

Epifanio de Salamina

# PANARION

LIBRO III, PARTE I

## Prólogo

Here too are the contents of Section One of Volume Three, Section Six in our previously mentioned system of numeration. It contains seven Sects together with the Schisms, as follows:

A rebellion and schism, but not sect, of Audians. They are orderly in their behavior and way of living, hold the faith exactly as the catholic church does, and most of them live in monasteries. But they make an immoderate use of a number of apocryphal works. They do not pray with us because they find fault with our bishops, and call [some of] < them > “rich” and others, other things. They keep the Passover separately from the rest of us, on the Jewish date. Besides they have some ignorant, contentious ideas and interpret our creation in God’s image with extreme literalness.

Photinians. Photinus of Sirmium, who is still alive and to this day has been wandering around; he held the same beliefs as Paul the Samosatian. They are somewhat different from Paul but they too maintain that Christ’s existence dates from Mary.

Marcellians, < who > derive from Marcellus of Ancyra in Galatia. Originally he was rumored to have views very close to Sabellius. And although he often appeared in his own defense, and explained himself in writing, he was accused by many of persisting in the same beliefs. But he has probably repented and corrected his errors, he perhaps, or his disciples. For some orthodox authorities have more or less defended him and his disciples.

Semi-Arians, who confess Christ as a creature, but deceptively say that he is not a creature like any other. “We call him ‘the Son,’” they say, “but to avoid attributing suffering to the Father as the result of begetting, we say he is a creature.” They similarly state categorically of the Holy Spirit that he likewise is a creature, and they reject the Son’s homoousion but prefer to say “homoeousion.” Others of them, however, have rejected the homoeousion as well.

Pneumatomachi. These have proper views of Christ, but blaspheme the Holy Spirit by defining him as a creature and not of the Godhead but rather, illegitimately, as something created for an operation, and they say that he is only a sanctifying power.

Aerians. Aerius was from Pontus; he still survives as a trial to the world. He was a presbyter of the bishop Eustathius who was slanderously accused of Arianism. And because Aerius was not made bishop himself he

taught many doctrines contrary to those of the church and was a complete Arian in faith but carried it further. He says we must not make offerings for those who have fallen asleep before us, and forbids fasting on Wednesday and Friday, and in Lent and Paschal time. He preaches renunciation but eats all sorts of meat and delicacies without hesitation. But he says that if one of his followers should wish to fast, this should not be on set days but when he wants to, “for you are not under the Law.” He says that a bishop is no different from a presbyter.

Aetians derive from Aetius of Cilicia, who was made a deacon by George, the Arian bishop of Alexandria. They are also called Anomoeans, but some call them Eunomians from one Eunomius, a disciple of Aetius who is still alive. Also allied with them was the Arianizer Eudoxius, but he separated himself from them supposedly for fear of the emperor Constantius, and only Aetius was exiled. Eudoxius continued to be an Arianizer, but not like Aetius.

These Anomoeans, or Aetians, separate Christ and the Holy Spirit from God altogether, maintain that he is a creature, and deny that he has even a likeness to God. For they like to give proofs of God with Aristotelian and geometrical syllogisms, and by such methods < determine >, if you please, that Christ cannot be of God.

The ones named Eunomians after Eunomius rebaptize all who come to them, not only [catholics] but < those who come > from the Arians as well. But they turn their candidates upside down to baptize them, or so it is widely reported. And they say that if one errs through fornication or another sin it does not matter; God requires only that one be in none other than this faith which they hold.

These, too, are the seven sects of Section One of Volume Three, which is Section Six of the series.

## I

### **Contra los Audianos, secta del Cristianismo**

1,1 Audians, or Odians, are a body < of laity\* >. They have withdrawn from the world and reside in monasteries—in deserts and, nearer the cities,

in suburbs, and wherever they have their residences, or “folds.” Audius became their founder in Arius’ time, when the council of those who deposed him was convened against Arius.

1,2 Audius was from Mesopotamia and a man eminent in his homeland for the purity of his life, godly zeal, and faith. And often, when he saw the things that went on in the churches under the noses of the bishops and presbyters, he would oppose such behavior, saying in reproof, “This is not the way it should be; these things ought not to be so done”—like a truth-teller, and as befits persons who speak openly from regard for the truth, particularly when their own lives are exemplary.

1,3 And so, as I said, when he saw such things in the churches he felt compelled to speak in reproof of them, and would not keep quiet. For if he saw a money-loving member of the clergy—a bishop, or presbyter, or any other cleric—he was sure to speak out. And if he saw one < living > in luxury and wantonness, or someone debasing the church’s message and ordinance, he could not abide it, and, as I said, would accuse him. (4) And to those whose lives were not up to standard, this was burdensome.

He was insulted and contradicted for this, was hated, and lived a stormy life of rejection and dishonor. For some time he was in good standing in the churches until certain persons, in extreme annoyance, expelled him for this reason. He would not consent to this, however, but persisted in speaking the truth and in not withdrawing from the bond of the one unity of the holy catholic church.

1,5 But because he was subjected to beatings, and his companions with him, and often very ill-used, he most reluctantly took account of the wretchedness of his mistreatment. For he separated himself from the church and many rebelled with him, and this is the way he caused the division, with no divergence at all from the faith but entire orthodoxy on his part and his companions’—even though one must certainly say that he and his adherents are contentious in a certain small point.

2,1 Besides his admirable confession of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit in the sense of the catholic church, and his completely orthodox observance of the rest, his whole manner of life < was > admirable. (2) For he earned his living with his own hands, and so did the bishops under him, and the presbyters and all the rest. (He was consecrated bishop later, after his expulsion from the church, by another bishop who had the same complaint and had withdrawn from the church.) (3) < But > as to what I started to say—since I have gotten sidetracked I shall take up the thread again and tell the whole story—I mean about the expression from the sacred scriptures which he harps on, as though to be as

stubborn, ignorant and contentious as possible. (4) For he and his adherents stubbornly declare that the gift God granted Adam of being in his image applies to his body,<sup>2</sup> supposedly because of the literal wording of “Let us make man in our image and after our likeness.”<sup>3</sup> And then the word of God adds, “And God took dust of the earth and made man.”<sup>4</sup> (5) “Since scripture has said < that God made > man from the earth,” says Audijs, “see how it has said with perfect truth that the entire earthy part is ‘man.’ Therefore it said earlier that the earthy part of man will itself be in the image of God.”

And this is stubborn, as I said, and ignorant—this deciding in which part of man, if there is any need to say, “part,” God’s image is located—because of the many conflicting ideas of this text which occur to people, occasioning a number of disputes. (6) If being “in the image of God” applies literally, and not figuratively, to the body, we shall either make God visible and corporeal by saying this, or else make man God’s equal. (7) We should therefore never declare or affirm with confidence which part of man is “in God’s image,” but, not to make light of God’s grace and disbelieve God, we should confess that God’s image is in man.

For whatever God says is true, even though, in a few instances, it has eluded our understanding. (8) To deny this doctrine of God’s image is not faithful, or true to God’s holy church. All people are plainly in God’s image and no one whose hope is in God will deny it, unless certain persons, who are expelled from the church and the tradition of the patriarchs, prophets, Law, apostles and evangelists, make up their own mythology.

3,1 And thus, with their quite contentious position on this point, the Audijs too depart from the church’s form of the tradition, which believes that everyone is in God’s image but < makes > no < attempt > to define where in man the image is located. For neither those who discuss this in mythological terms, nor those who deny it, can prove their point.<sup>5</sup> (2) For some say that “in the image” applies to the soul, from a belief that only physical things are susceptible to reasoning. And people like this do not know that the soul can be reasoned about—if we must attend to syllogisms

and not just rely on God with simple minds and believe that what God has said is truth, but is known only to one who knows the whole truth.

3.3 Others, though, say in turn that “in the image” applies neither to the soul nor to the body, but means virtue. But others say that it is not virtue but baptism and the gift conferred in baptism, supposedly from the literal wording of “As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.”<sup>6</sup> Others, again, disagree (4) but prefer to say that the image of God was in Adam until he fell into transgression, ate of the tree, and was expelled. But from the time of his expulsion he lost the image. (5) And people do make up a lot of stories! We must not “give place” to them “even for an hour”<sup>7</sup>—to the one group or the other, to those who say this, or those who say that—but believe that the image of God is in man, but that, first and foremost, it is in the whole man and not just < in one part >. But where this image is, or to which part of man “in the image” applies, is known only to the God who has graciously granted man the image.

3.6 For man has not lost the image of God, unless he has debased the image by sullyng himself with unimportant matters and pernicious sins. See here, God says to Noah after Adam’s time, “Lo, I have given thee all things as herbs of the field. Slay and eat, but eat not flesh with the life-blood, for I shall require your lives. Everyone that sheddeth a man’s blood upon the earth, for the blood of that man his own blood shall be required, for in the image of God have I made man, and I will require your blood from everyone that sheddeth it upon the face of the earth.”<sup>8</sup> (7) And do you see that God’s image is said to be in man ten generations after the creation of Adam?

David too, much later, says < in > the Holy Spirit, “All is vanity, every man that liveth; < and yet man goeth on in the image. >”<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the apostle after him says, “A man ought not to have long hair, for he is the image and glory of God.”<sup>10</sup> (8) Moreover James after him says that “The tongue is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison. Therewith we bless our God and Father, and therewith curse we men, which are made in the image of God. My brethren, these things ought not so to be.”<sup>11</sup> And see

how the argument of those who say that Adam lost the image of God has come to nothing.

4,1 But again, the argument and explanation of the people who say that “in the image” means the soul, goes something like this. The soul is invisible as God is invisible. It is active, a mover, intelligent, rational—and for this reason it is the image of God, since it mimics God on earth by moving, acting and doing all the other things that man does rationally. (2) But they too can be out-argued. If these are the reasons why the soul is said to be in the image of God, it cannot be in his image. God is more than ten thousand times, and still more incomprehensible and inconceivable than the soul, knowing all things past and present, visible and invisible, the ends of the earth and the pillars of the abyss, the heights of heaven and all that is, himself containing all things but contained by none. (3) The soul, however, is contained in a body, does not know the pillars of the abyss, has no knowledge of the breadth of the earth, is unacquainted with the ends of the world, does not comprehend the heights of heaven, < and does not know\* > all that will be, or when it, and all that has come to be before it, comes to be. And there is a great deal to say about it and about things of its sort, and besides, the soul has divisions, while God is indivisible. (4) The apostle says, “For the word of God is living, and quick, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and marrow, and is a discerner of thoughts and intents. And no creature is not manifest in his sight,”<sup>12</sup> and so on. And you see that their argument [here] has also failed.

5,1 And the argument of those who say that the body is in God’s image has failed in its turn. How can the visible be like the invisible? How can the corporeal be like the incorporeal? How can the tangible be like the incomprehensible? (2) We see in front of us with the eyes we have, but do not know what is behind us. But in God there is no vicissitude, no defect, never think it! He is altogether light, altogether eye, altogether glory; for God is spirit, and spirit above spirit, and light above every light. For all that he has made is inferior to his glory; only the Trinity exists in incomprehensibility, and in incomparable, unfathomable glory.

5,3 And as to the argument of those who say, in turn, that virtue is the image—there can be no virtue without the observance of the commandments, but many people differ from each other in virtue. For there are many kinds of virtue. I myself know some who are confessors, who have

given their bodies and souls for their Master in the confession of him; who have persevered in purity and held the truest faith; who are outstanding in godliness, kindness and piety and have persevered in fasting, and in every kind of goodness and the marks of virtue. (4) But they happen to have some failing—< they are > abusive, swear by God's name, are storytellers or irritable, lead a life < covetous\* > of gold, silver and the rest—all things which lessen the measure of virtue. What shall we say? Did they acquire God's image because of their virtue, but suddenly < lose\* > God's image because of a few human failings, < so that\* > the image of God < is incomplete\* >, and the image in them is no longer full? And again, their argument has failed.

5.5 Once more, there is a great deal wrong with the argument of those who say that baptism is < the > image of God. Abraham did not have baptism—or Isaac, Jacob, Elijah, Moses, or Noah and Enoch before them, or the prophets, Isaiah and the rest. Well? Don't they have the image? And there is much to say in reply < to > these people, as there is < to > the Audians with their contentious location of the image of God in the body.

6.1 But the Audians cite certain other texts as well. They say, “‘The eyes of the Lord look upon the poor, and his ears are open unto their prayer,’<sup>13</sup> and, ‘The hand of the Lord hath made all these,’<sup>14</sup> and, ‘Hath not my hand made all these, O stiff-necked people?’<sup>15</sup> (2) and, ‘Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool,’<sup>16</sup> and whatever else of the kind that scripture says of God. ‘I saw the Lord of hosts seated upon a throne high and lifted up’;<sup>17</sup> His head was white as wool and his garment white as snow.’<sup>18</sup> And do you see,” they say, “how the body is in the image of God?” And even in this they are refractory, and press the text, “The Lord appeared to the prophets”<sup>19</sup> farther than it is in man's power to do.

6.3 Of course the Lord appeared as he chose since he is mighty in all things, and we do not deny that the prophets saw God—and not only the prophets, but the apostles as well. St. Stephen the Protomartyr says, “Behold, I see heaven open, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God and the Father.”<sup>20</sup>

6,4 But in his kindness to his creation God the all-good [reveals himself] by his power, so that no unbeliever may suppose that what is said of God is mere words and not fact, that what is said of God stops with speech, and that the apostle's "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that love him,"<sup>21</sup> is not so. (5) To hearten the man he has formed God reveals himself to his holy and worthy ones, so that they may actually see God, be secure in their minds, hope in truth, truly proclaim him, and assure the faithful, (6) "Of course the pagans' beliefs about God are nothing but words and imagination. But we really know God, the true and truly existent king, the incomprehensible, the maker of all, one God—and the only-begotten God who is begotten of him and in no way different from the Father; and his Holy Spirit, who differs in no way from the Father and the Son"—as I have said at length, in every Sect, about the godly faith.

7,1 And that God has appeared to men I have often said and do not deny. For if we deny the sacred scriptures we are not truthful, but guilty of abandoning the truth—or, if we reject the Old Testament, we are no longer members of the catholic church.

7,2 But the Gospel has said, "No man hath seen God at any time, let the only-begotten God himself declare him."<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, the same sacred scripture < says >, "God appeared to Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia."<sup>23</sup> And the Lord himself says in the Gospel, "Their angels behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."<sup>24</sup>

7,3 But someone will be sure to say the sacred scripture means that the prophets saw God in their minds, because of the text, "Even their angels behold the face of my Father which is in heaven," and again, "Blessed are the pure *in heart*, for they shall see God."<sup>25</sup> (4) If < someone > has noticed this and put texts together to fit his own conception, < he > might say that each prophet sees God in his mind, for he does not do it with his eyes.

