

CORPVS CHRISTIANORVM

Series Graeca

35



CORPVS CHRISTIANORVM

Series Graeca

35

PETRI CALLINICENSIS
PATRIARCHAE
ANTIOCHENI

CONTRA DAMIANVM

BREPOLS – TURNHOUT

1998

PETRI CALLINICENSIS
PATRIARCHAE ANTIOCHENI
TRACTATVS CONTRA
DAMIANVM

III
LIBRI TERTII CAPITA XX-XXXIV

EDIDERVNT ET ANGLICE REDDIDERVNT

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



TURNHOUT
BREPOLS

1998

LEUVEN
UNIVERSITY PRESS

EDITORES

E. DEKKERS
M. GEERARD
C. LAGA
J. NORET
C. STEEL
P. VAN DEUN
A. VAN ROEY

ABBREVIATIONS

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



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

© Brepols 1998

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

INTRODUCTION

The textual tradition of Book III, chap. 20-34

1. The direct tradition

The Syriac text of chapters 20-34 of Book III given here in this third volume of the edition of Peter of Callinicus *Contra Damianum* is transmitted in only three of the four manuscripts used for the edition of the 19 preceding chapters¹: British Library Add. MSS 7191 and 14603, Vaticanus Syriacus 108².

British Library Add. MS 7191 (A) ff. 75, 89-119 and 121-132ra gives Book III chapters 20-34 almost complete though in some disorder. Ff. 89-94 give chapters XX - XXII, l. 97 (*explicit*: ܘܢܪ ܥܘܨܐ ܥܘܨܐ); ff. 95-102 give chapters XXII, l. 234 (*incipit*: ܥܠ ܘܢܪ ܘܥܘܨܐ ܘܥܘܨܐ) - XXV, l. 273 (*explicit*: ܪܘܡܐ ܪܘܡܐ, ܡܘܕܐܪܐ); ff. 103-113 give chapters XXV, l. 420 (*incipit*: ܪܘܡܐ ܪܘܡܐ) - XXVIII, l. 394 (*explicit*: ܐܘܒܐ ܐܘܒܐ); ff. 114-119 give chapters XXIX, l. 94 (*incipit*: ܡܘܨܐܪܐ ܕܐܡܐ ܪܘܡܐ) - XXXI, l. 92 (*explicit*: ܪܐ ܪܘܡܐ); f. 75³ gives chapter XXXI, lines 99-228 (*incipit*: [ܪܘܡܐ ܐܘܒܐ]) (*explicit*: ܪܘܡܐ ܐܘܒܐ); ff. 121-132ra give chapters XXXI, l. 368 (*incipit*: ܘܢܪ ܪܘܡܐ) - XXXIV.

British Library Add. MS 14603 (B) contains the first 25 chapters of Book III. Between f. 56vb and f. 57ra a folio containing chapter XXI, lines 19-80, is lost, and between f. 75rb and f. 75va there is a lacuna (chapter XXIV, lines 124-257) which perhaps existed already in the model copied by the scribe.

Vaticanus Syriacus 108 (D) contains the text of chapters 26-50. It originally contained also the list of headings of these chapters; only those for XXVI and XXVII and the first words of that for XXVIII remain.

¹ Vat. Syr. 107 has only some fragments of Book III chapters X, XI, XIV and XV.

² See our descriptions, vol. I, p. XXIX-XXXIV, and vol. II, p. VII-XIII and XVI-XXI.

³ F. 120 gives chapter XI, 107-243; cf. vol. II, pp. 307-315.

II. *The indirect tradition*1. *The Florilegium Trinitarium (Flor. I)*

This florilegium has quoted from the *Contra Damianum* the following patristic extracts:

- XX, 27-30 (25-28): W, f. 15va; X, f. 101rb; Y, f. 75vb; Z, f. 122r
 XXIII, 37-39 (34-36): W, f. 16ra, 24ra; X, f. 103ra, 107rb; Y, f. 76va, 78rb; Z, f. 122v, 124r
 49-52 (46-49): W, f. 26ra; X, f. 112vb; Y, f. 80va; Z, f. 126r
 114-116 (108-110): W, f. 18rb, 26ra; X, f. 112va-vb, 120rb; Y, f. 80va, 84ra; Z, f. 126r, 129r
 XXV, 451-458 (407-413): W, f. 24rb-va; X, f. 108ra-rb; Y, f. 78va; Z, f. 124r
 460-463 (415-418): W, f. 24rb; X, f. 108ra; Y, f. 78va; Z, f. 124r
 XXVI, 37-40 (36-40): W, f. 15va; X, f. 101rb; Y, f. 75vb; Z, f. 122r
 130-135 (124-128): W, f. 15vb; X, f. 102ra-rb; Y, f. 76rb; Z, f. 122r
 XXVIII, 253-262 (229-237): W, f. 24ra; X, ff. 106vb-107ra; Y, f. 78ra; Z, f. 124r
 262-265 (237-240): W, f. 24rb; X, f. 107va; Y, f. 78rb; Z, f. 124r
 286-289 (260-263): W, f. 24ra-rb; X, f. 107va; Y, f. 78ra; Z, f. 124r
 331-343 (298-309): W, f. 18ra; X, f. 119va-vb; Y, f. 83vb; Z, f. 128v
 343-354 (309-318): W, f. 24ra; X, f. 107ra-rb; Y, f. 78ra-rb; Z, f. 124r
 414-421 (373-378): W, f. 24rb; X, f. 107vb; Y, f. 78rb-va; Z, f. 124r
 XXX, 109-118 (101-109): W, f. 24ra-b; X, f. 107va; Y, f. 78rb; Z, f. 124r
 230-245 (216-231): W, f. 29va
 315-324 (294-302): W, f. 20rb-va; X, f. 124ra-rb; Y, f. 85va; Z, f. 130r-v
 328-335 (306-312): W, f. 20va; X, f. 124rb-va; Y, f. 85vb; Z, f. 130v

- XXXI, 40-50 (41-51): W, ff. 25vb-26ra; X, f. 112rb-va; Y, f. 80rb; Z, ff. 125v-126r
 52-60 (53-60): W, f. 24va; X, f. 108rb; Y, f. 78va-vb; Z, f. 124r-v
 80-86 (80-86): W, f. 24va, 26ra; X, f. 108va, 112vb; Y, f. 78vb, 80va; Z, f. 124v, 126r
 100-109 (97-104): W, f. 26ra; X, ff. 112vb-113ra; Y, f. 80va; Z, f. 126r
 186-204 (174-188): W, f. 24vb; X, f. 109ra-rb; Y, f. 79ra; Z, f. 124v
 540-543 (486-488): W, f. 14vb; X, f. 99rb; Y, ff. 74vb-75ra; Z, f. 121r
 571-580 (514-522): W, f. 14vb; X, f. 99va; Y, f. 75ra; Z, f. 121v
 XXXII, 152-163 (141-150): W, f. 23ra; X, f. 131va-vb; Y, f. 88va-vb; Z, f. 133r
 166-170 (153-157): W, f. 23ra; X, f. 131vb; Y, f. 88vb; Z, f. 133r
 312-327 (287-299): W, f. 22vb; X, f. 131rb-va; Y, f. 88va; Z, ff. 132v-133r
 XXXIII, 139-148 (134-142): W, f. 14vb; X, f. 99va; Y, f. 75ra; Z, f. 121v
 164-168 (156-159): W, f. 14vb; X, f. 99vb; Y, f. 75ra; Z, f. 121v
 232-237 (219-224): W, f. 20va; X, f. 124va; Y, f. 85vb; Z, f. 130v
 238-243 (225-230): W, f. 20va; X, f. 124va-vb; Y, f. 85vb; Z, f. 130v
 263-273 (245-253): W, f. 20va; X, ff. 124vb-125ra; Y, ff. 85vb-86ra; Z, f. 130v
 280-291 (260-270): W, f. 20va-vb; X, f. 125ra-rb; Y, f. 86ra; Z, f. 130v
 XXXIV, 21-28 (20-26): W, f. 15ra; X, f. 100rb-va; Y, f. 75rb-va; Z, f. 121v
 30-42 (28-38): W, f. 15ra-rb; X, f. 100va-vb; Y, f. 75va; Z, f. 121v
 65-73 (58-65): W, f. 15rb; X, f. 100vb; Y, f. 75va; Z, f. 121v
 75-78 (67-68): W, f. 15rb; X, ff. 100vb-101ra; Y, f. 75va; Z, f. 121v

- 84-87 (73-76): W, f. 15rb; X, f. 101ra; Y, f. 75va-vb; Z, f. 121v
 119-131 (105-116): W, f. 15rb; X, f. 101ra-rb; Y, f. 75vb; Z, f. 122r
 132-140 (117-123): W, f. 15ra; X, f. 100ra; Y, f. 75rb; Z, f. 121v
 145-147 (128-130): 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).*

The list of the quotations from *Contra Damianum* III, 20-34 has been given already in vol. II, p. XXVI-XXVII. The equivalent places in volume III are as follows:

- XXII, 2-31 (2-29): Y, f. 155rb-va
 44-86 (41-75): Y, f. 155va-vb
 113-158 (99-142): Y, ff. 155vb-156rb
 276-299 (248-268): Y, f. 156rb-va
 XXIII, 135-181 (128-171): Y, f. 156va-vb
 391-416 (361-382): Y, ff. 156vb-157ra
 426-439 (391-404): Y, f. 157ra-rb
 XXIV, 218-300 (197-270): Y, ff. 157rb-158ra
 XXV, 14-27 (14-26): Y, f. 158ra
 245-254 (218-227): Y, f. 158ra
 XXVI, 333-350 (317-334): Y, f. 158ra-rb
 XXVII, 49-55 (47-53): Y, f. 158rb
 89-92 (83-85): Y, f. 158rb
 182-186 (168-173): Y, f. 158rb-va
 XXIX, 207-212 (177-182): Y, f. 158va
 XXX, 82-92 (76-85): Y, f. 158va
 199-206 (184-192): Y, f. 158va-vb
 230-245 (216-231): Y, f. 158vb
 XXXI, 134-145 (125-136): Y, f. 158vb
 374-391 (335-352): Y, ff. 158vb-159ra
 XXXII, 80-84 (74-78): Y, f. 159ra
 124-130 (114-120): Y, f. 159ra-rb
 XXXIII, 20-46 (22-47): Y, f. 159rb-va
 54-63 (54-62): Y, f. 159va
 105-110 (101-105): Y, f. 159va

- XXXIV, 65-73 (58-65): Y, f. 159va
 251-271 (226-244): Y, f. 159va-vb

Acknowledgements

Once more we declare a debt of gratitude to Professor J. Noret for his invaluable collaboration. He re-read the translation offering a number of corrections, and we owe to him the preparation of the final versions of the critical apparatus and appendices.

ANALYSIS OF BOOK III, CHAPTERS 20-34

Chapters I-XVIII had examined the answer given by Damian in his *Many-lined Letter* to Peter's strictures on Damian's treatise *Against the Tritheists* and in chapter XIX Peter moved on to an examination of Damian's criticism, in his *Festal letters*, of the *Syndocticon* composed by Peter's bishops when about to encounter the Alexandrine patriarch in Arabia (see vol. I, p. XX). This examination continues until the end of chapter XXX (see XXXI, 18-20). The quotations from the *Syndocticon* and the *Festals* will be printed in small type. In chapters XXXI-XXXIV Damian's notion of the hypostase will be discussed (cf. XXXI, 33-39).

Chapter XX

Peter quotes again Damian's criticism, made in the later *Festal Letter*, of the Eastern bishops' use of a passage from Gregory of Nyssa's *Against Eunomius III*, 1:

'In that document (= the *Syndocticon*) they produced a proof-text from Gregory ... that the begotten and birth are not the same' (see chapter XIX, 146-166).

Contrary to what Damian writes, the important and clear idea expressed by Gregory in the passage is that what is begotten is not the same as generacy (14-84).

Perhaps Damian will object that Gregory said, not that generacy is different from what is begotten, but only that John 16, 21 proves that *birth* is different from *man*. However a second text from Gregory (perhaps also quoted by Peter and his bishops) makes explicit the conclusion that what is begotten is different from being begotten (generacy), by distinguishing, in Eunomius' formula 'the begotten substance', the fact of being begotten and the begotten substrate or subject (85-104).

Damian had argued in a subsequent passage of his *Festal Letter* that the text from Gregory proves that, for Gregory, Eunomius' formula 'the begotten substance' implies a distinction in meaning between 'substance' and 'generacy' (or 'generation') equivalent to the distinction between the (common) substance and hypostasis:

'The doctor, after entrapping the mischief-monger here, added the Gospel illustration, proving that although according to his' (i.e. Eunomius') 'argument, as its conclusion has now appeared, the meaning of "substance" is one thing and that of "generacy" i.e. of "hypostasis", is another' (104-114).

Peter adduces another text from the same portion of *Against Eunomius* where Eunomius asserts that the name of the begotten substance is 'Son'. Clearly, then, Gregory understands 'begotten substance' in the passage under discussion to mean 'derived hypostasis' i.e. derived substrate or subject (114-127). If 'substance' is interpreted according to Damian, 'begotten substance' would imply that the whole divine substance, i.e. the Holy Trinity, derives from another and that it constitutes a single hypostasis (127-133). If Damian admits that this substrate is the Son, as Gregory says, generacy cannot be the hypostasis of the Son, since Gregory clearly distinguishes between the substrate and its mode of being by generation. Damian is at odds not so much with Peter and his bishops as with the fathers (134-145).

Peter passes on to the next lines in Damian's *Festal Letter*:

'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 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...' (146-175).

'Back to carnalities with the carnal', writes Damian. But, Peter retorts, it was not he but Gregory who introduced the example of human birth to illustrate a point about divine generation (176-210). But had Peter done so, he would scarcely have been at fault, since the fathers regularly introduce corporeal analogies as aids to comprehension of things divine. Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* 37, 4) and Severus (*Against the Grammarian* II, 17; *42nd Cathedral Homily*) are cited as doing so (211-245). And Damian himself, in his *Against the Tritheists* chapter 14, had written: 'These things, then, will not be predicated of the substrate, of that which is called the "nature" in the full sense of the term. The Arians meant this

and lapsed into their unsound view. For, as the same Theologian said, "all the predicates of something are not simply predicates of its substrate"; e.g. someone examining the notion of an inseparable accident would give as an example the fact that the black in an Ethiopian and the white in a Scythian cannot exchange names, since they cannot also exchange the very thing they are (viz. their natures) so that black should become white and white black; as the Bible somewhere bears witness: *Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?*... Pardon the example of an accident which has been taken for illustration *a fortiori*. For if we have been able to term the accidents "natures" in this way, when wanting to indicate what they are, *a fortiori* if someone uses the term "nature" of the hypostases, he is not debarred from completely negating talk of natures in the plural in respect of co-naturals, since they are not natures in the full sense. Why should I say "in the full sense"? They do not, indeed, have any indication of a nature at all, according to the distinction we are drawing between "nature" and "hypostasis" (245-266). Moreover, Damian has no cause to criticize Gregory's use of an unseemly illustration if he himself identifies even human offspring and generation; if he does not, let him acknowledge the truth the father was illustrating (266-286).

Chapter XXI

In his *Festal Letter*, as quoted in the previous chapter, Damian accused Peter and his followers of 'limping on their two hams' i.e. simultaneously maintaining contradictory views. Elijah's words, Peter answers, apply more exactly to Damian himself and his party with their pious-sounding but fraudulent propaganda, for they maintain that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are individually [καθ'ἑαυτοῦς] subsisting hypostases *and* that they are the characteristic properties ingeneracy, generacy and procession, which, as the fathers teach, do not subsist properly and individually; that each divine hypostasis is God in the full sense and naturally [κυρίως καὶ φυσικῶς] *and* that it is God by participation in the Godhead; that hypostases and substance of the Godhead are different things *and* that the three hypostases *are* the Godhead. The opinions are mutually contradictory. No patristic theologian ever taught that the characteristic properties subsist; that each di-

vine hypostasis is 'God' only by participation in the Godhead; or that hypostases and Godhead are different things (14-72).

Damian had accused Peter of belittling the divine generation, because he denies it to be a hypostasis. But, in fact, it is Damian by refusing to consider the Son an individually subsisting reality i.e. a hypostasis, who makes 'generation' a word without content: for without a begotten there can exist no begottenness or generation. Damian pretends to honour the divine generation (or generacy) but in fact negates the Son's hypostasis, in the same way as Sabellius and Arius, advocating monotheism [τὴν μοναρχίαν τῆς θεότητος], negated, in contrary ways, the Godhead (73-128). Damian destroys the whole Trinity by denying Father, Son and Holy Ghost any individual subsistence (129-136). And why make the properties of the hypostases hypostases but not the properties of the substance substances (137-153)?

Leaving this passage of Damian's *Festal Letter*, Peter passes on to the arguments adduced in the following lines of the quotation:

'Why, then, you people, do you maltreat those properties which you say are homonyms of the perfect properties, by calling them non-subsisting marks and defining them as different from the hypostases, whereas you favour those you call 'hypostases', understanding them to be substances (though you endeavour to conceal the fact!) and dupe the simple by imagining that the fatherhood or ingeneracy of God the Father, the sonship or generacy of the Only-begotten Son of God, and the procession or sanctity of the divine and life-giving Spirit are appellations bereft of realities?' (154-163)

Peter is astonished that intelligent people in Alexandria could find this rubbish plausible (163-200). Nevertheless he will answer Damian's cavils as Gregory of Nyssa, similarly placed, advised in a passage in chapter 30 of his first book *Against Eunomius*, which Peter quotes (201-227).

The first objection alleged by Damian in his second *Festal Letter* is that Peter and his bishops in their *Syndocticon* made the characteristic properties of the hypostases merely 'homonyms of the perfect properties' and consequently imperfect properties, and that they called them non-subsistent marks. This same objection had been made in Damian's first *Festal Letter*, a lengthy extract from which Peter now quotes:

'But these statements are at once untrustworthy and slanderous, and not only do they divide it' [sc. 'the faith'] 'in the hypostases or prop-

erties' [sc. by profession of faith in Father, Son and Holy Ghost], 'they also stand convicted of making a division in the substance. Scheming to fortify our faith with variegated sophisms, they, of necessity, admit its separation by natures and substances, teaching the severance of the Godhead: which is the endeavour, even now, of the inventors of novel doctrines, as one can find in that *Entolicon* or *Syndocticon* (for I do not know what to call it, its patch-work character and dubiety about the faith on the part of those who set it down have rendered doubtful even the pamphlet's name) which was set down and reached us. Passing much of it over with closed eyes (because it would require a book, or refutation, too long for the present time, since we are not aiming at a book now) I will quote one statement by the present-day theologians, or rather, proponents of novelties, out of the few ones belonging to the little work, a statement which can show in an obscure way their plain opposition here too to the God-clad fathers. The text is as follows: "Not supposing that the characteristic properties (we mean fatherhood, sonship and procession and the like) are hypostases or conversely, again, thinking foolishly of the 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties' as characteristic properties of the prosopa". Oh, the outlandish and irrational teachings! Hear, you deaf! See, you blind, what the doctors of impiety teach! They say the fatherhood of God the Father, the sonship of the Only-begotten Son of God and the procession of the Holy Ghost are imperfect and non-subsisting. For if the properties are other than "spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting", they must obviously be imperfect, non-subsisting and non-spiritual. For the diametrical opposite of the spiritual is what is not thus, of the perfect the imperfect, of the subsisting the non-subsisting. But if this is how they are, how could the subsisting be characterized by what, according to their argument, do not subsist, the perfect by the imperfect and the spiritual by what is not thus? But Gregory, formerly holy bishop of Nyssa, plainly proves it impious to suppose God consists of perfect and imperfect. Meaning to rebut the stupidity of polytheism, he wrote as follows in his *Catechetical Oration...*' (227-264).

[The proof-text from Gregory of Nyssa is given *infra*, chapter XXII, 158-169].

Peter first observes that Damian had quoted the passage from the *Syndocticon* out of context, and transcribes it with the immediately preceding sentences:

'We said this, not as unaware that in various passages the God-clad fathers indicated the hypostases by the term "properties". Yet we do not deny a difference of meanings, on account of the homonymity of the term, by taking "properties" solely as "hypostases" or alternatively as solely modes of the hypostases in every case. No, explaining the realities by reference to the ideas expressed we thus keep hold of the truth, not supposing that the characteristic properties of the prosopa [sic!] (we mean fatherhood, sonship and procession and the like) are hypostases or conversely, again, thinking foolishly of the "spiritual, perfect and indi-

vidually subsisting properties" as characteristic properties of the hypostases [sic!] (265-301).

Borrowing some lines from Severus when writing against the Grammarian, Peter first complains bitterly of the misrepresentation of his argument. According to Damian, the Oriental bishops had suggested that the characteristic properties of fatherhood, sonship and procession were imperfect, non-subsisting and non-spiritual and hence incapable of characterizing anything. He is able to make the outrageous suggestion because he ignores 'individually' and treats 'not individually subsisting' as equivalent to 'not subsisting i.e. not existing' (302-348).

Chapter XXII

Continuing his answer, Peter responds in detail to Damian's argument that 'if the properties' (fatherhood, sonship and procession) 'are other than "spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting", they must obviously be imperfect, non-subsisting and non-spiritual'. This, he says, is the kind of arbitrary dogmatizing already condemned by Basil in *Eunomius* (23-36). Why must the characteristic properties be imperfect, non-subsisting and non-spiritual because they differ from the individually subsisting properties (hypostases)? If that were so, we should have to say (to illustrate from the created order), that because an incorporeal, immortal, rational and spiritual angel is different from a soul, a soul must be corporeal, mortal, irrational and non-spiritual: difference does not entail difference in all respects (36-75). If we take the highest example (from Godhead itself), we see, as Cyril has taught in his *Thesaurus* and Severus in his *Letter to Maron the Reader*, that Father, Son and Holy Ghost have all things in common but are different each in this unique respect. Hence, characteristic properties may share some aspects of hypostases yet differ from them (76-112).

Damian has urged that imperfect, non-subsisting and non-spiritual characteristic properties could not characterize the perfect, the subsisting and the spiritual. Peter responds that ingeneracy, generacy and procession characterize only by indicating the difference in the hypostases' mode of being; they do not indicate the perfection of the Godhead or the individual subsistence and spirituality of the three hypostases, and, in order to characterize at

all, must be other than the hypostases and the common divine substance (113-143)

Damian has adduced (158-169) Gregory of Nyssa's *Catechetical Oration* in support: God may not be thought to consist of perfect and imperfect. The principle, Peter rejoins, is universally agreed (Gregory had stated it as a plain truth accepted by pagans) and it is absurd (as Basil has explained in his *Against Eunomius*) to put it forward as if it were in doubt (144-209).

After quoting Gregory's words, Damian had continued in his first *Festal Letter*:

'After hearing those divinely inspired words of the father they should tell us how, in thinking of something imperfect in the holy and consubstantial Trinity, they cannot be outdoing all impiety. But if they say (to avoid rebuttal from that earlier teaching), "we ourselves too do not call the characteristic properties imperfect", they therefore acknowledge necessarily that they are perfect or that they are only empty terms bereft of realities. If, therefore, they call them perfect, and between perfect things there is no difference *qua* perfection they must concede that the characteristic properties also are "spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties"' (210-221).

Peter draws upon some ironical words of Severus to pour scorn on this claim (222-235). If, he answers, the characteristic properties and the hypostases are identical because they are perfect, by parity of argument all created things, because they are perfect in their principle, must be mutually identical, and likewise the three perfect divine hypostases each of which on its own must be the perfect comprehensive substance of the Godhead (236-274).

Chapter XXIII

Peter takes up the passage of the *Festal Letter* he has already quoted in chapter XXI, 155-163: 'Why then, you people, ... are appellations bereft of realities?' (18-28)

It is quite clear, says Peter, that 'property' is used by the fathers in different senses. In *Against the Arians*, in *On the Lights*, and in *On himself after returning from the desert*, the Theologian uses the term to mean 'hypostasis'; in the *First Oration on the Son* and in the *First Oration on Theology* he means 'characteristic property of the hypostasis' (29-112). If Damian jibs at the idea of homonyms, let him remember that he himself spoke of homonymity in his *Many-lined Letter*: 'So, just as in the case of the Holy Trinity

the Godhead is not different from, but the same as, the substance and yet, to make clear that they are not using the word to refer to another substance, the holy fathers frequently say, "the substance of the Godhead", so, to deliver the tradition that "property" and "hypostasis" are the same, they used the periphrasis "the properties of the prosopa" and "of the hypostases" in order that the hearer's mind should not be misdirected towards the properties of the nature or substance as a result of the homonymity' (113-122). Thus Damian accepts a difference in sense between 'properties of' when applied to 'the substance' and when applied to 'the hypostases', as does Peter between '(the properties) ingeneracy, generacy and procession' and 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties' (123-132). Talk of the hypostases as 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties' does not imply that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are imperfect: they are perfect not *qua* hypostases but in their own principle as characterizing and differentiating between the hypostases (133-141). If to characterize is *ipso facto* to be imperfect, the characteristic properties of the divine substance, in order to be perfect, would have to be the divine substance or substances (141-154). No, the perfection of any entity is its abiding in its own principle: as each divine hypostasis is perfect without being the Holy Trinity, so the characteristic properties of the hypostases and of the substance are perfect without being the hypostases or the substance (155-181).

Peter now moves on to the accusation that he makes the characteristic properties empty terms, and quotes in addition a passage from the first *Festal Letter*:

'But if they should say that the characteristic properties of the Holy and consubstantial Trinity are, as has been previously stated, nothing but empty terms and relationships bereft of realities, Saint Cyril, arbiter of correct doctrines, will rebut them in their blasphemy, writing, as he does, in the first book of the *Thesaurus*, as follows' (182-190).

Damian's aim, says Peter, is like the Grammarian's: a Nestorian himself, he accused Severus of Nestorianism. The initial charge against Damian had been that he made the hypostases of the Trinity empty terms; now he makes that very charge against Peter. He wrote in his *Apology on behalf of the First Apology* delivered by Zachariah: 'But since your excellency said that certain earnest brethren under your direction were in doubt with regard to certain words by my humble self, and again suppose, even

after the defence on these points made by my humble self, that we reckon the hypostases or properties of the Holy Trinity to be mere utterances, let us bring forward, with the Spirit's guidance, a few words on this point too now' (191-237). This is not worth refuting, says Peter, since Damian can produce no evidence at all that Peter has ever taught or implied this error: it is all Damian's arbitrary assertion, worthless as dreams - as Gregory of Nyssa said in his *Refutation of Eunomius* (238-325).

Damian, according to Peter, apparently imputes the error because Peter refuses to allow that the characteristic properties are hypostases. But can Damian not see that the mode of being of a hypostasis is not a hypostasis any more than the mode of being of a substance is a substance? Just as immortality, immutability, invisibility etc. are not God's substance but belong with it, so ingeneracy, generacy and procession are not the hypostases but belong with them. If the characteristic properties of the hypostases were empty terms unless they were understood to be hypostases, so would be those of the substance unless they were substance (326-366). Contrariwise: if hypostases subsist properly and individually, and the characteristic properties which do not so subsist were to be hypostases, such 'hypostases' would be null and void; and Cyril clearly teaches in *To Hermias* that 'generacy' and 'ingeneracy' are not individually subsistent but indicative only of mode of being (366-390). They are not, though, mere words: that they do not subsist properly does not mean that they are unreal (391-407).

Chapter XXIV

Peter quotes the lines which follow directly in Damian's second *Festal Letter* upon the passage 'Why, then, you people ... bereft of realities' given first in chapter XX, 167-175:

'For if a hypostasis is not a property, or indicative mark, of each one (in accordance with Basil the Great) what, then, is it? Must it not be a proper Godhead, in accordance with the polytheists around you? Why are you ashamed to preach your opinion clearly? How long will you, being (as the Scripture has it) sensual and unspiritual, despoil simpler folk by persuasive arguments? You blather emptily. What hypocrisy have you overlooked, you despoilers of souls?' (14-23).

He responds that Basil certainly does not consider a hypostasis to be a characteristic property of a hypostasis (24-37). Damian

sometimes defines a hypostasis as an indicative mark or single property, sometimes — where different properties are ascribed to one hypostasis — as a collection of properties. How can a collection of properties be one property i.e. hypostasis? (37-54). Damian's dilemma, 'either a property or a proper Godhead', is as absurd as saying 'if a man is not a horse he must be an angel'. The reference to Basil is fraudulent: neither he, nor any other father thought that a hypostasis could be a characteristic property, nor can it be proved from human reasonings. What nobody ever supposed is not worth rebutting, as Gregory observed in his *Refutation of Eunomius* (55-109).

Damian writes again in his second *Festal Letter*:

'For tell us, you clever fellows, for we ask the same question again, what do you say the generacy of the Only-begotten is? An activity [ἐνέργεια]? But an activity is non-subsistent, whereas to call the generacy of the Only-begotten which proceeds from the Father non-subsistent is akin to blasphemy. For who is so godless as by mental invention to make what does not exist prior to God? A subsistent, but a different one, according to your definition, from the Son? The Son then will either be third from the Father (generacy subsisting first) or, if that is not so, he will be found composed of generacy and his proper hypostasis. Or will you speak of the Son of God as "belonging to the will" and as "the Son of the will"? What illustration do these ample demonstrations of your blasphemy require?' (110-121).

Damian, it is answered, is scarcely consistent. He has demanded that God's birth be honoured by silence, but now proceeds to explore the generacy, or generation [γέννησις] of the Son (122-132). He has propounded the choices open, he alleges, to Peter, if Peter objects to his view: an activity — impossible, because an activity does not subsist, i.e. is not a hypostasis, and moreover the blasphemous notion of an unreality causing the Son's generation is implied; a subsistent entity, distinct from the Son — impossible because it yields a series of entities, Father-generation-Son; hence generacy must be the Son. Peter's response is to pronounce irrelevant the first choice: nobody thinks *that*. Damian must prove that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases (133-176). The second choice arises only on Damian's terminology, which equates 'subsisting' with 'individually subsisting' [καθ'ἑαυτούς] and 'non-subsisting' with 'non-existing' (177-216). As often, Peter rebuts Damian's conclusion by asking if, in parity of argument, the properties of the substance subsist indi-

vidually. Cyril shows in his *Thesaurus* that this would make God a manifold of hypostases (or substances). Gregory of Nyssa is adduced as saying in his *Against Eunomius* that it is absurd to equate non-subsisting with (plain) non-existing. The dilemma, then for Damian with his terminology is: *either* a manifold of hypostatic properties in the divine substance *or* nullity of all the divine properties (217-265). Peter ends with an ironic rephrasing of Damian's proposed choices in terms of the divine substance and its properties (266-292).

Chapter XXV

Damian might try to justify his interpretation of 'subsisting', as meaning '(simply) existing', in the case of the divine properties, from the example of Severus (whose *Cathedral Homily 123* was quoted by Damian and will be considered by Peter below). Peter counters by recalling the texts of Cyril, used earlier, affirming that generacy and ingeneracy do not exist on their own (9-31). Generacy, therefore, is not a hypostasis, but the mode of a hypostasis; Damian's tangle of choices is unravelled. If the characteristic properties of the divine substance do not make it composite, neither does the Son's generacy make him composite (31-45).

The second *Festal Letter* is quoted:

'Can they argue again? Will they be in doubt about the doctor? I should think not, but, nevertheless, let them accept another testimony by famous Severus, loyal to his fathers and their wise hearer, who proclaimed in his 123rd *Cathedral Sermon*: "For if he *was in the beginning as He who is with Him who is* and as God with God, how can we understand God's generation which exists perpetually, as not being true, subsistent and eternal and from the very substance of the begetter, but compare it with rain and dew?" Will you not acknowledge that the generacy of the Only-begotten exists in its own hypostasis, true, eternal and subsistent? But perhaps this will still be difficult for you. For once you had planned to proceed in the opposite direction and unsparingly to pour out blasphemies against the Holy and consubstantial Trinity, *seeing you will not see and hearing you will not hear*, as Scripture has it' (46-59).

Peter puts the *testimonium* into its full context (60-112) and comments: Severus used 'subsistent' of the Son's generation or generacy, but also explained that terms have to be understood in correspondence with the underlying realities — a principle set out in various passages in *Against the Grammarian* (113-138). Like

other heretics, Damian wrongly exploits the ambiguity of a term. 'Subsistent', for Severus, meant 'always in existence', not 'individually subsisting' (139-173). Such abusers of words, according to the Theologian, in his *Second Oration on Theology*, deserve stoning (174-196).

'Will you not acknowledge that the generacy of the Only-begotten exists in its own hypostasis, true, eternal and subsistent?', Damian has written. Leaving aside 'in its own hypostasis', for the moment (in fact, till chapter XXIX below), Peter examines Severus' predication 'true, eternal and subsistent' of the Son's generacy or generation. Does it imply a hypostasis? (197-249). 'True' does not have that implication: the properties of the divine substance are not hypostases because they are 'true' (250-266). So too, with 'subsistent' and 'eternal' (267-282). In any case, as Damian has himself advised in his *Against the Tritheists*, interpretation of the fathers ought to be based on clear affirmations not rare and obscure phrases: 'We ought, then, to examine the thoughts of the fathers and willingly harmonize the words with them and not by, as it were, making them prisoners of war and mutilating them in combat, enslave them to our will. Not to prolong the discussion unduly by always examining the texts thus referred to, we give the general advice to readers that here especially they should be directed by the Spirit's guidance, pursue the intention of true religion and explain by undisputed and clear statements those spoken in enigma and in a different style, without tearing the words out of context and changing them to an unsound meaning' (283-310). As for 'hypostasis', as Severus explains in *Against the Grammarian* book two chapter 1, each has its peculiar appellation designating the particular subject (311-356). If Damian objects that hypostases are collections of properties (cf. chapter XVII above), then the single property 'generacy' cannot be a hypostasis. Moreover, such a definition would equate them with 'accidents'; and how could collections of properties establish inclusion and differentiation of the particular in the genus as Severus says? (357-377).

Two passages are quoted from Severus *Against the Grammarian* book two (378-420). They declare that the divine hypostases are not distinguished by their eternity but only by their mode of being; that the Son exists from the Father by generation and the Holy Ghost by procession; and that each hypostasis is known by

its property. It is absurd to suggest that the modes of being and of being known could be hypostases, as if the Son could exist from the Father by the Son, or the Father be known as Father by the Father (421-463). Severus had also said that the Son has generation as his 'indication' and that the Holy Ghost has procession which 'shows' his hypostasis and that each hypostasis has its own innate property. On Damian's interpretation of hypostasis, such statements are senseless (463-488).

After invoking Severus in his second *Festal Letter*, Damian went on to speak of Gregory of Nyssa: 'Against whom did the father have his battle and why did he arrive at this examination? Was he explaining his own view when he subjected the divine nature to corporeal suffering? How could that be? Or was he controverting the opponents' argument? The answer, indeed, is evident to everybody, even the unwilling. It would be as well, all the same, to show you nurslings of the Church briefly, since time hastens on, why the father arrived at this examination, in order that you, when you read soul-destroying and lethal doctrines, may disregard them and be of the untainted. When, therefore, Eunomius was adducing a difference of substances by the distinction between ingeneracy and generacy, the saint, having previously set down the Anomean's argument, joins issue with him and restraining him with a bridle, as it were, confutes the impious fellow by his own words' (489-503).

Peter ripostes that Damian ducks the tasks of proving that Gregory of Nyssa identified 'offspring' and 'generacy' and of explaining what was at issue between Gregory and Eunomius (504-565).

Chapter XXVI

Peter undertakes to give the explanation Damian had avoided. Eunomius had attempted to prove that the Son is different in substance from the Father. Sometimes he spoke of two substances or hypostases, one unbegotten, the other begotten; sometimes he equated the Father's substance or hypostasis with ingeneracy, the Son's with generacy. Gregory had to prove that generacy and ingeneracy are not substances or hypostases, but are viewed in the hypostases (10-27). He therefore used (27-46) the illustration of human birth (quoted by the Eastern bishops in their *Syndecticon*, repeated by Damian in his second *Festal Letter* - see chapter XIX,

150-163 - and commented upon extensively by Peter previously in chapters XX-XXI).

It is clear, Peter says, from this passage that Eunomius identified 'begotten substance' and 'generacy' whereas Gregory distinguished them (47-65), and Peter adduces also another passage from *Against Eunomius* (66-80) to reinforce the point. Damian sidestepped the issue by talking of divine passibility (81-105). His second *Festal Letter* then went on:

'The doctor, after entrapping the mischief-monger here, introduced the Gospel illustration, proving that although according to his argument, as its conclusion has now shown, the meaning of "substance" is one thing and that of "generacy" i.e. of "hypostasis", is another, nevertheless begetter and begotten must be of one substance: the very thing which Eunomius nowhere wanted to concede' (106-112).

As usual with heretics, says Peter quoting Cyril's *On John's Gospel*, Damian employs unclear language (113-130): the 'his' (in 'according to his argument') is ambiguous but apparently refers to Eunomius, who is thus made to teach the correct doctrine (131-144). Moreover Damian has identified 'generacy' and 'hypostasis', whereas Gregory explicitly distinguished 'generation' and 'birth' from the generated or born (145-197). Peter follows this with a lengthy exposé of the point at issue between Eunomius and Gregory (198-342). Damian should acknowledge the truth and apply to himself the strictures he addressed to Peter in his second *Festal Letter*, another passage from which he quotes:

'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*' (342-354).

Chapter XXVII

Peter takes up again the disputed proof-text of Gregory of Nyssa adduced in the Eastern bishops' *Syndocticon* criticized by Damian. Gregory clearly teaches, according to Peter, that just as generation is different from the one generated, so the substance, which in Eunomius' words 'is begotten', is different from its being begotten (15-45): therefore, Gregory concludes, Eunomius' claim of a difference of substance between Father and Son is null and void (46-59).

Damian in his second *Festal Letter* noted that the bishops in quoting Gregory had abbreviated the proof-text in their *Syndocticon*:

'For he' [sc. Gregory] 'says, in between those words quoted by these admirable accusers, some which the agents of sacrilege have disregarded with a pricking conscience: "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 open to them to carry over the ingenerate-generate distinction to the substance of Son and Father and simultaneously transfer the mutual conflict of the names to the realities". These words, which rebut their insanity and free the doctor from their calumny, they have left out' (60-72).

Damian's effrontery in making this cavil is rebuked (72-78). The bishops had omitted the words mentioned, but had quoted those immediately following and conveying the same sense (78-104). Peter then examines the lines left out: they reinforce, he says, Gregory's teaching viz. that generacy (property) and the generated (hypostasis) are not the same (105-189).

Perhaps Damian may claim that Gregory distinguished not 'hypostasis' and 'generacy' but '(common) substance' and 'generacy'; but Gregory clearly meant by the phrase he took over from Eunomius, 'begotten substance', the Son's hypostasis: he does not identify generation and the one who is by generation (190-267). The passage omitted in the *Syndocticon* makes that point, and condemns an identification of hypostasis with property which produces a conflict between the hypostases - a trifling matter for Damian, who makes the hypostases names (268-318).

Peter returns to the second *Festal Letter*:

'These words, which rebut their insanity and free the doctor from their calumny, they have left out. The doctor to explain them to us in a different way, teaches again a little later: "But because the substance of Adam and of Abel is characterized by the same properties, we must necessarily profess that there is one substance in the two but that those viewed in the same nature are different. For Adam and Abel, the two of them, are one in the concept of nature but have a mutual, unconfused distinction in the properties viewed in each of them". You have heard the father. Is not the purpose for which he required the example of generation clear? Will not impure expositors of the fathers even now be ashamed? Indeed, it would have been easy to expand discussion on the point even more extensively. But because it is easy for every enquirer to read with greater diligence the God-clad father's teaching, let everybody learn

precisely from there the probity of the words we taught, and we should be wasting words if we were now to say the same things. But please let us examine "generation" and see the real opinion of the doctor on the divine generation. He says, then, a little after the words we set down previously, as follows: "But because, amongst men, the term 'father' has various conjoined meanings, to which the immortal nature is a stranger, we must leave aside all the material ideas entering in beside the corporeal meaning of 'father' and have the impress of a God-befitting thought which signifies only genuine relationship with God the Father. So, because along with human fatherhood one always conceives not only of all that the flesh gives to be apprehended in the notion of a human father, but also a temporal idea, it would be as well to rid divine generation of the temporal idea as well as of the corporeal taint; so that with the material property being everywhere cleansed away, the transcendent generation may be pure not only of any idea of passion but also of any of temporality". With the God-clad master of mysteries having taught that we ought to "rid the divine generation of any temporal idea", they are to tell us what they think of the generacy of the Only-begotten: is it subsistent or non-subsistent?' (319-359).

Damian, says Peter, had been required to demonstrate that the Son's generacy or generation, is his hypostasis. In what Damian quoted, Gregory did not touch on that question but rebutted Eunomius' claim of difference in substance between Father and Son, and taught that we should not subject the divine generation to passion or time; Basil's words in *Against Eunomius* book one are invoked to censure Damian's brazen effrontery; Gregory's 'Adam and Abel ... are one in the concept of nature but have a mutual, unconfused distinction in the properties viewed in each of them' confirms Peter's account (360-468). Severus in his *119th Cathedral Sermon* and in *Against the Grammarian* book two chapter 7, rebukes the slippery character of people arguing as Damian (469-501). Gregory makes plain how he qualifies appeal to human illustrations in a passage from *Against Eunomius*: he has used these illustrations to make the point that divine generacy characterizes the divine hypostasis (502-537). Damian's rhetorical dilemma, 'Is the divine generation subsistent or non-subsistent?' is a complete non sequitur (538-563).

Chapter XXVIII

There is another passage in the second *Festal Letter* defending the identity of the Son and his generacy which has to be examined, Peter writes. (It probably followed the passage quoted in the

preceding chapter). Damian wrote:

'So if, according to the father's theology, the generacy is non-temporal and is not separable or divisible, how can it not be the same as the Son? But if, as they say, it is other than the Son, whilst being non-temporal and indivisible, yet the Son too is non-temporal, how is the Son not found to be twofold because he shines out like a beam from a light non-temporally, without division or separation? For the divine words say this of the Son too. Therefore we must not lessen the incorporeal nature by a passible generation, but it must be conceived of in accordance with the magnitude of the immortal nature's honour' (14-24).

By parity of argument, Peter retorts, the characteristic properties of the divine substance will have to be identical with the divine substance (for they too are non-temporal, inseparable and indivisible), making the divine substance not merely twofold but ten-thousandfold (25-50). Why did Damian put forward these paltry arguments in his *Festal Letter*, omitting the proof-texts from Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril and Severus cited in the *Syndecticon* after that from Gregory of Nyssa and substituting others (51-76)?

After his examination of that text by Gregory of Nyssa, Damian continued in his *Festal Letter*:

'So he who in his theology destroyed the whole fortress of heresy, shall illuminate dwellers in the darkness of ignorance, teaching, as he does, that generacy is hypostasis in his *First Oration on Theology*. For he says: "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 (for what is to be thought and said overcomes my tongue)". Thus the doctor has clearly taught that generacy is hypostasis; yet not only that, but he testified that these things are so in a full sense too by adding "or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense", conceding, with true religion, the incomprehensibility of the divine generation; for it is clear to everybody that matters concerning God surpass all understanding' (77-89).

Peter merely refers the reader back to what he has said previously (in chapter XV, 375ff.) on the point (90-94) and turns to the passage which was quoted and discussed in the *Syndecticon*, where the Eastern bishops had written:

'But please let us see how by the same gift of the Spirit his peer also, who has illumined all under the Sun by the same beams of theology and is therefore justly named "the Theologian", sets down for us the same things in the same way. For, in investigating at length and explaining very exactly the meanings of "unbegotten" and "begotten" in connection with his great contest against the infamous Arians, he says in the *First*

Oration on the Son, where he went much further in tearing through all their inescapable traps and cunning mischiefs against divine doctrines like spiders' webs, as follows: "Then, why do you declare that ingenerate and generate are not the same thing? If you mean the uncreated and the created, I should be in agreement, for the unbeginning and the created are not the same thing in nature; but if you mean the begetter and the begotten, the statement is invalid, for it is absolutely necessary that they should be the same thing; indeed it is the nature of begetter and offspring that the offspring should be the same thing by nature as its begetter. Or thus again: what do you mean by 'the ingenerate' and 'the generate'? If you mean ingeneracy and generacy — no, these are not the same thing; but if you mean those who have these things, why should they not be the same thing? 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". To what man, who shares even a little in correct ideas, will it not have been evident from the divinely inspired words previously set down, that ingeneracy and generacy belong to Father and Son but are by no means themselves Father and Son? Because, as the master instructed us, the begetter and the begotten are the same but ingeneracy and generacy are not the same thing. Or were these latter too spoken by way of periphrasis? In that case what are spoken by way of periphrasis, according to their argument, will also admit of "same" and "not same". For example, when we hear what they quote in support of periphrasis from Basil: "But we must profess that each prosopon exists in a true hypostasis", we make a clear distinction by saying that the hypostases are the same in nature but the prosopa in them are not the same. For the Theologian too, having acknowledged that those who have ingeneracy and generacy are the same, ruled that ingeneracy and generacy are not the same thing. Indeed they are not so but are very remote from one another. No, it is necessary to inquire, in another way, what we should think those who have ingeneracy and generacy are. However, if we make them substances (as the polytheists see fit to do) it will be an impiety and alien to our faith. But if, again, we make ingeneracy and generacy substances: in addition to the impossibility and absurdity, we shall also be found making the Father and Son, who have them, things not subsisting individually; and we shall be clearly opposing the doctor who plainly said that those who have ingeneracy and generacy are the same but ingeneracy and generacy themselves are not the same thing. It remains for us, then, when we set truth above everything, neither to think polytheistically of those who have ingeneracy and generacy, as substances, nor godlessly as ingeneracy and generacy; but, rather are to pursue a course midway between both errors and to acknowledge the two hypostases of Father and Son as being themselves neither substances (as it pleases those who attempt to establish the foul nonsense of Arianism to suppose) nor ingeneracy and generacy (as is supposed again by the clever people who incline to the opposite evil). Therefore, if from it all it has been clearly proved that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are not hypostases but belong to hypostases, it is obvious that it is certainly now

hazardous to say of the hypostases themselves (after the fathers have wisely said that characteristic properties of the hypostases belong with the substance, exist in the substance and are viewed in the substance) that they belong with the substance, exist and are viewed in it; because the fathers did not use the words in that way, nor do what subsist individually admit of such notions' (95-170).

This, Peter tells us, is the passage from the *Syndecticon* left out of account by Damian in his second *Festal Letter*, where he examined instead the text of Gregory Nazianzen from his *First Oration on Theology* (171-178).

Damian similarly had ducked discussion of a proof-text of Cyril's quoted in the *Syndecticon*, and substituted discussion of another:

'Listen, then, to what sacred Cyril, the scales of orthodox doctrines, says, in the first book of the *Thesaurus* (as it is called): "The Father beget the Son from himself, indivisibly, in the same way as a wise man begets a wise idea in engineering or geometry, say, or some other such thing. For these sorts of thing are thought of as being fruits of wisdom, and thus have their nature; but the craftsmanship is undivided from the wisdom wherefrom it is begotten; is, indeed, from it and in it, bearing the parent's stamp and being thought of as being undividedly something other than it. In the same way too, the Son's generacy, existing inseparably from the Father, is preserved in its own hypostasis, transcending the power of an illustration"' (179-196).

This text, Peter concedes, might allow the thought that generacy or generation is a hypostasis, were it not that Cyril clearly says the opposite elsewhere; indeed in the proof-text used in the *Syndecticon*, where the bishops had written:

'What explanation does this' [sc. the text from Gregory of Nyssa] 'need to prove that the begotten and birth are not the same? None indeed, as it seems to us. Therefore, leaving it in its beauty we shall proceed to the wealth of proven teaching i.e. to Saint Cyril. He proclaims, then, expressly in the second book of his treatise *To Hermias*, as follows: "For you are not remembering that our argument laboured and proved to us, as well as it could, that one perceives things in the category of accidents or counted as simply existing in others, as not existing individually at all but, rather, as existing in others; they may seem to exist and be called individual things but they have as their own the nature of the one to whom they pertain. 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. B. You are right. A. So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something existing in the concept of the hypostasis of God the Father, and as belonging to it but we are not to sup-

pose it the hypostasis itself". Thus, expressly in plain terms this accurate doctor taught that ingeneracy and generacy do not exist individually and hypostatically, and, again, he said that ingeneracy is not a hypostasis but belongs to the hypostasis. As truth is our witness, we cannot conceive how, then, we can fail to be seen as thinking, expressly and intentionally, the opposite of this God-clad father (indeed, to speak truly, of all the masters of mysteries and of the very nature of the realities) if we profess ingeneracy and generacy as hypostases' (197-247).

Unless Damian thinks, says Peter, that everything *unhypostatic* is a hypostasis or that τὸ γεννητὸν and τὸ ἀγεννητὸν in Cyril mean something different from γέννησις and ἀγεννησία, then this text clearly convicts Damian of error uncompromisingly (248-280). Two further passages from the second book of *To Hermias* are quoted and expounded to reinforce Peter's interpretation (281-397).

Chapter XXIX

Peter now broaches the sentence from Cyril quoted by Damian: 'The Son's generacy is preserved in its own hypostasis' (cf. XXVIII, 194-195). He answers first that Damian is guilty of selecting rare and obscure phrases to advance his cause (12-29): a practice denounced by Severus in his *Against Felicissimus* and *Second Letter to Sergius the Grammarian* (30-143).

Damian, Peter says, has wrested the only phrase of Cyril he could find, from its context, where it clearly means that the Son's generation, unlike the transient production of the human mind, is eternally present (144-166), not as an individual but in the hypostasis to whom it pertains: as Cyril said in the text from *To Hermias* already quoted in XXVIII, 235-240 (166-183). Cyril often says that generacy is not a hypostasis, and it would be blasphemous to suppose him guilty of self-contradiction here (183-199). Even were one to grant that Damian's interpretation had some force, the Theologian and Severus agree that 'an isolated statement is not a law of the Church' (199-221). Damian in several passages of his *Against the Tritheists* asserted the same principle: 'Our famous father Theodosius too decreed that these things are so; the same who shone in his contests on behalf of true religion and in whose time this issue was proposed, clearly indicates that we ought not to speak of substances or natures in the Holy Trinity, or Gods or Godheads. Collecting the mind of the

holy fathers from the totality of them and not from rare usages in a different sense but from their widely extensive teaching, he ruled, in general and without qualification, that we are not to speak of substances or natures' (chapter 3); 'We ought, then, first to remember (as we said at the outset) that we should keep in mind that they address their thoughts to certain persons and we are to explain their rare statements by what are frequently written down by them at length, and not, on the contrary, make the rare a criterion for the many; we do not now concede this in regard to the examination set down but gladly advise that we should take in a devout sense little phrases uttered in a certain style, so that impiety should not through them be allowed any place ... But the admirable Athanasius clearly testifies, when he defends Dionysius, that doctrines and words should be judged on the basis of many written statements by the doctors and on the basis of what they ruled in laying-down the faith and not on the basis of their rare condescensions to heretics' (chapter 9); 'So if anyone wants to prove truly that the holy fathers think of substances and natures, let him prove such a thing from a statement of faith and we shall agree, and let him not do it from isolated words in refutation of heresy ... This is why I ask the friend of truth, not to be too readily overwhelmed and disturbed by this sort of quotation, but to be guided by the distinction in teaching I mentioned and investigate the holy fathers' thought' (chapter 10); 'Not to prolong ... to an unsound meaning' (chapter 13 — a passage Peter has already quoted before in book two, XVIII, 270-276 and supra, XXV, 300-306) (222-279). Let then Damian, according to this principles, quote a single text from Cyril which expressly and indubitably calls ingeneracy, generacy or procession a hypostasis and contradicts what he teaches very clearly in other places (280-321).

Chapter XXX

In fact, says Peter, Damian recognizes that Cyril does deny that ingeneracy is a hypostasis, but by 'hypostasis' he claims that Cyril meant (common) material substrate. Damian wrote in his *Letter delivered to Peter in Paralos by Zachariah*: 'But they will say that Saint Cyril said that ingeneracy is not a hypostasis. I too will say "Yes" to that: it is not a hypostasis understood as sub-

stance, or material substrate, which, when a *prosopon* participates in it, is called substance; for the doctor was speaking about this, when he proved at all levels that ingeneracy is not God's substance; which is why, when we want to indicate mode of being (i.e. subsisting ingenerately and subsisting generately) it is impossible for us to find the proper hypostasis understood here in any other way except through its indicative and hypostatic properties, just as we cannot see the commonness of the substance except through the marks characterizing the nature' (13-24). According to Peter, this proves that Damian identifies substance and hypostasis; consequently Damian sometimes makes the Godhead one hypostasis (like Jews and Sabellians), sometimes makes a distinction between substance and hypostases which deprives Father, Son and Holy Ghost of their Godhead (25-40). Damian uses 'hypostasis' not only for 'property' (i.e. in Damian's terminology 'proper hypostasis') but also for the common substance, and thus attempts to enlist Cyril who wrote that ingeneracy is something existing in the hypostasis (40-69). But Damian's terminology will require four hypostases in the Godhead: those of Father, Son and Holy Ghost *plus* the common substance (70-88).

Peter will none the less examine Damian's interpretation of Cyril (89-100). In the texts from Cyril which Peter now repeats, ingeneracy and generacy are always declared not to be hypostases (understood as individual subsistents) but to exist in hypostases; there is no question of the common substance of the hypostases (101-128). Damian by 'hypostasis' understands here 'common substance' because he explains it as the substrate in which the *prosopa* participate (129-173). Cyril denied that generacy and ingeneracy exist individually and hypostatically. If he meant that they *were* hypostases but not the 'hypostasis' which is the common substance, then, either nothing can exist individually and properly in the Trinity; or each hypostasis will be the common 'hypostasis' i.e. the divine substance inclusive of the three hypostases (174-192). Cyril also says that 'ingeneracy exists in the concept of the hypostasis of God the Father'. Damian, if he takes 'hypostasis' to mean here 'common substance', would imply that ingeneracy is the common mark of the three and would reduce the Trinity to a single subsisting hypostasis (193-231).

Damian, Peter says, makes out that Eunomius identified ingeneracy and the common substance, and hence Cyril's 'ingeneracy is

not a hypostasis' is explained as controverting Eunomius on the point. But neither Eunomius nor anybody else held such a view; and Cyril is slanderously alleged by Damian, therefore, to have been engaged in mere eristic (a practice he disclaims in his *Defence against Andreas' Criticism of the 12th Anathema*). Eunomius made ingeneracy the hypostasis or substance (the terms were synonymous for him) of the *Father* and likewise generacy that of the *Son* (232-274). Gregory of Nyssa's *Refutation* is quoted to reinforce the point (275-302), which Damian had acknowledged in the case of the Arians in his *Against the Tritheists* chapter 13: 'But that the Arians were not at war with the fathers only over the difference (as you suppose), but also over the number, of the natures, by their refusing to concede one common substance of the three hypostases; whereas the wise masters of mysteries, in advocacy of the spotless faith and for the avoidance of polytheism, accepted the oneness of the substance: this we have already proved' (303-312). Saying that "ingeneracy is not a hypostasis" Cyril did not mean that ingeneracy is not a common substance, but that it is in no way the Father's hypostasis (313-335). Severus in his *Against the Grammarian* book III chapter 20, interprets Cyril's careful distinction between 'substance' (as the common to all members of the same genus) and 'hypostasis' (the individual member), a term never used by the fathers for the common substance (336-399).

Chapter XXXI

Peter here announces the end of his rebuttal of Damian's *Festals* and a return to the main theme of the controversy. He proposes to demonstrate from the fathers that a hypostasis is neither each characteristic property of the hypostases nor a collection of the characteristic properties, as Damian teaches, but the substrate or subject in which the properties appear (18-39).

In proof of his understanding of 'hypostasis', Peter adduces Basil's *Letter to his brother* and *Letter to the town councillors of Neocaesarea*, Gregory of Nyssa's *Against Eunomius* III, 5, and Severus' *Against the Grammarian* II, 1 and *Letter to Maron* (40-127): texts, according to Peter, all showing that, for the fathers, the collection of a hypostasis' properties is always with a substrate and does not subsist apart from it. For how could a hypostasis be the properties appearing on it? (128-161).

If Damian proposes to interpret Basil's phrase in his *Letter to the town councillors of Neocaesarea*, 'for our mind must rest upon some substrate and have the impress of its clear marks', as meaning by 'substrate' the common substance and by 'its marks' the hypostases, Basil's distinction between the Father and fatherhood will rebut him; as will Severus' 109th *Cathedral Homily*. Severus here explains that by saying 'God' we indicate the whole Trinity and distinguish the persons by name through addition of the property e.g. 'God the Son'; in *Against the Grammarian II*, 18 the same authority also explains that fatherhood, sonship and procession are not empty names but exist in the Godhead in such wise that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are truly God (162-211).

This last proof-text had been used by Damian in his *Letter delivered through Zachariah*, where he had written: 'We recall, indeed, that the wise patriarch too somewhere or other in the work *Against the Grammarian of Caesarea* quoted passages from proven doctors, ruling as follows on such names: "And we must also recognize that fatherhood i.e. ingeneracy, or generacy or procession are not empty names and 'relationships bereft of realities' (as Gregory the Theologian says somewhere) but the fatherhood which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Father, and the sonship or generacy which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Son or offspring, and the procession which exists in the Godhead, so that the Holy Ghost is God proceeding. If, again, you say 'light', or any other common thing you will mean the ingenerate light, the generate light and the proceeding light: three lights in the hypostases. For it is not one light in a triple-named hypostasis which is changed now into being or being thought Father, now into being or being thought Son, and now into being or being thought Holy Ghost, but they are three lights in hypostases. Because of this the light is both recognized and believed to be one light, on account of the participation in substance, the complete likeness and sameness, the one will, the one activity and the one brilliant radiance they communicate which shines forth upon those who are aided and participate in it. For Gregory the Theologian said, in the *Oration on the Holy Ghost*, the following too: 'One commingling of light, as it were in three mutually linking Suns'." Thus do we believe, thus do we think. This is the stay of the orthodox profession of Christians. This is the foundation, and other than it can none be laid. Otherwise, if we suppose the charac-

teristic properties of the hypostases to be "relationships bereft of realities" and mere appellations, we are to say how *He who is* can be characterized by what does not exist. For on this very matter Gregory of Nyssa too criticized Eunomius for such an innovation, in the 18th chapter of his *Refutation of him*' (212-244). Damian, says Peter, had been criticized for eradicating the hypostases. The texts he produces are irrelevant, and actually condemn himself: a point similarly made about Julian by Severus in *Against the Additions* (245-307).

Another passage in this same *Letter* gives, according to Peter, further evidence of Damian's view: 'For if the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is a mere appellation, the name of the hypostasis derived from the fatherhood, I mean "Father", will become a meaningless word [σκινδαψός] like the pagan fables, even though, when we add the property to the common, by connection of the two we call the fatherhood existing in the Godhead God the Father' (308-318). Damian's language, Peter complains (quoting Gregory of Nyssa's remarks on expressions in Eunomius) is exceedingly arcane and muddled: if 'fatherhood' and 'Father', the name derived from it, are identical, why speak of 'the fatherhood' and 'the name of the hypostasis derived from it'? If they are not identical with each other, the Father cannot be fatherhood (318-352); moreover, Damian has arbitrarily asserted but never proved that the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father (353-369).

Two further passages of Damian are adduced by Peter as signs of Damian's arbitrary claims. First from this same *Letter*: 'So we do not discard the fatherhood or ingeneracy from the Godhead making it subsist on its own apart from the substance, and say it is a hypostasis but, as has been said, we profess as God the Father the fatherhood existing in the Godhead'. To which Peter joins a similar passage from the *Letter delivered to Peter through Geron-tius*: 'These and the like will always and necessarily be professed by us, besides the fact that we recognize, in accordance with the wise patriarch, that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated, and that the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father' (370-383).

The whole issue in dispute between Damian and himself, Peter writes, was whether fatherhood or ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases or only the characteristic properties of hy-

postases. It was to defend his view that they are hypostases that Damian sent these two *Letters* or *Apologies* to him at Paralos. Peter responds that he has no objection to the view expressed in the first passage that fatherhood exists in the Godhead but he repudiates the notion, also expressed there, that it is a hypostasis: it is a point to be proved, just as Eunomius had to prove (and could not) that ingeneracy is the divine substance. By professing fatherhood as the Father's hypostasis Damian teaches Eunomius' anomeism (383-431). The second passage appeals to the authority of Severus in *Against the Grammarian* II, 18 quoted by Damian (see lines 219-237 above). Peter examines the proof-text again, in its context, to establish that Severus, rebutting here Sabellian doctrine, teaches that 'fatherhood', 'sonship' and 'procession' represent real relationships. Severus, had he been asserting the identity of hypostasis and characteristic property would have said: '... the fatherhood which exists in the Godhead so that the *fatherhood* should be God the Father' (432-578). The same teaching is given in the *109th Cathedral Sermon* quoted above, where Severus explains that the hypostases are named by the common name 'God' coupled to the proper name of each. By coupling the characteristic property to the hypostasis' proper name (e.g. 'God the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father') the reality of the characteristic property is likewise asserted (579-650).

