩܠܝܠ ܡܫܘܬܦ ܒܗ̇ ܕܒܗܘܢܐ
ܡܬܚܫܒ. ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܟܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܚܕ
ܗܘ. ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܕܐ. ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ : ܕܦܘ̈ܚܠܐ
ܡܬܚ̈ܡܐ ܘܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ ܠܢ. ܠܐ ܡܨܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܒܗ
ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ : ܕܬܫܘܒܚܬܐ ܠܐ
ܟܠܝܠܬܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܠܡܬܡܠܠܘ ❖

ܡܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܕܓܠܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܩܝܢܬ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܢܫ̈ܝܡܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ
ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ. ܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ :
ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢ
ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܘܢ. ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܡܪ : ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܘܣܝ̈ܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ : ܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܗܕܐ ܗܘ̇ ܒܗ̇
ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܒܝܕ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ :
ܐܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܘܢ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܘܠܗܠܝܢ
ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܘܬܗ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ

A flor. I (without X) up to l. 152 (without YZ for lines 151-152) flor. II. from l. 154 on

Line 142: ܪܘܫܡܐ ܗܘ, Book II, ch. 21, line 38 om. ܗܘ.
Line 143: ܐܡܪ, cf. Book II, ch. 21, line 40 (ܐܡ̇ܪ).
Line 144: ܒܟܠ, WYZ: ܟܠ.
Line 149: ܕܦܘ̈ܚܠܐ, W: ܕܦܘܪ̈ܫܢܐ.
Line 150: ܡܨܝܐ ܓܝܪ, cf. Book II, ch. 21, line 46 (ܓܝܪ ܡܨܝܐ).
Line 151: ܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ, W and Book II, ch. 21, line 47 (ܬܪܝܨܬܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܠܐ). ܕܬܫܘܒܚܬܐ, W and Book II, ch. 21, lines 47-48: ܫܘܒܚܬ ܕܬܫܘܒܚܬܐ.
Line 153: ܡ̈ܠܐ, A: ܡܠܐ.
Line 154: ܐܡܪ, in flor. II bis scribitur.

turn with revulsion from people who impiously permit themselves to utter this rubbish? But what do we understand by impression of God in this passage? Basil says: 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 with him. Are we not to understand the small and modest imagery and knowledge we have about God? * I think, we know already that every right thinking person acknowledges this. Let sophists, then, accept that the signifiers and the characterizers are by no manner of means identical with the signified and characterized; if denial of things inappropriate to God and the acknowledgment of things belonging with him also stamp an impression of God in us, they are not the same as God. But he says again: So that the nature is signified by the term whereas the reality itself, which subsists and is signified properly, is not indicated by the term. But one who says 'Paul' has shown that the nature subsists in the reality which is signified by the name. Notice that the doctor says that the nature is signified by the term, and again that the reality is signified by the name. What, then, is this sophistical author to do? Will he reckon the nature and the reality as names, and satisfy himself richly with the nightmarish fantasy all this involves? Will he go on step by step and boldly decree that even the indications whereby Job is characterized are the same as Job, so that Job will be discovered by this remarkable expositor to be a country, a place, the features of his mode of life and all the externals which, taken together, distinguished him and set him apart from the general meaning of 'man'? For (as has previously been set out) the doctor expressly said, when he talked about divine Scripture: Yet with regard to the description of the substance, since that would bring no benefit to the proposed aim of the discourse, it was silent, whereas it characterizes '*a certain*' by its own features stating the place and the fea-

**152/153** cf. infra, 153-154 **153/155** cf. supra, 100-103 **160/162** cf. supra, 153-155 **163/166** cf. supra, 110-113 **167** cf. supra, 163-164 **168** cf. supra, 166 **174/176** cf. infra, 180-182 **177/182** cf. supra, 121-126



ܘܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܠܗܬܗ: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܡܩܡܗܘܐ. ܘܡܢܐ
ܕܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܪܫܡܐܝܬ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ
ܕܢܬܐܡܪܘܢ. ܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗܪܟܐ ܢܩܒܠ.
< ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܀ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ:
< ܘܦܘܢܝܐ ܡܬܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܠܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ. ܡܢ ܟܦܘܪܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ
< ܠܘܩܡ ܠܗ: ܘܡܢ ܡܘܕܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܀ ܐܪܐ
ܠܘ ܠܙܥܘܪܘܬܐ ܘܡܟܝܟܘܬܐ ܕܨܘܪܬܐ ܘܡܣܟܠܘܬܐ
ܕܡܛܠܬܗ: * ܘܦܘܢܝܐ ܕܢܘܕܥ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܩܪ ܐܢܐ: ܕܟܠܢ f. 58va
ܡܢ ܗܘܢ ܕܪܥܝܢ ܡܬܪܝܨܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܡܘܕܐ. ܢܩܒܠܘܢ ܗܟܝܠ
ܣܘܦܣܛܐ: ܕܠܘ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ: ܗܢܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܪܫܡܝܢ: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ:
ܐܦܢ ܕܟܦܘܪܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܠܘܩܡ ܘܡܘܕܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ
ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܘܦܘܢܝܐ ܡܛܒܥܝܢ ܠܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ: ܠܘ ܗܢܝܢ
< ܐܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ
< ܕܟܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܩܝܡ
< ܘܡܬܝܕܥ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܘܐ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ
< ܕܦܘܠܘܣ ܐܡܪ: ܚܘܝ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܬܝܕܥ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ
< ܡܩܝܡ ܟܝܢܐ ܀ ܗܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ ܐܡܪ
ܡܠܦܢܐ. ܘܬܘܒ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ. ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܥܒܕ
ܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܣܘܦܣܛܐ. ܢܚܫܘܒ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܘܠܩܢܘܡܐ
ܫܡܗܐ: ܘܡܬܬܐܪܬ ܢܣܒܥ ܡܢ ܗܠܓܘܬܐ ܣܠܚܝܢܬܐ
ܕܟܠܗܝܢ. ܘܒܕܪܓܐ ܒܪ ܦܪܗܣܝܐ ܢܦܣܘܩ: ܕܐܦ ܗܢܘܢ
ܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܒܐܝܘܒ ܡܬܪܫܡ ܐܝܘܒ: ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܘܢ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܐܝܘܒ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܫܬܟܚ ܐܝܘܒ ܡܢ ܗܢܐ
ܕܪܫܐ ܡܦܫܩܢܐ: ܘܐܬܪܐ ܘܕܘܒܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܫܘܕܥܐ
ܕܪܘܚܗ: ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܐܬܚܫܒ
ܦܪܫܘܗܝ، ܘܐܪܫܡܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܫܘܘܕܥܐ ܓܘܢܝܐ. ܗܘ ܕܡܠܬܐ
ܓܒܪ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܡܥܐ ܦܘܚܡܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ: ܒܪ ܡܛܠ
< ܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܠܡܫܘܕܥܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ: ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐ ܕܡܘܬܪܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܢܬܬܐ: ܠܢܝܫܐ
< ܕܡܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܫܬܩ ܫܬܩ. ܠܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒ ܫܘܘܕܥܐ

A flor. II up to l.170

Line 168: ܘܡܟܝܟܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܠܡܟܝܟܘܬܐ.

tures of his mode of life and all the externals which, being taken together, would distinguish him and set him apart from the general meaning.

And again, in the later passage too, he spoke of the names as indicative of the realities and taught us that the realities have full, proper being. Will he be saying that the names have full and proper being, because they are indicative of the realities? But let us also consider the immediate continuation of the passage: Father and Son and Holy Ghost have the same nature and one Godhead but different names which display to us definite and complete ideas. Must not this sly fellow, who propounds to us such impious and irrational rubbish, have lost his wits here too, when he professes that the names which show us definite and complete ideas are * definite and complete ideas?

Besides this, it is pertinent for us to look also at the opinion expressed by GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN on the subject. He wrote in the oration *On Gregory of Nyssa*, speaking as follows about the holy martyrs: Let us pay this tribute to their exploits: that we too become crowned, and inheritors of the same glory; both the glory they have from us and that which is reserved for them in heaven, glory whose memorials and certain small marks are the things seen.

He also said in the oration *On the Lights*: *We have one God: the Father, from whom is all; one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom is all;* and one Holy Ghost, in whom is all; 'from whom', 'through whom' and 'in whom' not dividing off natures (for neither the prepositions 'from',

**184/185** cf. supra, 135-137 **187/189** cf. supra, 137-139 **197/200** Greg. Naz., *Or. 11*, 4 (*PG* 35, 836D - 837A; *SChr.*, vol. 405, p. 338) **201/209** Greg. Naz., *Or. 39*, 12 (*PG* 36, 348AB; *SChr.*, vol. 358, pp. 172-174) **201/202** I Cor. 8:6



< ܩ̈ܛܠܐ ܡܢܗ. ܟܕ ܕܥܒܕܐ ܐܡܪ ܘܡܣܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܙܕܝܩܐ :
< ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܕܟܕ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܡܬܢܣ̈ܒܢ : ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢ
< ܗ̈ܘ، ܕܢܦܪ̈ܫܘܢܝܗܝ ܘܢܬܚܡܘܢܝܗܝ ܡܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܓܘܢܝܐ ❖

ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܡܫ̈ܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܘܐܠܦ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܠܝ. ܢܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܘܠܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܢܬܠ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ : ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫ̈ܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ.
< ܐܠܐ ܘܚܙܝ، ܕܡܠܬܐ ܢܩܝܦܬܐ ❖ ܕܐܒܐ ܒܪ ܐܡܪ ܘܪܘܚܐ
< ܩܘܕܫܐ ܡܕܝܢ : ܟܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ. ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܕܐ.
< ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܐ ܕܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܡܐ ܘܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܐ
< ܡܚܘܝܢ ܠܢ ❖ ܘܐܦ ܗܢܐ ܚܪܝܦܐ ܘܗܪܟܐ : ܟܕ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܠܢ ܠܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܡܐ ܘܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܐ : *
ܡܘܕܐ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܡܐ ܘܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : f. 58vb
ܠܐ ܡܫܬܠܗܝܬ ܢܦܩ ܡܢ ܗܘܢܗ : ܕܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܙ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܐܡܪ ܠܢ.

ܒܬܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܦܩܐ ܕܢܚܙܐ : ܘܕܥܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܕܫܒܝܚܐ ܠܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܬܡܢ. ܟܬܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܣܐ : ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܛܠ
< ܣܗ̈ܕܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܗܘܐ ܠܐܓ̈ܘܢܝܗܘܢ ܢܬܠ : ܗ̇ܝ،
< ܕܐܦ ܚܢ ܟܠܝܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܘܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܠܗ̇ ܕܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ. ܘܕܝܗ̇،
< ܕܡܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ : ܘܕܝܗ̇، ܕܒܫܡܝܐ ܢܛܝܪܐ ܠܗܘܢ. ܗ̇ܝ،
< ܕܥܘܗ̈ܕܢܝܗ̇ ܘܩܠܝ̈ܠܐ ܪܘܫ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ ❖

< ܐܠܐ ܘܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪ̈ܐ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܠܢ ܕܝܢ ܚܕ
< ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܡܢܗ ܟܠ. ܘܚܕ ܡܪܝܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ
< ܕܒܐܝܕܗ ܟܠ. ܘܚܕ ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܒܗ ܟܠ. ܟܕ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܢܗ
< ܘܒܐܝܕܗ، ܘܕܒܗ ܠܐ ܦܠܓ ܟ̈ܝܢܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܒ̈ܬܐ ܗ̈ܘ،

A flor. I (without X) from l. 215 on flor. II from l. 203 to l. 207

Line 216: ܡܪܝܐ, WYZ: ܡܪܢ.
Line 218: ܟ̈ܝܢܐ, Y: ܟܝܢܐ.

'through' and 'in', nor the positions of the names could change) but characterizing the properties of a single unconfused nature. And this is evident from what are brought together again into one, if what is in the same apostle is not read carelessly by anyone: *From him and through him and in him are all things; to him be glory for ever and ever, Amen.*

Besides this, he also spoke as follows in the oration *On the Love of Poverty*, writing: But you are witnesses also of the suffering. The harsh and pitiable spectacle is set before your eyes, incredible save to those who know: men dead and yet alive, mutilated in most of the limbs of the body, almost unrecognizable for who they formerly were or where they come from. No, rather they are the wretched remnants of sometime men; who tell their fathers, mothers, brothers and places as indications of who they are: 'I am so and so's son, so and so is my mother, such and such is my name, and you were once my friend and acquaintance'. And why do they do this? Because they cannot be recognized by their former mark.

In harmony with Basil the Great, this preacher, too, of plainly-expressed theology, Basil's intellectual partner and peer, here sets forth the difference between characterizers and characterized, saying, as he does, at one point that the things seen are memorials and certain small marks of the glory reserved in heaven; and, at another point, that the prepositions and the positions of the names * characterize the properties of a single unconfused nature; and not only this, but also, by naming fathers, mothers, brothers and places as indications of the men, Gregory recognizes as a former mark the form of the

**208/209** Rom. 11:36 **211/220** Greg. Naz., *Or. 14*, 9-10 (*PG* 35, 868C - 869A) **224/225** cf. supra, 199-200 **226/227** cf. supra, 204-206 **228/229** cf. supra, 216-217 **229** cf. supra, 219-220



< ܦܪ̈ܘܬܣܣ ܐܘ ܛܘܟ̈ܣܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ. ܐܠܐ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
< ܕܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܒܠܝܠܐ. ܘܗܕܐ ܝܕܝܥܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܚܕ
< ܡܬܟܢ̈ܫܢ ܬܘܒ : ܐܢ ܠܐܢܫ ܠܘ ܡܫܬܥܐܝܬ ܡܬܩܪܝܐ ܗܿܝ
<< ܕܒܗ ܒܫܠܝܚܐ : ܗܿܝ ܕܡܢܗ ܘܒܐܝܕܘܗܝ ܘܒܗ ܟܠܡܕܡ : ܕܠܗ
<< ܫܘܒܚܐ ܠܥܠܡܝܢ ܐܡܝܢ ܀

ܒܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܦ ܗܿܘ ܕܡܛܠ ܪܚܡܬ ܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܟܕ
< ܗܟܢܐ ܟܬܒ ܀ ܣܗܕ̈ܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܕܚܫܐ. ܚܙܘܐ ܩܫܝܐ ܡܕܡ
< ܒܥ̈ܝܢܝܟܘܢ ܣܝܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܬܥܝܢܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܣܓܝ
< ܡܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܗ ܡܬܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ. ܐܢܫܐ ܡܝ̈ܬܐ
< ܘܚܝܐ. ܕܡܦܣܩܝܢ ܒܣܘܓܐܐ ܕܗܕ̈ܡܐ ܕܓܘܫܡܐ. ܟܕ ܠܐ
< ܡܢ ܕܝܕܥ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ : ܘܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ
< ܐܢܬܘܢ ܒܨܝܪܐ ܡܠܝܠ ܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ. ܡܛܠ ܕܐܢ ܫܪ̈ܟܢܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝܐ
< ܕܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܕܩܕܡ. ܐܒܗ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܘܐܡܗ̈ܬܐ ܘܐܚ̈ܐ ܘܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ
< ܫܪ̈ܒܬܗܘܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܐܢܐ ܕܦܠܢ. ܘܦܠܢܝܬܐ ܐܡܝ. ܘܦܠܢ ܫܡܝ.
< ܘܐܢܬ ܗܘܝܬ ܪܚܡܐ ܘܝܕܘܥܐ ܕܝܠܝ. ܘܗܕܐ ܡܢܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܡܛܠ
< ܡܛܠܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܫܟܚ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ
< ܢܬܝܕܥܘܢ ܀

ܗܿܢ ܥܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܪܒܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ : ܘܗܢܐ ܡܟܪܙܐ
ܕܡܡܠܠܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܦܫܝܛܬܐ : ܘܒܪ ܚܠܡܗ ܘܫܘܐ ܠܗ
ܒܗܕܐ ܦܫܩ : ܒܗܠܝܢ ܠܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܒܝܢ ܕܡܣܡܢܝܢ
< ܘܡܬܣܡܢܝܢ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܒܙܒܢ ܗܝ ܒܪ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܕܘܟܪ̈ܢܐ ܘܪ̈ܘܫܡܐ
< ܙܥܘܪ̈ܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܗܿܝ ܕܢܛܝܪܐ ܒܫܡܝܐ
< ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܀ ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܀ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ
< ܘܛܘܟ̈ܣܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ : * ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܠܐ < f. 59ra
< ܡܒܠܒܠܐ ܀ ܘܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܝܢ : ܐܠܐ : ܘܟܕ ܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ
ܘܠܐܡܗ̈ܬܐ ܘܠܐܚ̈ܐ ܘܠܐܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ : ܫܘܕ̈ܥܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ
ܡܫܡܗ : ܘܗܘܢܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܢܕܥ ܠܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ :

A flor. I (without X) up to l. 223

Line 219: ܛܘܟ̈ܣܐ, YZ: ܛܘܟܣܐ.
Line 222: ܕܒܗ ܒܫܠܝܚܐ, WYZ: ܕܒܫܠܝܚܐ.

prosopon ravaged by suffering, because the hypostasis whose mark it was remains preserved.

Led by the same Spirit, wise GREGORY OF NYSSA, too, wrote in the first book *Against Eunomius* (whose beginning runs: There is a limit to him who *strives lawfully*): But I say, we ought to pay close attention to 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 along with affinity of names. For he is not saying that mere names on their own, separated from the meaning of the objects indicated have any mutual relationship and affinity; no, we distinguish 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 in the second book *Against Eunomius*: In the same way here too (when offspring and creature are mentioned together) in passing from the expressions to the meanings we do not envisage each of the names as containing the same understanding. And again in the book *Against* the

**234** II Tim. 2:5 **234/243** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (*PG* 45, 596CD; Jaeger II, pp. 33,25 - 34,8); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 12, 140-149 **244/247** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 2 (*PG* 45, 656A; Jaeger II, p. 86, 6-9)



ܕܡܢ ܢܟܠܐ ܕܚܫܐ ܐܬܦܪܣܬ : ܒܪ ܡܩܘܝܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܗܘܐ ܩܢܘܡܗ ܒܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܢܛܝܪ.

ܒܗ ܗܢܘ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܡܬܕܒܪܢܐ ܘܚܟܝܡܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ
ܕܢܘܣܐ : ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ : ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܪܫܗ ܚܕ ܬܚܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܗܘ
< ܕܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܬܫ ܒܠܚܘܕ ❖ ܐܠܐ ܒܗ̇، ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܙܕܩ
< ܕܢܬܬܐܬ ܢܬܒܩܐ : ܐܢܗܘ ܕܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܡܥܠܐ
< ܚܫܚܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ. ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܒܠܦܘܗܝ :
< ܕܥܡ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܘܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܥܐܠܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܒܪ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܥܪ̈ܝܩܐ ܡܢ
< ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢ ܦܪܝܫܝܢ : ܕܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܕܡ
< ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܘܬ ܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܘܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ. ܐܠܐ
< ܒܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܬܬܢܝܢ : ܠܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ
< ܘܢܘܟܪܝܘܬܐ ܕܟ̈ܘܢܝܐ ܡܦܪܫܝܢ. ܡܕܝܢ ܐܢܘ ܕܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ
< ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܒܪܐ ܥܡ ܐܒܐ : ܒܪ ܫܒܘܩܝܢ
< ܠܟܘ̈ܢܝܐ : ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢ ܢܬܒܩܐ ❖

< ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ❖ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܘܗܟܢܐ ܟܕ ܝܠܕܐ ܘܒܪܝܬܐ
< ܐܟܚܕܐ ܐܬܡܠܠܘ : ܟܕ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܬ ܩܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ
< ܥܒܪܝܢ : ܠܐ ܗܝ ܟܕ ܗܝ ܡܬܒܥܝܬܐ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ

AB from ܡܬܕܒܪܢܐ (l. 248) on flor. I (without X) from l. 251 to l. 261

Line 250: ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ, B: ܐܘܢܘܡܝܣ.
Lines 250-251: ܡܬܟܬܫ ..... ܚܕ, cf. ch. 19, lines 333-334.
Line 251: ܒܠܚܘܕ, B om. ܙܕܩ, WZ: ܕܙܕܩ.
Line 254: ܕܥܡ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 12, line 157 (ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ).
ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 12, line 157 (ܫ̈ܡܗܐ).
Lines 255-256: ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ..... ܦܪܝܫܝܢ, Book II, ch. 12, lines 158-159 and W: ܐܦ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܢܘܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܥܪ̈ܝܩܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ : ܟܕ ܦܪܝܫܝܢ ܡܢ ܣܘܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ.
Line 256: ܣܘܟܠܐ, YZ: ܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ.
Line 257: ܐܡܪ, cf. Book II, ch. 12, line 161 and W (ܢܐܡܪ).
Line 259: ܡܦܪܫܝܢ, Z: ܦܪܫܝܢ.
Line 261: ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢ, Z: ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ.
Line 264: ܥܒܪܝܢ, B: ܥܒ̈ܪܝܢ.

same wicked *Eunomius' Statement* (whose beginning runs: The faith of Christians): For 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. All the other things, too, are likewise depicted, through the names imposed on them, in the heart of one who has received through the ear the appellation imposed on the reality.

Let us contemplate, as best we can, the truth of these words by the doctor. For the instructor in truth says: passing from the expressions to the meanings. And again he wrote: For one who says 'sky' has brought the mind of his auditor to the created thing signified by this term. And again: For he is not saying * that mere names on their own, separated from the meaning of the objects indicated have any mutual relationship and affinity; no, we distinguish 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.

He has clearly shown that the indicators and signifiers are one thing, and the indicated and signified are another thing. Otherwise, let this sophistical expositor deign to say that someone passes from the same thing to the same thing, or that the term which indicates the sky is itself the sky, and that words and

---

**249/254** Greg. Nyss., *Refut. Conf. Eunomii* (*PG* 45, 473A; Jaeger II, p. 318, 8-15); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 22, 405-408 **256/257** cf. supra, 245-246 **257/259** cf. supra, 249-250 **259/264** cf. supra, 237-243



< ܫܪܝܪ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܦܘܢܝܐ ܕܠܗ ܕܥܘܠܐ
< ܕܐܬܘܗܝ، ܪܫܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܪ̈ܣܛܝܢܐ ܀ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܓܝܪ
< ܕܫܡܝܐ ܐܡܪ ܆ ܠܘܬ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܫܡܐ
< ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܫܡܥ ܐܝܬܝ. ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܘ
< ܠܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܚܝܘܬܐ ܐܬܕܟܪܗ ܒܫܡܐ ܆ ܡܚܕܐ
< ܚܙܬܐ ܕܚܝܘܬܐ ܒܗ̇ܘ ܕܫܡܥ ܛܒܥ. ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܐ̈ܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܆ ܒܝܕ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܣܝܡܝܢ
< ܡܬܬܨܝܪ̈ܢ ܆ ܒܠܒܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܩܒܠ ܒܝܕ ܡܫܡܥܬܐ ܠܟܘܢܝܐ
< ܕܣܝܡ ܥܠ ܨܒܘܬܐ ܀

< ܘܕܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܨܝܐ ܢܚܙܐ ܫܪܪܐ. ܟܕ
< ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܥܒܪܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܪܕܘܝܐ
< ܕܫܪܪܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܟܬܒ ܀ ܗ̇ܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܐܡܪ ܆ ܠܘܬ
< ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܫܡܐ ܆ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ
< ܕܫܡܥ ܐܝܬܝ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ * ܟܕ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ f. 59rb
< ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܫܚܝܡܐ ܡܢ ܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܦܪ̈ܝܫܝܢ ܆
< ܕܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܘܬ ܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܘܩܪܝܒܘܬܐ
< ܐܡܪ ܆ ܐܠܐ ܒܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܆
< ܠܩܪܝܒܘܬܐ ܘܢܘܟܪܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܘ̈ܢܝܐ ܡܦܪܫܝܢ ܆ ܗܘ ܕܟܕ
< ܡܘܕܐ ܠܟܘܢܝܐ ܟܝܢܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܢܬܒܩܐ ܀

ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܢܐ ܆ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܘܕܥܝܢ ܆ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ. ܘܐܠܐ ܢܦܝܣ ܗܢܐ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܣܘܦܣܛܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܆ ܕܡܢ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܡܢܗ ܠܘܬܗ، ܟܕ ܟܠܗ، ܐܢܫ ܥܒܪ ܆ ܐܘ ܕܫܡܝܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܚܘܐ ܠܫܡܝܐ ܗܘ ܐܬܘܗܝ، ܫܡܝܐ ܆ ܘܕܡ̈ܠܐ

---

AB flor. I (without X) from l. 266 to l. 273

---

Line 266: ܘܗ̇ܘ, Z: ܗ̇ܘ.
Line 268: ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ, B add. ܗܢܐ ܡܢ.
Line 269: ܐܬܕܟܪܗ, WYZ: ܡܬܕܟܪܗ.
Line 279: ܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ, A: ܣܘܟܠܐ.
Line 283: ܡܘܕܐ, B: ܡܘܕܐ ܗܘ.

terms are identical with what they signify, when the doctor very clearly exclaimed that mere names, separated from the meaning of the objects indicated, do not have mutual relationship; no, we distinguish affinity and alien-ness of the appellations by the meanings signified by the words; and, let us leave the appellations and scrutinize the force of the things indicated. For how could the names be separated from the meaning of the objects indicated, if they are themselves the objects indicated? In what way, on hearing let us leave the appellations and scrutinize the force of the things indicated, can we reckon the appellations identical with the objects indicated? We do not have an answer at all to that. No, anyone who undertakes to teach wondrous novelties must confirm his opinions with proofs himself!

A lucid demonstration, too, of the questions at issue, from the teaching of proven CYRIL, shall join these. He spoke in the following manner in the very title of the second chapter of the *Thesaurus:* That uncreatedness is not substance but is indicative of a substance. Again, moreover, in the third chapter he said: If uncreatedness and un-subjected-ness *et cetera* alike indicate substance, and the indicated are not the same as the indicators; then substance and uncreatedness will not be the same thing, just as, also, the indicated is not the same thing as the indicator. He wrote similar things, too, in the 19th chapter, saying as follows: It would be right to keep silent and make no response to such a foolish construction of argument, * neverthe-

**271/274** cf. supra, 259-262 **274/275** et **277/278** cf. supra, 263-264 **286/287** Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. II (*PG* 75, 28B) **287/291** Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. III (*PG* 75, 36C) **292/298** Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XIX (*PG* 75, 321BC); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 22, 540-545



ܘܫܡܗ̈ܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܚܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ
< ܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܝܢ : ܟܕ ܢܨܝܚܐܝܬ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܟܪܙ ܀ ܕܠܐ
< ܫܡܗ̈ܐ ܫܚܝܡܐ ܟܕ ܡܢ ܫܘܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܝܢ
< ܩ̈ܢܝܢ : ܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܘܬ ܚܕ̈ܕܐ : ܐܠܐ
< ܒܫܘܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ : ܠܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ
< ܘܢܘܟܪܝܘܬܐ ܕܟ̈ܘܢܝܐ ܡܦܪܫܝܢ : ܘܗܝ ܕܟܕ ܢܫܒܘܩ
< ܠܟ̈ܘܢܝܐ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܝܢ ܢܒܨܐ ܀
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܬܦܪ̈ܫܝܢ ܫܡܗ̈ܐ ܡܢ ܫܘܘܕܥܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ
ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܝܢ : ܐܢܗܘ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ
< ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܝܢ : ܐܘ ܒܐܝܢܐ ܙܢܐ ܡܟܐ ܕܫܡܥܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܟܕ
< ܢܫܒܘܩ ܠܟ̈ܘܢܝܐ : ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܝܢ ܢܒܨܐ :
ܗܢܘܢ ܚܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܝܢ ܠܟ̈ܘܢܝܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ :
ܦܢܝ ܡܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܚܣ ܠܝܬ ܠܢ. ܕܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܚ̈ܕܬܬܐ
ܘܬܕܡܘܪ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܪܐ ܕܢܠܦ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ : ܕܒܢܐ
ܡܚܘ̈ܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܪܟܐ ܢܫܪܪ.

ܠܗܠܝܢ ܬܘܒ : ܘܡܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܢܗܝܪܬܐ : ܡܢ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܗ
ܕܒܚܝܪܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܘܣ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܒܥܝܢ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܒܗ
< ܒܪܝܫܐ ܕܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܣܝܡܬܐ ܒܗܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܀ ܕܗ̇ܝ
< ܕܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ ܠܘ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܀
< ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ : ܐܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ ܘܠܐ
< ܡܫܥܒܕܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ : ܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ : ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܚܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢܝܢ : ܠܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܗ̇ܘܐ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ
< ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܗ̇ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ
< ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ : ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܫܥܣܪ
< ܟܬܒ ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܠܡܫܬܩ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܡܬܠ
< ܢܬܠ ܠܘܬ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܒܣܕܪܐ ܣܟܠܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ. * [ܒܪܡ] f. 59va

AB flor. I from l. 306 on (without X for lines 306-307)

Line 291: ܫܘܘ̈ܕܥܐ, A: ܫܘܘܕܥܐ.
Line 306: ܕܣܝܡ̈ܬܐ, B: ܕܣܝ̈ܡܬܐ.
Line 308: ܐܢ, cf. ch. 10, lines 162-163 (ܐܢ ܓܝܪ).
Line 310: ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ, Y: ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܝܢ.

less let us ask those who say things like this whether the names imposed in their proper sense 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. Moreover, he says in the 34th chapter: *My children, with whom I am in travail afresh until Christ be depicted in you.* If, through the Spirit alone, Christ is being depicted in us and sets in us his own marks, so to say, depicting afresh man's nature with the beauty of the Godhead, then Christ's Spirit, who is like him depicted in us, is God.

In the first chapter, also, of the second book of the *Exposition of John's Gospel* we will hear how he teaches us the same things and says: But because, in having gone astray through the Devil's deceits, he despised the Creator, and, by trampling on the law which had been defined, he pained his benefactor, the grace bestowed on him was claimed back. Then, as soon as he who had been made for life, heard, *You are dust, and to dust you shall return,* the likeness to God began to be contaminated by the sin which had entered in, and the marks were no longer bright in him but dim, so to say, and obscure, because of the trans-

**299/303** Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XXXIV (*PG* 75, 609A) **299/300** Gal. 4:19 **306/313** Cyr. Alex., *Comment. in Ioh.*, II, 1 (*PG* 73, 205A; Pusey, I, p. 183) **310** Gen. 3:19



‹ ܕܝܢ ܢܫܐܠ ܐܢܘܢ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟܢ ܗܘܝ :
‹ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܐܝܬ ܡܣܝܡܝܢ ܥܠ ܣܘ̈ܥܪܢܐ : ܠܐ ܗܘܐ
‹ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ : ܐܦ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ
‹ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗܘܢ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܫܡܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ :
‹ ܡܫܘܕܥ ܗ̇ܝ ܟܝܢܗ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ. ܐܚܪܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܒܪ
‹ ܡܢܗ. ܒܪܢܫܐ ܓܝܪ ܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ. ܫܡܐ
‹ ܕܝܢ ܕܥܠܘܗܝ، ܡܫܬܡܥܢܐ ܗܘ ܠܚܘܕ ⁘ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܗ̇ܘ
« ܕܬܠܬܝܢ ܘܐܪܒܥܐ ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܐܡܪ ⁘ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܚܒܠܢܐ ܚܒܠ
« ܐܢܐ : ܥܕܡܐ ܕܢܬܬܨܝܪ ܒܟܘܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܐܢ ܒܗ̇ ܪܘܚܐ
‹ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܬܬܨܝܪ ܒܢ ܡܫܝܚܐ : ܘܠܘܫ̈ܡܘܗܝ، ܐܝܟ
‹ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܣܐܡ ܒܢ : ܟܕ ܡܨܝܪ ܬܘܒ ܒܫܘܦܪܐ
‹ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ : ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܐܪܐ ܪܘܚܐ
‹ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ : ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟܘܬܗ ܒܢ ܡܬܬܨܝܪ ⁘

ܐܠܐ ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܦܘܫܩܐ
ܕܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܕܝܘܚܢܢ : ܢܫܡܥ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܡܠܦ
‹ ܠܢ ܘܐܡܪ ⁘ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܟܕ ܒܛܥܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܟܠ ܩܪܨܐ
‹ ܐܛܥܝ : ܡܫܛܦ ܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܘܝܐ : ܘܟܕ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܗܘ
‹ ܕܐܬܬܚܡ ܕܫ : ܡܟܐܒ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܛܝܒܢܗ̇ ܠܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ،
« ܕܐܬܝܗܒܬ ܠܗ ܡܬܬܒܥܐ ܗܘܬ. ܟܕ ܥܦܪܐ ܐܢܬ ܘܠܥܦܪܐ
« ܬܗܦܘܟ ܫܡܥ ܡܕܡܚܬ ܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ : ܗܘ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܚܝ̈ܐ.
‹ ܡܬܛܢܦܐ ܗܘܬ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܗ ܘܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܟܕ
‹ ܚܛܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܬ. ܘܐܬܘܬܗܘܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܠܐ ܡܨܚܠ
‹ ܗܘܝܢ ܢܗܝܪܐ. ܒܥܡܝܛܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܘܚܫ̈ܘܟܐ

AB flor. I up to l. 328

Line 317: ܕܡܪܝܐܝܬ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 22, line 575 (ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ).
Line 321: ܓܝܪ, cf. Book II, ch. 22, line 579 (ܗܘ ܓܝܪ).
Line 323: ܗܢܘܢ, B and flor. I: ܐܝܠܝܢ.
Lines 325-326: ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ..... ܘܠܘܫ̈ܡܘܗܝ، , cf. infra, line 367 (ܘܠܘܫ̈ܡܘܗܝ،).
Line 326: ܒܫܘܦܪܐ, XZ: ܒܫܘܦܪ̈ܐ.
Line 327: ܠܟܝܢܐ, cf. infra, line 368 (ܠܟܝܢܗ).
Line 335: ܡܕܡܚܬ, B: ܡܕܡܚܐܬ.

gression of the commandment. And later: It must be understood that we speak of man's spirit as the offspring of the Spirit, not as if man's spirit were from the Spirit by nature (for that is impossible!) but by a first, and more ancient, principle, on the one hand: because when non-existent, man's spirit was summoned into existence by him; and, then by a second principle in the dispensation, because man's spirit was transformed Godwards through the Spirit's depicting his marks in us and refashioning our understanding in his own character, so to say.

In the second chapter of the same second book, he again says: For by debasing him, is not what belongs to the Father dishonoured in the Son, and do we not dishonour the marks of the begetter? Again, moreover, in the fifth chapter of the third book: We speak of the Son as 'the Father's image', and say that what is other than himself is sealed in him, * so that he should not be thought of as his own image. But you, wrongly thrusting aside our reasoning on these matters, are not ashamed of applying to him only likeness in respect of activity. According to your argument, then, surely, the Son will be God only in the marks, and not at all by nature: by the fact, indeed, that he only resembles, and is being well fashioned into the likeness of his begetter.

Wise Cyril has indisputably shown, as we have seen with the help of so many texts, that indicators and characterizers are one thing, whereas the indicated and characterized are another thing. For he taught us well when he said expressly: Uncreatedness (which is the same as saying 'un-made-ness') is not substance but is indicative of a substance; and, the indicated are not the same as the indicators; and also, the name 'man' indicates man's nature but is some-

**313/320** Cyr. Alex., *Comment. in Ioh.*, II, 1 (*PG* 73, 245B; Pusey, I, p. 220) **322/323** Cyr. Alex., *Comment. in Ioh.*, II, 2 (*PG* 73, 265D; Pusey, I, pp. 240-241) **324/331** Cyr. Alex., *Comment. in Ioh.*, III, 5 (*PG* 73, 485D - 488A; Pusey, I, p. 445) **335/337** cf. supra, 286-287 **337/338** cf. supra, 288-289 **338/339** cf. supra, 296-297



< ܡܛܠ ܗܟܢ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܘܟܠܗ ܐܣܛܘܢܬܐ ⁘ ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܚܒܘ:
< ܕܠܐ ܕܘܒܝܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܪܘܚܗ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ: ܠܐ
< ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢ ܕܟܝܢܗ ܗ̄ܘ ܒܟܝܢܐ. ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܓܝܪ. ܐܠܐ
< ܐܝܟ ܕܒܫܘܪܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܘܥܬܝܩܬܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ: ܟܕ
< ܕܡܢܗ ܐܬܩܪܝ، ܗ̇ܘ ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܝܐ. ܟܕ
< ܕܝܢ ܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܘܡܕܒܪܢܝܬܐ: ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܠܦ ܕܒܐܠܗܘܬܗ
< ܕܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ: ܟܕ ܡܩܒܠܐ ܕܠܗ ܪ̈ܘܫܡܐ ܒܢ. ܘܠܡܣܬܟܠܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܗ
< ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܡܬܚܕܬܘ ܗ̇ܦܝܟ ܟܠ ⁘

ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܠܗ ܕܟܬܒܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܐܡܪ ⁘
< ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܠܗ ܒܒܪܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܨܛܥܪܐ: ܘܠܪ̈ܘܫܡܐ ܕܗܘ
< ܕܝܠܕ ܡܨܛܥܪܝܢ: ܟܕ ܒܒܨܝܪܘܬܐ ܡܢܚܬܝܢ ܠܗ ⁘ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ
< ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ⁘ ܨܠܡܐ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ
< ܕܐܒܐ ܠܒܪܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܡܬܛܒܥ ܒܗ ܕܝܢ ܢܘܟܪܝܐ: ܕܠܐ
< ܗܘ ܨܠܡܐ * ܕܠܗ ܢܬܚܫܒ. ܐܢܬ ܕܝܢ ܠܝ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܬܪܝܨܐܝܬ f. 59vb
< ܠܡܠܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܚܦܬ: ܘܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ
< ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܩܪܒ ܐܢܬ ܠܘܬܗ، ܠܐ ܡܬܚܡܬ ܐܢܬ. ܒܡܩܒܠܐ
< ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܕܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܘܫ̈ܐ ܒܪܐ:
< ܘܒܟܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ. ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܡܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܘܡܬܨܝܪ
< ܫܦܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܠܕ ⁘

ܘܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܠܗܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܚܪܝܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܚܙܝܢ ܗ̤ܘ،
ܚܟܝܡܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܘܣ: ܕܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ
ܘܡܚܘܝܢ: ܘܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ
< ܫܦܝܪ ܐܠܦ ܠܢ ܟܕ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ ⁘ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܥܒܝܕܐ ܗ̣ܝ
< ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܗ̣ܝ، ܠܡܐܡܪ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܐ ܥܒܝܕܐ ܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ: ܐܠܐ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܘܕܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܘܫܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܗ
< ܕܒܪܢܫܐ: ܡܫܘܕܥ ܡܢ ܟܝܢܗ ܕܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ. ܐܚܪܝܢ ܕܝܢ

AB

Line 342: ܘܥܬܝܩܬܐ, B: ܘܥܬܝܩܐ.
Line 352: ܕܠܗ, B: ܕܝܠܗ.

thing other than it; as well as, Christ is being depicted in us and sets in us his own marks, depicting afresh man's nature with the beauty of the Godhead.

What, therefore, does this good fellow think the Saviour's natural marks are? Substance or substances? For it follows of necessity that those who absolutely identify the characterizers and the characterized, must avow one of these absurdities. Therefore, casting aside, as at once impious and witless, such an idea, and adhering to the correct intention of the doctor, let us reckon the marks to be certain divine impressions, so to say, and images, by which our nature is being adorned. For this is also disclosed by what the same doctor says again at one point: The marks were no longer bright in him but dim, so to say, and obscure, because of the transgression of the commandment. At another point: By a second principle in the dispensation because man's spirit was transformed God-wards through the Spirit's depicting his marks in us and refashioning our understanding in his own character, so to say. And again: We dishonour the marks of the begetter by debasing him. It is worthwhile our scrutinizing carefully the words, so that he should not be thought of as his own image, and, according to your argument, then, surely, the Son will be God only in the marks.

---

**339/341** cf. supra, 300-302 **350/352** cf. supra, 311-313 **352/355** cf. supra, 317-320 **355/356** cf. supra, 322-323 **357** cf. supra, 326 **357/358** cf. supra, 328-329



« ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܬܗ̇، ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ. ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ: ܕܟܕ ܡܬܬܨܝܪ ܒܢ
« ܡܫܝܚܐ: ܘܠܘܩܕܡܘܗܝ، ܦܐܝܡ ܒܢ: ܟܕ ܡܢ ܕܪܝܫ ܨܐܪ
« ܒܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܠܟܝܢܗ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܀

ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܣܒܪ ܗܢܐ ܛܒܐ ܠܪܘܫܡܐ ܟܝܢ̈ܝܐ ܕܦܪܘܩܐ. ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ. ܣܢܩ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܩܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܢܦܩܐ ܕܢܘܕܘܢ: ܚ̇ܕܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܢ ܠܦܪܘܫ: ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢܟܦܝܢ ܠܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ. ܡܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܢ ܕܪܫܝܥܬܐ ܗܝ، ܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܟܪܗ ܢܦܩܝܢ ܗܘ ܥܒܕܝܢ: ܘܠܢܝܫܐ ܬܪܝܨܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ: ܠܪ̈ܘܫܡܐ ܛܒ̈ܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ ܘܨܠ̈ܡܐ: ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܝܢܢ ܡܨܛܠܒܬ. ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܬܓܠܝܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܡܪ ܬܘܒ ܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ:
« ܒܕܘܟ ܚܕ ܀ ܘܐܬܢܝܚܘܗܝ ܗܘܘ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܫܝܠ ܗܘܝܢܐ
« ܢܩܝܐ: ܒܫܘܬܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܘܡܚܫܟܐ ܡܛܠ
« ܥܒܪ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܀ ܒܕܘܟ ܕܝܢ ܀ ܒܗ̇، ܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ:
« ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܐܬܬܘܪ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ، ܕܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ: ܒܝܕ ܪܘܚܐ
« ܕܨܐܪ ܒܢ: ܘܠܪܘܫܡܘܗܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܢ
« ܘܦܫܛ ܟܠ: ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ: ܘܠܪܘܫܡܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܠܕ ܡܫܝܛܝܢ ܒܗ
« ܒܡܨܥܪܘܬܐ ܡܨܥܪܝܢ ܠܗ. ܫܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܗ̇، ܕܢܥܩܒ ܒܚܬܝܬܐ
« ܠܡܠܬܐ: ܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܨܠܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܬܚܫܒ: ܘܒܗ̇،
« ܕܒܡܠܬܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܟ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ
« ܡܠܬܗܘܢ ܒܪܐ ܀

---

AB

---

Line 367: ܘܠܘܩܕܡܘܗܝ، cf. supra, lines 325-326 (ܘܠܘܩܕܡܘܗܝ، ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ).

Line 368: ܠܟܝܢܗ, cf. supra, line 327 (ܠܟܝܢܐ).

Line 374: ܓܕܝܫ, B: ܓܕܫ ܣܝ.

Line 379: ܘܡܚܫܟܐ, B: ܘܚܫܟܐ.

Line 385: ܕܝܠܗ, B: ܕܢܦܫܗ.

Besides these passages a brief attention as well now to what wise SEVERUS too * (whose misrepresented statements were also set down for examination) teaches us, will be useful. In his *21st Cathedral Sermon* he wrote as follows: Where, then, do evils come from? Whence do they arise? From free-will. For God made us in his image, by bestowing a rational soul which brings in it the divine marks by its being incorporeal; because, in mental activities, it reaches out and extends, as much as it can, towards everything it desires, and is quite unbounded by place and is capable of virtues such as righteousness and the rest.

Notice, the teacher of truth said that our soul is rich and distinguished by the divine marks. What, then, do these instructors in novel doctrines teach us to think? That the human soul is its being incorporeal, its reaching out and extension in mental activities, its total unboundedness by place and its capacity for virtues? Should we not rightly incur much ridicule and be convicted of rushing into error of our own free will, were we to assent to such irrational blather?

It remains for us to point to famous THEODOSIUS' view on this subject and in this way finally reach the plainly-expressed teaching now under examination, by our God-clad father Severus.

**362/367** Sev. Ant., *Hom. cath. 21* (*PO* 37, pp. 70,32 - 72,2 [71,30 - 73,2])



ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܣܓܝܐܐ ܗܝ، ܕܟܕ ܘܒܐܘܪܚܬܐ ܕܥܠܬܐ ܢܥܒܕ܆
ܘܡܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܣܘܡܟܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܘܪܐܣ܆ ܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܩܕܝܫ *
[ܩܠܘܗܝ] ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܟܬܒܝܢ ܠܒܘܚܢܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܦܠܓ ܠܝ. ܐܡܪ f.60ra
ܓܝܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܣܪܝܢ ܘܚܕ ܕܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܘܬܗ ܗ̇ܝ ܗܟܢܐ
< ܟܬܒ ܀ ܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܢ ܐܬܝܗܝܢ ܒܝܫܬܐ. ܡܢ
< ܐܝܟܐ : ܡܢ ܨܒܝܢܐ ܥܠܝܗ ܕܝܠܗ. ܒܨܠܡܗ ܓܝܪ ܥܒܕ ܠܢ
< ܐܠܗܐ : ܟܕ ܝܗܒ ܢܦܫܐ ܡܠܝܠܬܐ : ܕܡܥܠܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܒܗ̇
< ܪ̈ܘܫܡܐ. ܒܗ̇، ܕܕܠܐ ܓܘܫܡ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܒܗ̇، ܕܒܡܬܒܪܢܘܬܐ
< ܡܬܚܫܒܢܝܬܐ ܥܠ ܟܠ ܡܐ ܕܬܪܓܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܨܝܐ
< ܬܬܦܫܛ ܘܬܬܡܬܚ : ܘܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܬܬܚܕܝܐ :
< ܘܕܡܩܒܠܢܝܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܕܡܝܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ : ܕܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ
< ܕܠܐܡܪ ܘܫܪܟܐ ܀

ܗܐ ܕܒܪ̈ܘܫܡܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ ܥܬܝܪܐ ܘܡܫܬܒܗܪܐ ܢܦܫܢ
ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܐܡܪ. ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܢܘܢ ܪܘܪܒܐ ܕܡܠܦ̈ܢܐ
ܚܕ̈ܬܐ ܡܠܦܝܢ ܠܢ ܕܢܬܪܥܐ. ܕܗܝ، ܗ̇، ܕܠܐ ܓܘܫܡܢܝܬܐ
ܗܘܬ : ܘܡܬܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܝܬܐ ܬܬܦܫܛ ܘܬܬܡܬܚ :
ܘܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܬܬܚܕܝܐ : ܘܕܡܩܒܠܢܝܬܐ ܗܘܬ
ܕܡܝܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ : ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܢܦܫܐ ܐܢܫܝܬܐ : ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ
ܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܓܘܚܟܐ ܪܒܐ ܢܣܒ : ܘܡܬܚܝܒܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܦܘܚܙܘܬܐ
ܪܗ̇ܛܝܢ ܢܬܚܝܒ : ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܢܬܪܓܐ ܠܦܬܓ̈ܡܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ
ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ.

ܕܫܪܟܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܘܢܚܘܐ ܕܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܪܥܝܢܐ ܕܡܫܒܚܐ
ܕܠܡܫܒܚܐ ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ. ܘܗܟܢܐ ܠܣܘܦܐ ܠܘܬ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ
ܓܠܝܬܐ ܘܦܫܝܩܬܐ ܡܬܒܥܝܢܐ ܕܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ

AB flor. I from l. 392 to l. 399

Line 389: ܐܘܪܐܣ, B: ܐܪܐܣ.
Line 395: ܒܗ̇،, flor. I: ܘܒܗ̇،.
Line 396: ܕܬܪܓܐ, Y: ܕܪܓܐ.
Line 398: ܕܡܝܬܪ̈ܘܬܐ, B: ܕܡܝܬܪܘܬܐ, W: ܕܡܝܬܪ̈ܬܐ.
Line 410: ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ, B: ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ.

He, who truly rose up like an apostle, in our times, as head of the orthodox Church, wrote, then, in the discourse *On Theology* he composed against the polytheists, as follows: Now the holy and consubstantial Trinity is in its hypostases, separate and unconfused, but of one substance, nature, indivisible Godhead, sovereignty, glory, eternity, power, activity, knowledge, adoration and the other attributes which God has by nature. Now the property of the Father is fatherhood and existing ingenerately; the property of the Son is sonship and being begotten by the Father; and the property of the Holy Ghost is the fact that he was not begotten but proceeds, without beginning and eternally, from the Father. For by means of these properties the unconfusedness of the three (i.e. hypostases) is characterized and signified. Whereas all the prosopa (i.e. hypostases) is characterized and signified. Whereas all the other things, as we have said before, * which characterize the Godhead, are common to them, are co-equal in honour and indivisible, and prove that we have put our faith in one God, who exists and is known in one substance and three hypostases.

Let us observe here too the harmony between this divinely inspired father and the rest of the doctors. For, unless we choose to misunderstand his words, we learn with clarity that neither the characteristic properties of the nature, nor those of the prosopa, can be the same things as the nature or the hypostases. For, setting

**381/394** Theod. Alex., *De Trin.*, 1 (*OLA* 56, pp. 152-153, ll. 116-130 [pp. 225-226, ll. 115-126])



ܣܐܘܪܐ ܢܐܬܐ. ܟܝܬ ܗܟܝܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܫܪܪܐ ܫܠܝܚܐܝܬ
ܒܙܒܢܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܪܝܫܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܕܐܪܬܕܘܟܣܘ ܩܡ : ܒܡܐܡܪܐ
ܕܡܡܠܠܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܬܬܣܝܡ ܡܢܗ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܣܓܝܐܐ,
< ܐܠܗ̈ܐ : ܒܗ̇ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
< ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܘܦܪܝܫܬ ܒܩܢܘܡܐ : ܒܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܡܦܪܫܬܐ :
< ܘܕܠܐ ܚܒܝܟܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇. ܕܚܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ
< ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܬܐ. ܘܡܠܟܘܬܐ. ܘܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ.
< ܘܡܫܬܘܡܝܘܬܐ. ܘܚܝܠܐ. ܘܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ. ܘܝܕܥܬܐ
< ܘܣܓܕܬܐ : ܘܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܝܢܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
< ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܒܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ : ܘܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܐܝܬ. ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܒܪܘܬܐ : ܘܗ̇ܘ، ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ
< ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܠܐ
< ܕܢܦܩ : ܕܠܐ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܘܡܫܬܘܡܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ. ܒܗ̇ܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
< ܓܝܪ ܗܠܝܢ : ܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܢ
< ܡܘܕ̈ܥܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܐ ܘܡܬܚܫܒܐ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܒܟܠܗܘܢ
< ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ * ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ : f. 60rb
< ܒܓ̈ܘܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܫ̈ܘܝܬ ܒܐܝܩܪܐ ܘܠܐ
< ܡܬܦܠܓ̈ܢܝܬܐ. ܘܡܚܘ̈ܝܢ ܕܒܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܝܡܢ. ܕܒܚܕܐ
< ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܡܬܝܕܥ ❖

ܢܬܒܩܐ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܫܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܐܒܐ ܢܣܝܒ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܫ̈ܪܟܐ ܕܡܠܦ̈ܢܐ. ܐܢܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܠܐ
ܡܡܘܡܐܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܩ̈ܠܘܗܝ، ܨ̈ܒܝܢ ܕܢܣܬܟܠ : ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ
ܢܠܦܝܢ : ܕܐܦܠܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܕܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܘܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܡܫܟܚܐ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܒܗ̇ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܦܐܫ

AB

Line 412: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܘܐܪܐ.

Line 423: ܐܬܝܠܕ, cf. infra, line 438 (ܝܠܝܕ).

Line 425: ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ, B: ܕܬܠܬܝ̈ܗܘܢ. ܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܢ, cf. infra, line 441 (ܐܘ ܟܡܬ).

Line 428: ܘܫ̈ܘܝܬ, B: ܘܫܘܝܬ.

Line 435: ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ, B: ܢܗܘܝܢ.

out for us the teaching on these matters, he says: Now the property of the Father is fatherhood and existing ingenerately; the property of the Son is sonship and being begotten by the Father; and the property of the Holy Ghost is the fact that he was not begotten but proceeds, without beginning and eternally, from the Father. For by means of these properties the unconfusedness of the three prosopa (i.e. hypostases) is characterized and signified. Whereas all the other things, as we have said before, which characterize the Godhead, are common to them, are co-equal in honour and indivisible.

How, then, will this pioneer of novel teaching interpret these words? Will he say that fatherhood and existing ingenerately, sonship and being begotten by the Father, and again, that not being begotten but proceeding without beginning and eternally from the Father, because they characterize the unconfusedness of the hypostases are the unconfusedness of the hypostases themselves? Or that the hypostases themselves are the unconfusedness of the hypostases? How can this not be senseless and extremely absurd? Is there something else? Yes, for we should want to ask him: does he accept the idea that the characteristic properties of the Godhead are the Godhead, because they characterize the Godhead's substance? But if he does not reckon the characteristic properties of the Godhead as identical with the Godhead, by what correct sequence of notions will he reckon the characteristic properties of the hypostases as being identical with the hypostases, when the characteristic properties of the divine nature are not identical with the divine substance? For though a person might concede that some of the characterizers and characterized are mutually identical, whereas some are not identical, it is absolutely obligatory,

**400/408** cf. supra, 385-392



< ܠܝ ܀ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܒܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ : ܘܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܐܝܬ. ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܒܪܘܬܐ : ܘܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܝܠܝܕ.
< ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕ ܐܠܐ ܕܢܦܩ
< ܕܠܐ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܘܡܬܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ. ܒܗܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܓܝܪ
< ܗܠܝܢ : ܠܐ ܫܓܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܘ ܗܢܘ
< ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܪܫܡܐ ܘܡܬܝܕܥܐ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܐ̈ܚܪܢܝܬܐ
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ ܕܡܚܩܝܢ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܓܘ̈ܢܝܬܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܫܘܝܬ ܒܐܝܩܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܢܝܬܐ ܀

ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܦܫܩ ܗܢܐ ܡܗܕܝܢܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܚܕܬܐ. ܐܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܘܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܕܒܪܘܬܐ ܘܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܠܝܕ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܝ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕ ܐܠܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܘܡܬܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܠܐ ܫܓܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܚܩܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ, ܠܐ ܫܓܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܫܓܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܘܠܓܡܪ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܥܡܛܪܘܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܐܫܬܥܒܕ. ܡܕܡ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ. ܐ̈ܝܢ ܨܒܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܢܫܐܠܝܘܗܝ. ܐܢ ܡܩܒܠ ܕܢܬܪܥܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܚܩܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܚܩܝܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܠܐ ܚܫܒ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܢܚܫܘܒ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܚܩܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܒܐܝܢܐ ܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܟ̈ܠܐ : ܚܕ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܚܩܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܠܐ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܚܩܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܢܩܝܦܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܐܦ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܩܝܢ ܘܡܬܚܩܝܢ : ܡܢܗܘܢ ܡ̇ܢ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܡܘܕܝܘ ܢܦܠ ܐܢܫ : ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ : ܐܢܗܘ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܚܝܒ ܐܢܫܐ : ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܕ̈ܡܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ

AB

Line 438: ܝܠܝܕ, cf. supra, line 423 (ܐܬܝܠܕ).
Line 441: ܐܘ ܗܢܘ, cf. supra, line 425 (ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ).
Line 447: ܕܒܪܘܬܐ, B: ܘܒܪܘܬܐ.

I think, that like should be judged by like and what is obscure should be proved * by what are known (if I may put it so); nor should we take an analogy from things utterly remote from one another, in the case of things in dispute. Therefore this excellent fellow must first understand that if he does not reckon the characteristic properties of the Godhead as identical with the Godhead, as a consequence the whole canon he has laid down (that characterizers and characterized are identical) will collapse. Next he must understand too, that just as the characteristic properties of the Godhead are other than the Godhead, so likewise those of the hypostases are other than the hypostases.

Yet, if perhaps, (and being consistent with himself) he were also to acknowledge as substance the characteristic properties of the substance, let him learn the conflict with, and clear opposition he has here too, to the God-clad fathers. For we shall give a lucid demonstration of the point from them.

Wise BASIL, then, spoke in his first book *Against Eunomius* as follows: It would be pleasant for me, then, to ask him whether he preserves this goodwill alike towards all the things said about God, or only with regard to this word? For if he regards nothing at all by mental invention lest he be thought to adorn God with human appellations, he will acknowledge what are spoken of God to be, all alike, substance. How, then, can it fail to be ludicrous to declare that creativity is substance, or providence, again, and fore-knowledge likewise, and, in a word, to posit every activity as substance? And if all these tend towards one meaning, all the terms must have the same potential as one another, as in the case

---

**445/468** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 8 (*PG* 29, 528B - 529A; *SChr.*, vol. 299, pp. 194-196)



ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܢܬܬܕܝܢ. ܘܗܝ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܕ̈ܝܥܢ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܐܡܪ: ܢܬܚ̈ܘܘܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ * ܕܡܣܬܟ̈ܠܢ. ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܪܚܩܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܐ̈ܚܝܢ: ܕܗܘܝܐ ܢܣܒ ܡܬܠ ܥܠ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ ܚܪܝܢܐ. ܡܟܝܠ ܙܕܩ ܠܗ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ: ܘܕܡܕܡܝܬ ܩܕܡ ܢܕܥ: ܕܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܚܫܒ ܚܕ ܢܣܒ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ: ܢܦܠ ܠܗ ܘܗܕܡܐ ܩܢܘܢܗ ܟܠܗ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܐܡ: ܕܡܫܡܠܝܢ ܚܕ ܡܫܡܠܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܡܠܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܡܠܝܢ. ܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܝܢ: ܘܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ: ܗܟܢܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܐܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. f. 60va

ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܟܒܪ ܘܟܕ ܢܦܩ ܠܢܦܫܗ ܘܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܘܕܐ: ܢܐܠܦ ܠܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܘܣܩܘܒܠܝܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܘܬܘܒ ܗܪܟܐ ܠܘܬ ܐ̈ܒܗܬܐ ܠܒ̈ܝܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ. ܡܢܗܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܘܠܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܢܗܝܪܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܢܩܪܒ.

ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ
< ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܗܟܢܐ ❖ ܪܓܝܓܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܝ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܕܐܫܐܠܝܘܗܝ. ܗܕܐ ܫܦܝܪܘܬ ܪܥܝܢܐ: ܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܥܠ
< ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܢܛܪ: ܐܘ ܒܗܕܐ
< ܡܠܬܐ ܟܠܚܘܕ. ܐܢ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ
< ܕܗܘܝܐ ܚܙܐ: ܕܠܐ ܢܣܒܪ ܕܒܫܡܗ̈ܐ ܐ̈ܢܫܝܐ ܡܨܒܬ
< ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
< ܡܘܕܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ
< ܡܬܓܚܟܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇: ܕܒܪܘܝܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
< ܠܡܐܡܪ: ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܬܘܒ ܘܡܩܕܡ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܗܘ
< ܗܟܘܬ: ܘܐܦܢ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܥܠ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܢܣܝܡ. ܘܐܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܚܕ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܪ̈ܗܛܝܢ:
< ܐܢܢܩܐ ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܝ ܒܗ̇ ܗܝ ܢܚܝܠܘܢ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ:

---

AB

---

Line 468: ܘܕܡܕܡܝܬ, B: ܘܕܡܕܐܡܝܬ.

of those with many names: for example, when we call the same person 'Simon', 'Cephas' and 'Peter'. So someone who has heard of the immutability of God will be led towards ingeneracy; one who has heard of his being without parts will be brought to his creativity. What could be more absurd than this confusion, when someone legislates against common usage and the teaching of the Spirit by removing the meaning of each term? Despite the fact that when we hear about God that *he made all things in Wisdom*, we learn his creative skill; when that *he opens his hand and satisfies the desire of every living thing*, the providence which is throughout; when that * *he made darkness his hiding-place*, we are instructed in the invisibility of his nature; when, again, it is said in the *persona* of God, *I am and have not changed*, we learn the eternal sameness and immutability of the substance. How, then, can it not be plain insanity to say that its proper meaning does not underlie each term, but to decree, against actuality, that all the terms have the same potential?

He wrote in the same way in the second book, as follows: 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

**460/461** Ps. 103:24 **461/462** Ps. 144:16 **463** Ps. 17:12 **465** cf. Mal. 3:6 **469/477** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 29 (*PG* 29, 640BC; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 124); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 6, 341-348



< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܦ̈ܢܝܬܐ, ܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܐܝܟ ܐܡܪܬ,
< ܕܫܡܥܘܢ ܘܟܐܦܐ ܘܦܛܪܘܣ ܠܗ̇ ܒܗ̇ ܠܗ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܡܕܝܢ
< ܗܘ ܕܫܡܥ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܠܘܬ ܠܐ
< ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܡܬܕܒܪ. ܘܗܘ ܕܫܡܥ ܠܐ ܡܦܠܓܘܬܐ : ܠܘܬ
< ܒܪܘܝܘܬܐ ܡܬܬܕܒܠ. ܘܡܢܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܕܫܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ
< ܠܘܠܒܬܐ : ܕܟܕ ܡܢܡܣ ܐܢܫ ܠܥܘܕܪܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ :
< ܢܦܩ ܢܡܘܣܐ ܕܠܡܘܟܠܐ ܕܫܡܫܬܐ ܕܟܘܢܐ ܘܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ
≪ ܕܪܘܚܐ. ܟܕ ܠܒ ܐܡܪܬ, ܕܡܚܡܣܢ ܡܚܠܠ ܐܠܗܐ : ܕܒܠܒܡ
≪ ܒܚܟܡܬܐ ܥܒܕ : ܠܐܘܡܢܘܬܗ ܒܒܪܝܬܐ ܝܠܦܝܢ. ܐܡܪܬ,
≪ ܕܦܬܚ ܐܝܕܗ ܘܡܣܒܥ ܨܒܝܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܕܚܝ : ܠܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ
≪ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܥܠ ܟܠ ܐܡܬܝܬ. ܐܡܪܬ, ܕܐܝ * ܕܣܡ ܚܫܘܟܐ ܛܘܫܝܗ : f. 60vb
< ܠܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܗ ܡܬܪܕܝܢ. ܬܘܒ ܕܐܝ ܗ̇ܝ,
≪ ܕܡܢ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ : ܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ, ܘܠܐ
≪ ܐܫܬܢܝܬ : ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܡܝܢܘܬ, ܗ̇ܝ, ܒܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ, ܘܠܐ
< ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܝܠܦܝܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܘ
< ܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ, ܓܠܝܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܕܝܠܢܝܐ ܬܚܝܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ
< ܫܘܕܪܐ ܕܠܝܠܐ ܢܐܡܪ : ܐܠܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ :
< ܕܗ̇ܝ, ܒܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ, ܡܫܟܚܢ ܠܬܕܪܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܀

ܗ̇ܘ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܟܬܒ ܒܗ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀
< ܘܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ : ܐܢ ܠܡܛܪܢ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ
< ܡܬܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܢܛܘܪ : ܐܘ ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ
< ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ : ܘܢܫܬܐܠ ܕܢܫܡܗܘܗܝ, ܠܐ
< ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܐ : ܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܐ : ܒܪܘܝܐ
< ܕܝܢܐ : ܘܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܠܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܢܦܩܝܢ : ܐܘ ܟܕ
< ܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܠܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܠܝܢ : ܡܢܐ ܢܥܒܕ. ܐܪܐ ܟܐܘܣܐ

AB W from l. 512 on

Line 509: ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ, B: ܢܦܩܘܬܐ.

Line 514: ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܠܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 6, line 355 (ܠܐ). ܘܢܫܬܐܠ, A: ܘܢܫܐܠ.

Line 515: ܘܠܐ, A: ܠܐ; cf. Book II, ch. 6, line 356 (ܠܐ).

Line 516: ܢܦܩܝܢ, B: ܢܦܩ ܚܢ.

Line 517: ܡܩܒܠܝܢ, B: ܡܩܒܠ ܚܢ.

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.

GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN, too, indeed, in the *First Oration on the Son* pokes fun at such witlessness and 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? Because also unwisdom and wisdom are not the same thing as each other, but are with the man himself. Neither do they divide the substance off, but are divided off with the substance. Or are immortality, freedom from evil and immutability God's substance? But, if so, there are many substances of God and not one.

Wise CYRIL, as we quoted a little earlier, wrote similar things in the third chapter of the *Thesaurus*, teaching us in the following fashion: If uncreatedness and un-subjected-ness *et cetera* alike indicate substance, and the indicated are not the same as the indicators; then substance and uncreatedness will not be the same thing, just as, also, the indicated is not the same thing as the indicator.

**479/487** Greg. Naz., *Or. 29*, 10 (*PG* 36, 88AB; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 198); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 6, 265-268 **490/493** cf. supra, 287-291



‹ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܢܬܠܐ ܘܢܣܝܡ܇ ܡܕܝܢ ܠܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܪܟܒܐ܇
‹ ܐܠܐ ܘܕܡܢ ܡܢ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܢ ܡܪܟܒ ܢܚܘܝܘܗܝ܂
‹ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܘܐܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ
‹ ܡܬܝܕܥܢܐ ܀

ܘܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܝܢ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ܇ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ
ܕܥܠ ܒܪܐ܇ ܒܗ ܠܫܛܝܘܬ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܓܚܟ ܐܡܪ
‹ ܀ ܐܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܬܘܒ܇ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ
‹ ܘܝܠܝܕܐ. ܐܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܠܗ̇ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܘ ܗܝ ܒܗ
‹ ܗܝ܇ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ܇ ܐܝܟܢ ܠܘ ܗܘ ܒܗ
‹ ܗܘ. ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܣܟܠܘܬܐ ܘܚܟܡܬܐ܇ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܠܘ ܗܝ
‹ ܒܗ ܗܝ. ܓܢܘܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ. ܘܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܦܣܩܝܢ܇
‹ ܓܢܘܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܦܣܩܝܢ. ܐܘ ܘܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ
‹ ܘܠܐ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ.
‹ ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܗܟܢܐ܇ ܣܓܝܐ̈ܢ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܕܐ ܀

ܐܠܐ ܘܩܘܪܝܠܠܘܣ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ
ܩܠܝܠ ܐܣܡܢ܇ ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܟܬܒ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ
‹ ܕܣܝ̈ܡܬܐ܇ ܟܕ ܒܗܢܐ ܙܢܐ ܐܠܦ ܀ ܐܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ
‹ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܥܒܕܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܕܟܐ܇ ܟܕ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
‹ ܡܚ̈ܘܝܢ܇ ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ
‹ ܕܡܚ̈ܘܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ܇ ܠܐ ܐܪܐ ܗܘ̇ܐ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ
‹ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܒܪ̈ܝܐ܇ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ
‹ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܀

AB W [up to l. 521] flor. I [from l. 524 to l. 529]

Line 518: ܟܠܗܘܢ, W: ܟܠܗܝܢ.
Line 524: ܐܝܢܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 6, line 35 (ܐܝܢ).
Line 526: ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ; flor. I: ܕܠܗܘܢ.
Line 528: ܓܢܘܗܝ, flor. I: ܠܘܬܗ.
Line 529: ܓܢܘܗ̇, flor. I: ܠܘܬܗ̇.
Line 536: ܡܚ̈ܘܝܢ, cf. ch. 11, line 372 (ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ).

He instructs us similarly, indeed, in the 31st chapter, also by saying: * If whatever belongs solely to God must also be his substance, he will be composed for us out of many substances. For there are many things which belong by nature solely to him but to no other existing thing. For 'King', 'Lord', 'immortal', 'imperishable', 'invisible' and, besides these, a host of other things, are said of him by the divine Scriptures. So, if everything belonging to him is placed in the order of substance, how can the simple fail to be composite — which it is absurd for us to think? Therefore the word 'ingeneracy', indicating something belonging to him, is not substance and it is futile to say that God has his being by his ingeneracy.

Accurate SEVERUS, in the 27th chapter of the discourse *Against Julian's Additions*, says: For mortality and immortality (or imperishability) are not substances but features belonging with the substance. That is why we believe that God has immortality. Yet he does not have this immortality as his substance; no, he is something other in substance, but his natural feature is his endlessness and imperishability.

And in the *Third Letter to Sergius the Grammarian* he wrote as follows: What, then, will you say, my admirable fellow? Is goodness in

**495/504** Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XXXI (*PG* 75, 444BC) **506/510** Sev. Ant., *C. Add. Iul.*, 27 (*CSCO* 295, p. 84, 1-6; *296*, p. 70, 24-30) **512/517** Sev. Ant., *Epp. ad Serg. Gramm.*, 3 (*CSCO* 119, p. 174, 2-8; *120*, p. 133, 12-16)



ܗܘ̇ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܝܢ ܘܚܕ ܙܪܝܙ ܠܢ
< ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡ̇ܪ ÷ * ܐܢܗܘ ܕܟܠ ܡܐ ܕܠܐܠܗܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܬ : f. 61ra
< ܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܒܠܦܘܬ ܐܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܗܘܐ : ܡܢ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ
< ܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ ܡܬܪܟܒ ܠܢ. ܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܠܗ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܒܟܝܢܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܚܕ ܕܝܢ
< ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܡ̇ܠܟܐ ܘܡܪܝܐ :
< ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ : ܘܒܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܣ̈ܓܝ
< ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܠܠܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܟ̈ܬܒܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ. ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܟܠ ܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ : ܒܛܟܣܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܬܣܝܡ :
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܦܫܝܛܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܕܢܬܚܫܒ
< ܫܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܡܕܝܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܟܕ ܚܕ
< ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܠܝܬܝܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ.
< ܘܣܪܝܩܬܐ ܗܝ, ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܐܡܪ : ܕܒܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ
< ܠܐܠܗܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ÷

ܘܐܟܪܝܒܐ ܕܝܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܥܣܪܝܢ ܘܫܒܥܐ
ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܕܝܘܠܝܢܐ ܐܡ̇ܪ ÷
< ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܠܐ
< ܡܬܚܒܠܢܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ. ܐܠܐ ܦܘ̈ܪܫܢܐ
< ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܘܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ
< ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܠܐ ܠܘ ܗܕܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܗ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܗ̇ܘ ܐܚܪܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
< ܒܐܘܣܝܐ : ܦܘܪܫܢܗ ܕܝܢ ܟܝܢܝܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܡ ܢܗܘܐ
< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܘܬܐ ÷

ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܬܠܬ ܕܠܘܬ ܣܪܓܝܣ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܐܡ̇ܪ
< ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܟܬܒ ÷ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܬܡܝܗܐ.

AB flor. I from l. 556 to l. 562

Line 540: ܘܚܕ, B om.
Line 543: ܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ², B: ܣܓܝܐܬܐ.
Line 554: ܘܐܟܪܝܒܐ, B: ܘܐܪܟܝܒܐ.
Line 559: ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ, WX: ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 563: ܣܪܓܝܣ, B: ܣܪܓܝܘܣ.

this way a property of God, just as laughter is a property of man or neighing of a horse? Therefore, say first what God is in substance and in this way we shall recognize what his property, in the full sense of the term, is. For it is obvious that substance is something other than property, since a property appears upon substances.

By these words the pillars of the Church have clearly cried aloud that it is beyond all insanity and witlessness to speak of the properties, whereby the substance of the Godhead is characterized, as substance. Therefore, this accurate dialectician ought to prove lucidly and beyond doubt, through the fathers' testimonies: not that the divinely inspired fathers * did call the hypostases simply 'properties' (for this we too acknowledge and never will deny) but that they thought that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the characteristic properties – ingeneracy, I mean, generacy and procession.

However, perhaps, battling again on behalf of his doctrines and helplessly employing the same circuitous dodges, he will say that he recognizes no difference in meaning at all between 'hypostasis' and 'characteristic property of the hypostasis', but that one and the same thing is indicated by these expressions; even though he acknowledges that the hypostasis is 'characterized by' the property according to a wordy and roundabout way of speaking. In answer to him we too will say: 'No, my sagacious friend! Since the truth of the realities rises up against your utterances, your pronouncement of unproven words is totally inane'. For wise GREGORY OF NYSSA answered Eunomius, who made similar thoughtless pronouncements: Every argument, so long as it is asserted by

539/542 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (*PG* 45, 320D - 321A; Jaeger I, p. 94, 9-14)



ܠܦܘܬܐ ܗܘܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܓܚܟܘܬܐ ܘܕܣܘܣܝܐ ܨܗܠܘܬܐ : ܡܕܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܒܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ : ܘܗܟܢܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܕܡܢܐ ܗܝ ܕܝܠܝܬܗ ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ. ܡܦܣܩܐ ܓܝܪ ܝܕܝܥܐ : ܕܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܥܠ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ✤

ܘܕܠܥܠ ܗܝ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ̇ ܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܘܫܛܝܘܬ ܗܘܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ܝ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܐܝ̈ܕܝܗܝܢ ܡܬܚܡܝܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܘܠܝ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܦܘܣܩܢܐ ܕܒܕ̈ܝܬܐ. ܕܢܚܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܟܝܠ ܙܕܩ ܠܗܘܢܐ ܕܙܘܥܐ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ : ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܘܕܠܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܒܝܕ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܕܠܘ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܩܪܘ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܢܦܝ̈ܚܝ * ܡܢ f. 61rb ܐܠܗܐ : ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܚܢܢ ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܡܬܘܡ ܟܦܪܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܕܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܐܬܪܥܝܘ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ.

ܐܠܐ ܟܒܪ ܒܗ ܚܠܦ ܕܘ̈ܓܡܘܗܝ، ܬܘܒ ܡܬܟܬܫ : ܘܒܗܘܢ ܒܗ̇ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܥܘܩ̈ܒܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܡܬܚܫܚ ܐܡܪ : ܕܠܐ ܦܪܫ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܒܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܒܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܕܥ. ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗ̇ܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܩܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥ : ܐܦ ܕܡܘܕܐ ܡܬܚܡܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܒܦܪܦܪܣܝܣ ܡܠܘܐ. ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܡܬܪܐܬ ܟܝ ܐܘ ܡܫܟܠܢܐ : ܟܕ ܫܪܪܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܩܐܡ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡ̈ܪܢ ܡܢܟ : ܣܪܝܩܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܦܘܪܣ ܡܫܬܡܥ ܦܣܩܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܣܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܟܘܬܗ ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܘܝܢܐ ܦܣܩ ܗܘܐ ✤ ܕܟܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܥܕܡܐ

AB

Line 586: ܒܦܪܦܪܣܝܣ. A note in the left margin of A, fol. 61r reads as follows: ܦܪܦܪܣܝܣ ܦܬܝܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ. *Paraphrasis: wordy way of speaking.*

authority without proof, is old wives' prattle, having no power to prove thereby the point at issue when no support for the statements made is introduced either from the divine words or from human reasonings.

Nevertheless, tell us why, with respect to the Godhead, you think that the characteristic properties are only indicative of the Godhead and are not, moreover, the Godhead itself; whereas, with respect to the hypostases, that the characteristic properties are not only indicative of the hypostases and prosopa, but you reckon them as being both hypostases and prosopa.



> ܕܡܫܠܛܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬ ܡܬܬܦܪܣܢܐ : ܗܘ
> ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܪܘܒܐ ܕܩܕܡܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܕܠܐ ܚܕ ܚܝܠܐ ܐܝܬ
> ܠܗ : ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܕܬܘܣܦܐ ܟܐܢܘܬܗ ܗܘ ܕܡܬܒܥܝܐ : ܐܡܬܝ
> ܕܐܦܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܡܣܝܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܬܢܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܬܐ :
> ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܬܘܥܝܬܐ ܐ̈ܢܫܝܬܐ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ
> ܡܬܬܬܝܐ ∻

ܒܪܡ ܐܡܪ ܠܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗ̈ܢܝ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ : ܡܚܘ̈ܝܢܝܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܠܘ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܬ : ܥܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ : ܠܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܡܚܘ̈ܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܘܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܠܗܝܢ ܚܫܒ ܐܢܬ.

AB

Line 602: ܘܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ, B: ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ.

*Chapter 9*

*Concerning the fact that it is impossible, even in the case of creatures, to profess either the characteristic properties of the substance, or those of the hypostases, as being substances or hypostases. And clear demonstration which proves that we do not, by refusing to think of the characteristic properties of the hypostases as hypostases, profess an accident or something imperfect in the Holy Trinity; whereas those who define the hypostases as ingeneracy, generacy and procession are obliged to think of the hypostases as imperfect, or, rather, to deny them completely.*

Or demonstrate clearly, in the case of some * existing things, that the characteristic properties are identical with what is characterized by them, so that, as a result of study as to whether we may say that of these others, we may imagine what it would mean for us to reckon the characteristic properties of the substance as identical with the substance itself, and likewise those of the hypostases with the hypostases themselves, in the case of the divine mystery.

What will you say? Will you grant that the characteristic properties of human nature are human nature itself (and likewise in the case of the rest of the creatures)? Or that the properties of each one (for example Job's or Elkanah's) – that these very properties are Job and Elkanah? No, the divinely inspired fathers do not teach us that nor does the nature of the realities itself disclose it to us?

Listen to what proven CYRIL, most accurate of the doctors, said on these matters. He wrote in the 31st chapter of the *Thesaurus* in

21 cf. Iob 1:1 cf. I Reg. 1:1

ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܫܥܐ.

ܥܠ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܥܠ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ: ܕܐܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ: ܐܘ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘܣܝ̈ܐ ܐܘ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܘܕܐ. ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܚܘܝܐ: ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܬܪܥܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܓܕܫܐ ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܥܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܚܕܐ. ܐܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ: ܕܠܐ ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܐ ܢܬܪ̈ܥܘܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܘܕܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܟܦܪܘܢ ܒܗܘܢ ✣

ܐܘ ܢܚܘܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܥܠ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ * ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ: ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܘܬܐ: ܕܗܢܝܢ ܗܢܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܠܗܘ ܕܡܬܝܕܥ ܡܢܗܝܢ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܬܒܥܬܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܐܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܟܕ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ: ܢܬܪܥܐ ܘܟܠ ܐܝܟ ܐܡܝܢ: ܕܗܢܝܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܝܢ ܢܚܫܘܒ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܗ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ: ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܒܗܢܐ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. A, f. 61va

ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ. ܐܪܐ ܝܗܒ ܐܢܬ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܢܫܝܐ: ܗܘ ܟܝܢܐ ܐܢܫܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ: ܘܥܠ ܫܪܟܐ ܕܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܗܟܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ: ܐܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ: ܐܝܟ ܐܝܬܐ ܠܐܝܘܒ: ܕܐܝܘܒ ܘܐܠܩܢܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܐܝܘܒ ܘܐܠܩܢܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܢܦ̈ܝܚܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܦܝܢ ܠܢ: ܘܠܐ ܗܘ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܡܚܘܐ ܠܢ.

ܘܫܡܥ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ: ܗܘ ܒܚܝܪܐ ܘܚܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܘܣ. ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܝܢ ܘܚܕ

AB

Line 5: ܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ, B: ܡܘܕܝܢ.
Line 19: ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ, A: ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ.

combating the Arians, as follows: If the term 'ingeneracy', which indicates the fact of not being begotten, is indicative of God's substance, what will prevent us from saying that laughter, too, which belongs to man's nature, is his substance; that the horse's neighing likewise is its substance; and that all those things which properly belong to existents, are to be called their substance? But if the property of each one is not itself substance, but belongs to the substance (like laughter to man and neighing to the horse) ingeneracy will not be substance, because it does not indicate what God is by nature, but the way in which he is and how his property is in relation to those others. Another answer: Ingeneracy will be predicated of God's substance as an inseparable, as colour is, too, of every body. But substances are not signified by what belong inseparably, but by those things that they are themselves. Just as one would not know what a swan or snow is by nature, were one to learn only that these are white. For whiteness will not be reckoned as substance but as one of the things belonging to the substance.

Famous SEVERUS too, nurtured in those irreproachable doctrines, writes * in the *First Letter to Sergius the Grammarian*, as follows: To say that Immanuel is composed of two properties or two activities is foolish and ignorant. For do we, because reasoning is a property of rational soul, whereas blackness or whiteness, it may be, is a

**27/42** Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XXXI (*PG* 75, 445BC) **45/58** Sev. Ant., *Epp. ad Serg. Gramm.*, 1 (*CSCO* 119, pp. 86,7 - 87,1; *120*, p. 63, 12-26)



< ܕܡܫܒܚܬܐ ܒܗ̇ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܪܝܘܣ ܡܬܟܬܫ ܗܟܢ܆ ܐܢ ܫܡܐ
< ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܕܗܘ̇ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕ ܡܫܘܕܥ : ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ
< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܗܘܬ : ܡܢܐ ܟܠܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܕܐܦ
< ܓܘܚܟܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ
< ܬܗܘܐ : ܘܨܗܠܬܐ ܕܣܘܣܝܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܬܗܘܐ : ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܝܠܢܝܬܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܢܬܩܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܠܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܐܝܟ ܕܠܒܪܢܫܐ ܓܘܚܟܬܐ : ܘܠܣܘܣܝܐ
< ܨܗܠܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܕܠܐ
< ܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܐܝܟܢ
< ܐܝܟ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ
< ܐܬܐܡܪ ܐܚܪܢܐ : ܥܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ :
< ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܬܬܡܠܠ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܓܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܟܠ
< ܓܘܫܡܐ ܓܘܫܡܐ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܒܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܦܪܫܢܐܝܬ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܘܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܒܗ̇ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܢܝܢ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܕܥ ܠܩܘܩܢܘܣ ܐܘ ܠܬܠܓܐ
< ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܒܟܝܢܐ : ܐܢ ܢܐܠܦ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܚܘܪܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܚܘܪܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܬܬܚܫܒ : ܐܠܐ
< ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܀

ܘܗܘ̇ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܠܐ ܥ̈ܕܠܐ ܐܬܪܒܝ ܣܐܘܪܐ
ܓܡܝܪܐ : ܟܕ ܟܬܒ ܠܘܬ * ܣܪܓܝܣ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ f. 61vb
< ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܗܟܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܕܡܢ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
< ܐܘ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܡ̈ܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܪܟܒ ܥܡܢܘܐܝܠ : ܣܟܠܐ ܘܠܐ
< ܝܕܘܥܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܕܗܘ̇ ܕܡܬܚܫܒ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܢܦܫܐ
< ܡܠܝܠܬܐ : ܕܦܓܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܟܡܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܚܘܪܘܬܐ ܐܢ

AB

Line 24: ܕܡܫܒܚܬܐ, B: ܕܡܫ̈ܒܚܬܐ.
Line 36: ܐܚܪܢܐ, B: ܬܘܒ.
Line 37: ܬܬܡܠܠ, B: ܬܬܐܡܪ.
Line 44: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܘܐܪܐ.

property of body, on that account say of the man himself that he is composed of reasoning, whiteness (or blackness). No, no sane person says that; but he will say that man subsists of the natures themselves, body and soul, to which the things stated attach, on which they appear and in accordance with which they naturally exist without separation. But in another way: must it not be ludicrous to speak of two properties or two activities? For there are many properties of each nature and not merely two. For example manhood's palpability, visibility, mortality, being subject to hunger, thirst and to other things likewise; whereas of God's nature there are a multitude of properties: invisibility, impalpability, being before the worlds and infinity.

The fathers' words have clearly proved that it is not possible, even in the case of created nature, to call the natural properties 'substances': because wise Cyril, on the one hand, gave the ruling that neither man's laughter nor the horse's neighing, nor again the whiteness of swan and snow, are their substances at all; whereas our holy father, Severus, called 'reasoning' a property of man's rational soul but blackness or whiteness a property of man's body, and, again, palpability, visibility, mortality, being subject to hunger, thirst and the like, properties of his manhood. Will anyone, in fact, ever approach such utter lunacy as madly to think and say that soul itself is reasoning; or to define the substance of man himself as palpability or visibility or mortality or being subject to hunger, thirst and the like?



< ܦܓܪܐ: ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܒܪܢܫܐ: ܕܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܪܟܒ
< ܘܡܢ ܚܘܪܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܐܘܟܡܘܬܐ ܡܪܟܒ: ܐܠܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܢܫ
< ܡܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܗܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ
< ܕܟܝܢܐ ܦܓܪܐ ܘܢܦܫܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܩܝܡ ܒܪܢܫܐ: ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܗ̇ܢܝܢ
< ܕܐܬܐܡܪ ܢܩܦܢ ܘܥܠܝܗܘܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܘܒܗܘܢ ܠܐ
< ܡܬܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܡܟܝܢ. ܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ
< ܡܬܓܚܟܢܘܬܐ ܗ̣ ܘܗ̇ܝ، ܕܢܐܡܪ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ
< ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ. ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܟܝܢܐ:
< ܘܠܐ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ. ܐܟܙܢܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ : ܡܬܓܫܫܢܘܬܐ
< ܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܬܗܘܐ ܡܫܬܒܕܐ ܠܟܦܢܐ
< ܘܠܨܗܝܐ : ܘܠܐܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ. ܘܕܟܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܐܠܗܝܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ ܠܐ
< ܡܬܓܫܫܢܘܬܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܩܕܡ ܥܠܡ̈ܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܣܬܝܟܢܘܬܐ ܀

ܘܐܦ ܠܐ ܥܠ ܟܝܢܐ ܒܪܝܐ: ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܐܡܪ: ܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܒܢ̈ܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܗ̈ܢܘ. ܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܚܟܝܡܐ ܓܝܪ ܩܘܪܝܠܠܘܣ ܦܣܩ ܘܐܡܪ : ܕܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܓܚܟܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ : ܐܘ ܨܗܠܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܚܘܪܘܬܐ ܕܩܘܩܢܘܣ ܘܕܬܠܓܐ : ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܒܘܢ ܣܐܘܪܐ : ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܢܦܫܐ ܡܠܝܠܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܡܪ. ܕܦܓܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܟܡܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܚܘܪܘܬܐ. ܘܬܘܒ ܕܝܠܗ̇ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ : ܡܬܓܫܫܢܘܬܐ. ܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܬܗܘܐ ܡܫܬܒܕܐ ܠܟܦܢܐ ܘܠܨܗܝܐ ܘܠܐܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ. ܡܢܘ ܓܝܪ ܠܗܠܗ̇ ܗܕܐ ܫܛܝܘܬܐ ܡܛܐ ܢܩܘܡ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܫܛܝܐܝܬ ܢܣܒܪ ܘܢܐܡܪ : ܕܗܝ ܢܦܫܐ ܗ̣ܝ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܢܣܒ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܐܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ : ܡܬܓܫܫܢܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܝܘܬܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܬܗܘܐ ܡܫܬܒܕܐ ܠܟܦܢܐ ܘܠܨܗܝܐ ܘܠܐܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܢܬܚܡ.

AB flor. I from l. 60 to l. 62

Line 54: ܢܩ̈ܦܢ, A: ܢܩܦܢ.
Line 64: ܗ̈ܢܘ, B: ܗܢܘ.
Line 68: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܘܐܪܐ.

Besides this, it would be profitable for eager listeners, to hear * what the same doctor instructs us on the subject of the characteristic properties of the hypostases, and to consider whether one who thinks that these characteristic properties are hypostases has not altogether fallen away from the truth and from the father's aim.

He spoke, then, in the first chapter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea*, as follows: But if anyone happens to mention Job, or Elkanah (father of Samuel), the meaning of the appellation points out, as if with a finger, so-and-so, and his single hypostasis. For immediately one hears 'Job', one has understood man – not all man but one * of those placed under the substance and common genus of manhood. For the particular appellation 'Job' does not permit the hearer's understanding to be diffused over the full expanse of the substance and embrace all men. No, it curbs the understanding by the properness of the designation; it limits and directs the mind towards the one hypostasis of so-and-so; and indicates distinctively what characterizes this very hypostasis. It grants us understanding of Job, the king and inhabitant of the land of Uz, the one to whose complete righteousness God bore witness, the one who was handed over to the evil demon and adversary for combat, that is for full mastery over him, which would provide a testing-out of this witness; the one who used to offer to God daily prayers and sacrifices for the transgressions or mental sins of his sons, and was deprived of these very sons and simultaneously of all his possessions, and in his bereavement of his sons and penury after his abundance of children and wealth, uttered that marvellous word of thanksgiving undimmed by time: * *The Lord gave, and the Lord took away; as it has pleased God, so has it been done; blessed be the Lord's name*; the one who, in addition to this, was smitten with ulcers all over his body and held out despite the ailment's unendurable and long ensuing pain, and despite the reproaches from friends who trifled with it ignorantly; the one

---

**78/119** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (*CSCO* 111, pp. 59,15 - 61,7; *112*, pp. 47,11 - 48,21) **89** cf. Iob 1:1 **89/90** cf. Iob 1:8 et 2:3 **90/92** cf. Iob 1:11-12 et 2:5-6 **92/93** cf. Iob 1:5 **94/95** cf. Iob 1:14-19 **97/98** Iob 1:21 **99** cf. Iob 2:7 **100/101** cf. Iob 4:1 - 42:6 **101/102** cf. Iob 42:8



ܒܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܘܬܪܐ ܕܢܫܡܥܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܪܚܡܝ ܫܡܥܬܐ ܢܝܠܦܘܢ:
ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܘܡܡܠܠ * ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܗܘ ܕܝ ܗܘ B, f. 28va
ܡܠܦܢܐ ܙܕܐ ܠܝ. ܘܠܡܚܙܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܢ
ܫܪܪܐ ܘܡܢ ܢܝܫܐ ܐܒܗܝܐ ܢܦܠ : ܗܘ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܗܠܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ.

ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ
ܕܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘ ܩܣܪܝܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܕܐܢܐ ܀
< ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܐܢܫ ܫܡܗ ܠܐܝܘܒ : ܐܘ ܠܐܠܩܢܐ ܐܒܘܗܝ
< ܕܫܡܘܐܝܠ : ܢܣܝܒܘܬܗ ܕܫܘܡܗܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܒܨܒܥܐ ܡܚܘܝܐ
< ܠܦܠܢ ܐܘ ܦܠܢ : ܘܠܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܗ ܕܝܠܗ. ܡܚܕܐ ܓܝܪ
< ܕܫܡܥ ܐܢܫ ܐܝܘܒ : ܒܪܢܫܐ ܗܘ ܐܣܬܟܠ. ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܟܠ ܒܪܢܫ.
< ܐܠܐ ܠܚܕ * ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܣܝܡܝܢ ܬܚܝܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܓܢܣܐ f. 28vb
< ܓܘܢܝܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܫܒܩ ܠܫܘܡܗܐ ܕܝܠܢܝܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܘܒ
< ܒܗܘܢܐ ܕܫܡܘܥܐ : ܕܢܬܦܫܛ ܥܠ ܦܬܝܘܬܗ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܓܡܝܪܬܐ.
< ܘܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܬܚܒܘܫ. ܐܠܐ ܡܟܠܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ
< ܕܫܘܡܗܐ : ܘܡܚܕܕ ܘܡܬܪܨ ܠܗ ܠܗܘܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ
< ܕܦܠܢ. ܘܡܚܘܐ ܠܗ ܠܗܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ. ܝܗܒ
< ܓܝܪ ܠܡܣܬܟܠܘ ܠܐܝܘܒ. ܠܡܠܟܐ ܘܡܥܡܪܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ ܕܥܘܨ.
< ܠܗܘ ܕܐܣܗܕ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ. ܠܗܘ ܕܐܫܬܠܡ
< ܠܫܐܕܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܘܠܒܥܠܕܒܒܐ ܠܡܬܟܬܫܘ : ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܟܠ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ :
< ܕܒܘܚܢܐ ܢܬܠ ܕܗܕܐ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ. ܗܘ ܕܚܠܦ ܡܬܥܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܐܘ
< ܬܘܠܡܬܐ ܕܒܪܥܝܢܐ ܕܒܢܘܗܝ : ܨ̈ܠܘܬܐ ܘܕܒ̈ܚܐ ܢܦܩ ܗܘܐ
< ܠܐܠܗܐ ܟܠܝܘܡ : ܘܡܬܓܙܡ ܗܘܐ ܕܒܢܘܗܝ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܦܠܐ ܢܟܣܘܗܝ ܒܚܕ
< ܟܠܗ ܩܢܝܢܗ : ܘܒܡܬܟܪܝܘܬ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ : ܡܢ ܒܬܪ
< ܡܬܝܬܪܘܬ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ ܘܥܘܬܪܐ : ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܘܬܒ ܠܡܬܕܡܪܘܬܐ
< ܢܗܒ : ܘܕܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܠܐܢܗܘܪܬܐ : ܘܕܠܐ ܐܬܥܡܛܬ ܒܙܒܢܐ : ܗܝ
<< * ܕܡܪܝܐ ܝܗܒ ܘܡܪܝܐ ܢܣܒ : ܐܝܟ ܕܫܦܪ ܠܡܪܝܐ ܗܟܢܐ f. 29ra
<< ܗܘܐ : ܢܗܘܐ ܫܡܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܡܒܪܟ. ܠܗܘ ܕܒܬܪ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܒܫܘܚܢܐ ܡܚܐ ܥܠ ܟܠܗ ܦܓܪܗ : ܘܣܝܒܪ ܟܐܒܐ ܕܡܪܗܘܢܐ ܠܐ
< ܡܣܝܒܪܢܐ ܘܢܓܝܪ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ : ܘܣܝܒܪ ܚ̈ܣܕܐ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܪ̈ܚܡܐ ܕܡܬܚܣܕܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܠܘܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܒܡܝܕܥܬܐ ܡܫܪܐ

---

A up to l. 78 B

to whom God again bore witness and who received the crown of martyrdom and divine splendours. Likewise, if one hears 'Elkanah', from the particular name one mentally imagines the marks characterizing a single man, not many men but a single hypostasis. For one mentally brings back and depicts the one who is known as being from the country of Ramah; the one who lived according to the Law; the one who used diligently to accomplish the sacrifices and offerings ordained through Moses and the other things, according to the prescribed cycles of seasons; who used to go up to the place of the divine tabernacle as the Law had ordained; the one who lived * with Hannah, his chaste and devout wife who valued the marriage embrace as a means to the procreation of sons and was without fruit by childbirth, yet who, by prayers and tears, conquered the defect of nature and received a child as a result of her petition; she brought Samuel, who became renowned among the prophets and great among those who invoke the Lord, and who was entrusted with the anointing of Israel's kings and used unerringly to foresee the future and prophesy what was to happen, so that *not one of his words fell to the ground* (as the Scripture says) for which reason he was called *the visionary* and *the seer*.

What will this sly fellow say, who (as he believes) surpasses everybody else in subtlety of thought? Will he turn this too to his own purpose by the power of his sophistical techniques and prove that all the characteristic properties of Job and Elkanah are hypostases? Must not the hypostases of the men mentioned be, as it were, innumerable and *mutually different? For the divinely inspired father says: No, the appellation curbs the understanding by the properness of the designation; it limits and directs the mind towards the one hypostasis of so-and-so; and indicates distinctively what character-

**102/103** cf. Iob 42:12-17 **106** cf. I Reg. 1:1 **107/110** cf. I Reg. 1:3 **111/113** cf. I Reg. 1:2 et 1:5 **113/115** cf. I Reg. 1:11-20 **116/117** cf. I Reg. 10:1; 16:3; 16:13 **118** I Reg. 3:19 **119** cf. I Reg. 9:9 **126/129** cf. supra, 85-88



< ܗܘܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܡܣܗܕܬܗ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ : ܘܟܠܝܠܐ
< ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܘܙܝܘ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ ܡܩܒܠ ܗܘܐ. ܗܟܢ ܕܒܫܡܥܬܐ
< ܘܐܢ ܠܡ ܐܠܩܢܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܫܡܥ : ܡܢ ܩܪܝܬܐ ܝܚܝܕܝܬܐ : ܠܦܪܨܘܦܐ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܓܒܪܐ ܡܬܨܝܪ ܒܗܘܢܗ ܘܠܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ.
< ܐܠܐ ܕܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܒܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܗܦܟ : ܘܨܐܪ ܠܗܘ
< ܕܡܢ ܐܪܥܐ ܕܪܡܬܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ. ܠܗܘ ܕܕܒܝܪ ܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ. ܠܗܘ
< ܕܕܒ̈ܚܐ ܘܩܘܪ̈ܒܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܝܕ ܡܘܫܐ ܐܬܦܩܕܘ : ܘܠܗܠܝܢ
< ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܣܘܕܪܐ ܡܬܦ̈ܢܝܢܐ ܕܙܒ̈ܢܐ ܒܚܦܝܛܘܬܐ
< ܡܫܡܠܐ ܗܘܐ : ܘܠܕܘܟܬܐ ܣܠܩ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܫܟܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ
< ܐܝܟ ܕܦܩܕ ܗܘܐ ܢܡܘܣܐ. ܠܗܘ ܕܥܡܪ * ܗܘܐ ܥܡ ܚܢܐ f. 29rb
< ܐܢܬܬܐ ܢܟܦܬܐ ܘܪܚܡܬ ܠܐܠܗܐ : ܘܠܙܘܘܓܐ ܡܝܩܪ
< ܡܦܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝܐ ܐܝܩܪܬ : ܘܠܐ ܡܦܪܝܢܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܬܝܠܕܘܬܗ
< ܗܘܬ ܝܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܬܠܐ : ܒܨܠܘ̈ܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܕܡ̈ܥܐ ܙܟܬ
< ܠܒܨܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܘܢܣܒܬ ܝܠܕܐ ܡܢ ܫܐܠܬܐ : ܘܐܝܬܝܬ
< ܠܫܡܘܐܝܠ ܗܘ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܫܡܗܐ ܒܢܒ̈ܝܐ : ܘܪܒܐ ܒܐܝܠܝܢ
< ܕܩܪܝܢ ܠܡܪܝܐ : ܘܐܬܗܝܡܢ ܠܡܫܚܘ ܠܡ̈ܠܟܐ ܕܐܝܣܪܝܠ :
< ܘܕܠܐ ܒܘܪܢܐ ܩܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܚܙܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܥܬܝܕܐ : ܘܡܬܢܒܐ
< ܗܘܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗܘܝܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܦܠ ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ
< ܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܟܬܒܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ : ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ
< ܘܗܘ ܪܐܝܐ ܘܗܘ ܕܚܙܝܐ ܡܬܩܪܐ ܗܘܐ ܀

ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܗܢܐ ܢܟܝܠܐ : ܘܕܒܚܟܝܡܘܬܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ
ܥܠ ܟܠ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܚܒܪ. ܐܪܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܒܚܝܠܐ
ܕܐܘ̈ܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܦܝܣܛܐ ܠܘܬ ܢܦܫܗ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܗܦܟ : ܘܡܚܘܐ
ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܘܒ ܘܕܐܠܩܢܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܐܢܘܢ : ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܘ ܠܐ ܡܬܡܢܝܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ
f. 29va ܢܗܘܘܢ ܘܒܪ * ܫܘ̈ܚܠܦܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ : ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܓܒܪ̈ܐ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܐܬܡܢܘ : ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܐܒܐ ܢܫܝܡ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ
< ܡܟܠܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܫܘܡܗܐ : ܘܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܘܬܪܨ ܠܗ
< ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܚܕ ܕܦܠܢ. ܘܐܠܦܠܝ ܕܡܩܒܠ ܠܗ ܠܗܢܐ

B

Line 111: ܡܬܨܝܪ ܒܗܘܢܗ, cf. infra, line 153 (ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܡܬܨܝܪ).

izes this very hypostasis. Which, then, will he say are the properties that characterize the single hypostasis of Job? Obviously, his being king, his being the inhabitant of such-and-such a country, his having his complete righteousness borne witness to by God, his being handed over to the evil demon for combat, his offering daily prayers and sacrifices to God for his sons, his being deprived of these sons along with all his possessions, his freely returning thanks to God for the tribulations which befell him, his being smitten all over his body with ulcers, his holding out in the face of unendurable and long ensuing pain and the reproaches of his friends who ignorantly trifled with the pain, his again having God bear witness to him and receiving the crown of martyrdom and divine splendours. * Of Job's hypostasis, as we have learned, all these same and other things accordingly are the characteristic properties. Which, on the other hand, are Elkanah's? For we have heard again that the doctor said: Likewise, if one hears 'Elkanah', from the particular name one mentally imagines the marks characterizing a single man, not many men but a single hypostasis. For, by mentally bringing him back, we apprehend that the marks which characterize the one depicted are his being from Ramah, his living in accordance with the Law, his accomplishing the ordinances of Moses, his going up to the place of the divine tabernacle as the Law ordained, his living with Hannah his chaste and devout wife, his having fruit from her in Samuel renowned among the prophets.