7,5 But the sacred scripture contradicts this by saying through Isaiah the prophet, "Woe is me, for I am stunned, for I, a man of unclean lips, dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips, and with mine eyes I have seen the Lord of hosts."<sup>26</sup> And he didn't say with his mind or in

his thoughts but with his eyes, confirming the truths and certainties of the faith.

7.6 What can we say, then, when the Gospel says that no one has ever seen God, while the prophets and apostles, and the Lord himself, say that they have? Is there any contradiction in the sacred scripture? Never! (7) Prophets and apostles did see God, and this is true. But they saw him as they were able and as it was possible for them, and God appeared to them as he willed, “for with him all things are possible.”<sup>27</sup> That God is invisible and incomprehensible, this is plain and universally agreed; but on the other hand, he is able to do what he wills, “For none can resist his will.”<sup>28</sup> By his nature, then, he is invisible, and in his glory he is incomprehensible; (8) but if he chooses to appear to the man he has made, there is nothing to oppose his will. For the Godhead has no frailties to prevent its doing what it wills or make it do what it does not will; it has the power to do what it wills. But it does what befits the Godhead, for there is nothing whatever to oppose God’s will so that he cannot do what he wills in keeping with his Godhead. (9) And first and foremost, it is not possible for a human being to see God, and the visible is not competent to see the invisible. But the invisible God has accomplished the impossible by his loving kindness and power, and by his might has rendered some worthy of seeing the invisible. And the person who < saw > him saw the invisible and infinite, not as the infinite was, but as the nature of one who had no power to see him could bear when empowered to the fullest. And there can be no discrepancy in the sacred scripture, nor will text will be found in contradiction to text.

8.1 To give an example I have often used, it is as though one saw the sky through a very small opening and said, “I see the sky,” and such a man would not be lying; he really does see the sky. But someone might wisely tell him, “You haven’t seen the sky,” and he would not be lying. (2) The person who says he has seen the sky isn’t lying, and the person who tells him he hasn’t is also telling the truth. For the man didn’t see its extent or its breadth. And the person who had seen it told the truth, but the one who replied that he hadn’t did not lie, but also told the truth.

8.3 Besides, we often stand on a mountain top and behold the sea, and if we say we have seen the sea, we haven’t lied. But if someone replies, “You haven’t seen it,” he isn’t lying either. Where its full breadth reaches to, its full length, its depth, where the innermost chambers of the deep

are and the furthest bounds of the deep, < no > human being can know. (4) Now if our knowledge of created things is so limited, how much more with the grace God has granted the prophets and apostles? They truly saw God, and yet did not see him. They saw him as far as their natures could bear, and that by the grace of the power with which, from love of the man who is his, He who is mighty in all things has endowed his true servants.

8,5 So if Audians think that God has hands for this reason, or eyes or the rest, because he so appeared to the prophets and apostles, they are behaving contentiously but are confuted by the truth. (6) Of all that God says in the sacred scripture, we must believe that it is; but how it is, is known to him alone. And that he really appeared—yes, but he appeared as he willed to, and truly looked as he appeared. For God can do all things, and nothing is impossible for him. But, being unfathomable spirit, he is incomprehensible, containing all things but himself contained by none. (7) And as is the Father, so is the Son, and so is the Holy Spirit in Godhead. But only the Only-begotten came and assumed the flesh in which he also rose, which he also united with his Godhead joining it to spirit, < and > [in which] he sat down in glory at the Father's right hand as the scripture says. (8) And since he is incomprehensible and unfathomable, all that is said of him is really true. And since God is incomprehensible all that is said of him is sure, but there is no comprehending God's attributes, and how he exists in incomprehensible glory.

8,9 And with my human lips I have said these things in praise of God as I was able. For even though I have further ideas about God in my mind I do not have the use of a tongue other than the one God has meted out to me. But all that is in the mind the mouth cannot say since it is closed by its measure and hemmed in by the organs of the body. (10) And so God pardons me and accepts my knowledge of him, and the praise that is beyond my power to give. < Not that I desire > to give God anything, but I desire to glorify the Godhead as best I can, so as to hold godly beliefs, and not be deprived of his grace and truth.

8,11 In singling out these points about Audius and the Audians I have reported the things they say, which they inappropriately affirm by expounding them themselves in an eccentric way, and by contentiously persisting in them. (9,1) But they have certain other positions besides, on which they take a particularly strong stand and have aggravated the division of the church, and with which they frighten others, often detach them from the church, and have attracted men and women. (2) For they choose to celebrate the Passover with the Jews—that is, they contentiously celebrate the Passover at the same time that the Jews are holding

their Festival of Unleavened Bread. And indeed, < it is true > that this used to be the church's custom—even though they tell churchmen a slanderous thing in this regard and say, (3) "You abandoned the fathers' Paschal rite in Constantine's time from deference to the emperor, and changed the day to suit the emperor." (4) And some, again, declare with a contentiousness of their own, "You changed the Passover to Constantine's birthday."<sup>29</sup>

9,5 And if the Paschal Feast were celebrated on the same day each year, and it had been decided to keep it on that day at the council convoked by Constantine, what they say might be plausible. But since the rite cannot be held on the same date each year, their argument is worthless. The emperor was not concerned for his birthday, but for the unity of the church. (6) In fact God accomplished two very important things through Constantine, the most beloved of God and forever the most blessed. [One was] the gathering of an ecumenical council and the publication of the creed that was issued at Nicaea and confessed < by > the assembled bishops with their signatures—the deposition of Arius, and the declaration to all of the purity of the faith. [The other was] their rectification of the Paschal Feast for the sake of our unity.

9,7 For long ago, even from the earliest days, its various celebrations in the church differed, occasioning ridicule every year, with some keeping it a week early and quarreling with the others, others a week late—some celebrating it in advance, some in between, others afterwards. (8) And in a word, as is not unknown to many scholarly persons, there was a lot of muddle and tiresomeness every time a controversy was aroused in the church's teaching about this festival—as in the time of Polycarp and Victor the east was at odds with the west and they would not accept letters of commendation from each other.<sup>30</sup> (9) But in as many other times—as in the time of Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria, and Criscentius,<sup>31</sup> when each is found writing to the other and quarreling, and down to our own day. This has been the situation ever since < the church > was thrown into disorder after the time of the circumcised bishops.<sup>32</sup> And so < bishops > ,

gathering then from every quarter and making a precise investigation, determined that the festival be celebrated with one accord, as befits its date and rite.

10,<sup>1</sup> But on this point the Audians cite the Ordinance of the Apostles, which is held to be dubious by many but is not spurious. For it contains every canonical regulation and no falsification of the faith < is to be found > there—of its confession, or of the church's order, law and creed. (2) But the line which they seriously misinterpret, and ignorantly misunderstand in taking < their cue > for the Paschal Feast from it, is < the following >. The apostles decree in the Ordinance, "Reckon ye not, but celebrate when your brethren of the circumcision do; celebrate with them."<sup>33</sup> And they did not say, "your brethren *in* the circumcision," but, "your brethren *of* the circumcision," to show that those who had come from the circumcision to the church were the leaders from then on, and so that the others would agree < with them >, and one not celebrate the Paschal Feast at one time, and another at another. (3) For they came to this conclusion entirely for the sake of the [church's] unity.

But the Audians were not aware of the apostles' intent and the intent of the passage in the Ordinance, and thought that the Paschal Feast should be celebrated with the Jews. (4) And there were altogether fifteen bishops from the circumcision.<sup>34</sup> And at that time, when the circumcised bishops were consecrated at Jerusalem, it was essential that the whole world follow and celebrate with them, so that there would be one concord and agreement, the celebration of one festival. (5) Hence their their concern [was] to bring people's minds into accord for the unity of the church.

< But\* > since < the festival\* > could not be celebrated < in this way\* > for such a long time, by God's good pleasure < a correction > was made for harmony's sake was made in the time of Constantine. (6) For the words of the apostles are quoted here for the sake of harmony, as they testify by saying, "Even if they are in error, let it not concern you."<sup>35</sup> But from the very words that are said there, the contradiction will be evident. For they say that the vigil should be held midway through the Days of Unleavened

Bread.<sup>36</sup> But by the church's dating [of the Paschal Feast] this cannot always be done.

11,1 For the fixing of the date of the Paschal Feast is determined by three factors: from the course of the sun; because of the Lord's Day; and because of the lunar month which is found in the Law, so that the Passover may be slain on the fourteenth of the month as the Law says. (2) Thus<sup>37</sup> it cannot be celebrated unless the day of the equinox is past, although the Jews do not observe this or care to keep so important a matter precise; with them, everything is worthless and erroneous.<sup>38</sup> Still, even though such precision is required in so important a question, the apostles' declaration was not made for the sake of this question and for precision, but in the interest of concord. And < if >, as the Audians insist, the apostles' ordinance was that we celebrate with the enemies of Christ, how much more must we celebrate with the church for the sake of concord, so as not to mar the harmony of the church?

11,3 Now how can this (i.e., celebrating on the Jewish date) be done? The same apostles say, "When they feast, mourn ye for them with fasting, for they crucified Christ on the day of the feast. And when they mourn on the Day of Unleavened Bread and eat with bitter herbs, then feast ye."<sup>39</sup> (4) But it sometimes happens that they take the bitter herbs on the Lord's Day. For they can slay the Passover at evening at the dawning of the Lord's Day. For they cannot do [this] work after the evening [just after] the Sabbath is over. Very well, if they wake up feasting after slaughtering [the lamb], how can we mourn and weep on the Lord's Day since, again, the apostles tell us in the Ordinance, "Whoso afflicteth his soul on the Lord's Day is under God's curse."<sup>40</sup>

11,5 And do you see how much scruple and contradiction there is when the thing cannot be done as directed? But the whole truth lies in the purpose of their teaching, and from the apostles' Ordinance itself < it

is plain > how the fixing of the reckoning was arrived at for the sake of concord. < For > if we < always > celebrate when the Jews do, < we shall sometimes celebrate > after the equinox, as they often do, and we too; and again, we shall sometimes celebrate before the equinox, as they do when they celebrate alone.<sup>41</sup> (6) Therefore if we celebrate [then] too, we may keep two Paschal Feasts in one year, [one] after the equinox and [one] before it; but the next year we shall not keep any Paschal Feast at all, and the whole thing will turn out to be error rather than of truth. For the year will not be over before the day of the equinox; and the cycle<sup>42</sup> of the course [of the sun], which God has given men, is not complete unless the equinox is past.

12,1 And much could be said about the good the fathers did—or rather, the good God did through them—by arriving at the absolutely correct determination, for the church, of this all-venerable, all-holy Paschal Feast, its celebration after the equinox, which is the day on which the date of the fourteenth of the lunar month falls. Not that we are to keep it on the fourteenth itself; the Jews require one day, while we require not one day but six, a full week. (2) The Law itself says, to extend the time, “Ye shall take for yourselves a lamb of a year old, without blemish, perfect, on the tenth of the month, and ye shall keep it until the fourteenth, and ye shall slay it near evening on the fourteenth day of the month,”<sup>43</sup> that is, the lunar. But the church observes the Paschal festival, (3) that is, the week which is designated even by the apostles themselves in the Ordinance, beginning with the second day of the week, the purchase of the lamb. And the lamb is publicly slaughtered (i.e., by the Jews) if the fourteenth of the month falls on the second day of the week—or if it falls on the third, the fourth, the fifth, the eve of the Sabbath, or the Sabbath; for the six days are designated for this purpose.<sup>44</sup>

12,4 For neither can we < end > the Paschal Feast when the sixteenth of the month begins, or begin the so-called holy week of dry fare and Paschal Feast on the ninth, but [must keep] between the tenth and the night before the fifteenth, in between the two courses of night and day. (5) And though their reckoning, of the fourteen days of the lunar month, is included [in ours]—even though it barely reaches to daybreak on the fifteenth because of our necessarily exact calculation of the course of the

sun after the equinox, the course of the moon because of the fourteenth, and the full week because of the Lord's Day—[still], we also < observe\* > the calculation on the tenth day, which is the taking of the lamb and the initial letter of the name of Jesus. For his antitype, a lamb, was taken in this name, and so is set on the tenth.

But we cannot have the beginning or end [of the festival] at the beginning of the sixteenth of the month, or on the ninth. (6) For by growing progressively shorter<sup>45</sup> because of the difference between the courses of the sun and the moon the [lunar] years cause the following inequality, though this is not meant to be a divinely ordained stumbling block. For this exact computation has been set by God in his all-wise governance, which he has granted his world by appointing, of his loving kindness, the bounds of the luminaries, seasons, months, years and solstices, through his providential care for humankind.

13,1 For though the solar year is completed in 365 days and three hours, there is still a shortage of eleven days, three hours in the course of the moon, since the moon completes its year in 354 days. (2) And the first year has eleven intercalary days, so called, and three hours, the second has twenty-two days and six hours, and the third has thirty-three days and nine hours. This makes one intercalary month, as it is called.

13,3 For the thirty days are intercalated, but three days and nine hours are left over. Added to the eleven days and three hours of the fourth year, these make fourteen days and twelve hours. And when another eleven days and three hours are added, the total is twenty-five days and fifteen hours. And in the sixth year, since another eleven days and three hours are added to the year, there is a total of thirty-six days and eighteen hours, which make one intercalary month. And two months have been intercalated, and (one) every three years. (4) There is one month in the first three years, and another month in the other three.

And six days, plus eighteen hours, are left over from the intercalary days. When these are added, in the seventh year, to the eleven days and three hours of that year, the total is seventeen days and twenty-one hours. And when the eleven days and three hours are again added on the eighth year, this becomes twenty-eight intercalated days—and twenty-four hours, which make two days. (5) The sum of these hours added to the twenty-eight days is thirty. And so the thirty days < are intercalated > in

the eighth year, the one month in two years. (6) And thus ninety days < are intercalated > over a period of eight years These are a total of three intercalary months, which come one month every three years, and later one month in two. The paschal festival differs among Jews, Christians and the others, in these three intercalations of the groups of days.