Chapter XXXII

Damian, according to Peter, makes each divine hypostasis into a substance inclusive of the three hypostases, and ingeneracy, generacy and procession into Father Son and Holy Ghost. A passage from the *Many-lined Letter* is quoted in evidence: 'So when we join the common to the property and say "God the Father", we do not simply indicate only the hypostasis by the terms, but the substantial hypostasis: by saying "God" we make plain the substance and the common; by the denomination "Father" we indicate the hypostasis and the properness of the prosopon, so that the substance will never be unhypostatic, nor will there be found an unsubstantial hypostasis, except when as an invention of our mind the enquiring reason asks what each of them is in its own concept, as has often been proved ... So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not

simply only an indication of a hypostasis. For this is the cause of our opponents' error, because they do not consent, or do not want, to separate hypostasis from substance but confuse their meanings and are thereby themselves confused' (9-33).

Peter proposes to examine the fathers to see if they concur with Damian. If they do not, but on the contrary consider the Father to be his hypostasis only, and not the comprehensive substance, Damian's error will become clearer still (34-67).

Peter, leaving on one side for the moment the question of 'substantial hypostasis', first points to an alleged error: Basil spoke, in his *Letter to Amphilochius* of joining the property to the common when we say 'God the Father'; Damian writes contrariwise of *joining the common to the property*. Indeed, for Damian 'God the Father' indicates both the common participated substance and the participating hypostasis, as he expressly says; consequently Damian must be making the Father both one hypostasis and the comprehensive substance (68-82). Peter's criticism here picks up some earlier reproach of misuse of a proof-text from Severus; to this Damian had responded in his *Many-lined Letter* where he had written: 'Such, then, are the words. But divination would now be required for us to ascertain the faults found in them, so that a defence relevant to the charge could be produced. So, they have made the charge that we belied the patriarch and fabricated things he did not say and palmed them off on him, and that it is not true that the God-clad man said that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated. For such a falsification (or, to speak more aptly, misrepresentation) is reprehensible and deserving of death many times over ... So, we ought here to set down again the patristic text from which I produced the rebuttal of the opposition in the same chapter. For perhaps those who read the book along with you turned their minds to something else and omitted it then in the examination; it is as follows: "Therefore each of the hypostases participates in the substance, but the substance is the participated holding all the hypostases participating in it by equality of honour in a common and generic principle. For each of us participates in the common manhood and the one substance over all, and is one man and one hypostasis. But he will not be called, because he participates in the substance, not a hypostasis but substance. For the former is the participant whereas the latter is the participated"'. In the *Letter to Peter*

delivered by Gerontius Damian had written: 'These and the like are always and necessarily our professions, besides the fact that we recognize, in accordance with the wise patriarch, that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated' (83-109). Peter quotes these letters to reinforce his charge of muddle. The quotations indicate that, for Damian, hypostasis is participant, substance participated; teaching that God the Father is both participant and participated he cannot call the Father's hypostasis 'God the Father', since a hypostasis cannot be simultaneously one participant and the common participated substance (110-120).

Two more passages are now quoted from Damian. First with partial repetition of some lines previously given above in chapter XXXI (313-318) from the *Letter to Peter delivered by Zachariah*: 'What then is anyone doing in the Christian Church, if he falls into such absurdities and supposes the three indicative properties of the three hypostases, properties existing in one and the same Godhead (I mean fatherhood, sonship and procession) to be mere appellations, empty and unsubsisting terms, and "relationships bereft of realities"? For if the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is a mere appellation, the name of the hypostasis derived from the fatherhood, I mean "Father", will become a meaningless word [σκινδαψός] like the pagan fables, even though, when we add the property to the common, by connection of the two we call the fatherhood existing in the Godhead God the Father ... So we do not discard the fatherhood or ingeneracy from the Godhead making it subsist on its own apart from the substance and say it is a hypostasis but, as has been said, we think of the fatherhood existing in the Godhead as God the Father ... So wise Basil, as has often been proved, joined the fatherhood to the common, and, as it were, made it substantial in the Godhead, changing its name to "Father" by the connection, when he said: "Common the Godhead, proper the fatherhood; combining them we say 'I believe in God the Father'". For he named as "God the Father" what he called "fatherhood" when he joined it to the common'. Peter repeats the lines from the *Letter to Peter delivered by Gerontius* given in the previous chapter (379-383), to reinforce the point (121-157). He argues that in these passages Damian contradicts himself: fatherhood or ingeneracy *joined* to the common is (allegedly) God the Father; but the participant hypostasis is *dis-*

tinct from the participated substance (158-252). Moreover, if God the Father is fatherhood (i.e. hypostasis, according to Damian), joined to the substance comprehending the three hypostases, fatherhood will be the whole Trinity (253-281). Damian's argumentation is deliberately murky and muddled (282-315).

Chapter XXXIII

Peter now turns to the expression he had left aside: 'substantial hypostasis', God the Father being, according to Damian, a substantial hypostasis, with the implication for Peter, that God the Father is both hypostasis and substance (12-20).

If God the Father, Peter asks, is one reality, how can he be both hypostasis and the common substance comprehending the three hypostases? Damian justifies 'substantial hypostasis' on the ground that without the qualification 'substantial' real being is not affirmed, and concludes that God the Father is both participant and participated: two realities, Peter argues. But that qualification, Peter says, implies falsely that a hypostasis could be unsubstantial i.e. non-existent (20-34).

Damian may object: he has already said that a hypostasis is always substantial. Peter responds that when this is held to imply 'both participant and participated', the same dilemma is involved: either one reality divided into two or two contracted into one (35-62). Damian has alleged that his opponents' mistake consists in confusing in God the Father his hypostasis and the common divine nature. That error, retorts Peter, is really and precisely Damian's: 'substantial hypostasis' for Damian means abandoning the distinction between hypostasis and substance which Damian affirms, in accordance with Severus' definition, and making the Father's hypostasis the whole Trinity (63-130). Peter repeats and expounds Severus' teaching in *Against the Grammarian* II, 19 and III, 1 that the Holy Trinity is the substance comprehending the hypostases (131-208).

Peter returns to the question whether a hypostasis can be 'unsubstantial', as Damian has implied. Texts from Basil, Athanasius and Cyril are adduced to show that 'unsubstantial' is denial of hypostasis and existence and that each hypostasis of the Trinity is 'substantial' (209-274).

Peter now quotes a section from the *Many-lined Letter* in which Damian says something more about 'substantial hypostasis': 'For

thus, in accord with the doctor, when we devoutly profess one substance and three hypostases (not simply unsubstantial hypostases or substances but substantial hypostases), a sound principle of faith is given. Because, as the patriarch says: "It has been revealed to us by the words and thoughts found in the sacred Scriptures that we are to believe that God exists in one substance and in three hypostases": so that the Trinity is thought of triply in the properties and the unity recognized in the Godhead; and is not separated in a divisible way or joined together in a confused way. For, as great Athanasius said, the Son or Holy Ghost is not unsubstantial, for they are substantial. For if the Father is in the Son and the Spirit in the Son, clearly they are substantial. But neither may we say "three substances", as did Arius, gone mad, when he covertly professed the opinion of Basilides. Let Basil, then, tell us what is substantial. For "substance", he says, "is the material substrate", but "substantial" is the participated in some substance or what exists in a substance: one of which is common, the other proper'. Peter complains that though Athanasius and Basil are quoted, Damian has failed to provide the necessary validating references: a common practice of heretics, as Severus bears witness in the case of Julian. Which words are Damian's and which the fathers', it is impossible to tell. However it is clear that Damian calls the hypostases 'substantial' (275-362). He does the same in other passages of the same *Many-lined Letter*: 'Who, then, taught that properties or hypostases not viewed in the substance (which is the same as saying "unsubstantial") subsist individually? Nobody ... So our statement that the properties are viewed in the substance is to be taken as the holy fathers' profession, meaning nothing else but that the Father is substantial, the Son substantial and the Holy Ghost substantial viz. in one Godhead, substance and nature and not in three according to the polytheists' insanity ... For necessarily, according to this argument, there will either be the fiction of prosopa professed according to Sabellius' argument - indeed more outlandishly than according to his [sc. Peter's] argument, since by putting only the Father in the substance, he made the remaining two prosopa of the Holy Trinity unsubstantial and non-subsistent; otherwise, either he must think of the hypostases as substances (in accordance with the madness of Arius I mentioned) or agree with what we published as the holy fathers' teaching' (363-379).

These passages demonstrate, according to Peter, that if Damian does make the hypostases unsubstantial then he makes them non-existent and will be clearly at odds with the fathers. He is also at odds with himself, saying in one place that the denomination 'Father' indicates 'the hypostasis and the properness of the pro-sopon', but in another place that 'God the Father is both participant and participated, i.e. a substantial hypostasis' (380-404). None the less let us, says Peter, interpret Damian in the more favourable sense viz. that he does concede that the hypostases are substantial (i.e. real). Let him then also concede that being substantial does not imply being both participant and participated, and that God the Father is a participant or single hypostasis (405-415).

Chapter XXXIV

Peter now turns to a critique of the contention that God the Father is both participant and participated (14-18). Basil's *Against Eunomius II*, Cyril's *Exposition of St John's Gospel* chapter 5 and *To Hermias V* and VI, Severus' *Letter to Constantine* and *Against the Grammarian II*, 1 are adduced by Peter: in all these texts 'God the Father' refers only to the Father and not to the common divine substance; he is not both hypostasis and comprehensive substance (19-94). Moreover, if God the Father is both participant and participated, then the whole Godhead or Holy Trinity must have become incarnate, as Severus demonstrated in his *Against the Grammarian II*, 17 and 25, and in his *Letter to Maron* (94-147). The Father, and likewise the Son, is only one hypostasis; and only the hypostasis of the Son became incarnate: this is the unanimous teaching of the fathers (148-181).

Peter quotes, to shame him, Damian's *Against the Tritheists* chapter 16, where he had used a passage by his predecessor as pope of Alexandria, Peter: 'Therefore let the listener remember the accusation, so that, when the text is written down, he may censure the accusers. For he who truly was a rock to the Church, and renewed it when he was ordained to the episcopate, wrote as follows: "For the Father is God the Father in the full sense and not the Son or Spirit; and the Son, God the Word, first-born, unique and eternal, who inexpressibly proceeded from God the Father without flux or passion, and was born of him not subsequently in time but being, with the Father, creator of times, is

neither Father nor Spirit; neither, indeed, is the holy and hypostatic Spirit, who is united to Father and Son substantially and naturally and adored with them, either Father or Son". Later, when commenting upon the passage Damian had written: 'But afterwards those who blather such things read the father's words apparently in a perfunctory way, unable to look at them dispassionately. For see how he has expounded in the text previously set down the God-befitting generation of God the Word from God the Father, by writing as follows: "Who inexpressibly proceeded from God the Father without flux or passion, and was born of him not subsequently in time". So if God the Word, who is professed as "God", proceeded inexpressibly without flux or passion from him who is professed as God the Father, how can he, according to this profession, not be perfect "God from God"?'. Peter quotes yet another passage from chapter 17: 'For just as the generation of the Son from God the Father has surpassed our human condition and is not confined to our ways, so too the mode of our consubstantiality; though it gives a dim indication to the orthodox profession of true religion, nevertheless it is impossible to say how far short the illustration falls from the truth' (182-211).

'The Father is God the Father in the full sense' (Peter of Alexandria's phrase) cannot mean, Peter argues, that God the Father is both participant and participated. Were this true, it would follow that 'God the Word proceeded from God the Father' meant that not only the Son but the whole Trinity was born from the whole Trinity (212-244). Gregory the Theologian, in his *Second Oration on the Son* and his *Oration on Heron the Philosopher*, and indeed, all the fathers condemn such outrageous notions and teach that the Son is 'Only-begotten' or unique, sole Son from sole Father (245-271). Damian cannot use such language, since for him 'God the Son' and 'God the Word' mean both hypostasis and comprehending substance (272-286). Peter repeats the passages in the *Many-lined Letter* where, he says, Damian had taught that Father and Son are both hypostasis and comprehensive substance since they are 'substantial' hypostases, both participants and participated (287-333). He reiterates Severus' rejection of the notion of an incarnation of the whole Trinity and Severus' definition of the substance of the Godhead in the generic sense as the Holy Trinity (334-344).

Damian, Peter concludes, cannot prove from patristic texts that God the Father and God the Word are both participants and

participated. Why, then, does he utter whatever comes into his mouth and contradict himself, by defining each hypostasis of the Holy Trinity sometimes as unsubstantial (i.e. non-existent), sometimes as substantial (i.e. as the whole substance of the Godhead)? (345-366).

SIGLA

- A London, British Library, Add. 7191
- B London, British Library, Add. 14603
- 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. 145). There is only one exception to this rule. In chapter XXXI, lines 92-228, where folio 75 of A is partly torn, the text follows D and the variant readings of A are given in the apparatus.

ܟܝܝܢܐ ܫܢܝܢܐ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ
ܟܠܗܘܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܟܠܗܘܢ

[ܟܠܗܘܢ - ܟܠܗܘܢ]

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 example 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.

These matters being thus proved, we will turn back again to take up the clever arguments of this acute and very educated writer, and consider what he wants to prove by them. For he said (as previously set down): In that document 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

5
 10
 10
 10

15
 20

AB

- Line 8: $\kappa\iota\kappa\iota$, B: $\kappa\iota\iota$.
- Line 9: $\mu\theta\iota$, B: $\mu\theta\iota$.
- Line 11: $\kappa\alpha\epsilon\iota\omega$, B om. $\kappa\epsilon\iota\iota$, B: $\kappa\epsilon\iota\iota$.
- Line 12: $\omega\alpha\iota\psi\iota\iota$, B: $\omega\iota\psi\iota\iota$.
- Line 14: $\kappa\omega\iota\kappa\ \kappa\iota\kappa\iota$, B: $\kappa\omega\iota\kappa\ \kappa\iota\iota$.
- Line 15: $\omega\alpha\iota\psi\iota\iota$, B: $\omega\iota\psi\iota\iota$.
- Line 21: $\omega\alpha\psi\iota\omega\kappa\iota$, A: $\omega\psi\iota\omega\kappa\iota$.

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 and birth are not the same?'

21/28 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (PG 45, 592A; Jaeger II, p. 29, 4-12) 21/22 cf. Ioh. 16:21 28/34 Ibid. (PG 45, 592B; Jaeger II, p. 29, 19-26) 36/37 Petr. Callinic., *Syndocticon*

— ܦܚܐ : ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ —
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 25 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 30 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 35 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ < f. 89rb
 < ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ <
 — ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ —
 — ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ —
 40 — ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ —

AB flor. I from ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ (l. 27) to l. 30

- Line 22: ܦܚܐ, B: ܦܚܐ.
- Line 24: ܘܚܘܪܐ, B: ܘܚܘܪܐ.
- Line 25: ܘܚܘܪܐ, cf. infra, line 83 (ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ).
- Line 26: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, cf. supra, ch. 19, line 159 and infra, lines 69, 147 (ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ).
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, B: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ.
- Line 27: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, B: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ. ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, cf. infra, line 103 (ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ).
- Line 28: ܘܚܘܪܐ, Y: ܘܚܘܪܐ.
- Line 29: ܘܚܘܪܐ, BWXY: ܘܚܘܪܐ. ܘܚܘܪܐ, flor. I: ܘܚܘܪܐ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, as infra, line 72.
- Line 30: ܘܚܘܪܐ, cf. infra, line 228 (ܘܚܘܪܐ). ܘܚܘܪܐ, W: ܘܚܘܪܐ.
- Line 32: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, cf. supra, ch. 19, line 60 (ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ).
- Line 33: ܘܚܘܪܐ, B: ܘܚܘܪܐ.
- Line 34: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, B: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ.
- Line 36: ܘܚܘܪܐ, B: ܘܚܘܪܐ.

Let us observe the start and beginning, so to say, of his clever and profound ideas. Let us marvel at the reverence and honour of the dutiful son towards the fathers. For who, after hearing this and the rest, will not discover that there is much intellectual profundity mixed up in the thought of the speaker of these words, and abundant love and humble gentleness towards the divinely inspired masters of mysteries? For he begins his valiant demonstration by saying: 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 and birth are not the same?' Tell us, admirable fellow, how we do not know what was important. Is it not obviously because we do not think offspring and generacy are the same? What worthy thanks, too, shall we render to God, who guides our affairs with supreme generosity and who, for the refutation and eradication of your novel and absurd blasphemies, has demolished you for blathering blasphemously not against us but against the patristic text itself? For what else, clever fellow, does the doctor struggle to prove through the previous words (or to put it more truly, through his whole contest with that evil devil) but that the begotten is not the same as generacy?

Now is the time for them and for those people who look at minutiae, so to say, to recognize this fact more clearly: first, on the basis of those same words by the wise father previously set down; next, through much other teaching. He says, then, in the foregoing: 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

נְחִיָּוִתָא : נְחִיָּוִתָא דִּכְרִיסְטוֹס דְּאֵלֵּינֵנוּ הָאֵלֵּינֵנוּ
 תְּחִילָתָא דְּחַוְּתָא. הַכִּינֵּה אֶתְּרֵיהֶן כַּמִּינֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן לֵב אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 45 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 50 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 55 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 60 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן

אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 65 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן
 אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן אֶתְּרֵיהֶן. אֶתְּרֵיהֶן

AB

Line 41: אֶתְּרֵיהֶן, B: אֶתְּרֵיהֶן.

Line 46: אֶתְּרֵיהֶן, B: אֶתְּרֵיהֶן.

Line 50: אֶתְּרֵיהֶן, B: אֶתְּרֵיהֶן.

45/47 cf. supra, 34-37 62/69 cf. supra, 21-28

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. What could be clearer or more lucid than this? For confirming the fact from the Gospel itself, he ruled that generation is one thing and the one who comes into existence by generation is another. Look closely and you will not go far from the father's mind, for we shall shout out to you again the very same things as if you were hard of hearing, in case, as Gregory the Theologian said, by persistent speech we may talk into listening ears: So, just as, he says, 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). Tell us what explanation this needs to prove that the begotten and birth are not the same, so that he may whisper again the same thing to you, in case you may open your mind's ear to receive a cure. Do you not feel the divinely inspired father shouting to you in loud proclamation: For a man is not generation but by generation the man exists?

65 < ܠܢ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ :
 70 < ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ :
 75 < ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ :
 80 < ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ :
 85 < ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ :
 90 < ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ : ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ :

f. 89va

AB

Line 68: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ, B: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ. ܕܢܫܘܢܐ, B: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ.
 Line 69: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ, cf. supra, line 26 (ܕܢܫܘܢܐ).
 Line 70: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ, cf. supra, line 27, and infra, line 103 (ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ).
 Line 72: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ, cf. supra, line 29, and infra, line 105 (ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ).
 Line 83: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ, cf. supra, line 25 (ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ). ܕܢܫܘܢܐ (bis), B: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ.
 Line 91: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ, B: ܕܢܫܘܢܐ ܥܠ ܕܢܫܘܢܐ.

73/75 cf. Greg. Naz., Or. 23, 6 (PG 36, 1157B; SChr., vol. 270, p. 292)
 75/79 cf. supra, 62-65 83/84 cf. supra, 78-79

The doctor, after entrapping the mischief-monger here, added the Gospel illustration, proving that although according to his argument, as its conclusion has now appeared, the meaning of 'substance' is one thing and that of 'generacy' i.e. of 'hypostasis', is another. This especially, admirable fellow, is the height of madness. For who does not know that Eunomius, in speaking of 'the begotten substance', was thinking of nothing else but the Son (i.e. the Son's hypostasis)? Listen to the same wise GREGORY, who speaks as follows in the first book *Against Eunomius* the impious and explains the point to us: 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'.

But let us look with intelligence in another way at what the doctor says, and we shall precisely understand that Gregory's argument here was not about the common, comprehensive substance and about hypostasis (as you please to think) but about the hypostasis and how the hypostasis exists. We have, he says, 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. What, then, do you think the substrate possessing a derived hypostasis? If indeed it is the common comprehensive substance it must follow that you profess not only another cause from which the whole Godhead (i.e. the Holy Trinity) is derived, but also that * you profess that the Holy Trinity itself is a single hypostasis. For you have heard that the doctor said: By the word 'sub-

108/111 Dam. Alex., *Ep. fest. secunda* 116/119 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (PG 45, 589C; Jaeger II, p. 28, 6-8); cf. supra, ch. 19, 24-26 124/127 cf. supra, 66-69 127/128 cf. supra, 126-127 132/133 cf. supra, 125-127

115 —
—
—
 120 <
<
<
 125 <
<
<
 130 <
<
<
 135 <
<
<

AB

Line 114: *ἡ ἀρχὴ*, cf. infra, ch. 26, lines 111-112 (*ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ*).

Line 115: *ἡ ἀρχὴ*, cf. ibid., line 113 (*ἡ ἀρχὴ*).

Line 116: *ἡ ἀρχὴ*, cf. ibid. (*ἡ ἀρχὴ*).

Line 131: *ἡ ἀρχὴ*, B: *ἡ ἀρχὴ*.

Line 135: *ἡ ἀρχὴ*, B: *ἡ ἀρχὴ*.

f. 90ra

do this, often indeed, but also in the passage above. Let us observe
 180 what he says: 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? What? Are you not, reverend sir, ashamed to say
 such things? For why does it please you to say: Back to carnalities
 185 with the carnal in reply to those who have set down a patristic
 proof-text, and said nothing except What explanation does this need
 to prove that * the begotten and birth are not the same? None, so it seems
 to us, which is why leaving it in its own beauty, we shall approach the
 wealth of sound teachings, we say Saint Cyril. Was it that we intro-
 190 duced the example of man and generacy? For that is why, so far as
 we can guess from these same words of yours, you pleased to
 write this. Did not the doctor very wisely and very opportunely
 use the example for the clear demonstration of the point at issue,
 and consider it? Because, in combating Eunomius, he says, as fol-
 195 lows, in the first book: 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 differ-
 ent ideas are created for the hearer of 'generation' and by the term 'sub-

195
 200
 205
 210
 215

f. 90va

AB

Line 196: *...*, cf. supra, ch. 19, line 175 (*...*). *...*, cf. *ibid.*
 (add. *...*).
 Line 197: *...*, B: *...*.
 Line 205: *...*, B: *...*.
 Line 207: *...*, B: *...*.
 Line 208: *...*, B: *...*.
 Line 216: *...*, cf. supra, ch. 19, line 39 (*...*).
 Line 217: *...*, cf. *ibid.*, line 41 (*...*).

180/183 cf. supra, 159-162 184/185 cf. supra, 180-181 186/189 Petr.
 Callinic., *Synodicon*; cf. supra, 36-37 195/210 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.*
 III, 1 (PG 45, 589D-592A; Jaeger II, pp. 28,19 - 29,12); cf. supra, ch. 19, 36-51

200 stance'. 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; 205 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 210 derived hypostasis.

You are thus convicted, cunning fellow, (as we said before) of contending not so much with us as with the fathers, the divine spokesmen, and of shamelessly saying to them: Back to carnalities with the carnal. For if we ourselves had introduced the illustration 215 of man and generation your argument might perhaps have had an excuse for its condemnation of us. Though not even in that case if, having introduced it, we used it suitably; since we have learned that the God-clad fathers too always explain * ideas about God to us by this method. The trustworthy witnesses, Gregory the Theologian and our proven father Severus will suffice for now to prove 220

218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230

231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239

f. 90vb

AB

Line 219: 30, cf. *ibid.*, line 43 (30).
 Line 221: 30, B: 30.
 Line 222: 30, B: 30.
 Line 223: 30, B: 30.
 Line 224: 30 (bis), B: 30. 30, cf. *supra*, ch. 19, line 48 (30).
 Line 225: 30, B: 30.
 Line 227: 30, B: 30.
 Line 228: 30, cf. *supra*, line 30 (30).

book *On the Holy Trinity*. Let us remind you that you said, as follows, in the 14th chapter: These things, then, will not be predicated of the substrate, of that which is called* the 'nature' in the full sense of the term. The Arians meant this and lapsed into their unsound view. For, as the same Theologian said, 'all the predicates of something are not simply predicates of its substrate'; e.g. someone examining the notion of an inseparable accident would give as an example the fact that the black in an Ethiopian and the white in a Scythian cannot exchange names, since they cannot also exchange the very thing they are (viz. their natures) so that black should become white and white black; as the Bible somewhere bears witness: *Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?* And again: Pardon the example of an accident which has been taken for illustration *a fortiori*. For if we have been able to term the accidents 'natures' in this way, when wanting to indicate what they are, *a fortiori* if someone uses the term 'nature' of the hypostases, he is not debarred from completely negating talk of natures in the plural in respect of co-naturals, since they are not natures in the full sense. Why should I say 'in the full sense'? They do not, indeed, have any indication of a nature at all, according to the distinction we are drawing between 'nature' and 'hypostasis'. How do you have so much authority to draw examples for the hypostases of the Godhead even from accidents, examples very adapted to your false and heretical opinion, whereas the Church's masters of mysteries may not apply examples from our hypostases to the prosopa of the Holy Trinity in defence of the

248/258 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 14 (n° 36) 251/252 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 29, 15 (PG 36, 93B; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 208) 257/258 Ier. 13:23 258/266 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 14 (n° 37)

270 — — — — —
 275 — — — — —
 280 — — — — —
 285 — — — — —
 290 — — — — —
 295 — — — — —

f. 91ra

AB

Line 294: *κικι*, B: *κίι*.
 Line 296: *κκκκ*, B om.

truth? Truly this is not the prerogative of anybody else but only of your impudent self!

Give a clear answer to the point we are considering. Do you in the case of men think one who came into existence by generation is the same as generation or different? But since, as has been seen, you give the impossible and irrational response, 'the same', * why do you rage with so much ferocity as if the father used an inapposite example? For even in the case of bodily parents and offspring, you will suppose, if you stick to your error, that the offspring is the same as generation. Teach us in our ignorance what is inapposite here, even according to your argument, in the example! But if they are different, in the way that the doctor here clearly proved, agree also that in the case of the divine nature the begotten is different from generation. For the wise instructor took the example of man and generation to point to the mystery of the divine generation.

אל האב האב : אל האב האב : אל האב האב :
הוא האב האב

אל האב האב : אל האב האב : אל האב האב :
300 האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :
הוא האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :
הוא האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :
305 האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :
הוא האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :
הוא האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :
310 האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :
הוא האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :
הוא האב האב : האב האב : האב האב :

f. 91rb

AB

Line 299: האב האב, B: האב האב.
Line 311: האב האב, B: האב האב.

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.

But let us consider also again what (as previously set down) you said: 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?* Let us look closely to see whether this does not better fit people who behave with deception and trickery, who accept a heretical view along with what belongs to correct profession: people whom the pillars of the Church are wont to compare with the Samaritans of old and their ilk, who both *feared God and worshipped* (as the sacred word says) *their own gods*. Listen to the famous SEVERUS, who said this about such people in the 16th chapter of the second book * *Against the Grammarian*, as follows:

ⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ

ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ : ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ

A, f. 91va

A B up to ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ (l. 19)

Line 10: ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ, B: ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ.

25 For thus it is written of these men in the fourth book of Kingdoms: *They feared the Lord and worshipped their own gods; and again: And these were the nations which feared the Lord and revered their own graven images, for their children and grandchildren, too, do as their fathers did to this day.* But Elijah the prophet, aflame with the fire of divine zeal,
 30 rebuked these wicked wretches with a foot in each camp when he said as follows: *How long will you limp on your two hams? If the Lord is God, follow him; but if Baal is, follow him!*

You will observe, my friend, that such words are very aptly addressed to those who lean indecisively in two directions, and make an enticing show of uttering truth's doctrines but think the
 35 opposite. So why have you judged fit to address those words to us, who have added nothing by way of mental invention to the fathers' tradition but only loathe and spurn your illegal novelties, and not, rather, to yourself? Is it not clear that you do not refrain
 40 from uttering pious words for the sole purpose of verbal deception but are convicted of thinking, with your heretical bent, what is totally opposite to them? Otherwise, say how there harmonize with one another your professing Father, Son and Holy Ghost as properly and individually subsisting hypostases but again,
 45 contrariwise, your supposing and thinking of the same Father, Son and Holy Ghost as ingeneracy, generacy and procession: i.e. as characteristic properties which the divinely inspired doctors have clearly taught us do not subsist properly and individually? In what way will your sometimes professing each hypostasis of the Holy
 50 Trinity as God in the full sense and naturally, concur with your

< ܐܝܢܝ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 << ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 << ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 30 << ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 << ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 < ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 < ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 35 << ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 << ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 << ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ

ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 40 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 45 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 50 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 55 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ
 ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ ܕܡܪܝܢܝ

25/32 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 16 (CSCO 111, pp. 141,27 - 142,9; 112, p. 110, 21-30) 25/26 IV Reg. 17:33 26/29 IV Reg. 17:41 31/32 III Reg. 18:21

sometimes impiously thinking that each hypostasis can be, and be termed, 'God', not in the primary sense * but because each participates in the substance and Godhead? Can those people have a coherent opinion who here define the hypostases of the Godhead as one thing and the substance of the Godhead as another thing, but go on to pretend that they are saying that the three hypostases are the Godhead? Why should we multiply words when we can observe from this the incongruity of your doctrines? For you are evidently expressly teaching, as has been proved and will be proved again, this and much else similar to it in your teachings. Have you any available point at which you can reconcile these totally opposed opinions, so that each will not altogether rebound far off from the other? Show us, then, any patristic theologian who says either that the characteristic properties of the hypostases subsist individually; or that each of the three hypostases can be, and be termed, 'God' not in the primary sense but by participation in the Godhead; or, again, any who defines the hypostases as one thing and the Godhead as another thing. Then we shall learn that the opinions mentioned are not contradictory. But if you cannot show this, do not be angry when you hear along with those who think the same as you: *How long will you limp on your two hams? If the Lord is God, follow him; but if Baal is, follow him!*

Again, let us listen to what follows, which is even more competent to inform us by its demonstrative force and exact teaching that generacy is not at all (as the fathers instruct us) the

f. 91vb

< * כי , וַיְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < 60 . כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < 65 כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < 70 כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < 75 כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < 80 כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < * כי

< כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < 85 כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ
 < כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ : כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ

A B From [L. 80] on

Line 82: כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ , כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ , B: כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ .
 Line 86: כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ , B: כְּשֶׁבָרֵנוּ .

characteristic property of the hypostasis of the Only-begotten but, rather, the hypostasis of the Only-begotten itself. For he added, immediately after what we have just examined, the following: Why do you belittle the divine generation? Why do you suppose you

80 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.

85 Do we need another clear demonstration, if we are well-disposed, of the writer's irreproachable doctrines? Or shall we not be subject to just censure for perfidy and apostasy unless we ourselves laud him too and admire his great wisdom and intelligence? Why do you belittle the divine generation? Tell us, my good

90 fellow, how we belittle the divine generation! Perhaps you will say because we refuse to profess it as a hypostasis. Therefore, because you aim at totally annihilating the divine mystery and hope to cover yourself as wild animals do in bogs and thickets, the God of all will justly rebuke you, as the prophet David sings, for

95 he said: *Rebuke the beasts of the thicket*. Will one not aptly think

79/84 cf. supra, ch. 20, 162-167 89 cf. supra, 79 95 Ps. 67:31

ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ : ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ : ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 90 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ —
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ —
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ —
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ — f. 92ra
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ —
 95 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ —
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ —

ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ :
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ : ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 100 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ —
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ —
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 105 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ :
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ

AB

Line 87: ⲛⲁⲛⲓ, B: ⲛⲁⲛⲓ.
 Line 91: ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ, cf. supra, ch. 19, line 180 (ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ).
 ⲛⲁⲛⲓ, cf. infra, line 164 (ⲛⲁⲛⲓ).
 Line 92: ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ, B: ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ.
 Line 93: ⲛⲁⲛⲓ, B: ⲛⲁⲛⲓ.
 Line 94: ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ, B: ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲧⲉⲛ.
 Line 101: ⲛⲁⲛⲓ, B: ⲛⲁⲛⲓ (wrongly).
 Line 105: ⲛⲁⲛⲓ, B: ⲛⲁⲛⲓ.

of the beasts of the thicket as being your, and your cunning ilk's, lofty assaults upon God's glory which are concealed by appearing to champion God? So do not say, like those of whom the prophet speaks: *The Lord has forsaken, the Lord does not see the earth.*

100 *Nor say: From the Lord am I hidden and who will remember me from the height? For the small in heart, says a wise man, considers these things, and the foolish man and astray thinks foolish things.* But recognize rather, that you do not even escape men's notice, you, who with a view to misleading and astounding the un-

105 educated, in appearance outwardly pretend to honour the divine generation but really are convicted of the irreverence of making even the divine generation an ordinary thing, indeed, of entirely eradicating the very hypostasis of the Only-begotten Son. For if (as the divinely inspired doctors teach us) the hypostasis of the

110 Only-begotten Son is a properly and individually subsisting reality whereas generacy is not this at all but means only that the Son is begotten, clearly anyone who does not concede that generacy * is the characteristic property of the begotten but who names to us only the generation will completely negate the one who exists by

115 generation (i.e. the hypostasis of the Son) and will prove that he is putting forward the Son's generation only as a mere empty word. For we cannot know how, if the begotten himself does not exist, being begotten, or generacy, could exist.

It really is evil cunning and trickery on the part of heretics to mislead simple souls by pretended love and honour towards God yet to dig a pit for them and blaspheme so many extreme insults

110 אפסיק יחיה נטותו ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 115 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 120 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 125 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 130 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :

f. 92rb

נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 135 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :
 נאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה : ונאמר יחיה :

AB

Line 115: נאמר יחיה, B: נאמר יחיה.
 Line 117: נאמר יחיה, B: נאמר יחיה.
 Line 133: נאמר יחיה, B: נאמר יחיה.

and blasphemies against him whom they honour. Both Sabellius and Arius did this (for their example may be applied to all their ilk): having iniquitously become the advocates of monotheism they fell into contrary and equally impious ruination and clearly negated the Godhead. In this way you too, my pleasant fellow, are convicted of denying the Son's hypostasis while honouring 'generation'.

However, we know that you define generacy and those other properties as hypostases not because you are concerned to honour them but because you are attempting and endeavouring to prove the hypostases of the Holy Trinity to be nothing at all. For how can the three hypostases exist in proper subsistence if they are denied a proper and individual subsistence? Or by what means are their characteristic properties not to be entirely negated along with them when they themselves are negated?

Otherwise, why for the sake of not belittling the properties of the hypostases do you define them as hypostases yet denigrate those of the substance? So, either shamelessly and more plainly call also the latter 'substances' or 'substance' as you see fit, so as not to belittle invisibility, incorruptibility, immutability and all those things which are properties of the divine substance; or, show how the properties of the hypostases are insignificant unless they are hypostases whereas those of the divine substance are not insignificant though they are not substance!

But what of the rest of this * insipid and flabby nonsense which contributes nothing whatsoever to the subject? Why do you suppose you comprehend things incomprehensible? When you hear of God's

147/152 cf. supra, 79-84

140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160

145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160

155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160

f. 92va
 —
 —

AB

Line 141: *κἀουεῖ*, B: *κἀουεῖ*.
 Line 148: *κἀουεῖ*, B: *κἀουεῖ*.
 Line 164: *κἀουεῖ*, cf. supra, line 91 (*κἀουεῖ*).

150 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. If we occupy ourselves with this how can we fail to provoke listeners to great boredom?

155 So we will leave it out of account and examine the irresistible demonstrations. For he said: Why, then, you people, do you maltreat those properties which you say are homonyms of the perfect properties, by calling them non-subsisting marks and defining them as different from the hypostases, whereas you favour those you call 'hypostases', understanding them to be substances (though you endeavour to conceal the fact!) and dupe the simple by imagining that the fatherhood or ingeneracy of God the Father, the sonship or generacy of the Only-begotten Son of God, and the procession or sanctity of the divine and life-giving Spirit are appellations bereft of realities? Who, on examining this with an unwavering and unruffled mind would not be right to weep for those who are carried away by these little phrases and to be at a loss, in justified astonishment, that where there once was a special authority over the words not only of outsiders but also of those of us who belong to the truth, and where judgement used most often to be given on correct and incorrect teachings, this contemptible and despicable rubbish seems a grand and powerful thing? This foolish, absurd falsehood takes on so much boldness there that it gets an effortless hold on, and renders easily captive, not only the simple but even the very people who

165 —
 —
 —
 —
 170 —

—
 —
 —
 —
 175 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 180 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 185 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 190 —
 —
 —
 —

AB

Line 180: *κἀνομιαν*, B: *κἀνομιαν*.

are not devoid of sacred theology. However, * let others, who can,
 175 tell those who are ignorant, the causes of this. We ourselves,
 though, will take up the words in question. Why, he says, do you
 maltreat those properties which you say are homonyms of the perfect
 properties, by calling them non-subsisting marks and defining them as
 different from the hypostases? Why, tell me, did this persuade ex-
 180 perts in theology to think that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity
 must be the characteristic properties (I mean ingeneracy, generacy
 and procession)? Would, indeed, that the jealousy of us, for some
 reason or another, on the part of certain persons from this great
 city might come to nought! For I have only to say the ludicrous
 185 words and their ignorance and fatuity will be apparent to
 everybody: Why, then, you people, do you maltreat those properties?
 (It pleases him to repeat the same things many times over, for
 whose greater awareness I do not know: of the dupers or the
 duped). And what is this, my very learned friend, on which you
 190 pride yourself and say: Why, then, you people, do you maltreat those
 properties which you say are homonyms of the perfect properties, by
 calling them non-subsisting marks and defining them as different from
 the hypostases? Are not these your valiant and irresistible argu-
 ments? And tell us clearly how, clever fellow, we maltreat the
 195 properties (to use your phraseology). Perhaps you may say: 'by
 not thinking of them as hypostases, but saying that they are

176/179 cf. supra, 155-158 186 cf. supra, 155-156 190/193 cf. supra,
 155-158 194/195 cf. supra, 190-191

195
 —
 —
 200
 —
 —
 —
 —
 205
 —
 —
 210
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 215
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 220

f. 92vb

AB

Line 204: κηουλη, B: κηουλη.
 Line 221: κηουλη, B: κηουλη.

homonyms of those spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties'; for it was by these powerful demonstrations, last year, that (as you supposed) you demolished and ridiculed our teachings.

It will be worthwhile, then, and because the present matter requires it of us, to set those down too for the sake of the security of the many, even if the argument is forced to be much prolonged. For we recollect wise GREGORY * OF NYSSA who, in the 30th chapter of the refutation *Against Eunomius* (whose beginning is: It seems that the wish to benefit all) explains this point for us and defines it as no small danger neglectfully to abandon truth slandered by the evil-minded. He says: So if some impiety which we should shun has become immediately obvious to everybody from what is said, and besides the impiety the baselessness of its design, it might be thought superfluous to make a detailed stand against each point. But because many, having adhered without examination to what has been said, *ere they perceive the thorns of the word* (to speak like the Psalmist) *have been swallowed up by wrath* (meaning that they would not have been swept away so much, as by a flood, into this depth of impiety, unless they had thought something in these arguments invincible and irresistible), it is wholly necessary that we should not surrender the truth through any negligence even though we need to rebut the argument by many words. So let us take up each point again. The wise listener will observe how the doctor has exactly delineated the present position. Therefore, because here, too, many, having adhered without

208/219 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I, textus graece non servatus; est enim in lacuna quam repperit Jaeger I, p. 154 213/214 Ps. 57:10 221/227 cf. supra, 212-219

225 : *Handwritten text in Syriac script*

230 : *Handwritten text in Syriac script*
f. 93ra
235 : *Handwritten text in Syriac script*
240 : *Handwritten text in Syriac script*
245 : *Handwritten text in Syriac script*
250 : *Handwritten text in Syriac script*

AB

Line 234: *Handwritten note*

Line 236: *Handwritten note*

Line 237: *Handwritten note*

examination to the words of this doubtful writer *have been swallowed up* by heresy *ere they perceived the thorns of the word* (for they would not perhaps have been swept away so much, as by a flood, into this depth of impiety, unless they had thought them invincible), it is wholly necessary that we should not surrender the truth even though we need to rebut the impious rubbish by many words. Therefore we shall also quote what he wrote, as we said, against the truth in his other *Festal* (beginning: The season of the whole world's rejoicing is known) and is wholly similar to what we have just examined, and we shall investigate it as best we can. It goes as follows: * But these statements are at once untrustworthy and slanderous, and not only do they divide it in the hypostases or properties, they also stand convicted of making a division in the substance. Scheming to fortify our faith with variegated sophisms, they, of necessity, admit its separation by natures and substances, teaching the severance of the Godhead: which is the endeavour, even now, of the inventors of novel doctrines, as one can find in that *Entolicon* or *Syndocticon* (for I do not know what to call it, its patch-work character and dubiety about the faith on the part of those who set it down have rendered doubtful even the pamphlet's name) which was set down and has reached us. Passing much of it over with closed eyes (because it would require a book, or refutation, too long for the present time, since we are not aiming at a book now) I will quote one statement by the present-day theologians, or rather, proponents of novelties, out of

: 252 : 253 : 254 : 255 : 256 : 257 : 258 : 259 : 260 : 261 : 262 : 263 : 264 : 265 : 266 : 267 : 268 : 269 : 270 : 271 : 272 : 273 : 274 : 275 : 276 : 277 : 278 : 279 : 280 : 281 : 282 : 283 : 284 : 285 : 286 : 287 : 288 : 289 : 290 : 291 : 292 : 293 : 294 : 295 : 296 : 297 : 298 : 299 : 300 : 301 : 302 : 303 : 304 : 305 : 306 : 307 : 308 : 309 : 310 : 311 : 312 : 313 : 314 : 315 : 316 : 317 : 318 : 319 : 320 : 321 : 322 : 323 : 324 : 325 : 326 : 327 : 328 : 329 : 330 : 331 : 332 : 333 : 334 : 335 : 336 : 337 : 338 : 339 : 340 : 341 : 342 : 343 : 344 : 345 : 346 : 347 : 348 : 349 : 350 : 351 : 352 : 353 : 354 : 355 : 356 : 357 : 358 : 359 : 360 : 361 : 362 : 363 : 364 : 365 : 366 : 367 : 368 : 369 : 370 : 371 : 372 : 373 : 374 : 375 : 376 : 377 : 378 : 379 : 380 : 381 : 382 : 383 : 384 : 385 : 386 : 387 : 388 : 389 : 390 : 391 : 392 : 393 : 394 : 395 : 396 : 397 : 398 : 399 : 400 : 401 : 402 : 403 : 404 : 405 : 406 : 407 : 408 : 409 : 410 : 411 : 412 : 413 : 414 : 415 : 416 : 417 : 418 : 419 : 420 : 421 : 422 : 423 : 424 : 425 : 426 : 427 : 428 : 429 : 430 : 431 : 432 : 433 : 434 : 435 : 436 : 437 : 438 : 439 : 440 : 441 : 442 : 443 : 444 : 445 : 446 : 447 : 448 : 449 : 450 : 451 : 452 : 453 : 454 : 455 : 456 : 457 : 458 : 459 : 460 : 461 : 462 : 463 : 464 : 465 : 466 : 467 : 468 : 469 : 470 : 471 : 472 : 473 : 474 : 475 : 476 : 477 : 478 : 479 : 480 : 481 : 482 : 483 : 484 : 485 : 486 : 487 : 488 : 489 : 490 : 491 : 492 : 493 : 494 : 495 : 496 : 497 : 498 : 499 : 500 : 501 : 502 : 503 : 504 : 505 : 506 : 507 : 508 : 509 : 510 : 511 : 512 : 513 : 514 : 515 : 516 : 517 : 518 : 519 : 520 : 521 : 522 : 523 : 524 : 525 : 526 : 527 : 528 : 529 : 530 : 531 : 532 : 533 : 534 : 535 : 536 : 537 : 538 : 539 : 540 : 541 : 542 : 543 : 544 : 545 : 546 : 547 : 548 : 549 : 550 : 551 : 552 : 553 : 554 : 555 : 556 : 557 : 558 : 559 : 560 : 561 : 562 : 563 : 564 : 565 : 566 : 567 : 568 : 569 : 570 : 571 : 572 : 573 : 574 : 575 : 576 : 577 : 578 : 579 : 580 : 581 : 582 : 583 : 584 : 585 : 586 : 587 : 588 : 589 : 590 : 591 : 592 : 593 : 594 : 595 : 596 : 597 : 598 : 599 : 600 : 601 : 602 : 603 : 604 : 605 : 606 : 607 : 608 : 609 : 610 : 611 : 612 : 613 : 614 : 615 : 616 : 617 : 618 : 619 : 620 : 621 : 622 : 623 : 624 : 625 : 626 : 627 : 628 : 629 : 630 : 631 : 632 : 633 : 634 : 635 : 636 : 637 : 638 : 639 : 640 : 641 : 642 : 643 : 644 : 645 : 646 : 647 : 648 : 649 : 650 : 651 : 652 : 653 : 654 : 655 : 656 : 657 : 658 : 659 : 660 : 661 : 662 : 663 : 664 : 665 : 666 : 667 : 668 : 669 : 670 : 671 : 672 : 673 : 674 : 675 : 676 : 677 : 678 : 679 : 680 : 681 : 682 : 683 : 684 : 685 : 686 : 687 : 688 : 689 : 690 : 691 : 692 : 693 : 694 : 695 : 696 : 697 : 698 : 699 : 700 : 701 : 702 : 703 : 704 : 705 : 706 : 707 : 708 : 709 : 710 : 711 : 712 : 713 : 714 : 715 : 716 : 717 : 718 : 719 : 720 : 721 : 722 : 723 : 724 : 725 : 726 : 727 : 728 : 729 : 730 : 731 : 732 : 733 : 734 : 735 : 736 : 737 : 738 : 739 : 740 : 741 : 742 : 743 : 744 : 745 : 746 : 747 : 748 : 749 : 750 : 751 : 752 : 753 : 754 : 755 : 756 : 757 : 758 : 759 : 760 : 761 : 762 : 763 : 764 : 765 : 766 : 767 : 768 : 769 : 770 : 771 : 772 : 773 : 774 : 775 : 776 : 777 : 778 : 779 : 780 : 781 : 782 : 783 : 784 : 785 : 786 : 787 : 788 : 789 : 790 : 791 : 792 : 793 : 794 : 795 : 796 : 797 : 798 : 799 : 800 : 801 : 802 : 803 : 804 : 805 : 806 : 807 : 808 : 809 : 810 : 811 : 812 : 813 : 814 : 815 : 816 : 817 : 818 : 819 : 820 : 821 : 822 : 823 : 824 : 825 : 826 : 827 : 828 : 829 : 830 : 831 : 832 : 833 : 834 : 835 : 836 : 837 : 838 : 839 : 840 : 841 : 842 : 843 : 844 : 845 : 846 : 847 : 848 : 849 : 850 : 851 : 852 : 853 : 854 : 855 : 856 : 857 : 858 : 859 : 860 : 861 : 862 : 863 : 864 : 865 : 866 : 867 : 868 : 869 : 870 : 871 : 872 : 873 : 874 : 875 : 876 : 877 : 878 : 879 : 880 : 881 : 882 : 883 : 884 : 885 : 886 : 887 : 888 : 889 : 890 : 891 : 892 : 893 : 894 : 895 : 896 : 897 : 898 : 899 : 900 : 901 : 902 : 903 : 904 : 905 : 906 : 907 : 908 : 909 : 910 : 911 : 912 : 913 : 914 : 915 : 916 : 917 : 918 : 919 : 920 : 921 : 922 : 923 : 924 : 925 : 926 : 927 : 928 : 929 : 930 : 931 : 932 : 933 : 934 : 935 : 936 : 937 : 938 : 939 : 940 : 941 : 942 : 943 : 944 : 945 : 946 : 947 : 948 : 949 : 950 : 951 : 952 : 953 : 954 : 955 : 956 : 957 : 958 : 959 : 960 : 961 : 962 : 963 : 964 : 965 : 966 : 967 : 968 : 969 : 970 : 971 : 972 : 973 : 974 : 975 : 976 : 977 : 978 : 979 : 980 : 981 : 982 : 983 : 984 : 985 : 986 : 987 : 988 : 989 : 990 : 991 : 992 : 993 : 994 : 995 : 996 : 997 : 998 : 999 : 1000 :

f. 93rb

AB

Line 253: $\omega\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau$, B: $\omega\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau$.
 Line 270: $\alpha\omicron\tau$, B om. $\alpha\omicron\tau$, B: $\alpha\omicron\tau$. $\alpha\omicron\tau$, B: $\alpha\omicron\tau$.
 Line 274: $\alpha\omicron\tau$, B: $\alpha\omicron\tau$.

245 the few ones belonging to the little work, a statement which can show in an obscure way their plain opposition here too to the God-clad fathers. The text is as follows: 'Not supposing that the characteristic properties (we mean fatherhood, sonship and procession and the like) are hypostases or conversely, again, thinking foolishly of the "spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties" as characteristic properties of the prosopa'. Oh, the outlandish and irrational teachings! *Hear, you deaf! See, you blind*, what the doctors of impiety teach! They say the fatherhood of God the Father, the sonship of the Only-begotten Son of God and the procession of the Holy Ghost are imperfect and non-subsisting. For if the properties are other than 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting', * they must obviously be imperfect, non-subsisting and non-spiritual. For the diametrical opposite of the spiritual is what is not thus, of the perfect the imperfect, of the subsisting the non-subsisting. But if this is how they are, how could the subsisting be characterized by what, according to their argument, do not subsist, the perfect by the imperfect and the spiritual by what is not thus? But Gregory, formerly holy bishop of Nyssa, plainly proves it impious to suppose God consists of perfect and imperfect. Meaning to rebut the stupidity of polytheism, he wrote as follows in his *Catechetical Oration*...

280 —
—
←
←
←
 285 ←
—
—
—
—
 290 —
—
—
—
—
 295 — f. 93va
—
—
—
—
 300 —
—
—
—

AB

Line 281: *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*, cf. infra, line 337 (add. *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*).
 Line 284: *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*, cf. infra, line 340 (*ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*).
 Line 285: *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*, cf. infra, line 341 (*ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*). *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*, B:
ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ.
 Line 299: *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*, cf. infra, ch. 22, line 131 (*ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*).
 Line 302: *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*, B: *ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ*.

247/251 Petr. Callinic., *Syndocticon* 249/250 cf. Greg. Naz., *Or.* 33, 16
 (PG 36, 236A; *SChr.*, vol. 318, p. 194) 251/252 Is. 42:18 255/256 cf.
 supra, 249-250

'hypostases' or alternatively as solely modes of the hypostases in every case. No, explaining the realities by reference to the ideas expressed we
 295 thus keep hold of the truth, not supposing that the characteristic
 properties of the prosopa (we mean fatherhood, sonship and procession
 and the like) are hypostases or conversely, again, thinking foolishly of the
 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties' as characteristic
 properties of the hypostases. It will be obvious here that these words
 300 quoted by this admirable expositor have been mischievously torn
 out of context.

But then, let us note also what the rebuttal aimed at. For he says
 in amazement at the impiety of the words: Oh, the outlandish and
 irrational teachings! *Hear, you deaf! See, you blind*, what the doctors of
 305 impiety teach! However, you should not only call out to the deaf
 and blind to bewail the fact that your soul has been brutalized (no
 more, petrified) by abundance of its impiety, but call out to
 insentient nature too, as our wise father in God SEVERUS said,
 writing about someone who had suffered the same fate as
 310 yourself: What Jeremiah who knows the mystery of lamentation will not
 weep over so much madness and lack of feeling and impose a lament
 upon inanimate things, as though rational nature is not capable of worthy
 lamentation, and say: *Let Zion's walls pour out floods of tears day and
 night?* For how can it not be most unfeeling, the work of a mind

298 cf. supra, 249-250 303/305 cf. supra, 251-252 310/314 Sev. Ant.,
 C. Imp. Gramm., II, 17 (CSCO 111, p. 146, 7-12; 112, p. 114, 1-5) 313/
 314 Lament. 2:18

335
 < 335
 < 340
 < 340
 <

345
 —
 —
 350
 < 355
 < <<
 <<

AB

Line 336: *πρωτον*, B: *πρωτον*.
 Line 337: *καταστασις*, cf. supra, line 281 (om.).
 Line 340: *καταστασις*, cf. supra, line 284 (*καταστασις*).
 Line 341: *καταστασις*, cf. supra, line 285 (*καταστασις*).
 Line 352: *κριασε*, B: *κριασε*.

315 hardened and, as it were, metamorphosed into flesh, to speak such things? For you said: They say the fatherhood of God the Father, the sonship of the Only-begotten Son of God * and the procession of the Holy Ghost are imperfect and non-subsistent. Having as it were posted these words in front of the gate as a preface, you then added: For if the properties are other than 'spiritual, perfect, and individually subsisting', they must obviously be imperfect, non-subsisting and non-spiritual. For the diametrical opposite of the spiritual is what is not thus, of the perfect the imperfect, of the subsisting the non-subsisting. But if this is how they are, how could the subsisting be characterized by what, according to their argument, do not subsist, the perfect by the imperfect and the spiritual by what is not thus? First, let us observe, here too, your villainous treatment of divine doctrines, my artful fellow. For in our phrase (but it is truer to say Gregory the Theologian's phrase) spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties, you have altered the form of words in your examination and substituted 'subsisting' for individually subsisting. You do this to obscure the obviousness of your impiety but also with a view to your having a plausible and facile argument to slander us with, as though we do not consider that the characteristic properties exist. For you ought, once having so absurdly and foolishly decided to blather about that text, to have preserved the same form of words used there and said: 'they say the fatherhood of God the Father, the sonship of God the Son and the procession of the Holy Ghost are imperfect and not individually subsisting'. But, as we said, to avoid discomfiture and

360 —
 —
 —
 —
 365 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 370 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 375 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 380 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 385 —

f. 94ra

AB

316/318 cf. supra, 252-255 319/326 cf. supra, 255-261 327/329 cf. supra, 298 et 249-250 330 cf. supra, 323 331 cf. supra, 329

Line 362: *ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲙⲏⲛⲏ*, B: *ⲟⲩⲥⲓⲙⲏⲛⲏ*.
 Line 374: *ⲉⲛⲏⲉⲛⲏⲉⲛⲏ*, cf. infra, ch. 22, line 131 (*ⲉⲛⲏⲉⲛⲏⲉⲛⲏ*).

340 with an eye to getting ready your slanders, you altered what was
 said and hoped to draw an outrageous conclusion not from 'not
 subsisting individually' but from 'not subsisting', or as it were,
 'not existing'. For had you said: 'they say the fatherhood of God
 the Father, * the sonship of God the Only-begotten Son and the
 345 procession of the Holy Ghost are imperfect and not individually
 subsisting', the feebleness of your rubbish would have been
 immediately self-evident, and no rebuttal of it would have been
 required.

390 , 𐌹𐌶𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰
 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰
 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰
 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰
 * 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 395 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 f. 94rb
 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 . 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰

AB

Line 395: 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰, B: 𐌺𐌴𐌹𐌶𐌰.

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 pro-
 5 cession 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 impos-
 10 sible for things which subsist (i.e. subsist individually) to be characterized by what do not subsist individually and by showing thereby that he thinks the characterized and the characterizers are the same, he is clearly found guilty of thinking that the divine sub-
 15 stance 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
 20 their characteristic properties must be the same, he is convicted of

חַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 5 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 10 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 15 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :
 20 וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם : וְחַיִּים אֵינָם :

AB flor. II from l. 2 on

Line 4: אֵינָם, B and flor. II: אֵינָם.
 Line 6: חַיִּים, flor. II: חַיִּים.
 Line 9: חַיִּים, flor. II: חַיִּים.
 Line 10: חַיִּים, flor. II: חַיִּים.
 Line 14: אֵינָם, B: אֵינָם.
 Line 15: אֵינָם, flor. II: אֵינָם. אֵינָם, B: אֵינָם.
 Line 19: חַיִּים, flor. II: חַיִּים.

supposing all the latter to be mutually identical: which is both blasphemy and the height of lunacy.

And why, my clever fellow, were you at pains to use words by which you were going to be thoroughly shamed? Do you not see
 25 by what absurd and entirely foolish inferences you have destroyed yourself? For you did not understand what you wrote when you said: For if the properties are other than 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting', they must obviously be imperfect, non-subsisting and non-spiritual. And how, again, with your * fabricating these things
 30 arbitrarily and witlessly, will there not justly fit you what BASIL, athlete in truth, exclaimed to Eunomius, your master also, when he wrote as follows: Those doctrines of yours are truly worthy of the judges you have fabricated. For you lay down the law with as much facility as if you were in a bazaar of dreams or an assembly of drunkards
 35 with nobody hearing or understanding what is said, because you think your *ipse dixit* suffices in place of all proof? Tell us, then, yourself, clever fellow, not as if you were telling a dream or were in a bazaar of ravers and drunkards (for the inquisitors are standing over you, tugging at you and demanding proofs of what you say)
 40 from what poisonous spring you pour out this empty wisdom to us. Who taught you to say that unless fatherhood and sonship (or

27/29 cf. supra, ch. 21, 255-257 32/36 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. II, 7 (PG 29, 588BC; SChr., vol. 305, p. 36)

ⲉⲕⲁⲓ ⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ

ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 25 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 30 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 35 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 40 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 45 ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ

A. f. 94va

AB flor. II up to l. 31 and from l. 44 on

- Line 22: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ, flor. II: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ.
- Line 23: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ, B and flor. II: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ.
- Line 24: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ, B: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ.
- Line 25: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ, flor. II: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ. ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ, flor. II: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ.
- Line 29: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ, B: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ.
- Line 32: At the top of fol. 94v A reads as follows: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ. Of saint Peter the patriarch against Damian.
- Line 45: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ, flor. II: ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲛⲁⲓ (wrongly).

ingeneracy and generacy) and procession, are spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties, fatherhood and sonship (or ingeneracy and generacy) and procession must (for this is the argument we are to examine now) be imperfect, non-spiritual and not subsist? Why does your wisdom thus decide that what are mutually different must necessarily be entirely and in all respects different and not mutually participate in any respect, or, contrariwise that what mutually participate in some respect must necessarily be the same? It is time, therefore, either that you said that man is the same as those who belong to an irrational nature because they all mutually participate in being alive, feeding and feeling; or that you defined only man (or, if you will, only irrational beings) as being alive, feeding and feeling, and thought one of those named to be non-living, non-feeding and insentient because it is not the same as the other. We can, indeed, see this not only in the case of man and irrational beings but also in that of horse, ox and numberless others. But let me take * a more similar case for illustration. Look at angel and soul. Is not an angel incorporeal, immortal, rational and spiritual like man's soul? Tell me why we should reckon angel and soul as being mutually identical because they have so many things in common? Or are we to define angel as incorporeal, immortal, rational and spiritual

45 : $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 50 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 55 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 60 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 65 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 70 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$

f. 94vb

AB flor. II

Line 50: $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, flor. II: $\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 52: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$, flor. II: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ (wrongly). $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$, flor. II:
 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 54: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$, flor. II: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 56: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$, flor. II: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 59: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$, flor. II: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 63: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$, flor. II: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 65: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$, flor. II: $\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$.

but soul as corporeal, mortal, irrational and without participation
 65 in intelligence because it is different from an angel? For cor-
 poreal is diametrically opposite to incorporeal, mortal to immortal,
 rational and spiritual to what are not rational and spiritual. You
 will observe the crazy impiety your argument has lapsed into.
 Why do you say again: For if the properties are other than 'spiritual,
 70 perfect and individually subsisting', they must obviously be imperfect,
 non-subsisting and non-spiritual? So, say the other, corresponding
 thing: 'If incorporeal, immortal, rational and spiritual angel is
 different from soul, then soul is not incorporeal, not immortal,
 irrational and, again, not spiritual', and you will see better the
 75 beauty of your accurate teachings.

