

# Durham E-Theses

---

## *Athanasius' contra arianos iv: a reconsideration*

Cathleen S.W. Walbrodt

### How to cite:

---

Cathleen S.W. Walbrodt (1993) Athanasius' contra arianos iv: a reconsideration. Masters thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/5522/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

ATHANASIUS' CONTRA ARIANOS IV:  
A RECONSIDERATION

VOLUME 2 OF 2

CATHLEEN S. W. WALBRODT  
DOCTOR OF JURISPRUDENCE  
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

MASTER OF ARTS DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

1993



30 JUN 1994

## THE FRAGMENTS OF MARCELLUS OF ANCYRA

A knowledge of the writings of Marcellus of Ancyra is necessary in order to determine the addressee of CAR IV. These fragments are available only in Greek. The English translation in Volume 2 was prepared in Dr. Dragas' Patristics Seminar during Epiphany and Easter terms 1990. The other regular members of the Seminar were Father Methodios Samaritakis and Father Wahib Boulos. Participation in this Seminar was part of my degree program. I assisted in the translation and I was the class stenographer. Also, as the native English speaker in the group, I undertook fundamental editing with the object of producing a very literal translation uppermost in my mind. This translation is presented as a supporting document to my thesis.

The Greek text of these fragments is from Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte.

Fragment 1: That no name of those named on the earth has been greater than that of Jesus, the gospel of course testifies, where the angel said to Mary, "Do not be afraid for you have found grace before God; and behold, you shall conceive in the womb and bear a son and you shall call his name Jesus; he shall be great and shall be called son of the most high;" it is then obvious from the prophesy of Zacharias also which prophesied of old concerning this name for "he showed to me," it says, "the Lord Jesus the great priest, standing before the face of the angel of the Lord, and the devil stood on his right hand in order to oppose him. And the Lord said to the devil, 'the Lord who has elected Jerusalem shall rebuke you.'" But when did He rebuke him? When he conjoined to his own logos the man who was loved by him. "The one who chose Jerusalem," he says, that is to say this Jerusalem of ours, about which the apostle says, "But this Jerusalem is above; for this one serves with her children." For such things came to be at that time in our great city, that is to say in our church, for when he rebuked the devil according to the prophecy, saying, "Go behind me Satan, for you are a scandal to me." He, then, is the great priest, whose type the Jesus of this instance preserved. For it was not possible for him to have been called a great priest although he became glorious in all things, whereas Moses was not called great (for Moses was not great since he was the servant of God and was called God of Pharaoh by God Himself) but if somebody might think that Jesus was called great on this account, namely that he was considered worthy to lead the people into the holy land and did many other great wonderful things, let him know through this also that it did not differ so much from the type, and what was the spoken greatness attributed to Joshua but that a little later he was the one who was going to lead his own people into this great Jerusalem.

Fragment 2: The apostle, then, does not say that this one is only, so the apostle does not say that he is only first-born of the creation but also (that he is) first-born from the dead, for no other reason it seems to me but in order that it might possibly be known through the phrase first-born from the dead that he is also called first-born of all creation. For it was not our Master Jesus Christ who was first-born from the dead but

the one who was raised by Elijah the prophet was prior and Lazarus was also raised before his Resurrection and at the time of the Passion many bodies of those who had fallen asleep were raised.

Fragment 3: But now let us examine a certain saying from those written by Asterius, for he said, "For the Father is one who gave birth from Himself to the only-begotten logos and first-born of all creation," and having conjoined both he has written only-begotten and first-born though there is much contradiction in these names as it is easy to learn even to those who have great difficulty in learning. For it is obvious that the only-begotten, if he were truly only-begotten, is no longer able to be first-born and the first-born, if he is such, cannot be only-begotten.

Fragment 4: Therefore, if he is first-born of all creation and if in him all things have been created, it is right that we must perceive that the apostle now makes mention of his economy according to the flesh.

Fragment 5: Therefore, he was called first-born of all creation because of the birth according to the flesh not because of the first creation as they think.

Fragment 6: It is not, therefore, this most holy logos who was called before the Incarnation first-born of all creation (for how was it possible for one who always exists to be first-born of somebody?) but the first "new man" in whom God willed to recapitulate all things, this one the divine scriptures call the first-born of all creation.

Fragment 7: You hear how it happens that not only these things but also the things that preexisted in heaven and on earth in him have been created according to the new creation.

Fragment 8: Asterius should not think that this is impossible if his body which is younger was able to be accorded such antiquity but he must perceive, if indeed the

human flesh happens to be younger, that the logos thought it worthy to take it up through a pure virgin, uniting it to himself, and thus not only made the man who was created in him the first-born of all creation, but he wanted him to be the beginning of all, not only of those on the earth but also of those in heaven.

Fragment 9: Therefore this chapter of the Proverbs refers to the beginning of the Godhead of our Savior when he said, "the Lord created me," but the second dispensation is according to the flesh. Therefore he appropriately mentions the human flesh as a creature.

Fragment 10: Therefore, creation differs from the work which is according to man with his dealing with man. Therefore he says, "the Lord created me a beginning of his ways for his works," that is to say he created me through the virgin Mary through whom God predetermined to unite the human flesh with his own logos.

Fragment 11: This therefore being so, it follows that we must aim at the meaning of what was said by way of a Proverb in this chapter, namely that the Lord created me a beginning of his ways for his works, for he truly created that which was not, and God our Master has acted as a Creator, for the flesh which the logos took up was not yet in existence, and as it was not yet in existence he created it as the beginning of his ways.

Fragment 12: Therefore, now that the old things have obviously passed away and all things are going to be new through the newness of our Savior and our Master, Christ has cried through the prophet, saying, "the Lord created me a beginning of his ways."

Fragment 13: For he became the way of piety to those who were going to live in righteousness, a beginning of all the ways which come after these things.

Fragment 14: For this reason he obviously called our Master and Savior a beginning

of ways because he became the beginning of the other ways which came through the holy apostles, who preached to us with an exacted preaching, according to the prophecy, of this new mystery.

Fragment 15: He says, then, that he created me a beginning of his works for his works, but which works does he speak of? About those which the Savior mentions, "My Father works up till now and I work," and again he says, "the work which you have given me I have finished."

Fragment 16: For who would have believed before the proof of the events that the logos of God would have taken up our own flesh, having been born through a virgin, and that he would demonstrate bodily the whole Godhead in it.

Fragment 17: He established me before time, he calls this a foundation, namely his predetermined economy, as the apostle says, for no one can place any other foundation but the one which is laid who is Jesus Christ, indeed he mentions only one age here, having spoken of the things having been founded by Christ although many centuries have passed as David says, "who exists before the ages."

Fragment 18: For when Asterius had said that the logos was born before the ages, it is this very verse which condemns him as lying so that not only concerning the reality but also concerning the letter he is in error; for if the Proverb says he founded me before the age, how does he say that he was born before the ages? For it is a different thing to say that he was founded before the age and trying to say that he was born before the ages.

Fragment 19: For as of old the Almighty God predestined the church, likewise (he predestined) the incarnate economy of Christ, thorough whom he predestined to call into adoption the generation of the pious, having beforehand founded this in his own mind, and this is why the apostle plainly foretells this through the Holy Spirit in saying

who was predestined to be Son of God.

Fragment 20: Therefore, if indeed on these last days this new mystery has been manifested, so that on this account this was foreordained before the age, obviously the prophets said, "Before the age he founded me, that is the flesh, on account of its communication with the logos who is truly his son.