14,1 Here is where the Audians differ; and they deceive men and women in this regard with their parade of keeping the original tradition and following the Ordinance of the Apostles. But they ignore any exact calculation and are not clear about the apostles' charge in the Ordinance—which was by no means to hold the observance exactly < like > the Jews, but to eliminate the contentiousness of those who each wanted to celebrate in their own way, and not in harmony. (2) For Christ desires one Paschal Feast, reckons this [one a Paschal Feast], and accepts a person who keeps it without contention but with those whose observance is exact, [that is], all the holy church which keeps the festival in many places. (3) And if the Paschal Feast had been fragmented after Constantine, the slanderers would have a point. But since the divisions came before Constantine and ridicule arose, with the pagans talking about the disharmony in the church and making fun of it—but by the zeal of the bishops the division was united in one harmony in Constantine's time—(4) what can be more important and acceptable than to reconcile a people to God from [all] the ends of the earth on one day? [What better] than that they agree, hold their vigil and keep exactly the same days, and < serve\* > God with watchings, supplications, concord, service, fasting, abstinence, purity and the other good things that please God, on this all-venerable day? But I think this is enough about this matter of the Audians' disagreement.

14,5 Audius suffered exile in his old age and was banished to Scythia by the emperor; < for > he was reported to the emperor by the bishops because of the rebellion of the laity. He lived there for the most part—I cannot say for how many years—and then went further on, even into the interior of Gothia. He instructed many Goths, and many monasteries therefore arose in Gothia itself, and the religious life, virginity and an ascetic discipline of no mean order. (6) In fact this body is absolutely < outstanding\* > in its admirable conduct, and all their customs are well regulated in their monasteries, except for these points of contention, the difference in their Paschal Feast and their ignorant profession of the doctrine of the divine image.

15,1 But the worst, most fearful thing of all is that they will not pray with someone even if he is plainly respectable and they have nothing to

accuse him of—no charge of fornication, adultery or covetousness, but simply membership in the church. Besides, this is a fearful thing, to change the name of the Christians—the holy church, which has no additional name, but simply the name of Christ and Christians—< and > be named for Audius, and to make, and be required to make a covenant < against > the human race even though the group is outstanding in life,<sup>46</sup> pure and boasts of all righteousness.

15,2 For even after Audius' death many joined them and became bishops of his faction after him—one Uranius of Mesopotamia, and they got some men from Gothia and consecrated them as bishops, < including. . . ><sup>47</sup> and there was a Silvanus and certain others. But some of these have died, Uranius in particular. For he was proud to be a member of this group.

15,3 But many members were dispersed after the death of these bishops, Uranius and Silvanus of Gothia, and their body dwindled to a small one in Chalcis by Antioch, and the Euphrates region. (4) Indeed, the majority of them were hounded out of Gothia—not only they, but also the Christians of our kind who were there, when a great persecution was launched by a pagan king. He was a dreadful person; besides, he drove all the Christians out of those < territories\* > from anger at the Romans, because the Roman emperors were Christian. But neither a root of wisdom nor a shoot of faith is wanting; even if they all appear to have been driven out, there must surely be < faithful > men there. It is not possible for the spring of faith to fail.

15,5 Many Audian refugees from Gothia came even here < to > our country, and lived as resident aliens for four years after that time. But they also withdrew once again < to > their Audian monasteries in the Taurus mountains, and in Palestine and Arabia. For they are widely dispersed by now but are still very few in number, and have few monasteries. But perhaps the group is still in two villages in the outer part of Chalcis, as I mentioned, and beyond Damascus and Mesopotamia, though, as I said, greatly reduced in number.

15,6 But I think that is enough about this group in its turn. Once more, I shall pass them by and investigate the rest, so as to omit nothing about the divisions, splits, differences and schisms which have arisen in the world. For even though they are not that much changed in faith and

< different\* > in behavior, if I can help it I am still not going to omit any separate group which has its own name.

## II

### **Contra los Fotinianos, secta del Cristianismo**

1,1 Photinus, the founder of the Photinians, flourished in our own time. Although he had been made a bishop of the holy catholic church he was taken with no light case of insanity but was madder than all before him, taking a view of the Son of God which was like Paul the Samosatian's and worse, and belching out confused blasphemies. (2) He came from Sirmium,<sup>2</sup> and was a bishop when he introduced this tare to the world in the reign of the emperor Constantius. < But > he has survived to this day, and was deposed by the western council which was assembled at Sardica,<sup>3</sup> for the stream of blasphemy which he spat up. (3) He claims that Christ does not exist from the beginning but is from Mary's time—since the Holy Spirit came upon her, he says, and he was conceived of the Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit is greater than Christ—says he, like a venturesome master builder, and a surveyor of the ineffable heights of heaven.

1,4 Photinus was all talk and glib tongue, but could fool many with his flow of words and readiness of speech. For though he was refuted many times by many opponents < he persisted in his defense of himself\* >—even after his defense at Sardica, when he was summoned by the bishops to give an account of the heresy he had put forward. Indeed, on the plea that he had been deposed for nothing, he asked the emperor Constantius for another set of auditors, so as to prove that he had been deposed for no good reason. (5) And so at that time the emperor sent Thalassius, Datianus, Cerealius, Taurus, Marcellinus, Euanthius, Olympius, and Leon-tius to be the judges and auditors of his the defense he was going to make, with Basil of Ancyra examining and rebutting him or, indeed, accepting the points he would make in his own defense.

1,6 Photinus made a speech of some length to Basil with his words in the discussion. But he offered confused statements which, like a painted hussy's complexion, < had a meaning something like\* > the sense of the

truth, but in his own mind were understood in an altered sense. (7) But when Basil and the audience < were caught > by his deceptive talk and the readiness of his speech for verbal trickery, the hotshot, even boastfully, professed himself ready to cite a hundred texts in proof of his thesis. (8) For despite the < auditors' > frequent replies to him < he never stopped offering arguments\* >—as I have found in the Speech to Basil,<sup>4</sup> in the parts they had the stenographers take down: Basil's deacon, Anysius; the governor Rufinus' secretary, Callicrates; the recorders Olympius, Nicetes and Basil; and the imperial notaries Eutyches and Theodulus. One volume was sent sealed to the emperor Constantius, one remained with Basil's council, and another, likewise sealed, < was left > with the court officials as the statements<sup>5</sup> of Photinus' opinion.

2.1 For any time Basil asked why the sacred scriptures teach that the Lord, the Word of God, is the Only-begotten before the ages and is with the Father, Photinus would accept the formula but, attaching a distinction to it, apply it partly to Christ but partly to the heavenly Word, drawing the analogy < of human nature >. (2) "For the Father said 'Let us make man in our image and after our likeness'<sup>6</sup> to his Word," said Photinus. "In what way? The Word was in the Father, but was not a Son. And 'The Lord rained from the Lord'<sup>7</sup> means the Word in the Father. (3) And scripture said 'I saw one like unto a son of man descending on the clouds'<sup>8</sup> predictively, and not as though the Son already existed. But because Christ would be called "Son" after Mary's time and after coming forth with flesh when he was born of the Holy Spirit and<sup>9</sup> of Mary," Audius says that all this is applied to him by anticipation, from the outset. (4) "But he was not yet < a Son >, he was a Word like the word in me." But I have said already that < he voiced\* > opinions partly like those of Paul the Samosatian, but that he expressed others, and went even farther in his thinking.

3.1 But he too will be exposed as having reached the ultimate degree of the denial of God, and come to an opinion entirely foreign to eternal

life. For if the Son is a latecomer in his Godhead then David is earlier—or rather, David is even to be preferred over his Maker. For Photinus meant this < in citing\* > the sacred scripture—(2) or rather, in bypassing it in terms of his erroneous opinion—< and > said, “Even the apostle has said, ‘The first *man* is of the earth, earthy, and the second *man* is from heaven.’”<sup>10</sup> (3) But the speech of the truth contradicts him at once, and refutes his mind. For the holy apostle said, “man,” and [again], “man,” and that *the first* “man,” Adam, is of the earth, while the *second* is from heaven. (4) But Christ’s flesh did not descend from heaven, though surely he said “man” [the second time]; even Photinus admits that it comes from Mary. Paul is not carelessly saying that flesh is from heaven, but means that the second man is from heaven, ever since the Word came down from on high and “dwelt among us,”<sup>11</sup> as the scripture says.

3,5 Now if the Lord < came from on high\* >, he was pre-existent. < Photinus concedes\* >, indeed, < that the scripture says\* > that “He which hath found out every path of knowledge”<sup>12</sup> is with us, but that the actual < Finder of every path of knowledge is the Word in the Father; and he wants to prove this from the line following, “Then he appeared on earth.” But anyone with sense can see\* > that the sacred scripture does not doubt < the Son’s preexistence\* >, for “then”<sup>13</sup> and “hath found out every path of knowledge” imply his preexistence. Then “He appeared on earth” < indicates > his coming incarnation.

3,6 And as to their claim that he has brought the man from heaven, the apostle does not say < this >. He calls him “man” because of the union of his human nature [with his Godhead], < but secondly >, because of the amount of time between Adam and the incarnation. (7) But he says that he is “from heaven” because the divine Word has come from on high and < assumed > flesh, as the scripture says, “The Word was made flesh,”<sup>14</sup>—but not as though he supposes that the Word has come forth from the Father and been turned into flesh.<sup>15</sup> For this is the explanation that Photinus, with his deluded notion, gave of the passage.

3,8 But if Adam is before the Word is, through whom was Adam himself created, and all God's creatures before him? To whom did the Father say, "Let us make man?"<sup>16</sup> (9) No one ever gives advice to the word within him or to his own spoken word;<sup>17</sup> God makes his all-wise statement < of > the coming creation of man to his immanent, holy Word, to teach us that the Son is with the Father from the beginning—so that we will not think that our creator is of recent origin, but that he is always with the Father before the ages. So John testifies by saying, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God."<sup>18</sup>

4,1 I say too, as the scum himself does, that the Word is from the beginning—but as a Son begotten < of > God. And if he is not God's Son Photinus' labor is for nothing, and so is his devotion, hope and purpose; for he is saying nothing more than the Jews who denied Christ. (2) The Gospel does not say of him, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was *in* God," but, "the Word was *with* God."<sup>19</sup> (3) And it does not say only that ["The Word] was in God," but that "The Word *was* God."<sup>20</sup> The immanent word which is always in man and is man's spoken word cannot be called, "man," but must be called, "man's word." (4) < But > if, as Photinus says, there was no Offspring yet [when the Word was "with God"], and if the divine Word was not yet God's Son, through whom were all things made? For the Gospel says, "All things were made *through him*, and without him was not anything made."<sup>21</sup>

4,5 But Photinus says, "As man does what he will through his reason, so the Father made all things by his own reason, through the Word that is in him." (6) Then why does the Lord say in the Gospel, "My Father worketh hitherto; I too work?"<sup>22</sup> However, "My Father worketh; I too work" does not mean that the Father is not at work in the work of the Son, or that the Son is separate from him and not at work in the Father's creation. (7) All the works there are, have been jointly performed by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. For all things have been done through the Son by the Father, and the Son himself has done all things with the Father, and with the Holy

Spirit. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth."<sup>23</sup>

4.8 And so the Lord spoke with assurance in the Gospel, knowing the opinion of those who have gone astray, and spoke with divine foreknowledge, and with < an awareness > of the way in which each would deprive himself of the truth. < For > he told the Jews, "The Son doeth nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do."<sup>24</sup> And this is not because he sees first and then does; he has all things within himself and does what he will.

5.1 Well, Photinus, how will it come out? Or again, who is in you to offer us this tare? Who concocted this poison for the world? What gave you the wicked idea of adopting a blasphemous opinion of your Lord? (2) Hasn't Abraham convinced you by speaking to Christ and saying, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do judgment?"<sup>25</sup> Admit defeat, for the Son visited him—and not as an utterance, but as a real divine Word.

5.3 And to show you what happens to those who have spent their time on this, you would-be sage, < hear > how God has closed the subject for us in the sacred scripture by saying, "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorra fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven."<sup>26</sup> (4) And he didn't say, "The Lord's word," but, "The Lord, from the Lord," just as David says, "The Lord said unto my Lord."<sup>27</sup> And to < show > that the Son does not date only from the incarnation, he also says of his original [begetting], "From the belly before the morning star I begot thee."<sup>28</sup>

5.5 And no one will accept what you say of the Holy Spirit, you wind-bag and useless busybody! The Holy Spirit is neither "greater" nor "less;" "Who hath required this at your hands?"<sup>29</sup> says scripture. (6) But the holy Word himself confounds you; to acknowledge the legitimacy of his God-head the Lord says of the Holy Spirit, "that proceeded from the Father and receiveth of me."<sup>30</sup>

6.1 And how many other proof texts are there? But since everyone can see that your nonsense is erroneous and untrue, and that it will be

detected not only by the wise but even by those who have a little knowledge of the text of the sacred scripture, and this frees me from the need of a great many proof texts or a long refutation—your tall tale and your wicked belief are easily refutable—(2) < I believe > that what I have said about you will do. I shall leave you behind as though I had squashed < some kind of > feeble bug with no strength that had grown up from the earth, or a worm or a maggot, with the foot of reason and the truth of the Word of God. (3) For this fool's sect has already been dispersed<sup>31</sup> in a short time. Calling on God as usual, I shall go on to the rest.

### III

#### **Contra los Marcelianos, secta del Cristianismo**

1,1 In his own turn Marcellus was born—all these people came at once—at Ancyra. Still < alive > till our day, he died about two years ago.<sup>2</sup>

(2) He too caused a division in the church from the start of his career, and gave a slight adumbration of this when—due to the Arians' irritation with him over his anti-Arian pamphlet,<sup>3</sup> if you please—he was compared with Sabellius and Navatus. For this reason he is also attacked by certain < orthodox > for partly believing, as I said, in Sabellius' nonsense.

Some have said in his defense, however, that this was not so; they maintained that he had lived rightly and held orthodox opinions. There has therefore been a great deal of controversy about him. (3) His secret thoughts are known only to God. But either because they did not know his mind, or because they were giving his actual ideas, his converts and pupils would not confess the three entities, which is what the truth is—that there is one Godhead and one Glory, a co-essential Trinity with no differentiation of its own glory. It is a perfect Trinity and one Godhead, one power, one essence, and neither an identity nor a subordination.