However, my speech aspires to things divine when I speak of
 the divine, and will even attempt to use them as an incidental illus-
 tration to support my point. So, think for me of the Father and the
 Son, knowing as you do, that *all that the Father has* belongs to the
 80 Son save only his being, and being called, Father. Observe wise CYRIL,
 who teaches us this very point in the 23rd chapter of the *Thesau-
 rus*, and says as follows: It is not because the Son does not have
 everything that he is said to receive everything from the Father. For he
 has naturally, by being the Father's Word and splendour, all that belongs
 85 to his Father save only his being, and being called, Father. * For,
 eradicating beforehand, as God, the opinions of heretics, he says he
 receives from the Father. For, so that no one, seeing the Son having all

69/71 cf. supra, 27-29 79/80 cf. Ioh. 16:15 80 cf. infra, 85 82/93
 Cyr. Alex., *Thesaurus*, ass. XXIII (PG 75, 381A); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 22,
 582-589 83 cf. Ioh. 3:35; 13:3; Matth. 11:27; Luc. 10:22 84 cf. Hebr.
 1:3 86/87 cf. supra, 83

65
 70
 75
 80
 85

90
 95

B, f. 63va

Aup to ... (l. 97) B flor. II up to l. 86

Line 73: ...
 Line 85: ...
 Lines 98-105: ...

that belongs to the Father, should suppose from the great likeness and unvarying sameness, that the same one is both Father and Son and fall
 90 into the error of Sabellius, he necessarily says that he receives from the Father, though he possesses it by nature; so that the statement, by introducing one who gives and one who receives, should disclose in separate hypostases, a duality which is not separated solely by names. And SEVERUS, Cyril's peer, wrote similarly in the *Letter to Maron the*
 95 *Reader* (whose beginning is When Naaman the Syrian) as follows: For the Son is all that the Father is, save only being Father, * and likewise the Holy Ghost has substantially what belong to Father and Son naturally, except fatherhood and sonship. What could be clearer in plain proof of the point at issue, than this? For our divinely
 100 instructed fathers have testified in all this to the sameness of Father and Son, save that the former is Father and not Son, whereas the latter is Son and not Father, and we should think the same of the Holy Ghost. So, if those who mutually participate in all respects, save only in the property which separates each of
 105 them properly, are, and are said to be mutually different, what is to prevent the characteristic properties of the hypostases receiving, by way of another consideration, certain of the features predicated of the hypostases and being different from them? Your ill-considered statement has therefore collapsed, and can no longer
 110 proceed: For if the properties are other than 'spiritual, perfect and

90/91 cf. supra, 83 95/98 Sev. Ant., *Ep. ad Maronem lectorem* (vel *novitium?*), fragm. hucusque incognitum 110/112 cf. supra, 69-71

100 : *ܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܠܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ*
ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ
ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ
 105 *ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ*
ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ
 110 *ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ*
ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ
 115 *ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ*
ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ
 120 *ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ*
ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ
ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܢ

f. 63vb

B flor. II from l. 113 or

- Line 104: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, cf. *ibid.*, line 627 (*ܘܢܝܢܐ*).
- Line 107: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, B: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, but see PO 12, p. 198, line 9.
- Line 113: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, flor. II: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*.
- Line 116: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, flor. II: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*. *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, flor. II: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*.
- Line 118: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, flor. II: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*.
- Line 120: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, flor. II: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*.
- Line 122: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*, flor. II: *ܘܢܝܢܐ*.

individually subsisting', they must obviously * be imperfect, non-substiting and non-spiritual.

But what of your second point, you very powerful and invincible fellow? For you say: But if this is how they are, how could the 115 subsisting be characterized by what, according to their argument, do not subsist, the perfect by the imperfect and the spiritual by what is not thus?

Now, we have already examined, according to our modest capacity, characterizers and characterized in past discussions, proving our view of these things from the divinely inspired 120 patristic teachings. Nevertheless, you are to understand here too, my clever fellow, that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are believed to characterize the hypostases by only indicating the difference in their mode of being. They show that the Father exists ingenerately, underived; whereas the Son exists from the Father, 125 by generation; and the Holy Ghost exists by procession from the same God the Father. * For we are not taught by the ingeneracy, generacy and procession either the fullness of the Godhead or the individual subsistence, or again, the spirituality of the three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but, as we said, their lack of 130 confusion and the mutual difference in their mode of being.

125 — — — — —
— — — — —
— — — — —

130 — — — — —
— — — — —
— — — — —
— — — — —

135 — — — — —
— — — — —
— — — — —
— — — — —
140 — — — — —
— — — — —
— — — — —
— — — — —
145 — — — — —
— — — — —
— — — — —

B flor. II

Line 125: — — — — —
Line 126: — — — — —
Line 131: — — — — —
Line 134: — — — — —
Line 139: — — — — —
Line 141: — — — — —
Line 142: — — — — —

114/116 cf. supra, ch. 21, 258-261

Otherwise, if the characterizers had to be without difference in any respect over against those who are characterized, they would, in the first place, be absolutely the same as them and not other than them: an impossibility which not even you can validate however hard you try and which has clearly been demolished by many irresistible demonstrations. But next, according to this argument it would be necessary for the characteristic properties of the divine substance either to be substance and Godhead or not to characterize the Godhead's substance at all. For how, according to your argument, will what is not substance or Godhead characterize the Godhead and the substance? But away with this absurd and * ill-considered rubbish! For these, and the like are the abortions only of your deep intellect and nobody else's.

Besides this, let us attend to the other words too. For you said: But Gregory, formerly holy bishop of Nyssa, plainly proves it impious to suppose God consists of perfect and imperfect. Meaning to rebut the stupidity of polytheism, he wrote as follows in his *Catechetical Oration*. Whom are you correcting, you best of writers, when you patch together these old-wives' tales? Go round the whole world under the sky, if you like, and see if you can find anybody so far gone in insanity as to profess that God consists of perfect and imperfect. Did your wise self not notice that not even the children of the heathen whom the doctor was addressing, would agree to this absurd supposition? For he was eradicating polytheism * on the basis of the same principles which were generally professed by them, in those very words you quoted, with the aim of drawing

145/147 cf. supra, ch. 21, 261-264

147: 21, flor. II: 21.
 148: 21, flor. II: 21.
 149: 21, flor. II: 21.
 154: 21, flor. II: 21.
 157: 21, flor. II: 21.

150: 21, flor. II: 21.
 160: 21, flor. II: 21.
 165: 21, flor. II: 21.
 170: 21, flor. II: 21.

f. 64va

B flor. II up to l. 158

Line 147: 21, flor. II: 21.
 Line 148: 21, flor. II: 21.
 Line 149: 21, flor. II: 21.
 Line 154: 21, flor. II: 21.
 Line 157: 21, flor. II: 21.

them to the perfection of truth. Observe closely what he said: Therefore, when there is a discussion with a pagan, it would be as well to produce this beginning to the argument: whether he supposes that God exists or is swept into the doctrine of atheists. So if he says there is no God he will be led on from the skillful and wise arrangements in the world to the acknowledgment thereby of the existence of a certain power, therein viewed, set over all. But if he has no doubt that God exists but proceeds with his suppositions into a plurality of Godheads, let us use this sort of order of argument with him. Which of these does he think God is: perfect or defective? When he rightly testifies to the perfection of the divine nature, let us require him to concede the fact that through all the things viewed in the Godhead he is perfect, so that God is not to be seen as a mixture of opposites, of perfect and defective. * You see that even those sick with the insanity of heathendom admit that God is perfect and thereby the master of mysteries attempts to direct them, even against their will, towards disavowing polytheism. But this becomes even clearer through the words you subsequently quoted: For if he concedes that perfection in all respects is to be confessed as belonging with the subject, but says that the perfect things which are characterized by the same attributes are many, it will be entirely necessary for him either to point out the property in those things which are distinguished by no difference but viewed with the same attributes; or if the mind apprehends nothing by way of property, not to suppose a division in those things in which there is nothing by way of distinction.

Why, then, do you pride yourself on so much learning and wisdom as if you were entering some lofty walkway when you teach us what is obvious, as it were, even to very infants and

158/169 Greg. Nyss., *Or. catech.* (PG 45, 12AB; Mühlenberg, pp. 6,14 - 7,6); Dam. Alex., *Ep. fest. prima* 174/181 *Ibid.* (PG 45, 12C; Mühlenberg, p. 7, 13-19); Dam. Alex., *Ep. fest. prima*

175
180
185
190
195
200

f. 64vb

f. 65ra

Handwritten Coptic text in a single column, with line numbers 175, 180, 185, 190, 195, and 200 on the left margin. The text is written in a cursive script with some decorative elements. Marginalia 'f. 64vb' and 'f. 65ra' are present on the right side. The text appears to be a translation of the Latin text on the left page.

Handwritten Coptic text at the bottom of the page, possibly a continuation or a separate note.

185 introduce proof-texts for it as if somebody would contend with
you over the point? * Therefore, the great herald of truth, BASIL,
shall again proclaim to you what he also proclaimed to Eunomius
who was striving to prove the Father ingenerate as if this was
something outlandish over which some of those with a desire to be
190 devout might have doubts. For he says: Why have I set down all this
talk of his? So that the fellow's nonsense, which he uses throughout his
entire discourse, may be known. For having said that it is clear to
everybody's common notions that God is ingenerate, he attempts to
produce proofs of it to us, acting somewhat like a man who wants by
195 words to teach people with healthy vision at bright noontide that the Sun
is the most luminous star in the sky. But if someone who gives a verbal
proof of things known to the senses is ludicrous, how can someone who
teaches things professed in common by everybody not be guilty of equal
witlessness? For these matters are far clearer to men of sound mind than
200 those which are visible to the eyes. For if there were anybody who
blasphemed against this truth and argued that the ingenerate was begotten
either by himself or by another * perhaps the inanity might have an ex-
cuse. But if no one up to today either of those who are outside our
theology or even of those from the Church itself who have withstood the
205 truth, has attained to such a pitch of witlessness as to doubt the ingener-
acy of the ingenerate, I fail to understand the profit derived from these
words. Do we really need Aristotle's and Chrysippus' syllogisms to learn
that the ingenerate has not been begotten either by himself or by another,
and is not older or younger than himself?

210 But let us also note the precise meaning of what you say after
the proof-text of Saint * Gregory; for there it runs, as follows:

205
f. 65rb
210
215
220
225
230
A f. 95ra
A from 204-234 on B

190/209 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. I, 5 (PG 29, 516AC; SChr., vol. 299, pp. 170-174)

After hearing those divinely inspired words of the father they should tell us how, in thinking of something imperfect in the holy and consubstantial Trinity, they cannot be outdoing all impiety. But if they say (to avoid rebuttal from that earlier teaching), 'we ourselves too do not call the characteristic properties imperfect', they therefore acknowledge necessarily that they are perfect or that they are only empty terms bereft of realities. If, therefore, they call them perfect, and between perfect things there is no difference qua perfection they must concede that the characteristic properties also are 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties'.

We think we should be maltreating these grand words of yours, my dear sir, if we were to praise your profound and subtle understanding with our own poor utterance and not with that of our wise father SEVERUS, which immediately and so spontaneously makes known the science of things ineffable and easily resolves many chance disputes over the truth. Therefore, we shall praise you with those words: Oh, the profound considerations! Oh, the inventions of a profound understanding! Oh, *the soul which is instructed*, in the proverbial phrase, in the repetition of words which are inescapable! But I was desirous of asking your Wisdom whether it gave birth to these things for us after a long watch, or whether it suddenly brought out such clever and acute things. For the whole world ran the risk of not knowing (if you yourself had not discovered it) that the human body is corruptible whereas the soul is immortal.

Therefore, since you suppose that through you the whole world under the sky has learned to think that there is no deficiency in the Holy Trinity, deign to learn also yourself that * you are giving

212/221 Dam. Alex., Ep. fest. prima 220/221 Greg. Naz., Or. 33, 16 (PG 36, 236A; SChr., vol. 318, p. 194); cf. supra, ch. 21, 249-250 228/235 Sev. Ant., loco non reperto 229 cf. Sir. 26:14

235
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 240
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 245
 —
 —
 —

<
 <
 250 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 255 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 <
 260 <
 <

...
 ...
 ...

vent to entirely absurd words full of folly and ignorance. Look at
 240 what you say in drawing your conclusion: If, therefore, they call
 them perfect, and between perfect things there is no difference *qua* per-
 fection they must concede that the characteristic properties also are
 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties'. The examina-
 tions we conducted just a little earlier on this point will have
 245 sufficiently laughed to scorn the ludicrous inanity of this sophism
 for men of sound sense. Nevertheless, for the security of readers
 let us, as briefly as we can, recall the tenor of the things said there
 and explain the earlier point. If, since there is no difference
 between perfect and perfect *qua* perfection, the characteristic
 250 properties of the hypostases, since they too are perfect, must
 (according to what this sophist says) be spiritual, perfect and
 individually subsisting hypostases (for this, it is, that spiritual,
 perfect and individually subsisting properties indicates to us) how can
 all things which have been brought into being by uncreated nature
 255 not be the same as one another, since each of them has been made
 perfect in its own principle by the creator? And (to disgrace these
 shameless blasphemers with a bold question) how can the hypo-
 stases of the Holy Trinity not be mutually merged and become
 only one, when each of them has perfection, indeed, rather, is *per*
 260 *se* total and entire goodness, and has no difference in this respect
 from the others? Must not, again, by this writer's abominable

265 * *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ f. 95rb
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 270 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 275 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 280 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 285 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*
 290 — *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*

AB flor. II from 1. 276 on

Line 280: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*.
 Lines 283-284: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*.
 Line 284: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*.
 Line 287: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*. At the top of fol. 66r B reads as fol-
 lows: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲉ*. *Of saint Peter of Antioch*
against Damian.

syllogism, each of the three hypostases also be the whole Godhead
 and substance in the generic sense, since *qua* perfection the
 hypostasis has no difference from the Godhead and the common,
 265 comprehensive substance of the three prosopa? But, if only to
 think this lapses into the most extreme impiety, you are to
 understand, clever fellow, that though the * characteristic prop-
 erties of the hypostases are perfect they are not hypostases. So,
 knowing the perdition your confused and ill-judged writings have
 270 placed you in, hurry and burn your blasphemous attacks on God,
 forthwith, if you think any hope of salvation (we do not see it!) is
 left you; and no longer allow yourself to be drawn by wretched
 ambition or swept off into writing what you are entirely ignorant
 of.

295
 300
 305

f. 95va

AB flor. II 299

- Line 293: *ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛ*, B and flor. II: *ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛ*.
- Line 294: *ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛ*.
- Line 297: *ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲓⲙⲓⲛ*.

sonship or generacy of the Only-begotten Son of God, and the procession or sanctity of the divine and life-giving Spirit are appellations bereft of realities?

Here too again, when you allege against us the imperfection, but besides this, the homonymity, and when, from sickness of soul, you repeat the same things, we must needs apply the same remedies and stop the flow of confused nonsense by the fathers' words. Listen, then, to GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN saying as follows, in the oration *Against the Arians*: But they 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 and individually subsisting properties, divided in number and undivided in Godhead. And in the *First Oration on the Son*, he says this: Then, why do you declare that ingenerate and generate are not the same thing? If you mean the uncreated and the created, I should be in agreement, for the unbeginning and the created are not the same thing in nature; but if you mean the begetter and the begotten, the statement is invalid, for it is absolutely necessary that they

34/38 Greg. Naz., Or. 33, 16 (PG 36, 236A; SChr., vol. 318, pp. 192-194); cf. supra, ch. 1, 76-80 39/49 Greg. Naz., Or. 29, 10 (PG 36, 88A; SChr., vol. 250, pp. 196-198); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 6, 259-268

30 ܠܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ : ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ : ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ : ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
* ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —

ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
35 ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
40 ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
45 ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —
ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ —

AB flor. I from I. 37 to 39 (l. 39)

Line 28: ܕܘܢܝܢܐ, B: ܕܘܢܝܢܐ.
Line 29: ܕܘܢܝܢܐ, cf. supra, ch. 20, line 187 (ܕܘܢܝܢܐ).
Line 30: ܕܘܢܝܢܐ, B: ܕܘܢܝܢܐ.
Lines 37-38: ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ, Z (f. 122v): ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ, W (f. 16ra) and Y (f. 76va): ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ, X (f. 103ra): ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ, cf. supra, ch. 1, line 82 (ܕܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܝܢܐ).
Line 38: ܕܘܢܐ, WYZ: ܕܘܢܐ.
Line 39: ܕܘܢܐ, WYZ: ܕܘܢܐ. ܕܘܢܐ, WYZ: ܕܘܢܐ.
Line 44: ܕܘܢܐ, cf. Book II, ch. 6, line 270 (add. ܕܘܢܐ). ܕܘܢܐ, cf. ibid., line 271 (trsp.).
Line 45: ܕܘܢܐ, B: ܕܘܢܐ.
Line 46: ܕܘܢܐ, B: ܕܘܢܐ.

rightly be thought of by us as hypostases but, rather, as different modes of the hypostases, just as the characteristic properties of the hypostases also are.

You will observe how your argument is reduced everywhere to absurd views by your refusal to agree with the truth; so it is fitting that we should be made to understand the two meanings of the word 'properties' by the words of the Theologian previously set down. For when we hear him saying this, as was said in the oration *Against the Arians*: One nature in three spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties, divided in number and undivided in Godhead; and this in the 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); and again in the oration *On himself after returning from the desert*, he asked, as if in astonishment: How are you, the same you, understood to be a unity and found as a Trinity? How are the ingenerate, the begotten and he who proceeds, one nature, three properties, *one God who is over all, through all and in all?*; when we hear these and similar things we know and understand that he applied the term 'properties' to the hypostases, not because he supposed that hypostases are the same as the characteristic properties of the prosopa, but because he very wisely contrived with the diplomacy of a master to guide the souls of his hearers in all ways. His aim throughout was to impress the truth of divine doctrines on the minds of his students. Hence he also says: But

74/76 cf. supra, 36-38 76/80 Greg. Naz., Or. 39, 11 (PG 36, 345C; SChr., vol. 358, pp. 170-172); cf. supra, ch. 1, 72-75 81/84 Greg. Naz., Or. 26, 19 (PG 35, 1252C; SChr., vol. 284, p. 270) 84 Eph. 4:6 91/95 cf. supra, 76-80

70 ...

75 ...

AB

Line 71: ... B om.

Line 72: ... B add.

Line 76: ... B:

Line 77: ... B: ...

make clear that they are not using the word to refer to another substance, the holy fathers frequently say, 'the substance of the Godhead', so, to deliver the tradition that 'property' and 'hypostasis' are the same, they used the periphrasis 'the properties of the prosopa' and 'of the hypostases' in order that the hearer's mind should not be misdirected towards the properties of the nature or substance as a result of the homonymity.

Enough will have been said previously * about the silly cleverness contained in these petty phrases. However, do not forget that you too accepted a homonymity in the case of the characteristic properties of the substance and of the hypostases. But perhaps you will say that you used the term mentioned, in different senses. Yet we too, clever fellow, shall confirm with clear proof that we by all means derived one understanding from 'ingeneracy, generacy and procession' and had the impress of another from hearing 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties'.

But if, again, we are mischievously misrepresented by you as thinking that the characteristic properties are imperfect because, like the doctor, we name the hypostases 'spiritual, perfect and individually subsisting properties', you are to learn (for we shall load you down again when you use the same evil arguments) that we call them perfect in their own principle (i.e. as characterizing

125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130

f. 96va
 135
 140

145

AB flor. II from l. 135 on

Line 128: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, A: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ* (wrongly).

Line 137: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, B: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*.

Line 138: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, B and flor. II: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, flor. II: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ*.

ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ.

Line 140: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*.

Line 141: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, flor. II: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, flor. II: *ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲉⲛ*.

Line 144: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, B: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*.

Line 146: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*.

the hypostases and making very clear the difference between each
 140 of them and the others in its mode of being) and not *qua* hyposta-
 ses. But if you think this too an imperfection, why do you not also
 think of the characteristic properties of the divine substance as
 substances, or at least, as substance, in order that you may not be
 convicted of thinking that they are imperfect, in accordance with
 145 your despicable opinion? So, either profess them to be substances
 or substance as you please, in order that on this point too besides
 the others, you may treat with clear contempt the divinely inspired
 words of the fathers, who never define them as substance or sub-
 stances but, on the contrary, as has been fully proved, think this a
 150 heretical opinion; or frankly call them imperfect, and you will
 then be convicted of saying what you witlessly attempted to infer
 to us: that we said there is a plurality of imperfect things in the
 Godhead; or recognize, at this late stage, that the perfection of any
 entity is its abiding in its own principle and not altering from it.
 155 Therefore, just as we recognize the Holy Trinity as perfect, we
 also recognize each of * its hypostases as perfect. For we have
 been taught to profess as perfect a Trinity consisting of three
 perfects, but do not therefore suppose each hypostasis to be the
 Holy Trinity. In the same way we recognize each characteristic
 160 property of the divine substance, and of the hypostases too, as
 perfect *qua* characteristic property, and do not define it as either

147 :
 148 :
 149 :
 150 :
 151 :
 152 :
 153 :
 154 :
 155 :
 156 :
 157 :
 158 :
 159 :
 160 :
 161 :
 162 :
 163 :
 164 :
 165 :
 166 :
 167 :
 168 :
 169 :
 170 :

f. 96vb

AB flor. II

- Line 147: Δ Δ flor. II: Δ
- Line 150: Δ flor. II: Δ
- Line 153: Δ flor. II: Δ
- Line 163: Δ flor. II: Δ
- Line 165: Δ flor. II: Δ
- Line 166: Δ flor. II: Δ
- Line 167: Δ flor. II: Δ
- Line 168: Δ , B: Δ

substance or hypostasis. But because the characteristic property e.g. of the substance is not substance nor again is the property of the hypostasis hypostasis, it is not thereby imperfect; because
 165 neither is each hypostasis imperfect because it is not the whole Godhead or Holy Trinity. For to suppose (I will not say 'think') this is the part either of people who have no share at all in the orthodox teachings of the Church or of people who only distort the truth with heretical malice and a poisonous understanding and
 170 thereby endeavour to wound and destroy the souls of simple people unaware of their mischief. As these same words of yours convict you and loudly proclaim, you wrote (as previously set down): Why, then, you people, do you maltreat those properties which you say are homonyms of the perfect properties, by calling them non-
 175 subsisting marks and defining them as different from the hypostases, whereas you favour those you call 'hypostases', understanding them to be substances (though you endeavour to conceal the fact!) and dupe the simple by imagining that the fatherhood or ingeneracy of God the Father, the sonship or generacy of the Only-begotten Son of God, and the pro-
 180 cession or sanctity of the divine and life-giving Spirit are appellations bereft of realities?

173/181 cf. supra, 19-28

...
 ...
 ...
 175 ...
 ...
 ...
 180 ...
 ...
 ...
 185 ...
 ...
 ...
 190 ...
 ...
 ...
 195 ...

AB flor. II 173-181

Line 172: יצא, flor. II: יצא.
 Line 174: דא, flor. II: דא.
 Line 176: רחמי, B and flor. II om.
 Line 180: חסד, flor. II: חסד.
 Line 192: רחמי, B: רחמי.

We may very aptly attach to this the rest of your other *Festal* whose impiety has been examined slightly earlier, and has been shaken and overthrown by the power of our Lord Jesus Christ. For you said there also: But if they should say that * the characteristic properties of the Holy and consubstantial Trinity are, as has been previously stated, nothing but empty terms and relationships bereft of realities, Saint Cyril, arbiter of correct doctrines, will rebut them in their blasphemy, writing, as he does, in the first book of the *Thesaurus*, as follows.

Is there any knowledgable judge between our doctrines and the opponent's who, on hearing these words, would not be rightly amazed and astounded at the writer's impudence and will not learn how swift he is in slander, and how crafty he is at shameless distortions and crazy accusations? Nevertheless, he has done nothing strange to heretical madness or unusual for those of his ilk. For such people conspire to wrest the truth and, impotent in the face of rebuttals, they therefore sometimes try, in their shameless confusion, to transfer their own unlawful blasphemies to those who think aright. Look at the 31st chapter of the second book *Against the Grammarian*, at what the Grammarian said and at what our divinely inspired father SEVERUS also said: The Grammarian: But perhaps our opponents will say that a difference

185/190 Dam. Alex., *Ep. fest. prima* 202/208 Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 31 (CSCO 111, p. 234, 20-27; 112, p. 183, 16-22)

196: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* : *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ : *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 197: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —
 198: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* — f. 97ra
 199: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —
 200: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —
 201: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —
 202: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —
 203: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —
 204: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —
 205: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —

206: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 207: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 208: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 209: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 210: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 211: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 212: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 213: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 214: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 215: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 216: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 217: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 218: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 219: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 220: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓ* —

AB

Line 196: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, B om.
 Line 202: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, cf. infra, line 301 (*ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*).
 Line 204: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, B: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 211: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, B: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 212: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, B: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 219: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, B: *ⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.

existed before the union, whereas after the union, none at all. But I pity
205 such people rather, for thinking the thoughts of Nestorius, for he too
grants that the man was created first and that God the Word then dwelt
in him. Which is what these present-day perverters of truth, who think
the thoughts of Nestorius, also assert. Then after the whole of the
Grammarians' text the master of mysteries says: So you say you
210 pity us, you, drunk with this incurable intoxication and so frantic and in
need of much pity, tears and wails of mourning! What is surprising about
that? For such are those who are drunk not only with the drunkenness
and craziness which comes from wine, but with that which comes from
different causes; who, in their confusion and dizziness * think that stand-
215 ing things, often indeed immovable things as well, are going round.

You have clearly learned, clever fellow, I think, that the
Grammarians said that even the proven Severus, who throughout
his life did not cease from demolishing Nestorianism, was a Nes-
torian; and again, that it is a familiar trait of those drunk and
220 mad with impiety to suppose that the healthy are smitten with their
own ailment, just as those who are confused and dizzy think that
standing and immovable things are going round. So you too, have
suffered nothing strange or out of keeping, you, who on being
censured by us for completely negating the hypostases of the Holy
225 Trinity and for professing the properties and their characterizing
terms merely with your voice and only with an empty mumbling
of words, falsely, indeed, and beyond the bounds of impudence,
accuse us, in return, of those self-same things for which we have
evidently reproved you, from the beginning of this commotion.
230 Does not the *Apology* delivered by Zachariah *on behalf of the*

209/215 *Ibid.* (CSCO 111, p. 235, 18-26; 112, p. 184, 4-10) *221/222 cf.*
supra, 214-215

— ܠܡܘܕܝܢܝܗ ܘܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ —
— ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ —
— ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ —
— ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ —
225 ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ —
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
< ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
< ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
< ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
230 ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
< ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
< ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
< ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ * ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <
< ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ <

f. 97rb

235 ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
240 ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
245 ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :
ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ :

AB

Line 225: ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ, B: ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ.
Line 236: ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ, B: ܝܘܨܝܢܝܗ.

First Apology also make this known? Immediately after the opening, you said: But since your excellency said that certain earnest brethren under your direction were in doubt with regard to certain words by my humble self, and again suppose, even after the defence on these points made by my humble self, that we reckon the hypostases or properties of the Holy Trinity to be mere utterances, let us bring forward, with the Spirit's guidance, a few words on this point too now.

You will have recognized these words of yours, my admirable fellow; you will have apprehended from them that you are the man, who, from the beginning of this commotion, was censured by us on the ground that you think that the hypostases of the Trinity and their characteristic properties are mere utterances and empty terms. How, then, is it that you are attempting, as a counter-charge, to spread about against us the just accusation we made against you?

It would, perhaps, have been necessary, if we had not already spoken on this point in almost every examination which has been conducted in this enterprise, to explore the matter as diligently as possible now. * But because this has been done sufficiently often, according to our modest capacity, it would be as well to remind readers merely with as brief an explanation as possible of our meaning, and move the investigation on to the folly of your other words. Come then, take note of these words of yours, and observe their fatuity and feebleness. For the edifice of your labours, as it were, has tumbled down even before it could be seen, because it was *built on sand*. For such are the blatherings of God's opponents, of whom the prophet David says: *Let them be like the*

232/237 Dam. Alex., *Apologia secunda* 256 cf. Matth. 7:26 257/260 Ps. 128:6-8

250 ܠܘܥܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ
 : ܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 : ܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 255 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 : ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —

ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ
 260 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —

ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ
 265 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 270 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 275 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —
 ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ —

f. 97va

AB

Line 264: ܡܘܨܘܢܐ, B om.
 Line 270: ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ, B: ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ.
 Line 272: ܕܡܘܨܘܢܐ, B om.

grass of the roofs which withers before it has shot up, with which
 the reaper did not fill his hand or the sheaf-binder his armful, and
 260 the passers-by did not say, 'the Lord's blessing on you'. For you
 said: Why, then, you people, do you maltreat those properties which you
 say are homonyms of the perfect properties, by calling them non-
 subsisting marks? And again: By imagining that the fatherhood or
 ingeneracy of God the Father, the sonship or generacy of the Only-
 265 begotten Son of God, and the procession or sanctity of the divine and
 life-giving Spirit are appellations bereft of realities. But also in the
 other passages, as previously set down, you said: But if they should
 say that the characteristic properties of the Holy and consubstantial
 Trinity are, as has been previously stated, nothing but empty terms and
 270 relationships bereft of realities, Saint Cyril, arbiter of correct doctrines,
 will rebut them in their blasphemy. These are the false accusations
 you have impudently made against us in the various *Festals* as we
 have set them down a little earlier. What mutual consonance do
 they have? For, there you said, as if you uttered the words with a
 275 certain hesitancy: But if they should say * that the characteristic
 properties of the Holy and consubstantial Trinity are, as has been
 previously stated, nothing but empty terms and relationships bereft of
 realities, Saint Cyril, arbiter of correct doctrines, will rebut them in their
 blasphemy. Whereas, in the other passages, you decided boldly and
 280 powerfully (but, rather, miserably and ignorantly) to misrepresent
 us by saying: Why, then, you people, do you maltreat those properties
 which you say are homonyms of the perfect properties, by calling them

261/263 cf. supra, 19-22 263/266 cf. supra, 24-28 267/271 cf. supra,
 185-189 275/279 cf. supra, 267-271 281/283 cf. supra, 261-263

280
 285
 290
 295
 300
 305

280
 285
 290
 295
 300
 305

f. 97vb

AB

Line 285: *κἀομνλκ*, B: *κἀομλκ*.
 Line 301: *κἀομλκ*, cf. supra, line 202 (*κἀομλκ*).

non-subsisting marks? And again: By imagining that the fatherhood or ingeneracy of God the Father, the sonship or generacy of the Only-begotten Son of God, and the procession or sanctity of the divine and life-giving Spirit are appellations bereft of realities. For you ought either to have known our views accurately, examined them without hesitancy and drawn the conclusion that they are absurd; or, if you were unsure about this, not to have published an unconsidered and uninvestigated decision, or, rather, an arbitrary slander. However, let such things be permitted to you who are unable, apparently, not to expand yourself thus in forms of words. Be obliged to tell us what exposition of ours you read which gave you the confidence to say that we think that the characteristic properties of the hypostases are utterances, relationships bereft of realities and empty terms. But if you have such a statement of ours you ought to have published it for the confirmation of what you said and the clear conviction of readers, and to have used our writings in proof of what was said against us. But if, again, having supposed that such an impious opinion is to be inferred to us, you had the confidence to write these things (for decrees should be pronounced either on the basis of plain and express words or of a tight sum of objections), why did you not prepare the ground and in that way, openly draw together whatever you thought were the consequences of our words and give sentence accordingly, but instead threw in whatever occurred to you (apart from a statement of ours which yields you * nothing relevant to this case) and, indeed, without any demonstrative examination whatsoever, as if nobody was listening or was able to judge your arguments? Or have you forgotten this too, though you are such a bold teacher and writer: that arbitrary statements without confirmatory rea-

—
 —
 —
 310 —
 —
 —
 —
 315 —
 —
 —
 —
 320 —
 —
 —
 —
 325 —
 —
 —
 —
 330 —
 —
 —
 —
 335 —

f. 98ra

AB

Line 309: ἄλλοι, B: ἄλλοι.

soning are no different from the fancy of dreams. Look at what wise GREGORY, bishop of Nyssa, says on this point in the *Refutation of Eunomius* (its beginning is: To want to help everybody was not, apparently): For though the Church teaches us not to divide out
 315 faith into a plurality of substances but to believe there is no difference in the three prosopa or hypostases *qua* being, whereas our opponents posit difference and dissimilarity in the substances themselves, this fellow confidently decrees the unproved and unprovable by any argument, as if
 320 the ground for it had been prepared; perhaps, without so much as addressing attentive ears, otherwise he would have learned from intelligent listeners, that every argument which issues unproven by authority is old wives' prattle, because it has no power to prove thereby the point at issue
 325 words or from human reasonings.

What then shall we do, my good fellow? Would it be appropriate to disregard and pass over your frigid phrases, or shall we give them a brief examination and demonstrate needlessly again their fatuity and wretchedness? What will you say? For I
 330 will ask you again; indeed, more: I will return on your behalf the answers you do not know at all perhaps, since you have been silent on the rights of your impious nonsense. By what pretext of argument do you affirm that we think that the properties of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are utterances bereft of the
 335 realities? Perhaps, you will say that it is because we will not submit to thinking them hypostases. And why? Will you not

315/325 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 320D-321A; Jaeger I, p. 94, 1-14); cf. supra, ch. 8, 539-542

340
 345
 350
 355
 360

355
 360

AB

Line 340: *mei*, B: *mei*.
 Lines 349-354: *...* cf. supra, ch. 8, lines 591-597 (some small variants).
 Line 362: *...* B: *...*

understand first, that the mode of the hypostases (i.e. the how-a-hypostasis-is) is not a hypostasis, just as the how-a-substance-is, is not a substance: for immortality is not itself God's substance, nor is immutability * nor, again, invisibility (for these are some of what belong with the substance and are not God's substance)? Are we not obliged to conceive of the reality as being free from death, immutable and invisible and correspondingly view with it immortality, immutability, invisibility and the like? Likewise, then, we should consider the unbegotten, the begotten and him who proceeds, themselves, and in due order conceive wisely of not-being-begotten, being-begotten and proceeding as belonging with them. But, if you suppose that not-being-begotten is the same as him who was not begotten, and that being-begotten is the same as him who was begotten and, again, that proceeding is the same as him who proceeds, correspondingly concede that not-dying, not-changing and not-being-seen (for these are immortality, immutability and invisibility) are the same as the Godhead itself which is subject neither to death, change or visibility; in which case, according to Gregory the Theologian, or the whole company of patristic theologians, there will be a plurality of substances of God and not one. But if it is a total absurdity to suppose that these are God's substance, how, according to your argument, can the characteristic properties of the divine substance not be mere utterances and empty terms because they are not God's substance? For if the properties of the hypostases are mere utterances unless

365 : *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία : ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία*
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία : ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
370 *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία*
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
375 *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία*
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
380 *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία*
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
385 *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία*
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία
390 *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία*
ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία

f. 98rb

AB flor. II from L. 391 on

Lines 376-377: *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία* ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία: this passage is repeated in B.
 Line 380: *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία*, B: *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία*.
 Lines 386-387: *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία* ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία, B: *ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία* ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία : ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία ἡ ὑπόστασις ἡ ἁγία.

they are hypostases, it must follow, that we shall say of the properties of the divine substance as well, that unless they are substance they are mere utterances. But if this is false, neither will the characteristic properties of the hypostases be mere utterances and empty terms unless they are understood to be hypostases. But, rather the contrary: if the hypostases were characteristic properties, they too would be reduced to nothingness and their characteristic properties would be mere utterances and empty terms as those utterers of blasphemous nonsense maintain. For if the hypostases under discussion must exist properly * and individually otherwise they will not be hypostases, and, conversely, the divinely taught doctors called the characteristic properties of the hypostases neither properly nor individually subsistent, those who think that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are Father, Son and Holy Ghost must entirely negate the hypostases. But if this is so, how can the properties of the hypostases not become mere utterances and empty terms? For if the individually subsisting realities, whose characteristic properties are ingeneracy, generacy and pro-

395
 400
 405
 410

f. 98va

AB flor. II

- Line 392: פֶּסֶם, flor. II: פֶּסֶם.
- Line 393: נִפְּחָה, flor. II: נִפְּחָה. דִּבְרָה, flor. II: דִּבְרָה.
- Line 397: פֶּסֶם, flor. II: פֶּסֶם.
- Line 400: פֶּסֶם, flor. II: פֶּסֶם.
- Line 402: פֶּסֶם, B: פֶּסֶם.
- Line 409: כָּרָה, flor. II: כָּרָה.
- Line 410: כָּרָה, flor. II: כָּרָה.
- Line 411: פֶּסֶם, flor. II: פֶּסֶם.
- Line 413: כָּרָה, B and flor. II: כָּרָה.

380 cession, are not professed, the characteristic properties must
 become relationships bereft of realities and, as has been said, mere
 utterances and empty terms. Wise CYRIL again bears witness that
 the characteristic properties of the hypostases do not properly and
 individually subsist, when he says, as follows, in the second book
 385 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
 390 begotten; it does not subsist on its own. So much for these things!

But, my good fellow, we shall speak briefly about the 'non-
 subsisting marks' which you slanderously ascribe to us, and we
 shall say that since you define the non-existent as the non-
 subsisting it is your fancy and imagination and not our thought
 395 that the characteristic properties of the hypostases are not extant or
 do not exist. For we do not (as it pleases madness to do) profess
 that the individually subsisting hypostases have them merely
 verbally but, as we have been taught, that they have them in the
 full sense and truly. But since you assert that the non-subsisting is
 400 what does not properly and individually subsist, open your mind's
 ear and listen to wise Cyril, who (as previously set down)
 exclaims: For 'generacy' and 'ingeneracy' are not things existing indi-
 vidually and hypostatically, but they only bring us the meaning of having

385/387 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. II* (PG 75, 741AB; *SChr.*, vol. 231, p. 272); cf. supra, ch. 18, 133-135 388/390 *Ibid.* (PG 75, 741D; *SChr.*, vol. 231, p. 274); cf. supra, ch. 18, 136-138 391/392 cf. supra, 21-22 402/404 cf. supra, 385-387

415 ܡܥܘܢܐ : ܦܐܪܘܨܐ ܕܐܘܪܝܘܨܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 420 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 425 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ

ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 430 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 435 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ
 ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ

AB flor. II up to l. 416 and from l. 426 on

Line 415: ܦܐܪܘܨܐ, flor. II: ܦܐܪܘܨܐ.
 Line 420: ܡܥܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ, cf. infra, ch. 25, line 28 (ܡܥܘܢܐ).
 Line 422: ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ, B om.
 Line 429: ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ, flor. II: ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ.
 Line 430: ܡܥܘܢܐ, flor. II: ܡܥܘܢܐ.
 Line 431: ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ, flor. II: ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ.
 Line 433: ܡܥܘܢܐ, B and flor. II: ܡܥܘܢܐ.
 Line 437: ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ, B: ܕܥܝܫܘܥܐ.

405 been begotten or not having been begotten. And again: * 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.

404/407 cf. supra, 388-390

: ܠܗ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ <
 ܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ <
 440 ܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ < f. 98vb
 ܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ <

AB flor. II ^{up to L 439}

Line 438: ܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ, flor. II: ܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ.

Line 439: ܡܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܐ, B and flor. II om.

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
 5 that if a man is not a horse it is clear that 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
 10 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.

But come, please let us examine in addition to this your other
 15 stupidities. For you wrote directly after the words just now investigated, in the recent *Festal*, as follows: For if a hypostasis is not a property, or indicative mark, of each one (in accordance with Basil the Great) what, then, is it? Must it not be a proper Godhead, in accordance with the polytheists around you? Why are you ashamed to
 20 preach your opinion clearly? How long will you, being (as the Scripture has it) sensual and unspiritual, despoil simpler folk by persuasive arguments? You blather emptily. What hypocrisy have you overlooked, you despoilers of souls?

ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 : ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 5 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 10 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ

ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 15 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 20 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ

AB

Line 5: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ, B: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ
 Line 13: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ, B om.

It is possible to see really plainly that as soon as people stray
 25 from the truth their understanding is darkened so that they do not
 see very obvious stumbling-blocks. Strength fails, firmness of
 mind is weakened in proportion as the plague-spot of presumption
 swells up on them. For is there any mad wretchedness of ideas or
 senselessness not outdone by these words? For if a hypostasis is not
 30 a property, or indicative mark, of each one (in accordance with Basil the
 Great) what, then, is it? Must it not be a proper Godhead, in accordance
 with the polytheists around you? * You will note the powerfulness
 of the arguments. Alas! It will not be easy to get out of these very
 difficult arguments or to escape ineluctable nets, and much proof
 35 has been given that Basil, wise in things divine, does not suppose
 a hypostasis to be a characteristic property of a hypostasis, but
 very much deprecates this mischievous opinion. However, the
 truth-loving listener will understand how (as we have also said in
 the foregoing) the writer, quite careless of truth and opportunistic,
 40 sometimes makes a hypostasis a collection of properties, sometimes
 an indicative mark. For where different properties are plainly
 attributed to a hypostasis he defines hypostasis as a collection of
 properties, so that he may not, by professing every property a
 hypostasis, be convicted of thinking each of the three prosopa to
 45 be many different hypostases. But when this is not clearly or
 expressly plain, he professes a hypostasis as being only one
 property. Which is why here too, having somehow forgotten his
 struggles over the collection of properties, he has called hypostasis
 the indicative mark of each one, disregarding whatever compre-
 50 hension he may imagine of each one, and bewildered by the use of

29/32 cf. supra, 16-19 34/37 cf. supra, ch. 17, 156-317 40 cf. supra,
 ch. 17, 90 et 54 41 cf. supra, 30 42/43 et 48 cf. supra, 40 49/50 cf. su-
 pra, 30

25 *אֲנִי הַיְהוּדִים וְהַנְּשִׁימִים וְהַכְּנָעִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים*
וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים
וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים
 30 *וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים*
וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים
 35 *וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים*
וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים
 40 *וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים*
וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים
 45 *וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים*
וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים
 50 *וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים*
וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים וְהַיְגֵרִים

A. f. 99ra

AB
 Line 25: *אֲנִי הַיְהוּדִים*, B: *אֲנִי הַיְהוּדִים*.
 Line 32: *וְהַיְגֵרִים*, B: *וְהַיְגֵרִים*.

Great) what, then, is it? Must it not be a proper Godhead? It will be obvious to everybody that to mislead, he fraudulently brought in Basil the Great here, because he wanted to use Basil's reputation to prove that a hypostasis is a characteristic property. So where are patristic testimonies to this? Where are the arguments from human reasonings? Let them come forward and guide the readers' mind to a true knowledge of the points at issue. Or if the clever fellow is incapable of that, let him learn that he is coming in to recite us his fables and fabrications again, or, rather he is patching together senseless cavills. Therefore, let him listen to what wise GREGORY, head of the see of Nyssa, said to Eunomius, a similar slanderer, in the *Refutation* (whose beginning is: To want to help everybody was not, apparently) as follows: For who would be so crazy or so out of his mind as to say 'Father' and 'Son', and again to suppose two ingenerates, and then think that the one had been begotten by the other? But what is the necessity thrusting his teaching into these suppositions? From what words of his has this been constructed so that the absurdity should be forced to crop up? For if he were alleging anything professed by us and then was bringing forward, whether by sophistry or with some sort of force, a proof for such a cavill, he might perhaps have had occasion for alleging such a thing for the slandering of our doctrines. But if there are not and will not be in the Church any such words, and none is convicted

75
 80
 85
 90
 95
 100
 105

AB

- Line 83: $\omega\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$, B: $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$.
- Line 84: $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$, B: $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$.
- Line 88: $\kappa\epsilon\gamma\iota$, B: $\kappa\epsilon\gamma\iota$.
- Line 93: $\sigma\epsilon\iota$, B: $\sigma\epsilon\iota$.
- Line 96: $\kappa\alpha$, B repeats.
- Line 98: $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$, B: $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$.
- Line 99: $\kappa\alpha\kappa\alpha$, B: $\kappa\alpha$.
- Line 105: $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$, B: $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$.

of saying them, none is proved to have heard them, and no necessity *
95 constructing this absurdity by way of some consequence is to be found, I
do not understand what purpose this shadow-battle of his has.

Therefore, we shall be right to spurn the empty verbiage of this
writer's idle slanders too, in proportion to the stupidity of such
allegations. For it is a peculiarity of champions of falsehood to be
100 struck with such severe frenzy that they defame those wont to
honour truth, with the opposite heresies without any plausible ar-
gument. But truth will fight for those who hold to her, and will
defeat those destroyers of souls who speak vain, ignorant lies and
attack orthodox doctrines, and will sling them out of the Church
105 like dead and putrifying limbs from a healthy body. So, by her
power, we shall pass by the bundle of insults, committing it to the
father of insults, and shall tear the arguments of his other fables,
like weak and feeble threads torn by the healthy finger of the pure,
patristic word.

110 He writes, then, again: For tell us, you clever fellows, for we ask the
same question again, what do you say the generacy of the Only-begotten
is? An activity? But an activity is non-subsistent, whereas to call the
generacy of the Only-begotten which proceeds from the Father non-sub-
sistent is akin to blasphemy. For who is so godless as by mental invention
115 to make what does not exist prior to God? A subsistent, but a different
one, according to your definition, from the Son? The Son then will either
be third from the Father (generacy subsisting first) or, if that is not so, he

◁ * * * * * f. 99va
◁ * * * * *
◁ * * * * *

110 * * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *
115 * * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *
120 * * * * *
* * * * *
* * * * *

— * * * * *
— * * * * *
125 — * * * * *
— * * * * *
— * * * * *
— * * * * *
— * * * * *
130 — * * * * *
— * * * * *

A B^{sup} to ... (l. 124)

Line 111: ... B: ...

Line 124: ... B: ...

Line 127: ... cf. infra, lines 160 and 314 (trsp.).

will be found composed of generacy and his proper hypostasis. Or will
 you speak of the Son of God as 'belonging to the will' and as 'the Son
 120 of the will'? What illustration do these ample demonstrations of your
 blasphemy require?

The writer's wise teachings have been proved very remarkable
 and self-consistent. For, above, he learnedly testifies (and this,
 whilst making a total innovation in the word of truth) that we
 125 should honour the birth by silence. For he wrote: 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. Whereas, here, he harshly demands that we
 130 investigate and give a scientific account of the generation. For tell
 us, he says, you clever fellows, for we ask the same question again, what
 do you say the generacy of the Only-begotten is?

So let it be understood that he has made this feigned show of
 reverence, to deceive. But who are those who investigate, or,
 135 rather, blaspheme against divine things? Is it they who abide
 solely by patristic definitions and refuse to mingle anything novel
 or destructive in with the confession handed down from the
 beginning; or he who, as has been abundantly proved, thinks and
 speaks what is alien to the Christian churches and has never been
 140 uttered at all there? For tell us, he says, you clever fellows, for we ask
 the same question again, what do you say the generacy of the Only-
 begotten is? An activity? But an activity is non-subsistent, whereas to
 call the generacy of the Only-begotten which proceeds from the Father

125/129 cf. supra, ch. 20, 162-165 130/132 cf. supra, 110-112 140/
 145 cf. supra, 110-115

—
 —
 —
 135 —

—
 —
 —
 140 — f. 99vb
 —
 —
 —
 —
 145 —
 —
 —
 —

—
 —
 150 —
 —
 —
 —
 155 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 160 —

A

Line 160: *cf. supra, line 127, and infra, line 222 (trsp.).*

non-subsistent is akin to blasphemy. For who is so godless as by mental
 145 invention to make what does not exist prior to God? As for us, we shall
 persist in our examination of these despicable words lest this
 absurd nonsense should seem to certain people to have some force
 against the truth. However, I believe that chaster persons will not
 free us from all blame for not spurning and, as one says, vaulting
 150 high over this putrid filth of heretical lunacy, since it destroys
 itself at once and needs nobody to investigate it and rebut it. For
 what sense does it have to say What do you say the generacy of the
 Only-begotten is? An activity? But an activity is non-subsistent, and
 then argue its absurdities, when there is nobody mad enough to
 155 teach it? Or * is the wise listener to suppose that this writer is
 different from someone who might say: 'What do you say man is?
 A horse? But a horse is a quadruped'? It will then be easy to
 counter someone who says he thinks that man is a horse with very
 crazy arguments. But such a person will hear, and very justly,
 160 from wiser men: 'You fool! Why are you squabbling, when there
 is nobody to argue the point with you?' In the same way, we shall
 say to this good fellow: If the discussion had not been in haste to
 get on to pressing matters you might easily have learnt that not
 even in these futile words did you understand what you argued.
 165 All the same, why do you fabricate things which have never been
 said or will be said by anyone who would draw you towards
 orthodoxy? You are required to prove from the fathers' doctrines
 that ingeneracy, generacy and procession are hypostases. So why
 do you put off making an orthodox and sufficient apology over the
 170 points you are censured on, and vainly argue to us that generacy is

—
 —
 165
 170
 175
 180
 185
 190
 f. 100ra

152/153 cf. supra, 141-142

not an activity, scoffing foolishly as if you had been victorious at the games, and doing the same as if someone somewhere were to think man's soul mortal and, on being required to give proofs of it, were to come in with all haughtiness, proving that fire is not cold or that a stone is inanimate and then demand with elation the crown of victory?

But someone will say with justice: Look, having arrived at the point set down, the writer asks whether we call generacy subsistent. Here we shall examine that issue. For he said by way of question: A subsistent, but a different one, according to your definition, from the Son? The Son then will either be third from the Father (generacy subsisting first) or, if that is not so, he will be found composed of generacy and his proper hypostasis.

It is with difficulty that the clever writer is persuaded to grasp the subject. So let us be wise and observe that he does not recognize any of the things spoken of the Trinity as not subsisting properly and individually, as we can infer from his words and is evident from the fact that he supposes * that we must of necessity diametrically oppose the individually subsistent to the non-existent. For if he had supposed that there is anything really existing but not individually subsistent, he would not have supposed the divine generacy necessarily either non-subsistent (i.e. non-existing) or subsistent (which he thinks of always as subsisting individually). It is easy for those who want to, to learn his understanding that what does not subsist is what does not exist whereas what subsists is what properly and individually subsists, from his writing: For tell us, you clever fellows, for we ask the same question again, what do you say the generacy of the Only-begotten is?

180/183 cf. supra, 115-118 197/202 cf. supra, 110-115

195
 200

205
 210
 215

f. 100rb

A flor. II from l. 218 on

Line 192: *αὐτὸς*, A: *αὐτὸς* (wrongly).

Line 218: *οὐκ ἔστιν*, flor. II: *οὐκ ἔστιν*. *αὐτὸς*, flor. II: *αὐτὸς*.

200 An activity? But an activity is non-subsistent, whereas to call the
 generacy of the Only-begotten which proceeds from the Father non-sub-
 sistent is akin to blasphemy. For who is so godless as by mental invention
 to make what does not exist prior to God? He has, you will see, taken
 the non-subsistent as being what does not exist.

205 But let us investigate also the other passage where he has
 understood 'subsistent' as being what properly and individually
 subsists. For he said: A subsistent, but a different one, according to
 your definition, from the Son? The Son then will either be third from the
 Father (generacy subsisting first) or, if that is not so, he will be found
 composed of generacy and his proper hypostasis. Clearly here again
 210 too he says subsisting is subsisting individually. For how can
 anybody even doubt this where he struggles throughout his book
 to prove ingeneracy a hypostasis? For if ingeneracy is, by his ar-
 gument, a hypostasis, and he unwillingly professes hypostasis as
 subsisting individually, it is obvious that when he uses the term
 215 'subsisting' of the generacy he also takes it as standing for 'in-
 dividually subsisting'.

This being thus explained, let us ask the clever fellow what he
 supposes each property of the divine substance to be. Subsistent
 i.e. properly and individually subsisting, or non-subsistent? (For

220 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 225 —

—
 —
 —
 —
 —
 230 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 235 —
 —
 —
 —
 —

—
 240 —
 —

A flor. II

Line 221: $\mu\alpha$, flor. II: $\mu\alpha$. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II om. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.

Line 222: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, cf. supra, line 160, and infra, line 314 (trsp.).

Line 224: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.

Line 227: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.

Line 230: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.

Line 233: $\mu\alpha$, flor. II: $\mu\alpha$.

Line 234: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.

Line 237: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.

Line 241: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, flor. II: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.

220 according to his clever and plain division, there is nothing *
 between these). But if subsistent i.e. subsisting properly and
 individually, how can there not be a host of hypostases to be
 viewed in the divine substance? For proven Cyril wrote in the 31st
 chapter of the *Thesaurus*, as follows: If whatever belongs solely to
 225 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', 'imperishable', 'in-
 visible' 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? You see,
 230 admirable fellow, that there is a host of things to be viewed in the
 divine substance. Therefore, if each of them is a subsistent, and
 what subsists must, by your argument, also subsist properly and
 individually (i.e. must be a hypostasis) how can the Holy Trinity
 235 be a trinity and not, rather a myriad (to make so bold in exposing
 your crazy and wicked opinion) or, at least, not be composed, as it
 were, of innumerably many hypostases? Otherwise it will be non-

245
 250
 255
 260

f. 100va

A B from (L 257) flor. II

- Line 244: ῥησιμον, flor. II: ῥησιμον. ῥησιμον, flor. II: ῥησιμον.
- Line 248: εἰς, flor. II: εἰς κατ.
- Line 249: ἁπλοῦς, flor. II: ἁπλοῦς.
- Line 252: ἁπλοῦς, flor. II: ἁπλοῦς.
- Line 253: ἁπλοῦς, flor. II: ἁπλοῦς.
- Line 255: ῥησιμον, flor. II: ῥησιμον.
- Line 257: ῥησιμον, flor. II: ῥησιμον.
- Line 259: ῥησιμον, flor. II: ῥησιμον. ῥησιμον, B and flor. II: ῥησιμον.
- Line 260: ῥησιμον, flor. II: ῥησιμον.
- Line 263: ῥησιμον, flor. II: ῥησιμον.
- Line 264: ῥησιμον, flor. II: ῥησιμον.

subsistent and therefore, of necessity, also non-existent, for what does not subsist does not exist. And how can what are viewed in
 240 the divine substance be non-subsistent and non-existent? For, as you have said, who is so godless, as to say that what always belong to God as God and characterize his substance, neither exist nor
 245 subsist? Listen to wise GREGORY OF NYSSA, saying in the 20th chapter of his refutation *Against Eunomius* (whose beginning is: To want to help everybody was not, apparently) that this is a complete
 250 absurdity, as follows: But if, escaping from these absurdities he should call the activity, whose completion defines the Son, a non-subsistent thing, let him tell us again how * what does not exist can follow *Him who is*, how, indeed, what does not subsist can effect what subsists. For it
 255 will be found that what do not exist will thereby follow God, indeed that what do not exist will be the causes of those that exist and that what do not subsist by their own nature will bound the nature of what subsists and that the power completing and making all Creation will be bounded by what does not, according to its own principle, exist. Such are the doctrines of the new theologian!

241 cf. supra, 114
 Jaeger I, p. 100, 6-15)

246/255 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 328B;
 248/249 cf. Ex. 3:14

265
 270
 275
 280
 285

f. 100vb

AB flor. II

Line 266: *ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ*, flor. II: *ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ*.

Line 267: *ⲡⲟⲩⲱ*, flor. II: *ⲡⲟⲩⲱ*.

Line 271: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*, B and flor. II: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*.

Line 273: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*.

Line 274: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*, B and flor. II: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*.

Line 277: *ⲱⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲱⲁⲓ*.

Line 278: *ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ*, flor. II: *ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ*.

Line 280: *ⲡⲟⲩⲱ*, flor. II: *ⲡⲟⲩⲱ*. *ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ*, flor. II: *ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲓⲁ*.

Line 281: *ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲁⲓⲁ*, flor. II: *ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲁⲓⲁ*. *ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲁⲓⲁ*, flor. II:

ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲁⲓⲁ.

Line 282: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*. *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲱⲁⲓⲡⲓⲗⲓ*.

What, then, does the clever fellow want to make the characteristic properties of the divine substance? Non-subsistents? And how can what are said of God and about God be not all non-subsistents and somehow empty terms too? Subsistents? Again the scale goes down perforce on the other side and the clever fellow will himself be convicted of correcting distortion by distortion. For, having rightly shunned saying that the perceived properties belonging to the divine nature do not exist, he wrongly fabricates for us an infinite quantity of hypostases by his abominable definitions.

So grant us a reply, clever fellow! For what you see fit to think (when, however, you follow the God-clad fathers) about the characteristic properties of the divine substance, will be the same answer we shall reasonably give to you on the subject of the characteristic properties of the prosopa. Why do you keep silent? Why is there no word, no reply, no wisdom? Where is your acuteness, your swiftness, your facility in writing theology? Where are those so truly wonderful mazes and tangles of syllogisms? Where the false cunning, the verbal clamour, the great ambition for innovating divine doctrines, source of your vanity and your contempt for the God-clad fathers? But you will learn, I think, to honour things divine by silence and not to suppose that you have comprehended the incomprehensible, and then

289
 290
 295

300
 305

AB flor. II up to l. 300

- Line 289: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*.
- Line 291: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*.
- Line 292: *ⲙⲁⲓⲁ*, flor. II: *ⲙⲁⲓⲁ*.
- Line 295: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*.
- Line 299: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*, B: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*.
- Line 300: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*.
- Line 303: *ⲙⲁⲓⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*, B: *ⲙⲁⲓⲁⲓⲥⲁⲓ*.

261 Greg. Naz., Or. 20, 5 (PG 35, 1072A; SChr., vol. 270, p. 68); cf. supra, ch. 3, 34

perhaps you will not say: For tell us, you clever fellows, for we ask
 280 the same question again, what do you say the generacy of the Only-
 begotten is? An activity? But an activity * is non-subsistent, whereas to
 call the generacy of the Only-begotten which proceeds from the Father
 non-subsistent is akin to blasphemy. For who is so godless as by mental
 invention to make what does not exist prior to God? But if not, we also
 285 will meet you with the same words by saying, 'Tell us, you clever
 fellow, for we ask the same question again, what do you say the
 properties of the divine substance are? Activities? But activities
 are non-subsistent, whereas to call the characteristic properties of
 the Godhead non-subsistent is akin to blasphemy. For who is so
 290 godless as by mental invention to add what does not exist to
 God?' You will see the similarity, indeed the identity, of the argu-
 ments.

310 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — — f. 101ra
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 315 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 320 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 325 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —

AB

Line 314: *גמלא*, B om. *לפניו*, cf. supra, lines 127 et 222 (trsp.).

Line 318: *לפניו*, B: *לפניו*.

Line 325: At the top of fol. 76v B reads as follows: *גמלא* *גמלא* *גמלא* *גמלא* *גמלא*. *Of saint Peter of Antioch against impious Damian.*

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 called the generacy 'subsistent', without, though, defining it as a hypostasis, as is evident from his abundant teaching.

But you are to allow the other part too of your question or syllogism to be addressed to you. A subsistent? Then the hypostases of the Godhead will either be many and not three, or they will be mutually compounded so as to make up one trinity out of many hypostases.

But perhaps you will say, under compulsion from the truth, and since you have no hope of avoiding the dilemma: 'I say that each of the Godhead's properties subsists, not in the sense that it subsists properly and individually but because it truly exists and belongs to the divine substance'. Thus it is, we say, that our divinely inspired father Severus, contrasted 'existing' with 'non-existing' and 'subsisting and being' with 'non-subsisting and non-being', in his statement (which you mischievously repeat) * and called generacy 'subsistent', without at all supposing that it sub-

Ἐπιφανήσῃς.

1 ἢ ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, τὸ ἀλλήλων ἔχοντες, ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ἃ καὶ ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα.

10 ὅτι ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα.

15 ἃ καὶ ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα. ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα, ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν ἅμα ἢ ἕνα.

A, f. 101rb

AB flor. II from l. 14 on

Line 6: ἡμεῖς, B: ἡμεῖς.
Line 19: ἡμεῖς, flor. II: ἡμεῖς.
Line 22: ἡμεῖς, B: ἡμεῖς.
Line 23: ἡμεῖς, flor. II: ἡμεῖς. ἡμεῖς, flor. II: ἡμεῖς.

19/22 cf. infra, 51-56

sists properly and individually but understanding the truly existing as subsistent. So, then, do we think of the divine generacy: as
 25 neither non-subsistent (i.e. non-existent) nor as subsisting individually. For we hear proven Cyril saying: 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 again: Ingeneracy, then, is by no means God's substance,
 30 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. Therefore, it is not a hypostasis, because whatever does not subsist on its own and individually is not a hypostasis or prosopon. If generacy is not a hypostasis but the mode of the Son's hypostasis, the Son will not
 35 be (as you have misled yourself into concluding) third from the Father or composed of two hypostases. For what follows the hypostasis of the Only-begotten and is viewed in him, yet, again, belongs to him and is innate in him, does not make him composite, since neither do the characteristic properties of the divine
 40 substance make composite the God to whom they are present and in whom they are viewed and to whom they belong. Therefore your miserable tangle of puzzles has been unravelled, and with it go your glorifications and your posturings based on that proof-text of our divinely inspired father Severus you congratulated yourself
 45 over when you gave it a nightmarish misrepresentation.