Fragment 21: Then he says in the beginning before the earth was made; which earth is he talking about but obviously our own flesh which became earth immediately after the disobedience, for he says "you are earth and to the earth you shall return," and it was necessary for this one to receive healing by communicating in some way with the holy logos.

Fragment 22: Then he says, "before he made the abyss;" here the prophet speaks of the hearts of the saints as the depths which have in their own depth the gift of the Spirit.

Fragment 23: What then, it is also this chapter "before the sources of the waters came forth" in which he says that this has to do with the holy apostles and this mystery is presented to us by the scripture of Exodus which foretells from of old the types of the apostles, for since the number of the apostles is twelve he mentions twelve sources.

Fragment 24: It is obvious then that this is about the incarnate birth that the Master speaks through Solomon the prophet is saying, "before the sources of the waters came forth."

Fragment 25: For thus the Savior said to the holy sources, "Go and make disciples of all the nations."

Fragment 26: It is everywhere obvious that the holy apostles were metaphorically

called sources by the prophet.

Fragment 27: Therefore, since we talked about what went before, it follows that we must supply what remains. What remains is what is said about the mountains and the hills, for he says, "before the mountains were established" and "before of all the hills he gives birth to me," he calls mountains and hills the apostles and the successors of the apostles so that he might denote by means of a proverb their just manner of life above all other human beings.

Fragment 28: For this reason, therefore, it seems to me that it is good to go now through those things which I did not go through earlier, for most of the things written by him have been obvious to you by what we have already said. He says, "from the womb before the morning star I gave birth to you" for he thought certainly somehow that the stolen preposition *ex* would concur with the opinion of the heresy.

Fragment 29: How then are those who are "full of guile and conspiracy" to speak in an apostolic fashion, when they refer the saying to his first creation, as they think, even though David has said these things most clearly about his generation according to the flesh.

Fragment 30: For while there was darkness before on account of the ignorance of God, and because the day was going to appear, (for he says) I am the day, with good reason he calls the star bearer of the morning light.

Fragment 31: For this reason then, because David with good reason called the bearer of the light the star which heralds the coming day, it is not right anymore to ask about the bearer of the light, who brought in and pointed to the day for the Magi. It is obvious then that the phrase "I gave birth to you before the morning star" was said by the Almighty Master about the logos who was born through the virgin with the human flesh, and this is clearly noted by the gospel since our Master was born through the

virgin beforehand, whereas the star which shows the day appeared afterwards.

Fragment 32: For how can they show to us from the divine verses that there is only one who is unbegotten and there is one who is begotten in this manner, as they hold that he was born, while neither prophets nor evangelists nor apostles have said this.

Fragment 33: Therefore, the holy apostle and disciple of the Lord, John, in making mention of his eternity became a true witness of the logos, when he said, "in the beginning was the logos and the logos was with God and the logos was God," making no mention here of a generation of the logos but using three witnesses, the one after the other confirming that the logos was in the beginning.

Fragment 34: And I will remind you of the things which he was writing when he was accepting what had been wrongly written by Eusebius so you may know that he is clearly standing apart from the preceding promise, for he wrote in these words thusly, for the pivot of the epistle is to refer to the generation of the Son as the will of the Father and that the birth must not be regarded as a passion of God, which of course the wisest of the fathers in their own compositions openly presented, having kept themselves from the impiety of the heretics who so fully lied about some kind of corporeal and passive childbearing of God inasmuch as they produced dogmas concerning projections.

Fragment 35: So Asterius, who was willing to defend what Eusebius had wrongly written, mentioned the nature of the Father and the nature of the ingenerate; he became the accuser of himself, for it (the depths of the understanding of Eusebius) was much better, as he wrote expressing himself briefly, and left it without examination rather than use this kind of theory to bring to light the deceit of the letter.

Fragment 36: But to say that he was born before the ages, he thinks that it was said in this manner, for offspring becomes what comes out of the preexisting father and

nothing healthy or pious was left out from it, for to say that it was not a word, the one who came forth from him, and that this is the true manner of the generation, when it is simply that an only son is accustomed to emphasize this to those who pay attention to human appearance.

Fragment 37: Paulinus wrote these things not in the fashion of reminding us of the gospel teaching and confessing that on the one hand some were moved like this by themselves, and on the other hand that others came to this manner from the readings of the aforementioned men, then finally producing, as it were, some sort of pivotal proof from the statements of Origen, wrote in his own epistle, as if he could be more persuasive about the evangelists and the apostles, these statements as follows: "there is time in taking up the discourse about Father and Son and Holy Spirit to go through a few things which were then left out; concerning the Father, how being undivided and unable to be partitioned, becomes the Father of a Son, not projecting him, as some think, for if the Son of the Father and offspring from him as a projection like the offsprings of the animals there is a necessity for the one who projects and the one who is projected to be corporeal."

Fragment 38: These things Origen has written, not willing to learn about the eternity of the logos from the holy prophets and the apostles, but, having allowed more to himself to make a second attempt to provide a discourse, he dares in vain.

Fragment 39: That in writing these things Origen was using his own dogmas is obvious from those texts which on many occasions refuted his own views, for in another verse what he says about God is relevant to recall here; he writes thusly, "for God did not start to be a Father having been prevented previously as the human being who become fathers (are prevented) by the fact that they are not able to become fathers for if God is always perfect and there is in him the possibility to be a Father and to be a good Father of such a Son, what is it that puts him off and deprives him of the good, and if we are to say from that he is able to be a father, and he doesn't become a father, indeed

the same must be said concerning the Holy Spirit;" how then, when Origen wrote such a thing, did Paulinus, who for him is blessed, not think to be without danger to hide this but he used it as an argument for those who seemed to him to hold the opposite views of which not even Origen, I would say, would be able to provide a response.

Fragment 40: Paulinus, the father of this one, being persuaded by these statements, does not get tired to say and to write these same things, sometimes calling him a second God and that he has become a God in a more human fashion and sometimes he specifies him to be a creature, and that this is so even to us that at some point passing through Ancyra he said that Christ was a creature.

Fragment 41: And this is why he does not call him Son of God but everywhere he calls him Son of Man, so that through such a confession he might prepare man to become Son of God by adoption by virtue of his communion with him and immediately after the end of the act he might be united to God as logos, fulfilling that which was said beforehand by the apostle, then he shall be subjected to the one who subjected all things to him so that "God might be all in all," for at this time all things will be what they were before.

Fragment 42: For the logos was in the beginning being nothing else but logos, whereas he who was united to the logos, not existing beforehand, came to be (a man) as John teaches us in saying, "and the logos became flesh;" for this reason then he appears, to mention only the logos for in mentioning either the name of Jesus or of Christ, divine scripture appears to name the logos of God who is together with human flesh, and if somebody could promise to be able to show before the New Testament the name of Christ or of Jesus to be applied to the logos alone he will find that this was said in the prophets, as it is clear from this: "for," he says, "the kings of the earth appeared and the leaders came together against the Lord and against his Christ."