1,4 But when he wanted in the worst way to prove his point to certain persons, he showed that < his > opinions were like those of Sabellius; hence this group too is refuted like a sect and counted as one. But again,

I subjoin a copy of the exposition of his argument that Marcellus wrote, (5) supposedly in his own defense, to Julius, the blessed bishop of Rome. From his defense [itself], and the document, it will be evident that his beliefs differed from the true faith. For if he did not think otherwise, why did he decide to offer a defense—if words which were issued by him were not right and disturbed certain people, and had brought < him > to this defense? Very well, here is the copy:

2,1 *Greetings in Christ from Marcellus to his most blessed fellow worker, Julius.*

*Some who were formerly convicted of heresy, and whom I confuted at the Council of Nicaea, have dared to write your Reverence that my opinions are neither orthodox nor in agreement with the church, thus endeavoring to have the charge against themselves transferred to me. (2) I therefore felt that I must come to Rome and suggest that you send for those who have written against me, so that I could prove, in a direct confrontation, that what they have written against me is untrue, and further, that they persist even now in their former error, and have dared dreadful ventures against the churches of God and us who head them.*

2,3 *But they have chosen not to appear, though you have sent presbyters to them and I have spent a year and three full months at Rome. On the eve of my departure, therefore, I feel that, with all sincerity and by my own hand, I must submit a written statement to you of the faith which I have learned and been taught from the sacred scriptures and remind you of the evils they have spoken, to acquaint you with the words with which, for their hearers' deception, they choose to conceal the truth.*

2,4 *For they say that the Son of the almighty God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is not his true and actual Word, but that God has a different word and a different wisdom and power. This person whom he has made is called Word, wisdom and power; and since they hold this opinion they say that he is another entity, separate from the Father. (5) They further declare in their writings that the Father is prior to the Son, < and > that the Son is not truly a son [begotten] of God. Even though they say he is "of God," they mean that he is "of God" just as all things are. And moreover, they dare to say that there was a time when he did not exist, and that he is a creature and a product of creation, and so separate him from the Father. It is my conviction, then, that persons who say these things are strangers to the catholic church.*

2,6 Now I, following the sacred scriptures, believe that there is one God and his only-begotten Son, the Word, who is always with the Father and has never had a beginning, but is truly of God—not created, not made, but forever existent, forever reigning with God and his Father, “of whose kingdom,” as the apostle testifies, “there shall be no end.”<sup>4</sup>

2,7 This Son, this power, this wisdom, this true and actual Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is a power inseparable from God, through whom all created things have been made as the Gospel testifies, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made.”<sup>5</sup> (8) He is the Word of whom Luke the Evangelist testifies, “Inasmuch as they have delivered, unto us, which were eye witnesses and ministers of the Word.”<sup>6</sup> Of him David also said, “My heart hath burst forth with a good Word.”<sup>7</sup> (9) So our Lord Jesus Christ has taught us through the Gospel by saying “I came forth from the Father and am come.”<sup>8</sup> At the end of days he descended for our salvation, was conceived by the Holy Spirit, and assumed manhood.

3,1 Therefore I believe in one God the Almighty, and in Christ Jesus his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, was buried, on the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into the heavens and is seated at the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

And in the Holy Spirit, the holy church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting.

3,2 I have learned from the sacred scriptures that the Godhead of the Father and of the Son cannot be differentiated. For if one separates the Son, that is, the Word, from Almighty God, he must either suppose that there are two Gods, which is agreed to be untrue to the sacred scripture, or else confess that the Word is not God, which likewise is plainly untrue to the right faith, since the Evangelist says, “and the Word was God.”<sup>9</sup> (3) But I understand perfectly that the Father’s power, the Son, is indistinguishable and inseparable [from him]. For the Savior himself our Lord Jesus Christ, says, “The Father

*is in me and I am in the Father,”<sup>10</sup> “I and my Father are one,”<sup>11</sup> and, “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.”<sup>12</sup>*

*3,4 This faith, which I have both learned from the sacred scriptures and been taught by godly parents, I preach in God’s church and have now written down for you, keeping a copy for myself. (5) I also request that you enclose a copy of it in your letter to the bishops, so that none of those who do not know me and my accusers well will be deceived by paying attention to what they have written. Farewell!*

*The End*

4,1 Those who can read this document, and those who can understand exactly what it says, < must > say whether it is all right. And if it is wrong, they must decide this for themselves. I do not wish to say anything more than I know and have been told. (2) For even though the document is right on the subject, those who read it and hear it read will suspect in their turn that Marcellus was not obliged to defend himself for nothing, or for no good reason, or because of < enmity > towards him—not unless he had belched out words that disturbed some and forced him to undertake his own defense because of things he had said.

4,3 For it may be that, even after falling into error, he defended and corrected himself with this document. Or he may have dressed his words up with the document to hide what he had said, and avoid exclusion by deposition from the college and order of bishops. At any rate, this is what I have learned about Marcellus.

4,5 However, I once asked the blessed Pope Athanasius myself how he felt about this Marcellus. He neither defended him nor, on the other hand, showed hostility towards him, but merely told me with a smile that he had not been far from rascality, but that he felt he had cleared himself.

5,1 But I shall cite the statements which some have found in Marcellus’ own writings and felt reprehensible, and so have inveighed against him and written replies of their own. (2) Their replies to him < were brought to light\* > by others in turn, for purposes of refutation, since those who had written in reply to him but later changed their minds < preferred to conceal what they had written earlier\* >. < Hence >, in refutation of Acacius, these people issued Marcellus’ statements and made them known in their own writings, during the disputes between Acacius, Basil of Galatia,

and George of Laodicea. (3) It was Acacius who, to refute Marcellus, had quoted passages from Marcellus' writings. < I shall cite them > to show by omitting none of the truth that I neither despise anything that may make for the correction of persons who try to prove untruths, nor wish to agree with such persons. And here are the passages from Acacius' argument against Marcellus:

*The following citations are made because of Marcellus:*

6,<sup>1</sup> *After his misinterpretation of the comments on Proverbs, Marcellus wrote the things which follow and others like them, speaking unrighteously of God and lifting up his horn on high. Past the middle of the book he again quotes the words of Asterius, which say, (2) "For the Father is another, who has begotten of himself the only-begotten Word and the firstborn of all creation—Unique begetting Unique, Perfect begetting Perfect, King begetting King, Lord begetting Lord, God begetting God, the exact image of his essence, will, power and glory."*

6,<sup>3</sup> *He quotes these words but objects to the "exact image"—that is, to the distinct, clear impress of God's essence, and the rest. Calling this notion a bad one, he appends his dissatisfaction and at this point writes: (4) "These words plainly reveal his poor opinion of Godhead. How can One who was begotten as Lord and God, as he himself has said earlier, still be an "image" of God? An image of God is one thing and God is another. If he is an image he is not Lord or God, but an image of a Lord and God. But if he is really Lord and really God, the Lord and God cannot be the image of a Lord and God."*

6,<sup>5</sup> *And next, "He does not allow that he is any of the things he has mentioned; he calls him the 'image' of all these things. Very well, if he is the image of an essence, he cannot be self-existence. If he is the image of a will, he cannot be absolute will. If he is the image of power, he cannot be power; if of glory, he cannot be glory. For an image is not an image of itself but an image of something else."*

7,<sup>1</sup> *You commended these words earlier, Marcellus, at the beginning of your book. But now, by denying that the God of God, the Word, is the Son and is Unique begotten of Unique, Perfect begotten of Perfect, you have plainly betrayed your poor opinion of the Godhead. (2) You ought to have cut your profane tongue out for understanding the image of the Great King < to be > lifeless and without Godhead, will, power, glory and essence, saying a word against the Lord, and dooming to death the soul that has committed such impiety.*

7,<sup>3</sup> *For by limiting the image of God to lifelessness, < you are saying > that it is neither Lord, God, essence, will, power nor glory. You would have it be a motionless image of these things and make it an inert, lifeless image*

set outdoors, as inert < as though > it were the product of mere human skill. You will not have God's image be a living image of a living God, will not have the image of an essence be an essence, or have the exact image of will, power and glory be will, power and glory. (4) But "exact" does not mean the same as "unoriginate;" it means that the divinity, and every action of the image is expressly and precisely like the divinity, and every action, of the Father.

7,5 And later [Acacius says], "Your lying < lips > should be put to silence that speak unrighteously against God, haughtily and with contempt."<sup>13</sup> (6) For even though you do not care for this and now prefer something else, the Father begot the Only-begotten as Unique begets Unique. The Son did not make his appearance because of Valentinus' aeons, but was begotten of a sole Father; and "Perfect begot Perfect." For there is no imperfection in the Father, and therefore there is none in the Son; the Son's perfection is the legitimate offspring of the Father's perfection and more than perfection.

And "A King begot a King." (7) It is orthodox doctrine that God rules < before the > [rule] of the Son, who was begotten before the ages and is a King who himself has a ruler; through him the rest are ruled, and he gratefully acknowledges his subjection [to the Father]. The Father has not begotten a subject but a King "whose kingdom hath neither beginning of days nor length of life."<sup>14</sup> For his rank is not a thing external to him but belongs to his essence, as is the case with the Father who begot him. And therefore scripture says, "Of his kingdom there shall be no end."<sup>15</sup>

7,8 But we confess that "Lord begets Lord" in this way, and "God begets God." And in a word, we say he is the image of an essence, a will, a power and a glory—not inert and dead but essential, possessed of a will, powerful and glorious. (9) For power does not beget powerlessness, but absolute power. Glory does not beget the absence of glory, but absolute glory. Will does not beget the absence of will, but absolute will. Essence does not beget the absence of essence, but self-existence.

The divine Word is therefore an image, a living wisdom, subsistent, an active Word and Son, himself invested with being. This < was > the image "in which" God "daily rejoiced, when he delighted in his completion of the world."<sup>16</sup> (10) But since you, Marcellus, have "denied these things before men, you will be denied," by that image itself, "before the Father which is

*in heaven.”<sup>17</sup> You will also, however, be denied before the church which is under heaven, and which has written of you in all parts of the world, “Hear the word of the Lord, write of this man, A man rejected; for no ruler, still seated upon David’s throne, shall grow any more from his seed.”<sup>18</sup>*

8,1 And later, after Marcellus has mentioned the words of Asterius, he goes on, *You quote these words and persist in your denial of our Savior’s image and essence; of his only-begotten sonship to the Father and his status as firstborn of all creation; of the uniqueness of the Only-begotten, his perfection begotten of the Perfect, his kingship begotten of the King, his lordship begotten of the Lord, and his Godhead begotten of God. In a word, [you persist in] your denial of the exact image of the essence, will, power and glory of God. (2) You “deny this before men” in words of no little import—* and therefore will be denied before his Father<sup>19</sup>*—and write next to this, “These words clearly demonstrate his poor opinion of the Godhead of the Father and the Son.” But your denial of them has plainly exposed your perverse and mean heresy with regard to the Godhead and essence of Christ.*

9,1 And later he adds some words of Marcellus’: *His next addition is worthless: “He will not allow him to be any of the things which he has mentioned, for he says that he is the ‘image’ of all these. Very well, if he is the image of an essence, he cannot be self-existence. If he is the image of a will, he cannot be absolute will. If he is the image of power, he cannot be power; and if of glory, he cannot be glory. For an image is not its own image, but an image of something else.” (2) But these remarks are worthless, Marcellus, and lies. When Asterius says, “A King begot a King; a Lord begot a Lord; God begot God,” he would have him be everything that he has mentioned. And he destroys your lifeless image, which in your view is a product of mere human skill. (3) He is saying that the Son is a living image of all these and the impress of the image of a living Begetter, and is calling him self-existence, the image of an essence; absolute will, the image of will; absolute power, the image of power; absolute glory, the image of glory—and not its own glory, but the glory of another image.*

9,4 *But by not confessing that the Son is God of God, light of light or power of power, you do not let the Son be God, light, power, essence, will or glory. In sum, the [lifeless] body [of your “image”] impiously does away with these*

things, together with the Son.<sup>20</sup> (5) You also deny that “The Word was God,”<sup>21</sup> and either call him God’s Son in name only, or else in the sense that [any] man [can be called God’s son]—making God the begetter of something different from himself, who begets the Son by adoption, as in “I have begotten sons and raised them up,”<sup>22</sup> “Ye have received the Spirit of adoption,”<sup>23</sup> and, “Ascribe to the Lord, O sons of God.”<sup>24</sup>

9,6 Thus, in saying that the Son is the exact image of the Father’s essence, power, will and glory, Asterius as good as says that the Father’s attributes inhere in the Son, and that what is conceived of the Father is impressed in or given to the Son, and is not different from him. (7) Thus he would have the Son be everything he has said. For he does not take the “image” as a painted image, or introduce a third artist to paint the qualities of someone different from the Father in some other place, and call this a “Son.” (8) For whether intentionally or not, this is what you are saying [with your] “Very well, if he is the image of an essence, he cannot be self-existence; and if of a will, he cannot be absolute will.”

For in our view, if he is the living image of an essence, he can be, and is self-existence. And thus we call the image of an essence an essence, because of its most faithful reproduction of its life and activity. And we call the image of a will, a will, “the angel of a great counsel”;<sup>25</sup> and the image of power and glory, power and glory. (9) And texts which support this are, “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,”<sup>26</sup> and, “As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, < even so the Son quickeneth whom he will >.”<sup>27</sup> For the [combination of the words] “as” and “thus” implies the exact reproduction of the portraiture and likeness which are proper to an image.

10,1 And a little later, For the divine Word who provides life, beauty and form for others, is not to be conceived of as himself without life, beauty and form, or dead or non-existent. He is informed with the Father’s attributes, and not as though he were different, with attributes different from the form. His attributes inhere in his existence, and his existence in his attributes. (2) But because the image—someone else’s image as you yourself agree, and

not its own—possesses the attributes of its original, it displays otherness, but otherness as though it were likeness. For as “the image of the invisible God,”<sup>28</sup> which it is, this image is not an image of itself, but an image of another person.

10,3 *In motion, activity, power, will and glory, then, the Son is the image of the Father, a living image of a living God—not a lifeless or inert image, which has its being in something else and is drawn on something else, but is not in motion in and through itself. And it is an exact image, though the exactitude makes it, not the Father, but a Son in the exact likeness [of the Father].*

The end of the excerpt from Acacius.

10,4 However, orthodox persons, brethren of mine and confessors, say that they have received a confessional statement in defense of Marcellus’ faith from some of the disciples he left behind him. I publish its subtleties here, since I do not understand it myself. Here is the copy:

*A Written Statement of the Faith of Marcellus’ Disciples*

11,1 *Greetings in the Lord from the presbyters of Ancyra in Galatia, Photinus, Eustathius, another Photinus, Sigerius, the deacon Hyginus, the subdeacon Heraclides, the lector Elpidius, and the proctor Cyriacus, to the most reverend and holy bishops in Diocaesarea who have been banished for the orthodox faith in our Savior Jesus Christ, Eubgius, Adelphius, Alexander, Ammonius, Harpocraton, Isaac, Isidore, Annubio, Pitimus, Euphratius and Aaron.*<sup>29</sup>

11,2 *While we were staying with your Reverences our countrymen, during the visit we fittingly made you, we were asked by your Holinesses how we hold the faith that is in us. Both because we approve of your solicitous inquiry, and particularly because those who so choose are spreading certain lies about us to no purpose, (3) we feel we must assure you, not only through the letter of fellowship your Holinesses have been shown which was addressed to us all by the thrice blessed Pope Athanasius, but also through this written confession of ours, (4) that we neither believe, nor have believed, anything other than the worldwide and church-wide creed determined at Nicaea. We offer this confession because we can assure you<sup>30</sup> that this is our belief, (5) and we condemn those who dare to say that < the Son or > the Holy Spirit is a creature; and the Arian heresy, and the heresies of Sabellius, Photinus*

and Paul the Samosatian; and those who deny that the Holy Trinity consists of three infinite, subsistent, co-essential, co-eternal and absolute Persons. (6) We also condemn those who say that the Son is an expansion, contraction or activity of the Father, and those who do not confess that the divine Word, the Son of God, is before the ages and co-eternal with the Father, and is subsistent, absolute Son and God.