All these, and others besides, being the characteristic properties of Elkanah's hypostasis, what will this clever fellow say? That all these are Job's and Elkanah's hypostases, insofar as they are also the characteristic properties of their hypostases? * Would he not

144/146 cf. supra, 103-105



< ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܡܫܘܕܥ ܀ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܡܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܩܢܝܢ ܠܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܝܘܒ. ܡܕܝܢ ܕܗܘ̇ ܕܡܠܟ ܗܘܐ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܥܡܘܪܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ ܦܠܢ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܣܗܕܘܬܗ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܟܠܗ̇ ܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܐܫܬܠܡ ܠܫܐܕܐ ܒܝܫܐ ܠܩܪܒܐ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܚܠܦ ܒܢܘ̈ܗܝ، ܟܠܝܘܡ ܢܩܪܒ ܨ̈ܠܘܬܐ ܘܕܒ̈ܚܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܬܓܠܙ ܥܡ ܟܠܗ ܩܢܝܢܗ: ܘܡܥܡܪܘܬ ܝ̈ܚܒܐ ܣܠܩ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܚܘܫܢܘܬܐ ܕܓܕܫ ܠܗ: ܘܡܚܠ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܢܦܪܘܥ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܢܒܠܥ ܒܫܘܚܢܐ ܥܠ ܟܠܗ ܦܓܪܗ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܢܟܪܐ ܠܘܬ ܟܐܒܐ ܠܐ ܡܣܬܝܒܪܢܐ ܘܡܓܪ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ: ܘܚܣ̈ܕܐ ܕܪ̈ܚܡܘܗܝ، ܕܡܬܒܙܚܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܠ ܟܐܒܐ ܠܐ ܡܕܥܐ: ܘܬܘܒ ܕܣܗܕ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ: ܘܟܠܝܠܐ ܘܢܘ̈ܗܪܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܢܣܒ. * ܘܕܩܢܘܡܗ ܗܢ f. 29vb ܕܐܝܘܒ ܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܦܢ: ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܠܫܘܝܘܬ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ. ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܠܩܢܐ. ܫܡܥܢܢ
< ܓܝܪ ܬܘܒ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܀ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܫܡܥ ܐܠܩܢܐ ܐܢܫ
< ܢܥܒܕ: ܡܢ ܦܪܝܫܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܦܐܢܛܐܣܝܐ ܡܬܩܢܝܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܓܒܪܐ
< ܒܬܪܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܫܒܢ: ܘܠܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܐ. ܐܠܐ ܕܚܕ
< ܩܢܘܡܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܒܬܪܝܫܘܬܐ ܡܗܦܟܝܢ: ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܕܦܐܢܛܐܣܝܐ ܡܬܩܢܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܗܘ̇ ܕܡܬܬܨܝܪ: ܗܘ̇، ܕܡܢ ܪܡܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܕܒܪ ܐܝܟ ܢܡܘܣܐ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܗܠܟ ܕܡܢ ܡܘܫܐ ܦܘ̈ܩܕܢܐ ܢܫܠܡ: ܘܠܕܘܟܬܐ ܢܣܩ ܕܡܫܟܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܦܩܕ ܗܘܐ ܢܡܘܣܐ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܥܡ ܚܢܐ ܐܢܬܬܐ ܢܟܦܬܐ ܘܪܚܡܬ ܠܐܠܗܐ. ܗܘ̇، ܕܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܦܐܪܐ ܠܫܡܘܐܝܠ ܗܘ̇ ܡܫܡܗܐ ܒܢܒ̈ܝܐ.

ܟܕ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܥܡܗܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܗ ܕܐܠܩܢܐ: ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܗܢܐ ܚܪܝܦܐ. ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܕܐܝܘܒ ܘܕܐܠܩܢܐ: ܟܕ ܐܦ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ

B

Line 152: ܦܪܫܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ, B: ܦܪ̈ܫܬܐ ܡܠ̈ܬܐ (wrongly; cf. supra, line 110).
Line 153: ܒܬܪܝܫܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܢ, cf. supra, line 111 (ܡܬܚܫܒܢܢ ܒܡܕܥܗ).

be laughed at loud and long for uttering such gibberish? Will he decline to say this because of the obviousness of the shame involved, make pretexts from unrealities and errors and propose that collections and assemblies of those properties are hypostases? How should readers consider those properties can concur with one another, there not being given the hypostases with which they are capable of concurring? However, we shall also learn that the hypostases are not the collection of the characteristic properties which are counted as Job and Elkanah either, if we attend to the following question: will they say that the characteristic properties which the doctor rehearsed were innate in Job and Elkanah, or will they say that they came to belong to them latterly? But I suppose they will say, unless they have lapsed from correct reasonings, that most of the properties occurred to them latterly. For nobody can say that what became Job's in his distress had been with him * all along, or that what was bestowed upon Elkanah as a result of his virtue and of his intercourse with Hannah, were innate. So how can what duly came to belong to the hypostases latterly, after a long time, be Job's and Elkanah's hypostases?

But perhaps, under pressure from the necessity of the argument, they may say again: 'we do not define all the properties, attributed to Job and Elkanah, as their hypostases, but only those which are there all along and are innate, as it were, in them'. Therefore, according to this clever division, some of the characteristic properties of the prosopa must be hypostases and some not. So tell me who will ever credit such gibberish, and will not cast out of his mind, and rightly so, this abominable and impious nonsense? Nevertheless, let it be granted by way of concession, if they like, that the characteristic and inseparable properties, which are there all along in certain men, are their hypostases, what will be the



ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܗܘܢ : * ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܙܕܩܬܐ ܢܬܚܫܒܢ : ܟܕ f. 30ra ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܚܒܪܢܐ : ܐܘ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܡܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܡܫܬܐܠ ܡܛܠ ܚܠܘܬܐ ܕܒܗܬܬܐ : ܟܕ ܡܬܥܠܠ ܕܝܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܘܒܛܘܥܝܬܐ : ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܟܢܘܫܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܟܕ ܩܘܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܠܘܬܗܘܢ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܬܚܒܢ ܠܐ ܡܬܝܗܒܝܢ : ܗܠܝܢ ܟܕ ܫ̈ܪܝܪܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܙܕܩ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܦܓܥܝܢ ܢܬܦܓܥܘܢ. ܘܐܦ ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܬܡܢܝ ܐܝܘܒ ܘܕܐܠܩܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܠܘܩܒܠ : ܐܢ ܗܕܐ ܢܬܒܝܢ ܒܗܕܐ ܕܡܫܐܠܬܐ. ܐܪܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܟܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܘܟܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܬܝܠܕ : ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܬܢܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ : ܐܘ ܕܠܚܪܬܐ ܗܘܝ ܠܗܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܢܫܘ ܕܠܐ ܢܦܠܘ ܡܢ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܐ : ܕܠܚܪܬܐ ܣܘܓܐܗܘܢ ܓܕܫ ܠܗܘܢ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܢܫ ܡܫܟܚ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܐܘ ܕܗܘܝ ܕܐܝܘܒ ܒܐܘܠܨܢܗ ܗܘ̣ܝ ܠܐܝܘܒ : ܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ * ܥܡܗ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܘ̣ܝ : ܐܘ f. 30rb ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܡܝܬܪܘܬܗ ܘܡܢ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܚܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܩܢܐ ܐܬܝܗܒ : ܕܟܝܢ ܠܗ ܟ̈ܝܢܝܢ ܗܘ̣ܝ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ : ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܙܒܢܐ ܣܓܝܐܐ ܠܚܪܬܐ ܠܐܝܟܢܐܝܬ ܗܘ̣ܝ ܠܗܘܢ.

ܐܠܐ ܟܒܪ ܟܕ ܡܢ ܐܘܠܨܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܬܚܡܢܗ̇ ܕܐܝܘܒ ܘܕܐܠܩܢܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܗܘܢ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ ܥܡܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܡܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܢܗܝܢ ܡܢ ܢܗܘܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܢܗܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܗܟܝܠ. ܘܡܢܘ ܐܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܝ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܙܘܟܐ ܡܬܦܠܣܦ ܡܢܗܘܢ : ܘܠܐ ܒܐܝܬܘ ܠܦܘܩܕܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܘܪܘܫܥܐ ܡܢ ܪܥܝܢܗ ܢܫܕܐ. ܟܢ ܥܕܡܐ ܒܡܫܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܢ ܨܒܝܢ : ܘܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ : ܘܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ ܒܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܗܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ.

---

B

upshot of the argument? * Will it not be to say that so-and-so's whiteness, for example, and narrowness of nose, and, in a word, everything whatsoever like these, and any qualities his soul may happen to have, are its hypostases; whereas another's are their opposites: for example, blackness, being snub-nosed *et cetera*? And, in the first place must not some of the hypostases be mutually opposite? But how we are to avoid falling into false and absurd ideas, if we call the collections of accidents, and what are viewed in the hypostases and accompany the hypostases, 'hypostases', we cannot say! But again: if, being troubled with various perplexities, they agree that we may not in the case of men (for the reasons stated) call the hypostases 'collections of characteristic properties', yet say that in the case of the Holy Trinity, where there is no accident and where nothing of later origin can be conceived of, we must, of necessity, profess as hypostases the characteristic properties of the hypostases, because 'we are compelled to allow of nothing * imperfect, non-subsisting or imaginary in the Holy Trinity'; we shall say perforce that we, for our part, adhering throughout to the doctrines of the Church's divinely inspired teachers, will never yield, * in any way whatever, to the thought of an accident or anything imperfect, non-subsisting (i.e. unreal) or imaginary in the Holy Trinity. No, we avert our gaze from whoever utter anything so blasphemous, as from strangers to the whole Church of the orthodox. Nevertheless, the pioneers of these novel and absurd doctrines are to recognize that it is not we who are forced to profess something imperfect, non-subsisting and imaginary in the Holy Trinity, by our not calling the characteristic properties of the prosopa 'hypostases'; but it is those who make the hypostases characteristic properties and thus, for their part, completely negate the Holy Trinity, who are compelled to define the whole mystery of Godliness as imperfect, non-subsisting and



ܠܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܟܝܠ ܡܬܦܢܝܢ ܡܠܬܐ. * ܐܪܐ ܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܝ f. 30va
ܕܢܐܡܪ : ܕܚܘܪܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܦܠܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܘܩܛܝܢܘܬ
ܢܚܝܪܐ : ܘܐܝܟܢ ܕܒܦܣܘܩܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܠܗܠܝܢ
ܕܡܝܢ : ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܐܦ ܕܐܬܓܕܫ ܕܢܗܘܝܢ ܕܢܦܫܐ ܡܘܡܝܬܗ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܕܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܗܢܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ :
ܐܟܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܟܡܘܬܐ ܘܦܛܝܣܘܬܐ ܘܕܐܪܬܐ : ܘܫܪܟܐܝܬ
ܦܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܘ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ
ܢܗܘܘܢ. ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܗ ܒܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܓܕܫܐ ܘܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܒܠ
ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܘܢܩܦܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܠܐ
ܒܬܥܝܬܐ ܕܫܘܐܠܐ ܘܡܥܪܩܬܐ ܢܦܠܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܡܐܡܪ. ܐܦ
ܕܝܢ ܗܘܒ ܒܗ ܡܫܠܡܝܢ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ : ܢܩܘܦܘܢ ܕܒܠ
ܒܢܝܢܫܐ ܡܢ : ܡܛܠ ܥܠܠܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ : ܠܐ ܢܐܡܪ
ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ : ܒܠ
ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܓܕܫܐ ܐܝܬ :
ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܚܪܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܕܢܬܚܫܒ : ܢܐܡܪܘܢ
ܕܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ
ܢܘܕܐ : ܕܠܐ ܠܢ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ * ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܡܩܢܝܐ f. 30vb
ܐܘ ܗܠܝܢܝܐ ܒܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܫܠܝܛ ܕܢܩܒܠ :
ܐܠܨܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܚܢܢ ܕܝܢ ܒܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܢܫܝܡܝ
ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܢܩܦܝܢ : ܠܐ ܡܬܛܦܣ ܡܬܬܪܟܢܝܢ
ܕܢܬܪܟܢ * ܒܐܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܢ : ܒܓܕܫܐ ܡܕܡ : ܐܘ ܠܐ A, f. 62ra
ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܡܩܢܝܐ : ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ : ܐܘ
ܗܠܝܢܝܐ : ܒܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܘܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ
ܕܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܟܢ ܗܘ ܡܓܕܦܝܢ : ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܕܟܠܗ
ܥܕܬܐ ܕܐܪܬܘܕܘܟܣܘ ܡܗܦܟܝܢ ܐܦܝܢ. ܒܪܡ ܢܕܥܘܢ
ܡܫ̈ܪܝܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܩ̈ܘܠܦܬܐ ܚ̈ܕܬܬܐ ܘܡܫܝܢܬܐ : ܕܠܘ ܚܢ
ܡܠܘܢ : ܒܗܝ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܐ
ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܩܢܝܐ ܘܗܠܝܢܝܐ
ܒܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܕܐܘܕܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ
ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ : ܘܗܟܢܐ
ܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܐܦܝܗܘܢ ܟܦܪܝܢ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܠܟܠܗ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܘܠܐ

A from l. 216 on B

imaginary. For if the characteristic properties do not subsist individually and in properness of subsistence, of necessity those who profess the hypostases of the Holy Trinity as characteristic properties will not merely think the hypostases imperfect, but will also deny their being hypostases at all. For it is impossible, if they do not subsist properly and individually, for them to be hypostases and prosopa. Yet the characteristic properties will not be found imperfect on that account. For, as we have said already earlier, even though they are not hypostases, none the less, *qua* characteristic properties, they are perfect, and by no means imperfect, non-subsisting or imaginary; for how could properties, characteristic and indicative of real hypostases be imperfect, imaginary or non-subsisting i.e. non-exist? So, because this prudent author will have no thought of anything imperfect, imaginary or non-subsisting in the Holy Trinity, he must clearly be professing also that the characteristic properties of the divine nature are the substance itself of the Godhead, if, as he supposes, whatever is neither substance nor hypostasis must be imperfect and non-subsisting. Otherwise * what will be the consequence? That whereas the characteristic properties of the hypostases will be imperfect, imaginary and non-subsisting unless they are hypostases, the characteristic prop-



ܡܦܢܝܢܐ ܘܗܓܝܓܐ ܕܢܬܝܣܒܘܢ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ
ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܘܒܕܝܠܝܘܬ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܐ
ܡܩܝܡܝܢ: ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ: ܠܘ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܠܐ
ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ: ܐܠܐ ܘܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗܘܝܢ
ܗܘܘ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܟܦܪܝܢ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܟܚܐ
ܕܟܕ ܕܝܠܐܝܬ ܘܡܢܗܘܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܡܩܝܡܝܢ: ܕܢܗܘܘܢ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܐܠܐ ܠܘ ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ
ܡܫܬܟܚܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ
ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܐܡܪܢ: ܐܦ ܐܢ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ
ܐܢܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܗܟܝ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ: ܐܘ ܠܐ ܡܩܝܡܬܐ ܐܘ
ܗܓܝܓܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ
ܘܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܫܪܝܪ̈ܐ: ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ
ܗܓܝܓܬܐ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܡܩܝܡܬܐ: ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
ܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ. ܡܛܠ ܗܟܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܐܘ ܗܓܝܓܐ
ܐܘ ܠܐ ܡܩܝܡܐ: ܢܬܪܥܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܪܥܝܢܐ ܣܟܘܠܬܢܐ
ܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܝܕܝܥܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܘܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ: ܕܗ̇ܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ: ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ: ܕܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ: ܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܡܢ ܟܠ ܦܘܪܣ ܘܠܐ ܡܩܝܡܐ. ܘܐܠܐ * ܐܝܢܐ ܢܦܩܘܬܐ f. 62rb
ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇: ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܗ̇ܢ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܠܐ
ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܘܗܓܝܓܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܩܝܡܬܐ ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ: ܐܢ ܗܘ

AB flor. II from l. 228 on

Line 241: ܠܐ, B: ܐܘ ܠܐ.

Line 243: ܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ, flor. II: ܢܗܘܘܢ.

Line 249: ..... ܐܝܢܐ. A note, written in a cursive hand in the left margin of fol. 62r in A, reads as follows: ܢܕܥ ܩܪܘܝܐ ܪܚܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܩܦ̄ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܕܒܬܪܗ ܦܫܩܝܢ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܡܘܣܦܝܢ [ܠܗ̇ ܠ] ܠܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܘܢܐ. *The God-loving reader should know that this chapter and the three following chapters explain the difference between 'property' and 'hypostasis' and give more explanation of Basilius' saying that 'Godhead' indicates the common.*

Line 251: ܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ, flor. II: ܢܗܘܘܢ

erties of the Godhead will not be incomplete, not be imaginary, will not be non-subsisting even though they are not the Godhead.

'How', someone may perhaps ask, 'will we not be rejecting Basil's statement which says that hypostasis is the collection of the properties?' In reply to whom we shall also answer, with justice, that we will again, with Truth aiding us, investigate the examination of this point when we get to the passage involved, although we have, in the foregoing, already made various, not altogether unhelpful, statements relevant to it. However, for the present, we should note only this point here: that the doctor did not call the collection of properties 'hypostasis', but the collection of properties 'belonging with' each one. We must, too, scrutinize the way in which it is prudent for us to conceive of the hypostasis as being the collection of the properties which belong with the hypostasis, because correct reasonings teach us that we are to understand 'belonging with each one' as meaning nothing other than 'belonging with each of the hypostases'. We shall, then, as we said before, reserve the full examination of the point to its proper place.

Let us investigate again this statement made by our divinely inspired holy father Severus. This excellent fellow, therefore, shall say clearly what he wants to infer in defence of his doctrines from the proof-text of Severus: 'The hypostasis is indicative of the property'.

For he wrote, as previously stated, immediately after the father's proof-text, in the *Many-lined Apology* mentioned before, as follows: Having set this down, therefore, I reminded the listener and

**242/243** cf. infra, ch. 16, 165 **245** cf. infra, ch. 17, 80-155 **246/247** cf. b. II, ch. 14 **260/261** cf. infra, 266 **264/277** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa:* cf. supra, ch. 7, 21-23



ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܩܢ̈ܘܡܝܬܐ
ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܗ̈ܓܓܝܬܐ
ܘܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܩܢ̈ܘܡܝܬܐ ܐܦ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ.

ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܐܢܫ ܟܒܪ ܠܐ ܡܣܠܝܢ ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܐܡܪܐ
ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ : ܕܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܩܢܘܡܐ.
ܠܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܒܥܘܕܪܢܐ ܗ̄ܘ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ
ܒܕܘܟܬܗ̇ ܗ̇ܘܝܢ : ܬܘܒ ܒܗ̇ ܒܨܝܪܐ ܡܥܒܪ ܠܢ ܡܬܦܢܝܢ :
ܐܦ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܡܫܠܡܢܘܬ ܟܐܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܝܬܪ : ܠܐ
ܦܠܓ ܟܠܢܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܕܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ ܐܡܪܢ. ܒܪܡ
ܕܢܬܒܐ ܗܕܐ ܗܪܟܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܢܕܥ : ܕܠܐ ܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ
ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ
ܚܕ. ܘܢܒܨܐ ܕܢܬܚܙܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܙܗܝܪܬܐ ܕܢܣܬܟܠ :
ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܡܛܠ
ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ : ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ
ܡܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܢܣܬܟܠ ܚܘ̈ܫܒܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܨܘܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܦܝܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܗܟܝܠ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ ܐܡܪܢ : ܒܥܘܩܒܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ
ܠܕܘܟܬܗ ܢܛܪ.

ܘܡܠܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܢܦܝܫ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ
ܣܐܘܝܪܐ ܬܘܒ ܢܒܨܐ. ܢܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ
: ܕܨܒܐ ܬܘܒ ܠܡܣܒܪܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܗ، ܡܢܗ̇ ܕܪܫܡܘܣ
ܟܬܒܐ ܕܣܘܝܪܐ. ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܡ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܝܪ ܠܡܘܕܥܢܐ.

ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡܢܐ ܐܡܝܪܐ : ܡܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ
ܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܒܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܦܬ̈ܓܡ
— ܗܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܗܕܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗ̇ ܦܩܕܬ :

AB flor. II up to l. 254

Line 253: ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ, flor. II: ܢܗܘܝܢ.
Line 265: ܕܗ̇ܝ, B: ܗ̇ܝ.
Line 270: ܣܐܘܝܪܐ, B: ܣܐܪܐܘܐ.
Line 271: ܕܪܫܡܘܣ, B: ܕܪܫܡܝܣ.
Line 275: ܦܩܕܬ ..... ܗܠܝܢ, cf. ch. 12, line 15 (ܦܩܕܬ ..... ܒܗ) and note.

said: 'Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis "indicative of the property"'. Has it not then been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases but accidents or certain natural indications which are introduced into all the hypostases which are under one substance? About these indications the Patriarch also spoke in *Against Felicissimus*, as follows: 'For, Felicissimus, (*for it is good to reply to you, because you are close) does calling the same body "corruptible", "passible", and "mortal", signify three hypostases and three substrates, as, e.g. *Paul, Silvanus and Timothy* and Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for those exist in three separate and unconfused hypostases?'

You will perceive the vast scale of the empty vauntings and hypocritical deception; for, having demonstrated nothing at all which would assist him in his fraudulent opinion, he said, with a haughty demeanour, like some general who has gained a powerful victory over his opponents: Has it not then been demonstrated by the quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases?

Since he includes himself in the rank of the doctors, he ought to give the same kind of proof as they, and to reveal plainly the

**265/266** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (n° 14); cf. supra, ch. 1, 58-60 **272/277** Sev. Ant., *C. Feliciss.*, loco incerto (fragm. hucusque incognitum) **275** I Thess. 1:1; II Thess. 1:1 **282/285** cf. supra, 266-269



— ܚܙܝܬ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܐܡܪܬ : ܕܗܘ ܠܢܦܫܟ ܚܒܝܒܐ : ܡܡܠܠ
— ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܐܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ
— ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܡܢ ܩܕܡ : ܕܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܘܠܐ
— ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ : ܗܝ ܕܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܟܕ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ
— ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
— ܢܣܒܪ ܐܠܐ ܓܕ̈ܫܐ : ܐܘ ܫܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܟ̈ܝܢܝܐ
— ܕܥܠ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܬܚܝܬ ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
— ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡ̈ܬܬܝܬܝܢ : ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܡܡܠܠ
← ܕܠܘܬ ܦܠܝܩܣܝܣܝܡܘܣ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ܃ ܐܪܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܘ
← ܦܠܝܩܣܝܣܝܡܐ : ܠܘܬܟ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܩܪܝܒ ܐܢܬ * ܫܦܝܪ f. 62va
← ܠܡܦܢܝܘ ܡܠܬܐ : ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܘܕܥܐ ܗܝ ܕܢܐܡܪ :
← ܠܡܬܚܒܠܢܐ ܘܚܫܘܫܐ ܘܡܝܘܬܐ ܠܗ ܠܦܓܪܐ : ܘܬܠܬܐ
← ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܝܡܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܢ ܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܣܝܠܘܢܘܣ
← ܘܛܝܡܬܐܘܣ : ܘܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܓܝܪ
← ܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܦܪ̈ܝܫܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܒ̈ܠܝܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ܀

ܚܙܝ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܪܒܘܬܐ ܕܫܘ̈ܒܗܪܐ ܣܪ̈ܝܩܐ : ܘܕܢܟܝܠܘܬܐ
ܐܣܟܡܢܝܘܬܐ : ܟܕ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܡ ܗܘ ܕܡܥܕܪ ܠܗ ܠܘܬ
ܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܐܢܟܝܠܬܐ ܗܘ. ܟܕ ܙܩܦ ܠܗ ܫܘܒܗܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܟ
ܪܒ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܚܝܠܬܢܐܝܬ ܙܟܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠܗ
— ܐܡܪ܃ ܐܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ
— ܕܩܕܝܡܢ : ܕܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ : ܗܝ
— ܕܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܟܕ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܕܠܐ
— ܐܢܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܣܒܪ܃

ܘܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܟܕ ܒܛܟܣܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܢܦܫܗ ܡܢܐ :
ܕܢܚܘܐ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܠܗ̇ ܕܐܝܢܐ ܕܡܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ : ܘܢܓܠܐ ܦܪܝܣܐܝܬ

AB up to ܐܢܟܝܠܬܐ (l. 293)

Line 277: ܐܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ, cf. infra, line 314 and note.
Line 278: ܕܩܕܝܡܢ ܩܕܡ, cf. infra, lines 295-296 (ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܡܢ).
Line 288: ܘܣܝܠܘܢܘܣ, B: ܘܣܝܠܘܢܣ.
Line 290: ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ, A: ܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܢ.
Lines 295-296: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܡܢ, cf. supra, line 278 (ܕܩܕܝܡܢ ܩܕܡ).

father's view (supposing he believed there was anything there to confirm his own professed view) and thereby convince everyone that the characteristic properties (i.e. ingeneracy, generacy and procession), subsisting and being perceived in the common substance, are hypostases; and not to have enacted his own arbitrary decree. If this is not the rule, what is to stop anybody charged with heresy from quoting whatever he likes out of the divine Scriptures or the fathers' teachings and saying, without any sort of examination or proof, 'has it not been demonstrated by the divine Scriptures and the fathers' opinion that such-and-such is as I please'?

However, we are to note here, too, that, fearful of the revelation of the fraud, he fought shy of wronging the truth openly and nakedly, and saying: 'Has it not been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there to suppose that the characteristic properties of the prosopa (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession), which subsist and are perceived in the common substance, are not hypostases?' No, aware that that would win him instant and just rebuttal (for no such thing is contained in the fathers' utterances) * he abandoned the cause, as it were, for which the whole controversy was taking place and said: Has it not been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases?

But because, here as well, he flaunts the fathers' testimonies as a bait to catch the simple, may we, please, dwell again a little

**301/305** et **309/312** cf. supra, 266-269



ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܐܝܟܘ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܕܡܫܪܪ ܠܬܘܕܝܬܗ ܕܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܒܗ̇ ܡܫܟܚ ܗܘܐ : ܘܡܚܘܐ ܠܟܠܢܫ ܢܦܝܣ : ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܝܬܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܟܕ ܡܩܝܡܢ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܝ̈ܕܥܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܒܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܢܦܫܗ ܗ̇ܘ, ܕܓܙܪܐ ܠܗ ܢܦܫܗ. ܘܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܠܡܦܠܐ : ܡܢܘ ܟܠܐ ܘܕܚܠܨ ܕܒܗܪܣܝܣ ܡܬܥܕܪܐ : ܢܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܢ ܕܨܒܐ ܐܘ ܡܢ ܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܐܠܗܝ̈ܐ ܐܘ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ : ܘܢܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܘܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ : ܐܪܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܡܢ ܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܐܠܗܝ̈ܐ ܘܣܘܟܠܐ ܐܒܗܝܐ : ܕܗܟܢ ܗܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܝ ܨܒܐ.

ܒܪܡ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܢܬܒܩܐ : ܕܟܕ ܡܢ ܓܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܕܓܠܘܬܐ ܕܚܠ : ܠܐ ܐܬܬܟܠ ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܘܕܠܐ ܚܦܝܬܘܬܐ ܢܛܠܘܡ
— ܠܫܪܪܐ ܘܢܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܐܪܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ
— ܕܩܕܡܝܢ ܦܫܝܩܢ : ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ :
— ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ
— ܐܢܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܢ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ
— ܡܬܝ̈ܕܥܢ : ܠܐ ܢܣܒܪ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܟܕ ܝܕܥ
ܕܡܚܕܐ ܡܟܣܘ̇ ܒܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܬܟܣܣ : ܘܠܐ ܓܝܪ
f.62vb ܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܒܡܠ̈ܬܐ ܩܠܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ * ܐܝܬ : ܫܒܩ ܗ̇ܝ,
ܕܡܛܠܬܗ̇ : ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘܐ ܒܗ̇ ܟܠܗ ܚܪܝܢܐ
— ܘܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܪܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ
— ܦܫܝܩܢ : ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ : ܗ̇ܝ,
— ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܟܕ ܡܩܝܡܢ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܝ̈ܕܥܢ ܕܠܐ
— ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܣܒܪ ܀

ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܠܘܬ ܨܝܕܐ ܕܦܫܝ̈ܛܐ ܒܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܠܗ ܡܫܬܒܗܪ. ܬܘܒ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܢ ܫܦܝܪ

A

Line 314: ܕܐܪܐ, cf. supra, line 277 (ܐܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ) et infra, lines 322 and 356 (ܐܪܐ).

Line 322: ܐܪܐ, cf. supra, line 314 and note.

on the examination of our God-clad father SEVERUS' text. Our author, then, having said, What are we to say of Saint Epiphanius and having quoted the words set out above without saying anything whatsoever about them, immediately went on as follows: And what are we to say of blessed Severus, who replies to the Grammarian of Caesarea: 'For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property'? Having set this down, therefore, I reminded the listener and said: 'Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis "indicative of the property"'. Has it not then been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases but accidents or certain natural indications? *et cetera* as previously set down.

It has already been proved to right-minded people, as I judge, and from this very same patristic text, that we are by no means compelled to say that the characteristic properties are hypostases. None the less, for the sake of our readers, we will do our utmost to demonstrate more clearly the correct interpretation of the father, on the basis of his divinely inspired utterances.

We should have liked to learn from the author himself what aid he supposes these words of the father bring his doctrines and not merely conjecture his reasonings. But because he said nothing at all except, Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis 'indicative of the property' * and added, as if he were draw-

**316** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa*; cf. supra, ch. 7, 13-14 **318/331** Ibid.; cf. supra, ch. 7, 15-23, et ch. 9, 266-270 **342/343** cf. supra, 326-327



— ܒܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܟܬܒܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܘܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܢܒܕܘܩ.
— ܟܕ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܡܪ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ : ܡܢܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܕܝܫܐ
— ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ : ܘܐܝܬܝ, ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܣܝ̈ܡܢ : ܘܠܡܕܡ
ܡܕܡ ܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܡܪ : ܡܚܠܐܬܝܬ ܚܒܝܒ ܒܗ ܗܟܢܐ
— ܐܡܪ ✤ ܘܠܛܘܒܢܐ ܣܐܘܪܐ ܕܡܦܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ
< ܩܣܪܝܐ ܘܐܡܪ ✤ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܟܠܗ
< ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܒܓܘܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܟܠܗ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ :
< ܡܠܬܐ ܘܡܫܒܠܐ ܠܝ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ :
< ܘܠܝܬ ܡܕܡ ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܘܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ : ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ,
< ܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ : ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ.
— ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܟܕ ܣܡܬ : ܐܥܝܪܬ ܠܫܡܘܥܐ ܘܐܡܪܬ. ܚܙܝ
— ܠܘܩܕܡ ܚܒܝܒܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܡܪ
— ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ. ܐܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܡܢ
— ܣܝ̈ܡܢ : ܕܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ : ܗ̇ܝ
— ܕܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܗ ܡܩܝܡܢ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܫܒܢ : ܕܠܐ
— ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܠܐ ܓܕ̈ܫܐ : ܐܘ ܫܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ
— ܟ̈ܝܢܝܐ ✤ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܕܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܥܠ ܣܝ̈ܡܢ.

ܘܗܐ ܡܢ ܒܗ ܡܢ ܠܬܪܝܨܝ̈ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ
ܐܢܐ : ܘܡܢܗ ܕܗܕܐ ܟܬܒܬ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܕܠܐ
ܗܝ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܐܡܪ
ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ. ܒܪܡ ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ : ܢܥܒܕ ܚܝܠܢ ܟܠܗ
ܠܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܬܘܪܓܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܢ ܬܒܥ ܩܠܘܗܝ, ܢܫܝ̈ܒܬ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܐ ܒܡܠܐ ܕܬܪܝܨܐ ܢܚܘܐ.

ܘܨܒܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢ ܕܡܢܗ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܢܐܠܦ : ܕܡܢܐ
ܡܥܕܪܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܘܬ ܒܘܕܪܫܐ
ܕܝܘܠܦܢܗ : ܘܠܐ ܢܬܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܚܘܫ̈ܒܘܗܝ.. ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ
— ܡܕܡ ܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܐܡܪ ✤ ܐܠܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܠܘܩܕܡ ܚܒܝܒܐ :
— ܡܛܠ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ✤ * ܘܡܢ — f.63ra

A

Lines 336-337: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ..... ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ, cf. ch. 3, lines 233-234 and note.

ing a grand inference from it, Has it not then been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases: we must, therefore, make a conjecture (if, too, we may trust our powers of conjecture) and say that what he means, though for shame he keeps silent about it, is this: that, with the doctor's having said, the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property, it has been proved that hypostasis, being indicative of the property, must in all respects and in every way be characteristic property. For if, as he says, hypostasis is signified by characteristic property and likewise, also, characteristic property is indicated by hypostasis, clearly hypostasis and characteristic property are identical. Such are his powerful objections, we imagine. We, on the other hand, uphold the truth in opposition to them and say he ought not to define things like this by authority, but, if he wants to *guide his words with judgment* (as the Scripture has it), should confirm what he says, either from the divinely inspired fathers, or from what is indubitably and universally professed. Otherwise, from what utterances of the doctors, or necessity of correct reasonings, can he prove (even were one to allow that characteristic property is indicated by hypostasis) that the characteristic property certainly must be the hypostasis, when all the doctors of the Church alike teach us, and the nature of the realities itself discloses to us, that in no existing thing are the characteristic properties of something identical with the object characterized?

**344/347** cf. supra, 327-330 **350/351** cf. supra, 323-325 **359/360** Ps. 111:5



— ܗܕܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܕܡ ܪܒܐ ܚܙܐ : ܐܘܣܦ ܀ ܐܪܐ ܠܐ
— ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܡ ܣܝܡܢ : ܕܣܢܝܐ ܘܠܐ
— ܠܫܠܡܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ : ܗܝ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܗ ܡܬܩܢܝܢ
— ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܩܝܡܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ
— ܢܣܒܪ ܀ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܚܝܠ ܒܪ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܚܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܦܢ ܘܗܘ
ܕܐܦ ܙܕܩ ܕܥܠ ܬܐܘܪܝܐ ܡܕܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܢܬܬܟܠ : ܕܗܕܐ ܪܟܐ
ܕܐܡܪ ܐܦ ܡܢ ܒܗܬܬܐ ܫܬܩ : ܕܟܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܀
< ܘܠܬܘܗܝ ܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܀ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܪ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܒܟܠ ܘܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ : ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܚܘܐ : ܟܡܐ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ : ܓܠܝܐ ܗܝ : ܕܗܘ ܒܪ
ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ. ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ
ܕܗܦܟܬܗ ܬܠܝܬܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܗܓܝܢ : ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ
ܐܬܝܗܝܢ. ܚܢܢ ܕܝܢ ܒܪ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ
ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܙܕܩ ܕܠܐ ܒܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܟܢ ܢܬܚܡ.
ܐܠܐ ܐܢܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܝ ܕܟܬܝܒܐ ܒܕܝܢܐ ܠܡܠܘܗܝ ܢܪܟܐ
ܕܢܒܪ : ܗܝ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ : ܐܘ ܡܢ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܢܦܝܫܝ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܐ : ܐܘ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܚܘܝܐ ܘܓܘܢܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܟܠܢܫ
ܡܬܬܘܕܝܢ ܢܫܪܪ. ܘܐܢ ܠܐ : ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܒܝܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ :
ܐܘ ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܕܦܘܫܩܐ ܬܪܝܨܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܘܐܦ
ܢܬܠ ܐܢܫ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ ܒܝܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ :
ܕܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ :
ܟܕ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܥܡܐܝܬ ܡܠܦܝܢ ܠܢ : ܘܗܘ ܕܝܢ
ܟܝܢܐ ܕܨܒܘܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܐ ܠܢ : ܕܠܐ ܒܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ
ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܡ : ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܡܬܝܕܥ
ܐܬܝܗܝܢ.

A

Line 356: ܐܪܐ, cf. supra, line 314 and note.

Lines 363-364: ܘܠܬܘܗܝ ..... ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ, cf. ch. 3, lines 233-234 and note.

For if, because in a particular sense, perhaps (again to concede this point as well) hypostasis and its characteristic property are mutually signified, hypostasis and its characteristic property were identical; must not, in this sense, both the Godhead's substance and its characteristic properties be identical? * For one who mentally imagines the Godhead can, perhaps, in thought apprehend its characteristic properties, by conceiving of it as uncreated, infinite and immutable, and, again, be led up by these same properties to the very thought of the Godhead. He will, not on that account suppose that the substance of God is the properties of the divine nature, nor, again, will he reckon properties to be the Godhead's substance. Thus, even if someone were to say that the hypostasis is signified by its own characteristic property and again that characteristic property is indicated by hypostasis, he would not be forced to suppose the characteristic property of the hypostasis as identical with the hypostasis.



ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܣܘܟܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܟܒܪ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܬܘܒ ܐܦ ܗܕܐ ܢܫܠܡ : ܡܢ ܚܕܕܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ : ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܗܘܝܐ : ܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܢܗܘܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܢ ܗܢܐ ܒܣܘܟܠܐ ܠܘ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܗܝ ܬܬܚܫܒ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܕܝ̈ܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ.

f. 63rb ܡܚܫܒ ܓܝܪ * ܟܒܪ ܗܘ ܕܒܗܘܢܐ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܬܗܘܠܠ : ܕܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܢܣܒ. ܟܕ ܠܐ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܣܬܝܟܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܝܬܐ ܢܣܒ ܠܗ. ܘܬܘܒ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܘܬܐ ܠܬܘܗ ܕܡܣܟܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܢܬܥܠܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܡܣܒܪ : ܐܘ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ : ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܘܬܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܗܘܝܐ ܕܝܢ : ܘܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ : ܘܬܘܒ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ : ܠܐ ܡܬܐܠܨ ܕܗܝ ܚܕ ܗܝ ܢܣܒܪ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ.

A

# Chapter 10

*Concerning the fact that it is in dealing with the difference of terms (and not as though they seek to prove that Godhead, substance and nature are several different things, or that the characterizers are the same things as the characterized, and signifiers and indicators as the objects signified and indicated) that the teachers of mysteries said that substance signifies the Godhead's nature whereas Godhead is indicative of the substance and that the hypostasis characterizes a single substrate and similar things. And refutation of the facile sophism whereby this cunning fellow attempts to argue that those who do not consider the characteristic properties of hypostases as being hypostases are bound to profess hypostases of hypostases, because wise Severus said that the hypostasis characterizes a single substrate.*

We have said these things with the intention of proving that when our divinely inspired father Severus says: For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property; even if we allow that the characteristic property is indicated by the hypostasis, we are not obliged to think of the hypostasis as the characteristic property, nor again, to call it the characteristic property even if the doctor understood property here as meaning hypostasis. For, as we have

---

**16/21** cf. supra, ch. 9, 320-325

## ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܥܣܪܐ.

ܥܠ ܕܡܛܠ ܫܘܚܠܦ ܫܡܗܐ: ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܒܥܝܢ ܬܚܘܝܬ ܐܪ̈ܐ ܕܢܚܘܘܢ: ܕܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ: ܐܘ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܗ̇ܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܡܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܡܝܢ: ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܣܡܢܝܢ: ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܣܡܢܝܢ: ܐܡܪܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ: ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ: ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܚܡܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ. ܘܡܦܢܐ ܕܣܘܦܣܡܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܕܟ̈ܠܢܝܘܗܝ، ܕܒܗܢܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܗ̇ܘ ܢܟܝܠܐ: ܕܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܐ ܚܫܒܝܢ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܚܝܒܐܝܬ ܕܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ: ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܕܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܢܘܕܘܢ: ܡܛܠ ܠܡ ܕܐܡ̣ܪ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ: ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܚܡܝܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ ܀

ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܡܪܢ ܒܗ ܒܨܒܝܢ ܕܢܚܘܐ: ܕܟܕ ܢܫܝܡ ܡܢ
« ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ
« ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܒܟܘܢܝܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ
« ܡܫܓܫ: ܡܬܒܠܒܠܐ ܘܡܬܚܒܠܐ ܠܝ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ
« ܘܩܢܘܡܐ: ܘܠܝܬ ܡܕܡ ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܘܢ ܘܠܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ:
« ܘܠܝܬܝܗܘܢ، ܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܕܟܘܢܝܘܬܐ: ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
« ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܀ ܘܐܦܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ
ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ ܝܗܒ: ܠܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܬܐ ܢܬܪܥܐ: ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܕܐܦܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܪܟܐ ܐܣܬܟܠ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܢܩܪܐ. ܡܬܩܢܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ

---

AC from ܕܡܢ (l. 21) on    flor. II from l. 24 on

---

Lines 20-21: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ..... ܘܠܝܬܝܗܘܢ, cf. ch. 3, lines 233-234 and note.
Line 24: ܡܬܩܢܝܢ, A: ܡܬܚܢܝܢ.

already * stated, our theologian fathers (even though, as a general principle, they recognize the characteristic properties of each individual as other than the very thing they characterize) appear as saying, in various passages, in dealing with the difference of terms, sometimes that the Godhead's nature is signified by substance, sometimes that the substance is indicated by Godhead; but sometimes, also, as proposing hypostasis as characteristic of a single substrate. We do not on that account have the silly idea that what is indicated by the terms 'substance', 'Godhead' and 'nature' are different things and not one; nor do we reckon what is signified by 'hypostasis' as one thing and what is signified by 'single substrate' as something else. No, and neither do we impiously identify the characteristic properties with what they characterize. For although owing to the difference of terms, we hear that the Godhead's nature is signified by substance, and, again, that substance is indicated by Godhead, and, again, that the single substrate is characterized by hypostasis; nevertheless it is quite impossible for us to conceive of these as being signified, indicated and characterized by characteristic properties, if we take the trouble not to veer from the mind of the fathers. Nobody, in fact, ever ventured, or would ever venture, I believe, to say that substance is a property of the Godhead's nature, or Godhead of the substance; nor evidently, indeed, hypostasis of the single substrate, either; unless this truly novel and outlandish theologian, in addition to the other impious and witless doctrines of his own, should perhaps introduce these too to miserable men.

However, it would be as well here too, by way of reminder, to set out statements dealing with the point. Gregory the Theologian, then, in his oration *On the illustrious Athanasius*, as we



ܕܡܢ * ܟܕܘ ܫܡܥܢ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܡܡܠܠܝ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܦ ܒܡܠܬܐ A, f. 63va
ܡܕܡ ܒܟܠܢܝܬܐ : ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܟܠ
ܚܕ. ܗ̇ܢܘ ܡܢܗ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܣܡܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܒܕܘܟ ܕܘܟ ܡܛܠ
ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܡ̣ܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܡܬܝܕܥ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ : ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ. ܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܬܝ : ܘܕܡܣܡܝܢܐ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ
ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܦܣܩܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܫܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܪܥܝܢܢ ܘܠܐ
ܚܕ : ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܗܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܕܟܝܢܐ
ܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ
ܘܡܢ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܫܡܥܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܘܠܐ ܕܢܦܘܩ ܒܗ ܦܘܢܝ
ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ
ܪܫܝܥܐܝܬ ܡܚܠܦܝܢ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܕܡܢ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ : ܘܬܘܒ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܡܢ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ : ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܗܘ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܕܡܢ
ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܡ ܫܡܥܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ : ܕܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܚܡܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܡܨܝܐ
ܕܢܣܬܟܠ : ܟܕ ܢܬܥܡܠ ܕܡܢ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܠܐ ܢܦܩ.
ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܡܪ ܗܘܐ ܡܡܪܚ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܐܘ ܐܡܪ
ܕܢܡܪܚ ܐܢܐ ܡܣܒܪ : ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܟܝܢܐ
ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܘ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܢܗܝܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܠܐ
ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܗܘ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ : ܐܠܐ ܒܪ ܗܢܐ ܕܒܫܪܪܐ
ܬܐܘܠܘܓܘܣ ܚܕܬܐ ܘܐܟܣܢܝܐ : ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܬܐ
ܕܝܠܗ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܬܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ : ܘܗܠܝܢ ܠܬܫܝܥܐ ܕܒ̈ܫܐ ܢܥܠ.

ܠܘܬ ܥܘܗܕܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܗܝ ܘܗܪܟܐ : ܠܡܬܒ ܩ̈ܠܐ
ܕܥܠ ܗܕܐ ܢܩܝܦ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ

AC flor. II up to l. 47

Line 25: ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ, flor. II: ܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ.
Line 28: ܫܘܚܠܦܐ, flor. II: ܫܘܚ̈ܠܦܐ.
Line 33: ܡܣܒܪܝܢ, flor. II: ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 39: ܫܡܥܝܢ, flor. II: ܫܡܥܝܢܢ.
Line 46: ܬܐܘܠܘܓܘܣ, flor. II: ܬܐܠܘܓܘܣ.

have already frequently quoted, says: For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three) the Italians understand them in the same way as we, but they were unable, owing to the constraints of their language and its poverty of * terms, to distinguish 'substance' and 'hypostasis' and therefore 'prosopa' was introduced so that three substances might not be accepted. Whereas holy Proclus wrote: By confessing the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, we do not, by means of the number, import three Gods into the faith, for the Godhead is indicative of the substance. In addition to these, wise SEVERUS, in the first chapter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian*, said: For substance is indicative of the genus and the sense inclusive of many species, whereas hypostasis is a determination of indicative one species having by its property non-participation with the fellow-members of the genus and embracing the substrate in its proper mark. Indeed, he wrote also in similar fashion in the fourth chapter of the same second book, as follows: This, then, to sum up, is what we are saying: that substance is indicative of the community and the generic sense, whereas hypostasis is characteristic of a single, separate substrate.

None the less, this author, misinterpreting and misrepresenting these plainly expressed words of the fathers, by repeating his

**55/61** cf. supra, ch. 4, 464-470 **62/64** cf. supra, ch. 8, 20-22 **66/70** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (*CSCO* 111, p. 57, 16-20; *112*, p. 45, 24-29) **71/74** cf. supra, ch. 8, 38-40



ܐܠܗ̈ܘܬܐ ܒܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܕܟܠ ܐܬܢܣܒܘ ܠܡܒܥܐ : ܐܡܪܐ
< ܕܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܕܩܢܝܬܐ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܀ ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ
< ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܥܡ ܡܢ ܒܫܝܠܬ
< ܐܠܗܐ : ܗ̇ܝ، ܥܡ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܗ̇ܝ،
< ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ. ܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܗ̈ܘܘ، ܕܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܐ̈ܝܛܠܝܐ
< ܗ̇ܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܫܟܝܚ ܗܘܘ ܡܛܠ ܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ
< ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ * ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܕܢܦܪܫܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ f. 63vb
< ܠܩܢܘܡܐ. ܘܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܡܥܠ ܗܘܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܠܬ
< ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܢܬܩܒܠܢ ܀ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܦܪܘܩܠܘܣ ܟܬܒ ܀ ܕܟܕ ܐܒܐ
< ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܠܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܐ̈ܠܗܐ ܒܝܕ
< ܡܢܝܢܐ ܡܥܠܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܥܠ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ. ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܀ ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܚܟܝܡܐ
ܣܘܝܪܐ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܦܘܠܘܩܒܠ
< ܕܠܩܘܒܠ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܓܢܣܐ
< ܘܣܘܟܠܐ ܐܚܝܕܐ ܕܐ̈ܕܫܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܣܘܡܟܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ. ܟܕ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܚ̈ܒܪܝ ܕܓܢܣܐ :
< ܒܕܝܠܝܬܗ ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ. ܘܡܩܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܗ ܢܣܒ
< ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܗܝܡ ܀ ܗ̇ܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ ܕܗܠܗ
< ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܗ̇ܘܝܘ ܟܬܒ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܐܡܪܝ̈ܢ ܠܢ
< ܐܝܟ ܕܒܦܣܝܩܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܝ. ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ :
< ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܘܓܢܣܝܐ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ.
< ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܗܝܡ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܀

ܐܠܐ ܟܕ ܒܥܐܡܬ ܡܦܩܬܠ : ܘܡܥܩܡ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܦܫܝܛ ܩ̈ܠܐ
ܕܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܘܡܬܗܦܟܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܡܠܠܢܐ : ܘܡܫܚܠܦ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܡܬܢܝܘܬ

AC

Line 54: ܡܩܒܠܝܢ, A: ܡܩܒܠ.
Line 58: ܘܩܕܝܫܐ, C: ܩܕܝܫܐ.
Line 60: ܡܥܠܝܢ ܚܢܢ, C: ܡܥܠܝܢ.
Line 62: ܣܘܝܪܐ, C: ܣܘܪܝܐ.
Line 68: ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܢ, C: ܒܗܕܐ.

verbosity everywhere attempts the impossible task of proving that indicators and characterizers are, in absolutely every way, identical with what are indicated, signified and characterized. Which is why he also says in the letter written jointly by himself and certain of his bishops to the holy bishops of the East, as follows: Now if certain parties elaborate upon these quotations, asserting that the properties they recognize as hypostases also are one thing, and the characteristic properties of those hypostases are another thing, and are fearful about the form of speech, let them tell us how the wise patriarch said that hypostasis is characteristic of a substrate, and let them admit hypostases of hypostases.

Let us scrutinize, in consequence too, how throughout, as it were, he battles for his opinion by the muddle of his words and ideas, which is why, insatiable * in writing such foolish things, he tries, through these unexamined words of his, to negate the difference between all indicators and indicated, characterizers and characterized. For deceiving himself, he thinks that, because our accurate father called the hypostasis characteristic of a single thing, the characteristic properties are necessarily identical with the characterized hypostases, and that those who do not concede this, think of hypostases of hypostases.

But this sophism * is proved utterly idle and absurd, because the divinely inspired fathers expressly, as has been shown above, often ruled that indicators and characterizers are one thing and indicated and characterized another thing. For, although (as we

**81/87** cf. supra, ch. 8, 30-35 **94** cf. supra, 73-74



ܡܠܬܗ ܡܟܢܝ : ܡܢܣܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܡܨܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܟܠ ܘܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ : ܗܢܘܢ ܚܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ. ܡܛܠܗܢܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܥܡܗ ܘܡܢ ܐ̈ܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܬܟܬܒܬ : ܠܘܬ ܩ̈ܕܝܫܐ ܐ̈ܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ ܒܗܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܀ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܒܗ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܟܬܒ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܘܡܢܝܢܬ ܡܥܠܠܝܢ : ܐܝܕܝܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܬܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܐܝܕܝܘ̈ܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܬܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܬܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ : ܘܡܛܠ ܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܡܣܝܠܝܢ : ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܠܝ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܕܕܒܪ ܕܩܢܘܡ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܘܕܥܐ ܕܡܣܝܡܐ : ܘܢܫܠܡܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܀

ܢܬܒܩܐ ܘܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܟܠܡܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܡܪ : ܒܝܕ ܒܠܒܠܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ، ܘܣܘ̈ܟܠܘܗܝ، ܚܠܦ ܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܡܬܟܬܫ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܘܒ ܠܐ ܣܒܥܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܫܛܝ̈ܢ * ܠܡܟܬܒ : ܦܓܥ ܕܒܝܕ [C, f. 121ra] ܗܠܝܢ ܒܬ ܩ̈ܠܘܗܝ، ܠܐ ܡܒܚܪܬܐ : ܢܣܬܪ ܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܡܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢ. ܒܕ ܓܝܪ ܒܢܦܫܗ ܡܛܥܐ ܡܣܒܪ : ܕܡܛܠ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܐܡܪ ܠܡܘܕܥܐ ܚܬܝܬܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܗܘ ܩܪܐ : ܡܢ ܟܠܗ̇ ܐܢܢܩܐ : ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܘ̈ܡܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܢܩܘܡ ܠܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ. ܘܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܗܕܐ ܠܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ.

ܐܠܐ ܣܘܦܝܣܡܐ ܘܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ * ܗܘܐ ܣܪܝܩܐ [f. 121rb] ܐܬܚܘܝ : ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܢܦܝ̈ܫܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܗ̇ܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܦ̈ܣܝܩܬܐ ܦܣܩܘ : ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ

A up to l. 90 C

Line 80: ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ, C: ܐܦܝܣܩܘ̈ܦܐ.
Line 81: ܐܝܕܝܘ̈ܬܐ, cf. ch. 8, line 32 (ܐܝܕܝܘ̈ܬܐ ܕܝܢ).

have already said) they said, in dealing with the difference of terms that the nature of God is indicated by 'substance', that substance is indicated by 'Godhead', and again, indeed, that the single substrate is characterized by 'hypostasis', they did not take the substance to be a characteristic property of the divine nature or the Godhead a characteristic property of the substance, and, clearly they did not take the hypostasis to be the characteristic property of the single substrate either, so that it would thereby be permissible for teachers of absurd and outlandish doctrines, to reckon as identical the characteristic properties and the things characterized by them. Thus, we are not forced at all, these things being as they are, to profess the characteristic properties of the hypostases (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and * procession) as hypostases, even if we concede that a characteristic property can be indicated by hypostasis; or, again, if we understand the property as hypostasis and say that it can be signified by hypostasis. Clearly we are not forced to profess hypostases of hypostases either: which is what this inventor of worthless and ludicrous sophisms attempts to infer to us from some kind of turbid and utterly rubbishy interpretation of his. For if, as has been proved, the characteristic properties of the hypostases, are not hypostases, and our God-clad father Severus, did not take the hypostasis itself as the characteristic property of a single substrate, by what sequence of ideas will those who suppose identical the single substrate and what is signified by the term 'hypostasis', but who posit their characteristic properties as different from the hypostases, be compelled to define hypostases of hypostases? For truly, if the characteristic properties of the hypostases were hypostases, it would be absolutely necessary * for those who do not identify hypostases and characteristic properties,



ܐܝܟ ܕܐܦ ܗܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ : ܒܚܠܦ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫܡܗ̈ܐ : ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܟܝܢܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ ܐܡܪܘ : ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܗܘ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܕܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܪܫܡ : ܠܐ ܗܘܘ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܢܣܒܘ : ܐܘ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܐܝܕܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ : ܕܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܫܠܝܛ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܫܢܝܐ ܘܐ̈ܟܣܢܝܐ ܠܡܚܫܒ : ܕܗܢܝܢ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܢܗܘ̈ܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܝܬܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕ̈ܥܢ ܡܢܗܝܢ. ܠܐ ܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܐܠܝܨܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܝܢ : ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘ * ܢܦܩܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ f. 121va
ܕܢܘܕܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ : ܘܐܦ ܟܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܢܥܦ ܕܡܬܬܪܫܡܐ : ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܕܟܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ ܢܐܡܪ. ܢܕܝܥܐ ܕܝܢ : ܕܐܦܠܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܢܗܒ ܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܬܪܚܬܐ ܥܓܫܬܐ ܘܡܠܝܬ ܢܦܫܬܐ ܨܢܥܬܐ ܕܢܐܠܘܨ ܠܢ : ܗܢܐ ܡܫܟܚܢܐ ܕܫܘ̈ܥܝܐ ܫ̈ܠܝܐ ܘܡܓܚܟ̈ܢܝܬܐ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ : ܠܗ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܢܣܒ : ܡܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܢܩܦܘܬܐ ܕܬܐܘܪܝܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥ : ܕܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܗܘܢ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܝܬܐ ܣܝܡܝܢ : ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ ܕܢܬܚܡܘܢ. ܫܪܝܪܐ ܓܝܪ : ܐܢܗܘ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗ̈ܘܝ : ܐܢܢܩܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܪܘܣ * ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܚܕ ܗܢܝܢ f. 121vb
ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܗܘܢ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܝܬܐ ܣܝܡܝܢ : ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ

C

Line 120: ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ. A note, written in a later West Syrian hand in the right margin of fol. 121v of C, reads as follows: (?) ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܟܘܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܕܠܚܡ ܚܪ̈ܡܐ ܘܫܘ̈ܢܩܐ ܩܫ̈ܝܐ ܒܥܘ̈ܡܩܐ ܕܫܝܘܠ ܘܪܘܓܙܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ. *Your father Severus ..... anathemas and hard torments in the depths of the Sheol and the anger of God but not God.*

to profess hypostases of hypostases. Likewise, if one were to distinguish the single substrate and the hypostasis, because the substrate is nothing else than the hypostasis, one would be forced in this way to profess hypostases of hypostases. But because, as was clearly proved, the characteristic properties of the hypostases are not hypostases, and no right thinking man will be found professing that hypostasis and substrate are not the same, the detractor of truth utters empty breaths, when he infers not for others but only for himself those foolish and most impious ideas. For we are forced, according to his feeble and uneducated arguments, to suppose many divine substances of the one Godhead, if we do not identify the characteristic properties of the Godhead with the Godhead: which is very damnable * and is completely alien to the doctors of the holy Church.

For if, because proven Severus called the hypostasis characteristic of a single, separate substrate, it is necessary either to think of characteristic properties of hypostases or to profess hypostases of hypostases; in the same way, when the Theologian said: Substance indicates the nature of Godhead, it is necessary either to think of the characteristic properties of the Godhead as identical with the Godhead or to think of substances of the divine substance.

These things being thus said, one in doubt may perhaps say: 'How is it possible to say, as Gregory the Theologian and Saint Proclus did, that the substance is indicative of the nature of God-

**145/146** cf. supra, 73-74 **148/149** cf. supra, 55-57



ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܘܕܘܢ̣. ܗܘ ܗܟܘܬ ܕܝܢ : ܐܠܝܨܘ ܕܐܢܫ ܢܚܫܒ
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܬܚܝܬ ܡܢܗ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗ̇ܘ
ܕܣܝܡ ܠܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܐܠܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܡܬܕܪܝܢ : ܘܗܟܢܐ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܘܕܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܬܚܘܝ ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ
ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܬܪܝܨܐܝܬ ܡܬܪܥܝܢ :
ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ
ܡܬܬܚܫ. ܕܫܪܪܐ : ܣܦܝ̈ܩܬܐ ܢܦܚ ܡܦܩܬܟܠܐ ܕܪܘܪܐ : ܟܕ
ܠܐ ܠܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܠܢܦܫܗ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܛܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܪܫܝ̈ܥܢ ܡܢ ܟܠ
ܡܕܡ ܕܫܥܝܢ ܡܟܝܢ. ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܒܡܠܘ̈ܗܝ
ܢܩܝܫܐ ܘܠܐ ܪ̈ܕܝܐ : ܕܢܩܒܠܢܢ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܐܠܗܝ̈ܬܐ ܣܓܝܐ̈ܬܐ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܢܬܪܒܐ : ܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ
ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܚܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܢܚܫܒ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܦ ܗ̣ܝ
ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ * ܕܠܐܬܟܪܝܐ ܩܛܝܪܐܝܬ ܡܫܬܒܬ̣ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : f. 122ra
ܘܢܘܟܪܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܕܡܠܦ̈ܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ.

ܐܢ̣ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܡܪ ܒܚܝܪܐ ܣܐܘܝܪܐ : ܠܩܢܘܡܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ : ܐܠܝܨܐ ܕܐܘ
ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܐܘ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܘܕܐ : ܗܘ ܗܟܢܐ : ܘܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܡܡܠܠ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ :
ܐܠܝܨܐ ܕܐܘ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܗܢܝܢ ܚܕ
ܗܢܝܢ ܢܚܫܒ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܘ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ
ܢܬܪܒܐ.

ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ : ܠܡܣܟܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܐܡܪ ܟܕ
ܡܬܦܫܩ ܐܡܪ : ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ : ܐܘ ܐܝܟ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܣ
ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ ܦܪܘܩܠܘܣ : ܕܠܐܘܣܝܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ

C flor. II from l. 144 on

Line 144: ܣܐܘܝܪܐ, flor. II: ܣܐܘܪܐ.
Line 153: ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܣ, flor. II: ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ.

head and that the Godhead is indicative of the substance, or as the patriarch Severus did, that hypostasis is characteristic of a single substrate and not to say that the Godhead is something other * than the substance and that the hypostasis is something other than a single substrate, when wise Cyril in the third chapter of the *Thesaurus*, as has previously been quoted, gave the full ruling and said that the indicators and indicated are not identical: For if uncreatedness and un-subjected-ness *et cetera* alike indicate substance, and the indicated are not the same as the indicators; then substance and uncreatedness will not be the same thing, just as, also, the indicated is not the same thing as the indicator?' We answer him, guided by the same divinely inspired fathers: if no difference at all is to be seen either in the expression of the word, i.e. the nomenclature, or the very thing indicated, we cannot speak at all of indicator and indicated, characterizer and characterized, signifier and signified.

For did one hear any doctor of the church who ever existed say that * the Godhead signifies Godhead or that the hypostasis of the Son, e.g., characterizes the hypostasis of the Son or that generacy and the name of 'Son' signifies generacy and the name of Son or anything similar to this? But rather we have learned that they say that the substance signifies the nature of the Godhead and Godhead indicates the substance; and the hypostasis of the Son

**155** cf. supra, 64 **156/157** cf. supra, 73-74 **161/165** cf. supra, ch. 8, 287-291



ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܘ ܐܝܟ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܣܘܐܪܐ
ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ : ܘܠܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܣܛܪ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܣܛܪ * ܡܢ ܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ ܢܐܡܪ : ܟܕ ܚܟܝܡܐ f. 122rb
ܩܘܪܝܠܘܣ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܬܫܒܚܬܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܩܕܝܡܐ
ܡܫܝܢܐ ܒܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܦܣܩ ܘܐܡܪ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ
< ܚܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ÷ ܐܢ
< ܓܝܪ ܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܘܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܬܥܒܕܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܫܪܟܐ : ܗܝ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ : ܠܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܚܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܠܐ ܐܦ ܗܘܐ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܐ
< ܒܪܝܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܗܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܗܘ
< ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ ÷ ܕܠܗܕܐ ܗܘ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܐܠܗܝܐ
ܢܫܡܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܕܒܪܝܢ ܕܟܕ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܘ
ܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ : ܐܘ ܒܡܦܩܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܕܫܡܗܐ :
ܐܘ ܒܗ ܒܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ : ܠܐ ܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܐܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ
ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥ : ܐܘ ܕܪܫܡ ܘܡܬܪܫܡ : ܘܡܚܘܐ
ܘܡܬܚܘܐ.

ܠܡܢܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܥܠܡ ܗܘܘ
ܫܡܥ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܡܪ : ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ * ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : f. 122va
ܐܘ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܐܝܬܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܒܪܐ
ܪܫܡ : ܐܘ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܫܡܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܫܡܐ
ܕܒܪܐ ܡܚܘܐ : ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܕܡܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܡܠܘ ܝܠܦܢ
ܕܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܐ.
ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ. ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ

C flor. II

Line 156: ܣܘܐܪܐ, flor. II: ܣܐܘܪܐ.
Lines 162-163: ܐܢ ܓܝܪ, cf. ch. 8, line 308 (ܐܢ).
Line 175: ܕܐܡܪ, flor. II: ܕܐܡܪܘ.
Line 177: ܘܫܡܐ, flor. II: ܘܠܫܡܐ.
Line 178: ܝܠܦܢ, flor. II: ܝܠܦ ܚܢ.

characterizes the Father's hypostasis, and likewise that generacy and the name 'Son' signifies the hypostasis of the Only-Begotten. But the doctors said that the substance indicates the nature of the Godhead and likewise that the Godhead indicates the substance, not as if in the Holy Trinity the Godhead were one thing, the substance another thing, and, again, the nature another thing. No, because they were anxious lest someone should understand, owing to the difference of the terms and the variation of words, not the same, but another notion, under each name.

But leaving other things aside because speaking only of the point at issue, we see that what happens to some people because of homonyms, happens contrariwise, also because of synonyms. For from homonyms * because of the community of the name, some error, so to speak, happens to the unlearned because they think that different things under one and the same name are one thing, and as a consequence they stray from the truth. Therefore, it is necessary for those who speak of these things to distinguish and explain to those who do not know the different things, the things indicated by one and the same name, and to say that although there is only one name, different things are indicated by it.

But, again, with synonyms the opposite happens: through the difference of names a false suspicion arises for the simple, who think that what is signified by the different names is not one but must be different things. Therefore, it is the task of the intelligent to lead people contending over this, to the truth of things, because



ܕܐܒܐ ܡܟܝܠ. ܗܘ ܡܚܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܫܡܐ ܕܒܪܐ
ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܡܘܕܥ. ܘܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ
ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܟܢ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܕܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܐܡܪܘ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ : ܠܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܗ̇
ܕܐܚܪܢܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ ܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܘܐܚܪܢܝܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܘܒ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܟܝܢܐ : ܐܠܐ ܒܕ
ܚܦܝܛܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܘܡܫܚܠܦܘܬܐ ܕܒܪ̈ܬ
ܡ̈ܠܐ : ܥܠ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܠܘ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ : ܐܠܐ
ܣܘܟܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܢܣܬܟܠ ܐܢܫ.

ܘܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܫܒܩܝܢ : ܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܚܘܕ
ܕܡܬܒ̈ܥܝܢ ܠܢ ܢܐܡܪ : ܚܙܝܢ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܓܕܫܐ ܠܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܘܝ
ܫܡܗܐ : ܗܕܐ ܒܡܦܓܥܐ ܘܡܢ ܦ̈ܠܝܓܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ. ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܓܝܪ
* ܫ̈ܘܝ ܫܡܗܐ : ܡܛܠ ܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܫܡܐ : ܠܒܘܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܡܕܡ f. 122vb
ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܗܦܟܐ ܠܠܐ ܡܪ̈ܕܫܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܢܣܒܪܘܢ
ܕܚܕ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܬܚܝܬܘܢ ܚܕ
ܘܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܫܡܐ ܗܘܝܢ. ܘܡܢ ܥܒܪܐ ܒܗ ܗܕܐ ܦܕܝܢ. ܡܢ
ܫܪܪܐ ܘܐܘܠܨܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܡܠܠܝܢ : ܕܢܦܪܫܘܢ
ܘܢܦܫܩܘܢ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܬܐ : ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܡܢ ܚܕ ܘܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܕܫܡܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢ : ܘܢܐܡܪܘܢ :
ܕܐܦ ܚܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܫܡܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢ.

ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܦ̈ܠܝܓܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܗܦܟܐ. ܒܕ
ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܡܣܬܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܓܠܬܐ ܗ̇ܘܝܐ
ܠܦ̈ܫܝܛܐ. ܒܕ ܡܣܬܒܪܝܢ : ܕܠܘ ܚܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܐܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܡܢ ܚܠܦܘܗܝ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ ܡܬܚܘܐ.
ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܘܕܝ̈ܕܘܥܬܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ : ܕܠܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ
ܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܪܘܫܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ : ܢܕܒܪܘܢ ܠܘܬ

C flor. II

Lines 181-182: ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ..... ܕܐܒܐ, C om.
Line 191: ܠܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ, flor. II: ܠܐܢܫܝܢ.

they struggle in vain. So, to make clear to everyone what we are saying * by an example: if it appears that some people know the first of the disciples only by the name 'Peter', and other people only by the name 'Simon', and in ignorance they argue with one another and the first group says: 'Peter is the head of the apostles'; and the second maintains the contrary: 'it is Simon'; would it not be right for someone to stand up in their midst and say: 'Dear fellows, you are arguing in vain, for both of you say the same thing; Simon is the same as Peter and Peter is the same as Simon'? Very right, I should say.

What are we to say the reason for their dispute was? Was it the thing itself to which these different names were applied, or the difference of names? It is evident to everyone, I suppose, that it is owing to the difference of names given to the things. For it is impossible that any people should reach such madness * as to think that Peter is not the same as Peter and therefore need to learn that 'Peter' indicates Peter; and as to think that the Sun is not the Sun, or * imagine that another creature is not what it is, so that it would be necessary for them to learn that 'Sun' indicates the Sun or that some word or other indicates the thing itself. An incident like this, to be sure, does not usually occur from the realities but from the names imposed upon the realities. Which is why those in



ܫܪܪܐ ܕܫܡܗ̈ܐ. ܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܝܢܢ ܕܒܝܕ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܠܓܠܝܬܐ ܣܢܝܩܬܐ * ܬܗܘܐ ܠܟܠ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ : ܐܢ [f. 123ra] ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܕܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܡ̇ܢ : ܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ : ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܠܗܘ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܬܠܡܝ̈ܕܐ : ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܫܡܥܘܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ : ܘܒܗ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ : ܘܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܩܕ̇ܡ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܪܝܫܢܐ ܕܫܠܝ̈ܚܐ : ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ : ܘܡܫܪ̈ܪܝܢ ܕܫܡܥܘܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܐܪܐ ܠܐ ܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܩܐܡ ܐܢܫ ܒܡܨܥܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ : ܕܣܪ̈ܝܩܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܐܘ ܗܠܝܢ : ܗ̇ܝ ܓܝܪ ܒܪ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܬܪܝܟܘܢ : ܫܡܥܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܒܪ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܦܛܪܘܣ : ܘܦܛܪܘܣ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܫܡܥܘܢ : ܘܦܫܝܛ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ.

ܡܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܗܘܬ ܚܪܝܢܐ. ܐܪܐ ܡܢܗ ܕܨܒܘܬܐ ܕܥܠܝܗ̇ ܗܠܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ ܡܬܬܣܝܡܝܢ : ܐܘ ܡܢ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ. ܘܝܕܝܥܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܟܠܢܫ : ܕܡܢ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܥܠ ܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ ܣܝܡܝܢ. ܐܦܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܠܫܛܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ * ܗܕܐ ܢܐܬܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܢܣܒܪܘܢ ܠܦܛܪܘܣ [f. 123rb] ܕܠܘ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܦܛܪܘܣ : ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܢܣܬܢܩܘܢ ܕܢܐܠܦܘܢ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܠܦܛܪܘܣ ܡܫܘܕܥ : ܘܕܫܡܫܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܫܡܫܐ ܢܣܒܪܘܢ : ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ * ܢܬܚܫܒܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܠܨܐ ܐܝܬ ܢܐܠܦܘܢ : ܕܫܡܫܐ [A, f. 64ra] ܠܫܡܫܐ ܐܘ ܕܦܠܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܡܫܘܕܥ. ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܠܘ ܡܢ ܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܠ ܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ ܣܝܡܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܕܥ. ܡܦܠܓܘܬܐ

A [from l. 231 on] C flor. II [up to l. 225]

Line 210: ܕܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ, flor. II: ܕܐܢܫܝܢ.
Line 214: ܪܝܫܢܐ, flor. II: ܪܫܐ.
Line 221: ܡܢ, flor. II: ܘܡܢ. ܐܡܪܝܢ, flor. II: ܐܡܪ ܚܢܢ.

the dark over such matters (who had not grasped what the term 'substance' and, on the other hand, 'hypostasis' indicated, and who, in consequence, were in schism with the truth and with one another, so that as a result of this some of them professed one hypostasis of the Trinity in the same way as one substance, whereas others falsely supposed just as there were three hypostases so there were three substances), were very necessarily and very lawfully instructed and illuminated by the teachers of truth. They cured everybody's particular ignorance, by divulging to them the teaching of correct and plainly expressed doctrines. They taught that when we use the terms 'Godhead', 'substance' and 'nature' of the Holy Trinity, we by no means suppose because of the difference of terms, that Godhead indicates one reality, substance another and nature another. No, by saying 'substance' we indicate the Godhead's nature and by using the term 'Godhead' we signify the Godhead's substance and nature. Indeed in the same way too, by saying 'hypostasis', 'prosopon' and 'a single substrate', even though the verbal utterance is different, we do not, on that account, suppose that we are indicating as several different things, the hypostasis, the single prosopon and the substrate.

We say that Gregory the Theologian also teaches us this, when he says: For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three) the Italians understand them in the same way

245/251 cf. supra, 55-61



ܠܗܘܢ ܕܒܐܝܟܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܬܚܫܟܘ : ܘܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܐܝܟ ܐܕܪܟܘ :
ܕܡܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܕܡܢܐ
ܕܝܢ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܠܘܬ ܫܪܪܐ ܘܠܘܬ ܚ̈ܕܕܐ
ܢܬܦܠܓܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ : ܗܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܝܟ ܚܕܐ
ܕܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܐܘܕܝܘ :
ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܒܗ ܟܝܢܐ ܘܬܠܬ
ܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ ܒܣܟܠܘܬ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܢܣܒܪܘܢ : ܛܒ ܐܠܝܨܐܝܬ
ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ : ܘܛܒ ܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ ܪܕܘ ܘܢܗܪܘ : ܘܠܟܠ
ܚܕ ܚܕ ܕܒܠܥܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܐܕܝܘܬܗ ܐܣܝܘ : ܟܕ
ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܝܘ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܐ ܘܦܫ̈ܝܩܐ ܦܪܫܘ ܠܗܘܢ.
ܘܐܠܦܘ : ܕܐܡܬܝ ܕܥܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ : ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܛܠ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ
ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܢ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ: ܐܠܐ ܟܕ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܟܕ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܚܢܢ : ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ. ܗܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܟܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܚܕ ܡܕܡ
ܕܣܝܡ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܦ ܐܢ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܦܩܢܐ
ܕܡܠܬܐ : ܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܡܘܕܥܘ :
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܕܡ ܠܚܕ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ
ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ. ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܚܕ
ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ.

ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܕܐܦ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܢ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ
‹ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
‹ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܢܢ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܗ̇ܘ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝܢܐ
‹ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ :
‹ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܗ̈ܘܘ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܐ̈ܝܛܠܝܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ

AC

Line 246: ܡܫܡܗܝܢ, C: ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 248: ܡܣܒܪܝܢ, C: ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 249: ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ, C: ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 250: ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܚܢܢ, C: ܡܫܡܗܝܢ.

as we, but they were unable, owing to the constraints of their language and its poverty of terms, to distinguish 'substance' and 'hypostasis' and therefore 'prosopa' was introduced so that three substances * might not be accepted. Whereas holy Proclus taught us: By confessing the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, we do not, by means of the number, import three Gods into the faith, for the Godhead is indicative of the substance. Likewise, indeed, exact Severus says: This, then, to sum up, is what we are saying: that substance is indicative of the community and the generic sense, whereas hypostasis is characteristic of a single separate substrate and similar things. Take a look, indeed, at Basil the Great, who spoke as follows at the beginning of the letter written to his brother Gregory *On Substance and Hypostasis:* Seeing that many people, by failing to distinguish, in the mystic doctrines, between the community of the substance and the concept of the hypostasis, lapse into the same ideas and suppose that it makes no difference whether we say 'substance' or 'hypostasis', and consequently certain people, who accept things like this without examination, have seen fit to speak of 'one hypostasis' just as they do of 'one substance'; and, conversely, those who accept three hypostases suppose they ought, as a result of this profession, to teach a division of the substances corresponding with the same number; for this reason, so that you too may not suffer the same fate, I have composed for you a short essay on the subject as a reminder. He wrote, indeed, in the same manner on substance and hypostasis *To Amphilochius* as follows: Substance, indeed, and hypostasis possess the same distinction as holds between common and individual, between, say, animal and such-and-such a man. Which is why we profess one sub-

**251/253** cf. supra, 62-64 **254/257** cf. supra, 71-74 **259/269** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 38*, 1 (*PG* 32, 325A; Forlin Patrucco, p. 178) **271/276** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 236*, 6 (*PG* 32, 884A; Courtonne, III, p. 53)



ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܛܠ ܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ
ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܕܢܦܪܫܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ
ܡܥܠ ܗܘܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܠܐ ܬܠܬ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܢܬܩ̈ܒܠܢ ܀
ܦܪܘܩܠܘܣ ܕܝܢ ܣܗܕܐ ܀ ܕܒܕ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ
ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܠܘ ܬܠܬܐ ܐ̈ܠܗܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܢܝܢܐ ܡܥܠܝܢ ܟܠ
ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ : * ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ f. 64rb
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܀ ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܫܬܝܬܐ ܣܘܪܐ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ
ܗܟܝܠ ܕܐܡܪܢ ܠܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܣܘܟܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢܢ :
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܝ ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܘܕܓܢܣܝܘܬܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ : ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܦܪܝܫ
ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܀ ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ. ܚܙܝ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ
ܪܒܐ : ܕܗܟܢ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ
ܐܚܘܗܝ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܬܟܬܒܬ ܕܐܡܪܐ
ܐܡܪ ܀ ܡܛܠ ܕܣ̈ܓܝܐܐ ܟܕ ܠܦܘܪܫܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܟܠ
ܢ̈ܩܦܢܐ ܕܐ̈ܢܫܐ ܠܐ ܡܦܪܫܝܢ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܬܐ ܕܡܘܕܝܢ : ܒܗܘܢ
ܒܕ ܒܗܘܢ ܒܡܫܡܪ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܢܦܠܝܢ : ܘܣܒܪܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ
ܡܕܡ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܥܦܪܬ
ܠܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ : ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܒܚܢܐܝܬ ܠܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܩܒܠܝܢ :
ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܚܕ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ :
ܘܒܗܦܟܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܩܒܠܝܢ : ܘܦܠܓܐ
ܕܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܒܡܢܝܢܐ ܫܘܝܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܢܠܦܘܢ
ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܕܙܕܩ : ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܐܡܪܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܦ ܐܢܬ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܕ̈ܡܝܢ ܬܚܫ : ܥܘܗܕܢܐ ܒܝܕ ܕܒܗܪܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ
ܟܬܒܬ ܠܟ ܀ ܘܠܘܬ ܐܡܦܝܠܘܟܝܘܣ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܡܛܠ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܟܬܒ ܒܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܢ
ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܢܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܩܢܝܢ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܓܘܢܝܐ ܠܘܬ ܟܠ
ܚܕ. ܕܐܝܟ ܐܡܪ. ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܚܝܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܦܠܢ ܒܪ

AC flor. I from l. 286 on

Line 268: ܣܘܪܐ, C: ܣܪܘܐ.

Line 278: ܡܢ, C: ܘܡܢ.

Line 285: ܐܡܦܝܠܘܟܝܘܣ, A: ܐܡܦܝܠܟܝܘܣ, C: ܐܡܦܠܟܝܘܣ; cf. supra, p. 13, line 143 and note.

stance in the Godhead, so as not to differentiate the concept of the being, but particular hypostases in order that the conception of Father, Son and Holy Ghost may exist in us unconfused and clear.

We learn clearly from these words not that those for whom the doctor wrote them failed to recognize the difference between the realities themselves (I mean between the common and the individual) but that they were not aware that the terms 'substance' and 'hypostasis' were different in meaning. For he said: Certain people who accept things like this without examination, have seen fit to speak of 'one hypostasis' just as they do of 'one substance'; and, conversely, those who accept three hypostases suppose they ought, as a result of this profession, to teach a division of the substances corresponding with the same * number. They did not, in fact, suppose the community itself to be the individual or the individual the community. No, those who were minded to say 'one hypostasis' just as they did 'one substance', supposed the term 'hypostasis' to be indicative of the community, as the term 'substance' is; and again, those who supposed that a confession of 'hypostases' obliged them to have the impious conception of a division of substances as well, approved of saying 'three substances' not because they thought the term 'substance' was applicable to a community, but because they supposed it significant of the proper meaning like the term 'hypostasis'. Did anyone, in fact, of those who have acknowledged Father, Son and Holy Ghost as being in truth three realities, ever profess the Holy Trinity either as one substance and one hypostasis in the proper meaning or as three hypostases in the generic meaning?

**281/286** cf. supra, 263-268



< ܐܢܫܐ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܚܕܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ :
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐܝܬ ܢܬܠ.
< ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܝ̈ܚܝܕܝܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܒܘܠܒܠܐ ܘܢܗܝܪܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܒܢ
< ܣܘܟܠܐ : ܗܘ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ❖

ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܝܠܦܝܢ : ܕܠܘ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܟܬ̈ܒܢܐ
ܐܟܬܒ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܓܢܣܐ ܘܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ
ܫܘܚܠܦܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܕܐܝ̈ܬܝܐ ܘܐܝ̈ܬܝܐ ܫܘܕܥܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܐ ܡܦܫܩܝܢ ܗܘܘ :
ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܬܒ ܡܠܦܢܐ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ❖
< ܘܐܢܫܝܢ ܠܐܢܫܝܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܒܚܢܢܘܬܐ ܠܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܡܩܒܠܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ
< ܠܡܐܡܪ. ܘܗܦܟܐ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܩܒܠܝܢ :
< ܘܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܐܘ̈ܣܝܐ ܒܡܢܝܢܐ ܫܘܝܐ * ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ f. 64va
< ܕܢܠܦܘܢ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܕܘܡ ❖ ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܠܗ̇ ܠܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܟܠ ܚܕ
ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܐܘ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܠܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ. ܐܠܐ
ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
ܕܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܨܒܝܢ ܗܘܘ : ܠܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ :
ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܘ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܘܬܘܒ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ :
ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܐܘ̈ܣܝܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܥܘܠܐܝܬ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܙܕܩ
ܕܢܫܪܘܢ ܠܘ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܪܢܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܥܠ
ܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܡܪ ܡܬܬܠܬܬܐ. ܕܬܠܬ ܐܘܣܝ̈ܐ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܡܫܪܝܢ
ܗܘܘ : ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܣܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ : ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ
ܕܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܫܡܐ
ܕܩܢܘܡܐ. ܡܢܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܟܝܠ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ
ܒܫܪܪܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܘܕܝܘ : ܐܘ ܚܕܐ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܝܠܦ ܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ : ܐܘ ܬܠܬ
ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ ܒܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ
ܦܣܠ.

AC flor. I up to l. 289

Line 293: ܝܠܦܝܢ, C: ܝܠܦܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 298: ܠܐܢܫܝܢ, C: ܠܐܢ̈ܫܝܢ.

Hear the Church's luminary proving this clearly in the subsequent proof-text: Substance, indeed, and hypostasis possess the same distinction as holds between common and individual, between, say, animal and such-and-such a man. You will perceive that he discloses the obscure knowledge of the terms from the nature of the realities as it is known and clear to everybody; otherwise, what would be the consequence for him? That those, who had not previously learned plainly the difference between the common and the individual (i.e. between animal and such-and-such a man) should learn from the difference between common and individual the unknown difference between substance and hypostasis? For we are able to learn the unclear not from the unknown, but from the better known.

Therefore, if all this has made it plain that those then in ignorance of the meanings of the terms 'substance' and 'hypostasis' knew the difference between the realities themselves (viz. the common and the individual), it has been proved (as we have already said) * that Gregory the Theologian also spoke in reference to those who were not ignorant of the difference between the common and the individual but who had hitherto not grasped the distinction between the terms 'substance' and 'hypostasis': For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three) the Italians understand them in the same way as we, but they were unable, owing to the constraints of their language and its poverty of terms, to distinguish 'substance' and 'hypostasis' and therefore 'prosopa' was introduced so that three substances might not be accepted. Besides this, the passage immediately following proves even more clearly that the dispute was not over the realities but over the terms. For he said: What happens? Something ridiculous and pitiable; the verbal triviality was thought a difference of faith.

**301/303** cf. supra, 271-273 **319/326** cf. supra, 55-61 **328/329** cf. supra, ch. 4, 115-117



ܘܫܡܥ ܕܢܗܝܪܐ ܥܕܬ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܢܗܝܪܐ
< ܕܒܕܝܠܬܐ ܡܢܘܬܐ ܀ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܢܐ
< ܥܘܠܦܐ ܩܢܝܢ : ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܓܘܐ ܓܒ ܟܠ ܚܕ. ܕܐܝܟ
< ܐܡܪ. ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܚܝܘܬܐ ܓܒ ܦܠܢ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܀ ܚܙܐ
ܐܢܬ ܕܡܢ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܨܒܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܕܝܥ ܘܓܠܐ ܠܟܠܢܫ :
ܠܝܕܥܬܐ ܟܣܝܬܐ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܡܢܘܬܐ : ܘܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ :
ܐܝܕܐ ܢܦܩܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ : ܕܡܢ ܥܘܠܦܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܘܕܚܕ
ܚܕ. ܢܐܠܦܘܢ ܠܥܘܠܦܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܝܥ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ
ܘܩܢܘܡܐ : ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܩܕܡ ܐܠܦܘ ܠܥܘܠܦܐ
ܕܓܘܐ ܘܕܚܕ ܚܕ : ܐܦ ܐܝܬ ܠܢ ܕܢܐܠܦ ܘܕܠܐ ܓܠܝܐ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ
ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܝܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܓܠܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܝܬܝܪ ܝܕܝܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܓܠܝܢ ܕܢܐܠܦ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ.

ܡܕܝܢ ܐܢ ܡܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܘܬ ܢܗܝܪܬܐ : ܕܕܝܠܗܘܢ
ܕܫܡܗܐ : ܡܕܥܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܓܘܐ ܘܕܚܕ ܚܕ : ܝܕܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ
ܥܘܠܦܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܘܘ :
ܕܢܘܕܥܐ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܐܝܟ
ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ : * ܕܐܦ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : f. 64vb
ܡܛܠ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܦܐ ܗܘ ܕܓܘܐ ܘܕܚܕ ܚܕ ܠܐ ܛܥܝܢ
ܗܘܘ ܠܗܘܢ : ܠܐ ܒܪܡ ܕܝܢ ܠܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܕܪܟܘ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ
< ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܗܟܢ ܓܝܪ
< ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ :
< ܡܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܗܢܝ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܐܝܛܠܝܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ
< ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܛܠ ܐܠܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܠܫܢܗܘܢ ܘܡܣܟܢܘܬܐ
< ܕܫܡܗܐ : ܕܢܦܪܫܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܡܛܠܗܕܐ
< ܡܥܠ ܗܘܐ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ : ܕܠܐ ܬܠܬ ܐܘܣܝ̈ܘܣ ܢܬܩܒܠܢ ܀ ܒܪ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܬܪ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܡܚܘܝܐ : ܕܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܨܒܘܬܐ
ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܫܡܗܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܚܪܝܢܐ : ܘܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܠܬܗ ܐܝܬ
< ܡܢܐ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܀ ܡܕܡ ܗ̇ܘܐ. ܡܕܡ ܕܓܘܚܟܐ ܠܚܘܣܝܐ
< ܘܠܡܚܘܣܝܐ. ܥܘܠܦܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܙܥܘܪܘܬ
< ܡܠܬܐ ܕܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܀

AC

And again, in recounting the story of famous Athanasius, he says: So the saint, truly a man of God and great steward of souls, on seeing and hearing this, did not feel it appropriate to disregard so absurd and irrational a dissection of the word, but applies his own remedy to the ailment. How, then, does he do this? Inviting both sides to come to him, so gently and humanely, he carefully investigated the meaning of their statements and, because he found both sides of one mind and not removed from one another on any point of principle, indulgent to the terms, he bound them by the realities.

Observe, too, what the same master of proven theology says in another place too: What, then, do hypostases mean to you, or prosopa to you, for I put the question? They mean that those divided not in natures but in properties are three. Very good. How could people more think the same thing or say the same thing than those who hold to these things? Even though they differ in words. But Saint Proclus too, in saying, for the Godhead is indicative of the substance, clearly proved that the reality indicated by the term 'substance' is the same thing as what is * indicated by 'Godhead'.

Our opponent will bear witness that these words are for the slanderers themselves too, when he speaks about the same Theologian, in words set down in the *Many-lined Letter*, as follows: The same doctor gave teaching similar to this also in the *Farewell Address to the Bishops*, saying: 'What, then, do hypostases mean to you, or prosopa to you, for I put the question? They mean that those divided not in natures but in properties are three'. Here too, after first inquiring about the view of those in dispute over the terms 'prosopon' and

**331/338** cf. supra, ch. 4, 121-128 **340/344** cf. supra, ch. 4, 359-363 **345** cf. supra, 63-64 **351/361** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* **352/354** Greg. Naz., *Or. 42*, 16 (*PG* 36, 477B; *SChr.*, vol. 384, p. 84); cf. supra, 340-342



ܘܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܡܛܠ ܠܬܫܥܝܬܐ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ ܡܫܬܒܗܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܀
< ܗܠܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܟܕ ܚܙܐ ܘܫܡܥ ܗܘ ܠܦܘܠܓܐ ܘܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܓܒܪܐ
< ܕܐܠܗܐ܆ ܘܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܪܒܐ ܕܢܦܫܬܐ܆ ܠܐ ܐܣܬܒܪ ܕܢܛܠܬܐ
< ܕܢܦܩܐ ܒܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܥܒܕ ܘܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ.
< ܚܠܦ ܕܝܢ ܕܢܟܣܐ ܣܡܐ ܠܟܘܪܗܢܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܕܐ
< ܥܒܕ. ܟܕ ܩܪܐ ܠܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܠܓܘܬܐ܆ ܗܟܢܐ ܢܝܚܐܝܬ
< ܘܪܚܡܬ ܐܢܫܐܝܬ܆ ܘܒܨܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܢ ܚܦܝܛܐܝܬ
< ܒܥܒ܆ ܡܛܠ ܕܫܟܚ ܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܚܕܐ ܐܝܟ ܘܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܠܐ
< ܪܫܝܡ ܒܡܠܬܐ܆ ܒܗ ܠܨܒܘܬܐ ܐܣܪ ܀ ܐܡܪ܆ ܒܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܀

ܘܚܙܝ ܕܐܦܠܝܢ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܗܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ
< ܕܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ܒܫܪܪܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܩܢܘܡ ܠܟܘܢ
< ܡܘܕܥܐ ܐܘ ܠܟܘܢ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ. ܡܫܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ. ܕܬܠܬܐ
< ܐܬܘܗܝ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ. ܠܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ
< ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܫܦܝܪ ܠܚܕܐ܆ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܬܪܥܝܢ ܝܬܝܪܐ ܗܢܝ
< ܟܕ ܗܢܝ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ܆ ܘܗܢܝ܆ ܟܕ ܗܢܝ ܢܐܚܕܘܢ܆ ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܚܕܐ ܐܚܝܕܝܢ܆ ܘܐܦ ܒܡܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ
< ܦܪܘܩܠܘܣ܆ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܘܝܬܗ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܗܝ܆ ܕܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܕܠܗ ܐܚܘܝܬܗ܆ ܫܡܐ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ܆ ܕܠܗ ܟܕ ܕܠܗ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
* ܐܚܘܝܬܗ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ. f. 65ra

ܕܐܦ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܠܡܠܫܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܣܗܕܐ ܐܚܝܕܝܢ
ܗܠܝܢ܆ ܢܣܗܕ ܗܘܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ܆ ܟܕ ܡܡܠܠ ܥܠ ܬܐܘܠܘܓܐ
ܕܡܛܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ܆ ܒܡܠܐ ܕܐܬܟܪܝܬܐ ܡܠܐܟܬ
— ܡܘܪܟܢܐ ܩܢܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܡܢܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ܆ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ
— ܡܠܦܢܐ ܘܡܬܐܡܪܢܐ ܕܡܬܠܟܣܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ
→ ܟܕ ܫܠܡ ܐܡܪ܆ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܩܢܘܡ ܠܟܘܢ ܡܘܕܥܐ ܐܘ
→ ܠܟܘܢ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ. ܡܫܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ. ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܬܘܗܝ
→ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ. ܠܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ܆ ܐܠܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܘܗܪܟܐ
— ܟܕ ܩܕܡ ܫܐܠ ܡܛܠ ܪܥܝܢܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܛܠ

AC

Line 374: ܫܠܡ, cf. ch. 14, line 196 (ܢܕܪܐ).

'hypostasis', to reconcile the two and unite them into one mind, he said to each side that the same thing is indicated by the different appellations and took the unambiguous word 'property', signifying the same things as 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis', and said that 'those divided not in natures but in properties are three' i.e. that 'prosopa' and 'hypostases' seek to indicate nothing else but subsisting properties.

One may justly say too about this that the author has spoken his words in fit accord with his aim, for when he says that the realities are nothing but terms he rightly uses such words. However, we say that we also know that by defrauding the mystery of the Holy Trinity of all the truth of realities he has, for his part, made our hope consist of appellations only and names bereft of realities; as he has clearly been convicted of doing in the previous examination, and will again, indeed, with Christ our God championing the truth, be convicted. Nevertheless, for the present we ought simply to observe that, being quite unable to deny the fathers' words expressly quoted, he has clearly borne witness to the fact that it was about terms that those of that time had a dispute. Therefore, we must look at the intention of the doctors and learn from the previous examination that they ruled absolutely that realities are not the same thing as terms.

---

**359/360** cf. supra, 353-354



— ܫܡܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܟܢܫ ܠܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܘܢ ܘܡܚܝܕ
— ܠܚܕܐ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܓ̈ܒܐ : ܕܗܘ̇ ܗܘ ܗܘ̇
— ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ ܒܝܕ ܟ̈ܘܢܝܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ. ܗܘ ܫܡܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܠܗܘ
— ܦܘܠܓܐ ܢܣܒ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܒܗ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ
<- ܠܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܩܢܘܡܐ. ܘܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ
<- ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ ܠܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ
— ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܒܥܝܢ ܕܢܫܘܕܥܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ :
— ܐܠܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܩܝܡܢ ܀

ܘܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܙܕܩܐܝܬ ܐܦ ܢܐܡܪ : ܕܠܡܣܟܐܝܬ ܠܢܝܫܐ
ܕܝܠܗ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܕܠܐ
ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ :
ܒܐܝܢܐܝܬ ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢ ܡܬܚܫܚ. ܐܠܐ
ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܝܕܥܝܢ : ܕܟܕ ܥܠ ܐܪܙܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܓܠܙ ܟܠܗ ܫܪܪܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܒܟ̈ܘܢܝܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ
ܘܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܡܣܪ̈ܩܝܢ ܡܢ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܟܐܪܘܗܝ
ܠܗܕܪ̈ ܐܡܝܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܬ ܒܐܡܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡ ܒܕܘ
ܐܬܟܣܝ ܐܬܟܣܣ : ܘܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܢ ܚܐܦ
ܫܪܪܐ ܡܬܟܬܫ ܡܬܟܣܣ. ܒܪܡ ܕܥܕܡܐ ܕܠܗܫܐ ܙܕܩ
ܠܡܣܒ : ܕܟܕ ܒܟܠܗ ܩܠܐ ܕܐܟܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ
ܩܒܝܠ ܠܐ ܗܘ ܐܫܟܚ ܕܢܟܦܘܪ : ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܣܗܕ : ܕܡܛܠ
ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܚܪܝܢܐ. ܡܕܝܢ
ܠܘܬ ܢܝܫܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܚܘܪ. ܘܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡ ܒܕܘ
ܐܬܩ̈ܢܝܢ ܢܐܠܦ : ܕܡܠܘܐܝܬ ܦܣܩܘ : ܕܠܘ ܗܘ̇ ܗܘ ܗܘ̇
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ.

---

AC

* *Chapter 11*

*Clear demonstration which lucidly makes known by many means that it was in teaching people who were mistaken as to the meanings of terms, that the God-clad fathers declared that substance indicates the Godhead's nature and Godhead signifies the substance, and that hypostasis is characteristic of a single substrate etc.*

Now if, because they said 'Godhead', 'substance' and 'nature', 'hypostases' and 'properties', anybody objects to accepting that they spoke also there about the terms, we can make the true reply that they frequently appear to have used this form of words, not with the supposition that the terms are identical with the realities (for this has been abundantly disproved by their wise writings!) but because sometimes the argument itself compelled them to speak in this fashion and because they were quite aware that their readers could readily make a distinction in what was said, from the context. This, indeed, will appear at once from the examination of the words of our proven father Severus, from which this detractor of them vainly attempts to prove that the characteristic properties of the prosopa are hypostases.

So let us take up again the words he quoted and use their plainly-expressed teaching to display again their meaning more clearly. This excellent fellow, then, quoted them 'in support' of his

* ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܕܥܣܪ. A, f. 65rb

ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܕܥܐ ܒܝܕ ܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ ܡܗܕ̈ܢܐ: ܕܒܕ ܕܪܕܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܛܥܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ: ܐܡܪܘ ܠܒ̈ܫܝ ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܝ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ: ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ: ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ ❖

ܠܐ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ: ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪܘ: ܡܬܚܪܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܢܩܒܠ ܕܐܦ ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܬܡܢ ܐܡܪܘ: ܐܝܬ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܢܐ ܒܫܪܪܐ ܡܡܠܠܝܢ ܠܗܢܐ: ܕܣܓܝܐܐܝܬ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܕܒܗܢܐ ܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ: ܠܘ ܒܕ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ̇ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ: ܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܣܓܝ ܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܡܟܬ̈ܒܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܚ̈ܟܝܡܬܐ ܐܬܒܣܝܬ: ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܙܒܢ ܗܝ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܐܠܨܬ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗܘܢ: ܘܡܛܠ ܕܝܕܥܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܕܩܪ̈ܝܢܐ ܕܦܫܝܩܐܝܬ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܗ̣ܘܘ ܕܢܦܪܫܘܢ: ܕܡܢ ܫܘܩܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܢ: ܢܦܪܫܘܢ ܦܫܝܩܐܝܬ ܕܗ̇ܘܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ. ܘܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܚܕܐ ܬܬܚܙܐ: ܡܢܗ ܕܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܒܚܪܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܣܐܘܪܐ: ܕܡܢܗܝܢ ܗܢܐ ܐܟܠ ܩܪ̈ܨܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܕܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ ܡܫܬܐܠ ܕܢܚܘܐ: ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܝܚܕܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ.