Fragment 43: Therefore it is obvious everywhere that no other name is appropriate to the eternity of the logos except that which the most holy disciple of God and apostle John has said in the beginning of the gospel, because after the assumption he is preached to be Christ and Jesus and life and way and day and resurrection and door and bread and whatever else might be mentioned by the divine scriptures, it is not right that we should ignore on this account the first name, namely that he was logos; for this reason, then, the most holy evangelist and disciple of the Lord being fully alert by the Spirit mentioning the beginning from above and nothing else that came later, he said, "in the beginning was the logos and the logos was with God and the logos was God," in order to show whatever new name this one applies on account of this new and recent incarnate economy.

Fragment 44: For Sabellius too, having slipped away from the right faith, he did not know God accurately nor his holy word for he who did not know the logos did not know the Father, for he says, "nobody knows the Father except the Son," that is the logos supplies the knowledge of the Father through himself for likewise to the Jews at this time who thought that they knew God but dismissed his logos through whom alone God is known said, "nobody knows the Father except the Son and to whom the Son might reveal him," because it was impossible to know God in any other way, as he teaches human being to know him through his own logos, so that he is wrong who does not exactly know the Father and his logos.

Fragment 45: And you must learn then that the logos of God has become not a logos who has been called such by convention, as they say, but one who is a true logos.

Fragment 46: For he has been called logos not by convention even if those who teach otherwise rent their garments in lying, but being properly and truly logos.

Fragment 47: And of those who teach them mention the logos as being recent who thus all the divine scriptures declare, for David says about him, "by the word of the

Lord the heavens were established," and immediately the same on says, "he sent out his logos and he healed them." And Solomon, "the evil ones will seek me and not find me for they hated wisdom and they did not choose the logos of the Lord," and Isaiah says, "for from Zion a law will come forth and a logos of the Lord from Jerusalem," and also Jeremiah says, "the wise were ashamed and they were taken aback and they were lost because they did not approve the logos of the Lord," and Hosea the prophet says, "they hated the one who criticized them in the gates, and they detested a holy logos," and Micah likewise speaking about the logos says, "from Zion a law will come forth and a logos of the Lord from Jerusalem."

Fragment 48: Therefore, before he came down and was from the virgin he was only logos because what else was he before he took up the human flesh, the fact that which came down in these last days, as he himself has written, and was born from a virgin? None other than logos.

Fragment 49: It was obvious, then, that before the descent he was this which we said many times, a logos; but after the descent and the assumption of the flesh he acquired various designations because the logos became flesh.

Fragment 50: For what other mystery was hidden or that which relates to the logos? Indeed, it was thus hidden in God, that mystery which was before, so that no one among the previous people was able to know clearly what relates to the logos but we are to receive the richness of the glory of the hidden mystery now.

Fragment 51: But the holy apostle and disciple of the Lord, John, clearly and expressly teaches in the beginning of the gospel that he was unknown beforehand by the human being and calling him the logos of the Almighty said this, "in the beginning was the logos and the logos was with God and the logos was God," and he did not use one witness to point to the eternity of the logos.

Fragment 52: So that he might show in saying "in the beginning was the logos" that the logos was in the Father potentially (for God is he "from whom all things came to be"), and in saying "and the logos was with God" to show that the logos was with God functionally (for all things were made through him and without him nothing was made), and by the statement "the logos was God" to say that the Godhead should not be divided because the logos is in him and he is in the logos for "the Father is in me and I in the Father."

Father 53: You see then how the Holy Spirit agrees as through many and various persons bearing witness to the eternity of the logos and for this reason he begins with the eternity of the logos in saying, "in the beginning was the logos and the logos was with God and the logos was God," using three consecutive witnesses he wants to point out the eternity of the logos.

Fragment 54: What was this which descended before it was inhominated? Somehow one must certainly say a spirit for if he would like to say something other than this, this would not be allowed by the angel who said to the virgin, "a Holy Spirit will come upon you," and if he says that he is spirit one should listen to the Savior who says God is Spirit.

Fragment 55: But the case is that the Father is in the logos even if Asterius does not think so, as well as those who think the same as him, for this seems to be the case to the divine prophet Isaiah who through the Holy Spirit said, "and they will worship you and in you they will pray because God is in you and there is nobody else except you because you are God," do you see how he uproots beforehand the clever evil doing of those who wish to teach otherwise.

Fragment 56: And here likewise the prophet speaks about the logos who assumed our own flesh.

Fragment 57: For it would not be possible to have a spirit who creates a shadow and that spirit is God Himself, for the Savior said, "God is Spirit," and that God is light he teaches us this in saying, "I am the light."

Fragment 58: For who among, either the holy angels or the righteous men, would be so trustworthy as to loosen the punishment which was specified for him from the face of God unless this very logos who was with him and created with him, to whom the Father said, "let us make man according to our image and likeness," since it is not possible for any other God to be with him and create with him, for he says, "I am God first and I am after this, and beside me there is no other God," nor was there a more recent God nor another God after these things who would be able to cooperate with God but if one were to use some little human paradigm which applies to us examining the divine act by means of an image, as one specialist man who makes statues, wanting to construct a statue, first of all he specifies in himself of his types and characters then afterwards the width and the length as it seems to him to be appropriate and he examines the analogy of everything in relation to every part and prepares the appropriate material of copper and impressing in his own mind the statue which he is going to do and as he sees with his own mind he thinks that he has his own logos working along with him with whom he thinks and with whom he always does everything (for nothing good is done without logos) and as he begins this sensible work he tells himself, as if he is addressing someone else, "let's do it," "let's form a statue," likewise the master of all in creating from the earth the statue, he addressed nobody else but his own logos saying, "let us make man," not in the same way as we did the other things for with the logos the whole creation was made.

Fragment 59: For God did not need in order to create any other preparation such as matter or of some other human element but of this preparation which is in his own mind since then it was impossible without the logos and the wisdom which befits the logos that God should think about the creation of heaven it was obviously said, "when he was preparing the heavens I was with him."

Fragment 60: For before the world was, the logos was in the Father and when the Almighty God decided to create the things in heaven and on earth, the creation of the world required an active operation and for this reason, since there was nobody else except God for all things are confessed to have been made by him, then, the logos coming forth became the creator of the world who beforehand was preparing it inside the mind of God as the prophet Solomon teaches us in saying, "when he was preparing the heavens I was present with him," "and as he was putting firm sources for the place under the heavens when he was making firm the foundations of the earth, I was beside him working it out, I was the one in whom he rejoiced," for indeed the Father was rejoicing with wisdom and power as he made all things through the logos.

Fragment 61: For us all things that were made were made by the Father through the logos, likewise the things which are said by the Father are specified by the logos, for this reason the most holy Moses calls the logos in this place an angel for he did not appear for anything but in order to declare to Moses these things which he regarded to be beneficial to know, that there is one God and therefore he said to him, "I am the one who is," so that he might teach that there is no other God beside him and I think that this is easy for those who think properly to know also by means of some small and humble example which relates to us, for neither is it possible for anyone to approach the human logos potentially and hypostatically for the logos is one and the same thing with the man and it is in no way divided except only through the operation of the act.

Fragment 62: Here the Father says to Moses, "I am the one who is," and he obviously says this through the logos, for all the things which the Father might say, these things he appears everywhere to say through the logos and this is obvious to us even from ourselves, however little we might guess about the great and divine things, for we too, all the things which we might like to say and do, as far as possible we do through our own logos.

Fragment 63: Who then does Asterius think is the one who says, "I am the one who

is," the Son or the Father? For seeing two hypostases in the human flesh which the logos of God took up and thinking this to be the case, on its account he said that there is that of the Father and that of the Son and thus he divided the Son of God from the Father just as he would have divided the Son of Man from whomever might be his natural father.