12,1 If anyone says that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are the same, let him be anathema.

If anyone attributes a beginning or end to the Son and Word of God or to his kingdom, let him be anathema.

If anyone says that the Son or the Holy Spirit is a part of the Father, and does not confess that the Son of God was begotten of the Father's essence before anyone can conceive of it, let him be anathema.

12,2 As to the incarnation of the divine Word, the only-begotten Son of God, we confess that < the > Son of God has also become man without sin, by the assumption of all of human nature, that is, of a rational and intellectual soul and human flesh.

12,3 We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, begotten as the Only-begotten of the Father, that is, of the Father's essence, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, co-essential with the Father, through whom all things were made in heaven and on earth;

Who for us men and for our salvation came down and was incarnate and made man, suffered and rose the third day, ascended into the heavens, and will come to judge the quick and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit.

12,4 But those who say that there was a time when the Son of God did not exist, and that he did not exist before his begetting, and that he was made from nothing or that he is of another substance or essence, or that he is mutable or alterable, them the catholic and apostolic church condemns.

12,5 I, Photinus, presbyter of the catholic church at Ancyra, believe and hold as is written above.

< I >, Eustathius, presbyter of the catholic church at Ancyra, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Photinus, presbyter of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Sigerius, presbyter of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Hyginus, deacon of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Heraclides, sub-deacon of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Elpidius, lector of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Cyriacus, proctor of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

12,6 This is what they wrote to the confessors and fathers. If the wise can take it to be a commendable statement it should be categorized as such. On the other hand, if there are accidental unorthodoxies even there, in the argument they use in their actual defense of themselves, the scholarly, once more, should put it in that category. But since I have given all the above information about Marcellus, I shall pass him by in his turn and go on to investigate the rest.

#### IV

#### **Contra los Semiarianos, secta del Cristianismo**

1,1 By God's power we have torn Arius' abominable doctrines up, which he originally belched out like a man overtaken with drunkenness, and the doctrines of his successors—I mean Photinus, and Marcellus too during the short time in which he seemed to be shaken. May Arius' pupils be set straight, if indeed they can be!

But now that, with the word of God "which is sharper than any two-edged sword,"<sup>2</sup> we have cut down the tares which sprouted from Arius himself, let us survey the tangled woodland which has grown up from Arius, to see how some are halfway Arians, (2) who repudiate his name but adopt the man and his heresy. By some pretense they falsely put on a different mask, as the acting of stage performers is a sham, and they conceal their faces with different masks, and inside the masks recite the shameful, boozy lines of the comedy—a new comedy, or the myths of the ancients, since their poets used to do the same. (3) Thus, though these people would like to mislead the simple, they are the same as Arius and the Arian Nuts—on the surface, in their behavior, and in their heresy. (4) But in the desire to pretty up their perverse doctrine, as a deceitful piece of flattery they call the Son of God a creature but cheaply add, "We do not mean a creature like any other creature or an offspring like any other offspring"—as a piece of deception and to do the Son of God a favor, as well as to soothe those who are frightened by this expression. And yet they altogether reject the homoousion supposedly because it is untrue to the sacred scripture! (5) I have discussed this with extreme thoroughness in the Sect about Arius.

But to suggest a word similar to “homooousion” they say—I mean the followers of Basil and George, the leaders of this Semi-Arian sect—“We do not say, ‘homooousion,’ but ‘homoeousion.’” (6) These were the members of the Council < at Ancyra ><sup>3</sup> who separated from the sect of the Arian Nuts itself—their leader, Basil of Ancyra, and George of the Laodicea by Antioch in Daphne, or Coele-Syria.

1,7 Their view of the Holy Spirit too is the same as that of the Pneumatomachi. [In the case of the Spirit] they no longer begin as they do with the Son, with a sort of shame or with a word expressive of hesitancy. They are ashamed to say that the Son is altogether a creature, though this is what they think, but from fear of men they add the homoeousion, and the doctrine that the Son is a creature < but not > like any other. But with the Holy Spirit, as I said, they do not begin hesitantly, but like ravening dogs pitilessly declare him a creature in every respect, and thus also maintain that he is different from the Father and the Son.

1,8 And lest it be said that I accuse anyone falsely, I shall cite a letter here as each of them wrote it—Basil, one, but George of Laodicea together with Basil and his companions, another. And here are the letters.

2,1 *Greetings in the Lord from the holy council, assembled from various provinces at Ancyra at the approach of Easter, to the most honored Masters, our colleagues in Phoenicia and elsewhere, who are of one mind with us.*

2,2 *After the trial of the church’s faith, as though by fire, by the ordeals for the faith which took place in our midst; and < after > the proceedings at Constantinople because of Marcellus;<sup>4</sup> and the issuance of the creed at the council gathered for the dedication of the church in Antioch<sup>5</sup> and afterwards at Sardica,<sup>6</sup> and the faith that bloomed again there—and further, after the proceedings at Sirmium<sup>7</sup> with regard to Photinus (3) and still further, after the explanations we issued of each article of the creed when questioned by those who differed with the easterners at Sardica,<sup>8</sup> it is our prayer that we*

*may rest at last and, with all stumbling blocks removed and the church from east to west united under the pious rule of our master Constantius, be at peace and attend to the divine services.*

2,4 *But the devil, it seems, does not abandon his utmost endeavors to foment apostasy in every way through his peculiar vessels, < as > was foretold by the Lord and, correspondingly, declared by the holy apostle for the protection of the faithful. (5) For by devising rebellions against the faith of the church he is even now < attempting\* > to claim certain individuals for his own “with a form of godliness,”<sup>9</sup> and through them has invented < novelties\* > and “profane new babblings”<sup>10</sup> against the legitimacy of the only-begotten Son of God.*

*When we heard formerly that some were running about in Antioch, but also in Alexandria, and further, in Lydia or Asia, and planting sparks of impiety in the souls of the simple, (6) we hoped that, due to the audacity of the impiety and < the > extent of their shamelessness, the heresy they have invented had been quenched, and the evil suppressed, by the championship of the Masters, our colleagues, in each locality.*

2,7 *But since persons from the places aforesaid next arrived, and persons from Illyria, and informed us that the inventors of this evil are zealous in the venture of doing harm to a larger number and infecting them with a leaven of wickedness, we could brook no further delay. (8) Since, moreover, we have read the letter, copies of which we subjoin, of our like-minded colleague, George of the church of Laodicea,<sup>11</sup> and since we respect the testimonies of those who have witnessed to us before God, (9) as many of us have gathered as could do so given the season, the approach of the holy day of Easter—the winter was a hindrance to many, as they have indicated by letter—and hastened to set forth the norm of the faith in the following form. (10) As far as the remaining points are concerned, < we are in agreement\* > with the council at Antioch, as we have said, and the creed the Council at Sirmium accepted<sup>12</sup> which was issued at the dedication as well as at Sardica, and with the arguments that were presented at Sirmium. < It is our purpose > to give an accurate description of the catholic church’s faith in the holy Trinity, as*

*we said, and of the form of the innovation besides, replying to it only as the Spirit has permitted us.*

2,11 *And because you, most honored Sirs and colleagues, have stood firm in the faith which has been handed down to us from our fathers, and because our faith, as we believe, is in accord with yours, we urge you, on reading this, to append your signatures. Thus those who dare to introduce this impiety will be assured that we have accepted, and guard as our inheritance, the faith < of the > fathers, < transmitted > from the time of the apostles, through the intervening generations, even to us. (12) Hence they will either be ashamed and submit to correction, or persist in error and be expelled from the church, < for > preparing, by their own efforts, the falling away for the son of iniquity who threatens to venture "to sit even in the temple of God."*<sup>13</sup>

3,1 *Our faith is in a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit. For so our Lord Jesus Christ taught his disciples, "Go make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."*<sup>14</sup>  
(2) *Therefore we who are born again into this faith should have a godly understanding of the meanings of the names. For he did not say, "Baptize them in the name of the Incorporeal and the Incarnate," or, "of the Immortal and of Him who knew death," or, "of the Ingenerate and the Generate,"*<sup>15</sup>  
*but "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."*  
(3) *And thus, since we also hear < the > names in nature, and < a father\* > there < always begets a son like himself\* >,<sup>16</sup> we may understand the "Father" to be the cause of an essence like his. And when we hear the name, "Son," we may understand that the Son is like the Father whose Son he is.*

3,4 *We have therefore believed in a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit, not in a creator and a creature. For "creator and creature" are one thing but "father and son" are another, since these two concepts differ in meaning. (5) If I say, "creature," I must first say, "creator;" < and if I say\* >, "son," I must first say, "father." But even the term, "Son," is not quite right\* >, since it is taken from physical things, and [used] because of the passions and effluents of flesh and blood fathers and sons. < If we exclude these, however\* >, it does plainly mean the existence of the incorporeal Son of an incorporeal Father. (6) Thus < our Lord refrained from putting the term\* >, "creature," [into the baptismal*

formula], because it entailed a notion of something corporeal. And since the creature the Father makes < is a "son" >, < God called > him "Son" by borrowing from the notions of "creator" and "creature" only the creator's impassibility with respect to the creature, and the creature's stability—the result of the impassibility—and its being as the > creator intended, (7) and has plainly taught us the whole notion of the Father and the Son from [the parallels of] a physical father and son, < and > a physical creator and creature.

For with its externality eliminated from "creature," its materiality, and all else that the name, physical "creature," implies, all that remains of "creature" is the notion of impassibility—I mean the impassibility of its creator—and the notion of the creature, and of its being as its creator intended, is complete. (8) If, again, we then eliminate the rest from the notion of "creator" and "creature," and take only the notion that a creature is made by an impassible creator and is perfect, stable and as its creator intended, it follows—since we have been taught above all to believe in a Father and a Son—that as orthodox Christians believe, we form one particular idea of the terms, "Father" and "Son."

4,1 Thus if, in addition to these things, we eliminate anything that has to do with passion or effluent, < and so > understand that the Father is the Father of a Son, and that the Son was not physically engendered and brought to maturity by natural physical things which, as is characteristic of physical things, are constantly made to grow and decay, only the notion of likeness will be left. (2) For as we shall say once more of a creature that >, when < all physical features > were eliminated, its creator's impassibility was left, and a < notion > of the creature's perfection, of its being as its creator intended, and of its stability, so we shall say of the Father and the Son that, with all physical features eliminated, only the generation of a living being of like essence will be left—for every "father" is understood to be the father of an essence like his. (3) If, however, along with the elimination of all other physical notions from the terms, "Father," and "Son," the one which enables us to think of the Father as the cause > of a living being of like essence is also eliminated, our faith will no longer be in a Father and a Son but in a creator and a creature. And the terms, < "Father," and "Son," > will be unnecessary, since they contribute nothing of themselves. And thus, as God, he will be a creator < but > in no way at all a Father.

4,4 For it is plain from natural considerations that the "Father" does not mean the Father of an activity but of an essence like himself, whose subsistence corresponds with a particular activity. God has many activities, and is understood to be a creator from another activity whereby he is the creator of heaven, earth and everything in them, and of things invisible as well. But as

*the Father of the Only-begotten he is seen to be, not a creator but a Father who has begotten [a Son].*

4.5 *But if, from motives of reverence, < someone > removes the legitimate notion of the relationship of the Father and the Son because of his idea of the sufferings of physical paternity and sonship, and his fear that the Incorporeal may suffer some effect in begetting unless his Offspring and the effects of physical paternity and sonship are incomplete, whatever he says, he will be saying that the Son is another creature, and never that the Son is a son. (6) Even if he says he surpasses [other creatures] in greatness as heaven surpasses a mountain or hill, he will regard him as < being one ><sup>17</sup>—even though he is thought to excel in greatness, in utility as the first creature to be made, or as serving for the creation of the rest,<sup>18</sup> even so he will not remove him from the category of creatures. (7) For just as taking a coal from the altar with tongs rather than with the hand itself is the same thing, even < though > the bronze work, the overlaying of the iron, is done with the hand—for both the tongs and the iron that is overlaid by the hand are creatures—even so, the One through whom all creatures were made will not be different from the creatures unless he is a Son, as the natural concept [of “son”] suggests. If he is made, he will be the first of created things and will become the maker’s instrument by which the creator makes all things.*

5.1 *And let no one ingeniously derive the notion of “Father” in the proper sense, and “Son” in the proper sense, from the things more commonly called “sons,” since in this sense there will be many sons of God—< as > when scripture says, “I have begotten sons and brought them up, and they have rebelled against me;”<sup>19</sup> “Have we not all one Father?”<sup>20</sup> “As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, which were born, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God”<sup>21</sup>—and also of inanimate objects, “Who hath begotten drops of dew?”<sup>22</sup> (2) These texts will prove instead, from the < meaning > common [to all of them], that the Son is not a son just as these things are not, but that, being a creature like them, he shares the mere title of “son.”*

5.3 *But the church has believed that God is not only a creator of creatures—Jews and Greeks understand this—but is also the Father of an Only-*

*begotten. He possesses not only his creative activity whereby he is understood to be a creator, but a generative activity peculiar and unique to himself; whereby we understand him to be the Father of a unique Offspring. (4) It is to teach us this that the blessed Paul writes, "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."<sup>23</sup> < For as fathers on earth are termed "fathers" > because they have sons in the likeness of their own essences, so we name the One for whom the fathers on earth were named "fathers" in accordance with their essences, "Father in the heavens"—for he surely has the Son begotten of him in the likeness of his own essence.*