ܢܣܒܐ ܢܣܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܐܬܬܐܝ: ܘܒܝܕ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܓܠܝܬܐ: ܬܘܒ ܢܚܘܐ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܣܘܟܠܗܘܢ ܢܓܠܐ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ: ܒܕ ܠܣܡܟܐ ܠܗ

AC

Line 16: ܕܗ̇ܘܝܢ, C: ܕܗܠܝܢ.
Line 18: ܣܐܘܪܐ, C: ܣܐܘܝܪܐ.
Line 21: ܢܣܒ ܗܟܝܠ, C trsp.

absurd doctrines, in the *Letter to the Bishops of the East*, as follows: To make the point clear for readers, we will quote expressly the very text of the doctor from the fourth chapter of the second book of the work *Against the Caesarean*, which contains the following: 'This, then, to sum up, is what we are saying: that substance is indicative of the community and the generic sense, whereas hypostasis is characteristic of a single separate substrate which we term also "prosopon" when it exists in its own proper subsistence, whether it be simple or brought together into indivisible union by composition'. And again, a few lines later, he writes about our divinely inspired father, as follows: The same wise patriarch, therefore, understood this sort of verbal expression and says in the first book * *Against the Grammarian* as follows: 'Hypostasis, indeed, in reference to the meaning of "being", is the same as "substance". For just as "substance" means what is, so "hypostasis" means what subsists, but what is and what subsists do not differ in anything'. This, then, is why this wise doctor, under the impulse of Saint Athanasius' teachings, ruled that 'hypostasis' is the same as 'substance'. But the same master of mysteries later teaches that the pair are not identical by saying 'But in that other there is a great and wide difference. For substance is indicative of the genus and the sense inclusive of many species, whereas hypostasis is a determination of some one species i.e. it is indicative of the prosopon

**25/32** cf. supra, ch. 8, 35-43 **33/46** Dam. Alex., *Ep. ad episc. Orientis;* cf. supra, ch. 8, 44-50 **35/38** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (*CSCO* 111, pp. 56,29 - 57,2; *112*, p. 45, 7-10) **40** cf. supra, 35-36 **41/46** cf. supra, ch. 8, 45-50



ܕܦ̈ܠܣܘܦܘܬܗ܆ ܥܡܝ̈ܪܐ ܡܢܗܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ
— ܐ̈ܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܢܬܓܠܐ
— ܠܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ ܬܗܘܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܬܐ : ܠܗ̇ ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ
— ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܢܝܫܬܐ. ܕܡܢ ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ
— ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܩܣܪܝܐ : ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ
← ܗܕܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܦܣܝܩܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ
← ܐܬܝܗܝܢ. ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܕܓܢܣܝܘܬܐ ܘܕܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ
← ܐܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܢ ܕܣܝܡ
← ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ. ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܦ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢܢ ܐܡܬܝ
← ܕܒܕܝܠܝܘܬ ܩܘܡܐ ܡܩܝܡ : ܘܐܢ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ ܘܐܢ ܡܢ
← ܪܘܟܒܐ ܠܚܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܢܝܬܐ ܡܟܢܫ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܒܬܪ
ܙܥܘܪܬܐ ܡܠܠܬܗ ܕܥܠܗ ܕܢܦܫ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܟܬܒ
— ܗܟܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܡܪ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܟܝܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܗܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܝܣ
— ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ * ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ : ܗܟܢ ܠܗܢܐ f. 65va
← ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܬܐ ܐܫܬܘܕܥ ܗܘܝܐ : ܘܩܢܘܡܐ
← ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܟܝܢ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܝܠܬܐ : ܗ̇ܘ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆
← ܠܐܘܣܝܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ : ܗܟܢܐ
← ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܩܝܡ ܡܫܬܡܥܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ ܘܡܩܝܡ :
← ܘܠܐ ܒܡܕܡ ܦܪܝܫܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܗܢܐ
— ܚܟܝܡܐ ܟܕ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܬܢܐܣܝܘܣ ܐܬܬܙܝܥ :
— ܕܗ̇ܘ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܦܣܩ. ܐܠܐ ܘܕܠܐ
— ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ : ܗ̇ܘ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܠܦ
← ܒܟܠ ܕܐܪܐ ܙܕܩܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ. ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ : ܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ
← ܐܚܪܬܐ ܦܝܫ ܡܒܪܪ ܥܘܡܩܐ. ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ : ܕܓܢܣܐ
← ܘܕܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܚܝܕܐ ܕܐܕ̈ܫܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܐܬܝܗ̇
← ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܚܘܡܐ ܕܚܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ ܕܚܕ

AC

Line 25: ܐ̈ܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ, C: ܐܦܝܣ̈ܩܘܦܐ.
Line 26: ܬܗܘܐ ..... ܠܗ̇ܘܢ, cf. ch. 8, line 37 (ܠܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ ܬܗܘܐ).
Line 28: ܒܗ, C: ܒܗ̇.
Line 33: ܡܩܝܡ, cf. ch. 8, line 44 (ܐܬܩܝܡ).
Line 34: ܡܬܦܠܓܢܝܬܐ, C: ܡܬܦܠܓܢܬܐ.
Line 42: ܘܠܐ, C: ܠܐ. ܗܟܝܠ, C om.

having by its property non-participation with the fellow-members of the genus and embracing the substrate in its proper mark'. What do we say of this? For, he says, the doctor teaches us that substance is indicative of the community and the generic sense whereas hypostasis is characteristic of a single separate substrate; and again, in the other passage, he says: For substance is indicative of the genus and the sense inclusive of many species whereas hypostasis is a determination of some one species i.e. it is indicative of the prosopon.

First, let us recognize the complete accuracy of this novel author. For, having quoted this pair of proof-texts previously set out, allegedly from the first book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian* (they are in fact from the first chapter of the second book) he then very brazenly inserted what he chose in the middle so that no one should be able to get an unsullied knowledge of the father's statement. In fact, though the doctor said, whereas hypostasis is a determination indicative of one species which has by its property non-participation with the fellow-members of the genus and embraces the substrate in its proper mark, Damian covertly inserted what he chose, and said whereas hypostasis is a determination of s o m e one species, i.e. it is * indicative of the prosopon which has by its property non-participation with the fellow-members of the genus and embraces the substrate in its proper mark. However, we mention such points at this length to disclose the wicked negligence of the fellow in things divine.

**47/49** cf. supra, 28-30 **50/52** cf. supra, 42-44 **59/62** cf. supra, ch. 10, 67-70 **63/66** cf. supra, 43-46



← ܐܕܫܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܒܕ ܠܘܬ
← ܩ̈ܢܝ ܓܢܣܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ :
← ܘܡܩܦܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܢܝܐ ܠܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܬܚܬ ✣ ܡܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ
← ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܕܟܢܘܫܝܘܬܐ
← ܘܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ
← ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܕܙܪܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ. ܘܬܘܒ
← ܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܐܡܪ : ܐܘܣܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܓܢܣܐ : ܕܓܢܣܝܐ
← ܘܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܐܚܝܕܐ ܕܐ̈ܕܫܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
← ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܚܘܡܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܚܕ
← ܐܕܫܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ ✣

ܘܩܕܡܝܬ ܡܢ ܢܕܥ ܠܫܪܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܝ، ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܒܪ̈ܫܝܗ ܕܩܕ̈ܝܡܢ ܣܝ̈ܡܢ : ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܡܢ ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ : ܦܟܪ ܡܪܚܐܝܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܨܒܐ ܒܡܨܥܬܐ ܣܡ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܫܟܚ ܐܢܫ ܕܕܓܠܐܝܬ ܢܬܘܕܥ ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ
< ܐܒܗܘܬܐ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܡܪ ✣ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܚܘܡܐ
< ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ : ܕܠܘܬ ܩ̈ܢܝ ܓܢܣܐ
< ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ : ܘܡܩܦܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܢܝܐ
< ܠܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܬܚܬ ✣ ܗܘ ܡܛܠܡܢܐܝܬ ܗ̇، ܕܨܒܐ ܪܡܐ ܠܗ ܒܡܨܥܬܐ
— ܐܒܕܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ✣ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܚܘܡܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܚܕ
← ܐܕܫܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ * ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ : ܕܠܘܬ f. 65vb
← ܩ̈ܢܝ ܓܢܣܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ.
← ܘܡܩܦܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܢܝܐ ܠܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܬܚܬ ✣ ܐܠܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܕܐܝܟܢ
ܗܟܢ ܒܠܗ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܝܢ : ܒܡܐ ܕܢܬܚܘܐ ܡܬܡܗܠܢܘܬܐ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܓܒܪܐ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܐܠܗܝ̈ܬܐ.

AC up to ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ (l. 67)

Line 50: ܒܕ ܠܘܬ, cf. ch. 8, line 52 (ܕܠܘܬ).
Line 51: ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ, cf. ch. 8, line 52 (ܒܗ̇، ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ).
Line 59: ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ, C: ܕܦ̈ܪܨܘܦܐ.
Line 63: ܒܪ̈ܫܝܗ, C: ܒܪܫܝܗ.

But let us put a question to him and get his opinion from him: Tell us, clever fellow, how you infer from the preceding statements, that all characterizers are identical with what they characterize! If you prove this, the characteristic properties of the hypostases will also be hypostases, and nobody will contradict you about it. If contrariwise, as has been clearly demonstrated by many means, the characteristic properties of the nature are not identical with the nature neither those of the hypostases with the hypostases nor again the terms identical with the realities they signify, tell us, who are asking you, what advantage there is for the confirmation of your feeble doctrines, in the fact the wise doctor at one point said that the hypostasis is characteristic of a single separate substrate and at another that it is a determination indicative of one species! We ought, perhaps, to have kept silent and not entangled ourselves in idle words with you, seeing that this does not profit you even, so to say, in its very appearance. Nevertheless, so that you may not seem wise to yourself and be able to use frigid arguments like this to disturb the uneducated, we must make a further short examination with you of the statements you have quoted from our divinely inspired father Severus. So listen both to what precedes and what follows them and understand, from them all, the genuine meaning of the teaching. Better, adhere to the fathers' conceptions and do not attempt to wrest them to suit your aim!

The same proven SEVERUS, champion of the truth, wrote in the first chapter of the second book, as follows: The term 'substance', then, is indicative of something which is; for we must produce definitive demonstrations of the terms by approximating them to the thoughts and words of divine Scripture. And again: For it is clear that the term 'sub-

**80** cf. supra, 49 **81** cf. supra, 60 et 63 **93/96** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (*CSCO* 111, p. 56, 1-4; *112*, p. 44, 16-19) **96/98** ibid. (*CSCO* 111, p. 56, 24-27; *112*, p. 45, 3-5)



ܢܫܐܠܝܘܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܢܗ ܢܣܒ ܬܪܥܝܬܗ. ܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܐܘ
ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܕܡܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡ̈ ܦܣܝ̈ܩܢ ܡܚܘܐ ܐܢܬ.
ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܝܚܕܝܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
ܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܝܚܕܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܐ̄ ܗܢ ܗܕܐ ܡܚܘܐ ܐܢܬ :
ܢܗܘܘܢ ܘܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ
ܐܢܫ ܠܡܩܒܠܟ ܠܐ ܢܐܡܪ. ܐ̄ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܦܟܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܣ̈ܓܝ
ܦܢ̈ܝܬܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ
ܕܟܝܢܐ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܠܟܝܢܐ : ܘܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܠܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ
ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ : ܡܢܐ ܡܘܬܪܐ ܠܟ ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܬܫܪܪ ܕܘ̈ܓܡܝܟ
ܡܚܝ̈ܠܬܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ. ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܬܚܘܡܐ
ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ : ܕܡܫܬܐܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ
ܠܝ. ܘܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ ܟܡ ܚܒܪ : ܕܒܪ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ
ܐܦܠܐ ܒܗ ܒܗ̇، ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܘܬܪܐ ܠܟ : ܕܢܫܬܘܩ ܘܠܐ
ܡܬ̈ܪܬܐ ܠܘܬܟ ܢܬܚܪܐ. ܒܪܡ ܕܠܐ ܬܣܬܒܪ ܠܘܬ ܢܦܫܟ
ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܘܬܫܟܚ ܒܗܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܠܠܐ ܡܪ̈ܕܝܬܐ ܒܝܕ ܬܚܠܐ
ܦܘܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܡܫܓܫܘ : ܐܠܝܨܐ ܕܬܘܒ ܒܠܝܠ ܢܒܨܐ
ܥܡܟ ܡܛܠ ܬܒܥܬܐ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܬ، ܡܢܢ : ܕܢܦܝܫ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ. ܡܕܝܢ ܫܡܥ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕ̈ܡ
ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܩܦܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܘܡܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܐܣܬܟܠ ܠܗܘܢܐ
ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܙܝܦܐ. ܘܡܦܣ ܡܟܠ ܠܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܐ :
ܘܠܐ ܬܥܫܢܐܝܬ ܬܬܚܪܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܢܝܫܟ ܬܓܪܘܓ ܐܢܘܢ.

ܟܬ̣ܒ ܡܟܝܠ ܗܘ ܒܚܝܪܐ ܘܐܓܘܢܣܛܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ
ܣܘܝܪܐ : ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ
< ܐܡܪ ܂ ܫܡܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܡܕܡ
< ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܙܕܩ ܠܢ ܓܝܪ : ܕܬܚܘܡܐ ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ
< ܕܟܬܒܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ : ܠܡܩܪܒ ܠܡܬܚܫܒܬܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܚܘ̈ܡܐ.

A flor. II up to l. 89

Line 78: ܗܘܢ, flor. II: ܗܠܝܢ.
Line 85: ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ, flor. II: ܠܗ̇ܝ.
Line 88: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ, flor. II om.

stance' is derived from 'being'. Therefore the word is not unscriptural, as the frigid and lamentable little arguments of the Arians ......

* ...... And a little later he writes the words quoted by your wise self, which are as follows: For substance is indicative of the genus and the sense inclusive of many species, whereas hypostasis is a determination indicative of one species having by its property non-participation with the fellow-members of the genus and embracing the substrate in its proper mark. Besides this he wrote in the fifth chapter of the same second book, setting down for us precise knowledge of the terms and of those indicated by the terms, as follows: These distinctions having been thus made and the force and meaning of each of the terms previously set down for examination having been clarified as best I can, we are to recognize that we find sound doctors of the holy churches often using the term 'substance' of the proper hypostasis too. And again: It is, therefore, not unknown that here too the one flesh ensouled with intelligent soul, the flesh hypostatically united with the Word, is clearly denominated 'substance'; because the fathers sometimes apply the term 'substance' in the proper sense. In the second chapter of the same book, he wrote as follows: So much for substance and hypostasis. The term 'nature', on the other hand, is sometimes indicative of the common and the genus like 'substance', sometimes of the species and of a single substrate like 'hypostasis' too. And again: It is to be noted and observed here too how the saint termed the two hypostases of Father and Son 'two natures'; and showing that he applied the term 'nature' for the

**100/104** cf. supra, ch. 10, 66-70 **106/110** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 5 (*CSCO* 111, p. 81, 14-19; *112*, p. 64, 7-11) **111/114** Ibid. (*CSCO* 111, p. 84, 23-27; *112*, p. 66, 23-26) **115/118** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 2 (*CSCO* 111, p. 68, 5-8; *112*, p. 53, 23-26) **118/125** Ibid. (*CSCO* 111, pp. 69,25 - 70,6; *112*, p. 55, 1-9)



< ܘܬܘܒ : ܚܠܦ ܓܝܪ ܕܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܫܬܡܗ, ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܡܕܝܢ ܠܘ ܠܐ ܟܬܒܢܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ, ܡܠܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ
< ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܩܪ̈ܝܪܬܐ ܘܕܘܝܬ ܠܬܐܪ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܐܪ̈ܝܢܘ ......

* ...... ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܩܠܝܠ ܣܐܡ : ...... [ܡ̈]ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ A, f. 120ra
< ܣܟܠܬܢܘܬܟ [ܐ̈]ܬܝܬܝ, : ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܀ [ܕ]ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܥܠ ܓܢܣ ܕܓܢܣܐ : [ܘ]ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܚܘܕܐ ܕܐܕ̈ܫܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ. ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܣܘܡܟܐ ܡܦܪܫ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ,
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ. ܟܕ ܠܘܬ ܥ̈ܒܝܪ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܓܢܣܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬܗ̇ ܠܐ
< ܡܫܬܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ. ܘܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܕܒܕܝܠܝܬܗ̇ ܠܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܬܚܬ ܀
ܒܬܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ :
ܟܕ ܝܗܒ ܠܢ ܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܘܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ
< ܣܐܡ ܠܝ : ܗܠܝܢ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܦܪܫ : ܘܚܝܠܐ
< ܘܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ ܣܡܝܢ
< ܠܒܘܚܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܨܝܐ ܐܬܢܗܪ ܢܕܥ ܕܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܠܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ
< ܚܠܝܡܐ ܕܥܕ̈ܬܐ ܩܕܝ̈ܫܬܐ : ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܘܣܝ̈ܐ ܥܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ
< ܕܝܠܢܝܐ ܡܬܚܫܚܝܢ ܒܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
< ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܝܕܝܥܬܐ : ܕܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܚܕ ܒܣܪܐ ܕܡܢܦܫ ܒܢܦܫܐ
< ܝܕܘܥܬܢܝܬܐ : ܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܩܢܘܡܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܝܕ ܠܡܠܬܐ :
< ܠܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܬܩܪܝ. ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܥܠ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܢܝܐ
< ܐܝܬ ܐܡ̈ܬܝ, ܕܡܫܬܡܠ ܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܐ̈ܒܗܬܐ ܀
ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܟܬܒ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܕ
< ܐܡܪ ܀ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ. ܟܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܕܓܘܐ ܘܕܓܢܣܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ :
< ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܕܫܐ ܘܕܚܕ ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ :
< ܐܝܟ ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܠܡܬܒܩܝܘ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܙܕܩ
< ܘܠܡܚܙܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܢܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܠܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ
< ܘܕܒܪܐ : ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܫܡܗ. ܘܟܕ ܡܚܘܐ ܕܫܠܦ ܫܘܕܥܢܐ

A

Line 126: ܕܓܘܐ ..... ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ, cf. infra, lines 168-169 and note.
Line 127: ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ, cf. infra, line 170 (ܕܣܝܡ).
Line 128: ܐܝܟ, cf. infra, line 170 (ܐܝܟܢܐ).
Line 130: ܫܡܗ, A: ܫܡܗܘ (wrongly), cf. *CSCO* 111, p. 69.

proper sense he said 'two hypostatic natures', aware that the term 'nature' is often used also for 'substance'. This can be seen not only in the case of the Godhead but in that of the manhood too: sometimes the term 'nature' is used for substance and the generic sense, sometimes for the proper sense declaratory of hypostasis.

What? Are these words not clear enough for readers to know that the God-clad father was fully at pains to show not what sense such a sense * is significative of but rather what sense each of the terms mentioned is declaratory of. Listen to him acknowledging this very thing at the start of his teaching on the point: The term 'substance', then, is indicative of something which is; for we must produce definitive demonstrations of the terms by approximating them to the thoughts and words of divine Scripture. So, he means to teach us what the terms, not the realities, are indicative of. That is why he also said: The term 'substance', then, is indicative of something which is i.e. it is not indicative of how the realities exist but is declaratory of the fact that they exist. For example, it does not declare that the subject of the words is immortal or mortal, uncreated or created, ingenerate or generate, but informs us that it exists. In this latter case, then, substance, being and hypostasis share a meaning; in the former, the difference between them is wide. As the same God-clad doctor instructs us by saying: In this latter case, then, substance, hypostasis and being share a meaning; in the former the difference is wide. For substance is indicative of the genus and the sense inclusive of

**130/133** cf. supra, 93-96 **135** cf. supra, 130-131 **139/141** cf. infra, 142-144 **142/146** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (*CSCO* 111, p. 57, 13-18; *112*, p. 45, 21-26)



< ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܥܘܠ ܠܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪ.
< ܟܕ ܝܕܥ ܕܐܦ ܚܠܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܣܓܝܐܐܝܬ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ
< ܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ. ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܘ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܠܐ
< ܠܡܚܙܝܐ : ܐܠܐ ܘܥܠ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ. ܙܒܢܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܚܠܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܘܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ : ܙܒܢܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܚܠܦ ܗܘ ܕܝܠܝܐ ܘܡܚܘܝܢܐ
< ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܬܬܣܝܡ ܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܀

ܘܡܢܐ. ܠܘ ܓ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܩܪܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܢܕܥܘܢ : ܕܗܢܐ ܐܒܐ ܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܟܠܗ ܚܦܝܛܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ : ܠܘ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܕܐܝܢܐ ܫܘܕܥܐ * ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܚܘܝܢܐ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ : ܐܠܐ f. 120rb ܡܠܘܢ ܕܐܝܢܐ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܥܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܚܘܝܢܐ. ܘܫܡܥܝܘܗܝ, ܕܟܕ ܗܘ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ

< ܕܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ : ܕܗ̇ܝ ܗܕܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܀ ܫܡܐ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܙܕܩ ܠܢ
< ܓܝܪ ܕܩܘܪܒܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܥܝܬܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ :
< ܠܡܥܒܕ ܠܬܚܘܡܝܬܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܀ ܗܐ ܕܢܐܠܦ

ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܚܘ̈ܝܢܐ : ܘܠܘ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܘ̈ܝܢܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ܦ̈ܠܓܐ ܕܠܦ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܀

< ܫܡܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܡܕܡ
< ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܀ ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ : ܠܘ ܕܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ

ܗܘ̈ܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܚܘܝܢܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ. ܕܐܝܟܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ. ܠܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܝܘܬܐ : ܐܘ ܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ ܐܘ ܒܪܝܐ : ܐܘ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܐܘ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܘ ܕܡܬܡܠܠܗ ܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܡܘܕܥ. ܒܗܕܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܝܬܘܬܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ. ܒܗ̇, ܕܝܢ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܡܣܓܝܐܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ

< ܕܪܫܐ ܠܢ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܀ ܒܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ
< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܝܬܘܬܐ. ܒܗ̇, ܕܝܢ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܡܣܓܝܐܐ
< ܡܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܘܡܫܘܚܠܦܐ. ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ : ܕܓܢܣܐ
< ܘܫܘܕܥܐ ܐܚܝܕܐ ܕܐ̈ܢܫܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ

A

many species whereas hypostasis is a determination indicative of one species. But he clarifies the force of the meaning of the terms under examination more subtly by saying: The holy fathers often used the term 'substance' in the proper sense, of the hypostasis too. Likewise he also spoke of the term 'nature' in a different way, as previously set down: Sometimes it is indicative of the common and the genus like 'substance', sometimes of the species and of a single substrate like 'hypostasis' too. Therefore when he said that substance, for example, is indicative of the genus and the inclusive sense, or hypostasis indicative of one species or characteristic of a single separate substrate, we are accordingly to understand not that he is making the realities * indicate, signify or characterize themselves but is speaking of the terms by which the realities are indicated and characterized: how the term 'substance' signifies the generic sense, how the term 'hypostasis' characterizes a single substrate. He is not saying that the generic sense means the generic sense or that the proper sense characterizes the proper sense. That is nothing but idle and empty talk. For what further good would it do us to say that substance signifies substance, and hypostasis signifies and characterizes hypostasis? We must, then, either reckon saying 'indicates' and 'is signified' and the like as empty useless language, or we must consider that we utter such words in a certain

**147/148** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, loco non reperto **150/152** cf. supra, 116-118 **153** cf. supra, 144 **154** cf. supra, 145-146 cf. supra, 80



< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ. ܣܘܓܐܐ ܕܝܢ ܫܘܡܗܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܘܗܘ ܝܬܝܪ ܦܠܝܐܝܬ ܠܚܝܠܐ
ܘܠܡܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܒܚܢܝܢ ܡܢܗܪ ܐܡܪ ܀
< ܕܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܥܠ ܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ ܘܥܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ :
< ܕܩܢܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ ܒܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܀ ܒܗ̇ ܕܝܢ
ܒܡܬܘܬܐ ܘܠܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܡܫܠܦܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡܐ
< ܣܝܡܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܒܙܒܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܓܘ̈ܢܐ ܘܕܓܢܣܐ
< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܕܫܐ ܘܕܚܕ
< ܕܣܝܡ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܀ ܡܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ ܕܐܡܪ
ܐܘ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܬܝܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܕܓܢܣܐ ܘܫܘܕܥܢܐ
ܐܚܝܕܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ : ܐܘ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ
ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ : ܐܘ ܡܣܝܡܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ :
ܠܣܘܟܠܐܝܬ ܢܣܬܟܠ : ܕܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܘ̈ܝܢ ܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ
ܠܗܘܢ * ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܐܘ ܡܘܕܥܝܢ ܐܘ ܡܣܝܡܝܢ f. 120va
ܡܡܠܠ : ܐܠܐ ܠܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ ܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ
ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ. ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ. ܕܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ :
ܕܠܗ̇ ܕܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ. ܘܫܡܐ
ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܡܣܝܡܢܐ ܕܠܗ ܕܚܕ ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ. ܘܠܐ ܕܗܘ
ܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܡܣܘܡܢܐ ܕܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ : ܐܘ
ܗܘ ܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ : ܡܣܝܡܢܐ ܕܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ. ܗܕܐ
ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܐܠܐ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܠܐ ܝܬܝܪܬܐ
ܘܣܪܝܩܬܐ. ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܘܬܪܬܐ ܠܝ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܘܩܢܘܡܐ
ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܘܡܣܝܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ. ܟܕ ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܗܟܝܠ : ܐܘ ܠܡܐ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܘܕܡܕܡ ܗܘܝ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܐ ܠܢ :
ܢܚܫܘܒ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪܢ ܕܡܘܕܥ ܘܡܬܝܕܥ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ : ܐܘ

A

Lines 168-169: ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ..... ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ, cf. supra, line 126, et infra, l. 211.

Line 170: ܕܣܝܡ, cf. supra, line 127 (ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ). ܐܝܟܢܐ, cf. supra, line 128 (ܐܝܟ).

Line 175: ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ. At the top of fol. 120v A reads as follows: ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ. *Of Saint Peter the Patriarch against Damian.*

way because, as we said before, some sort of differentiation is to be seen, as wise Cyril, along with other God-clad masters of mysteries taught us.

But perhaps this cunning dialectician will see clearly from this that his view is demolished and will do battle again for his feeble notions. Perhaps he will say that terms do not differ from realities nor do signifiers from signified, nor characterizers and indicators from characterized and indicated. So then, he will say, we see the holy patriarch sometimes saying the terms 'substance' and 'nature' signify and indicate such-and-such, sometimes that they signify and indicate the substance and the nature themselves i.e. he reckons the terms 'substance' and 'nature' and substance and nature themselves to be the same thing. So in reply to this we stick to the divinely inspired patristic teaching and say that people who tell such fables are clearly using the different meanings to fight with the Church's teachings and with the plain facts. We will omit those already examined and mention just one text which will be enough, we believe, to prove the total witlessness of this mistake. The God-clad doctor expressly says, as we have previously * set down: the term 'nature', on the other hand (for here is the right place to start the examination now) is sometimes indicative of the common and the genus like 'substance', sometimes of the species and of a single substrate like 'hypostasis' too. If, then, we take the reality indicated by the term 'nature' to be the term 'nature', we should consider what the word of truth is inviting us to understand. Is it substance

---

**186/189** cf. supra, 116-118



ܕܒܝܢܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܗ ܥܘܫܠܩܐ ܐܝܬܝܐ ܕܗܘ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܠܦܢ ܐܡܪܢܢ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪ ܩܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܡܦܩܝܢ ܚܟܝܡ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܐܪܙܢܐ ܠܒܝܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ : ܘܣܓܝܐܐ ܡܩܪܒܘ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܕܐܟܐ ܠܝ.

ܐܠܐ ܟܒܪ ܒܗ ܘܚܙܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܠܝܠܐܝܬ ܢܘܟܠܐ ܕܡܬܗܦܟܢܘܬܐ ܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܦܪܘܩܐ ܢܦܠܐ : ܘܡܬܟܬܫ ܬܘܒ ܥܠ ܚܘܫܒܘܗܝ ܡܚܝܠܐ ܘܐܡܪ : ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܫܡܗܐ ܡܢ ܨܒܘܬܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܥܠܡܝܢ : ܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ. ܒܪܡ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܢ ܘܢܐܡܪ ܚܙܝܢ ܠܡܕܥܐ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ : ܕܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܐܡܪ : ܕܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܟܝܢܐ : ܕܠܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܡܚܘܐ ܘܡܫܘܕܥ. ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܟܝܢܐ. ܘܐܝܟܢܐ : ܕܗܝ ܒܗ ܗܝ . ܚܫܒ ܠܫܡܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ : ܘܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܟܝܢܐ. ܠܘܬ ܗܕܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܢܩܝܦܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܩܦܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܒܗܝ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ : ܒܥܡ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܒܪܬܝܟܐ ܘܡܬܘܡ ܕܥܠܝܬܐ ܕܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܠܡܝܢ. ܘܕܗܘܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܒܪܘ ܐܬܚܙܝ ܢܫܒܘܩ ܚܕܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܣܦܩܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܠܫܪܪܬܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܡܫܬܠܡܢܬܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܠܦܘܕܐ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܘ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ * ܦܫܝܛܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܒܝܫ f. 120vb

> ܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܫܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܥܦܝܪܐ ܗܘ ܓܒܪ ܕܫܡܬܐ

> ܕܗܪܟܐ ܢܦܩ ܠܡܫܪܝܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܘܕܓܢܣܐ

> ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܗܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ

> ܕܐܕܫܐ ܘܕܚܕ ܕܩܝܡ : ܐܝܟ ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܀ ܐܢ

ܗܟܝܠ ܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܠܗ ܠܨܒܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܚܘܝܐ ܕܫܡܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܢܚܫܘܒ : ܕܗܘ ܠܡܬܚܙܝܘ : ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܡܩܪܝܐ ܠܢ. ܐܝܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܢܐ

---

AB from ܘܚܙܐ (l. 192) on flor. II from l. 207 on

---

Line 202: ܢܩܦܝܢ ܚܢܢ, B: ܢܩܦܝܢ.

Line 206: ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܚܢܢ, B: ܕܡܚܘܝܢ.

Line 211: ܡܗܘܕܥܢܐ, cf. supra, lines 168-169 (ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ) and note.

(the inclusive sense) or proper hypostasis, or will those who scare us with bugbears of wisdom gone mad and get ready an armoury of notions from spiders' webs to oppose right belief say both substance and hypostasis? But if it is substance in the generic sense, how can the generic be indicative of hypostasis? Or rather, how can substance comprehending hypostases be a hypostasis? For if indicator and indicated are identical and the generic sense indicates hypostasis, hypostasis must be the generic sense. If, on the other hand, we consider the term 'nature' (which sometimes signifies the common and the genus, sometimes the species and the single substrate) as hypostasis i.e. the proper sense, how can the proper sense indicate the generic sense or be the generic sense? But if, again, we think the term 'nature' to be both substance in the generic sense and proper hypostasis we must lapse into the same or worse absurdities by clearly making one and the same reality both substance inclusive of hypostases and proper hypostasis. The upshot will be, then, if we do not follow the orthodox and irreproachable understanding of the doctors, that we cannot consider the term 'nature' to be either the generic sense (i.e. substance inclusive of hypostases) or the proper sense (i.e. hypostasis).

But why did the accurate doctor teach us that the term is sometimes indicative of the community and the genus, sometimes of the species and of a single substrate? Perhaps some right-minded people on reading this will say that really whenever the divinely inspired fathers expressly speak * in this way of 'terms' which characterize or signify the realities indicated by them, then we ought not to

212/214 cf. supra, 187-189



ܫܘܕܥܐ ܐܚܘܕܐ ܆ ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ ܆ ܐܘ ܐܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܆ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܒܫܠܬܐ ܕܣܟܠܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܫܬܓܪܐ ܡܕܚܠܝܢ ܠܢ. ܘܡܛܝܒܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܓܘܓܠ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ ܡܐܢܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܡܘܕܥܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ. ܡܟܝܠ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܘܕܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܬܗܘܐ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܘܕܥ ܘܡܬܝܕܥ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܗ̣ܘ : ܡܘܕܥ ܕܝܢ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܢܐ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ ܠܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܘܠܓܘܢܐ ܐܚܘܬܗ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ : ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܕܫܐ ܘܚܕ ܕܗܢܘ : ܐܝܟ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ : ܠܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܢܫܘܕܥ : ܐܘ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܢܗܘܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ : ܠܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܢܣܒܪ : ܒܗܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܒܗܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܠܥܘܗ ܒܥܒܝܪܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܕܒܝܫ ܡܢܗܝܢ ܢܦܠ : ܒܗ̇ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܒܗ̇ ܠܗ ܠܚܕ ܨܒܘܬܐ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܘܕܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ. ܫܪܟܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗ̇ ܠܡܗܘܠܐ ܬܪܝܨܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܒܠܝܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܢܦܩܝܢ : ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܗܘ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܚܘܕܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܗܘ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܝܐ ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܢܚܫܘܒ ܕܐܬܘܗܝ، ܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ.

< ܐܠܐ ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܚܬܝܬܐ ܐܠܦ ܠܢ : ܫܡܐ ܕܙܒܢ
< ܡܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܘܓܢܣܐ. ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܕܫܐ
< ܘܚܕ ܕܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܒܗ̇ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܟܕ ܩ̈ܪܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܝܢ
ܕܬܪܝܨܐܝܬ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ ܦܐܡ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ : ܕܒܟܪܝ̈ܬܐ ܐܡܬܝ، ܡܢ
ܕܢܫ̈ܡܬ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ : * ܗܟܢܐ ܒܗ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܦ̈ܫܝܩܬܐ A, f. 66ra
ܕܡܟܢܫܝܢ ܐܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܠܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝ̈ܢ

AB flor. II

Line 241: ܐ̄ܢܫܝܢ, flor. II: ܐܢܫܝܢ.

reckon the indicators and the indicated, characterizers and characterized, and likewise the signifiers and signified as identical with one another, because the term is not identical with the reality it signifies. Whereas when they do not say 'terms', but clearly 'substance', 'nature' and 'being', and, again, will say that something characterizes, signifies or indicates them, how can we interpret the indicators, signifiers and characterizers as one thing and the objects indicated, characterized and signified as another thing? Our same tried and tested father Severus answers this and shows clearly (as has been set out above) that they used such a form of words without distinction. Perhaps for other reasons too, but especially when they were sure that readers would easily discern the sense of what was written by the meaning underlying each word.

He says, then, towards the end of the second chapter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian*, as follows: So it is evident here too, that the nature is called one 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis'. But where the doctor said that man's nature has by Adam's transgression come under the curse and death, he has indicated, by the term 'nature', the community of man and the whole race. Therefore 'nature' sometimes signifies 'substance', sometimes 'hypostasis'. And again, at the very beginning of the third chapter: Thus also 'being' is indicative of both substance and hypostasis and is something intermediate, meaning sometimes the one sometimes the other in accordance with the

---

**233/237** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 2 (*CSCO* 111, p. 70, 25-30; *112*, p. 55, 28-33) **238/241** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 3 (*CSCO* 111, p. 71, 4-7; *112*, p. 56, 5-7)



ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܢ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ : ܢܕܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܢ ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܪܫܡܝܢ ܘܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ : ܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢ : ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܠܫܪ̈ܪܐ ܢܣܒܘܢ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܫܡܐ ܠܨܒܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܢܗ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ. ܐܡܬܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܘܐܝܬܘܬܐ : ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܩܘܡܟܐ : ܕܡܚܘܐ ܐܘ ܡܪܫܡ ܐܘ ܡܫܘܕܥ ܡܕܡ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܨܝܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܪܫܡܝܢ ܘܡܚܘܝܢ : ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܘܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ ܢܦܬܟܪ. ܡܦܢܐ ܗܘܝܠ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܠܗܕܐ ܗܘܐ : ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܒܚܝܪܐ ܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܣܐܘܪܐ : ܘܡܚܘܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܕܠܐ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܒܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ. ܘܡܛܠ ܥ̈ܠܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ : ܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ.: ܘܟܕ ܬܟܝܠܝܢ ܕܦܫܝܩܐܝܬ ܗܘܘ ܕܩܪ̈ܝܢܐ : ܡܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܬܚܝܬ ܟܠ ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ : ܡܦܪܫܝܢ ܠܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܝ̈ܒܢ.

ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܘܬ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܦܣܘܩܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܗܟܢܐ ∻
< ܐܬܓܠܝܬ ܗܟܝܠ ܘܗܪܟܐ : ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܬܩܪܝܗ ܚܕ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ
< ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܝܟܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ : ܕܐܢܫܘܬ ܟܝܢܐ
< ܕܥܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܐܕܡ ܠܠܘܛܬܐ ܘܠܡܘܬܐ :
< ܒܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܠܓܘܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܘܠܟܠܗ ܓܢܣܐ ܫܘܕܥ.
< ܡܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܟܝܢܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥ : ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܩܢܘܡܐ ∻ ܘܬܘܒ ܒܗ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܦܣܘܩܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ∻
< ܗܟܢܐ ܐܦ ܐܝܬܐ : ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ : ܘܡܨܥܝܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܘܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ

---

AB flor. II

---

Line 246: ܘܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ, A: ܘܕܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ.
Line 247: ܘܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ, flor. II: ܘܡܬܚܘܝܢ.
Line 255: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܐܝܪܐ.
Line 258: ܬܟܝܠܝܢ, flor. II add. ܗܘܘ.
Line 260: ܕܟܬܝ̈ܒܢ, A: ܕܟܬܝܒܢ.

underlying meaning. He speaks, indeed, in similar terms at the end of the fourth chapter of the second book: This, then, to sum up, is what we are saying: that substance is indicative of the community and the generic sense, whereas hypostasis is characteristic of a single separate substrate which we term also 'prosopon' when it exists in its own proper subsistence, whether * it be simple or brought together into indivisible union by composition. A few lines later, he introduced this too: But 'nature' and 'being' we understand to be intermediate terms and are sometimes taken to stand for 'substance', sometimes for 'hypostasis'.

This has proved that the doctor, in speaking here also of 'nature' and 'being', meant nothing other than the terms 'nature' and 'being', viz. the fact that he said: Therefore 'nature' sometimes signifies 'substance', sometimes 'hypostasis', and again: Thus also 'being' is indicative of both substance and hypostasis and is something intermediate, meaning sometimes the one sometimes the other; and in the later passage: But 'nature' and 'being' we understand to be intermediate terms and are sometimes taken to stand for 'substance', sometimes for 'hypostasis'. For had he taken 'nature' or 'being' not as the terms but as the realities themselves, how could the nature or the being be indicative of substance and hypostasis? For it is impossible that in the same way that a single name can be imposed upon different realities, one and the same reality should be both the sub-

**242/247** cf. supra, 27-32 **247/249** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 4 (*CSCO* 111, p. 81, 9-11; *112*, p. 64, 1-3) **252/253** cf. supra, 236-237 **253/255** cf. supra, 238-240 **256/258** cf. supra, 247-249



> ܡܫܘܕܥ : ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܐܚܪܬܐ : ܠܦܘܬ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܗ̇ܘ
> ܕܗܫܐ ✣ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ : ܘܒܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܩܦܠܐܘܢ
> ܕܐܪܒܥܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܐܡܪ ✣ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܟܠ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ
> ܡܢ ܐܢܫ ܕܒܦܣܝܩܬܐ ܗܟܢ ܐܢܫ. ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ :
> ܕܟܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܘܕܓܢܣܐ ܡܚܘܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܕܥܢܝܬܐ.
> ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܣܝܡܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܦܪܝܫ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ. ܠܗ̇ܘ
> ܕܐܦ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܒܕܝܠܘܬ ܩܢܘܡܐ
> ܡܦܝܣ : ܘܐܢ * ܦܫܝܛܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، : ܘܐܢ ܡܢ ܪܘܟܒܐ f. 66rb
> ܠܚܕܝܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܠܓܢܝܬܐ ܡܚܒܪ ✣ ܒܬܪ ܙܥܘܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝ،
> ܘܗܠܝܢ ✣ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܝܬܐ ܕܡܨ̈ܥܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
> ܐܣܬܒܪܝܢ. ܘܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܚܠܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܚܠܦ
> ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܢܣܒܝܢ ✣

ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܘܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ : ܕܐܦ ܗ̇ܪܟܐ ܟܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܘܐܝܬܐ
ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ : ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ
> ܘܕܐܝܬܐ ܐܣܬܟܠ. ܘܝܕܝܥܐ : ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ✣ ܡܕܝܢ ܗܘ
> ܟܝܢܐ ܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥ. ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ✣
> ܘܬܘܒ ✣ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܦ ܐܝܬܐ : ܘܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ
> ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ : ܘܡܨܥܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، : ܘܙܒܢ
> ܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܡܫܘܕܥ : ܘܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܐܚܪܬܐ ✣ ܘܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ
> ܘܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ✣ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܝܬܐ : ܕܡܨ̈ܥܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
> ܐܣܬܒܪܝܢ : ܘܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܚܠܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܚܠܦ
> ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܢܣܒܝܢ ✣ ܐܢ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܐܠܐ
ܐܝܟܘܬܗ ܕܣܘܥܪ̈ܢܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܘܠܐܝܬܐ ܢܣܒ : ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܡܫܟܚܐ ܗܘܬ : ܐܘ ܟܝܢܐ ܐܘ ܐܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ
ܢܗܘܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܟܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܫܘܟ̈ܢܐ
ܡܫܚܠ̈ܦܐ ܚܕ ܫܡܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܢܬܬܣܝܡ : ܗܟܢ ܟܝܢܐ

AB flor. II

Line 271: ܙܒܢ, cf. infra, l. 289 (ܘܙܒܢ) and note. ܗ̇ܘ, cf. ch. 18, line 33 (ܕܗ̇ܘ).

Line 273: ܕܐܪܒܥܐ, flor. II add. ܕܠܗ. ܐܡܪ, flor. II: ܐܡܝܪ.

Line 274: ܐܢܫ, B: ܐ̈ܢܫ.

Line 284: ܐܡܪ, B: ܐܡܪ̇.

Line 285: ܕܐܡܪ, B: ܕܐܡܪ̇.

Line 289: ܘܙܒܢ, flor. II: ܙܒܢ; cf. supra, line 271

stance inclusive of different hypostases and the single and sole proper hypostasis. Therefore, when the instructor in Truth says: Whereas hypostasis is a determination indicative of one species and again: whereas hypostasis is characteristic of a single separate substrate, although he does not expressly say 'the term "hypostasis"', someone understanding him aright will say that the term 'hypostasis' signifies and characterizes a certain single substrate species. For had the doctor been speaking here too not of the term 'hypostasis' but of the reality, what of value would he have done by saying that hypostasis is a determination indicative of one species and again characteristic of a single separate substrate? For this is nothing other than saying that one species indicates one species and that a single substrate indicates a single substrate, which is capable of adding nothing at all by way of knowledge of the subject to learners. Who, in fact, needs to learn that one species is * one species, or that a single substrate is a single substrate? Similarly, if anyone is willing to accept the other statement of the wise doctor, which our author quotes as if it were his own bogus opinion, he will not stray from the truth. The passage says: For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property. If hypostasis i.e. the single substrate, because

**265** cf. supra, 145-146 **266** cf. supra, 244-245 **272/273** cf. supra, 265-266 **281/286** cf. supra, ch. 10, 16-21



ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܚܕ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܒܗ̇ ܫܘܡܗܐ: ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܗܘܐ
ܐܣܘܪܐ ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ: ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܒܠܚܘܕ
ܕܝܠܝܐ. ܡܕܝܢ ܘܐܡܬܝ، ܕܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܪܕܘܝܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܀
< ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܫܘܡܠܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ
< ܐܕܫܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܚܘܝܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ
< ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܀ ܐܦܢ ܠܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪ:
ܒܪ ܗܘܢܐܝܬ ܐܢܫ ܡܣܬܟܠ ܐܡܪ: ܕܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ: ܕܚܕ
ܐܕܫܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܣܝܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܘܡܚܘܝܢܐ. ܐܢ
ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ: ܘܗܪܟܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ
ܡܠܬܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܕܣܘܥܪܢܐ: ܡܢܐ ܝܬܝܪܐ
< ܥܒܕ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܫܘܡܠܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܡܚܘܝܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܡܕܡ
< ܕܣܝܡ ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܀ ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇:
ܐܠܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ: ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܚܕ
ܐܕܫܐ. ܘܬܘܒ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܚܘܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ: ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܗܝ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܦܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܘܣܦܐ
ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܐܬܠ. ܡܢܘ ܓܝܪ ܘܣܢܝܩ ܢܐܠܦ: ܕܚܕ ܐܕܫܐ
ܚܕ * ܐܕܫܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܐܘ ܕܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. f. 66va
ܗ̇ܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ: ܘܐܢܗܘ ܕܨܒܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܢܩܒܠ
ܠܗ̇، ܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ:
ܕܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܢܝܬܗ ܕܐܦܣܘܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܡܝܬܐ: ܗ̇ܝ
< ܕܐܡܪܐ ܀ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ
< ܒܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ: ܟܠܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܣܬܒܪ: ܡܚܠܚܠܐ
< ܘܡܚܒܠܐ ܠܝ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ: ܘܠܝܬ ܡܕܡ
< ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܦܘܠܓܗܘܢ ܘܠܦܘܫܚܠܐ: ܘܠܬܘܗܝ، ܗܢܐ ܡܢ
< ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ: ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܀ ܠܐ ܦܐܫ
ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ: ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܚܕ
ܕܣܝܡ: ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ: ܢܬܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܫܘܡܗܐ

AB flor. II [up to l. 304]

Line 298: ܐܣܘܪܐ, flor. II: ܐܣܘܪܬܐ.

Line 304: ܕܣܝܡ, flor. II: ܘܣܝܡ.

Lines 321-322: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ..... ܘܠܬܘܗܝ, cf. ch. 3, lines 233-234 and note.

it participates in the substance (i.e. in the reality understood in the generic sense), has itself the generic sense, the terms 'substance' and 'hypostasis' will not be indicative, the former of the community, the latter of the property. For the realities being mutually confused, neither of the terms will retain its own meaning. Readers should not miss the fact that here, where the wise father's aim was to teach his hearers about the terms 'substance', 'nature' and 'being', and 'hypostasis', he confirmed what each of the terms was indicative of, from the nature of the realities; but where rebuttal of one who was attempting to confuse the meanings with heretical intent, was his aim, he had to make a separation of the things signified on the basis of the divergence of the terms. Therefore he said in the former passage: The term 'nature' is sometimes indicative of the common and the genus like 'substance', sometimes of the species and of a single substrate like 'hypostasis' too. Whereas here he wrote: For if each of the hypostases be deemed to be the whole substance because it participates in the community of the substance, our reasoning about substance and hypostasis will be muddled and ruined and there will be nothing to mark the divergence between the two; the former will not be indicative of the community, the latter of the property.

These words will suffice at once for our rebuttal of those who attempt to confirm their evil views by proving that in each and every way indicators, signifiers and characterizers are identical with what are indicated, * signified and characterized, and in this way endeavouring to confuse everything. For it has been clearly demonstrated that when the discussion investigates characteristic properties and the terms signifying realities, characterizers and characterized, signifiers and signified, indicators and indicated are totally different; but when it is said by one of the divinely inspired

**289/290** cf. supra, 285-286 **299/301** cf. supra, 186-189 **301/306** cf. supra, 281-286



ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦ : ܗܘ ܢܗܘܐ
ܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ : ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܗܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ :
ܗܘ ܡܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܓܢܣܝܘܬܐ ܢܗܘܐ : ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ.
ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܒܚܕܕܐ ܡܬܒܠܒܠܝܢ : ܐܦܠܐ
ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܫܡܗܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܛܪ. ܙܕܩ ܕܝܢ
ܠܗܘܢ ܕܦܓܥܝܢ : ܕܐܦܠܐ ܗܝ ܢܛܥܘܢ. ܕܬܡܢ ܡܢ
ܕܨܒܝܢܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܐܒܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܕܢܠܦ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܫܡܥܝܢ
ܡܛܠ ܫܡܗܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܟܝܢܐ ܘܕܐܝܬܘܬܐ : ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ
ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܡܢܗ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܕܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܫܪܪ : ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܫܡܗܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ. ܟܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ : ܕܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ
ܠܫܘܕܥܐ ܢܒܠܒܠ ܒܥܐ ܗܘܐ : ܡܢ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܫܡܗܐ
ܠܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܢ ܕܢܥܒܕ ܙܕܩ. ܒܓܒܗ ܘܠܥܠ
ܡܢ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܕܫܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܘܕܓܢܣܐ <
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ <
ܕܐܕܫܐ ܘܕܚܕ ܕܣܝܡ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ❖ ܗܪܟܐ <
ܕܝܢ ܟܬܒ ❖ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ <
ܒܓܘܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܟܠܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ : ܡܬܒܠܒܠ <
ܘܡܬܚܒܠ ܠܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ. ܘܠܝܬ ܡܕܡ <
ܕܡܦܪܫ ܠܬܪܝܗܘܢ ܘܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ. ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܢܐ ܡܢ <
ܕܓܢܣܝܘܬܐ : ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ❖ <

ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܠܬܐ : ܢܣܦܩܢ ܠܝ ܠܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ
ܕܡܬܚܪܝܢ : ܕܠܫܘܪܪܐ ܕܒܝܫܬ ܬܪܥܝܬܗܘܢ ܢܣܒܘܢ :
ܕܟܠ ܘܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܣ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܘܡܣܡܢܝܢ ܘܡܪܫܡܝܢ :
ܗܢܘܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ
* ܘܡܬܬܣܡܢܝܢ ܘܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ : ܘܡܗܕܪܐ ܢܒܠܒܠܘܢ ܟܠܡܕܡ ܦܫܝܛ. f. 66vb
ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܓܝܪ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܕܐܡܬܝ ܡܢ ܕܡܛܠ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܒܩܝܬܐ : ܘܫܡܗܐ ܕܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ
ܡܚܡܟܐ : ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܣ ܡܚܫܒܐ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܪܫܡܝܢ
ܘܠܗܘܢ ܕܡܬܪܫܡܝܢ : ܘܡܣܡܢܝܢ ܘܡܬܬܣܡܢܝܢ : ܘܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ

AB

Lines 344-345: ܘܠܝܬܘܗܝ ..... ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ, cf. ch. 3, lines 233-234 and note.

doctors that substance signifies the Godhead's nature or, again, that Godhead indicates the substance and similar things, we clearly learn that they are by no means using words like this to disclose that e.g. Godhead indicates Godhead or substance signifies substance or, again, hypostasis characterizes hypostasis (that would be nothing but empty verbiage, for what would be the use and value to learners, of someone who says that Godhead indicates Godhead *et cetera*?) but by way of necessary proof (as has been examined in the foregoing) to those ignorant of the force of the terms that, although the terms are different, what they signify are not different things but one and the same thing. Thus, indeed, the Church's doctors are seen to be in harmony both with themselves and with one another, nor was wise Cyril, who says (as previously quoted): If uncreatedness and un-subjected-ness *et cetera* alike indicate substance, and the indicated are not the same as the indicators, in any way at odds with the Theologian, who said: For when we say 'one substance' and 'three hypostases' with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three); or all, who have used words and thoughts like this, with one another.

**329/330** cf. supra, ch. 10, 161-163 **331/333** cf. supra, ch. 10, 319-322



ܘܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ. ܐܡܬܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܡܢ ܐܚܪ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ
ܢܦܫ̈ܬܪ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ: ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܘܕܥܐ:
ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܕ̈ܡܝܢ
ܠܗܝܢ: ܒܠܐܝܬ ܢܠܦܝܢ: ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܚܘܘܢ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܐܝܬܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ. ܐܘ ܐܘܣܝܐ
ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܘܕܥܐ: ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܚܘܐ:
ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܫܚܝܢ: ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܘ ܡܕܡ
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇: ܐܠܐ ܨܘܪܬܐ ܡܠܠܐ ܣܪܝܩܐ: ܡܢܐ
ܓܝܪ ܝܘܬܪܢܐ ܘܡܘܬܪܢܘܬܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܦܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ: ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܐܠܝܨܐܝܬ ܚܘܝܘܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܗܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܐܬܒܚܢܬ:
ܠܗܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܚܝܠܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ: ܕܐܦ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ: ܗܘ ܕܡܚܘܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܠܘ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܘܐܚܪܢܐ: ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܘܗܘ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܗܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ
ܠܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܘܠܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܕܫܠܡܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ:
ܘܠܐ ܒܣܕ ܡܢ ܙܢ ܐܦ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܘܣ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܕܐܢܕܝܐ ܗܘܝܐ ܀ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܥܒܕܐ <
ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܒܫܘܘܝܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ: ܠܐ <
ܕܝܢ ܐܚܪܢܝܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ <
ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ: ܠܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܗ̇ܘܐ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܐ <
ܒܚܕܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܫܘܕܥ ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܕܥ ܀ <
ܗ̇ܘܐ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ ܕܡܠܠ ܬܐܘܠܘܓܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܒܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ <
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܡܢܢ ܒܚܣܝܘܬ <
ܐܠܗܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܗܝ ܓܝܪ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܘܕܥܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ <
ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܀ ܐܘ ܠܫܪܟܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܡ̈ܠܬ <
ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܟܢ ܘܡܚܫ̈ܒܬܐ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ.

AB

Line 372: ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ, cf. ch. 8, line 536 (ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܝܢ).

*Concerning the fact that though he was under an obligation to examine the proof-texts quoted by him and show in what way they assisted him, he declined to do so, but only * praises and congratulates himself in a ridiculous fashion accompanied by much bragging, on the grounds that he has, he says, proved that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are the characteristic properties of the prosopa. Besides this, indeed, he also tries to conclude that if we do not accept his views we shall be forced, of necessity, to call the characteristic properties of the prosopa 'accidents' or 'certain natural indications'. For this reason the discussion at once, clearly and briefly, reduces him to absurdity, and passes on to the rebuttal of his other despicable ineptitudes.*

Consequently may we please investigate again what this author also says after the God-clad Severus' proof-text. He says: Having set this down, therefore, I reminded the listener and said: 'Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis "indicative of the property"'. Has it not then been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases but accidents or certain natural indications?'

16/23 cf. supra, ch. 9, 325-331



ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܚܝܒ ܗܘܐ : ܕܠܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܝܢ ܡܢܗ : ܢܒܚܘܢ ܘܢܚܘܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܡܢܐ ܡܥܕܪ̈ܢ ܠܗ : ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܢܥܒܕ ܡܫܬܐܠ. ܡܬܪܒܪܒܢܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ. ܥܡ ܢܦܫܗ ܡܓܚܟܢܝܬܐ * ܡܫܒܚ ܠܢܦܫܗ ܘܡܛܘܒ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܚܘܝ : ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܡܟܘܢܐ ܕܢܚܪ : ܕܐܢ ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܩܒܠ ܠܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ : ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܠܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܐܘ ܫܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܘܒܪ ܡܚܕܐ ܡܚܘܪܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܘܒܦܣܝܩܬܐ ܡܥܒܪܐ ܠܗ ܡܠܬܐ : ܠܘܬ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܫܪܟܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܐ ܫܝ̈ܛܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܫܪܟܐ ܀

ܝܒ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܐܦ ܫܦܝܪܐ : ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪ ܦܣܘܩܗ ܕܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܣܐܘܪܐ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܬܘܒ ܢܒܚܢ.

— ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܀ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܣܡܬ : ܐܥܗܕܬ ܠܫܡܘܥܐ
— ܘܐܡܪܬ. ܚܘܪ ܠܢܦܫܟ ܫܦܝܪܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ
— ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ. ܐܝܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ
— ܣܗܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܣܝ̈ܡܢ : ܕܣܪܝܟܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ
— ܕܬܡܢ : ܗܝ ܕܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܟܕ ܡܬܣܟ̈ܠܢ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ
— ܡܬܩܝܡܢ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܣܒܪ : ܐܠܐ ܠܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܐܘ
— ܫܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܐ ܀

A, f. 67ra

AB

Line 10: ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ, B: ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ ܚܢܢ.

Line 13: ܒܪ̈ܦܣܘܩܗ, B: ܒܪܦܣܘܩܗ.

Line 14: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܐܝܪܐ.

Line 15: ܣܡܬ ..... ܟܕ (as ch. 14, lines 50-51), cf. ch. 9, line 275 (..... ܗܠܝܢ ܣܡܬ).

This cunning author's demonstrations are powerful and it is impossible to speak against them! For (as has been said frequently) the issue being proposed whether the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the characteristic properties of the prosopa and nothing on the point having been proved or examined by him (which is remarkable!), this thoroughly discerning speaker and writer loudly exclaims: Has it not then been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases but accidents or certain natural indications?

Why sir, do you deceive the simple and leave out the matters you were censured over, mix in what you mention and put forward to us things irrelevant, as it were, to the point proposed? For we do not require from you defences of your calling the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost subsisting properties (i.e. properties which subsist on their own) but of * your defining them as ingeneracy, generacy and procession, defences which you even pass through with studied swiftness, so to say, transferring your discussion to other matters, without being able (as truth accuses you) to produce a single proof of the points you were censured over? For where is it possible at all in the fathers' words you quoted to find that ingeneracy, generacy and procession (i.e. the characteristic properties of the prosopa) are hypostases?

Besides which, indeed, the phrase but accidents or certain natural indications ought to be scrutinized. Tell me what necessity at all there is for those who do not submit to professing the characteristic properties of the hypostases as hypostases to make them accidents or certain natural indications. Where do you get this from?

**30/34** cf. supra, 19-23 **48/49** cf. supra, 33-34



ܫܠܝܛܝܢ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܢܟܝ̈ܠܐ: ܘܠܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܘܩܒܠܗܝܢ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܣܓܝܐܐ ܠܚܕܐ ܐܡܝܪܐ ܕܐܒܥܝܢ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܝܪܝܢ: ܕܐܢ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ: ܘܠܐ ܐܦ ܡܕܡ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܡܢܗ ܐܬܚܘܝ، ܐܘ ܐܬܒܚܢ، ܗ̇ܝ ܕܬܕܡܘܪܬܐ: ܙܘܕܐܒܝܬ ܦܪܘܫܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܠܠܐ ܘܟܬܘܒܐ ܐܡܪ

— ܘܟܬܒ ✣ ܐܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕ̈ܡܝ
— ܣܡ̈ܝ: ܕܣܪܝܟܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ: ܗ̇ܝ
— ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܕ ܡܣܬ̈ܟܠܢ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܩ̈ܝܡܢ: ܕܠܐ
— ܐܬܝܗܝܢ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܢܣܒܪ: ܐܠܐ ܓܕ̈ܫܐ: ܐܘ ܫܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ
— ܟ̈ܝܢܝܐ ✣

ܘܠܡܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܡܓܠܚܘܬܐ ܕܦܫܝ̈ܛܐ ܐܘ ܒܪܢܫܐ: ܟܕ ܫܒܩܬ ܐܢܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܟܠܠܬ ܡܬܪܥܐ ܐܢܬ: ܢܚܡ ܐܢܬ ܗܢܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܢ: ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܕܡ ܠܗܕܐ ܕܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܡܕܝܢ: ܡܩܪܒ ܐܢܬ ܠܢ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܕܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܗ ܕܩܝܡܝܢ ܘܠܗܝܢ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ: ܠܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ: ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ * ܡܬܚܡ ܐܢܬ: ܗܢܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܢܐ ܐܢܬ ܡܢܗܝܢ ܒܪ̈ܗܛܐ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܟܦ ܟܕ ܒܝܨܝܦܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܘܫܢܐ ܐܢܬ ܡܠܬܟ ܐܢܬ: ܠܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܠܬܝܟ ܥܒܪ ܐܢܬ: ܟܕ ܘܠܐ ܫܟܚ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܡܟܣܢ ܠܟ ܐܢܬ ܠܟ ܕܬܚܘܐ: ܡܛܠ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܬܥܝܪܬ ܐܢܬ. ܐܝܟܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܝܟ ܒܟܬ̈ܒܐ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܬ، ܐܢܬ ܠܡܫܟܚܘ: ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ: ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ.

— ܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܡܬܒܨܝܘ ܘܒܗ، ✣ ܐܠܐ ܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܐܘ
— ܫܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܟ̈ܝܢܝܐ ✣ ܘܡܢܐ. ܐܡܪ ܠܝ. ܐܝܢܐ ܗܝ ܒܥܠ ܦܘܣ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܕܢܘܕܘܢ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܛܦܝܣܝܢ: ܕܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܐܘ ܫܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܟ̈ܝܢܝܐ

f. 67rb

AB

Can you show us? Or do you think we should only ask what pleases you and you alone? In that case the greater our ignorance the greater will be the force of the authority you enjoy, the ease you will have in proving and supporting your teachings. None the less, you are to know clearly that nobody will look at your nonsense who is not servile in mind. Therefore note the pitfalls into which your ill-judged notions thrust you. For if (as you unsoundly suppose) those who do not define the characteristic properties of the prosopa as hypostases must necessarily make them either accidents or natural indications, you too, if you do not call the natural properties of the divine substance 'substances', or, at least, 'substance', and a substance composed of many and various things, will be forced to appoint either accidents or characteristic properties as their hypostases. Choose, then, which of the evils you prefer. Or consider how you may avoid absurdity, if you will not submit to denying these sophistical and cogent syllogisms of yours.

Let us proceed, then, to the rest. Unless, therefore, he says, the Unbeginning, the Beginning, and the With the Beginning, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the three properties of the Holy Trinity * when viewed in the common substance, are conceived of, in the way we say, as three hypostases, it will turn out that Fatherhood, Sonship and Procession will belong to a single hypostasis like natural properties (uncreatedness, I mean, invisibility, eternity and the rest) which is plain Sabellianism; or, that we shall attribute substantial differences and substance itself to each

69/78 Dam. Alex., *Epist. prolixa*



ܠܗܘܢ ܢܫܡܗܘܢ܆ : ܘܡܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܟ ܗܘܐ. ܐܝܬ ܠܟ ܐܪܐ ܕܬܘܕܐ : ܐܘ ܡܚܫܒ ܐܢܬ ܕܪܘܡ ܠܝ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܢܒܥܐ : ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܟ ܘܠܡܣܒܪܢܟ ܥܦܪܐ. ܡܕܡ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܟ ܢܕܥܬ܆ : ܡܫܟܚܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܫܝܠܐ ܕܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܟ : ܘܦܫܝܩܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ : ܘܡܣܡܟܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܟ. ܐܠܐ ܕܥ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ : ܕܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܗܘܢ̈ ܕܠܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܒܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܒܒ̈ܕܝܢܝܟ ܢܟܐ. ܡܕܡ ܐܬܒܩܐ ܕܒܐܝܠܝܢ ܬܩ̈ܠܬܐ : ܠܐ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܕܬܘܣܥܒܝܢ ܦܫܘܩ ܠܟ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܫܪܝܪܘܬ ܡܚܫܒ ܐܢܬ : ܠܗܘܢ ܕܠܘ ܡܘܕ̈ܥܢܐ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ : ܐܢܢܩܐ ܕܐܘ ܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܐܘ ܫ̈ܘܕܥܐ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܢܫܡܗܘܢ܆ : ܡܬܐܠܨ ܐܢܬ ܡܢ ܒܠܦܘܗ ܘܐܦ ܐܢܬ : ܐܢ ܠܘ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ ܐܘ ܕܡܫܡܗ ܐܢܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܘܠܗܘܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܠܝܠܐܝܬ ܘܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܬܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ : ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܬܐܡܪ : ܐܘ ܠܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܐܘ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܬܐ ܕܡܘܕ̈ܥܢܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܬܬܐܠܨ. ܓܒܝ ܠܟ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܒ̈ܝܫܬܐ ܐܢܬ ܡܢ ܕܓܒܝܐ. ܐܘ ܐܬܒܩܝ ܐܝܟܢ ܬܥܪܘܩ ܡܢ ܡܣܪܝܘܬܐ : ܐܢ ܚܠܠܬܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܣܘܠܘܓܝܣܡܘܣ ܣܘܦܣܛܝܩܝܐ ܘܐܠܝܨܐ : ܕܬܟܦܘܪ ܠܐ ܡܬܛܪܦܐ ܐܢܬ.

— ܢܐܬܐ ܠܝ ܗܟܝܠ ܘܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢܬܐ ❖ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܡ
— ܠܘ ܐܝܟ ܗܝ ܕܡܢ ܐܡܪܝܢܢ : ܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܪܫܐ ܘܪܫܐ ܘܥܡ
— ܪܫܐ : ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܬܠܬ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ
— ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : * ܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ : f. 67va
— ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܡܬܡܣܟܠܢ : ܢܫܟܚ ܗܝ ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܘܒܪܘܬܐ
— ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܥܠ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܬ̈ܠܝܢ : ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ
— ܟܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ : ܠܐ ܒܪܝܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ
— ܘܡܬܘܡܝܘܬܐ ܘܫܪܟܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ. ܗܝ ܕܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ
— ܓܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ. ܐܘ ܕܦܘܠܓܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܬܠ : ܘܗܝ

AB flor. II from l. 60 to l. 70

Line 63: ܘܐܦ, flor. II: ܐܦ.
Line 67: ܠܗܘܢ ܬܬܐܠܨ, flor. II: ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܬܬܐܠܨ.
Line 75: ܡܬܡܣܟܠܢ, B: ܡܬܡܣ̈ܟܠܢ.

hypostasis, which is the diametrically opposite evil and, evidently, clear Arianism.

Could not one with justice liken these opaque and dark thoughts and words by this clever author to tortuous oracles? Unless, therefore, he says, the Unbeginning, the Beginning, and the With the Beginning, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the three properties of the Holy Trinity when viewed in the common substance, are conceived of, in the way we say, as three hypostases. Observe how, through being hopelessly nonplussed and not knowing how he is covertly to import the wickedness of his heterodoxy, he is justly compelled to write things undreamt before by any understanding or mind. Otherwise, what reason exists for his saying Unless, therefore, the Unbeginning, the Beginning, and the With the Beginning, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the three properties of the Holy Trinity when viewed in the common substance, are conceived of, in the way we say, as three hypostases, such-and-such will be deduced? For whom did he ever hear arguing or saying that when the Theologian says, the Unbeginning, the Beginning and the With the Beginning, one God, we ought not to understand the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost? What advantage, indeed, would it bring him with regard to the point proposed, even if someone, indicating the hypostases by the term 'properties', were to say that the properties (i.e. Father, Son and Holy Ghost) existing in the common substance are hypostases? Is it thereby proved that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost? But he evidently does not dare to speak his own opinions directly. Which is why he falls over opposite stumbling-blocks.

So let him reveal to us what he wants * to say, without shame, so that we may learn the invincibility of his powerful notions! For he is hastening, as it appears, to the argument that unless, as it pleases him to suppose, the characteristic properties, ingeneracy, generacy and procession, viewed in the common substance, are conceived of as the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, it

---

**80/84** et **88/91** cf. supra, 69-73 **93/94** Greg. Naz., *Or. 42*, 15 (*PG* 36, 476A; *SChr.*, vol. 384, p. 80); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 5, 103-104 **108/111** cf. supra, 71-75



— ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܗ̇ ܕܐܦ ܗ̣ܝ ܒܫܡܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
— ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇. ܘܡܬܝܕܥܢܐܝܬ ܐܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܀

ܘܐܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܦܪܫܐ ܕܠܚܟܝܡܐ : ܢܕܡܐ
ܐܝܟ ܠܥܠܡ ܦ̈ܬܓܡܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܠܐ ܓ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܘܚ̈ܫܘܟܬܐ : ܕܗܢܐ
— ܡܚܬܡܢܐ ܗܘܠܬܢܐ ܀ ܐܢ ܗ̇ܟܝ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܡܪ : ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܝ
— ܕܡܢ ܐܡܪܢܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܪܫܐ ܘܪܫܐ ܘܥܡ ܪܫܐ : ܐܒܐ
— ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܬܠܬ ܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ :
— ܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܣܬܟܠ̈ܢ ܀
ܐܬܚܙܘ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܟܕ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܡܬܦܫܩ : ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥ
ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܛܫܝܐܝܬ ܠܒܝܫܬܐ ܕܫܘܚܠܦ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܗ ܢܥܠ :
ܒܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܡܬܐܠܨ ܕܢܟܬܘܒ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܪܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ
ܒܗܘܢܐ ܩܕܝܡ ܐܬܬܚܙܝ. ܘܐܠܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܚܫܚܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ
— ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܠܐ ܪܫܐ ܘܪܫܐ ܘܥܡ ܪܫܐ : ܐܒܐ
— ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܬܠܬ ܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ
— ܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܩܒ̈ܠܢ ܀
ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܐܡܪܢ. ܠܡܢܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܡܬܘܡ ܫܡܥ ܕܡܬܕܪܫܐ ܐܘ
< ܕܐܡܪ : ܕܐܡܬܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܪܫܐ ܘܪܫܐ
< ܘܥܡ ܪܫܐ ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ : ܠܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ
ܩܕܝܫܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܣܬܟܠ. ܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܬܪܬܗ̇ ܠܘܬ ܗܪܐ
ܕܣܝܡܐ : ܐܦ ܟܕ ܒܫܡܐ ܕܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܫܘܕܥ
ܢܐܡܪ : ܕܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܘܝ ܕܝܢ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ :
ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܐܪܐ
ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ : ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܓܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܡܪܚ ܕܢܡܠܠ ܕܝܠܢܝܬܗ
ܬܪܝܨܐܝܬ ܢܐܡܪ. ܘܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܒܬܘܩ̈ܠܬܐ ܣܩܘ̈ܒܠܝܬܐ ܢܦܠ.

f. 67vb ܡܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܗܬܬܐ ܢܓܠܐ ܠܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܐ ܕܨܒܐ * ܕܢܐܡܪ :
ܕܢܐܠܦ ܠܐ ܡܬܙܟܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܚ̈ܫܒܘܗܝ ܚ̈ܝܠܬܢܐ. ܥܨܠ ܠܗ̇ ܓܝܪ
ܣܐܦ ܠܡܠܬܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܡܝܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ : ܕܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܟ
ܗ̇ ܕܠܗ ܫܦܪܐ : ܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
— ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ : ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ

---

AB

will turn out that Fatherhood, Sonship and Procession will belong to a single hypostasis like natural properties – which is plain Sabellianism; or that we must concede substantial differences and the hypostases to be substances – which is plain Arianism. This is the trend of his doctrine, even though, by muddling thoughts and ideas, he studiedly conceals the force of all he says in order that his folly may not become manifest to the readers. Where, then, is the argumentation for it, where the foundation? No, it does not exist at all. You will see that all the power of his invincible demonstrations depends solely on his superior authority, hence also it is that he spews us out these crazy books and numberless 'apologies', with a view to the mystification and delusion of the multitude. What, in fact, is simpler than saying 'unless ingeneracy, generacy and procession be hypostases, either Sabellianism or Arianism must necessarily be introduced'? Would not all heresies be right to offer him hearty thanks when he lays this down as the law? For in this way they will effortlessly deduce whatever they please for the orthodox. Everybody knows that there is no force in this empty, frigid claptrap.

Nevertheless, not to give justified annoyance to the diligent listener by leaving these words entirely without examination, we shall dwell a little on the argument. We say, therefore, that this accurate author should clearly prove that the fathers thought of the characteristic properties of the hypostases (I mean, ingeneracy, generacy and procession) seen in the common substance, as hypostases, and should not have heedlessly tossed out in this way, without any thought or consideration or proof whatsoever, words



— ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܢܬܩܒܠ : ܫܪܒܐ ܗܝ،
— ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܘܒܪܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܥܠ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܬܬܠܝܢ :
— ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ. ܗܝ، ܕܐܝܬܝܗ ܣܒܠܝܢܘܬ
— ܘܠܡܘܕܝܘܬܐ : ܐܘ ܫܘ̈ܚܠܦܐ ܐܘܣܝܐܝܐ ܢܬܠ : ܘܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܐ
— ܠܐܘ̈ܣܝܐ. ܗܝ، ܕܐܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ. ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܨܒܝܢܐ
ܕܝܘܠܦܢܗ : ܘܐܦ ܟܕ ܗܘ، ܕܒܠܒܠ ܠܡܚܫ̈ܒܬܐ ܘܠܡ̈ܠܬܐ ܠܡܛܫܝܘ
ܡܢܩܦ : ܚܝܠܐ ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ̈ ܠܗ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܬܗܘܐ
ܓܠܝܬܐ ܫܛܝܘܬܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ. ܐܝܟܐ ܗܘ ܟܝܠ ܒܗ ܬܘܪܐ
ܕܗܠܝܢ. ܐܝܟܐ ܫܘܬܐܣܐ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܚܙܝ
ܐܢܬ ܕܟܠܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܙܟܘܬܢܝܬܐ : ܒܠܚܘܕ ܒܐܘܚܕܢܐ
ܕܡܫܬܥܠܝܢܘܬܗ ܠܐ ܡܬܟܒܫܢܝܬܐ : ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܐܦ ܬܗܪܐ
ܘܡܦܩܡܦܩ ܕܫܛ̈ܝܬܐ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܡܦ̈ܩܢܘܬܐ ܕ̈ܡܠܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܦܩ
ܒܪܘܚܐ ܠܡ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܒܩܢܐ ܡܦܩܐ ܠܗ. ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܦܫܝܛ ܡܢ
ܗܝ، ܕܐܢܐܡܪ : ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܗܘ̈ܘܢ : ܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܦܘܪܣ : ܐܘ
ܕܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܕܐܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܬܥܘܠ. ܘܐܢܝܢܐ ܒܪ ܗܘܠܝ
ܦܐܝܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ : ܠܗ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܡܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܠܡܬܠ
ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܙܘܕܩܐ ܢܫܬܝ ܠܗ. ܕܗܐ ܒܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܢܐ
ܢܐ : ܟܠ ܡܐ ܕܨܒܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܐܪܬܕܘܟܣܘܬܐ ܡܥܒܕܝܢ ܡܚܘܢܝܢ.
ܘܟܠܢ ܚܕ ܝܕܥ ܐܢܬ ܠܗ ܠܗܕܐ ܦܘܩܐ ܦܘܚܐ ܘܦܘܪܢܐ :
ܠܟܠܢܫ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܝܬܐ.

ܒܪܡ ܕܠܐ ܒܗ ܠܓܒܪܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܥܘܬܐ ܚܦܝܛܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡ̈ܪܢ :
ܒܐܝܬܘܬ ܢܚܫ ܠܡܫܡܥܢܐ ܚܦܝܛܐ : ܩܠܝܠ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܢܬܢܪ.
ܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ : ܕܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܚܬܬܢܐ ܚܬܝܬܐ
ܕܢܚܘܐ ܢܗܝܪܐ : ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ :
ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܒܗ
ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܬܚܙܝܘ :
ܘܠܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܒܥܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܒܩܘܬܗ ܦܩܚܬܐ

AB

Line 125: ܢܗܘ̈ܘܢ, A: ܢܗܘܘܢ.
Line 127: ܠܡܬܠ, A: ܡܬܠ.
Line 129: ܡܚܘܢܝܢ, B: ܡܚ̈ܘܢܝܢ.

* like this. However, because this clever fellow, being quite unable to produce this proof, busied himself with making it look to simple folk, by the unclarity and murkiness of what he says, as if he were saying something useful, we shall reveal the meaning of what he writes, as we are wont to do, by gathering it from the scattered droppings.

What, then, he wants to deduce from these statements (so far as we can infer) is as follows: that what are believed to be in the common substance, he says, should either be hypostases or natural properties. So it is, he thinks, necessary, unless we conceive of the characteristic properties (i.e. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) seen in the common substance, as hypostases: either that the common substance, in which the characteristic properties of the hypostases are seen, should be a single hypostasis and the doctrines of Sabellius will enter in; or that they should be natural properties and the common substance itself dissected into a plurality of substances and natures, and the madness of Arius will prevail. Otherwise, he says, how, if they are not hypostases but characteristic properties of the hypostases, can they be seen in the common substance and not, rather, in the hypostases? These, briefly, are the murky conceptions, so far as we have been able to imagine them, of this writer.

He ought, as we have said, to have spoken his opinion boldly and without concealment, and to have given the necessary supports for it, and not to have laid down the law for us over divine doctrines like these in a dictatorial manner. Nevertheless we shall put it to him: if (as you mislead yourself by saying) it is necessary



f. 68ra ܘܡܬܚܫܚܢܘܬܐ : ܠܬܢܝܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܐܡܝܢ * ܗܠܝܢ ܠܐ ܕܗܘܢܐܝܬ ܢܒܝܐ. ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܚܕ ܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ ܣܚܝܦܐ ܠܗ ܗܦܟ ܐܝܟ ܐܡܥܢ ܠܡܚܘܝܘ : ܚܝܠܐ ܟܡܐ، ܕܚܕ ܠܐ ܓܠܝܘܬܐ ܘܡܥܡܛܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢܗ ܡܬܐܡܪܢ : ܢܦܩܘܢ ܠܦܫܝܛܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܫܝܢ ܐܡܪ : ܐܝܟ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܥܕ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܕܪܫܐܝܬ ܓܕܝܫ ܠܗ ܡܢܗܘܢ : ܚܠܝܡ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܦܘܫ ܕܗܠܟܝܢ ܠܗ.

ܗܝ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܪܓܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪܢ ܢܚܦܛ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܟ ܡܕܡܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܕܐܬܝܕܥܝܢ ܠܡ ܡܬܗܝܡܢܝܢ : ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܘ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ. ܗܟܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪ : ܐܢܘܢ ܕܠܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܣܬܟܠ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܐܘ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܬܗܘܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܗܝ ܕܒܗ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܘܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܢܥܘܠ : ܐܘ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ : ܘܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܣܓܝܐܘܬܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܬܬܦܠܓ ܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ : ܘܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܪܝܘܣ ܬܬܥܫܢ. ܘܐܠܐ ܠܡ ܐܡܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܢ ܠܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܘܠܘ ܡܟܝܠ ܒܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ. ܘܕܚܫܘܟܝܬܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܗܠܝܢ ܐܢܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܟ ܐܬܗܓܝܢ ܦܣܝܩܐ ܬܘܟܠܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ.

ܘܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܢ : ܕܕܠܐ ܚܘܫܚܬܐ ܘܡܢ ܦܪܗܣܝܐ ܬܪܓܡܗ ܢܐܡܪ : ܘܥܘܫܢܐ ܐܢܝܩܝܐ ܢܬܠ : ܘܠܐ ܘܢܡܘܣܐ ܡܛܠ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܣܝܡ ܠܢ ܢܡܘܣܐ. ܒܪܡ ܕܝܢ ܢܫܐܠܝܘܗܝ، ܕܐܢܘ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܢܬ ܒܗ

---

AB flor. II from l. 145 on

---

Line 143: ܓܕܝܫ, B: ܓܕܫ.

Line 147: ܕܢܗܘܘܢ, flor. II: ܕܢܗܘܢ.

Line 151: ܐܘ, flor. II: ܕܐܘ.

Line 153: ܕܝܠܝܬܐ, B and flor. II: ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܢܗܘܘܢ, flor. II: ܢܗܘܢ.

Line 160: ܕܕܠܐ, flor. II: ܕܠܐ.

for the characteristic properties of the prosopa, seen in the common substance, to be hypostases or those who do not profess this will practise Sabellianism or Arianism, by what argument does Sabellianism or Arianism not adhere to you too, if you do not think of the substance's characteristic properties seen in the hypostases as substance? Indeed, how if the hypostases' characteristic properties seen in the common substance, must of necessity, be hypostases, can the natural properties also, which are seen in the hypostases, fail to be substance and nature – not to mention substances and natures? So your intelligent self ought either to be consistent in making the hypostases' characteristic properties (ingeneracy, * I mean, generacy and procession) seen in the common substance, the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and should also define the common natural properties seen in the hypostases as substance – and expressly oppose all the God-clad fathers (as has already been proved in many places previously!); or you ought to adhere to the truth, though you do not like it, and clearly acknowledge that just as the substance existing along with its characteristic properties in the hypostases is not identical with its characteristic properties, so indeed also, the hypostases existing along with their characteristic indications in the substance will not be identical with their characteristic indications. But unless, he says, the characteristic properties of the prosopa, viewed in



ܡܠܟܐ ܐܢܬ ܢܦܫܟ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ
ܘܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ : ܐܘ ܡܢ ܚܠܦܘܗ̇ ܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ ܐܘ
ܐܪܝܘܣܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܗܕܐ ܠܐ ܡܘܕܐ : ܒܐܝܢܐ
ܡܠܬܐ ܠܐ ܢܦܩܐ ܘܠܟ : ܕܡܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܘ
ܐܪܝܘܣܢܘܬܐ : ܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܬܬܪܥܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܐܢ ܐܦ ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܒܗ̇
ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ : ܠܐ
ܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ : ܕܠܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܘܟܝ̈ܢܐ. ܚܕ ܙܕܩ
ܠܡܫܬܟܠܢܘܬܟ : ܕܐܘ ܒܗ̇ ܢܦܩܐ ܗܝ ܠܗ̇ : ܘܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ * ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ f.68rb
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܣܢܝܩܐ :
ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܓܘ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܘܟܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ
ܬܬܚܡ : ܘܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܕܘ ܒܕܘ̈ܟܝܬܐ
ܩܘܒܠܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܣܝܬ : ܠܘܩܒܠ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܠܒ̈ܫܝ
ܠܐܠܗܐ ܬܩܘܡ. ܐܘ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܘܟܕ ܠܐ ܪ̈ܚܡܐ ܢܦܫܟ :
ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܬܘܕܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܥܡ ܕܝܠܝܬܗ̇
ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܠܘ ܗܝ ܒܗ̇ ܗܝ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
ܠܕܝܠܝܬܗ̇ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܥܡ
ܫܘ̈ܕܥܝܗܘܢ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܠܘ
ܗܢܘܢ ܒܗ̇ ܗܢܘܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܠܫܘ̈ܕܥܝܗܘܢ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܐ. ܐܠܐ
ܐܢܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܠܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܬܩܒܠܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ

AB flor. II

Line 166: ܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ, flor. II: ܡܣܒܠܝܢܐ.
Line 167: ܐܪܝܘܣܐ, flor. II: ܐܪܝܘܣܐ.
Line 168: ܕܡܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ, B: ܕܡܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܡܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ.
Line 169: ܐܪܝܘܣܢܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܐܪܝܘܣܢܘܬܐ.
Line 172: ܕܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ, flor. II: ܕܢܗܘܘܢ.
Line 173: ܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ, flor. II: ܢܗܘܘܢ. ܕܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ, B: ܕܒܩܢܘܡܐ.
Line 175: ܗܝ ܠܗ̇, B: ܠܗ̇ܘܢ.
Line 180: ܬܬܚܡ, flor. II: ܕܬܚܡ. ܕܗܘܐ, flor. II: ܕܗܘܐ.

the common substance, are conceived of as hypostases, they will either belong to a single hypostasis (which is Sabellianism) or they will be natural properties (and that will be Arianism). So someone may answer him (and very rightly!): 'My admirable fellow, according to these cogent syllogisms of yours, the natural properties also, viewed in the hypostases, will, unless they are taken to be substance, be hypostatic properties. Hence, of necessity, either the doctrines of Sabellius or (the contrary) those of Arius will enter in. For if the ingeneracy, generacy and procession seen in the common substance must by all means either make the common substance one hypostasis unless they are conceived of as hypostases, or being substantial properties prove the hypostases substances; why, unless the natural properties (I mean uncreatedness, invisibility, immutability and the rest which are seen in the hypostases) are substances and are, so to say, hypostatic properties will they not contract the three hypostases into one hypostasis, by being seen commonly in the three (for the properties of the hypostases cannot be seen commonly in them), or, by not being seen in the three will they not make the hypostases different in substance (for the uncreated, invisible and immutable must be different in substance from what is not these things)?' 'But what are the grounds for this?', perhaps he will say. But we will answer him: 'What are the grounds for that?' For with whatever arguments he confirms his statements, by the same * arguments will fitly be confirmed what is said in reply to him here.



ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܒܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ܆ ܐܘ ܥܠ ܚܕ
ܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܬܬ̈ܐܡܢ܆ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܣܒܠܝܢܘܬܐ܆ ܐܘ ܕܟܝܢܝܬܐ
ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ ܘܬܗܘܐ ܐܪܝܘܣܝܢܘܬܐ. ܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܟܠ ܐܢܫ
ܠܗܘ ܘܫܦܝܪ ܟܐܢܐܝܬ܆ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܡܬ̈ܢܝܢ ܐܠܝ̈ܨܐ
ܐܘ ܬܡܝܗܐ܆ ܘܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܒܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ܆
ܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܬܚܫ̈ܒܢ܆ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ.
ܘܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܡܚܝܠ ܕܐܘ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܣܒܠܝܘܣ܆ ܐܘ ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܪܝܘܣ ܢܥܠܘܢ. ܐ̱ܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ܆ ܕܒܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ܆
ܒܟܠ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ܆ ܐܘ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ
ܢܥܒ̈ܕܢ܆ ܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܢܬܚܫ̈ܒܢ܆ ܐܘ ܒܗ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
ܐܘܣܝ̈ܬܐ ܗ̈ܘܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܐ ܠܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ܆ ܡܛܠ
ܡܢܐ ܐ̱ܢ ܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ ܘܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ܆ ܠܐ
ܒܪܝܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ
ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܘܬܐ܆ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ ܕܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܒܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ܆
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܗ̈ܘܝܢ܆ ܠܐ ܠܚܕ
ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܢܩܦ̈ܣܢ܆ ܟܕ ܓܘܢܐܝܬ ܥܠ ܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ
ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ܆ ܐܦ ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܟ̈ܚܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ
ܕܓܘܢܐܝܬ ܒܗܘܢ ܢܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ܆ ܐܘ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܥܠ
ܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ܆ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܥܒ̈ܕܢ
ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܗ̇ܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ ܘܠܐ
ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܐ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ܆ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ
ܐܚܪܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܗܘܐ. ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܐ̇ܝܕܐ ܥܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܗܠܝܢ
ܐܡܪ. ܐܠܐ ܘܡܢ ܐ̇ܝܕܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢ ܠܗ ܐܢܫܝܢ.
ܒܗܠܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܗܘ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܠܗ ܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ ܡܫܪܪ܆ ܒܗܝܢ ܒܗ
* ܒܗܝܢ ܠܫܪܪܐܝܬ ܘܐܝܠܝܢ܆ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܗܪܟܐ ܐܡܪ̈ܝܢ f. 68va
ܢܫܬܪܪܢ.

AB flor. II

Line 191: ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ, flor. II: ܢܗܘܝܢ.
Line 201: ܢܗ̈ܘܝܢ, flor. II: ܢܗܘܝܢ.
Line 205: ܠܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ, B: ܠܬܠܬܝ̈ܗܘܢ.
Line 208: ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ, A: ܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܝܢ.
Line 209: ܕܠܐ, flor. II: ܠܐ.
Line 212: ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢ, B and flor. II: ܐܡܪܝܢܢ. ܐܢܫܝܢ, B and flor. II: ܐܢܫ.

Chapter 13

*Concerning the question how we are to conceive of the natural properties in the hypostases and again those of the hypostases in the substance without our admitting either the confusion of the hypostases or the division of the substance. And that if, as the author sees fit, the characteristic properties of the prosopa are the hypostases of the Holy Trinity, illustrious Basil and Saint Severus plainly appear to contradict each other; the one saying that the characteristic properties of the hypostases do not participate in, and do not accord with, the community of the substance, and again, that it is not ingeneracy but ingenerate beauty which is viewed in the generate; but the other writing that each hypostasis, through the community of the substance, has absence of difference and total likeness with respect to the consubstantial hypostases, and, on account of the total equality of the community, the others too, who participate in the very same substance, are seen and known in each hypostasis. And close examination of these matters.*

We have said this with a view to shaming and inhibiting the senselessness of his absurd and ill-considered syllogisms. We shall, however, say briefly what we ought to say on this point to the friends of truth: namely that the Church's doctors, handing on to us by the gift of the Spirit the knowledge of the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost as one substance of Godhead, spoke, in many passages, of this Godhead as being in the three hypostases themselves, and likewise of the three hypostases as

ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܥܣܪ.

ܥܠ ܗܝ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܣܬܟܠ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܘܬܘܒ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ: ܘܠܐ ܒܘܠܒܠܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܩܒܠ. ܘܐܢܗܘ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܫܦܪ ܠܡܟܬܒܢܐ: ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܕܡܣܬܩܒܠܝܢ ܠܚܕ̈ܕܐ: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ ܣܐܘܪܐ. ܚܕ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܐܡܪ: ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܢ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܡܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܘܬܘܒ: ܕܠܐ ܗܝ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܒܗܘ ܕܝܠܝܕ ܡܬܚܙܐ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܟܬܒ: ܕܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܝܕ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ: ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܘܬܐ ܘܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ: ܠܘܬ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܘܡܛܠ ܫܘܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܠܗ̇ ܕܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ: ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܘܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ ܒܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ: ܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܒܗ̇ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܝܢ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܐܠܝܢ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܀

ܝܓ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܠܘܬ ܗܝ ܕܢܒܗܬ ܘܢܟܠܐ ܠܫܢܝܘܬ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܣ̈ܘܠܘܓܝܣܡܘܗܝ، ܫܒܝܫܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܒܚܘܫܒܐ ܡܢ ܐܬܐܡܪ. ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܙܕܩܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܠܘܬ ܪ̈ܚܡܝ ܫܪܪܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܒܦܣܝܩܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ: ܕܡܠܦ̈ܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ: ܟܕ ܡܢ ܡܘܗܒܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܐܫܠܡܘ ܠܢ: ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܢܕܥ: ܒܕܘܟ̈ܝܬܐ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬܐ ܠܗܕܐ ܗܘ̈ܝ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܡܪܘ: ܒܗ̇

AB W from l. 18 on flor. II from l. 18 on

Line 2: ܕܢܣܬܟܠ, A and B: ܢܣܬܟܠ; cf. p. 9, line 112.

Line 4: ܬܘܒ, B om.

Line 8: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܐܝܪܐ.

Line 19: ܕܢܐܡܪ, W: ܠܐܡܪ.

being in it; and it is clear that they said 'in the three hypostases' without separating the substance from its natural and characteristic properties, and, again, that they professed the three hypostases to exist in the substance, without separating them from their characteristic properties. However, this by no means compels us to consider its characteristic properties identical with the substance, or, again, their characteristic properties with the hypostases; nor do we conceive of division of the substance or merging of the hypostases. For the existence of the substance and its natural properties in the hypostases produces no contraction of the hypostases nor does the existence in the substance of the hypostases with their characteristic properties produce any cleavage of the substance: because the natural properties, * seen equally in the three hypostases display the three hypostases not as one hypostasis but, rather, as one substance and Godhead; and again, the characteristic properties of the prosopa viewed in the substance display the one substance and Godhead, not as substances in some way but as three hypostases.

Wise Basil, the great pastor of the Church, proves this clearly by saying as follows, in the letter to his brother *On Substance and Hypostasis:* But, in the same way also, one who has accepted the Father has implicitly accepted the Son and the Spirit along with him. For it is impossible to invent cleavage or division in any way such that the Son should be conceived of apart from the Father or that the Spirit should be separated from the Son. No, a certain ineffable and unknowable communion and separation is apprehended in them, with the difference of the

47/54 Bas. Caes., *Ep. 38*, 4 (*PG* 32, 332D - 333A; Forlin Patrucco, p. 186)



ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܗ܂ ܘܢܗܝܪܐ܇ ܕܟܕ ܐܦܠܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܗ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܘܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܦܪܫܝܢ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܘ܇ ܘܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܠܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܗ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܡܦܪܫܝܢ܇ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܐܘܕܝܘ܂ ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܕܚܝܩ ܒܢ ܕܢܚܫܘܒ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ܇ ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܗܘܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܐܠܦܝܢ܇ ܘܠܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܣܚܝܒܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܪܥܝܢ܂ ܘܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܝ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܗܪܐ ܒܩܢܘܡܐ ܬܗܘܐ ܡܩܦܣܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܥܒܕܐ܇ ܘܠܐ ܗܝ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܥܡ ܕܝܠܝܬܗܘܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ܇ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܥܒܕܐ܂ ܡܛܠ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܒܗ ܒܟܠ * ܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܫܘܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ܇ ܠܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ܇ ܚܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܠܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ܂ ܘܬܘܒ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܒܗ ܒܟܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ܇ ܠܘ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܡܢ ܐܡܟܐ܇ ܐܠܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ܂ A, f. 68vb

ܘܗܕܐ ܠܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܚܘܐ܇ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܘܪܒܐ ܪܥܝܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ܇ ܟܕ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܚܘܗܝ ܕܥܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܬܟܬܒܬ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܒܗ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܘ
< ܕܠܐܒܐ ܩܒܠ܇ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܥܡܗ ܩܒܠ ܒܚܝܠܐ܂ ܠܝܬ ܓܝܪ
< ܠܡܥܒܕ ܦܣܩܐ ܐܘ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܐܦ ܠܐ ܒܚܕ ܙܢܐ܇ ܕܐܘ ܒܪܐ
< ܣܛܪ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܢܬܝܕܥ܇ ܐܘ ܪܘܚܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܐ ܢܬܦܪܫ܂ ܐܠܐ
< ܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܢܝܬܐ ܡܕܡ܇ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܒܨܝܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܐ
< ܒܗܘܢ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܘܦܘܪܫܢܐ܂ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ܇

AB W flor. II

Line 24: ܘܢܗܝܪܐ, W: ܢܗܝܪܐ.

Line 25: ܕܝܠܝܬܗ, W: ܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܟܝܢܝܬܐ, A om. ܘܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ, A: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ.

Line 29: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ, B: ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ.

Line 35: ܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ, B and flor. II: ܬܠܬܝܗ̈ܘܢ.

Line 41: ܘܪܒܐ ܪܥܝܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ, W om.

Line 42: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ, W and flor. II: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ. ܟܕ, W om. ܗ̇ܝ, W om.

Line 43: ܐܡܪ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܟܬܒܬ, W om.

hypostases not sundering the connection of nature and the community of substance not merging the properness of the marks.

We have learned clearly from these sacred words that, on the one hand, the properties and marks of the hypostases do not sunder the unity of the one substance and Godhead, and, on the other hand, that the connection of the nature does not produce a confusion of the hypostases or of their properties. It is time, then, to prove again, by means of this wise doctor's plain words, that when the characteristic properties of the prosopa are viewed in the substance, they are not, as this author pleases to think, hypostases. Truth's champion, then, speaks as follows, in the same letter just now mentioned: Seeing, then, that the Holy Ghost, from whom all bestowal of graces upon creation springs, depends upon the Son with whom he is apprehended indivisibly, whereas he has his being from the cause of the Father whence also he proceeds, he has this sign as indicative of the property of the hypostasis: the fact that he is known after the Son and along with him and subsists from the Father. But the Son, who makes known the Spirit (who proceeds from the Father) through and with himself, alone shining forth in only-begotten fashion from the ingenerate light, has no participation, by the properness of the marks, with the Father or with the Holy Ghost. No, he is known as unique by the stated indications. But the all-transcending God alone has, as a distinctive mark of his hypostasis, the fact that he is Father * and alone subsists from no cause; and by means of this mark again he too is known properly. 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

**64/80** Ibid. (*PG* 32, 329C - 332A; Forlin Patrucco, p. 184); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 8, 121-125



« ܠܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܢܦܫ : ܘܠܐ ܠܚܘܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ :
« ܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܡܒܠܒܠܐ ܀

ܘܐܠܦܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܪ̈ܘܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ : ܠܚܝܕܝܘܬܐ ܕܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܦܣܩܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܡܙܘܓܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܐܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܥܒܕܐ : ܙܠܝܩܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܩܠܐ ܕܚܟܝܡܐ ܡܠܦܢ. ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܬܘܒ ܒܝܕ ܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܦܪ̈ܝܫܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܢܚܘܐ : ܕܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܠܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܨܒܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܬܪܥܝܢܐ ܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܢܐ ܟܐܓܘܢܣܛܐ ܗܘ܆ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܗܝ ܐܓܪܬܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ
« ܕܢܠܦ ܥܘܢܝܢ ܒܗܢܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܀ ܡܛܠ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܗܘ
« ܕܡܢܗ ܠܗ ܬܢܝܕܐ ܟܠ ܡܘܗܒܬܐ ܕܛܝ̈ܒܘܬܐ ܢܒܥܐ : ܒܒܪܐ
« ܡܢ ܬܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܥܡܗ ܠܐ ܡܦܠܓܐܝܬ ܡܬܕܪܟ : ܗܘ܆ ܕܝܢ
« ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ : ܡܢ ܥܠܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܦ ܢܦܩ :
« ܗܢܐ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ : ܗܘ܆
« ܕܒܬܪ ܒܪܐ ܘܥܡܗ ܡܬܝܕܥ ܘܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܡܬܩܝܡ. ܒܪܐ ܕܝܢ
« ܕܠܪܘܚܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܢܦܩ ܒܝܕ ܢܦܫܗ܆ ܘܥܡܗ ܡܫܘܕܥ :
« ܒܪ ܝܚܝܕܝܘܬܗ܆ ܡܚܝܕܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܕܢܚ : ܘܠܐ
« ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܫ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ : ܠܘܬ
« ܐܒܐ ܐܘ ܠܘܬ ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܐܠܐ ܒܪ̈ܘܫܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ
« ܕܐܡܝܪܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ܆ ܡܬܝܕܥ. ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܥܠ ܟܠ ܪܘܫܡܐ
« ܡܒܪܙ ܝܚܝܕܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܗ : ܗܘ܆ ܕܐܒܐ ܗܘܐ *ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ ܘܒܠܐ f.69ra
« ܡܢ ܥܠܬܐ ܚܕܐ ܡܬܩܝܡ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ܆ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ. ܘܒܗ܇ ܗܢܐ
« ܪܘܫܡܐ ܬܘܒ : ܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܝܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܝܕܥ. ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ
« ܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܠܐ ܥܠܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ :
« ܘܠܐ ܡܫ̈ܘܕܥܬܐ ܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܕܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ :

AB W up to l. 50 and from l. 59 on flor. II

Line 60: ܕܛܝ̈ܒܘܬܐ, W: ܛܝܒܘܬܐ.
Line 61: ܡܦܠܓܐܝܬ, B: ܡܦܠܓܢܐܝܬ.
Line 70: ܝܚܝܕܐ, W om.
Line 72: ܡܛܠ, flor. II: ܘܡܛܠ.
Line 74: ܡܫ̈ܘܕܥܬܐ, flor. II: ܡܫܘܕܥܬܐ.

property of the prosopon is disclosed, are disparate and incommunicable, each prosopon being apprehended separately by his own marks. And again: Just as, then, in the example we recognize also clearly the difference between the colours and it is impossible to apprehend by sense the remoteness of one from another, so you are to consider that it is possible to think in the case of divine doctrines that the properties of the hypostases, like some colours appearing in the rainbow shine upon each of those believed in the Holy Trinity; whereas no difference of one from another is to be discovered in the natural property, but in the community of the substance the indicative properties give light upon each. For there too, in the example, what beams forth the many-coloured light was one substance, reflected by the sunray, but the colour of what appears is multiform.