Fragment 64: For if, therefore, these things were said to Moses in the sense that the Father separates himself from the Son he would confess that the Son is not God, for how is it possible for the one who says, "I am the one who is," not to confess at the same time that he says he is himself the one who is in contrast to the one who is not? And if he says that this implies that the Son is divided hypostatically in saying "I am the one who is" then the same must be thought to be said about the Father and both of these things are impious.

Fragment 65: I shall therefore start with the epistle written by him, contradicting each one of the things which have not been written rightly, that he has written that we should believe in a Father, God Almighty and in his Son the only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Holy Spirit and he says that this manner of reverence he has learned from the divine scriptures; as for me, when he says this, I accept what he says very strongly for this the manner of piety that is common to all of us, that is to believe in a Father, a Son, and a Holy Spirit but when he does not say that the Father is Father inasmuch as he thinks in a more human fashion of the divine power through some kind of artificial theory and that the Son is Son, I can no longer praise this theory as being without danger for through such a theory it happens that the heresy which has been invented by them is increasing which I can show clearly from his own words for he said that the Father must be thought to be truly Father and the Son truly Son and the Holy Spirit likewise.

Fragment 66: For it is impossible for three hypostases to be united in a monad unless beforehand the Trinity has its beginning in a monad, for St. Paul says that these things

are recapitulated in a monad which do not differ in the unity of God for the logos and the Spirit differ from God only as far as the unity is concerned.

Fragment 67: If, therefore, the logos appears to have come from the Father and to have come forth to us and the Holy Spirit, as Asterius also confessed, and proceeds from the Father and at the same time the Savior says concerning the Spirit that he will not speak from himself but he will speak of whatever he hears and shall declare to you the things that are coming for, "he will glorify me because he shall take from me and declare to you," is it not clear and obvious that here the monad appears by a secret reason to be expanded into a Trinity and does not allow to be divided in any way? For if the logos proceeds from the Father and the Spirit also is confessed to proceed from the Father and at the same time the Savior says about the Spirit, "he will take from me and declare to you," it is not therefore obvious that some sort of hidden mystery is here revealed, for how, if the monad is not expanded into a Trinity, being undivided, is it possible for him to say about the Spirit that sometimes he proceeds from the Father and sometimes to say that "he shall take from me and declare to you," and also that he breathed on his disciples and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit," for how, if he proceeds from the Father is he said to receive this ministry from the Son, for it is necessary, if there are two divided persons as Asterius says, that either the Spirit who proceeds from the Father should not need the ministry from the Son for whatever proceeds from the Father should of necessity be perfect having no need at all of somebody else's help, or if he receives from the Son and administers the grace from his power, he should no longer proceed from the Father.

Fragment 68: If then the gospel said that he breathed on the disciples and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit," it is obvious that the Spirit came forth from the logos, how then if the Spirit was derived from the logos again does the same one proceed from the Father.

Fragment 69: So then he did not speak correctly and properly when he spoke of three hypostases and he said this not once but twice.

Fragment 70: As far as the incarnate economy is concerned we know that it differs from man and as far as the eternity according to the Spirit is concerned we have believed that he is united to the Father.

Fragment 71: For if we are to make only the examination of the Spirit it would appear that the logos is obviously one and the same with God; if, on the other hand, the addition according to the flesh of the Savior were to be examined, God appears to be expanded only in operation and therefore there is truly and obviously an undivided monad.

Fragment 72: For Asterius declared that the Father and the Son alone are one and the same, inasmuch as they agree in all things, for he said thusly on account of the exact agreement in all words and deeds, "I and the Father are on."

Fragment 73: If then he says these things, "I came from the Father and I shall come," and again, "and the logos whom you hear is not mine but of the Father who sent me," and "all that the Father has are mine," it is plainly obvious the other thing which he said, "the Father is in me and I in the Father," so that the logos might be in God who says this, "and the Father in the Logos," because the logos is the power of the Father for he has been called the power of God and the witness of God by a trustworthy witness, not on account of the exact agreement in all words and deeds, as Asterius says, does the Savior say, "I and the Father are one, but because it is impossible either for the logos of God or for God to be separated from his own logos because if it is on account of the agreement in all thing that the Savior has said this, as Asterius thinks and does not wish to pay attention to the second economy so that he may learn what is true, it is necessary that we remind him how sometimes what appears to be the case must be seen to be incongruous, for this is how we are taught by the verses, for what

kind of agreement is implied when at the time of the Passion he said, "Father, if possible let this cup pass away," and adding also this other one, "but not as I wish but as you do," for he was in agreement at the first in saying, "let this cup pass away," but nothing that admits to agreement is implied by what is added for he says "not my own, but your will, let it be, O Father," do you hear how phenomenologically the letter denotes a sort of disagreement between the one who wants and the one who does not want because what the Father wanted is obvious from what he wanted and happened and that the Son did not want is obvious from what he resigns and again he says, "I do not ask for my own will but for the will of the Father who sent me," how then is it that on account of the agreement in all things the Savior has said, "I and the Father are one."

Fragment 74: How then can the Son have an agreement with the Father or the Father with the Son if the Son says that all that the Father has are his, for it is obviously expressed of the Son in comparison to the Father to say that all that the Father has are mine, for on this account they are in common presenting this statement that all that the Father has are common, that is to say that all that the Father has are mine even though it is not proper to the one who agrees to say so but all the things which the Father has are common, for if the Acts of the Apostles said in praising those who came together in agreement of the faith that they had all things in common and we ought to think that in the case of human beings who are able to agree that they have all things in common, how much more befits the Father and the Son to partake in a communion though they are divided into two hypostases? But now in saying, "all that the Father has are mine," the Son appears to be exceeding the Father; and in saying that not in his logos is Lord but his Father for he says ("the word which you hear is not mine but of the Father who sent me") it shows that the Father is deprived of what is proper to the child. Now both of these do not appear to have been said as consequences according to Asterius' view for the one who agrees ought not to take away the rights which belong to the other for this would be a sign of greed, but rather to think of what belongs to the other as being common so that when we look at the human flesh, not as Asterius has written should

we find the Savior saying, "I and the Father are one," for it is not on account of the exact agreement on all words and deeds as he wrote that the Son has said, "I and the Father are one." For if that was the case he must certainly have said I and the Father agree with each other in all things. But now he said, "I and the Father are one," therefore, if in them there are some kind of disagreement it is necessary that the Master must say the truth, we ought to understand exactly what the Savior says when he says, "I and the Father are one," and at the same time he does not say this with reference to the man whom he assumed, but to the logos who came forth from the Father, for if there appears to be some disagreement this ought to be referred to a weakness of the flesh, which the logos not having beforehand assumed, and if the unity was spoken about this seems to be different in relation to the logos, hence not only did he obviously say, "I and the Father are one," but also that other statement, "I have been with you for such a long time Philip and you say 'Show me the Father,'" is obvious that not with his eyes but with the ones which which belong to the mind which are able to see the things perceived by the mind. For invisible to the eyes of the flesh is both the Father and his logos and it was not then on account of the agreement in all things that he said this to Philip.

Fragment 75: For he confesses, saying, "the Father is in me and I too in the Father," and that he did not say this simply and purposelessly is obvious also from another apostolic saying, for he who said, "there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism," he also said that there is one God and Father who is in all and through all and in all; do you see that not even here he departs from the agreement but the same has happened here for saying one Lord he immediately said one God so that at the moment he might speak of the Father he might not bear witness to the logos being outside God.