For let us observe what you said after the other words we have now examined: Can they argue again? Will they be in doubt about the

26/29 cf. supra, ch. 23, 385-387 29/31 cf. supra, ch. 23, 388-390 35/36 cf. supra, ch. 24, 117-118 47/59 Dam. Alex., Ep. fest. secunda

25
 30
 35
 40
 45

—

AB flor. II ¹⁰ l. 27

Line 24: ἰσορ, flor. II: οἰσορ.
 Line 25: ἰσορ, flor. II: ἰσορ.
 Line 26: ἰσορ, flor. II: ἰσορ.
 Line 28: ἰσορ, cf. ch. 23, line 420, and ch. 30, line 109 (ἰσορ οἰσορ).
 Line 46: ἰσορ, B: ἰσορ.

doctor? I should think not, but, nevertheless, let them accept another testimony by famous Severus, loyal to his fathers and their wise hearer,
 50 who proclaimed in his 123rd *Cathedral Sermon*: 'For if he was in the beginning as He who is with Him who is and as God with God, how can we understand God's generation which exists perpetually, as not being true, subsistent and eternal and from the very substance of the begetter, but compare it with * rain and dew?' Will you not acknowledge that the
 55 generacy of the Only-begotten exists in its own hypostasis, true, eternal and subsistent? But perhaps this will still be difficult for you. For once you had planned to proceed in the opposite direction and unsparingly to pour out blasphemies against the Holy and consubstantial Trinity, *seeing you will not see and hearing you will not hear*, as Scripture has it.

60 The purpose of the father's statement, and again the error and total hypocrisy of the writer, can be readily recognized from the previous examinations. Damian's endeavour, indeed, has been to confirm his perfidy not from the truth but, just like the founders of evil heresies before him, from the similarity of certain little phrases and terms. For the same wise SEVERUS shows this very clearly by the words previous to the divinely inspired statement which Damian excerpted, words which he maliciously curtailed out of heretical villainy. In proof of this and in order that readers may

50/54 Sev. Ant., *Hom. cath. 123* (PO 29, p. 134, 13-16 [135, 16-21]) 50/51 cf. Ioh. 1:1 51 cf. Ex. 3:14 54 cf. infra, 71-72 58/59 cf. Matth. 13:13-14; Marc. 4:12; Luc. 8:10; Is. 6:9; Act. 28:26

50 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܐܘܪܘܫܝܡ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 55 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 60 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 65 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —

f. 101va

ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 70 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —
 75 ܕܘܟܘܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ ܕܡܘܩܝܢ —

AB

Line 51: ܕܘܟܘܢ, B om. ܕܘܟܘܢ, B: ܕܘܟܘܢ.
 Line 57: ܕܘܟܘܢ, cf. infra, line 114 (trsp.).
 Line 64: ܕܘܟܘܢ, B: ܕܘܟܘܢ.
 Line 75: ܕܘܟܘܢ, B: ܕܘܟܘܢ.

amply learn the already stated correct meaning of this patristic
 70 text, we must set down in full the doctor's words, which are as
 follows: *Who is the father of the rain or who begat so much dew and
 abundance?* It was not to show the birth and generation of these things
 but because he is explaining that to human generations or births and those
 of the rest of what are on earth belong time and travail, this is why he
 75 says, 'Do you suppose I have need of those things, of such delay and la-
 bour in generation, for bringing dew, rain, frost and ice, and did not these
 things subsist more swiftly than a word, as a result of the divine activity,
 indeed, rather, by the will, by a sign only, or by whatever swifter thing
 than these we can say of God?' But we should, then, understand the
 80 terms in correspondence with the meaning of the underlying realities and
 not maim truth by a metaphorical usage of words. For one understands
 God as Father 'of the rain' and 'of the Son, the Only-begotten', in dif-
 ferent senses. For the term 'Only-begotten' shows that God the Word was
 begotten of God the Father, unique from unique and outside every kind *
 85 and notion of any generation. Therefore 'Only-begotten' separates the
 Son's generation on high from the later generations or births below,
 whether they really exist or are called this by custom. In other words, if
 Scripture had only said, 'The Father begat the Son' and nothing else, one
 90 could have understood the birth by a comparison with similar expres-
 sions, not as truly from the Father's substance but in its metaphorical

71/112 Sev. Ant., Hom. cath. 123 (PO 29, pp. 132,12 - 134,27 [133,14 - 135,34]) 71/72 Iob 38:28 82 cf. supra, 71

71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104.

f. 101vb

AB

Line 85: *α. β. γ. δ. ε. ζ. η. θ. ι. κ. λ. μ. ν. ξ. ο. π. ρ. σ. τ. υ. φ. χ. ψ. ω. α. β. γ. δ. ε. ζ. η. θ. ι. κ. λ. μ. ν. ξ. ο. π. ρ. σ. τ. υ. φ. χ. ψ. ω.*
 Line 100: *α. β. γ. δ. ε. ζ. η. θ. ι. κ. λ. μ. ν. ξ. ο. π. ρ. σ. τ. υ. φ. χ. ψ. ω.*
 Line 104: *α. β. γ. δ. ε. ζ. η. θ. ι. κ. λ. μ. ν. ξ. ο. π. ρ. σ. τ. υ. φ. χ. ψ. ω.*

listeners by the assimilation, alteration and misinterpretation of words. Extremely hard up and poverty-stricken (for falsehood cannot but be denuded of any support from truth's divinely instructed athletes) he does not honestly quote from the abundance
 145 of their teaching and their rich, everflowing spring of * clear and lucid words but looks out for obscure similarities of words and terms, endeavouring to hide in their holes and pits, as it were, and so not be noticed when he inflicts great wounds on the souls of the simple. So it is that like mice, as we have been taught, he filthily
 150 nibbles off phrases and attempts to alter them to his fraudulent and utterly abominable purpose. For when those who attempt to establish the doctrines of Arius, in addition to the villainy itself, attack the sacred words and devise their whole plan to impugn the divine generation of the Only-begotten by assimilating terms, and
 155 when our God-clad father Severus powerfully ranges himself against them here, clearly rebuts their absurd madness, and lucidly proves that the generation of rain and dew (which the impious dared to assimilate to the generation of God's Son) is not generation at all, but the term 'generation' is applied to these
 160 things by metaphorical usage, whereas the generation of the Son is not unsubsistent or non-existent but is really always in-existence (for this is what 'subsistent' means here for him) and is from the divine substance itself of the begetter, because God the Word, whose generation it is, is believed to have been truly begotten
 165 without beginning i.e. non-temporally of God the Father and is present from the beginning with *Him who is God and Father*, as

165
 170
 175
 180
 185

f. 102rb

AB

Line 167: *κἀουλι*, B: *κἀουλι*.
 Line 177: *κἀουλι*, B: *κἀουλι*.
 Line 186: *κἀουλι*, B: *κἀουλι*.

He who is, God and Son — when all this is so, this cunning
 deceiver, accuser and slanderer of all the Church's masters of
 mysteries, very swiftly (indeed, rather, very villainously) fell on
 170 the word 'subsistent', like savage and untameable beasts on some
 prey. The wretch presumptuously hoped to seize the expression,
 expecting that it would provide him with material for the advocacy
 of his absurd and despicable doctrines.

For this reason too, it is right that he should be stoned and broken
 175 in pieces and the evil one shall perish evilly, because he pillages and
 tears out sound words, not to reject them clearly but to present
 them cunningly as a trap for the simple and to string them as bait
 on the hook and secretly mix the edible in with the lethal poi-
 sons - which is the summit of wickedness. For, in truth, true and
 180 solid words are stones for the brutal, as GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN,
 speaking about such things * with divine inspiration, teaches us
 very clearly when he wrote as follows in the *Second Oration on
 Theology*: If anyone is an evil and untameable beast, unreceptive in any
 way of words of insight and theology, let him not creep into thickets
 185 maliciously and craftily to catch some word or doctrine by suddenly
 leaping and rending sound words with abuse, but let him stand again far
 off and depart from the mountain, otherwise he will be stoned and broken
 in pieces and the evil one shall perish evilly. For true and solid words are
 stones for the brutal. And if he is a leopard he shall die with his spots; if
 190 a ravening and roaring lion desiring to make food of our souls or words;
 if a swine trampling on the beautiful, shining pearls of truth; if an
 Arabian wolf, foreign in breed, sharper than these in sophisms; if a fox, a

167 cf. Ex. 3:14 174/175 cf. infra, 187-188 179/180 cf. infra, 188-189
 183/196 Greg. Naz., Or. 28, 2 (PG 36, 28BD; SChr., vol. 250, pp. 102-
 104) 186 cf. I Tim. 6:3; II Tim. 1:13 186/187 cf. Ex. 19:12-13 188 cf.
 Matth. 21:41 189 cf. Jer. 13:23 190 cf. I Petr. 5:8 191 cf. Matth.
 7:6 192 cf. Hab. 1:8; Soph. 3:3 192 et 194 cf. Cant. 2:15

190 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 : ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 .ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 195 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ

ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 200 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 205 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 210 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 215 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ

f. 102va

AB

Line 190: ܡܪܝܢܐ, B: ܡܪܝܢܐ.
 Line 194: ܡܠܟܐ, B: ܡܠܟܐ.
 Line 201: ܡܪܝܢܐ, B: ܡܪܝܢܐ.
 Line 207: ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ, B: ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ.
 Line 216: ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ, B: ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ.

deceitful and treacherous soul, now this now that, changing with times and deeds, whom dead and putrifying corpses nourish or little vineyards since they avoid the big; or if any other of the animals rejected by the Law, which eat live flesh and are unclean for eating and enjoyment.

So, again, let us take up afresh the clever writer's statement and investigate as best we can its subtle and profound ideas. For he says, after setting down our God-clad father Severus' proof-text:
 200 Will you not acknowledge that the generacy of the Only-begotten exists in its own hypostasis, true, eternal and subsistent? For the moment we shall keep over in its own hypostasis until we have reached that point and learned again the careful and plain interpretation of it by wise Cyril. But we shall examine the passage according to our
 205 powers.

Tell me, excellent fellow, (for we may justly address the question to you) what necessity had the man who professes the divine generation as not misnamed or non-existent, not subject to time or resulting from will (as the godless suppose) but, rather, as being true, eternal and from the substance itself of the begetter, what
 210 necessity had he to define it as a hypostasis also? And you must * clearly inform those who do not know where you confirm this from! But perhaps you may say that these things are rightly said about a hypostasis and not about any of the other things which do
 215 not subsist individually. It will be sufficient proof if that can be shown clearly, for truth is to be valued more than anything. Come then, expound the passage to us. For it will be easy to understand

ⲉⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 220 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ

ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 225 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 230 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ

ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 235 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 240 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ

f. 102vb

AB

Line 226: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ, B: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ.
 Line 236: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ, B: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ.
 Line 243: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ, B om.

the point at issue, if we consider it as follows: we know that the peculiar mark of a hypostasis is that it has, uniquely, proper and individual subsistence; for of nothing else except a hypostasis is this so. (Indeed none of those wont readily to attack the truth with great savagery would object against us the hypostases which have concurred into one without confusion in a natural collection and do not subsist in proper subsistence but in composition). For these are predicates of a hypostasis existing in proper subsistence, the hypostasis whose peculiar mark, 'proper and entirely individual subsistence', we have mentioned. Therefore, if we find that we do not have to take any non-individual subsistent as predicated by the wise master of mysteries of the divine generation, it will be immediately obvious that the divine generation has been understood by the doctor in place of hypostasis. But if we can profess the things which have here been said about the divine generation also of things which truly exist but do not subsist properly and individually, it will not be necessary, I think, to understand generacy as being a hypostasis as a result of what the God-clad father says about the generation.

Therefore, let us examine, word by word, the whole passage of the master of truth quoted by your clever self, and it would be helpful to begin a little before it. For what are we to do, he says, when we hear John saying, *In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God*. These things, which you have

239/241 cf. supra, 95-97

245
 250
 255
 260

265

AB flor. II from l. 245 to l. 254

- Line 245: B: *...*
- Line 246: flor. II: *...*
- Line 255: B: *...*
- Line 259: B: *...*
- Line 265: B: *...*
- Line 267: B: *...*

excerpted very aptly to your intention, my admirable fellow, are indubitably said about the hypostasis of the Only-begotten Son. *In the beginning, he says, * was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God.* What you set down and which connect with this is: For if he *was in the beginning * as He who is with Him who is* and as God with God, how can we understand God's generation which exists perpetually, as not being true, subsistent and eternal and from the very substance of the begetter?

250 Let us observe how the doctor, ever careful, having first fixed the hearer's mind on the hypostasis, then speaks about the generation, For if, he says, he (i.e. the Word) *was in the beginning as He who is with Him who is* and as God with God, how can we understand God's generation who exists perpetually, as not being true, sub-
 255 sistent and eternal and from the very substance of the begetter? So, he has called true the generation of God who exists perpetually i.e. the generation of the hypostasis of God the Word. Do you, then, see fit to say that the generation is a hypostasis on the ground that it is true? Then it is time that you professed that the properties of the
 260 divine substance too are hypostases because, I suppose, * you will not reject calling these 'true'. For if, because the father called the generation true, you thought you should profess the generation as being a hypostasis, of necessity the properties of the Godhead too
 265 will be hypostases, or, if you like, substance, because they are true. But if they are true but not hypostases, the generacy then too will not of necessity be a hypostasis because it is true.

270
 275
 280
 285
 290
 295
 f. 80rb
 f. 80va
 f. 80vb

A 77 to 78 (L 273) B

Line 271: *κεεις*, B: *δεις*.

243/245 cf. supra, 240-241 246/249 cf. supra, 97-100 et 50-53 252/
 255 cf. supra, 246-249 256 cf. supra, 254 262 cf. supra, 256

We shall say the same thing too about subsistent and eternal: that if you do not call the characteristic properties of the divine substance unsubstisting or non-existent and recent (characteristic properties which I do not suppose you would feel justified in calling hypostases), likewise also when the doctor calls the divine generation subsistent and eternal and from the very substance of the begetter of the Only-begotten Son because it always and truly exists, he too is not compelled to think of it as a hypostasis. What will you say, my good fellow? Will you bow to this? Or will you travail with a counter-argument consisting of sophisms, as is your wont, * repeat your words, and say that because the divine generation is not unsubstisting or non-existent, it also necessarily subsists properly and individually and is a hypostasis? In that case do not be ashamed to say that the characteristic properties of the Godhead also subsist properly and individually and are hypostases because they too are not unsubstisting and non-existent.

But if you judge this an impiety, desist from excerpting, curtailng and despicably misinterpreting divinely inspired words, from giving impossible support to your feeble misunderstanding, from stealing and capturing the simple souls of ingenuous people and from making them participants in your ruin! For you ought, if you care in any way for truth, to take a reasoned view of the abundance of orthodox teaching and not leave out of account the vast range of testimonies on the point, by taking hold of only one passage, even if you really did think it would aid your purpose. For you yourself will perhaps know what you said * in the 13th chapter of your book, and so we shall remind you very usefully and frequently of your words, in order that you may be shamed at least by your admonitions, made to blush a little, and restrained

267 et 272/273 cf. supra, 255

300
 305
 310
 315

f. 81ra

320
 325

f. 81rb

of the whole genus. But if anyone happens to mention Job, or Elkanah
 (father of Samuel), the peculiar mark of the appellation points out, as if *
 325 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 under
 the substance and common genus of manhood. For the particular appella-
 tion '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
 330 understanding by the peculiar mark of the designation; it limits and di-
 rectly the mind towards the one hypostasis of so-and-so and indicates
 distinctively what things characterize it. And again: Likewise if one
 hears 'Elkanah', from the particular name one mentally imagines the im-
 pressions characterizing a single man, not many men but a single hy-
 335 postasis. And a few lines later: Therefore Elkanah, who is signified to
 us by what has been said, is a man like Job, but another one apart from
 him and subsisting separately and particularly. For hypostasis establishes
 at the same time the identity of being with the co-generic and separates
 the one signified by particular and unconfused marks, * from those who
 340 share in the genus and substance with him. What sophism will the
 cunning fellow again devise for us? What will knavery fabricate
 against sacred doctrines? Indeed, how many hypostases for every
 hypostasis will verbosity lay down for us by law? No, says the
 345 doctor, the appellation curbs the understanding by the peculiar mark of
 the designation; it limits and directs the mind towards the one hypostasis

332/335 Ibid. (CSCO 111, p. 60, 18-20; 112, p. 48, 4-6); cf. supra, ch. 9, 103-
 105 335/340 Ibid. (CSCO 111, p. 61, 8-14; 112, p. 48, 22-27) 343/346 cf.
 supra, 329-332

360 ארבעה עשרה ימים ושלשה ימים ושלשה ימים ושלשה ימים ושלשה ימים <
 * חן : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים ושלשה ימים ושלשה ימים ושלשה ימים ושלשה ימים < f. 81vb
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <
 ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים <

B

Line 359: ארבעה עשרה ימים, cf. supra, ch. 9, line 84 (ארבעה עשרה ימים).
 Line 364: ארבעה עשרה ימים, cf. ibid., line 88 (ארבעה עשרה ימים). ארבעה עשרה ימים, cf. ibid.
 (om.). ארבעה עשרה ימים, cf. ibid., line 89 (ארבעה עשרה ימים).
 Line 367: ארבעה עשרה ימים, cf. ibid., line 91 (ארבעה עשרה ימים).
 Line 369: ארבעה עשרה ימים, cf. ibid., line 93 (add. ארבעה עשרה ימים).
 Lines 369-370: ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים : ארבעה עשרה ימים, sic punctuation in B.
 Line 372: ארבעה עשרה ימים, cf. supra, ch. 9, line 111 (ארבעה עשרה ימים).

f. 81vb

f. 82ra

of so-and-so and indicates distinctively what things characterize it. And again: Likewise if one hears 'Elkanah', from the particular name one mentally imagines the impressions characterizing a single man. And again: For hypostasis establishes at the same time the identity of being with the co-generic and separates the one signified by particular and unconfused marks. Now observe, we expressly hear as belonging to one hypostasis sometimes what things characterize it, sometimes the impressions characterizing it, sometimes again, its proper and unconfused marks. So let him foolishly suppose different hypostases belonging to a single man, for this is the conclusion right reasoning draws from your novel theology.

But perhaps the author will say that a hypostasis is not a single property, * but, rather, a collection of different properties. In that case generacy is not a hypostasis, for generacy is a single property and not a plurality of them; furthermore, should the studious listener investigate the characteristic properties listed by the doctor of Job and Elkanah, he will discover that many of them were later acquisitions. How, then, can hypostases be collections of them? If the excellent fellow says that hypostases are collections of properties which were generated along with the hypostases, we again meet a crazy and irrational division of properties. In this way too he will be convicted of thinking hypostases only 'accidents'; for experts in such matters understand as 'accidents' of created things what are viewed in hypostases, whether as separable or inseparable. To use another argument, how, if a hypostasis is a collection of properties, will it establish at the same time the identity of being with the co-generic and separate the one signified by particular and unconfused marks? For the characteristic properties of the prosopa do not establish the identity * of being with the

347/348 cf. supra, 332-334 349/351 cf. supra, 337-339 352 cf. supra, 346
 353 cf. supra, 348 353/354 cf. supra, 350-351 371/373 cf. supra, 349-351

385
 390
 395

f. 82rb
 400
 405
 410
 f. 82va

B

Line 385: ... sic punctuation in B.

375 generic, but only the difference in hypostasis of the co-generic.
Will this pleasant fellow not perceive what the absurdities of his
perfidy are?

But let us set down other words by the guide to truth. For he
said in the same first chapter, as named before, of the second
380 book, after what has just been quoted: The hypostasis of * the Father,
that of the Son and that of the Holy Ghost are different. For though
eternity belongs to them and thereby the fact of being equal in honour
and without difference of substance, nevertheless their mode of being is
different. For the Father exists ingenerately unbegotten by another;
385 which is why he is Father in the full sense. Whereas the Son is non-
temporally and eternally begotten of the Father, shining unparted from
his Father's hypostasis like a beam from the Sun, spiritual light from
spiritual light. But the Holy Ghost has his eternal being from the Father,
yet not generately like the Son, but by procession. For just as the Son
390 exists from the Father by a divine, incorporeal and inconceivable
generation, which the mind cannot comprehend, so too the Holy Ghost
exists from the Father by divine, incomprehensible and inexplicable pro-
cession. For it is written that he is *the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from
the Father*. Therefore, the fact of their existing non-temporally and
395 eternally shows the community and consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity,
whereas the difference in mode of being brings in the particularity and
non-participation of each of the hypostases with respect to the other two.
For the Father stands fixedly in being neither from anything nor existing
generately, not changing from this property whereby he is known as

380/413 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 1 (CSCO 111, pp. 63,1 - 64,16; 112,
pp. 49,36 - 51,3) 393/394 Ioh. 15:26

415 *ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ*
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ

ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
420 *ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ*
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
425 *ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ*
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
430 *ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ*
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
435 *ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ*
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
440 *ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ*
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ
ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ

A, f. 103ra

A from ܘܥܘܕܢܐ ܕܘܥܘܕܢܐ (l. 420) B

Line 424: ܘܥܘܕܢܐ, B: ܘܥܘܕܢܐ.
Line 425: ܘܥܘܕܢܐ, B: ܘܥܘܕܢܐ.

400 Father. Whereas the Son abides in shining forth generately from the Father, not changing to the ingeneracy of his begetter or to the procession of the Holy Ghost, but having divine and incomprehensible generation as the unblended indication, present to him alone, whereby he is recognized as the Only-begotten Son in his particular hypostasis. But the Holy Ghost
 405 possesses a fixed procession from the Father which shows clearly his hypostasis, not changing to the ingeneracy of the Father or to the Son's generacy. In this way, then, with its innate property being present in each of the three hypostases (fatherhood in the Father, generacy in the Son, procession in the Spirit) the Father remains Father and not Son or Spirit,
 410 the Son remains Son and not Father or Spirit, and the Holy Ghost remains Holy Ghost and not Son or Father. Thus * the Holy Trinity is known in three distinct hypostases by the distinction of properties, and in one substance by the identity of the Godhead.

He wrote similar things too in the eighteenth chapter of the same second book: So will one who said these things appear to you to be severing the substance of Father and Son or is he disclosing that each hypostasis exists in the substance of the Godhead, having its own innate property? And because of his being without difference with respect to his consubstantials each will be said to share in the same substance because
 420 the substance over all the hypostases of the same genus is one.

415/420 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 18 (CSCO 111, p. 170, 9-16; 112, p. 133, 2-8)

445
 450
 455
 460
 465

f. 103rb

460
 465

AB flor. I from l. 451 to l. 458 and from l. 460 to l. 463

Line 451: *ⲁⲗ*, cf. infra, line 524 (*ⲁⲗ*).
 Line 452: *ⲉ*, flor. I om. *ⲉ*, flor. I om.
 Line 453: *ⲕⲁⲕⲁ*, flor. I: *ⲕⲁⲕⲁ* om.
 Line 454: *ⲕⲁⲕⲁ*, flor. I: *ⲕⲁⲕⲁ* om.
 Line 457: *ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*, B and flor. I: *ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛ*.
 Line 460: *ⲉⲛⲉ*, cf. infra, line 530 (*ⲉⲛⲉ*).
 Line 462: *ⲁⲗ*, Y add. *ⲉ*. *ⲕⲁⲕⲁ*, Y om.
 Line 463: *ⲕⲁⲕⲁ*, W: *ⲕⲁⲕⲁ*.

as well, all the same, to show you nurslings of the Church briefly, since time hastes on, why the father arrived at this examination, in order that you, when you read soul-destroying and lethal doctrines, may disregard them and be of the untainted. When, therefore, Eunomius was adducing a difference of substances by the distinction between ingeneracy and generacy, the saint, having previously set down the Anomean's argument, joins issue with him and restraining him with a bridle, as it were, confutes the impious fellow by his own words.

Truly, falsehood is ever a constant follower of obscurity, as these murky and completely dark words of this good fellow will also testify. For though it was his task to examine, as he had promised, whether Saint Gregory of Nyssa does or does not think the offspring and generacy are the same, he leaves off examining the question and ends up in inane blather. And this, when time, * as he says, hastes on hard for him! He said: Against whom did the father have his battle and why did he arrive at this examination? Was he explaining his own view when he subjected the divine nature to corporeal suffering? How could that be? Why this babble on the part of one who is in haste and under pressure? Why, my admirable fellow, do you need to labour inanely over these things? For no God-fearing man will oppose the proposition that the divine nature is impassible. So do not suppose any longer that you are bestowing a great favour on the world by proudly teaching that God is incorporeal and impassible. Or was he controverting, he says, the opponents' argument? The answer, indeed, is evident to everybody, even

509/510 cf. supra, 497 510/513 cf. supra, 491-494 519/521 cf. supra, 494-495

—
 —
 —
 —
 —
 555 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —

560 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 565 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 570 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 575 —
 —
 —

AB
 Line 562: *ⲓⲱⲓⲱⲃ*, B: *ⲓⲱⲓⲱⲃⲟ*.
 Line 570: *ⲛⲉⲙⲉⲣⲁⲩ*, B: *ⲛⲉⲙⲉⲣⲁⲩ*.
 Line 571: *ⲛⲉⲙⲉⲣⲁⲩ*, B: *ⲛⲉⲙⲉⲣⲁⲩ*.

the unwilling. You will see the old-wives' tales, and to what end he does not make the hearers, if any remain, abhor them. For though he ought first to have explained, as much as possible, what the present dispute is about, and then clearly indicate what Eunomius and what wise Gregory thought about the things in contention between them, he apparently forgot the subject itself and uttered fatuous words. Having filled his volumes with those fatuities, simply in order to be thought an author, he maliciously railed against more trusting folk, because they are unable or unwilling to comprehend his trickery. Look at the elaborate deception! For he said: It would be as well, all the same, to show you nurslings of the Church briefly, since time hastes on, why the father arrived at this examination, in order that you, when you read soul-destroying and lethal doctrines, may disregard them and be of the untainted. Now he has promised to show briefly, since time hastes on, why the father arrived at the examination. (I do not know which one he means). So let us look carefully at the fulfilment of the promise. When, therefore, he says, Eunomius was adducing a difference of substances by the distinction between ingeneracy and generacy, the saint, having previously set down the Anomean's argument, joins issue with him and restraining him with a bridle, as it were, confutes the impious fellow by his own words. * You will observe how clearly this very learned author has shown briefly, since time was hastening on, and explained to the Church's nurslings, the entire knowledge of the issues, and what Eunomius, on the one hand, and what wise Gregory, on the other, thought about the question whether the begotten is or is not the same

525

530

535

540

545

580 ...
 ...
 585 ...
 ...
 590 ...
 ...
 595 ...
 ...
 600 ...
 ...
 605 ...

f. 104rb

AB

Line 581: ... B: ...

Line 587: ... B: ...

Line 605: ... B: ...

* Chapter 26

Concerning the fact that since the author promised to state
 Saint Gregory of Nyssa's and impious Eunomius' view of
 generacy and the begotten and put forward empty and idle
 5 blathering, we ourselves ought, for the full assurance of readers,
 to do that clearly and to show by a full examination and demon-
 stration 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.

10 So, since he refused to explain, as he had promised the Church's
 nurslings to do, what Eunomius and what the doctor, on the other
 hand, thought about the matter in doubt between us and him, we
 ourselves will bring the matter to as full and clear a light as we
 can. When Eunomius was shamelessly attempting to maintain that
 15 the Son is different in substance from the Father (and was
 therefore sometimes positing a substance that was begotten and a
 substance that was unbegotten, sometimes claiming ingeneracy
 itself as the Father's substance and hypostasis and likewise
 generacy as the Son's substance and hypostasis, in order that, by
 20 transferring the difference and otherness of ingeneracy with re-
 spect to generacy to the substances and hypostases of Father and

አዲስ ግጥም ይባላል፣ እርሱም ገንዘብ ሆኖ ገባ
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 : ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 5 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 : ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 : ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 : ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡

10 አዲስ ግጥም ይባላል፣ እርሱም ገንዘብ ሆኖ ገባ
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 15 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡
 20 ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡

AD

Line 2: At the top of fol. 5v D reads as follows: አዲስ ግጥም ሆኖ ገባ ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡ ለአዲስ ግጥም ሲባል ማለቱን ያሳያል፡፡ *Of Peter, archbishop of Antioch, the latter half of the third book against Damian.*

Line 3: አዲስ ግጥም, D: አዲስ ግጥም.
 Line 7: አዲስ ግጥም¹, D: አዲስ ግጥም.
 Line 13: አዲስ ግጥም, D: አዲስ ግጥም.
 Line 17: አዲስ ግጥም, D: አዲስ ግጥም.
 Line 20: ማለቱን, D om.

Son he speaks of, he might then have indubitably and indisputably what he sought) he was very powerfully and manfully rebutted by the guide to truth who proves, from his opponent's words themselves, what was also very important should be proved: that ingeneracy or generacy is not a substance or a hypostasis at all but, rather, that these are viewed in the hypostases. It was this, then, as we have said, that the doctor claimed on the basis of the very statement by blasphemous Eunomius which defines the generation of a substance, but he secured the point also by a Gospel illustration, adding the words set down by us in our brief *Joint Agreement* about the current matter of doubt 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'.

32/46 Petr. Callinic., *Syndocticon*; Dam. Alex., *Ep. fest. secunda*; cf. supra, ch. 20, 21-34 32/40 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (PG 45, 592A; Jaeger II, p. 29, 4-12) 33 cf. Ioh. 16:21 40/46 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (PG 45, 592B; Jaeger II, p. 29, 19-26)

,ո և Կոտն Կառն Կիտ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ : ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ : ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 25 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ : ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 30 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 35 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 40 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 45 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :
 ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ ԿԵԱԵ :

f. 104vb

AD flor. I from L 37 to L 40

- Line 28: ,ո, D: Կտ.
- Line 34: Կ, D: illegible.
- Line 35: ԿԵԱԵ, D: ԿԵԱԵ.
- Line 36: ԿԵԱԵ (bis), D: ԿԵԱԵ.
- Line 37: ԿԵԱԵ, Y: ԿԵԱԵ.
- Line 39: ԿԵԱԵ, DWXY: ԿԵԱԵ. ԿԵԱԵ, D: ԿԵԱԵ.
- Line 43: ԿԵԱԵ, D: ԿԵԱԵ.
- Line 44: ԿԵԱԵ, D: ԿԵԱԵ.

These are the father's words. The wise listener is to judge whose thought it is that generation is one thing but the man who comes into being by generation is another. Is it the thinking of one who supposes it is the same thing to say, like Eunomius, 'begotten substance' and 'generacy', or, on the contrary, the thought of one who strongly opposes this? But anyone who is in doubt over the matter is clearly at odds with sense itself. For it is evident to everybody that the man who wants to prove the begotten substance one thing but the generation another must be reckoning the affirmation that offspring is different from generation as his own opinion. Who, then, is it who thought that the begotten substance and generacy are the same thing? Is it not Eunomius? Who is it who painstakingly sought to prove that generacy is something different from the begotten substance? It is, indeed, obvious that it was wise Gregory. Therefore it has been proved beyond doubt, that professing the man born different from the generation belonged to the doctor's profession and not to the impiety of impious Eunomius, who was defining generacy and begotten substance as identical.

Listen to the master of mysteries himself, who clearly explains these things to us through his plain words. For he says about

48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

66
 67

AD

Line 49: At the top of fol. 6v D reads as follows: *ⲛⲓⲥⲁ ⲛⲓⲥⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲥⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓ*. *Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.*

Line 50: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛ.

Line 52: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛ.

Line 56: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ.

Line 59: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ.

Line 63: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛ.

Line 64: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛ. ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛ.

Line 66: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓⲛ.

Line 67: ⲛⲓⲥⲁ, D: ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲛⲓ.

Eunomius in the first book *Against Eunomius* (whose beginning is: There is a limit to him who *strives lawfully*): I will take up and
70 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
75 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
80 the substance.

How can it not be obvious to anybody, when these things have thus been said, that Eunomius thought of ingeneracy as a substance, and again, of generacy as a substance, whereas his wise adversary proved from the fact that the impious fellow said
85 begotten substance, that neither ingeneracy nor generacy is substance? How, then, can we fail to take the statement that generation is one thing but the one who comes into existence by generation is another, as the doctor’s own orthodox view? For if

69 cf. II Tim. 2:5 69/80 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (PG 45, 589BC; Jaeger II, pp. 27,21 - 28,6); cf. supra, ch. 19, 14-24 85 cf. supra, 72

70 < ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
75 < ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
80 < ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς

f. 105ra

85 < ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς
< ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς

AD

- Line 69: $\mu\epsilon\tau\iota$, D: $\mu\epsilon\tau\iota$.
- Line 70: $\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\psi\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda$, cf. supra, ch. 19, lines 333-334 ($\epsilon\psi\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\psi\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda$).
- Line 72: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda$, D: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$.
- Line 74: ψ , D om.
- Line 78: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$ (bis), D: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$.
- Line 83: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$, D: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$.
- Line 84: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$, D: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$.
- Line 87: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$ $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda$, D: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda$.
- Line 88: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$, D: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$.
- Line 89: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$, D: $\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\sigma\tau$.

one who says begotten substance must truly say in consequence that
 90 the substance is one thing and generation another, one who says
 that a man has been born (or a hypostasis has been begotten), must
 by similar logic recognize the hypostasis (or man) as one thing
 and the generation and birth as another. So why does the writer
 deceive himself, and, elated by empty nonsense, ignorant of what
 95 he is speaking, declare with pride: Against whom did the father have
 his battle and why did he arrive at this examination? Was he explaining
 his own view when he subjected the divine nature to corporeal suffering?
 How could that be? Or was he controverting the opponents' argument?
 The answer, indeed, is evident to everybody, even the unwilling. In truth
 100 these frigid words only deserve tears and not refutation at all. For
 though this empty talker had to prove that the doctor did not by his
 own view call generacy one thing and man another (for this * was
 the only point here) he abandoned the issue and, lo and behold, he
 105 struggles to prove that the doctor did not subject the divine nature
 to corporeal suffering.

But let us hear again the rest of his old-wives' nonsense: The
 doctor, after entrapping the mischief-monger here, introduced the Gospel
 illustration, proving that although according to his argument, as its con-
 clusion has now shown, the meaning of 'substance' is one thing and that

89 cf. supra, 72 95/99 cf. supra, ch. 25, 491-495 106/112 Dam. Alex.,
 Ep. fest. secunda; cf. supra, ch. 20, 108-111

90 נפסו וְאֵלֶּיךָ יָבוֹאוּ וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 95 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 100 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 105 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 f. 105rb

110 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ
 וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ וְיִשְׁתַּכַּח וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְיִשְׁתַּבַּח וְיִשְׁתַּמְּחוּ

AD
 Line 91: כְּהַוְּיָהּ, D: כְּהַוְּיָהּ.
 Line 94: כְּהַוְּיָהּ, D: כְּהַוְּיָהּ. כְּהַוְּיָהּ, D om.
 Line 101: כְּהַוְּיָהּ, D: כְּהַוְּיָהּ.
 Lines 111-112: כְּהַוְּיָהּ, כְּהַוְּיָהּ, cf. supra, ch. 20, line 114 (כְּהַוְּיָהּ
 כְּהַוְּיָהּ).
 Line 113: כְּהַוְּיָהּ, cf. ibid., line 115 (כְּהַוְּיָהּ). כְּהַוְּיָהּ, cf. ibid., line
 116 (כְּהַוְּיָהּ).

110 of 'generacy' i.e. of 'hypostasis', is another, nevertheless begetter and be-
gotten must be of one substance: the very thing which Eunomius no-
where wanted to concede.

And here again the writer has been shown to be a faithful pupil
of his master. For he resembles his forebears not only in his doc-
trines but even in the obscurity of what he writes. So, out of regard
115 for the absurdity of his doctrine, he publishes the same argument
of his not stripped bare but covered up; because this too is the
practice of evil thinkers. Exact CYRIL is one of many to teach this,
when he says as follows, in the eighth book of his commentary *On*
120 *John's Gospel*: This is the absurd and murky language of our
opponents. For it is a common practice stemming from their evil method,
to make use of obscure language, especially when the wretches venture to
disgorge something very blasphemous and out of tune with the divine
scriptures. For their conscience buffeting them within will rightly not per-
125 mit them to *lift up their horn on high*, as Scripture has it, *and speak*
wickedness against him who is God in truth and nature i.e. the Only-
begotten whom the Father's nature beamed forth, the stamp and image of
his own substance and nature. But as for me (for I believe I must tell you
the truth) I do not understand very well what they mean by saying 'he
130 everywhere acknowledging the Father's rule!'

120/130 Cyr. Alex., *Comment. in Ioh.*, VIII, fragm. graece non servatum et
hucusque partim incognitum (cf. Pusey, II, p. 332) 125/126 Ps. 74:6

ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲁⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
115 : ⲁⲟⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —

ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
120 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
125 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
130 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
135 ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —
ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓⲛⲓ —

AD flor. I from l. 130 to l. 135

Line 114: ⲛⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ. ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ.
Line 116: ⲛⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲓ.
Line 120: ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲛⲓⲛⲓ. ⲛⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲓⲛⲁ.
Line 130: ⲛⲓⲛⲁ, Y: ⲛⲓ.
Line 131: ⲛⲓⲛⲁ, Y add. ⲛⲓⲛⲁ.

The doctor, he says, after entrapping the mischief-monger here, introduced the Gospel illustration, proving that although according to his argument, as its conclusion has now shown, * the meaning of 'substance' is one thing and that of 'generacy' i.e. of 'hypostasis', is * another, nevertheless begetter and begotten must be of one substance: the very thing which Eunomius nowhere wanted to concede. Who can understand the obscurity (or to speak truer, the dense darkness) of these maliciously devised words? For it is rather easy to learn from them that, according to the argument of this clever author, the master of mysteries was convicted of thinking the begotten substance and generacy the same, whereas Eunomius, on the contrary, has appeared to adhere to the truth, or to think something that befits the champions of truth, by stating that the meaning of substance is one thing and that of generacy another.

145 However, because these words of the admirable author are, apparently, not difficult at all to understand, but are completely senseless, let us put aside the other matters and carefully inquire why he quoted proof-texts again and named generacy here too as a hypostasis. For he said: The doctor, after entrapping the mischief-monger here, introduced the Gospel illustration, proving that although according to his argument, as its conclusion has now shown, the meaning of 'substance' is one thing and that of 'generacy' i.e. of 'hypostasis', is another. What? Did you learn, excellent fellow, that generacy is a

140 —
—
—
— f. 105va
—
—
145 —
—
—
—
150 —
—
—

155 —
—
—
—
—
160 —
—
—
—

AD

Line 144: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, D: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$.

Line 146: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, D: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$.

Line 149: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, D: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$.

Line 154: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, D: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$.

Line 164: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, D: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$. $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, D: $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$.

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.

These words having been thus quoted, it will be explained, as well as one can, what impure Eunomius' meaning is and what the doctor's is. For he is acting, he says, with malicious deceit in speaking

180 ἁλ κῆουεβ κῆο κῆουεβεβ : εωσῶκῆ κῆουεβ ἁλῆ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 190 ἱεβ ὀκῆ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ : κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ : ἱεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 ἱεβ ὀκῆ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 : ἱεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 195 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 : ἱεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 200 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 : ἱεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 205 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 : ἱεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 210 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <
 κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ κῆουεβεβ <

AD

Line 188: κῆουεβεβ, D: κῆουεβεβ. κῆουεβεβ, D: κῆουεβεβ.
 Line 202: κῆουεβεβ, D: κῆουεβεβ.
 Line 204: κῆουεβεβ, D: κῆουεβεβ.
 Line 205: κῆουεβεβ², D: κῆουεβεβ.
 Line 206: κῆουεβεβ (bis), D: κῆουεβεβ. κῆουεβεβ, D: κῆουεβεβ.
 Line 208: κῆουεβεβ, D: κῆουεβεβ.
 Line 212: κῆουεβεβ, D: κῆουεβεβ.

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. So, as we said before, * impious Eunomius tried mainly by two arguments to claim the Father as different in substance from the Son: by an argument which 'proves' that ingeneracy is a substance and likewise generacy; and, again, by an argument which proposes one substance as begotten but the other substance as not begotten. As is clear because at one point the master of mysteries says, 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, whereas at another (as previously set down), 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. Thus the wicked fellow professes that generacy itself is the substance and again that the substance was begotten, supposing that by these two arguments (as we have said) he may procure the opposition of the substances he speaks of. But that (I mean, that ingeneracy is a substance and similarly generacy) if it be granted to him, must establish what the heresy is looking for; as BASIL THE GREAT also testifies, writing, as he does, as follows in the first book against the wicked man: But that fellow, taking a path from the argument he had forcibly seized, went on from these to the claim that ingeneracy is the substance of the God of all, so that when this is acknowledged he will have the dissimilarity in substance between the Only-begotten and the

: ܘܫܘܕܢܐ ܕܢܘܨܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܝܘܢܐ : ܝܘܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ <
 215 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ * ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ f. 106ra <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 220 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 : ܝܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 225 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 : ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 230 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 235 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܝܐ : ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <

AD

Line 214: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ. ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ.
 Line 221: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ.
 Line 226: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ.
 Line 230: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ.
 Line 231: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ.
 Lines 234-237: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ, cf. infra, ch. 31, lines 470-473 (a different Syriac translation).
 Line 234: ܕܐܠܘܗܝܘܬܐ, D om.

209/211 cf. supra, 200-202 212/214 cf. supra, 182-185 217/218 cf. supra, 210-211 222/226 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. I, 5 (PG 29, 520B; SChr., vol. 299, p. 180)

Father as an undisputed point. And again: He denies that ingeneracy is viewed in God by way of 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. He teaches more clearly on this point also in the sermon *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 a substance. The Father is not begotten. This is the meaning of ingeneracy. So how can * not having been begotten be substance? How, indeed, did the one who was begotten receive any of it? If he did not, what is the aim of his sophism which calls ingeneracy the Father’s substance and generacy the Only-begotten’s? It is to prove that the substances are different in the same way that ingeneracy is unlike generacy. But let us observe how the wicked fellow’s own impiety is clearly rebutted by that other argument, even if one allows him, as a concession, to profess the generacy of the substance, as wise Gregory clearly proves by the words previously set down. For he is acting, he says, 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

230
235
240
245
250
255
260

238 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 239 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 240 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 241 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 242 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 243 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 244 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 245 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 246 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 247 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 248 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 249 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 250 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 251 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 252 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 253 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 254 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 255 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 256 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 257 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 258 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 259 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <
 260 ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ <

f. 106rb

AD

- Line 238: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 240: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 244: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 245: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 249: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 250: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ. ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 251: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 252: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 256: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 258: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.
- Line 260: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ, D: ܕܥܘܢܝܘܬܐ.

226/230 Ibid. (PG 29, 521A; *SChr.*, vol. 299, pp. 180-182); cf. supra, ch. 17, 419-423 231/241 Ps. Bas. Caes., *De eis qui dicunt Filium esse dissimilem Patri*, Van Roey, pp. 189-190 (pp. 185-186, lines 58-69); cf. supra, ch. 18, 236-243 245/252 cf. supra, 175-182

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
 250 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. You will see that Eunomius' studied object was to prove that generacy is the same as begotten substance in order that he may thus prove that the Only-begotten is dissimilar
 255 in substance from the Father, whereas the master of truth was concerned to eradicate this opinion by the very words of the impious fellow. For he has not done, he says, 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
 260 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'. Nobody will suppose that the doctor is saying that Eunomius professes that the substance was begotten with a view to proving that generacy is not the same as substance (for instead
 265 of proving ingeneracy a substance, and again generacy a substance, that blasphemer was straining every nerve, as it were, so that, as we have learned, he might hereby have the difference in substance between the Only-begotten and the Father as an undisputed

261 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ : ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 265 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 270 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 275 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 280 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <
 ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ <

AD

- Line 263: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.
- Line 265: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.
- Line 266: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.
- Line 267: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.
- Line 271: At the top of fol. 11v D reads as follows: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܩܘܡܝܢܐ. *Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.* ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.
- Line 277: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.
- Line 278: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.
- Line 279: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.
- Line 281: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ, D: ܩܘܡܝܢܐ.

257/262 cf. supra, 182-187 266/269 cf. supra, 224-226

point) but that in attempting * to claim from the substance's
 270 having been begotten the difference in substance between Father
 and Son, he is by all means convicted, even through what he
 hoped would confirm his view, of unintentionally rendering in-
 valid the whole of his heterodoxy. For truth's athlete reveals this,
 when he says: For he is acting with malicious deceit in speaking of the
 275 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 is begotten
 clearly defines generacy as being something other than substance, so as
 280 not to permit the meaning of generacy to be adapted to the concept of
 substance. It is thus obvious that the very thing Eunomius was
 expressly not conceding, the wise master was concluding from his
 impious arguments - I mean, the fact that generacy is other than
 the 'begotten substance'. For he did this also in the words that
 285 follow, by saying: 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 sub-
 stance itself; but here he acknowledges that the substance has been
 begotten, so that the hearers have a distinct idea of each word. Eu-
 nomius, he says, having said the substance has been begotten and
 290 thereby wanted to prove the difference in nature between Father
 and Son, forgot himself and denied what he designs in many pas-
 sages i.e. his saying that generacy itself is the substance. For a
 separate idea is applied to each word by those who hear that the
 substance has been begotten. The hearer, in fact, has one notion by

* , *ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ* f. 106va
ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ
 285 *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ
 290 *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*
 295 *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*
 300 *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*
 305 *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*

AD
 Line 282: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*.
 Line 289: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*. *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*.
 Line 292: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*.
 Line 297: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*.
 Line 306: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ*.

274/281 cf. supra, 175-182 285/288 cf. supra, 182-186 289 cf. supra,
 287-288 291/292 cf. supra, 285-286

295 'has been begotten' and another by the term 'substance'. Having very cleverly hereby demolished the champion of impiety, the advocate of truth, for clearer demonstration of his words (and lest anybody should perhaps suppose that he was contending for orthodoxy with a sophism), rightly confirms the conceded argument by a Gospel example and says: 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. 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 no-

310
 315
 320
 325
 330

f. 106vb

AD

- Line 317: $\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$.
- Line 319: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$.
- Line 320: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$.
- Line 321: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$. $\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$. $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$.
- Line 322: $\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$.
- Line 323: $\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota$.
- Line 325: $\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota$.
- Line 328: $\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota$.
- Line 329: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$. $\kappa\alpha\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota$.

315 tion proper to each term) the heresy which teaches the otherness of substances through such words absolutely has no longer any room.

What, then, do you want, my pleasant fellow? For the discussion has reached the point at issue. Do you suppose that what the master concluded from the Gospel illustration is true or false? If
 320 false, in the first place the Gospel illustration taken by the father has become for us a cause of falsehood. And then the wise master used a false illustration to produce a conclusion against the impious Eunomius. In which case the fact of substance's being one thing and generacy's another (as the master of mysteries holds)
 325 must also be thought false. For if it is false to say that generation is one thing and the one who came into existence by generation another, what was concluded by the doctor from the Gospel illustration must also be false: viz. that the substance which it is said has been begotten is one thing and the generation another. In
 330 which case not only will generation be the same as the one who came into existence by generation but also, again, ingeneracy and generacy will be the same as substance. And so the blasphemer's repeated impudence against Christians (rather, indeed, against God the Word himself) will win. But if, though you venture so

ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ❖ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ

ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 335 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 340 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 345 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ : ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 350 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ

AD flor. II from l. 333 to l. 350

Line 333: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, flor. II trsp.
 Line 337: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, flor. II: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ.
 Line 340: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, D: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲏ.
 Line 341: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, flor. II: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ. ⲛⲏⲓ, flor. II: ⲛⲏⲓ.
 Line 342: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, D: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲏ.
 Line 343: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, D and flor. II: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ.
 Line 346: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ (bis) D: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ.
 Line 347: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, D: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ.
 Line 348: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, flor. II: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ.
 Line 349: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, D and flor. II: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ.
 Line 351: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ, D: ⲛⲏⲓⲛⲏⲟⲩⲁⲓ.

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.

15 But come, let us put presumption to shame (seeing that we are forced by evil thinkers, like people pointing out the Sun at high noon, to clarify such plain words), let us investigate again in detail every word of what was quoted by us in that document mentioned by this good fellow.

20 So, just as, he says, in this passage we have learned from the Gospel two distinct ideas. *Hear, you deaf*, that the master said that we have learned from the Gospel two distinct ideas: first, he says, we have

והואו יאחינא עכא דאוינומו עכא עכא
 כלה : אכלא עכא : כה : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :

A, f. 107rb

אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :

אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :
 אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא : אכלא עכא :

AD

Line 13: אכלא עכא, D: אכלא עכא. אכלא עכא, D: אכלא עכא.
 Line 17: אכלא עכא, D: אכלא עכא.
 Line 24: אכלא עכא, D: אכלא עכא. אכלא עכא, D: אכלא עכא.

20/21 cf. supra, ch. 26, 303-304 21 Is. 42:18; cf. supra, ch. 21, 251
 21/25 cf. supra, ch. 26, 304-307

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! *See you blind!* For a man is not generation, he proclaims loudly, but by generation the man exists! Who is giving these definitions? Is it Eunomius, as our author chooses to think? No, as we have heard, the doctor affirmed that it was from the Gospel that he learned that generation is one thing and the one who came into existence by generation another. For he said (to shout the same words ten thousand times in dull ears): 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. Is not what has been said obvious to everybody: that just as on having heard from the Gospel that *a man has been begotten* we immediately learn, by the true necessity of the realities itself, that generation is one thing and he who exists by generation another, so also with Eunomius

25 Is. 42:18; cf. supra, ch. 21, 252 25/26 cf. supra, 24-25 31/38 cf. supra, ch. 26, 303-310 40 cf. supra, ch. 26, 303

25 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 30 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 35 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 40 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ
 ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ ἡ ἀνομιὰ

AD

Line 25: ἀνομιὰ (bis), D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 26: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 27: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 28: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ. ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 31: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 32: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 36: ἀνομιὰ², D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 37: ἀνομιὰ (bis), D: ἀνομιὰ. ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 38: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 39: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 41: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 42: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.
 Line 44: ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ. ἀνομιὰ, D: ἀνομιὰ.

having acknowledged that a substance was begotten, we must be led to understand that the substance is one thing and its being be-
 45 gotten another?

Thus the heresy which teaches the otherness of substances through such words will no longer have any room, he says. For if the argument which he had forcibly seized (I mean which * proposes the identity of generacy and substance) procured dissimilarity in substance be-
 50 tween the Only-begotten and the Father, it is obvious that, with its being proved that substance and generacy are not the same, the difference in substance between Father and Son which he was claiming is null and void. However, I have not forgotten that I wanted to clarify the doctor's words but have been able to say
 55 nothing except those same words of his as they are. And this is as it should be: for if I were required to denote the sky in speech I could not do anything but point to the sky itself. I think this has thoroughly demonstrated what the doctor's purpose and contest with that wicked fellow was.

But let us, please, look at the harshness of the noble and truth-
 60 loving writer's grand criticisms of us. He wrote, then, immediately after his words just examined, about wise Gregory, as follows: For he says, in between those words quoted by these admirable accusers, some which the agents of sacrilege have disregarded with a pricking
 65 conscience: '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

46/47 cf. supra, ch. 26, 315-316 47/50 cf. supra, ch. 26, 222-226
 62/72 Dam. Alex., Ep. fest. secunda 65/71 Greg. Nyss., Contra Eun. III, 1
 (PG 45, 592AB; Jaeger II, p. 29, 12-19); cf. supra, ch. 19, 51-57

45 ܩܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ

ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 50 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 55 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 60 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ

f. 107va

ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 70 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ

AD flor. II from l. 49 to l. 55

Line 48: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ. ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.
 Line 51: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, flor. II: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.
 Line 52: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.
 Line 54: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, flor. II: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.

together and shattering one another. For it will no longer be open to them to carry over the ingenerate-generate distinction to the substance of Son and Father and simultaneously transfer the mutual conflict of the names to the realities'. These words, which rebut their insanity and free the doctor from their calumny, they have left out. That this model of liberality speaks such things out of immeasurable and, so to say, peerless, impudence, must be known to all who read the above words and who everywhere see now his excerptings and despoliations, now his revisions and additions, now (to put it in a nutshell) his many falsifications and evident alterations of his words and writings. However, let us now investigate what he calls our 'sacrilege', and so far as we can expose and reveal it so that honest men may know exactly what doubtful charges he alleges against us, he who is * censured and accused by us of many absurd and impious doctrines and makes no sort of defence whatever. For as the same wise father says of Eunomius: The caviller's trivial accusation becomes important advocacy of the defendant's superiority. In proof, therefore, that generacy is not the same as he who is begotten, we set down the doctor's statements in our *Summary Joint Confession*, previously mentioned, as follows: So, just as in this passage we have learned from the Gospel two

83/85 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 284A; Jaeger I, p. 58, 5-7) 88/95 cf. supra, ch. 26, 32-40

< 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95

< 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95

AD flor. II from l. 89 to l. 92

- Line 71: 71, D: 71.
- Line 73: 73, D: 73.
- Line 82: 82, D: 82.
- Line 89: 89, flor. II: 89.
- Line 90: 90, D: 90. 90, D and flor. II: 90.
- Line 91: 91, flor. II: 91.

It will not be unknown to any of the readers of our writings that we quoted the father's proof-text to prove that generacy and the begotten are not the same. How, then, do the father's words stand opposed to our purpose? Is it because the master of truth said: 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? But this, clever fellow, confirms our view. For if with someone's saying * that a substance has been begotten the meaning produced for the hearers by the designation 'substance' is one thing but by 'generation' is another (for the doctor says, as we have learned in the previous passage: For one who says the substance is 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; and again: For different ideas are created for the hearer of 'has been begotten' and by the term 'substance') how also, if someone were to say that a man (i.e. a hypostasis) is begotten, will not one meaning be produced for hearers by 'hypostasis' but another by 'is begotten'? Or have you forgotten that the master of mysteries confirmed his conclusion against impious Eunomius from the example of man (i.e. a hypostasis) and his generation? Listen to what he says: 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

150 <
 155 <
 160 <
 165 <
 170 <

f. 108rb

AD

Line 155: $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$, D: $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$.
 Line 160: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, D: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 161: $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$, D: $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$. $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$, D: $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$.
 Line 162: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, D: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 164: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, D: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 170: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, D: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 174: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (bis), D: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$.

140/144 cf. supra, 112-116 148/151 cf. supra, ch. 26, 179-182 151/
 152 cf. supra, ch. 26, 186-187 158/165 cf. supra, ch. 26, 190-197

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. You see that the herald of truth confirms, from the example of man and generation, that generation is different from the substance Eunomius called 'begotten'. Therefore, if it has been truly proved by the father that Eunomius, in acknowledging that the substance was begotten, is wholly and necessarily convicted of making substance one thing and generacy another, of necessity also one who says that the hypostasis was begotten, defines the begotten hypostasis as one thing and the generacy belonging with it as another. Otherwise, where is the similarity, if from the begotten substance we interpret generacy as one thing, and substance as another whereas from the begotten hypostasis we understand that hypostasis and generacy are the same? How, indeed, also was it that the * divinely inspired father took the example of man and generation in proof that substance is one thing and generacy another if generacy and hypostasis are the same, or if generacy is not birth but the hypostasis produced by birth?

175 : ܠܗ ܝܫܘܥ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ : ܠܗ ܝܫܘܥ ܘܡܘܬܐ <
 : ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 180 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 : ܝܫܘܥ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 185 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 190 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <
 195 ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܠܗܘܢ <

f. 108va

AD flor. II from 1. 182 to 1. 186

- Line 175: ܠܗ ܝܫܘܥ (bis), D: ܠܗ ܝܫܘܥ.
- Line 177: ܠܗܘܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢ.
- Line 180: ܠܗܘܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢ, ܠܗܘܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢ.
- Line 182: ܘܡܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܡܘܬܐ.
- Line 183: ܘܡܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܡܘܬܐ. ܘܡܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܡܘܬܐ.
- Line 184: ܘܡܘܬܐ, D and flor. II: ܘܡܘܬܐ. ܘܡܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܡܘܬܐ.
- Line 186: ܠܗܘܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢ. ܘܡܘܬܐ, flor. II: ܘܡܘܬܐ.
- Line 188: ܠܗܘܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢ. ܠܗܘܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢ.
- Line 190: ܠܗܘܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢ.
- Line 193: ܠܗܘܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢ.

It has thus been clearly proved that we are not refuted either by the words of the doctor we left out (as you falsely and craftily said) but have had much support from them, because we think and hold the same views as the master of mysteries. For we were concerned to prove nothing by the father's words we there set down except that generacy and the one begotten are not the same. For we said, after their quotation: What explanation does this need to prove that the begotten and birth are not the same?

But perhaps, you will say, my clever fellow, that the doctor, in making a distinction here between 'substance' and 'generation', does not lay down for us a difference between hypostasis and generacy, but between generacy (i.e. hypostasis) and the substance comprehending the hypostases. You hint, indeed, at this, by what you wrote when you said: The doctor, after entrapping the mischief-monger here, introduced the Gospel illustration, proving that although according to his argument, as its conclusion has now shown, the meaning of 'substance' is one thing and that of 'generacy' i.e. of 'hypostasis', is another. But, my admirable fellow, you are misled by your great intellectual subtlety, into disgorging for us very inept and ignorant words. For you are convicted both of total ignorance of Eunomius the blasphemer's arguments and of illiterately misrepresenting the master of mysteries here as laying down for us from Eunomius' begotten substance a distinction between hypostasis and common substance. For it was not his object here to

185
 190
 200
 205
 210
 215
 220

205
 210
 215
 220

AD

Line 199: *κττ*, D: *κτττ*.
 Line 201: *κθουβ*, D: *κθουβκ*.
 Line 203: *σενε*, D: *σενε*.
 Line 205: *κθκ*, D: *κθ*.
 Line 206: *κθουβκττ*, D: *κθουβκτττ*.
 Line 207: *κθουβκττ*, D: *κθουβκτττ*.

188/189 cf. supra, ch. 20, 36-37 195/199 cf. supra, ch. 26, 106-110 204 cf. supra, ch. 26, 72

teach the difference between substance comprehensive of hypostas-
 es and hypostasis, but between Eunomius' begotten substance and
 generacy. Observe what he says: For one who says the substance is
 begotten clearly defines generacy as being something other than sub-
 210 stance, so as not to permit the meaning of generacy to be adapted to the
 concept of substance. And again: But he acknowledges that the sub-
 stance is 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'. So, the doctor has clearly pointed to the dis-
 215 tinction between the substance which, according to Eunomius,
 was begotten and which he understands as hypostasis, and
 generacy; and not a distinction between common substance and
 hypostasis. For if, on hearing that a substance is begotten, we are
 put in mind (in accordance with your clever propositions) not of
 220 hypostasis and generacy but of common substance and hypostasis,
 must we not fall into the grossest insanity: either madly supposing
 that the substance comprehensive of hypostases was begotten or
 irrationally inferring to Eunomius, as something grand, ideas
 without any sort of logical necessity whatever? For did anybody
 225 ever (I mean not merely any churchman but any of the proponents
 of impious and variegated error) say that the common substance
 was begotten? Did not the very impious Eunomius think the
 begotten substance was a hypostasis? Listen, the same wise doctor
 explains this point too, by saying in the passage set down a little
 230 before and examined: 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'. What? Is
 it not obvious to everybody that the superficial Eunomius re-

207 cf. supra, ch. 26, 72 208/211 cf. supra, 148-151 211/214 cf. supra,
 ch. 26, 184-187 228 cf. supra, ch. 26, 72 230/232 Greg. Nyss., *Contra*
Eun. III, 1 (PG 45, 589C; Jaeger II, p. 28, 6-8); cf. supra, ch. 20, 116-119

κρίσις ἢ καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία
 ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία : καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία : καὶ ἡ οὐσία
 ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία : καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 225 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 230 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 235 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 240 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 245 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <
 καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ οὐσία <

f. 108vb

AD

Line 224: καὶ ἡ οὐσία, D: καὶ ἡ οὐσία.
 Line 234: καὶ ἡ οὐσία, D: καὶ ἡ οὐσία.
 Line 237: καὶ ἡ οὐσία, D: καὶ ἡ οὐσία.
 Line 249: καὶ ἡ οὐσία, D: καὶ ἡ οὐσία.

cognized as a hypostasis the one he named 'Son'? Very obvious, I think. That, then, is why the father also spoke to the impious fellow about the substance, which, according to Eunomius, has been begotten and which he also named 'Son'. For he felled the tainted wretch on the basis of his own statement and profession. See what he says in what has been quoted a little earlier: 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. You will have discerned, * surely, clever fellow, that the master and guide to truth, expressly leaving aside Eunomius' madness, distinguishes generacy from the substance which is said by the blasphemer to have been begotten and is understood, according to his argument, to be the Son, and not (as you said) from the substance comprehensive of the hypostases; which is why, then, and very rightly, he also took in demonstration of the point at issue, the example of man and generacy. For he said: 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

250 *ⲕⲁⲣⲁ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ : ⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ*
ⲕⲁⲣⲁ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ
ⲕⲁⲣⲁ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ
ⲕⲁⲣⲁ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ
 255 *ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ* <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
 260 *ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ* <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
 265 *ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ* <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
 270 *ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ* <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ <
 275 *ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ* <

f. 109ra

AD

Line 255: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ, D om.
 Line 259: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ (bis), D: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ.
 Line 270: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ, D: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ.
 Line 271: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ, cf. supra, lines 97-98 (ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ) ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ, D: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ.
 Line 272: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ (bis), D: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ.
 Line 275: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ, D: ⲛⲓⲃⲟⲛ.