Who will not justly marvel at this great pillar of the Church, because of his total accuracy and correctness? For both when he said, we say that in the commonness of substance the marks appearing in the Trinity are disparate and incommunicable; and again: the properties of the hypostases, like some colours appearing in the rainbow shine upon each of those believed in the Holy Trinity; whereas no difference of one from another is to be discovered in the natural property, but in the community of the substance the indicative properties give

**81/91** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 38*, 5 (*PG* 32, 336AB; Forlin Patrucco, p. 188) **94/95** cf. supra, 77-79 **95/100** cf. supra, 84-88



< ܕܐܩ̈ܢܘܡܗܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܒܡܫܘܚܘܬܐ ܐܫܬܠܡܘ. ܒܗ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܒܫ̈ܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ
< ܡܦܪܫܐܝܬ ܡܬܕܪܟܝܢ ❖ ܘܬܘܒ ❖ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܒܡܬܠܐ :
< ܘܦܘܪ̈ܫܢܐ ܕܓܘ̈ܢܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ : ܘܪܚܝܩܘܬܐ
< ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܒܪ̈ܓܫܐ ܠܡܬܕܪܟܘ : ܗܟܢܐ
< ܐܬܚܫܒ ܕܡܬܡܨܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܡܛܠ ܡܠ̈ܦܢܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ
< ܕܢܬܚܫܒ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܓܘ̈ܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ
< ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܩܫܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܡܢܗܪܝܢ ܥܠ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ
< ܕܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܬܗܝܡܢܝܢ. ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܟܝܢܐ :
< ܘܠܐ ܚܕ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܫܬܟܚ. ܐܠܐ
< ܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫ̈ܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܡܢܗܪܢ ܥܠ
< ܟܠ ܚܕ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܘܬܡܢ ܒܡܬܠܐ : ܗ̇ ܕܡܫܠܚܐ ܠܢܘܗܪܐ
< ܗܘ ܦܓܢ ܓܘ̈ܢܐ : ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘܬ : ܗ̇ ܕܒܙܢ
< ܠܙܠܓܐ ܫܡܫܢܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܚܙܝܐ. ܓܘܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ
< ܦܓܢ ܓܘ̈ܢܐ ❖

ܘܡܢܘ ܠܐ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܢܬܕܡܪ ܒܗܢܐ ܥܡܘܕܐ ܪܒܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ :
ܡܛܠ ܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ ܕܒܟܠܡܕܡ ܘܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ
< ܐܡܪ ❖ ܕܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܫܘ̈ܚܠܦܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܢܐ ܫ̈ܘܕܥܐ ܕܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
< ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ❖ ܘܬܘܒ ❖ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܓܘ̈ܢܐ
< ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܩܫܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܡܢܗܪܝܢ ܥܠ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ
< ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܬܗܝܡܢܝܢ : ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܕܟܝܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܕ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܫܬܟܚ :
< ܐܠܐ ܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫ̈ܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܡܢܗܪܢ

AB W up to l. 86 flor. II

Line 78: ܘܦܘܪ̈ܫܢܐ, W: ܘܦܘܪܫܢܐ. ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ, B: ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 80: ܐܬܚܫܒ, flor. II: ܐܬܚܫܒܘ.
Line 81: ܓܘ̈ܢܐ, B: ܓܘܢܐ.
Line 82: ܡܢܗܪܝܢ, W and flor. II: ܡܢܗܪܢ.
Line 91: ܘܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܬܪܘܨܘܬܐ.
Line 94: ܡܬܚܙܝܢ, B: ܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ.
Line 95: ܡܢܗܪܝܢ, flor. II: ܡܢܗܪܢ.

light upon each; did he not make it clear to everybody that the hypostases along with their marks are in the substance of the Godhead, but that the indicative properties are by no means the hypostases? How, indeed, are hypostases even to be conceived of, as shining and giving light upon hypostases? Is there to be seen any doctor of the Church who ever said or thought this? * Therefore, this excellent fellow will be convicted, by these very attempts to prove that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases, of professing and putting down absurdities utterly alien to the fathers' teaching.

Sound SEVERUS, too, indeed, clearly shows that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are seen, and are, in the substance not as hypostases but as characteristic properties of hypostases, when he wrote, as follows, in the eighteenth chapter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian*: 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 the 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.

You hear, admirable sir, this wise doctor who exclaimed, but each hypostasis exists along with its indication in the substance of the

**114/122** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 18 (*CSCO* 111, p. 169, 13-22; *112*, p. 132, 12-21); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 11, 322-330 **123/128** cf. supra, 115-120



> ܥܠ ܟܠ ܚܕ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܠܟܠܢܫ ܥܒܕ ܓܠܝܬܐ܆ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܝ
ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܥܡ ܫ̈ܘܘܕܥܝܗܘܢ܆ ܠܐ ܕܝܢ
ܗܢܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫ̈ܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ
ܢܐ ܘܡܬܒܚܪ̈ܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܡܢܗܪ̈ܝܢ ܘܡܙܠܓܝܢ ܥܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ܆
ܐܘ ܡܢܘ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܘ
f.69rb ܐܬܪܥܝ ܡܬܘܡ. * ܡܕܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܚܡܐ ܕܢܣܘܐ ܗܢܐ
ܡܝܬܪܐ܆ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ܆ ܡܚܘܝܢ ܡܠܘ̈ܗܝ ܡܬܟܣܣ܆ ܕܢܟܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܘܡܫܠܠܢܬܐ
ܐܟ̈ܣܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܟ̈ܠܗܝܢ ܘܣܐܡ.

ܕܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ
ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ܆ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ
ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܘܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ܆ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܚܘܐ ܘܚܠܝܡܐ ܣܐܘܪܐ܆ ܟܕ
ܗܠܝܢ ܟܬܒ ܒܟܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܡܢܬܥܣܪ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ
> ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘ܀ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܝܠܦܝܢܢ܆
> ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܐܚܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܒܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ.
> ܐܠܐ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆
> ܥܡ ܫܘܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ. ܕܒܝܕ ܓܘܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ܆ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܘܬ
> ܗܠܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܫ̈ܘܝ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ܆ ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܘܬܐ ܘܕܡܘܬܐ
> ܕܓܡܝܪܘܬܐ܆ ܘܗܝ ܕܚܕܐ ܗܝ܆ ܗܝ ܗܘ. ܒܝܕ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ
> ܐܚܝܕܘܬܐ. ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܬܡܠܠ ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܕܒܘܠܒܠܐ
> ܕܒܘܠܒܠܐ܆ ܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܘܢܬܝܕܥܘܢ ܒܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ܆
> ܘܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ܆ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܒܗ̇ ܒܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܝܢ܀

ܫܡܥ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܬܡܝܗܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܕܐܩܥܐ܀
> ܐܠܐ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ

AB W from l. 99 to l. 101 and from l. 112 to l. 120 flor. II

Line 99: ܥܒܕ, W: ܐܥܒܕ.
Line 101: ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ, W: ܐܝܬ̈ܝܗܝܢ.
Line 110: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܐܘܝܪܐ.
Line 113: ܠܐ ܐܝܬ, W: ܠܝܬ.
Line 116: ܘܕܡܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܕܡܝܘܬܐ as in Book II, ch. 11, line 357.
Line 117: ܕܝܠܝܬܐ, W: ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 11, line 358 (ܕܝܠܝܬܗ).

Godhead; because through the community of substance, it possesses absence of difference, complete similarity, unity and identity with the consubstantial hypostases, whereas through the property it possesses absence of confusion. What? Do you impudently say that ingeneracy, for example, exists along with its indication in the substance of the Godhead? What are we to say, clever fellow, is the indication by which ingeneracy possesses absence of confusion with respect to generacy? How, indeed, too, through the community of substance does ingeneracy possess (as you say, as if in a nightmare), absence of difference, complete similarity, unity and identity with the consubstantial hypostases? Did you, indeed, hear anyone who ever said that ingeneracy is consubstantial with generacy and that through the community of substance it possesses absence of difference, total likeness, unity * and identity with it, whereas through its property each possesses absence of confusion?

Prove these things from whatever patristic text you like and persuade everybody that we are in error and that, because we did not comprehend your deep and irreproachable thoughts, our struggle with you is idle? Did you not hear just now the great Basil say that in the commonness of substance the marks themselves of the hypostases are disparate and incommunicable? For this is the reason why, he says, we say that in the commonness of substance the marks appearing in the Trinity are disparate and incommunicable. How, then, can these servants of truth fail to be thinking mutually contradictory things, if (as you please to think for I know not what reason)

**129/130** cf. supra, 116-117 **132/135** cf. supra, 117-119 **145/147** cf. supra, 76-79



‹ ܥܡ ܫܘܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇ : ܒܗ̇ ܓܝܪ ܒܓܘܐ ܡ̣ܢ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇
‹ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܫܘ̈ܝܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ : ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܘܬܐ
‹ ܘܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܠܡܕܡ : ܗ̇ܘ, ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̣ܘ, ܚܕ ܗ̣ܘ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
‹ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܛܢܘܬܐ ✤ ܘܡܢܐ. ܕܠܐ ܒܚܘܣܪܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ : ܕܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
ܥܡ ܫܘܘܕܥܐ ܕܝܠܗ̇ : ܘܡܢܘ ܢܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܫܘܘܕܥܐ
ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܕܒܐܝܕܘܗܝ, ܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܛܢܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܡܢܟܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܝܕ ܓܘܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܬܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܘܬ
ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܫ̈ܘܝܬ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܕܒܚܠܡܐ ܐܡܪ
ܐܢܬ : ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܘܬܐ ܘܕܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܠܡܕܡ : ܗ̇ܘ, ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇
ܗ̣ܘ, ܚܕ ܗ̣ܘ. ܠܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܘܫܡܥܬ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܬܘܡ : ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܫܘܝܬ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܘܒܝܕ ܓܘܐ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܘܬܐ ܠܘܬܗ̇ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇ ܘܕܡܘܬܐ
ܕܟܠܡܕܡ : ܗ̇ܘ, ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ * ܗ̣ܘ, ܚܕ ܗ̣ܘ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܝ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܐ f. 69va
ܡܬܚܠܛܢܘܬܐ.

ܚܘܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡ̣ܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܗ̣ܝ, ܕܨܒܝܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܕܢܦܫܟ
ܐܢܬ : ܘܦܝܣ ܠܟܠܢܫ ܕܛܥܝܢ : ܘܗ̇ܝ, ܕܠܐ ܐܕܪܟܬ
ܠܡ̈ܚܫܒܬܟ ܥܡ̈ܝܩܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܪ̈ܫܝܢܐ : ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ ܠܘܬܟ
ܡܬܟܬܫܢܘܬܢ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܐܦ ܗܫܐ ܫܡܥܬ : ܕܐܡܪ ܪܒܐ
ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ : ܕܒܗ̇ ܒܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ
‹ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܫܘ̈ܘܕܥܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ✤ ܡܛܠ
‹ ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܒܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܠܐ ܫ̈ܘܬܦܐ
‹ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܘ̈ܬܦܢܐ ܫ̈ܘܘܕܥܐ ܕܒܬ
‹ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ✤ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ : ܠܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
ܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܢܬܚܫܒܘܢ ܕܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܫܡ̈ܫܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ :

AB flor. II up to l. 146

Line 124: ܗܠܝܢ, flor. II: ܗܢܘܢ.
Line 125: ܘܕܡܝܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܕܡܘܬܐ.
Line 131: ܫ̈ܘܝܬ, flor. II: ܫܘܝܬ.
Line 141: ܡܬܟܬܫܢܘܬܢ, B and flor. II: ܡܬܟܬܫܬܢ.
Line 142: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ, flor. II: ܒܣܝܠܘܣ.

the characteristic properties of the prosopa and the hypostases are the same things? But when the same accurate Severus also says, 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, how can he fail, according again to your argument, clearly to oppose great Basil, who decrees and proclaims that ingeneracy cannot be seen in the Son? For he wrote in the letter just mentioned, as follows: So one who has observed the beauty of the image is endowed with a mental picture of the examplar. And one who has taken up into his understanding the form, as it were, of the Son, has imprinted it with the impress of the Father's hypostasis, seeing him by it, not because he sees the Father's ingeneracy in the impress derived from him (otherwise he would be totally identical and not different) but because he sees the ingenerate beauty in the generate. And again: So the Son's hypostasis becomes as it were the form and the prosopon of the indication of the Father, and the Father's hypostasis is recognized in the Son's form, the property viewed in them abiding for the clear distinction of the hypostases.

You are to understand, my valiant fellow, the force of these divinely inspired words and to consider by what artifice of sophisms (or, rather, nonsense) you will prove ingeneracy the Father's hypostasis. For with the doctor clearly saying, not because he sees the Father's ingeneracy in the impress derived from him (other-

**152/154** cf. supra, 120-122 **157/163** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 38*, 8 (*PG* 32, 340B; Forlin Patrucco, p. 194) **163/167** Ibid. (*PG* 32, 340C; Forlin Patrucco, p. 194) **171/174** cf. supra, 161-163



ܐܝܢܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܠܝܟ ܠܐ ܢܕܥ ܐܢܐ ܐܡܪܢܐ ܥܦܪܐ : ܗܢܝܢ
ܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ
ܘܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܐܠܐ ܡܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܚܬܝܬܐ ܣܐܘܝܪܐ ܀
« ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܫܘܝܘܬܐ ܕܓܡܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܒܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ : ܢܬܚܙܘܢ
« ܘܢܬܝܕܥܘܢ ܒܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ : ܐܝܠܝܢ
« ܕܒܗ ܒܗ ܗܝ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܝܢ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ
ܐܝܟ ܡܠܬܟ ܬܘܒ : ܢܩܘܡ ܠܘܩܒܠܗ ܕܪܒܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ
ܕܦܣܩ ܘܡܟܪܙ : ܕܠܐ ܡܨܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܒܪܐ
ܬܬܚܙܐ. ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܗܫܐ ܐܬܕܟܪܬ : ܟܕ
« ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ܒܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܝ̈ܘܩܢܐ :
« ܒܡܣܟܠܬܐ ܕܐܬܦܐܝܢܐ ܗܘܐ. ܘܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܒܘܟܪ
« ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܥܝܢܗ : ܒܛܘܦܣܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ
« ܛܒܥܗ. ܟܕ ܚܙܐ ܒܗ ܗܘܝܘ ܠܗܘ. ܠܘ ܟܕ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
« ܕܐܒܐ : ܒܛܘܦܣܐ ܕܡܢܗ ܚܙܐ. ܐܘܟܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ : ܒܟܠܗ ܗܘ
« ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܘܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ
« ܒܗܘ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܚܙܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܗܟܢ ܡܗܘܐ ܕܒܪܐ : ܐܝܟ
« ܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ.
« ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ : ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ : ܟܕ ܡܟܬܪܐ
« ܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܗܘܢ : ܠܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܓܠܝܐ
« ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܀

ܐܣܬܟܠ ܐܘ ܙܪܝܙܐ ܠܚܝܠܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܦܝ̈ܫܬܐ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܐ : ܘܐܬܒܩܐ ܒܐܝܢܐ ܨܢܝܥܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܦܣܛܝܐ ܡܠܘ ܕܝܢ
ܕܫܪ̈ܝܐ : ܡܚܘܐ ܐܢܬ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܟܕ
« ܓܝܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܠܘ ܟܕ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ

AB

Line 150: ܣܐܘܝܪܐ, B: ܣܘܝܪܐ.

Line 157: ܕܝ̈ܘܩܢܐ, cf. ch. 18, line 193 (ܕܨܘܪܬܐ).

Line 158: ܕܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܒܘܟܪ, cf. ch. 18, line 194 (ܕܐܝܟ) and note.

Line 159: ܒܛܘܦܣܐ, cf. ch. 18, line 194 (ܛܘܦܣܐ) and note. ܕܐܒܐ, cf. ch. 18, line 195 (ܐܒܘܗܝ) and note.

Line 164: ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ, cf. ch. 18, line 206 (ܕܡܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ).

Line 168: ܢܦܝ̈ܫܬܐ, B: ܢܦܝܫܬܐ.

wise he would be totally * identical and not different) but because he sees the ingenerate beauty in the generate, who in the whole world, will be so bold as to agree to say or think that ingeneracy and generacy are not (as the whole sacred company of the fathers has wisely taught us) characteristic properties but the Father and Son themselves? For if ingeneracy is the Father, how can it fail to be seen, of necessity, in the Son? You are to tell us, indeed, very clearly what you thought the ingenerate beauty seen in the generate is! Is it not the Father in the Son? How, too, is the Father seen in the Son, but not ingeneracy at all, if the Father is ingeneracy, according to your empty words? Consider, too, besides this that the Father's hypostasis is recognized in the Son's form. It would also be truly astonishing that with ingeneracy being the Father's hypostasis (as you falsely suppose), the Father and the Father's hypostasis is seen and known in the Son, whereas it is quite impossible to see ingeneracy in the Son.

A man would perhaps be right to censure us for gibberish when we spend so long on the verbosity of this author and do not run past this rubbish 'with nimble foot' (as the saying goes). However, lest it should seem to anybody, from our silence in the face of these words that they have any kind of foundation, we shall make modest examination of the rest of them too.

**183/184** cf. supra, 165-166



< ܕܐܟܢܐ ܒܥܘܡܩܐ ܕܟܝܢܗ ܫܢܐ : ܘܐܦ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܒܟܠܗ * ܗܘ ܒܪ. f.69vb
< ܗܘ ܐܬܘܗܝ، ܘܠܘ ܐܫܘܝܐ : ܐܠܐ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܒܗܘ
< ܝܠܝܕܐ ܚܙܐ ܀ ܡܢܘ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܬܒܝܠ ܕܢܡܪܚ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܐܘ
ܕܢܬܪܥܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܗܢܝܢ ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ ܐܠܦܢܐ ܕܟܠܗ
ܓܘܕܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܬܐ ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܕܪܫ ܠܝ : ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ :
ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܬܘܗܝ :
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܘ ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܒܪܐ. ܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܕܝܢ ܟܠ
ܓܠܝܐܝܬ : ܘܡܢܐ ܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܠܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܗܘ
ܕܒܝܠܝܕܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ. ܐܢ ܠܘ ܠܐܒܐ ܒܒܪܐ : ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܒܐ
ܡܢ ܒܒܪܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ : ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܗܘܝ : ܐܢ
ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܬܘܗܝ، ܐܒܐ : ܐܝܟ ܒ̈ܢܬ ܩܠ̈ܝܟ
ܣܦܝ̈ܩܬܐ. ܐܬܒܩܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܦ ܗܕܐ ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ : ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ
ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ. ܘܐܬܘܗܝ ܐܦ ܕܬܗܪܐ ܗܝ
ܬܗܪܘܬܐ : ܕܟܕ ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܐܬܘܗܝ :
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܣܒܪܬ ܡܫܩܪ ܐܢܬ : ܐܒܐ ܗܘ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ
ܕܐܒܐ ܒܒܪܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܘܡܬܝܕܥ : ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ
ܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܒܒܪܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܠܡܬܚܙܝܘ.

ܘܡܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܒܒܪ ܢܚܘܠ ܠܝ ܐܢܫ ܒܘܣܪܐ : ܟܕ
ܒܡܠܐܝܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ ܟܠܗ ܗܢܐ
ܡܬܚܪܝܢ : ܘܠܘ ܒܪܓܠܐ ܩܠܝܠܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ
ܠܗܘܦܟܐ ܠܒܪܐ ܡܬܗܦܟܝܢܢ ܒܚܕܪܝܢ. ܒܪܡ ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܫܬܩܐ
ܕܠܘܬܗܝܢ ܘܡܬܒܥܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܗܘ ܢܣܒܪ ܠܟܠ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܝܬ
ܠܗܝܢ : ܡܫܬܐܣܬܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ ܡܬܒܚܝܢ ܐܒܚܢ.

AB

Line 193: ܒܚܕܪܝܢ, B: ܒܚ̈ܕܪܝ ܣܝܢ.

*Clear demonstration whereby it will be plainly recognized that even the author's supposedly strong proofs are nothing but old-wives' tales. And examination of statements by Gregory the Theologian, which he puts forward, which are of no help at all to him in establishing his absurd and despicable doctrines.*

The subsequent words of this valiant and invincible demonstration shall come forward, then, in order. This author, then, who always writes only totally clear and plain proofs, says also the following: * Therefore, either let someone prove that the words are not patristic and those who spoke them unworthy of credence in their testimony and we shall be silent; or, if the words are patristic and their authors' testimony is true, how can it not be an obvious misrepresentation to excerpt from them the phrase which was the reason for their quotation and to condemn it as an innovation? For if this phrase does not have the same meaning as the testimonies it will rightly be condemned. But, until anyone proves this, he is to understand that he not only condemns the phrase but also criticizes the patristic teaching which confirmed it. My sole desire, in fact, was to use it to show first the sense of the testimonies quoted. But if the aim went astray and did not find expression, someone should explain the lapse and we will owe him a debt for his learning. If, too, because the proof-texts were explained by us earlier and the reason for their quotation was made known previously by other words, the

10/35 Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa*



ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܐܝܕܗ ܢܬܝܕܥ ܡܦܫܩܐܝܬ : ܕܐܦ ܗܢܝܢ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܫܒܢ ܕܚܝܠܬܢ̈ܝܬܐ ܙܢܝܬܐ : ܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܐܢܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܙܘܥܐ ܩܪ̈ܝܪܐ ܕܩܫܝܬܐ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܒܬ̈ ܩܠܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܚܢܘ ܡܬܬܩܢܝܢ ܕܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܡܥܕܪܝܢ ܠܗ : ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܘܗܝ ܣܪ̈ܝܩܐ ܘܡܣܠ̈ܝܐ ܢܫܪܪ ❖

ܝܕ ܢܐܬܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܛܟܣܐ : ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܗ ܙܪܝܙܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܙܟܝܢܝܬܐ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܟܠܙܒܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܬܚܘ̈ܝܬܐ ܓܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܘܦܫܝ̈ܩܬܐ ܟܠܗܝܢ. ܟܬܒ ܘܗܠܝܢ ❖ * ܡܕܝܢ ܐܘ ܢܚܘܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܒܬ̈ ܩܠܐ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܐܒܗܝ̈ܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܐܡܪܘ ܐܢܝܢ : ܫܘܝܢ ܕܢܬܗܝܡܢܘܢ ܒܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܘܫܠܝܢ : ܐܘ ܐܢܗܘ ܕܐܒܗܝܬܝܢ ܒܬ̈ ܩܠܐ ܐܒܗܝ̈ܬܐ ܘܫܪܝܪܐ ܣܗܕܘܬܗܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܒܝܕܥܬܐ ܗܘ ܡܛܠܥܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܦܣܘܩ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܛܠܬܗ ܐܬܬܬܝ, ܘܢܦܠܓܢܘܗܝ : ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܚܕܬܘܬܐ ܦܣܩܐ ܐܚܪܢ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܗܘ ܗ̇ܝ ܗ̇ܘ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ : ܢܬܦܠܓ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ. ܥܕܡܐ ܕܝ ܕܐܢܫ ܗܕܐ ܢܚܘܐ: ܢܕܥ ܕܠܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܦܬܓܡܐ ܡܦܠܓ : ܐܠܐ ܐܦ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܬܗ ܟܒܠ. ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܨܒܝܬ : ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܩܕܡܝܘܗܝ, ܐܚܘܐ ܣܘܟܠܐ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܗܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܬܬܝ̈ܝ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܢܝܫܐ ܛܥܐ ܡܢ ܦܠܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܐܕܪܟܗ ܠܡܐܡܪܐ : ܢܫܘܐ ܐܢܫ ܠܦܘܪܫܢܬܐ : ܘܐܓܪܐ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܗ ܢܣܒ ܠܗ. ܘܐܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܦܪܝܡ ܐܬܦܫܩ ܬܚܘ̈ܝܬܐ ܠܘܬܢ : ܘܥܠܬ ܐܬܬܬܝܬܗ ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܛܠܬܗ ܐܬܬܬܝܬ : ܡܬܒܝܠ

A, f. 70ra

AB

Line 4: ܩܪ̈ܝܪܐ, B: ܩܪ̈ܝܪܐ.

Line 6: ܡܬܬܩܢܝܢ, B: ܡܬܬܩܢܝܢ.

phrase is criticized on the grounds that those proof-texts ought only to appear in express quotation without any interpretation or preface, it is obvious that I am being condemned for no other reason but that I did not make my little exposition a collection of proof-texts. But we have been taught not to fight truth's enemies so simply, because they too quote us often the same testimonies, giving them a wrong interpretation and because one who responds with discernment to challenges like these, besides being anchored in the biblical and patristic tradition, should endeavour to explain and harmonize the fathers' meaning in its entirety from all their expositions and to record the disputations they were variously engaged in and all the other things which compell those who oppose them to write works of refutation.

Will not somebody who spends too long on these old-wives' tales, be convicted of engaging in like inane nonsense and will not he be thought, with justice, to have no other concern but showing off and wanting to usurp the honour he does not possess, in the same sort of way? For though this sound author ought to have investigated and fixed his mind * on what was written and to have proved plainly (were he able) from the fathers' words he quotes, that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, he studiously leaps aside from this yet exclaims, at one point, with all the liberty in boasting of a victor: Having set this down, therefore, I reminded the listener and said: 'Take note of the fact, my dear fellow, that he called the hypostasis "indicative of the property"' as if the whole demonstration of the

**46/48** cf. supra, ch. 9, 325-327



— ܦܬܓܡܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܡ̣ܢ ܕܘܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܗ̇ܘܝܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ
— ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܢܩ̈ܦܢ : ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܡܕܡ ܘܡܩܕܡܘܬ
— ܬܐܡܪܐ : ܡܚܘܝܐ : ܕܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܬܚܝܒ ܐܢܐ :
— ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܥܒ̇ܕܬ ܠܦܘܫܩܢܐ.
— ܐܠܦ ܠܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܠܡܦܩ ܕܢܬܟܬܫ ܠܒܥܠ
— ܕܒ̈ܒܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܠܗܝܢ ܟܕ ܠܗܝܢ
— ܠܣܗܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܒܡܦ̈ܩܢܘܬܐ ܡܦܩܝܢ ܠܝ : ܟܕ ܒܫܘܚܠܦܘܬ ܡܦܫܩܝܢ
— ܠܗܝܢ. ܘܕܥܗ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܒܘܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܓܘ̈ܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ
— ܥܢܐ : ܟܕ ܗ̣ܝ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܚܝܕ ܒܐܘܡܢܐ ܕܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ
— ܟܬܒܢܝܬܐ ܘܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܢܬܒܥܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܗܘܢܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܐ ܡܢ
— ܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܦ̈ܩܢܝܗܘܢ ܢܦܫܐ ܘܢܠܒܫ. ܘܟ̈ܬܒܬܐ ܐܝܠܝܢ
— ܕܡܫܠܡܐܝܬ ܗ̈ܘܝ ܠܗܘܢ ܢܟܬܘܒ : ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ
— ܕܡܬܚܫ̈ܒܬܐ ܕܟܠܗ̇ ܡܦ̈ܩܢܘܬܐ : ܐ̈ܢܫܝܢ ܠܡܟܬܒ ܠܘܩܒܠܗܘܢ
— ܕܠܬܗܘܢ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܀

ܘܡܢܘ ܟܕ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܬ̈ܟܠܬܐ ܕܡܫ̈ܬܐ ܢܛܪ ܡܢ ܦܠܛܐ ܡܚܟܬܪ :
ܠܐ ܡܬܬܚܝܕ ܡܢ ܒܠܦܘܗ ܕܒܙ̈ܘܚܐ ܫܦ̈ܝܩܐ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ
ܡܬܠܒܢܐ : ܘܡܬܐܡܢܐܝܬ ܢܫܬܒܪ : ܕܠܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܢܪܦ :
ܐܠܐ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܝܢ ܢܬܚܙܐ : ܘܐܝܩܪܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܗ
ܢܓܒܐ ܠܡܚܛܦ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ ܚܠܝܡܐ :
ܕܢܒܨܐ ܘܗܘܢܗ ܢܩܦ * ܒܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܝܒܢ : ܘܢܚܘܐ ܐܢ ܐܝܬ ܐܝܟܘ f. 70rb
ܕܡܫܟܚ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܬ̈ܢܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܢܣܒܐ :
ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ
ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܒܡܬܚܫܒܢܐ ܫܦ ܡܢ ܗܪܐ
ܥܒܪ ܘܐܙܠ : ܟܕ ܟܠܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܚܐܪܘܬܐ ܕܫܘܒܗܪܬ ܙܟܘܬܐ
— ܢܩܥܐ : ܐܝܟ ܐܝܬ ܠܟܠ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܒܚܕ ܡܢ ܦܢܝܬܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ
— ܗܟܝܠ ܦܫܚܬ : ܗܕܪܬ ܠܡܫܡܥܢܐ ܘܐܡܪܬ. ܚܙܝ ܗܘܝ ܠܢܦܫܟ
— ܚܒܝܒܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܀

AB

Line 26: ܕܗ̇ܘܝܢ, B: ܕܗ̈ܘܝܢ.
Line 35: ܕܟܠܗ ܗܘܢܐ, cf. infra, line 85 (ܕܗܘܢܐ ܟܠܗ) and note.
Lines 50-51: ܟܕ ..... ܦܫܚܬ, cf. ch. 12, line 15 and note.

points at issue depended on this. Which is why he adds: Has it not, then, been demonstrated by the previously quoted testimonies that it is contrary to, and in disagreement with, the teaching there, to suppose the properties, which are perceived as subsisting also in the common substance, not to be hypostases but accidents or certain natural indications? But at another point, though nothing at all has been examined by him, he boasts: Unless, therefore, the Unbeginning, the Beginning, and the With the Beginning, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the three properties of the Holy Trinity, when viewed in the common substance, are conceived of, in the way we say, as three hypostases, such-and-such (as previously set down) will be deduced.

Indeed, again, (as has been amply made known) having proved nothing at all and having, as though from incontrovertible considerations and patristic statements, devised whatever he wants, he vaunts his devastating words and boasts, as follows: Therefore, either let someone prove that the words are not patristic and those who spoke them unworthy of credence in their testimony and we shall be silent. How can anyone, on hearing such empty, nonsensical verbiage, restrain himself from bursting out into uncontrollable laughter, or (to put it more truly) into tears, and not, with justice, say to him: 'Prove first, my excellent fellow, that the patristic statements you quote contain any of the points in question, and then tell your opponents such things, as boldly as you please'?

However, we have forgotten, it seems, that we risk causing our hearers nausea and depression to the last degree, by constantly saying the same things and examining rubbish like this. * So, pas-

**49/53** cf. supra, ch. 9, 327-331 **55/58** cf. supra, ch. 12, 69-73 **63/66** cf. supra, 10-12



ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܠܡ ܟܠܗ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܬܟܝܢ
— ܬܠܝܐ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܘܡܘܣܦ ܃ ܐܪܐ ܗܘܝܠ ܠܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܒܝܕ
— ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܡܢ ܣܝܡܢ ܃ ܕܒܝܫܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ
— ܕܬܡܢ ܃ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܩܝܡܢ ܘܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ
— ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܃ ܕܠܐ ܐܩܢܘܡܝܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܃ ܐܠܐ ܓܕܫܐ ܐܘ
— ܫܘܕܥܐ ܡܕܡ ܟܝܢܝܐ ܃ ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢ ܚܕ ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܓܡܪ ܒܨܐ ܡܢܗ
— ܐܬܒܗܝ ܃ ܡܬܪܘܪܒ ܘܐܡܪ ܃ ܐܢ ܗܝ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܝ
— ܕܡܢ ܐܡܪܢܐ ܃ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܪܫܐ ܘܪܫܐ ܘܥܡ ܪܫܐ ܃ ܐܒܐ
— ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܃ ܬܠܬ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ
— ܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܃
ܘܦܠܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܢ.

ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܚܘܝ، ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܝܕ ܦܪܝܣܐܝܬ ܐܬܝܕܥܬ ܃ ܘܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܬܘܟ̈ܣܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܘܩܒܠܗܘܢ ܃ ܘܡ̈ܠܝܬ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ ܕܨܒܐ ܓܒܠ ܃
— ܡ̈ܠܐ ܚܪ̈ܒܬܐ ܡܫܬܒܗܪ ܘܡܬܦܚܚ ܘܡܬܘܡܐ ܐܡܪ ܃ ܡܕܝܢ
— ܐܘ ܢܚܘܐ ܐܢܫ ܠܡ̈ܠܝܬ ܕܠܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܃ ܘܠܐ
— ܕܝܢ ܗܘܢ ܕܐܡܪܘ ܫ̈ܘܝܢ ܥܠܡ ܕܢܬܗܝܡܢܘܢ ܒܣܗܕܘܬܐ
— ܘܫܬܩܝܢ ܃ ܘܐܝܢܐ ܟܕ ܠܫܒܘܪܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܣܪ̈ܝܩܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ
ܗܕܐ ܫܡܥ ܐܢܫ ܃ ܢܣܝܒܪ ܘܠܐ ܠܓܘܚܟܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܠܒܟܢܐ ܢܦܘܩ ܃ ܐܘ ܢܛܪ ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܒܟܝܐ ܃ ܘܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܘܬܗ ܃ ܚܘܝ ܕܡܚܪܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܗܝܪܐ ܃ ܕܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܒܥܝܢ ܃ ܐܝܬ ܒܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܐܢܬ ܃ ܘܗܝܕܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܣܩܒܠܝܢ ܠܡܘܬܒܐ ܃ ܒܡ ܦܪܗܣܝܐ ܟܡܐ ܕܨܒܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ.

ܐܠܐ ܛܥܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ ܃ ܕܒܟܪܝܘܬܐ ܘܡܚܒܘܪܘܬ ܢܦܫܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܢܬܠ ܠܫܡܘܥܐ ܡܢܕܘܕܝܘܬܐ ܒܥܒܕܝܢ ܃ ܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢ ܃ ܘܠܦܠܘܪܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ

AB

Line 53: ܕܡܬܬܟܝܢ, B: ܕܡܬܟܝܢ.
Line 77: ܛܥܝܢ, B: ܛܥܝܢ ܚܢ.

sing over all this verbiage, we shall call to mind only the single point, at the end of his just quoted statement, which is relevant to the issues under examination. He says: One who responds with discernment to challenges like these, besides being anchored in the biblical and patristic tradition, should endeavour to explain and harmonize the fathers' meaning in its entirety from all their expositions. What? One who said: we ought to explain the fathers' meaning in its entirety from all their expositions, should not, if he has only one patristic statement that seems to confirm his view and proves that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, then arrive at such impious and absurd effrontery.

Let us, therefore, examine the rest. Perhaps then, we may be criticized on the grounds that the proof is defective and constructed with only a couple of testimonies. But it would be wrong to take much offence at this. The law of apostolic teaching affirms that *by two or three witnesses every word shall be established*. Nevertheless, critics of the statement may, if they like, have further testimonies in which the holy fathers recognize the properties as identical with the hypostases. In the oration *On the Lights*, then, Gregory the Theologian clarifies our ideas and shows the single meaning in the terms by saying: 'But when I say "God", be illumined by one light and by three; by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead'. Those who say, then,

---

**77/80** cf. supra, 30-33 **81/82** cf. supra, 79-80 **86/105** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa;* cf. supra, ch. 5, 285-297



ܘܠܝ ܡܚܣܢܝܢ * ܣܢܝ. ܡܕܡ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܘܠܝ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܦܩܬܐ f. 70va
ܒܚܪܝܢ : ܠܚܕܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܠܘܬ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܗܝ،
ܕܗܢܐ ܐܬܬܬܬ ܡܒܥܝܐ : ܕܕܢܚܫܒܢܐ ܐܬܬܢܝ ܠܘܬܢ ܕܩܘܡ
— ܢܠܟܘܢ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ✣ ܘܕܐܡ ܠܗܘ ܕܒܒܘܚܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܓ̈ܘܢܐ
— ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܥܢܐ : ܒܪ ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܚܝܕ ܒܐܘܡܢܐ
— ܕܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܟܬܒܢܝܬܐ ܘܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܢܒܥܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ ܟܠܗ
— ܐܒܗ̈ܝܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܦܘܫ̈ܩܝܗܘܢ ܢܫܘܐ ✣ ܘܡܢܐ. ܠܐ ܙܕܩ
— ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ : ܕܘܠܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܗܘܢܐ ܐܒܗܝܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ
— ܦܘܫ̈ܩܝܗܘܢ ܢܫܘܐ : ܕܐܦ ܚܕܐ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ
ܬܗܘܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܕܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܕܠܬܪܝܨܘܬܗ ܡܫܪܪܐ : ܘܡܚܘܝܐ
ܠܡ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܘܡܛܝܐ ܠܘܬ
ܡܪܚܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܕܪܫܝܥܘܬܐ ܘܡܣܟܠܘܬܐ ܐܬܐ.

— ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܢܚܙܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ ✣ ܟܒܪ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܟܝܠ ܠܡ ܐܝܟ
— ܗܘ ܕܢܣܝܪܬܐ ܐܬܬܢܝ ܡܬܚܣܝܢܘܬܐ : ܘܟܕ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ
— ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܒܒܢܝܐ ܐܬܪܥܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ
— ܕܢܬܒܠܗܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܦܝܫ ܠܚܕܐ. ܕܥܠ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܘ ܬܠܬ
← ܣܗ̈ܕܝܢ ܬܩܘܡ ܟܠ ܡܠܐ : ܢܡܘܣܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܫܠܝܚܝܬܐ
← ܡܫܪܪ. ܒܪܡ ܘܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܬܢܝܢܬܐ ܐܦ ܐܢ ܨ̈ܒܝܢ ܢܡܟܠܘܢ
— ܡܦܠܓܢܐ ܕܡܬܚܒܠܐ : ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܢܝܢ ܒܗ̇
— ܗܢܝܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܕܥܝܢ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ. ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܘ ܡܟܝܠ
— ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪ̈ܐ : ܒܗ ܠܡܚܫ̈ܒܬܢ ܡܢܗܪ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ
— ܠܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ : ܘܠܚܕ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܒܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܡܚܘܐ ܐܡܪ ✣
← ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬ، ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܒܚܕ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ
← ܘܒܬܠܬܐ. ܒܬܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܒܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܒܗܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ. ܐܢ
← ܪܚܡܐ ܠܐܢܫ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܐܘ ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ
← ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܬܬܟܬܫܝܢ : ܟܡܐ ܕܐܟܚܕܐ ܒܗ ܐܟܚܕܐ
← ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܡܬܝ̈ܬܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ. ܒܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܒܬ

---

AB up to ܡܪܚܘܬܐ (l. 92) C from ܕܐܝܟ (l. 92) on

---

Line 80: ܡܚܣܢܝܢ ܣܢܝ, B: ܡܚܣܢܝܢ.
Line 85: ܕܗܘܢܐ ܟܠܗ, B: ܕܟܠܗ ܗܘܢܐ; cf. supra, line 35 (ܕܟܠܗ ܗܘܢܐ).
Line 105: ܒܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ, C: ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ.

that the terms 'hypostasis', 'property' and 'prosopon' here do not bring the hearers to the very same idea, stand confounded and are in disaccord with this teaching of accurate theology, as it is here set down. Who, therefore, having read this will fault the statement that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the properties' * (a review of which we have previously conducted) 'viewed in the common substance, "hypostases" '?

This fellow's contempt for all his contemporaries is truly astonishing. For, supposing them to have been changed ere this into a brutish and irrational nature, he even attempts in these clear words to mislead them, as though he had clearly apprehended and was truly convinced that it was impossible for any present-day man to withstand these childish, irrational and despicable objections. In that way it is easy for him to venture against the divine mystery, not only with completely alien doctrines unventured even by mighty blasphemers of God, but with absurd and lawless practices as well. As has been proved in the slightly earlier examination, having torn out from his writing the passage he deemed to belong to Saint Epiphanius and substituted the statement of the Theologian here set down and now being examined, he was compelled to alter and reconstruct the form of the text he had previously written, by additions. For after saying as it was in the text: In the oration *On the Lights*, then, Gregory the Theologian clarifies our ideas, he interposed the addition as we have already said, which had no

**102/105** cf. supra, ch. 1, 42-44 **120/121** cf. supra, 92-93, et ch. 5, 291-292
**122** cf supra, ch. 5, 307



← ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܢܐ : ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ
— ܘܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܘܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ : ܠܘ ܠܐܕܢܗ̇ ܒܗ̇ ܐܕܢܗ̇
— ܕܐܬܪ̈ܚܝܬܐ ܫ̈ܡܥܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܫܡܥܝܢ : ܒܗܕܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܫܠܡܝܢ
— ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܚܬܝܬܐ ܕܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ܣܝܡܬܐ. ܡܢܘ
— ܗܟܝܠ ܕܟܕ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܦܓܥ : ܢܚܣܘܕ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ : ܕܠܐ
— ܐܣܬܟܢ̇ ܘܗܪܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗܝ
— ܕܢܣܒܪ : ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ * ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܦܘܚܡܝܢ ܥܒܕܝܢ f. 70vb
— ܬܐܘܪܝܐ : ܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܩܪܐ
— ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܀

ܠܡܬܕܡܪܘ ܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܪܝܪܐ ܒܡܣܬܟܪܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܓܒܪܐ : ܕܥܠ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܕܪܐ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܡܣܒܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ : ܕܠܘܬ ܟܝܢܐ ܒܥܝܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܠܝܠܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܐܫܬܚܠܦܘ : ܦܬܐ ܘܒܗܝܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܨ̈ܠܝܢ ܢܛܥܐ : ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܐܕܪܟ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܘܒܫܪܪܐ ܐܬܛܦܝܣ : ܕܠܐ ܡܨܝܐ ܕܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܫܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܕܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܛ̈ܠܝܐ ܦ̈ܠܘܣܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܘܡܣ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܢܩܘܡ. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܕܠܝܠܐܝܬ : ܠܗ ܠܡܣܒ. ܒܝܕ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܠܡܢܐܝܬ ܐܬܩ̈ܝܦܐ : ܘܕܠܐ ܐܬܡܪܚ ܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܦܪ̈ܘܫܬܐ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܒܝܬܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܬܬܪܝܫ : ܐܠܐ ܐܦ ܘܒܣܘ̈ܥܪܢܐ ܕܡܣܪܩܘܬܐ ܥܣܝܩܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܬܐ ܥܠ ܐܪܙܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܡܬܡܪܚ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܡܢ ܒܗ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܬܚܘܝ ܐܬܬܘܣܬ : ܟܕ ܢܦܫ ܡܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܕܟܬܒ̈ܘܗܝ ܠܗ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܗܕܐ ܬܘܣܦ ܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܗܪܟܐ ܣܝܡܐ ܘܗܫܐ ܡܬܒܚܢܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܠܨܗ̇ ܐܝܟ : ܐܬܐܠܨ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܡ ܘܡܢ ܡܕܡ ܡܢܗ ܐܬܬܟܒ : ܒܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܫܪ̈ܝܬܬܐ ܢܚܠܦ ܐܣܟܡܗܘܢ
— ܘܗܘܦܟܢ ܢܟܠܐ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܟܬܝܒܐ ܀ ܗ̇ܝ
— ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܥܠ ܢܘܗܪܐ : ܟܕ ܠܡܬܚܫܒܢܘܬܢ ܡܢܗܪ ܡܡܠܠ
— ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܀ ܥܪܒ ܒܡܨܥܬܐ : ܟܕ ܐܘܣܦ ܗ̇ܝ

AC

Line 125: ܥܠ, C: ܕܥܠ.

place in the genuine text of his *Many-lined Letter*. He did this, indeed, with a view to misleading readers by his attempted falsification. So, this having been rebutted in no small measure in the foregoing, we must attend to the examination of the text and thereby disclose its empty abundance of impious nonsense.

For the dispute between him and us being over whether we ought to think of the characteristic properties of the hypostases (I mean ingeneracy, generacy and procession) as the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, he studiously severs the connection, as it were, which leads to it, turns aside from the matters he is accused about, and sets down, * for a defence of his view, patristic testimonies which are of no avail for him but which simply name the hypostases 'properties'. Otherwise, what benefit to the point at issue is what Gregory the Theologian (as has been previously quoted) says: But when I say 'God' , be illumined by one light and by three; by three in properties or hypostases, if anyone loves to call them that, or in prosopa (for we are not disputing at all over names, so long as the words come to the same thought); but by one in the concept of the substance or Godhead. We have clearly shown in abundance that we have never been in disagreement over this point, and will not disagree. Indeed, he has vainly exercised his tongue, so to say, to answer often, out of sheer helplessness, that It is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance 'hypostases'. And here again, having proved nothing relevant to the point proposed, he unblushingly

**137/141** cf. supra, 94-98, et ch. 5, 227-231 **144/146** cf supra, ch. 1, 42-44



— ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܘܐܝܟ ܒܗܘ ܐܡܪܢܢ ܀ ܗܿܝ ܕܒܝܫܐ ܫܛܝܬܐ
ܕܐܓܪܬܗ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܣܘܪ̈ܛܐ ܠܐ ܡܒܥܐ. ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܟܒܪ܆
ܠܘܬ ܗܿܝ ܠܡ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܕܦܓܥܝܢ ܡܟܝܐ ܕܦܠܛܘܬܗ ܢܟܝܐ. ܟܕ
ܗܘܐ ܡܚܠ ܠܗ ܕܚܘܪܐܝܬ ܒܗܿܢܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܐܬܒܥܝܬ܆ ܙܕܩ
ܕܒܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܒܝܥܢ ܢܟܝܢܐ܆ ܘܒܐܝܕܝܗܘܢ ܠܡܓܠܝܘܬܐ
ܣܪܝܩܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܓܐܬܐ ܕܦܩܥܬܐ ܪܫܝܥܐ.

ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܠܘܬܗ ܚܪܝܢܐ܆ ܡܛܠ ܗܿܝ ܕܐܢ ܙܕܩ
ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ܆ ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ
ܐܢܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ܆ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ
ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܢܬܪ̈ܟܐ܆ ܟܕ ܠܐܦܣܘܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܘܬܗ
ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܡܦܣܬܐ ܠܗ ܒܟܠܗ ܥܡܠܢܝܐ ܡܦܣܩ܆
ܣܛܐ ܡܢ ܗܿܢܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܟܠܝܢ ܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ܆ ܠܡܣܡ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܝܢ
ܕܦܢܝܐ ܣܐܡ * ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ܆ ܕܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܠܐ f. 71ra
ܡܥܕܪ̈ܢ ܠܗ܆ ܐܠܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܡܫܡܗ̈ܢ
ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܘܐܢ ܠܐ ܡܢܐ ܝܘܬܪܢܐ ܠܗ ܠܘܬ ܗܿܝ
ܕܡܬܒܥܝܐ܆ ܗܿܝ ܕܐܡܝܪܐ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܡܦܩܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܡܠܠ
< ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܀ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܡܪܬܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ܆
< ܒܚܕ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܬܬܢܗܪܘ ܘܒܬܠܬܐ܆ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܒܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ
< ܐܘ ܒܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ܆ ܐܢ ܪܚܡܐ ܐܢܫ ܠܡܩܪܝܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܘ
< ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ܆ ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢܢ܆
< ܟܡܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܒܗ̇ ܕܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܡܛܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ܆ ܒܚܕ
< ܕܝܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܒܗܿܝ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀ ܘܕܠܘܬ ܗܕܐ
ܠܐ ܐܬܚܪܝܢ ܡܬܘܡ ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ܆ ܟܕ ܣܓܝܐܝܬܐ
ܚܘܝܬ ܣܓܝ. ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ ܐܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܠܫܢܗ
ܚܬ ܟܗ̇، ܕܠܝܫܘ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܒܟܠ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܐܝܟ
— ܕܣܡܟܢܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܠܐ ܐܣܦܠܝܗ ܘܗܪܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܟܣܐ
— ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܗܿܝ ܕܢܣܒܪ܆ ܕܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܟܕ
— ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܬܩܪܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܀
ܘܗܪܟܐ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܡܛܠ ܗܘܐ ܕܡܒܥܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ

AC up to ܐܡܪܬܝ (l. 153)

Line 149: ܕܡܕܡ, C: ܕܡܕܡܕܡ.

says: Who, therefore, having read this will fault the statement that 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the properties' (a review of which we have previously conducted) 'viewed in the common substance, "hypostases"'?

Let us observe the cunning fellow's licence! For perceiving that he is unable to deceive even simpletons by the quotation of these statements of the Theologian, instead of saying, as he ought, 'it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the characteristic properties (I mean, ingeneracy, generacy and procession) viewed in the common substance "hypostases"', he conceals his thought and says it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance 'hypostases'.

But let us pass quickly over these frigid and quite impotent things and go on to what follows them. He wrote, then, * in the following fashion, immediately after what has just now been quoted: Thus in the second chapter I quoted careful readers the same Theologian, cited by the thoroughly distinguished Theodosius, saying in his oration *On Athanasius*, as follows: 'For when we say "one substance" and "three hypostases" with true religion (for the first indicates the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three)'. So he clearly said that the properties of the three are signified by the term 'hypostases'! Thus it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose the terms do not indicate the same thing here. The same doctor gave teaching similar to this also in the *Farewell Address to the Bishops* saying: 'What,

**148/151** cf. supra, 101-105 **158/160** cf. supra, 144-146 **164/182** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* (ed. prima); cf. supra, ch. 10, 351-361 **166/168** Theod. Alex., *De Trin.*, 1 (*OLA* 56, p. 158, ll. 286-288 [p. 230, ll. 271-273]); Greg. Naz., *Or. 21*, 35 (*PG* 35, 1124D; *SChr.*, vol. 270, pp. 184-186); cf. supra, ch. 4, 109-112



— ܗܘ܂ ܕܠܐ ܐܣܬܟܠܐ ܐܡܪ܀ ܡܢܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܟܕ ܒܗܠܝܢ
— ܦܓܥ ܢܚܘܒ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܡܪܐ: ܕܠܐ ܐܣܬܝܗ
— ܘܡܪܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܗܝ܂ ܕܢܣܒܪ:
— ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܗܝܢ ܡܩܕܡ ܥܒܕܢ ܬܐܘܪܝܐ: ܟܕ
— ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܩܪܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ܀

ܘܬܚܙܐ ܒܡܪܫܘܬܗ ܕܚܪܝܦܐ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܪܓܫ: ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܦܫܝܛܐ ܕܢܛܥܐ ܡܫܟܚ: ܒܕ ܦܘܫܩ ܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܬܐܘܠܘܓܐ ܕܡܚܠܠ ܡܥܡܕܢܐ ܕܢܝܐܗܐ: ܚܠܦ ܗܝ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ: ܕܠܐ ܐܣܬܝܗ ܘܡܪܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܗܝ܂ ܕܢܣܒܪ: ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܠܐܠܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ: ܕܟܕ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ
— ܕܢܩܪܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ: ܡܛܫܐ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܘܐܡܪ܀ ܕܠܐ ܐܣܬܝܗ
— ܘܡܪܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܗܝ܂ ܕܢܣܒܪ:
— ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܗܝܢ ܦܘܫܩ ܥܒܕܢ ܬܐܘܪܝܐ: ܟܕ
— ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܩܪܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ܀

ܐܠܐ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܦܓܪ̈ܢ ܩܪ̈ܝܪܬܐ ܘܕܡܚܝܠܢ ܣܓܝ ܡܕܡ ܠܗ̇ ܒܗܝܢ: ܡܠܝܠܐܝܬ ܢܥܒܪ: ܘܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܩܦܢ ܢܐܬܐ. ܟܬܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗ ܡܕܡ ܒܬܪܒܥܬܐ ܠܐ ܗܟܢ: ܡܢ ܒܬܪ
— * ܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܡܥܐ ܐܬܬܫܝܡ ܒܗܢܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ܀ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܗ ܒܕ — f. 71rb
— ܠܗ ܠܡܢܟܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܒܡܦܩܢܐ ܘܕܬܪܝܢ ܦܫܝܛ: ܠܗܘܢ
— ܕܠܗ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬ ܦܓܪܝܢ: ܕܡܢ ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܦܠܝܓ ܒܟܠ
< ܐܬܬܝܗ܇ ܕܐܡܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ: ܟܕ ܚܕܐ ܓܝܪ
< ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܗ̄ܢ ܡܢ ܒܕܚܠܬ
< ܐܠܗܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܓܝܪ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ. ܗ̇ܝ
< ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ܀ ܗܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ: ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
— ܕܬܠܬܐ ܒܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܢ. ܠܐ ܗܟܝܠ
— ܐܣܬܝܗ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܗܝ: ܕܠܐ ܗܝ ܒܗ
— ܗ̇ܝ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܢܣܒܪ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ. ܕܕܡܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܗܘ
— ܒܗ ܗܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ: ܘܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܫܘܢܝܗ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܐܡܪ

A

then, do hypostases mean to you, or prosopa to you, for I put the question? They mean that those divided not in natures but in properties are three'. Here too, after first inquiring about the view of those in dispute over the terms 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis', to reconcile the two and unite them to one mind, he said to each side that the same thing is indicated by the different appellations and took the unambiguous word 'property', signifying the same things as 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis', and said that 'those divided not in natures but in properties are three' i.e. that 'prosopa' and 'hypostases' seek to indicate nothing else but subsisting properties, as Saint Epiphanius also testified when defending the Easterns.

You have conquered, my valiant fellow, with your supports from patristic testimonies! You have excelled in argument and in indisputable demonstrations! We ought, indeed, when you thus deceive yourself, to cry out to you similar things to what Saint Gregory also proclaimed to Eunomius who, having proved nothing at all that concerned his lunatic doctrine, estimated in himself none the less that he was proving something. For to whom will it not be evident, from the points which have been sufficiently discussed a little earlier, that the fact that the Theologian said, For when we say one substance and three hypostases with true religion (for the first indicates * the nature of the Godhead, the second the properties of the three) is of no help to you at all? You ought, had you any care for the truth, to have set down what preceded and what followed the Theologian's words, and not have maliciously excerpted it and plucked it out of its context, and so readers would know the full

**191/193** cf. supra, 166-168



← ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܟܕ ܕܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܚܫܒ ܠܟܘܢ
← ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܐܘ ܠܟܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܡܫܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ.
← ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ. ܠܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܐ
← ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܀ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܟܕ ܩܕܡ ܫܐܠ ܥܠ ܪ̈ܥܝܢܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ
— ܕܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ : ܡܛܠ ܫܡܗܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ :
— ܘܡܫܝܢ ܠܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܘܡܚܝܕ ܠܚܕܐ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ
— ܡܢ ܓܒ̈ܐ : ܕܗܝ ܟܕ ܗܝ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ ܒܝܕ ܟܘ̈ܢܝܐ ܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܐ.
— ܟܕ ܫܡܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܗ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܢܣܒ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܗܝ
— ܕܗܢܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܘܐܡܪ ܀
← ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ. ܠܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܐ
← ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܀ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܒܥܝܢ ܕܢܫܘܕܥܘܢ
— ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ
— ܕܐܦ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܟܕ ܚܠܦ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܣܗܕ
— ܡܕܢܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܣܗܕ ܀

ܙܟܝܬ ܐܘ ܓܢܒܪܐ ܒܣܡ̈ܘܟܐ ܕܡܢ ܣܗܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ.
ܐܬܥܠܝܬ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܘܒܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܪܝܢܐ. ܠܡܩܥܐ
ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܠܢܦܫܟ ܡܛܥܐ ܐܢܬ : ܕܘܠܝܢ ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ
ܢܩܥܐ ܠܟ : ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܠܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ
ܐܟܪܙ : ܕܟܕ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܡܛܠ ܫܘܢܝܗ ܠܐ ܚܘܝ :
ܐܣܒܪ ܕܝܢ ܒܗܘ ܒܢܦܫܗ ܕܚܘܝܐ. ܠܡܢܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ
ܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ ܣܦܩܐܝܬ ܐܬܡܠܠ ܠܐ ܗܘܬ ܝܕܝܥܐ : ܕܠܐ
ܡܕܡ ܠܡܢ ܡܥܕܪܐ ܠܟ ܗܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀
< ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܡܢ
< ܡܢ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܗܝ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ * ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܐ : ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܀ ܘܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܟ
ܡܢ ܐܢܘ ܕܒܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܒܛܠ ܠܟ ܥܠ ܫܪܪܐ : ܘܕܐܝܠܝܢ
ܕܩܕ̈ܡܢ ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܢܩܦܢ ܠܒܬܪ ܡܠܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܬܣܝܡ : ܘܠܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܒܒܝܫܘܬ ܐܫܟܡܐ ܬܦܣܩܝܗ ܘܡܢ
ܫܘܟܠܗ ܬܬܠܥܝܗ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܕܥܘܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ ܫܪܟܐ

f. 71va

AC from ܠܡܢ (l. 217) on

Line 196: ܕܪܐ, cf. ch. 10, line 375 (ܕܠܐ).

purport of what was said. But you did not do that. For you had foreseen very accurately the rebuttal resulting from them, a rebuttal which we have frequently demonstrated as clearly as we could in what has already been investigated.

Nevertheless, we shall consider your interpretation and see how, from this patristic text, you have proved that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases. For you said straight after the Theologian's words: So he clearly said that the properties of the three are signified by the term 'hypostases'! And you, at once, hailed the statement and adopted it as yours. Thus it is hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose the terms do not indicate the same thing here. And why because the words 'hypostasis' and 'property' here signify the same thing, tell me, must the characteristic properties necessarily be hypostases? How has your wisdom failed to consider what it says? For you shall tell us what the same thing here means. Does it not mean that in other places the terms 'property' and 'hypostasis' do not signify the same thing? Or will you grant that the terms 'hypostasis' and 'property' signify the same thing also when the discussion is about natural properties? But I do not think that anybody will reach such a pitch of ignorance and insanity as ever to suppose that! So I ask even you, excellent fellow, to accept that although the terms 'hypostasis' and 'property' here mean the same, nevertheless where there is consideration of the characteristic properties of the hypostases, the terms 'hypostasis' and 'property' do not signify the same thing. This, indeed, has been proved abundantly to you already, if you do not refuse proof, and shall again be proved clearly by the divinely inspired fathers, * with Christ our God strengthening our weakness.

205/206 cf. supra, 168-169 207/209 cf. supra, 169-171



ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܕܗܘܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ. ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܗܕܐ ܥܒܕܬ.
ܩܕܡܬ ܓܝܪ ܚܙܝܬ ܛܒ ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ.
ܗܝ ܕܐܦ ܒܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܒܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܟܒܪ ܘܐܬܒܚܢ:
ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܒܡܐ ܕܡܨܝܐ ܚܘܝܢ.

ܒܪܡ ܢܬܒܩܐ ܒܦܘܫܩܟ: ܘܢܚܙܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ
ܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܚܘܝܬ: ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܢܘܢ. ܐܡܪܬ ܓܝܪ ܡܚܕܐ ܒܬܪ
— ܒܬܪ ܡܠܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ❖ ܗܟܢ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ:
— ܕܡܬܚܘܝܢ ܒܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܗܘܢ ❖
ܘܡܚܘܝܐ ܡܚܕܐ ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܗܝ، ܒܪܬ ܐܬܚܒܝܬ ܘܡܫܬܥܒܕܬܐ ❖
— ܠܐ ܙܗܝܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ
— ܗܝ ܕܠܘ ܗܝ، ܒܗ ܗܝ، ܒܗܠܝܢ ܢܣܒܪ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ❖
ܘܡܢܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܗܝ، ܒܗ ܗܝ، ܒܗܠܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ
ܘܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ: ܗܐ ܡܢ ܟܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܐܢܢܩܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܝ: ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܫܟܚܢܝܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܢܘܢ: ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܒܝܢܐ
ܚܟܡܬܟ ܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ. ܬܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܓܝܪ ܡܢܐ
ܨܒܝܐ ܠܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܗܝ، ܒܗ ܗܝ. ܐܝܟܐ ܠܘ ܕܒܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ
ܠܘ ܗܝ، ܒܗ ܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥ ܫܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ: ܐܘ
ܐܦ ܐܡܪܬ، ܕܡܛܠ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܒܥܝܐ ܬܐܘܪܝܐ: ܕܗܝ،
ܒܗ ܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܢܗܒ ܐܢܬ.
ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܢܫ ܠܟܠܗ̇ ܗܕܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ
ܘܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܢܐܬܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܕܐ ܢܣܒܪ ܡܬܘܡ.
ܐܫܐܠܐ ܡܕܝܢ ܕܬܩܒܠ ܐܦ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܡܝܬܪܐ: ܕܐܦܢ ܗܪܟܐ
ܗܝ، ܒܗ ܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ: ܐܠܐ
ܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ، ܒܘܚܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܟܚܢܝܬܐ
ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܠܘ ܗܝ، ܒܗ ܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ
ܘܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܟܒܪ ܒܟܠ ܦܢܝܢܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ
ܠܟ: ܐܢܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܬܠܘܡ ܐܢܬ: ܘܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܢ
ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܢܦܝ̈ܫܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܬܬܚܘܐ: ܟܕ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܢ
ܠܚܝܠܢ * ܬܫܘܒܚܐ ܡܚܝܠ. f.71vb

AC

But let us, please, look at the other statement, set down afterwards, from the Theologian. For having set it down, you wrote as follows: The same doctor gave teaching similar to this also in the *Farewell Address to the Bishops* saying: 'What, then, do hypostases mean to you, or prosopa to you, for I put the question? They mean that those divided not in natures but in properties are three'. These are the words of the father's proof-text. But let us look at your astonishing interpretation. For you said (as previously set down) about the Theologian: Here too, after first enquiring about the view of those in dispute over the terms 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis', to reconcile the two and unite them to one mind, he said to each side that the same thing is indicated by the different appellations and took the unambiguous word 'property', signifying the same things as 'prosopon' and 'hypostasis', and said that 'those divided not in natures but in properties are three' i.e. that 'prosopa' and 'hypostases' seek to indicate nothing else but subsisting properties.

My admirable fellow, with these words you have clearly shown us the father's view. For you decreed that the Theologian, by writing What, then, do hypostases mean to you, or prosopa to you, for I put the question? They mean that those divided not in natures but in properties are three, meant that hypostases and prosopa are properties i.e. characteristic properties. Where, then, do you get the idea from, that he who said that those divided not in natures but in properties are three defined the hypostases and prosopa as being ingeneracy, generacy and procession? Prove clearly and elucidate by clever

228/231 cf. supra, 171-175 **234/241** cf. supra, 175-181 **244/246** cf. supra, 229-231 **248/249** cf. supra, 245-246



ܢܚܙܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܢ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܘܠܘܬ ܗܝ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܘܕܒܬܪܟܢ
ܣܝܡܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܟܕ ܣܡܬ ܓܝܪ ܗܕܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܟܬܒܬ
— ܘܗܟܢܐ ܐܠܦܬ܆ ܕܕܡܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ:
— ܘܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܫܘܢܝܗ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܦܝܣܩܦܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ
← ܐܡܪ܆ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢ̈ܩܦܝܢ ܠܟܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܐܘ ܠܟܘܢ
← ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܡܫܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ. ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ
← ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ܆ ܠܘ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ܆ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܗܢ
ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ. ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܬܐܝܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܡܬܗܪܢܘܬܐ ܬܡܝܗܬܐ ܢܚܙܐ. ܐܡܪܬ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠܬܗ
— ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡ ܣܝܡܐ܆ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܒܪ
— ܒܬܪ ܕܫܐܠ ܡܛܠ ܪ̈ܥܝܢܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ: ܡܛܠ
— ܫܡܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܕܩܢܘܡܐ: ܘܡܫܝܢ ܠܬܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܘܡܚܝܕ
— ܠܚܕܐ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܓܒ̈ܐ: ܕܗܝ ܗܝ ܗܝ
— ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐ ܒܝܕ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ. ܒܗ ܫܡܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܠܘܗܝ
— ܦܘܠܓܐ ܢܣܒ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ܆ ܗܝ ܕܗܢܝܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܝܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ
← ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܩܢܘܡܐ. ܘܐܡܪ܆ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ
← ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ. ܠܘ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ܆ ܗܘܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܘ
— ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܒܥܝܢ ܕܢܫܘܕܥܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܠܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ:
— ܐܠܐ ܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܩܝ̈ܡܢ܆

ܠܡܐܡܪܟ ܒܝܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܘ ܬܡܝܗܐ: ܚܘܝܬ ܠܢ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ
ܐܒܗܝܬܐ. ܦܣܩܬ ܓܝܪ: ܕܟܕ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܟܬܒ܆
< ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢ̈ܩܦܝܢ ܠܟܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܐܘ ܠܟܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ:
< ܡܫܐܠ ܐܢܐ ܓܝܪ: ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ:
< ܠܘ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ܆ ܐܘܕܥ : ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܩܝܡܢܝܬܐ.
ܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܠܟ ܗܟܝܠ: ܗܕܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ ܠܘ ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ܆ ܕܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܬܚܡ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ

AC

Line 277: ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ, C: ܕܡܬܦܠܓܝܢ (wrongly).
Line 279: ܗܝ, C: ܗ̇ܝ.

and invincible refutations the logic which renders this necessary, so that you may teach us to say in future with confidence: 'Ingeneracy, generacy and procession being divided not in natures but in properties are united in substance, indeed, rather, are substance; for this is what we have been taught to think concerning the hypostases and prosopa of the Holy Trinity'. So until you prove this we shall be justified in treating these fables and fabrications of yours, along with the rest, with contempt.

253/254 cf. supra, 245-246



ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܢܘܣܐ ܠܐܠܨܬ : ܘܡܢ ܗܫܟ̈ܝܢ
ܬܒ̈ܟܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܙܕܟ̈ܝܢܬܐ : ܢܠܦܬܐ ܚܪܝ ܠܐܝܡܢܐ
ܕܠܗܘܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܐ. ܐܚܝܕܐ ܕܡܬܦܠܓ ܘܡܢ ܦܪܘܫܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܗ
ܗ̇ܠܟ ܠܝ : ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܟܕ ܠܐ
ܒܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܦܠ̈ܓܢ : ܡܚܝ̈ܕܢܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
ܒܐܘܣܝܐ. ܡܠܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ
ܥܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܕܢܬܪܥܐ
ܠܗܢ. ܥܕܡܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܡܚܘܐ ܐܢܬ : ܟܡ ܗ̇ܘ ܐܝܟܢܐ :
ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܫ̈ܥܝܬܟܘܢ ܘܒܕ̈ܝܬܟܘܢ ܥܡ ܫܪ̈ܟܐ ܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܢܫܛܝܢ.

AC

## * Chapter 15

*Concerning the fact that, having said in his* Many-lined Letter *that the term 'property' is unambiguous, a little later, forgetting himself, so to say, he declared that the term 'hypostasis' is more accurate than the term 'property'. And due examination of this point. And subsequently quotation of proof-texts from Gregory the Theologian, who proves that he by no means proposed, as the author falsely accuses him of doing, the generation of the Son as a hypostasis when he says: 'But if you do not investigate whether one should speak of the Son's generation or hypostasis etc.'*

So, let us investigate your other invented arguments. You said, indeed, as previously set down, by taking the unambiguous word 'property'. For you want, it appears, to use this too to argue that we ought to forswear 'hypostases' and 'prosopa' and keep only 'properties' and 'names'. Otherwise what is the meaning of by taking the unambiguous word 'property'? However, if you are saying that the Theologian and the other holy fathers, guiding the weakness of those who were unable to accept the orthodox profession of three hypostases, used the term 'properties' in reference to the hypostases, but did not reckon as hypostases the characteristic properties (I mean ingeneracy, generacy and procession), we ourselves shall say that with you. If, though, by saying the unambiguous word 'property' you want to argue that we ought to think of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as characteristic properties, you will

**12/13**, **15/16** et **22/23** cf. supra, ch. 14, 237-238

A, f. 72ra

## * ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܬܥܣܪ.

ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܦܘܪܓܡܐ : ܕܠܐ ܦܠܝܓܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܫܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܒܬܪ ܙܥܘܪܬܐ ܟܕ ܛܥܐ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ : ܕܝܬܝܪ ܚܬܝܬ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ. ܘܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܙܕܩ ܕܥܠ ܗܕܐ. ܘܒܬܪܟܢ ܡܝܬܝܬܐ ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܡܚܘܝܢܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܛܥܢ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ : ܩܢܘܡܐ
< ܣܐܡ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܒܨܐ
< ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܙܕܩ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܕܡܝܢ ܀

ܝܗ ܡܕܝܢ ܢܒܨܐ : ܘܡܚܫܒܬ ܬܚܠܝܢ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ. ܐܡܪܬ ܓܝܪ
— ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܝܡܐ ܣܝܡܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܫܡܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܗ ܦܘܠܓܐ
— ܢܣܒ : ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܀ ܨܒܐ ܐܢܬ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ ܘܒܗ ܗܕܐ ܕܬܬܟܬܫ : ܕܢܕܘܢ ܠܝ ܕܒܗ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܟܦܪܝܢ : ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܘܠܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܢܐܚܘܕ. ܘܐܠܐ ܡܢܐ ܨܒܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܟܕ ܫܡܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܗ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܢܣܒ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܗ̇ܢ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ : ܕܟܕ ܠܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܐܫܟܚܘ ܕܠܡܩܒܠܘ ܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܩܒܠܘܢ : ܡܕܒܪ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ : ܒܫܡܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܥܠ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ : ܠܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܝܢ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܠܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܚܫܒܘ : ܘܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܥܡܟ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܗ̇ ܕܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܢܬܪܥܐ : ܨܒܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܬܬܟܬܫ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܐܢܬ : ܫܡܐ

AC

Line 4: ܗܘ ܠܗ, C: ܢܦܫܗ.
Line 10: ܕܕܡܝܢ, C: ܕܫܪܟܐ.
Line 14: ܟܦܪܝܢ, C: ܟܦܪ ܣܢ.

evidently be consistent with yourself in endeavouring, by all means, totally to eradicate, quietly and gradually, the very term 'hypostases'. But how is it that the pillars of the Church did not use the word more frequently, which according to your argument is more precise (I mean, 'properties'), but, instead, the ambiguous term 'hypostases'? For all of them are to be seen naming and professing Father, Son and Holy Ghost, times without number, 'hypostases', whereas they rarely termed the hypostases 'properties'. They did not teach by this that the hypostases are ingeneracy, generacy and procession, as you impiously hold, (away with such an idea!); but by saying 'individually subsisting properties' and the like, they prove clearly their caution over divine doctrines. What, then, * do we say? Should we not then be right, according to your argument, to subject the pastors and theological teachers to criticism on the ground that they abandoned the unambiguous term 'properties' and used ambiguous terms? And how can thinking like that fail to be anything but utter lunacy? So desist, please, even at this late stage, from your insolence towards proven teachers and end your implacable war with them!

Indeed, it is time you remembered what you wrote a little after this passage of yours which is being examined. You expressly said, in fact, this: For it is unusual to say that the union has been effected from the properties; whereas such a union has been handed down to us by the clear and unambiguous word 'hypostases'. But we shall not reckon the two as not the same thing, though I myself in my book (in order that the hypostases should not be thought of as non-substantial) referred the concept to the properties indicating the prosopa.

46/51 Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa*



ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܟ ܠܗܘܢ، ܦܘܠܓܐ : ܢܕܒܪܐ ܐܬܚܙܝܬ ܕܒܟ ܠܦܣܝܢ ܢܦܩ ܐܢܬ : ܢܝܚܐܝܬ ܘܩܠܝܠ ܩܠܝܠ : ܘܠܗ ܠܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܡܫܬܠܡܢܘܬ ܐܡܬܝ ܒܟܠ ܦܘܪܣܝܢ ܢܦܩ ܐܢܬ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܡܫܝܢܘܬ ܒܗ̇ : ܥܡܘ̈ܕܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܡܠܬܟ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ : ܐܠܐ ܒܗܘ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ، ܦܘܠܓܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܒܕܬܐ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ. ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܠܗܘܢ : ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܗ̇ܢ ܙܒ̈ܢܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܢܝܢ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܩܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܘܡܘܕܝܢ : ܕܕܝܠܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܪܘܗܝ. ܟܕ ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ ܒܗܕܐ ܕܠܐ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܢܦܩܘܬܐ ܐܠܦܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܠܦܘ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܫܐܠܬ ܐܢܬ ܥܘܠ ܠܟ. ܐܘܦܠ ܠܗܘܠ. ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܗܿܝ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܢܝܗܝܢ ܘܠܗܝܢ ܡܩܝܡܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ : ܠܐܝܬ ܙܗܝܪܘܬܗܘܢ ܕܥܠ ܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ. ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ * ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܐܦܢ ܠܘ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܐܝܟ f. 72rb ܡܠܬܟ ܗܫܐ ܒܪܥܝܐ ܚܒܝܫܝܢ : ܠܪ̈ܥܘܬܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܡܬܟܠܠ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܥܒܕܘ ܠܫܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ، ܦܘܠܓܐ : ܘܚܫܠܝ ܥܒܕܘ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܐܬܚܫܚܘ : ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܕܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܐܬܚܙܝܬ ܗܿܝ ܕܗܕܐ ܢܗܪܐ. ܦܘܫ ܡܟܝܠ ܐܦ ܐ̱ ܡܦܣܢܘܬܐ ܐ̱ ܫܦܝܪܐ : ܡܢ ܗܿܝ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܒܚܝܪ̈ܐ ܡܬܚܫܠ : ܘܠܩܪܒܢ ܠܐ ܡܬܦܝܣܢܐ ܕܠܘܬܗܘܢ ܫܪܝ.

ܐܬܥܗܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܙܒܢܐ ܕܠܝܚ : ܘܠܗܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܗܕܐ ܩܠܝܠ ܟܬܒܬ ܕܗܕܐ ܒܬܪ ܗܕܐ ܕܝܠܟ ܕܡܬܒܚܢܐ ܒܗܕܐ ܠܝ. ܐܦܪܫܬ ܓܝܪ
— ܗܝ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܗܟܢ ✤ ܠܐ ܕܢܥܕܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܬܬܗܝܒ ܗܝ
— ܕܗܢܝ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܐܡܪ ܕܗܘܬ ܚܕܝܘܬܐ. ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ
— ܠܒܝܠܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܕܠܝܬ ܠܗ̇ ܦܘܠܓܐ : ܗܝ ܕܐܝܟܢ ܗܕܐ
— ܐܫܬܠܡܬ. ܘܠܘ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܚܫܘܒ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܝ، ܟܕ
— ܗܝ ܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ : ܘܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܒܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ ܡܠܘܠܝ ܕܠܐ
— ܢܬܚܫܒܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܢܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܥܒܪܬ ܒܗ

AC

Line 31: ܡܢܝܢ, A: ܡ̈ܢܝܢ.
Line 39: ܚܒܝܫܝܢ, C: ܚܒܫܝܢ ܗܘ.

And some lines later: So my mention of the Patriarch here and my assertion 'the Patriarch says' are a sort of summary addressed to men who know the father's words, but one has to add: 'concerning the natural properties'. So we also, in the case of the substrates, profess the Saviour's union as being not a union of properties, but, more accurately, of hypostases, lest anyone think that the concurrence is simply a concurrence of non-substantial properties, and that it is mere sonship and not the Son's Godhead (i.e. his nature) which was incarnate. In answer, then, to that objection I was saying that 'the hypostasis of the Only-begotten' was clearer as a full indication of the mystery of his becoming man, because it can better disclose the subsistence of the substantial property in its own being without confusion or when it is mentally separated from the substance in which it is seen as naturally existing.

What will a discerning reader of these things say they belong to, if not to an unstable mind, driven in all directions by unsettled reasonings, or, on the contrary, to an * evil and heretical mind which, for the ensnaring of the simple, cunningly assumes opposite forms, disports itself in contrary ideas and concepts, and, by seeming to hold orthodox doctrines, covertly, so to say, imports its evil idea? What are we to say, then, in reply to such mutually inconsistent propositions, such violent articles of peace and unconfused mixture of warring arguments, a mixture which, being helpless and impotent (as the God-clad Severus teaches us), heretics contrive to

52/64 Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* 53 et 60 Dam. Alex., loco non reperto



— ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܡܥܗܕܢ ܀ ܘܒܬܪ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܀ ܗ̇ܝ
— ܗܟܝܠ ܕܥܗܕܢ ܐܬܥܗܕܘܬ ܠܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܘܐܡܪܬ : ܕܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ
— ܐܡܪ : ܐܝܟ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܕܥܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܒܐ ܒܦܣܝܩܘܬܐ
— ܐܡܝܪܐ. ܒܪ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇ ܕܡܬܬܘܣܦܐ ܒܗ̇ ܡܢ ܠܒܪ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܥܠ
— ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܘܐܦ ܚܢܢ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܝܡܝܢ : ܠܗ ܡܢ
— ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܡܫܪܪ ܐܬܐܡܪܬ ܠܚܕܝܘܬܐ
— ܕܦܪܘܩܐ ܡܗܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗ̇. ܕܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܢܣܒܪ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ
— ܠܐ ܐܘܣܝܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܫܘܬܦܘܬ ܪܗܛܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܟܚܕܐ
— ܐܦܬ : ܘܕܒܪܘܬܐ ܫܚܝܡܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܗܘ ܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܗ ܕܒܪܐ
— ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܟܝܢܗ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܐܬܒܣܪ. ܒܦܢܝܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܡܢܬܐ
— ܐܡܪܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܐܡܪ ܗ̇ܘܝܬ : ܕܢܗܝܪ ܝܬܝܪ ܠܟܠ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
— ܒܚܘܝܐ ܕܡܘܠܡܝܐ ܕܐܪܙܐ ܕܥܠ ܡܬܒܪܢܫܢܘܬܗ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܬܐܪܐ
— ܕܡܬܒܪܢܫܘܬܐ : ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܬܓܠܐ ܩܘܝܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
— ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܒܢܬܗ ܕܝܠܗ ܘܠܐ ܒܠܒܠܐܝܬ ܐܘ ܟܕ ܦܪܝܫ ܒܗܘܢܐ : ܐܘ
— ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܒܗܘܢܐ ܡܬܦܪܫܐ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܗ̇
— ܡܬܩܢܝܐ ܀

ܘܕܟܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘܢܐ ܕܡܣܟܠܢܐ ܕܗܘܢ ܦܠܝܓ : ܐܠܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܫܚܐ ܗܦܟ ܠܗ ܠܗ̇ : ܘܡܢ ܬܘܟܒܐ ܠܐ ܡܦܣܬܐ ܠܟܠ ܓܒ̈ܝܢ ܡܬܕܒܪܢܐ : ܐܘ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܘܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ : ܕܠܦܫܝ̈ܛܐ * ܕܢܨܘܕ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܣܩܘܒܠܝܬܐ ܐܣܟ̈ܡܐ ܢܟܝܠܐܝܬ ܡܬܦܪܦܣܐ : f. 72va ܘܠܩܘܒܠܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܐ ܣܩܘܒܠܝܐ ܚܫܒܐ : ܘܒܗ̇ܘ، ܕܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ ܡܬܕܒܪܢܐ : ܡܛܫܝܐܝܬ ܕܐܝܟ ܐܡܪ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܡܚܫܒܬܗ̇ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܡܥܠܐ. ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܫܠܡܝܢ ܠܚܕ̈ܕܐ : ܘܫܝ̈ܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܝ̈ܢܐ : ܘܚܘܠܛܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܚܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܬܟܬܫܢܝܬܐ : ܗܘ ܕܒܪ ܕܕܠܐ ܦܘܪܣܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܡܨܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܡܠܦ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܒܝܫܐ ܣܘܐܪܐ ܡܠܦ ܠܢ : ܗܪ̈ܛܝܩܘ ܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ ܕܡܬܡܨܝܢܐ

AC

Line 60: ܡܗܕܝܢ, C: ܡܗܕܝܢ ܗܝ.
Line 75: ܣܩܘܒܠܝܐ, C: ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ.
Line 81: ܣܘܐܪܐ, C: ܣܐܘܪܐ.

prove potent, except his wise words in the title of the fifteenth chapter of the second book, *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea*: That the heretics, as if in concord, and with the pretence of peace, are at pains to say with evil trickery, 'Let us use our phrases and those beloved of the orthodox', a thing which the word of truth will not accept. And again in the same fifteenth chapter he wrote: Heretics are careful either to import their heresy *in toto* or, at least, by all means to mix, in various plausible ways, something heretical in with what is correct. So, here discriminating the meaning also of the inconsistencies uttered by this author, we say that his saying taking the unambiguous word 'properties' and thereby cunningly impugning, as it were, the term 'hypostases', is the truly accurate indication of his view. Whereas his saying afterwards, For it is unusual to say that the union has been effected from the properties; whereas such a union has been handed down to us by the clear and unambiguous word 'hypostases' *et cetera*, (as has previously set down), belongs to a fellow who takes malicious care to overwhelm the hearers with fine words, a fellow who is compelled of necessity to be consistent and say what is right. To him, and aptly (I think) it must be said: 'If, as you testified, the term "hypostases" is more accurate, clearer, and less ambiguous * than "properties", why are you attempting to subvert and eradicate the holy Church and why do you so brutally disturb those who profess three true consubstantial and real hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, one God, one Godhead, one substance and nature in concept and in reality as they received the tradition from the divinely inspired fathers? Why do you force them by a great variety of stratagems not to name the hypostases of

**77/79** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 15 (*CSCO* 111, p. 129, 22-25; *112*, p. 101, 5-7) **80/82** Ibid. (*CSCO* 111, p. 130, 4-8; *112*, p. 101, 16-19) **84/85** cf. supra, 12-13 **87/89** cf. supra, 46-48



ܣܘܗܝ : ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܘ ܒܪܘܫܡܐ ܕܩܦܠܐܘܢ
ܕܚܡܫܬܥܣܪ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
‹ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘ ܩܣܪܝܐ : ܫܦܝܪ ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܠܗܪܛܝܩܘ
‹ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܫܠܡܘܬܐ ܘܒܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܫܝܢܐ ܒܢܟܠܐ ܒܝܫܬܐ
‹ ܡܬܚܦܛܐ ܕܢܐܡܪܘܢ : ܢܐܡܪ ܠܚܢܢ ܩܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ
‹ ܕܠܐܪܬܕܘܟܣܘ ܪܚܝܡܝܢ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܩܒܠܐ ܠܗ̇ ܡܠܬܐ
‹ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܒܗ ܒܗܘ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܬܥܣܪ ܟܬܒ ܟܕ
‹ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܚܦܝܛܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܪܛܝܩܘ : ܕܐܘ ܠܗ̇
‹ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܡܫܬܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܢܥܠܘܢ : ܐܘ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܐ : ܡܢ
‹ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ ܢܚܠܛܘܢ ܡܕܡ ܕܗܪܣܝܣ ܒܗ̇ ܕܬܪܝܨܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ :
‹ ܡܫܠܡܐܝܬ ܘܡܦܝܣܐܝܬ ܀ ܡܕܡ ܟܕ ܠܬܪܝܨܬܐ ܘܕܗܠܝܢ
ܕܠܐ ܫܠܡܐܝܬ ܐܡܝܪܢ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ ܗܪܟܐ ܡܦܪܫܝܢ
— ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܟܕ ܫܩܠ ܕܠܝܬ ܒܠܘܗ̇ ܦܘܠܓܐ
— ܢܦܩ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܀ ܘܟܕܗܘܐ ܢܟܝܠܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ
ܣܢܐ ܠܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܫܘܕܥܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܪܪܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܗ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܐܝܟ
— ܕܐܝܬܝܒܘܬ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܠܐ ܕܝܫܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܢܐܡܪ
— ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܗܘܬ ܚܕܝܘܬܐ : ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܪܬ ܡܠܬܐ
— ܓܠܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܠܝܬ ܒܠܘܗ̇ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܟ ܗܪܐ
— ܐܫܬܠܡܬ ܀ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܬܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡܐ ܣܝܡܐ : ܕܓܒܪܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܕܡܬܒܛܠܐܝܬ ܢܦܫ ܕܢܛܘܦ ܒܗ ܒܡܠܐ ܫܦܝܪܬܐ
ܠܫܡܘܥܐ ܕܫܡܥܝܢ : ܘܕܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܐܠܝܨ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܙܕܩܢ ܢܐܡܪ
ܡܢ ܩܢܝܢ ܕܢܩܦ ܡܫܬܘܕܐ. ܕܠܗ ܗܘ ܘܠܫܦܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ
ܕܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܐܠܝܨܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܬ
ܐܣܗܕܬ : ܕܬܪܝܨ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܓܠܝܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ *
ܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܠܡܢܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܠܥܕܬܐ f. 72vb
ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܥܩܪܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܡܬܗܦܟܝܢ ܘܬܗܦܘܟ : ܘܠܗܠܝܢ
ܕܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܩܢܘܡ ܟܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܫܪܝܪܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ
ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܚܕܐ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܒܬܐܘܪܝܐ ܘܒܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܒܠܘ ܡܢ
ܐܒܗܬܐ ܢܦܝܚܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ : ܡܛܠܡܢܐ ܒܡܢܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܗܢ
ܐܢܬ : ܘܡܬܚܒܬܐ ܩܛܝܥܐܝܬ ܙܢܝܐ ܐܠܨ ܐܢܬ. ܕܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ

AC

Father, Son and Holy Ghost "properties" in accordance with the fathers' mind, but to agree to think of them as characteristic and not individually subsisting properties and thereby utterly neglect them and become entangled in the Jewish toils of the Libyan?'

Moreover, be prompt to teach us, who are very ignorant, what the 'non-substantial properties' and 'mere sonship' are, which you are afraid of being supposed to think of? For if you utterly eradicate the hypostases and attempt to reduce the mystery of the Holy Trinity to names because, as you say, you do not honour non-substantial properties and mere sonship, it will turn out that we shall reckon it is those who do not even put forward the names of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost who do think them non-substantial properties and mere sonship. And who these people are you ought to show clearly. Do not say 'Sabellius'. For although (like your foolish self) he did not admit Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be full and individually subsisting realities, he none the less respected the word of divine Scripture and did not refuse to profess the names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost or to term them 'prosopa'.

Basil the Great, luminary of the Church, clearly attests this, writing, in the *Letter to Terentius*: But what could be a worse slander, * more capable of unsettling the majority of folk, than if some of us should be seen to speak of one hypostasis of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, some who despite frequent clear confession of the difference between the prosopa nevertheless confess what was accepted by Sabellius formerly who says this very thing: 'God is one in hypostasis but is presented by

**121/136** cf. supra, ch. 4, 234-249



ܐܝܟ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ: ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܢܚܫܒܘܢ ܠܗܘ̈ܢܐ
ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܐܠܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢ̈ܘܡܝܬܐ
ܘܕܡܘܬܝܢ ܘܠܗܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܩܒܝܢ ܢܦܠܚܘܢ ܕܢܫܪܘܢ: ܘܒܗܕܐ
ܡܫܬܠܡܐܝܬ ܢܪܦܘܢ ܐܢܘܢ: ܘܒܡܨܝܕܬܐ ܝܗܘܕܝܬܐ
ܕܠܘܒܝܐ ܢܬܦܪܟܠܘܢ.

ܗܫܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܠܦ ܠܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܛܒ ܐܬܛܝܒ:
ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܝܬܐ ܘܒܪܘܬܐ
ܫܠܝܚܬܐ: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܚܠ ܐܢܬ ܕܠܐ ܬܬܚܫܒ ܕܡܬܪܥܐ ܐܢܬ.
ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܢܬ ܒܕ ܡܫܬܠܡܐܝܬ ܥܩܪ ܐܢܬ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ:
ܘܪܙܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܠܐܪܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܕܬܡܟܟ
ܡܬܚܦܛ ܐܢܬ: ܠܗ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܝܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܬ
ܐܢܬ: ܘܠܐ ܒܪܘܬܐ ܫܠܝܚܬܐ ܡܝܩܪ ܐܢܬ: ܢܦܩܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ
ܢܚܫܘܒ ܕܡܬܦܪܫܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܐܘ̈ܣܝܝܬܐ ܘܒܪܘܬܐ
ܫܠܝܚܬܐ: ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ
ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܡܩܪܒܝܢ. ܘܡܢܘ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ: ܙܕܩ ܠܟ
ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܬܚܘܐ: ܐܦܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܬܐܡܪ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ
ܠܗ ܣܒܪܬܐ ܡܫܡ̈ܠܝܐ ܘܕܡܩܢܡܝܢ ܘܠܗܘܢ ܡܩܒܠ:
ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܢܩܒ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ
ܠܐ ܡܣܬܠܝܘܬܗ: ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܩܒܠ ܒܗ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ
ܕܬܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ: ܘܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ
ܠܘܕܝܐ: ܘܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܢܩܪܝܘܢ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܐܠ ܗܘܐ.

ܘܗܕܐ ܡܣܗܕ ܠܓܠܝܐܝܬ: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܢܗܝܪܐ ܪܒܐ
ܕܥܕܬܐ: ܟܕ ܗܟܢ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܛܪܢܛܝܘܣ ܟܬܒ ܀
< ܐܝܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܫܢܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܝܫܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܬܗܘܐ: ܘܕܬܬܪܝܐܝܬ
< ܡܙܝܥܐ ܕܠܣܘ̈ܓܐܐ ܬܘܒ: ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܕܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܐܢ̈ܫܝܢ
< ܡܢܢ: ܕܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ.
< ܗܢܘܢ ܕܐܦ ܛܒ ܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܠܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܘܕܝܢ:
< ܐܠܐ ܒܬܪ ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܘܕܝܢ * ܠܡܟܣܐ: ܕܗܝ ܗܕܐ f. 73ra

AC

Line 137: ܘܕܬܬܪܝܐܝܬ, C: ܘܕܬܬܪܝܐ.
Line 140: ܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ, cf. ch. 4, line 266 (ܫܘܚܠܦܐ).

Scripture in the guise of prosopa in various fashions to suit the particularity of the subject-matter, sometimes taking upon itself the Father's words whenever there is occasion for this prosopon, sometimes those which are fitting for the Son whenever he condescends to a concern for us or to other actions of the scheme of salvation, and sometimes he wears the prosopon of the Spirit whenever the occasion demands words of such a kind from such a prosopon'? If, therefore some of our people are seen to say that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one in the substrate but to profess three perfect prosopa, how can they not be supposed to be giving a clear and irrefutable proof of the truth of what is said about us?

In addition to all the said matters, the careful listener is to know that this same truth-loving author changed and falsified too (as has been clearly proved in the foregoing) what is set down at the end of this author's words which have just been examined (i.e. as Saint Epiphanius also testified when defending the Easterns) and set down, as we have adduced God-clad fathers teaching in many other passages. We have thereby made known to listeners what is adduced by the author himself in 'confirmation' of his false opinion from the Theologian's teaching, and we have plainly proved, as has been previously set down, that the quotation of the proof-texts in no way assists his empty words.

**140/141** cf. supra, ch. 14, 182 and ch. 5, 339-340 **142** cf. supra, ch. 5, 340-341



< ܐܡܪ : ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܦܘܡܐ ܐܒܗܘܗܝ, ܐܠܗܐ : ܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܢ ܒܡܠ̈ܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐܝܬ : ܠܦܘܬ ܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ
< ܕܨܒܘܬܐ ܗܝ, ܕܡܫܡܠܝܐ : ܘܒܙܒܢ ܡܢ ܦܐܐܡ ܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܠܒܝܢܬ ܩܠ̈ܐ
< ܐܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܡܬܝ, ܕܙܕܩܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܒܪܐ ܦܐܝܢ : ܐܡܬܝ, ܕܢܚܬ ܣܘܥܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ : ܐܘ ܕܢܚܬ
< ܡܕܒܪ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܒܫ : ܒܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܡܬܠܒܫ : ܐܡܬܝ, ܕܙܕܩܐ ܠܒܝܢܬ ܩܠ̈ܐ
< ܕܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܠܗܕ : ܐܢܫܘ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܕܐܦ ܐܢ̈ܫܝܢ ܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܐܡ̈ܪܝܢ : ܕܚܕ ܒܗܘ ܕܩܝܡ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ
< ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܫ̈ܡܠܝܐ
< ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܣܘܪܚܐ ܢܬܚܙܘܢ
< ܕܢܗܘܢ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ : ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܫܪܪ̈ܬܐ ܐܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܥܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܡܛܠܬܢ ܀

ܥܡ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܢܕܥ ܫܡܘܥܐ ܚܦܝܛܐ : ܕܐܦ
ܗ̇ܘ ܕܟܣܘܠܛܐ ܡܒܝܢܐ : ܕܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ, ܕܗܢܐ ܡܬܒܥܝܢܐ ܐܠܝܢ
— ܕܗܫܐ ܐܬܒܨܝ : ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܡܝܪܐ ܕܐܦ ܩܕܝܫܐ
— ܐܦܝܦܢܝܘܣ ܟܕ ܚܒܪ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܚܠܦ ܡܕܢܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܣܗܕ :
ܢܠܦ ܘܦܠܛܪ ܗܘ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܬܒܥܐ ܪܫܡ ܣܪܪ̈ܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܕܗܐ ܡܢ ܒܗܘ ܒܗܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܘܣܡ
— ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܕܡܠܦܝܢ
— ܐܝܬܝܢ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܒܝܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܕܡܝܬܝ
ܕܡܬܒܥܝܢܐ : ܠܘܬ ܫܘܪܪܐ ܠܗ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܕܐܦܣܝܬܐ ܡܢ
ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܐܘܠܘܓܐ ܐܬܬܝܬ, : ܘܢܚܘܝܬܐ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ
ܒܕܒܝܢ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܫܘܚܠܦܝܢ : ܟܕ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܕܒܪܐ
ܡܒܝܢܐ ܣܡܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܕܡ ܠܒܝܢܬ ܩܠܘܗܝ, ܡܥܕܪܢܘܬܐ
ܡܬܬܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܕܪ̈ܫܝܡܐ ܡܟܪܙܐ.

AC

Line 142: ܒܦܘܡܐ, C: ܒܦ̈ܘܡܐ.
Line 144: ܠܗ, cf. ch. 4, line 270 (ܒܠܗܘܢ).
Line 146: ܕܢܚܬ, cf. ch. 4, line 272 (ܢܚܬ) and note.
Line 148: ܡܬܠܒܫ, cf. ch. 4, line 274 (ܠܒܫ).
Lines 150-151: ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ, cf. ch. 4, lines 276-277 (ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ).

It is time, then, we set down various points adduced by us in support of the truth from the very treasures of the Theologian, so that by an accurate comparison the friends of truth may learn even more clearly by what clear and lucid demonstrations the truth is confirmed, but by what mad, senseless sophisms this valiant fellow endeavours to defend falsehood. So let us quote a presentation of the Theologian's words and it shall justly shake the bastions of heterodoxy, for it is good that rebuttals based on truth should succeed variously twisted error * and the complex distortion of corruption, lest, from lack of these rebuttals, heresy be supposed by the uncultivated to have some force and the scheme of impiety thought to be gaining dominion over orthodoxy.

The master of exact theology speaks, then, as follows in the oration *On the Nativity*: When you hear of the generation of God, of the Virgin and the swathing bands and all that belongs to bodily advent, do not be ashamed! For nothing God approaches sullies him, even though it appears to you to do so; no more does he share our impurity than does the Sun, from the things over which it passes in its course, yet also giving them some of its purity. But revere in the same way both the first incorporeal generation and the second spotless and pure, free from the pleasure wherein is shamefulness. Again, in the *Second Oration on the Son*, he is seen to say similar things: Is not, then, *he created me* spoken along with cause? For *he created me as the beginning of his ways, for his works*; but *the works of his hands are truth and judgement*, because of which he was anointed with Godhead for this is the unction of manhood. On the other hand, *he begets me* is without cause – or you are

**161/168** Greg. Naz., *Or. 38*, 6 (textus longior) (*SChr.*, vol. 358, p. 92)
**169/176** Greg. Naz., *Or. 30*, 2 (*PG* 36, 105BC; *SChr.*, vol. 250, pp. 228-230)
**169/171** Prov. 8:22 **171** Ps. 110:7 **173** Prov. 8:25



ܘܥܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܟܝܠ : ܘܡܘܠܕ ܡܘܠܕ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܠܗܘܡܢܐ ܕܥܙܪܐ ܡܢ ܬ̈ܫܬܫܝܬܐ : ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܒܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ
ܕܡܚܠܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܢܐ ܢܩܫ : ܐܡܪܢܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܦܘܣܩܐ ܣܬܝܬܐ :
ܬܘܒ ܡܛܠ ܠܥܠܬܐ ܢܐܠܦܘܢ ܙܒܢ ܥܙܝܪܐ : ܕܒܐܝܠܝܢ ܗ̄ܢ
ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܢܗܝܪܬܐ ܘܕܒܝܪܬܐ ܡܫܬܪܪ ܫܪܪܐ : ܒܐܝܠܝܢ
ܕܝܢ ܬܗ̈ܡܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܘܫܒܝܐ : ܡܫܦܩܐ ܗܢܐ ܙܪܝܙܐ
ܕܢܚܒܪ ܗܘܦܟܘܬܐ ܠܕܓܠܘܬܐ. ܬܬܬܐ ܗܟܝܠ
ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܬܬܪܥܒ
ܒܐܝܬܝܬ ܠܫܘܪܐ ܕܥܡܘܕܝܬ ܛܥܝܘܬܐ. ܫܦܝܪܐ ܗܝ ܓܝܪ
ܕܠܦܘܠܚܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܠ ܙܢ ܡܬܥܩܡܢܐ : * ܘܠܥܘܪܩܢܐ f. 73rb
ܡܬܦܬܠܢܘܬ ܡܬܗܦܟܢܐ : ܢܩܦܢ ܘܡܟܫܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܥܙܪܐ :
ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܚܣܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ : ܕܢܣܒܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇
ܬܬܣܒܪ ܠܠܐ ܡܪܕܝܐ ܗܪܣܝܣ : ܘܬܬܕܢܐ ܐܣܟܡܐ ܕܐܦܣܛܘܬܐ
ܕܪܘܫܡܐ : ܕܥܠ ܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܬܬܚܣܢ ܐܘܪܬܕܘܟܣܝܐ ܢܣܒܐ.

ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܡܡܠܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ
ܚܬܝܬܐ : ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܡܘܠܕܗ ܒܗܢܐ ܕܝܢܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܕܝܢ <
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܫܡܥ ܐܢܬ ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܘܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܘܥܙܪܘܪܐ : <
ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܥܡܠܐ ܦܓܪܢܝܐ : ܠܐ ܬܒܗܬ ܡܕܡ ܬܛܘܫ. ܠܐ <
ܛܒܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܕܡ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܬܩܪܒ ܐܦ ܠܘ <
ܡܬܛܡܐ. ܘܠܐ ܓܡܠ ܡܠܘܗ̇ ܡܢ ܛܘܠܫܐ ܕܝܠܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ <
ܕܐܦܠܐ ܫܡܫܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܠܝܫܝܢ ܥܒܪ : ܒܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܗ <
ܙܪܐ. ܐܠܐ ܘܝܗܒ ܡܢ ܕܟܝܘܬܗ. ܐܠܐ ܒܗ̇ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ <
ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܓܫܡ ܐܝܩܪ : ܘܠܗ̇ ܕܬܪܬܝܢ <
ܕܠܐ ܟܬܡܐ ܘܕܕܟܝܬ : ܐܝܟ ܡܫܪܝܬ ܡܢ ܗܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܒܗ̇ <
ܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܀ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܥܠ ܒܪܐ <
ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ : ܠܘ ܗ̇ܝ ܒܪ <
ܕܒܪܢܝ ܐܡܝܪܐ ܥܡ ܥܠܬܐ : ܒܪܢܝ ܓܝܪ ܠܝ ܪܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܚܬܗ ≪
ܠܥܒ̈ܕܘܗܝ : ܥܒ̈ܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܐ̈ܝܕܘܗܝ ܫܪܪܐ ܘܕܝܢܐ : ≪
ܕܡܛܠܬܗܘܢ ܐܬܡܫܚ ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܗܕܐ ܗܝ ܓܝܪ <
ܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܕܐܢܫܘܬܐ : ܕܝܠܕ ܠܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܥܠܬܐ : ܐܘ ܚܘܐ <

AC up to ܕܗܠܝܢ (l. 179)

Line 169: ܬ̈ܫܬܫܝܬܐ, C: ܬܫܬܫܝܬܐ.

to show some statement with it. So what reasoning will dispute the fact that Wisdom is called a creature in respect to the earthly generation, but offspring in respect to the first and more incomprehensible? He wrote in similar terms to these in the oration *On Baptism*, as follows: The word knows a three-fold generation. One from bodies, one from baptism, one from resurrection. Of these, the first is nocturnal, servile and involving passion. The second is of the day, is at liberty and is free from passions; it severs all the covering derived from generation and restores to heavenly life. The third is more fearful and briefer, gathering all creation in a flash to stand before its fashioner and to render an account of its service and behaviour here, as to whether it has only followed the flesh or journeyed with the Spirit and reverenced the grace of re-fashioning. All these generations my Christ appears as having honoured through himself: the first in the * primal, vitalizing in-breathing; the second in incarnation and the baptism with which he was baptized; the third in the resurrection which he initiated, deigning to become also *first-born from the dead* as he became *first-born amongst many brothers*. It does not belong to the present moment to philosophize about two of these generations, then, (the first and the last, I mean) but let us philosophize about the middle one, the one that now presses upon us, which gives its name to the day of Lights. And a few lines later: When I take the three together in speculation, I see one lamp, for I cannot sunder or measure the united light. Do you fear generation, lest the impassible God should suffer? I fear creation, lest I destroy God through insult and through iniquitous severance, when I either cut the Son off from the Father or the Spirit's substance from the Son.