Fragment 76: And if you wish you can hear of another prophecy of his which confirms that there is for us one God, for he says, "I am God first and in what is coming I am also," for the Father is indicative of the one person for the two saying, denote one person to us, for saying I he also brings in the am so that by the two parts of the

discourse of the proverb he bears witness to the monad of the Godhead and if there was need of another witness, immediately I would hear the same prophet saying, "I am the first and I am after these things apart from me there is no other God," and if Asterius thinks that the Son of the Father, as Son of Man is in his hypostases divided, being scandalized on account of the human flesh which he assumed for us, let him show to us him who says these things for the saying here refers to one person who then is he who says there is no one beside me, but let him also hear of another prophecy, "there is no one who is just and Savior apart from me," if he thinks that there are two gods it is necessary for him to confess that there is another who is neither just nor Savior or how could he any longer be God for he declares that there is one person, just and Savior, and immediately before me nobody has come to be and after me there will be and if he wishes to hear of another prophetic saying, as if somehow that has been said to him and to those who stand in the same position with him concerning the Godhead, let him hear of Isaiah who says, "Repent, those who have gone astray, return in your heart and remember the things which were before the age for I am God and there is no one apart from me," he did not say I am a God so that by the addition of the article he might show clearly that there is one God, and what about Hosea the prophet, does he not also bear witness to the same things in saying, "I brought you up from Egypt and you shall not know any God apart from me and there is no one who saves except me," and immediately Malachi says, "Is there not one God who created you is there not one Father of all of you," but Asterius would say that David has never said anything about this even though he is more senior than Moses and the other prophets and this is why he is of two minds for either he thinks that there must be two gods divided in hypostases or not; therefore, so that he might say this, I think it is right to show him that he says the same things with the aforementioned sayings, and there he says, "my people and I will speak to you Israel and I will bear witness to you, if you hear me there will be no recent God in you nor will you venerate another God for I am the Lord your God," he who showed him and said I am, he is clearly saying that there is one God, that, in other words, himself.

Fragment 77: What then, if not paying attention to the Spirit, we do not think that the monad is undivided in power; therefore, unless we think that the monad is not undivided in power, we shall not commit an error as the word clearly teaches us, "the Lord your God you shall venerate and him alone you shall worship," and he teaches the same thing through St. Mark's gospel, for when a scribe said to him and raised questions which might be the first of the commandments he replied to him saying thus, "first of all, hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord and you shall love the Lord your God from all your soul and from all your strength, this is the first one and there is a second which is like this one, you shall love your neighbor as yourself, there is no other commandment which is greater than these," and the scribe said to him, "very well Master you truly said that God is one and that there is no other apart from him," but the scribe, thinking that he had learned the true piety through the law he seems to be approving of the saying of the Savior in saying, "hear O Israel the Lord your God is one," he testified with an oath that it was well said for he says in truth "that there is one God and there is no other apart from him," but those who boast that they know the mysteries of the New Testament, these ones wish to create a second God who is divided from the Father with respect to hypostases and power.

Fragment 78: And that the divine scripture very well knows how to call the monad Lord and God already has become obvious from what has been said above, through which God said to his servant Moses, "God said again to Moses, you shall say thus to the sons of Israel, 'the Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaiac, and the God of Jacob has sent me to you'," do you see how showing to us here one person he calls this one to be the Lord and God, and again scripture says likewise, "and the Lord spoke all these words saying, 'I am the Lord your God who brought you up from the land of Egypt and the house of bondage there shall be no other gods apart from me'," do you hear how through the pronoun he declares that there is only one God and a little later, "I am the Lord your God," saying that he is himself Lord and God, what then do we learn from another scripture where he says, "and you shall know today and you shall not be deviated in your mind for the lord your God he is God in heaven

above and on the earth below and there is no one apart from him,' and again in the same Deuteronomy, "hear O Israel," it says, "the Lord our God is one Lord and you shall love the Lord your God from all your heart and from all your soul and with all your mind," and again in the same, "see, see that I am and there is no God apart from me, I destroy and I will revive, I will extinguish and I will heal," how then did Asterius, pretending to follow the scriptures simply and with fear, not see this part saying, "the Lord your God he is God on heaven above and earth below and there is no one apart from him," and that there is no one and apart from him no other?

Fragment 79: How then does the holy prophet Jeremiah not criticize him who openly is giving another teaching, for prophesying the things which relate to our Lord he said thusly, "this is our God and no other shall be considered to be next to him," he invested every way of signs and he gave to Jacob his child and Israel who is beloved by him, after these things he appeared on the earth and communicated with human beings.

Fragment 80: So that if one were to say that, constructing that there is first God and a second one, as Narcissus has written in so many words (for this is not allowed by him who says, "let us make man according to our own image and likeness"), that he and his Father are two, we have heard from the Lord who bore witness and partly from the holy scriptures. If, then, Narcissus for this reason wishes to divide the logos of the Father in terms of power, let him know that the prophet who wrote as if God said, "let us make man according to our image and according to our likeness," he also wrote, "and God made man."

Fragment 81: For having read into the epistle of Narcissus, who is the leader of Naronius, which he had written to some Crestus and Euphonius and Eusebius allegedly because he asked a holy bishop, he says as Eusebius of Palestine that there are two substances, he also says the same, this I came to know from what he wrote in his response that he believed that there are three substances.

Fragment 82: For having dared to sever the logos of God and to call the logos another God standing apart from the Father in essence and power we can learn easily from the very statements which were written by him to what extent of blasphemy he had fallen, for he has written certainly through these words thusly, "for certainly the image and whose image it is cannot be thought to be one and the same but these are two beings and two things and two powers as there are as many designations."

Fragment 83: But the apostle writes such things about the faith of the Galatians, and Eusebius then transfers the apostolic sense which this apostle on account of the aforementioned sense said, "my children, for whom I am in pain until Christ is formed in you," he reprimanded the Galatians for not having the right view of God for he was truly in pain with a powerful and bitter pain because he understood that the Galatians did not have the same opinion as he about the true piety, not speaking of two essences and two things and two powers and Gods.

Fragment 84: And Eusebius of Caesarea has also written likewise, he too having the same opinion with Paulinus and those outside (the church) concerning (the) gods; for he has written not as if there is an only God, but as if "the only true God is one," and hence Paulinus, the father of Asterius, having learned this, thought that "there are more recent gods."

Fragment 85: How then did they not intend to teach and to write the same things with those outside (the church), having been led astray to the same most evil way, since on the one hand Eusebius has spoken in the same manner as Valentinus and Hermes, and on the other hand Narcissus, as Marcion and Plato?

Fragment 86: But having put aside the true knowledge, he put forward to us at this time the artfully constructed theory, for not having (any evidence) from the divine scriptures to construct what he wanted he turns to, as he thinks, the most wise fathers, speaking of "that which the most wise of the fathers authoritatively declared in their

own compositions" and thus Asterius claims that his own fathers have authoritatively made a declaration and have articulated a dogma about God out of their own free choice. For the term dogma is connected with human will and opinion; and that this is the case is sufficiently witnessed to us by the dogmatic art of the medical practitioners and it is also witnessed by the so-called dogmas of the philosophers, and that what things seemed to be right to the senate are even now called dogmas of the senate, I consider no one to be ignorant.