239/246 cf. supra, ch. 26, 73-80; ch. 19, 17-24 254/261 cf. supra, ch. 26, 32-40; ch. 19, 44-51

a substrate possessing a derived hypostasis. Will you understand generation (i.e. the very fact of being from something) as a hypostasis but him who is by generation, the substrate, the one possessing a derived hypostasis, as the substance comprehensive of the hypostases? For this is the intended aim of your teaching. So it too will be your confabulation and, as such, abominable and alien to everybody!

But repeat to us, doubtful fellow, those words of yours! For we shall enjoy them often and marvel the more at your cleverness. For, you attacked us on the ground that we curtailed the fathers' words unduly, saying the following about the doctor: For he says, in between those words quoted by these admirable accusers, some which the agents of sacrilege have disregarded with a pricking conscience. And again: These words, which rebut their insanity and free the doctor from their calumny, they have left out. How, sir, are you not convicted hereby of daring to vent your mouth against truth and truth's minister and of reckoning sacred teachings as nonsense? For if by the patristic words we were (as has been seen) intending to prove only that generacy and offspring are not the same thing, and it has been proved in much abundance that * this is the view of the master of mysteries, it is, surely, clearly evident that you have very impudently reckoned that as not so much our insanity as the God-clad father's. Where, then, is the sacrilege? Where is the rebuttal of insanity, where the calumny against the father? No, they have, it seems, perished and those turbid accusations of yours have come to naught. Such, indeed, is the way of falsehood: it withers ere it shoots up.

263/264 cf. supra, 261
 271/273 cf. supra, 62-65
 274/275 cf. supra, 71-72
 283 cf. supra, 273
 284 cf. supra, 274-275

276 < 277 < 278 < 279 < 280 <

281 — 282 — 283 — 284 — 285 — 286 — 287 — 288 — 289 — 290 — 291 — 292 — 293 — 294 — 295 — 296 — 297 — 298 — 299 — 300 — 301 — 302 —

f. 109rb

AD

Line 282: 276, D: 276.
 Line 296: 296, D: 296. 296, D om.
 Line 299: 299, D: 299.
 Line 301: 299, D: 299.

335 unconfused distinction in the properties viewed in each of them'. You have heard the father. Is not the purpose for which he required the example of generation clear? Will not impure expositors of the fathers even now be ashamed? Indeed, it would have been easy to expand discussion on the point even more extensively. But because it is easy for every enquirer to read with greater diligence the God-clad father's teaching, let everybody learn precisely from there the probity of the words we taught, and we should be wasting words if we were now to say the same things. But please let us examine 'generation' and see the real opinion of the doctor on the divine generation. He says, then, a little after the words we set down previously, as follows: 'But because, amongst men, the term "father" has various conjoined meanings, to which the immortal nature is a stranger, we must leave aside all the material ideas * entering in beside the corporeal meaning of "father" and have the impress of a God-befitting thought which signifies only genuine relationship with God the Father. So, because along with human fatherhood one always conceives not only of all that the flesh gives to be apprehended in the notion of a human father, but also a temporal idea, it would be as well to rid divine generation of the temporal idea as well as of the corporeal taint; so that with the material property being everywhere cleansed away, the transcendent generation may be pure not only of any idea of passion but also of any of temporality'. With the God-clad master of mysteries having taught that we ought to 'rid the divine

335 ← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...
← ... : ... : ... : ...

f. 109vb

AD

Line 353: ... , cf. infra, lines 432 and 440 (...).
 Line 359: ... D: ...
 Line 362: ... D: ...
 Line 371: ... D: ...
 Line 372: ... D: ...
 Line 376: ... D: ...

345/356 Ibid. (PG 45, 593AB; Jaeger II, p. 31, 7-20) 357/358 cf. supra, 353

is the same as hypostasis? But see what he proclaims: So, just as in
 this passage we have learned from the Gospel two distinct ideas: first, we
 385 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). 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
 390 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. What has the reverend gentleman
 to say to this? Will not impure expositors of the fathers even now be
 395 ashamed?

Is it not remarkable into what contemptibleness this wretched
 fellow has fallen, as a result of his appetite for glory or I know not
 what we should call it? BASIL THE GREAT shall justly exclaim to
 him too what he proclaimed of old, from the prophet's voice, to
 400 Eunomius who shamelessly uttered similar blasphemies, in the
 first book *Against Eunomius*: Let us say to him, then, in reply to this,
 the prophet's words, *Your face has become a harlot's face, you have
 acted impudently to everybody*. For they too besmirch those who live
 chaste lives with their own shames. Why, then, admirable fellow, do
 405 you want us to be ashamed? What have you proved, indeed rather,
 what did you examine at all? Is it because Adam and Abel, the two
 of them, are one in the concept of nature but have a mutual, unconfused

383/387 cf. supra, 88-91 387/393 cf. supra, 98-104 394/395 cf. supra,
 369-370 401/404 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. I, 23 (PG 29, 564C; SChr., vol. 299,
 pp. 254-256) 402/403 Ier. 3:3 406/408 cf. supra, 333-335

383 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌰𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 384 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 385 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 386 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 410 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 411 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 412 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 413 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 414 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 415 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰

420 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 421 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 422 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 423 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 424 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 425 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 426 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 427 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 428 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 429 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰
 430 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰

AD

Line 406: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰, D: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰.
 Line 409: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰, D: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰.
 Line 410: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 (bis), D: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰.
 Line 414: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰¹, D: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰, D: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰.
 Line 415: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰, D: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰.
 Line 422: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰, D: 𐌹𐌸𐌳𐌰.

distinction in the properties viewed in each of them? What of it? Did the master of mysteries thereby say that generacy and he who is by generation are the same or define ingeneracy and generacy as being hypostases? On the contrary, did he not confirm our doctrines i.e. the doctrines of truth, by proving that the characteristic properties are other than the hypostases they are viewed in? See: Adam, he says, and Abel, the two of them, are one in the concept of nature * but have a mutual, unconfused distinction in the properties viewed in each of them. So if, as you prate, Adam and Abel are characteristic properties of the hypostases, tell us by what characteristic properties viewed in them they have a mutual, unconfused distinction! But keep hold here of your own words as well. Proclaim aloud and cry out: Will not impure expositors of the fathers even now be ashamed?

But because you have, as you think, solved the question, by saying: You have heard the father. Is not the purpose clear?, we shall also clearly state the purpose of the patristic text you quoted. It is: that on profane Eunomius' having very impudently attempted to claim, from the fact that the Father was not begotten whereas the Son beamed forth from him by way of generation, that the Father was different in substance from the Son, the doctor eradicated the impiety by the example of Adam, who was not made to subsist by birth but by the divine hand, and of Abel who was born as a result of the intercourse of man and woman. For if Father and Son are mutually different in substance because the Father was not

414/416 cf. supra, 333-335 418/419 cf. supra, 415-416 420/421 cf. supra, 394-395 423 cf. supra, 335-337

435
 440
 445

450
 455

AD

Line 432: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$, cf. supra, line 353 ($\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$).
 Line 433: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$, D: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$.
 Line 434: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$, D: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$. $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$, D: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$.
 Line 440: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$, cf. supra, line 353 ($\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$).
 Line 441: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$, D: $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize\text{D}}}$.

f. 110rb

begotten whereas the Son was begotten (as that blasphemer wanted to claim) Adam and Abel must also necessarily be different from each other in nature because Adam came into existence without generation whereas Abel by generation: to say which would clearly be the height of frenzy!

Besides this, what is your other redoubtable proof? For you wrote: But please let us examine 'generation' and see the real opinion of the doctor on the divine generation. Having read those promises of yours and expected that after your extensive fabrications you would get to grips with the subject, we were very ready and willing to prick up our ears as it were and listen to what was said, hopeful of learning in plain terms from you what you thought the doctor's views were on the question at issue. We were, however, suddenly and unexpectedly disappointed on finding that your demonstrations contained nothing at all about the matters under discussion between you and us. Instead they diligently testify to the fact that we should not subject the divine generation to notions of passion or time. Hence, in explaining the meaning of the father's words, * you said: With the God-clad master of mysteries having taught that we ought to 'rid the divine generation of any temporal idea', they are to tell us what they think of the generacy of the Only-begotten: is it subsistent or non-subsistent? What, my good fellow, are

460
 465
 470
 475

440
 445
 450
 455
 460
 465
 470
 475

f. 110va

AD

- Line 458: $\mu\alpha\tau$, D: $\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$.
- Line 461: $\kappa\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$.
- Line 465: $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$.
- Line 466: $\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\epsilon$, D: $\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\epsilon$.
- Line 471: $\epsilon\iota$, D: $\epsilon\iota$.
- Line 474: $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$, D om. $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$.
- Line 478: $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$.
- Line 479: $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$, D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$.

455 you proving when you put forward proof-texts like this, as if you
 were either correcting someone who thought the divine generation
 passible and subject to time or were being censured by someone
 on the point? Is it not a piece of clear deception and trickery that
 when you are criticized for defining the hypostases of the Holy
 460 Trinity as being ingeneracy, generacy and procession, you defend
 or prove the claim that the divine generation is neither passible nor
 subject to time. What of it? Because through your wisdom, as you
 suppose, we have now learned that the divine generation is pure
 from all corporeal taint and idea of time, has it, also now, been
 465 thoroughly proved to be a hypostasis? Who will not censure you
 with justice and scorn your insanity (or rather, indeed, bewail your
 ruination) when you deceive yourself and all your wretched
 adherents with these inane and frigid notions?

Therefore, since you used a mischievous trick to avoid the
 470 points on which you are censured and put forward proofs from
 patristic teachings over matters everybody agrees on, we may very
 justly apply to you the words of our God-clad father SEVERUS,
 who wrote in the *119th Cathedral Sermon* as follows: We spurn
 such people as heretics and when they allege some defence which chimes
 475 in with orthodoxy on another point and not on the one on which they are
 criticized or censured, they will be adjudged wrong-doers and deceivers.
 For the fact that Eutyches and Nestorius judged the Holy Trinity to be
 consubstantial does not free them from their other errors. For nobody
 censured them over that. The fact that Novatus agreed with the Church's

480 ܠܡܢ ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 485 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 490 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ

495 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 500 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 505 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ
 ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ

AD

Line 482: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ, D: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ.
 Line 487: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ, D: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ.
 Line 489: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ, D: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ. ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ, D: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ.
 Line 496: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ, D: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ.
 Line 501: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ, D: ܕܡܘܨܝܢܐ.

480 view on all other points was no help to him, when he would not accept
 repentance. For it would be ridiculous for someone accused of
 committing adultery to weave a defence of not having committed murder.
 No heretic, in fact, can be found who never said anything sound, as the
 Church holds it, and we do not * therefore number them anywhere with
 485 the orthodox. These divinely inspired words clearly prove that it is
 a mockery for someone censured on this or that point to defend
 himself on another.

Let us see what the doctor also says about those who gather
 themselves patristic texts in proof of what nobody doubts. He
 490 wrote, then, in the seventh chapter of the second book of his
 treatise *Against the Grammarian*, as follows: Likewise you too, with
 the difference that you do not begin your first assault involuntarily like
 them, but very willingly, speak at random and claim it true, as if it were a
 point of dispute, that the uncreated is not the same in substance as the
 495 created, nor the made with the unmade nor the temporally subject with
 the non-temporal. And though there is no one who disputes the point, you
 quote a multitude of proof-texts by the holy fathers. In regard to this it is
 good and very appropriate to say to you what was said by one of the
 prophets: *Woe to him who multiplies what are not his - till when? - and*
 500 *makes heavy upon him his yoke with severity; because those who bite*
him will suddenly arise.

510
 515
 520
 525
 530

f. 110vb

520
 525
 530

AD

Line 512: D: ...

Line 513: D: ...

Line 514: D: ...

Line 516: D: ...

Line 531: repeated in A.

Line 532: D: ...

491/501 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 7 (CSCO 111, pp. 92,21 - 93,3; 112, pp. 72,27 - 73,2) 499/501 Hab. 2:6-7

Because famous Severus said this and since we surmise that this cunning fellow all over the place puts forward the impassibility and non-temporality of the divine generation for the destruction of the truth visible in the divine doctrines from the example of a man's generation, it would be as well to prove again from wise GREGORY'S own exact teaching his aim on such matters. To confirm the truth, he used, in addition to the Gospel illustration, the example of Adam and Abel previously set down. In order that nobody should go on from the example to incongruous opinions through neglect of the idea which occasioned the use of the example, he granted that the example, devoutly understood, is truly applicable to the divine nature. Nevertheless he warned the hearer to keep only to those ideas in the example which pertain to God. Therefore he writes in the first book *Against Eunomius*, after the words just now examined, as follows: So what we have been guided to learn of human nature (the same thing which has been proved by a train of argument) this, I think, is what ought to be taken as our guide to the exalted conception of divine doctrines as well. For * having shaken off every carnal and material conception from the divine and exalted doctrines we shall have, through the conception that remains, secure guidance to the exalted and unapproachable, when that conception is purified of such things.

So, now you will have learned, my good fellow, if you want to, that the master of mysteries did not teach what was quoted about the divine generation in order to get rid of the examples he correctly took from our human condition, but for the sake of our

535
 540
 545
 550
 f. 111ra
 555

AD

- Line 534: Ἀποκρίσεις, D: Ἀποκρίσεις.
- Line 547: ἁπλοῦς, D: ἁπλοῦς. ἁπλοῦς, D: ἁπλοῦς.
- Line 548: ἁπλοῦς, D: ἁπλοῦς.
- Line 549: ἁπλοῦς, D: ἁπλοῦς.
- Line 558: Ἀποκρίσεις, D: Ἀποκρίσεις.

516/523 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 1 (PG 45, 592D-593A; Jaeger II, pp. 30,24 - 31,3)

not understanding from the examples anything unseemly in divine doctrines. So, accept the example of man's generation and devoutly leaving below every material and temporal notion, ascend by its means to the divine generacy and confess that it characterizes the Only-begotten's hypostasis; but do not like Eunomius suppose that it is a hypostasis, for you have heard that the father taught and said: For a man is not generation but by generation the man exists. And again: We do not understand man and generation as meaning the same thing but have received the notion proper to each term.

But you are to know that this too has not escaped us: having promised (as previously set down) to examine 'generation', as you said, and to disclose the real opinion of the doctor on the divine generation, and having shown nothing at all except that the generation is impassible and non-temporal, you set out the father's words (which were of no relevance to the point proposed) and then, on the contrary, showed us in a very disordered and ignorant fashion that you declined your duty of clear proof, and wrote as follows: With the God-clad master of mysteries having taught that we ought to 'rid the divine generation of any temporal idea', they are to tell us what they think of the generacy of the Only-begotten: is it subsistent or non-subsistent? It is as if you were saying with assurance:

560
 565
 570
 575
 580

570
 575
 580

AD

Line 560: *ἁποῦ*, D: *ἁποῦ*.

Line 561: *ὁ*, D: *ὁ*.

Line 566: *ἁποῦ*, D: *ἁποῦ*.

Line 567: *ἁποῦ*, D: *ἁποῦ*.

Line 572: *ἁποῦ*, D: *ἁποῦ*.

Line 579: *ἁποῦ*, D: *ἁποῦ*. *ἁποῦ*, D: *ἁποῦ*.

At the top of fol. 26v D reads as follows: *ἁποῦ*, *ἁποῦ*, *ἁποῦ*.
ἁποῦ. Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

534/535 cf. supra, 386-387 535/537 cf. supra, 390-391 539/541 cf. supra, 439-440 546/549 cf. supra, 451-454

550 'Because it has been indisputably proved from the father's
 treasury that generacy is a hypostasis and I have been seen to
 agree with the doctors' aim, let them tell us if they think the divine
 generacy subsistent or non-subsistent?' How, admirable fellow,
 (even if you were confident of being able to mislead all men by
 555 sophisms and verbal trickery) * can you fail to be accused here by
 your conscience (if you have not misled it too, enslaved it and
 persuaded it to laud you with encomia)? Therefore, even now
 consider these views of yours, and even if you have no great
 concern for future glory or shame, be assured that there are many
 560 to whom your games seem thoroughly ludicrous. So, you have
 in the foregoing a sufficient examination of the question. By
 investigating it diligently you too will perhaps partially understand
 yourself and the weakness and febleness of your doctrines.

: *ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ ἀποδείκνυμεν ὅτι τὸ θεῖον
 γενεῖον ἡμεῖς ἵστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 585 : ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 * : ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 590 ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 595 : ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται
 ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴστανται*

f. 111rb

AD

Line 586: *ἡμεῖς*, D: *ἡμεῖς*.
 Line 590: *ἡμεῖς*, D: *ἡμεῖς*.

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 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.

However, the examination of one of those very redoubtable assaults of yours has almost escaped us. You wrote, indeed, as follows: So if, according to the father's theology, the generacy is non-temporal and is not separable or divisible, how can it not be the same as the Son? But if, as they say, it is other than the Son, whilst being non-temporal and indivisible, yet the Son too is non-temporal, how is the Son not found to be twofold because he shines out like a beam from a light non-temporally, without division or separation? For the divine words say this of the Son too. Therefore we must not lessen the incorporeal nature by a passible generation, but it must be conceived of in accordance with the magnitude of the immortal nature's honour.

1. καὶ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 2. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 3. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 4. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 5. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 6. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 7. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 8. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 9. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 10. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 11. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 12. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 13. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 14. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 15. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 16. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 17. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 18. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 19. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 20. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 21. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 22. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 23. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 24. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 25. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή

1. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 2. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 3. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 4. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 5. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 6. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 7. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 8. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 9. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 10. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 11. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 12. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 13. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 14. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 15. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 16. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 17. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 18. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 19. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 20. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 21. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 22. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 23. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 24. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή
 25. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή καὶ ἡ οὐσία ἡ αὐτή

AD

Line 3: ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία, D: ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία.
 Line 16: ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία, D: ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία.
 Line 24: ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία, D: ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία.

25 You will note the generosity, the power and superabundance of the manifold, indubitable demonstrations. Will not * men (if they are well-disposed) offer many thanks to this admirable author for not only having set down for them orthodoxy in doctrines, but also for having been the inventor of many varieties of out-

30 landish syllogisms which did not even enter the minds of predecessors wise in such matters. So if, he says, the generacy is non-temporal and is not separable or divisible, how can it not be the same as the Son? The demonstration is very brilliant and ornate, and whom, my good fellow, are we to wonder at the more? At you

35 who write such things without observing the ridicule your driveling brings on your clever self, or at those to whom you are always showing what you write, people who have despised you so much that they have not even pointed out the things which immediately of themselves and clearly, rebut your ignorance? For by what

40 necessity or sequence of thoughts do you say that the divine generacy must be the same as the Son because it too is non-temporal, indivisible and inseparable from the Godhead? Do you not know (to mention only what is known to everybody) that all the characteristic properties of the divine substance too are non-

45 temporal, indivisible and inseparable from the Godhead? Therefore, according to your thesis, they too must be the same as the divine substance, because they are non-temporal, indivisible and inseparable

31/33 cf. supra, 16-18

26 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ : ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ * ܐܠ ܐܢܝ : ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 30 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 35 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 40 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 45 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ
 50 ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ

A, f. 111va

AD

Line 27: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ, D: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ.
 Line 29: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ, D: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ.
 Line 31: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ, D om.
 Line 34: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ, D: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ.
 Line 43: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ, D: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ.
 Line 46: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ, D: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ.
 Line 49: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ, D: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗܘܢ.

to be a defaulter, very frightened and alarmed by rebuttals from all
 70 of them. Therefore, we shall set them down here also, along with
 the examination of them there given, and shall add your non-
 sensical remarks, so that they may always give you a painful
 reminder when you annually publish, as is your custom, a small
 extract from them and cause your ignorant self to be always
 75 scoffed at, and be incessantly rebutted, and amass reproach and
 ignominy from men of true religion.

Tell us, then, what you wrote in the subsequent passage: So he
 who in his theology destroyed the whole fortress of heresy, shall
 illuminate dwellers in the darkness of ignorance, teaching, as he does,
 80 that generacy is hypostasis in his *First Oration on Theology*. For he says:
 '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 (for what is to be thought and said overcomes my tongue)'. Thus
 the doctor has clearly taught that generacy is hypostasis; yet not only
 85 that, but he testified that these things are so in a full sense too by adding
 'or whatever else which one may find fuller in sense', conceding, with
 true religion, the incomprehensibility of the divine generation; for it is
 clear to everybody that matters concerning God surpass all under-
 standing.

ⲓⲱⲛⲓⲁ ⲡⲓⲛⲓⲁⲓⲁⲛⲟⲩ : ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲥⲟⲩⲏⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲧⲉⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 80 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ

ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 85 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 90 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 95 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ

AD

Line 85: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ, *A before correction*: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ.
 Line 88: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ.
 Line 89: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ (ter), cf. supra, ch. 15, lines 382-383 (ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ). ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ. ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ, cf. supra, ch. 15, line 383
 (ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ).
 Line 90: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ, cf. *ibid.*, lines 383-384 (a slightly different trans-
 lation).
 Line 93: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ.
 Line 95: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲩ.

77/89 Dam. Alex., *Ep. fest. secunda* 81/83 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 20, 10 (*PG* 35,
 1077A; *SChr.*, vol. 270, p. 78); cf. supra, ch. 15, 336-338 86 cf. supra, 82-83

90 It has clearly been demonstrated frequently in the foregoing from his divinely uttered words themselves that the sacred herald here indicated not that generacy is a hypostasis, but that we ought not to investigate the question of how the Only-begotten Son exists i.e. as begotten of God the Father.

95 * Those who do not aim to compose a multitude of words should not idly say the same things on the same point. However, your honest and wise self ought (as we have said already) to have remembered the Theologian's utterance quoted in our aforementioned *Joint Confession* on the matters mooted, to have quoted
 100 it along with our examination of it, and to have rebutted anything we said there which seemed to you not in accord with the father's intention. But even now make good what you omitted very usefully for your purpose, read it carefully and criticize what you want to, so that you may be convicted again of criticizing the pure
 105 thought and the patristic view itself and may be condemned to ridicule not so much for taking up a contest with us as for clearly withstanding the stewards of the Spirit.

So, to remind you and convince readers, we shall set down the proof-text and what we there said about it, which is as follows:
 110 But please let us see how by the same gift of the Spirit his peer also, who has illumined all under the Sun by the same beams of theology and is therefore justly named 'the Theologian', sets down for us the same things in the same way. For, in investigating at length and explaining very

100
 105
 110

115
 120

f. 112ra

AD

Line 97: ἁγιος, D: ἁγιος.
 Line 98: ἡ, D: ἡ ἁγιος, D: ἁγιος.
 Line 106: ἁγιος, D: ἁγιος.
 Line 122: ἁγιος ἁγιος, D: ἁγιος ἁγιος.

exactly the meanings of 'unbegotten' and 'begotten' in connection with
 115 his great contest against the infamous Arians, he says in the *First Oration*
on the Son, where he went much further in tearing through all their
 inescapable traps and cunning mischiefs against divine doctrines like spi-
 ders' webs, as follows: 'Then, why do you declare that ingenerate and
 generate are not the same thing? If you mean the uncreated and the
 120 created, I should be in agreement, for the unbeginning and the created are
 not the same thing in nature; but if you mean the begetter and the
 begotten, the statement is invalid, for it is absolutely necessary that they
 should be the same thing; indeed it is the nature of begetter and offspring
 that the offspring should be the same thing by nature as its begetter. Or
 125 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
 130 substance off, but are divided off with the substance'. To what man, who
 shares even a little in correct ideas, will it not have been evident * from
 the divinely inspired words previously set down, that ingeneracy and
 generacy belong to Father and Son but are by no means themselves
 Father and Son? Because, as the master instructed us, the begetter and
 135 the begotten are the same but ingeneracy and generacy are not the same
 thing. Or were these latter too spoken by way of periphrasis? In that case

118/130 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 29, 10 (PG 36, 88AB; *SChr.*, vol. 250, pp. 196-198);
 cf. supra, ch. 23, 39-49; ch. 8, 483-485

125
 130
 135
 140
 145

f. 112rb

AD

- Line 128: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 130: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 134: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 135: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 136: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, cf. supra, ch. 8, line 526 ($\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$).
- Line 137: $\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\alpha$, cf. ibid., line 528 ($\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\alpha$).
- Line 141: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 143: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 144: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 145: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha$.

what are spoken by way of periphrasis, according to their argument, will also admit of 'same' and 'not same'. For example, when we hear what they quote in support of periphrasis from Basil: 'But we must profess that each prosopon exists in a true hypostasis', we make a clear distinction by saying that the hypostases are the same in nature but the prosopa in them are not the same. For the Theologian too, having acknowledged that those who have ingeneracy and generacy are the same, ruled that ingeneracy and generacy are not the same thing. Indeed they are not so but are very remote from one another. No, it is necessary to inquire, in another way, what we should think those who have ingeneracy and generacy are. However, if we make them substances (as the polytheists see fit to do) it will be an impiety and alien to our faith. But if, again, we make ingeneracy and generacy substances: in addition to the impossibility and absurdity, we shall also be found making the Father and Son, who have them, things not subsisting individually; and we shall be clearly opposing the doctor who plainly said that those who have ingeneracy and generacy are the same but ingeneracy and generacy themselves are not the same thing. It remains for us, then, when we set

ἡν καὶ ἐπεὶ τὸ ἐκείνου
 ἐστὶν ὅτι τὸ ἐκείνου τὸ αὐτό ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 140 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 145 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 150 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 155 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 160 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ
 165 ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ

AD

- Line 146: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Line 148: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Line 149: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Line 151: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Lines 152-153: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, in D written in margin (between columns).
- Line 153: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Line 157: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Line 160: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Line 162: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Line 163: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ. ὡς ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ.
- Line 164: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.
- Line 165: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ, D: ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐστὶν ὁμοῦ.

139/140 Bas. Caes., Ep. 210, 5 (PG 32, 776C; Courtonne, II, p. 196); cf. supra, ch. 15, 277-278

155 truth above everything, neither to think polytheistically of those who have ingeneracy and generacy, as substances, nor godlessly as ingeneracy and generacy; but, rather are to pursue a course midway between both errors and to acknowledge the two hypostases of Father and Son as being themselves neither substances (as it pleases those who attempt to establish the foul nonsense of Arianism to suppose) nor ingeneracy and generacy (as is supposed again by the clever people who incline to the opposite evil). Therefore, if from it all it has been clearly proved that ingeneracy, * generacy and procession are not hypostases but belong to hypostases, it is obvious that it is certainly now hazardous to say of the hypostases themselves (after the fathers have wisely said that characteristic properties of the hypostases belong with the substance, exist in the substance and are viewed in the substance) that they belong with the substance, exist and are viewed in it; because the fathers did not use the words in that way, nor do what subsist individually admit of such notions.

This clever fellow negligently omitted this passage, though he ought to have quoted and examined it, and, in proof that generacy is a hypostasis, quoted the text previously set down which is of no assistance in fulfilling his promise (as he may perhaps learn if he

166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185

f. 112va

AD

Line 166: *שחיה*, D: *שחיה*.
 Line 167: *שחיה*, D: *שחיה*.
 Line 169: *שחיה*, D: *שחיה*.
 Line 170: *שחיה*, D: *שחיה*.
 Line 176: *שחיה*, D: *שחיה*.
 Line 177: *שחיה*, D: *שחיה*.
 Line 185: *שחיה*, A: *שחיה*.
 Lines 185-186: *שחיה*, in D written in margin (between columns).

175 ponders the examination given of it in the preceding); and, indeed, the consequence of what has just been set down is complete rebuttal of his contention, a rebuttal which clearly laughs to scorn the effrontery of his unbiddable and ill-intentioned mind.

But we must look at the way in which he used his same trickery over the teaching of wise Cyril. For having passed over in profound silence many clear statements of the same proven father, which make it as clear as day that ingeneracy and generacy are not hypostases, besides the proof-text which we set down in the said brief *Joint Confession* of ours, against which he pretended to be writing, he set down another in confirmation of his view, saying as follows: Listen, then, to what sacred Cyril, the scales of orthodox doctrines, says, in the first book of the *Thesaurus* (as it is called): 'The Father begat the Son from himself, indivisibly, in the same way as a wise man begets a wise idea in engineering or geometry, say, or some other such thing. For these sorts of thing are thought of as being fruits of wisdom, and thus have their nature; but the craftsmanship is undivided from the wisdom wherefrom it is begotten; is, indeed, from it and in it, bearing the parent's stamp and being thought of as being undividedly something other than it. In the same way too, the Son's generacy, existing inseparably from the Father, is preserved in its own hypostasis, transcending the power of an illustration'.

186/196 Dam. Alex., Ep. fest. secunda VI (PG 75, 80CD) 187/196 Cyr. Alex., Thesaurus, ass.

190
195
200
205
210

Handwritten text in Syriac script, corresponding to the line numbers on the left margin. The text is arranged in lines, with some lines starting with a star symbol (✧). The script is dense and appears to be a translation or transcription of the adjacent page's text.

AD

Line 189: *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*, D: *ܡܢ ܗܘܐ*.
Line 202: *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*, D: *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*.
Line 203: *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*, D: *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*.
Line 210: At the top of fol. 31v D reads as follows: *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*, *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*.
Line 211: *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*, D: *ܕܡܢ ܗܘܐ*.

Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

* Were it not possible from many clearer words of this proven doctor to see him plainly ruling that we should not suppose ingeneracy and generacy to be hypostases, the inexpert might perhaps properly be excused for supposing, on the basis of this preceding proof-text, that he defined generacy as a hypostasis. But since from many clear words of his anybody can easily see, like some brilliant light aloft, his pure and exact profession on the point, how can it not be evident that the author is scheming against the truth and slandering the God-clad father in order to confirm his insanity, and that he is proving from himself that he thinks the opposite to him? Proof that he is concerned not with truth or the fathers' doctrines but only with misleading the simple in whatever way he can, is given by the fact that he pretended to refute the brief *Joint Confession* we composed yet very carefully omits the many patristic texts we quoted in it, and their examinations, which thoroughly and indisputably eradicate his false opinion, and by the fact that he puts forward others irrelevant to the point proposed and is at pains cunningly to alter the accuracy of truth by the seeming similarity of the passages. For if along with the patristic words we there mentioned this cunning fellow had set down a refutation of them, his vain efforts would immediately have come to absolutely nothing and honest readers would not have needed anything else to make his insanity repulsive.

So, what the clever fellow by intention omitted we will now, and very opportunely, quote, and so set down in due course the

f. 112vb

* ⲉⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 215 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 220 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 225 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 230 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 235 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 240 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ

ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ

AD

Line 216: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ
 Line 219: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ

rest of the accurate father's texts as well, from which everybody will clearly recognize this good fellow's slanderous and abusive cavils against the doctor. What we said after the proof-text from
 225 Gregory of Nyssa is as follows: What explanation does this need to prove that the begotten and birth are not the same? None indeed, as it seems to us. Therefore, leaving it in its beauty * we shall proceed to the wealth of proven teaching i.e. to Saint Cyril. He proclaims, then, expressly in the second book of his treatise *To Hermias*, as follows: 'For
 230 you are not remembering that our argument laboured and proved to us, as well as it could, that one perceives things in the category of accidents or * counted as simply existing in others, as not existing individually at all but, rather, as existing in others; they may seem to exist and be called individual things but they have as their own the nature of the one to
 235 whom they pertain. 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. B. You are right. A. So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something existing in the concept of the hypostasis of God the Father, and as belonging to it but we are not to sup-

245
 250
 255
 260

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

f. 113ra

A with lacunae D flor. I from L 253 on

- Line 243: α , D: β α .
- Line 248: α , D: α .
- Line 255: α , flor. I: α .
- Line 256: α , flor. I om. α , Z: α .
- Lines 258-259: α α , flor. I: α .
- Line 259: α , flor. I: α .
- Line 261: α , flor. I: α . α , cf. Book II, ch. 11, line 150 (α). α , D and flor. I: α .
- Line 262: α , D: α .
- Line 263: α , D: α .

225/247 Petr. Callinic., *Syndocticon* 229/240 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. II* (PG 75, 741AB; *SChr.*, vol. 231, p. 272); cf. *supra*, ch. 23, 385-387

ically, but they only bring us the meaning of having been begotten or not having been begotten. You will perceive that the exact guide to truth taught us in plain terms that ingeneracy and generacy do not exist individually and hypostatically. How, then, when all commonly
 265 acknowledge hypostases as existing individually, can what do not exist individually and hypostatically be rightly thought hypostases? Or do you consider that the wise instructor here defines *genneton* and *agenneton* as one thing but generacy and ingeneracy
 270 another? For your novel wisdom must by all means discover fresh resources. Otherwise how will you be more distinguished than all the others you excell? Tell us clearly, then, that *genneton* and *agenneton* are not hypostases whereas generacy and ingeneracy are hypostases, so that as a result of this admirable wisdom
 275 *genneton* and *agenneton* will be characteristic properties of generacy and ingeneracy: which will be a sufficient proof to everybody of your new and peerless madness. Where, indeed, do you put down this: So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something

288 <
 289 <
 290 <
 291 <
 292 <
 293 <
 294 <
 295 <
 296 <
 297 <
 298 <
 299 <
 300 <
 301 <
 302 <
 303 <
 304 <
 305 <
 306 <
 307 <

AD flor. I 289

- Line 288: *ἄγονος* (bis), D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 289: *ἄγονος*, D and flor. I om. *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*. *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 291: *ἄγονος ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος ἄγονος*.
- Line 292: *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 295: *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 296: *ἄγονος*, A: *ἄγονος*. *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 299: *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 300: *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 301: *ἄγονος*, A: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 302: *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 303: *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 305: *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.
- Line 307: *ἄγονος*, D: *ἄγονος*.

existing in the concept of the hypostasis of God the Father, and as
 280 belonging to it but we are not to suppose it the hypostasis itself?

But because we do not depend solely on this statement by the
 divinely inspired father (even though it so indisputably and
 completely destroys in every detail the force of your impious non-
 sense), accept his other testimonies too which state clearly and in
 285 no different way the same correct and spotless teaching. He writes,
 then, in the same second book as follows: B. Let that be so, one says,
 yet to exist ingenerately is different from existing generately and is not to
 be conceived of as the same thing. For if they are not two different things
 but you thought them the same, they will be interchanged indiscrim-
 290 inately and the property of the names will belong likewise to Father and
 Son just as incorruptible, invisible etc. do. A. To exist ingenerately is
 indisputably and indubitably different * from existing generately, for we
 shall not destroy the order of what is fitting and true. Nevertheless, in
 such matters the difference of names does not denote a difference of God
 295 *qua* God but only indicates that he does not exist in such wise viz. that he
 has not been begotten. But what, then, will those who confuse everything
 together and who, though having an astute intellect in these matters, are
 very vain and puffed up, reply to this? B. In that case, ingeneracy is an
 accident of God the Father. A. Not at all. For at the same time that God is

286/318 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. II* (PG 75, 720B-721A; *SChr.*, vol. 231, pp. 232-236)

ⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲥⲁⲗⲉⲛⲁⲗⲏⲥⲁⲛⲁⲙⲁⲛⲁⲥⲏⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ

310 ⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲥⲁⲗⲉⲛⲁⲗⲏⲥⲁⲛⲁⲙⲁⲛⲁⲥⲏⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 315 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 320 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 325 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 330 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ

f. 113va

AD flor. I from L 331 on

- Line 312: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ.
- Line 315: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ.
- Line 316: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ.
- Line 317: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ.
- Line 323: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ. ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ.
- Line 331: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ, D: ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲏⲟⲩ.

300 conceived of, all that belongs to him is conceived of along with him, and
 no accident is then to be thought of in him. Do not be surprised; because
 those, who want to, can see very easily in our case too that it is so. For
 though we have obtained existence in time, we are born together with
 what exist substantially and are inseparably innate in us. No accident,
 305 then, is to be conceived of rightly in God. For even if there be accidents
 or things naturally present in the substances of certain things, we by no
 means conceive of them as existing in their own distinct and individual
 being (as we do man or any other existent) but, rather, they are seen as
 belonging with the substances of existents, or in them. What place, then
 310 are we to think ingeneracy has in God? For if ingeneracy exists
 individually, subsisting in its own being, but is, as they say, a property of
 God the Father, it will be other than him whose property it is; for what
 belongs to something and exists in proper subsistence must be different
 from what it belongs to. And so the Father's simple nature is doubled,
 315 being compounded for us of Father and ingeneracy. But let us have re-
 gard not to their plausible sophisms but to the Saviour's words, who
 knows well his own and his begetter's nature, never naming him to us
 'ingeneracy' but 'Father'.

How can one fail to say of those who have knowledge of these
 320 divinely inspired words and * misrepresent this doctor as thinking
 ingeneracy or generacy a hypostasis (although his teaching is so

335
 340
 345
 350

355

AD flor. I up to l. 343 and from l. 343 to l. 354

Line 334: *ἰσχυρὸς* *καὶ*, flor. I om.

Line 335: *οὐκ*, WXZ: *οὐ*.

Line 337: *ἁρξεν*, Z: *ἁρξεν*. *ἁρξεν*, X: *ἁρξεν*. *ἁρξεν*, D
 and flor. I om.

Line 341: *ἁρξεν*, X: *ἁρξεν*.

Line 344: *ἁρξεν*, DX: *ἁρξεν*.

Line 351: *ἁρξεν*, D and flor. I: *ἁρξεν*.

Line 354: *ἁρξεν*, D and flor. I: *ἁρξεν*.

For at the same time that God is conceived of, all that belongs to him is conceived of along with him. Let us note that the doctor said that the Father's ingeneracy is conceived of along with all that belongs to him. How, then, it will not be absurd and very foolish to conceive of the Father's hypostasis itself in addition to the Father along with all that belongs to him as well, let him who rests content with lunatic inventions tell us! What place, then, he says, are we to think ingeneracy has in God? For if ingeneracy exists individually, subsisting in its own being, but is, as they say, a property of God the Father, it will be other than him whose property it is; for what belongs to something and exists in proper subsistence must be different from what it belongs to. And so the Father's simple nature is doubled, being compounded for us of Father and ingeneracy. * You will see that if we admit an ingeneracy individually subsisting in its own being, we shall of necessity profess that we are conceiving of the Father's simple nature as doubled. In which case we shall not be thinking what is orthodox but the thoughts of Eunomius and the novel theology: that ingeneracy, and clearly generacy too, exist individually and in proper subsistence. How then can ingeneracy and generacy be hypostases, when they are proved absolutely by the doctor's divinely uttered words not to exist individually * and in proper subsistence?

What? Do these arguments, so many and so clear, suffice for one who attempts to establish his manifold and pluriform false opinion from a conjecture and surmise based on a single brief extract? Or must we produce others as well, so that either the

345

350

355

360

365

385 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 390 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 395 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 400 < ...
 < ...
 < ...
 < ...

D, f. 35va

f. 35vb

405 : ...
 : ...
 : ...

A^{sup 10} (l. 394) D
 Line 382: ...
 Line 387: ...
 Line 393: ...
 Line 394: ...

fever of corrupting heresy may be abated by a multitude of compelling *testimonia* or that from henceforth it may have just hatred and ridicule by all God-fearing men? Let us listen, therefore, to other similar words. For the doctor, continuing in the same second book in his total eradication of lunacy * and holding firm to his lawful slaughter of truth's enemies and opponents, added the following: Do you not, then, now perceive that the particular properties of the Godhead will not, rather, fit the concept and mode of ingeneracy (not to mention that they belong to others which exist and are seen to subsist apart from generation) but harmonize more with God the Father? For in this way the sameness in substance will, I think, extend thereafter to the Son, from him by law of nature. 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.

Surely truth's * adversaries will agree, at least now, to recognize that ingeneracy and generacy do not subsist properly and individually, and obviously that they are not hypostases either. For the guide to truth's doctrines, as we have now learned, expressly said at one point: For 'generacy' and 'ingeneracy' are not things existing individually and hypostatically. And again: So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something existing in the concept of the hypostasis of God the Father, and as belonging to it but we are not to suppose it the hypostasis itself. And elsewhere: For if * ingeneracy exists individually, subsisting in its own being, but is, as they say, a property of God the Father, it will be other than him whose property it is; for what

373/380 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. II* (PG 75, 741CD; *SChr.*, vol. 231, p. 274); cf. supra, ch. 23, 388-390 385/386 cf. supra, 235-236 386/389 cf. supra, 237-240 389/394 cf. supra, 349-354

410
 415
 420
 425
 430
 435

f. 36ra
 f. 36rb
 f. 36va

D flor. I from l. 414 to l. 421

Line 416: *κἀουελ*, X: *κἀουελ*.

Line 417: *κἀουελ*, XY: *κἀουελ*.

Line 435: At the top of fol. 36v D reads as follows: *κἀουελ*, *κἀουελ*. Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

belongs to something and exists in proper subsistence must be different from what it belongs to. And so the Father's simple nature is doubled, being compounded for us of Father and ingeneracy. In addition to this, 395 he wrote, as previously set down, the following: 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.

395/397 cf. supra, 378-380

440
 441
 442
 443

said that the Word condensed with our denseness meaning that he hypostatically united our substance to himself truly without illusion. That is why he also said: 'The Word condenses, the invisible becomes visible, the impalpable becomes palpable, the timeless begins'. * I could set down very many words which those who contend with orthodoxy have excerpted from the holy fathers' sound doctrine and used as weapons against us in various ways, but which refuted and shamed them when they said them in full. But having compiled a book of up to 250 testimonies, so called 'excerpts' from the proven doctor Cyril, and alleged him as an advocate of the error of two natures, God stretched out his hand in the imperial city and we set briskly to work against the error; and we wrote a book entitled *Philalethes* using the same words of Cyril as weapons against them and everybody knew what the force of truth was and what was sacrilege and plausible falsehood.

The careful listener will note that this author has not been able to do anything at all which the rest of the promoters (to say the least) of absurd and varied heresies did not also do. For though there is from wise Cyril much irreproachable teaching where he clearly shows in plain terms (as we have learned from what has been set down) that the characteristic properties of the hypostases (I mean ingeneracy, generacy and, clearly indeed, procession) are not hypostases, this good fellow, though he went around, over and over again making use of the abundance of this doctor's writings and, as it were, picking over all of them to collect his little phra-

90 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܘܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ : ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ : ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <<
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ . ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <<
 * ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ : ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ : ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <<
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ : ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 95 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 100 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <

A. f. 114ra

105 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 110 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <
 115 ܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ <

A from ܘܗܘܢܝܢ (L. 94) on D

Line 103: ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ, D: ܕܠܗܘܢܝܢ. ܠܗܘܢܝܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢܝܢ.
 Line 104: ܠܗܘܢܝܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢܝܢ, as infra, line 170.
 Line 107: ܘܗܘܢܝܢ, D: ܘܗܘܢܝܢ.
 Line 110: ܠܗܘܢܝܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢܝܢ.
 Line 112: ܠܗܘܢܝܢ, D: ܠܗܘܢܝܢ.

75/76 Greg. Naz., Or. 38, 2 (PG 36, 313B; SChr., vol. 358, p. 106)

ses, he found only one which might seem to those who read only it, to have some plausibility; and yet it affords him no help. And it is this which he very irrelevantly inserted into that *Festal*, in order that he might seem to confirm his unorthodoxy from patristic testimony. That is his and his ilk's studied practice, as we have now clearly recognized, seeing that our divinely inspired father SEVERUS said so; for he wrote of mad Julian's assistants: And then in their pretence they strained every nerve, as they say, to help out their penury by a theft capable of * misleading the simple: by testimony extracted somehow from books by the holy fathers, the initiators into divine mysteries, without concern for the whole teaching set down in all their writings. You will see the mental affinity of those at enmity with the truth. They strained, he says, every nerve, as they say, to help out their penury by a theft capable of misleading the simple: by testimony extracted somehow from books by the holy fathers, the initiators into divine mysteries, without concern for the whole teaching set down in all their writings. Is not this bold and boastful author convicted, by what has already been examined, of spurning all express statements yet of having, from poverty and utter helplessness, pinned his hopes on rare expressions, of no avail to his lawlessness, in order to practise some sort of trickery upon his wretched dupes? But let us consider the rest of the doctor's words: For though, he

100
 110
 120
 125
 130
 135
 140

100
 110
 120
 125
 130
 135
 140

f. 114rb

AD

Line 122: *ⲁⲓⲃⲏ*, D: *ⲁⲓⲃⲏⲥ*.

Line 128: *ⲕⲓⲓ*, D: *ⲕⲓⲓⲥ*.

Line 129: *ⲥⲓⲣⲁⲥ*, D: *ⲥⲓⲣⲁⲥⲏ*.

Line 135: *ⲕⲓⲓ*, D: *ⲕⲓⲓⲓ*.

Line 136: *ⲥⲓⲣⲁⲥ*, D: *ⲥⲓⲣⲁⲥⲏ*, *ⲥ*, cf. supra, line 51 (*ⲥⲓⲣⲁⲥ*).

120 says, I could have introduced many other passages written by Gregory
the Theologian and taken up very ferociously by those who divide the
one Christ, I left them aside on the ground that I did not want to dis-
turb your mind. Is it surprising, when, as we heard, Peter, first of
the Apostles, says that *the ignorant and unstable distort* some things
125 from the wise epistles of great Paul, as they do the rest of the Scrip-
tures, to their own damnation? But, he says, they are clearly convicted
of being sick in mind to the last degree and of gnawing off petty phra-
ses like mice, by the very thoughts and words of the sacred Bible
and by the father's doctrines. And again he says: I could set down
very many words which those who contend with orthodoxy have
130 excerpted from the holy fathers' sound doctrine and used as weapons
against us in various ways, but which refuted and shamed them when
they said them in * full. We are to observe that it is the practice of
opponents of orthodoxy to extract words from sound teaching and
maliciously make them weapons against right-thinking men. They
135 will be refuted by the full statements of the divine spokesmen,
be ridiculed and be shamed twice over. But, he says, having com-
piled a book of up to 250 testimonies, so called 'excerpts' from the
proven doctor Cyril, and alleged him as an advocate of the error of
two natures, God stretched out his hand in the imperial city and we set
140 briskly to work against the error; and we wrote a book entitled
Philalethes using the same words of Cyril as weapons against them and
everybody knew what the force of truth was and what was sacrilege and
plausible falsehood.

122/125 cf. supra, 56-59 125/127 cf. supra, 66-67 128/132 cf. supra, 76-80 136/143 cf. supra, 80-86

145 :
:
:
:
:
150 :
:
:
:
:
155 :
:
:
:
160 :
:
:
:
165 :
:
:
:
170 :
:

f. 114va

AD

Line 147:
Line 162:
Line 164:
Line 170:
supra, line 104 (

So, my brethren, it is no great matter if a champion and
 145 advocate of falsehood has also now left out many clear things and
 quoted one text in proof of his abominable opinion from the
 irreproachable teaching of proven Cyril; and if you will inves-
 tigate this text, comparing it wisely and truthfully and putting it
 alongside the words we took as weapons against him from the
 150 spiritual treasures of the same doctor, you will fully know what
 the force of truth is and what is sacrilege and plausible falsehood. For
 who, on reading with understanding all the words set down above
 of the same master of mysteries, will not easily learn that he did
 not say the divine generacy is preserved in its own hypostasis with
 155 the aim of making it subsist properly and individually? No, he
 will very reasonably think that he came to say this because he
 likened it to the generation of the craftsmanship born of some
 wisdom which is not a hypostasis but rather the knowledge which
 can occur or not occur, be or not be, indicating, as he was, that
 160 the generation of the Only-begotten is not like the gener-
 ation belonging to some wise understanding and craftsmanship,
 a generation which reason recognizes also as an operative
 movement, which the intellect of a wise understanding * and
 craftsmanship have discovered and which ceases immediately
 165 along with the effect; no, it always exists, preserved in its own
 hypostasis in which it is eternally present. But the same accurate
 instructor in things divine taught us again that the properties
 belong to those in whom they exist as their own, by saying in the

175
 180
 185
 190
 195

f. 114vb

AD

- Line 179: *αὐτῶν*, D: *οὐκ αὐτῶν*.
- Line 181: *καὶ τὸ*, D: *καὶ τὸν*.
- Line 182: *καὶ*, D: *καὶ*.
- Line 185: *καὶ τὸν*, D: *καὶ τὸν*.
- Line 187: *καὶ τὸν*, D: *καὶ τὸν*.
- Lines 187-188: *καὶ τὸν*, D: *καὶ τὸν*.

passage already quoted: For you are not remembering that our argu-
 170 ment laboured and proved to us, as well as it could, that one perceives
 things in the category of accidents or counted as simply existing in
 others, as not existing individually at all but, rather, as existing in others;
 they may seem to exist and be called individual things but they have as
 their own the nature of the one to whom they pertain. For 'generacy' and
 175 'ingeneracy' are not things existing individually and hypostatically, but
 they only bring us the meaning of having been begotten or not having
 been begotten. The wise father has thus clearly instructed us that
 things in the category of accidents do not exist individually, but, rather, in
 others; they may seem to exist and be called individual things but they
 180 have as their own the nature of the one to whom they pertain. Using this
 mode of speech, as we can see, the doctor said that generacy is
 preserved in its own hypostasis, and thought nothing contrary to
 himself. For how could it not be an exceedingly godless
 misrepresentation and slander to think that such a father is at war
 185 with himself and thinks generacy a hypostasis? For he said very
 clearly and proclaimed aloud with all confidence, at one point: For
 if ingeneracy exists individually, subsisting in its own being, but is, as
 they say, a property of God the Father, it will be other than him whose

198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220

AD flor. II from l. 207 to l. 212

Line 201: *ⲟⲩ*, D om.

Line 205: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*.

Line 206: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ* *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ* *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, D om.
ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ, D: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*.

Line 207: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, D and flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*.

Line 209: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*.

Line 212: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*.

Line 215: At the top of fol. 43v D reads as follows: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*.

ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ. Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

Line 216: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲗ*.

169/177 cf. supra, ch. 28, 229-237 178/180 cf. supra, 171-174 186/
 192 cf. supra, ch. 28, 310-315

property it is; for what belongs to something and exists in proper
 190 subsistence must be different from what it belongs to. And so the Father's
 simple nature is doubled, being compounded for us of Father and
 ingeneracy. But at another point: * For 'generacy' and 'ingeneracy'
 are not things existing individually and hypostatically. But at another
 point: So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something existing in the con-
 195 cept of the hypostasis of God the Father, and as belonging to it but we are
 not to suppose it the hypostasis itself. But besides this: 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. For even were one to grant by way of concession that
 200 what this excellent fellow puts forward against the doctor had
 some force (which is impossible, for the Spirit who spoke in him
 was never contrary to himself) we should stick to the Church's
 definitions which ordain that an isolated statement is not the
 Church's law. For GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN said in his oration
 205 *On the Lights*: An isolated statement is not a law of the Church, since
 one swallow does not make a spring, nor one line a geometer nor one
 voyage a sailor. Indeed proven SEVERUS, who always followed
 Saint Cyril, wrote in the *Third Letter to Sergius the Grammarian*,
 confirming this very fact, as follows: For this reason we counsel your
 210 Charity, with a mind of love, to bid adieu to such sophisms, to honour
 faith's simplicity and not to run too readily into doctrinal discussions, but
 to reckon it a good thing always to follow the fathers if, at any time, it
 befalls you of necessity to write or say some such thing. For it is no small

: *ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα, ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι* <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
 225 *ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι* <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
 230 *ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι* <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
 235 *ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι* <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
 240 *ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι* <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
 245 *ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι* <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <
ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα ὅτι <

f. 115ra

192/193 cf. supra, ch. 28, 235-236 194/196 cf. supra, ch. 28, 237-240
 196/199 cf. supra, ch. 28, 378-380 205/207 Greg. Naz., Or. 39, 14
 (PG 36, 352B; SChr., vol. 358, p. 182) 209/221 Sev. Ant., Epp. ad Serg. Gramm., 3 (CSCO 119, pp. 164,24 - 165,11; 120, p. 126, 1-15)

AD

Line 226: ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα, D: ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα.
 Line 227: ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα, D: ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα.
 Line 231: ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα, D: ἡ ἀποδοξαστικὴ ἰδέα.

thing to make a slip in these matters or say something not very expert and
 215 not first to save ourselves, so far as we can, at all points from ambushes
 and cavils by opponents. For if we are going to inquire after things said
 too readily by certain persons and to defend mis-statements, it will be
 opportune for us to mention the Holy Trinity of one hypostasis; because
 we find Eustathius, of blessed memory, formerly bishop of Antioch,
 220 saying in his *Commentary on the 92nd Psalm* of Father and Son that they
 are one hypostasis.

What, then, indeed? Can one not see the author himself paying
 lip service * to these words? Let us look at what he says in the
 third chapter of his book: Our famous father Theodosius too decreed
 225 that these things are so; the same who shone in his contests on behalf of
 true religion and in whose time this issue was proposed, clearly indicates
 that we ought not to speak of substances or natures in the Holy Trinity, or
 Gods or Godheads. Collecting the mind of the holy fathers from the
 totality of them and not from rare usages in a different sense but from
 230 their widely extensive teaching, he ruled, in general and without qualifi-
 cation, that we are not to speak of substances or natures. Again, too,
 in the ninth chapter he wrote, as follows: We ought, then, first to
 remember (as we said at the outset) that we should keep in mind that they
 address their thoughts to certain persons and we are to explain their rare
 235 statements by what are frequently written down by them at length, and

250
 255
 260
 265
 270

260
 265
 270

AD

Line 252: D: *...*
 Line 255: D: *...*
 Line 256: D: *...*
 Line 262: D: *...*
 Line 268: D: *...*
 Line 273: D: *...*

220/221 Eustath. Antioch., *Comm. in ps. 92*, fragm. per Seuerum solum
 seruatum 224/231 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 3 (n° 3) 232/239 Dam. Alex.,
Adv. Trith., 9 (n° 20)

not, on the contrary, make the rare a criterion for the many; we do not now concede this in regard to the examination set down but gladly advise that we should take in a devout sense little phrases uttered in a certain style, so that impiety should not through them be allowed any place. And a few lines later: But the admirable Athanasius clearly testifies, when he defends Dionysius, that doctrines and words should be judged on the basis of many written statements by the doctors and on the basis of what they ruled in laying-down the faith and not on the basis of their rare condescensions to heretics. And in the tenth chapter, warning the friends of truth not to be overwhelmed easily or drawn away by little phrases emanating from cunning heresy (but it would be much better to say, by his publications) he says the following: So if anyone wants to prove truly that the holy fathers think of substances and natures, let him prove such a thing from a statement of faith and we shall agree, and let him not do it from isolated words in refutation of heresy. And again: * This is why I ask the friend of truth, not to be too readily overwhelmed and disturbed by this sort of quotation, but to be guided by the distinction in teaching I mentioned and investigate the holy fathers' thought. In addition to all this, he wrote as follows in the 13th chapter: Not to prolong the discussion unduly by always examining the texts thus referred to, we give the general advice to readers

240/244 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 9 (n° 21) 247/251 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 10 (n° 25) 251/254 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 10 (n° 26) 255/260 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 13 (n° 31); cf. *supra*, ch. 25, 300-306

275
280
285
290
295

f. 115va

AD

Line 277: *ⲉϥⲓⲗⲉ ⲙⲁⲕⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, D: *ⲉϥⲓⲗⲉ ⲙⲁⲕⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*.
 Line 286: *ⲙⲁⲕⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, D: *ⲙⲁⲕⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*.
 Line 290: *ⲙⲁⲕⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, D: *ⲙⲁⲕⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*.
 Line 292: *ⲙⲁⲕⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, D: *ⲙⲁⲕⲉ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*.
 Lines 297-304: *ⲉϥⲓⲗⲉ* *ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, cf. *supra*, ch. 25, lines 334-341 and Book II, ch. 18, lines 309-315 (a few variants).

that here especially they should follow the Spirit's guidance, pursue the intention of true religion and explain by clear and undisputed statements those spoken enigmatically and in a different style, without tearing the words out of context and changing them to an unsound meaning. A truly just decree here of the writer, in harmony with the fathers' mind! And we will not gainsay it. Hence, cherishing it very much and embracing it, we shall rightly present him with his own judgement in order that he may be acquitted or condemned by it. For the sacred word says: *By your words you will be acquitted and by your words you will be condemned.* So, what he said shall adjudicate between him and us. For he said at one point, as previously set down: Our famous father Theodosius collecting the mind of the holy fathers from the totality of them and not from rare usages in a different sense but from their widely extensive teaching, ruled, in general and without qualification, that we are not to speak of substances or natures. At another point: We are to explain their rare statements by what are frequently written down by them at length, and not, on the contrary, make the rare a criterion for the many. And again: Doctrines and words should be judged on the basis of many written statements by the doctors and on the basis of what they ruled in laying-down the faith and not on the basis of their rare condescensions to heretics. But in addition to this: We ought not to explain by isolated statements those spoken enigmatically, but by means of clear and undisputed statements.

300 — ܐܘܪܘܫܠܝܡ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 305 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 310 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 315 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 320 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ
 — ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ

AD

Line 305: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ, D: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ.
 Line 306: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ, D: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ.
 Line 309: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ, D: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ.
 Line 313: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ, D: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ.
 Line 314: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ, D: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ.
 Line 321: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ, D: ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ.

265/266 Matth. 12:37 268/272 cf. supra, 224 et 228-231 272/274 cf. supra, 234-236 274/277 cf. supra, 241-244 278/279 cf. supra, 258-259

subistence must be different from what it belongs to. And so the Father's simple nature is doubled, being compounded for us of Father and ingeneracy. And again: 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 again: So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something existing in the concept of the hypostasis of God the Father, and as belonging to it but we are not to suppose it the hypostasis itself. But he writes again besides this: 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.

* What, sir, will you say in reply to this? For we shall investigate the case with you. Do you think that these are clear and indubitable words or that you quote in defence of your view any more numerous and clearer than them, so that ours, isolated and obscure, would be explained by your more numerous and clearer words? No, you will not do so. You are, indeed, endeavouring covertly to nullify and discard from the fathers' teachings everything which puts a brake on your impious inventions.

355
 360
 365
 370

f. 116ra
 365
 370

AD

- Line 355: ἰγγενεια, D: ἰγγενεια.
- Line 356: ἰγγενεια, D: ἰγγενεια. ἰγγενεια, D: ἰγγενεια. ἰγγενεια, A: ἰγγενεια.
- Line 357: ἰγγενεια, D om. ἰγγενεια, D: ἰγγενεια.
- Line 361: ἰγγενεια, D: ἰγγενεια.
- Line 362: ἰγγενεια, D: ἰγγενεια.
- Line 369: ἰγγενεια, D: ἰγγενεια.
- Line 372: ἰγγενεια, D: ἰγγενεια.

305/307 cf. supra, ch. 28, 235-237; cf. etiam supra, 192-193 supra, 194-196 311/313 cf. supra, 196-199 308/310 cf.

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 he 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.

Hence, having clearly bidden farewell to decency, you wrote in the Letter you sent to Paralos by Zachariah the following shameful little phrases: But they will say that Saint Cyril said that ingeneracy is not a hypostasis. I too will say 'Yes' to that: it is not a hypostasis understood as substance, or material substrate, which, when a prosopon participates in it, is called substance; for the doctor was speaking about this, when he proved at all levels that ingeneracy is not God's substance; which is why, when we want to indicate mode of being (i.e. subsisting ingenerately and subsisting generately) it is impossible for us to find the proper hypostasis understood here in any other way except through its indicative and hypostatic properties, just as we cannot see the commonness of the substance except through the marks characterizing the nature.

ⲉⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ

ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ

ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ
 ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ

AD

Line 14: ⲛⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲁⲛ, D: ⲛⲓⲁⲛ.
 Line 16: ⲛⲓⲁⲛ, D: ⲛⲓⲁⲛ.