The prudent listener, on reading this, should consider carefully whether in representing this truth-loving writer we have swerved

177/194 Greg. Naz., *Or. 40*, 2-3 (*PG* 36, 360C - 361B; *SChr.*, vol. 358, pp. 198-200) **187** cf. Gen. 2:7 cf. Ioh. 1:14 **188** cf. Matth. 3:13-16; Marc. 1:9-10; Luc. 3:21-22 **188/189** cf. I Cor. 15:20 **189** Col. 1:18 **190** Rom. 8:29 **194/199** Greg. Naz., *Or. 40*, 41-42 (*PG* 36, 417CD; *SChr.*, vol 358, p. 294)



‹ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܡܕܡ ܥܡ ܗܘܐ. ܐܝܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܐ :
‹ ܕܒܪܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܬܬܐܡܪ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܒܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܢܝܬ : ܝܠܕܐ
‹ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ̇، ܘܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܘܝܬܝܪ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܝܬܐ ܀ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ
ܟܬܒ : ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܠܠ ܕܡܥܡܘܕܝܬܐ ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀
‹ ܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܬܠܝܬܝܬܐ ܝܕܥܐ ܠܗ̇ ܡܠܬܐ. ܚ̇ܕ، ܕܡܢ ܦܓܖ̈ܐ. ܚ̇ܕ،
‹ ܕܡܢ ܡܥܡܘܕܝܬܐ. ܚ̇ܕ، ܕܡܢ ܩܝܡܬܐ. ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ : ܚ̇ܕ، ܡܢ
‹ ܠܠܠܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܘܐܡܬܢܝܬܐ ܘܚܫܘܫܬܐ. ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ
‹ ܐܝܡܡܝܬܐ ܘܒܪܬ ܚܐܖ̈ܐ ܘܦܨܝܬ ܚ̈ܫܐ. ܘܟܠ ܬܟܣܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ
‹ ܝܠܕܘܬܐ. ܦܣܩܐ ܘܡܦܢܝܐ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܥܠ ܡܫܡܝܐ. ܗ̇، ܕܝܢ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ
‹ ܕܚܝܠܬܐ ܘܟܪܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܘܟܠ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܡܟܢܫܐ ܒܪܦܦܐ
‹ ܕܬܩܘܡ ܩܕܡ ܓܒܘܠܗ̇ : ܘܡܠܬܐ ܬܬܠ ܕܦܘܠܚܢܘܬܐ ܕܕܘܒܪܐ
‹ ܘܕܘܒܪܐ. ܐܢ ܠܒܣܪܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܢܩܦܬ : ܘܐܢ ܥܡ ܪܘܚܐ
‹ ܪܕܬ : ܘܡܢ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܕܓܒܠܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܪܝܫ ܐܬܟܒܫܬ.
‹ ܠܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܝܠܕܘ̈ܬܐ : ܡܬܚܙܐ ܕܝܩܪ ܢܦܫܗ ܡܫܝܚܐ
‹ ܕܩܕܡ. ܗ̇، ܡܢ ܒܡܦܘܚܝܬܐ * ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܘܡܚܝܢܝܬܐ. ܗ̇، ܕܝܢ f. 73va
‹ ܒܡܬܒܪܢܫܢܘܬܐ ܘܡܥܡܘܕܝܬܐ. ܗ̇، ܕܒܗ̇ ܥܡܕ. ܗ̇، ܕܝܢ
‹ ܒܩܝܡܬܐ ܗ̇، ܕܒܗ̇ ܫܪܝ. ܕܐܫܘܝ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܒܘܟܪܐ ܠܡܝ̈ܬܐ
‹ ܩܕܝܡܐ : ܗܘܝܘ ܘܒܘܟܪܐ ܡܢ ܣ̈ܓܝܐܐ ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ.
‹ ܡܛܠ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܝܠܕܘ̈ܬܐ : ܗ̇، ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܝܐ
‹ ܐܢܐ ܘܗ̇، ܐܚܪܝܬܐ : ܦܝܠܣܘܦܘܬܐ ܢܚܒ : ܠܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܙܒܢܐ
‹ ܕܩܐܡ. ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܡܨܥܝܬܐ ܘܗܕܐ ܕܗܫܐ ܐܠܝܨܐ
‹ ܠܢ : ܗ̇، ܕܐܬܝܗ̇، ܒܪ ܫܡܗ̇ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܝܘܡܐ ܦܝܠܣܘܦܘܬܐ
‹ ܢܚܒ ܀ ܘܒܬܪ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܀ ܐܡܪ، ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܐܡܚܝܪܐ
‹ ܒܬܐܘܪܝܐ : ܚܕ ܠܡܫܪܓܐ ܚܙܐ ܐܢܐ. ܠܝܬ ܠܝ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܦܠܓ
‹ ܐܘ ܐܡܫܘܚ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܡܚܝܕ. ܕܚܠ ܐܢܬ ܡܢ ܝܠܕܘܬܐ :
‹ ܕܠܐ ܚܫ ܡܕܡ ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܚܫܐ : ܐܢܐ ܕܚܠ ܐܢܐ
‹ ܡܢ ܒܪܝܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܘܒܕ ܒܨܥܪܐ ܘܒܦܘܠܓܐ
‹ ܥܘܠܐ : ܟܕ ܐܘ ܒܪܐ ܦܣܩ ܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ : ܐܘ ܡܢ ܒܪܐ
‹ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܀

ܟܕ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܦܓܥ ܫܡܘܥܐ ܣܟܘܠܬܢܐ : ܢܬܒܩܐ
ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ : ܕܐܢ ܟܕ ܐܬܕܡܝܢ ܒܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܪܚܡ

A

from the proposed aim and have appeared to be going far off the finishing-post, as the saying goes. For it has been proved by these divinely inspired and undisputed words that it is impossible for those who call generacy a hypostasis not to accept opinions which, in the magnitude of their impiety, outdo, as it were, all the madness of all the heretics who have ever existed. For besides the wicked blasphemies against the Holy Trinity he is convicted of affirming Nestorius' (to say nothing more for the moment!), he who has such pernicious views and has heard the doctor who clearly proclaims: But revere in the same way both the first incorporeal generation and the second spotless and pure, and again: So what reasoning will dispute the fact that Wisdom is called a creature in respect to the earthly generation, but offspring in respect to the first and more incomprehensible? Did not the teacher of truth name here as the first generation the one from God the Father but the second the one from the Holy Virgin? How, then, can those who reckon these two generations 'hypostases' fail to be found in agreement with Nestorius and those of his ilk * who opposed the truth and those who fought for it, especially wise Cyril? Let this advocate and supporter of I know not how many despicable heresies, say! It will not be out of place to set down some passages of his own, relevant to the present subject and making a complete mockery of his fickle doctrine. They are set down, indeed, in his *Enthronement Sermon* (whose beginning is: Those ablaze with warm love for the noble faith) as follows: Hence the Virgin is believed to be 'Theotocos' in the full sense of the word and in reality. Had mere man been born (as those who begrudge our redemption and negate the incarnate dispensation assert)

**211/212** cf. supra, 166-167 **212/215** cf. supra, 174-176 **226/238** Dam. Alex., *Serm. incathedr.* (aliunde incogn.) et *Ep. synod.* (Chabot, IV, pp. 358-359; *II*, pp. 326-327)



ܫܪܪܐ : ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܢܣܒܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܗܘܝܬ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܘܕܠܐܘܣܡܐ
ܡܢ ܡܬܠܘܘ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܕܪܗܛܝܢ ܐܬܚܙܝܢ.
ܐܘ ܓܝܪ ܒܗ ܗܠܝܢ ܒ̈ܢܬ ܩܠܐ ܢܦܝܫ̈ܬ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܕܠܬ
ܚܠܝܡܢ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܕܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܕܗܢܘܢ
ܕܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܠܘ ܗܢܝܢ ܢܩܒܠܘܢ
ܕܬܪ̈ܥܝܬܗܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢ ܕܒܡܣܓܝܐܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܫܥܐ ܚܒܪ̈ܢ ܐܝܟ
ܕܠܡܐܡܪ : ܠܟܠܗ̇ ܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܗܪܛܝܩܘ̈ ܕܗܘܘ ܡܬܚܙܩ
ܗ̇ܘܘ. ܠܡ ܓܝܪ ܒ̈ܪܘܦܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܟܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܡܬܚܝܒܐ : ܘܕܗܘܝܢ ܕܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܕܫܡܐܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܟܝܠ
ܝܬܝܪ ܢܐܡܪ ܡܬܬܚܝܢ ܕܡܓܙܪܝܢ : ܗܘ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟܢ ܗܟܢ
ܡܬܒܢܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܐ : ܘܫܡܥ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ
< ܡܟܪܙ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܗܘ̇ ܒܗ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܠܐ
< ܓܘܫܡ ܣܓܘܕܘ : ܘܠܗ̇ ܕܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܛܘܠܫܐ ܘܕܟܝܬܐ ܀
< ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܐܝܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܐ : ܕܒܪܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ
< ܬܬܐܡܪ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܒܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܢܝܬܐ : ܝܠܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ̇
< ܡܬܚܫܒܐ : ܘܬܩܪܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܝܬܐ ܀ ܐܘ ܠܘ ܗܪܟܐ ܗܠܝܢ :
ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ : ܠܗ̇ ܕܝܢ
ܕܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܡܩܕܫܬܐ ܕܩܪܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ.
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܬܪܬܝܢ ܝܠܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
ܚܫܒܝܢ : ܠܐ ܕܢܫܬܟܚܘܢ ܠܢܣܛܘܪܝܘܣ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟܘܬܗ *
f. 73vb ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܫܪܪܐ ܘܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܚܠܦܘܗܝ ܐܬܟܬܫܘ :
ܘܡܝܬܪܐܝܬ ܕܠܩܘܪܠܘܣ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܢܬܟܬܫܘܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ.
ܢܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܕܕܒܝܐ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܡ̈ܣܠܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܐܢܐ
ܣܢܐܓܪܐ ܘܦܘܡܐ. ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܢܣܝܡ :
ܕܠܝܫܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܗܫܐ ܠܬܚܡ : ܘܡܫܥܠܐܝܬ ܠܡܪܕܘܬܗ
ܡܫܬܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܡܓܚܟ ܠܗ ܫܪܝܪܐ. ܣܝܡܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ
— ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܘܬܗ ܕܠܗ. ܗܘ ܕܫܘܪܝܗ ܀ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܚܘܒܐ
— ܚܡܝܡܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܫܦܝܪܬܐ ܕܠܩܝܢ ܀ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܬ
— ܒܗܘܢ ܀ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܝܠܕܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܫܪܪܐ : ܒܬܘܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ
— ܒܫܠܡܘܬܐ ܡܬܗܝܡܢܐ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܫܚܝܡܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ :
— ܐܝܟ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܚܣܡܝܢ ܒܦܘܪܩܢ : ܘܠܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܣܪܐ

AC from ܠܡܠܦܢܐ (l. 239) on

Line 259: ܕܗܢܘܢ, C: ܗܢܘܢ.

how was it that the bearer was kept a virgin after the birth? Confessing, therefore, two generations of the one Son, the first eternally from his Father before all worlds, in which generation he has no mother, the second with his flesh, in the last times, without intercourse, from the Virgin Mary, in which the same Son is without father, we do not say 'two Christs' or 'two Sons' or 'two natures' or 'two activities' but one Son, one incarnate nature of the Word, one hypostasis, one prosopon and one activity. This passage he repeated unaltered in the *Synodical Epistle* he sent to our holy father James and to all the holy and devout bishops, priests and deacons of the East etc.

We should note as carefully as possible the meaning of his words. For here he himself too has clearly stated that he professes two generations of the one Son. He must, then, as a consequence of, I think, unavoidable reasonings, either reject the novel impiety which lawlessly proposes ingeneracy and generacy as hypostases and say two generations of the one Son, and think, with true religion, of one incarnate nature and hypostasis; or, he must reckon ingeneracy and generacy as hypostases, be self-consistent and state unhesitatingly: Confessing, therefore, two generations and two hypostases of the one Son, the first eternally from his Father before all worlds, in which generation he has no mother, the second * with his flesh, in the last times, without intercourse, from the Virgin Mary, in which the same Son is without father, we do not say 'two Christs' or 'two Sons' or 'two natures' or 'two activities' but one Son, one incarnate

247/253 cf. supra, 229-236



— ܡܪܘܝܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܠܕܬ : ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܝܠܕܐ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ
— ܐܬܢܛܪܬ. ܟܕ ܗܟܝܠ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܝܠܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܚܕ ܒܪܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ :
— ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܡܬܘܡܝܬܐ ܩܕܡ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܥܠܡ̈ܐ :
— ܕܒܗ̇ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܐܡܐ : ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܥܡ ܒܣܪܐ
— ܒܙܒ̈ܢܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܙܘܘܓܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܡܪܝܡ : ܕܒܗ̇
— ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܐܒܐ ܗܘ ܒܪ ܗ̣ܘ : ܠܘ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܡܫܝ̈ܚܐ
— ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ. ܘܠܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ
— ܡܥܒ̈ܕܢܘܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܒܪܐ ܘܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܠܗ ܕܡܠܬܐ
— ܕܡܒܣܪ. ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܚܕ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܡܥܒ̈ܕܢܘܬܐ ⁘

ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܐܦ ܒܟܬܒܬܐ ܣܘܢܗܕܝܩܝܐ ܕܫܕܪ ܗܘܐ ܠܘܬ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܘܐܒܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܝܥܩܘܒ : ܘܠܘܬ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܢ̈ܟܦܐ ܘܕܚ̈ܠܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܦܝܣܩܘ̈ܦܐ : ܘܩܫ̈ܝܫܐ ܘܡܫܡ̈ܫܢܐ ܘܕܡܕܢܚܐ.

ܠܡܬܚܡܣܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܙܕܩ ܒܟܡܐ ܕܡܨܝܐ ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܒܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ. ܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ : ܕܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܝܠܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܚܕ ܒܪܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܐܡܪ. ܐܢܢܩܐ ܠܗ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܢ ܦܘ̈ܫܩܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܡܦܠܛܘ ܡܢܗܘܢ : ܐܘ ܕܒܗ ܠܕܘܝܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܕܠܐ ܢܡܘܣ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܥܒܕܐ ܕܐܬܬܣܝܡܘ ܡܣܠܝܐ : ܢܐܡܪ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܡܢ ܝܠܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܚܕ ܒܪܐ : ܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܟܝܢܐ ܡܒܣܪܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܬܪܥܐ : ܐܘ ܒܗ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܚܫܘܒ : ܠܢܦܫܗ ܢܫܘܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܦܘܫܟܐ ܢܐܡܪ : ܟܕ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ

— ܝܠܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܘܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܚܕ ܒܪܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܚܕ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ
— ܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܡܬܘܡܐܝܬ ܩܕܡ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܥܠܡ̈ܐ ܕܒܗ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
— ܕܠܐ ܐܡܐ : ܐܚܪܢܐ * ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܥܡ ܒܣܪܐ ܒܙܒ̈ܢܐ — C, f. 132v
— ܐܚܪ̈ܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܙܘܘܓܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܡܪܝܡ : ܕܒܗ * ܐܝܬܘܗܝ — f. 132v
— ܕܠܐ ܐܒܐ ܗܘ ܒܪ ܗ̣ܘ : ܠܘ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܡܫܝ̈ܚܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܘܠܐ
— ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܒܢ̈ܝܐ. ܘܠܐ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ. ܘܠܐ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܡܥܒ̈ܕܢܘܬܐ.

A [up to l. 284] C

Line 264: ܒܙܒ̈ܢܐ, C: ܒܙܒܢܐ.
Line 270: ܘܐܒܐ, C: ܐܒܐ.
Line 274: ܕܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ, C: ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ.

nature of the Word, one hypostasis, one prosopon and one activity. But even so, he will not agree with himself. For how can he who professes the one Son as two hypostases say, we do not say 'two Christs' or 'two Sons' or 'two natures' or 'two activities' but one Son, one incarnate nature of the Word, one hypostasis, one prosopon and one activity. You will see the inconsistency and disharmony of confused thoughts and concepts; what, then, are we to suppose the sly sophist thinks? Is it his earlier statements or these latter full, as they are, of absurd lunacy? However, if the earlier, where he also clearly proposed two generations but one hypostasis of the Son, he can, then by means ......

* ...... proclaims his feebleness even if those who help it with crafty argumentation are skilled and cunning. So first let us make a reply to this despotic opposition to correct teachings, a reply similar to wise Severus's of old to the Grammarian of Caesarea, who through the apparent homonymy was attempting to obfuscate and muddle the understanding of the meanings of 'hypostasis' and 'substance inclusive of the hypostases': the reply that because the hypostases were termed 'properties' they have by no means therefore become characteristic properties. Indeed, later on we shall examine the meaning of those words too. For this excellent fellow said: For if one does not take such words in this way one will not think either that a prosopon is the same as a hypostasis because Basil professed the prosopon as being in the hypostasis. 'Why', someone might say to him, 'because on hearing God-clad Basil say: We must acknowledge

**255/258** cf. supra, 251-253 **274/276** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* **277/278** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 210*, 5 (*PG* 32, 776C; Courtonne, II, p. 196); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 14, 47-48



— ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܒܪܐ ܘܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܬܒܣܪ. ܘܚܕ
— ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܚܕ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ. ܐܠܐ ܘܠܐ
— ܗܟܢܐ ܢܫܠܡ ܠܢܦܫܗ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܠܚܕ
— ܒܪܐ ܡܘܕܐ: ܡܫܟܚ ܕܢܐܡܪ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܡܫܝ̈ܚܐ
— ܐܡܪܝܢ: ܘܠܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ: ܘܠܐ ܬܪܝܢ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ
— ܡܥܒ̈ܕܢܘܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܚܕ ܒܪܐ: ܘܚܕ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܠܬܐ
— ܕܡܬܒܣܪ: ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܚܕ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ.
ܚܙܝ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܠܐ ܫܠܡܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܘܬܐ ܕܚܘ̈ܫܒܐ ܡܒܠܒ̈ܠܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܐ: ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܣܒܪ ܕܡܬܪܥܐ ܣܘܦܝܣܛܐ ܨܢܝܥܐ. ܐܪܐ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܐܡܝ̈ܪܢ ܠܗ: ܐܘ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܝܬܐ: ܘܕܠܝܗ̇ ܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܥܡܝܪܬܐ ܡ̈ܠܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܐܢ̈ ܗ̇ܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܩܕ̈ܡܝܬܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܝܠܝ̈ܕܘܬܐ: ܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܠܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ: ܠܐ ܗܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܫܟܚ ......

A, f. 74ra

* ...... ܘܡܚܝܠܘܬܗ ܡܟܪܙܐ: ܘܐܦ [ܗܟܢ] ܡ̈ܥܕܪܢܘܬܐ ܒܥܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ: ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܠܗܕܐ ܡܥܕܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܡܗܝܪܝܢ ܘܚܪܝܦܝܢ. ܩܕܡܝܬ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܘܬ ܗܕܐ ܠܚܘܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܝ̈ܘܠܦܢܐ ܬ̈ܪܝܨܐ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗ̇ܢܝܢ: ܕܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܠܘܬ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܩܣܪܝܐ: ܕܒܝܕ ܫܘܬܦܘܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ: ܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܣܘܟ̈ܠܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܘܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܩܢܘܡ̈ܐ ܡܫܝܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܥܟܪ ܘܢܒܠܒܠ: ܡܦܢܝܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ: ܕܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܬܩܪܝܘ: ܗܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܦܘܪܣ: ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܟ̈ܚܢܝܬܐ ܗܘܝ. ܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܝܢ ܢܒܚܘܢ: ܘܠܗܘܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܝܢ
— ܕܐܬܐܡܪ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܗܢܐ ܡܥܠܝܐ ✧ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܗܟܢܐ
— ܐܝܟ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܣܒ: ܘܠܐ ܕܗܘ ܚܕ ܗ̇ܘ
— ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܣܒܪ. ܡܛܠ ܕܒܩܢܘܡܗ:
— ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܐܘܕܝ ✧ ܘܡܢܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܒܪ.
ܫܡܥܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܐܢܫ: ܠܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܐܡܪ ✧

A from l. 302 on C up to l. 301 flor. II from l. 315

Line 301: see Appendix I (infra, p. 548).
Line 316: ܠܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ, flor. II: ܠܒܣܝܠܝܣ.

each prosopon as existing in true hypostasis, we understand the hypostasis as the same as prosopon, is it necessary also, when the Theologian said: Because we must preserve one God and profess three hypostases or prosopa and each of them along with its property, to think the prosopa the same as the characteristic properties of the prosopa?' In that case, why, similarly, should we not reckon the characteristic properties of the Godhead the same as the Godhead, because, with the famous THEODOSIUS declaring: We worship and glorify one God in one substance and nature but in three hypostases, we acknowledge and believe the one substance and nature of the Godhead to be nothing other than God himself? For he wrote in his discourse *On Theology* as follows: So these things were said by us in proof of the fact that we worship and acknowledge one God, in one substance and nature but in three hypostases. And again: So, as has often been said, bidding farewell to deductions like this we have learned to believe one God in one substance and nature but in three hypostases or prosopa, not dividing the one Godhead or merging the three hypostases for * the evil involved in both is equal even though it is to be found in opposites. You will observe, wise sir, the feebleness of your criteria, for you are attempting to draw the impossible inference: that because by speaking of each prosopon in true hypostasis, we reckon prosopa as not other than hypostases, so also by speaking of 'characteristic properties of hypostases' or of 'hypostases with

**280/281** Greg. Naz., *Or. 20*, 6 (*PG* 35, 1072D; *SChr.*, vol. 270, p. 70) **285/286** cf. infra, 290-291 **289/291** Theod. Alex., *De Trin.*, 1 (*OLA* 56, p. 159, ll. 319-321 [p. 231, ll. 302-304]) **291/296** Theod. Alex., *De Trin.*, 5 (*OLA* 56, p. 172, ll. 51-56 [p. 242, ll. 54-58]) **298** cf. supra, 278



ܕܢܕܥ ܕܟܠ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܒܩܘܡܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܢܕܪܐ ܀
ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܐܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ
ܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ : ܘܕܐܡܪܬ، ܕܐܡܪ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܀
ܡܛܠ ܕܢܛܪ ܕܒܥܐ ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܛܪ : ܘܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܘܕܐ
ܐܘ ܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܘܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܥܡ ܕܝܠܝܘܬܗ ܀
ܕܗܝ، ܒܗ ܗܝ، ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ
ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܢܬܪܥܐ : ܡܕܝܢ : ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܠܐ ܒܗ ܗܟܢܐ
ܢܪܐ : ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܗܝ ܒܗ ܗܝ
ܢܣܒܪ ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܠܝܕܝܥܐ ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ :
ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ : ܒܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܣܓܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܘܡܫܒܚܝܢ : ܠܗ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
ܘܟܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܗ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ
ܘܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ. ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܠ ܡܡܠܠܘܬ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܘܝ ܡܢܢ
ܐܬܐܡܪ : ܠܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܕܗܝ، ܕܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
ܘܟܝܢܐ : ܒܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܣܓܕܝܢ ܘܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܀
ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܚܢܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܙܒܢܝܢ ܣܓܝܐ̈ܢ ܐܬܐܡܪ : ܟܕ
ܫܠܡ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܚܘܫܒ̈ܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ : ܒܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܡܗܝ
ܡܗܝܡܢܘ ܕܒܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ : ܒܬܠܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܐܘ ܒܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ. ܟܕ ܠܐ ܠܚܕܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܦܠܓܝܢ :
ܘܠܐ ܠܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܚܠܛܝܢ. ܫܘܝܐ ܗܝ، ܓܝܪ * ܒܝܫܬܐ f.74rb
ܒܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܝܢ : ܐܦ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ ܡܫܬܟܚܐ ܀ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ
ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܢܝܟ : ܡܛܠ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܢܬ
ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܡܬܡܨܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܟܢܫ : ܕܡܛܠ ܕܟܕ ܠܟܠ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ
ܒܩܘܡܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܚܫܒܝܢ : ܗܟܢܐ ܘܟܕ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ

A flor. I for lines 320-321 and 330-332 flor. II up to l. 329 and from l. 338 on

Line 325: ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ, flor. II: ܬܐܕܘܣܝܘܣ.
Line 328: ܡܘܕܝܢ, flor. II: ܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ.
Line 330: ܗܟܢܐ, flor. I add. ܗܠܝܢ.
Lines 330-331: ܡܢܢ ܐܬܐܡܪ, flor. I: ܐܬܐܡܪ ܡܢܢ
Line 331: ܠܬܚܘܝܬܐ, flor. I: ܠܡܬܚܘܝܘܬܐ ܗܘܬ.
Line 332: ܘܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ, flor. I: ܘܡܫܒܚܝܢ.
Line 342: ܚܫܒܝܢ, flor. II: ܚܫܒܝܢ ܚܢܢ.

properties' we are thinking that the characteristic properties must be the same as the hypostases. How, then, according to these rules, by your calling God in one substance and nature and not reckoning God as one thing and the substance and nature as another, will you not be compelled of necessity to define the substance and nature as the same as its characteristic properties? But in another way, on what principle in your self-deception, do you not pay attention to what is being said, and especially when you have so much surpassed (as you believe) everybody of this generation, in keenness of intellect? Or do you not realise that the consequence of your spurious assertions must be that all the things existing in men (to say nothing now about other things) and which are spoken of as belonging with men and to men, will be the same as the men? For if it is true to say of men too, that each prosopon exists in true hypostasis and is the same as the hypostasis, evidently everything existing in men or belonging with men or to men, will be the same as the men, if (as you argue) the characteristic properties of the hypostases are the same as the hypostases because when Basil the Great said each prosopon exists in true hypostasis we understood prosopon as the same as hypostasis. But, if this is true, we must be the same not only as the accidents in us but also as all the things which are said to belong with us and to us from outside. But the wise listener will judge if this is not beyond any sort of impious absurdity and witlessness whatever. Perhaps, ashamed at the absurdities you are forced to infer, you will say we ought not to apply these reasonings to created things. In that case, clearly repudiate, too, calling the characteristic properties of hypostases, 'hypostases', in the case of created things, and then you will

**303** cf. supra, 293 **314/315** et **319** cf. supra, 278



ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܗܟܢ ܟܕ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܪܘܣ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܗܘܢ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܩܢܘܢܐ : ܟܕ ܒܚܕܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܒܚܕܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ : ܘܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ : ܘܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܟܝܢܐ ܚܫܒ ܐܢܬ : ܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܕܗܟܢ ܟܕ ܗܟܢ ܬܬܐܠܨ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܬܬܚܡ. ܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܒܐܝܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܟܕ ܡܛܠܥܐ ܐܢܬ ܒܢܦܫܟ ܠܐ ܡܬܒܝܢ ܐܢܬ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ : ܘܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܟܠܗ ܒܚܪܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ ܐܢܬ : ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܒ̈ܢܝ ܕܪܐ ܗܢܐ ܥܒܪܬ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܐܢܬ ܕܢܦܩܐ ܠܟ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܪܘܣ ܟܕ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܟܕܒܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܬܗܘܐ : ܘܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܠܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܫܐ ܕܡܠܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܡܪ : ܘܕܠܘܬ ܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܘܕܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ : ܗܟܢ ܟܕ ܗܟܢ ܠܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܘܥܠ ܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܕܟܠ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܒܩܢܘܡܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܘܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܒܝܕܥܐ ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܒܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܐܘ ܠܘܬ ܒ̈ܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܘ ܕܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ : ܗܟܢ ܟܕ ܗܟܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܠܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܡܪܐ ܕܡܟܢܬ ܐܢܬ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܗܟܢ ܟܕ ܗܟܢ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܪܒܐ : ܕܟܠ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܒܩܢܘܡܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ : ܗܟܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܪܘܣ ܗܟܢ ܟܕ ܗܟܢ : ܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܓܕ̈ܫܐ ܕܒܢ : ܐܠܐ ܘܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ : ܠܘܬܢ ܘܕܝܠܢ ܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܡܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܥܕܡܐ ܐܫܬܪܝܘܬܐ ܪܫܝܥܬܐ ܘܣܟܠܘܬ ܗܕܐ ܠܐ ܗܘܝܐ : ܥܡܝܩܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܢܕܘܢ. ܘܡܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܒܗܬ ܐܢܬ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܥܕܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܨܐ ܐܢܬ ܡܬܟܒ̈ܢ ܠܝ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܬ : ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܥܠ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܚܘܝܐ ܢܩܫ.

A flor. II up to l. 350, and from l. 358 to l. 369

Line 364: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ, flor. II: ܒܣܝܠܘܣ.

plainly * recognize that it is unsafe to think in this way of the Holy Trinity. For all the God-clad doctors when giving teaching about the characteristic properties of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity used the human condition to illustrate it. However, we will investigate your other statement, my admirable fellow. For you said, as previously set down, the following also, about the same Theologian: And again, in a later passage he called the Son's generation a hypostasis, thus: 'But if you do not investigate, whether we should speak of the Son's generation or hypostasis or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense than these.' Whence, admirable sir, can you prove from this that the doctor here thought of generacy as a hypostasis? Indeed, rather, how will you not be again invoking support for the truth against yourself? Is it not clear from this that the Theologian (who did not presume like you) warned us by these words not to investigate how the Son is begotten of the Father? For had the doctor not been speaking about not investigating how we ought to say that the Son is, exists, shines forth, dawns or has his natural being from the Father by generation (for we find these expressions used variously by the doctor) he would not have added, after speaking of generation and hypostasis: or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense than these. For he could not, in discoursing particularly about the Only-begotten Son and God the Word from God the Father (or, rather, of the things said about him), possibly have had occasion to say or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense than these. For no Christian thinking man can ever dare imagine anything fuller in sense than God the Word, or reckon his

**335/338** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* **336/338** cf. infra, 359-361 **348/349** cf. supra, 337-338



ܡܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ܂ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܕܥܢ̈ܝܬܐ ܡܘܕܥܢ̈ܝܬܐ
f. 74va ܥܠ ܒܢ̈ܝܢܫܐ܆ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܦܠܓܐ܂ ܘܗܫܐ ܢܒܨܐ ܐܚܪܢܝܬ * ܢܒܥ
ܐܢܬ܂ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܥܠ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܬܐ܆ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܗܘܢܐ
ܬܪܝܨܐ ܐܬܚܙܝ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܘ܂ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ
ܠܒܫ̈ܝ ܐܠܗܐ܆ ܟܕ ܥܠ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܕܥܢ̈ܝܬܐ
ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܡܠܦܝܢ܆ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬܢ
ܢܗܘܐ܂ ܐܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܠܟ ܐܘ ܬܡܝܗܐ ܢܒܨܐ܂
ܐܡܪܬ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡܐ ܣܝܡܐ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܕܡܡܠܠ
— ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ✧ ܘܬܘܒ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
← ܕܒܪܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܩܪܐ ܗܟܢܐ܆ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܥܩܒ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ
← ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܙܕܩ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ܆ ܐܘ ܐܢ ܡܕܡ
← ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܟܚ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܥܠܝ ܐܢܫ ✧ ܘܡܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܡܢ
ܗܠܝܢ ܐܢܬ ܠܝ ܕܬܚܘܐ ܐܘ ܡܚܘܐ܆ ܕܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ
ܒܗܠܝܢ ܐܣܬܒܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ܂ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ
ܕܗܘܬ ܥܠ ܫܪܪܐ ܬܬܥܫܢ ܬܘܒ ܠܟ܂ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܓܠܝܐ܆
ܕܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܝܠܝܕ ܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ܆ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܒ̈ܩܠܐ
ܐܙܗܪ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ܆ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܒ ܐܝܟܘܬܟ܂ ܐܢ
ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܢܒܨܐ܆ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܙܕܩ
ܠܡܐܡܪ ܟܕ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ܆ ܐܘ ܕܡܬܚܙܐ ܐܘ
ܕܡܕܢܚ ܐܘ ܕܕܢܚ ܐܘ ܕܟܝܢ܆ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ
ܡܫܚܠܦܐܝܬ ܐܬܐܡܪ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ܆ ܐܬܬܘܣܦ ܗܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ
ܠܡܠܦܢܐ܆ ܠܘ ܟܕ ܡܛܠ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪ܆ [illegible]
ܗܘܐ܆ ܕܐܘ ܐܢ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܟܚ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܥܠܝ
ܐܢܫ܂ ܐܦܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܒܕܝܠܝܬ ܕܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܒܪܐ
ܘܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܒܐ܆ ܘܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܟܠܗ̇ ܡܛܠ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܡܫܬܥܐ ܗܘܐ܆ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ
ܠܗ ܐܬܪܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ܆ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܘ ܐܢ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܟܚ
ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܥܠܝ ܐܢܫ܂ ܘܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܡ ܕܡܫܟܚ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ
ܡܠܬܐ ܡܫܝܚܝܐ ܡܬܘܡ ܕܡܬܪܥܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܢܬܗܘܠܠ܆ ܡܢ

A

Line 383: ܠܡܐܡܪ, cf. infra, line 409 (ܕܠܡܐܡܪ) and note. ܐܘ ܐܢ, cf. infra, line 409 (ܐܘ) and note.

hypostasis not one reality but various realities so as to say fittingly of it than these and fuller in sense.

But for elucidation and confirmation of what is said it will be useful to listen in full to the Theologian's words, which are as follows: But if * you do not investigate, whether we should speak of the Son's generation or hypostasis or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense than these (for what is to be thought and said overcomes my tongue), do not investigate the procession of the Spirit either. It will be enough for me that I hear 'the Son' and 'from the Father' and that whatever the Father is yet the Son is and nothing beyond this will I investigate, lest the same thing happen to me as to words which, on being shouted frequently, fall utterly away, or as to a gaze extended towards the Sun's ray; for the more accurately a man seeks to see, the more will he be damaged in his perception, and will be deprived of the faculty of seeing because what is seen overcomes the gaze by its abundance, if it desires to see all and not in so far as it is safe. You hear of generation; do not investigate how! You hear of the Spirit who proceeds from the Father; do not investigate how! But if you do investigate the Son's generation and the Spirit's procession, I too will investigate the coupling of your soul and your body.

My admirable fellow, you observe that the doctor testifies to not investigating how the Son exists from the Father by generation: But if you do not investigate, whether we should speak of the Son's

356 cf. supra, 349 **359/374** Greg. Naz., *Or. 20*, 10-11 (*PG* 35, 1077AC; *SChr.*, vol. 270, pp. 78-80) **377/378** cf. supra, 359-360



ܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ. ܘܠܐ ܕܠܝܬ ܦܘܡܗ ܠܗ
ܚܕ ܦܘܫܩܢܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܢܣܒ : ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܕܢܬܡܠܠ ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܝܬܝܪ ܡܐܙܢ ܦܠܐܬܐ
ܢܐܡܪ.

ܠܢܘܗܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܫܘܪܪܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ : ܡܥܕܪܢܐ ܗܘ
ܘܕܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇ ܠܟܠܗ̇ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ
< ܢܫܡܥ : ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̇ܢܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܀ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ * ܡܥܩܒ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ f. 74vb
< ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܘ ܡܕܡ
< ܐܚܪܝܢ ܕܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܫܡܠܝ ܐܝܬ : ܐܦܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܠܫܢܝ ܗܘ
< ܡܟܐ ܕܡܬܗܘܐ ܘܡܬܐܡܪ : ܘܠܐ ܢܦܩܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ
< ܬܒܥ. ܣܦܩܐ ܠܝ ܕܐܫܡܥ ܕܒܪܐ. ܘܕܡܢ ܐܒܐ. ܘܕܗܘ ܡ̇ܢ
< ܐܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܪܐ. ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܒܪ ܡ̇ܢ ܗܕܐ ܡܥܩܒ
< ܐܢܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗ̤ܝ ܒܗ ܗ̤ܝ ܬܓܕܫܢܝ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܡ̈ܠܬܐ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܒܗ̇، ܕܡܩܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܬܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܠܓܡܪ ܢܦܠܝܢ : ܐܘ ܠܚܝܪܐ
< ܕܡܬܡܬܚ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܙܠܝܩܐ ܕܫܡܫܐ. ܟܡܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܝܬܝܪ
< ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܒ̇ܥܐ ܐܢܫ ܕܢܚܙܐ : ܗܢܐ ܟܠܗ ܡܬܚܒܠ
< ܒܪܓܫܬܐ. ܘܡܢ ܗ̇، ܕܐܝܟ ܕܗ̤ܘ ܢܚܙܐ ܡܬܓܠܙ : ܒܗ̇،
< ܕܡܣܬܟܠܢܘܬܐ ܙܟܐ ܠܚܙܝܐ ܗܘ̇ ܡܟܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ : ܐܢ
< ܢܪܓܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܢܚܙܐ : ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܟܐ ܕܙܗܝܪܐ ܢܚܙܐ. ܫܡܥ
< ܐܢܬ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢ ܠܐ ܬܒܥܐ. ܫܡܥ ܐܢܬ ܪܘܚܐ
< ܕܢܦܩ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢ ܠܐ ܬܒܥܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܥܩܒ ܐܢܬ
< ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܘܢܦܩܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ : ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܡܥܩܒ
< ܐܢܐ ܡܙܘܓܐ ܕܢܦܫܟ ܘܕܦܓܪܟ ܀

ܡܬܕܡܐ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܬܡܝܗܐ : ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܐ ܢܥܩܒ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ
ܒܪܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܒܝܕ ܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܣܗܕ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܀
< ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܥܩܒ ܐܢܬ ܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܙܕܩ

A

Line 409: ܕܢܐܡܪ (as infra, lines 428 and 457), cf. supra, line 383 (ܠܡܐܡܪ). ܐܘ[2] (as infra, line 457), cf. supra, line 383 (ܐܘ ܐܢ).
Line 421: ܕܐܝܟܢ, cf. infra, line 432 (ܕܐܝܟܢܐ).

generation or hypostasis. That is: if you do not investigate how he exists generately, neither are you to investigate the Spirit's procession i.e. neither are you to investigate how the Spirit exists proceedingly. Notice how he puts the point more clearly when he gives the teaching: You hear of generation; do not investigate how! You hear of the Spirit who proceeds from the Father; do not investigate how! But if you do investigate the Son's generation and the Spirit's procession, I too will investigate the coupling of your soul and your body.

He says similar things in the *First Oration on the Son*: How, then, was he begotten? It would have been no great generation had it been comprehended by you, you who do not even know your own generation. And again: Let God's generation be honoured with silence. It is a great thing for you to learn that he was begotten, but how, not even the angels are able to conceive of, not to mention our granting that you might understand. You want me to show you how? As knows ......

* ...... My good fellow, you hear the divinely inspired father proclaim: The one who has a different fleshly generation has also a different spiritual generation. How, then, if we think of generation as a hypostasis, shall we not be giving the Son both a fleshly hypostasis and also another spiritual one? How, indeed, can we make a transition to the very next passage? For having taken up to start with the Son's generation he later passed on to discuss the Father and said: Or rather, the one whose existence is not the same has also a different generation. Is it not because not only the generation of him

**382/385** cf. supra, 370-374 **386/389** Greg. Naz., *Or. 29*, 8 (*PG 36*, 84A; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 190) **389/392** Ibid. (*PG* 36, 84C; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 192) **394/395** Greg. Naz., *Or. 29*, 4 (*PG* 36, 77D - 80A; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 184) **400/401** Ibid. (*PG* 36, 80A; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 184)



< ܕܢܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܡܘܠܕܐ ܀ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܐ ܡܥܩܒ ܐܢܬ
ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܘܠܕܢܐܝܬ : ܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ
ܬܒܥܐ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܢܦܩܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ,
ܪܘܚܐ ܬܒܥܐ. ܘܚܙܝ, ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܗ̇, ܕܐܡܪܐ
< ܟܕ ܪܙܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܫܡܥ ܐܢܬ ܠܡ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ
< ܬܒܥܐ. ܫܡܥ ܐܢܬ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܢܦܩ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ
< ܬܒܥܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܥܩܒ ܐܢܬ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܘܠܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ
< ܕܪܘܚܐ : ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܡܥܩܒ ܐܢܐ ܡܙܘܓܝܐ ܕܢܦܫܟ
< ܘܕܦܓܪܟ ܀

ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܘܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܥܠ ܒܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܀
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܠܐ ܪܒܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܐܢ
< ܡܢܟ ܡܬܕܪܟܐ ܗܘܬ : ܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܟ ܕܝܠܟ
< ܝܕܥ ܐܢܬ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܒܫܬܩܐ ܬܬܝܩܪ.
< ܪܒܐ ܗ̇, ܠܟ ܕܬܐܠܦ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ. ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ : ܘܠܐ
< ܠܡܠܐܟܐ ܕܢܣܬܟܠܘܢ : ܠܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܠܟ ܬܣܬܟܠ
< ܫܡܥܝܢ. ܨܒܐ ܐܢܬ ܐܚܘܐ ܠܟ ܐܝܟܢ : ܐܝܟ ܕܝܕܥ ......

* ...... ܫܡܥ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܛܒܐ : ܠܗܢܐ ܐܒܐ ܢܦܝܚ ܡܢ flor. II, f. 154vb
< ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܟܪܙ : ܕܠܗܘ ܕܡܫܚܠܦܐ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܣܪ :
< ܠܗܢܐ ܘܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܪܘܚܢܝܬܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܟܕ
ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ : ܠܘ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܗ̇ܘ
ܕܒܣܪܐ : ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܪܘܚܢܝܐ ܝܗܒܝܢ ܠܒܪܐ. ܒܐܝܢܐ
ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܢܫܟܚ ܠܡܥܒܪܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܬܬܩܦܬ. ܟܕ
ܒܪ ܡܛܠ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܢܣܒ : ܠܚܪܬܐ ܠܘܬ
< ܐܒܐ ܐܥܒܪܗ̇ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܘܐܡܪ : ܡܠܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܗ̇ܘ,
< ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܠܝܬܘܗ̇ ܗ̣ܝ, ܗܘ ܗ̣ܝ : ܠܗܢܐ ܘܗ̇ܝ, ܕܐܟܠ

A up to l. 443 flor. II from l. 444 on

Line 428: ܕܢܐܡܪ, cf. supra, line 409 and note.

Line 432: ܕܐܝܟܢܐ, cf. supra, line 421 (ܕܐܝܟܢ).

Lines 444-493: ܫܡܥ ܐܢܬ ..... ܘܗܟܢܐ: This passage in flor. II is headed: ܬܘܒ ܡܢ ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܬܥܣܪ ܕܠܗܘ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ. *Again, from chapter fifteen of the same book.*

who was begotten but also that of him who begat can be, and be spoken of, in certain different senses? For after alluding perhaps to this he said: But if you do not investigate, whether we should speak of the Son's generation or hypostasis or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense than these. For knowing, as has been said, that the Father's generation too is spoken of he is also careful that total accuracy should rebut what has been said; and he says: whether we should speak of the Son's generation or hypostasis or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense than these – * as light, it may be, or radiance or as substantial, or something fuller in sense than these. Observe him explaining in the words set down that it is the Father's generation also which is being spoken of, for he says: But they are different things, I think: willing and will, generating and generation, speaking and speech – unless we are drunk. The former are the moving, the latter as it were the motion itself. So what is willed is not the will's (for that by no means follows!) nor is the generated the generation's, nor the heard the expression's; but they are the willer's, the begetter's and the speaker's.

God-clad Basil, also, makes this clear by writing as follows in the discourse he composed on *In the beginning was the Word*: So he said 'Word' in order to disclose to you the Father's impassible generation, to give you a full theology of the Son's being, and to show you thereby the non-temporal connexion of Father and Son.

**404/406** et **408/410** cf. supra, 359-361 **411** cf. supra, 410 **413/419** Greg. Naz., *Or. 29*, 6 (*PG* 36, 81B; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 188) **421** Ioh. 1:1 **421/424** Bas. Caes., *In illud : In principio erat Verbum*, 3 (*PG* 31, 477C)



< ܡܫܠܡܐ. ܐܝܟ ܠܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܗܘ̇
ܕܐܬܝܠܕ : ܐܠܐ ܘܕܗܘ̇ ܕܐܘܠܕ : ܒܣܘܟܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܕܬܗܘܐ ܘܬܬܐܡܪ ܡܫܟܚܐ : ܘܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܟܢ ܟܒܪ ܪܡ̇ܙ
< ܐܡ̇ܪ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܥܩܒ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ
< ܙܕܩ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪ ܡܢ
< ܗܠܝܢ ܡܫܡܠܝ ܐܝܬ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܝܕܥ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ :
ܕܐܦ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ : ܘܙܗܝܪ ܕܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ
< ܕܒܟܠܡܕܡ : ܬܗܦܘܟ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ ܟܕ ܐܡ̇ܪ : ܐܘ ܐܢ
< ܐܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܐܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢ
< ܕܡܬܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܫܡܠܝ ܐܝܬ : *ܕܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܢ ܬܓܠܐ : ܐܘ
ܙܠܝܩܐ : ܐܘ ܐܘܣܝܐܬܐ : ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܬܘܒ
ܕܡܬܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ. ܕܐܦ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ :
< ܫܡܥܘܗܝ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܣܝܡܢ ܠܗܕܐ ܡܦܫܩ. ܐܡ̇ܪ ܓܝܪ ܀ ܐܠܐ
< ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܨܒܐ ܘܨܒܝܢܐ : ܘܡܘܠܕ
< ܘܝܠܕܘܬܐ. ܐܡ̇ܪ ܘܡܠܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܪܘܝܢ. ܗܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ
< ܕܡܬܬܙܝܥ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܗܝ، ܡܬܬܙܝܥܢܘܬܐ. ܠܐ
< ܡܟܝܠ ܕܨܒܝܢܐ. ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܨܛܒܝ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܩܦܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܡ :
< ܘܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܕܝܠܕܘܬܐ. ܘܠܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܫܬܡܥ ܕܒܪܬ
< ܩܠܐ. ܐܠܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܨܒܐ ܘܕܝܠܕ ܘܕܐܡ̇ܪ ܀

ܐܦ ܕܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܡܚܘܐ ܘܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ : ܟܕ
ܗܟܢܐ ܟܬ̇ܒ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܐܬܬܣܝܡ ܡܢܗ : ܥܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܪܫܝܬ
< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗ̇ܘܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܀ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܘ̣ ܡܛܠ ܐܡ̇ܪ : ܕܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
< ܕܠܐ ܚܫܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܢܚܘܐ ܠܟ : ܘܬܐܘܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ
< ܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ܢܬܠ ܠܟ : ܘܠܡܩܦܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܙܒܢ ܕܒܪܐ
< ܕܢܚܘܐ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܒܗ ܗܠܝܢ ܚܘܝܐ ܀

flor. I from l. 474 on flor. II

Line 457: ܕܢܐܡܪ, cf. supra, line 409 and note. ܐܘ², cf. supra, line 409 and note.

Line 474: ܕܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ, flor. I: ܕܝܠܕܘܬܐ.

Line 475: ܘܬܐܘܠܝܬܐ, flor. I: ܘܬܐܘܠܐ.

Line 476: ܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ܢܬܠ ܠܟ, flor. I: ܬܚܘܐ ܠܟ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܬܐ.

Line 477: ܕܢܚܘܐ, flor. I: ܬܚܘܐ.

What are we to say to these people when they um-and-ah pompously, raise their eyebrows and assert that ingeneracy and generacy are hypostases? Are they not ashamed of being compelled to ascribe to the Father ingeneracy as a single proper and unshared hypostasis and generation as another, so to say, common hypostasis of Father and Son, or do they deign to think the Father's generation one thing and that of the Son another thing? In that case, there would be two hypostases of the Father (unless they also define ingeneracy as being generation) and one of the Son. But were they to call ingeneracy 'generation', the right would be conferred on them of calling the generation of the Son 'ingeneracy', of calling the Father 'Son' and the Son 'Father' and all would be muddled and confused. Sabellius would win and would rule in the triumphs of this new, powerful writer who champions him and hastens like a soldier to take us prisoner at every turn of the argument......

* ...... For how, when they look at the words of the doctors now set down here with honesty and without obfuscation, will they not be persuaded that generation is not a hypostasis? The Father's generation is spoken of in the sense that he begat and was not begotten; the Son's in the sense that he was begotten and did not beget......

* ...... and generacy they define as hypostases him who begat and him who was begotten i.e. those who have ingeneracy and generacy, not at all as hypostases but rather as substances or nothing at all – which they frequently endeavour to think. Because, as



ܡܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ܆ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܟܕ ܫܢܬܐܝܬ
ܡܓܒܓܒܝܢ ܡܪܝܡܝܢ ܓܒܝܢܐ܆ ܘܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܥܪܪܝܢ. ܐܪܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܟܚܡܝܢ܆ ܟܕ ܚܕ
ܗ̇ܝ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܚܠܦܘܗܝ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܘܬܦܐ ܠܐܒܐ
ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܢܬܠܘܢ ܠܐܒܐ ܡܬܐܠܨܝܢ܆ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ
ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܓܘܢܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܢܕܘܢ܆ ܐܘ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ܆ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ
ܕܒܪܐ ܕܢܬܪܥܘܢ ܡܥܒܝܢ. ܗܝܕܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ
ܕܐܒܐ܆ ܐܢܗܘ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܬܚܘܡ ܠܗ̇ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܕܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܢܬܚܡܘܢ܆ ܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܪܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ
ܘܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ܆ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܡܛܐ
ܠܗܘܢ܆ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ܆
ܘܠܐܒܐ ܒܪܐ܆ ܘܬܗܒ ܠܒܪܐ ܐܒܐ܆ ܘܢܬܒܠܒܠ ܒܠܒܘܠܝܐ܆
ܘܢܬܥܫܢ. ܘܢܙܟܐ ܣܒܠܝܘܣ ܘܢܡܠܟ ܒܙܟܘ̈ܬܐ܆ ܕܗܢܐ
ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܘܚܝܠܬܢܐ ܕܣܥܘܪܗ̇ܝ ܡܬܚܬܫ܆ ܟܕ ܟܠ
ܗܢܐ ܘܒܕܘܟܬ ܡܬܦܢܝܢܐ ܪܗܛ ܘܫܒܐ܀ ......

...... * ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܚܘܪܝܢ܆ ܠܘܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ W, f. 28rb
ܕܗܪܟܐ ܐܬܬܣܝܡܘ܆ ܒܬܪܝܨܘܬ ܪܥܝܢܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܒܥܪܦܠܐ
ܡܬܛܦܝܣܝܢ܆ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܠܡܢܘܬ ܡܬܦܝܣܝܢ܆ ܕܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܐ
ܗܝ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܩܢܘܡܐ܆ ܐܠܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܡܢ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ
ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܐܘܠܕ ܘܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ܆ ܕܒܪܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢ
ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܘܠܐ ܐܘܠܕ. ......

* ...... ܘܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܚܡܝܢ܆ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܘܠܕ ܘܠܗ̇ܘ A, f. 76ra
ܕܐܬܝܠܕ܆ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ܆ ܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ܆ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܘܢ܆
ܐܘ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܟܠ ܟܠܗ܆ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܣ̈ܓܝܐܬܐ ܚܦܝܛܝܢ ܢܣܒܪܘܢ.

A from l. 500 on flor. I from l. 494 to l. 499 flor. II up to l. 493

Lines 494-499: ܐܘܠܕ ..... ܐܝܟܢܐ: This passage in flor. I is headed: ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܕܐܢܛܝܘܟܝܐ܆ ܡܢ ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܚܡܫܬܥܣܪ܆ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܡܝܢܐ. *Of Saint Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, from chapter fifteen of the third book against Damian.*

everybody knows, he who begat and he who was begotten (i.e. those who have ingeneracy and generacy) are neither natural properties, nor again (as has been proved already by the fathers' words set down) are they ingeneracy and generacy. For we clearly heard the doctor proclaim that he who begat and he who was begotten are the same as those who have ingeneracy and generacy, whereas ingeneracy and generacy are not the same thing. But those who profess ingeneracy and generacy as hypostases accordingly deny their identity in nature. Because he who begat and he who was begotten (i.e. who have ingeneracy and generacy) are the same in nature; whereas the teacher of truth defined ingeneracy and generacy as not the same thing. Clearly in addition to the Libyan's godlessness there will accrue to them as well impious Eunomius' curtailment and division of the Godhead and the establishment of heathen polytheism.

But, perhaps, to establish their own follies, and attack the fathers' teaching, they will say that if ingeneracy and generacy are not the same thing in nature, the properties will be different in substance. Whom we answer: Clever sirs, your battle is not against us here but, clearly, with the Theologian, who plainly said that he who begat and he who was begotten (i.e. those who have ingeneracy and generacy) are the same, whereas ingeneracy and generacy are not the same thing. But otherwise, too, it has escaped their clever selves that things viewed externally in the substance and the hypostases are not called mutually consubstantial or different in substance. The hypostases themselves, indeed, and not the things viewed as with the hypostases, are consubstantial or different in substance. For how can things which do not in any way

**454/456, 458/461** et **470/472** cf. Greg. Naz., *Or. 29*, 10 (*PG* 36, 85D - 88B; *SChr.*, vol. 250, pp. 196-198); cf. supra, ch. 8, 479-487



ܡܛܠ ܕܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܟܠܢ : ܘܠܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܐ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܝܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܗܘܬ ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܚܕ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܩ̈ܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܫܝܩܢ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܠܐ ܠܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܗܘ ܕܐܘܠܕ ܘܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ : ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܫܡܥܢ ܓܝܪ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܠܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܐܡܪ : ܕܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܠܕ ܘܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ : ܘܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ. ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܠܘ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܗܝ : ܒܦܢܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܫܘܐܝܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܡܘܕܝܢܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܘܒܗ̇ ܕܗܝ ܚܕ ܗܝ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܒܟܝܢܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܘܠܕ ܘܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ : ܘܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܒܟܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ : ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܠܘ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܗܝ, ܡܠܦܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܬܚܡ. ܘܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܐܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܥܡ ܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܒܝܐ : ܘܦܣܩܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܦܠܓܐ ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܪܫܝܥܐ : ܘܣܘܡܐ ܕܣܓܝܐܘܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܢܦܝܬܐ.

ܐܠܐ ܟܒܪ ܚܕ ܠܫܛܝܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܡܩܝܡܝܢ : ܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܘ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܗܝ ܠܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܟܝܢܐ : ܐܚܪܢܝܬ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܗܘܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ. ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ : ܕܡܬܦܪܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܐܘ ܚ̈ܟܝܡܐ : ܕܠܘ ܠܘܬܢ ܡܠܘܢ ܒܗܕܐ : ܐܠܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܠܟܘܢ ܦܘܪܟܐ : ܗܘ ܕܦܫܝܩܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ : ܕܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܒܟܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܠܕ ܘܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ : ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܗܝ ܚܕ ܗܝ, ܠܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܘܛܥܬ ܠܚܟܝܡܘܬܗܘܢ : ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܟܠ ܡܕܡ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܥܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܥܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܫ̈ܘܝܬ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܐܚܪܢܝܬ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܢ. ܗܢܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ : ܘܠܘ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ : ܐܘ ܫ̈ܘܝܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܓܡܪ ܠܐ

A

participate in the substance * or cannot ever be substance, be mutually consubstantial or different in substance? 'But ingeneracy and generacy participate in the substance and therefore are substance too', he may say. Very good. Let these admirable fellows prove only this, then, from the Church's theologians and doctors, and we will give up the battle with them without delay, and we shall offer them many thanks for setting us right! However, if they cannot prove it, everybody is to recognize that the whole business of these new-fangled authors is nothing but deception.



ܡܫ̈ܘܬܦܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ : * ܐܘ ܕܢܗ̈ܘܘܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܬܘܡ f. 76rb
ܡܥܒܕܝܢ : ܫ̈ܘܝܘܬ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘ ܐܚܪܢܝܘܬ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܚ̈ܕܕܐ
ܢܐܡܪ. ܐܠܐ ܡܫ̈ܘܬܦܢ ܠܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܘܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܐܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܛܒ
ܫܦܝܪ. ܗܕܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܠܚܘܕ : ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܡܡ̈ܠܠܝ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܢܚܘܘܢ ܗ̈ܢܘܢ ܬܡܝ̈ܗܐ : ܘܕܠܐ ܬܘܗܝܐ
ܩܪܒܐ ܕܠܘܬܗܘܢ ܢܫܪܐ : ܘܩܘܒܠ ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬܐ
ܕܬܪܨܢ ܢܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܗܕܐ ܢܚܘܘܢ ܠܐ
ܡܥܒܕܝܢ : ܢܕܥ ܟܠܢܫ : ܕܟܠܗ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܐܠܐ ܠܛܥܝܘܬܐ :
ܟܘܠܗ ܬܐܓܘܪܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܚ̈ܕܬܟܬܒܐ ܣ̈ܦܪܐ.

A

# Chapter 16

*Concerning the fact that in attempting to prove by texts he quotes from Saints Amphilochius, Damasus and John of Jerusalem that the characteristic properties of the hypostases are hypostases, he shows himself plainly to be falsifying truth and incapable of disclosing any valid defence at all for his absurd doctrines from what the doctors said. For, by simply denominating the hypostases 'properties', they did not at the same time define them as being ingeneracy, generacy and procession.*

It is time, in addition to this, to proceed to the subsequent words by this clever author. He wrote, then, straight after commentary and a 'clarification' of the Theologian's words, as follows: Hence wise Amphilochius, roused, yet, rather, instructed by, the Holy Ghost, gives, in the third book *On the Holy Ghost*, a tradition similar to the foregoing and accompanies it with a statement to the effect that the terms 'hypostases' and 'properties' indicate the same things; which passage I also set down in the discourse. He said the following: 'But we do not call those three hypostases and three properties "substances" or "natures", nor "three powers", for the three hypostases have one substance and nature and the three properties have one power'. Thus the father! But if someone were to say that the terms are not set down in direct connection, let him distinguish their different meanings and tell us what the statement then amounts to. For we cannot now speak on these points in detail, but shall simply set down the

13/35 Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* (hucusque incognitum), 3 18/21 Amphil. Icon., *De Spir. Sancto*

## ܦܘܠܓܐ ܕܐܬܬܥܕܪ.

ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܒܥܐ ܒܝܕ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܡܝܬܐ ܐܡܦܝܠܘܟܝܘܣ ܘܕܡܣܘܣ ܘܝܘܚܢܢ ܕܐܘܪܫܠܡ : ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ ܕܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܘܡܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ : ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܕܠܫܪܪܐ ܒܙܥ : ܘܠܐ ܡܨܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܫܠܝܡ ܠܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܕܣܟ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܥܡܝ̈ܪܐ : ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝ̈ܪܢ ܠܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ. ܠܘ ܒܚܕ ܒܗܿ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܦܣܩܐܝܬ ܥܡܗܘܢ ܠܡܢܝ̈ܢܐ : ܗܐ ܡܢ ܚܕܐ ܚܕܐ ܡܢܗܝܢ : ܘܕܠܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܬܚܘܡܐ ܀

ܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘ ܒܬܪ ܗܠܝܢ : ܘܠܡܐܬܐ ܥܠ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܡܠܐ ܡܚܟܡܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܗܢܐ. ܟܬܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܚܕܐ : ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܡܬܬܪܓܡܢܘܬܐ ܘܦܘܫܩܐ ܠܡ ܕܒܝܕ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܡܬܟܠܠܬ — ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܒܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܒܕ ܐܬܬܥܝܪ — ܐܡܦܝܠܘܟܝܘܣ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܬܠܦ : — ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠܬܗ ܕܠܘܬ ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܗܠܝܢ — ܕܕܡ̈ܝܢ ܠܐܠܝܢ ܕܩܕ̈ܡܝܢ ܡܫܠܡ ܡܫܠܡ ܘܡܠܘܐܝܬ ܦܣܩܐ : — ܐܝܟ ܕܡ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܕ ܗܘ ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ — ܘܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܣܡܬ. ܐܡܪ ܕܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܀ ← ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܬܠܬ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ : ܠܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ← ܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܐܘ ܟܝ̈ܢܐ. ܘܠܐ ܬܠܬ ܚ̈ܝܠܘܬܐ. ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܓܝܪ ← ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܟܝܢܐ ܚܕ. ܘܕܬܠܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܚܕ ← ܚܝܠܬܐ ܀ ܗܟܢ ܐܒܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܫ ܢܐܡܪ : ܕܠܘ — ܒܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܣܝ̈ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܢܐܡܪ ܘܢܦܪܘܫ ܫܘܚܠܦ ܣܘ̈ܟܠܝܗܘܢ — ܡܫܚܠܦܐ : ܘܢܐܡܪ ܕܠܐܝܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܦܪܥܐ. ܗܫܐ ܓܝܪ — ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ : ܕܢܡܠܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܣܘܥܪܢܐܝܬ ܢܐܡܪ. ܟܠܗ̇ ܕܝܢ

A

Line 25: ܡܫܟܚܝܢ, cf. infra, line 98 (ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܐ). ܢܐܡܪ, cf. infra, line 99 (ܐܡܪ).

fathers' words. For holy Damasus too, * bishop of Rome, in his *Third Oration against the Arians* pronounced a blessing on those who think of the properties of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, as three subsisting prosopa, saying as follows: 'Blessed is he who confesses one Godhead and that all the Godhead's fullness belongs to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Blessed is he who confesses that the properties of the names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are three subsisting prosopa'. Therefore it is not only hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose that the properties of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are not three subsisting prosopa, but it is also foreign to the foregoing blessing.

And how can anyone, obliged to say the same things many times, not perhaps seem to some people to be talking too much? But what else is one to say, in answer to a person who repeats the same useless and inane nonsense, save what he has already said frequently? So now too we shall say the same things to this clever author (who is at great pains to stop his ears) and shall shout out the more, proclaiming loudly: 'My excellent fellow, we have no quarrel at all with those who term the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost "properties", but with you rather, who impiously make the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost nothing but names and ingeneracy, generacy and procession'. So why, as if you were unconsciously self-deceived and labouring vainly under doubt and uncertainty, do you make yourself wretched with so many circuitous arguments and repetitions, and why, like people who think in their dreams that they are enjoying pleasures and suddenly exchange the seeming pleasure for pain, do you pretend, whenever you find any sort of mention of the term 'properties' to

---

**28/32** Damas. p., *Or. 3 contra Arianos* (hucusque incognita); cf. supra, ch. 4, 490-492



ܕܠܒܪ ܩܠܐ ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܢܦܩ. ܘܕܡܣܘܣ ܓܝܪ ܩܕܝܫܐ
*ܐܦܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܪܗܘܡܐ: ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܪ̈ܝܢܘ A, f. 76va
ܝܗܒ ܛܘܒܐ: ܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ
ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܩ̈ܢܡܐ ܡܚܫܒܝܢ: ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ
ܐܡܪ: ܛܘܒܘܗܝ ܠܗܘ ܕܡܘܕܐ ܚܕܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ: ܘܕܟܠܗ
ܡܠܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ
ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܛܘܒܘܗܝ ܠܗܘ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ
ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܕܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
ܡܘܕܐ. ܡܟܝܠ ܠܘ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܐ ܙܗܝܪܬܐ: ܘܕܠܐ ܠܫܘܝܐ
ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗܝ، ܕܢܣܒܪ: ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ
ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܝܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܘܠܛܘܒܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܗܘܐ ܢܘܟܪܝܬܐ ܀

ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܟܕ ܙܩܬܝܢ ܦܓ̈ܥܐ ܡܬܐܠܨ ܐܢܫ ܕܗܢܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ
ܢܐܡܪ: ܠܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܟܒܪ ܢܬܚܙܐ ܠܐܢܫܝܢ. ܘܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܚܪܢܐ
ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܕܠܗ ܟܕ ܠܗ ܠܦܘܩܐ ܣܪܝܩܐ ܘܫܪܝܪܐ ܡܟܪܟ
ܢܐܡܪ: ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܕܩܕܡܬܐ ܦܓ̈ܥܬܐ ܐܡܪ.
ܡܕܝܢ ܘܗܫܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ: ܕܒܡܫܬܠܛܢܐ
ܦܓܥܐ ܡܦܩܪ ܐܕ̈ܢܘܗܝ: ܗܒܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܒܝܢ ܢܐܡܪ: ܘܬܘܒܐܝܬ
ܢܩܥܐ ܟܕ ܙܥܩܐܝܬ ܡܟܪܙܝܢ. ܕܠܐ ܗܝܟ ܠܟ ܠܘܬ ܗܢܘܢ
ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ
ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܐܘ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ: ܐܠܐ ܠܘܬܟ ܡܟܠ: ܗܘ
ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ: ܐܠܐ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܘܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ: ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ
ܕܥܒܕܬ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܢܬ. ܠܡܢܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥ
ܐܢܬ ܡܛܠܥܐ ܐܢܬ ܒܢܦܫܟ: ܘܡܢ ܦܘܫܟܐ ܘܡܢ ܠܐ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ
ܒܟܠ ܐܢܬ ܡܬܢܟܐ ܐܢܬ: ܟܕ ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܣܘܪ̈ܚܢܐ ܘܡܦ̈ܢܝܬܐ
ܡܬܕܘܐ ܐܢܬ: ܘܐܝܟ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܒܚܠܡ ܦܓܥܬܐ ܕܒܣܝܡܬܐ
ܡܣܬܒܪܝܢ ܕܡܬܒܣܡܝܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܢܝܘܬܐ: ܘܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ ܒܚܫܐ
ܒܗܘܟܐ ܕܐܣܬܒܪܬ ܡܫܠܡܝܢ: ܐܡܬܝ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܗܘ ܬܫܟܚ

---

A

---

Line 28: In the margin of A: ΙΔΙΩΜΑΤΑ ܐܝܕܝ̈ܘܡܛܐ.
Line 32: In the margin of A: ΙΔΙΩΜΑΤΑ ܐܝܕܝ̈ܘܡܛܐ.

exult and make merry in defiance of truth? You make use of extraordinary (indeed, rather, puerile) leapings and dancings, as if you had defeated your opponents; and why do you write down your cry of triumph (but it is rather, the frigid expression of defeat) with all your usual bad manners, and say: It is hazardous * and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose it wrong to call the properties viewed in the common substance 'hypostases'? For how can you also prove from this just quoted testimony of Saint Amphilochius that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases? Is it because the hypostases are termed 'properties'? In that case, it is time you defined the characteristic properties of the substances as hypostases, because the hypostases and the natural and characteristic indications of the substance are also termed 'properties'. Who would be wrong to doze off, when trying to rebut such gibberish?

He says: Thus the father! But if someone were to say that the terms are not set down in direct connection, let him distinguish their different meanings and tell us what the statement then amounts to. For we cannot now speak on these points in detail, but shall simply set down the fathers' words. You see the force of the invincible arguments – indeed, rather, how impossible it is to oppose them and to attack them! But if someone were to say that the terms are not set down in direct connection, let him distinguish their different meanings and tell us what the statement then amounts to. My excellent friend, we shall answer you yet again: no orthodox man will ever argue with someone who terms the hypostases 'properties'. However, when you profess the hypostases as not simply 'properties' but as 'characteristic properties of the prosopa' (I mean as ingeneracy, generacy and procession), you should not utter the words in such a covert fashion, nor

**57/59** cf. supra, ch. 14, 158-160 **68/72** cf. supra, 21-25 **74/76** cf. supra, 68-70



ܕܐܡܪ̈ܢ ܥܡܟܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ: ܡܟܝܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܐܫܟܚܐ ܕܕܐ̈ܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܘܡܟܘܪ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܡܟܠ ܥܙܪܐ: ܘܡܥܘܪ̈ܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܠܬ̈ܟܫܬܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܠܠܩ̈ܘܡܬܐ ܘܕܩ̈ܝܐ ܡܬܝܚܕ ܐܝܬ: ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܗ̇ܘܢ ܕܠܡܟܠܝ ܡܬܟܬܫ ܐܢܬ: ܘܠܟܪܬ ܡܠܝ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܕܟܘܬܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܦܪ̈ܢܣܬܐ ܘܕܒܘܬܬܐ: ܒܡ ܟܠܗ̇ ܠܐ ܡܚܘܕܘܬ ܒܠ̈ܩܘܬܐ ܟܘܢ ܐܝܬ ܘܐܡܪܬ ܐܝܬ ܀ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܘܡܪܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܟܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܣܒܪ: ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ * ܕܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܒܗ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܟܘܢܐ ܡܬܚܙ̈ܝܢ ܢܩܪܐ f. 76vb
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܦܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܡܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܗܫܐ ܐܬܬܐܬ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܦܝܠܘܟܝܘܣ ܡܚܘܝܐ ܐܝܬ: ܕܠܐ ܐܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܐܪܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܫܬܡܗܘ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܡܕܝܢ ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘ ܠܟ: ܕܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܘܡܥܪ̈ܒܢܐ ܟܝ̈ܢܝܐ ܘܦܪ̈ܝܫܝܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ: ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܬܡܗܝܢ: ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܬܬܚܡ: ܘܠܡܢ ܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܘܡܢܘ ܠܐ ܢܘܡ ܟܕ ܐܢܬ ܒܗ ܡܢܗܐ ܕܠܬܘܟܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܢܚܐ.

ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܀ ܘܗܟܢ ܗ̇ܢ ܐܒܐ: ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܫ ܢܐܡܪ: ܕܠܐ ܒܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܣܝܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ: ܢܐܡܪ ܘܢܦܪܘܫ ܥܘ̈ܕܢܝܗܘܢ ܘܡܫܬܠܡܐ: ܘܢܐܡܪ ܕܠܐܝܟܐ ܡܛܠܬܐ ܓܪܒܐ. ܗܫܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܡܨܝܢܢ ܕܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܠܝܢ ܣܬܟܐܡܬ ܢܐܡܪ. ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܢܣܝܡ ܀ ܚܙܝ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܕ̈ܟܝܢܢܐ: ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܦܟܗܘܢ: ܘܠܡܚܕ ܚܠܘ ܠܝܬ ܠܡܩܡ ܒܠܩܘܒܠܗܘܢ ܀ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܫ ܢܐܡܪ: ܕܠܐ ܒܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܣܝܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ: ܢܐܡܪ ܘܢܦܪܘܫ ܥܘ̈ܕܢܝܗܘܢ ܘܡܫܬܠܡܐ: ܘܢܐܡܪ ܕܠܐܝܟܐ ܡܛܠܬܐ ܓܪܒܐ ܀ ܘܡܬܦܢܐ ܐܢܬ ܡܢ ܐܘ ܡܝܬܪܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܘܬܗ: ܕܠܐ ܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ ܡܬܪܥܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܢܐ ܥܡܗ: ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܕܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܡܗ. ܒܕ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ ܒܗ ܠܘ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܦܪ̈ܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ: ܠܐ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܘܕܐ ܐܢܬ: ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝܐ ܡܫܚܠܐܝܬ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܬܦܩ: ܘܠܐ ܠܡܬܪܐ

A

should you despatch those you ought to rebut to procure rebuttals, but should plainly show what the statement amounts to if ingeneracy, generacy and procession are not hypostases. But I cannot now, he says, speak on these points in detail. Is there anybody who will not be justly astounded at the order and connectedness of this author in every particular? For if, at the time a support for what he wrote is required by people who are trusted by him to judge and correct it, he cannot, as he says, prove it in detail, let him tell us clearly, when he will be able to do so? Yet, besides this, let us note that he did not speak in detail, even when he wrote the very words which are part, he said, of a careful work of persuasion and apologia. For he said, as previously set down: * For I cannot now speak on these points in detail, but we shall simply set down the fathers' words.

What are the following words? For holy Damasus too, bishop of Rome, in his *Third Oration against the Arians* pronounced a blessing on those who think of the properties of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, as three subsisting prosopa, saying as follows: 'Blessed he is who confesses one Godhead and that all the Godhead's fullness belongs to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Blessed is he who confesses that the properties of the names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are three subsisting prosopa'. Having set this down and made a sudden leap as it were, away from any sort of examination or explanation, he proclaimed the same passage again to us and said the following: Therefore it is not only hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose that the properties of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are not three subsisting prosopa, but it is also foreign to the

**84/85** cf. supra, 23-24 **93/94** cf. supra, 23-25 **95/102** cf. supra, 25-32
**105/108** cf. supra, 32-35



ܕܡܬܚܫܒܢܘܬܐ : ܠܦܘܢ ܕܚܝܒܝܢ ܕܕܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܬܚܫܒܘܢ
ܬܫܕܪ. ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ : ܕܠܐܝܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܫܬܥܪܐ: ܐܢ
ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܢܗܘܘܢ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܐ ܠܡ ܗܫܐ : ܕܡܦܠܓ ܗܠܝܢ
ܣܦܩܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܡܢܘ ܠܐ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܢܬܕܡܪ : ܒܛܟܣܐ
ܘܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܒܥܢܐ ܕܠܗܢܐ ܒܟܠܗܝܢ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܬܝ
ܕܣܡܘܟܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܡܬܒܥܐ : ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܗܘܘ
ܕܢܕܘܢܘܢ ܘܢܬܪܨܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܗ ܐܬܗܝܡܢܘ : ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܣܦܩܐܝܬ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܗܠܝܢ : ܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ
ܡܦܩܦܩ ܢܥܒܕ : ܒܠܥܕܝܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܢ. ܢܬܚܫܒ ܕܝܢ ܗܟ ܗܠܝܢ :
ܕܐܦܠܐ ܗܟܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܫܩܐ ܕܥܒܠ ܦܠܓܝܐ ܘܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܗܘ ܐܡܪ : ܒܕ ܒܣܦܩܘܬܐ ܡܠܠ ܒܗܝ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ
ܐܢܚܢܐ ܕܡܢܚܡܐ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܀ * ܗܫܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܐ f. 77ra
ܕܡܦܠܓ ܗܠܝܢ ܣܦܩܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ. ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܝܢ ܠܡ̈ܠܐ ܩܠܐ
ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܢܣܝܡ ܀

ܐܝܠܝܢ ܡܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܀ ܘܕܡܣܘܣ ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܚܣܝܐ
ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܪܗܘܡܐ : ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܪ̈ܝܢܘ
ܢܘܗܪ ܛܘܒܐ : ܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ
ܩܕܝܫܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ : ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ
ܐܡܪ ܀ ܛܘܒܘܗܝ ܠܗܘ ܕܡܘܕܐ ܕܚܕܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܘܟܠܗ
ܡܠܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ
ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܛܘܒܘܗܝ ܠܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ
ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܕܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ
ܡܘܕܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܣܡ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܡܢ ܥܠ ܥܒܪ : ܡܚܕܐ
ܡܢ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܐܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܘܦܘܫܩܐ : ܠܗ̇ ܬܘܒ ܠܗ̇ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ
ܐܟܪܙ ܠܢ ܘܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܐ ܙܗܝܪܬܐ :
ܘܠܐ ܠܢܡܘܣܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܣܒܪ : ܕܠܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ

A

Line 98: ܐܢܐ ܡܫܟܚ, cf. supra, line 25 (ܡܫܟܚܝܢ).
Line 99: ܐܡܪ, cf. supra, line 25 (ܢܐܡܪ).

foregoing blessing. Is there anybody who, on reading the rich quantity of all these and the like proof-texts, will not be justifiably much more astonished at the education of this clever author, when he apprehends that his saying, therefore it is not only hazardous and at odds with the fathers' teaching to suppose that the properties of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are not three subsisting prosopa, but it is also foreign to the foregoing blessing is not too small but abundantly enough for the full and necessary proof of the issues in question? So we shall answer the speaker of such drivel: My dear fellow, we ourselves have already said how we understood the words of Saint Damasus set down, conceding that he said them in this way, when we quoted them in the foregoing. But please may we ask you why, though the proof-text says that the properties of the names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are three subsisting prosopa, you said, both in what precedes the proof-text and what follows the proof-text, instead of the properties of the names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, 'the properties of the Father, the Son * and the Holy Ghost'. For you have given grounds for a suspicion that you are apprehensive about the words you quoted. We urge the prudent reader, then, to judge whether you honestly believed that, with our disagreement with you being about the hypostases and their characteristic properties, it was right for you to create 'supports' for the things on which you are censured, by means of people who never agreed at all to profess Father, Son and Holy Ghost as three hypostases? Nevertheless, let this too be granted, if you like, that you created them fittingly; how, then, do you prove from this text that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are ingeneracy, generacy and procession? For someone will say, (indeed with justice) that even if the Italians (it may be out of simplicity or the

**111/114** cf. supra, 32-35 **120/122** cf. supra, 100-102 **123/124** cf. supra, 120-121 **124/125** cf. supra, 97-98 et 106-107 **136/137** cf. supra, ch. 4, 113



— ܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܐܠܐ ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܫ ܗܟܢ
— ܢܩܒܠܬܐ ⁘ ܘܡܛܠ ܕܒܗ ܒܡܫܪܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
ܘܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܪ̈ܝܪܘܬܐ ܦܝܫܐ : ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܬܡܝܗܘܬܐ ܒܝܘܠܦܢܐ
ܡܬܕܪܫ : ܡܫܪܪܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܡܠܠܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܒܕ ܡܬܕܪܟ
ܕܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܠܐ ܘܡܣܟܢܐ ܬܬܚܙܐ ܠܘܬ ܝܘܠܦܢܐ
ܡܫܚܠܦܘܬܐ ܘܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡܬܗܝܢ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗܘ ܐܡܪ ⁘
— ܡܕܝܢ ܠܗ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܐ ܕܡܫܪܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܠܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ
— ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܒܥܐ : ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܝܗܝܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ
— ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܡܫ̈ܡܗܐ : ܐܠܐ
— ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܫ ܗܟܢ ܢܩܒܠܬܐ ⁘ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܗܘܝܠ ܠܬܗ
ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܥܠܝܐܝܬ ܡܫܡܫ : ܕܣܝܡ ܐܘ ܒܡܫܡܗܐ : ܕܐܒܗܬܐ
ܠܬܠܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܡܫܡܗܘ ܐܣܛܘܟܣܝܢ : ܒܕ ܢܛܠ
ܕܗܘܒܐ ܠܗ ܐܡܪܬ݂ : ܗܘ ܐܦ ܒܗܘ : ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܫ̈ܝ ܒܗ
ܐܬܚܫܒܬ݁ ܣܡ ܐܬܪܝ ܐܡܪܢܝ. ܗܘܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܬܐܠܝܟ :
< ܕܡܛܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܒܕ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܐܡܪܐ ⁘ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
< ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܬܠܬܐ ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ
< ܡܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܐܬܝܠܝܗܝܢ ⁘ ܐܝܬ ܘܡܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܫ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ
ܘܡܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܬܪ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܐܡܪܬ : ܚܠܦ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ
ܘܕܒܪܐ * ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܪܬ. ܠܡܣܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ f. 77rb
ܝܗܒܬ ܥܠ ܢܦܫܟ. ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܕܚܝܠܐ ܐܢܬ ܠܟ ܡܛܠ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܬ. ܕܢܒܘܢ ܗܘܠ ܠܡܣܟܠܢܐ ܦܪܫܟܠܢܐ
ܡܣܦܩܝܢ : ܕܐܢ ܒܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܐܡܪܬ ܕܗܢܐ : ܕܟܕ ܡܛܠ
ܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܘܕܝܠ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ ܚܠܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܕܥܡܟ ܗܘܬ ܠܝ ܒܚܝܠ
ܡܣܦܠܝܢ : ܕܐܝܟ ܒܪܝܫܬ ܐܡܣܟܢܬ ܕܒܕܘܡ : ܕܒܗ ܡܛܠ
ܗܠܝܢ ܘܢܛܠܘܬܐ ܡܚܝܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܐܬܬܗܘܝ ܠܝ ܒܚܝܢ
ܣܢܝܐ : ܒܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܟܢ ܬܠܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ
ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܢܘܕܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܫܬܘܝܘ ܐܬܡܪܘ : ܠܩܢ̈ܘܡܐ
ܠܡ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܟܠܠܝܢ ܐܦ ܒܬܪܥܐ ܐܝܬ ܒܛܒܐ. ܒܝܫ
ܬܬܚܘܒ ܐ ܒܪܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܘܗܘܕܐ ܕܠܣܘܟܐ ܒܛܒܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܗܘܝܠ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܦܘܣܘܬܐ : ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ
ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ
ܐܬܝܗܘܢ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܐܡܪ : ܕܐܦ ܐܢ ܡܢ
ܦܫܝܛܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܢ ܒܝܫ ܐܡܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܠܐܝܛܠܝ̈ܐ ܐ݇ܢ

A

constraints of their language and its poverty of terms) instead of saying 'the properties or hypostases of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost', called the properties of the names 'subsisting prosopa', they did not therefore think that Father, Son and Holy Ghost were the characteristic properties viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession. So, here too, my clever fellow, you are caught out making idle, and in truth, totally inane boasts, when you contend in this irrational way for doctrines which are novel and are yours alone, when you defame the divinely inspired fathers with these slanders and attempt to embellish your heterodoxy with them.

So, let us again take up the conclusion of this cunning author's doughty proof, at the point where, deceiving himself, he believes he has shown that the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are the characteristic properties viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession. He says, then, following on the words previously set down, as follows: Saint John, who was bishop of Jerusalem, is like him in saying, in the *Exposition of the Faith* he wrote, as follows: 'We believe that the Holy and adorable Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is one Godhead or substance, for we understand that each of the things is the same in the three hypostases or properties'. * Let us, then, observe the form of periphrasis. The father, having said that the Godhead or substance is one, added, as the reason for his statement, 'for we understand that each of the things is the same'. He used the same form of periphrasis when he said with a direct connection of 'hypostasis' and 'property': 'in the three hypostases or properties'. Because here also he understands that each of the things is the same. That sage in divinity, Basil, was also

**152/179** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* **153/156** Ioh. Hieros., *Expos. fid.* (Caspari, p. 185 [186]) **158/159** cf. supra, 155-156 **161** cf. supra, 156



[illegible]

[illegible]

f. 77va

A

Line 175: [illegible], cf. ch. 17, lines 9-10 ([illegible]).

an instructor in such a tradition when, in writing to his brother Gregory *On the difference between substance and hypostasis*, he said: 'For if we have allowed that the hypostasis is the collection of properties belonging with each'. And again the same author says in the second book *Against Eunomius*: 'It is clear, then, from what has been said, that also in the case of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the names do not display substances but are indicative of properties'. Likewise, also, in the sermon *On the Faith* he writes: '"Son" – not an acquisition; "Maker" – not a work; "Creator" – not a creature. He is all those same things that the Father is. "Son", I said, and "Father". Save me only those properties'. One could set down many such passages but I omit them because of their length. For I have put the same texts with a further investigation in various chapters of this treatise. But let us proceed with an examination of the rest of the words and let us take note of them, lest any concept or thought unknown to the holy fathers is concealed there. For by these passages it has now been proved that to name the subsisting properties 'hypostases' is patristic.

Who will not pity the wretched dupes of this writer? Or rather, who will not with justice bewail the wretchedness of one who persists so long in this obvious and ludicrous rubbish for the sake of being thought something by ordinary people and who barters all his hope in God for this abominable and very despicable reputation, or (to put it more truly) who on account of the fear of being shamed before a few unlearned people * will bring on himself

164/166 Bas. Caes., *Ep. 38*, 6 (*PG* 32, 336C; Forlin Patrucco, p. 190) **167/169** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 5 (*PG* 29, 580C; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 22); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 13, 9-11 **170/173** Bas. Caes., *De fide*, 2 (*PG* 31, 465D - 468A)



— ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܒܫܠܝܘ : ܕܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܗܘܐ
— ܕܪܘܫܐ : ܟܕ ܠܘܬ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܚܘܗܝ، ܡܛܠ
← ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܟܬܒ ܘܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ
← ܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܩܒܠ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ
← ܚܕ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ
← ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܀ ܓܠܝܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ : ܘܕܐܦ ܥܠ
← ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܠܐ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ ܡܚܘܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ :
← ܐܠܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ܀ ܗ̇ܝ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ
← ܘܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܀ ܒܪܐ ܠܐ ܩܢܝܢܐ. ܥܒܘܕܐ
← ܠܐ ܥܒܕܐ. ܒܪܘܝܐ ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܪܝܬܐ. ܟܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
← ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܒܐ. ܒܪܐ ܐܡܪܬ ܘܐܒܐ. ܣܛܪ ܠܝ ܒܠܚܘܕ
← ܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܀ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܬ ܩܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ̈ܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ
— ܡܨܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܡܣܡ. ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܐܘܪܟܘܬܗ̇ ܫܒܩܬ
— ܐܢܐ. ܘܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܓܝܪ ܒܗ ܒܦܘܡܐ ܬܢܝܢܐ ܒܩܦܠܐ̈ܐ
— ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ : ܗܢܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܦܫܛܬ. ܐܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܒܘܚܢܐ
— ܕܫܪܟܐ ܕܦܬܓܡ̈ܐ ܢܐܬܐ ܘܢܚܙܐ ܐܢܘܢ : ܕܕܠܡܐ
— ܡܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܘ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܡܟܣܝ ܒܗܘܢ : ܕܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ
— ܩܕܝ̈ܫܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܝܥ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܝܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
— ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝ̈ܡܬܐ
— ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܫܡܗ̇ ܀

ܘܡܢܘ ܠܐ ܢܚܘܣ ܥܠ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܛܥܝܢܐ ܕܡܣܟܢܘܬ ܛܥܝܢ. ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܡܢܘ ܕܠܐ ܠܗ ܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ ܢܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܘܝܘܬܗ : ܕܡܬܡܪܚܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܢܬܚܫܒ : ܗܢܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܒܥܘܩ̈ܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܘܡܬܓܚܟܢܝܬܐ ܢܣܒܗ : ܘܗܕܐ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ ܡܫܠܡܢܬܐ ܘܕܦܫܝܛ ܥܡܠܐ : ܟܠܗ ܣܒܪܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܚܠܦ ܕܢܚܡ : ܐܘ ܕܫܪܝܪ ܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܡܛܠ ܕܚܠܬܐ ܕܒܗܬܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܒܨܝܪܐ

A W from l. 181 to l. 183

Line 180: ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ, cf. ch. 17, line 14 (ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܗܘܝܢ).
Line 181: ܓܠܝܐ, W: ܝܕܝܥܐ. ܘܕܐܦ, W: ܐܦ.
Line 182: ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ, W om. ܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ, W: ܐܘܣܝܐ.
Line 183: ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ..... ܐܠܐ, W: ܐܠܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ

eternal shame and punishment. Let us hear what he says, using, as he does, the same enticements to the simple: Saint John, who was bishop of Jerusalem, is like him in saying, in the *Exposition of the Faith* he wrote, as follows: 'We believe that the Holy and adorable Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is one Godhead or substance, for we understand that each of the things is the same in the three hypostases or properties'. Let him show us clearly anyone anywhere who will argue against this! Or how anyone who counts it a great thing to be a Christian, on hearing that the Godhead or substance is one, will not suppose the Godhead and the substance of the Godhead to be the same thing? Which of us has ever seen someone arguing or saying that when someone says (like Gregory the Theologian or some other divinely inspired teacher) 'properties or hypostases' or the like, he will not be applying the term 'properties' to the hypostases, with true religion, as this teacher does too? For this cunning fellow is not to suppose that because we do not think of the characteristic properties of the prosopa (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) as hypostases, we have *ipso facto* rejected entirely the idea of naming the hypostases in accordance with the correct understanding of the fathers, 'properties'; as he has rejected the true profession itself of hypostases, although for persuasive deception he forces their name upon his lips. As for us, adhering to the fathers' definitions, we acknowledge that when the fathers say 'properties or hypostases' we are to understand nothing else but that the terms 'hypostasis' and 'property' mean the same thing. But when we find the term 'properties' applied to the indications of the hypostases, we recognize, by this term, not the hypostases themselves but their characterizing impressions viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession. When, again, we hear that the fathers name the marks of the divine nature 'properties', * we

---

**188/193** cf. supra, 152-156



ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܫܝܢ: ܠܒܗܬܬܐ ܘܬܫܢܝܩܐ ܕܠܥܠܡ *
ܠܢܫܡܥ ܗܟܝܠ. ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܟܕ ܡܬܚܫܚ ܒܗܘܢ ܟܕ ܒܗܘܢ f. 77vb
— ܒܥ̈ܕܠܐ ܕܥܠ ܦ̈ܫܝܛܐ ܐܡܪ ܢܩܒܠ ❖ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
— ܘܝܘܚܢܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܘܪܫܠܡ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܗܘܐ: ܒܗ
— ܒܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ❖
← ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܘܣܓܝܕܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ
← ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܚܕܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ
← ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܗܝ ܐܡܪ ܟܕ ܗܝ ܠܟܠ ܚܕܐ ܡܢܗܝܢ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ:
← ܒܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܢ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ❖ ܘܐܡܟܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܚܪܐ ܢܚܘܐ ܠܢ ܐܝܟܐ. ܐܘ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܗ̇ܘ،
ܕܟܪ̈ܣܛܝܢܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܡܕܡ ܪܒܐ ܚܫܒ: ܟܕ ܫܡܥ ܕܚܕܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ: ܠܐ ܗܝ ܟܕ ܗܝ ܢܣܒܪ
ܠܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܡܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܡܢܢ ܚܙܐ
ܡܬܘܡ ܕܡܬܚܪܐ ܐܘ ܐܡܪ: ܕܐܡܬܝ، ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܫ ܐܝܟ
ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ
ܢܫܝ̈ܡܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ: ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܘ ܡܕܡ
ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ: ܠܐ ܒܫܪܝܪܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܫܡܐ ܕܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܥܠ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܢܫܕܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܢܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܢܣܒܪ
ܗܢܐ ܥܪܘܡܐ: ܕܡܛܠ ܕܠܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ:
ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܠܐ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܬܪ̈ܥܝܢ: ܗܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܦܪܣ ܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ
ܫܡܗܝܢ: ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܟ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܬܪܝܨܐ ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܢܩܪܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܠܗ̇ ܠܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܫܪܝܪܬܐ
ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ: ܐܦ ܠܘܬ ܡܛܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܘܦܝܣܐ ܠܡ ܚܛܦܐ
ܢܦܫܗ: ܕܟܦܝܣܘܬܐ ܘܟܠܝܘܗ ܠܫܡܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܢܬܠܐ. ܚܢܢ ܓܝܪ
ܟܕ ܠܬܚܘܡܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܬܐ ܢܩܦܝܢ: ܡܘܕܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܕܐܡܬܝ، ܕܟܕ
ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ: ܠܐ ܡܕܡ
ܐܚܪܢܐ: ܐܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܟܕ ܠܗ ܡܣܬܒܪ ܫܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ
ܘܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܬܡܠܝܢ. ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܝܢ ܕܥܠ ܫܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ
ܕܫܡܐ ܗܢܐ ܫܡܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ: ܠܗ ܠܗܘܢ
ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܫܡܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܛܘ̈ܦܣܐ ܡܫܘ̈ܕܥܢܐ
ܕܗܠܝܢ: ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܘܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ

---

A

by no means mentally apprehend the hypostases or, again, their characteristic properties (viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession) but understand the common and natural properties of the three hypostases (viz. invisibility, immutability, infinity and the like); and we do not, because these different meanings are signified by the one term 'properties', foolishly suppose that the things signified by the same term are one and the same.

But why, excellent author and so boastful of your intelligence, why in contriving to muddle everything absurdly, do you, whenever you happen to read the term 'property' bring it in recklessly to 'prove' that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are ingeneracy, generacy and procession? Will nothing stop you, not even the laughter and derision of discriminating and knowledgeable readers of your writings? Or do you not know what the God-clad father SEVERUS said about the Grammarian of Caesarea who recklessly attacked the term 'nature' (as you too do, 'properties'), as if he were making merry over something amusing, in the 31st chapter of the third book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian*, as follows: But this foolish ignoramus, like a greedy hound ever drawn on by the smell of meat, is enticed towards the term, 'nature', and, greedily

---

**235/239** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, III, 31 (*CSCO* 101, p. 116, 13-19; *102*, p. 84, 17-21)



ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ. ܐܡܬܝ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ : ܕܢܘܩܦܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ
ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܫܡܥܗܘܢ ܫܡ̈ܥܝܢ : * ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܘܠܐ f. 78ra
ܬܘܒ ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܩܢܝܢܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ
ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܟܬܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܢܣܒܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܠܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
ܓܘ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܘܟܝܢܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܠܐ
ܡܬܚܙܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ
ܡܣܝܟܘܬܐ : ܘܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ. ܘܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܕܒܚܕ
ܫܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܘܘ̈ܕܥܐ ܡܫܚܠ̈ܦܐ ܡܬܬܪܡܙܝܢ :
ܣܟܠܐܝܬ ܕܢܣܒ ܗܘܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܪܡܙܝܢ ܒܚܕ
ܡܢܗ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܝܢ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ.

ܠܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܡܝܬܪܐ ܕܡܬܟ̈ܬܒܢܐ :
ܘܕܡܣܬܟܠܢܘܬܐ ܒܠܗ ܗܢܐ ܡܫܬܒܗܪ : ܟܕ ܒܠܡܕܡ
ܡܬܦܪܥ ܐܢܬ ܕܡܥܒܪܬ ܬܫܓܫ : ܐܡܬܝ ܕܗܘܐ ܐܢ
ܬܓܕܘܫ ܕܬܩܪܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܫܡܐ ܬܦܓܥ : ܕܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ
ܡܬܚܪܐ ܐܢܬ : ܠܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܡ ܕܬܚܘܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܩܕܝܫܬܐ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ : ܐܦ ܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܡ ܐܬܟܠܝܬ : ܘܠܐ ܡܢ ܓܘܚܟܐ
ܘܡܘܡܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܒܢܝ ܦܪܘܫܘܬܐ ܘܝܕܥܬܐ
ܦܓܥܝܢ ܒܥܘܢܝܢ ܕܡܟܬ̈ܒܢܝܟ ܡܫܬܐܠ ܐܢܬ. ܐܘ ܠܐ
ܝܕܥ ܐܢܬ : ܕܐܝܠܝܢ ܘܡܠܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܠܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܩܣܪܝܐ : ܗ̇ܘ
ܕܥܠ ܫܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܡܪܚܐ ܕܐܦ ܐܢܬ ܥܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
ܕܠܐ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܫܪܐ ܗܘܐ : ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܘܬ ܡܕܡ ܡܓܚܟ ܗܢܝܐܐ ܠܡ
ܡܬܦܫܩ ܗܘܐ : ܐܡܪ ܠܟܢ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܐܠܘ ܗܟܢ ܐܪܘܐܣ :
ܘܒܦܣܘܩܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܢ ܘܚܕ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ
< ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ ܒܗܢܐ ܙܢܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܗܢܐ ܠܐ
< ܠܝܦܐ ܘܣܟܠܐ : ܒܕܡܘܬ ܟܠܒܐ ܥܠܘܒܐ : ܘܢܓܝܕ ܪܝܚܐ
< ܕܒܣܪܐ ܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ ܡܬܢܓܕ : ܘܡܬܠܒܒ ܘܡܬܚܬܚܬ

---

AB from ܐܡܬܝ (l. 247) on

---

Line 253: ܡܟܬ̈ܒܢܝܟ, A: ܡܟܬܒܢܝܟ.
Line 256: ܗܢܝܐܐ, A: ܗܢܝܐ.
Line 257: ܐܪܘܐܣ, B: ܐܪܐܘܣ.
Line 261: ܘܡܬܚܬܚܬ, B: ܘܡܬܚܬܚ (wrongly).

seizing upon the fact that the doctor said 'confirming the nature of the resurrected body', he supposed that this suffices him to divide the one Christ into two natures after the union. Again, he speaks as follows in the 40th chapter of the same third book: Why, then, you ignorant fellow, do you go around collecting words idly, extracts from other people, and if you find the holy fathers anywhere using 'natures' in the plural, you immediately exult like a proverbial puffed-up, avaricious harlot, as though the orthodox deny that Christ is from two natures?

**237/238** Bas. Caes., *De ieiun. hom. 1*, 9 (*PG* 31, 177D - 180A) **240/244** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, III, 40 (*CSCO* 101, p. 264, 19-25; *102*, p. 194, 29-33)



< ܓܐܪܘܗܝ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܗܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܡܪ :
« ܕܒ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܕܦܓܪܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܩܡ ܡܩܒܪ : ܣܒܪ ܕܗܕܐ ܣܦܩܐ
< ܠܗ : ܚܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܢܦܠܓܝܘܗܝ ܠܚܕ ܡܫܝܚܐ : ܠܬܪ̈ܝܢܘܬܐ
< ܕܟ̈ܝܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܚܕܝܘܬܐ ✣ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܗܟܢ ܗܘ ܒܦܘܪܫܐ
ܕܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܐܪܒܥܝܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܗܘ ܗܢܐ
< ܐܡܪ ✣ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܬܟܪܟ ܐܢܬ ܡܠܩܛ ܐܢܬ ܡ̈ܠܐ
< ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܝܕܘܥܐ : ܦܬ̈ܓܡܐ ܕܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ : ܘܐܢ ܡܫܟܚ
< ܐܢܬ ܒܕܘܟ ܠܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܩܕ̈ܝܫܐ : ܕܡܦܩܝܢ ܐܝܬ ܘܕܗܒܬܐ
< ܟ̈ܝܢܐ : ܡܚܕܐ ܡܫܬܒܪ ܐܢܬ ܒܡܬܠܐ ܕܙܢܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܦܚܝܙܐ
< ܘܪܓܝܓܬܐ ܕܐܡܗܘܢܐ ܒܬܫܠܘܬܐ : ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܪܬܕܘܟܣܘ
< ܠܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܕܡܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܟ̈ܝܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܫܝܚܐ ✣

AB

Line 262: ܕܟܝܢܐ, A: ܕܟ̈ܝܢܐ.
Line 264: ܠܬܪ̈ܝܢܘܬܐ, B: ܠܬܪܝܢܘܬܐ.
Line 271: ܕܐܪܬܕܘܟܣܘ, B: ܕܐܪܬܕܘܟܣܐ.