Fragment 87: For (Asterius) having decided to lend his support to Eusebius who wrongly wrote this epistle, first of all he (Asterius) said that he (Eusebius) did not compose the epistle in order to provide a doctrinal exposition of the dogma, for the letter was not sent either to the church or to those who are ignorant but to the blessed Paulinus; and he called him blessed for this reason, namely that he had the same opinion with Asterius. Since, therefore, we have learned who the most wise fathers of Asterius are, it follows, in my opinion, that we may regard Paulinus as having been the teacher of the others for it will become obvious to us from the epistle of Paulinus who in his turn his teacher has been.

Fragment 88: Although, if we ought to say the truth about the Origen, this we ought to say, that having departed at first from the study of philosophy and having decided to familiarize himself with the divine words before the exact and full understanding of the scriptures and on account of the extent and the attachment to the outer wisdom, he began in a manner easier than he ought to write and to be led by the words of philosophy and therefore has on this account written certain things not so well at all, it is obvious then that having still in his mind the dogmas of Plato and the difference of the principles which he mentions, he wrote a book on principles and placed this title at the top of this composition. And the greatest indication of this is that he took the beginning of the words or the title of the book from nowhere else but from the words said by Plato; for he wrote in the beginning thusly: "those who have believed and are persuaded." This statement likewise you would find in Plato's Gorgias.

Fragment 89: Indeed I demand from those who deal with holy things, truly taking the beginnings of the explanation like seeds, to add more proofs to those that have been mentioned, so that much more will the choices of those who distort the faith be exposed. For "they truly abandoned the God who begot them and dug up broken cisterns for themselves."

Fragment 90: I consider it (to be) relevant also to speak briefly about the icon. For he has written, "that the one who is begotten of him is another, who is the icon of the invisible God." When did he become an image except when he took up the creature which was made after the image and likeness of God? Because previously, as I said many times, he was nothing else except logos.

Fragment 91: It is obviously for this reason that he brings in the [text] "who is the image of the invisible god." [Col 1:15] When did he become an image except when he took up the creature which was made after the image and likeness of God? Because previously, as I said many times, he was nothing else except logos.

Fragment 92: It is obvious, therefore, that before taking up our body the logos was not in himself an image of the invisible God. For the image needs to be seen so that through the image what was previously not seen might be seen.

Fragment 93: How then did Asterius write that the logos of God is an image of the invisible God? For the images show forth those of whom they are images even when they are absent so that even the one who is absent seems to appear through them. Now if it happens that the logos should be invisible inasmuch as God is invisible, how could the logos be in himself an image of the invisible God, given that He too is invisible? For it is impossible for what is not visible ever to appear through the invisible.

Fragment 94: Therefore, it is everywhere evident that the flesh united to the logos is called by the holy apostle an image of the invisible God so that through the visible the

invisible may also appear. And so the apostle says, "he is an image of the invisible God." It is now obvious that when he took up the flesh which was made in the image of God he became a true image of the invisible God. For if we were deemed worthy to know through the image of the logos of God, we ought to believe this very logos who says through the image, "I and the Father are one." For neither the logos nor the Father of the logos can become known by anyone without this image.

Fragment 95: Therefore, then, the apostle says, as we said a little earlier, "he emptied himself, taking the form of a servant," through the form of the servant denoting to us the human flesh, which God our master forming through his own wisdom said, "let us make man in our image and likeness," appropriately calling the human flesh an icon. For he knew exactly that after a little while it would be an image of his own logos.

Fragment 96: What then will he say about these things? For I do not think that he has anything to say about this nor do I think that he could clearly and openly confess to others what he hides in his own mind, as it can be clearly gathered from what he has written: "for another is the Father," he says, "who gave birth out of himself to the only-begotten logos who is also first-born of all creation, an only one (giving birth) to an only one, a perfect one to a perfect one, a king to a king, a lord to a lord, a god to a god, an undifferentiated image to a being, a will, a glory, and a power." These verses clearly expose this erroneous opinion about the Godhead. For how could the Lord who, as he previously said, was born and is God, be an image of God, for the image of God is one thing and God is another. Thus if He is an image He is not Lord nor God but an image of the Lord and God; but if however he is truly Lord and God, the image of the Lord and God cannot possibly be Lord and God anymore.

Fragment 97: Nothing then from what he said before does he want to be (the case); for he says that he is the image of all these. Thus, if He is the image of a being, He can no longer be self-being, and if He is an image of the will, He can no longer be self-will, and if an image of power, no longer power, and if an image of glory, no longer

a glory, for an image is not an image of itself but of something else.

Fragment 98: For behold, what relates to Asterius does not upset us so much, namely if he came forth to write such things, but that some of those who think that they are leaders in the church, on the one hand neglecting the apostolic tradition and on the other hand preferring to write such things which are outside those divinely given, dared to teach things which are no less exposed to the deceit of those aforementioned.

Fragment 99: On the contrary, for them it would be necessary to shout with tears and contrition to the Lord "we sinned, we committed impiety, we transgressed and we did the evil thing before you, but now having changed our mind we seek to gain the loving kindness which comes from you." Such things behooved him and such things would be of benefit to say on account of God's immeasurable goodness and loving kindness although it would have been consistent for God who cares with loving kindness and justice to have replied, saying, "if any enemy derided me I would have suffered it, and if the one who hates me boasted to me, I would have hidden myself from him; but you, O man of equal soul, my leader and my acquaintance, who plied me with sweet delicacies repeatedly, you walked with me in accord to the house of God." For we know that He is present with us his own ministers from his own sayings, "behold I shall be with you," he said, "all the days of your life until the consummation of the age." Then it would certainly have been consistent if he introduced the following sayings to those who came forward, "let death come upon them and let them descend to Hades alive, because there is evil in their hearts," because scripture says that those who are dead on account of their ignorant impiety are swallowed up by Hades, for they happened to be dead even though they thought they were alive.

Fragment 100: For they want the Savior to be a man; and this is obvious from his tests that he (Eusebius) in an evil way altered the saying of the apostles according to his will, harmonizing them with his own will. For in his willingness to give birth to the supreme blasphemy on account of some ancient labor, "he poured out from his own

treasure what is evil," according to the Savior's saying. For wishing to show the Savior to be only a man, as if he was uncovering for us a supreme and ineffable mystery of the apostle, he spoke thusly: "for this reason the divine Apostle most eloquently delivering to us the ineffable and mystical theology, shouts and cries, 'God is one,' and then after the one God he says, 'and there is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus'." If, therefore, he says that he is a man, focusing attention on his incarnate economy alone, of necessity he must also confess that he has no hope in him. For the prophet Jeremiah says that "cursed is the man who has his hope in a man."

Fragment 101: But (the aforementioned) Eusebius, caring very little for the holy prophets, and explaining the theology of the apostle as something ineffable and obscure, said, "there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." But he who wrote such things and who boasted so much in recalling the scriptures did not perceive that other, namely, "who being in the form of God did not consider it a robbery to be equal with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, coming to be in the likeness of man and found in shape as a man." Do you see how the holy apostle (as if foreseeing in the Spirit their evil intent) wrote thusly in another place "as a man" and "coming to be in the likeness of a man," in order to put an end to such a blasphemy as theirs.

Fragment 102: How then, paying no attention to these (things), does Eusebius want the Savior to be only a man? Of course, he does not dare to say this openly, but rather he is exposed by his own statements that he wants (to say) this.