25 * You cunning and thought-concealing man, you have here revealed your mad mind clearly; for you are convicted of reckoning your fabricated substance and Godhead (which you also absurdly think alien to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost) a hypostasis, like Sabellius (even if with trickery and deception, on account of the thought and opinion of the majority, you sometimes call this hypostasis the common substance and the names you apply to it 'hypostases'). I find myself astonished how, whenever you scheme to alienate Father, Son and Holy Ghost from the Godhead and substance, you carefully lay claim to a difference between substance and hypostasis, but whenever the masters of mysteries propound to us the otherness of hypostasis from its characteristic property you thereupon disclose more clearly your Jewish opinion, muddling and confusing everything, with a view to proving that the substance and Godhead, comprehending the hypostases, is only one hypostasis. So, to prove the difference not between hypostasis and property but between property (i.e. in your terms 'proper hypostasis') and common hypostasis, you seem, my pleasant fellow, to have employed this brazen and novel terminology here also, with great abundance. For when foul Eunomius strove to prove ingeneracy the Father's substance and hypostasis, and, again, generacy the Son's substance and hypostasis, so as to establish therefrom a complete contrariety of hypostases (or what he called 'substances') and to transfer to the hypostases of Father and Son the foreignness ingeneracy has to

A, f. 116rb

25 * און חכמה ופחד חשבוני * און חכמה
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 30 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 35 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 40 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 45 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 50 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני
 חשבוני ופחד חשבוני. און חכמה ופחד חשבוני

AD

Line 38: און חכמה, D: און חכמה.
 Line 39: און חכמה, D om.
 Line 42: און חכמה, D: און חכמה.
 Line 47: און חכמה, D: און חכמה.
 Line 48: און חכמה, D: און חכמה.
 Line 52: און חכמה, D: און חכמה.

50 generacy, Cyril, truth's champion, powerfully overthrows him (as did also the divinely taught doctors before him) giving many clear proofs that ingeneracy is not (as the impious fellow supposed) the substance and hypostasis of God the Father, but rather, the characteristic property of the hypostasis, and then rightly ruled, after conclusive demonstrations, as follows: So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something existing in the concept of the hypostasis * of God the Father, and as belonging to it but we are not to suppose it the hypostasis itself. You, my admirable fellow, as if you had sprung up from Hell and seen your whole fortress of impious verbal inventions collapse at this one little statement, and clearly unable to reject this divinely-spoken utterance for fear of the populace, then turned to slanders upon the doctor, and made him out to be a teacher of muddle and want of differentiation between doctrines better discriminated by yourself, saying disrespectfully: But they will say that Saint Cyril said that ingeneracy is not a hypostasis. I too will say 'Yes' to that: it is not a hypostasis understood as substance, or material substrate, which, when a prosopon participates in it, is called substance; for the doctor was speaking about this, when he proved at all levels that ingeneracy is not God's substance.

70 You have hereby presented us with one hypostasis understood, as you say (but to speak more truly, understood according to Sabellius, your master) as substance, to which, like him, you apply

53 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 55 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 60 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ * ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 65 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 70 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 * ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ

75 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ
 ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ : ܘܥܘܕܘܢ

AD

Line 53: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ, D: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ.
 Line 57: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ, D: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ.
 Line 59: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ, D: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ.
 Line 70: At the top of fol. 46v D reads as follows: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ, ܘܥܘܕܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܢ. *Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.*
 Line 74: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ, D: ܘܥܘܕܘܢ.

empty names, but you have also introduced three other hypostases: those apprehended as characteristic properties and names.
 75 How, then clever fellow, will there not be, according to your argument, four hypostases of the Godhead? For if your audacity counsels you to define one hypostasis understood as a substance but again three others apprehended as properties and names apart from this one, by what sophisms or deceits will you persuade the
 80 truth-loving hearers of your learned fabrication that you do not hold to four hypostases? Therefore, be assured that you are to be charged rather more justly than Eunomius, with Jewish and Pagan opinions: with idolatry and Paganism, by proposing not a trinity but a quaternity; with Judaism, by limiting the Godhead to only
 85 one hypostasis. For you recognize as God in the full sense and truly only the hypostasis understood by you as substance, * as has now already been proved in the preceding and will be more clearly proved again, indeed, with truth aiding our discussion.

However, since you utter everything with arbitrary authority
 90 you will certainly say, 'Look, wise Cyril here used "hypostasis" in place of "substance comprehending the hypostases"'. We are well aware that those who can easily investigate your frigid words

: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
 80 *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
 : *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
 85 *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
 : *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
 90 *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
 : *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
 95 *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ

f. 116vb

ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ
 : *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*
 100 *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*

AD flor. II from l. 82 to l. 92

Line 84: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 85: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 86: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 87: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, D and flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 88: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 89: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*. *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 90: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 92: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, D and flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.
 Line 95: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲁⲓ*.

will consider it idle jaw clicking to combat such disrespectful fatuities. Nevertheless, lest it might seem to the more inexpert (for
 95 whose sake especially we have undertaken this enterprise), that there is something in what you say, we shall again spend a pleasant moment with you and examine the chit-chat you talked here, setting down again prior to the examination, as a reminder to readers, various words by the same father in conjunction with your
 100 marvellous explanation of them.

The doctor said, then: 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. *B.* You are right. *A.* So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something existing in the
 105 concept of the hypostasis of God the Father, and as belonging to it but we are not to suppose it the hypostasis itself. And again, 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. So come, then, you accurate expositor of the
 110 fathers, tell us the meaning of this. For you wrote, saying: But they will say that Saint Cyril said that ingeneracy is not a hypostasis. I too will say 'Yes' to that: it is not a hypostasis understood as substance, or material substrate, which, when a prosopon participates in it, is called

ⲕⲁⲟⲓ ⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲥ ⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲁ, ⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 105 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ

ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 110 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 115 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 120 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ

AD flor. I from l. 109 to l. 118

- Line 104: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 109: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, flor. I: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, as supra, ch. 25, line 28.
- Line 110: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D and flor. I: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 111: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ. ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ. ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D and flor. I om.
- Line 112: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 115: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, flor. I: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 117: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, W: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ. ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 121: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.

101/106 cf. supra, ch. 28, 235-240 107/109 cf. supra, ch. 28, 378-380
 110/115 cf. supra, 64-69

substance; for the doctor was speaking about this, when he proved at all
 115 levels that ingeneracy is not God's substance. Who, on seeing this very
 clear misrepresentation, will not blush deeply for you, my
 precious fellow? For, having quaffed * the muddy dregs of heresy,
 and therefore become crazed, as it were, with some long intoxica-
 tion by it, you wretchedly think you are victorious in the contests,
 120 if you simply blot out in full the source of your embarrassment
 and continue to patch together this ignoble and despicable non-
 sense. Otherwise, how is it that you do not test out the significance
 of what the doctor wrote and what you wrote? For where in the
 foregoing does he mention the common substance of the hyposta-
 125 ses, as you, deceiving only yourself, wrote when you said: I too
 will say 'Yes' to that: it is not a hypostasis understood as substance, or
 material substrate, which, when a prosopon participates in it, is called
 substance.

Will you say that the hypostasis understood as a substance is
 130 not the common substance of the three hypostases? In that case,
 another trinity of hypostases has appeared: one of hypostases
 understood as properties and terms, and another, again, of hypo-
 stases understood as substances or I know not what.

But that you have called the common substance comprehending
 135 the hypostases a hypostasis understood as substance is evident from
 the fact that you added: Or material substrate, which, when a prosopon
 participates in it, is called substance. For you must acknowledge that
 what gives participation is substance in the common meaning. For,
 you said again, the doctor was speaking about this, when he proved at

125/128 cf. supra, 111-114 135/137 cf. supra, 126-128 138/141 cf. su-
 pra, 114-115

—
 125 —
 —
 —
 f. 117ra
 130 —
 —
 —
 135 —
 —
 —
 —

140 —
 —
 —
 145 —

—
 —
 —
 150 —
 —

AD

Line 126: ἡ ὑπόστασις, D: ἡ ὑπόστασις.

Line 147: ἡ ὑπόστασις, D: ἡ ὑπόστασις.

140 all levels that ingeneracy is not God's substance. What is the meaning of about this? For we ought to investigate that as well, seeing that you have apparently thought fit to utter almost no word without obscurity. For your words must always be covered in obscurity, as if in a dark fog, as venomous animals are concealed in swamps or
 145 deadly poisons in foods. You said: I too will say 'Yes' to that: it is not a hypostasis understood as substance, or material substrate, which, when a prosopon participates in it, is called substance; for the doctor was speaking about this, when he proved at all levels that * ingeneracy is not God's substance. It is not evident, then, from the structure of the
 150 sentence, what you have in view when you said: For the doctor was speaking about this. Is it the hypostasis (understood by you as substance), which, as has been proved, according to your argument, is comprehensive of the hypostases; or, the prosopon which, as you said, when it participates in the material substrate, is called substance?
 155 For you have so hidden what you said in darkness that listeners will not recognize anyhow what you mean by these words, emulating in this, as you do, the cunning of your masters who endeavoured to conceal their execrable blasphemies in obscurity. However, from your thought we will surmise that you are not
 160 speaking about the prosopon which is called a substance (otherwise you would have been speaking the truth and not have been fully supposing ingeneracy a hypostasis, pronouncing and propounding a law contrary to the doctors) but about the (according to your argument) common hypostasis comprehensive of the
 165 hypostases. Will we not appear to be speaking marvels in attempting to make your rubbish plain? What? Should you not have foreseen

—
 —
 —
 155 —
 —
 160 —
 —
 —
 —
 — f. 117rb
 —
 165 —
 —
 —
 —
 170 —
 —
 —
 —
 175 —
 —
 —
 —
 180 —
 —
 —
 —

AD

Line 164: אֲנִי, D: אֲנִי.

145/149 cf. supra, 111-115 150-151 cf. supra, 147-148 154 cf. supra, 113-114

the shame involved in the clear rebuttals? See what the doctor said: 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 again: * 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.

But let us enjoy your clever exposition of these words too. Tell us, what does the doctor mean and what is he distinguishing generacy and ingeneracy from, when he said: For 'generacy' and 'ingeneracy' are not things existing individually and hypostatically. Did he mean hypostases, and distinguish them from the hypostasis understood, according to your argument, as substance? In which case the hypostases will be found not to subsist individually, properly and hypostatically but, on the contrary, to be substance and common hypostasis comprehending the hypostases, as you say, subsisting individually in proper subsistence and properly. For if generacy and ingeneracy * are hypostases (in the way that you think, but not in the way that the father testified) subsisting individually, hypostatically and properly, it must be the case that either nothing will be found subsisting individually, hypostatically and properly in the Holy Trinity, or, of necessity, it

⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 185 ⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ

ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 190 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 195 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 200 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ

f. 117va

AD flor. II from l. 199 on

- Line 184: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 185: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ. ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D om. ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 188: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 199: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D and flor. II: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 200: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, flor. II: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 201: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, flor. II: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ. ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 202: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D and flor. II: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
- Line 203: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, flor. II: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.

168/170 cf. supra, 101-103 170/173 cf. supra, 107-109 176/177 cf. supra, 168-169 182/183 cf. supra, 164-165

will be a hypostasis, understood according to your argument as substance i.e. the substance of the Godhead comprehending the hypostases which subsists individually, hypostatically and properly.

You will observe, pleasant fellow, what absurd lunacies your ignorant self's blasphemous effrontery has plunged you into? Therefore, do not hold back, but justly and very loudly proclaim your own word to yourself: Will not the impure expositor of the fathers even now be ashamed? With the overthrow of your hypocrisy and the abode of your deception, look (if you can get rid of the scales of heresy) at the pure light of the doctor's accurate understanding and see the consonance and apt order which his words, spoken by inspiration from on high, have with one another and with the truth! For having first argued and said: 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 thereby shown that generacy and ingeneracy are not hypostases but characteristic properties indicating the different mode of the hypostases of Father and Son, and his interlocutor having in some sense agreed with this statement by the response You are right, he then confidently went on to add something immediately and said: So ingeneracy is to be reckoned as something existing in the concept of the hypostasis of God the Father, and as belonging to it but we are not to suppose it the hypostasis itself. Then, after a few lines, he confirmed the same argument by adding: Ingeneracy, then, is by no means God's substance, but is indicative, as I

196/197 cf. supra, ch. 27, 337-338 202/205 cf. supra, 101-103 210/212 cf. supra, 104-106 214/216 cf. supra, 107-109

205 *Handwritten text in Syriac script*

Handwritten text in Syriac script, including lines 210, 215, 220, and 225.

AD flor. II ¹⁰ 206

Line 206: *Handwritten*, flor. II: *Handwritten*.
Line 209: *Handwritten*, D: *Handwritten*.
Line 217: *Handwritten* (bis), D: *Handwritten*.
Line 218: *Handwritten*, D: *Handwritten*. *Handwritten*, D om.
Line 219: *Handwritten*, D: *Handwritten*.

215 have said, only of the fact that the Father has not been begotten; it does
 not subsist on its own. But let us take very careful note that the
 doctor said that ingeneracy exists in the concept of the hypostasis of
 God the Father. So if (as you, clever fellow, please to think) * the
 master of mysteries understood the hypostasis of God the Father
 220 as the common substance comprehending the three hypostases and
 instructed us to think that ingeneracy exists in the concept of the
 substance, how, then, will ingeneracy not of necessity belong not
 only to God the Father but also to Son and Holy Ghost? For if
 ingeneracy exists in the concept of the substance and consub-
 225 stantials must, of necessity, have in common both the substance
 and all the substance's properties, either ingeneracy will be
 common to the three hypostases and the hypostases will be
 mutually merged and the Libyan's Jewish doctrines take hold (as
 is also the aim of your new-fangled writings) or, the contrary, the
 230 hypostases will be different in substance, not having in common
 the properties of the one substance.

But again, you incautiously championed your feeble supposi-
 tions by saying that the doctor was discoursing about the common

230
 235
 240
 245

f. 117vb

AD W from l. 230 to l. 245 flor. II from l. 230 to l. 245

- Line 230: *ⲛⲉⲗ*, D: *ⲛⲉⲗⲉ*.
- Line 232: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*.
- Line 234: *ⲛⲓⲓ*, DW and flor. II: *ⲛⲓⲓⲓ*.
- Line 235: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, DW and flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*. *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*.
- Line 236: *ⲛⲉⲗⲉ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲗⲉ*.
- Line 237: *ⲛⲉⲗ*, D and flor. II: *ⲛⲉⲗ*.
- Line 238: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, D and flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*.
- Line 239: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, W: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*. *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*. *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*.
- Line 241: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, DW and flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*. *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*.
- Line 242: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, DW and flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*. *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*, flor. II: *ⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲛⲉⲗ*.

even more than the others you are guilty on these charges, you, who * grant the same substance to begetter and begotten. By that you have prepared here a sort of inescapable snare for your own ruination, with justice rightly awarding victory to our words against you. For either you
 285 will be subject to your own charges, if you suppose the substances mutually separated without beginning, but also endeavour to attribute to one of them the rank of Son existing by generation and to say that this unbeginning being was begotten by *Him who is* (for you publicly ascribe a generation by another to one whom you imagine existing without
 290 generation); or, if you profess only one substance without beginning but then limit it to Father and Son by generation, you will be saying that the ingenerate substance was begotten by itself.' Taking up these words and pouring scorn upon them, the doctor, after a few lines, says: He repudiates a commonness of substance by a twofold argument and
 295 says: either there are two parallel ingenerate first principles, one of which we name 'Father' and the other 'Son', saying that *He who is* has been begotten by *Him who is*; or, one and the same substance is understood as belonging to both, a substance which receives the names in turn, and is

300 ... ܘܠܚܘܿܠܘܿܬܘܿܗ ܘܢܫܘܿܗ ܐܝܘܿܒܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ
 305 ... ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ
 310 ... ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ
 315 ... ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ
 320 ... ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ

f. 118rb

AD flor. I ^{from l. 315 on}

Line 300: At the top of fol. 51v D reads as follows: ܐܝܘܿܒܘܿܗ ܘܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ ܘܕܢܘܿܗ. Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

Line 302: ܐܝܘܿܒܘܿܗ, D: ܐܝܘܿܒܘܿܗ.
 Line 307: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐ, D: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐ.
 Line 310: ܕܢܘܿܗ, D: ܕܢܘܿܗܐ.
 Line 313: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ, D: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ.
 Line 314: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐ, D: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐ.
 Line 317: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ, D: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ. ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐ, D: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ. ܐܝܘܿܒܘܿܗ, W:

Line 319: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ, X: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ. ܕܢܘܿܗ, flor. I: ܕܢܘܿܗ.
 Line 320: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ, D and flor. I: ܕܢܘܿܗܘܿܘܿܐܘܿܐ.

288 cf. Ex. 3:14 294/299 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 397D-400A; Jaeger I, p. 165, 10-16) 296 et 297 cf. Ex. 3:14

Father and becomes Son, being produced from itself by generation. And
 300 again: He says we conceive of two ingenerate substances. How can
 someone who accuses us of merging and muddling everything by
 professing a single substance, say this?

Thus Saint Gregory! But what do you yourself say? Did you
 not yourself, my good fellow, rule in the 13th chapter of your
 305 book that the Arians do not acknowledge the common substance?
 I will recall what you said there; it is as follows: But that the Arians
 were not at war with the fathers only over the difference (as you sup-
 pose), but also over the number, of the natures, by their refusing to
 concede one common substance of the three hypostases; whereas the
 310 wise masters of mysteries, in advocacy of the spotless faith and for the
 avoidance of polytheism, accepted the oneness of the substance: * this
 we have already proved.

This being thus proved, must you not, admirable fellow, be
 uttering idle arguments when you say that accurate Cyril, by the
 315 words we quoted, was striving to prove, against proud Eunomius,
 that ingeneracy is not the common substance; for if that impious
 fellow did not even pay lip service to the thought of a common
 substance, not to mention ingeneracy as a common substance, of
 what use were the efforts of truth's athlete? He seems, then,
 320 according to your argument, to be merely buffeting the air and not

300/302 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* I (PG 45, 400C; Jaeger I, p. 166, 18-20) 306/312 Dam. Alex., *Adv. Trith.*, 13 (n° 32)

ⲕⲟⲙⲟⲩ ⲕⲓⲁⲛ ⲕⲉⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ

325 ⲉⲛ ⲁⲗ ⲕⲓⲛⲁ . ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 330 ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 335 ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲓ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ

f. 118va

ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 340 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ

AD flor. I up to l. 324 and from l. 328 to l. 335

Line 322: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, DW: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
 Line 323: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ. ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, WXY: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
 ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, flor. I: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
 Line 324: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, X: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ. ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, Y: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
 Line 332: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, DWZ: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, XY: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ.
 Line 335: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, XYZ: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ. ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ, W: ⲕⲁⲓⲛⲁ.

fighting with anybody. But no right-minded person indeed would ever accept that! He will, indeed, rather, perceive the inanity and weakness of your empty sophisms truly outrageous in their insanity, and your malice and disregard for the correct and spotless teaching of the masters of mysteries. For the wise instructor strove very valiantly and very adeptly, and he nobly overthrew a blasphemous device against our common hope, by clearly proving not that ingeneracy is not the common substance of the three hypostases (for this is generally agreed by all except you) but that ingeneracy is in no way God the Father's hypostasis. For it was by calling ingeneracy the Father's hypostasis, or substance, and likewise generacy the Son's hypostasis and substance, that impious Eunomius attempted to make the Son foreign in substance and nature to the Father and not, as your erudite self supposes, by thinking ingeneracy the common substance.

Besides this, it remains to prove how wise Cyril, the guide to plain teaching, sets out for us, with great accuracy, the difference between a hypostasis and the common substance of the three hypostases. This we shall accordingly do through * his true expositor and advocate; I mean our God-clad father SEVERUS, who very clearly and as lucidly as possible, makes the said distinction in the 20th chapter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian* in refutation of falsehood and support of truth,

345 ܕܗܘܘܢ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 350 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 355 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 360 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ

ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ
 ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܘܚܪܝܘܫܐ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ

f. 118vb

AD

- Line 347: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ, D: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ.
- Line 351: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ, D: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ ܕܐܘܪܘܨܘܢ.
- Line 353: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, D: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ.
- Line 356: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, D: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ.
- Line 358: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, D: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ.
- Line 362: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ, D: ܕܥܘܢܘܡܝܘܫ.

saying as follows: However, please listen. For we shall again whisper
 345 to you some of the fathers' Spirit-uttered words, those of Cyril, the
 proven doctor, who teaches that the sameness of substance introduces no
 confusion of hypostases into the Holy Trinity and that the substance of
 the hypostases is comprehensive of each. He wrote in the first book of the
 treatise *On the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity* addressed to a certain
 350 Hermias in the form of question and answer, as follows: "There is a
 natural and ineffable unity, not with the hypostases undergoing some
 mutual confusion (as certain people have supposed) so that Father and
 Son should be the same; but, with each of the two existing and subsisting
 and being said to possess a particular being, it is the identity of substance
 355 which bestows unity. *B.* So, are you saying that the Son is apart from the
 Father in a particular substance? *A.* Not in a substance other than what he
 has *qua* God, but in the hypostasis he has *qua* Son. *B.* Is substance one
 thing and hypostasis another? *A.* Yes, there is a big difference and dis-
 tinction between them, since the substance is comprehensive of each. *B.*
 360 How do you mean? I am apparently slow in such matters. *A.* Do you not
 know that for me, too, discourse on these things is unfamiliar? You must,
 therefore, proceed none the less to an examination, available by an
 image, since the divine greatness exists in exalted heights. Thus the
 meaning of substance seems to apply to some common reality whereas
 the term "hypostasis" is * said and used of each thing that falls under this

344/380 Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 20 (CSCO 111, pp. 175,23 - 177,16;
 112, pp. 137,7 - 138,17) 350/380 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. I* (PG 75,
 697D-700C; *SChr.*, vol. 231, pp. 194-198)

370 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 375 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 380 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 385 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 390 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 395 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ
 ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ

AD

Line 384: ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ, D: ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ.
 Line 386: ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ, D: ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ.
 Line 388: ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ, D: ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ. ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ, D: ܘܢܩܘܠܘܢ.

common reality. Suppose I now tell you! A. What? B. We define man as a "rational, mortal animal", ascribing him the appropriate concept, and this we say is the definition of a substance which extends over each of the separate subsistents. So under this common thing, man, i.e. the definition of man, fall, I suppose, Thomas and Mark or, let us say, Peter and Paul, and in this way one will indicate the substance. But one has not yet effected a clear and evident indication of what are to be recognized separately. For all that is simply man is not Peter and Paul. But by saying "Thomas" or "Peter" one will not bring the signified outside the limits of the substance. For he is no less man, but one has shown him existing in such and such a species in proper hypostasis and separately. So substance applies to every man, because it is pregnant with the common principle of the genus, whereas hypostasis to each one, by its not bringing the signified out of the community or, again, confusing and mixing into unrecognizability the properly individual'.

We have clearly heard, when famous Severus (more to be trusted than you to understand this divinely inspired father's words!) bears witness, that the doctor sets down for us a careful separation of substance and hypostasis. However, pleasant fellow, prove, if you can, by any text whatsoever from a single one of the

400 405 410 415

400 405 410 415

420

AD

Line 400: ...
 Line 401: ...
 Line 402: ...
 Line 405: ...
 Line 412: ...
 Line 414: ...
 Line 419: ...

420

AD

Line 400: ...
 Line 401: ...
 Line 402: ...
 Line 405: ...
 Line 412: ...
 Line 414: ...
 Line 419: ...

doctors, that they take 'hypostasis' in various senses, sometimes as proper, sometimes as comprehensive of the hypostases. But if you are incapable of that, the absurdity of your mad and feeble opinions is not to escape you. Do not seek to cast such mad aspersions upon the luminaries of the Church, alleging that they think the whole Godhead is one hypostasis! Learn, even at this late stage, the extent of your opposition not only to the truth but even to yourself. For * you shamelessly said that the doctors think what you accused us of. For you will, perhaps, not have forgotten what you disgorged against us in puerile mocking: that we do not admit a difference between hypostasis and common substance. As you see, these aspersions have been rightly retorted on your own head, you who spurning everybody's respect will fitly harvest the fruits of your madness.

425 ...
 ...
 430 ...
 ...
 435 ...
 ...

f. 119rb

AD

Line 429: אב, D: אבא.
 Line 431: אבא, D om.
 Line 433: אב, D om.
 Line 436: אב, D: אבא. אב, D: אבא.

and fit end may be appointed for your absurd and corrupting doctrinal fabrication in that *Festal*. But because it would be an invidious task for those occupied in more urgent business to spend
 30 time on such matters, we shall despatch any who want to know your excellence in them too to that *Festal*, whereas we will occupy ourselves with prior considerations, and, with Christ our God directing our discussion, we shall again prove from the fathers' divinely inspired teaching that a hypostasis is neither each
 35 characteristic property of the hypostases, nor, again, indeed, a collection of characteristic properties (as it pleases new-fangled literature to suppose) but (as examination of the truth in the foregoing has proved) the substrate, it being understood that the properties appear on it.

40 BASIL THE GREAT, wise in things divine wrote, then, in the *Letter to his brother*, as follows: So we say this: that what is said properly is signified by the word 'hypostasis'. For 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
 45 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
 50 and delimits the common and unbounded in some reality, by means of the

41/51 Bas. Caes., Ep. 38, 3 (PG 32, 328AB; Forlin Patrucco, p. 180); cf. supra, ch. 8, 108-117

30
 35
 40
 45

40
 45

AD flor. I from l. 40 on

- Line 29: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$, D: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 30: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$, D: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 32: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$, D: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 38: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$, D: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 40: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$, W: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 41: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$, D: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Lines 42-50: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$, cf. supra, ch. 8, lines 117-126 (many small variants).
- Line 48: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$, X: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\epsilon$.

properties appearing on it. Again, in his *Letter to the town councillors of Neocaesarea*, he discourses more clearly on the point, as follows: For we must recognize that just as the one who does not profess the commonness of the substance lapses into polytheism, so also the one
 55 who will not admit the properties of the hypostases slips away into Judaism. For our mind must rest upon some substrate and have the impress of its clear marks and thus have imagination of the one loved. For if we had not conceived of the fatherhood or considered the one for whom this property was set aside, * how could we have taken in the idea
 60 of God the Father?

What will he who affirms that a hypostasis is a collection of properties and indicative marks, and not the substrate they are collected to belong with, devise against these words? For we have now heard the doctor saying: For one who says 'man' has effected a
 65 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
 70 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. And again: For our mind must rest upon some substrate and have the impress of its clear marks and thus have im-
 75 agination of the one loved. For if we had not conceived of the fatherhood

53/60 Bas. Caes., *Ep.* 210, 5 (PG 32, 776BC; Courtonne, II, pp. 195-196); cf. *supra*, b. II, ch. 14, 39-46 64/73 cf. *supra*, 42-51 73/77 cf. *supra*, 56-60

50 † ܘܣܘܒܝܢܐ ܐܰܠܗܐܐܰܢܰܗܐܰܘܢ ܰܩܰܘܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܚܰܘܰܒܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܒܰܘܰܨܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 : ܰܠܰܚܰܘܰܒܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܒܰܘܰܨܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 55 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 60 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ

f. 119vb

ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 65 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 70 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ
 ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ

AD flor. I up to l. 50 and from l. 52 to l. 60

Line 51: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ, D: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ.
 Line 54: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ, Y: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ.
 Line 58: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ, D: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ.
 Line 62: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ, D: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ.
 Line 63: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ, D: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ (wrongly).
 Line 74: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ, D: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ. ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ, D: ܰܘܰܠܰܥܰܐܰܠܰܘܰܢܰܐ.

or considered the one for whom this property was set aside, how could we have taken in the idea of God the Father?

GREGORY, his brother, wrote similar things to this in the fifth book of the treatise *Against Eunomius* (its beginning is: But because, he says, the word 'Lord') as follows: For when we say 'this one was begotten' or 'was not begotten', we are stamped with a twofold conception by the statement: by the demonstrative part of the sentence we look at the substrate; by 'was begotten' or 'was not begotten' we learn what is viewed as pertaining to the substrate. So that we understand one thing concerning the being, but another thing concerning what is viewed as pertaining to the being. Besides, along with each term used of the divine nature (e.g. 'just', 'incorruptible', 'immortal', 'ingenerate' and any other expression) 'is' has to be understood. Even if the word happens not to accompany the statement, all the same the speaker's and listener's minds must complete the term by 'is'; so that * the title lands in a vacuum unless the 'is' be supplied. For instance (for it is better to present the argument using an example) when David says: *God the righteous judge*,

75 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ : ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 * ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <

ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ : ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ : ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <
 ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ <

D. f. 56va

Aug 10 (l. 92) D flor. I from l. 80 to l. 86

Line 77: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, D: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ.
 Line 80: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, Y: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ. ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, cf. infra, line 147 (ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ : ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ).
 Line 81: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, Z: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ.
 Line 83: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, W: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ.
 Line 84: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, W: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ.
 Line 87: At the top of fol. 56v D reads as follows: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ. *Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.*
 Line 88: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, D: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ.
 Line 89: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ, D: ܕܝܘܫܝܘܿܬܝܗܘܿܐ.

80/104 Greg. Nyss., *Contra Eun.* III, 5 (PG 45, 761BD; Jaeger II, pp. 180,19 - 181,21); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 14, 54-71 92/93 Ps. 7:12

mighty and patient, unless 'is' were understood along with each term used, the itemizing of titles unsupported by any substrate would be thought vacuous and baseless. But when * 'is' is understood along with each term, the expressions altogether gain significance as they are viewed belonging with that which is. So just as by saying 'he is judge', we have conceived of as belonging with him a certain activity by means of judgement, yet we have cast our mind on the substrate by 'is', clearly being taught hereby not to suppose the concept of being the same as the activity; so also, as a result of saying 'is generate' or 'is ingenerate' we divide our understanding into a twofold conception, by 'is' conceiving of the substrate, but by 'generate' or 'ingenerate' * apprehending either what belongs or does not belong to the substrate.

105 Did not wise SEVERUS too teach similar things in the first chapter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Grammarian*, as follows: Wherefore the divine Scripture, about to discourse on each of those mentioned (Job, I mean, and Elkanah) began in similar manner, *there was a certain man in the land of Uz* and *there was a certain man from Ramah*; and by 'man' sets out the identity of being and community of each, but in saying 'a certain' and 'in the land

107/124 Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (CSCO 111, pp. 61,20 - 62,11; 112, pp. 48,33 - 49,19) 109 Iob 1:1 109/110 I Reg. 1:1 110 'man': cf. supra, 109 et 110 111 'a certain': cf. supra, 109 et 110 111/112 cf. supra, 109-110

95 < ܐܘܢܝܢܐ : ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ * ܘܡܢܝܢܐ < f. 56vb
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ : ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ < [A, f. 75]
 100 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 105 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ < f. 57ra
 110 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 115 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <
 < ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ <

A from ܘܡܢܝܢܐ (l. 99) on (with lacunae) D flor. I from l. 100 to l. 109

Line 101: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, W: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ.
 Line 102: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, WXY: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ.
 Line 105: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, YZ: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ. ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, flor. I: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ.
 Line 106: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, X: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ.
 Lines 107: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, cf. infra, lines 151-152 (a slightly different Syriac translation). ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, A and flor. I: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ.
 Line 108: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, A and flor. I: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ. ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, WX: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ.
 Line 115-116: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ, A: ܘܡܢܝܢܐ.

However, Saint Gregory, his brother, also taught this clearly in the former passage: When we say 'this one was begotten' or 'was not begotten', (we are stamped with a twofold conception by the statement):
 140 by the demonstrative part of the sentence we look at the substrate; by 'was begotten' or 'was not begotten' we learn what is viewed as pertaining to the substrate. And again: By 'is' we conceive of the substrate, but by 'generate' or 'ingenerate' we apprehend either what belongs or does not belong to the substrate. That is, when * we say, e.g. of the Father, that he is unbegotten, we disclose a twofold
 145 conception and indicate the substrate by 'is' and what does not belong to the substrate by 'unbegotten'. Thus it is possible to see in each of the other two hypostases both the substrate and what appears upon the substrate. Otherwise, were what appears upon
 150 the substrate conceived of apart from the substrate, the title must land in a vacuum (as the doctor says) and become vacuous and baseless. We learned similar things when proven Severus said: 'Being', said without determination, produces a generic indication and is
 * indistinguishable from substance, but, conjoined with a particular distinction, contains the meaning of hypostasis. And again: Hypostasis,

138/142 cf. supra, 80-84 142/144 cf. supra, 102-104 150/151 cf. supra, 90-91 151/152 cf. supra, 95 153/155 cf. supra, 119-121 155/157 cf. supra, 125-127

ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲟⲩⲧⲓⲛⲓ ⲧⲉⲩⲉⲃⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 150 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 155 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 160 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <
 165 ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ <

f. 58ra

f. 58rb

A with lacunae D

Line 147: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, cf. supra, line 80 (ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ).

Line 148: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, these words, missing in A and D, are supplied from lines 81-82 above; see line 155 below, where ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ appears to explain ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ.

Lines 151-152: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, cf. supra, lines 107-108 (a slightly different Syriac translation).

Line 152: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, A: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ.

Line 154: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, A: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ.

Line 155: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, A: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ.

Line 156: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, A: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ.

Line 157: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, A: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ.

Line 165: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲁⲛⲥⲓ, A: ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓ.

therefore, without denying the identity of the being distinguishes the substrate by particular marks. Does this not tell us very precisely that a hypostasis is a substrate, having its proper marks coupled with it? For God-clad Basil proves it again by his words: For our mind must rest upon some substrate and have the impress of its clear marks and thus have imagination of the one loved.

160 'But look here', he may say, 'he has understood by substrate comprehensive substance, and by its marks * hypostases'. Anybody who said this, however, would be clearly and very justly refuted by what follows. For the master of mysteries went on to say: For if we had not conceived of the fatherhood or considered the one for whom this property was set aside, how could we have taken in the idea of God the Father? So, when we distinguish with subtle considerations the force of the words said, what we understand by 'fatherhood' and what by 'the one for whom fatherhood is set aside', i.e. God the Father, are very recognizable. The exact expositor of the fathers, the patriarch Severus, teaches us this too when he theologizes, in such plain and wise terms, in his *109th Cathedral Sermon*, * as follows: 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 be, to the

159/161 cf. supra, 56-57 162/163 cf. supra, 160 166/168 cf. supra, 58-60
 174/188 Sev. Ant., *Hom. cath. 109* (PO 25, pp. 747,6 [8] - 748,5 [9]); cf. supra, ch. 17, 293-307

167
 170
 175
 180
 185
 190

f. 58va
 f. 58vb

A with lacunae D flor. I from l. 186 on

Line 167: *ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ*, A: *ⲛⲁⲛⲁ*.
 Line 175: *ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ*.
 Line 177: *ⲛⲁⲛⲁ*, A: *ⲛⲁ*.
 Line 178: *ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ*, A: *ⲛⲁⲛⲁ*.

Holy Ghost, and use the invocation 'God' or 'He who is' or 'Lord' or any
 180 other term common to the Holy Trinity, you are making a good invoca-
 tion; 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
 185 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.

We have clearly learned by these words too, as also by those
 190 quoted a little earlier, that when we happen to say 'God'
 indefinitely, we conceive of the whole Holy Trinity, without
 merging or confusing the hypostases, but when we look *
 definitely towards the Father, for example, and use the invocation
 'God' or 'He who is' or 'Lord', we couple the property and so
 195 recognize God the Father. And we do likewise in the case of the
 Son and Holy Ghost. If we take the sentence For if we had not
 conceived of the fatherhood or considered the one for whom this property
 was set aside, how could we have taken in the idea of God the Father? in
 this way, we shall not stray from the truth; for we should couple
 200 the property when we invoke the Father as 'God' or 'Lord' or 'He

193 : ܠܝܘܗܐ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ : ܘܡܘܬܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ : ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܕܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ : ܘܠܝܘܗܐ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܕܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 195 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 : ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ < f. 59ra
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 : ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 200 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <

205 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 * ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 210 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ < f. 59rb
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 215 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <
 ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ <

AD flor. I up to l. 204

Line 194: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, cf. supra, ch. 17, line 330 (ܐܘܪܝܘܢ). ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, cf. ibid., line 331 (ܐܘܪܝܘܢ).
 Line 197: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, flor. I: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ. ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, Y: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ.
 Line 198: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, X: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, Z: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ. ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, W om.
 Line 201: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, flor. I: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ.
 Line 202: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, Z add. ܐܘܪܝܘܢ.
 Line 203: cf. supra, ch. 17, line 339 (ܐܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܘܢ).
 Lines 215-216: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ, A: ܐܘܪܝܘܢ.

179, 183 et 194 cf. Ex. 3:14 196/198 cf. supra, 166-168 200/201 cf. Ex. 3:14

Son or offspring, and the procession which exists in the Godhead, so that
 225 the Holy Ghost * is God proceeding. If, again, you say "light", or any
 other common thing you will mean the ingenerate light, the generate light
 and the proceeding light: three lights in the hypostases. For it is not one
 light in a triple-named hypostasis which is changed now into being or
 being thought Father, now into being or being thought Son, and now into
 230 being or being thought Holy Ghost, but they are three lights in hyposta-
 ses. Because of this the light is both recognized and believed to be one
 light, on account of the participation in substance, the complete likeness
 and sameness, the one will, the one * activity and the one brilliant radi-
 ance they communicate which shines forth upon those who are aided
 235 and participate in it. For Gregory the Theologian said, in the *Oration on*
the Holy Ghost, the following too: "One commingling of light, as it were
 in three mutually linking Suns".¹ Thus do we believe, thus do we think.
 This is the stay of the orthodox profession of Christians. This is the
 foundation, and other than it can none be laid. Otherwise, if we suppose
 240 the characteristic properties of the hypostases to be 'relationships bereft
 of realities' and mere appellations, we are to say how *He who is* can be
 characterized by what does not exist. For on this very matter Gregory of
 Nyssa too criticized * Eunomius for such an innovation, in the 18th
 chapter of his *Refutation* of him.

245 You will observe (to say things which will even give him
 pleasure) what a cunning fashioner of sophisms this writer is. For

236/237 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 31, 14 (PG 36, 149A; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 302)
 239 cf. I Cor. 3:11 240/241 cf. supra, 220-221 241 cf. Ex. 3:14

245
 250
 255
 260
 265
 f. 60ra
 f. 60rb
 f. 60va

270

D

Line 245: *cf.* cf. *ibid.*, line 38 (*cf.*).

Line 246: *cf.* *infra*, line 527 (*cf.*).

whilst affirming without any patristic teaching (as has been clearly shown) that the hypostases of the Holy Trinity are ingeneracy, generacy and procession, and thereby depriving them of being
 250 three individual and properly subsisting realities (to speak indeed more truly, removing them from existence altogether so that he is then also justly * censured by us for thinking of them as mere properties, 'relationships bereft of realities' and empty names), he uses the mischievous device, to deceive the simple, of quoting irrelevant patristic statements so that he may seem to be confirming
 255 his false doctrine by them. He is seen to have done this here too. For on being carefully and as insistently as possible, required by us to show how he does not altogether erase the hypostases of the Holy Trinity by supposing them to be the characteristic properties
 260 of the prosopa viz. ingeneracy, generacy and procession (for they will not be hypostases, even, if they do not subsist on their own individually) * and moreover to show in what way he is not convicted of thinking ingeneracy, generacy and procession mere properties (because, with the non-existence of the hypostases,
 265 which the characteristic properties belong to, they too must, of necessity, not exist) he passed by the point at issue and quoted as his advocate our God-clad father Severus, who specially refutes him and his ilk because they fancy a merger of the hypostases, and who lucidly proves that fatherhood and sonship (or ingeneracy and generacy) and procession are not empty names and 'relationships
 270 bereft of realities', since they are * the characteristic properties of individually subsisting realities i.e. true hypostases. It seems that he is totally ignorant of the fact that he deludes only himself

270 :
 275 :
 280 :
 285 :
 290 :
 295 :
 300 :

f. 60vb

f. 61ra

f. 61rb

253 et 270/271 cf. supra, 220-221

300 someone charged with theft, who, though he ought to defend himself on
 that count and prove himself free * of the accusation, leaves it on one
 side and hastens to charge robbers like him with another theft. So, the
 good fellow has done nothing surprising or alien to heretical
 cunning by deriding his own madness, for the deception of the
 305 simple, and making a hypocritical allegation against those who
 think, he says, the characteristic properties of the hypostases are
 relationships bereft of realities and mere appellations.

However, because, as we saw, he made a clear and very
 ridiculous defence over his 'mere appellations', let us look also at
 310 his other powerful and convincing proofs whereby he, as he sup-
 poses, very fitly proves that the fatherhood, * or ingeneracy,
 existing in the Godhead is a hypostasis i.e. God the Father. For, a
 little after his words just quoted, he says: For if the fatherhood
 existing in the Godhead is a mere appellation, the name of the hypostasis
 315 derived from the fatherhood, I mean 'Father', will become a meaningless
 word like the pagan fables, even though, when we add the property to the
 common, by connection of the two we call the fatherhood existing in the
 Godhead God the Father. Only Eunomius, it would seem, who wrote
 this sort of riddle and concealed his mischief in a morass of
 320 darkness, could understand the obscurity * of these phrases, Eu-
 nomius of whom wise GREGORY OF NYSSA says the following in
 the 23rd chapter of the *Refutation* of him (which begins: To want
 to help everybody was not, apparently): I suppose, then, that not even the
 writer himself would be able to say in simple terms what he meant when
 325 he wrote this. The meaning of what is said is so befouled in the mire of

335
 340
 f. 62ra

345
 350
 355
 360
 f. 62rb
 f. 62va

the diction that no one can easily recognize the intention for the mud of the explanation. For one would suppose that 'come out to as great a difference as the works come out to' belongs to a pagan word-twister, * who talks nonsense to deceive the audience. Otherwise, what can one confidently say when one hears: * For if the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is a mere appellation, the name of the hypostasis derived from the fatherhood, I mean 'Father', will become a meaningless word like the pagan fables, even though, when we add the property to the common, by connection of the two we call the fatherhood existing in the Godhead God the Father. What is the riddler saying? Does he think that fatherhood and the name taken from fatherhood, I mean 'Father', and the hypostasis itself, are each other or does he suppose them different? If they are identical, what is the use of this long circumlocution (or, rather, very intricate deception) and what is the point of saying 'fatherhood' and the name of the hypostasis, 'Father', derived from the fatherhood? How, indeed, could anyone reckon as identical fatherhood and the name of the hypostasis derived from fatherhood i.e. the name 'Father', and the hypostasis itself whose property is fatherhood and whose name is taken from fatherhood i.e. 'Father'? But if they are not identical with one another, then fatherhood will not be Father nor will the name of the hypostasis derived from fatherhood, viz. 'Father', be the hypostasis itself. So then the writer's labours have ended in nothingness, those labours whereby in muddling and confusing everything he vainly persuaded himself into thinking he had proved that the

365 < < < < < f. 62vb — A, f. 121ra
 370 — — — — —
 375 — — — — —
 380 — — — — —
 385 — — — — —

A from ⲓⲁ (l. 368) on D flor. II from l. 374 on

- Line 377: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ , flor. II: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ .
- Line 379: ⲓⲛⲁⲓ , flor. II: ⲓⲛⲁⲓ .
- Line 382: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ , flor. II: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ .
- Line 387: ⲛⲁⲓ , D: ⲛⲁⲓ . ⲁⲓ , flor. II: ⲁⲓ .
- Line 388: ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ , flor. II: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ .
- Line 389: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ , flor. II: ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲓ .

names and the characteristic properties of the prosopa are hypostases.

But perhaps someone may say: 'He has here indubitably proved already that the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father i.e. a hypostasis, by saying, when we add the property to the common, by connection of the two we call the fatherhood existing in the Godhead God the Father. You may see the invincible demonstrations, the order and sequence of word and thought.' But, to tell the truth, I do not know whence or by what reason or idea it has thus been proved to us all of a sudden that the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father. For, alongside the inane nonsense on other matters there has crept in this first principle, as it were, of all the points in doubt, * as if it were agreed by everybody. For is there any consideration of proof in saying: For if the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is a mere appellation, the name of the hypostasis derived from the fatherhood, I mean 'Father', will become a meaningless word like the pagan fables, even though, when we add the

390 אלוהים אלהים אלהים : אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים

אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים : אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
[אלוהים] אלוהים אלוהים [אלוהים] אלוהים אלוהים : אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים : אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
395 אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים : אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
400 אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
405 אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים
אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים

f. 121rb

A with lacunae D flor. II up to L 391

- Line 390: אלוהים, flor. II: אלוהים, flor. II: אלוהים.
- Line 395: אלוהים, D: אלוהים.
- Line 398: אלוהים, D: אלוהים.
- Lines 399-400: אלוהים אלוהים, D: אלוהים אלוהים.
- Line 400: אלוהים, D: אלוהים.
- Line 402: אלוהים, D om.
- Line 403: אלוהים, D: אלוהים.
- Line 406: אלוהים, cf. infra, ch. 32, line 147 (אלוהים).
- Line 407: אלוהים, cf. ibid., line 149 (אלוהים).
- Line 408: אלוהים אלוהים, cf. ibid. (אלוהים). אלוהים, cf. ibid., line 150 (אלוהים).
- Line 409: אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים, cf. ibid., lines 150-151 (אלוהים אלוהים אלוהים). אלוהים, D: אלוהים.

355/357 cf. supra, 333-335 364/369 cf. supra, 313-318

property to the common, by connection of the two we call the fatherhood existing in the Godhead God the Father ?

370 Therefore, ceasing to spend time on empty and frigid little phrases, let us consider only how, being always drawn on by his audacity, without any shadow of proof, he decrees what he, and he alone, sees fit. Therefore, let us observe what he wrote again on this subject in the same letter: So we do not discard the fatherhood or
375 ingeneracy from the Godhead making it subsist on its own apart from the substance, and say it is a hypostasis but, as has been said, we profess as God the Father the fatherhood existing in the Godhead. He wrote again similar things to this in the *Letter delivered to us through Gerontius*: These and the like will always and necessarily be professed by
380 us, besides the fact that we recognize, in accordance with the wise patriarch, that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated, and that the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father. The author runs the risk, apparently, of being elevated by his much wisdom (rather, indeed, his wretchedness) above human

410 ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —

ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
415 ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
420 ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
425 ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —
ܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ ܕܩܘܨܩܐ —

A with lacunae D

Line 418: ܩܘܨܩܐ, D: ܩܘܨܩܐ. ܩܘܨܩܐ, D: ܩܘܨܩܐ.
Line 419: ܩܘܨܩܐ, D: ܩܘܨܩܐ.
Lines 420-421: ܩܘܨܩܐ ܩܘܨܩܐ, cf. *infra*, ch. 32, lines 155-156 (a slightly different Syriac translation).
Line 421: ܩܘܨܩܐ, D: ܩܘܨܩܐ.
Lines 422-423: ܩܘܨܩܐ ܩܘܨܩܐ, cf. *infra*, ch. 32, line 166 (ܩܘܨܩܐ ܩܘܨܩܐ).
Line 423: ܩܘܨܩܐ, cf. *infra*, ch. 32, line 115 (ܩܘܨܩܐ). ܩܘܨܩܐ, cf. *infra*, line 485 (ܩܘܨܩܐ). ܩܘܨܩܐ, cf. *infra*, ch. 32, lines 116 and 167 (ܩܘܨܩܐ ܩܘܨܩܐ ܩܘܨܩܐ).
Lines 423-424: ܩܘܨܩܐ ܩܘܨܩܐ, cf. *infra*, ch. 32, lines 167-168 (a slightly different Syriac translation).
Line 425: ܩܘܨܩܐ ܩܘܨܩܐ, cf. *ibid.*, line 169 (*trsp.*).

385 nature and of behaving according to other customs and laws!
 Which is why most of these words of his are entirely novel and
 strange; as we can learn from the foregoing too. For while all who
 do anything by authority purchase, so to say, the grounds of their
 command from some power they possess, he alone has obtained so
 390 much authority from abundant weakness and feebleness as to lay
 down the law as he pleases even over divine and ineffable doc-
 trines. For, whilst he does not examine any of his impious state-
 ments in any manner (never mind prove them) * he has ended up
 decreeing what he pleases without any reasonable argument at all.
 395 For is there anybody who does not know that almost the whole is-
 sue in dispute between us hangs only upon demonstrating whether
 fatherhood or ingeneracy (and, indeed, generacy and procession)
 is a hypostasis or only a characteristic property of a hypostasis.
 For it was largely to ask him for an explanation on this point that
 400 we then went to Paralos and spent quite a long time there; he
 patched together and sent us there those letters or, as he calls them
 'Apologies', full of total deceit and trickery (from which we
 quoted the foregoing) expecting in vain to make us a slave of his
 error and trickery as well. Was he not then obviously denuded of
 405 any appearance of proof whatever, when he ruled on a matter over
 which there existed such strong dissension, as if it were professed

430
 435
 440
 445
 450

f. 121va

A with lacunae D

- Line 429: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$.
- Line 430: $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$, D trsp.
- Line 431: $\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta$, D: $\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta$.
- Line 443: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.
- Line 449: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$, D: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$.
- Line 450: $\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$, D: $\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$.
- Line 452: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$, D: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.
- Line 453: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$.

475 changed now into being or being thought Father, now into being or being thought Son, now into being or being thought Holy Ghost.

We have already thoroughly proved in the previous examinations that this was written in reply to those eager to embrace the insensate error of Sabellius, who suppose that a division in the
480 Godhead must enter in unless there is a merger of the hypostases. But we shall now also attempt, as best we can, to prove the same point, by way of assurance and reminder to the readers, both from the words themselves and from those set down before and after them.

485 The doctor also says, then, a little before those words just quoted, as follows: For Christ is not the whole substance of the Godhead but one hypostasis of the substance and Godhead viewed and known in trinity, a hypostasis which is the Son, * the Word who became incarnate without alteration, one ensouled and mind-endowed flesh which
490 he assumed from the Virgin Mother of God by hypostatic union, wherein he displays the Father, as an image displays the original and as the hypostatic Word displays, with total exactness, the mind which begat him, and not as if the Father's hypostasis were poured out into him: for that is the blasphemous confusion of Sabellius and Marcellus. He wrote
495 similar things to this also in the 19th chapter, after the words set down for examination, as follows: So if the Son (the begotten light, who displays in himself, as in an image, the unbegotten light, the Father; who is unmerged with the hypostasis of his begetter, and is a paraclete,

486/494 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 18 (CSCO 111, p. 167, 20-29; 112, p. 131, 2-11); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 18, 89-93 496/504 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 19 (CSCO 111, pp. 172,25 - 173,6; 112, p. 135, 1-10)

530 < ܐܘܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܦܘܬܪܐ ܕܘܨܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
< ܐܘܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܦܘܬܪܐ ܕܘܨܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ

ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
535 ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ

ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
540 ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
545 ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
550 ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ

f. 122rb

AD flor. I from l. 540 to l. 543

Line 533: At the top of fol. 66v D reads as follows: ܐܘܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܦܘܬܪܐ ܕܘܨܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ. Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.
Line 535: ܐܘܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܦܘܬܪܐ ܕܘܨܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ.
Line 538: ܐܘܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܦܘܬܪܐ ܕܘܨܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ.
Line 552: ܐܘܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܦܘܬܪܐ ܕܘܨܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ.
Line 553: ܐܘܢ ܕܗܘ ܕܦܘܬܪܐ ܕܘܨܚܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ
ܘܗܘܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܘܠܐ.

other than the Holy Ghost, and separate and different in hypostasis; and
 500 who because of the non-difference of the common substance is viewed
 and known in him as in image) became incarnate and made man; what
 division do you suppose will thereby be made of the Holy Trinity, of the
 single substance and of the Godhead in which the three hypostases
 participate equally alike without difference? And again: But if you shun
 505 saying that the Father was incarnate, or the Holy Ghost, and say that the
 whole Godhead exists in the Son's hypostasis, you are to recognize that
 you lapse unconsciously into the same impiety. For the Son is not the
 whole Godhead, but one hypostasis out of the three hypostases wherein
 the whole Godhead consists. For neither the Father's nor the Holy
 510 Ghost's hypostasis is merged in him. For although the archetype, which
 is the Father, is revealed and viewed in the Son as in a living and
 unvarying image, nevertheless the image is not therefore not other in
 hypostasis than the archetype nor are the two contracted into one
 hypostasis. And again: So you hope, then, to appease true religion by
 515 empty mouthings, saying 'not as if the Father were the Son or the Son the
 Father', wherever you are caught out merging the hypostases by saying
 'in Christ are the whole Godhead and the whole of manhood'; and thus
 drawing the blasphemous inference that Christ is in two substances in the
 common meaning, * with the consequence that in this way, as a result of

504/514 Ibid. (CSCO 111, pp. 173,30 - 174,10; 112, pp. 135,31 - 136,
 3) 514/522 Ibid. (CSCO 111, p. 174, 19-29; 112, p. 136, 11-19); cf. supra, b.
 II, ch. 18, 97-105

555 ܘܢܝܗܘܐ ܘܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 560 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 565 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 570 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 575 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ
 * ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ ܕܩܘܕܫܐ

AD flor. I from l. 571 on

- Line 554: ܕܩܘܕܫܐ, D: ܕܩܘܕܫܐ.
- Line 560: ܘܢܝܗܘܐ, D: ܘܢܝܗܘܐ.
- Line 571: ܕܩܘܕܫܐ, D and flor. I om.
- Line 573: ܕܩܘܕܫܐ, Z: ܕܩܘܕܫܐ.
- Line 574: ܘܢܝܗܘܐ, X: ܘܢܝܗܘܐ.
- Line 576: ܘܢܝܗܘܐ, X: ܘܢܝܗܘܐ.
- Line 578: ܘܢܝܗܘܐ, Y: ܘܢܝܗܘܐ.

520 this subtle confusion of yours, the whole substance of the Godhead i.e. the Holy Trinity, will be found to be incarnate in the whole substance of manhood and the whole human race.

This was the theme he took up when he wrote: And we must also recognize that fatherhood i.e. ingeneracy, or generacy or procession are not empty names and 'relationships bereft of realities' (as Gregory the Theologian says somewhere) but the fatherhood which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Father, and the sonship or generacy which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Son or offspring, and likewise the pro-
525 ceeding which exists in the Godhead, so that the Holy Ghost is God proceeding - proving that there is not one triple-named hypostasis which is changed now into being or being thought Father, now into being or being thought Son, now into being or being thought Holy Ghost. Otherwise, the properties would necessarily be empty names and
530 'relationships bereft of realities'. But there are three hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, it being understood that its property exists in each. For to confirm this point the God-clad father said, a little prior to these words: So will one who said these things appear to you to be severing the substance of Father and Son or is he disclosing that each hypostasis exists in the substance of the Godhead, having its
535 own innate property? In the first chapter, too, of the same second book he wrote as follows: In this way, then, with its innate property being present in each of the three hypostases (fatherhood in the Father, generacy in the Son, procession in the Spirit) the Father remains Father

523/530 cf. supra, 465-471 530/532 cf. supra, 474-476 533/534 cf. supra, 466-467 537/540 cf. supra, ch. 25, 415-418 541/547 cf. supra, ch. 25, 407-413

580 *ἁγίας πνεῦμα θεῶν ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὅτι* < f. 122va
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <

ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
585 *ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος* <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
590 *ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος* <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
595 *ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος* <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
600 *ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος* <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος <
605 *ἁγίου πνεύματος ὁμοουσίους ἁγίου πνεύματος* <

AD flor. I up to 1.580
Line 579: ἁγίου πνεύματος, flor. I: ἁγίου πνεύματος.
Line 582: ἁγίου πνεύματος, D: ἁγίου πνεύματος.
Line 586: ἁγίου πνεύματος, D: ἁγίου πνεύματος.
Line 587: ἁγίου πνεύματος, D: ἁγίου πνεύματος.

and not Son or Spirit, the Son remains Son and not Father or Spirit, and
 545 the Holy Ghost remains Holy Ghost and not Son or Father. Thus the Holy
 Trinity is known in three distinct hypostases by the distinction of
 properties, and in one substance by the identity of the Godhead.

The wise listener will observe that the doctor, excluding a con-
 fusion and mixture of the hypostases but distinguishing the
 550 prosopa by the properties, and to show that the hypostases are not
 the same as their characteristic properties said: But the fatherhood
 which exists * in the Godhead, so that God is Father, and the sonship or
 generacy which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Son or offspring,
 and likewise the procession which exists in the Godhead, so that the Holy
 555 Ghost is God proceeding. But he did not say, in accordance with the
 writer's abominable sophisms, that God the Father is fatherhood
 or ingeneracy; for he would have said, 'But the fatherhood which
 exists in the Godhead so that the fatherhood should be God the
 Father'. No, he immediately explained the statement very clearly
 560 by saying in the same passage: And the sonship or generacy which
 exists in the Godhead, so that God is Son or offspring, and likewise the
 procession which exists in the Godhead, so that the Holy Ghost is God
 proceeding. For had he understood that the fatherhood or ingeneracy
 existing in the Godhead is God the Father, he would have had
 565 to say *and likewise the procession existing in the Godhead so that

: ܠܘܕܝ ܘܥܝܢܝ ܘܥܝܢܝ ܘܥܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝ ܘܥܝܢܝ ܘܥܝܢܝ ܘܥܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ .ܘܥܝܢܝ ܘܥܝܢܝ ܘܥܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 610 * ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <

ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 * ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 615 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ < f. 122vb
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 620 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 .ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ * ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 625 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ * ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <
 630 ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ : ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ ܠܘܕܝܢܝ <

AD

Line 609: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ, D: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ.
 Line 616: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ, D: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ.
 Line 621: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ, D: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ.
 Line 624: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ, D: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ.
 Line 625: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ, D: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ.
 Line 628: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ, D: ܠܘܕܝܢܝ.

the procession should be God proceeding'. But the Holy Ghost did not prescribe that he should say this. Hence, and because he was inspired by him, he thoroughly eradicated beforehand and demolished all the cavils of truth's enemies, by saying: And likewise the procession which exists in the Godhead, so that the Holy Ghost is God proceeding. Hereby he clearly gave us to understand also that by saying But the fatherhood which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Father, and the sonship or generacy which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Son or offspring, he did not at all say that the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father, or that the sonship or generacy existing in the Godhead is God begotten, but he said that the Father i.e. the Father's hypostasis is God the Father and the Son i.e. the Son's hypostasis is God begotten.

He instructed us on this same point in no different way in the 109th Cathedral Homily, as we indeed have set down previously already, by writing as follows: 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 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

569/571 cf. supra, 561-563 572/574 cf. supra, 551-553 581/595 cf. supra, 174-188

יְהוָה הוֹדוֹתָהוּ יְהוָה הוֹדוֹתָהוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 : אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ , אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ . אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 : אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 635 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 640 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <

אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 : אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <
 אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ : אֱלֹהֵינוּ <

f. 123ra

AD

Line 639: אֱלֹהֵינוּ, D: אֱלֹהֵינוּ.
 Line 642: אֱלֹהֵינוּ, repeated in A.
 Line 646: אֱלֹהֵינוּ, D: אֱלֹהֵינוּ.
 Line 650: אֱלֹהֵינוּ, D: אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

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.

So if, as the master of mysteries instructs us, when we confine our view to Father, Son or Holy Ghost, we use the names 'God' or 'He who is' or 'Lord' or any of the common titles of the Trinity, having of course, the property also coupled, it is obvious that also when we hear, But the fatherhood which exists in the Godhead, so that God is Father, we rightly think not that the fatherhood is God the Father but that the hypostasis as it is known to exist in the fatherhood or ingeneracy is God the Father. For he gives us to understand the same thing by 'existing' and 'coupled'. For if the Father were the fatherhood existing in the Godhead we would have, when we confine our view to the Father, not to use the name 'God' or 'He who is' or 'Lord' and couple the fatherhood or ingeneracy, but, rather, invoke the Father as 'fatherhood' or 'ingeneracy' and, in this way, fancy him as existing in the Godhead. However, the guide to truth did not teach us this, but taught us to invoke the Father as 'God' or 'He who is' or 'Lord'; because he commanded us to have the property coupled or existing. Listen to him saying: But when you confine your view to the Father, or e.g. to the Son, or it may be, to the Holy Ghost, and use the invocation 'God' or 'He who is' or 'Lord' or any

614/617 cf. supra, 608-612 618/619 cf. supra, 604-605 624/625 et 628/629 cf. supra, 610 630/634 cf. supra, 608-612

685 .חָטָם אֱלֹהִים אֲבִיהֵנוּ : אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
.אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ : אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
* ,אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ .אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
,אֲבִיהֵנוּ : אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
690 אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
695 אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
700 אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
705 אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <
אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ אֲבִיהֵנוּ <

AD

Line 686: אֲבִיהֵנוּ, D: אֲבִיהֵנוּ.
Line 690: אֲבִיהֵנוּ, D: אֲבִיהֵנוּ.
Line 692: אֲבִיהֵנוּ, D: אֲבִיהֵנוּ.
Line 696: אֲבִיהֵנוּ, D: אֲבִיהֵנוּ.
Line 702: אֲבִיהֵנוּ, D: אֲבִיהֵנוּ.

common; by the denomination 'Father' we indicate the hypostasis and
 25 the properness of the prosopon, so that the substance will never be
 unhypostatic, nor will there be found an unsubstantial hypostasis, except
 when as an invention of our mind the enquiring reason asks what each of
 them is in its own concept, as has often been proved. And after other
 matters: So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a
 30 substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis.
 For this is the cause of our opponents' error, because they do not consent,
 or do not want, to separate hypostasis from substance but confuse their
 meanings and are thereby themselves confused.