* *Chapter 17*

*Examination of the testimonies from Saint Basil on which this excellent fellow prides himself as perfectly proving that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are either some sort of collections of properties or are ingeneracy, generacy and procession. And rebuttal of the aspersion on the doctor from many brilliant and divinely inspired words of his.*

At this point let us also investigate Basil the Great's words. This excellent fellow, indeed, wrote, having set down these things, as follows: That sage in divinity, Basil, was also an instructor in such a tradition when, in writing to his brother Gregory *On the difference between substance and hypostasis*, he said: 'For if we have allowed that the hypostasis is the collection of properties belonging with each'. And again the same author says in the second book *Against Eunomius*: 'It is clear, then, from what has been said, that also in the case of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the names do not display substances but are indicative of properties'. Likewise, also, in the sermon *On the Faith* he writes: '"Son" – not an acquisition; "Maker" – not a work; "Creator" – not a creature. He is all those same things that the Father is. "Son", I said, and "Father". Save me only those properties'. Having quoted this he added, without anything intervening: One could set down many

10/20 cf. supra, ch. 16, 162-173 21/28 cf. supra, ch. 16, 173-179

* ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܫܒܥܣܪ. A, f. 78rb

ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܣܗܕ̈ܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ: ܕܒܗܝܢ ܡܫܬܒܗܪ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ ܕܡܫܠܡܐܝܬ ܡܚܘܝܐ: ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܐܘ ܟܢܫ̈ܐ ܠܐ ܢܕܥ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ: ܐܘ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ. ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܡܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܠܦܢܐ: ܡܢ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܡܨܒ̈ܬܢܝܬܐ ܢܗܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܘܡܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܀

ܝܙ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܠܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܕܪܒܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܢܒܨܐ. ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ: ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܣܡ ܗܘܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܗܘ̇ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ: ܕܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ. ܕܐܝܟܢ ܗܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܪܒܐ: ܟܕ ܠܘܬ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܚܘܗܝ، ܟܬܒ ܥܠ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܡܩܘܡܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܩܢܘܡܐ ܟܢܫܐ ܕܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܀ ܓܠܝܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ: ܘܕܐܦ ܥܠ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܠܐ ܐܘܣ̈ܝܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ: ܐܠܐ ܕܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܫ̈ܘܕܥܢܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܀ ܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܗܟܢܐ. ܒܪܐ ܠܐ ܩܢܝܢܐ. ܥܒܘܕܐ ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܥܒܕܐ. ܒܪܘܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗܘ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܒܐ. ܒܪܐ ܐܡܪܬ ܘܐܒܐ. ܠܒܪ ܠܝ ܡܢܗܝܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܕ̈ܝܠܝܬܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܬܝ: ܐܘܣܦ ܕܠܐ ܡܨܥܝܘܬܐ

AB

Line 2: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ, B: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ.
Line 6: ܕܒܡܘܫܐ, B: ܕܒܡܘ̈ܫܐ.
Lines 9-10: ܡܫܠܡܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ, cf. ch. 16, line 175 (ܡܫܠܡܢܐ).
Line 11: ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ, B: ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘ.
Line 14: ܟܕ ܗܘ, B om. ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ, cf. ch. 16, line 180 (ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ).
Line 21: ܡܨܥܝܘܬܐ, A: ܡܨܥܠܝܘܬܐ (wrongly).

such passages but I omit them because of their length. For I have put the same texts with a further investigation in various chapters of this treatise. But let us proceed with an examination of the rest of the words and let us take note of them, lest any concept or thought unknown to the holy fathers is concealed there. For by these passages it has now been proved that to name the subsisting properties 'hypostases' is patristic.

Everybody knows that with these he has brought to an end all his 'powerful supports' from such patristic statements as he deems prove that the hypostases are ingeneracy, generacy and procession; even though, as is his wont, he irrelevantly said: One could set down many such passages but I omit them because of their length and specially by adding a few lines later: For by these passages it has now been proved * that to name the subsisting properties 'hypostases' is patristic.

However, the wise listener should consider how this cunning author, knowing the feebleness of his so-called demonstration, has not ventured, even after all this quotation of proof-texts, to say: 'By these passages it has now been proved that to name the characteristic properties (I mean ingeneracy, generacy and procession) "hypostases" is patristic'. For this (as has been said thousands upon thousands of times) is the chief issue in dispute between him and us. But he said: For by these passages it has now been proved that to name the subsisting properties 'hypostases' is patristic: about which we have evidently never been in dispute with

32/33 cf. supra, 21-22 34/36 et 44/46 cf. supra, 26-28



— ܘܐܡܪ ܀ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܩܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܣܝܡܐ ܗܘܬ
— ܠܡܣܡ. ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܐܘܪܟܗܝܢ ܫܒܩܬ ܐܢܝܢ. ܘܒܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܓܝܪ
— ܒܗ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܢܐ: ܒܦ̈ܘܠܓܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ: ܗܢܝܢ ܒܗ ܗܢܝܢ
— ܫܡܫܬ. ܐܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܫܪܟܐ ܕܡܠ̈ܬܐ ܢܐܬܐ
— ܘܢܚܙܐ ܐܢܘܢ: ܕܕܠܡܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܘ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܡܛܫܐ
— ܒܗܘܢ: ܕܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܩܕܝ̈ܫܐ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ. ܒܗܢ ܓܝܪ ܗܠܝܢ
— ܕܩܢ̈ܝܢ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ: ܕܐܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܬܝܗ̇: ܗ̇ܝ،
— ܕܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܡܩܕܫ̈ܬܐ ܘܡܘܬ̈ܪܐ ܢܒܥܬܗ ܀

ܘܕܒܗ ܗܠܝܢ: ܚܝܠܘ̈ܗܝ ܘܡܘܬܒܘ̈ܗܝ، ܠܡ ܫܠܠܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܩܠܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܓܠܡ: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܡܚܘܝܢ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ: ܠܚܠܦ ܗܘܬ ܕܢܚܘܬܐ: ܘܐܦ ܐܝܟ ܥܝܕܗ ܒܪ ܫܘܪܬܐ ܡܡܠܠ
— ܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܣܓܝܐܬ ܩܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܣܝܡܐ ܗܘܬ
— ܠܡܣܡ: ܐܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܐܘܪܟܗܝܢ ܫܒܩܬ ܐܢܝܢ ܀ ܘܬܘܪܥܐܝܬ ܒܗ̇،
— ܕܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܙܘܥܪܐ ܐܡܪ، ܀ ܒܗܢ ܓܝܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢ̈ܝܢ ܕܫܡܗܐ
— ܐܬܚܘܝܬ * ܕܐܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܬܝܗ̇: ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܡܩܕܫ̈ܬܐ f. 78va
— ܘܡܘܬ̈ܪܐ ܢܒܥܬܗ ܀

ܕܢܬܒܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܙܕܩ ܠܗ ܠܫܡܘܥܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ: ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܪ ܢܟܠܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܝܕܥ: ܡܚܠܫܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܬܚܘܝܬܗ: ܠܐ ܐܡܪܚ ܘܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܟܠܗ̇ ܡܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܕܬܚܘ̈ܝܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ: ܕܒܗܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢ̈ܝܢ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ: ܕܐܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܬܝܗ̇: ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܡܩܕܫ̈ܬܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܘܡܘܬ̈ܪܐ ܢܒܥܐ: ܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܪ̈ܒܘ ܕܩܕܡ ܐܡܝܪܐ: ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܪܝܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܝܢܬ ܠܝ ܘܠܗ ܐܝܟ ܚܠܝܦܝܢ ܚܕܕܐ. ܐܠܐ
— ܐܡܪ ܀ ܒܗܢ ܓܝܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܢ̈ܝܢ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ:
— ܕܐܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܡܩܕܫ̈ܬܐ ܘܡܘܬ̈ܪܐ
— ܢܒܥܐ ܀ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܕܐܬܚܪܝܢ ܥܡ

AB up to ܗܢܐ (l. 40)

Line 38: ܢܒܥܬܗ, cf. infra, line 49 (ܢܒܥܐ).
Line 49: ܢܒܥܐ, cf. supra, line 38 (ܢܒܥܬܗ).

him. So, leaving aside the quotation here from God-clad Basil which says: It is clear, then, from what has been said, that also in the case of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the names do not display substances but are indicative of properties, on the ground that it contributes nothing to the point and has been very sufficiently discussed in the foregoing, let us proceed with examining again, by the aid of Christ our God, what seems to have in it something for his defence i.e. the point about the collection of properties belonging with each. For is any examination necessary of the fact that the same Basil the Great again said: 'Son', I said, and 'Father'. Save me only those properties when no one of sound views refuses to name the properties 'hypostases'? To be sure, if the divinely inspired and accurate father had not said belonging with each and thereby clearly shown that he recognized that the hypostasis is an individually subsisting reality (i.e. with the properties which particularly belong to it being viewed in it) it might have looked as if this excellent fellow was justified in making the father's proof-text a defence for his doctrine; but it would not look so to those who examine the matter more fully. For how could anyone who supposes * that only the ingeneracy, e.g., perceived in the common substance, is a hypostasis, be permitted to call a hypostasis a collection of properties? For if a hypostasis is a collection of properties it must be a collection of at least two or more, whereas ingeneracy, for example, or generacy or procession is one property; consequently he who calls ingeneracy, generacy or procession 'hypostases' cannot call a hypostasis a collection of properties if he wants to obey the order of things. Therefore, either he is clearly to say that he does not reckon as hypostasis only the ingeneracy per-

**48/50** cf. supra, 14-17 **54/55** cf. supra, 13 **56/57** cf. supra, 19-20
**59** cf. supra, 54-55 **67/68** et **72** cf. supra, 54



ܠܡܬܒܥܘ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ. ܡܛܠ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ
< ܗܪܟܐ ܐܬܬܚܙܝܬ ܘܐܡܪܢܐ ✧ ܟܠܗ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܐܡܝܪܢ : ܘܕܐܦ ܥܠ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܠܐ
< ܐܘܣ̈ܝܣ ܡܚܘܝܢ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ✧ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܥܠܐ ܠܗܕܐ ܕܫܒܩܢܐ :
ܘܣܦܩ ܣܦܩܐܝܬ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡ ܡܢܢ ܐܬܒܥܝܬ ܒܗ ܒܥܝܢ :
ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܣܬܒܪܐ ܠܗ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ̇ ܡܕܡ ܠܘܬ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ
ܕܗܘ ܒܗ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܬܘܒ : ܒܥܘܕܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܗܢ
ܐܬܝܢ. ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܥܠ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ
ܟܠ ܚܕ. ܘܗ̇ܝ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܡܪ ܬܘܒ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܪܒܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ✧
< ܒܪܐ ܐܡܪܬ ܘܐܒܐ : ܦܨܝ ܠܝ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ✧ ܟܠ
ܐܢܫ ܒܗܘܢܐ ܚܘܠܡܢܐ : ܒܕ ܠܐ ܐܚܝܕ ܡܢ ܗ̈ܢܘܢ ܕܢܩܪܐ
ܡܬܪܚܩ ܡܥܠܐ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܢܩܪܐ. ܘܡܬܚܫܒܢܐ
ܗܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ : ܐܠܘ ܠܐ ܕܝܢ، ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܐܡܪ
ܐܒܐ ܢܩܝܦ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܚܬܝܬܐ : ܘܒܗ ܗܕܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܚܘܝ :
ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܒܪܢܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܘܠܗ ܡܩܝܡ ܚܕ : ܒܕܝܠܝܐ ܗܘ، ܕܝܢ
ܕܒܗ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܟܠܗܝܢ، ܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܕܝܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ :
ܟܐܢܐܝܬ ܠܡܬܠܒܘܗ̇ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܡܢ ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ
ܒܟܕ ܗܘܐ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ. ܡܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܐ
ܗܘܬ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܥܬܝܪ ܡܒܨܝܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܕܠܠܐ
ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ *
ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܡܫܬܒܩ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܕܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ
ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܡܫܬܒܩ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ : ܕܬܪܬܝܢ
ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܒܪܝܫܐܝܬ : ܐܘ ܕܝܬܝܪܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܪܘܣ ܕܢܗܘܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܙܕܩ : ܠܐ ܐܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ
ܐܘ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ : ܚܕܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܗܘ
ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܠܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ
ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ : ܒܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝ̈ܬܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ :
ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܛܟܣܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܕܢܬܛܦܝܣ ܨܒܐ. ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܐܘ
ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܐܡܪ : ܕܠܘ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܗ̇ ܕܡܬܚܫܒܐ

f. 78vb

A

Line 69: ܡܒܨܝܢ, A: ܡܒܣܝܢ (wrongly).

ceived in the common substance (and his whole design against the truth collapses immediately) or, reckoning as hypostasis the ingeneracy perceived, as he says, in the common substance, let him learn that he is convicted, here too, of having used inappropriate and utterly incongruous testimony.

But perhaps he will say that the holy Basil called the hypostasis not only the collection of properties belonging with each, but also each one's indicative note. For he does not stop quoting this in many passages both in his many-groans-inducing book and in this *Many-lined Apology*. He wrote in chapter nine of his book as follows: Saint Basil, then, giving a sort of definition of 'hypostasis' called it 'the collection of properties' or 'each one's indicative note'. And again in what follows the passage of his *Many-lined Letter* we have just examined, he is seen to say: For we, listening to the magisterial word of teaching which defines 'hypostasis' as 'each one's indicative note' or 'the collection of properties' or 'the subsisting property', and 'substance' as 'the material substrate', affirm we believe this: that one of them is the shared in, whereas the other is the sharer, i.e. one is common, whereas the other is proper.

First let us note that, though the father's statement contains 'the collection of properties belonging with each', this truth-loving writer studiously cuts out the phrase belonging with each from the wording, * so that a hypostasis will necessarily be thought of (as he wants) as only a collection of properties. But later, feeling the justice of the objections to him he cautiously said:

**81** cf. supra, 54-55 **81/82** cf. infra, 86 et 89 **85/86** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (n° 19); cf. infra, 100-102 cf. supra, ch. 16, 165 **86** Bas. Caes., loco non reperto **88/93** Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* **90/91** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 4 (*PG* 29, 577C; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 20); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 8, 24 **95** cf. supra, ch. 16, 165-166 **96** cf. supra, 86 et 90



ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܝܐ ܢܣܒ ܩܢܘܡܐ: ܘܐܣܬܬܪ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܐ ܟܠܗ ܬܘܪܨܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܫܪܪܐ: ܐܘ ܟܕ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܓܘܢܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܢܣܒ ܩܢܘܡܐ: ܢܐܠܦ ܕܒܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܠܢܝܫܐ ܘܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܠܐ ܦܐܝܐ: ܘܗܪܟܐ ܕܐܬܚܝܒ ܡܬܚܙܐ.

ܐܠܐ ܟܒܪ ܐܡܪ: ܕܠܘ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ: ܐܠܐ ܘܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ: ܩܪܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܘ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ. ܗܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܡܬܡܟܬܒܘܬܗ ܗܝ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܐܬܢܚܬܐ: ܘܒܗ ܒܗܢܐ ܡܦܩ ܒܪܘܚܐ ܠܡ ܣܓܝ ܣܘܪܓܐ: ܒܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܫܘܪܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܫܠܝܐ. ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܒܦܢܩܝܬܗ ܕܬܫܥܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܟܕ ܒܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ

— ܐܡܪ ܀ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܗܟܝܠ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܟܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܬܚܘܡܐ
— ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܬܚܡ: ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܗ̇ ܐܘ ܪܘܫܡܐ
— ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܀ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܐܠܝܢ ܕܠܒܬܪ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܗܘܝܐ ܐܬܒܩܝ ܕܐܓܪܬܗ ܣܓܝܐܬ ܣܘܪܓܐ: ܡܬܚܙܐ
— ܕܐܡܪ ܗܟܢ ܀ ܚܢܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܫܡܥܝܢ ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܡܠܦܢܝܬܐ
— ܕܡܬܚܡܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ: ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ
— ܚܕ: ܐܘ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ: ܐܘ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܢܝܬܐ: ܘܐܘܣܝܐ
— ܕܝܢ ܗܘܠܢܝܐ ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ: ܕܗܠܝܢ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
— ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ: ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦ: ܐܘ ܚܕ ܕܗܘ ܡܢ ܓܘܢܝܐ
— ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܝܐ: ܘܗܟܢܐ ܕܢܗܝܡܢ ܡܫܪܪܝܢ ܀

ܘܩܕܡܝܬ ܢܬܒܩܐ: ܕܐܡܟܢܐ ܟܕ ܒܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܝܬ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ: ܒܫܠܝܛܐܝܬ ܗܢܐ ܡܚܒܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ: ܡܢ ܩܪܝܢܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܢܦܣܩ * ܗ̇ܝ f. 79ra ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܢܢܩܐ: ܗܘ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܨܒܐ ܢܬܒܣܡ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܝܢ: ܟܕ ܐܪܓܫ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܕܟܐܢܘܬܗ ܬܟܬܘܫܝܢ ܠܘܩܒܠܗ:

AB from ܕܐܡܟܢܐ (l. 101) on

Lines 91-92: ܡܬܚܡ ..... ܟܕ, cf. infra, lines 107-108.
Line 106: ܬܟܬܘܫܝܢ, A: ܡܬܟܬܘܫܝܢ.

Saint Basil, then, giving a sort of definition of 'hypostasis' called it 'the collection of properties' or 'each one's indicative note' or 'the subsisting property'. We shall, then, ask why he is at pains to distinguish in this way and say, the collection of properties *or* each one's indicative note *or* the subsisting property, if he thinks of hypostasis as being the collection of properties, each one's indicative note, the subsisting property! And let him clearly show how again (as we have already said) he is able to define as hypostasis both only ingeneracy and the collection of properties. Moreover, indeed, the reader should consider whether anybody can conceive of the collection of properties as a single substrate subsisting particularly and individually.

But let this excellent fellow pass on to teach what he thinks God-clad Basil means by 'each' with whom belongs the collection of properties and whose is the indicative note. However, he promptly answers this with what he said in chapter twelve of his notorious book. For, wise Basil said in the second book *Against Eunomius*: '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 as belonging with each are we different from one another. So titles are not indicative of substances, but of the properties which characterize each one.' Having said this, he wrote as follows: If Peter, Paul and, as it were, those names which are names in the full sense,

**100/102** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (n° 19) **103/104** cf. supra, 100-102
**116/122** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 12 **117/122** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 4 (*PG* 29, 577C; SC ... 305 ... 18-20) **123/128** Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 12



— ܟܝܠܢܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ܀ ܕܒܪ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܡܪ ܬܚܘܡܐ
— ܟܢܫܘܦ ܡܬܩܝܡ: ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܗ: ܐܘ ܪܘܫܡܐ
— ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ: ܐܘ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܬܐ܀ ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ
ܗܟܢ ܡܬܚܦܛ ܡܢܗ ܗܘ، ܕܗܟܢܐ ܢܦܪܘܫ ܘܢܐܡܪ: ܟܢܘܫܝܐ
ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ: ܐܘ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ: ܐܘ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܡܩܝܡܬܐ: ܐܢܘܗ̱ ܕܠܩܢܘܡܐ: ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ:
ܘܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ: ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܩܝܡܬܐ
ܕܐܬܘܗܝ، ܡܬܚܙܐ: ܕܡܫܐܠܝܢ ܢܐܡܪ: ܘܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܚܘܐ:
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܬܘܒ ܐܝܟ ܡܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܡܪܢ: ܡܫܟܚ
ܘܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܗ̇ ܘܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ
ܢܬܚܡ. ܢܬܒܩܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܗ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܩܪܐ: ܐܢܗܘ ܐܢܫ ܕܡܫܟܚ
ܘܢܣܬܟܠ ܡܢܗ ܘܠܗ ܡܩܝܡ: ܠܗ ܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
ܢܣܬܟܠ ܐܝܟ ܡܫܟܚ.

ܐܠܐ ܗܢܐ ܢܫܒ ܘܠܟܠ ܚܕ: ܕܠܘܬܗ ܐܦ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ
ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ: ܘܗܘ ܕܕܝܠܗ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܒܫ
ܠܐܠܗܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܢܚܘܐ ܢܠܦ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܗܪܐ. ܐܠܐ
ܡܠܒܟܐܝܬ ܘܠܘܬ ܗܕܐ ܡܦܢܐ ܦܬܓܡܐ: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܡܦܠܐܘܢ
— ܕܬܪ̈ܬܥܣܪ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܠܟܬܒܬܐ ܐܡܝܪܬܐ ܠܗ. ܒܗ ܓܝܪ
— ܚܟܝܡܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܐܡܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
← ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ܀ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܓܝܪ ܘܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܡܪ
← ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ: ܒܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܢ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ: ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܢ
← ܕܟܠܗܘܢ ܚܕܐ: ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܒܣܘܓܐܬܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܚܕ ܗܘܝܢ
← ܠܚܕ̈ܕܐ ܐܝܬܝܢ: ܒܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ
← ܡܬܚܙܝܢ: ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ: ܘܫܡ̈ܗܐ
← ܡܘܕܥ̈ܢܐ ܠܐ ܕܐܘ̈ܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܫܘܕ̈ܥܢܐ: ܐܠܐ
← ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܦܩܢ܀ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ܀
— ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܦܛܪܘܣ ܘܦܘܠܘܣ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܡܪ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܗܠܝܢ

AB W from l. 126 to l. 132

Lines 107-108: ܕܒܪ ..... ܡܬܩܝܡ, cf. supra, lines 91-92.
Line 126: ܘܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܡܪ, Book II, ch. 8, line 18 and W: ܘܡܫܠܡܐܝܬ.
Lines 130-131: ܘܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܡܘܕܥ̈ܢܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 8, line 22 (ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܐܦ ܩ̈ܢܝܐ).
Line 131: ... Book II, ch. 8, line 22 and W: ...

do not disclose the substance but the collection of properties belonging with the substance, nevertheless, then, by the naming of the names in the full sense, there enters the mind at the same time an indication also of that substance which the properties subsisting in it characterize as a hypostatic being.

You will discern the * respect of this expositor of divine doctrines for divine doctrines; you will see the reverence of this advocate of the fathers for the fathers! For Basil the Great having spoken of the collection of the properties as belonging with each, and again of each one's indicative note and having thereby shown that he does not speak of the collection of the properties or the indicative note as being itself the hypostasis, but rather that the substrate is (the properties evidently viewed in it), Damian called the hypostasis a collection of properties in many places, very studiedly omitting (as has been demonstrated) belonging with each; indeed not only this, but he also (as we have set down) called the collection belonging with the substance instead of belonging with each, so that the hypostasis alone is thought of as a collection of properties and 'each one' as the substance. Let this wise man tell us how each is to be conceived of without the acknowledgement of hypostas*es* and prosop*a*, with which also the collections of properties are and exist; for 'each' or 'every' is not used of a single item. But it has already been proved to men of sound sense that Basil, the great champion of truth, reckoned as hypostasis neither the collection of properties nor a single property alone, but rather the substrate itself in which are viewed, as has been said, the properties belonging with it. It has been proved by the fact that he said the properties belonging with each and again, each one's indicative note. Otherwise, let some one demonstrate that he ever called the hypostasis a collection of properties or indicative note without always

**132** cf. supra, 95 **133** cf. supra, 86 **137** cf. supra, 86 et 90 **138** cf. supra, 96 **140** cf. supra, 124-125 cf. supra, 132 **143** cf. supra, 140 **151** cf. supra, 132-133



— ܕܡܐܪܢܝܢ : ܠܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܚܘܝܢ : ܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ
— ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܚܝܠ ܒܐܡܝܪܘܬܗܝ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ
— ܡܐܪܢܝܐ : ܥܐܠ ܒܚܕܗ̇ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܘܫܘܕܥܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ :
— ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܗ̇ ܒܗ̇ ܡܬܩܝܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܠܢܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܡܚܬܡܢ ܀

ܡܬܒܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܒܝܩܪܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ : ܕܗܢܐ * ܡܦܫܩܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܐ : ܚܙܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܚܘܒܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ : ܕܗܢܐ ܣܢܓܪܐ ܕܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ : ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܪܒܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܤ ܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ : ܘܟܕ ܗܕܐ ܚܘܝ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘ ܡܠܠ ܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܘܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪ : ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܝܡ : ܟܕ ܝܕܝܥܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܒܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܗܘ ܒܕܘܟ̈ܝܬܐ ܣܓܝܐ̈ܬܐ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܟܕ ܒܚܦܝܛܘܬܐ ܦܬܝܟܬܐ ܫܒܩ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ. ܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܒܠܚܘܕ : ܐܠܐ ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܣܡܢ : ܣܠܦ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ : ܠܘܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܡ ܕܗ̣ܘ ܗܘ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܢܬܡܣܟܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ : ܟܠ ܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ. ܘܐܡܝܪܐ ܗܦܟ ܡܢ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܘܕܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ : ܕܠܘܬܗܘܢ ܘܟܢܘܫ̈ܝܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܗܘܘ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܟܝܢ : ܢܬܡܣܟܠ ܟܠ ܚܕ : ܢܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܣܟܠܐ. ܐܦܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܟܠ ܚܕ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ ܬܬܒܣܡ ܡܚܝܕܐ. ܕܐܓܘܢܣܛܐ ܕܝܢ ܪܒܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܤ : ܘܠܐ ܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܚܕܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܗܘ ܠܗ ܡܠܘܢ ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܟܕ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܒܠܗܘܢ, ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ ܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܫܥܒ ܡܘܕܥܐ : ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܒܕܘ ܡܢ ܠܥܦܪ̈ܝ, ܬܪܓܡܬܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܒܗ̇, ܕܐܡܪ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ : ܘܬܘܒ ܐܡܪ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ. ܘܐܠܐ ܢܚܘܐ ܗܘ, ܐܢܫ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܬܘܡ : ܐܘ ܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܕܕܝ̈ܠܝܬܐ ܠܩܢܘܡܐ : ܐܘ

f. 79rb

AB

Line 134: ܕܡܐܪܢܝܢ, B: ܕܡܪܢܝܢ.
Line 144: ܗܘ, B om.
Line 155: ܒܣܝܠܝܘܤ, B: ܒܣܝܠܘܤ.

adding with each one or of each. Or again, let it be proved out of the divinely inspired words of his peers as fathers and theologians.

BASIL wrote, then, in the first book *Against Eunomius* as follows: 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 premises, 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

---

**157/184** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 5 (*PG* 29, 517B - 520B; *SChr.*, vol. 299, pp. 176-180); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 9, 263-291



ܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ : ܘܠܐ ܡܠܘܐܬܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܦܪܨܘܦ ܡܢܗܬܐ
ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܘܬ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܗܘ̇ ܕܟܠ ܚܕ. ܐܠܐ ܘܬܘܒ ܬܬܚܘܐ
ܡܢܗܘܢ ܕܟܢܘܬܗ ܩܠܘܗܝ ܢܫ̈ܝܩܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ : ܘܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ
ܡܡ̈ܠܠܝ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܦܫܝܩܗ.

ܟܬܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܗܟ.
< ܒܗܢܐ ܕܐܢ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܕܐܢ̱ ܗܘ ܠܐ ܠܗ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܢ
< ܩܕܡ ܢܦܫܗ : ܘܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡܘܗܝ : ܢܩܦܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܘܒܬܪܟܢ ܟܕ ܐܪܓܫ ܕܡܢ ܢܩܦܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܐܬܬܣܝܡ : ܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܡܩܒܠܢܝܬܐ ܢܦܩܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܬܐ : ܐܢ̱
< ܓܝܪ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܡܒܝܢܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܢ
< ܠܒܪ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܗ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܠܘ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܕܝܠܗ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܡܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܙܠ ܠܗ ܘܡܬܥܩܪܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ :
< ܕܠܐ * ܗܕܐ ܢܚܫ : ܡܢܐ ܥܒܕ. ܟܕ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܚܫܒ ܕܒܘܣܚܐ f. 79va
< ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܓܕܫ ܠܗ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܢܩܦܬܐ ܡܡܠܠ
< ܗܘܐ : ܟܕ ܬܪ̈ܝܨܐ ܐܘܒܠܗ̇ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܪܓܝܓ
< ܗܘ̈ܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ❖ ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܡܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇
< ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܩ̈ܕܡܬܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܕܢܩܦܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ
< ܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܘܕܠܐ ܢܩܦܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܒܡܠܬܐ
< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܣܝܡܐ. ܒܪܡ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܫܒܩ ܕܠܓܡܪ ܢܬܦܪܟ ܠܗ
< ܣܘܦܝܣܡܐ. ܐܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ : ܕܢܩܦܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ :
< ܗܪܟܐ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܐܫܠܝ : ܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܐܡܟܢܐ : ܕܐܘ
< ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܢܩܪܐ : ܐܘ
< ܕܢܚܘܐ ܕܢܘܟܪܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܘܬܗ̇ ܕܗܢܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܒܪܐ

---

AB up to ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ (l. 166) W from l. 167 to l. 174

---

Line 164: ܢܫ̈ܝܩܬܐ, B: ܢܫܝܩܬܐ.

Line 171: ܢܩܦܐ, W: ܢܦܩܐ.

Line 173: ܠܗ, in A bis scribitur; cf. Book II, ch. 9, line 291.

Line 179: ܘܕܢܩܦܐ, cf. infra, line 290 (ܘܕܢܩܦܐ).

Line 180: ܘܕܠܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 9, line 298 (ܘܬܘܒ ܘܕܠܐ). ܕܒܡܠܬܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 9, line 298 (ܕܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ).

Line 183: ܕܐܡܟܢܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 9, line 301 (ܐܡܟܢܐ).

Line 185: ܠܘܬܗ̇ ܕܗܢܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ, cf. infra, lines 488-489 (ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ).

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 straight. 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?

We have already shown clearly, when we elsewhere examined the foregoing statement of the doctor according to our modest capacity, that the property (viz. ingeneracy) is by no means the Father whom it follows but is quite other than he; just as that which follows is other than the one it follows. Having answered for ourselves, and refuted out of the fathers' words also, all that the wise in their own eyes are muttering under their teeth (not frankly, but for the deception of wretched men), we ought not, I think, to prolong the examination by saying the same things again, because it is easier for the one who wants to, to read the texts and make searching investigation of * the solution to possible objections from supporters of untruth. Nevertheless, because the impiety, though everywhere rebutted, does not desist from using the same

**185** cf. supra, b. II, ch. 9, 292-324



ܢܫܘܐ : ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܫܟܚ ܡܢ ܡܦܠܓ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܦ :
ܕܠܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܕܒܪܐ ܢܦܪܘܫ. ܗܫܐ ܕܝܢ
ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܘܣܦ : ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܚܘܝ : ܕܗܘ ܗܘ ܡܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ : ܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܪ̈ܗܛܐ ܠܘܬ ܣܘܚܦܐ
ܕܓܘܕܦܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܛܝܒܐ ܠܗ : ܟܕ ܩܠܝܠ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܢܪܕܐ
ܢܚܘܐ. ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܟܝܠ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܢ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܐܡܝܪܐ ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ
ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ : ܟܕ ܒܢܩܦܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܝܗܒ ܐܫܬܟܚܬ ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܝܢ ܕܠܣܘܪܬܐ ܐܘܣܦ : ܡܢ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ ܐܫܬܕܝܬ.
ܟܕ ܟܠܗ ܠܗܦܟܐ ܡܬܬܟܢܢܐ ܠܘܬ ܬܘܪܨܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܥܒ̈ܪ
ܚܒܪ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ، ܟܕ ܗܘ، ܘܢܩܦܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܗܘ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܟܕ ܠܟܠܢܫ ܝܕܝܥܐ : ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
ܣܛܪ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܗ ܢܩܦܐ ✣

ܘܗܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܚܢܢ ܒܡܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ : ܟܕ ܐܝܟ ܚܝܠ
ܡܝܬܪܐ ܒܚܢ ܠܒܪܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܦܫܝܩܐ ܕܒܚܩܢܐ :
ܠܐܒܐ ܣܡܝܟ : ܕܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܘܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܗ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܒܐ ܗܘ ܕܠܗ ܢܩܦܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܠܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ
ܡܢ ܟܠܦܪܘܣ ܠܒܪ ܡܢܗ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ
ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܗ ܢܩܦܐ. ܟܕ ܐܗܦܟܢ ܥܠ ܢܦܫ ܘܡܟܣܢ ܕܒܢ̈ܬ ܩܠܐ
ܐܦ̈ܗܬܐ ܓܙܝܢ : ܘܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܦܡ
ܒܦܪܗܣܝܐ : ܠܡܛܥܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܕܘ̈ܝܐ ܐܢܫܐ ܚܫܒܬ ܐܢܐ ܡܠܣܥܝܘ
ܣܚܦܢ ܒܚܘܫܒܗܘܢ. ܘܠܐ ܥܠ ܟܠܗ ܦܡ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܦܩܪ
ܐܢܐ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ : ܕܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܟܕ ܗܢܝܢ ܡܬܡܠܠܝܢ : ܬܘܒ
ܒܒܨܝܐ ܕܡܬܡܠܠܐ ܢܘܪܝܟ : ܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܕܪܟܐ ܦܫܝܩ ܠܗ̇ܘ
ܕܨܒܐ ܕܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܢܩܪܐ : * ܘܫܪܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܕܪ ܡܬܬܗܦܟܢ f. 79vb
ܡܢ ܦܘܠܚ̈ܢܐ ܕܕܓܠܘܬܐ ܢܚܡܕ ܘܢܚܙܐ. ܒܪܡ ܡܛܠ ܕܟܕ
ܒܟܠܕܘܟ ܡܬܟܣܣܐ ܪܘܫܥܐ : ܠܐ ܫܠܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܒܗ

A W from l. 192 to l. 198

Line 187: ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 9, line 304 (ܕܐܘܣܝܐ).
Line 193: ܟܕ, Book II, ch. 9, line 310 and W om.
Lines 195-196: ܥܒ̈ܪ ܚܒܪ, cf. Book II, ch. 9, line 313 (ܥܒܪ ܚܒܪ).
Line 196: ܘܢܩܦܐ, cf. infra, line 274 (ܢܩܦܐ).

round of arguments and from attempting to dignify the ugliness of false teaching, it will perhaps be useful, at this point too, to give the listener a brief reminder, for safety's sake, and thus move the discussion on to other words of the God-clad father.

So let the friend of truth observe that Basil the Great was here in dispute with impure Eunomius over God the Father and particularly because he had said (with reference to the villain): Having declared that 'if he is not prior to himself nor is there another to be prior to him, ingeneracy must follow him'. For Eunomius by no means admitted saying this of the Son or the Holy Ghost. How, indeed, could Eunomius have said that when he made those mentioned, creatures and subject to time? Therefore, it is plain that finding a strong defence of the truth in the exposition by the heretic, he proved that ingeneracy ('agenneton' here means this) is not the Father, but that it follows the Father externally, and that it is entirely other than the Father. He says, then: For if ingeneracy follows God, it evidently follows him externally; now what is outside God is not his substance. And again: 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?

But we must take note of another passage: 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. If, then, his initial statement (i.e. that ingeneracy follows God) is a consequence of the truth of the realities but what follows must be different from what is followed, how can the ingeneracy which follows fail to be different from the Father

---

**205/206** cf. supra, 157-158 **213/215** cf. supra, 160-162 **215/217** cf. supra, 182-184 **218/222** cf. supra, 178-180 **222** cf. supra, 158 et 160



ܗܘܘ ܒܒܪ̈ܘܪܒܐ ܢܬܥܣܩ: ܘܬܚܪܐ ܕܫܘܚܬܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܓܠܬܐ ܢܬܝܩܪ: ܫܟܝܚܐ ܒܒܪ ܕܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܕܠܫܡܘܥܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܙܗܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܫܡܘܥܐ ܒܟܪܝܘ. ܘܡܫܢܐ ܠܡܬ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܢܥܒܪ ܠܡܘܥܝܐ.

ܢܚܙܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܪܚܡ ܫܪܪܐ: ܕܠܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܪܒܐ: ܗܪܟܐ: ܡܛܠܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܠܘܬ ܛܢܦܐ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܐܬܚܪܝ ܗܘܬ ܒܡܠܬܐ. ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܛܠ ܒܝܫܐ: ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ܆ ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܠܐ ܐܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܢܦܫܗ: ܘܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡܘܗܝ: ܢܩܦܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܠܝܕܘܬܐ܆ ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܛܠ ܒܪܐ ܐܘ ܡܛܠ ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܗܢܐ ܕܗܪܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܡܩܒܠ ܗܘܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܦ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܘܕܬܚܝܬ ܙܒܢܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܘ ܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ. ܡܟܝܠ ܓܠܝܐ ܗܝ: ܕܟܕ ܡܚܝܠ ܕܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܪܫܝܥܐ: ܐܫܟܚ ܥܘܕܪܢܬܐ ܚܝܠܬܢܝܬܐ ܠܫܪܪܐ: ܚܘܝ: ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝܘ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܐܒܐ. ܗܘܪܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܬܡܠܝܐ ܗܪܟܐ ܐܟܚܕܐ: ܘܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܠܓܒܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܃ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܡܒܝܢܐ ܗܝ، ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܗ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܕܐܠܗܐ: ܠܘ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܃ ܘܬܘܒ ܃ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܝ، ܒܗ ܗܝ، ܘܢܩܦܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܬܝܗ: ܟܕ ܠܟܠܢܫ ܡܒܝܢܐ: ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܣܛܪ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܗ ܢܩܦܐ ܃

ܘܚܙܝ، ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܦܠܐ ܕܐܬܚܡܝܬܐ ܃ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܕܝܢ ܠܡ ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ، ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ: ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ: ܒܗ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܠܗ̇ܝܢ ܕܐܬܝܗܒ ܐܫܬܘܝ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܚܪܬܐ ܐܘܣܦ: ܡܢ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ ܐܬܐܬܝܬ ܃ ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܐܡܪ: ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ ܕܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ: ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܠܓܒܪ ܐܝܬܝܗ، ܕܢܩܦܐ ܣܛܪ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܗ ܢܩܦܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܣܛܪ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܗ ܢܩܦܐ

---

A

whom it follows? Ingeneracy will, surely, not be perceived as the Father's hypostasis but as the Father's characteristic property.

* He also proves this in the second book *Against* the same evil *Eunomius*, by saying: 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. But one will, from the above, learn also the difference between the meanings. It is said that God *dwells in light* and that he *decks himself in light*, but nowhere does the Scripture say that he dwells in his own ingeneracy or that he has it for his covering. And again: 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 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?

Here too, be it noted, when Eunomius denies his thesis in a different way and brazenly attempts to prove the opposite, that ingeneracy does not follow God but is God's substance, the doctor

228/237 Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 28-29 (*PG* 29, 637C - 640A; *SChr.*, vol. 305, pp. 120-122); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 10, 49-55 **235** I Tim. 6:16 **236** Ps. 103:2 **237/245** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 29 (*PG* 29, 640B; *SChr.*, vol. 305, p. 122); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 6, 331-338



ܬܗܘܐ ܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܠܘ ܐܝܟ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܐܬܝܕܥܬ ܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ.

ܗܢܐ ܐܦ * ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܕܗܘ ܪܫܝܥܐ f. 80ra
ܡܚܘܐ ܟܕ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܐܠܐ ܗܢܐ ܟܕ ܫܘܚܠܦܘܬܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܥܒܪ : ܘܗܪܟܐ ܥܠܬܐ ܕܓܘܕܦܐ ܢܓܕ. ܟܕ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܛܠܝܐ ܒܣܘܦܣܡܘܗܝ ܡܕܚܠ ܠܢ. ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܐܚܪܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܨܐ ܐܝܬ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܠܗ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ. ܕܐܢ ܠܘ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܢܬܐܡܪ ܬܘܒ ܥܠ ܒܪܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܗܝ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܝܠܦ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܫ ܘܡܢ ܠܥܠ : ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܫܡܗܐ. ܕܐܡܪ ܒܢܘܗܪܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܝܪܐ. ܘܕܡܬܥܛܦ ܒܢܘܗܪܐ. ܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܕܘܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܟܬܒܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ : ܘܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܠܗ ܕܡܬܥܛܦܐ ܐܡܪܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ ❖ ܘܬܘܒ ❖ ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܠܘܬ ܗܝ ܕܡܪܟܒܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܐܠܗܐ : ܐܢ ܗܝ ܟܕ ܗܝ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܐ ܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܢܘܗܪܐ : ܗܝ ܐܝܬ ܠܢ ܕܢܐܡܪ. ܕܐܢ ܡܢ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ : ܫܩܠܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܐܬܪܐ ܠܡܠܬܗ : ܟܕ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܐܡܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ ܡܪܟܒ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܣܝܡܝܢ : ܐܘ ܚܝܐ ܐܘ ܛܒܬܐ : ܟܠܗ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܚܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܘܟܠܗ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܟܠܗ ܛܒܬܐ : ܕܢܩܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܚܝܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ❖

ܗܢܐ ܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ : ܟܕ ܒܥܢܝܢܗ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܐܝܬ ܚܦܪ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ : ܘܗܝ ܕܠܡܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ : ܐܠܐ ܕܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ :

A flor. I from l. 262 to l. 266

Line 247: ܗܪܟܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 10, line 54 (ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ).
Lines 263-264: ܟܠܗ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ..... ܘܟܠܗ ܛܒܬܐ, flor. I om.
Line 265: ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܚܝܐ, cf. infra, line 286 (ܠܚܝܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ).

courageously rebuts him by proving plainly that ingeneracy is not the light (likewise, indeed, not the life or the goodness) but follows the light. For how, he says in the passage just examined, 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? For when Eunomius was saying, that if the light he acknowledges as Father is different from ingeneracy we must be making God composite, the doctor blocked the path to blasphemy by writing: 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. And again: 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 the ingeneracy follows the life, how can the simple in substance not be incomposite? Let us observe closely that having said in the above: For if ingeneracy follows God, it evidently follows him externally, and later: For how can God have the ingeneracy, which both follows him and does not follow him, the master of mysteries also endeavoured to draw Eunomius unwillingly to the soundness of the truth by the mad fellow's own confession and here expressed an argument based not on Eunomius' statement but clearly on his own teaching. He ruled that ingeneracy follows the life. If, however, anyone has reached such a pitch of contentiousness as to say that, because the doctor said that ingeneracy follows the life, he did not

**251/253** cf. supra, 182-184 **256/258** cf. supra, 232-234 **259/262** cf. supra, 241-245 **263/264** cf. supra, 160-161 **264/265** cf. supra, 166-167 **269** et **271** cf. supra, 261



ܠܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܢܦܫܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܐ: ܒܓܢܒܪܐܝܬ ܡܟܣ ܡܠܦܢܐ.
ܟܕ ܡܚܘܐ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ: ܕܐܦܠܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ: ܗܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ
ܕܝܢ: ܘܠܐ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܘ ܛܒܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ:
ܢܩܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܢܘܗܪܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܫܐ
ܐܬܡܨܝ ؞ ܗ̇ܝ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ܝ: ܟܕ
ܠܟܠܢܫ ܝܕܝܥܐ: ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ܝ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ
ܕܠܗ ܢܩܦܐ ؞ ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܐܡܪ ܗܘܐ: ܕܐܢ ܗܘ
ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܢܘܗܪܐ: ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܦ ܐܒܐ ܡܘܕܐ
ܗܘܐ: ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܠܨܐ ܗܘܬ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܐ
ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܟܕ ܣܟܪ ܠܗ ܐܘܪܚܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܓܘܕܦܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ
ܟܬܒ ؞ ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ. * ܕܐܢ ܠܘ ܐܚܪܢܐ f. 80rb
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ
ܕܢܬܐܡܪ ܬܘܒ ܥܠ ܒܪܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ؞ ܘܬܘܒ ؞ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ
ܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܦܣܝܢܢ: ܐܘ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܘ ܛܒܬܐ: ܟܠܗ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܕܡ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ؛ ܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܘܟܠܗ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܟܠܗ ܛܒܬܐ:
ܕܢܩܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܘ
ܠܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ؞ ܢܬܒܩܐ
ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ: ܕܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ؞ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܢܩܦܐ
ܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܝܕܝܥܐ ܗܝ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܗ ؞
ܘܒܬܪܟܢ ؞ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܕܢܩܦܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܬܘܒ ܘܕܠܐ ܢܩܦܐ ؞ ܘܡܢ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܠܗ
ܕܥܡܠܐ: ܠܘܬ ܫܠܝܡܘܬܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܐܚܝܦ ܘܟܕ ܠܐ ܨܒܐ
ܢܓܕܝܘܗܝ: ܒܗܠܝܢ ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ ܘܡܢ ܡܦܩܢܐ ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ:
ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܦܩ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܦ ܕܐܪܐ.
ܘܦܣܩ ܕܠܚ̈ܝܐ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܠܟܠܗ̇
ܗܕܐ ܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܐܬܐ ܐܢܫ ܘܐܡܪ: ܕܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ
ܡܠܦܢܐ: ܕܠܚ̈ܝܐ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ

A

Line 274: ܢܩܦܐ, cf. supra, line 196 (ܘܢܩܦܐ).
Line 286: ܠܚ̈ܝܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ, cf. supra, line 265 (ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܚ̈ܝܐ).
Line 290: ܘܕܢܩܦܐ, cf. supra, line 179 (ܘܕܢܩܦ̇ܐ).

mean that ingeneracy does not follow the Father but the substance inclusive of the hypostases, such a person must understand the feebleness of his sophism. For the contest here with Eunomius was only over the Father. For it was not because he thought of the substance in the generic meaning (of which he was entirely ignorant) or of the Son or the Holy Ghost, but only of God the Father, whom he also defined as 'he who is ingeneracy', that the wicked man said: if the light is something else beside the ingeneracy, God will necessarily be proved composite. But that the God-clad Basil too was talking about the same God the Father of whom Eunomius was speaking in the above-quoted passage, he himself showed both by saying that ingeneracy follows the life and again by immediately adding, how can the simple in substance not be incomposite? For he says: 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 the ingeneracy follows the life, how can the simple in substance not be incomposite? For we unhesitatingly call Father, Son and Holy Ghost 'life'. But when we understand that ingeneracy follows and is coupled with the life, we do not then affirm that the whole Trinity is thereby meant by us, but mean, as we have been taught, the hypostasis of God the Father alone. For the famous SEVERUS said in his *109th Cathedral Homily*: So when you mentally apprehend or imagine the Trinity, call the whole 'one God', not because you diffuse or merge the hypostases but because you recognize in the three one Godhead and the other indications of the common identity. But when you confine your view to the Father, or e.g. to the Son, or it may

**279/280** cf. supra, 230-232 **283/284** cf. infra, 287-288 **285/288** cf. supra, 241-245 **293/307** Sev. Ant., *Hom. cath. 109* (*PO* 25, pp. 747,6 [8] - 748,5 [9]); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 10, 163-177



ܠܐܒܐ : ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܣܘܪܬܐ ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܥܩܒ
ܕܢܩܦܐ : ܢܕܥ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܢܫܝܫܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܦܣܡܗ.
ܡܛܠ ܐܒܐ ܓܝܪ ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ : ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܗܪܐ ܠܘܬ
ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܐܓܘܢܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܒܗܘܢܐ : ܐܘ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ
ܗܝ ܕܐܝܟ ܥܘܕܪܢܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ : ܠܗܝ ܕܐܦ ܠܓܡܪ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ
ܗܘܐ : ܐܘ ܬܘܒ ܠܒܪܐ ܐܘ ܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ : ܐܠܐ ܠܗ
ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ : ܠܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܡܢܐ ܕܐܬܚܡܗ
ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܐܡ ܗܘܐ : ܒܕ ܡܦܬܠ ܐܡܪ ܗܘܐ ܀
— ܕܐܢ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܐ
— ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܨܐ ܐܝܬ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܠܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܕܐܦ
ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܒܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ : ܡܛܠܠܗ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ : ܡܛܠ ܗܘ
ܕܐܦ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܡܬܝܒܢ ܡܡܠܠ ܗܘܐ : ܚܘܝ
ܘܒܗ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܚܝܐ : ܘܬܘܒ ܒܗ
ܕܢܩܦܐܝܬ ܐܘܣܦ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ
< ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܝ
< ܕܐܠܗܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܫܪܝܢܢ : ܐܘ ܚܝܐ ܐܘ ܛܒܘܬܐ : ܟܠܗ ܗܘ
< ܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܚܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܘܟܠܗ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܟܠܗ
< ܛܒܘܬܐ : ܕܢܩܦܐ * ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘ ܠܚܝܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : f. 80va
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܠܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܀
ܚܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܠܐ ܦܘܫܟܐ : ܘܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ
ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܠܚܝܐ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܘܡܙܕܘܓܐ
ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ : ܠܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܕܟܠܗ ܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ
ܒܗܕܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܐ ܠܝ ܡܫܪܪܝܢ : ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܒܐ
ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܠܦܢ ܡܬܠܡܕܝܢ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ
ܕܡܐܐ ܘܬܫܥܐ ܕܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܘܬܐ ܣܐܘܝܪܐ ܗܘ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܀
< ܐܡܬܝ، ܗܟܝܠ ܕܡܕܥܐ ܬܦܣ ܠܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܐܘ ܬܨܝܪ
< ܬܗܓܐ : ܚܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܠ. ܠܐ ܒܗ݁ܝ ܕܐܫܦܥ ܐܢܬ
< ܐܘ ܡܚܠܛ ܐܢܬ ܠܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ. ܐܠܐ ܒܗ݁ܝ ܕܝܕܥ ܐܢܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ
< ܒܬܠܬܝܗܘܢ ܚܕ ܐܢܬ. ܘܫܪܟܐ ܫܘܕ̈ܥܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ
< ܕܓܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܘܕܠܝܢ ܒܕ ܕܠܗܝܢ. ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܒܐ ܬܚܘܪ

A flor. I from l. 323 on

Line 324: ܠܗ, cf. Book II, ch. 10, line 179 (ܠܐ).

be, to the Holy Ghost, and use the invocation 'God' or *'He who is'* or 'Lord' or any other term common to the Holy Trinity, you are making a good invocation; but, let the property be coupled by you, and invoke God as Father who exists ingenerately and not from others, and likewise name the Son 'God', 'Lord', and *'He who is'* but who has been begotten eternally of the Father; and likewise extoll the Holy Ghost with the same equally honourable names: not as if he were not from 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.

Basil the Great wrote similarly, because he recognized that the life that ingeneracy follows is God the Father: 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 the ingeneracy follows the life, how can the simple in substance not be incomposite? So the sophists should say how ingeneracy can fail to be other than God the Father. For if ingeneracy follows the life * whereas the doctor understood the life that ingeneracy follows to be God the

**298** et **302** cf. Ex. 3:14 **309/312** cf. supra, 241-245 **314** cf. supra, 311-312



< ܡܬܩܪܝܢܘܬܐ: ܐܘ ܐܝܬܝܐ ܠܡܐܡܪ ܠܘܬ ܒܪܐ: ܐܘ ܠܘܬ
< ܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܬܠܒܫ: ܘܩܪܐ ܐܢܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܘ
< ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܘ ܡܪܝܐ: ܐܘ ܡܕܡ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܓܘܢܝܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܫܦܝܪ ܩܪܐ ܐܢܬ. ܒܪܡ
< ܕܡܘܙܓܐ ܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ܠܟ ܕܝܠܢܝܬܐ: ܘܩܪܝ، ܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܟ
< ܐܒܐ. ܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܚܪܢ. ܐܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܠܝܕܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܗܟܢ
< ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܠܒܪܐ: ܘܐܠܗܐ ܘܡܪܝܐ ܘܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܫܡܗ.
< ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܘܡܐܝܬ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ. ܘܗܟܢ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ
< ܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܒܗܠܝܢ ܗܢܝܢ ܫܘܝܬ ܐܝܩܪܐ ܒܫܡܗܐ
< ܫܒܚ. ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܘ ܝܠܝܕܐ:
< ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܢܦܘܩܐ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ. ܢܩܘܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܬܬܙܝܥܢܝܬܐ
< ܡܢ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܘܫܡܗܐ ܓܘܢܝܐ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ. ܘܗܢܝܢ ܕܓܘܢܝܢ ܕܝܢ
< ܗܢܝ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܡܬܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ ܢܗܘܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܕܕܝܠܝܘܬܐ ❖

ܗܟܢܐ ܐܦ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܪܒܐ : ܟܕ ܝܕܥ ܕܚܝܐ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܠܗܘܢ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ:
< ܟܬܒ ❖ ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܚܝܐ:
< ܐܘ ܚܝܐ ܐܘ ܛܒܬܐ: ܟܠܗ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܚܝܐ
< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܘܟܠܗ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܟܠܗ ܛܒܬܐ: ܕܢܩܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬ
< ܠܗܘܢ ܠܚܝܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ
< ܗܘ: ܗܘ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ❖ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܣܘܦܣܛܐ:
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܠܗ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܠܐ
ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܢܩܦܐ ܠܚܝܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: * ܠܚܝܐ f. 80vb
ܕܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ
ܐܣܬܟܠ ܡܠܦܢܐ: ܐܚܪܬܐ ܡܢ ܠܘܩܒܠܗ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ

A flor. I up to l. 341

Line 328: ܡܬܩܪܝܢܘܬܐ, W: ܡܬܩܪܝܢܘܬ.
Line 330: ܕܓܘܢܝܐ, flor. I: ܕܓܘܢܐ.
Line 331: ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ, flor. I: ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ.
Line 334: ܠܒܪܐ, Y: ܘܠܒܪܐ.
Line 335: ܕܐܬܝܠܕ, XZ: ܕܐܬܝܠܝܕ. ܕܝܢ, WXY om.
Line 339: ܕܝܢ, Book II, ch. 10, line 194 and WXY om.

Father, ingeneracy must be other than God the Father, because we have been taught that what follows is different from what it follows.

However, let us investigate the words How can the simple in substance not be incomposite? For the doctor said of Eunomius: 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. And later: 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 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? Then whom was Eunomius professing to be 'light', 'ingenerate', 'God' and 'simple in substance'? Everyone knows, I think: the Father alone. So of the same God the Father the wise theologian too said: How can the simple in substance not be incomposite? When he has completely controverted, indeed, rather, proved utterly impotent, the blasphemer's sophism, what do you desire, then, you cunning fellow? Will you shamelessly embrace the Jewish notions of the Libyan, defining Father, Son and Holy Ghost as not really three hypostases but one hypostasis named with three titles? Or, forbearing, for the deception and ensnaring of the simple, openly to avow these things, * will you allege against us some alien and utterly incongruous fictions marvel-

**317** cf. supra, 183-184 **318/319** cf. supra, 244-245 **319/323** cf. supra, 228-232 **323/331** cf. supra, 237-245 **334/335** cf. supra, 330-331



‹ ܐܝܟܐ ܬܫܬܟܚ ܠܐ ܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܡܛܠ ܕܗܘ ܡܕܡ ܕܢܩܦ:
‹ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܗ ܢܩܦ ܠܘܬܗ.

ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ
‹ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܢܒܚܘܢ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܡܛܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܀ ܐܠܐ
‹ ܗܪܟܐ ܒܗ ܣܘܣܛܠܘܬܐ ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܥܒܪ: ܡܢ
‹ ܗܪܟܐ ܥܠܬܐ ܕܓܘܕܦܐ ܢܓܕ: ܟܕ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܛܠܝܐ
‹ ܒܣܘܦܣܡܘܗܝ، ܡܕܚܠ ܠܢ. ܕܐܢܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܕܡ ܢܘܗܪܐ
‹ ܢܘܗܪܐ: ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܠܨܐܝܬ ܡܪܟܒܐ
‹ ܡܬܚܙܐ ܠܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܘܡܬܪܡ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܠܘܬ ܗܝ،
‹ ܕܡܪܟܒܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܐܠܗܐ: ܐܢ ܗܝ، ܟܕ ܗܝ، ܠܐ ܡܬܢܣܒܐ
‹ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܢܘܗܪܐ: ܗܝ، ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܕܐܡܪ. ܕܐܢ ܡܢ
‹ ܐܝܟ ܡܢܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܫܩܠܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܝܬ
‹ ܗܘܐ ܐܬܪܐ ܠܡܠܬܗ: ܟܕ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܐܡܪ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ:
‹ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܡܫܚܠܦܐ ܡܪܟܒ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܕܐܠܗܐ
‹ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܡܫܘܕܝܢ: ܐܘ ܚܝܐ ܐܘ ܛܒܬܐ: ܟܠܗ ܗܘ ܡܕܡ
‹ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܚܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܘܟܠܗ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܟܠܗ ܛܒܬܐ:
‹ ܕܢܩܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܚܝܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ
‹ ܠܐ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܀ ܐܝܠܐ. ܠܡܢܘ
ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ: ܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ: ܘܐܠܗܐ ܘܦܫܝܛܐ
ܒܐܘܣܝܐ: ܡܘܕܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܠܟܠܢ ܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ
ܝܕܝܥܐ: ܕܠܐܒܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ. ܡܛܠܬܗ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ
‹ ܘܡܠܦܢܐ ܚܟܝܡ ܒܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ
‹ ܡܪܟܒܐ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܦܫܝܛܐ ܀ ܟܕ ܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ
ܗܟܝܠ: ܟܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܬܚܒܠܐ ܚܒܠܗ ܠܣܘܦܣܡܗ
ܕܡܓܕܦܢܐ. ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܨܒܐ ܐܢܬ ܐܘ ܨܢܝܥܐ.
ܡܓܦܦ ܐܢܬ ܕܠܐ ܒܗܬܐ: ܡܣܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܝܘܕܝܬܐ
ܕܗܘ ܠܘܒܝܐ: ܟܕ ܠܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ:
ܚܕ ܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܒܬܠܬܐ ܫܡܗܐ ܡܫܬܡܗ ܡܬܚܡܢ
ܐܢܬܘܢ: ܠܐܒܐ ܘܠܒܪܐ ܘܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ: ܐܘ ܟܕ ܠܘܬ
ܦܠܚܘܬܐ ܘܨܝܕܐ ܕܦܫܝܛܐ ܡܬܬܠܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ
ܬܫܬܘܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ: ܠܦܘܠܓܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ ܘܡܫܠܡܝܢ ܠܐ

A

lously compounded of Jewish godlessness and pagan lunacy, thinking of Father, Son or Holy Ghost not as God but as followers who follow God externally? For if, the herald of truth says, ingeneracy follows God, it evidently follows him externally. How, then, can one who follows God externally, and is other than light, be God? For, as we have heard, the guide to divine mysteries said expressly: 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 again: 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. So let the clever say either that ingeneracy is only the Father's characteristic property and is not the Father, or professing it to be the Father, let them clearly say that the Father is not (or, to speak comprehensively, the three hypostases of the Holy Trinity are not) God (according to what has been said) at all, but followers who follow God externally, or are only names. For this, though covertly, is what the unsound author desires to claim throughout his book.

Besides this, let us examine in due order other statements too of the divinely inspired father, which are set down in the first book *Against Eunomius* the impious, but will instruct us in the truth of sound doctrines. Why, then, he says, is it absurd for certain things even about the God of all to be accepted in this way in accordance with inventive thought, and primarily this very thing which is the whole subject of our argument? For we find that 'ingeneracy' is used in no different way. We say, indeed, that the God of all is incorruptible and ingenerate, call-

**345/346** cf. supra, 160-161 **349/351** cf. supra, 182-184 **351/353** cf. supra, 232-234 **364/378** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 7 (*PG* 29, 525BC; *SChr.*, vol. 299, pp. 190-192)



ܠܫܢܝܐ: ܘܬܫܡܫܬܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܡܗܘܕܝܘܬܐ ܘܡܢ
ܚܢܦܘܬܐ ܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܡܪܟܒܝܢ ܡܬܪܥܝܢ *ܐܢܘܢ ܠܝ: ܟܕ ܠܐ f. 81ra
ܗܟܢ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܐܘ ܠܒܪܐ ܐܘ ܠܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ
ܡܬܪܥܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ: ܢܩܝܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܘ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܦܝܢ
< ܠܐܠܗܐ ✧ ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ ܟܪܘܙܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ: ܢܩܝܦܐ ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܡܕܝܢܐ ܗܝ، ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܝܦܐ ܠܗ ✧
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܝܦ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܚܪܢܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܢܘܗܪܐ: ܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܠܗܐ. ܟܡ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ
ܟܡܠܬܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܝ̈ܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܡܥܢ ܐܡܪ ✧
< ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ، ܒܗ ܗܘ، ܘܢܩܝܦܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ:
< ܟܕ ܠܟܠܢ ܝܕܝܥܐ: ܕܗܘ، ܕܢܩܝܦܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܣܛܪ ܡܢ
< ܗܘ ܕܠܗ ܢܩܝܦܐ ✧ ܘܬܘܒ ✧ ܡܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܡܠܠܐ
< ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ. ܕܐܢ ܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܒܪ ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܬܬܐܡܪ ܬܘܒ ܥܠ ܒܪܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ
< ܕܐܦܠܐ ܗܝ، ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ✧ ܐܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܚܟܝܡܐ
ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ: ܘܠܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܒܐ ܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ ܬܫܒܘܚܬܐ: ܐܘ ܟܕ ܡܘܕܝܢ ܠܗ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܐܒܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܐܡܪܘܢ: ܕܐܒܐ ܐܘ ܕܒܟܠܢܐܝܬ ܐܡܪ
ܬܠܬܐ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ: ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ ܐܠܗܐ: ܢܩܝܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܦܝܢ
ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܐܘ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܘܗܕܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܦ
ܡܛܫܝܐܝܬ: ܒܥܐ ܒܟܠܗ ܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܠܐ ܚܠܝܡܐ
ܕܢܚܘܐ ܨܒܐ.

ܒܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܛܟܣܐ ܕܦܐܐ ܢܒܚܢ: ܘܫܪ̈ܟܐ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ
ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܢܦܝܚ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ. ܕܣܝ̈ܡܢ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ
ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܪܫܝܥܐ. ܕܕܝܢ ܠܝ ܕܝܢ ܫܪܪܐ
< ܕܝ̈ܘܠܦܢܐ ܚܠܝ̈ܡܐ ✧ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܡܪ ܫܚܝܩܐ: ܕܗܠܝܢ
< ܘܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ: ܢܬܩܒܠܢ ܗܟܢ ܗܟܢ ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ
< ܕܡܫܟܚܢܐ: ܘܠܩܘܕܡ ܗܝ، ܗܕܐ ܕܡܛܠܬܗ ܟܠܗ ܡܠܬܐ
< ܡܬܬܙܝܥܐ ܠܝ. ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ
< ܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ

A

ing him by these names in accordance with various ideas. For when we survey the first world-eras and discover that God's life falls beyond all beginning, we call him ingenerate. When, on the other hand, we stretch our mind to future world-eras, we call him infinite and unlimited, not comprehended by any end whatsoever, incorruptible. * So, just as endlessness of life is called 'incorruptibility' so also its unbeginningness has been called 'ingeneracy' as we view the two things in him in accordance with inventive thought. What reasoning, then, will gainsay that each one of these terms too will be the result of inventive thought and an acknowledgement of whatever truly belongs to God. And later: Since, then, God's substance has been seen to be incomprehensible and ineffable to man's understanding, it remains to disclose, with regard to ingeneracy itself, what it is and how it is perceived in the God of all. We discover, then, in reasoning, that the idea of ingeneracy does not fall for us within the consideration of what he is but rather (I speak the expression under compulsion) of how he is. For our mind investigates whether *the God over all* has some cause prior to him and then, unable to think of one, names his unbeginningness of life 'ingeneracy'.

I do not think those who observe the exactness of these words of the Father can rightly fail to be surprised and highly astonished at the snarling of this author. For, drawn and dragged along with

**378/386** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 14-15 (*PG* 29, 545AB; *SChr.*, vol. 299, p. 224) **384/385** cf. Rom. 9:5



< ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ : ܒܕ ܒܚ̈ܘܫܒܐ ܡܫܚ̈ܠܦܐ
< ܒܩ̈ܕܡܝܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܚܙܝܢ. ܐܡܬܝ، ܟܕ ܚܙܝܢ ܕܒܥܠܡ̈ܐ ܕܡܬܩܢܝܢ
< ܚܙܝܢ : ܘܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܕܠܗܠ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܫܪܝܐ ܢܦܠܝܢ ܚܝ̈ܐ
< ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗ. ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܝܢ ܕܒܥܠܡ̈ܐ
< ܕܐܬܝܢ ܡܬܦܫܛܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ : ܠܐ ܡܬܚܡܢܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܣܘܦܐ
< ܕܟܐܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܥܘܠܡܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܐ : ܕܠܐ ܚܒܠܐ ܩܪܝܢ.
< * ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܘܬܐ : f.81rb
< ܡܬܩܪܐ ܗܘ، ܕܠܐ ܫܪܝܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܬܩܪܝܬ.
< ܟܕ ܒܚܘܫܒܐ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܟܠܗܘܢ، ܫܪܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܗܘܢ. ܐܝܢܐ
< ܗܟܝܠ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܚܪܝܐ : ܘܕܡܢ ܚܘܫܒܬܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܘܣܒܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ
< ܐܬܬܝܗܘܢ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܡ̈ܗܐ : ܘܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ
< ܕܗܘ ܡܐ ܕܒܫܪܪܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܐܠܗܐ ܀ ܘܒܬܪ ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ ܀
< ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܬܚܙܝܬ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ
< ܡܬܡܠܠܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܡܕܥܬܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܪ̈ܒܢܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܢܣܒܐ ܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܕܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ
< ܕܟܠ. ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ : ܕܠܘ ܒܒܥܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ
< ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܢܦܠ ܠܝ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ
< ܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܒܕ ܐܟܣܐ ܐܝܟ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ : ܒܗ̇، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ
< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܒܕ ܡܒܩܐ ܓܝܪ ܗܘܢ : ܕܐܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܠ ܟܠ
< ܥܠܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܕܩܕܝܡܐ ܠܗ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ : ܘܡܬܐܪܡ ܒܕ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ
< ܠܡܬܪܥܝܘ ܘܠܐ ܚܕܐ : ܠܠܐ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܘܗܝ، ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
< ܫܡܗ ܀

ܠܐ ܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܡܚܝܪܝܢ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ
ܗܠܝܢ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܡܬܟܫܪܝܢ : ܕܠܐ ܒܟܐܢܘܬ ܢܬܕܡܪܘܢ :
ܘܒܚܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܐ ܦܩܚ ܢܬܕܡܪܘܢ. ܒܕ ܓܝܪ

AB from ܕܠܐ (l. 421) on

Line 423: ܫܪܝܢ, B: ܫܪܝܢ ܗܘܝ.
Line 431: ܡܫܟܚܝܢ, B: ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܗܘܝ.
Lines 431-432: ܕܗ̇ܝ ..... ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, cf. ch. 18, line 69 (ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ).
Line 433: ܒܕ, cf. ch. 18, line 70 (ܕܒܕ) and note.

heretical perversity as with some harsh and irresistible force, he has arrived at so much brazenness as to despise even the common law fixed in man's nature. As Scripture has it: *Ephraim has waxed strong against his adversary, he has trampled on judgement, because he has begun to go after vanities.* Therefore, casting shame aside, he is contending against the clear definitions of the Spirit. For is there any pretext for his abominable opinion that the guide of sacred doctrines has not plucked out along with its very roots by this divinely inspired teaching? Let us observe, first, that he speaks here indeed of God the Father alone and the property viewed in him viz. ingeneracy. He says, in fact: Why, then, is it absurd for certain things even about the God of all to be accepted in this way in accordance with inventive thought, * and primarily this very thing which is the whole subject of our argument? For we find that 'ingeneracy' is used in no different way. We say, indeed, that the God of all is incorruptible and ingenerate, calling him by these names in accordance with various ideas. We have learned, I suppose, that by the God of all the doctor understood the Father. He says: We say, indeed, that the God of all is incorruptible and ingenerate. For though we believe that each hypostasis of the Holy Trinity is *agennetos* in the sense of uncreatedness, none the less, he did give us the tradition of not

**392/394** Os. 5:11 **400/406** cf. supra, 364-369 **407/408** cf. supra, 404-405



ܟܕ ܦܘܬܠܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܚܝܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܩܫܝܐ
ܘܠܐ ܡܬܬܟܣܢܐ ܡܛܝ. ܘܡܬܚܨܦ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܗܕܐ
ܠܡܡܪܚܘܬܐ ܐܬܐ : ܐܡܝܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܗ ܒܟܝܢܗ ܕܐܢܫܐ
ܘܕܟܝܢܐ ܐܢܫܝܐ ܡܛܝܒ ܠܡܒܣܪܘ. ܐܝܟ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܟܬܝܒܐ ܀
< ܕܐܬܚܣܢ ܐܦܪܝܡ ܥܠ ܒܥܠ ܕܝܢܗ. ܕܫܗ ܠܕܝܢܐ : ܡܛܠ ܕܫܪܝ
< ܕܢܐܙܠ ܒܬܪ ܣܪܝܩܘܬܐ ܀ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܟܕ ܫܕܝܗ̇ ܠܒܗܬܬܐ :
ܠܘܩܒܠ ܬܚܘܡܐ ܓ̈ܠܝܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܡܬܟܬܫ. ܠܐܝܢܐ ܓܝܪ
ܥܠܬܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܡܣܩܒܠܬܐ : ܠܐ ܚܣܩܗ̇ ܕܒܥܩܪܐ ܬܬܥܩܪ
ܒܝܕ ܗܕܐ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܢܦܝܚܬ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ : ܡܗܕܝܢܐ
ܕܝ̈ܘܠܦܢܐ ܟܗ̈ܢܝܐ. ܘܢܬܒܩܐ ܩܕܡܝܬ : ܕܡܛܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ
ܒܠܚܘܕܘܗܝ, ܘܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܒܗ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ : ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܡܡܠܠ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܀ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܥܕܠܐ : ܕܗܠܝܢ ܘܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܢܬܩܒܠܢ ܗܟܢ ܗܟܢ
< ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܕܫܘܟܠܠܐ : * ܘܠܘܩܕܡ ܗܝ, ܗܕܐ ܕܡܬܡܠܠܐ ܥܠܝܗ̇ f. 81va
< ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܪܥܝܢܐ ܠܝ : ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܓܝܪ ܕܠܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܟ
< ܐܚܪܢܐܝܬ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܐ ܓܝܪ
< ܘܠܐ ܐܝܠܝܕܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ : ܟܕ
< ܒܚܘܫܒܐ ܡܫܚܠ̈ܦܐ ܒܫܡܗܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܟܢܝܢ ܀ ܐܠܦܢ
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ : ܠܐܒܐ ܐܣܬܟܠ
ܡܠܦܢܐ. ܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܠܡ ܘܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ. ܐܦ ܓܝܪ ܐܓܢܝܛܘܢ : ܒܡܘܕܝܢܐ
ܕܠܐ ܒܪܝܘܬܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ

AB

Line 450: ܩܕܡܝܬ, B: ܩܕܡܐܝܬ.

Line 455: ܡܫܟܚܝܢ, B: ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܚܢܢ.

Line 460: ܐܡܪܝܢ ܚܢܢ, B: ܐܡܪܝܢ.

Line 461: ܐܓܢܝܛܘܢ. The following note is written in a *tabula ansata* in the right margin of both A and B: ܐܓܢܝܛܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ : ܘܙܒܢ ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ. ܘܙܒܢ ܬܘܒ ܐܝܟ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܡܫܬܡܥܐ ܒܠܫܢܐ ܝܘܢܝܐ. ܓܢܝܛܘܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܝܠܝܕܐ : ܘܙܒܢ ܐܝܟ ܒܪܝܐ. ܘܙܒܢ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܐܝܟ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ ܡܫܬܡܥܐ. *The Greek ἀγέννητον means 'unbegotten'; sometimes 'uncreated' or also 'unbegottenness'. Γεννητόν is understood as 'begotten'; sometimes as 'created' or simply as 'begottenness'.*

confessing any but the Father as *agennetos* in virtue of being ingenerate (i.e. not having a cause of being). It was over this sense of *agennetos*, which signifies the fact that the God of all (i.e. the Father) is not from anything, that the God-clad fathers, as we have learned, had their whole battle against that Anomean, because he was struggling wrongly to claim by it the non-consubstantiality of Father and Son.

Listen to the wise doctor himself, who says of Eunomius in the first book *Against Eunomius:* He denies that ingeneracy is viewed in God by way of inventive thought supposing that thereby it will be easy for him to attempt to prove that ingeneracy is the substance and thereby demonstrate indubitably that the Only-begotten is dissimilar in substance from the Father. For this reason he entangles himself with the expression 'inventive thought', on the ground that it indicates nothing at all but only has subsistence in utterance, and he pretends that it is unsuitable to honour God by thoughts. The master of mysteries, having said this and duly discussed in thought, went on to say: Why, then, is it absurd for certain things even about the God of all to be accepted in this way in accordance with inventive thought, and primarily this very thing which is the whole subject of our argument? But also in the just recently quoted passage he reminds us of the point: 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

**419/426** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 5 (*PG* 29, 520C - 521A; *SChr.*, vol. 299, pp. 180-182) **427/430** cf. supra, 400-403 **431/436** cf. supra, 169-174



ܕܬܠܝܬܝܘܬܐ ܡܫܬܡܥܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܘ ܐܬܓܠܝܬ ܒܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܥܠܬ: ܐܘ ܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܥܠܬܐ ܗܘܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܐܠܐ ܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܕܢܘܕܐ ܐܥܠܡ ܠܝ. ܡܠܒܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܓܒܪ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܕܐܬܓܠܝܬ: ܗܘ ܕܡܘܕܥ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܠ ܟܠ ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܐܒܐ: ܟܠܗ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܦܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܠܠܒܫܝ ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܠܘܬ ܗܘ ܠܐ ܡܕܡܝܐ: ܟܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܗ̇ ܐܫܘܝܘܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܕܢܟܬܫ ܡܣܪܘܬ ܒܫܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܬܫ ܗܘܐ.

ܘܫܡܥ ܠܗ ܠܚܟܝܡܐ ܐܣܝܐ: ܕܡܬܠܠܗ ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ
< ܐܡܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܠܘܬܗ ❖ ܟܦܪ ܕܒܣܘܟܠܐ
< ܬܬܚܙܐ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܒܕ ܡܣܒܪ ܕܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ
< ܕܠܒܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܦܫܝܩܐ: ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܦܘܫܟܐ ܢܚܘܐ: ܕܠܐ ܕܡܐ
< ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܠܐܒܐ. ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܡܬܟܪܟ
< ܒܡܠܬܐ ܕܒܣܘܟܠܐ: ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܚܘܐ
< ܡܫܘܕܥܐ: ܐܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܒܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇ ܩܘܝܡܐ.
< ܘܡܬܦܣܩܐ ܡܣܟܐ: ܕܠܐ ܠܫܘܚܐ ܕܒܣܘܟܠܐ ܢܝܩܪ
< ܠܐܠܗܐ ❖ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ: ܘܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ
< ܕܒܣܘܟܠܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܪܫ: ܐܘܣܦ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܡܢܐ
< ܗܟܝܠ ܥܕܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܘܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܥܠ ܢܬܩܒܠܢ ܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ
< ܒܚܫܒܬܐ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ: ܘܠܘܩܕܡ ܗ̇ܝ ܗܕܐ ܕܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܟܠܗ̇
< ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܥܒܕܐ ܠܢ ❖ ܐܠܐ ܘܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ
< ܐܬܬܐܡܪ̈ܝ، ܟܕ ܠܗܕܐ ܡܥܗܕ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܐܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ
< ܕܢܩܦܐ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܗܪܟܐ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܐܫܠܝ: ܠܐ
< ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܕܐܡܟܢܐ ܘܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ

AB up to ܠܝ (l. 484) flor. I from l. 472 to l. 476

Line 472: ܕܒܣܘܟܠܐ; flor. I: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܣܘܟܠܐ.
Line 473: ܕܡܢ, flor. I: ܡܢ.
Line 474: ܕܠܒܠܐ, flor. I: ܕܦܫܝܩܐ. ܕܠܐ, W: ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ.
Line 475: ܦܘܫܟܐ, flor. I: ܢܗܝܪܐ. ܕܠܐ², W: ܕܕܠܐ.
Line 476: ܒܐܘܣܝܐ, flor. I: ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ.

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. And again: 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. But a little later, after the words which have been set down for our examination, he wrote as follows: Then just as in the case of men, 'being from something' is not their substance, so neither is it possible in the case of the God of all, to call ingeneracy (which is equivalent to 'not being from anything') his substance. And later: For this is the notion of ingeneracy: his not having a beginning of his existence from elsewhere. But because ingeneracy is viewed only in the God of all, these people have seized this, in the most vicious of all ways, as a blasphemy against the Only-begotten.

It has been clearly demonstrated, and in as plain a way as possible, by this patristic instruction also, both that the doctor meant the Father by the God of all, and, again, that he indicated to us ingeneracy as being the property which is viewed only in the Father. What are we to say? For we ought, if we are ready, to investigate the truth of what is said, to accept from the outset what is said divinely, and by carefully tracing out its meaning we shall recognize that those who make the Father (viz. the God of all) ingeneracy, and thereby, for their part, remove him from any existence at all, are convicted of falling into the extreme of blasphemy. For how, if the hypostasis itself does not exist, can there be a mode of the hypostasis? See too, the prudence of the doctor here! And why do I say 'of the doctor'?

**436/438** cf. supra, 232-234 **440/443** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 15 (*PG* 29, 548A; *SChr.*, vol. 299, p. 226) **443/447** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 16 (*PG* 29, 548C; *SChr.*, vol. 299, p. 228)



< ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܢܚܘܐ: ܐܘ ܕܢܘܟܪܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܗ̇ܘ
< ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܝܚܝܕܝܐ * ܒܪܐ ܗܘܐ: ܟܕ ܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܫܟܚ f. 81vb
< ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܠܒܪ ܢܩܝܦ: ܕܠܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ
< ܘܕܒܪܐ ܢܦܪܘܫ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ.
< ܕܐܢ ܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܢܘܗܪܐ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܠܐ
< ܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܢܬܐܡܪ ܥܠ ܒܪܐ: ܐܝܟܢܐ
< ܕܐܦܠܐ ܗ̣ܝ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܘܚܕܐ ܒܬܪ ܡܬܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ
< ܩܕܡ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܣܝܡܝܢ ܠܝ ܠܒܘܚܢܐ ܟܬܒ ܗܠܝܢ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܕܥܠ ܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܢ ܡܕܡ: ܗܟܢܐ ܘܠܐ
< ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ: ܐܝܬ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ،
< ܕܫܘܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܗ̇، ܕܠܘ ܡܢ ܡܕܡ ܀ ܐܘܣܝܬܗ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ
< ܓܝܪ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܕܘܟ ܐܚܪܝܢ
< ܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܪܫܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܐܝܬܘܬܗ. ܗ̇ܘܝܘ ܕܝܢ ܡܛܠ
< ܕܒܠܚܘܕ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ: ܠܗ̇ܝ
< ܡܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܣܪܩܬ ܒܝܫܐܝܬ: ܠܓܘܕܦܐ ܕܥܠ ܝܚܝܕܝܐ
< ܢܓܠܦܘ ܀

ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܟܚܐ ܦܫܝܛܐܝܬ: ܘܒܗ̇
ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ: ܘܕܐܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ
ܠܐܒܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ: ܘܬܘܒ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ:
ܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܥܠ ܐܒܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܫܘܕܥ ܠܢ.
ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܙܕܩ ܠܢ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܠܥܕܪܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ
ܕܐܬܐܡܪ̈ ܕܢܒܥܐ ܫܪܝܪܘܬܐ: ܕܡܢ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܢܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܐܠܗܐܝܬ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ. ܘܟܕ ܢܩܝܦܝܢ ܚܦܝܛܐܝܬ ܠܣܘܟܠܗܝܢ
ܢܕܥ: ܕܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܪܘܫܡܐ ܡܬܬܚܝܢ ܕܦܠܓܝܢ: ܗ̇ܘܝܘ
ܕܠܐܒܐ ܗܘܝܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ: ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܥ̈ܒܕܝܢ:
ܘܟܕ ܗ̇ܘܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܢܦܩܝܢ ܐܢܘܢ ܡܢ ܕܟܠ
ܐܬܕܪܫܘܢ، ܡܚܣܢ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܗ̣ܘ ܩܘܡܐ ܠܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܐܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܡܐ ܢܗܘܐ. ܚܙܝ، ܘܗܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܗܪܟܐ
ܕܡܠܦܢܐ. ܘܡܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ. ܠܫܘܟܢܐ ܕܠܘܬ

A

Lines 488-489: ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܗ̇ܘ, cf. supra, lines 185-186 (ܕܢܘܟܪܝܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ).

See the compassion and the humanity of the Spirit speaking in him, the Spirit who foreseeing this mouthing of novelties against the Godhead, wisely manages, both through these and similar patristic statements, to shake corrupting blasphemy from its foundations and snatch the friends of truth from, as it were, the mouths of wild, savage beasts. For the doctor says: Why, then, is it absurd for certain things even about the God * of all to be accepted in this way in accordance with inventive thought, and primarily this very thing which is the whole subject of our argument? For we find that 'ingeneracy' is used in no different way. We say, indeed, that the God of all is incorruptible and ingenerate, calling him by these names in accordance with various ideas.

How, then, will our clever author contrive to wrest this to his point of view, and prove that the God of all is ingeneracy? For note: the master of mysteries said, that, with regard to the God of all, 'ingeneracy' is to be taken by way of inventive thought, like 'incorruptibility'. Then is the God of all himself too, to be understood by way of inventive thought if he is ingeneracy, as these careful expositors suppose? Is there anyone who will not detest this heretical impurity which the same wise instructor rebutted even more clearly by saying again: So, just as endlessness of life is called 'incorruptibility' so also its unbeginningness has been called 'ingeneracy' as we view the two things in him in accordance with inventive thought. The wise listener is to observe that ingeneracy gives us only the notion that the God of all is without beginning. Therefore, the God of all must, I suppose, exist, and in this way we shall understand, in due consequence the unbeginningness, and the unendingness of life as well. How, then, can it fail to be absurd and entirely foolish to suppose that the God of all is the

**465/470** cf. supra, 400-406 **479/482** cf. supra, 373-376



ܘܪܚܡܬ ܐܢܫܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ ܕܒܗ ܡܠܠ. ܗܘ ܕܟܕ ܩܕܡ ܚܙܐ
ܠܦܩܝܪܘܬ ܦܘܡܐ ܗܕܐ ܘܠܚܕܬܘܬ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
ܐܠܗܘܬܐ : ܒܚܟܝܡܘܬ ܕܒܪ. ܕܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܩܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܐܠܐ
ܐܒܗ̈ܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܐܡܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܕܠܗ ܡܢ ܠܫܘܥܐ
ܡܚܒܠܢܐ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܬܐܣܐ ܢܥܩܪ. ܠܪ̈ܚܡܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܫܪܪܐ :
ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܦܘܡܐ ܕܚܝܘܬܐ ܒܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܘܡܚܒܠܢܝܬܐ ܢܫܠܘܦ.
< ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܀ ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܣܟܠܐ : ܕܗܟܢܐ ܘܥܠ
< ܐܠܗܐ * ܕܟܠ ܢܬܩܒܠ ܡܕܡ ܡܕܡ ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ : f. 82ra
< ܘܠܩܘܕܡ ܗܝ ܗܕܐ ܕܡܬܡܠܠܐ ܥܠܝܗ̇ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܘܟܢܐ ܠܝ.
< ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܓܝܪ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܐܚܪܢܝܬ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܠܐ
< ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ
< ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ. ܟܕ ܒܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܡܫ̈ܚܠܦܐ ܒܫ̈ܡܗܐ
< ܗܠܝܢ ܡܟܢܝܢ ܀

ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܪܐ ܡܬܚܦܛ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܬܟܠܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ :
ܘܠܘܬ ܪܥܝܢܗ ܢܓܪ : ܘܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܐ
ܕܟܠ ܢܚܘܐ. ܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ : ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ
ܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦ ܪ̈ܐܙܐ ܕܡܬܩܒܠܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ :
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܐ ܡܬܚܒܠܢܘܬܐ. ܢܣܬܟܠ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܦ ܗܘ
ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ : ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܕܪ̈ܘܫܐ ܚ̈ܬܝܬܐ. ܘܡܢܘ ܠܐ
ܢܣܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܛܢܦܘܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ. ܠܗ̇ ܕܐܦ ܟܕ
ܬܘܒ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܝܬܝܪ ܗܘ ܗܢܐ ܪܕܘܝܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܐܘܟܣ
< ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܐ ܠܐ
< ܡܬܚܒܠܢܘܬܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܘܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܠܐ
< ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܬܟܢܝܬ : ܟܕ ܒܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܕܣܘܟܠܐ ܠܘܬܗ ܚܙܝܢ
< ܢܬܒܩܐ ܀ ܠܫܡܘܥܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܕܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
ܗ̇ܝ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܕܠܐ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܡܘܕܥܐ ܠܝ
ܗܫܟܠܐ. ܡܕܝܢ ܙܕܩ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
ܗܘ : ܘܗܟܢܐ ܠܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܘܠܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܚ̈ܝܘܗܝ
ܒܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܦܐܝܐ ܢܣܬܟܠ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܣܟܠܐ
ܘܡܣܟܠܐܝܬ ܟܠܗ̇ ܗܝ ܕܢܣܒܪ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ : ܗܝ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ

A

very unbeginningness which is viewed in him, if one does not also prate, somehow or other, about the endlessness of his life which he also is?

However, it is truly idle to do battle at immoderate length with such rubbish, seeing that it has been entirely eradicated, and dispelled once for all, rather, both by the very nature of the realities and (as we have said) by the fathers' teachings. We run the risk, it seems, of imitating people who draw weapons against the simply dead, those ravaged and slaughtered by others, of imitating people who count it no absurdity to smite miserable, putrefying corpses. Therefore, because * long ere now, indeed, the Church's pastors have vigorously smitten down with their divinely inspired teaching, as they would do ravaging wolves, those who spewed out these novel books to us, it will be thought superfluous to go on at length, particularly about such clear matters.

Yet it will be useful to assail the nonsense of our opponents which has long ere now been ridiculed to extinction, with heresy-destroying and divinely inspired utterances, lest, if these be missing, their rubbishy attacks on truth should seem to have any vital force. Therefore, let us look at the meaning of another statement by the same master of mysteries: Since, then, God's substance has been seen to be incomprehensible and ineffable to man's understanding, it remains to disclose, with regard to ingeneracy itself, what it is and how it is perceived in the God of all. You see the concord of the Spirit! The master of mysteries said here also that ingeneracy is perceived in the God of all. Let those who define the hypostasis of the God of

508/511 cf. supra, 378-381



ܪܫܝܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܐܢܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܦ ܠܗ
ܬܗܘܒ ܠܠܐ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܚܝܘܗܝ: ܕܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܐ ܢܕܒܒ
ܐܝܟ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܢܦܫܗ.

ܐܠܐ ܣܪܝܩܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܪܪܐ: ܕܠܘܬ
ܥܠܘܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܢܬܟܬܫ: ܟܕ
ܬܐܬܥܩܪܬ ܚܕܐ ܙܒܢ ܘܡܢܗ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܕܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ: ܘܐܡܪܢܐ
ܕܐܡܪܢ ܒܝܕ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܢܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܡܪ
ܘܐܫܬܕܪ. ܘܡܣܬܟܢܐ ܒܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܡܝܐ: ܕܢܬܕܡܐ
ܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܐܬܚܒܠܘ ܘܡܚܒܠܐ
ܕܚܪܒܐ ܗܘܘ: ܘܠܡܦܫܩܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܚܫܒܘ ܡܚܝܘ: ܦ̈ܓܪܐ
ܕܡܝܬܐ ܡܚܝܠܝܢ: ܘܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܡ ܢܦܩܘ ܠܗ
ܢܥܡܝܢ ܥܡܝܪ̈ܬܐ. ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܕܗܐ ܡܢ ܟܕ ܘܡܢ * ܕܥܕܬܐ f. 82rb
ܫܦܝܪܐܝܬ: ܙ̈ܢܘܢܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܒܠܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܡܚܝܘ ܠܗܢܘܢ
ܕܡܚܬ̈ܒܢܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܚܕ̈ܬܬܐ ܐܬܩܝܘ ܠܢ: ܐܝܟ ܕܠܕ̈ܐܒܐ
ܡܚܒ̈ܠܢܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܗܘܢ ܢܦܝܫܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ: ܝܬܝܪܬܐ
ܡܬܚܫܒܐ ܘܡܫܬܡܥܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܓܠܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ: ܗܝ ܕܢܘܪܟ.

ܢܥܕܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܘܢ ܗܝ ܕܢܥܒܪ ܥܠ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܕܩܕܡܘܢ
ܕܠܩܘܒܠܢܐ: ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܦܫܪ ܐܬܚܝܟ ܘܐܬܡܥܕܒ:
ܒܝܬ ܩܠܐ ܩܛܠܝ ܗܪ̈ܣܝܣ ܕܢܦܝܫܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ. ܕܕܠܡܐ ܡܢ
ܚܣܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ: ܕܢܬܚܙܝܢ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܗܝ ܗ̈ܒܠܐ ܘܪ̈ܥܝܐ
ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܫܪܪܐ. ܒܪܡ ܘܡܬܚܫܒܐ ܕܚܙܐ ܡܠܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ
< ܕܗܘ ܕܡܠܦ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܢܬܚܙܐ ܀ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܠܡ ܕܐܬܝܕܥܬ
< ܕܗܘܝܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܢܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܬܗ
< ܠܒܪܢܝܬܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ: ܗܝ ܕܫܪܟܐ
< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܢܘܕܥ: ܡܛܠܬܗ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ:
< ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܀ ܚܙܝ ܐܝܟܘ
ܥܠܘܬܐ ܕܪܘܚܐ: ܬܗܘܒ ܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܠ
ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ. ܘܐܝܠܝܢ

AB from ܠܠܐ (l. 549) on

Line 562: ܝܬܝܪܬܐ, B: ܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ.

all as ingeneracy tell us what coherent thought anybody could attach to saying that his hypostasis (indeed, rather, the God of all himself) is perceived in the God of all. However, we must consider another point as well: how the doctor, having said Since, then, God's substance has been seen to be incomprehensible and ineffable to man's understanding, added it remains to disclose, with regard to ingeneracy itself, what it is and how it is perceived in the God of all. For this suffices to prove clearly, to men of sound sense, the feebleness of the absurd doctrines: namely when that possessor of so much prudence in divine matters desired also to say (and, in addition, immediately after that exceedingly careful teaching whereby he proved the divine substance incomprehensible to human nature) that it remained to disclose, with regard to ingeneracy itself, what it was and how it was perceived in the God of all, if he was bent on professing that the God of all was ingeneracy. Has not the impiety been clearly rooted out, even by this brief utterance of the divinely inspired father? * Is it not the chief point of the blasphemy that he feels no shame at these rebuttals?

However, the rest of the proof-text will assault and buffet the heads of those who are unable to feel shame, and will, if it be possible, make even the hardened in insensitivity drop their gaze and hide. We discover, then, says truth's champion, in reasoning, that the idea of ingeneracy does not fall for us within the consideration of what he is but rather (I speak the expression under compulsion) of how he is. What does the father mean by but rather (I speak the expression under compulsion) of how he is? Is it not clear that on wrong-headed

**516** cf. supra, 511 **517/520** cf. supra, 508-511 **526/527** cf. supra, 519-520 **535/537** cf. supra, 381-384 **538/539** cf. supra, 537



ܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܣܘ̈ܟܠܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ̇، ܕܢܐܡܪ :
ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܠܘ̱ ܕܝܢ ܕܗܘ ܟܠܗ، ܡܬܝܕܥ ܐܠܗܐ
ܕܟܠ : ܢܐܡܪܘܢ̱ ܗ̇ܘܝܢ̱ ܕܠܐ ܐܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܝܢ
ܠܡܘܕܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ. ܐܠܐ ܐܦ ܗ̇ܝ، ܐܚܪܬܐ ܐܠܝܨܐ
< ܕܢܬܒܩܐ : ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܀ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ
< ܕܐܬܚܙܝܬ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܢܝܬܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܦܪܘܫܘܬܐ ܕܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ ܐܘܣܦܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܘܣܦ : ܗ̇ܝ
< ܕܫܪܟܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܢܣܒܐ : ܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܡܢܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܐ ܒܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܀ ܣܦܩܐ ܗܘ
ܓܝܪ ܐܦ ܗܕܐ : ܕܢܬܚܘܐ ܬܫܘܐ ܠܚܟܝ̈ܡܐ، ܬܚܝܪܬܐ
ܢܣܝܒܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܥܣܝ̈ܪܐ. ܐܡܬܝ، ܟܕ ܡܪܓܐ ܗܘܐ ܗ̇ܘ
ܕܟܠܗ̇ ܗܕܐ ܢܟܦܘܬܐ ܒܡ̈ܠܝܢ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܨܒܐ ܐܦ ܗܘܐ :
ܕܢܐܡܪ ܘܬܘܒ ܐܝܬ ܘܡܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ
ܡܝܬܪܬܐ ܘܕܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ : ܕܒܗ̇ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܝܬܐ ܠܟܝܢܐ
ܕܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ ܚܘܝ، ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ : ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܫܪܟܐ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܢܣܒܐ ܡܛܠܬܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ :
ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܐ ܒܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ. ܐܢ̱ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܬܘܗܝ، ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܢܘܕܐ ܡܬܚܦܛܐ ܗܘܐ.
ܐܪܐ ܠܘ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܬܥܩܪ ܪܘܫܥܐ : ܘܒܝܕ ܗܕܐ ܒܪܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܠܐ
ܕܒܪܘܚܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܢܦܫ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ. * ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܗ f. 82va
ܕܓܘܕܦܐ ܪܫܐ : ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܠܐ
ܢܒܗܬ.

ܐܠܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ ܕܐܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܢܚܒܛܢ : ܘܢܩܦܚܢ
ܠܪ̈ܫܐ ܕܗ̇ܘܢ̱ ܕܠܐ ܡܨܝܢ ܕܢܬܒܗܬܘܢ̱ : ܘܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܠܗ
ܡܬܩܫܝܘܬܐ ܡܟܒܝܢ : ܕܠܬܚܬ ܢܚܘܪܘܢ̱ ܘܢܬܟܣܘܢ̱ ܐܢ̱
< ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܢܚܢܢ̱ ܀ ܡܥܩܒܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܡܪ ܪܫ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ
< ܟܕ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ : ܕܠܘ ܒܣܟܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܡܢܐ ܐܬܘܗܝ، ܢܦܠ ܠܢ
< ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܐܬܐܠܨܬ ܕܟܕ ܩܛܝܪ ܐܢܐ
< ܠܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ : ܒܗ̇، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܡܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܢܦܩܐ
< ܠܗ ܐܡܪ ܠܐܒܐ ܗ̇ܘ، ܕܐܠܐ ܐܬܐܠܨܬ ܕܟܕ ܩܛܝܪ ܐܢܐ
< ܠܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ : ܒܗ̇، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܘ ܠܐ ܓܠܝܐ ܗܘ :

AB

Eunomius' attempting to prove ingeneracy a substance and thereby make Father and Son different in substance, the God-clad father said, 'I am so far removed from the idea of calling ingeneracy a substance, that, if compelled to do so, I will put it in the consideration of how he is'? Who, then, can be so far gone in madness as to identify the mode of a hypostasis with the hypostasis?



ܕܟܕ ܡܢ ܐܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܤ ܡܚܘܝܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܘܣܐ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܘܥܒܕ ܗܘܐ ܐܚܪܝܢ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ
ܒܪܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܡܬܠܒܫ ܗܘܐ : ܠܚܡ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܡܪ :
ܕܟܠܗ ܗܢܐ ܪܚܝܩ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܡܪܝܘܗܝ ܠܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܟܕ ܐܠܨܐ ܐܢܐ : ܒܚܘܫܒܬܐ
ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܣܐܡ ܐܢܐ ܠܗ. ܡܢܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܟܠܗ ܗܢܐ
ܢܬܥܘܩ ܒܫܢܝܘܬܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܝܢܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ : ܠܗ ܟܕ ܠܗ
ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܢܐܡܪ.

AB

## Chapter 18

*Concerning the fact that since hypostasis is indicative of subsisting which is the same as being and existing, whereas ingeneracy discloses only the mode of being of the substrate, ingeneracy cannot be the Father's hypostasis. But this is proved again also from the fact that wise Basil said that the Father possesses his fatherhood co-extensively with his eternity and that it is not ingeneracy but ingenerate beauty that is perceived in the offspring; along with this also that generation is not a denial of the ingeneracy of God.*

But how can ingeneracy be a hypostasis, if hypostasis indicates subsisting, which is the same as being and existing, whereas ingeneracy discloses only the mode of being of the substrate? Listen to our God-clad father SEVERUS * explaining the point to us very clearly and precisely in the first chapter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian:* Hypostasis, indeed, in reference to the meaning of 'being', is the same as substance. For just as substance indicates existing, so too hypostasis indicates subsisting. 'Existing' and 'subsisting', indeed, are indistinguishable. Thus the God of all is brought forward by Jeremiah the prophet as saying: *If they stood within my basis.* He who said *I am 'He who is'* himself said: *If they stood within my basis,* signifying that he both exists and has been subsisting perpetually and never either non-existing or non-subsisting, gathering together in

---

**15/25** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (*CSCO* 111, pp. 56,29 - 57,11; *112*, p. 45, 7-19) **19/20** Ier. 23:22 **20** Ex. 3:14 **20/21** Ier. 23:22

## ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܡܢܬܥܣܪ.

ܥܠ ܕܟܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܩܝܡ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗ̣ܝ ܟܕ ܗ̣ܝ ܐܝܬܘܬܗ̇ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܡܫܟܚ: ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ: ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ܝ ܡܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ: ܠܐ ܡܨܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܬܗܘܐ. ܡܬܚܘܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ: ܐܦ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܡܪ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ: ܕܕܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܥܡ ܡܬܡܘܡܘܬܗ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܐܒܐ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ: ܘܕܠܐ ܗ̇ܘܝܘ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ: ܗ̇ܘ ܒܝܠܕܐ ܡܬܒܚܢܐ. ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܕܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܟܦܘܪܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܀

ܝܚ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܬܗܘܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܐܢ ܗ̣ܘ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܩܝܡ ܡܫܘܕܥ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗ̣ܝ ܟܕ ܗ̣ܝ ܐܝܬܘܬܗ̇ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܡܫܟܚ: ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ: ܒܠܚܘܕ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܚܘܝܐ. ܘܫܡܥ ܠܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܘܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ. ܕܡܦܫܩ ܠܘܢ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܘܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܦܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܓܪܡܛܝܩܘܣ: * ܦܬܓܡ ܚܕ ܗܢܘܢܐܝܬ ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܠܝ: ܘܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀

< ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܘܬ ܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܗܘܝܐ: ܗ̣ܘ ܟܕ ܗ̣ܘ
< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ:
< ܡܚܘܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܩܝܡ ܡܫܘܕܥ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ
< ܘܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܩܝܡ: ܘܠܐ ܒܡܕܡ ܦܪܝܫܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ
≪ ܡܝܬܐ ܠܗ ܒܝܕ ܐܪܡܝܐ ܢܒܝܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܢ ܗ̣ܘ ܕܩܡܘ ܒܩܘܝܡܝ.
≪ ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܗ̣ܘ ܐܡܪ: ܘܗ̇ܝ
≪ ܕܐܢ ܩܡܘ ܒܩܘܝܡܝ: ܟܕ ܡܘܕܥ: ܘܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܕܡܩܝܡ
< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ: ܘܠܐ ܡܬܘܡ ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ

---

A

---

Line 23: ܕܐܢܐ, cf. infra, line 44 (ܐܢܐ). ܐܡܪ ܘܗ̇ܝ, cf. infra, line 55 (ܐܡܪ) and note.

himself all his eternal existence and subsistence. The word 'being' also is the same in meaning as 'existing' and 'subsisting', for there is no difference between existing, subsisting and being. He speaks again also as follows in the third chapter of the same book: Thus also 'being' is indicative of both substance and hypostasis and is something intermediate, meaning sometimes the one sometimes the other in accordance with the underlying meaning. Athanasius proves this also by a few words, when he writes as follows *To the Bishops of Africa*: 'For being is hypostasis and substance; for it is and exists.'