Fragment 103: Before the whole of creation there was a sort of silence, as it is since the logos was inside God. Indeed, if Asterius believes that God is the creator of all, it is obvious that he will confess with us that he always exists, and never received the beginning of his being whereas they have been made by him and have come to be out of non-being. Because I do not think that this is believed by him who says there are some things which are unbegotten, but exactly that he has been persuaded that heaven

and earth and all the things that exist in heaven and on earth have been made by God. If therefore he believed that he would also have to confess with us that other, namely that apart from God there is nothing else. The logos, then, had His own glory by being in the Father.

Fragment 104: Asterius calls the authority which was given to him a glory, and not only "a glory" but also a "primordial glory" not understanding that before the world was made there was nothing else except God alone.

Fragment 105: Because the man has received not only authority over things on earth, but also over things in heaven, as it is apparent. For if it was when He became both "man" and "mediator between God and men" that "all things were created for him," as the apostle said, "things in heaven and things on earth," this knowledge flows exactly, namely that authority has been given to him not only over the things on earth but also over those in heaven.

Fragment 106: For if the holy gospel speaks about a certain glory given to him by the Father, this appears to have been received by man through the logos. For becoming a "mediator between God and men" according to the holy apostle, he glorified the people who revere God with the glory which was given to him by the Father.

Fragment 107: And he resolved that the man who fell through the transgression should be conjoined to his own logos through the virgin. For what other greater glory could be given to men then this glory? But when he said that "I glorified you," he also adds, "and I will glorify again," in order to render immortal the man who was previously mortal, on account of an excess of love for man, by means of the second glory which comes after the resurrection of the flesh, and in order to glorify him with such a glory, so that he might be not only freed from the previous servitude but also to be made worthy of the glory which is above humanity.

Fragment 108: In order that I said, he might immediately enable man, who was previously deceived by the devil, to defeat the devil. On this account he assumed the man, in order to make him the first to receive the gift of authority.

Fragment 109: For he is the beloved, namely the name who was united with the logos, of whom the evangelist said, "he is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased."

Fragment 110: Because the logos of the invisible God was to be born through a virgin and assume the human flesh, and in order that he might prepare the man who through (the flesh) previously fought and defeated the devil, not only to become incorruptable and immortal, but also to be enthroned in heaven together with God.

Fragment 111: The one, then, who came down and assumed the flesh through the virgin was made king over the church so that through the logos it would be obvious that the man who had previously fallen from the kingdom of heaven might be granted the kingdom. It is, then, on account of this man, who previously fell from the kingdom through disobedience, whom God wanted to become Lord and God and God worked out this economy (dispensation). Therefore, the most holy prophet, David, says prophetically, "the Lord has established his reign, let the earth rejoice."

Fragment 112: For which cause, the prophecy says, "and I have been made king by him," indicating that Christ our Master received the beginning of the kingdom from a certain time.

Fragment 113: For this reason, the man who was previously deceived will also reign, having come to be in the human flesh and having been made king through the logos, and will abolish "every principality and power and authority" of the devil. For he says that he must reign "until he places the enemies under his feet." The holy apostle says then that this is the end of the kingdom of Christ our Master, namely that all things are put under his feet.

Fragment 114: It is the greatest mystery that the apostle reveals here, when he says that there will be an end to the kingdom of Christ, and that this end will take place when all things will be put under his feet.

Fragment 115: We said, in our previous statements, that Christ our Master was granted the beginning of his kingdom, using proof which says, "I was made a king by him on Mt. Zion which is holy to him," and another one is, "the Lord has established his reign, let the nations rage," and immediately, "the Lord has established his reign, let the earth rejoice," and there are countless sayings bearing witness which could abundantly show that the man has received the beginning of his reign through the logos. If then he has received the beginning of his reign before a certain number of years, not more than four hundred, there is nothing strange if the apostle says that he who received this kingdom in this manner, before some time would deliver the kingdom, namely to God who made him king as the scripture says.

Fragment 116: It is obvious therefore (that the Logos) is to be separated from the Father only in terms of operation on account of the pretext of the flesh until such time when the time of the coming judgment appears so that those who inflicted such wounds on Christ according to the prophecy will see the one who was inflicted with them, and likewise the remainder will take place accordingly. Since therefore all are going to be subjected to Christ at the end of time as the apostle says, in the same manner "he shall be subjected to the one who subjected all things to him;" what then do we learn about the human flesh which the logos has taken up for us before some four hundred years? Which of the two is the case, will the logos also have it in the coming ages or will he have it only until the time of the judgment? For it is necessary for what the prophet said to be confirmed in deed. Because he says, "they will see the one whom they afflicted," namely the flesh which they afflicted.

Fragment 117: For, the fact that the logos did not take our own flesh in order to benefit himself, but in order that the flesh might acquire immortality through

freedom of the glory of the children of God," how would it be possible any longer for the form of the servant which the logos took up and which is a form of a servant, to coexist with the logos? Thus the divine Paul has spoken clearly and expressly that when the future ages will have passed away in a certain length of time the economy of the logos which is according to the flesh and which has taken place for us will also have an end as it happened to have a beginning, saying thusly: "then, the end, when I deliver the kingdom to God the Father."

Fragment 118: "It is this that scandalized you," namely that he touched the human body and showed it to the onlookers? He said, "if then you see the son of man going up where he was before, (you must understand that) the Spirit vivifies, the flesh profits nothing."

Fragment 119: He took up the human flesh not for himself but for us, and if then he appears to have taken it up for us, and if all the things that relate to us in his providence and operation will come to an end at the time of the judgment, then there will no longer be any need for this partial kingdom.

Fragment 120: If, however, one were to say that the human flesh is worthy of the logos for this reason, namely for the reason that he made it immortal through the Resurrection, he should know that not everything which is immortal is also worthy of God. For God is grater than immortality itself since He is able to render immortal by his own will even transitory beings, besides that not everything immortal is worthy of being united to God is obvious from the fact that the principalities and authorities and the angels who are immortal do not differ in any way by virtue of their union with God.

Fragment 121: But if somebody were to speculate concerning this flesh which has become immortal in the logos, what shall we say to him? We do not think it to be safe to formulate dogmas about things which we have not exactly learned from the divine

scriptures, for how could this be done by those who refute the dogmas of others? But we shall say to those who wish to learn from us the exact logic concerning this, because we are persuaded by the sacred apostle, that we know that we are obliged to see the hidden mysteries in this manner, as he said: "for we now see," he says, "as through a mirror, enigmatically, but then we shall see face to face; now we know in part, but then we shall know as we have been known." Thus you must not force me to speculate about things which I have not clearly learned from the divine scriptures, neither will I be able to speak explicitly about that divine flesh which became partaker of the divine logos. As for the present, I believe the divine scriptures that God is one, and that his logos came forth from the Father, in order that all things might come to be through him, and that after the time of judgment and the reparation of all things and the obliteration of every opposing operation, then "he shall be subjected to the one who subjected all thing to him," "to God and Father," so that in this way the logos might be in God as he was previously, before the world came to be. For since there was no one previously except God alone and all things were destined to come into being through the logos, the logos came forth through an active operation, namely this logos who is the Father's.

Fragment 122: This is the one about whom Paul said, "who was foreordained as son of God."