5.5 *And the notion of "sons" which applies to things that are loosely and equivocally so called cannot fit the Only-begotten. For as a "box tablet" properly speaking means a tablet made of boxwood, but more commonly and in the colloquial sense of the word, a tablet made of lead, bronze or any other material < is called\* > a "box tablet" after the boxwood tablet, < so only the Son begotten of the Father is properly termed "Son of God," while the others are so named in the loose sense of the word. \* > (6) Nor < is he named "son" in the sense of, "Who hath begotten drops of dew?" Properly speaking, God did not "beget" dew\* >, that is, not in actuality; here the word for begetting an offspring is colloquially applied to a created object. And he is not called "Son" in the sense of, "I have begotten sons and brought them up"; here too the term is loosely applied, because of [God's] good will and respect towards them. (7) Nor is he called "Son" < in the sense of >, "He gave them power to become sons of God"; this too is derived < from > the idea of virtuous creation in his own image. The Only-begotten is < not > to be understood as Son in these senses but in the proper one, as an only Son begotten of an only Father, in the essential likeness of the Father whose Son he is called, and is understood to be.*

6.1 *But suppose that, from the incapacity of his reasoning powers, someone refuses to accept this line of reasoning on the grounds that the Father must be subject to some passion, division or effluence if he is to be conceived as this sort of father—and has [thus] mutilated the godly conception of the Father and the Son, and requires reasons for it. (2) He must be required to provide reasons why God is crucified, and why "the foolishness" of the proclamation of the Gospel—[called "foolishness"] because of its unreasonableness in the eyes of those whom the world counts as wise—is wiser than men. The blessed Paul did not consider these persons worthy of notice, since by the*

unreasonableness of power God has “made the wisdom” of persons with the ability to reason “foolish.” (3) For Paul said, “I came declaring unto you the mystery of God, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.”<sup>24</sup> The blessed Paul did not consider these persons worthy of notice, since by the unreasonableness of power God has “made the wisdom” of persons with the ability to reason “foolish.”<sup>25</sup> (3) For Paul said, “I came declaring unto you the mystery of God, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.”<sup>26</sup> Anyone who, with wisdom of words, demands < reasons > for the mystery, should disbelieve the mystery, since his portion is with the wisdom which has been made foolish. For even though such a person disbelieves from wisdom of words, Paul < chooses to preach “only in demonstration of the Spirit and of power” \* ><sup>27</sup> “lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.”<sup>28</sup>

6,4 But if he replies in this way he does not do so with wisdom of words, but by the unreasonableness of power confounds all wisdom which is based on reasoning and accepts faith alone for the salvation of those who receive the Gospel. (5) He does not answer [by explaining] how the Father begets the Son without passion, or the mystery of the Only-begotten’s sonship to the Father might be robbed of its significance. He confounds the wisdom of the wise, which is “made foolish”<sup>29</sup>—as scripture says, “Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world?”<sup>30</sup>—but not with verbal wisdom, so that the < mystery > will not be rendered meaningless by suspicions occasioned by arguments. I mean that < the > godly conception of the Father and the Son—but a Father and a Son with no passions—declares, without deriving the idea from reason, that the Father had begotten the Son of himself without emission or passion, and that a Son like his Father in essence has been begotten of the Father, Perfect of Perfect, an only-begotten entity. [These are doctrines] which are either < believed > by the faithful, or suspected < by the unbelieving >.

6,7 For only a fool would hear of Wisdom originating from a wise God, as the Father of the Wisdom begotten of him wisely knows, and attribute passion to the Father < because > Wisdom originated from him—if, [that is], the

Wisdom essentially like the wise God is to originate from him. (8) For, if we are not to conceive of the wise God as compoundedly wise by participation in wisdom, he is himself wise, himself an essence, without compounding, and the wisdom by which he is known is not the Son. The Wisdom which is the Son is an essence begotten of the essence of the Wise, which is Wisdom. The Son will subsist as an essence like the essence of the wise Father, from whom the Son originated as Wisdom.

7,1 And so the blessed Paul, with his excellent training in Hebrew lore, was accustomed, by the inspiration of the same Spirit who spoke in the Old and the New Testaments, to derive the same notions as the ones in the two Psalms, "Thy judgments are a great deep,"<sup>31</sup> and "Thy paths are in deep waters, and thy footsteps shall not be known."<sup>32</sup> But he altered the language about God's judgments < by replacing > "great deep" with "O the depth of the riches;"<sup>33</sup> "Thy paths are in deep waters and thy footsteps shall not be known" with "unsearchable;" and "Thy judgments are a great deep" with "Thy judgments are past finding out."

7,2 And because Wisdom itself had taught him its notion of the Father and itself, and of its relation to created things, Paul in his own writings presents us with the idea of the Father and the Son, and the things which have been created by the Father through the Son, in the following manner. (3) For Wisdom had said, "I, Wisdom, give counsel a home"<sup>34</sup> and so forth, and gone on to explain "by whom?"—for it said, "By me are kings,"<sup>35</sup> and "If I shall tell you the things that are by me, I shall remember to recount the things of old."<sup>36</sup> It said, "The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works. Before the age he established me, and before all things he begets me;"<sup>37</sup> (4) but for "beginning" Paul understood "first,"<sup>38</sup> and for "begets me," "-born."<sup>39</sup> And for the entire sentence, "He created me the beginning of his ways and begets me," the apostle understood "firstborn of every creature." For "he established" Paul understood "In him are all things created"; for "By me are the things of old," "Whether thrones or principalities or powers or authorities, all things were created by him and for him."

7,5 Thus all < the > apostle's phrases are word for word equivalents of the things that were said by Wisdom. That is, "beginning" is equivalent to "first," "begets" to "-born," and "He created me the beginning of his ways, for his works," to "firstborn of every creature." "In him were created" is a substitute for "He established me," and "All things are by him" for "By me are the things of old." (6) It is thus evident < that > neither did the "image" originate from passion, but that it must be understood in the sense of "I, Wisdom"; and that, as Wisdom is the Son of the Wise, an essence which is the Son of an essence, so the image is like the essence. The "image" too was understood as "of God the invisible." (7) And we have the equivalents for all the words: "God" for "wise," "image" for "wisdom," "first" for "beginning," and "-born" for "first."

But we can also give the equivalents of whole phrases. "Firstborn of every creature" is the equivalent of "He created me the beginning of his way, for his works, and begets me." "In him were created" is the equivalent of "He established me." "All things are by him and for him" is the equivalent of "by me." (8) It is thus plain that not only Paul exposes the entire wrongness<sup>40</sup> of those who hear that the Son "is the image of the invisible God," and try to quibble shamelessly about the Son's likeness of essence to the Father. John before him, truly the son of thunder, similarly sounded the godly conception of the Son forth to us with his own loud peal—from the clouds, as it were, of the riddles of Wisdom.

8,1 For see how he too transmitted the truths he had learned from Wisdom in the Gospel he proclaimed to us. (2) Because Wisdom had said, "He created me the beginning of his ways,"<sup>41</sup> John used the phrase, "in the beginning" in his "In the beginning was the Word." And for "He created me" John substituted "And the Word was God,"<sup>42</sup> so that we would not take this to mean the spoken word, but the divine Word < begotten > of the Father without passion, as a stable entity. And for "I was by him,"<sup>43</sup> John substituted "And < the Word > was God." (3) For "Through me are the things from of old"<sup>44</sup> John substituted "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made."<sup>45</sup> For "She hath founded"<sup>46</sup> John substituted "That which was made, in him was life,"<sup>47</sup> which means the same as "In him were

all things created.”<sup>48</sup> (4) He said, “The Word was made flesh,”<sup>49</sup> to correspond with “Wisdom hath builded her house.”<sup>50</sup> He substituted “The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise”<sup>51</sup> for “I was by him in accord with him.”<sup>52</sup> John thus has < the confirmatory testimony \* > of two or three witnesses to prove the Son’s likeness of essence to the Father. (5) For one witness says that the Wisdom of the wise God is his Son; one, that the Word of God is the only-begotten God; one, that the Son is the image of God. Thus it is proclaimed by all that the Word, Wisdom and Image of God is in all respects like him, as we have said, and that he is the essential Son of his God and Father. (6) Still more, when God’s Word says, “As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;”<sup>53</sup> he is educating us, like Thomas, by contact with the actuality of the likeness of essence. (7) For if “as the Father hath” does not mean what it would in something else—(the Father is not one thing and the life in him something else, so that the one thing means the possessor and the other the thing possessed. The Father himself is uncompoundedly life, and has granted the Son < to have life > as he does—plainly, to have it uncompoundedly, like the Father.) [Thus] it is plain that in having life in this way, since he has it neither without generation nor compoundedly, the Son too, like the Father, has all things essentially and without compounding.

8,8 And yet it is plain that “like” can never be the same as the thing it is like. For proof < of this we have \* > the fact that when the Son of God “was made in the likeness of men”<sup>54</sup> he became man indeed, but not the same as man in every respect. And when he was made “in the likeness of the flesh of sin”<sup>55</sup> he was made with the passions which are the cause of sin in the flesh—I mean hunger, thirst and the rest—but was not made the same as the flesh of sin. Thus the Son’s likeness of essence to the Father is also proclaimed by the texts from the apostle.

9,1 For as he was made in the likeness of man he was both man, and yet not entirely so—was man in his assumption of human flesh, for “The Word

was made flesh,<sup>56</sup> but not man in that he was not begotten of human seed and sexual commerce—(2) just so, in that he was the Son of God, he was the Son of God before all ages, just as, in that he was a son of man, he was man. But he is not the same thing as the God and Father who begot him, just as he is not the same thing as man, since [he was begotten] without emission of seed and passion, < just as > [he was made man] without human seed and sexual enjoyment.

9,3 And < as he was made > in the likeness of the flesh of sin through being subject to fleshly hunger, thirst and sleep, the passions by which bodies are moved to sin, and yet, though subject to these passions of the flesh, he was not moved to sin by them—(4) even so the Son, who was < Son > of God, “in the form of God,” and is “equal” to God,<sup>57</sup> possessed the attributes of the Godhead in being by nature incorporeal, and like the Father in divinity, incorporeality and activities. As he was “like” the flesh in being flesh and subject to the passions of the flesh, (5) and yet was not the same, < so he is “like” God > in the sense that, as God, he is not “the form” of “the God” but the form of “God,”<sup>58</sup> and “equal,” not to “the God” but to “God.” Nor does he < have the Godhead > with full sovereignty like the Father. For as he was not < moved > to sin < tike > a man, and yet behaved tike a man, < so, as God, he behaves “like” the Father\* >, “For whatsoever the Father doeth, the Son also doeth.”<sup>59</sup>

9,6 Now he was not moved to sin here on earth, but was moved in ways similar to persons in the flesh. (It would be strange if, after passing from his natural state to a state unnatural to him, that is, after becoming a son of man when he had been God, he should become like those to whom this state was natural—that is, who were human by nature—in a trait that was unnatural to him, but [at the same time] not be like his Father by nature in the trait that was natural to him, since he was God begotten of God. And it is plain that those who deny the Son’s likeness of essence to the Father do not call him a son either, but only a creature—and do not call the Father a father, but a creator. For the notion of “like” does not entail the Son’s identity with the Father, but his likeness of essence to him, and his ineffable sonship to him without passion.) (7) For, I say again, as he was not brought to identity with men < by being made > in the likeness of men and of sinful flesh, but, for the reasons given, became like the essence of the flesh, so, by being made

*like in essence to the Father who begot him, the Son will not bring his essence to identity with the Father, but to likeness to [him].*

10,1 *And if, through heeding the wisdom of the world which God has made foolish, anyone fails to heed God's wise declaration and confess with faith the Son's likeness of essence to the Father, for example by giving false names to the Father and the Son and not truly terming them "Father" and "Son" but "creator" and "creature," equating the concepts of the Father and the Son with the [fatherhood and sonship] of other creatures—and if, from a desire to rationalize, he says that the Son < is superior > [only] in utility as the first of < the > creatures < which have been made > through him, or in the excellence of his greatness, thus confessing none of the church's faith in the Father and the Son, as though to preach by deliberate choice a Gospel different from the Gospel the apostles preached to us, let him be anathema.*

10,2 *And—to repeat the blessed Paul's words, "As we said before, so say I now again"<sup>60</sup>—we too must say < in our turn >, If, on hearing that the Father is the only wise God and that his only-begotten Son is his Wisdom, anyone says that the Wisdom is the same as the only wise God and thus denies his sonship, let him be anathema.*

10,3 *And if, on hearing that the Father is the wise God and the Son is his Wisdom, anyone says that the Wisdom is unlike the wise God in essence, and thus denies that the wise God is truly the Father of the Wisdom, let him be anathema.*

10,4 *And if anyone regards the Father as "the God" but < denies > that the Word and "God" in the beginning existed as "God" with "the God" and that, as Word and "God," he was with "the" very "God" himself, with whom he existed as Word and God—and so denies his true sonship—let him be anathema.*

10,5 *And if anyone, on hearing that the only-begotten divine Word is the Son of "the God" with whom the Word and "God" is, says that the Father's divine Word, the "God" who belongs to "the God" and Father, is essentially unlike Him with whom the Only-begotten was at the beginning as [his] divine Word—and so denies his true sonship—let him be anathema.*

10,6 *And if, in denial of his true sonship, anyone, on hearing that the Son is "the image of the invisible God,"<sup>61</sup> says that the image is the same as the invisible God, let him be anathema.*

10,7 And if, in true denial of the sonship, anyone, on hearing that the only-begotten Son is “the image of the invisible God,” says that, since he is the invisible God’s “image,” the Son is unlike the invisible God in essence even though the Son is held to be the invisible God’s “essential” image, let him be anathema.

10,8 And if anyone, on hearing the words of the Son, “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,”<sup>62</sup> says that the Recipient of the life from the Father—he who confessed, “And I live by the Father”<sup>63</sup>—is the same as the Giver of the life, let him be anathema.

10,9 And if anyone, on hearing “For as the Father hath life in himself, even so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,” says that the Son is essentially unlike the Father even though he affirms that the truth is as the Son has stated it,<sup>64</sup> let him be anathema. For plainly, as the life which is held to be in the Father means his essence, and as the life of the Only-begotten, who is begotten of the Father, is held to be his essence, thus the word, “so,” denotes the likeness of essence to essence.

11,1 And if anyone, on hearing the Son’s, “He created me,” and, “He begets me,”<sup>65</sup> does not take “begets me” literally and as a reference to essence, but says that “He begets me” means the same as “He created me,” thus denying that the Son is < designated > by the two terms as the perfect < Son > [begotten] without passion, < but >, < on the basis of these two terms >, confessing that he is a mere creature and not a Son—for Wisdom has conveyed the godly meaning by the two terms—let him be anathema.