Let us examine attentively the meaning of these divinely spoken words. For we ought to aim at the most accurate comprehension possible of these texts and at fully grasping the fathers' thought. First, then, let us note here that in what was said a little earlier we proved that this doctor too understood the Father to be the God of all. For he said: Thus the God of all is brought forward by Jeremiah the prophet as saying: *If they stood within my basis*. He who said *I am 'He who is'* himself said: *If they stood within my basis*. Let us enquire, then, who it is who said *I am 'He who is'*, and thus we shall recognize who he understood to be the God of all. He wrote, then, a little earlier than the proof-text just cited from the first chapter, as follows: For this reason too, * the voice came to Moses from the person of God the Father and said *I am 'He who is'*; *thus shall you speak to the*

**26/31** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 3 (*CSCO* 111, p. 71, 4-10; *112*, p. 56, 5-10); cf. supra, ch. 11, 238-241 **30/31** Athan. Alex., *Ep. ad Afros episc.*, 4 (*PG* 26, 1036B) **37/39** cf. supra, 18-21 **40** Ex. 3:14 **43/45** Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (*CSCO* 111, p. 56, 4-7; *112*, p. 44, 19-21) **44/45** Ex. 3:14



< ܐܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܫܝܢ. ܟܕ ܟܠܗ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܩܝܡܘܬܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
< ܘܡܩܘܝܡ ܚܢܢ ܟܗ. ܗ̇ܘ ܟܕ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܫܘܘܕܥܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
< ܘܡܩܝܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܦ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ. ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܚܢܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
< ܘܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܩܝܡ ܘܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܢܚܙܐ ܠܘܬ ܡܕܡ ܥܘܣܠܩܐ ❖ ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ
< ܘܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܠܗ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܢܐ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܗܟܢܐ
< ܐܦ ܝܬܐ : ܘܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ.
< ܘܡܨܥܝܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، : ܕܒܙܒܢ ܚܕ ܗܢܐ ܡܫܘܕܥ : ܒܙܒܢ
< ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ، ܐܚܪܢܝܬܐ. ܠܦܘܬ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܕܣܝܡ. ܘܗܕܐ ܡܚܘܐ
< ܒܙܥܘܪܬ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܬܢܣܝܘܣ : ܟܕ ܟܬܒ ܠܘܬ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ
<< ܕܐܦܪܝܩܝ̈ ܗܟܢܐ ❖ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܓܝܪ ܘܐܘܣܝܐ : ܝܬܐ
<< ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܓܝܪ ܘܡܩܘܝܡ ❖

ܒܗܘܢܐ ܠܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܬܢܝܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܢܚܘܪ. ܙܕܩ ܓܝܪ ܟܕ ܒܟܠܐ ܕܚܝܠܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܢܩܫ ܠܘܬ ܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ ܫܬܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܝ̈ܒܢ : ܡܫܡܠܝܐܝܬ ܠܫܡܥܐ ܐܒܗܝ̈ܐ ܢܐܚܘܕ. ܩܕܡܝܬ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܢܬܒܩܐ : ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܬܐܡܪ ܚܘܝܢ : ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܠܐܒܐ ܐܦ ܗܢܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܐܣܬܟܠ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ :
< ܗܟܢܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܟܐܠ ܒܝܕ ܐܪܡܝܐ ܢܒܝܐ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܐܢ
<< ܗܘ ܕܩܡܘ ܒܩܘܝܡܝ. ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܡܪ : ܐܢܐ ܐܝܬ، ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، :
<< ܗܘ ܐܡܪ : ܘܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܢ ܩܡܘ ܒܩܘܝܡܝ ❖ ܢܒܥܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܡܢܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܝܬ، ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،. ܘܗܟܢܐ ܢܕܥܝܢ : ܕܠܡܢܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܐܣܬܟܠ. ܟܬܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܗܫܐ ܐܬܬܬܝܬ ܡܢ ܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ
< ܗܟܢܐ ܙܢܐ ❖ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ * ܘܟܕ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܦܪܨܘܦܗ f. 83ra
< ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܩܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܡܘܫܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܗܘܐ :

A flor. I from l. 49 on

Line 33: ܕܗ̇ܘ, cf. ch. 11, line 271 (ܗ̇ܘ).
Line 44: ܐܢܐ, cf. supra, line 23 (ܕܐܢܐ).
Line 45: ܐܡܪ ܘܗ̇ܝ،, cf. infra, line 55 (ܐܡܪ) and note.
Line 49: ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ, flor. I: ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܗܟܝܠ. ܘܟܕ ܐܝܟ, flor. I: ܟܕ ܐܝܟ.

*children of Israel*: *I am has sent me to you.* Notice, *I am 'He who is'* is said to be from the person of God the Father. So, the doctor understood the God of all to be God the Father. For He who said *I am 'He who is'* himself said: *If they stood within my basis.* Subsequently, indeed, we are to recognize that hypostasis indicates subsisting, whereas existing and subsisting are indistinguishable. For the same master of mysteries instructed us, saying, as previously set down: Hypostasis, indeed, in reference to the meaning of 'being', is the same as substance i.e. not by being inclusive and belonging to the generic meaning but by pointing to the existing. Which is why he went on: For just as 'substance' indicates existing, so too 'hypostasis' indicates subsisting. 'Existing' and 'subsisting', indeed, are indistinguishable.

With this thus proved, let us go on to investigate the notion introduced to us by 'ingeneracy'. The very statement by Basil the Great set down for examination will show it us, then. For he says: We discover, then, in reasoning, that the idea of ingeneracy does not fall for us within the consideration of what he is but rather (I speak the expression under compulsion) of how he is. And a little later he said similarly: Then just as in the case of men, 'being from something' is not their substance, so neither is it possible in the case of the God of all, to call ingeneracy (which is equivalent to 'not being from anything') his substance. A person calling unbeginningness a substance does something similar to somebody who, being asked what Adam's substance and nature

---

**45/46** cf. supra, 43-44 **47/48** cf. supra, 38-39 **49/50** cf. supra, 17-18 **52/53** cf. supra, 15-16 **55/56** cf. supra, 16-18 **60/62** cf. supra, ch. 17, 535-537 **63/73** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 15 (*PG* 29, 548AB; *SChr.*, vol. 299, p. 226); cf. supra, ch. 17, 440-443



«« ܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ، ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، : ܗܟܢܐ ܬܐܡܪ ܠܒܢܝ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ : ܗܘ
«« ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܫܕܪܢܝ ܠܘܬܟܘܢ ܀ ܗܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܦܪܨܘܦܐ
ܕܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܒܐ ܐܬܐܡܪܐ : ܗ، ܕܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ، ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ.
< ܡܕܝܢ ܘܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ : ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܣܬܟܠ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܀ ܗܘ
«« ܓܝܪ ܠܗ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܐܢܐ ܐܝܬܝ، ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، : ܗܘ ܐܡܪ
«« ܕܐܢ ܩܡܘ ܒܩܘܝܡܝ ܀ ܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܝܢ ܢܕܥ : ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܗ،
ܕܩܝܡܘ ܡܫܘܕܥ. ܗ، ܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܕܩܝܡܘ : ܘܠܐ ܒܡܕܡ
ܦܪܝܫܐ. ܕܗܢܐ ܠܝ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܡܠܦ ܕܐܪܙܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܕܡܬܐ
< ܣܝܡܬ ܒܗ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܩܒ ܫܘܕܥܐ
< ܕܢܬܐ : ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܀ ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܘ
ܒܗ، ܕܢܣܒܥ ܘܢܗܘܐ ܕܫܘܕܥܐ ܓܢܣܝܐ : ܐܠܐ ܒܗ،
< ܕܡܚܘܐ ܗ، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܘܐܘܣܦ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ
< ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܗ، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، : ܡܚܘܝܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܗ، ܕܩܝܡܘ
< ܡܫܘܕܥ. ܗ، ܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܗ، ܕܩܝܡܘ ܘܠܐ ܒܡܕܡ
ܦܪܝܫܐ ܀

ܟܕ ܗܕܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ : ܐܬܐ ܢܒܨܐ ܕܐܝܢܐ ܣܘܟܠܐ
ܡܥܠܐ ܠܢ ܠܐ ܠܐܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܠܗܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܐܡܪܗ ܬܚܘܐ ܠܢ : ܗ،
ܒܪܬ ܡܠܐ ܕܣܝܡܐ ܠܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܪܒܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܀
< ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ : ܕܠܘ ܒܡܢܬܐ ܕܗ، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،
< ܢܦܠ ܠܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܡܬܐܢܣܬ ܕܟܕ ܐܝܟܢܐ
< ܐܝܟ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ : ܒܗ، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܀ ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ
< ܘܬܘܒ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܥܠ ܒܢܝܢܫܐ ܠܝܬܝܗ̇
< ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗ، ܕܡܢ ܡܕܡ : ܗܟܢܐ ܘܠܐ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ ܐܝܬ
< ܕܢܐܡܪ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܗ، ܕܫܘܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗ̇ :
< ܠܗ، ܕܠܘ ܡܢ ܡܕܡ. ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܗ، ܕܠܐ ܪܫܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗ̇
< ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܡܪ : ܡܕܡ ܕܕܡܐ ܥܒܕ : ܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܫ ܘܕܐܫܬܐܠ ܒܗ
< ܢܬܫܐܠ ܕܡܢܐ ܗ، ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܕܡ ܘܡܢܐ ܗܘ ܟܝܢܗ : ܗܘ ܕܝܢ

---

A flor. I up to l. 51

---

Line 51: ܐܝܬܝ، ܐܢܐ, flor. I: ܐܢܐ ܐܢܐ.
Line 55: ܐܡܪ, cf. supra, lines 23 and 45 (ܐܡܪ ܗ،).
Line 69: ܕܗ، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، , cf. ch. 17, lines 431-432 (ܕܗ، ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،).
Line 70: ܕܟܕ (as infra, line 123), cf. ch. 17, line 433 (ܟܕ).

were, should reply 'not being from the intercourse of man and woman but being formed by the hand of God'. 'But I am looking', the other will say, 'not for the mode of the hypostasis but for the material substrate itself of the man, which I am very far off learning from your answer'. This happens to us too * with the word 'ingeneracy', whereby we learn how God is rather, and not the nature itself.

GREGORY, too, Basil's brother, taught these sacred doctrines and taking up the same contests against Eunomius the intoxicated, wrote in his fifth book (its beginning runs, Because, he says, the word 'Lord'), as follows: Anyone, then, undertaking to give a definition of the existence of the one who is good and is ingenerate, would be useless if he spoke of the things viewed in him and said nothing of the substance itself which he had undertaken to explain with a definition. For existing ingenerately is one of the things viewed in *Him who is*, whereas the concept of existing is one thing and that of how it exists, another.

Wise CYRIL too will disclose to us his view of the matter and rebuke impudent nonsense. For he initiated the whole world under heaven into perfect ideas of theology, when he wrote in the second book of his treatise *To Hermias*: So if ingeneracy in God the Father indicates to us only the fact that he was not begotten, how can it have the force of a definition, since it shows us not what he is but that he is not thus? *B*. Perhaps you will say that he has not been begotten? *A*. Yes, I do.

Has it not become clear to everybody, through these previous quotations, that hypostasis indicates subsisting which is equivalent (as we have learned) to being and existing, whereas ingeneracy

---

**77/82** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 5 (*PG* 45, 764A; Jaeger II, p. 182, 7-13)
**81** cf. Ex. 3:14 **86/89** Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. II* (*PG* 75, 732B; *SChr.*, vol. 231, pp. 254-256)



< ܢܦܫܐ: ܕܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܙܘܘܓܐ ܕܓܒܪܐ ܘܕܐܢܬܬܐ: ܐܠܐ ܡܢ
< ܐܝܕܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܐܬܓܒܠ. ܐܠܐ ܠܘ ܙܢܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܡܪ
< ܗܘ ܚܒܪܐ ܐܢܐ: ܐܠܐ ܠܗܘ ܗܘܠܐ ܕܗܢܘ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ. ܠܗܘ
< ܕܣܓܝ ܪܚܝܩ ܐܢܐ ܕܐܠܦ ܡܢ ܦܢܝ ܦܬܓܡܟ. ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܦ
f. 83rb < ܠܢ * ܓܕܫܐ ܡܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܕܗܘ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ
< ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܦܝܢ: ܘܠܐ ܠܗ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܝܠܦܝܢ ❖

ܠܗܠܝܢ ܝܘܠܦܢܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܒܪ ܐܬܐܪܙ ܘܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܡܠܦܢܐ
ܐܚܘܗܝ ܕܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ: ܘܠܗܘܢ ܒܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܐܓܘܢܐ ܢܣܒ ܠܘܩܒܠ
ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܡܪܘܝܐ: ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܚܡܫܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ
< ܪܫܗ: ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܠܡ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܐ: ܗܟܢ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܕܠܗ ܗܟܝܠ
< ܕܗܘܝܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܛܒܐ ܘܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ: ܒܪ ܐܢܫ
< ܡܫܬܘܕܐ ܕܬܚܘܡܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܢܬܠ: ܣܪܝܩܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܪ
< ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܒܗ ܐܡܪ: ܠܗ ܕܝܢ ܠܐܘܣܝܐ ܫܬܩ:
< ܠܗ ܕܐܫܬܘܕܝ ܕܢܦܣܘܩ ܒܬܚܘܡܐ. ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐܝܬ
< ܗܘܐ: ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ.
< ܐܚܪܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܘܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܗܘ
< ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ❖

ܐܠܐ ܘܚܟܝܡܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܘܣ: ܬܪܥܝܬܗ ܕܥܠ ܗܕܐ ܢܓܠܐ
ܠܢ. ܘܢܟܐ ܒܫܠܝܛܘܬܐ ܡܪܘܚܬܐ. ܒܪ ܓܝܪ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ
ܕܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ܐܪܙ ܠܟܠܗ ܗܝ ܕܬܚܝܬ ܫܡܝܐ:
ܒܦܢܓܟܬܒܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܪܡܝܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܒܦܘܩ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ❖
< ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܒܐ: ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܗ ܕܠܐ
< ܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܠܢ: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܬܚܘܡܐ
< ܢܗܘܐ ܠܗ: ܟܕ ܠܘ ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܐܠܐ ܕܠܘ ܗܟܢ
< ܗܘܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܚܘܐ ܠܢ. ܒ. ܕܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܟܒܪ ܐܡܪ
< ܐܝܬ. ܐ. ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪܢܐ ❖

ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܒܗ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡ ܡܬܬܝܒ ܠܘ ܝܕܝܥܬܐ ܠܟܠܢܫ
ܗܘܬ: ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܠܗ ܕܡܩܝܡ: ܗܘ ܕܗܘ ܒܪ ܗܘ ܡܫܬܘܝܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܦܢ ܠܗ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܡܩܝܡ ܡܚܘܐ: ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ

---

A

indicates not this at all, but only how he exists? But it is quite clear, as we have learned, that the concept of existing is one thing and that of how it exists, another. For our wise father Severus instructing us with plain accuracy on the subject of hypostasis, said, as previously set down at one point: Hypostasis, indeed, in reference to the meaning of 'being', is the same as substance. For just as substance indicates existing, so too 'hypostasis' indicates subsisting. 'Existing' and 'subsisting', indeed, * are indistinguishable. And elsewhere: The word 'being' also is the same in meaning as 'existing' and 'subsisting', for there is no difference between existing, subsisting and being.

The distinguished Basil taught about ingeneracy, as follows: We discover, then, in reasoning, that the idea of ingeneracy does not fall for us within the consideration of what he is but rather (I speak the expression under compulsion) of how he is. And again: This happens to us too with the word 'ingeneracy', whereby we learn how God is rather, and not the nature itself. Basil's brother said: For existing ingenerately is one of the things viewed in *Him who is*, whereas the concept of existing is one thing and that of how it exists, another. Wise Cyril wrote: So if ingeneracy in God the Father indicates to us only the fact that he was not begotten, how can it have the force of a definition, since it shows us not what he is but that he is not thus?

**94/95** cf. supra, 82 **97/100** cf. supra, 15-18 **100/102** cf. supra, 23-25 **104/106** cf. supra, 60-62 **106/108** cf. supra, 71-73 **108/110** cf. supra, 80-82 **110/113** cf. supra, 86-89



ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ ܗܘܐ܆ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܝܢ ܠܗ̇ܝ، ܕܕܐܝܟ ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܝܕܝܥܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܣ܆ ܕܕܗ̇ܝ، ܡܢ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܦܢ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܡܠܬܐ܆ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ
ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܕܐܝܟ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܘܠܦܢ ܓܝܪ ܚܟܝܡܐ
ܣܘܝܪܐ܆ ܟܕ ܡܛܠ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ ܦܫܝܛܬܐ ܐܪܪ ܠܢ܆
< ܒܕܘܟ ܡܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܣܝܡܐ ܐܡܪ܀ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܐܝܬܐ܆ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
< ܠܐܘܣܝܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ ܡܚܘܝܐ
< ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܩܝܡ ܡܫܘܕܥ. ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܗ̇ܝ،
< ܕܡܩܝܡ܆ ܘܠܐ * ܡܩܒܠܢ ܦܘܪܫܢܐ܀ ܒܕܘܟ ܕܝܢ܀ ܕܗ̇ܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ f. 83va
< ܒܫܘܕܥܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܕܡܩܝܡ܆ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܦ ܫܡܐ
< ܕܐܝܬܐ. ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܓܝܪ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܩܝܡ ܘܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܬܝܐ܆ ܠܝܬ
< ܡܕܡ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ܀

ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ܆ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܡܝܬܪܐ
< ܐܠܦ ܟܕ ܗܟܢ ܐܡܪ܀ ܡܫܟܚܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܟܕ ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ܆
< ܕܠܘ ܒܒܚܝܢܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܢܦܠ ܠܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ܆ ܐܠܐ ܡܬܐܡܪܬ ܕܒܕ ܩܛܝܪܐ ܐܡܪܐ ܐܢܐ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ܆
< ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܦ ܠܢ ܓܕܫܐ
< ܡܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܝܠܦܝܢ܆
< ܘܠܘ ܠܗ̇ ܠܟܝܢܐ ܢܦܫܗ܀ ܘܐܚܘܗܝ، ܕܝܢ ܕܗܢܐ ܐܡܪ܀ ܗ̇ܝ، ܓܝܪ
< ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐܝܬ ܢܗܘܐ܆ ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܥܠ ܗ̇ܘ
< ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܚܪܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܝܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ،܆
< ܘܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܀ ܐܠܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܘܣ ܗܘ
< ܚܟܝܡܐ ܟܬܒ܀ ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܥܠ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܒܐ܆ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
< ܠܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܫܘܕܥܐ ܠܢ܆ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܘܚܝܠܐ
< ܕܬܚܘܡܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇܆ ܟܕ ܠܘ ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ،܆ ܐܠܐ ܕܠܘ
< ܕܐܝܟ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܚܘܝܐ ܠܢ܀

A

Line 123: ܕܒܕ, cf. supra, line 70 and note.

Is there any reader of patristic and correct doctrines unused to spurning truth, who will not perceive the erroneous belief of this impudent and truly alien writer? Must not those who make ingeneracy a hypostasis also necessarily define ingeneracy as indicative of subsisting, which is the same thing as being and existing, but hypostasis too as indicative again of how he is, or (to speak more precisely) of how he is not? How can thinking like this fail of itself to become abominable to all not drunk with heretical insanity, by its alienation and complete estrangement not only from patristic teaching but from the very nature of the realities? For we cannot say by what order and sequence of concepts anyone can either call 'hypostasis' the ingeneracy which nowise exists with a proper basis nor yet * is indicative of subsisting (which is the same, as we have learned, as existing and being) but only of how he is not, or, contrariwise, can suppose the hypostasis which exists individually, properly and subsistingly, and is indicative of subsisting to be ingeneracy. Look at the accurate and prudent CYRIL, who confirms again what we said and speaks as follows in the second book, which we have mentioned, of the treatise *To Hermias*: For 'generacy' and 'ingeneracy' are not things existing individually and hypostatically, but they only bring us the meaning of having been begotten or not having been begotten. And a few lines later: 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 own.

**133/135** Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. II* (*PG* 75, 741AB; *SChr.*, vol. 231, p. 272); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 11, 134-137 **136/138** Ibid. (*PG* 75, 741D; *SChr.*, vol. 231, p. 274); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 11, 137-140



ܐܝܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܐܢܫ ܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܥܕܝܢ ܕܒܣܪܘܢ ܥܠ
ܫܪܪܐ : ܘܩܪܝܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ ܘܬܪ̈ܝܨܬܐ : ܗܘ
ܕܠܐ ܡܪܓܫ ܒܛܥܝܘܬ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܡܪܝܚܐ
ܘܐܝܟ ܕܫܪܝܪܐܝܬ ܐܟܣܢܝܐ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܐܢܢܩܐ ܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ
ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܥܒܕܝܢ : ܒܟܠ ܡܢ ܠܒܪܘܗ : ܘܠܐ
ܐܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܩܝܡ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܒ ܗ̇ܝ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܥܒܕܝܢ ܢܬܣܝܡܘܢ : ܘܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܝܢ
ܬܘܒ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܟܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܘ ܕܬܚܬܝܪ ܚܬܝܬܐܝܬ
ܠܐܡܪ : ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܐܝܟܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܘܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ
ܗ̇ܝ ܡܢܗ̇ ܡܚܫܒܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܬܬܪܚܩ : ܠܟܠܗܘܢ
ܗܢܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܪܘܝܢ ܒܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ
ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܘܕܝܠܗ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܕܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ
ܐܟܣܢܝܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܘܡܫܬܠܡܢܘܬ ܢܘܟܪܝܘܬܐ. ܒܐܝܢܐ ܓܝܪ
ܛܟܣܐ ܘܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܬܐ : ܐܘ ܠܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ
ܩܝܡ ܒܕܝܠܝܘܬ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܠܐ ܕܝܢ * ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ f. 83vb
ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܩܝܡ : ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒ ܗ̇ܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܝܠܦܢ ܠܗ̇ܝ
ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܘܥܒܕܝܢ : ܐܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܕܐܝܟܢ ܗܟܢܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬ ܢܣܒܪ : ܐܘ ܒܗܦܟܐ : ܠܩܢܘܡܐ
ܗܘ ܕܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܘܠܗ ܘܕܝܠܢܐܝܬ ܘܡܩܝܡܢܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ :
ܘܡܫܘܕܥܢܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܩܝܡ ܢܣܒܪ ܠܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܬ ܠܟ
ܕܢܐܡܪ. ܘܢܘܪ ܚܬܝܬܐ ܘܚܣܝܢܐ ܩܘܪܝܠܘܣ : ܕܬܘܒ ܠܗܠܝܢ
ܕܡܢ ܐ̈ܡܪܢ ܡܫܪܪ : ܘܡܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܕܐܬܕܟܪܢ
< ܕܦܢܩܝܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܪܡܝܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܡ
< ܕܝܚܝܕ ܘܠܗ ܘܩܢܘܡܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ
< ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܝܢ ܫܘܕܥܐ ܡ̈ܥܠܝܢ ܠܢ : ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܠܝܕ
< ܓܒܪܐ : ܐܘ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܀ ܘܒܬܪ ܙܥܘܪ̈ܝܬܐ ܀ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇
< ܗܟܝܠ ܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܠܐ ܗܘܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܠܗܐ.
< ܡܫܘܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕ
< ܐܒܐ : ܘܠܐ ܡܩܝܡܐ ܕܝܠܢܝܬ ܀

A flor. I for lines 156-159 and 159-162

Line 158: ܫܘܕܥܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 11, line 150 (ܫ̈ܘܕܥܐ).

These texts, then, having been examined, let us pass on to other divinely inspired words of wise BASIL, whereby he demolishes, as if by these other words, the novel and deceitful insanity and despoils it utterly of its knavish trickery. He wrote, then, as follows, in the second book *Against Eunomius* the impure: But afterwards, in adherence to his blasphemies, he will say: 'The Father also was not Father to begin with, but became so later'; and so, if it was good and fitting to God's goodness to be Father, why was what befits him not present to him in the beginning? For they must necessarily impute the defect itself either to ignorance of something better or to impotence: ignorance, if he discovered the good later; and impotence, if aware of and understanding it, he fell short of excellence. But if (which it is impermissible to say) it was not a noble thing for him to be Father, why did he change and choose the inferior? However, let the blasphemy recoil upon those who were its cause! The God of all, indeed, is Father eternally, never beginning to be Father. For he was not * prevented from the accomplishment of his will by lack of power nor did he delay for the revolutions of eras so that, as with men and the rest of living beings, he should effect his aim after the completion of the age when capacity for begetting reaches him (for it belongs to madmen to think and utter these things), but he has his fatherhood (so to name it) co-extensive with his eternity. Therefore, the Son, being before time, and ever existing, never began to exist, but from when there has existed the Father there has also existed the Son, and with the idea of the Father there immediately enters that of the Son. He speaks similarly in the letter to his brother Gregory *On Substance and Hypostasis*, as follows: So one who has observed the beauty of the image is endowed with a mental picture of the exemplar. And one

**143/162** Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* II, 11-12 (*PG 29*, 593AB; *SChr.*, vol. 305, pp. 44-46) **164/180** Bas. Caes., *Ep. 38*, 8 (*PG* 32, 340BC; Forlin Patrucco, p. 194); cf. supra, ch. 13, 157-163 et 163-167



ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܒܨܝ : ܢܥܒܪ ܠܘܬ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ ܢܫ̈ܝܡܬ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܚܟܝܡܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܕܒܐܝ̈ܕܝܗܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ : ܠܗ̇ ܠܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܘܐܪܡܝܘܬܐ ܦܫܘܬ : ܘܚܒܠܐ ܕܡܥܒܕܢܐ ܡܢ ܡܚܪܒܬ ܒܥܡܘܬܐ ܐܣܛܡܛܝܩܘܬܐ ܡܓܠܣ. ܟܬܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܛܢܦܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ⁘ ܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܢܩܦ ܠܓܘ̈ܕܦܘܗܝ، ܐܡܪ ⁘ ܕܐܦ ܐܒܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘܐ ܐܒܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ. ܐܠܐ ܐܚܪܝܬ ܗܘܐ ⁘ ܘܗܘܐ ܐܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܘܦܐܝܐ ܠܛܒܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܒܐ : ܐܡܢܐ ܠܘ ܡܢ ܒܪܫܝܬ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܦܐܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܡܩܪܒܐ ܗܘܬ. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܕܡܕܡ ܕܡܝܬܪ : ܐܘ ܡܢ ܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܚܠܦܘܗ̇ ܢܣܒܝܢ ܠܗ̇ ܠܒܨܝܪܘܬܐ. ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܡ̇ܢ ܐܢ ܐܚܪܝܬ ܐܫܟܚ ܠܛܒܬܐ. ܡܢ ܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ : ܐܢ ܟܕ ܝܕܥ ܘܡܣܬܟܠ : ܦܓܪ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܫܦܝܪܘܬܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܫܠܝܛ ܠܡܐܡܪ : ܠܐ ܫܦܝܪܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܒܐ : ܡܛܠ ܡܢܐ ܡܢ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܚܫܒܢܐ ܓܒܐ. ܐܠܐ ܬܗܦܘܟ ܡܢ ܓܘܕܦܐ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܘܘ ܥܠܬܐ. ܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܟܠ : ܡܬܘܡܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܒܐ. ܠܐ ܟܕ ܫܪܝ، ܡܬܘܡ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܒܐ. ܘܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܚܣܝܪܘܬܐ * ܕܚܝܠܐ ܕܢܫܡܠܐ ܨܒܝܢܗ ܡܬܟܠܝܐ ܗܘܐ : ܘܠܐ ܠܚܘ̈ܕܪܐ ܕܥܠܡ̈ܐ ܡܘܪܟ ܗܘܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܒܢܝ̈ܢܫܐ ܘܠܫܪܟܐ ܕܚܝ̈ܘܬܐ : ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܫܘܡܠܝܐ ܕܙܒܢܐ : ܟܕ ܐܬܐ ܠܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܝܠܕ : ܢܥܒܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܬܚܦܛ. ܕܫ̈ܢܝܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ : ܘܕܢܪܢܘܢ ܘܕܢܡܠܠܘܢ. ܐܠܐ ܥܡ ܡܬܘܡܝܘܬܗ ܕܡܬܬܫܝܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܗ̇، ܕܐܡܪܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܗ̇ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ. ܡܕܝܢ ܐܦ ܒܪܐ ܟܕ ܩܕܡ ܠܙ̈ܒܢܐ ܘܟܠܙܒܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܠܐ ܫܪܝ، ܠܡܗܘܐ ܡܬܘܡ. ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܡܬܝ، ܕܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ. ܘܡܚܕܐ ܥܡ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܐܒܐ : ܘܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܪܐ ܥܐܠ ⁘ ܗܟܢ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܚܘܗܝ، ܕܥܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܘܩܢܘܡܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ⁘ ܡܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ܒܫܘܦܪܐ ܕܝܘܩܢܐ : ܒܡܣܬܟܠܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܪܟܛܘܦܐ ܗܘܐ

A

Line 193: ܕܝܘܩܢܐ, cf. ch. 13, line 157 (ܕܨܠܡܐ).

who has taken up into his understanding the form, as it were, of the Son, has imprinted it with the impress of the Father's hypostasis, seeing him by it, not because he sees the Father's ingeneracy in the impress derived from him (otherwise he would be totally identical and not different) but because he sees the ingenerate beauty in the generate. For just as someone looking at a clear mirror observes the appearance of the form there created and is in possession of clear knowledge of the depicted face, so he who perceives the Son has obtained in his heart, through the knowledge of the Son, the image of the paternal hypostasis. For all things belonging to the Father are viewed in the Son and all things belonging to the Son belong to the Father. Because all the Son abides in the Father, and again, he has all the Father in himself. So the Son's hypostasis becomes as it were the form and the prosopon of the indication of the Father, and the Father's hypostasis is recognized in the Son's form, the property viewed in them abiding for the clear distinction of the hypostases.

By these words of the father we are taught again that when impious Eunomius uttered those, so to say, unspeakable blasphemies against even the God of all himself for the denigration of the Son's Godhead and eternity, and alleged that he who exists perpetually and non-temporally later * became Father, the master of mysteries rebuts his irreligion and shows that he is eternally Father just as he is eternally God. Hence, he defined God's fatherhood (i.e. the characteristic property of the Father's hypostasis) as being co-extensive with his eternity. For just as unbeginning ....... and when eternity .... the Father, unbeginning .... fatherhood

**189** cf. supra, 159



< ܘܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܫܩܠ ܒܣܘܟܠܗ : ܛܒܥܐ
< ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܒܗܝܐ ܛܒܥܗ : ܟܕ ܚܙܐ ܒܗ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘ. ܠܘ ܟܕ
< ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ : ܒܛܒܥܐ ܕܡܢܗ ܚܙܐ. ܘܐܠܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܠܐ : ܒܟܠܗ [ܗܘ] ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܠܐ ܐ[ܚܪ]ܢܐ : ܐܠܐ
< ܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ [ܕ]ܗܘ ܒܝܠܝܕܐ ܚܙܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ [ܕ]ܗܘ
< ܕܒܡܚܙܝܬܐ ܕܢܗܝܪܬܐ : ܟܕ ܚܙܐ ܚܙܬܐ ܕܕܡܘܬܐ ܗܝ، ܕܗܘܬ
< ܡܬܩܢܐ : ܝܕܥܬܐ ܢܗܝܪܬܐ ܕܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܨܝܪ
< ܗܟܢܐ : ܗܘܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܕܪܟ ܠܒܪܐ : ܠܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ
< ܐܒܗܝܐ : ܒܝܕ ܝܕܥܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܒܠܒܗ ܩܢܐ. ܟܠܗܝܢ ܓܝܪ
< ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܒܐ ܒܒܪܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܢ. ܘܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܪܐ ܕܐܒܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ. ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܟܠܗ ܒܪܐ ܒܐܒܐ ܡܩܘܐ : ܘܟܠܗ
< ܬܘܒ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܒܗ. ܡܕܝܢ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܒܪܐ : ܐܝܟ
< ܕܡܘܬܐ ܘܦܪܨܘܦܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܫܘܘܕܥܐ ܕܐܒܐ. ܘܩܢܘܡܐ
< ܕܐܒܐ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܡܬܝܕܥ. ܟܕ ܡܩܘܝܐ ܠܗܘܢ
< ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܗܝ، ܕܡܬܚܙܝܐ ܒܗܘܢ : ܠܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܓܠܝܐ
< ܕܩܢܘ̈ܡܐ ✣

ܘܒܝܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܡܠܦܝܢܢ : ܕܟܕ ܥܘܠܐ
ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܠܘܬ ܠܙܘܠܙܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܘܡܬܘܡܝܘܬܐ
ܕܒܪܐ : ܐܦ ܒܟܠܗ، ܕܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠ : ܗܠܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܬܡܠܠܢܝܬܐ
ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܓܘܕ̈ܦܐ : ܘܐܡܪ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܝܬ ܐܡܝܢܐܝܬ
ܘܕܠܐ ܙܒܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، : ܠܚܪܬܐ * ܕܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܐܒܐ : ܡܪܗ f. 84rb
ܠܪܫܝܥܘܬܗ ܡܟܣ ܪ̈ܐܙܐ ܘܡܚܘܐ : ܕܡܬܘܡܐܝܬ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐܒܐ ܕܐܦ
ܐܠܗܐ ܗܘܝܘ ܘܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܠܐܒܗܘܬܐ
ܐܦ ܬܚܡ ܠܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܒܡܫܘܚܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܕܡܬܬܚܡܢܐ
ܥܡ ܡܬܘܡܝܘܬܗ ܦܫܛ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܟܕ ܕܠܐ
ܫܘܪܝܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܫܘܦܢܐ ... ܕܠܗ ......... ܡܬܘܡ ......... ܘܟܕ
ܡܬܘܡܝܘܬ[ܐ] ................................ ܐܒܐ : ܕܠܐ ܫܘܪܝܐ

A

Line 194: ܕܐܝܟ (as infra, line 237), cf. ch. 13, line 158 (ܕܐܝܟ ܕܠܐܡܪ). ܛܒܥܐ (as infra, line 237), cf. ch. 13, line 159 (ܒܛܒܥܐ).
Line 195: ܐܒܗܝܐ (as infra, line 238), cf. ch. 13, line 159 (ܕܐܒܐ).
Line 206: ܕܫܘܘܕܥܐ, cf. ch. 13, line 164 (ܕܡܫܘܕܥܢܘܬܐ).

belongs to him also as the characteristic property of the hypostasis. But if someone were to say that he is fatherhood, because he has fatherhood eternally, such a person must also profess him as being the characteristic properties of his nature. Since he is acknowledged by everyone to have these also eternally and not latterly. How, indeed, can he fitly be said to have his fatherhood co-extensive with his eternity, if his fatherhood is his hypostasis? Will it not be seen as the height of lunacy and absurdity to say that the Father has his hypostasis co-extensive with his eternity? For according to this folly the co-extensive with his eternity will be found to be entirely other than his very own hypostasis. However, this is really rubbish and the fictions of an aberrant mind.

But let us now examine the meaning also of the proof-text set down after. For the guide to truth expressly said there: And one who has taken up into his understanding the form, as it were, of the Son, has imprinted it with the impress of the Father's hypostasis, seeing him by it, not because he sees the Father's ingeneracy in the impress derived from him (otherwise he would be totally identical and not different). Are we not to say that those in any doubt whatsoever over these things must be devoid of sound sense and discretion but full of much impiety and impudence? For the famous doctor expressly said the Father's ingeneracy is not the hypostasis of the Father, by writing: Seeing him by it, * not because he sees the Father's ingeneracy in the impress derived from him (otherwise he would be totally identical and not different) but because he sees the ingenerate beauty in the generate.

**196/197** cf. supra, 158-159 **199** cf. supra, 196-197 **204/209** cf. supra, 165-169 **213/216** cf. supra, 167-170



...................... ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܐܦ [ܐܒܗܘܬܐ] ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܩܢܘܡܝܬܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܗ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܡܬܘܡܐܝܬ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܐܒܗܘܬܐ: ܢܐܡܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܢܘܕܐ ܠܗ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ: ܘܕܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܗ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܡܛܠ ܕܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܬܘܡܐܝܬ: ܘܠܐ ܠܚܪܬܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܟܠܢܫ ܡܬܬܘܕܝܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܐܒܗܘܬܗ ܕܡܫܬܘܚܬܐ ܥܡ ܡܬܘܡܝܘܬܗ: ܠܫܦܝܪܐܝܬ ܡܬܐܡܪܐ: ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܒܗܘܬܗ ܩܢܘܡܗ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܐܘ ܠܐ ܕܫܢܝܘܬܐ ܪܫܝܬܐ ܘܫܒܝܬܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ: ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܐܒܐ ܩܢܘܡܗ ܕܡܫܬܘܚ ܥܡ ܡܬܘܡܝܘܬܗ. ܡܫܬܟܚ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܫܛܝܘܬܐ: ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܣ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܡܢܗ ܩܢܘܡܗ: ܗܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܚ ܥܡ ܡܬܘܡܝܘܬܗ. ܐܠܐ ܫܛܝܘܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܪܪܐ: ܘܡܫܢܝܬܐ ܕܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܛܥܝܐ.

ܢܒܚܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܟܝܠ ܗܘܢܐ: ܘܕܐܘܣܬܐ ܕܟܬܝܒܐ ܒܬܪܟܢ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܘܒܗ̇: ܡܗܕܝܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܗܟܢ ܃
< ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܐ ܩܒܠ ܒܡܕܥܬܗ: ܘܦܘܫܩܐ
< ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܒܗܝܐ ܛܒܥܗ. ܒܗ̇ ܚܙܐ ܒܗ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ. ܠܘ ܒܗ̇
< ܠܐ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܒܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܡܢܗ ܚܙܐ. ܘܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ:
< ܒܟܠܗ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܃ ܘܐܡܪܢܐ ܠܐ
ܕܡܢ ܟܠܗ̇ ܡܢ ܥܡܝܪܘܬ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܘܡܩܦܝܬܐ ܚܠܝܡܝܢ: ܕܡܠܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܥܘܬܐ ܡܪܚܩܬܐ ܘܡܪܚܘܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ: ܗܘܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܒܗ ܡܬܦܩܚܝܢ. ܗܐ ܓܝܪ ܒܗ̇ ܒܡܠܬܐ: ܕܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ: ܗܘܐ
< ܡܠܦܢܐ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܐܡܪ: ܟܕ ܟܬܒ ܃ ܒܗ̇ ܚܙܐ ܒܗ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘ.
< ܠܘ ܒܗ̇ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ: ܒܦܘܫܩܐ * ܕܡܢܗ ܚܙܐ. f. 84va
< ܘܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ: ܒܟܠܗ ܗܘ ܒܗ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ.
< ܐܠܐ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܒܗ̇ ܗܘ ܒܝܠܝܕܐ ܚܙܐ ܃

A

Line 237: ܕܐܝܟ, cf. supra, line 194 and note. ܦܘܫܩܐ, cf. supra, line 194 and note.

Line 238: ܐܒܗܝܐ, cf. supra, line 195 and note.

You will observe that we see the Father, i.e. the ingenerate beauty, in the Son, i.e. the generate beauty, but not the Father's ingeneracy. What else, indeed, does he mean when he says: Seeing him by it, not because he sees the Father's ingeneracy in the impress derived from him (otherwise he would be totally identical and not different) but because he sees the ingenerate beauty in the generate? Will the falsifiers of truth understand the ingenerate beauty not as the Father, nor yet the generate beauty as the Son, but as something else? In that case, the matter is very arbitrary and senseless. How, then, can the Father's ingeneracy be the Father's hypostasis? For if the Father's hypostasis is the Father, yet whilst the Father is seen in the Son his ingeneracy is not seen, it is quite obvious that ingeneracy is not the Father (i.e. the Father's hypostasis) but has been proved to be, rather, his characteristic property. So let the madmen cease from their impudence towards such clear words and from disturbing the souls of the simple! For they have heard, if they will also understand, that the great Paul cries out: *The man who disturbs you shall bear the judgement, whoever he is*. That too applies to them. For the same warrior for truth said also in the address *To those who say the Son is unlike the Father*: 'But if', they say, 'he begat, he gave some of his ingeneracy.' And how did he give any of his unbegottenness to the one whom he brought into being through his begetting of him, for ingeneracy is the negation of God's being begotten? But you are reckoning a negation as the substance. The Father is not begotten. This is the meaning of ingeneracy. So how can not having been begotten be a substance? How, indeed, could the one who was begotten receive any of it? So, the doctor ruled that ingeneracy is a negation. For, he says, ingeneracy is the negation of God's being begotten. * But you are reckoning a negation as the substance. The Father is not begotten. This is the meaning of ingeneracy. But perhaps, our author

**217/218** cf. supra, 215-216 **219/224** cf. supra, 213-216 **233/234** Gal. 5:10 **236/243** Bas. Caes., *De eis qui dicunt Filium esse dissimilem Patri*, hucusque ineditum **244/246** cf. supra, 239-241



ܡܬܚܙܝܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܕܠܐܒܐ ܚܙܐ ܗܘܝܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܐ: ܒܒܪܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܒܫܘܦܪܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܚܙܝܢ: ܘܠܐ ܗܟܢ
ܕܝܢ ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ: ܡܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܢܐܡܪ
< ܕܡܬܚܙܐ ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܡܪ ܀ ܟܕ ܚܙܐ ܒܗ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ
< ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ: ܒܚܘܬܡܐ ܕܡܢܗ ܚܙܐ: ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܠܐ: ܒܟܠܗ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܘܠܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ: ܐܠܐ
< ܫܘܦܪܐ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܒܗܘ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܚܙܐ ܀ ܐܘ ܠܐ ܫܘܦܪܐ ܡܢ
ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܠܐܒܐ: ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܝܠܝܕܐ ܠܒܪܐ: ܐܠܐ ܡܕܡ
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܙܝܦܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ. ܡܕܝܢ ܕܫܠܝܛܢܐ
ܗܟܢܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܨܒܝܢܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ
ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܒܐ: ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܐܒܐ. ܐܢ
ܓܝܪ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، : ܟܕ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܚܙܐ
ܐܒܐ ܒܒܪܐ: ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܗ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ: ܡܦܪܣܐ
ܝܕܝܥܐ: ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܗܟܢ ܡܢ ܐܒܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ
ܩܢܘܡܐ ܕܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ: ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ
ܕܗܘܐ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܢܬܠܘܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܘܬ
ܗܠܝܢ ܕܗܢܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܟ̈ܠܗܝܢ ܢܟܪܘܢ: ܘܠܢܦ̈ܫܬܐ ܕܦܫܝ̈ܛܐ
ܢܥܝܩܘܢ ܬܘܒ. ܫܡܥܘ ܓܝܪ ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ
< ܕܡܟܪܙ ܦܘܠܘܣ ܪܒܐ ܀ ܕܗܘ ܕܕܠܚ ܠܟܘܢ ܗܘ ܢܣܒܪܝܘܗܝ،
< ܠܕܝܢܐ ܡܢ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܀ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܢܦܩ ܐܦ ܗ̇ܘ، : ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ
ܗܘ ܡܬܟܬܫܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ: ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ
< ܕܠܐ ܕܡܐ ܒܪܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܐܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܐܢ ܗܘ ܠܡ
< ܕܐܘܠܕ ܡܢ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܝܗܒ ܡܢܝܬܐ ܠܗܘ ܕܝܠܕ ܗ̇ܘ،
< ܕܐܘܠܕ ܐܡܪ: ܠܗܢܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܝܗܒ. ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܒܣܘܪܒܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܠܗܐ. ܐܝܬ
< ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܚܫܒ ܐܢܬ ܠܣܘܪܒܢܐ. ܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܒܐ. ܗܢܐ
< ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗ̇ܝ،
< ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܢܣܒ ܡܢ ܗܕܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܀ ܗܐ
< ܠܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܣܘܪܒܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܦܣܩ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܀ ܠܐ
< ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܡܪ: ܣܘܪܒܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ
< ܐܠܗܐ. * ܐܢܬ ܕܝܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܚܫܒ ܐܢܬ ܠܣܘܪܒܢܐ. ܠܐ f. 84vb
< ܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܒܐ ܗܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܟܒܪ

A flor. II from l. 258 to l. 264

will say: 'I am not saying that a negation is the substance'. Then let him say clearly that he professes God the Father i.e. his hypostasis as a negation. You will perceive the frenzy of the novel doctrines. The God-clad father proclaims that ingeneracy is the negation of God the Father's being begotten. The novel theologian exclaims, in contradiction of these words, that ingeneracy is God the Father. In that case, God the Father too must be a negation. For if, according to Basil the Great, ingeneracy is a negation, but according to this fellow it is God the Father, quite obviously God the Father is both ingeneracy and a negation, if we reckon as true both Damian's and the master of mysteries' doctrines. So the upshot will be that either we profess God the Father a negation (and in that case we shall not believe he is also a hypostasis, for a negation cannot be a hypostasis) or justly thinking this impious and crazy, we shall have to reject in every way either the doctrines of the famous Basil or of the writer himself. What do the friends of truth want to condemn?

**250/251** cf. supra, 244-245



ܢܐܡܪ ܡܚܠܬܒܢܐ : ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝܘ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܟܘܪܢܐ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܢܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܕܠܗ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܘ ܟܝܬ ܠܩܢܘܡܗ ܕܐܒܐ : ܒܟܘܪܢܐ ܡܘܕܐ. ܚܙܝ ܐܬܘܢ ܠܫܪܝܘܬܐ ܕܢܘܟܪ̈ܝܐ ܚܕ̈ܬܐ : ܠܒܝܫ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܡܟܪܙ : ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܟܘܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ. ܡܡܠܠ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܚܕܬܐ : ܒܗ ܠܩܘܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܡܠܠ ܦܥܐ : ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇. ܡܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܒܟܘܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܪܒܐ : ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܒܟܘܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܡܕܝܢ ܝܕܝܥܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ : ܘܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܒܟܘܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܢ̈ܘܟܪܝܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܘܕܡܝܢܐ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ : ܫܪܝܪܐ ܢܚܫܒ : ܥܬܝܕܐ ܠܝ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܘ ܕܒܐ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܒܟܘܪܢܐ ܡܘܕܝܢ : ܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܢܗܘܐ ܕܐܦ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܒܟܘܪܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ : ܐܘ [ܒܗ] ܠܗܕܐ ܕܕܐܝܬ ܪܫܝܥܬܐ ܐܟ[ܝܢܐ] ܘܫܛܝܬܐ ܡܫܒܪܝܢ : ܒܟܠ ܙܢ .. ܠܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܢܨܝܚܐ : ... ܐܘ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܚܠܬܒܢܐ. ܠܚܒܗ ... ܕܪ̈ܚܡܝ ܫܪܪܐ ܢܚܝܒܘܢ.

A flor. II from l. 284 to l. 293

Line 287: ܘܐܒܐ, flor. II: ܐܒܐ.
Line 292: ܐܪ̈ܙܐ, flor. II: ܐ̈ܪܙܐ.

## Chapter 19

*Examination of Saint Gregory of Nyssa's statement (parts of which we quoted in our* Joint Confession and Agreement *concerning the present affair) which the good Damian has shown he attacked in that previously mentioned* Festal Epistle. *And rebuttal of the same ludicrous blather against us in the same* Festal Epistle, *whereby he reveals himself to be an imitator of women of ill-fame by publicizing his revilings against us and as exceedingly ignorant in accusing us of ignorance because, he says, we did not know from what book we had quoted Saint Gregory's testimony.*

Here we shall move the examination on to words akin to those divinely inspired words of Saint Basil. For the wise instructor, his brother GREGORY, wrote in the first book *Against Eunomius* * as follows: I will take up and repeat the sentence of his which I set down at the beginning. 'We do not refuse', he says, 'also to call the Son, since he is begotten, "offspring", the begotten substance itself and the title "Son" laying claim to such a relationship of terms'. So now let the critical hearer of these words remember this: by using 'begotten substance' of the Only-begotten he grants, by logical sequence, that we should use 'unbegotten substance' of the Father, so that, therefore, neither ingeneracy nor generacy will be understood as substance; but substance, on the one hand, and the fact that it was begotten or not begotten, on the other hand, are to be considered individually by means of the properties viewed in the substance. But let us consider the reasoning on this point more studiously. He says that a substance has been begotten, and that the name of the substance which has been begotten is 'Son'. However, here the argument from our side rebuts the opposing argument on two grounds:

14/63 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (*PG* 45, 589B - 592B; Jaeger II, p. 27,21 - 29,26); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 11, 270-274 et 208-214

ܡܦܠܚܘ̈ ܕܬܫܥܝܬܐ.

ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܣܐ: ܕܡܢܗ ܘܡܢܗ ܡܢܗ ܣܡܢ: ܒܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܓܘܢܐ ܘܫܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܥܠ ܕܡܛܠܬܗ ܥܢܝܢܐ ܕܗܫܐ. ܗܝ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܗ ܗܘ، ܕܛܒ ܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܚܘܝ: ܒܗ̇، ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܥܐܕܐ. ܘܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܗܝ ܕܗܠܝܢ: ܕܡܬܓܚܟܢܘܬܐ ܦܩܩ ܥܠܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܥܐܕܐ: ܕܒܐܝܕܗ̇ ܡܬܚܘܐ ܡܬܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܢܫܐ ܡܛܥܝܢܝܬܐ: ܒܗ̇، ܕܫܘܕܥܗ، ܥܠܝܢ ܡܓܕܦ. ܘܣܟܠ ܠܗ ܛܒܐ ܟܕ ܠܢ ܡܣܟܠ ܥܠ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܐ: ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܝܬܝܢ ❖

ܝܛ ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܠܘܬ ܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ ܕܬܒܐ ܩܠܐ ܢܫܝܩܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܢܥܒܪ ܠܒܘܚܢܐ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܚܘܗܝ، ܪܕܘܝܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ: ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ * ܕܠܘܬ A, f. 85ra
‹ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܗܟܢܐ ܒܗܠܝܢ ❖ ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܡܢ ܠܥܠ
‹ ܫܩܠ ܐܢܐ ܡܠܬܗ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܢ ܪܝܫܐ ܣܡܬ. ܟܕ ܠܡ ܠܝܠܕܐ
‹ ܐܬܝܗ، ܒܪܐ: ܕܐܦ ܝܠܕܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܡܬܟܠܝܢ. ܟܕ ܗ̇ܝ
‹ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܘܫܡܐ ܕܒܪܐ: ܡܚܣܢܐ ܐܚܝܢܘܬܐ
‹ ܕܫܡܗܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ. ܢܥܗܕ ܡܟܝܠ ܗܘ ܕܕܝܢܐ ܗܘ ܫܡܘܥܐ
‹ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܐܡܪܢ: ܗܕܐ ܕܒܡܐܡܪ.. ܕܒܗ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ
‹ ܥܠ ܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܐܡܪ. ܝܗܒ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܢܩܦܬܐ: ܕܐܦ ܥܠ ܐܒܐ
‹ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܢܐܡܪ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܘܠܐ ܠܐ
‹ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܘܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܚܠܦ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܬܣܝܡܢ. ܐܠܐ
‹ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܢ ܡܢܗ ܘܠܗ̇: ܡܢܗ ܘܠܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܐܘ ܠܐ
‹ ܐܬܝܠܕܬ: ܒܝܕ ܕܝܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܒܗ̇ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܚܕ ܚܕ ܕܝܢ
‹ ܒܢܘܚܡܬ ܒܚܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܢܫܩܘܠ. ܐܘܣܝܐ
‹ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܐܡܪ. ܘܫܡܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܒܪܐ
‹ ܐܬܝܗ،. ܐܠܐ ܗܪܟܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܒܬܪܝܢ ܡܟܣܐ

A

first, for the impudence of its knavery; secondly, for the feebleness of its attack upon us. For he is acting with malicious deceit in speaking of the generacy of the substance, in order to procure the mutual opposition of the substances sundered by generacy and ingeneracy into a difference of natures. The feebleness of the attempt is rebutted by the very means whereby the plot is set up. For one who says the substance has been begotten clearly defines generacy as being something other than substance, so as not to permit the meaning of generacy to be adapted to the concept of substance. For he has not done in this part the very thing he designed in many passages so that he could say that generacy is the substance itself; but here he acknowledges that the substance has been begotten, so that the hearers have a distinct idea of each word. For different ideas are created for the hearer of 'has been begotten' and by the term 'substance'. The argument will become clearer to us by illustrations. The Lord said in the Gospel that when her labour is at hand a woman is in pain but afterwards rejoices in her happiness *that a man has been born into the world*. So, just as in this passage we have learned from * the Gospel two distinct ideas: first, we have understood a generation by birth; secondly, the one who has come into existence by generation (for a man is not generation but by generation the man exists); so also here, since Eunomius has acknowledged that the substance was begotten, we have learned by the word 'begotten' the fact of being derived from something and by the word 'substance' we have understood a substrate possessing a derived hypostasis. If, then, the meaning of 'substance' is one thing and the term 'generation' is 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

**42/44** cf. Ioh. 16:21



ܠܚܠܫܘܬܐ ܕܠܩܘܒܠܐ. ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܠܡܪܚܘܬܐ ܕܡܣܟܪܘܬ ܥܒܘܕܘܬܐ.
ܐܚܪܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܚܫܝܠܘܬܐ ܕܡܚܒܐ ܕܠܩܘܒܠ ܡܛܠܬܢ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ
ܒܢܟܝܠܘܬ: ܟܕ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܡܪ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܬܚܝܒ
ܣܘܩܒܠܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܚܕܕܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܣ: ܕܒܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܠܘܬ ܐܚܪܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܟܝܢܐ ܦܪܝܫ. ܡܬܒܣܣܐ ܕܝܢ
ܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܕܡܚܒܐ: ܒܟܠܗܝܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܬܚܒܠܐ ܡܬܬܚܒܠ.
ܗܘ ܓܝܪ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܡܪ: ܕܡܚܕܐ ܬܚܘܡ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ
ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܡܢ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܦܪܫ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܫܒܘܩ
ܕܬܬܩܪܒ ܕܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܡܠܬܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ ܢܬܠܚܡ. ܠܘ ܓܝܪ
ܗܝ ܕܒܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܟܬܒ: ܗܕܐ ܐܦ ܒܡܢܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܥܒܕ:
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܕܗܝ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܐܠܐ
ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܡܘܕܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܫܡܥܢܐ ܕܦܪܫ ܟܠ ܟܠ
ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܡܠܝܢ: ܢܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܦܠܝܢ. ܣܘܟܠܐ ܓܝܪ
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܘ ܕܢܫܡܥ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ: ܘܐܚܪܢܐ ܟܕ ܢܫܡܥ
ܕܐܘܣܝܐ. ܡܠܬܐ ܓܝܪ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܬܗܘܐ ܠܢ ܡܢ ܡܬܠܐ ܟܕ
ܬܘܕܝܬܐ. ܐܡܪ ܡܪܢ ܒܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ: ܕܟܕ ܡܛܝ ܚܒܠܗ
ܕܐܢܬܬܐ ܟܪܝܐ ܠܗ ܐܝܬ. ܒܬܪ ܕܝܢ ܚܕܝܐ ܒܚܕܘܬܐ:
ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܒܥܠܡܐ ❖ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܒܡܠܬܐ ܗܕܐ:
ܬܪܝܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܡܦܪܫܐ ܡܢ * ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܝܠܦܢ: ܚܕ ܡܢ f. 85rb
ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܒܚܒܠܐ ܐܣܬܟܠܢ: ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܗܘ
ܕܡܢ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ: ܠܘ ܓܝܪ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ:
ܐܠܐ ܒܝܕ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܒܪܢܫܐ: ܗܟܢܐ ܘܗܪܟܐ: ܟܕ
ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘܕܝ: ܒܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܝܕܐ
ܗܝ ܕܡܢ ܡܕܡ ܢܦܩܝܢ: ܒܗܿ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܡܠܬܐ ܠܗ ܠܗܘ ܕܩܝܡ
ܐܣܬܟܠܢ: ܠܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܩܢܘܡܐ. ܐܢ ܗܟܝܠ
ܐܚܪܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܐܘܣܝܐ: ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܢ
ܫܡܗܐ ܕܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܒܗ ܕܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ: ܢܦܠܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܥܠ
ܨ̈ܒܥܐ ܣܘܦܣܛܐ: ܐܝܟ ܡ̈ܐܢܐ ܕܚܨܦܐ ܕܢܩܝܫܐ ܠܚܕܕܐ:
ܘܟܕ ܬܪܥܐ ܐܬܬܒܪܘ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܟܝܠ ܥܠܝܗ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܟܕ

A flor. I from l. 49 to l. 52

Line 51: ܠܗܘ ܠܗ, cf. Book II, ch. 11, line 300 (ܗܘ ܗܘ).
Line 52: ܩܢܘܡܐ, W: ܩܢܘܡܐ.
Line 56: ܥܠܝܗ, cf. Book II, ch. 11, line 233 (ܡܚܝܘ).

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. For with Eunomius having agreed that the substance was begotten (as the Gospel illustration too explains this sort of notion, an illustration by which, on learning that a man has been begotten we do not understand man and generation as meaning the same thing but have received the notion proper to each term) the heresy which teaches the otherness of substances through such words absolutely has no longer any room.

These words having been quoted and having very lucidly taught us the truth concerning the points at issue, how inconceivable it is that they should reckon it right to put together those additional words! And how (we blush at it!) shall we expect to make their meaning clearer by the quantity of them, were it not that liberty, so to call it, and much critical sense has become apparent in men of the present day with regard to divine teachings? It is that which forces us against our will to utter a good many nonsensical words in our modest endeavour to ensure that certain persons should not imagine the truth to be weak owing to our being too long silent in the face of them.

So, seeing we have a golden opportunity to examine the text just quoted, readers must know that whilst we were living in the East, and were about to make a quick journey to Arabia with a view to our examining with the good Damian his recently decreed doctrinal innovations, * all of us, who have been thought worthy by God's love to be set amongst the high priests, took a common decision, with regard to the security and trust of our brethren and fellow-believers. We decided to explain, in as small a text as



< ܦܘܪܫܢܐ ܕܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܠܘܬ ܠܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܥܠ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܒܐ
< ܘܕܒܪܐ ܡܥܒܪܝܢ : ܢܥܒܪܘܢ ܐܟܚܕܐ ܥܠ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܡܚܪܝܘܬܐ
< ܕܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܚ̈ܕܕܐ. ܟܕ ܐܫܬܘܕܝܬ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ
< ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ : ܐܝܟ ܡܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܬܠܬܐ ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢܝܬܐ
< ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܡܦܫܩܐ : ܕܒܗܿ ܟܕ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ
< ܝܠܦܢ : ܠܘ ܗܘ ܟܕ ܗܘ ܐܣܬܟܠܢ ܒܪ ܐܢܫܐ ܘܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ
< ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܝܠܝܦܐ ܥܠ ܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܫ̈ܡܗܐ ܩܒܠܢ : ܠܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܐܝܬ
< ܕܢܗܘܐ ܐܬܪܐ ܡܢ ܟܠܦܘܪܗ ܠܗܪܣܝܣ : ܕܐܚܪܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ
< ܒܝܕ ܬܒܠܬ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܠ̈ܦܐ ❖

ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܬܬܐܡܪ̈ܝ : ܘܦܫܝܩ ܢܗܝܪܐܝܬ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܡܛܠ ܨ̈ܒܘܬܐ ܕܡܬܒܥܝܢ ܗ̈ܘܝ ܠܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܠܗ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܐܢ ܕܦܫܝܩ ܗܘ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܡܠ̈ܘܬܐ ܢܚܒܫܘܢ ܢܥܒܕ ܗܘܝܢ : ܠܗܿ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܢܣܩܘܪ : ܘܢܦܩ ܕܣܘܓܐܐ ܕܬ̈ܟܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܓܠܝܬܐ ܠܗܪܥܬܗܘܢ ܢܒܕܐ. ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܚܐܪܘܬܐ ܕܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܘܦܘܪܫܢܘܬܐ ܣܓܝܐܬܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝܫܐ : ܕܗܫܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܟܡ ܐܬܚܙܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܠܗ̈ܝܬܐ : ܗܿܝ ܕܐܟܦ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܨܒܝܢ ܐܠܨܐ ܠܢ : ܕܠܟܠܐ ܦ̈ܛܝܐܬܐ ܢܡܠܠ : ܒܙܗܝܪܘܬܢ ܐܝܟ ܚܝܠ ܒܝܢܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܡ ܫܬܝܩܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܿܢܘܢ ܢܣܬܒܪ ܠܐܢܫܝܢ ܕܡܬܡܚܠ ܫܪܪܐ.

ܡܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܟܘܫܪܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܡܥܐ ܐܬܬܐܡܪ̈ܝ، ܠܩܪ̈ܘܝܐ ܗܘܐ : ܢܕܥܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܦܓܥܝܢ : ܕܟܕ ܒܡܕܢܚܐ ܡܕܒܪܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ : ܘܡܬܛܝܒܝܢ ܗܘܝܢ : ܕܒܪ̈ܗܠܐ ܩܠܝܠܬܐ ܠܐܪܒܝܐ ܢܥܒܕ : ܠܘܬ ܗܿܘ، ܠܡ ܕܢܒܚܢ ܥܡ ܛܒܐ ܕܡܝܢܐ : ܡܛܠ ܚ̈ܘܠܦܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܬܘܪܐܬܐ ܒܦܘܩܕܐ ܚܕܬ : ܟܠܢ * ܠܟܠ ܗܿܢܘܢ ܕܐܫܬܘܝܢܢ، ܕܐܠܗܐ f. 85va ܐܫܬܘܝܢ ܕܪܝܫ ܟܗ̈ܢܐ ܢܬܬܣܝܡ ܥܦܝܬ : ܡܛܠ ܙܗܝܪܘܬܐ ܘܦܢܝܬܐ ܕܐܚ̈ܝܢ ܒܢ̈ܝ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ : ܕܐܬܕܘܝܬܐ ܗܿܝ، ܕܡܢ ܠܟܠ ܡܢ

A

Line 57: ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ..... ܕܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 11, line 234 (ܕܗܿܝ ܕܝܠܝܕܐ ܠܘܬ ܠܐ ܝܠܝܕܐ).

Line 63: ܥܠ, cf. infra, line 168 (ܠܘܬ).

possible and in their own divinely inspired words, the confession we received from on high from the Church's pastors and doctors on the issue posed. So after we had written it, and it had been published everywhere and had been justly viewed by those not immersed in the mire of wickedness as free from all taint of heresy and as full as could be of patristic and irreproachable thought, he, instead of being led to correction by the fathers' testimonies there (as a scrupulous author ought, if he has any care at all for the truth), on the contrary became furiously angry. Hoping by much knavery to escape rebuttals and dupe the simple, he made pretence (so severely wounded was he) of annually excerpting certain phrases from that document of ours, gnawing them like mice, and in appearance writing against them. Thereupon last year, the seventh year I mean, being in residence in this big city, we pressed him hard, begging and adjuring him both verbally and in writing to get on quickly with a lawful assembly and defend to us in the presence of suitable persons the points of doctrine we brought against him. He refused, though, to participate in any way in such a joint meeting, afraid lest his blighted blasphemy would be clearly refuted before those expected to be present at the examination. To mislead the ingenuous, he got hold of one phrase from the *Joint Confession* I have mentioned, wrenching it mischievously from its context, and put it into his afore-mentioned *Festal Letter* which was published at the time just stated; thus, from then on, he disgorged his abominable and profane blather, which, with God's power, we shall also examine very soon. However, just recently * he composed yet another dreary *Festal Letter*, omitting all the patristic passages set down in our *Confession of Agreement* and taking only what we had quoted there from the above proof-text of Saint Gregory, he presumptuously,



ܪ̈ܥܘܬܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܡܢ ܠܥܠ : ܒܡ̈ܠܬܗܘܢ ܐܠܗܝܬ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܟܚܐ ܒܬܘܕܝܬܐ : ܒܬܪ ܕܟܬܒ ܩܠܐ ܕܠܗܘܢ ܢܦܫܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܝܬ ܠܒܥܬܐ ܢܦܩܬ : ܡܛܠ ܒܥܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܐܬܒܥܬ. ܒܬܪ ܗܕܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܗܘܬ ܡܢ : ܘܐܬܦܪܣܡܬ ܒܟܠܢܫ : ܘܒܐܢܫܐ ܐܬܚܙܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܐܬܛܡܫܘ ܒܚܡܬܐ ܕܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܐܬܚܙܝܬ : ܕܚܣܝܪܐ ܡܢ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܣܪܝܘܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ : ܘܡܠܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܫܟܚܐ ܡܢ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܚܠܠܬܐ : ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܬܘܬܒܘܢܐ ܡܬܥܬܐ : ܐܝܟ ܕܒܥܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܣܦܩܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܡܛܠ ܫܪܪܐ : ܕܢܬܗܦܟ ܠܘܬ ܬܪܘܨܐ ܒܝܕ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ ܕܬܡܢ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܠܡܥܠܐ : ܠܣܘܓܐܐ ܚܡܬܐ ܦܩܪܬܐ ܐܬܚܡܬ. ܘܒܪ ܡܣܒܪ ܕܒܝܕ ܣܘܓܐܐ ܕܢܟܠܐ ܢܥܪܘܩ ܡܢ ܡܟܣܢܘܬܐ ܘܢܛܥܐ ܠܦ̈ܫܝܛܐ : ܗܢܘ ܕܒܡܫܡܥܐ : ܘܗܘܐ ܒܪ ܡܫܪܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܣܒܪܐ : ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܢ ܗܝܕܝܢ ܕܒܫܢܐ ܠܝ ܢܩܛܥ : ܘܒܒܘܬܐ ܐܝܟ ܥܩܒܪ̈ܐ ܢܬܚܘܐ : ܘܕܚܘܝܗ ܠܡܟܬܒ ܥܠܝܗܝܢ. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܘܐܫܬܘܕܝ : ܐܡܪ ܐܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܒܫܢܬܐ ܕܫܒܥ : ܟܕ ܫܪܝܢ ܒܗܕܐ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܩܪܒܢܢ : ܘܩܒܠ ܡܥܒܪܢܘܬ ܡܬܟܬܒܢ ܠܗ : ܘܒܬܟܐ ܘܒܟܬܒܐ ܠܐܦܬܚܘܢ ܘܡܫܬܪܐ ܠܗ : ܕܢܪܗܛ ܠܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܢܡܘܣܝܐ : ܘܢܦܩ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܢ̈ܫܝܐ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗܘܢ ܡܬܬܢܝܢ : ܒܦܢܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܚܕܝܢ ܢܫܘܐ ܠܝ ܒܦܘܣܐ : ܒܪ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܠܐ ܒܪ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܡܕܡ ܗ̇ܘܐ ܕܐܫܬܘܬܦܘ ܕܡܫܬܘܬܦܝܢ ܒܟܢܘܫܝܐ ܢܬܒܨܐ ܘܢܬܟܣܐ ܡܬܩܝܡܐ : ܒܟܠ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܒܬܥܒܪܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܢܬܚܙܘܢ ܕܐܬܐ. ܘܠܡܛܥܝܘ ܕܫܒ̈ܠܐ ܕܒܬܪ ܒܗ : ܒܪ ܚܕܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܢܣܒ ܘܐܝܬܝ ܕܒܫܢܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܫܬܘܝܘܬ : ܡܢ ܗܝܕܝܢ : ܦܢܝ ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܬܩܢܝܬ ܐܬܡܚܝܗ : ܘܥܒܕܗ ܕܒܐܓܪܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܥܐܕܐ : ܘܗܟܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܝܕܝܢ ܦܘܩܫܗܘܢ, ܢܘܪܐ ܘܡ̈ܠܝܐ ܐܬܗܦܟܬ. ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܒܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܡܒܚܢܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܘܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܩܠܝܠ ܬܘܒ : ܒܪ ܐܚܪܬܐ * ܕܡܒܢܝܐ ܐܓܪܬ ܥܐܕܢܝܬܐ ܒܟܘܠܗ̇ ܚܒܪ : ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܠܟܠܗܝܢ ܩܢ̈ܘܢܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܕܠܗܝܢ ܣܝܡܢ : ܘܒܪ ܢܣܒ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܬܡܢ ܕܡܬܒܩܝܐ ܡܢ ܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ : f.85vb

A

clearly and in expressly precise terms opposed the fathers' thoughts and words.

It would be inopportune now to investigate these matters as they deserve, because we are getting on as fast as possible to the conclusion of this enterprise. Nevertheless, because he saw fit to attack the patristic teaching set down, whereby his book is rendered totally impotent, it will not perhaps be out of place to make appropriate comments upon it with a view to reminding and reassuring readers, and to prove clearly that he did not, as certain persons suppose, pay heed to any correction whatsoever, but stuck so much the more to his first or to even worse blasphemies. These we must by all means test in the fire which consumes feeble and vile matter: that is, in the sound words of divinely-inspired masters of mysteries, where the whole monstrous sham of doctrines reprobate is consumed and utterly destroyed.

What he said there with utter haughtiness against our expositions shall come into public view, and we will see their huge, irresistible force. Omitting as much as possible of his foolish old-wives' babble, which imports nothing at all relevant and is enough to produce boredom and annoyance even in those who make great efforts to read it (as diligent readers of it will appreciate), we shall expressly inquire into this fellow's presumptuous misinterpretation of the patristic proof-text quoted above and his advocacy of heretical opinion. For it is not our business to investigate absolutely all his baseless nonsense; but the business, rather, of people who enjoy dreams and fictions.



ܕܐܬܬܝܡ ܒܗ ܒܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܕܝܠܢ : ܐܬܚܫܒ ܡܬܚܪܝܢܘܬܗ : ܘܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܦܪܝܫܬܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܚܘܫܒܐ ܘܡܠܐ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܩܡ.

ܘܕܠܐ ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘ ܗܫܐ ܐܬܪܗ : ܕܐܝܟ ܕܙܕܩ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܢܒܨܐ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܡܨܝܐ ܠܘܬ ܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܗܕܐ ܣܘܥܪܢܘܬܐ ܡܣܬܪܗܒܝܢ. ܒܪܡ ܡܛܠ ܕܐܫܦܪ ܕܙܘܕ ܕܢܥܘܪ ܥܠ ܡܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܐܝܕܝܗ̇ ܟܠܗ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܒܨܪ : ܠܐ ܒܪ ܥܕܢܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܒܗܕܐ ܘܦܢܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ : ܕܢܬܠ ܕܘܟܪܢܐ ܘܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܢܐܡܪ. ܘܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܢܚܘܐ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܫܦܪܘ ܐܢܫܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܗܘ ܬܘܪܥܐ ܚܪ : ܐܠܐ ܘܝܬܝܪ ܝܬܝܪܐ ܒܓܘܕܦܘܗܝ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܐܘ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܒܝܫܝܢ ܐܚܝܕ. ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܙܕܩ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܦܘܡ ܕܒܢܘܪܐ ܡܬܒܚܢܝܢ ܕܗܘܠܐ ܡܚܝܠܬܐ ܘܡܣܠܝܬܐ ܢܒܘܪ : ܗܢܘ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܠܐ ܚܠܝܡܬܐ ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܪ̈ܐܙܐ ܢܟܝܪܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ. ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܠܗ ܙܝܦܐ ܥܡܝܪܐ ܕܝ̈ܘܠܦܢܐ ܡ̈ܣܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܐܟܠ ܘܡܫܬܚܠܦܐ ܐܟܚܕܐ.

ܢܐܬܝܢ ܗܟܝܠ ܠܡܨܥܬܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܒܠܘ ܡܫܬܥܠܢܘܬܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܦܫܩܢ ܠܢ ܗܘܝ ܐܡܝܪ̈ܢ ܠܗ. ܘܢܚܙܝܗ ܪܒܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬܕܚܝܢܐ ܚܝܠܗ. ܟܕ ܫܒܩܝܢ ܗ̇ܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܨܝܐ ܦܟܝܗܘܬܐ ܕܣܒ̈ܬܐ ܥ̈ܩܠܬܐ ܘܦܟܝܗܘܬܐ ܠܫܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܡܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܒ̈ܥܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܝ : ܘܡܣܦܩ ܕܐܦ ܠܗܢܘܢ ܕܒܛܠܢܘܬܐ ܡܥܝܩܢܘܬܐ ܦܩܚܝܢ ܕܠܡܩܪܝܗ̇ ܘܠܐ ܗܢܝܘܬܐ ܢܬܠܘܢ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܒܪܝܫܝܬ ܒܟܠܗ ܦܪܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ ܡܬܥܘܕܝܢ : ܒܠܚܘܕ ܕܝܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܠܦܘܫܩܗ ܒܝܫܐ ܘܠܣܘܡܟܢܐ ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܡܝܬܝܐ : ܘܫܘܐܠܐ ܦܪܘܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܐܪܬܝܩܘܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ. ܗ̇ܝ ܓܝܪ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܠܟܠܗܝܢ ܫܪܝܘܬܗ ܕܠܐ ܡܣܡ ܢܒܩܐ : ܠܘ ܕܣܘܥܪܢܐ ܕܝܠܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܐܠܐ ܡܟܠ ܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܚ̈ܒܝܒܐ ܗܘ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܢܬܚ̈ܫܒܢܐ ܕܚ̈ܠܡܐ ܘܕܨܒ̈ܘܬܐ ܢܬܒܣܡܘܢ.

A

He wrote, then, in the *Festal Letter* published just now in the eighth year (whose beginning is * Seeing that you have blessed, heavenly wealth) after much extensive and abusive twaddle directed at us, by means of which, as he believes, he made the *Festal Letter* itself extremely respectable and brilliant, blathering as follows: For in support, as they suppose, of their evil doctrine they go a-begging for patristic proof-texts which rebut both their ignorance and their blasphemy. So they then acted corruptly in that document and produced a proof-text from Gregory (the one time sainted bishop of Nyssa, who illuminated the whole world under the Sun with the radiance of his words) when he caught Eunomius the impious in the toils of his arguments in the third book he wrote against that wicked man, as follows: 'So just as in this passage we have learned from the Gospel two distinct ideas: first, we have understood a generation by birth; secondly, the one who has come into existence by generation (for a man is not generation but by generation the man exists); so also here, since Eunomius has acknowledged that the substance was begotten, we have learned by the word "begotten" the fact of being derived from something and by the word "substance" we have understood a substrate possessing a derived hypostasis'. And again: 'For with Eunomius having agreed that the substance was begotten (as the Gospel illustration too explains this sort of notion, an illustration by which, on learning that a man has been begotten we do not understand man and generation as meaning the same thing but have received the notion proper to each term) the heresy which teaches the otherness of substances through such words absolutely has no longer any room.' The clever fellows having set this down and not knowing what was important in it, added, 'What explanation does this need to prove that the begotten

**144/174** Dam. Alex., *Ep. fest. secunda* **150/157** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (*PG* 45, 592A; Jaeger II, p. 29, 4-12); cf. supra, 44-51 **158/163** Ibid. (*PG* 45, 592B; Jaeger II, p. 29, 19-26); cf. supra, 57-63 **165/166** Petr. Callinic., *Syndocticon*



ܟܬܒ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܐܓܪܬܗ ܠܡ ܕܥܐܕܐ ܐܬܦܪܣܬ ܕܬܡܢܝܬܐ
ܕܫܢܬܐ : ܗܝ ܕܪܫܗ̇ : ܟܕ ܐܢܬ * ܠܟܘܢ ܥܘܬܪܐ ܫܡܝܢܝܐ f. 86ra
ܘܡܫܟܢܐ : ܡܢ ܒܬܪ ܦܪܝܢܐ ܣܓܝܐܐ ܘܡܪܝܪܐ ܕܦܟܗܘܬܐ
ܕܠܘܬܢ : ܕܒܐܝܕܝܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪ ܗܘ ܠܥܐܕܝܬܐ
ܘܝܩܝܪܬܐ ܠܗ̇ ܠܐܓܪܬܐ ܒܒܝܪ : ܟܕ ܟܕܘܢܐ ܘܢܐ ܦܩܩ ܀
ܠܦܘܬܚܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܗܘܢ ܒܝܫܐ :
ܚܕܪܝܢ ܫܘܐܠܬܐ ܐܒܗܝܬܐ ܕܡܟܣܢ ܠܠܐ ܝܕܥܬܗܘܢ
ܘܠܓܘܕܦܗܘܢ. ܟܕ ܗܟܝܠ ܡܚܒܠܝܢ ܒܗ̇ܘ ܟܬܒܐ :
ܐܦܩܘ ܫܘܐܠܬܐ : ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܕܩܕܝܫܐܝܬ
ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܘܣܐ : ܘܠܟܠܗ̇ ܗܝ ܕܬܚܝܬ ܫܡܫܐ
ܬܒܝܠܐ ܕܢܗܪ ܐܢܗܪ : ܒܕ ܠܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܪܫܝܥܐ
ܒܡܨܝܕܬܐ ܕܡܠܘܗܝ ܨܝܕܗ ܦܩܕ : ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ
ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܘ ܒܝܫܐ ܐܬܟܬܒ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ
ܗܟܝܠ ܕܒܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ ܗܕܐ : ܬܪܝܢ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܦܪܝܫܐ ܡܢ
ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܝܠܦܢ : ܚܕ ܡܢ ܠܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܗܝ ܕܒܛܢ ܝܠܕܐ
ܐܣܬܟܠܢ : ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܘ ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܗܘܐ : ܠܐ
ܓܝܪ ܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܒܪܢܫܐ : ܐܠܐ ܒܝܕ ܝܠܕܘܬܐ
ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܒܪܢܫܐ : ܗܟܢܐ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܟܕ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ
ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܘܕܝ : ܒܡܠܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܡܬܝܠܕܐ : ܗܝ ܕܡܢ ܡܕܡ
ܝܠܦܢ. ܒܗ̇ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܗ ܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܩܢܘܡ ܐܣܬܟܠܢ. ܠܗ̇ܘ
ܕܡܢ ܡܕܡ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܘܬܒܐ ܀ ܘܬܘܒ ܀ ܟܕ ܐܫܬܘܕܝ ܓܝܪ
ܡܢ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܕܐܬܝܠܕܬ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܬܚܘܝܢܘܬܐ
ܐܘܢܓܠܝܬܐ ܬܪܥܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܕܐ ܡܦܫܩܐ : ܕܒܗ̇ ܟܕ
ܟܕ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܝܠܦܢ : ܠܐ ܗܘ ܚܕ ܗܘ ܐܣܬܟܠܢ
ܒܪܢܫܐ ܘܝܠܕܘܬܐ : ܐܠܐ ܣܘܟܠܐ ܕܝܠܢܝܐ ܠܗܬ ܟܠܚܕ ܡܢ
ܫܡܗ̈ܐ ܩܒܠܢ : ܠܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܐܝܬ ܕܘܟܬܐ ܡܢ ܟܠ
ܦܘܪܣ ܠܗܪܣܝܣ : ܕܐܚܪܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܘ̈ܣܝܣ ܒܝܕ ܬܢܝܬ ܩܠܐ
ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܠܦܐ ܀ ܗܠܝܢ ܟܕ ܣܡܘ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܚܟܝܡܐ :
ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥܘ ܗܝ ܕܚܫܝܚܐ ܀ ܐܘܣܦܘ ܀ ܟܠ ܐܝܢܐ ܦܘܫܩܐ
ܣܢܝܩ ܗܘܠܝܢ ܕܢܚܘܐ : ܕܠܗ ܗܘ ܒܪ ܗܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܗܘ

A

Line 168: ܠܗܬ, cf. supra, line 63 (ܠܗ).

and birth are not the same?' What are we to say to them? Back to carnalities with the carnal! Now is the hour for Elijah the Tishbite to cry to them as he cried to the Israelites of old who were defying God *How long will you limp on your two hams?* * Why do you belittle the divine generation? Why do you suppose you comprehend things incomprehensible? When you hear of God's birth, abandon all carnal imagination, if you take account of your salvation. Let God's birth be honoured by silence, for it is spoken humanly according to our frailty, but is to be understood divinely and in a way beyond thought.

This we have thus set down and the rest we shall set down, exposing the ludicrous feebleness of his positions and omitting, so far as we can, all the absurdity of his foolish and abusive words. On him, rather, we shall confer those gifts, or on those of his house who delight to wallow in such verbal pits like swine in putrid mire. For those who have been taught to honour temperance even in speech, ought, as far as possible, not to mention such things at all nor sully their readers' ears besides their own. Therefore, let him have the advantage in these and the like things, and let him fatten increasingly on insults; let him luxuriate in the power and victory he has in them. But we, who have learnt that it is more the way of women who are ashamed of being modest, to besmear the chaste with their obscenities, ought to despise these things, and not pay him back with similar, and as ludicrous, insults, and with shameful slanders and irrational calumnies. But quickly passing over all such things, we will direct the argument towards an examination of essentials. For on such things too we

**168/169** III Reg. 18:21 **185/187** cf. infra, 207



— ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܘܡܠܝܕܘܬܐ. ܡܢ ܕܝܢ ܢܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ. ܬܘܒ
— ܦܓܪܢܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܦܓܪܢܝܘܬܐ. ܗܢܘ ܠܗܘ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܢܩܥܐ
— ܐܠܝܐ ܗܘ ܬܫܒܝܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܡ ܠܒܢܝ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ
← ܕܡܬܚܪܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܒܐܠܗܐ : ܥܕܡܐ ܠܐܡܬܝ ܡܚܓܪܝܢ
← ܐܢܬܘܢ ܥܠ ܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ ܦܩܣܝܟܘܢ ܀ * ܠܡܢܐ ܡܒܣܪܝܢ f. 86rb
— ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ. ܠܡܢܐ ܡܣܒܪܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ
— ܕܡܕܪܟܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢ. ܟܕ ܫܡܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ
— ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܐܪܚܩܘ ܡܢ ܟܠܗ ܦܢܛܣܝܐ ܦܓܪܢܝܬܐ :
— ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܟܘܢ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܦܘܪܩܢܟܘܢ. ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ
— ܕܐܠܗܐ ܒܫܬܩܐ ܬܬܝܩܪ. ܡܬܡܠܠܐ ܗܝ ܓܝܪ ܐܢܫܐܝܬ
— ܐܝܟ ܡܚܝܠܘܬܢ. ܡܬܣܬܟܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܐܠܗܐܝܬ ܘܠܥܠ ܡܢ
— ܚܘܫܒܐ ܀

ܘܗܠܝܢ ܡܚܕܐ ܣܡܢ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ ܣܝܡܝܢܢ : ܟܕ ܓܠܝܢ ܡܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܡܬܓܚܟܢܝܬܐ ܕܣܘܡ̈ܐܘܗܝ : ܘܐܝܟ ܕܡܨܝܐ ܚܒܪܝܢ ܠܟܠܗ ܫܒܝܪܘܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ ܥܛܝܠܬܐ ܘܡܨܥܪܢܝܬܐ. ܘܠܗ ܗܘ ܡܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܥܒܕܝܢ ܐܘ ܒܢܝ ܒܝܬܗ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܒܚܝܢ : ܠܗܘܢ ܕܗܘ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܚܙܝܪܐ ܒܣܝܢܐ ܣܪܝܐ ܒܡܥܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܬܥܪܓܠܘܢ. ܗܢܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܐܦ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܐܠܦܘ ܕܢܝܩܪܘܢ ܠܢܟܦܘܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܦܝܫ ܒܟܠܐ ܕܡܫܟܚܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܬܕܟܪܘܢ : ܘܠܐ ܡܫܡܥܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܢܛܡܘܢ ܘܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ. ܡܕܝܢ ܠܗܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܘܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ ܠܗܝܢ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܬܝܪܘܬܐ ܬܗܘܐ : ܘܒܨܥܪ̈ܢܘܬܐ ܢܬܦܛܡ ܣܓܝܐܐ. ܒܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܢܬܦܢܩ ܘܒܙܟܘܬܐ ܕܒܗܠܝܢ. ܠܢ ܕܝܢ ܕܝܠܦܢ ܐܠܝܦܝܢ ܕܕܢܫ̈ܐ ܕܡܬܒܗ̈ܬܢ ܕܢܬܚܣܕܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܨܝܪܘܬܗܝܢ ܒܟܠܝܢ ܢܟܦ̈ܬܐ ܢܛܘܫܢ : ܙܕܩ ܕܢܒܣܐ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ : ܘܠܐ ܢܦܪܘܥ ܕܕ̈ܡܝܢ ܘܕܗܘܢ ܓܚܘܟܝܢ : ܘܒܫܘܬܪ̈ܐ ܕܒܗܬܬܐ ܘܒܥܘ̈ܠܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܢܦܪܥܝܘܗܝ. ܐܠܐ ܟܕ ܒܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܠܠܐܝܬ ܒܪܗܝܒ : ܠܘܬ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝ̈ܬܝܗܝܢ ܢܬܪܝܨ ܠܡܠܬܐ. ܐܦ ܠܢ ܓܝܪ ܘܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ : ܠܗ

A

have the same wise GREGORY who instructs us by his defence of his brother, Basil the Great, against Eunomius, the master and teacher of this writer, and says as follows in the eighth chapter of his *Refutation of Eunomius* the impious (its beginning runs: To want to help everybody was not, apparently): Therefore, the sequence of insulting and abusing is prevented from its further courses by patience. So that if anybody pays back insult with insult and abuse * with abuse, he must increase the outrage by nourishing it with things similar. Therefore, leaving aside all the intervening argument, which consists of insults, mockery, abuse and cavils, I shall hurry the discussion on to the examination of doctrines. But if anyone says I am refraining from abuse owing to a lack of requital in kind, let him observe himself how much proneness there is towards evil, slipping without occasion into sin of its own accord. And a few lines later: But I recollect that divine utterance which spoke prophetically those prophetic things about him, where he compares him with abusive women who load the modest with their own obscenities.

The doctor having spoken these things in a way befitting priests, it befits us too, contending, as we do, over realities rather than over those frigid and empty words which this excellent fellow is always concerned about, to yield him what he supposed he would be embellished by, but investigate the force of statements by him which seem to have something to them. So let us begin with the clever attacks of his *Festal Letter*, with the very grand and grievous transgression which he painstakingly charges us with, whereby he has clearly proved us (as readers will learn) not

---

**196/204** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (*PG* 45, 277BC; Jaeger I, p. 53, 6-17) **205/207** Ibid. (*PG* 45, 280C; Jaeger I, p. 55, 11-14) **206/207** Locum non invenimus



ܠܫܡܥܐ ܒܪ̈ܚܝܩܘܗ ܕܪܪܐ ܠܝ: ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܐܟܘܬܗ،
ܝܕܥܐ ܒܡܠܝܢܘܗܝ: ܠܘܬ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܪܒܗ ܘܡܠܦܢܗ ܕܗܢܐ
ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܡܬܟܬܒ ܘܗܟܢܐ ܐܡܪ: ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܡܢܝܐ
ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܣܘܩܒܠܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܪܫܝܥܐ
ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ. ܕܐܝܬܘܗ̇ ܪܫܗ: ܕܠܟܠ ܐܢܫ ܕܢܥܕܪ ܕܢܚܙܐ
‹ ܕܠܐ ܨܒܐ ܗܘܐ ܀ ܡܕܝܢ ܘܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܨܥܪ ܘܒܚܣܕ :
‹ ܡܬܟܠܝܐ ܡܢ ܡܪܕܝܬܐ ܕܠܩܕܡܘܗ̇ ܒܝܕ ܡܣܝܒܪܢܘܬܐ.
‹ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܢ ܐܢܫ ܢܦܪܘܥ ܠܨܥܪܐ ܒܨܥܪܐ ܘܠܚܣܕܐ
‹ * ܒܚܣܕܐ: ܡܣܓܐ ܡܢ ܠܦܪܘܣ: ܟܕ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ f. 86va
‹ ܡܬܪܣܐ ܠܨܥܪܘܬܐ. ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܟܕ ܠܟܠܗ̇ ܡܠܬܐ
‹ ܕܡܨܥܬܐ ܫܒܩ ܐܢܐ: ܕܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܨܥܪܐ ܘܒܙܚܐ
‹ ܘܚܣܕܐ ܘܬܪܥܠܬܐ: ܠܘܬ ܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܡܣܪܗܒ
‹ ܐܢܐ ܠܡܠܬܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܐܢܫ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܡܛܠ ܚܣܝܪܘܬܐ
‹ ܕܦܘܪܥܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܡܝܢ: ܡܬܟܠܐ ܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܨܛܪܐ.
‹ ܢܚܙܐ ܗܘ ܠܘܬܗ: ܕܟܡܐ ܦܫܝܩܘܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܘܬ ܒܝܫܬܐ:
‹ ܟܕ ܫܠܝ ܡܢ ܡܠܐܟܐ ܗ̣ܝ ܡܢܗ̇ ܠܘܬ ܚܛܝܬܐ ܓ̇ܪܒܐ ܀
‹ ܘܒܬܪ ܙܥܘܪܝܬܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܡܬܕܟܪ ܐܢܐ ܠܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܗ̇ܝ
‹ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܕܢܒܝܐܝܬ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܢܒܝܘܬܐ ܐܡܝܪܬ :
‹ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܢܫ̈ܐ ܒܙܘܚܝܬܐ ܡܦܚܡ ܠܗ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܥܒܪܘܬܗܝܢ
‹ ܥܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܢܟܦܬܐ ܛܥܢܢ ܀

ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܦܐܐ ܠܟܗ̈ܢܐ ܐܬܐܡܪ ܡܢ
ܡܠܦܢܐ: ܦܐܐ ܐܦ ܠܢ: ܟܕ ܡܛܠ ܨܒܘ̈ܬܐ ܡܟܬܫܢ ܘܠܐ
ܡܛܠ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܩܪ̈ܝܪܬܐ ܘܣܦܝܩܬܐ: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܥܡ ܟܠܙܒܢ ܚܫܝܫ
ܠܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ: ܕܢܫܒܘܩ ܠܗ ܗ̇ܢܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܗܘܢ
ܐܣܒܪ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܕܢܬܨܒܬ: ܢܒܨܐ ܕܝܢ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܫܬܥܝ̈ܢ
ܕܡܢܗ ܐܬܐܡܪܝܢ ܘܡܚܙܝܢ ܐܬܐܡܪ. ܢܫܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܚܟ̈ܝܡܐ
ܬ̈ܟܬܫܬܐ ܕܐܓܪܬܐ ܕܥܐܕܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܢ ܥܠܬܐ ܗ̣ܝ ܕܪܒܐ ܝܬܝܪܐ
ܘܥܫܝܢܐ ܕܚܠܦ ܒܥܡܠ ܨܒܝܢܐ ܡܟܣ. ܕܒܗ̇ ܚܘܝ ܠܢ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܪܝܢ ܢܠܦܘܢ ܗܘܐ ܠܝ: ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢ

---

A

---

Line 204: ܕܪܪܐ, A: ܕܪ̈ܪܐ (wrongly).

to have read the divinely inspired books of the God-clad masters of mysteries at all, but to have borrowed them from others and gone a-begging for patristic proof-texts and set them down in the *Joint Confession of Agreement* we mentioned above. And so, having proved for the reassurance of the hearers that his cleverness is astray also here, we may proceed, with due order, in the discussion, to an examination of the teachings. For, on our quoting for examination, from the first book *Against Eunomius*, the statement by wise Gregory, Damian said, in the passage just set down: They produced a proof-text from Gregory (the one time sainted bishop of Nyssa, who illuminated the whole world under the Sun with the radiance of his words), when he caught Eunomius the impious in the toils of his arguments in the third book * he wrote against that wicked man, as follows. After proceeding a little further he added: But perhaps they will not forbear to attribute efflux and scission and the rest of the incidents attested in human birth, to the divine and incomprehensible birth, to say nothing of their ignorant presumption in not even knowing what book the proof-text they quoted came from. They seem to us, indeed, not even to have read the book at all. Otherwise they would have known from the opening that it was the third and not, as they carelessly said, the first. For after the opening the father says: 'So because Eunomius, though already twice overthrown in the previous discussion does not yet permit truth to have its victory over falsehood but again struggles by literary production a third time against true religion'. So they clearly borrowed the proof-text from another passage and are damaging the truth. The Lord rebukes them, as he did the Jews of old and says: *You err because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God.*

**219** cf. supra, 144-145 **225/230** cf. supra, 146-150 **230/243** Dam. Alex., *Ep. fest. secunda* **237/240** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (*PG* 45, 572B; Jaeger II, p. 3, 6-10) **242/243** Matth. 22:29



ܒܟܬ̈ܒܐ ܢܦܝ̈ܫܝ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܝ ܐܪ̈ܙܐ ܠܒ̈ܫܝ ܐܠܗܐ
ܦܟܚܝܢ܆ ܒܪ ܡܢ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܢܣܒܘ ܘܣܕܪܘ ܣܗ̈ܕܘܬܐ
ܐܒ̈ܗܝܬܐ ܒܟܬܒܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܘܕܥܘܬܐ ܕܫܝܢܐ ܗܝ܆ ܕܩܕܡ ܠܥܠ
ܐܬܕܟܪܢ ܣܝܡ ܗܫܐ. ܐܡܟܢܐ ܕܒܪ ܐܦ ܒܗܕܐ ܕܚܟܝܡܐ
ܣܛܝܬܗ ܡܫܘܕܥܝܢ ܡܛܠ ܦܘܝܣܐ ܕܫܡܘ̈ܥܐ܆ ܠܘܬ ܒܘܚܢܐ
ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܟܕ ܠܘܬܟܐ ܕܪܘܫ ܢܬܪܐ ܒܡܠܬܐ. ܟܕ ܓܝܪ ܡܢ
ܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ܆ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ
ܕܚܟܝܡܐ ܠܒܘܚܢܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ. ܗܘ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܡ
— ܕܗܫܐ ܐܬܬܣܝܡ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܒܪ ܗܡܝܢ ܒܗܘ ܒܪܫܡܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ
— ܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܕܐܦܣܩܘܦܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܗܘܐ
— ܕܢܘܣܐ܆ ܘܠܟܠܗ ܗܝ ܕܬܚܝܬ ܫܡܫܐ ܒܙܠܝ̈ܓܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ
— ܐܢܗܪ܆ ܟܕ ܠܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܗܘ ܪܫܝܥܐ ܒܡܨܝ̈ܕܬܐ ܕܡ̈ܠܘܗܝ
— ܨܕ ܦܟܪ܆ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ * ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܘ ܒܝܫܐ f. 86vb
— ܐܬܟܬܒ ܗܟܢ ܒܗܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܀ ܒܪ ܕܝܢ ܩܠܝܠ ܐܬܬܘܣܦ
— ܐܘܣܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܟܒܪ ܘܪܕܝܐ ܘܦܣܩܐ ܘܫܪܟܗܝܢ
— ܗܠܝܢ ܕܣܗܝܕܢ ܕܒܝܠܕܘܬܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ ܡܫܬܘܕܥܢ
— ܕܝܠܕ̈ܝܢ. ܕܢܪܡܘܢ ܠܐ ܡܬܕܪܟܢܝܬܐ ܠܝܠܝܕܘܬܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ
— ܘܠܐ ܡܬܦܪܫܢܝܬܐ. ܐܡܟܢܐ ܕܢܫܬܒܩܘܢ ܘܡܪܚܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ
— ܝܕܥܬܐ܆ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܡܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ
— ܕܐܝܬܝܘ ܐܬܬܬܝܬ ܢܕܥܝܢ. ܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܝ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܦܠܐ
— ܩܪܘ ܐܦ ܠܟܬܒܐ. ܘܐܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܠܟ ܡܢܗ ܕܫܘܪܝܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ
— ܗܘܘ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ܆ ܘܠܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪܝܢ
← ܒܗܡܝܢܐ ܐܡܪܘ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܐܒܐ ܒܬܪ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܀ ܡܛܠ
← ܗܟܝܠ ܕܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܙܒܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܬܬܪܝܡ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܒܡ̈ܠܐ
← ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ܆ ܘܠܐ ܒܟܠ ܥܕܡܐ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܕܬܗܘܐ ܠܗ
← ܙܟܘܬܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܓܠܬܐ܆ ܐܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܗܝ ܕܬܠܬ
← ܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܫܪܝܪ ܐܠܗܐ ܒܝܕ ܡܟܬܒܢܘܬ ܟ̈ܬܒܐ ܟܬܫ ܀ ܡܢ
— ܕܟܬܒܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܠܬܚܘܝܬܐ ܒܪ ܐܢܣܒܘ ܘܠܫܪܪܐ ܡܚܒܠܝܢ
— ܡܢܝܢ ܠܫܪܪܐ. ܒܗܘܢ ܕܒܪ ܟܕ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܡܟܢܐ
← ܕܒܝܗܘܕܝܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܛܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ
← ܐܢܬܘܢ ܟܬ̈ܒܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܀

A

Line 259: ܡܟܬܒܢܘܬ, A: ܡܟܬܒܘܬ; cf. infra, lines 463, 477, 509 and 521.

You see the bold insolence of this ignorant wretch's attack; you will observe *the heart* seething with swinish rage, *which has brought forth from its abundance*, as the Lord says, these shocking things. Have not the words of this excellent fellow depicted for us clearly his turmoil and the habitual disposition of a soul brutalized by savagery? So much so that even successful artists will not boast of copying animal bodies any better.

For, let it be granted that we were in ordinary human error about the number of Gregory's books, could we not have had forgiveness, and especially when this offence will be attested as not having occurred through malice or heretical intention? But so great and harsh was the censure needed over this matter, that even those who made mistakes might be reproached by the Lord like the Jews and might hear, *You err because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God*. Fit words for priests who daily publicize their profound old age and white hairs, for the subversion and deception * of gentler folk! What, then, will this cunning fellow do after such a bitter onslaught, if it clearly appears that the fault lay with him rather than us? Will he not have to rule against himself and include his own insensate folly in the very same condemnations to which he would have subjected us? Will he not have to acknowledge (unless here too he violates truth and justice with a bold face) that it is not we, but he, who will be rebuked by the Lord with justice and will hear, *You err because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God*, like those Jews. Indeed more than they, so much the more brazenly than they does he attack Church and champion falsehood.

Therefore, SEVERUS the proven, the manifold advocate of truth, shall pour scorn on the ignorance on the part of this boastful writer

**245/246** cf. Matth. 12:34; Luc. 6:45 **257/258** et **267/268** Matth. 22:29



ܫܪܝܪ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܡܪܚܘܬܐ ܘܡܣܟܢܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܘܠܐ ܝܠܝܦܐ : ܡܬܚܙܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܒܐ ܕܒܚܡܬܐ ܚܙܝܪܝܬܐ ܡܬܬܪܬܚ : ܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܬܘܬܪܗ، ܐܝܟ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܪܢܐ ܢܦܩ ܗܠܝܢ ܥܫܝ̈ܢܬܐ : ܐܘ ܠܐ ܠܓܠܝܘܬ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܝܬܪܐ : ܠܫܓܝܫܘܬܐ ܘܠܚܒܫܐ ܕܢܦܫܗ ܕܡܢ ܚܝܘܬܘܬܐ ܡܚܒܪܐ ܨܝܪ ܠܝ. ܘܗܢܐ ܟܠܗ ܟܡܐ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܨܠܚܝܢ ܒܐܘܡܢܘܬܐ ܡܫܬܒܗܪܝܢ ܕܢܨܝܪܘܢ ܒܚܫܝܫܬܐ ܕܚܝܘܬܐ.