Fragment 123: For it was on his account that the most holy prophet Solomon said, "receive both strophes of words," and again, "sayings of wise men and riddles."

Fragment 124: Therefore it seems to me that this most wise prophet has said the first utterances of the prophecy proverbially.

Fragment 125: For I do not think it is out of place to remind you a little of secular proverbs. BUT EITHER HE HAS DIED OR HE TEACHES GRAMMAR. One might take this proverb as it appears literally to have been said with reference to those who

teach grammar because another one of these said YOU TAUGHT GRAMMAR AND I ATTENDED. But that this is not so has been stated by those who have written commentaries. But because they say the Sicilians, having won a victory over the Athenians, spared only those who revered education, taking them to be teachers for their children, while they put to death all the rest and because some of them, having escaped and returned home were asked by the Athenians about certain others of whom they were interested, they were said to have said, but he either has died or he teaches grammar. What then about the (proverb) A GOAT TO THE KNIFE. One would have thought, so that I can put first what is said about this, that this proverb was certainly said about a goat which was sacrificed by the sword. But it was not this that the ancients said; for what has been said would not be a proverb if it was only that (as indeed it is appropriate to understand from all appearances), but they claim that this was said concerning those who bring evils upon themselves. For they say that Media killed her children in Corinth according to the oracle, and the Corinthians were given a black goat and were wondering were to find a knife, the goat stumbled on the foot of Media and found a knife that had been placed there. And what is the meaning of A CHAIN OF AN OAK TREE, one might say? For it is not possible to know the proverb at first sight. The ancients, as they said, were eating acorns before the cultivation of wheat, because they thought this product was later discovered, having in mind and rejoicing in the change spoke of the CHAIN OF THE OAK; and this they said to be the proverb. Again, there is another proverb which was told by most of those who are wise among them in many and various books and it is necessary that we must mention at this moment that those who wish to interpret the proverbs have written about it... in order that we may expose Asterius who has pretended at the present moment to be ignorant though he does know exactly the proverb from the lessons of the secular teachers, so that he might think that he has possibly reconstructed his own mind through the use of this proverbial statement, this is THE ART OF GLAFKOS. The secular sages who mentioned this proverb exegeted it variously, for one of them said a certain scientist called Glafkos having acquired the skill of an art which was more wondrous than many others was lost together with him in the sea and nobody else ever heard of it; but

someone else who became witness of the exact experience of music that belonged to Glafkos spoke of four copper disks that were made by him so that they might constitute some kind of musical accompaniment to sounds when they struck together and it is from this that the proverb derives its meaning. Some other one says that there was for the alyattic dedications a sort of wonderful great bowl and another one smaller under it, a construction of Glafkos the Kiot. And another one said that this Glafkos dedicated a three-legged copper tripod to Delphi made in such a way that when it was hit in the legs on which it stood and on what was placed over it and on the crown which was placed on the bowl and on the rods which were stretched in the middle it sounded like the voice of the lyre and again another one thought something more about a certain Glukos that caused the proverb to be recited. You see how the difficulty concerning this proverb has been demonstrated by the fact that those who wished to exegete it did not stand firm on one interpretation, this is how difficult the case of the proverb is regarded to be by the secular sages and this is why one of these wise sages, having gathered the proverbs recited by many and in different manners has written these in six books, two with them in metre and four without metre and all these were called proverbs by the secular sages for no other reason, in my opinion, but for the fact that having learned through them that there is nothing in what is said in them which could be clearly learned offhand, they too wished to imitate the prophetic letter and have written in the same manner as he (Solomon). Then, since they could not invent any other name more proper than that, they called them by the name of Proverbs.

Fragment 126: This is, therefore, the saying "the Lord created me a beginning of his ways for his works."

Fragment 127: He said that the logos of God rendered the human flesh immortal through the Resurrection and sat at the right hand of the Father, having taken up, as it were, the crown of victory.

Fragment 128: Having composed one such writing, he is said to have done this because he knows of one God.

Fragment 129: To the most blessed concelebrant Julius whom Marcellus salutes in Christ. Because there have been some from those who were exposed previously of not believing rightly, when I was rebuked at the Synod of Nicaea, and who dared to write to Your Reverence against me, as if I did not hold the right and ecclesiastical views and who have sought to transfer their own crime to me, I thought it necessary on this account to send a reply to Rome and to remind you so that you might respond to those who wrote against me in favor of the criticism raised by me on both counts against those who replied; and that what they have written against me happened to be lies and that even now they persist in their previous error and dare to cause evils against the churches of God and us who preside over them.

Since then they did not want to respond when you sent presbyters to them and all this in spite of my residence in Rome for a whole year and three entire months, I considered it necessary, as I was to come out here, to write to you of my faith in all truth and to hand over what I wrote with my own hand which is what I learned and was taught from the divine scriptures and to remind you of those things which are wrongly said by them, so that you may know what words they use to deceive those who hear them in their desire to hide the truth. For they say that the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is not proper and true logos of the Almighty God, but he is another word of his and another wisdom and power. That the same one who was made by him was called logos and wisdom and power, and because they think in this manner they say that he is another hypostasis distinguished from the Father. Furthermore, they declare through their writings that the Father preexists of the Son and (that he is not truly Son from God); but even if they say (the phrase) again, they dare to say that there was when he was not and that he is a creature and a thing made, differentiating him from the Father. I have been persuaded that those who say these things are alien to the catholic church. I believe, following the divine scriptures, that there is one God and his only-begotten

Son-Logos, the one who always coexists with the Father and never, ever, ever did he come to receive a beginning of his being, but truly existing from God, not created, but being always, always reigning with God the Father, whose kingdom, according to witness of the apostle, will have no end. He is the Son, he is the power, he is the wisdom, he is proper and true logos of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, the undivided power of God through whom all things made have been made. As the gospel bears witness saying, "in the beginning was the logos, and the logos was with God, and the logos was God; all things were made through him and without him not one thing has been made," he is the logos about whom Luke the evangelist also bears witness, saying, "as it was handed on to us from the beginning by those who became eye-witnesses and servants of the logos," about the same one David also said, "my heart brought forth a good logos," thus also our Lord Jesus Christ teaches us through the gospel saying, "I came out and come from the Father," he is the one who in these last days came down for our salvation and through being born from the virgin Mary he assumed the man.

I believe therefore in God the Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only begotten Son our Lord, born from the Holy Spirit and the virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried and the third day raised from the dead, ascended into heaven and seated at the right hand of the Father, whence he comes to judge the living and the dead, and in the Holy Spirit, the holy church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, the life eternal.

We have learned from the divine scriptures that the Godhead of the Father and the Son is undivided, for if one separates the Son, that is the logos, from the Almighty God, it is necessary that he should hold that there are two gods (which is believed to be alien to the divine teaching) or to confess that the logos is not God (which, of course, also appears to be alien to the orthodox faith) since the evangelist says, "and the logos was God." But I have learned exactly that he is undivided and inseparable, the one who is the power and the Son of the Father, for he is himself Savior, our Lord Jesus Christ, and he says, "the Father in me and I in the Father," and, "I and the Father

are one,"and, "he who has seen me has seen the Father," this faith I have received from the divine scriptures and I was taught by my forefathers in God and I was preaching in the church of God and I have now written to you, keeping for myself a copy of this, and I have the demand that a copy of this should be written into your epistle to the bishops so that no one from among those who do not know us might be deceived by paying attention to their writings.

With Love.