11,2 And since the Son reveals to us his likeness in essence to the Father through his words, “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,” but his likeness in activity through his teaching, “For what things soever the Father doeth, these also the Son doeth likewise<sup>66</sup>—[therefore], if anyone grants him only the likeness of activity but denies the Son his likeness of essence, the cornerstone of our faith, and denies himself eternal life in the knowledge of the Father and the Son, let him be anathema.

11,3 And if anyone who professes to believe in a Father and a Son says that the Father is not the Father of an essence like his, but the Father of an activ-

ity, let him be anathema for daring to utter “profane babblings”<sup>67</sup> against the essence of the Son of God, and denying the truth of his sonship.

11,4 And if anyone who holds that [Christ] is the Son of an essence like his of whom he is held to be the Son, should say that the Son is the same as the Father, or is part of the Father, or that the incorporeal Son originated from the incorporeal Father by emission or passion as corporeal sons do, let him be anathema.

11,5 And if anyone who, because the Father is one person and the Son is another, says that the Son differs from the Father since the Father is never conceived of as the Son and the Son is never conceived of as the Father—as the scripture says, “There is another that beareth witness of me,”<sup>68</sup> for “The Father that hath sent me beareth witness”<sup>69</sup>—[if anyone who says this] because of this godly distinction of the persons of the Father and the Son which is made in the church, fears that the Son may be supposed to be the same as the Father, and therefore says that the Son is unlike the Father in essence, let him be anathema.

11,6 And if anyone holds that the Father is the Father of the only-begotten Son in time, and does not believe that the only-begotten Son has originated impassibly from the Father beyond all times and differently from any human thought—thus abandoning the preaching of the apostles, which rejected time with reference to the Father and the Son, but faithfully taught us, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,”<sup>70</sup>—let him be anathema.

11,7 And if anyone says that the Father is prior in time to his only-begotten Son, and that the Son is later in time than the Father, let him be anathema.

11,8 And if anyone ascribes the only-begotten Son’s timeless origin from the Father to the unbegotten essence of God, and thus speaks of a Son-Father, let him be anathema.

11,9 And if anyone says that the Father is < the Father > of the only-begotten Son by authority only, and not the Father of the only-begotten Son by authority and essence alike—thus accepting only the authority, equating the Son with any creature, and denying that he is actually the true Son of the Father—let him be anathema.

11,10 *And if anyone, though saying that the Father is the Father of the Son by authority and essence, also says that the Son is co-essential, or of identical essence with the Father, let him be anathema.*

11,11 *The signers are Basil, Eustathius, Hyperechius, Letoeus, Heorticus, Gymnasius, Memnonius, Eutyches, Severinus, Euty chius, Alcimides and Alexander. I too believe as the above articles have stated, and confess them with my signature.*

The end of the memorial of Basil, George and his companions

< *The Letter of George* >

12,1 *It is plain that the term, "being"<sup>71</sup> does not appear in the Old and the New Testaments, but the sense of it is to be found, everywhere. In the first place, He who owes his origin to none but is the cause of all things < is implied > by God's words when he sent Moses, "Thus shall thou say unto the children of Israel, 'He Who Is' "<sup>72</sup>—< meaning > him who is regarded primarily as the Father "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named,"<sup>73</sup> who has no cause and is the cause of the things that exist. (2) Now the Son also "is"; but Paul the Samosatian and Marcellus took advantage of the text in the Gospel according to John, "In the beginning was the Word."<sup>74</sup> No longer willing to call the Son of God truly a Son, they took advantage of the term, "Word," I mean verbal expression and utterance, and refused to say "Son of God." (3) And so the fathers who tried Paul the Samosatian for this heresy were forced to say that the Son too is a being to show that the Son has reality, subsists, and is, but is not a word, and to distinguish, by means of the term, "being," between a thing which has no existence of its own, and a thing which does. (4) For a word has no existence of its own and cannot be a son of God, since if it could, there would be many sons of God.*

*For it is agreed that the Father said many things to the Son—When, for instance, he said, "Let there be a firmament,"<sup>75</sup> "Let there be luminaries,"<sup>76</sup> "Let the earth bring forth,"<sup>77</sup> and, "Let us make man."<sup>78</sup> (5) The Father therefore speaks to the Son, and yet God's words, which he says to the Son, are not sons. The Son to whom the Father speaks, however, may with piety*

*be called, among other things, "bread," "life," and "resurrection"; and he is further termed, "Word," since he is the interpreter of the counsels of God.*

*12,6 And therefore lest, to deceive the simple, the heretics should say that the Son is the same as the words which are spoken by God, the fathers, as I say, called the Son a "being" to show the difference between the Son of God and the words of God. They expressed the distinction in this way because God "is," and the words which he speaks < "are" >, and yet they are not God's "beings" but his verbal operations. But although the Son is a Word, he is not God's verbal operation; he is a "being" since he is a Son. (7) For if the Father "is" the Son also < "is" >; but the Son "is" in such a way that, (8) since he has his being from God by true sonship, he will not be regarded as a Word like the words God speaks. They have their being in the Speaker; but he has his in virtue of his begetting by the Father, his hearing of the Father, and his service to the Father. The fathers, then, called this entity a "being."*

*13,1 We regard the Son as like the Father in all respects, in opposition to the party that is now growing up as an excrescence on the church. (2) This current faction declares that the Son is like the Father in will and activity, but that the Son is unlike the Father in < being >. (3) Thus it is the contention of these new sectarians that the will of the Son and the activity of the Son are like the will of the Father and the activity of the Father, but that the Son himself is unlike the Father. And they agree that the Son's will and activity are like the Father's will and activity, but the reason they will not allow that the Son is like the Father is that they maintain that the Son is not begotten of God. He is merely a creature, and differs from the other creatures in that he surpasses them in greatness and came into being before them all, and that God availed himself of his assistance in the creation of the rest. (4) Because, say the sectarians, God made the rest through a Son, but made him by no one's instrumentality but personally, and made him superior in greatness and might to all things, God called him an "only-begotten Son."*

*14,1 We of the catholic church, however, have taken our confession of faith from the sacred scriptures, and hold as follows. The Father is the Father of a Son like himself, and the Son is like the Father of whom he is held to be the Son. (2) Defining this further, and thus narrowing the sense of it as against the Sabellians and the rest, we hold that the Son cannot be a Father, or the Father a Son. (3) (The accurate knowledge of the Persons consists of the following: The Father, who is everlastingly a Father, is incorporeal and immortal, while the Son, who is everlastingly a Son and never a Father, but is called everlasting because of his being's independence of time and incomprehensibility, has taken flesh by the will of the Father, and has undergone death for us.)*

14,4 *Despite the clarity of these distinctions, the strange people who support this sect exert themselves in an effort to achieve two aims. One is never again to say "Father and Son," but "Ingenerate and Generate"; for in this way they hope to foist the sophistry of their sect on the church. (5) For those who are wise in the things of God understand that "Ingenerate" < plainly > means less than the term, "Father." Since "ingenerate" means [only] that a thing has not been generated, it does not yet say whether it is also a father—for the term, "father," means more than the term, "ingenerate." (6) As I say, "ingenerate" does not carry the connotation of fatherhood, but "father" connotes, both that the father is not a son—provided that he is understood as a "father" in the proper sense of the word—and that he is the cause of a son like himself.*

14,7 *This is one aim. Besides, they were the first to portray the Son as unlike the Father in essence, since they supposed, from something they had unearthed in a letter by the venerable bishop Hosius in which the essential unlikeness is mentioned,<sup>79</sup> that the church had affirmed it. (8) However, since the easterners who came to Sirmium last year<sup>80</sup> exposed this sect's sharp practice, they tried their best, in order to escape punishment for their assaults on the church's faith, to remove the term, "being" which was used by the fathers, from the church's teaching for these reasons, as another way of lending apparent strength to their sect.*

15,1 *For they supposed that, if the word, "being," were rejected, they could say that the Son is like the Father only in will and activity, and gain the right to say, finally, that since "being" was not mentioned, the Son is unlike the Father in being and existence. (2) But God, the vindicator of the truth who "taketh the wise in their own craftiness,"<sup>81</sup> openly declared, through the mouth of the pious emperor, that his Only-begotten's relation to himself is the Son's likeness to him in all respects. (3) For this was the emperor's own view, in his piety, of God's only-begotten Son who fought for him. And since this was his belief he declared with pious lips that the Son is like the Father in all respects, as the catholics believe; and that it was not by his doing that this proceeding against the church's faith had been launched, the aim of which*

was to eliminate the term, "being" so that, with "being" no longer on men's lips, the heresy might make its lair in their hearts.

15,4 But let us anticipate them, since they describe [the Son] as like [the Father] in will but unlike him in essence. If, indeed, they candidly and plainly admit his likeness in all things to the Father, the worthlessness of their anxious effort to remove the word, "being," will be exposed. (5) For they gained nothing since they were compelled to confess that the Son is like the Father in all respects. For if he is like in all respects, as they have confessed him to be—and it is in this way that the Son is like the Father—he is like, not just in will and operation—the distinction they draw—but in existence, subsistence and being as a son should be.

And once for all, < the phrase >, "in all respects," is all-inclusive and leaves no room for distinction. (6) This—if it be admitted that the Father himself is not "like" himself, and the Son himself is not "like" himself, but is instead a Son who is like his Father; and that, since he is in all respects like the Father, he is not a Father but a Son—[this] provides us with a worthy conception of the Father through our contemplation of him. (7) For the Son was begotten of this Father, Perfect begotten of Perfect, begotten in the Father's likeness<sup>82</sup> before anyone can conceive and, before all reckonings, times and ages—as only the Father knows, who begot the Son of himself without passion; and the Son, who has his being from him; and he to whom the Son will reveal him.

16,1 And the word, "hypostases," need trouble no one. The easterners say "hypostases" as an acknowledgment of the subsistent, real individualities of the persons. (2) For if the Father is spirit, the Son is spirit, and the Holy Ghost is spirit, < but > "the Son" does not mean "Father"—and since there is also a "Spirit," and this does not mean "Son," and he is not the Son—and since the Holy Spirit cannot be the Father or the Son, but is a Holy Spirit given to the faithful by the Father through the Son—and since, in all probability, the Holy Spirit too subsists and is real—the easterners, as I said, call the individualities of the subsistent Persons "hypostases." They do not mean that the three hypostases are three first principles, or three Gods, for they condemn anyone who speaks of three Gods. (3) Nor do they call the Father and the Son two Gods; they confess that the Godhead is one, and that it encompasses all things through the Son, in the Holy Spirit.

16,4 < But > though they confess one Godhead, dominion and first principle, they still acknowledge the Persons in an orthodox manner through the individualities of the hypostases. They perceive the Father as subsistent in

his paternal authority and confess the Son, not as a part of the Father, but as a perfect Son plainly begotten without blemish of a perfect Father. And they acknowledge that the Holy Spirit, whom the sacred scripture calls the Paraclete, owes his being to the Father through the Son. (5) < For > as the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, teaches us the truth, which is the Son—No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Spirit<sup>83</sup>—so the Son, who is truth, teaches the godly knowledge of the true God, his Father, as he says, “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.”<sup>84</sup> (6) In the Holy Spirit, then, we have a godly apprehension of the Son; but in the only-begotten Son we piously and worthily glorify the Father. And this is the seal of the faith, the seal with which our Savior and Lord, Jesus Christ, who said, “Go make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,”<sup>85</sup> commanded us to be baptized.

17,<sup>1</sup> The Son’s likeness in all respects to the Father has been more extensively discussed elsewhere. Even now, however, I do not mind noting briefly in passing that the apostle, who called the Son “the image of the invisible God”<sup>86</sup> and in this way taught us that the Son is like the Father, has told us in other passages how we are to conceive of the Son. (2) In the Epistle to the Philippians he says, “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men,”<sup>87</sup> and in the Epistle to the Romans, (3) “For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of flesh, and for sin, condemned sin the flesh.”<sup>88</sup>

Thus, through the two passages from the two Epistles, we are also taught, through physical examples, the orthodox notion of likeness as it applies to the incorporeal Father and Son. (4) The words, “took upon him the form of a servant and was made in likeness of men,” show that the Son took flesh from the Virgin. Therefore the flesh which the Son of God took is the same as human flesh. But it is “in the likeness” of men, since it was not generated from seed, as men are, or by commerce with a man. (5) Similarly the Son, who is spirit and begotten of the Father as spirit, is the same as the Father in that he is spirit begotten of spirit, just as he is < the same as men > in that he

*is flesh born of Mary's flesh. But in that he is begotten of the Father without emanation, passion and division, he is "like" the Father, and yet not < the Father > himself—< just as > the fleshly Son is in the "likeness" of men, and yet not himself man in all respects.*

18,1 *Through the Epistle to the Philippians, then, Paul has taught us how the hypostasis of the Son is like the hypostasis of the Father. For the Son is spirit, [begotten] of the Father, and, as far as the meaning of "spirit" goes, the same as he—just as he is the same [as man] as far as the meaning of "flesh" goes. And yet he is not the same but like, since "spirit," which the Son is, is not the Father, and the flesh the Word assumed has not originated from human seed and through pleasure, but as the Gospel has taught us.*

18,2 *As I have said, the Son has taught us through Philippians how the Son is entirely like the Father in his being and subsistence. (3) But how he is like him in his will, activity and operations he has taught us through Romans, with the words, "In the likeness of the flesh of sin he condemned sin in the flesh."<sup>89</sup> The flesh which the Son of God assumed was the same as the flesh of sin, and was likewise moved to hunger, thirst and sleep like all flesh, but was not moved to sin by them. (4) This is why scripture says, "in the 'likeness' of the flesh of sin," an expression similar to, "What things soever the Father doeth, the same doeth the Son in like manner."<sup>90</sup> For the Father, who is spirit, acts on his own authority; the Son, though spirit, does not act on his own authority like the Father, but acts "in like manner."*

18,5 *Therefore, insofar as all flesh is the same, he is the same—just as, insofar as all spirit is the same, he is the same. But insofar as [his flesh was conceived] without seed, he is not the same [as flesh] but like it, just as, insofar as he was begotten, [though] without emission and passion, he is not the same [as the Father], but like him. And he is the same as flesh insofar as all flesh is the same, just as he is the same as spirit insofar as all spirit is the same. But insofar as he is in the likeness of sinful flesh, he is like in the impulses of the flesh and yet not the same, just as the Son [acts, but] in a subordinate role in the likeness of the [Father's] action, and not in the same way that the Father acts, with full sovereignty. (6) From these considerations it is evident that the Son is like the Father in all respects, as a son is like his father if he is legitimately begotten of him.*

*For it would be absurd for Him who was God's Son before all ages, and who was by nature God of God the Father, to become like those who were*

men by nature, in a way unnatural to him, when he was made man of Mary, contrary to nature—(since he was God, it was not natural for him to become man)—and yet for him not to be like the Father who begot him in a way that was natural to him. (7) If he, unnaturally, is like those who are men by nature, all the more is he by nature like the Father who begot him legitimately in accordance with his nature. It is thus in keeping with the scriptures that the doctrine of the Son's likeness to the Father in all respects be added to the scriptures. < But > he is like him, < and > has been understood < by us > [to be like him] in the senses in which the apostle has taught us the notion of "likeness" through the above passages. (8) For he is also like [the Father] in that he is life of life, light of light, very God of very God, and wisdom of the wise God. And in a word, according to the scriptures he is not like [the Father] merely in activity and will. In his very being, subsistence and actuality, he is in all respects like the Father who begot him—as a son is like a father.