ܬܬܝܗܒ ܓܝܪ ܕܒܛܥܝܢܐ ܕܒܪܢܫܐ ܐܝܟ ܦ̈ܫܝܛܐ ܛܥܝܢ. ܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܗܘܐ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܠܢ ܫܘܒܩܢܐ : ܘܝܬܝܪܐܝܬ ܟܕ ܠܘ ܡܢ ܒܝܫܘܬܐ ܘܪܬܝܚܘܬܐ ܗܪܛܝܩܝܬܐ : ܕܐܬܝܬܗ̇ ܗܘܬ ܗܕܐ ܡܬܒܪܝܢܘܬܐ ܡܣܬܗܕܐ : ܐܠܐ ܟܠܗ̇ ܗܕܐ ܟܐܬܐ ܡܫܚܬܐ ܡܛܠ ܗܕܐ ܡܬܒܥܝܐ ܗܘܬ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܛܥܘ ܢܬܟܐܪܘܢ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܝܗܘ̈ܕܝܐ : ܘܢܫܡܥܘܢ ܕܛܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܟ̈ܬܒܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܦܐܝ̈ܢ ܠܟܗ̈ܢܐ ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܒܟܠ ܝܘܡ ܡܟܪܙܝܢ ܒܫܝܢܘܬܐ ܘܣܝܒܘܬܐ ܡܥܫܢܝܢ : ܠܗܦܟܬܐ ܘܠܛܠܘܡܝܘܬܐ * ܕܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܟܝܟܐ ܐܝܟ ܬܘܒ ܒܡܫܚܠܦܝܢ : ܡܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܥܒܕ ܗܘ ܚܪܝܦܐ ܒܬܪ ܟܠܗ ܗܕܐ ܚܐܦܐ ܡܪܝܪܐ : ܟܕ ܢܬܓܠܐ ܡܬܓܠܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܡܠܘ ܐܦ ܟܗܕܐ ܘܠܘ ܚܢܢ ܚܛܝܢ. ܐܪܐ ܠܘ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܢܦܩܘܢ ܥܠ ܢܦܫܗ : ܘܟܗܘܢ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܫ̈ܘܕܝܐ ܕܒܗܘܢ ܙܕܩ ܕܢܬܒܥܐ ܠܝ ܠܫܘܦܛܗ ܢܦܫܗ : ܘܢܘܕܐ ܐܢܘܢ ܕܠܘ ܐܦ ܒܗܕܐ ܒܦܪܘܦܐ ܒܐܦܝ̈ܢ ܡܚܝܪܬܐ ܢܥܠܘܒ ܠܫܪܪܐ ܘܠܟܐܢܘܬܐ : ܕܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܚܢ : ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܡܠܘ ܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ ܢܬܟܣܢ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܐ : ܘܢܫܡܥ ܕܛܥܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܐܢܬ ܟ̈ܬܒܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ : ܐܝܟ ܗܢܘܢ ܝܗܘ̈ܕܝܐ : ܡܠܘ ܕܝܢ ܘܝܬܝܪ ܡܢܗܘܢ : ܟܡܐ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܡܪܝܚܐܝܬ ܡܢܗܘܢ ܡܩܪܒ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܥܕܬܐ : ܘܡܬܟܬܫ ܚܠܦ ܕܓܠܘܬܐ.

ܡܕܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܠܣܟܠܘܬܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܗܕܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܡܫܬܒܗܪܢܐ ܡܣܪܗܒܐ : ܢܒܙܚ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܘܡܚܝܪܐ

A

in this matter also. For writing in the sixth chapter of the third book of the treatise *Against Felicissimus* he calls 'third' the book, which according to the opinion of this good fellow, he should have called the 'fifth' of wise Gregory's books *Against Eunomius*. Obviously, then, the doctor counted as 'first' the book (from which we quoted the proof-text) which this quick, scholarly writer named 'third'. The point will become clearer if the father's proof-text itself comes forward in evidence. He says, then: Similarly, he says these things also, expressing them in almost the same words, in the third book *Against Eunomius* (whose beginning goes: 'But concerning the statement of the Apostle Peter, it is time to examine more studiously what was said'): 'So that these things seem not to exist in the two on their own with any division; but by juncture with the Godhead, the temporal nature, being re-formed in accordance with the stronger nature, receives the Godhead's power, as one might say that the mixture makes into sea a drop of vinegar mingled with the ocean, so that the natural operation of the latter moisture no longer remains in the boundlessness of what contains it'.

Likewise SEVERUS says, indeed, at the beginning of the 10th chapter * of the same third book: But Gregory of Nyssa, wise in things divine, will confirm that he recognizes the immortal and uncreated nature, God the Father's eternal and Only-begotten Word, as unchangeable and immutable in the same divine substance, and that he voluntarily took on the change involved in the passibility of the flesh which he united to him hypostatically. For he wrote in the fourth book *Against Eunomius* the impious: 'So believing the immortal, impassible and uncreated nature to have been made in the passibility of the Creation and therein understanding change, how can we be condemned for saying that *he emptied*

**280/290** Sev. Ant., *C. Feliciss.*, III, 6 (fragm. hucusque incognitum) **284/290** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 3 (*PG* 45, 708C; Jaeger II, pp. 132,26 - 133,4) **292/302** Sev. Ant., *C. Feliciss.*, III, 10 (fragm. hucusque incognitum) **298/302** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 4 (*PG* 45, 721A; Jaeger II, pp. 143,26 - 144,1) **300/301** Phil. 2:7



ܦܐܘܪܐ. ܒܗ ܓܝܪ ܟܬܒ ܒܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܫܬܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ
ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܦܠܝܩܣܝܣܡܘܣ : ܠܡܐܡܪܐ
ܗܘ ܕܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܐܝܟ ܡܣܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܗܢܐ ܛܒܐ :
ܕܚܡܫܐ ܢܐܡܪ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܚܟܝܡܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ
ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ : ܕܬܠܬܐ ܥܒܕܗ. ܓܠܝܐ ܗܝ ܡܟܝܠ ܕܗܘ ܕܡܢܗ
ܠܣܗܕܘܬܐ ܐܝܬܝܢ : ܠܗܘ ܕܥܒܕܗ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ
ܚܪܝܦܐ ܘܣܦܪܐ ܒܬܐܘܪܝܐ : ܘܡܕܡܟܐ ܫܥܒ ܡܬܓܠܝܐ.
ܘܡܬܓܠܝܐ ܦܥܒܪܢܐ ܬܐܬܐ ܢܦܩܬ : ܒܗ ܗܝ ܬܚܘܝܬܐ
< ܐܒܗܘܬܐ ܐܬܝܐ ܠܡܨܥܬܐ. ܐܡܪ ܗܟܝܠ ܀ ܗܘ ܒܗܢܐ :
< ܒܗܝܢ ܒܡܠܐ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ
< ܕܫܘܪܝܗ ܗܟܢ : ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܗܝ ܡܠܐ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܫܠܝܚܐ :
< ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܢܬܒܥ ܒܪܘܚܬܐ ܒܚܠܐ ܢܒܚܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ :
< ܗܠܝܢ : ܒܗ ܒܗܝܢ ܒܬܪܬܝܢ ܩ̈ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܡܦܩ
<< ܘܐܡܪ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܘ ܒܦܘܠܓܐ ܡܕܡ ܠܝܚܝܕܐܝܬ ܥܠ
<< ܬܪܬܝܗܘܢ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ. ܐܠܐ ܒܡܘܙܓܐ
<< ܕܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܗܝ ܕܙܒܢ ܐܢܫܝܐ : ܒܗ ܡܬܬܒܕܐ ܟܝܢܐ
<< ܘܚܝܠܐ ܢܣܒ ܚܝܠܐ ܕܐܠܗܘܬܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܫ ܢܐܡܪ
<< ܕܠܛܘܦܬܐ ܕܚܠܐ ܕܐܬܚܠܛܬ ܒܬܗܘܡܐ ܝܡܐ ܥܒܕ
<< ܣܘܠܦܢܐ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܟܝܠ ܡܥܒܕܢܘܬܐ ܟܝܢܝܬܐ ܕܗܕܐ
<< ܪܛܝܒܘܬܐ : ܒܠܐ ܣܘܦܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܐܚܝܕ ܗܘܬ ܀

f. 87rb ܗܘ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܘܒܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܩܦܠܐܘܢ ܕܥܣܪܐ * ܕܗܘ
< ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܀ ܡܫܪܪ ܕܝܢ ܚܟܝܡ ܒܐܠܗܝܬܐ
< ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܢܘܣܐ : ܕܠܟܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܐ
< ܘܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ ܠܡܠܬܗ ܡܬܘܡܝܐ ܘܝܚܝܕܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ :
< ܗܘ ܒܐܘܣܝܐ ܐܠܗܝܬܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܢܐ ܢܕܥ ܘܠܐ
< ܡܫܬܓܢܝܢܐ. ܕܡܟܠ ܕܝܢ ܨܒܝܢܐܝܬ ܫܘܚܠܦܐ ܒܚܫܘܫܘܬܐ
< ܕܒܣܪܐ ܗܘ ܕܩܢܘܡܐܝܬ ܚܕ ܠܗ. ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ
<< ܕܐܪܒܥܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܪܫܝܥܐ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܗܠܝܢ ܀ ܒܗ ܗܟܝܠ
<< ܠܟܝܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܫܘܫܐ ܘܠܐ ܒܪܝܐ : ܕܗܘܐ
<< ܒܚܫܘܫܘܬܐ ܕܒܪܝܬܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܝܢ : ܘܒܗܕܐ ܡܫܬܚܠܦܝܢ
<< ܠܫܘܚܠܦܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܬܚܝܒܝܢ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܗܘܐ ܒܗ

A

*himself* by those who noise abroad their own argument in opposition to our doctrines?' Here again, though the divinely inspired father, according to our author's aberrant wisdom, ought to have said 'sixth' he named it 'fourth', showing clearly that this treatise in ten books exists on its own and is not numbered with those other books.

Indeed, we will further explain the point in question again by setting down the beginnings and the order of these ten books: The beginning of the first book: There is a limit to the labours of those who *strive lawfully* in contests; the second: But it is time that the explanation of the offspring's nature; the third: But concerning the statement of the Apostle Peter, it is time to investigate more studiously; the fourth: But I feel that I have lingered on this passage beyond what is appropriate; the fifth: But because, he says, the word 'Lord'; the sixth: These, then, are Eunomius' strong points; the seventh: But he passes on to more elevated arguments; the eighth: But let us hold on to the previously established points; the ninth: But let us also approach the subsequent stage of the argument; the tenth: But let us see what follows the blasphemy.

Using this order our wise father Severus named the book whose beginning is, But concerning the statement of the Apostle Peter, as the 'third', as has been demonstrated by the words previously set down. Likewise, indeed, * he also called 'fourth' the book after this, whose beginning is, But I feel that I have lingered on this passage beyond what is appropriate. For in it, as enquirers may see, is the

310 cf. II Tim. 2:5



« ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܐܬܦܫܩܘ : ܡܢ ܗܢܘܢ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗܘܢ ܡܩܠܣܝܢ « ܥܠ ܝ̈ܘܠܦܢܝܢ ܀ ܘܗܪܟܐ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗܢܐ ܐܒܐ ܢܦܝܫ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܢ ܣܟܠܘܬܗ ܠܚܟܡܬܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܕܢܐܡܪ ܕܫܬܝܬܝܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܝܐ ܩܪܐ. ܟܕ ܡܚܘܐ ܓܠܝܐܝܬ : ܕܦܢܩܝܬܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܒܥܣܪܐ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܒܠܚܘܕܝܗ̇ ܘܠܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ : ܘܠܐ ܡܢܝܐ ܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ ܡܬܚܫܒܢܐ.

ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܢܦܫܩ ܠܒܥܝܬܐ ܡܣܝܡܝܢ ܠܗ̇، ܕܡܬܒܥܝܢܐ : ܟܕ ܫܘܪ̈ܝܗܘܢ ܘܛܟܣܗܘܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܪܐ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܦܫܝܩܝܢ. < ܫܪܝܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܀ ܣܟ ܬܫܡܫܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ < ܕܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܒܐ̈ܬܠܐ ܕܐܓܘ̈ܢܐ ܀ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܀ < ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܚܘܫܒܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܝܠܕܐ ܀ < ܕܬܠܬܐ ܀ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܫܠܝܚܐ : ܙܒܢܐ < ܐܬܝܗ̇، ܕܒܬܪ ܒܙܗܝܪܘܬ ܒܥܠܐ ܢܒܥܐ ܀ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ < ܡܪܓܫ ܐܢܐ : ܕܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܦܐܝܘܬܐ ܚܕܪܬ ܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܀ < ܕܚܡܫܐ ܀ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܠܡ ܡܠܬܐ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܪܝܐ ܀ ܕܫܬܐ ܀ < ܗܠܝܢ ܗ̇ܟܝܠ ܐܝܬܝܗܝܢ ܬܘ̈ܩܦܬܐ ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܡܚܝܠܐ ܀ < ܕܫܒܥܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܠܘܬ ܪ̈ܡܬܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܥܠ ܪ̈ܡܢ ܥܒܪ ܀ < ܕܬܡܢܝܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܝܡ ܣܝ̈ܡܢ ܢܐܚܘܕ ܀ < ܕܬܫܥܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܘܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܒܬܪܟܢ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܢܬܩܪܒ ܀ < ܕܥܣܪܐ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܢܚܙܐ ܘܠܗ̇ܝ، ܕܡܢ ܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܫܒܝܠܐ < ܠܓܘܕܦܐ ܀

ܒܗܢܐ ܠܛܟܣܐ ܟܕ ܐܫܬܡܫ ܐܒܘܢ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܣܘܝܪܐ : < ܠܡܐܡܪܐ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܪܫܗ : ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ < ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܫܠܝܚܐ ܕܬܠܬܝܐ ܩܪܐ : ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ، ܕܩܕܝܡ ܣܝ̈ܡܢ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ. ܗ̇ܘ ܕܝܢ < ܒܕܡܘܬܐ * ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܒܬܪ ܗܢܐ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܪܫܗ : ܐܠܐ f.87va < ܡܪܓܫ ܐܢܐ ܕܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܦܐܝܘܬܐ ܚܕܪܬ ܒܕܘܟܬܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܝܐ ܩܪܗ. ܒܗ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܢܚܙܘܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܥܝܢ ܕܢܣܩܘܢ

AB from ܣܟܠܘܬܗ (l. 327) on, but barely legible

Lines 333-334: ܕܐܓܘ̈ܢܐ ..... ܣܟ, cf. ch. 8, lines 250-251.

second proof-text set down above. Therefore, it is obvious that the book whose beginning is, There is a limit to those who *strive lawfully* and from which we ourselves set down the father's statement in what this good fellow calls a 'document', is the first; and not, as that totally accurate fellow supposes, the third. For our proven father Severus numbered from it and called one 'the third' but the other 'the fourth'. How, then, can there exist another 'third' after the one which, according to this excellent fellow, is the third? For there would exist (according to his wisdom) two third books, with one only existing in between; for between the one he calls 'third' and the one named by the God-clad patriarch 'third' there is one single book. For the beginning of the first (which he calls 'third') is: There is a limit to the labours of those who *strive lawfully* in contests; whereas that of the book after it is: But it is time that the explanation of the offspring's nature; and of the one set down immediately after this, the one which the God-clad doctor expressly called 'third': But concerning the statement of the Apostle Peter.

The upshot, therefore, is that we are to understand either that this invincible fellow has lapsed from the truth here too, or that we are to be bold-faced and say that the oecumenical doctor, amongst whose disciples we are placed, did not know the order of the books mentioned. For it is impossible that there should be two 'third books' amongst the books duly set down in order and enumerated with each other. Either, then, the author must prove this sequence, previously set down, of wise Gregory's books erroneous and that the accurate Severus is here at fault; or let him learn, at this late stage, that he makes his home with the most wicked igno-

326 et 337 cf. II Tim. 2:5



ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܕܬܪܬܝܢ ܕܣܝܡܐ ܡܢ ܠܥܠ. ܡܕܝܢ ܓܠܝܐ ܗܝ: ܕܟܬܒܐ ܗܘ ܕܪܫܝܬܗ ✣ ܚܕ ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ✣ ܕܡܢܗ ܐܦ ܚܢ ܒܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܛܒܐ ܐܡܪܢ ܒܪܛܝܣܐ : ܩܕܡܝܬ ܒܪܬ ܘܠܐ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܡܢܕܥܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ. ܘܠܐ ܗܝܟ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܒܪ ܗܘ ܕܟܠܗܝܢ ܫܬܝܬܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ. ܡܢܗ ܓܝܪ ܡܢܐ ܐܒܘܢ ܣܘܝܪܐ ܘܩܪܐ : ܠܗܘ ܡܢ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ : ܠܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܪܒܥܝܐ ܫܡܗ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܬܪ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܢܐ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ : ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܢܬܟܬܒ. ܡܬܚܫܒܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܚܟܡܬܗ : ܬܪܝܢ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ : ܟܕ ܚܕ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܒܡܨܥܬܐ : ܡܨܥܬ ܓܝܪ ܗܘ ܕܩܪܐ ܡܬܐܡܪ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ : ܘܠܗܘ ܕܡܢ ܦܛܪܝܪܟܐ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܫܬܡܗ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ : ܚܕ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܐܝܬ. ܕܗܘ ܡܢ ܓܝܪ ܩܕܡܝܐ : ܠܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܫܡܗ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܪܫܗ ✣ ܚܕ ܬܘܣܦܬܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܢܡܘܣܐܝܬ ܡܬܟܬܫܝܢ ܒܐܬܠܐ ܕܐܓܘܢܐ ✣ ܕܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܒܬܪܗ ✣ ܙܒܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܝܢ ܕܐܦ ܒܫܘܥܝܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܝܠܕܐ ✣ ܘܕܗܘ ܕܡܣܝܡܐ ܒܬܪ ܗܢܐ ܡܚܕܐ : ܠܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܒܗ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܩܪܐ ✣ ܡܛܠ ܕܝܢ ܒܪܬ ܩܠܐ ܕܦܛܪܘܣ ܫܠܝܚܐ ✣

ܫܪܟܐ ܡܕܝܢ ܕܢܣܬܟܠ : ܕܐܘ ܗܢܐ ܠܐ ܡܬܙܟܝܢܐ ܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܦܠ ܡܢ ܫܪܪܐ : ܐܘ ܕܢܚܪ ܡܚܕܐ ܢܐܡܪ : ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܬܐܒܠܝܐ : ܕܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܒܬܠܡܝܕܘܬܗ ܐܬܬܣܝܡܢ ܚܢ : ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܠܛܟܣܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܐܬܡܢܝܘ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܛܟܣܐ ܘܠܡܢܝܢܐ ܣܝܡܝܢ ܘܥܕܡ ܬܪ̈ܕܝܐ ܡܬܡܢܝܢ : ܬܪܝܢ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ. ܐܘ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܚܘܐ ܡܬܡܢܝܢܐ ܠܗܕܐ ܢܩܝܦܘܬܐ ܕܣܕܪܐ ܣܝܡܐ ܕܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܕܛܥܝܐ : ܘܠܣܘܝܪܐ ܫܬܝܬܐ ܕܗܪܟܐ ܛܥܐ : ܐܘ ܡܫܪܝܘܬܐ ܢܐܠܦ ܕܥܡ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܘܬܐ

AB barely legible up to l. 360

Line 362: ܡܐܡܪܐ, B om.
Line 372: ܡܕܝܢ, B: ܗܟܝܠ.
Line 379: ܘܠܣܘܝܪܐ, B: ܘܐܣܘܝܪܐ.

rance, since he does not know the things he makes assertions about nor is he even able to comprehend the fact that he is ignorant, which is truly the worst of human evils.

* Leaving the other matters out of account, we shall prove to readers that SEVERUS, the proven teacher of truth, did not only use here the above-mentioned order of Saint Gregory's books, and we shall confirm what is said from the *Annotations* which he wrote with his own hand, annotations this good fellow quoted a proof-text from in the second chapter of his book. For he says in the 165th annotation, as follows: Just as, too, the economy of the incarnation is termed 'ministry', because the Only-begotten became obedient voluntarily to the Father, delineating to us the pattern of obedience, ministry and service by his dealings with men which (as we have often said) the doctors term *'the form of the slave'*. Gregory, wise in things divine, brother of Basil the Great and bishop of Nyssa, will confirm this in the second book *Against Eunomius*: 'Therefore he indicates by the word the fearful manifestations of the judge at the end of the ages, when he will be seen no longer in *the form of the slave* but seated in grandeur on the throne of empire, worshipped by all the angels round him. For this reason, he who came once for all into the world and was made *first-born of the dead*, of his *brothers* and *of all Creation*, when he comes again into the world, he who (as prophecy says) *will judge the world in righteousness*, does not reject the title "first-born" which he accepted once for all on our behalf' and the rest of the proof-text. Let the clever fellow

**361/375** Sev. Ant., *Annotationes (= Hypomnestica ad Caesariam ?)*, 165 (fragm. hucusque incognitum) **365** Phil. 2:7 **367/375** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 2 (*PG* 45, 633D - 636A; Jaeger II, pp. 67,25 - 68,8) **369** Phil. 2:7 **370** cf. Hebr. 1:6 **371/372** Col. 1:18 cf. Rom. 8:29 Col. 1:15 **373/374** Ps. 9:9; 95:13; 97:9; Act. 17:31



ܒܥܠܬܐ ܘܐܣܝܪܘܬܐ ܚܣܪ : ܟܕ ܐܦܠܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܠܠܗܘܢ
ܡܫܪܪ ܢܕܥ : ܐܦܠܐ ܕܝܢ ܛܒ ܗܘ ܗܕܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܕܥ ܡܫܟܚ
ܕܢܣܬܟܠ. ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܫܪܝܪܐ : ܒܥܠܬܐ ܗܝ ܪܫܬܐ ܕܟܠ
ܒ̈ܢܝܫܐ.

ܕܠܐ ܕܝܢ * ܒܗܠܝܢ ܠܒܪ : ܠܩ̈ܪܝܢܐ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ f. 87vb
ܕܡܐܡ̈ܪܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܬܚܘܝ ܕܪܘܫܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ
ܒܣܢܐ ܗܐܡܘܪܐ : ܟܕ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܐܣܝܪܘܬܐ ܡܣܝܡܝܢ
ܠܗܘܢ ܕܦܠܚܝܢ : ܟܕ ܡܢ ܙܘܥܡܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܟܬܒܢܐ ܐܝܕܘܗܝ,
ܟܬܒ : ܕܡܢܗܘܢ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܗܢܐ ܛܒܐ ܒܡܦܩܐ ܘܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ
ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ ܐܡܪ ܐܣܗܕܘܬܐ : ܡܥܢܝܢ ܚܕ ܠܗ̇,
ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ. ܐܡܪ ܓܝܪ ܒܗܘܦܡܢܐ ܕܡܐܐ ܘܫܬܝܢ
< ܘܚܡܫܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܀ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ
< ܕܡܬܒܪܢܫܘܬܐ ܬܫܡܫܬܐ ܡܫܬܡܗܐ : ܒܗ̇ ܕܝܚܝܕܝܐ
< ܒܨܒܝܢܗ ܡܫܬܡܥܢܐ ܗܘܐ ܠܐܒܐ. ܟܕ ܛܘܦܣܐ
< ܕܡܫܬܡܥܢܘܬܐ ܘܬܫܡܫܬܐ ܘܦܘܠܚܢܐ ܪܫܡ ܠܢ : ܒܗ̇
< ܡܦܩܬܐ ܕܥܡ ܒ̈ܢܝܢܫܐ. ܠܗ̇ ܕܐܦ ܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܥܒܕܐ ܐܝܟ
< ܕܙܒ̈ܢܝܢ ܣܓܝ̈ܐܢ ܐܡܪܢ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ. ܘܗܕܐ ܡܫܪܪ
< ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܗ̇ܘ ܚܟܝܡ ܒܐܠܗ̈ܝܬܐ : ܗ̇ܘ ܐܚܘܗܝ ܕ
< ܕܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܪܒܐ : ܐܦܝܣܩܘܦܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܢܘܣܐ : ܒܡܐܡܪܐ
≪ ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܀ ܡܛܠ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܕܚܝܠܬܐ ܕܕܝܢܐ
≪ ܕܒܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡ̈ܐ ܡܫܘܕܥ ܒܡܠܬܐ : ܐܡܪ ܕܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܡܟܝܠ
≪ ܒܕܡܘܬܐ ܕܥܒܕܐ ܡܬܚܙܝܐ : ܐܠܐ ܟܕ ܥܠ ܬܪܘܢܘܣ
≪ ܕܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܒܦܐܝܘܬ ܪܒܘܬܐ ܝܬܒ : ܘܡܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ
≪ ܡ̈ܠܐܟܐ ܕܠܘܬܗ ܡܣܬܓܕ. ܡܛܠܗܕܐ ܟܕ ܚܕܐ ܙܒܢ ܥܠ
≪ ܠܬܐܒܝܠ ܘܗܘܐ ܒܘܟܪܐ ܕܡ̈ܝܬܐ ܘܕܐܚ̈ܘܗܝ ܘܕܟܠܗ̇ ܒܪܝܬܐ :
≪ ܐܡܬܝ ܕܬܘܒ ܐܬܐ ܠܬܐܒܝܠ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܕܐܢ ܠܬܐܒܝܠ ܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ
≪ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܢܒܝܘܬܐ ܐܡܪܐ : ܠܐ ܫܕܐ ܡܢܗ ܫܡܐ
≪ ܕܒܘܟܪܐ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܚܕܐ ܙܒܢ ܚܠܦܝܢ ܩܒܠ ܀ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ
ܕܣܗܕܘܬܐ. ܢܚܙܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ : ܘܠܒܪܢܬ ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܪܗܛܐ

AB

Line 387: ܗܐܡܘܪܐ, B: ܗܐܡܪܐ.

investigate this present quotation from Saint Gregory the master of mysteries, and he will discover that it is contained in the book (with the beginning, But it is time that the explanation of the off-spring's nature) which is set down immediately after the book he calls 'third', but we 'first'. Let this apparently all-surpassing recounter of wonders say how 'second', not 'fourth', can be after 'third' or 'third' not 'first', before 'second'! Or if he cannot prove this, let him * who brazenly and irrationally writes and speaks everything that comes into his head impudently say whom the Lord rebukes for being like Jews ignorant of the Scriptures and God's power, and who is obviously untaught and uneducated, not even touching the fathers' doctrines with his finger tips, so to say! Let him, indeed, listen again to what the God-clad doctor and destroyer of his witless blather says in the 166th annotation. For he wrote as follows: The brilliant speech about the ant which demolishes the arrogance of Eunomius who boasts that he knows what God's substance is and the nature of beings, by the same author from the eighth book *Against Eunomius*: 'So one who prides himself on having attained a knowledge of beings should explain to us the kind of nature the smallest of visible things has, so that he may assure us about the hidden by the known. Let him explain to us by reason what the ant's nature is' and the rest of the proof-text. Let this admirable fellow inquire and investigate again to see if he does not find it set down in the tenth book (according to his reckoning) whose beginning is: But let us hold on to the previously established points? Why, then, if this divinely

**390/396** Sev. Ant., *Annotationes (= Hypomnestica ad Caesariam ?)*, 166 (fragm. hucusque incognitum) **393/396** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 8 (*PG* 45, 828A; Jaeger II, pp. 238,19 - 239,2)



ܐܬܬܚܝܬ ܡܢ ܡܠܦ ܬܐܪܐ ܕܪܘܚܢܐ ܠܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ: ܘܡܫܟܚ
< ܕܡܬܐܡܪܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܗܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܕܥܒܪ ܀ ܘܕܒܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܕܝܢ
< ܕܐܦ ܒܚܘܫܒܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ ܠܥܠܐ ܀ ܗܘ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܚܕܐ ܡܢ
ܒܬܪ ܗܘ ܕܟܬܒܐ ܗ̇ ܡܢ ܡܬܐܡܪ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ: ܚܢܢ ܕܝܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ.
ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗ̇ܟܝܠ ܐܘ ܒܬܪ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܘܠܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ
ܗܘܝ: ܐܘ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܗܘ ܕܬܪܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ: ܘܠܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ
ܢܚܘܐ: ܢܐܡܪ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܕܕܚܝܠܐ ܚܒܪ ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܡܡܠܠ
ܬܡܚܫܬܐ. ܐܘ ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܕܗܘܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ: ܢܐܡܪ
ܕܠܐ ܒܡܣܟܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܡܦܪܫܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܬܐ: ܟܠܗܝܢ ܗܠܝܢ
ܕܐܬܝܢ * ܠܡܢܘ ܚܠܦ ܡܡܠܠ: ܕܡܟܣ ܠܗ ܡܪܢܐ ܐܝܟ f. 88ra
ܕܝܗ̈ܘܕܝܐ: ܐܝܟ ܡܢ ܕܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܟܬ̈ܒܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ
ܕܐܠܗܐ: ܘܡܚܘܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ، ܠܐ ܝܠܝܦܐ ܘܠܐ ܪܕܝܐ: ܘܐܦܠܐ
ܒܪܫ ܨ̈ܒܥܬܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܢܓܥ ܒܡܠ̈ܦܢܘܬܐ ܐܒܗ̈ܝܐ.
ܢܫܡܥ ܕܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܡܢ ܠܒܝܫ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܘܡܣܚܦܢܐ ܡܠܬܐ
ܐܡܪ ܗܘ ܡܠܦܢܐ ܠܚܡܫ. ܠܐܠܗܐ: ܘܗܦܘܟܝܐ ܕܦܩܘܩܘܬܗ،
< ܕܠܐ ܒܡܢܝܢܐ. ܟܬܒ ܓܝܪ ܗܟܢ ܀ ܡܡܠܠܐ ܦܨܝܚܐ ܡܛܠ
< ܫܘܡܫܡܢܐ: ܕܣܚܦ ܥܠ ܐܪܒܐ ܠܫܘܒܗܪܗ ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ:
< ܕܡܫܬܒܗܪ ܕܝܕܥ ܕܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܐܘܣܝܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ :
< ܘܟܝܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ. ܕܝܠܗ ܕܗ̇ ܕܝܠܗ ܡܢ ܡܐܡܪܐ
≪ ܕܬܡܢܝܐ ܕܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ: ܡܢܘ ܗ̇ܘ ܕܠܝܕܥܬܐ ܕܡܛܠ
≪ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝܗܘܢ ܡܫܬܒܗܪ ܕܐܕܪܟ: ܢܦܫܩ ܠܢ ܕܐܝܢܐ
≪ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܟܝܢܐ: ܠܗ̇ܘ ܕܙܥܘܪ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚܙܝܢ ܠܢ.
≪ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܒܝܕ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܝܕܝܥܐ: ܢܫܪܪ ܠܢ ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܟܣܝܐ.
≪ ܘܡܢܐ ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܫܘܡܫܡܢܐ ܢܦܫܩ ܠܢ ܒܡܠܬܐ ܀
ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ ܕܬܚܘܝܬܐ. ܐܦ ܠܗܕܐ ܬܘܒ ܢܒܥܐ ܘܢܒܨܐ
ܗܢܐ ܬܡܝܗܐ : ܐܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܥܣܪܐ ܐܝܟ
< ܡܢܝܢܗ : ܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܫܘܪܝܗ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡ ܫܪ̈ܝܪܢ

AB

Line 424: ܘܗ, B: ܘܗ̇.

Line 425: The following note is written in a *tabula ansata* between the columns of fol. 88r in A and in the right margin of fol. 49v in B: (B ܣܐܘܝܪܐ) ܣܘܝܪܐ ܡܝܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܕܢܘܣܐ. *Severus quotes a word of Gregory of Nyssa.*

instructed father failed to call this book 'the tenth' and termed it 'the eighth', will not this arrogant superior to the fathers, obviously be saying that it is because Severus has not attained to an exactitude in these matters like his? But these things should be abandoned to their own discomfiture, since they will cause the readers uncontrollable laughter.

But we will say briefly how the occasion arose for this miserable author to load us foolishly and ignorantly with such reproaches and ignominy for using the introduction (set down above) to the proof-texts, following, as we did, our divinely inspired father Severus. Eunomius the impious blathered some inane absurdity against what the famous Basil wrote by inspiration from on high, after that great doctor's departure to be with God, and so wise Gregory, Basil's brother, wrote two books, * wreaking complete havoc, so to say, on that wicked man in each of them. When that presumptuous fellow wrote again against these also he instigated a third contest and struggle, as it were, through the ten books mentioned above. And so, when he begins the second of that earlier pair, he says: The first things in the contests with Eunomius have indeed already been accomplished sufficiently with God's help in the previous labours; whereas near the beginning of the first of those ten he wrote: So because Eunomius, though already twice overthrown in the previous discussion, does not yet permit truth to have its victory over falsehood but again struggles by literary production in the accustomed wrestling-booth of falsehood for a third time against true religion, strength-

---

**419/421** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* II (*PG* 45, 909A; Jaeger I, p. 226, 3-5)
**422/427** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (*PG* 45, 572B - 573A; Jaeger II, p. 3, 6-13)



< ܢܐܚܘܕ. ❖ ܡܫܟܚ ܠܗ̇ ܕܢܦܢܐ. ܠܒܪܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܒܗ̇. ܥܡ ܐܒܐ
ܗܢܐ ܡܠܝܦ ܡܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܆ ܕܕܥܣܪܝܐ ܢܩܪܐ ܠܡܐܡܪܐ ܗܢܐ ܆
ܕܬܡܝܢܝܐ ܥܒܕܗ̇. ܐܘ ܢܕܝܢܐ ܗܘ̣، ܕܐܡܪ ܗܘ̇ ܕܥܠ ܐܒ̈ܗܬܐ
ܡܬܥܫܠ ܆ ܕܡܛܠ ܕܠܐ ܐܕܪܟ ܐܟܘܬܗ ܠܚܬܝܬܘܬܐ
ܕܗܠܝܢ. ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܫܒܘ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܕܡܠܐܐ ܕܒܗܬܬܐ
ܠܐ ܡܬܟܠܝܢܐ ܠܩܪ̈ܘܝܐ ܚܕ̈ܐ ܆ ܒܓܚܟܬܗܘܢ ܢܬܠܬܡ.

ܕܡܢ ܐܡܪܝܢ ܕܝܢ ܗܘܬ ܥܠܬܐ ܠܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܘܝܐ ܆
ܕܡܠܐܬ ܘܠܐ ܝܕܥܬ ܒܫܛܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܒܨܥܪܐ
ܢܡܚܐ ܠܢ ܆ ܡܛܠ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܚܕ ܠܦܪܘܐܡܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܣܝܡ ܡܢ
ܐܠܗܐ ܢܩܦܝܢ ܆ ܐܬܚܫܚܢ ܒܡܫܠܡܢܘܬܐ ܗܕܐ ܕܡܕܒܪܢܐ
ܥܝܕܐ ܕܬܫܒ̈ܘܚܬܐ ܆ ܟܕ ܕܟܬ̈ܒܘܬܐ ܐܡܪܝܢ. ܟܕ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ
ܪܫܝܥܐ ܆ ܠܩܘܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܠܥܠ ܐܬܟܬܒ ܡܢ
ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܡܫܒܚܐ ܆ ܦܩܩ ܦܚܘܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܥܒܝܪܬܐ ܡܢ ܒܬܪ
ܫܘܢܝܗ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܠܗܐ. ܕܡܠܦܢܐ ܗܘ ܪܒܐ ܆ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ
ܚܟܝܡܐ ܐܚܘܗܝ ܆ ܐܟܬܒ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ. ܟܕ ܒܟܠ ܚܕ
ܡܢܗܘܢ ܒܚܘܒܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ * ܕܗ̇ܘ f.88rb
ܥܘܠܐ ܚܒܠ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܗܘ̇ ܡܪܚܐ ܟܬܒ ܆
ܐܓܘܢܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܘܬܟܬܘܫܐ ܕܬܠܬܐ ܆ ܟܕ ܗܠܝܢ
ܒܥܣܪܐ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܘ ܐܦܘܣ. ܡܢ ܗܪܟܐ ܟܕ ܡܫܪܐ
< ܗܘ̇ ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܩܕ̈ܡܝܐ ܐܡܪ ❖ ܗܠܝܢ
< ܡܢ ܩܕ̈ܡܝܬܐ ܕܐܓܘ̈ܢܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܆ ܗܐ ܡܢ ܟܒܪ
< ܫܡܠܝܬ ܒܥܘܕܪܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܐ ܒܥܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ
< ܐܫܬܡܠܝ ❖ ܠܘܬ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܩܕܡܝܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܪܐ
< ܟܬܒ ❖ ܡܛܠ ܗܟܝܠ ܕܟܕ ܬܪܬܝܢ ܙܒ̈ܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܟܒܪ ܐܬܬܪܡܝ
< ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܆ ܒܡ̈ܠܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܩܕܡܝܢ ܆ ܠܐ ܥܕܟܝܠ ܫܒܩ ܠܫܪܪܐ
< ܕܬܗܘܐ ܠܗ̇ ܙܟܘܬܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܓܠܘܬܐ ܆ ܐܠܐ ܬܘܒ ܟܕ
< ܗ̇ܝ، ܕܬܠܬ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܕܚܠܬ ܐܠܗܐ ܟܕ ܡܬܟܬܫܘܬ ܬܟܠܐ ܒܟܠ

---

AB

---

Line 445: ܠܦܪܘܐܡܝܐ, B: ܠܦܪܐܡܝܐ.
Line 446: ܢܩܦܝܢ, B: ܢܩܦ ܚܢ.
Line 461: ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ, B: ܐܢܘܡܝܘܣ.
Line 463: ܡܬܟܬܫܘܬ, A: ܡܬܟܬܫܬ; cf. supra, line 259, and infra, lines 477, 509 and 521.

ening himself for contests on behalf of error, the word of truth must now stand up through us for the overthrow of falsehood. Will it not be obvious to all who have grasped the meaning of what is said in any way, that with Eunomius having written first against Basil the Great's book but later, also against those two books of wise Gregory, the champion of truth began a third treatise against him with these ten books? Very obvious, I think. But this fellow, knowing nothing of this at all, but priding himself on some alien and very exalted wisdom, supposed that these ten had to be numbered along with the two earlier books, as though there was a single undivided literary work: a treatise which consisted of both the two earlier and the ten. That is why he attacked us with these violent and harsh words and was hoist with his own petard, as the proverbial saying has it, so that the Psalmist's word may be aptly said of him: *He burrowed out a pit and digged it through and is fallen into the hole he made; his own effort shall rebound upon his head, and his wickedness upon his own pate.*

The friends of learning should not miss this either: the same instructor in truth * evidently wrote another book *Against Eunomius' Statement*, after these ten. It is the fourth in the order of the books, and they will also call it 'the fourth' when they give each of the earlier pair of books its proper place, making those ten 'the third' book, and this one 'the fourth'. So, lest we should appear to have made this up ourselves (just like this clever writer) SEVERUS, that

439/441 Ps. 7:16-17



< ܒܥܬ ܕܪܐ ܕܒܥܒܐ ܕܕܝܠܘܬܐ : ܒܪ ܫܠܦ ܐܝܟܘܬܐ ܕܫܠܦ
< ܠܗܒܝܢ ܚܝܠ ܢܦܫܗ : ܐܠܝܐܝܬ ܘܐܦ ܗܟܢܐ ܒܟܬ̈ܒܝܢ ܬܠܬܐ
< ܕܢܙܪܐ ܠܘܬ ܗܦܘܟܝܐ ܕܕܝܠܘܬܐ ܡܢܟܐ ✤ ܐܝܪܐ ܠܗ
ܠܟܠܗܘܢ ܗܘܐ ܕܐܡܝܢ ܕܗܘ ܐܕܪܟܘ ܠܗܘܢܐ ܕܗܠܝܢ
ܕܐܬܐܡܪ : ܕܡܕܥܡܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܗܘܬ : ܕܟܕ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ
ܡܕܡܝܬ ܡܢ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ ܪܒܐ : ܠܣܘܦܐ ܕܝܢ
ܐܦ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܚܟܝܡܐ
ܒܬܪ : ܒܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ ܕܬܠܬ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܗ :
ܐܓܘܢܣܛܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܫܪܝ، ܒܗܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܪܐ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ :
ܘܦܫܝܩ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܢܐ ܡܣܒܪ ܐܢܐ. ܐܠܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܠܐ
ܡܕܡ ܐܝܟ ܢܕܥ : ܗܘ ܕܒܚܟܡܬܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܟܣܢܝܬܐ ܘܪܡܐ
ܡܬܠܝܐ ܡܬܥܒܪܢܘܬܗ : ܐܬܚܫܒ ܕܡܢ ܠܥܣܪܐ ܙܕܩ ܕܥܡ ܗܠܝܢ
ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ ܩܕ̈ܡܝܐ ܢܬܡܢܘܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܪܐ : ܐܝܟ
ܗܘ ܕܚܕܐ ܡܬܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ ܘܦܪܓܡܛܝܐ ܕܕܠܐ ܦܘܠܓܐ ܗܘܬ
ܐܝܬܝܗ̇ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܘܕܗ̇ܢܘܢ. ܡܛܠ ܗܢܐ ܘܒܗ ܒܬܢܐܦܐ
ܕܗܠܝܢ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܡܩܫܝܬܐ ܥܙܝܙ ܥܠܝܢ : ܐܬܬܟܝܢ : ܒܗ ܒܚܦ̈ܘܗܝ
ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܡܬܠܐ ܐܬܬܚܕ. ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܠܡܙܡܪܢܐ ܐܦ
< ܥܠܘܗܝ، ܬܬܐܡܪ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܙܡܘܪܐ ✤ ܕܟܪܝܐ ܚܦܪ
< ܘܚܦܪܗ : ܘܢܦܠ ܒܓܘܡܨܐ ܕܥܒܕ : ܢܗܦܘܟ ܥܡܠܗ ܒܪܝܫܗ ܥܠ
< ܗܘܪܗ : ܘܥܠ ܩܘܕܩܕܗ ܥܘܠܗ ܢܚܘܬ ✤

ܐܦ ܗܕܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܬܛܥܐ ܠܪܚܡܝ ܝܘܠܦܢܐ. ܕܐܚܪܢܐ
ܡܐܡܪܐ ܒܬܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܪܐ : ܒܓܠܝܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܠܡܐܡܪ
ܕܐܪܒܥܐ : * ܡܬܚܙܐ ܕܟܬܒ ܗܘ ܪܒܘܢܐ ܕܫܪܪܐ ܠܘܩܒܠ f. 88va
ܡܢܟܐ ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ. ܠܗܘ ܕܐܦ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ ܡܫܡܗܝܢ. ܟܕ
ܠܕܘܟܬܐ ܡܢ ܕܝܠܗ ܠܟܠ ܚܕ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܡܐܡܪ̈ܐ
ܩܕ̈ܡܝܐ ܝܗܒܝܢ : ܕܬܠܝܬܝܐ ܕܝܢ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܪܐ : ܕܐܪܒܥܐ ܕܝܢ
ܬܘܒ ܠܗܢܐ. ܕܠܐ ܗܟܝܠ ܢܬܚܙܐ : ܕܡܢ ܢܦܫܢ ܐܝܟܢܐ ܕܐܦ
ܗܢܐ ܡܟܬܒܢܐ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܕܕܐܝܟ ܗܘܝܢ ܒܕܝܢ :

AB

Line 469: ܡܕܡܝܬ, B: ܡܕܡܐܝܬ.
Line 489: ܩܕ̈ܡܝܐ, B: ܩܕܡܝܐ.

guide to the utterly true and inerrant pathway, shall confirm what is said by his writing as follows in the 101st *Hypomnesticon* to the first volume of what he wrote with his own hand *to Caesaria* (its beginning runs: Strategus the captain has sailed): Your God-loving Eminence should know that Gregory, wise in the Spirit, initially produced two volumes or books against Eunomius the blasphemer, in defence of what Saint Basil had said which had been written against by Eunomius; and these two books are not in the volume sent me by you. Now when Eunomius wrote also against what had been written by holy Gregory, he provided, as third in the order, those ten refutatory books against the wicked fellow which are set down in this volume; and thereafter he wrote, fourth in order, *Against Eunomius' Statement*, which is entitled 'fourth' in this volume; the blasphemous *Statement*, against which was written the literary work standing fourth in order, is set down at the end of the volume. So look for another volume which is not at fault. But if you cannot, write to me, since the work is hard to come by.

Will this clever fellow become conscious of his impudence and ignorance, and learn that he subjects us to so much savage ignominy in vain, for it may be he can have pardon for numbering those ten later-written books along with the two earlier works? For we find (to show him a defence which he will not know) our thrice-blessed

**452/464** Sev. Ant., *Hypomnestica ad Caesariam*, I, 101 (fragm. hucusque incognitum)



ܬܪܝܢ ܬܘܒ ܠܡܐܪܐ ܕܐܬܐܡܪܬ : ܣܐܘܪܐ ܗܘ ܡܣܬܒܪܢܐ
ܕܐܘܪܘܢܐ ܕܒܚܠܡܝܗܘܢ ܥܪܝܪܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܦܠܚܬܐ : ܒܪ ܡܗܝܢܐ
ܟܬܒ : ܒܗܦܘܡܢܣܛܝܩܘܢ ܕܡܐܐ ܘܚܕ : ܕܒܟܬܒܐ ܩܕܡܝܐ
ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܬ ܩܣܪܝܐ ܒܟܬܒܬ ܐܝܕܗ, ܟܬܒ. ܕܫܘܪܝܗ,
< ܪܝܫܗ : ܣܛܪܛܝܓܘܣ ܗܘ ܐܠܦܪܐ ܦܠܓ ܀ ܬܕܥ ܕܝܢ ܡܥܠܝܘܬܟ
< ܪܚܡܬ ܐܠܗܐ : ܕܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܚܟܝܡ ܒܪܘܚ : ܬܪܝܢ ܟܬܒܐ
< ܐܘ ܒܬܐ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܒܩܕܡܝܬܐ ܐܦܩ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ
< ܡܓܕܦܢܐ : ܒܪ ܢܦܩ ܒܘܝܐܐ ܚܠܦ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܬܐܡܪ ܡܢ
< ܩܕܝܫܐ ܒܣܝܠܝܘܣ. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܗܘܢ ܐܟܬܒ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ.
< ܘܗܠܝܢ ܬܪܝܢ ܡܐܡܪܐ : ܠܝܬ ܐܢܘܢ ܒܟܬܒܐ ܗܢܐ
< ܕܐܫܬܕܪ ܠܝ ܡܢܟ. ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܟܕ ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ ܟܬܒ ܐܦ
< ܠܘܬ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܐܬܟܬܒ : ܒܛܟܣܐ
< ܕܬܠܬܐ : ܐܦ ܠܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܪܐ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܡܦܩܢܘܬ ܡܠܬܐ
< ܠܘܩܒܠ ܒܝܫܐ : ܗܠܝܢ ܕܣܝܡܝܢ ܒܗܢܐ ܟܬܒܐ. ܘܡܒܬܪ
< ܒܛܟܣܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ : ܐܟܬܒ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ.
< ܘܗܢܐ ܕܐܬܟܬܒ ܠܘܩܒܠ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ ܪܫܝܡ ܒܗܢܐ
< ܟܬܒܐ. ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܝܢ ܡܓܕܦܢܐ : ܗܘ ܕܠܘܩܒܠܗ ܐܬܟܬܒ
< ܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ ܗܝ, ܕܒܛܟܣܐ ܕܐܪܒܥܐ ܐܬܬܟܬܒܬ :
< ܒܫܘܠܡܐ ܕܟܬܒܐ ܣܝܡ ܒܗ ܗܘܝܠ ܟܬܒܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ܕܠܐ
< ܦܠܚܐ. ܐܢ ܕܝܢ ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ ܐܢܬ, ܡܢ ܗܢܐ ܟܬܘܒ.
< ܡܛܠ ܕܥܣܩ ܠܡܫܟܚܘ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ, ܗܢܐ ܟܬܒܐ ܀

ܐܪܐ ܡܪܓܫ ܚܪܝܦܐ ܒܡܪܚܘܬܗ ܘܒܠܐ ܝܠܦܘܬܗ :
ܘܝܠܦ ܕܨܥܪܐ ܚܣܝܢܬ ܒܠܗ ܗܘ ܒܡܐܪܐ ܫܪܟܐ ܚܒܪ.
ܠܝ : ܕܗܘܐ ܓܒܪ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܫܘܒܩܢܐ : ܟܕ ܡܢܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܥܣܪ
ܡܐܡܪܐ ܡܬܬܟܬܒܢܐ : ܠܗܠܝܢ ܥܡ ܬܪܝܢ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܩܕܡܝܬܐ
ܐܫܟܚܢܢ ܓܝܪ. ܡܚܘܝܢ ܚܢܢ ܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܕܐܦ ܠܗ
ܡܦܩܢܘܬܐ ܗܝ, ܕܠܐ ܢܕܥ ܠܗ ܚܘܝܐ : ܠܗܘ ܬܠܝܬܝ,

AB

Line 492: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܐܪܐܘ.
Line 498: ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ, B: ܐܘܢܘܡܣ.
Line 512: ܕܥܣܩ, B: ܕܥܫܩ.
Line 518: ܬܠܝܬܝ, B: ܦܚܡ.

father Theodosius doing so, in his discourse which was truly *On Theology*. * The pardon is specially fitting because apparently Theodosius was unaware of the whole history of Saint Gregory's literary activity and also of the usage of our father Severus, as it has been clearly demonstrated. Let him not pour out upon us again such a load of abuse and accusations so unsparingly and maliciously!

We have perhaps discussed these matters too much, though we are not unaware that people with pressing tasks ought not to be subjected to such investigations. They run the risk of dwelling too much upon these minutiae, and hence of losing sight of what is more important. But knowing, as we do, that many can be hurt not only by the important, but also by the seemingly trivial, we thought it could be germane to the purpose to have, here too, hewn down by Christ our God's aid this good fellow's arrogant boastings. But there was also another reason. We thought that the friends of truth, seeing his feebleness in extra-doctrinal matters and his great carelessness, and appreciating from the clearer matters what is capable of inflicting damage, would, instead of being anxious about truth as a result of his false and witless cavills, do the opposite: condemn falsehood and attach themselves wisely to the correctness of patristic doctrines. For the same Saint GREGORY OF NYSSA, whom we are presently discussing, said, in the seventh chapter of his *Refutation of Eunomius* (whose beginning goes:

**470** cf. Theod. Alex., *De Trin.*, 2 (*OLA* 56, p. 164, l. 136-137 [p. 235, l. 130])



ܠܦܩܐ ܐܒܘܢ ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ : ܕܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܠܘܗ ܕܐܟܝܢ
ܕܫܪܝܪܐ ܕܬܐܘܠܘܓܝܐ ܗܘܐ ܟܬܒ. ܘܡܟܝܠ ܙܕܩ ܗܘܐ ܠܗ :
* ܘܬܬܐܪܬ ܒܗ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܡܐ ܟܠܗ ܫܪܒܐ ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܗ f. 88vb
ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ ܠܐ ܝܕܥ ܠܗ : ܬܘܒ ܕܝܢ ܘܥܝܕܐ
ܕܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܒܘܢ ܣܐܘܪܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܓܠܝܐܝܬ ܐܬܚܘܝܬ :
ܕܠܐ ܚܘܣܝܐ ܘܒܐܠܘܨܘܬܐ ܥܠܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܡܐܫܘܪܬܐ ܕܓܕܘ̈ܦܐ
ܘܕܘܘ̈ܬܟܐ ܢܐܫܘܕ ܬܘܒ.

ܘܗܠܝܢ ܟܒܪ ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ ܦܘܠܬܐ ܒܚܢ : ܠܘ ܟܕ ܠܐ ܝܕܥܝܢ
ܕܠܐ ܙܕܩ ܠܗܘܢ ܕܗܠܝܢ ܐ̈ܠܝܨܐ ܒܥܒܕܐ : ܕܢܬܒܚܢܘܢ
ܠܒܘ̈ܩܝܐ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܠܝܢ : ܘܡܣܬܟܢܘܬܐ ܢܗܘܘܢ ܡܛܠ ܕܒ
ܒܥܡܠ ܠܦܘܬ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ ܗܢܝܢ ܕܒܪܝܬܐ : ܝܬܝܪ ܡܢ ܡܐ
ܕܙܕܩ ܢܬܚܙܘܢ : ܢܬܗܡܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܝܢܐ ܟܗ̇ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܪܒܐ.
ܐܠܐ ܟܕ ܝܕܥܝܢ ܕܠܐ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܪ̈ܘܪܒܬܐ : ܐܠܐ
ܘܡܢ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܬܚ̈ܙܝܢ ܕܙܥܘ̈ܪܢ ܡܬܚܣܪܝܢ ܕܢܣܬܪܩܘܢ
ܣ̈ܓܝܐܐ : ܠܘ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܢܣܒܐ ܟܒܪ ܒܡܥܘܕܪܢܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ
ܐܠܗܢ : ܘܐܦ ܗܪܟܐ ܠܫܡܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܦܘܪܣܘܗܝ ܕܗܢܐ
ܛܒܐ ܗܓ̈ܓܢ. ܐܫܬܟܚܬ ܕܝܢ ܘܐܦ ܥܠܬܐ ܐܚܪܬܐ ܫܪܝܪܐ
ܡܚܝܠܘܬܗ ܕܐܦ ܒܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܘܬܐ ܘܡܒܣܪܢܘܬܗ
ܣܓܝܐܬܐ : ܘܡܢ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܬܝܪ ܓܠܝܢ ܡܣܬܟܠܝܢ ܠܗ̇
ܡܕܡ ܕܡܫܟܚ ܕܢܗܪ : ܚܠܦ ܗ̇ܝ ܕܒܛܝܠܝܢ ܗܘܘ ܥܠ : ܕܡܢ
ܒܠܘ̈ܥܘܗܝ ܕܟܕܒܐ ܘܕܠܐ ܗܘܢܐ ܢܬܦܠܠܘܢ ܠܘܬ ܫܪܪܐ : ܗ̇ܝ
ܕܡܣܦܩܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܗܘܢ. ܕܠܕܓܠܘܬܐ ܢܦܠܓܘܢ :
ܠܬܪܝܨܘܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܕܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܐܒ̈ܗܝܐ ܚܟܝܡܐܝܬ
ܢܬܢܩܦܘܢ. ܗܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܓܪܝܓܘܪܝܘܣ
ܕܢܘܣܐ : ܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܬܡܠܠܐ ܗܫܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܠܢ ܡܠܬܐ : ܐܡܪ
ܒܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܫܒܥܐ : ܕܡܟܬܒܢܘܬܐ ܡܠܘܬܐ ܕܠܘܬ

AB

Line 519: ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ, B: ܬܐܘܕܘܣܝܘܣ.
Line 523: ܣܐܘܪܐ, B: ܣܐܘܝܪܐ.
Line 526: ܒܚܢ, B: ܒܚܢ ܚܢ.
Line 535: ܗܓ̈ܓܢ, B: ܗܓܓܢ ܚܢ.
Line 542: ܢܬܢܩܦܘܢ, B: ܢܩܦܘܢ.

To want to help everybody was not apparently): But I will reserve the discussion of doctrines to its due time. But now for the present let us observe what truth the man, who makes the accusation at the beginning that he is hated by unbelievers for speaking the truth, uses. For it will not perhaps be beside the point to learn through his extra-doctrinal discussions his attitude to truth and use this as an example in dealing with the doctrinal also. *For he who is faithful in little will also be faithful in much, and he who is unrighteous in little will also be unrighteous in much.*

---

**493/500** Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (*PG* 45, 268AB; Jaeger I, p. 42, 16-24)
**499/500** Luc. 16:10



ܐܘܢܘܡܝܘܣ. ܕܐܠܗܘܬܗ܇ ܪܫܡ : ܠܘܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܕܝܢܐ ܗܘ܇
› ܕܢܒܥܐ ܕܠܒܠܫ ܢܟܪ : ܟܕ ܗܘܝܐ ܟܠܗܝܢ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܠܟܠܗܬܐ ܡܢ
› ܕܡܛܠ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܠܐܒܘܗ ܢܛܪ ܐܝܟܐ. ܕܫܒܩܬܐ ܕܝܢ ܗܫܐ ܗܘ
› ܕܡܛܠ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܫܪܪܐ : ܡܢ ܠܐ ܡܗܝܡܢܐ ܣܢܐ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ
› ܡܬܢܟܐ : ܒܐܝܢܐ ܫܪܪܐ ܡܬܚܫܒ ܠܬܪܥܐ. ܠܐ ܓܝܪ ܡܕܡ
› ܒܒܪ ܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܣܘܟܐ : ܘܟܕ ܡ̈ܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܠܒܪ ܡܢ ܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ :
› ܟܕ ܢܠܦܝܢ ܕܐܝܟܢܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܠܘܬ ܫܪܪܐ : ܢܬܚܫܒ ܒܗܘܕܐ
» ܐܝܟ ܕܒܬܚܘܡܬܐ : ܘܡܛܠ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܒܡ̈ܠܦܢܐ ܀ ܗܘ ܓܝܪ
» ܠܡ ܕܒܩܠܝܠ ܡܗܝܡܢ : ܐܦ ܒܣܓܝ ܡܗܝܡܢ ܗܘ. ܘܗܘ ܕܒܩܠܝܠ
» ܥܘܠ : ܐܦ ܒܣܓܝ ܥܘܠ ܗܘ ܀

---

AB

## APPENDIX I

### The fragments of Add. MS 14603, f. 43

f. 43r [ܩ̈ܢ]ܘܡܐ ..............................
ܒ̈ܢܝܐ ....................................
ܥܢܝܢܐ : ܒܓܝܪ ................
ܗ̇ܝ ܕܐܦܠܐ ܬܠ̈ܬܝܢ ..........
ܡܟܐ : ܘܐܠܘܬ ܗ̇ܝ ........
[ܕܐ]ܦܠܐ ܬܠ̈ܬܝܢ ܒܡ̈ܢܝܢܝܢ
[ܘܠܐ] ܬܠ̈ܬܝܗܝܢ ܡܒ̈ܕܢܘܬܐ :
[ܐܠ]ܐ ܚܕ ܒܪܐ ܘܚܕ
[ܚܕ]ܐ ܕܝܠܗ ܕܡܠܬܐ
[ܕܡ]ܫܝܚܐ : ܘܚܕ ܩܢܘܡܐ
[ܘܚܕ] ܦܪ̈ܨܘܦܐ ܘܚܕܐ
[ܡܚ]ܝܒܢܘܬܐ ܀ ܘܗܕܐ
..........ܐܦ ܚܕ ܘܗܘܝܢ
..........ܚܕ ܒܗ ܒ ... ܗܘܐ
..........ܐ ܕܗ .............. ܕ

f. 43v ................................ ܘܗ̇
ܡܫܝܚܐ ........................
ܘܬܪܝܢ ܒ̈ܢܝܐ .................
ܡܠܟܐ : ܘܬܠܬܝ ............
ܕܬܪ̈ܝܢ ܩ̈ܢܘܡܐ ܕ ......
ܐܠܐ ܗܠܝܢ ܐ̈ܦ ܟܕ ......
ܕܢܒܥܘܢ ܗ̇ܢܘܢ ܕܦ ......
ܕܠܗ̇ ܡܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ......
ܐ̈ ܡܫܘܪܥܘܬ ܒܝܫ[ܬܐ]
ܝܕܥ. ܠܡܐܡܪ ܕܠ ......
ܦܠܓܘܬܐ ܕܗܘܝܐ ܡ ......
ܒܗܕ ܠܝ. ܢܬܒܥܐ ......
ܒܗ ܗ̇ܠܝܢ : ܘܡ ......
ܕܒܬܪܝܢ ܕܡ̈ܠܐ ܕܡ ......
ܐ................ ܐܡܪ ......

The lines on f. 43r contain part of a text of Damian quoted in XV, 266-268 and 287-289 so that we can assume that the two fragments belong to chapter XV, in the lacuna between lines 301 and 302.

## APPENDIX II

### Addenda and corrigenda to volume I

p. v, penultimate line, instead of 'PO' read 'PTS'
p. vii, line 8, instead of '557/8 till 606/7' read '577/8 till 606/7'
pp. xxxii-xxxiv, the description of British Library Add. MS 7191 must be amplified and corrected by what is said above pp. vii-ix
pp. 14-23, the text there headed 'Part of an uncertain chapter' has now been identified: it constitutes lines 11-144 of Book III chapter III as presently edited. A few faults in the text and apparatus given in vol. I are here set right.
p. 61, last line, instead of '17ra' read '17rb'
p. 327, fifth from bottom line, instead of '243: ܕܢܟܣܐ ܐܝܬܘܗܝ' read '267: ܘܗ̇ܘ ܕܡܬܠܬܐ'
p. 346, translation, lines 442-443, read: '... all the invented names by means of which the divine nature, as it is, abides without designation? ...'
ibid., line 2 from bottom, instead of 'locum non invenimus' read '*Ad Eust. de Sancta Trin.* (*PG* 32, 696A; *GNO*, III,1, p. 14, 7-8)'
We owe this twofold correction to Prof. B. Lourié of St. Petersburg
p. 356, line 3 from bottom, instead of '*Thesaurus*, ass. V (*PG* 75, 68B)' read '*Comment. in Ioh.*, XI, 7 (*PG* 74, 500B; Pusey, II, p. 681)'
p. 378, after Cyrillus Alexandrinus, insert:
*Commentarii in Iohannem* (*CPG* 5208). *PG* 73, 9-1056; 74, 9-756. Ed. P.E. Pusey, *S.P.N. Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1872 (Brussels, 1965).
XI, 7 (74, 500B; t. II, p. 681) XXII, 594-596, (598-600)
p. 378, delete line 3 from the bottom
p. 379, line 17, instead of 'VII, 23-28' read 'VII, 23-38'
p. 381, after Gregorius Nyssenus, insert:
*Ad Eustathium de Sancta Trinitate* (*CPG* 3137). *PG* 32, 683-696. Ed. Fridericus Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni opera dogmatica minora*, Pars I (*GNO* III,1), Leiden, 1958, pp. 3-16.
696A; p. 14, 7-8 XXII, 442-443, (446-447)
p. 382, delete line 11

# INDICES

INDEX NOMINVM

INDEX LOCORVM S. SCRIPTVRAE

INDEX ALIORVM FONTIVM

# INDEX NOMINVM
# ET VOCVM QUARVNDAM EX EIS FORMATARVM


Acacius IV, 265, 328, 342
Adam XI, 234; XVIII, 67
Africa XVIII, 30
Aleppo IV, 265
Alexandrian V, 199
Amphilochius Tab., 162; X, 271; XVI, 3, 13, 60-61
Anatolius IV, 45
Anomean XVII, 415
Antioch Tab., 281; I, 2; IV, 218, 331
Apostle (the) II, 95 - cf. Paul
Arabia XIX, 77
Arian Tab., 414, 437; I, 76; III, 71, 94; IV, 52, 225, 284; V, 59; IX, 27; XI, 98; XVI, 26, 96
Arianism III, 32-33; IV, 92, 118, 186, 301-302; XII, 78, 113, 123, 166, 167, 189
Arianize III, 41, 59, 67, 123
Arius III, 70; IV, 81, 210, 315; XII, 153, 194
Asterius IV, 45
Athanasius III, 44, 73, 92; IV, 44, 93, 100, 321, 324, 403, 404, 453; V, 54; X, 54, 330; XI, 39; XIV, 166; XVIII, 29

Basil Tab., 131, 170, 181, 500; II, 147; IV, 209, 251, 328, 329, 367; VIII, 94, 153, 221, 222, 444; IX, 242; X, 257; XIII, 7, 45, 143, 155; XV, 120, 275, 277, 318, 420; XVI, 162; XVII, 2, 8, 10, 47, 56, 80, 85, 100, 113, 116, 131, 146, 156, 202, 280, 308; XVIII, 6, 58, 74, 103, 108, 140, 254, 262; XIX, 12, 193, 366, 412, 414, 429, 455
Basilides IV, 83

Caesarea I, 53; III, 205; V, 218, 232, 268, 279; VII, 16, 34, 39, 41; IX, 78, 320; XV, 76, 267; XVI, 231
Caesarean VIII, 37; XI, 27 - cf. Grammarian
Caesaria XIX, 451
Cephas VIII, 455 - cf. Peter (apostle)
Christ IV, 82; VI, 60, 124; VIII, 202, 300 (bis), 302, 339; X, 369; XIV, 225; XV, 186, 234, 251, 256; XVI, 239, 244; XVII, 53; XIX, 483 - cf. Immanuel
Christian IV, 147; V, 198; VIII, 249; XV, 353; XVI, 195
Cymatius IV, 45
Cyril Tab., 318, 327, 332, 339; IV, 266; VIII, 284, 332, 488; IX, 25, 61; X, 159; XI, 168, 328; XV, 220; XVIII, 83, 110, 131

Damasus Tab., 162; IV, 412, 488; XVI, 3, 25, 95, 118
Damian Tab., 2, 189, 282; I, 1, 15; VIII, 51; XI, 62; XVII, 136; XVIII, 257; XIX, 4, 78, 225
David II, 180

East V, 209; X, 81; XI, 24; XV, 238; XIX, 76
Eastern Tab., 33; I, 49; III, 201; IV, 4, 16, 208; V, 180, 213, 264, 338, 340; VIII, 25-26; XIV, 182; XV, 141
Elijah the Tishbite XIX, 167
Elkanah IX, 21, 22, 79, 103, 123, 143, 144, 154, 155, 165, 167, 172, 175, 178
Ephraim XVII, 392
Epiphanius I, 47; III, 199; IV, 14, 26; V, 185, 186, 212, 223, 262, 317, 324, 331, 338, 339; VII, 14, 28, 32; IX, 316; XIV, 117, 182; XV, 141
Eunomianism Tab., 449
Eunomius Tab., 202, 285, 298, 446; II, 118, 150; V, 75; VIII, 98, 233, 244, 248, 444, 538; XIV, 187; XV, 462;

XVI, 167; XVII, 14, 117, 156, 203, 206, 208, 228, 246, 254, 266, 268, 274, 281, 319, 331, 363, 418, 419, 540; XVIII, 75, 143, 182; XIX, 13, 48, 57, 149, 154, 158, 193, 195, 224, 228, 237, 276, 282, 297, 315, 367, 391, 393, 411, 419, 422, 429, 443, 454, 455, 457, 460, 492
Eusebius IV, 44-45
Eustathius II, 54

Felicissimus VII, 50, 57; IX, 272, 272-273; XIX, 274

Grammarian (the) I, 53; III, 205; V, 218, 232, 268, 278; VII, 16, 34, 39, 41; IX, 78, 319; X, 66; XI, 35, 55-56, 232; XIII, 114; XV, 76, 267; XVI, 231, 234; XVIII, 15 - cf. Caesarean - vide etiam Sergius the Grammarian
Greek IV, 273, 349
Gregory (of Nazianzus) Tab., 146, 154-155; I, 65; III, 28; IV, 29, 99, 367; V, 226, 237, 272, 291, 307; VI, 54; VIII, 195, 229, 478; X, 53, 153, 244, 316; XIV, 4, 93, 121, 136; XV, 6; XVI, 198 - cf. Theologian (the)
Gregory (of Nyssa) Tab., 187, 195, 201, 206, 285, 295, 511; II, 117, 144; V, 73; VIII, 108, 196, 232, 537-538; X, 259; XIV, 187; XVI, 163; XVII, 11; XVIII, 74, 163; XIX, 2, 10, 13, 112, 147, 192, 225, 226, 252, 276, 292, 349, 357, 365, 376, 414, 430, 453, 457, 472, 490

Hannah IX, 111, 151, 173
Hermias XVIII, 86, 133

Immanuel V, 219, 233; IX, 45 - cf. Christ
Israel IX, 117; XVIII, 45 - cf. Israelite, Jew, Jewish
Israelite XIX, 168 - cf. Israel, Jew, Jewish
Italian IV, 112, 187, 295, 305, 367, 431, 466; X, 58, 247, 322; XVI, 136

James XV, 237
Jebusite IV, 385
Jeremiah XVIII, 19, 37
Jerusalem - cf. John of Jerusalem
Jesus VI, 124; VIII, 202 - cf. Christ, Immanuel
Jew XIX, 242, 257, 268, 385 - cf. Israel, Israelite, Jewish
Jewish Tab., 29, 444, 542, 544; III, 7, 72, 79; IV, 181, 193; XV, 105; XVII, 338, 343 - cf. Israel, Israelite, Jew
Job VIII, 118, 119, 172 (bis), 173; IX, 21, 22, 79, 81, 83, 88, 123, 130, 141, 155, 165, 167, 171, 175, 178
John (apostle) V, 120, 122, 123, 126 (bis), 127, 137, 139, 140, 145, 147, 148, 149, 153; VIII, 305
John (archimandrite) IV, 370
John (other archimandrite) IV, 370
John the Grammarian - cf. Grammarian (the)
John of Jerusalem Tab., 160; XVI, 3, 152, 188-189
Julian Tab., 58; II, 166; V, 244; VI, 4, 24, 25; VII, 56; VIII, 506

Latin Tab., 33; IV, 4, 272, 348
Liberius IV, 402
Libyan Tab., 445; III, 79; IV, 395; XV, 105, 461; XVII, 338
Lucifer IV, 45

Manes IV, 84
Manichean Tab., 437
Mary XV, 233, 250 - cf. Virgin
Meletius IV, 216, 218
Moses IX, 108, 149; XVIII, 43
Museum V, 198

Neocaesarea VIII, 128
Nestorius XV, 209, 219
Nicaea IV, 50, 412
Nyssa Tab., 187, 285, 295, 511; II, 117; V, 74; VIII, 196, 232, 538; XIX, 2, 147, 227, 292, 366, 491

Paralos II, 138
Paul (apostle) IV, 378; V, 120, 122, 123, 126 (bis), 127, 136, 139 (bis), 145, 147, 148, 149, 153; VIII, 112, 131, 165; IX, 275; XVII, 117, 123; XVIII, 233 - cf. Apostle (the)
Paul of Samosata IV, 83
Paulinist IV, 329
Paulinus IV, 214, 269, 345
Peter (apostle) V, 120, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 136, 139 (bis), 145, 147, 148, 149, 153; VIII, 455; X, 204, 206, 210 (bis), 217 (bis), 218 (bis); XVII, 117, 123; XIX, 283, 312, 320, 341
Peter (of Callinicus) Tab., 281; I, 1
Peter (martyr) VII, 56
Proclus VIII, 19; X, 62, 154, 251, 344

Ramah IX, 106, 148
Roman IV, 209, 323, 329, 351, 372, 380, 385, 398, 403, 412
Rome IV, 415; XVI, 25, 96

Sabellianism Tab., 449; IV, 92, 117, 301; XII, 75, 111, 123, 166, 167, 188
Sabellianize III, 39, 57, 65, 89, 121
Sabellius III, 31, 46, 69, 72, 95, 131; IV, 72, 82, 190, 210, 238, 395; XII, 151, 194; XV, 115, 125, 437
Samosata - cf. Paul of Samosata
Samuel IX, 79, 115, 152
Sergius the Grammarian VIII, 511; IX, 44
Severus Tab., 60, 62, 72, 103, 132, 278, 347, 500; I, 53; II, 52, 166; III, 205; IV, 369; V, 218, 232, 268, 278, 318; VI, 6, 24, 25, 103; VII, 2, 11, 16, 37, 39, 41, 49; VIII, 3, 23, 24, 26, 360, 378, 505; IX, 43, 64, 258, 260, 315, 319; X, 13, 16, 65, 122, 145, 156, 254; XI, 18, 88, 92, 226; XII, 16; XIII, 8, 110, 151; XV, 74, 267; XVI, 231; XVII, 293; XVIII, 13, 95; XIX, 271, 291, 319, 330, 350, 356, 403, 411, 448, 473
Silvanus VIII, 131; IX, 275
Simon VIII, 455; X, 205, 207, 210, 211 - cf. Peter (apostle)
Strategus XIX, 452

Terentius IV, 212; XV, 121
Theodosius VIII, 376; XIV, 165; XV, 285; XIX, 470, 472
Theologian (the) Tab., 147, 155, 251-252; I, 65; III, 28, 117; IV, 29-30, 99, 195, 203, 289, 308, 320, 349-350, 426; V, 96, 111, 226, 272-273, 292, 307, 322, 325, 328, 333; VI, 54, 67, 74, 84; VIII, 15, 195, 478; X, 53-54, 148, 153, 244, 316, 349-350; XI, 331; XII, 93; XIV, 5, 93, 117-118, 121, 136, 154, 164, 191, 195-196, 205, 227, 234, 243; XV, 7, 17, 145, 149, 154, 280, 334-335, 341, 358, 469; XVI, 12, 198 - cf. Gregory (of Nazianzus)
Timothy VII, 57; VIII, 131; IX, 275
Tishbite cf. Elijah
Tritheist III, 101, 133

Uz IX, 89

Valentinus IV, 83
Virgin XV, 162, 226, 232, 250

Western IV, 217, 251, 272, 279, 330, 348, 420, 459

# INDEX LOCORVM SACRAE SCRIPTVRAE


Genesis
2, 7 XV, 187
3, 19 VIII, 310

Exodus
3, 14 XVII, 298, 302; XVIII, 20, 38-39, 40, 44-45, 47-48, 81, 109

I Regnorum
1, 1 IX, 21, 106
1, 2 IX, 111-113
1, 3 IX, 107-110
1, 5 IX, 111-113
1, 11-20 IX, 113-115
3, 19 IX, 118
9, 9 IX, 119
10, 1 IX, 116-117
16, 3 IX, 116-117
16, 13 IX, 116-117

III Regnorum
18, 21 XIX, 168-169

Psalmi
7, 16-17 XIX, 439-441
9, 9 XIX, 373-374
17, 12 VIII, 463
49, 18 II, 179-180
95, 13 XIX, 373-374
97, 9 XIX, 373-374
103, 2 XVII, 236
103, 24 VIII, 460-461
110, 7 XV, 171
111, 5 IX, 359-360
144, 16 VIII, 461-462

Proverbia
1, 20-21 VII, 65-67
8, 22 XV, 169-171
8, 25 XV, 173
9, 9 II, 192-193
21, 6 VI, 38-39

Ecclesiastes
3, 7 II, 182

Iob
1, 1 VIII, 120-121; IX, 21, 89
1, 1 sq VIII, 123-126, 180-183
1, 5 IX, 92-93
1, 8 IX, 89-90
1, 11-12 IX, 90-92
1, 14-19 IX, 94-95
1, 21 IX, 97-98
2, 3 IX, 89-90
2, 5-6 IX, 90-92
2, 7 IX, 99
4, 1-42, 6 IX, 100-101
42, 8 IX, 101-102
42, 12-17 IX, 102-103

Siracides
7, 12 VI, 36

Osee
5, 11 XVII, 392-394

Malachias
3, 6 VIII, 465

Isaias
28, 15 VI, 63
30, 12 VI, 63
50, 11 IV, 179-180

Ieremias
13, 25 VI, 63
23, 22 XVIII, 19-20, 20-21, 38, 39, 48

Matthaeus
3, 13-16 XV, 188
12, 34 XIX, 245-246
22, 29 XIX, 242-243, 257-258, 267-268
28, 19 VIII, 128-129





Marcus
1, 9-10 XV, 188

Lucas
3, 21-22 XV, 188
6, 45 XIX, 245-246
16, 10 XIX, 499-500

Iohannes
1, 1 XV, 421
1, 14 XV, 187
14, 6 II, 115
16, 21 XIX, 42-44

Actus Apostolorum
17, 31 XIX, 373-374

Ad Romanos
8, 29 XV, 190; XIX, 371-372
9, 5 XVII, 384-385
10, 2 II, 95
11, 36 VIII, 208-209
12, 19 VI, 112-113

I ad Corinthios
8, 6 VIII, 201-202
12, 31 II, 95-96
15, 20 XV, 188-189

II ad Corinthios
13, 1 V, 288-289, 303-304; VI, 50-51; XIV, 89-90

Ad Galatas
4, 19 VIII, 299-300
5, 10 XVIII, 233-234

Ad Philippenses
2, 7 XIX, 300-301, 365, 369

Ad Colossenses
1, 15 XIX, 371-372
1, 18 XV, 189; XIX, 371-372

I ad Thessalonicenses
1, 1 VIII, 131 et 132; IX, 275

II ad Thessalonicenses
1, 1 VIII, 131 et 132; IX, 275

I ad Timotheum
1, 7 IV, 376-377
6, 16 XVII, 235

II ad Timotheum
2, 5 II, 94; VIII, 234; XIX, 310, 326, 337

Ad Hebraeos
1, 6 XIX, 370

Locum non invenimus
XIX, 185-187, 206-207

# INDEX ALIORUM FONTIVM(*)


ACACIUS, EPISCOPUS BEROEAE

*Epistula ad Cyrillum episcopum Alexandriae* (*CPG* 6479). *PG* 77, 100-101. *ACO* I, I, 1, pp. 99-100.

100 CD; p. 99, 23-28 — IV, 267-274, (343-349)

AMPHILOCHIUS ICONIENSIS

*De Spiritu Sancto* (opus hucusque incognitum).

3 — XVI, 18-21

ATHANASIUS ALEXANDRINUS

*Epistula ad Afros episcopos* (*CPG* 2133). *PG* 26, 1029-1048.

4 (1036 B) — XVIII, 30-31

*Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae* (*CPG* 2092). *PG* 25, 537-594.

11 (561 B) — V, 60-64

11 (561 C - 564 A) — V, 65-72

*Tomus ad Antiochenos* (*CPG* 2134). *PG* 26, 796-809.

5-6 (800 D - 804 A) — IV, 46-84

8 (805 AB) — IV, 84-89

BASILIUS CAESARIENSIS

*Adversus Eunomium* I. *PG* 29, 497-572. Ed. Bernard SESBOÜÉ, *Basile de Césarée. Contre Eunome, suivi de Eunome, Apologie*. Tome I (*SChr*. 299), Paris, 1982, pp. 140-268.

5 (517 B - 520 B; pp. 176-180) — XVII, 157-184, (205-206), (213-215), (215-217), (218-222), (222), (251-253), (263-264), (264-265), (317), (345-346), (349-351), (431-436)

5 (520 C - 521 A; pp. 180-182) — XVII, 419-426

7 (525 BC; pp. 190-192) — XVII, 364-378, (400-406), (407-408), (427-430), (465-470), (479-482)

8 (528 B - 529 A; pp. 194-196) — VIII, 445-468

10 (533 C; p. 204) — VIII, 98-103, (149-150), (152-153), (153-155), (160-162)

10 (536 B; p. 206) — VIII, 103-107

14-15 (545 AB; p. 224) — XVII, 378-386, (508-511), (516), (517-


(*) 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.




520), (526-527), (535-537), (538-539); (XVIII, 60-62), (104-106)

15 (548 A; p. 226) — XVII, 440-443

15 (548 AB; p. 226) — XVIII, 63-73, (106-108)

16 (548 C; p. 228) — XVII, 443-447

*Adversus Eunomium* II. *PG* 29, 573-652. Ed. Bernard SESBOÜÉ, *Basile de Césarée. Contre Eunome, suivi de Eunome, Apologie*. Tome II (*SChr*. 305), Paris, 1983, pp. 10-142.

4 (577 C; pp. 18-20) — XVII, 117-122

4 (577 C; p. 20) — XVII, 90-91

5 (580 C; p. 22) — XVI, 167-169; (XVII, 14-17), (48-50)

11-12 (593 AB; pp. 44-46) — XVIII, 143-162, (189), (196-197), (199)

28-29 (637 C - 640 A; pp. 120-122) — XVII, 228-237, (256-258), (279-280), (319-323), (351-353), (436-438)

29 (640 B; p. 122) — XVII, 237-245, (259-262), (269), (271), (283-284), (285-288), (309-312), (314), (318-319), (323-331), (334-335)

29 (640 BC; p. 124) — VIII, 469-477

*Adversus Eunomium* IV. *PG* 29, 672-709.

681 C — VIII, 95-97, (144-145)

*De eis qui dicunt Filium esse dissimilem Patri* (an *CPG* 2950?), hucusque ineditum.

XVIII, 236-243, (244-246), (250-251)

*De fide* (*CPG* 2859). *PG* 31, 464-472.

2 (465 D - 468 A) — XVI, 170-173; (XVII, 18-20), (56-57)

*De ieiunio hom. I* (*CPG* 2845). *PG* 31, 164-184.

9 (177 D - 180 A) — XVI, 237-238

*Epistula 38*. *PG* 32, 325-340. Ed. Marcella FORLIN PATRUCCO, *Basilio di Cesarea. Le lettere*, I (*Corona Patrum* 11), Torino, 1983, pp. 178-194.

1 (325 A; p. 178) — X, 259-269, (281-286)

3 (328 AC; p. 180) — VIII, 108-126, (163-166), (167), (168), (174-176), (177-182)

4 (329 C - 332 A; p. 184) — XIII, 64-80, (94-95), (145-147)

4 (332 D - 333 A; p. 186) — XIII, 47-54

5 (336 AB; p. 188) — XIII, 81-91, (95-100)

6 (336 C; p. 190) — XVI, 164-166; (IX, 242-243); (XVII, 12-13), (54-55), (59), (67-68), (72), (81), (85-86), (95), (96), (132), (138), (140), (143), (151)

8 (340 B; p. 194) — XIII, 157-163, (171-174)

8 (340 BC; p. 194) — XVIII, 164-180, (204-209), (213-216), (217-218), (219-224)

8 (340 C; p. 194) XIII, 163-167, (183-184)

*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) VIII, 128-141, (184-185), (187-189)

5 (776 C; p. 196) XV, 277-278, (298), (314-315), (319)

*Epistula 214. PG* 32, 785-789. Ed Yves COURTONNE, *Saint Basile. Lettres.* Tome II (*Collection des Universités de France*), Paris, 1961, pp. 202-206.

2 (785 B; pp. 202-203) IV, 213-219, (329-331)

2-3 (788 A - 789 A; pp. 203-205) IV, 219-249, (257-261), (262-264), (332-336), (336-339), (340-342); (XV, 121-136)

*Epistula 236. PG* 32, 876-885. Ed. Yves COURTONNE, *Saint Basile. Lettres.* Tome III (*Collection des Universités de France*), Paris, 1966, pp. 47-55.

6 (884 A; p. 53) X, 271-276, (301-303)

*In illud: "In principio erat Verbum"* (*CPG* 2860). *PG* 31, 472-481.

3 (477 C) XV, 421-424

Locum non invenimus XVII, 81-82, (86), (89), (133), (151)

CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS

*Commentarii in Iohannem* (*CPG* 5208). *PG* 73, 9-1056; 74, 9-756. Ed. P.E. PUSEY, *S.P.N. Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis evangelium*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1872 (Bruxelles, 1965).

II, 1 (73, 205 A; t. I, p. 183) VIII, 306-313, (350-352)

II, 1 (73, 245 B; t. I, p. 220) VIII, 313-320, (352-355)

II, 2 (73, 265 D; t. I, pp. 240-241) VIII, 322-233, (355-356)

III, 5 (73, 485 D - 488 A; t. I, p. 445) VIII, 324-331, (357), (357-358)

*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.

II (732 B; t. I, p. 254-256) XVIII, 86-89, (110-113)

II (741 AB; t. I, p. 272) XVIII, 133-135

II (741 D; t. I, p. 274) XVIII, 136-138

*Thesaurus* (*CPG* 5215). *PG* 75, 9-656.

Ass. II (28 B) VIII, 286-287, (335-337)

Ass. III (36 C) VIII, 287-291, (337-338), (490-493); (X, 161-165); (XI, 329-330)

Ass. XIX (321 BC) VIII, 292-298, (338-339)

Ass. XXXI (444 BC) VIII, 495-504

Ass. XXXI (445 BC) IX, 27-42

Ass. XXXIV (609 A) VIII, 299-303, (339-341)



DAMASUS PAPA

*Oratio tertia contra Arianos*, aliunde incognita.

XVI, 28-32; (IV, 490-492); (XVI, 98-102), (120-122), (123-124)

Vide etiam SYNODUS ROMANA.

DAMIANUS ALEXANDRINUS

*Adversus Tritheitas* (*CPG* 7245). Versio: A. VAN ROEY, *Le traité contre les Trithéites* (*CPG* 7245) *de Damien d'Alexandrie*, in *Philohistôr. Miscellanea in honorem Caroli Laga septuagenarii* (*OLA* 60), Leuven, 1994, pp. 229-250.

c. 9 (no. 14) I, 41-60, (94-98); (II, 15-19), (25-28), (30-32), (104-105); (III, 148-152), (181-183), (193-211), (230-232), (233-234), (268-273); (IV, 14-19); (V, 179-183), (211-218), (257-268); (VII, 13-14), (15-23), (32-33), (38-39), (78-83), (83), (84-85), (97-98); (IX, 260-261), (265-266), (316); (XI, 281-286), (289-290), (301-306); (XIV, 102-105), (144-146), (158-160); (XVI, 57-59) (prima editio).

(no. 15) V, 27-34, (42-45)

(no. 16) V, 218-224 (prima editio)

(no. 17) V, 226-232 (secunda editio)

(no. 18) V, 233-238 (secunda editio)

(no. 19) XVII, 100-102, (85-86), (103-104), (133), (137)

c. 12 (deest apud Van Roey) IV, 402-411

IV, 411-418

XVII, 116-122

XVII, 122-128, (140)

c. 15 (no. 38) VIII, 20-22; (X, 62-64), (155), (251-253), (345)

*Epistula ad episcopos Orientis.*

VIII, 26-43; (X, 81-87); (XI, 25-32), (47-49)

VIII, 44-50

XI, 33-46, (50-52), (63-66), (81)

*Epistula festalis secunda.*

XIX, 144-174, (219), (225-230)

XIX, 230-243

*Epistula prolixa* (cf. supra, p. XXIX).

I, 106-112

I, 113-118

I, 119-124

I, 148-151, (158-160)

I, 151-157, (135-137), (160-163)
II, 86-105, (193-195), (195-196), (196-197); (III, 9-14), (82-86), (136-141), (146-147), (153-157)
III, 177-211; (II, 197-199); (III, 215-218), (229-232), (236-242), (256-258), (259-261), (264-273); (IV, 14-19); (V, 251-268); (VII, 13-14), (15-23), (32-33), (38-39), (78-83), (83), (84-85), (97-98); (IX, 260-261), (316). Secunda editio: V, 270-271 et 272-279
IX, 264-277, (282-285), (301-306), (309-312)
IX, 318-331, (342-343), (344-347), (350-351); (X, 16-21); (XI, 281-286), (289-290), (301-306); (XII, 16-23), (30-34), (48-49); (XIV, 46-48), (49-53)
XII, 69-78, (80-84), (88-91), (108-111); (XIV, 55-58)
XIV, 10-35, (63-66), (77-80), (81-82)
XIV, 86-105; (V, 285-297), (319-320); (XIV, 120-121), (148-151). Secunda editio: V, 300-313, (329); (VI, 47-59), (69-71), (71-72); (XIV, 122)
XIV, 164-182; (V, 333-338), (339-340); (X, 351-361); (XIV, 205-206), (207-209), (228-231), (234-241), (244-246), (248-249), (253-254); (XV, 12-13), (15-16), (22-23), (84-85), (140-141). Secunda editio: V, 342-346, (340-341); (XV, 142)
XV, 46-51, (87-89)
XV, 52-64
XV, 274-276
XV, 335-338
XVI, 13-35; (IV, 490-492); (XVI, 68-72), (74-76), (84-85), (93-94), (95-102), (105-108), (111-114), (120-122), (123-124), (124-125)
XVI, 152-179, (188-193); (XVII, 10-20), (21-28), (32-33), (34-36), (44-46)
XVII, 88-93, (137)

*Epistula Synodica* (*CPG* 7240). Ed. Jean-Baptiste Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*. Textus, t. IV, Paris, 1901, p. 358-363; versio, t. II, Paris, 1901, p. 325-334.

T. IV, pp. 358-359; *t. II, pp. 326-327* — XV, 226-236 et 236-238, (247-253), (255-258)



*Sermo incathedrationis*, aliunde incognitus. — XV, 226-236, (247-253), (255-258)

Locum non invenimus — XV, 53, 60sq.

Epiphanius Constantiensis

*Panarion (Adversus haereses)* (*CPG* 3745). *PG* 41, 156-1200; 42, 9-832. Ed. K. Holl, *Epiphanius*, 3 vols. (*GCS* 25, 31, 37), Leipzig, 1915, 1922, 1933.

Haer. 73 (42, 432-433; III, p. 288, 20-22) — I, 48-50; (III, 200-202); (IV, 15-17); (V, 179-181), (212-215), (263-265)

Haer. 73 (42, 433 A; III, p. 288, 27-29) — I, 50-52; (III, 202-204); (IV, 17-19); (V, 181-183), (215-217), (223-224), (265-267)

Gregorius Nazianzenus

*Oratio 11 (Ad Gregorium Nyssenum)*. *PG* 35, 832-841. Ed. Marie-Ange Calvet-Sébasti, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 6-12* (*SChr.* 405), Paris, 1995, pp. 328-346.

4 (836 D - 837 A; p. 338) — VIII, 197-200, (224-225)

*Oratio 14 (De pauperum amore)*. *PG* 35, 858-909.

9-10 (868 C - 869 A) — VIII, 211-220, (228-229), (229)

*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) — III, 29-36, (54-57), (64-65), (88-89), (118-121)
6 (1072 D; p. 70) — XV, 280-281
10 (1077 A; p. 78) — XV, 336-338, (348-349), (356)
10-11 (1077 AC; pp. 78-80) — XV, 359-374, (377-378), (382-385), (404-406), (408-410), (411)

*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) — III, 44-52, (61-64), (73-74), (90-92)
35-36 (1124 C - 1125 C; pp. 184-188) — IV, 100-135, (187-190), (194), (197-198), (290-302), (311-313), (428-434), (453-457), (461-472); (V, 98-100); (VIII, 16-18); (X, 55-61), (148-149), (245-251), (319-326), (328-329), (331-338); (XI, 331-333); (XVI, 136-137)
35 (1124 D; pp. 184-186) — XIV, 166-168, (191-193)

*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.

4 (77 D - 80 A; p. 184) — XV, 394-395
4 (80 A; p. 184) — XV, 400-401
6 (81 B; p. 188) — XV, 413-419
8 (84 A; p. 190) — XV, 386-389
8 (84 C; p. 192) — XV, 389-392
10 (85 D - 88 B; pp. 196-198) — XV, 454-456, (458-461), (470-472)
10 (88 AB; p. 198) — VIII, 479-487

*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.

2 (105 BC; pp. 228-230) — XV, 169-176, (212-215)

*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.

28 (164 CD; p. 330) — I, 66-71

*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) — I, 76-80

*Oratio 38 (In Theophania)*. Ed. Claudio MORESCHINI, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41* (*SChr.* 358), Paris, 1990, pp. 104-148 + 92.

6 (p. 92) — XV, 161-168, (211-212)

*Oratio 39 (In sancta Lumina)*. *PG* 36, 335-360. Ed. Claudio MORESCHINI, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41* (*SChr.* 358), Paris, 1990, pp. 150-196.

11 (345 C; pp. 170-172) — I, 72-76; (IV, 205-207), (449-452); (V, 227-231), (237-238), (273-277), (293-297), (308-313); (VI, 55-59); (XIV, 94-98), (137-141)
12 (348 AB; pp. 172-174) — VIII, 201-209, (226-227)

*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.

2-3 (360 C - 361 B; pp. 198-200) — XV, 177-194
41-42 (417 CD; p. 294) — XV, 194-199

*Oratio 42 (Supremum vale)*. *PG* 36, 457-492. Ed. Jean BERNARDI, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Dicours 42-43* (*SChr.* 384), Paris, 1992, pp. 48-114.

15 (476 A; p. 80) — XII, 93-94
16 (476 C; p. 82) — III, 37-43, (57-61), (65-68), (89-90), (121-125)
16 (477 AB; p. 84) — IV, 352-365, (444-448); (X, 340-344)



16 (477 B; p. 84) — X, 352-354, (359-360); (XIV, 172-175), (180), (229-231), (239), (244-246), (248-249), (253-254)

GREGORIUS NYSSENUS

*Contra Eunomium libri* (*CPG* 3135). *PG* 45, 248-464 et 572-1121. Ed. Wernerus JAEGER, *Contra Eunomium libri* (GNO I et II), Leiden, 1960², vol. I, pp. 3-409; vol. II, pp. 3-311.

I: 249 AB; t. I, pp. 23,8 - 24,7 — II, 145-165
I: 256 AB; t. I, p. 29, 11-20 — II, 119-127
I: 268 AB; t. I, p. 42, 16-24 — XIX, 493-500
I: 277 BC; t. I, p. 53, 6-17 — XIX, 196-204
I: 280 C; t. I, p. 55, 11-14 — XIX, 205-207
I: 320 D - 321 A; t. I, p. 94, 9-14 — VIII, 539-542
I: 381 AB; t. I, p. 149, 1-11 — V, 76-85
II: 909 A; t. I, p. 226, 3-5 — XIX, 419-421
III, 1: 572 B; t. II, p. 3, 6-10 — XIX, 237-240
III, 1: 572 B - 573 A; t. II, p. 3, 6-13 — XIX, 422-427
III, 1: 589 B - 592 B; t. II, pp. 27,21 - 29,26 — XIX, 14-63
III, 1: 592 A; t. II, p. 29, 4-12 — XIX, 150-157
III, 1: 592 B; t. II, p. 29, 19-26 — XIX, 158-163
III, 1: 596 CD; t. II, pp. 33,25 - 34,8 — VIII, 234-243, (259-264), (271-274), (274-275), (277-278)
III, 2: 633 D - 636 A; t. II, pp. 67,25 - 68,8 — XIX, 367-375
III, 2: 656 A; t. II, p. 86, 6-9 — VIII, 244-247, (256-257)
III, 3: 708 C; t. II, pp. 132,26 - 133,4 — XIX, 284-290
III, 4: 721 A; t. II, pp. 143,26 - 144,1 — XIX, 298-302
III, 5: 764 A; t. II, p. 182, 7-13 — XVIII, 77-82, (94-95), (108-110)
III, 8: 828 A; t. II, pp. 238,19 - 239,2 — XIX, 393-396

*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, 8-15 — VIII, 249-254, (257-259)

IOHANNES II HIEROSOLYMITANUS

*Expositio fidei* (*CPG 3621*). Ed. C.P. CASPARI, *Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel*, I, Christiania, 1866, pp. 185-186 (pp. 186-190).

I, p. 185 (186) — XVI, 153-156, (158-159), (161), (190-192)

LIBERIUS PAPA
*Epistula ad Athanasium*, hucusque incognita.
IV, 405-411

PETRUS CALLINICENSIS
*Syndocticon*, fragmentum aliunde incognitum.
XIX, 165-166

PROCLUS CONSTANTINOPOLITANUS
*Epistula uniformis ad singulos Occidentis episcopos* (*CPG* 5915). *ACO* IV, 2, pp. 65-68.
p. 65, 27-28 — VIII, 20-22; (X, 62-64), (155), (251-253), (345)

SEVERUS ANTIOCHENUS
*Contra additiones Iuliani* (*CPG* 7029). Ed. Robert HESPEL, *Sévère d'Antioche. La polémique antijulianiste*. II A: *Le* Contra additiones Juliani. Textus (*CSCO* 295). Versio (*CSCO* 296), Louvain, 1968.
1 (p. 1,22 - 2,16; [p. 1,24 - 2,13]) — II, 168-185
3 (p. 9, 3-9; [p. 7, 9-15]) — VI, 27-32
4 (p. 11, 1-15; [p. 8, 22-32]) — VI, 32-39
27 (p. 84, 1-6; [p. 70, 24-30]) — VIII, 506-510

*Contra Felicissimum* (*CPG* 7032), fragmenta hucusque inedita.
III, 6 — XIX, 280-290
III, 10 — XIX, 292-302
V, 1 — VII, 51-69
loco incerto — IX, 272-277

*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. *Orationis tertiae pars posterior*. Textus (*CSCO* 101). Versio (*CSCO* 102), Paris - Louvain, 1933.
II, 1 (p. 56, 1-4; [p. 44, 16-19]) — XI, 93-96, (130-133), (135)
II, 1 (p. 56, 4-7; [p. 44, 19-21]) — XVIII, 43-45, (45-46)
II, 1 (p. 56, 24-27; [p. 45, 3-5]) — XI, 96-98
II, 1 (pp. 56,29 - 57,2; [p. 45, 7-10]) — XI, 35-38, (40)
II, 1 (pp. 56,29 - 57,11; [p. 45, 7-19]) — XVIII, 15-25, (37-39), (47-48), (49-50), (52-53), (55-56), (97-100), (100-102)
II, 1 (p. 57, 13-18; [p. 45, 21-26]) — XI, 142-146, (139-141), (153), (154), (265), (272)
II, 1 (p. 57, 14-20; [p. 45, 22-29]) — VIII, 45-50; (XI, 41-46), (50-52)
II, 1 (p. 57, 16-20; [p. 45, 24-29]) — X, 66-70; (XI, 59-62), (81), (100-104)
II, 1 (pp. 59,15 - 61,7; [pp. 47,11 - 48,21]) — IX, 78-119, (126-129), (144-146)
II, 2 (p. 68, 5-8; [p. 53, 23-26]) — XI, 115-118, (150-152), (186-189), (212-214), (299-301)



II, 2 (pp. 69,25 - 70,6; [p. 55, 1-9]) — XI, 118-125
II, 2 (p. 70, 25-30; [p. 55, 28-33]) — XI, 233-237, (252-253)
II, 3 (p. 71, 4-7; [p. 56, 5-7]) — XI, 238-241, (253-255)
II, 3 (p. 71, 4-10; [p. 56, 5-10]) — XVIII, 26-31
II, 4 (pp. 80,26 - 81,4; [p. 63, 26-31]) — VIII, 38-43; (X, 71-74), (94), (145-146), (156-157), (254-257); (XI, 27-32), (47-49), (80), (154), (242-247), (266), (273)
II, 4 (p. 81, 9-11; [p. 64, 1-3]) — XI, 247-249, (256-258)
II, 5 (p. 81, 14-19; [p. 64, 7-11]) — XI, 106-110
II, 5 (p. 84, 23-27; [p. 66, 23-26]) — XI, 111-114
II, 15 (p. 129, 22-25; [p. 101, 5-7]) — XV, 77-79
II, 15 (p. 130, 4-8; [p. 101, 16-19]) — XV, 80-82
II, 18 (p. 169, 13-22; [p. 132, 12-21]) — XIII, 114-122, (123-128), (129-130), (132-135), (152-154)
III, 31 (p. 116, 13-19; [p. 84, 17-21]) — XVI, 235-239
III, 40 (p. 264, 19-25; [p. 194, 29-33]) — XVI, 240-244
Locum non invenimus — I, 54-58, (59-60); (III, 205-210), (211); (VII, 16-21), (23), (78-83), (83), (84-85), (97-98); (IX, 260-261), (266), (320-325), (327), (343), (350-351); (X, 16-21); (XI, 281-286), (289-290), (301-306) XI, 147-148

*Epistula ad Eustathium Scholasticum*, hucusque incognita.
II, 56-62

*Epistula ad presbyteros et archimandritas Iohannem et Iohannem et alios*. Ed. E.W. BROOKS, *PO* 12, Paris, 1916, pp. 214-216.
pp. 214-215 — IV, 372-380
pp. 215-216 — IV, 380-396

*Epistulae ad Sergium Grammaticum* (*CPG* 7025). Ed. Josephus LEBON, *Severi Antiocheni orationes ad Nephalium, eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici epistulae mutuae*. Textus (*CSCO* 119), Louvain, 1949, pp. 103-177. Versio (*CSCO* 120), Louvain, 1949, pp. 53-136.
I (pp. 86,7 - 87,1; [p. 63, 12-26]) — IX, 45-58
III (p. 174, 2-8; [p. 133, 12-16]) — VIII, 512-517

*Homelia cathedralis 21*. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE and François GRAFFIN, *PO* 37, Turnhout, 1975, pp. 64-87.
pp. 70,32 - 72,2 (pp. 71,30 - 73,2) — VIII, 362-367

*Homilia cathedralis 109*. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE, *PO* 25, Paris, 1943, pp. 732-781.
pp. 747,6 (8) - 748,5 (9) — XVII, 293-307

*Hypomnestica ad Caesariam*, fragmenta hucusque inedita.

| | |
|---|---|
| I, 101 | XIX, 452-464 |
| 165 | XIX, 361-375 |
| 166 | XIX, 390-396 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Locum non invenimus | VI, 105-113 |

SYNODUS ROMANA, praeside Damaso p.

*Epistula ad episcopos Illyrici*. Cf. THEODORETUS, *Ecclesiastica Historia*, II, 22. *PG* 82, 1052-1056.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1053 AB | IV, 415-418 |

THEODOSIUS ALEXANDRINUS

*De Trinitate* (*CPG* 7137). Ed. A. VAN ROEY and P. ALLEN, *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century* (*OLA* 56), Leuven, 1994, pp. 148-251.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1, 116-130; (115-126) | VIII, 381-394, (400-408) |
| 1, 286-288; (271-273) | XIV, 166-168 |
| 1, 319-321; (302-304) | XV, 289-291, (285-286) |
| 2, 136-137; (130) | XIX, 470 |
| 5, 51-56; (54-58) | XV, 291-296, (303) |


# CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---|
| ABBREVIATIONS | V |
| INTRODUCTION | VII |
| The textual tradition of Book III | VII |
| I. The direct tradition | VII |
| II. The indirect tradition | XXI |
| Acknowledgements | XXVII |
| ANALYSIS OF BOOK III CHAPTERS 1-19 | XXIX |
| TEXT | 1 |
| APPENDIX I. The fragments of Add. MS 14603, f. 43 | 548 |
| APPENDIX II. Addenda and corrigenda to volume I | 549 |
| INDICES | 551 |
| Index nominum et vocum quarundam ex eis formatarum | 553 |
| Index locorum Sacrae Scripturae | 556 |
| Index aliorum fontium | 558 |