This having been quoted, it is time to examine as best we can
 35 the words of the theologians. If (as this excellent fellow pleases to
 think) they are seen to profess God the Father not only as the
 Father's hypostasis but also as the hypostasis and the substance
 comprehensive of the three hypostases (which is the same as
 saying of the Holy Trinity) it is evident that the Father's hypo-
 40 stasis is only fatherhood (as the new-fangled doctrine intends) or
 ingeneracy joined to the common (the same thing too will be said
 of generacy and procession) and we are truly in error for using idle
 and useless arguments in reply to this careful author. If, on the
 other hand, the all-wise pastors of the Church consciously
 45 professed God the Father as the Father's hypostasis only and not
 as the hypostasis and the substance comprehensive of the three

25 ... —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 30 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 35 —
 —

... —
 —
 —
 40 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 45 —
 —
 —

AD

Line 35: At the top of fol. 71v D reads as follows: ... Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

Line 37: ... D: ...

Line 40: ... D: ...

Line 42: ... D: ...

Line 44: ... D: ...

Line 45: ... D: ...

hypostases, this will make it clearer still that the admirable fellow has been convicted of being completely foreign to the true and spotless faith, not only because he makes the fatherhood or ingeneracy, generacy and procession, seen in the common substance, the hypostases of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but also because he thinks that every hypostasis (or, to put it more truly, * according to his argument, every characteristic property of the hypostases) is the whole Trinity.

Therefore let us take up again some of his words and examine them as best we can, with a view to explaining them as fully and clearly as possible. Let us compare them with one another and with the patristic testimonies set down, so that readers may easily appreciate the accuracy of fault-free doctrines and falsehood's opposition to, and discord with, itself and with the truth. So when, he says in the *Many-lined Letter*, we join the common to the property and say 'God the Father', we do not simply indicate only the hypostasis by the terms, but the substantial hypostasis: by saying 'God' we make plain the substance and the common; by the denomination 'Father' we indicate the hypostasis and the properness of the prosopon. And after other matters: So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis.

The author has hereby been clearly proved not to have joined the property to the common (as wise Basil did), but, on the

60/65 cf. supra, 20-25 66/67 cf. supra, 29-30 68/69 cf. Bas. Caes., Ep. 236, 6 (PG 32, 884B; Courtonne, III, p. 53); cf. infra, 147-148

50
 55
 *
 f. 124ra

60
 65
 70

75

AD

Line 62: *ⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓ*, D: *ⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓ*.

Line 69: *ⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓ*, cf. infra, ch. 33, lines 18-19 (*ⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓ*). *ⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓ*, cf. ibid., line 19 (*ⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩⲁⲓ*, ⲟⲩ).

70 contrary, the common to the property, when he said 'God the
 Father', and to have meant not only the hypostasis but both the
 hypostasis and the substance comprehending the hypostases (to
 leave out of account now and reserve to a fitting place what
 concerns his 'substantial' and 'unsubstantial' hypostasis). For if
 75 God the Father is both participant (as he says) and participated,
 and a participant and participated is both hypostasis and substance
 comprehending hypostases, then God the Father must indisputably
 be both hypostasis and substance comprehending hypostases. He
 himself too attested that a hypostasis is participant whilst sub-
 80 stance comprehending hypostases is the participated, when he
 proved this very laboriously in debate in the wretched hope of
 thereby confirming his false opinion.

He wrote, then, an empty reply to us, in the same *Many-lined
 Letter*, called, I know not why, * an *Apology and Plerophoria*, as
 85 follows: Such, then, are the words. But divination would now be re-
 quired for us to ascertain the faults found in them, so that a defence rel-
 evant to the charge could be produced. So, they have made the charge
 that we belied the patriarch and fabricated things he did not say and
 palmed them off on him, and that it is not true that the God-clad man said
 90 that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated.
 For such a falsification (or, to speak more aptly, misrepresentation) is

al : כר כרלר יררר : כחל.ל כרל כרלכררר
 כר.ררר כרררר כרררר כר : כררר ררר
 כרררר רררר רררר ררר : כררר ררר
 .רר כררר רררר : ררר רררר ררר
 80 כררר רררר ררררר רר : כר כרלר רר
 ררר ררר ררר רר : רררר ררר , רררר ררר
 כר.ררר ררררר , רררר רררר : רררר
 רררר : כר כרלר ררר ררר רר : ררר
 רררר ררר ררר רר . ררר רררר רר.ררר ררר
 85 כר.ררר רררר רררר רר רר : , רררר ררר
 רררר ררר רר רר רר רר רר רר : ררר
 ררר רררר ררר ררר רר : , רר ררר רר
 . רררר ררר

רר רר : רר ררר רר רר רר רר רר
 90 * ררר רר רר רר רר רר רר : רר רר רר רר רר
 רר רר רר רר רר רר רר : רר רר רר רר רר
 רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר
 רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר
 95 רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר
 רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר
 רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר
 רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר
 רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר רר

f. 124rb

AD flor. II from l. 80 to l. 84

Line 76: כרלכררר, D: כרלכרר.
 Line 81: רררר, flor. II: ררר.
 Line 89: רר, D: רר.
 Lines 91-100: ררררר רר, cf. infra, ch. 34, lines 342-350 (a few small variants).
 Line 91: רר, D om.
 Line 94: ררר, D: ררר.

reprehensible and deserving of death many times over. And again: So, we ought here to set down again the patristic text from which I produced the rebuttal of the opposition in the same chapter. For perhaps those who
 95 read the book along with you turned their minds to something else and omitted it then in the examination; it is as follows: 'Therefore each of the hypostases participates in the substance, but the substance is the participated holding all the hypostases participating in it by equality of honour in a common and generic principle. For each of us participates in
 100 the common manhood and the one substance over all, and is one man and one hypostasis. But he will not be called, because he participates in the substance, not a hypostasis but substance. For the former is the participant whereas the latter is the participated'.

He wrote similar things, too, in the *Letter* he sent to us at
 105 *Paralos through Gerontius* (its beginning is: This is, then, a time to be silent) as follows: These and the like are always and necessarily our professions, besides the fact that we recognize, in accordance with the wise patriarch, that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated.

110 Let us observe closely that here this deep-minded and cunning fellow boasts over us boldly and unsparingly, accusing us falsely of not recognizing any difference between 'hypostasis' and 'sub-

92/103 Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* 96/103 Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 23 (CSCO 111, pp. 191,21 - 192,1; 112, p. 149, 27-35) 106/109 cf. supra, ch. 31, 379-382

100 ܠܢܢܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܕܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 105 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <
 110 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ <

ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 115 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —

ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 120 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —
 ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ —

AD

Line 102: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, cf. infra, ch. 34, line 360 (ܕܢܘܢܝܢ).
 Line 103: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, cf. ibid. (ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ).
 Line 106: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, cf. ibid., line 363 (ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ).
 cf. ibid., line 364 (ܕܢܘܢܝܢ).
 Line 114: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, D: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ. ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, D: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ.
 Line 115: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, D: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, as supra, ch. 31, line 423.
 Line 116: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, cf. ibid. (ܕܢܘܢܝܢ ܕܢܘܢܝܢ).
 Line 117: ܕܢܘܢܝܢ, D om.

stance in the generic sense'. It will be obvious, then, that he refuses to profess the Father's hypostasis as God the Father. For if
 115 God the Father, according to his argument, is both participant and * participated and a participant and participated is both hypostasis and substance comprehending hypostases, and if, moreover, it is manifest that one hypostasis cannot be both hypostasis and substance comprehending hypostases, it is clear that he is unable to
 120 call the Father's hypostasis 'God the Father'.

How, then, does this clever fellow, the great writer and doctor of our era, not perceive that he demolishes, completely destroys and cancels his doctrines? For elsewhere, indeed, he joined the property to the common and professed that we must think of the
 125 fatherhood or ingeneracy, existing in the Godhead, as God the Father. So let us listen too to the doctrines opposed to, and at variance with, these words and see the utterly irreconcilable civil war between the two. For he wrote in the *Letter* he sent through *Zachariah* and his companions to Paralos, which was read by us
 130 (its beginning is: Your God-honoured beatitude having also now displayed an apostolic deed) as follows: What then is anyone doing in the Christian Church, if he falls into such absurdities and supposes the three indicative properties of the three hypostases, properties existing in one and the same Godhead (I mean fatherhood, sonship and procession)
 135 to be mere appellations, empty and unsubstisting terms, and 'relationships

115/116 cf. supra, 66 130/140 Dam. Alex., *Apologia secunda*; cf. supra, ch. 31, 313-318 135/136 cf. Greg. Naz., *Or.* 29, 5 (PG 36, 80B; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 184); cf. supra, ch. 31, 220-221

125
 130

f. 124va

135
 140
 145

AD flor. II from l. 124 to l. 130

Line 125: *ἁγιότης ὁμοῦ* : ,*ἁγιότης ἁγίας*, D: *ἁγιότης ὁμοῦ* ,*ἁγιότης ἁγίας*.
 Line 129: *ἁγίας*, D: *ἁγίας*.
 Line 135: *ἁγιότης*, D: *ἁγιότης*.
 Line 137: *ἁγιότης*, we corrected, A: *ἁγιότης*, D: *ἁγιότης*.
 Line 144: *ἁγιότης*, D: *ἁγιότης*.

bereft of realities'? For if the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is a mere appellation, the name of the hypostasis derived from the fatherhood, I mean 'Father', will become a meaningless word like the pagan fables, even though, when we add the property to the common, by connection of the two we call the fatherhood existing in the Godhead God the Father. And again: So we do not discard the fatherhood or ingeneracy from the Godhead making it subsist on its own apart from the substance and say it is a hypostasis but, as has been said, we think of the fatherhood existing in the Godhead as God the Father. And again: So wise Basil, as has often been proved, joined the fatherhood to the common, and, as it were, made it substantial in the Godhead, changing its name to 'Father' by the connection, when he said: 'Common the Godhead, * proper the fatherhood; combining them we say "I believe in God the Father"'. For he named as 'God the Father' what he called 'fatherhood' when he joined it to the common.

140
145
150

141/144 cf. supra, ch. 31, 374-377 144/150 Dam. Alex., *Apologia secunda* 147/148 Bas. Caes., *Ep.* 236, 6 (PG 32, 884B; Courtonne, III, p. 53)

קדושה ואלוהים יי. כן. פ. משהו. ואלוהים —
 רוחו ואלוהים משהו ואלוהים ואלוהים : רוחו ואלוהים —
 רוחו ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים —
 150 רוחו ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —
 רוחו ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים —
 ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —
 ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —
 ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —
 155 ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —
 ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —
 ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים —
 ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים ואלוהים —
 160 * ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —
 ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים — f. 124vb
 : ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —
 * ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים ואלוהים : ואלוהים —

AD flor. I from l. 152 on

Line 147: ואלוהים, cf. supra, ch. 31, line 406 (ב. ב. ב.).
 Line 149: ואלוהים, cf. ibid., line 407 (ב. ב.). פ. פ., cf. ibid., line 408 (א. א.).
 Line 150: ואלוהים, cf. ibid., line 408 (ב. ב.).
 Lines 150-151: ואלוהים ואלוהים, cf. ibid., line 409 (א. א. א.).
 Line 152: ואלוהים, D: ואלוהים.
 Line 153: ואלוהים, flor. I trsp. ואלוהים, D: ואלוהים. ואלוהים.
 XY: ואלוהים.
 Line 154: ואלוהים, X: ואלוהים.
 Line 155: ואלוהים, DWXZ: ואלוהים.
 Lines 155-156: ואלוהים ב., cf. supra, ch. 31, lines 420-421 (רוחו ואלוהים).
 Line 156: ואלוהים, Y: ואלוהים.
 Line 161: ואלוהים, WX: ואלוהים.
 Line 163: ואלוהים, X om., Y: ואלוהים.

He wrote similar things, in presumptuous attack upon truth, and spoke as follows in the *Letter* he sent us through *Gerontius* just now mentioned, also: These and the like are always and necessarily our professions, besides the fact that we recognize, in accordance with the wise patriarch, that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated, and that the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father.

Who can mourn aright or fittingly weep over the ample wickedness of these contradictions, even were he to outstrip by far the prophet Jeremiah's compassionate voice itself? For truth's enemy, attempting to make falsehood acceptable and, somehow, couple it with truth, is justly rendered impotent and is made drunk by his ideas like men giddy with the madness of intoxication, so that not only does he, for example, elsewhere reject as enemies the doctrines he here embraces and, contrariwise, here adopt gladly as orthodox and irreproachable those which elsewhere, on occasion, he rejects as impious, but also he makes the same opinion simultaneously both elect and reprobate: which is darkness and total mental confusion. For is there anybody who reads the quoted passages with judgement, consideration and discernment, to whom it will not be clear that what he has pronounced false, and scorned, with charges too numerous to mention, as impiety, he has again,

155

160

165

170

165 : *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 170 : *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*

ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 175 *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 180 *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*
ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ
 185 *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*

AD flor. I from l. 166 to l. 170

Line 165: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, D: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*.
 Line 166: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, cf. supra, ch. 31, lines 422-423 (*ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*).
 Lines 167-168: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ* *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, cf. ibid., lines 423-424 (*ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*).
 Line 169: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ* *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, cf. ibid., line 425 (trsp.).
 Line 170: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, W: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ* *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*.
 Line 180: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*, A before correction: *ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲓⲛⲟⲩ*.

contradictorily, justified as orthodoxy with many praises, as if he had changed into an opponent of his view?

175 And how he does so, we shall attempt, as briefly as we can, to demonstrate to truth-loving listeners for the sake of further clarification. For as they will have learned by the preceding, this excellent fellow, having diligently combated those who say that participant does not differ from participated (i.e. hypostasis from substance comprehending the three hypostases) and proved, from the spiritual treasures of our God-clad father * Severus, that it is very

180 impious to think this at all, he carefully says, in his later statements, as if he had forgotten himself, that the fatherhood or ingeneracy joined to the common is God the Father. How is the most absurd absurdity not to be inferred to one who lays down

185 these rules? For if it is absurd to think that participant is the same as participated (i.e. hypostasis as substance comprehending the hypostases) and God the Father is (as he says) both participant and participated, how will it not be very absurd to profess the fatherhood or ingeneracy joined to the common as God the Father

190 (i.e. as hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases)? Where, then, are the just complaints and charges against those who, as he says, suppose participant and participated (i.e. hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases) to be the same? What will he say in reply to the quotations of the God-

195

ⲉⲓⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ

190 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 195 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 200 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 205 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 210 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ
 ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓ

f. 125ra

AD

Line 190: ⲛⲓⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲛⲓ.
 Line 192: ⲛⲓⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲛⲓ.
 Line 198: ⲛⲓⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲛⲓ.
 Line 200: ⲛⲓⲛⲓ, D: ⲛⲓⲛⲓ.

clad Severus' words whereby that careful expositor was at pains to prove the difference between participant and participated?

It will, perhaps, be of some value to examine this briefly and show the incongruity of these words of his. He expressly says, then, in the quoted words, the following: So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis. So now he has ruled that God the Father is both participant and participated, we are to hear from him what he supposes we ought to think of participant and participated! However, he promptly says the following (which he has already said in the preceding): Such, then, are the words. But divination would now be required for us to ascertain the faults found in them, so that a defence relevant to the charge could be produced. So, they have made the charge that we belied the patriarch and fabricated things he did not say and palmed them off on him, and that it is not true that the God-clad man said that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated. For such a falsification * (or, to speak more aptly, misrepresentation) is reprehensible and deserving of death many times over. And again: These and the like are always and necessarily our professions, besides the fact that we recognize, in accordance with the wise patriarch, that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated.

200/202 cf. supra, 66-67 202/203 cf. supra, 200-201 206/214 cf. supra, 85-92 214/217 cf. supra, 106-109

ⲕⲉⲟⲓⲛ ⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲓⲁ ⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲓⲛ ⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲓⲁ
ⲉⲃⲓ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ

215 ⲉⲃⲓ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲉⲃⲓ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
220 ⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲓ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
225 ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
230 : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
235 ⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ
ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ

f. 125rb

AD

Line 214: ⲉⲃⲓ, D: ⲉⲃⲓⲁ.
Line 224: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ.
Line 225: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ.
Line 226: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ.
Line 234: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲓⲟⲩⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ.
Line 235: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ, D om.
Line 236: ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁ, D om.

Having learned by this prudent author's previous words that God the Father, according to his argument, is both participant and participated, and apprehended again from the previous statements that he considers the participant a hypostasis and the participated the common substance comprehending the three hypostases (for our God-clad father Severus, in the words he just now quoted, said: Therefore each of the hypostases participates in the substance, but the substance is the participated holding all the hypostases participating in it by equality of honour in a common and generic principle. For each of us participates in the common manhood and the one substance over all, and is one man and one hypostasis. But he will not be called, because he participates in the substance, not a hypostasis but substance. For the former is the participant whereas the latter is the participated) we will rightly take note of these words too in which this writer judged it right to think fatherhood or ingeneracy God the Father. He said, then, as we set down in the preceding, as follows: For if the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is a mere appellation, the name of the hypostasis derived from fatherhood, I mean 'Father', will become a meaningless word like the pagan fables, even though, when we add the property to the common, by connection of the two we call the fatherhood existing in the Godhead God the Father. And again: So we do not discard the fatherhood or ingeneracy from the Godhead making it subsist on its own apart from the substance and say it is a hypostasis but, as has

219/220 cf. supra, 200-201 224/230 cf. supra, 96-103 233/238 cf. supra, 136-140 238/242 cf. supra, 141-144

240 :
 245 :
 250 :
 255 :
 260 :

AD

Line 237:
 Line 252:
 Line 253:
 Line 258:
 Line 260:
 Lines 261-262:

been said, we think of the fatherhood existing in the Godhead as God the Father. And again: So wise Basil, as has often been proved, joined the fatherhood to the common, and, as it were, made it substantial in the Godhead, * changing its name to 'Father' by the connection, when he said: 'Common the Godhead, proper the fatherhood; combining them we

245 say "I believe in God the Father"'. For he named as 'God the Father' what he called 'fatherhood' when he joined it to the common. And elsewhere as previously set down, he says: These and the like are always and necessarily our professions, besides the fact that we

250 recognize, in accordance with the wise patriarch, that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated, and that the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father.

It has been made clear to us from this excellent fellow's words that he supposes fatherhood (and, of course, ingeneracy too) joined to the common, to be God the Father. But if so, it will be, according to his argument, both participant and participated, both hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases. How, then is this sensible fellow not convicted of thinking outlandish, utterly foreign thoughts outside the genus of human, rational nature, when he makes fatherhood or ingeneracy not only a hypostasis but also the substance and Godhead comprehending the three hypostases? For if, as he says, God the Father is both participant and participated, and a participant and participated is not only a hypostasis but also the substance comprehending hypostases, and

242/247 cf. supra, 144-150 248/252 cf. supra, 153-157 256 et 262/263 cf. supra, 200-201

⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 265 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ * ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ — f. 125va
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 270 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —
 275 ⊛ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ —

ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 280 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 285 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 : ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ

AD

Line 263: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.

Line 267: At the top of fol. 76v D reads as follows: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ. *Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.*

Line 268: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ.

Line 285: ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ, D om.

265 it has been proved by many words of his that he professes the fatherhood or ingeneracy joined to the common to be God the Father, it is evident that he also defines fatherhood or ingeneracy as both participant and participated, as both hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases; and what Christian will ever submit to these impious and abominable fabrications? How, indeed, according to this absurd nonsense, could fatherhood or ingeneracy not be the whole Holy Trinity? For if the substance and Godhead comprehending the three hypostases is the Holy Trinity (as will be proved - Christ, our God aiding us - forthwith) and the fatherhood or ingeneracy joined to the common is both hypostasis * and substance and Godhead comprehending the three hypostases, the fatherhood or ingeneracy (which is the same thing, according to his argument, as saying the Father) will necessarily be found to be not only Father, but Son and Holy Ghost as well; and the blasphemy is obliged to think likewise of Son and Holy Ghost.

You have seen into what an abyss of perdition his perfidious innovation has thrust the wretch and cast him down! You will observe that this new upholder of Jewish godlessness has been proved an exact disciple of the Libyan. However, let us also note carefully his other absurdities. He wrote, then, in the *Many-lined Letter*, as follows: So when we join the common to the property and say 'God the Father', we do not simply indicate only the hypostasis by the terms, but the substantial hypostasis: by saying 'God' we make plain

285

290
 : אֱלֹהִים וְאֱלֹהִים אֶת אֱלֹהִים : כֹּה : כֹּה :
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 295
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 300
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 305
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה

f. 125vb

310
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 315
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה
 : כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה

AD flor. I from L 312 on

Line 290: כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה, D: כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה.
 Line 303: כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה, D: כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה.
 Line 313: כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה, cf. infra, ch. 33, line 113 (כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה).
 Line 315: כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה, Y: כֹּה כֹּה כֹּה.

290 the substance and the common; by the denomination 'Father' we indicate
 the hypostasis and the properness of the prosopon, so that the substance
 will never be unhypostatic, nor will there be found an unsubstantial
 hypostasis, except when as an invention of our mind the enquiring reason
 asks what each of them is in its own concept, as has often been proved.
 295 And after other matters: So God the Father is both participant and
 participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indica-
 tion of a hypostasis. For this is the cause of our opponents' error, because
 they do not consent, or do not want, to separate hypostasis from sub-
 stance but confuse their meanings and are thereby themselves confused.

300 Oh, the deception and hypocrisy of this truth-lover's sophisms
 (or if one ought to speak truer, his witless folly), for he is clearly
 attempting a multifarious plot and scheming to hide his het-
 erodoxy in the obscurity and confusion of his words! Never-
 theless, truth will rebut him and strip heretical wickedness of its
 305 pretence. So when, he says, we join the common to the property and
 say 'God the Father', we do not simply indicate only the hypostasis by
 the terms, but * the substantial hypostasis: by saying 'God' we make
 plain the substance and the common; by the denomination 'Father' we

— : ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 320 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 325 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —

— ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 330 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 335 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —
 — ܠܟܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ —

f. 126ra

AD flor. I ^{up 10 l. 327}

Line 316: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.
 Line 317: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, XYZ: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ. ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, XY: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.
 ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.
 Line 322: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, Y om.
 Line 324: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, flor. I om.
 Line 326: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, cf. infra, ch. 33, line 53 (ܕܥܘܠܡܐ).
 Line 330: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.
 Line 331: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.
 Line 334: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.

310 indicate the hypostasis and the properness of the prosopon, so that the substance will never be unhypostatic, nor will there be found an un-substantial hypostasis. Will anyone confronting the murk of these words not perceive at once the opposition between the tongue and the disordered mind of this clever author, which schemes now one thing now another with So when we join the common to the property
 315 and say 'God the Father'?

314/315 cf. supra, 305-306

—
 —
 340 —
 —
 —
 —
 345 —

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 5 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 unsubstantial, and it will plainly be found to be non-existent; for 10 the divinely-inspired teachers have said that what is not substantial is non-existent.

First let us consider that, as he says, by joining the common to the property he recognizes God the Father who indicates, he says, not only hypostasis but substantial hypostasis. And then we will 15 ask him what an unsubstantial hypostasis is and what a substantial hypostasis is. For our part, indeed, we have not heard till the present of anyone at all who thinks of an unsubstantial hypostasis.

Besides this, we will investigate what this admirable fellow 20 thinks God the Father to be, when he divides him into substance in the generic sense and hypostasis. By saying 'God', he says, we make plain the common and the substance; by the denomination 'Father' we indicate the hypostasis and the properness of the prosopon. However, if he recognizes God the Father as one reality, how can the same be both hypostasis and common substance comprehending

מפלאו קאריה קאריה

כא דכח א חפא מוואס נאמא קאריה קאריה
 חפאל : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא קאריה קאריה
 אריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 5 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא

10 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 15 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא

כא דכח א חפא מוואס נאמא קאריה קאריה
 חפאל : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא קאריה קאריה
 אריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 20 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא
 קאריה קאריה קאריה : אל די מ, נאמא נאמא

AD flor. II from l. 20 on

Line 11: קאריה, D: קאריה.
 Lines 18-19: קאריה קאריה קאריה, cf. supra, ch. 32, line 69 (קאריה קאריה קאריה).
 Line 19: קאריה, מ, cf. ibid. (קאריה).
 Line 21: קאריה, flor. II: קאריה.

25 the hypostases? Yet if he makes God the Father two realities and a substantial hypostasis, he must be two realities (i.e. both hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases) since * he recognizes God the Father as a substantial hypostasis. For he said in the preceding: So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis. In that case, according to this novel and abominable theology, a hypostasis itself is unsubstantial, indeed it obviously does not even exist; for we have been taught that the unsubstantial is also the non-existent.

35 But perhaps someone will say that a hypostasis is always substantial, for this is, perhaps, what this exact expositor means when he says: So that the substance will never be unhypostatic, nor will there be found an unsubstantial hypostasis. In which case a hypostasis is always not only a hypostasis but also a substance comprehending hypostases. For if a hypostasis is never unsubstantial and a substantial hypostasis is at once both participant and participated (for he wrote, as previously set down, So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis) and a participant and participated is both hypostasis and substance compre-

25 A. f. 126rb
 30
 35
 40

35
 40

AD flor. II

- Line 23: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 25: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 28: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 29: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 31: D: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 32: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 35: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 40: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 41: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 42: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .
- Line 43: D and flor. II: ܩܘܕܫܘܬܗ .

29/31 cf. supra, ch. 32, 295-297 37/38 cf. supra, ch. 32, 291-293 42/43 cf. supra, 29-30

this first to himself? Does he not see that (as we said above) in the same breath he has asserted totally opposite and mutually contradictory things? For having said: So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis, he immediately added: For this is the cause of our opponents' error, because they do not consent, or do not want, to separate hypostasis from substance but confuse their meanings and are thereby themselves confused. And how does he condemn those who do not distinguish hypostasis from substance if he always recognizes hypostasis as substantial (for he said: So that the substance will never be unhypostatic, nor will there be found an unsubstantial hypostasis) and thinks of a substantial hypostasis as participant and participated (for he wrote: So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis)? For if a hypostasis is always substantial (not to mention now a subsistent substance) and a substantial hypostasis, according to his argument, is both participant and participated, and, again, a participant and participated is both hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases, a hypostasis must then be both a hypostasis and a substance comprehending the hypostases. Where, then, is the distinction between substance and hypostasis? How, indeed, does this babble of senseless words not demonstrably belong to people who confuse the meanings of substance and hypostasis and are thereby themselves confused and who * propound entirely contradictory and incongruous things?

However, let us look too at the other examples of the writer's evident confusion and contradiction in the same breath. For having

69/71 cf. supra, 49-51 71/74 cf. supra, 51-54 76/78 cf. supra, 37-38 79/81 cf. supra, 69-71

70
 75
 80
 85
 90
 95

70
 75
 80
 85
 90
 95

f. 126vb

* *q̄lāq̄* *ḥnḥm*.

92
 93

AD

Line 92: ḥnḥm, D: om ḥnḥm.

95 said: These and the like are always and necessarily our professions, besides the fact that we recognize, in accordance with the wise patriarch, that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated; and having distinguished hypostasis from common substance, he forthwith muddled again what he said by saying immediately
 100 afterwards: And the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father. For if the fatherhood existing in the Godhead is God the Father and God the Father is both participant and participated, where is the difference between participant and participated i.e. between hypostasis and common substance? You will see the con-
 105 tradiction in this senseless nonsense, and that is what it is to be called.

But lest we seem to anybody to be making an implausible response to what he says, let us enquire in the same way again into his words: So when, he says, we join the common to the property and
 110 say 'God the Father', we do not simply indicate only the hypostasis by the terms, but the substantial hypostasis: by saying 'God' we make plain the substance and the common; by the denomination 'Father' we indicate the hypostasis and the properness of the prosopon. What, then, this novel expositor wants to prove by this, he should say clearly and
 115 frankly. Is it that the Father's hypostasis is substantial? In which case let him also profess it God the Father and (as he sees fit to do) both participant and participated, and, consequently as both hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases. But then, of necessity, let him call it unashamedly Father, Son and Holy

95/97 cf. supra, ch. 32, 248-251 100/101 cf. supra, ch. 32, 251-252 109/113 cf. supra, ch. 32, 287-291

100 : ...
 : ...
 : ...
 : ...
 105 : ...
 : ...
 : ...
 : ...
 110 : ...

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

AD flor. II from l. 105 to l. 110

Line 105: ... flor. II: ...
 Line 107: ... flor. II: ...
 Line 113: ... cf. ch. 32, line 313 (...)
 Line 117: ... D: ...
 Line 121: ... D: ...
 Line 124: ... D: ...

120 Ghost. For if, by joining the common to the property and saying
 'God the Father' he recognizes a substantial hypostasis, and a
 substantial hypostasis is, according to his argument, both partici-
 pant and participated, and a participant and participated is both
 hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases, and
 125 again the substance comprehending the hypostases is the Holy
 Trinity, * the Father's hypostasis, by being substantial, must,
 according to his clever teaching, be not only God the Father but
 also participant and participated, both hypostasis and substance
 comprehending the hypostases, and also, indisputably, the Holy
 130 Trinity itself.

Now SEVERUS, guide to accurate doctrines, teaches us that the
 Holy Trinity is the substance comprehending the hypostases. For
 he wrote in the 19th chapter of the second book of the treatise
Against the Grammarian as follows: So you hope, then, to appease
 135 true religion by empty mouthings, saying 'not as if the Father were the
 Son or the Son the Father', wherever you are caught out merging the hy-
 postases by saying 'in Christ are the whole Godhead and the whole of
 manhood'; and thus drawing the blasphemous inference that Christ is in
 two substances in the common meaning, with the consequence that in this
 140 way, as a result of this subtle confusion of yours, the whole substance of

134/148 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm.; II, 19 (CSCO 111, pp. 174,19 - 175,5;
 112, p. 136, 11-25); cf. supra, ch. 31, 514-522

125 ܠܘܡܘ : ܝܘܢ ܠܘܢ ܠܘܠܢܐ ܠܚܘܠܝܢ ܠܘܠ ܐܢܘܢ
 ܐܘܢ : ܡܕܠܘܢ ܚܘܢ ܠܘܡܘܢ ܦܢ ܠܘܡܘܢ : ܥܢܝ ܠܘܡܘܢ
 ܦܢ ܐܘܢ : ܐܠܘܠܘܢܐ ܐܘܢܐ ܠܘܡܘܢ , ܡܘܬܘܢ ܐܠܘܠܘܢܐ
 ܠܘܡܘܢܐ , ܡܘܬܘܢ ܠܘܡܘܢܐ : ܐܠܘܠܘܢܐ ܐܘܢܐ ܐܠܘܠܘܢܐ
 ܠܘܠܘܡܘܢܐ ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܠܘܡܘܢ ܦܢ ܐܘܢܐ : ܠܘܠܘܡܘܢܐ ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ
 130 ܡܘܠܘܠܐ ܦܢ ܡܕܠܘܢܐ : ܡܘܬܘܢ ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܠܚܘܠܘܠܐ
 ܠܘܡܘܢܐ ܘܢ ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܡܕܠܘܠܘܢܐ ܚܘܢ ܠܘܢܐ * ܠܘܡܘܢ
 ܐܘܢܐ ܠܘܢܐ : ܠܘܢ ܠܘܠܢܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܐܠ : , ܡܘܬܘܢ
 ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܠܘܡܘܢܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܐܠܘܠܘܢܐ ܐܘܢܐ ܐܠܘܠܘܢܐ
 . ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܠܚܘܠܘܠܐ , ܡܘܢ ܦܢ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ . ܠܘܠܘܠܐ

f. 127ra

135 ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܠܚܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܦܢ ܠܘܡܘܢܐ
 . ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܐܘܢܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ : ܡܘܬܘܢ
 ܦܢܝܝܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐܐ ܝܘܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܝܠ ܐܘܢܐ
 * ܝܘܢ ܠܘܢܐ ܘܢ ܡܘܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܝܠ
 ܕܘܢ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܘܢ ܝܘܢ ܠܘܢܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ <
 140 ܠܘܢܐ ܐܘܢܐ ܚܘܢ ܐܠܐ : ܕܘܢ ܝܘܢܐ ܘܢ : ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ <
 ܠܘܢܐ : ܠܘܢ , ܡܘܬܘܢ ܠܘܢ ܐܠܐ : ܠܘܢ , ܡܘܬܘܢ <
 ܕܘܢ ܝܘܢܐ , ܡܘܢ : ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܘܢ ܝܘܢܐ ܕܘܢ ܝܘܠܘܠܐ
 ܠܘܠܘܠܐ : ܠܚܘܠܘܢܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܘܢܐ <
 ܠܘܠܘܠܐ , ܡܘܬܘܢ ܡܘܠܘܠܐ ܦܢܝܝܝܐ : ܕܘܢܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܘܢ ܝܘܢܐ <
 145 ܦܢ ܐܘܢܐ ܡܕܠܘܢܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ : ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ , ܡܘܢ <
 , ܡܘܢ : ܠܘܠܘܠܐܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ , ܡܘܢ : ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܚܘܢܘܠܘܠܐ <

AD flor. I from l. 139 on

Line 139: ܠܘܢ, D and flor. I om. ܕܘܢ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܢ, cf. Book II,
 ch. 18, line 102 (ܕܘܢ ܡܘܠܘܠܐ ܕܘܢ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ).
 Line 141: ܠܘܢ, Z: ܠܘܢ.
 Line 142: ܝܘܠܘܠܐ, X: ܝܘܠܘܠܐ.
 Line 144: ܡܘܠܘܠܐ, X: ܡܘܠܘܠܐ.
 Lines 145-146: ܠܘܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܐ, cf. infra, lines 172-173 (..... ܠܘܠܘܠܐ
 ܡܕܠܘܠܐ; a slightly different Syriac translation); see also Book II, ch. 18, lines
 108-109 (trsp.).
 Line 146: ܚܘܢܘܠܘܠܐ, Y: ܚܘܢܘܠܘܠܐ , ܡܘܢ, cf. infra, line 173, and Book II,
 ch. 18, line 109 (ܡܘܢ).

the Godhead i.e. the Holy Trinity, will be found to be incarnate in the whole substance of manhood and the whole human race. For this is the common meaning of 'substances': being a substance comprehending many hypostases, and not a single hypostasis participating with fellow
 145 hypostases of the same genus in the same substance, in the way that so-and-so participates in manhood. Otherwise, indeed, the same hypostasis would also be found to be a substance because it participates in the substance; which is at once very ludicrous, and very absurdly blasphemous. He is seen to say similar things, too, in the first chapter of the third
 150 book of the same treatise *Against the Grammarian*: For Immanuel is not from two substances in the generic sense, comprehending a plurality of hypostases, but from one hypostasis of God the Word and from proper flesh ensouled with intelligent soul, flesh which is from Mary and subsists in unity with God the Word and completed without confusion or
 155 division one Christ, one Lord, one hypostasis and nature of the Word incarnate and in an ineffable manner made man. For it is not the Godhead's substance in the * generic sense (which is the Holy Trinity) which was incarnated into the substance and whole genus of manhood. For this is the height of impiety and witlessness.

160 So now we have heard the doctor saying that the whole Godhead is both the Holy Trinity and the substance comprehending the three hypostases. For he said, as previously set down,

150/159 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., III, 1 (CSCO 93, pp. 7,28 - 8,9; 94, pp. 5,28 - 6,5)

147 ܠܘܟܢ ܩܠܘܬܐ ܕܗܝܘܫܝܥܝܢ : ܠܗܘܝܬܐ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܝܬܐ ܝܩܠܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ : ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ , ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 150 ܐܗܘܝܬܐ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ , ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ : ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ <
 : ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܐܗܘܝܬܐ <
 , ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܐܗܘܝܬܐ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ : ܡܫܝܚܝܢ <
 155 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 , ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 160 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 165 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ * ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ < f. 127rb
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 : ܡܫܝܚܝܢ <

: ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 170 , ܡܫܝܚܝܢ : ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <
 ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ <

AD flor. II up to l. 148 and from l. 164 to l. 168

Line 147: ܩܠܘܬܐ, cf. ibid., line 110 (ܩܠܘܬܐ).
 Line 148: ܩܠܘܬܐ, cf. ibid., line 111 (ܩܠܘܬܐ). ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ, D: ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ.
 Line 155: At the top of fol. 81v D reads as follows: ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ. *Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.*
 Line 159: ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ, D: ܠܗܘܫܝܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ.
 Line 167: ܩܠܘܬܐ, Y om. ܩܠܘܬܐ, D: ܩܠܘܬܐ.

aiming at the Grammarian: With the consequence that in this way, as a result of this subtle confusion of yours, the whole substance of the Godhead i.e. the Holy Trinity, will be found to be incarnate in the whole substance of manhood and the whole human race. For this is the common meaning of 'substances': being a substance comprehending many hypostases, and not a single hypostasis participating with fellow hypostases of the same genus in the same substance, in the way that so-and-so participates in manhood. Otherwise, indeed, the same hypostasis would also be found to be a substance because it participates in the substance; which is at once very ludicrous, and very absurdly blasphemous. You will see that the substance comprehending the three hypostases is the whole Godhead and the Holy Trinity. How, then, can this writer, professing, as he does, Father, for example, or Son, it may be, or Holy Ghost, in accordance with his false opinion, as a 'substantial hypostasis', not be thinking of each of the hypostases of the Holy Trinity as the substance comprehending the hypostases and the whole Godhead and Holy Trinity? For if 'substantial hypostasis' predicated of the Father is God the Father, and God the Father, according to his argument, is both participant and participated and the participated is substance comprehending hypostases, clearly the Father, by being a substantial hypostasis, is both God the Father and both participant and participated. But if so, he is also the substance comprehending the hypostases and clearly also the whole Godhead and Holy Trinity; which it is beyond the bounds

170 ܠܘܬ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ <
 ,ܩܘܪܒܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 175 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 180 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 185 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 190 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 195 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <
 ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ <

AD

Lines 172-173: ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ, cf. supra, lines 145-146 (..... ܩܘܪܒܐ ܩܘܪܒܐ; a slightly different Syriac translation).
 Line 173: ,ܩܘܪܒܐ, cf. ibid., line 146 (ܩܘܪܒܐ).
 Line 175: ܩܘܪܒܐ, D: ܩܘܪܒܐ.
 Line 185: ܩܘܪܒܐ, D: ܩܘܪܒܐ.
 Line 193: ܩܘܪܒܐ, D: ܩܘܪܒܐ.
 Line 195: ܩܘܪܒܐ, D: ܩܘܪܒܐ.

of lunacy even to think of. For one hypostasis, because it participates in the substance, cannot be the substance comprehending the hypostases. This, in fact, as we have now learned, is at once
190 very ludicrous * and very absurdly blasphemous.

However, let us look at the later text from the champion of truth. He said, then: For it is not the Godhead's substance in the generic sense (which is the Holy Trinity) which was incarnated into the substance and whole genus of manhood. For this is the height of impiety
195 and witlessness. It is clear that here too this God-clad teacher instructs us that the substance of Godhead and the common meaning is the Holy Trinity, by ruling that it is the height of impiety to suppose it was incarnated into the substance and whole genus of manhood. So, if the Father's, e.g., substantial hypostasis is (as this
200 writer sees fit to think) participant and participated (i.e. is hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases) this cunning writer with his grand and exalted notions should tell us how it can fail to appear to be the Holy Trinity, and should demonstrate the agreement between his words and the patristic
205 texts! It will have also been made clear hereby into what absurd and impious nonsense this excellent fellow has been brought by defining 'substantial hypostasis' not in a valid way but in accord with his abominable opinion.

After this it will be relevant to investigate the consequences for
210 him when he covertly claims that a hypostasis is unsubstantial. First, then, (as we have already indeed said before) he is convicted

189/190 cf. supra, 171-172 192/195 cf. supra, 156-159 197/199 cf. supra, 193-194

197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223

f. 127va

205
210
215
220
225

226
227
228
229
230

AD

Line 199: *בלע*, D: *בלע*.
Line 209: *רעז*, D: *רעז*.

of reducing hypostasis to utter non-existence — which is very much what he desires; next of being up in arms expressly against the Church's pastor; again, too, of being in opposition to himself, when he, not soundly but hypocritically, calls the hypostasis 'substantial'. This too we shall clearly prove by giving relevant testimonies.

BASIL, the great luminary of the Church, then, discoursing of the Holy Ghost in the *Refutation*, wrote as follows: Again, we understand 'ingenerate' as unsubstantial: the utterly non-existent. Anyone who said 'unsubstantial' has eradicated hypostasis and substantial being. 'Unsubstantial', indeed, and 'non-subsistent' * mean a non-existent nature, which does not exist at all. But if one says 'substantial' and 'subsistent', one has meant an existing hypostasis. And again a little prior to this he wrote: Yet, indeed, the prophet himself will explain this by saying: *By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made firm and all their power by the breath of his mouth*. But just as there is not in God uttered word, but living, subsistent and active Word, so there is not in God outpoured Spirit; there is not dissoluble air but hallowing power, substantial, actual, subsistent.

Apostolic ATHANASIUS, too, in the previously-mentioned *Letter to bishops Eusebius, Lucifer, Asterius, Cymatius and Anatolius*

219/224 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. V (PG 29, 749B) 225/230 Ibid. (PG 29, 713B) 226/227 Ps. 32:6

225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230

230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246

f. 127vb

245
 246

AD flor. I from l. 232 to l. 257 and from l. 238 to l. 243

- Line 232: $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\alpha\kappa$, XZ: $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\alpha\kappa$.
- Line 233: $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\alpha\kappa$, Z: $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\alpha\kappa$.
- Line 237: $\mu\tau\alpha$, D: $\mu\tau\alpha$.
- Line 240: $\nu\iota\alpha$, D: $\nu\iota\alpha$.
- Line 243: $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\alpha$, D: $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\alpha$.
- Line 245: $\iota\alpha\mu\alpha$, D: $\iota\alpha\mu\alpha$.
- Line 246: $\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha\kappa$, D: $\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha\kappa$.

says: So even though someone publishes this or another document, silence such folk and make them quieten down. For we see nothing more in
 235 them than mere contentiousness. For we urged those, whom some criticize for saying 'three hypostases' because the words are un-biblical and hence under suspicion, to require nothing more than the confession of Nicaea. Nevertheless, owing to the contentiousness, we asked them whether they too said, as Arians say, that the three hypostases are
 240 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
 245 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

233/258 Athan. Alex., *Tom. ad Antioch.*, 5-6 (PG 26, 800D-801C); cf. supra, ch. 4, 46-71

ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 250 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 255 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 260 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 265 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ
 ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ

AD flor. I from l. 263 on

Line 249: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, cf. supra, ch. 4, line 51 (ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ).
 Line 252: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, cf. ibid., line 54 (om.).
 Line 254: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, cf. ibid., line 56 (ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ).
 Line 257: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, cf. ibid., line 59 (ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ).
 Line 258: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, AD: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, but see supra, ch. 4, line 60 (ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ).
 Line 262: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, cf. ibid., line 63 (ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ).
 Line 265: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, Z: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ.
 Line 266: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, W: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ.
 Line 267: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, W: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, as supra, ch. 4, line 68. ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, cf. ibid., line 69 (ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ).
 Line 268: ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ, cf. ibid. (ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲓ).

250 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 recognize 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
 255 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 investigated those whom they had criticized
 for saying 'one hypostasis' etc.

Besides this let us attend to wise CYRIL who said, in the fifth
 260 book of his *Exposition of John's Gospel*, as follows: For just as this
 uttered word of ours which proceeds through the tongue, indicates what
 is in the depth of our minds, takes up an intention about something in the
 mind (I mean, for example, some teaching), and from it gets the impulse
 to speak in some particular way, so, again, shall we think devoutly of
 265 God the Son as (though he transcends the power of an illustration)
 speaking what is in him since he is himself God the Father's Word and
 Wisdom. And because he is not, as a human word is, non-subsistent, but
 substantial and living, through his having his being in the Father and with

260/270 Cyr. Alex., *Comment. in Ioh.*, V, 5 (PG 73, 844B; Pusey, II, pp. 47-48)

270 ܕܡܢ ܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܡܘܢܝܢܐ * : ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ,ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ < f. 128ra
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 275 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <

ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ : ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 280 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 285 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ .ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܡܘܢܝܢܐ <

AD flor. I up to l. 273 and from l. 280 on

Line 269: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, D and flor. I: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ. ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, cf. supra, ch. 4, line 70 (ܡܘܢܝܢܐ).

Line 270: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ,ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, cf. ibid., line 71 (ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܡܘܢܝܢܐ).
 ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, WXZ: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ.

Line 272: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, X: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ.

Line 274: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, D: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܡܘܢܝܢܐ.

Line 277: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, cf. supra, ch. 4, line 78 (ܡܘܢܝܢܐ).

Line 278: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ : ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, cf. ibid., line 79 (ܡܘܢܝܢܐ ܡܘܢܝܢܐ).

Line 285: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, Y: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ.

Line 286: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, Z: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, X: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ.

Line 289: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, Y: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ. ܡܘܢܝܢܐ, XZ: ܡܘܢܝܢܐ.

the Father, he here says that he is *not alone* but that with him there is also
270 *he who sent him.*

We have clearly learned by these patristic texts that 'unsubstantial' is the complete negation of hypostasis and of being in existence at all, and moreover, that we ought to think of each hypostasis of the Holy Trinity as substantial.

275 But now our author's words shall be produced and our clever fellow shall explain what he says about it, and shall demonstrate clearly how he appears to be consistent here, I will not go so far as to say with the God-clad fathers, but with himself.

280 He spoke, then, in his famous *Many-lined Letter*, about Gregory the Theologian, as follows: For thus, in accord with the doctor, * when we devoutly profess one substance and three hypostases (not simply unsubstantial hypostases or substances, but substantial hypostases), a sound principle of faith is given. Because, as the patriarch says: 'It has been revealed to us by the words and thoughts found in the sacred
285 Scriptures that we are to believe that God exists in one substance and in three hypostases'; so that the trinity is thought of triply in the properties and the unity recognized in the Godhead; and is not separated in a divisible way or joined together in a confused way. For, as great Athanasius said, the Son or Holy Ghost is not unsubstantial, for they are substantial.

269/270 cf. Ioh. 8:29 280/295 Dam. Alex., *Ep. prolixa* 283/286 Sev. Ant., *C. Imp. Gramm.*, II, 1 (CSCO 111, p. 65, 25-27; 112, p. 51, 33-36) 289/291 cf. Athan. Alex., *Or. IV contra Ar.*, 2 (PG 26, 469CD; Stegmann, pp. 45-46)

290 . ܘܘܢܐ ܕܒܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܐܘܪܝܢܐ <
† ܘܘܢܐ ܕܒܝܬܐ ܕܐܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܐܘܪܝܢܐ <

ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
295 ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ

ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
300 ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ

ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
305 ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
310 ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ
ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܘܪܝܢܐ

AD flor. I 291

Line 294: ܘܘܢܐ, D: ܘܘܢܐ.
Line 295: ܘܘܢܐ, D: ܘܘܢܐ. ܘܘܢܐ, D trsp.
Line 304: ܘܘܢܐ, cf. infra, line 383 (ܘܘܢܐ).
Line 312: ܘܘܢܐ, cf. infra, line 385 (ܘܘܢܐ).

290 For if the Father is in the Son and the Spirit in the Son, clearly they are
 substantial. But neither may we say 'three substances', as did Arius, gone
 mad, when he covertly professed the opinion of Basilides. Let Basil, then,
 tell us what is substantial. For 'substance', he says, 'is the material
 295 exists in a substance: one of which is common, the other proper.

Let us see how this friend of truth, though using these words as
 his yardstick and with the utmost diligence scheming to hide and
 cover up the truth of what is written, did not think he had to
 indicate what treatise, volume or book by the divinely inspired
 300 Athanasius and Basil the words he put down come from; and this
 although they taught there about doctrines so pressing and
 necessary to many people. Even if we admit that they are their
 words and not his, their teaching being large and extensive. For he
 so confuses the business, that, though we have laboured much, we
 305 have been unable to discern whether what the fathers said was
 quoted expressly or as he repeats it in his own words. Let the
 careful listener consider whether he himself too is able to
 distinguish in these statements between the prudent author's
 words and the fathers'. Is this not a heretical device? Indeed, to
 310 put it more broadly, can this * excellent fellow find any heretic
 who does quote patristic statements in support of his doctrines but
 does not indicate where they come from? No, one does not find

293/294 Bas. Caes., Adv. Eun. II, 4 (PG 29, 577C; SChr., vol. 305, p. 20); cf. supra, ch. 17, 90-91

— 315
 — 320
 —

325
 330
 335
 340

f. 128va

AD

Lines 314-315: *ἡ οὐσία*, cf. infra, lines 387-388 (*ἡ οὐσία* ἡ οὐσία).
 Line 315: *ἡ οὐσία*, cf. infra, line 388 (*ἡ οὐσία*).
 Line 318: *οὐσία*, cf. infra, line 392 (trsp.).

even Julian himself, I think, who became better known than the rest for such unlawful activities, imagining such patent tricks. 315 About him (as we have already quoted it before) our wise father Severus said the following in the first chapter of the fifth book of the treatise *Against Felicissimus*: But by usefully repeating these things to you, I have made known the doctor's words, put to shame the asinine and contentious ears of the impious, and demonstrated with 320 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 325 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 330 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 335 covering of tricks, just as thieves and bandits love to hide behind walls and darkness. It is with a view to the readers' knowing how champions of truth openly publish the fathers' testimonies, not only

317/336 Sev. Ant., C. Feliciss., V, 1; cf. supra, ch. 7, 51-69 1:20-21 332/334 Prov.

345 350 355 360 365

345 *Against Felicissimus*...
 350 ...
 355 ...
 360 ...
 365 ...

AD

Line 345: ... D: ...
 Line 355: ... cf. supra, ch. 7, line 63 (...).
 Line 357: ... D: ...
 Line 364: ... D: ...
 Line 368: ... D: ...

pointing out those who said them but also announcing the books they come from, sometimes also their occasions and intentions, but how, on the other hand, protagonists of falsehood omit all this and scheme now with alterations, subtractions * and additions, now with a mixture and confusion of their own and the fathers' words, to hide and falsify correctness of doctrine, that we have set down this patristic statement now too.

345 Nevertheless, to revert to our subject, let us observe that even in these confused words of his the writer is clearly calling the hypostases 'substantial'. For he said (as previously set down) in expounding the Theologian's words, as follows: For thus, in accord with the doctor, when we devoutly profess one substance and three hypostases (not simply unsubstantial hypostases or substances, but substantial hypostases), a sound principle of faith is given. And again: For, as great Athanasius said, the Son or Holy Ghost is not unsubstantial, for they are substantial. For if the Father is in the Son and the Spirit in the Son, clearly they are substantial. But neither may we say 'three substances', as did Arius, gone mad, when he covertly professed the opinion of Basilides. Let Basil, then, tell us what is substantial. For 'substance', he says, 'is the material substrate', but 'substantial' is the participated in

370 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܘܥܠ ܐܠ ܕܥܠܝܘܢܐ ܘܠܠܗܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 375 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ

f. 128vb

ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 380 ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 385 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 390 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ
 : ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ

AD

Line 380: ܘܥܠܝܘܢܐ, D: ܘܥܠܝܘܢܐ.
 Line 383: ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ, cf. supra, line 304 (ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ). At the top of fol. 86v D reads as follows: ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ, ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ. Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

Line 385: ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ, D: ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ. ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ, cf. supra, line 312 (ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ).
 Lines 387-388: ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ, cf. supra, lines 314-315 (ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ).
 Line 388: ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ, D: ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ, cf. supra, line 315 (add. ,ܩ).
 Line 392: ܩܘܘܝܘܢܐ, cf. supra, line 318 (trsp.).

some substance or what exists in a substance: one of which is common, the other proper. What words here (as we have already said) belong to the fathers and what to our author, we ourselves are quite unable to discern. However, it will be clear to everybody that he called the hypostases 'substantial' here.

Let us hear also what he wrote on the subject again in the same *Many-lined Letter*. He says as follows: Who, then, taught that properties or hypostases not viewed in a substance (which is the same as saying 'unsubstantial') subsist individually? Nobody. And again: So our statement that the properties are viewed in the substance is to be taken as the holy fathers' profession, meaning nothing else but that the Father is substantial, the Son substantial and the Holy Ghost substantial viz. in one Godhead, substance and nature and not in three according to the polytheists' insanity. And after other matters: * For necessarily, according to this argument, there will either be the fiction of prosopa professed according to Sabellius' argument - indeed more outlandishly than according to his argument, since he, by putting only the Father in the substance, made the remaining two prosopa of the Holy Trinity unsubstantial and non-subsistent; otherwise, either he must think of the hypostases as substances (in accordance with the madness of Arius I mentioned) or agree with what we published as the holy fathers' teaching.

In addition to the other things, this has also proved that if the excellent fellow does think the hypostases of the Holy Trinity unsubstantial, not only will he be in clear opposition to the very

364/366, 366/371 et 371/379 Dam. Alex., Ep. prolisa

— וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ שְׂמוֹתָם וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 395 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —

— וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 400 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 405 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 410 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 415 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —

f. 129ra

— וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —
 420 — וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ : אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ —

AD
 Line 399: וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ, D: אֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ
 Line 409: וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ, D: וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ

nature of the realities by making the hypostases non-subsistent and non-existent, but also, indeed, he will clearly oppose the fathers' orthodox profession, and, moreover, be seen to be unashamedly at war with himself. What are we to say, then, when he exclaims at one point: So when we join the common to the property and say 'God the Father', we do not simply indicate only the hypostasis by the terms, but the substantial hypostasis: by saying 'God' we make plain the substance and the common; by the denomination 'Father' we indicate the hypostasis and the properness of the prosopon; but at another: So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis? Does he profess the Father, for example, as a substantial hypostasis, and what does this outlandish qualification of hypostasis mean, for he said: I.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis? And if not, as unsubstantial? And how will the other words harmonize with this opinion? For he said, as we have just now set down: So our statement that the properties are viewed in the substance is to be taken as the holy fathers' profession, meaning nothing else but that the Father is substantial, the Son substantial and the Holy Ghost substantial. Where, then, do these agree with one another, or who can miss the fact that this confusion of words is nothing but a heretical perversion?

405 However, * let us put the better construction on it and concede that he thinks the hypostases substantial. In that case he must also agree that God the Father is only hypostasis and is not both participant and participated i.e. both hypostasis and substance compre-

387/391 cf. supra, 109-113 391/393 cf. supra, 69-71 396/397 cf. supra, 392-393 399/402 cf. supra, 366-369 407/408 cf. supra, 392

425 — — — — —
 430 — — — — —
 435 — — — — —
 440 — — — — —
 445 — — — — —

445 — — — — — f. 129rb

AD

Line 429: ἁπολυτο, cf. infra, ch. 34, line 333 (ἁπολυτο).
 Line 444: ἁπολυτο, D: ἁπολυτο.

hending the hypostases. For if the Father by being a substantial
 410 hypostasis, is not both participant and participated (i.e. both hy-
 postasis and substance comprehending the hypostases) but only a
 participant (i.e. one hypostasis), clearly God the Father too, by
 being a substantial hypostasis, is not both participant and participated
 (i.e. hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases), but
 415 is evidently only a participant or single hypostasis.

450 ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ : ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός . ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα
 ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ , ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα : ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ
 ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ : ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός
 ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ , ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα
 455 ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ
 ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός
 ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα
 ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ
 ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα ἁπλοῦς ὁ πατήρ ἁπλοῦς ὁ υἱός ἁπλοῦς ὁ πνεῦμα

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.

But we shall again prove by the doctors' many and divinely inspired words that God the Father (and indisputably also God the Word) is not (as it pleases impiety to suppose) both participant and participated (which is the same as saying both hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases).

אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד

כִּי אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : כִּי אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד
 , מֵאֵלֹהִים אֶחָד : כִּי אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים
 אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים
 5 : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד . אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 10 : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד . אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד

15 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד
 אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד : אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד וְיֵשׁוּעַ אֶחָד

AD

- Line 2: אֵלֹהִים, D: אֵלֹהִים.
- Line 5: אֵלֹהִים, D: אֵלֹהִים.
- Line 7: אֵלֹהִים, D: אֵלֹהִים וְיֵשׁוּעַ.
- Line 9: אֵלֹהִים, D: אֵלֹהִים.
- Line 12: אֵלֹהִים, D: אֵלֹהִים.
- Line 13: אֵלֹהִים, D: אֵלֹהִים.
- Line 15: אֵלֹהִים וְיֵשׁוּעַ, D: אֵלֹהִים.
- Line 19: אֵלֹהִים, D: אֵלֹהִים.

6/7 cf. supra, ch. 32, 29

an insanity (unless, maybe, he thinks things similar to the aforesaid) as to
 40 say that the word and reality of ministering service is rightly predicated
 of the Father's glory itself because 'through whom' has been applied to
 him too. And again, indeed, in the fifth book of the treatise *To*
Hermias, he appears as saying: For that the Son is as it were God the
 Father's prosopon the Psalmist will teach us easily by his saying, *Whither*
 45 *shall I go from your Spirit, and where flee to from your prosopon?*
 Another time again, indeed, in the person of believers in him, *Let there*
be marked upon us the light of your prosopon, O Lord. He said similar
 things to this too in the sixth book of the same treatise *To*
Hermias, clearly proving that he recognizes no difference at all
 50 between saying: 'God the Father' and 'Father'. For just as, he says,
 he is the * Father's prosopon and image, his wisdom, glory, effulgence
 and stamp, so also is he thought of as his power whereby he was, is and
 will be the creator of all that are made. *For all things were made through*
him and without him nothing was made. Cyril's peer, proven and
 55 accurate SEVERUS, taught us this orthodox teaching when he wrote
 as follows in the *Letter to Constantine bishop of Seleucia in*
Isauria (its beginning is: What was earlier sent me by your holiness):
 But if we were to accept those who assembled at Chalcedon on the
 ground that they are against the heresies of Eutyches and were to praise,

41 cf. supra, 33 43/47 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. V* (PG 75, 945A; *SChr.*, vol. 237, p. 288) 44/45 Ps. 138:7 46/47 Ps. 4:7 50/54 Cyr. Alex., *De SS. Trin. Dial. VI* (PG 75, 1049BC; *SChr.*, vol. 246, pp. 94-96) 51 'image': cf. II Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15 'wisdom': cf. I Cor. 1:24 51/52 cf. Hebr. 1:3 53/54 Ioh. 1:3 58/65 Sev. Ant., *Ep. ad Constantinum ep. Seleuc.* (ed. Brooks, p. 5-6 [6])

40 ܩܠܘܢ : ܘܢ ܩܕܝܫ ܩܝܡܘܢ ܩܘܪܘܢ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܕܐܠ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 : ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 45 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ : ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ : ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 * ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 50 * ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 * ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <<
 * ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <<
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ : ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 55 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ : ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ : ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ * ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ : ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 60 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 65 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ <

f. 129vb

AD flor. I from l. 65 on flor. II from l. 65 on

Line 56: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, D: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ.
 Line 58: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, D om.
 Line 63: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, D: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ.
 Line 66: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, Y: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ. ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, W and flor. II: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ.
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, flor. II: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ.
 Line 67: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, DWXY: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ. ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, DW and flor. II:
 ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ. ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ, flor. II: ܩܕܝܫܘܬܗ.

60 rather than censure, them, for having in part spoken well, it is time we
 also lauded the heresy of the Ario-maniacs, for contending with the evil
 view of Sabellius and for being partly in harmony with the Church's
 orthodox teachings by professing God the Father as ingenerate and by not
 confounding the three hypostases but defining them in their proper marks
 65 or prosopa. And again he taught us the same things too in the first
 chapter of the second book of the treatise *Against the Gram-*
marian, saying: For this reason too, then, 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 children of Israel: *'He who is has sent me to you'*! John
 70 the theologian and evangelist, too, said in the Gospel, about the living
 and subsisting Son and Word 'begotten of the Father before the worlds':
In the beginning was the Word; and in his epistle: *Who was from the*
beginning; and in his *Revelation: Who is and was and is to come*. And
 Job the philosopher, speaking of the holy and hypostatic Spirit who
 75 proceeds eternally from God the Father: *But the divine spirit who is in my*
nostrils.

It will have become indisputably clear to us by these words, that
 God the Father is not both participant and participated (as he is

67/76 Sev. Ant., C. Imp. Gramm., II, 1 (CSCO 111, p. 56, 4-16; 112, p. 44, 19-
 29); cf. supra, ch. 18, 43-45 68/69 Ex. 3:14 71 Symb. Constantinop., 3-
 4 (ed. Dossetti, p. 244) 72 Ioh. 1:1 72/73 I Ioh. 1:1 73 Apoc.
 1:8 75/76 Iob 27:3

60 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 70 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 75 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 80 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 85 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <

אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <
 אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : וְכֵן אֵל אֵל : <

AD flor. I up to l. 73, from l. 75 to l. 78, from l. 84 to l. 87 flor. II up to l. 73

Line 69: אֵל אֵל, DWX: אֵל אֵל. אֵל אֵל, flor. II: אֵל אֵל.
 אֵל אֵל, flor. II: אֵל אֵל.
 Line 70: אֵל אֵל, flor. I: אֵל אֵל. אֵל אֵל, flor. II: אֵל אֵל.
 אֵל אֵל, flor. II: אֵל אֵל.
 Line 71: אֵל אֵל, flor. II: אֵל אֵל. אֵל אֵל, D: אֵל אֵל.
 Line 72: אֵל אֵל, W om. אֵל אֵל, flor. II: אֵל אֵל. אֵל אֵל, flor. II:
 אֵל אֵל.
 Line 76: אֵל אֵל, cf. supra, ch. 18, line 49 (om.). אֵל אֵל, cf. ibid. (אֵל אֵל).
 אֵל אֵל.
 Line 77: אֵל אֵל, D and flor. I: אֵל אֵל.
 Line 84: אֵל אֵל, DX: אֵל אֵל, W: אֵל אֵל, Y: אֵל אֵל.

according to mad new rubbish) i.e. hypostasis and substance com-
 80 prehending the hypostases, but one only hypostasis. For who, on
 hearing Basil the Great * exclaiming in plain terms: When we hear
 of a man as father we then also apprehend the idea of passion; but when
 that God is Father, we are elevated in thought to the impassible cause;
 and wise Cyril clearly crying out: All these things, indeed, have
 85 reference to God the Father's prosopon; and again: For the Son is, as it
 were, God the Father's prosopon; and again: For just as he is the
 Father's prosopon and image, his wisdom, glory etc., will think of God
 the Father as not the Father's hypostasis only but also the sub-
 stance comprehending the hypostases, unless he is convicted of
 90 lapsing into the utmost absurdity? Are we impiously to think of
 God the Father as hypostasis and substance comprehending the
 three hypostases, if in accord with God-clad Severus we call God
 the Father 'ingenerate' or say the Holy Ghost proceeds from God
 the Father? How can we not be convicted of mutually merging the
 95 three hypostases in confusion and thereby babbling that the whole
 Godhead or Holy Trinity was incarnate? For if God the Father is
 both hypostasis and substance comprehending the three hyposta-
 ses (i.e. is both participant and participated) God the Word must
 also be both hypostasis and substance comprehending the three
 100 hypostases. But if so, then not the one hypostasis of the Son but
 the whole Godhead or Holy Trinity will appear to have become

90 ܩܘܪܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 * ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 95 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 100 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 105 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 110 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ
 115 ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ

f. 130ra

AD

Line 92: ܥܘܠܐ, D: ܥܘܠܐ.
 Line 93: ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ. ܕܥܘܠܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ.
 Line 94: ܕܥܘܠܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܐ.
 Line 104: ܕܥܘܠܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܐ.
 Line 107: ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ, D: ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ.

81/83 cf. supra, 20-22 84/85 cf. supra, 37-38 85/86 cf. supra, 43-44
 86/87 cf. supra, 50-51 98 cf. supra, 7

125 for being one hypostasis he also united to himself one flesh ensouled with
 rational soul in a concurrence of natural union. Again, too, he taught as
 follows, in the *Letter to Maron* (whose beginning is: Naaman the
 Syrian): But the divine Scriptures instruct us in a different fashion,
 teaching us that God the Word, one only of the three hypostases, was in-
 carnate and made man. For *the Word was made flesh and dwelt among*
 130 *us.*

What could be more exact, what could be clearer, than these
 patristic teachings? For this master of mysteries has just expressly
 said that God the Word is not participant and participated i.e.
 135 hypostasis and the substance and Godhead comprehending the
 three hypostases, but one and only one hypostasis, by saying as
 follows: Inasmuch as God the Word, one hypostasis, united to himself
 hypostatically one particular flesh, rationally and spiritually ensouled,
 from Mary the mother of God; and then: Therefore, it was not a union
 140 of substances that was effected, but of one hypostasis, that of God the
 Word with particular flesh endowed with soul and mind; and again, at
 another point: But the one prosopon out of the Trinity, God the Word,
 is a hypostasis and not a substance in the common sense, as you said;
 and: A hypostasis is not the substance; because it participates in the sub-
 145 stance; and again, But the divine Scriptures instruct us in a different

128/131 Sev. Ant., *Ep. ad Maronem lectorem* (vel novitium?), PO 12, p. 198, 5-8 (20-24) 130/131 loh. 1:14 137/139 cf. supra, 110-113 139/141 cf. supra, 113-115 142/143 cf. supra, 117-119 144/145 cf. supra, 122-123 145/147 cf. supra, 128-130

145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163

150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163

AD flor. I¹ from l. 145 to l. 147

Line 144: *meia*, D: *meia*.

Line 153: *riir*, D: *riir*.

Line 154: At the top of fol. 92v D reads as follows: *riir meia*, cf. *riir meia*. Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

Line 155: *riir*, D: *riir*.

Line 159: *riir*, D: *riir*.

Line 163: *riir*, D: *riir*.

170 as one and only one hypostasis, and likewise also recognize God
 the Word as one and only one hypostasis (for, as we have just
 learned, one hypostasis is not the substance comprehending the hy-
 postases; because it participates in the substance); or, do not be any
 175 less contrary to your doctrines, professing, as you do, God the
 Father as both participant and participated but illogically, making God
 the Word one and only one hypostasis - no, proclaim frankly that
 God the Word too is participant and participated, and clearly
 legislate against the Spirit's stewards, by stating that it was not
 180 the one and only one hypostasis of the Son and Word * but the
 whole Godhead or Holy Trinity which was incarnate and made
 man.

But perhaps you will be shamed too by what you said and
 quoted somehow or other on the point, in the 16th chapter of your
 unlawful and abominable book, from our holy father Peter, for you
 185 wrote as follows: Therefore let the listener remember the accusation, so
 that, when the text is written down, he may censure the accusers. For he
 who truly was a rock to the Church, and renewed it when he was
 ordained to the episcopate, wrote as follows: 'For the Father is God the
 Father in the full sense and not the Son or Spirit; and the Son, God the
 190 Word, first-born, unique and eternal, who inexpressibly proceeded from
 God the Father without flux or passion, and was born of him not

190 : ܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 , ܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ : ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 195 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 200 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 .ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ

f. 130vb

ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 205 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 210 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ
 ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ

AD

- Line 191: ܕܘܢܘܢ, D: ܕܘܢܘܢ.
- Line 194: ܕܘܢܘܢ, D: ܕܘܢܘܢ.
- Line 195: ܕܘܢܘܢ, D: ܕܘܢܘܢ.
- Line 196: ܕܘܢܘܢ, D: ܕܘܢܘܢ.
- Line 207: ܕܘܢܘܢ, D: ܕܘܢܘܢ.
- Line 208: ܕܘܢܘܢ, D: ܕܘܢܘܢ.
- Line 209: ܕܘܢܘܢ, D: ܕܘܢܘܢ.

172/173 cf. supra, 122-123 174/175 cf. supra, ch. 32, 29 185/195 Dam.
 Alex., Adv. Trith., 16 (n° 40) 188/195 Petr. IV Alex., fragm. hucusque
 incognitum

subsequently in time but being, with the Father, creator of times, is neither Father nor Spirit; neither, indeed, is the holy and hypostatic Spirit, who is united to Father and Son substantially and naturally and adored with them, either Father or Son'. These are the father's words you set down. But look at what you said by way of explanation of them later, when you said: But afterwards those who blather such things read the father's words apparently in a perfunctory way, unable to look at them dispassionately. For see how he has expounded in the text previously set down the God-befitting generation of God the Word from God the Father, by writing as follows: 'Who inexpressibly proceeded from God the Father without flux or passion, and was born of him not subsequently in time'. So if God the Word, who is professed as 'God', proceeded inexpressibly without flux or passion from him who is professed as God the Father, how can he, according to this profession, not be perfect 'God from God'? You wrote the following again in the 17th chapter: For just as the generation of the Son from God the Father has surpassed our human condition and is not confined to our ways, so too the mode of our consubstantiality; though it gives a dim indication to the orthodox profession of true religion, nevertheless it is impossible to say how far short the illustration falls from the truth.

You will notice, * my good fellow, the force of what you have quoted and written. For that saint Peter, who occupied the presidency of this great city in holy fashion, says: The Father is God the Father in the full sense. What? If (as you think) God the Father is both participant and participated, is it not clear that the master of mysteries would have believed that the Father is not one and one only hypostasis, but also the substance comprehending

197/206 Dam. Alex., Adv. Trith., 16 (n° 41) 201/203 cf. supra, 190-192 206 Symb. Nic., 4 (ed. Dossetti, p. 228) 207/211 Dam. Alex., Adv. Trith., 17 (n° 42) 214/215 cf. supra, 188-189 215/216 cf. supra, 7

...
 215 ...
 ...
 220 ...
 ...
 225 ...
 ...
 230 ...
 ...
 235 ...

... f. 131ra
 ...
 240 ...
 ...

AD

Line 230: ... D: ...

then participant and participated must have been born of participant and participated. In which case, it is not the Son alone who has proceeded from the Father alone, but indeed also the whole substance of the Godhead * from the whole substance of the Godhead; or, if we might say something more clearly blasphemous, the Holy Trinity was born of the Holy Trinity.

245 What are we to say of GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN, not to mention divine Scripture itself or the entire number of divinely inspired fathers who eradicate and overturn such madness from the very foundations? For he wrote in the *Second Oration on the Son*, as follows: But let us proceed to the appellations of the Son, which is 250 the starting-point of the argument. For I think he is called 'Son' as being the same thing in substance as the Father, and not only that, but as being also therefrom. Whereas he is called 'Only-begotten', not only because he alone is from the only one, but also because he is so in a unique mode, unlike bodies. And again, in the *Oration on Heron the Philosopher*: 255 Truly we call the Father 'Father', and much more truly than with our human fathers; because he is Father solely, in his own fashion, and unlike bodies; and sole, for without intercourse; and he is Father of the sole, for of the Only-begotten; and only: for not first, a son; and wholly

249/254 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 30, 19-20 (PG 36, 128C-129A; *SChr.*, vol. 250, p. 266); cf. supra, b. II, ch. 22, 198-203 255/265 Greg. Naz., *Or.* 25, 16 (PG 35, 1221AB; *SChr.*, vol. 284, p. 196)

265 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 , 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 * : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 f. 131rb
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰

𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 275 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 280 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 : 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰
 285 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰

AD flor. II 𐌸𐌹𐌳𐌰 I. 271

Line 266: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, flor. II: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰.
 Line 267: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, flor. II: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰.
 Line 269: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, flor. II: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰.
 Lines 277-278: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, cf. Book II, ch. 22, lines 221-222 (𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰).
 Line 279: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, D: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰.
 Lines 279-280: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, cf. Book II, ch. 22, lines 223-224 (𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰).
 Line 280: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, cf. ibid., line 224 (𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰). 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, cf. ibid., line 225 (𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰).
 Line 281: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, D: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰. 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰, D: 𐌲𐌹𐌳𐌰.

Father of a whole - something unknown, indeed, with us; and from the
 260 beginning, for not latterly. Truly we call the Son 'Son', because he is Son
 solely, of the sole, and in a unique way, and only. For he will not later be
 Father, and the whole is Son and of the whole, and from the beginning
 and has never begun to be Son, for Godhead does not change its mind,
 nor is deification progressive so that the one should ever lack anything of
 265 being Father or the other of being Son.

You have, my admirable fellow, heard the doctor loudly saying:
 Whereas he is called 'Only-begotten', not only because he alone is from
 the only one'. And again: Solely, in his own fashion, and unlike bodies;
 and sole, for without intercourse; and he is Father of the sole, for of the
 270 Only-begotten. But again: Truly we call the Son 'Son', because he is
 Son solely, of the sole, and in a unique way, and only.

How, then, if God the Father, and again also God the Word, is
 both participant and participated, and God the Word was born of
 God the Father, sole Son of sole Father, will it not be found that
 275 the whole substance of Godhead (i.e. the Holy Trinity) was born
 of the whole substance * of Godhead (which is the same as saying
 of the Holy Trinity)? Or are you professing that the Son and Word
 was born of the Father, but not God the Word from God the
 Father? In which case, cancel from what you wrote: For see how he

267/268 cf. supra, 252-253 268/270 cf. supra, 256-258 270/271 cf.
 supra, 260-261 279/281 cf. supra, 199-201

286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305

295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305

300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305

f. 131va

AD

Line 287: *h'w'w'*, corrected in A from *h'w'w'w'*.
 Line 288: *,w'w'w'w'w'*, cf. infra, line 299 (*,w'w'w'w'w'*).
 Line 294: *w'w'w'*, D: *w'w'w'w'*.
 Line 298: *w'w'w'w'*, D: *w'w'w'w'w'*.
 Line 299: *,w'w'w'w'w'*, cf. supra, line 288 (*,w'w'w'w'w'*).
 Line 309: *w'w'w'w'*, D: *w'w'w'w'w'*. *w'w'w'w'w'*, D: *w'w'w'w'w'w'*.

280 has expounded the God-befitting generation of God the Word from God
 the Father; but, again, obliterate too: So if God the Word, who is
 professed as 'God', proceeded inexpressibly without flux or passion from
 him who is professed as God the Father, how can he, according to this
 profession, not be perfect God from God? Rightly negate also: Just as
 285 the generation of the Son from God the Father, so that you may agree
 if only with yourself!

But we are, it seems, forgetting that you do think things consist-
 ent with yourself in professing the Father both as Son and Holy
 Ghost, and likewise the Son as both Father and Holy Ghost and
 290 similarly the Holy Ghost as both Father and Son. For these Jewish
 and godless doctrines are yours and your Libyan master's. And
 pay close heed and consider intelligently the words lest, so cun-
 ning and deep-minded as you are, we falsely and wrongfully
 condemn you. For we shall show you again, as briefly and con-
 295 cisely as possible, what has already been said, and remind you
 of your own words. For you expressly said in your *Many-lined
 Letter* the following: So when we join the common to the property and
 say 'God the Father', we do not simply indicate only the hypostasis by
 the terms, but the substantial hypostasis: by saying 'God' we make plain
 300 the substance and the common; by the denomination 'Father' we indicate
 the hypostasis and the properness of the prosopon, and again: So God
 the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypo-
 stasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis.

281/284 cf. supra, 203-206 284/285 cf. supra, 207 297/301 cf. supra,
 ch. 32, 20-25 301/303 cf. supra, ch. 32, 29-30

310 —
 —
 —
 —
 —
 315 —
 —

—
 —
 320 —
 —
 —
 325 —
 —
 —
 —
 330 —
 —
 —
 —
 335 —
 —

AD

Line 315: $\alpha\theta\omega\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, D: $\alpha\theta\omega\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 316: $\alpha\theta\omega\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, D: $\alpha\theta\omega\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 325: $\alpha\theta\omega\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, D: $\alpha\theta\omega\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.
 Line 333: $\alpha\theta\omega\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, D: $\alpha\theta\omega\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, as supra, ch. 33, line 429.

You have now called God the Father not simply a hypostasis but a
 305 substantial hypostasis and both participant and participated. Readers
 ought, then, to know too what you think a participant and
 participated is. * But they will easily learn this, again from your
 words themselves. For you wrote: But divination would now be
 required for us to ascertain the faults found in them, so that a defence rel-
 310 evant to the charge could be produced. So, they have made the charge
 that we belied the patriarch and fabricated things he did not say and
 palmed them off on him, and that it is not true that the God-clad man said
 that hypostasis is the participant whereas substance is the participated.
 For such a falsification (or, to speak more aptly, misrepresentation) is
 315 reprehensible and deserving of death many times over. And you have
 acknowledged by these words that God the Father is both partici-
 pant and participated, and that the participant and participated, is
 both hypostasis and substance comprehending the hypostases.

But if you also say (which I do not think you will) that you did
 320 not say that the participated is the substance comprehending the
 hypostases, remember your subsequent words. For you also wrote
 the following, a few lines after your words just quoted: So, we
 ought here to set down again the patristic text from which I produced the
 rebuttal of the opposition in the same chapter. For perhaps those who
 325 read the book along with you turned their minds to something else and
 omitted it then in the examination; it is as follows: 'Therefore each of

304/305 cf. supra, 298-299 305 cf. supra, 302 308/315 cf. supra, ch. 32, 85-92 322/333 cf. supra, ch. 32, 92-103

340
 345
 350
 355
 360

340
 345
 350
 355
 360

340
 345
 350
 355
 360

340
 345
 350
 355
 360

f. 131vb

AD

Line 341: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$, D: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\alpha\kappa$.
 Lines 342-350: $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ $\mu\eta\theta\iota$, cf. supra, ch. 32, lines 91-100 (a few small variants).
 Line 360: $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$, cf. ibid., line 102 ($\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota$). $\kappa\alpha\theta\iota\omega\upsilon\sigma$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\iota\omega\upsilon\sigma$, cf. ibid., line 103 ($\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota$ $\mu\eta\theta\iota$).

the hypostases participates in the substance, but the substance is the participated holding all the hypostases participating in it by equality of honour in a common and generic principle. For each of us participates in the common manhood and the one substance over all, and is one man and one hypostasis. But he will not be called, because he participates in the substance, not a hypostasis but substance. For the former is the participant whereas the latter is the participated'.

This makes it clear, my excellent fellow, that you thought of the participated as the whole substance comprehending the hypostases, the substance which (as has already been proved) our God-clad father Severus defined as being the Holy Trinity. For (as we set down) at one point, aiming at the Grammarian from Caesarea, he said: With the consequence that in this way, as a result of this subtle confusion of yours, the whole substance of the Godhead i.e. * the Holy Trinity, will be found to be incarnate in the whole substance of manhood; and at another point: For it is not the Godhead's substance in the generic sense (which is the Holy Trinity) which was incarnated into the substance and whole genus of manhood.

Tell us clearly and let us know how then (if, as you think, God the Father is, and likewise, too, God the Word is both participant and participated, and if God the Word was born of God the Father, sole

339/341 cf. supra, ch. 33, 139-142 342/344 cf. supra, ch. 33, 156-158
 345/347 cf. supra, 301-302

365
 370

375
 380

385

AD

Line 363: אֲהַרְבַּח הַיְהוּדָה, cf. ibid., line 106 (אֲהַרְבַּח).

Line 364: אֲהַרְבַּח, cf. ibid. (אֲהַרְבַּח הַיְהוּדָה).

Line 367: אֲהַרְבַּח, D: אֲהַרְבַּח.

Line 371: אֲהַרְבַּח, D: אֲהַרְבַּח.

Line 375: אֲהַרְבַּח, D: אֲהַרְבַּח.

Line 385: At the top of fol. 96v D reads as follows: אֲהַרְבַּח הַיְהוּדָה, אֲהַרְבַּח הַיְהוּדָה. Of the patriarch Mar Peter against Damian.

f. 132ra

Son from sole Father), the whole substance of the Godhead was not born of the common substance of the Godhead (which is the same as saying the Holy Trinity of the Holy Trinity). Or, if you cannot do this aright through your redoubtable and invincible reasonings, merely prove by any little statement you like, by any God-clad doctor, that God the Father or God the Word is both participant and participated, and it will suffice us, because we shall be better persuaded by a patristic testimony than by any clear demonstration. However, you will never prove it. So why do you chatter away garrulously about divine doctrines like youths telling tales in the market-place, and endanger yourself and insult the faith of Christians by uttering whatever comes into your mouth, and by self-contradictorily (as has now been proved often) defining each hypostasis of the Holy Trinity now as unsubstantial and hence as completely non-subsistent and non-existent, now professing it unlawfully not substantial but rather as the whole substance of the Godhead or Holy Trinity, by saying: So God the Father is both participant and participated i.e. is a substantial hypostasis and not simply only an indication of a hypostasis?

: ἁπομονῆς καὶ ἀπομονῆς ἵνα ἴσῃ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 390 : ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 395 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 400 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 405 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ
 ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἡ θεοῦ

AD

Line 388: ἁπομονῆς καὶ ἀπομονῆς ἵνα ἴσῃ. These words are inserted in the margin in D.

Line 398: ἁπομονῆς, D: ἁπομονῆς.

364/366 cf. supra, 301-303

APPENDIX

Addenda and corrigenda to volumes I and II

Volume I.

- p. 246, line 2 from bottom, instead of '26' read '29'
- p. 250, line 3 from bottom, after 'Luc. 10:22', insert 'Ioh. 3:35'
- p. 356, line 4 from bottom, instead of 'Luc. 10:21' read 'Matth. 11:27;
Luc. 10:22'
- p. 374, col. B, line 7 from bottom, after 'XVIII, 148', insert 'XXII, 586'
- p. 375, col. A, lines 10-11, instead of '10, 21 ... XVIII, 148' read
'10, 22 XVIII, 148; XXII, 586'
- p. 375, col. A, line 23, after 'XVIII, 141' insert ', 148'
- p. 383, line 6, instead of '26' read '29'

Volume II.

- p. 232, line 5, delete 'immortal'
- p. 490, line 1, instead of '*I am has sent*' read '*He who is has sent*'
- p. 522, lines 2-1 from bottom, instead of 'Locum non invenimus', read
'cf. Bas. Caes., *Adv. Eun.* I, 23 (PG 29, 564C; *SChr.*, vol. 299,
pp. 254-256)'
- p. 549, line 19, instead of 'Lourič' read 'Lourié'
- p. 557, col. B, delete lines 2-1 from bottom
- p. 559, after line 5, insert:
23 (564C; pp. 254-256) XIX, 185-187, 206-207
- p. 559, line 21, delete '(an CPG 2950?)'

INDICES

INDEX NOMINVM

INDEX LOCORVM S. SCRIPTVRAE

INDEX ALIORVM FONTIVM

INDEX NOMINVM
ET VOCVM QVARVNDAM EX EIS FORMATARVM*

- Abel XXVII, 331, 333, 406, 414, 416,
430, 434, 436, 509
Adam XXVII, 331, 333, 406, 414, 416,
429, 434, 435, 509
Anatolius XXXIII, 232
Andreas XXX, 244
Anomean XXV, 501, 540, 553
Antioch XXIX, 219
Arabian XXV, 192
Arian XX, 250; XXIII, 34, 74; XXV,
109, 125; XXVIII, 115; XXX, 257,
305, 306; XXXIII, 239
Arianism XXVIII, 160
Ario-maniac XXXIV, 61
Aristotle XXII, 207
Arius XXI, 123; XXV, 152; XXXIII,
291, 355, 377
Asterius XXXIII, 232
Athanasius XXIX, 240; XXXIII, 231,
288, 300, 352

Baal XXI, 32, 72
Basil XX, 176; XXII, 30, 186; XXIV,
17, 30, 35, 56, 71, 74 (bis); XXVI,
220; XXVII, 398; XXVIII, 139;
XXXI, 40, 134, 159, 420; XXXII,
69, 144, 242; XXXIII, 218, 292,
300, 356; XXXIV, 19, 81
Basilides XXXIII, 292, 356

Caesarea XXXI, 218; XXXIV, 338
Chalcedon XXXIV, 58
Christ XXIII, 184; XXIX, 51, 121,
294; XXXI, 32, 296, 486, 517, 518;
XXXII, 274; XXXIII, 137, 138,
155; XXXIV, 35 - cf. Jesus
Christian XXIV, 139; XXVI, 333;
XXXI, 238; XXXII, 132, 269;
XXXIV, 359
Chrysippus XXII, 207
Constantine XXXIV, 56
Cymatius XXXIII, 232
Cyril XX, 189; XXII, 80, 94; XXIII,
188, 270, 278, 382, 401; XXIV, 223;
XXV, 26, 204; XXVI, 118; XXVIII,
13, 60, 180, 186, 228; XXIX, 9, 12,
47, 81, 84, 90, 138, 141, 147, 208,
282, 284, 295; XXX, 3, 10, 15, 50,
65, 90, 111, 314, 336, 345; XXXIII,
259; XXXIV, 26, 54, 84

Damian XXIV, 68; XXV, 62, 67
David XXI, 94; XXIII, 257; XXXI, 92
Dionysius XXIX, 241

Elijah the Tishbite XX, 160, 181; XXI,
15; XXVI, 349 - Elijah the prophet
XXI, 29
Elkanah XXV, 323, 333, 335, 347,
362; XXXI, 108
Ethiopian XX, 254, 257
Eunomius XX, 8, 20, 25, 29, 65, 89,
97, 105, 113, 116, 142, 194, 207;
XXI, 205; XXII, 31, 187; XXIII,
314; XXIV, 82, 244; XXV, 499,
524, 538, 544, 551, 559; XXVI, 3,
11, 14, 29, 36, 40, 50, 58, 64, 68
(bis), 82, 111, 136, 141, 164, 194,
199, 203, 252, 263, 281, 288-289,
307, 311, 323, 338, 340; XXVII, 7,
27, 35, 42, 83, 92, 98, 157, 162, 167,
169, 202, 204, 207, 215, 223, 227,
233, 236, 248, 258, 387, 400, 401,
425, 515, 533; XXVIII, 358; XXX,
44-45, 82, 257, 258, 267, 315, 333;
XXXI, 79, 243, 318, 320-321, 416,
421, 428; XXXIV, 20
Eusebius XXXIII, 232

* To Professor J. Noret we owe the final version of the indices.

- Eustathius XXIX, 219
 Eutyches XXVII, 477; XXIX, 60; XXXI, 296; XXXIV, 59
 Felicissimus XXIX, 32; XXXIII, 317, 323
 Gerontius XXXI, 378-379; XXXII, 105, 152
 Grammarian (the) XX, 231; XXI, 24; XXIII, 201 (bis), 203, 209, 217; XXV, 130-131, 320; XXVII, 491; XXX, 343; XXXI, 107, 204, 218; XXXIII, 134, 150, 163; XXXIV, 66-67, 105, 338 - vide etiam Sergius the Grammarian
 Gregory (of Nazianzus) XX, 74, 219, 221; XXI, 328; XXIII, 33, 355; XXV, 180; XXVIII, 60; XXIX, 50, 60, 72, 119, 204; XXXI, 207, 221, 235, 467, 525; XXXIII, 279; XXXIV, 245 - cf. Theologian (the)
 Gregory (of Nyssa) XX, 6, 11, 18, 115, 121; XXI, 204, 261; XXII, 145, 211; XXIII, 313; XXIV, 81, 243; XXV, 491, 507, 525, 545; XXVI, 3, 61, 244; XXVII, 4, 62, 507; XXVIII, 65, 225; XXX, 275, 303; XXXI, 78, 137, 242, 321
 Hermias XXIII, 385; XXVIII, 229; XXX, 256, 350; XXXIV, 43, 49
 Heron XXXIV, 254
 Immanuel XXXIII, 150 - cf. Jesus
 Isauria XXXIV, 57
 Israel XXXIV, 69
 Israelite XX, 161, 182; XXI, 16; XXVI, 350 - cf. Jew
 Jeremiah XXI, 310; XXXII, 160
 Jesus XXIII, 184; XXXIV, 35 - cf. Christ, Immanuel
 Jew XXVI, 353; XXIX, 68 - cf. Israel, Israelite
 Jewish XXX, 38, 82, 228; XXXII, 284; XXXIV, 290
 Job XXV, 323, 326, 328, 336, 362; XXXI, 108; XXXIV, 74
 John (apostle) XXV, 96, 240; XXVI, 120; XXXIII, 260; XXXIV, 27, 69
 John the Grammarian - cf. Grammarian (the)
 Judaism XXX, 84; XXXI, 56
 Julian XXIX, 103; XXXI, 294; XXXIII, 313, 322
 Libyan XXX, 228; XXXII, 285; XXXIV, 291 - cf. Sabellius
 Lucifer XXXIII, 232
 Manes XXXI, 296
 Manichee XXXI, 299
 Marcellus XXXI, 494
 Mark XXX, 370
 Maron XXII, 94; XXXI, 125; XXXIV, 127
 Mary XXXIII, 153; XXXIV, 112, 139 - cf. Virgin (the)
 Mopsuestia - cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia
 Moses XXXIV, 67
 Naaman the Syrian XXII, 95; XXXIV, 127-128
 Neocaesarea XXXI, 52
 Nestorian XXIII, 218-219
 Nestorianism XXIII, 218
 Nestorius XXIII, 205, 208; XXVII, 477; XXIX, 48
 Nicaea XXXIII, 238
 Novatus XXVII, 479
 Nyssa XX, 18; XXI, 204, 262; XXII, 145; XXIII, 313; XXIV, 82, 243; XXV, 491, 507; XXVI, 3; XXVII, 4; XXVIII, 65, 225; XXX, 275; XXXI, 243, 321
 Paralos XXX, 14; XXXI, 400; XXXII, 105, 129
 Paul XXIX, 56, 124; XXX, 370, 373; XXXI, 46, 68; XXXIV, 35 (bis)
 Peter (apostle) XXIX, 56, 122; XXX, 370, 373, 374
 Peter (martyr) XXXIII, 323; XXXIV, 184, 213
 Ramah XXXI, 110, 112

- Sabellius XXI, 122; XXII, 90; XXX, 29, 72; XXXI, 479, 494; XXXIII, 373; XXXIV, 62 - cf. Libyan
 Samaritan XXI, 21
 Samuel XXV, 324
 Scythian XX, 254
 Seleucia XXXIV, 56
 Sergius the Grammarian XXIX, 45-46, 208
 Severus XX, 220, 229; XXI, 23, 308; XXII, 94, 225; XXIII, 202, 217; XXV, 6, 19, 44, 49, 65, 155, 199, 312; XXVII, 472, 502; XXVIII, 61; XXIX, 30, 103, 207; XXX, 340, 381; XXXI, 6, 105, 152, 172, 202, 267, 293, 462; XXXII, 181, 196, 223; XXXIII, 131, 316; XXXIV, 55, 92, 103, 160, 337
 Sion - cf. Zion
 Syrian - cf. Naaman the Syrian
 Theodore of Mopsuestia XXV, 134
 Theodosius XXIX, 224, 268
 Theologian (the) XX, 74, 219-220, 251; XXI, 328; XXIII, 8, 33, 72, 355; XXV, 180; XXVIII, 60, 98, 112, 142; XXIX, 50, 120, 204; XXXI, 207, 221, 235, 467, 526; XXXIII, 280, 348; XXXIV, 245 - cf. Gregory (of Nazianzus)
 Thomas XXX, 370, 374
 Timothy XXXIII, 324
 Tishbite - cf. Elijah
 Uz XXXI, 109, 112, 118, 124
 Valentinus XXXI, 296
 Virgin (the) XXXI, 490; XXXIV, 115 - cf. Mary
 Zachariah (messenger of Damian) XXIII, 230; XXX, 14; XXXI, 216; XXXII, 129
 Zion XXI, 313

INDEX LOCORVM SACRAE SCRIPTVRAE

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Genesis | | Canticum | | | |
| 7, 2 | XXV, 195-196 | 2, 15 | XXV, 192 et 194 | | |
| 7, 3 | XXV, 195-196 | | | | |
| 7, 8 | XXV, 195-196 | Iob | | | |
| | | 1, 1 | XXXI, 109, 110, 111, 111-112, 117-118, 123-124 | | |
| Exodus | | 27, 3 | XXXIV, 75-76 | | |
| 3, 14 | XXIV, 248-249; XXV, 51 (bis), 98 (bis), 166, 167, 246 (bis), 253 (bis); XXX, 288, 296, 297; XXXI, 179, 183, 194, 200-201, 241, 280, 586, 590, 602, 610, 615-616, 624, 629, 632, 641-642, 644, 646; XXXIV, 68-69 | 38, 28 | XXV, 54, 71-72, 82 | | |
| | | Siracides | | | |
| 19, 12-13 | XXV, 186-187 | 16, 17 | XXI, 100-101 | | |
| 19, 13 | XXV, 174 | 16, 23 | XXI, 101-102 | | |
| | | 26, 14 | XXII, 229 | | |
| I Regnorum | | Habacuc | | | |
| 1, 1 | XXXI, 109-110, 111, 112 | 1, 8 | XXV, 192 | | |
| | | 2, 6-7 | XXVII, 499-501 | | |
| III Regnorum | | Sophonias | | | |
| 18, 21 | XX, 161-162, 182-183; XXI, 16-17, 31-32, 71-72; XXVI, 350-351 | 3, 3 | XXV, 192 | | |
| | | Isaias | | | |
| IV Regnorum | | 6, 9 | XXV, 58-59 | | |
| 17, 33 | XXI, 21-22, 25-26 | 42, 18 | XXI, 251-252, 304; XXVII, 21, 25 | | |
| 17, 41 | XXI, 26-29 | Jeremias | | | |
| | | 3, 3 | XXVII, 402-403 | | |
| Psalmi | | 13, 23 | XX, 257-258; XXV, 189 | | |
| 4, 7 | XXXIV, 46-47 | Lamentationes | | | |
| 7, 12 | XXXI, 92-93 | 2, 18 | XXI, 313-314 | | |
| 32, 6 | XXXIII, 226-227 | Ezechiel | | | |
| 48, 13 | XXXI, 116-117 | 8, 12 | XXI, 99 | | |
| 57, 10 | XXI, 213-214, 222-223 | Matthaeus | | | |
| 67, 31 | XXI, 95, 96 | 7, 6 | XXV, 191 | | |
| 74, 6 | XXVI, 125-126 | 7, 26 | XXIII, 256 | | |
| 128, 6-8 | XXIII, 257-260 | 11, 27 | XXII, 83, 86-87, 90-91; XXV, 103-105 | | |
| 138, 7 | XXXIV, 44-45 | 12, 37 | XXIX, 265-266 | | |
| Proverbia | | 13, 13-14 | XXV, 58-59 | | |
| 1, 20-21 | XXXIII, 332-334 | | | | |
| | | 21, 41 | XXV, 175, 188 | | |
| | | 22, 29 | XXVI, 353-354 | | |
| | | Marcus | | | |
| | | 4, 12 | XXV, 58-59 | | |
| | | Lucas | | | |
| | | 8, 10 | XXV, 58-59 | | |
| | | 10, 22 | XXII, 83, 86-87, 90-91; XXV, 103-105 | | |
| | | 19, 40 | XXVII, 317-318 | | |
| | | Iohannes | | | |
| | | 1, 1 | XXV, 50-51, 96-98, 240-241, 243-246, 252; XXXIV, 72 | | |
| | | 1, 3 | XXXIV, 28, 53-54 | | |
| | | 1, 14 | XXXIV, 109, 130-131 | | |
| | | 3, 35 | XXII, 83, 86-87, 90-91 | | |
| | | 8, 29 | XXXIII, 269-270 | | |
| | | 13, 3 | XXII, 83, 86-87, 90-91 | | |
| | | 15, 26 | XXV, 393-394 | | |
| | | 16, 15 | XXII, 79-80 | | |
| | | 16, 21 | XX, 21-22, 202-203; XXVI, 33, 189-190, 302-303; XXVII, 40 | | |
| | | Actus Apostolorum | | | |
| | | 28, 26 | XXV, 58-59 | | |
| | | Ad Romanos | | | |
| | | 16, 18 | XXIV, 20-22 | | |
| | | I ad Corinthios | | | |
| | | 1, 1 | XXXIV, 35 | | |
| | | 1, 9 | XXXIV, 33-35 | | |
| | | 1, 24 | XXXIV, 51, 87 | | |
| | | 3, 11 | XXXI, 239 | | |
| | | II ad Corinthios | | | |
| | | 1, 1 | XXXIV, 35 | | |
| | | 4, 4 | XXXIV, 51, 87 | | |
| | | Ad Galatas | | | |
| | | 4, 7 | XXXIV, 36-37 | | |
| | | Ad Ephesios | | | |
| | | 1, 1 | XXXIV, 35 | | |
| | | 4, 6 | XXIII, 84 | | |
| | | Ad Colossenses | | | |
| | | 1, 1 | XXXIV, 35 | | |
| | | 1, 15 | XXXIV, 51, 87 | | |
| | | I ad Timotheum | | | |
| | | 6, 3 | XXV, 186 | | |
| | | II ad Timotheum | | | |
| | | 1, 1 | XXXIV, 35 | | |
| | | 1, 13 | XXV, 186 | | |
| | | 2, 5 | XXVI, 69 | | |
| | | Ad Hebraeos | | | |
| | | 1, 3 | XXII, 84; XXV, 106; XXXIV, 51-52 | | |
| | | I Petri | | | |
| | | 5, 8 | XXV, 190 | | |
| | | II Petri | | | |
| | | 3, 16 | XXIX, 57-59, 123-125 | | |
| | | I Iohannis | | | |
| | | 1, 1 | XXXIV, 72-73 | | |
| | | Iudas | | | |
| | | 19 | XXIV, 20-22 | | |
| | | Apocalypsis | | | |
| | | 1, 8 | XXXIV, 73 | | |

INDEX ALIORVM FONTIVM

ATHANASIUS ALEXANDRINUS

Oratio IV contra Arianos (CPG 2230). PG 26, 468-525. Ed. Anton STEGMANN, *Die pseudoathanasianische "IVte Rede gegen die Arianer" als "κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγος"* ein Apollinarisgut, Rottenburg a.N., 1917, pp. 43-87.

2 (469 CD; pp. 45-46) XXXIII, 289-291

Tomus ad Antiochenos (CPG 2134). PG 26, 796-809.

5-6 (800 D - 801 C) XXXIII, 233-258

BASILIUS CAESARIENSIS

Adversus Eunomium I. PG 29, 497-572. Ed. Bernard SESBOUÉ, *Basile de Césarée. Contre Eunome, suivi de Eunome, Apologie*. Tome I (SChr. 299), Paris, 1982, pp. 140-268.

5 (516 AC; pp. 170-174) XXII, 190-209
5 (520 B; p. 180) XXVI, 222-226, (266-269); (XXVII, 47-50); (XXXI, 421-425)
5 (521 A; pp. 180-182) XXVI, 226-230
23 (564 C; pp. 254-256) XXVII, 401-404

Adversus Eunomium II. PG 29, 573-652. Ed. Bernard SESBOUÉ, *Basile de Césarée. Contre Eunome, suivi de Eunome, Apologie*. Tome II (SChr. 305), Paris, 1983, pp. 10-142.

4 (577 C; p. 20) XXXIII, 293-294
7 (588 BC; p. 36) XXII, 32-36
23 (621 BC; p. 92) XXXIV, 20-26, (81-83)

Adversus Eunomium V. PG 29, 709-773.

713 B XXXIII, 225-230
749 B XXXIII, 219-224

Epistula 38. PG 32, 325-340. Ed. Marcella FORLIN PATRUCCO, *Basilio di Cesarea. Le lettere, I* (Corona Patrum 11), Torino, 1983, pp. 178-194.

3 (328 AB; p. 180) XXXI, 41-51, (64-73), (133-134)

Epistula 210. PG 32, 768-777. Ed. Yves COURTONNE, *Saint Basile. Lettres*. Tome II (Collection des Universités de France), Paris, 1961, pp. 189-197.

5 (776 BC; pp. 195-196) XXXI, 53-60, (73-77), (135), (159-161), (162-163), (166-168), (196-198)
5 (776 C; p. 196) XXVIII, 139-140

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 B; p. 53) XXXII, 147-148, (68-69)

PS. BASILIUS CAESARIENSIS

De eis qui dicunt Filium esse dissimilem Patri. Ed. Albert VAN ROEY, *Une homélie inédite contre les Anoméens attribuée à saint Basile de Césarée*, in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 28 (1998), pp. 179-191.

pp. 189-190 (pp. 185,58 - 186,69) XXVI, 231-241

CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS

Apologia XII capitulorum contra Orientales (CPG 5221). PG 76, 316-385. Ed. Eduard SCHWARTZ, *ACO I*, t. 7, pp. 33-65.

Anath. 12 (380 CD; p. 62, 21-26) XXX, 244-251

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).

I, 5 (73, 85 AB; t. I, p. 72) XXXIV, 28-42, (84-85)
V, 5 (73, 844 B; t. II, pp. 47-48) XXXIII, 260-270
VIII, fragm. partim incogn. (cf. t. II, p. 332) XXVI, 120-130

De sanctissima Trinitate Dialogi (CPG 5216). PG 75, 657-1124. Ed. Georges Matthieu DE DURAND, *Cyrille d'Alexandrie. Dialogues sur la Trinité*. Tomes I-III (SChr. 231, 237, 246), Paris, 1976-1978.

I (697 D - 700 C; t. I, pp. 194-198) XXX, 350-380
II (720 B - 721 A; t. I, pp. 232-236) XXVIII, 286-318, (324-325), (332-335), (335-336), (337), (341-343), (348-354), (355), (356-357), (389-394); (XXIX, 186-192), (299-305)
II (741 AB; t. I, p. 272) XXVIII, 229-240, (260-263), (278-280), (385-386), (386-389); (XXIX, 169-177), (178-180), (192-193), (194-196), (305-307), (308-310); (XXX, 55-58), (101-106), (168-170), (176-177), (202-205), (210-212)
II (741 AB; t. I, p. 272) XXIII, 385-387, (402-404); (XXV, 26-29)
II (741 CD; t. I, p. 274) XXVIII, 373-380, (395-397); (XXIX, 196-199), (311-313); (XXX, 107-109), (170-173), (214-216)
II (741 D; t. I, p. 274) XXIII, 388-390, (404-407); (XXV, 29-31)
V (945 A; t. II, p. 288) XXXIV, 43-47, (85-86)
VI (1049 BC; t. III, pp. 94-96) XXXIV, 50-54, (86-87)

Thesaurus (CPG 5215). PG 75, 9-656.

Ass. VI (80 CD) XXVIII, 187-196; (XXIX, 9-10), (13-14), (154), (165-166)
Ass. XXIII (381 A) XXII, 82-93, (80)
Ass. XXXI (444 BC) XXIV, 224-230

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. 3 (no. 3) XXIX, 224-231, (268-272)
 c. 9 (no. 20) XXIX, 232-239, (272-274)
 (no. 21) XXIX, 240-244, (274-277)
 c. 10 (no. 25) XXIX, 247-251
 (no. 26) XXIX, 251-254
 c. 13 (no. 31) XXV, 297-306; (XXIX, 255-260), (278-279)
 (no. 32) XXX, 306-312
 c. 14 (no. 36) XX, 248-258
 (no. 37) XX, 258-266
 c. 16 (no. 40) XXXIV, 185-195
 (no. 41) XXXIV, 197-206, (279-281), (281-284)
 c. 17 (no. 42) XXXIV, 207-211, (284-285)

Apologia secunda, seu epistula per Zachariam tradita.

- Initium: XXXII, 130-131
 XXIII, 232-237
 XXX, 15-24, (64-69), (110-115), (125-128), (135-137), (138-141), (145-149), (150-151), (154)
 XXXI, 216-244, (278-280)
 XXXII, 130-140, (233-238)
 XXXI, 313-318, (330-335), (340-341), (342-343), (346-347), (355-357), (364-369)
 XXXI, 374-377, (407-411); (XXXII, 141-144), (238-242)
 XXXII, 144-150, (242-247)

Epistula festalis prima, cuius initium "Tempus gaudii orbis universi".

- Initium: XXI, 229-230
 XXI, 231-264, (284), (288-289), (303-305), (316-318), (319-326), (330); (XXII, 27-29), (69-71), (110-112), (114-116), (145-147), (252-253); (XXVII, 21), (25)
 XXII, 158-169
 XXII, 174-181
 XXII, 212-221, (240-243)
 XXIII, 185-190, (267-271), (275-279)

Epistula festalis secunda, cuius initium "Videns te benedixisse".

- XX, 17-37, (45-47), (150-152); (XXVI, 32-46); (XXVII, 188-189)
 XX, 108-111

- XXVI, 106-112, (131-136), (149-153); (XXVII, 195-199)
 XX, 159-175, (180-183), (184-185), (213-214); (XXI, 15-17), (79-84), (89), (147-152), (155-163), (176-179), (186), (190-193), (194-195); (XXIII, 19-28), (173-181), (261-263), (263-266), (281-283), (283-286), (391-392); (XXIV, 59-63), (125-129)
 XXIV, 16-23, (29-32), (41), (49-50), (51), (55-58), (70-72)
 XXIV, 110-121, (130-132), (140-145), (152-153), (180-183), (197-202), (206-209), (241), (279-284); (XXV, 35-36)
 XXV, 47-59, (19-22), (200-201)
 XXV, 491-503, (509-510), (510-513), (519-521), (531-534), (535-536), (537-541), (543-544), (551-555); (XXVI, 10-11), (95-99)
 XXVI, 345-351
 XXVI, 351-354
 XXVII, 62-72, (105-107), (120-121), (131-132), (132-133), (134-135), (136), (271-273), (274-275), (283), (284), (315), (316)
 XXVII, 328-359, (368-375), (379-380), (381-382), (394-395), (420-421), (423), (439-440), (451-454), (539-541), (546-549); (XXX, 196-197)
 XXVIII, 16-24, (31-33)
 XXVIII, 77-89
 XXVIII, 186-196

Epistula per Gerontium allata.

- XXXI, 379-383, (434-438), (443-445), (448-449); (XXXII, 106-109), (153-157), (214-217), (248-252); (XXXIII, 95-97), (100-101)

Epistula proluxa seu Apologia.

- XXIII, 115-122
 XXIV, 40, (42-43), (48), (53-54)
 XXXII, 20-28, (60-65), (287-294), (305-311), (314-315); (XXXIII, 20-22), (37-38), (76-78), (109-113), (387-391); (XXXIV, 297-301), (304-305)
 XXXII, 29-33, (66-67), (115-116), (200-202), (202-203), (219-220), (256), (262-263), (295-299); (XXXIII, 29-31), (42-

43), (49-54), (57-58), (64-66), (69-71), (71-74), (79-81), (391-393), (396-397), (407-408), (413); (XXXIV, 6-7), (98), (152-154), (174-175), (215-216), (220-221), (234-235), (301-303), (305), (345-347), (364-366)
 XXXII, 85-92, (206-214); (XXXIV, 308-315)
 XXXII, 92-103, (224-230); (XXXIV, 322-333)
 XXXIII, 280-295, (348-351), (351-359)
 XXXIII, 364-366
 XXXIII, 366-371, (399-402)
 XXXIII, 371-379

EUSTATHIUS ANTIOCHENUS

Commentarii in psalmum 92 (CPG 3356)

fragm. per Seuerum solum seruatum XXIX, 220-221

GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSIS

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; p. 68) XXIV, 261
 6 (1072 D; p. 70) XXIII, 108-110
 10 (1077 A; p. 78) XXVIII, 81-83, (86)

Oratio 23 (De pace III). PG 35, 1152-1168. Ed. Justin MOSSAY and Guy LAFONTAINE, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 20-23* (SChr. 270), Paris, 1980, pp. 280-310.

6 (1157 B; p. 292) XX, 73-75

Oratio 25 (In laudem Heronis philosophi). PG 35, 1197-1225. Ed. Justin MOSSAY and Guy LAFONTAINE, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 24-26* (SChr. 284), Paris, 1981, pp. 156-204.

16 (1221 AB; p. 196) XXXIV, 255-265, (268-270), (270-271)

Oratio 26 (In seipsum cum rure rediisset). PG 35, 1228-1252. Ed. Justin MOSSAY and Guy LAFONTAINE, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 24-26* (SChr. 284), Paris, 1981, pp. 224-272.

19 (1252 C; p. 270) XXIII, 81-84

Oratio 28 (Theologica II). PG 36, 25-72. Ed. Paul GALLAY and Maurice JOURJON, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques)* (SChr. 250), Paris, 1978, pp. 100-174.

2 (28 BD; pp. 102-104) XXV, 183-196, (174-175), (179-180)

Oratio 29 (Theologica III). PG 36, 73-104. Ed. Paul GALLAY and Maurice

JOURJON, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques)* (SChr. 250), Paris, 1978, pp. 176-224.

5 (80 B; p. 184) XXXI, 206-207, (220-221), (240-241), (253), (270-271); (XXXII, 135-136)
 10 (88 A; pp. 196-198) XXIII, 39-49, (53-56), (96-99)
 10 (88 AB; pp. 196-198) XXVIII, 118-130
 12 (89 AB; p. 200) XXIII, 99-108
 15 (93 B; p. 208) XX, 251-252
 19 (100 A; pp. 216-218) XXIX, 69-72

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.

19-20 (128 C - 129 A; p. 266) XXXIV, 249-254, (267-268)

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.

14 (149 A; p. 302) XXXI, 236-237

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) XXIII, 34-38, (50-51), (60), (74-76)
 16 (236 A; p. 194) XXI, 249-250, (255-256), (298), (328-329), (331); (XXII, 220-221), (252-253)

Oratio 37 (In dictum evangelii: "Cum consummasset..."). PG 36, 281-308. Ed. Claudio MORESCHINI, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 32-37* (SChr. 318), Paris, 1985, pp. 270-318.

4 (285 CD; p. 278) XX, 222-229

Oratio 38 (In Theophania). PG 36, 312-333. Ed. Claudio MORESCHINI, *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41* (SChr. 358), Paris, 1990, pp. 104-148.

2 (313 B; p. 106) XXIX, 61-62
 2 (313 B; p. 106) XXIX, 75-76

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) XXIII, 76-80, (91-95)
 14 (352 B; p. 182) XXIX, 205-207

Oratio 44 (In novam dominicam). PG 36, 608-621.

4 (612 B) XXIX, 64-65

GREGORIUS NYSSENUS

Contra Eunomium libri (CPG 3135). PG 45, 248-464 et 572-1121. Ed. Wernerus JAEGER, *Contra Eunomium libri* (GNO I-II), Leiden, 1960², vol. I, pp. 3-409; vol. II, pp. 3-311.

I: 280 C; t. I, p. 55, 11-14 XX, 176-178

- I: 284 A; t. I, p. 58, 5-7 XXVII, 83-85
 I: 320 D - 321 A; t. I, p. 94, 1-14 XXIII, 315-325
 I: 328 B; t. I, p. 100, 6-15 XXIV, 246-255
 I: 349 D - 352 A; t. I, pp. 121,22 - 122,5 XXXI, 323-329
 I: in lacuna; cf. t. I, p. 154 XXI, 208-219, (221-227)
 I: 397 BC; t. I, p. 164, 10-27 XXX, 280-292
 I: 397 D - 400 A; t. I, p. 165, 10-16 XXX, 294-299
 I: 400 C; t. I, p. 166, 18-20 XXX, 300-302
 I: 400 D - 401 A; t. I, p. 167, 5-19 XXIV, 84-96
 III, 1: 589 BC; t. II, pp. 27,21 - 28,6 XXVI, 69-80, (85), (89); (XXVII, 204), (207), (228), (239-246)
 III, 1: 589 C; t. II, p. 28, 6-8 XX, 116-119; (XXVII, 230-232)
 III, 1: 589 C - 592 A; t. II, pp. 28, 11 - 29,12 XXVI, 175-197, (200-203), (209-211), (212-214), (217-218), (245-252), (257-262), (274-281), (285-288), (289), (291-292), (300-310); (XXVII, 20-21), (21-25), (25-26), (31-38), (40), (148-151), (151-152), (158-165), (208-211), (211-214)
 III, 1: 589 D - 592 A; t. II, pp. 28, 19 - 29,12 XX, 195-210
 III, 1: 592 A; t. II, p. 29, 4-12 XX, 21-28, (62-69), (75-79), (83-84), (96-100), (124-127), (127-128), (132-133), (134-135), (138-145); (XXVI, 32-40); (XXVII, 88-95), (254-261), (263-264), (383-387), (534-535)
 III, 1: 592 AB; t. II, p. 29, 12-19 XXVII, 65-71, (112-118), (140-144), (293-295), (297-298), (300-302)
 III, 1: 592 B; t. II, p. 29, 19-26 XX, 28-34, (89-92); (XXVI, 40-46), (310-316); (XXVII, 46-47), (98-104), (387-393), (535-537)
 III, 1: 592 D; t. II, p. 30, 14-20 XXVII, 330-335, (406-408), (414-416), (418-419)
 III, 1: 592 D - 593 A; t. II, pp. 30, 24 - 31,3 XXVII, 516-523
 III, 1: 593 AB; t. II, p. 31, 7-20 XXVII, 345-356, (357-358), (452-453)
 III, 5: 761 BD; t. II, pp. 180,19 - 181,21 XXXI, 80-104, (138-142), (142-144), (150-151), (151-152)

Oratio catechetica magna (CPG 3150). PG 45, 9-105. Ed. Ekkehardus MÜHLENBERG, *Gregorii Nysseni Oratio Catechetica* (GNO III, 4), Leiden, 1996.

- 12 AB; pp. 6,14 - 7,6 XXII, 158-169
 12 C; p. 7, 13-19 XXII, 174-181

PETRUS IV ALEXANDRINUS

Fragmentum hucusque incognitum.

- XXXIV, 188-195, (201-203), (214-215), (219-220), (227-229), (237-238)

PETRUS CALLINICENSIS

Synodicon, fragmenta aliunde incognita.

- XXVI, 32-46
 XX, 36-37, (46-47), (151-152); (XXVII, 188-189)
 XX, 186-189
 XXI, 247-251, (255-256), (284); (XXII, 252-253)
 XXI, 289-299, (328-329), (331)
 XXVIII, 110-170
 XXVIII, 225-247

SEVERUS ANTIOCHENUS

Contra additiones Iuliani (CPG 7029). Ed. Robert HESPEL, *Sévère d'Antioche. La polémique antijulianiste. II A: Le Contra additiones Iuliani. Textus* (CSCO 295). Versio (CSCO 296), Louvain, 1968.

- 29 (p. 99, 2-12 [pp. 82,30 - 83,4]) XXXI, 294-302

Contra Felicissimum (CPG 7032), fragmenta per Petrum Callinicensem solum servata.

- II, 3 XXIX, 32-44
 V, 1 XXXIII, 317-336

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 prior. Textus* (CSCO 93). Versio (CSCO 94), Paris - Louvain, 1929.

- II, 1 (p. 56, 4-16 [p. 44, 19-29]) XXXIV, 67-76
 II, 1 (p. 59, 11-26 [p. 47, 7-22]) XXV, 321-332, (343-346), (352)
 II, 1 (p. 60, 18-20 [p. 48, 4-6]) XXV, 332-335, (347-348), (353)
 II, 1 (p. 61, 8-14 [p. 48, 22-27]) XXV, 335-340, (349-351), (353-354), (371-373)
 II, 1 (pp. 61,20 - 62,11 [pp. 48,33 - 49,19]) XXXI, 107-124, (153-155)
 II, 1 (pp. 63,1 - 64,16 [pp. 49,36 - 51,3]) XXV, 380-413, (422-426), (433-435), (441-450), (455-456), (464-465), (465-466), (472-476); (XXXI, 541-547)
 II, 1 (p. 65, 25-27 [p. 51, 33-36]) XXXIII, 283-286
 II, 7 (pp. 92,21 - 93,3 [pp. 72,27 - 73,2]) XXVII, 491-501
 II, 16 (pp. 141,27 - 142,9 [p. 110, 21-30]) XXI, 25-32

- II, 17 (p. 144, 18-19 [p. 112, 22-23]) XXV, 131-132
 II, 17 (p. 146, 7-12 [p. 114, 1-5]) XXI, 310-314
 II, 17 (pp. 147,27 - 148,6 [p. 115, 13-21]) XXXIV, 105-113, (137-139)
 II, 17 (p. 148, 9-12 [p. 115, 24-27]) XXXIV, 113-116, (139-141)
 II, 17 (p. 157, 13-16 [p. 122, 31-34]) XX, 231-233
 II, 17 (p. 160, 23-25 [p. 125, 18-20]) XX, 234-236
 II, 18 (p. 167, 20-29 [p. 131, 2-11]) XXXI, 486-494
 II, 18 (p. 170, 9-16 [p. 133, 2-8]) XXV, 415-420, (477-479); (XXXI, 537-540)
 II, 18 (pp. 170,26 - 171,4 [p. 133, 17-24]) XXXI, 205-211, (6-9)
 II, 18 (pp. 170,26 - 171,20 [pp. 133, 17 - 134,3]) XXXI, 219-237, (271), (465-476), (523-530), (530-532), (533-534), (551-555), (560-563), (569-571), (572-574), (604-607), (618-619)
 II, 19 (pp. 172,25 - 173,6 [p. 135, 1-10]) XXXI, 496-504
 II, 19 (pp. 173,30 - 174,10 [pp. 135, 31 - 136,3]) XXXI, 504-514
 II, 19 (p. 174, 19-29 [p. 136, 11-19]) XXXI, 514-522
 II, 19 (pp. 174,19 - 175,5 [p. 136, 11-25]) XXXIII, 134-148, (163-172), (189-190); (XXXIV, 339-341)
 II, 20 (pp. 175,23 - 177,16 [pp. 137, 7 - 138,17]) XXX, 344-380
 II, 23 (pp. 191,21 - 192,1 [p. 149, 27-35]) XXXII, 96-103, (224-230)
 II, 25 (p. 203, 12-23 [pp. 158,31 - 159,6]) XXXIV, 117-126, (142-143), (144-145), (172-173)
 II, 31 (p. 234, 20-27 [p. 183, 16-22]) XXIII, 202-208
 II, 31 (p. 235, 18-26 [p. 184, 4-10]) XXIII, 209-215, (221-222)
 II, 48 (fragm. hucusque incognitum) XXV, 134-138
 III, 1 (pp. 7,28 - 8,9 [pp. 5,28 - 6,5]) XXXIII, 150-159, (192-195), (197-199); (XXXIV, 342-344)

Epistula ad Constantinum episcopum Seleucia Isauriae. Ed. E.W. BROOKS, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, in the Syriac Version of Athanasius of Nisibis*. Vol. I (Text) Part I; Vol. II (Translation) Part I, London, 1902-1903, pp. 3-12 [3-11].

pp. 5-6 [6] XXXIV, 58-65

Epistula ad Maronem lectorem (vel novitium ?), cuius initium "Cum Naaman Syrus". Fragmenta ed. E.W. BROOKS, *PO* 12, Paris, 1915, pp. 196-200.

p. 198, 5-8 [20-24] XXXIV, 128-131, (145-147)

- fragm. hucusque incognitum XXII, 95-98
 fragm. hucusque incognitum XXXI, 125-127, (155-157)

Epistulae ad Sergium Grammaticum (CPG 7025). Ed. Iosephus LEBON, *Severi Antiocheni orationes ad Nephaliium, eiusdem ac Sergii Grammatici epistulae mutuae*. Textus (CSCO 119), Louvain, 1949, pp. 103-177. Versio (CSCO 120), Louvain, 1949, pp. 53-136.

II (pp. 119,1 - 120,24 [pp. 89,12 - 90,25]) XXIX, 46-86, (118-122), (122-125), (125-127), (128-132), (136-143), (150-151)

III (pp. 164,24 - 165,11 [p. 126, 1-15]) XXIX, 209-221

Homilia cathedralis 42. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE and François GRAFFIN, *PO* 36, Turnhout, 1971, pp. 30-73.

pp. 46,25 - 48,2 (pp. 47,26 - 49,2) XX, 237-245

Homilia cathedralis 109. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE, *PO* 25, Paris, 1943, pp. 732-781.

pp. 747, 6 (8) - 748, 5 (9) XXXI, 174-188, (581-595), (597-603), (608-613), (614-617), (624-625), (628-629), (630-634), (642-650)

Homilia cathedralis 119. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE, *PO* 26, Paris, 1948, pp. 375-439.

pp. 438, 6 (7) - 439, 2 (3) XXVII, 473-485

Homilia cathedralis 123. Ed. Maurice BRIÈRE, *PO* 29, Turnhout, 1960, pp. 124-189.

pp. 132,12 - 134,27 (pp. 133,14 - 135,34) XXV, 71-112, (118-120), (120-125), (125-129), (149-150), (239-241), (243-245), (246-249), (252-255), (256), (262), (267), (272-273)

p. 134, 13-16 (p. 135, 16-21) XXV, 50-54, (19-22)

loco non reperto

XXII, 228-235
 XXIX, 103-108, (109-113)

Symbolum Constantinopolitanum (CPG 8599). Ed. Giuseppe Luigi DOSSETTI, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli*. Edizione critica (*Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose* 2), Roma, 1967, pp. 244-250.

ll. 3-4 (p. 244) XXXIV, 71

Symbolum Nicaenum (CPG 8512). Ed. Giuseppe Luigi DOSSETTI, *ibid.*, pp. 226-240.

l. 4 (p. 228) XXXIV, 206
 l. 6 (p. 230) XXXIV, 28

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| ABBREVIATIONS | V |
| INTRODUCTION | VII |
| The textual tradition of Book III, chap. 20-34 | VII |
| I. The direct tradition | VII |
| II. The indirect tradition | VIII |
| Acknowledgements | XI |
| ANALYSIS OF BOOK III, CHAPTERS 20-34 | XIII |
| TEXT | 1 |
| APPENDIX. Addenda and corrigenda to volumes I and II | 533 |
| INDICES | 535 |
| Index nominum et vocum quarundam ex eis formata-
rum | 537 |
| Index locorum Sacrae Scripturae | 540 |
| Index aliorum fontium | 542 |