19,1 If the new sectarians go on to dispute with us and speak of "ingenerate" and "generate," we shall tell them, "You have disingenuously refused to accept the word, 'being,' although it was used by the fathers, because it is unscriptural. Neither will we accept the word, 'ingenerate,' since it is unscriptural. The apostle says, 'incorruptible,' 'invisible,' 'immortal,' but scripture has never called God 'ingenerate.'"

19,2 Then, as I have already said, "ingenerate" does not yet mean "Father." And in itself, "generate" does not yet mean "Son," but applies the meaning equally to all things that have origins. (For if one says "generate," he has indicated that the thing had an origin, but has nowhere given indication of One who must forever be regarded as a Son. We, therefore, who forever regard him as the Son of God, shall not accept this term.)

19,3 < But > besides, the phrase, "Father and Son," denotes a relation to something. Thus even if we name only a "father," we have the notion of "son" included in the term, "father," for "father" means the father of a son. < And > even though we name only a "son," we have the notion of the "father," for "son" means the son of a father. (4) Each is linked with the other, and the connection cannot be broken. Indeed, either of them mentioned alone implies the notion of the other—and not only the name, but with the name, the natural relationship. (5) In understanding God to be a Father, we understand him to be the Father of God. And in understanding a Son of God to be God, we also understand the said Son of God to be of like nature with Him whose Son he is understood to be. But "ingenerate" does not mean "the ingenerate father of a generate son", nor does "generate" mean "generate son of an ingenerate father."

20,1 The terms “ingenerate” and “generate,” then, do not imply a relationship between the ingenerate and the generate, or, at the same time, give indication of their nature. Instead they put the individuality of the Son on a level with the rest of created things. Therefore, because of the impious trickery, we shall not accept the terms, but shall persist in our holy use of “Father and Son.”

20,2 In the first place, we who were called from the gentiles were not baptized in the name of an Ingenerate and a Generate, but of a Father and a Son. And then, the Son is nowhere found to have called his Father “Ingenerate,” but to have always called God, “Father,” and himself, “Son of God.” (3) To mention a few examples in passing we hear him say, “If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I go unto my Father”;<sup>91</sup> “Are ye angry with me, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, because I said, I am the Son of God?”<sup>92</sup> “I proceeded forth from the Father and am come. I came forth from the Father and am come into the world. Again, I leave the world and go unto the Father.”<sup>93</sup> And Peter’s confession, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of God.”<sup>94</sup> And the Father says from on high, “This is my beloved Son.”<sup>95</sup>

20,4 And therefore, since the Father thus refers to the Son and the Son to the Father, and we—to say it once more—were baptized in these names, we shall always use them, and reject the “profane innovations”<sup>96</sup> against the apostolic faith. (5) For the words of the Father, “By the splendors of the saints, from the belly, before the morning star begot I thee,”<sup>97</sup> are spoken perforce, and will withdraw the Son from the category of creatures; for by the term which corresponds to the term, “belly,” (i.e., “beget”) the Father teaches us of the Son he has legitimately begotten as his own. (6) And when the Son likewise said “The Lord created me,”<sup>98</sup> to < keep us from > supposing that his nature is in the same category as the other, created things,” he perforce added, “Before all hills he begets me,”<sup>99</sup> providing us with the notion of his sonship to God the Father that is a godly one and implies no passion. (7) However, the Father has expounded “generate” to us once, and the Son

once, because of the Son's godly filiation. But the entire New Testament is full of the words, "Father," and, "Son."

21,1 But so that the coiners of this heresy may be known by their own words, I note in passing a few examples of the many things they have written on the subject—[no more than a few,] because of their length. From these, I presume, the catholics must surely understand the full purport of their heresy, and make the decision that those who have written these things must abjure them, and to expel both them and their doctrines from the apostolic faith, as well as condemning those who believe and teach the same as they. For they write as follows, in these very words:

21,2 "Most of all I am eager to convey to you, in brief compass, some of the finest, God-inspired words. Any who suppose that the Son has a likeness of essence to the Father have departed from the truth, for with the title, 'generate,' they impeach the likeness of essence."<sup>100</sup>

21,3 And again, they say, "The Son both is and is admitted to be inferior < to the Ingenerate because of his > generation. He therefore cannot have likeness of essence to the Ingenerate, but does have the likeness by upholding the will of God, unaltered, in his own person. He has a likeness, then—not a likeness of essence but a likeness in respect of will, <for God > brought < him > into being as he willed."

And again, "Why do you yourself not agree with me that the Son is not like the Father in essence?"

Further, (4) "When it is admitted that the Son is everlasting although he does not have life of his own nature but by the authority of the Ingenerate; but it is also admitted that ingenerate nature endlessly transcends all authority; why is it < not > plain that the impious are exchanging the godly doctrine of the heteroousion for 'likeness of essence?'"

21,5 And again, "Therefore the word, 'Father,' is not indicative of essence, but of the authority which brought the Son into being before all ages as the divine Word, everlastingly < in possession > of the essence and authority which have been given him, and which he continues to possess."

21,6 And again, "< If > they maintain that 'Father' denotes essence but not authority, they should also call the person of the Only-begotten, 'Father.'"

22,1 We shall now say to the present day sectarians, "You have written, 'Like in will, unlike in essence.' We have therefore written in reply, 'Like, not merely by imitation, but in essence as well.' (2) You, then, were the first to

mention essence, when you said 'unlikeness in essence'; and you are eager for the elimination of the word, 'essence,' so that you can say that the Son is like the Father only in will. (3) Therefore, if you really agree that the Son is in all respects like the Father, condemn those who speak of a distinction in likeness, and write as follows: 'If anyone denies that the Son is like the Father just as [any] son is like his father, but says that he is like him only in will and unlike him in essence, let him be anathema.'" (4) And if they choose < not > to mention the word, "essence," after that, and repudiate even their own signatures by making < no > mention at all of "essence," they should still confess the faith of the fathers that the Son is like < the > Father not only in will, but in essence, subsistence and actuality—in a word, in everything as a son is like his father, as the sacred scriptures say."

22,5 The signatories of the statement of faith<sup>101</sup> in the Son's likeness to the Father in all respects were the following:

Mark, bishop of Arethusia. I so believe and hold, and < I >, and all here present < am in agreement > with the foregoing.

But Valens subscribed as follows. All here present, and the godly emperor before whom I have testified both orally and in writing know how I have affixed the above signature on the night before Pentecost.

22,6 But after this Valens signed the document in his own way. To his signature he added a statement that the Son is like the Father, but without adding, "in all respects," and making it clear in what sense he agreed with the above, or how he understood "co-essential." The godly emperor pointed this out and compelled him to add, "in all respects," which he did.

But Basil suspected that he had added even "in all respects" in a sense of his own<sup>102</sup> to the copies < which > Valens was anxious to obtain, to take to the council at Ariminum.<sup>103</sup> So he subscribed as follows:

22,7 Basil, bishop of Ancyra. I < so > believe. And I assent to the foregoing by confessing that the Son is like the Father in all respects. But in all! Not merely in will, but, as the sacred scriptures teach, in subsistence, actuality and essence, as a son is. [I believe that he is] spirit of spirit, life of life, light of light, God of God, very Son of very < Father >; the Son, who is Wisdom, of a

*wise God and Father. And in a word, [I confess] that the Son is like the Father in all respects, as a son is like a father. (8) And as has been stated above, if anyone says that the Son is like the Father [only] in a particular way, he is untrue to the catholic church, since he is not saying that the Son is like the Father in accordance with the sacred scriptures.*

*The postscript was read and given to Valens in the presence of the bishops Mark, George, Ursacius, Germanus and Hypatian, and a larger number of presbyters and deacons.*

23,1 I have inserted these letters to show all studious persons who are in search of the truths of the faith that I do not accuse people without reason, but do my best to base what I say on reliable evidence.

23,2 In turn, the Semi-Arians fell out with their allies; and they quarreled with each other and competed for leadership because of the grudges of some of them, and from common jealousy of each other and the desire to rule. And at that time the party of these Semi-Arians—I mean Basil, George, Silvanus and the rest of them—were in the ascendent. But < the others\* >—Eudoxius, George of Alexandria, and Euzoeus of Antioch—< opposed them\* >, and had on their side an arm of flesh, the emperor Constantius. (3) And in spite of their great influence the party of Basil and George of Laodicea were humiliated.<sup>104</sup> Still others of them broke with this faction and confederacy, and the Arian movement was divided into three groups. (4) For because of his envy and hatred of Cyril of Jerusalem, this same Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine, along with Melitius, Uranius of Tyre, and Eutychius of Eleutheropolis opposed Basil, George of Laodicea, Silvanus of Tarsus, Eleusius of Cyzicus, Macedonius of Constantinople, Eustathius of Sebaste and the newly consecrated bishop of Antioch, Anianus. < And > by ranging himself against them, Acacius caused a great deal of confusion.

23,5 [All of] these people, in fact, were of the same opinion, but were divided; because they each confessed it differently they differed, and were separated into the three factions I have indicated. (6) For although they were the same as the others, Acacius and his allies would neither confess the homoousion, nor say that Christ is a creature < like > any other creature. While < they > kept quiet about the word, “creature,” because of the times, they were entirely like < the > Arians. But at that time they concealed the fact that they believed no differently than these, because

of the admixture with them of people who were really orthodox, but were hypocrites and practiced hypocrisy for fear of the emperor's right arm.

And what with their mutual hatred, < they could not > stand firm even though they wanted to. (7) For from enmity towards Cyril, Eutychius of Eleutheropolis became one of Acacius' supporters, since he had learned the plain creed of orthodoxy from the blessed Maximon, the confessor bishop of Jerusalem. He was orthodox for a while, but dissembled to keep his see, as did many other Palestinian bishops. (8) For their sakes Acacius and his friends, though they were infected with the same madness and insane heresy, did not agitate these issues for the time being, and < did not dare > either to confess or to deny < the homoousion >. But at the Emperor Constantius' command they met at the town in Isauria called Rugged Seleucia and issued another creed, if you please<sup>105</sup>—a creed not in agreement with the one the fathers had drawn up in the city of Nicaea, which was orthodox and well drawn. Instead, they said with feigned simplicity, (24,1) *We believe in one God the Father almighty*, and next simply, *And [we believe] in the Son of God*, without saying anything of weight about him.<sup>106</sup> But later, to give a glimpse of their device, they said, *We reject the homoousion as untrue to sacred scripture, but condemn the doctrine of the Son's unlikeness to the Father*.

24,2 And this was the lure of crafty hunters. In fact, when they were by themselves they would assert and teach that the Son of God is a creature, but that he is "like" the Father in the common understanding of the term. (3) For even sculptors create images and produce likenesses, of gold, silver and other materials or of paint on wood, and they have the likeness of their models, but nothing to equal them. And so their strategy was to confess that the Son is "like" the Father, but without one bit of the Father's Godhead.

24,4 Some of their supporters accepted this < with hesitation\* >, but still accepted it because of the misfortune of the time that had befallen them; and at the same time most knew what they were doing, though some were indeed in ignorance, as was shown later. For Patrophilus of Scythopolis was on their side, and after him Philip, who was consecrated there as his successor, and many others who really held this heresy. (5) Now, however,

after their deaths, when their heresy has become widespread and they are free to speak because of the arm of flesh, they are stating their thesis plainly with no further hindrance, and are no longer restrained by any shame, or pretending because of an emperor's order. (6) <But> lest it be thought that I am attacking them for no good reason, I shall here give the creed which was issued there by Acacius' faction themselves, over the signature of the participants in the council. It is as follows:

25,1 *The bishops who have assembled at Seleucia in Isauria from various provinces at the command of his Reverence, our most God-fearing emperor Constantius. We, who have assembled at Seleucia in Isauria by the will of the emperor, have passed the following resolution:*

25,2 *Yesterday, the fifth before the Kalends of October, we made every effort, with all decorum, to preserve the peace of the church and, as our emperor Constantius, the most beloved of God, commanded us, produce a sound statement <of> the faith in the words of the prophets <and Gospels>, and add nothing contrary to the sacred scriptures to the creed of the church.*

25,3 *But certain persons abused some of us at the council, silenced others and did not permit them to speak, locked some out against their will, were accompanied by deposed clerics from various provinces, and brought with them persons who had been uncanonically ordained. The session thus became full of clamor on every side, as the most illustrious count Leonas, and Lauridus, the most illustrious governor of the province, saw with their own eyes. Therefore we assert that we do not abandon the genuine creed < which was put forth > at the Dedication at Antioch, but bring <it> forward. This is the main reason the fathers themselves came together at that time, the one which underlies the question.*

25,4 *< But > since the doctrines of the homoousion and homoeousion have troubled many in the past and do today, and it is further said that the novel doctrine of the Son's unlikeness to the Father is even now taught by some, we reject the homoousion as untrue to the scriptures, but condemn the doctrine of the unlikeness, and regard all who hold it as strangers to the church. (5)*

However, like the apostle who said, "He is the image of the invisible God,"<sup>108</sup> we plainly confess the likeness of the Son to the Father.

25,6<sup>109</sup> We confess and believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, things visible and invisible.

25,7 And we believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of him without passion before all ages, the divine Word, only-begotten God of God, light, life, truth, wisdom, power, by whom all things were made, things in heaven and things on earth, whether visible or invisible. (8) We believe that, to take away sin, he took flesh of the holy Virgin at the close of the ages and was made man. He suffered for our sins, rose again, was taken up into heaven, is seated at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead.

25,9 And we believe also in one Holy Spirit, whom our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ also termed the Paraclete, and whom he promised to send to the disciples after his ascension; and he sent him, and through him sanctifies the believers in the church, who are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

The catholic church knows that those who preach anything other than this creed are not her own.

25,10 The readers will recognize that the creed formerly issued at Sirmium<sup>110</sup> in the presence of his Reverence, our emperor, is of a meaning equivalent to this.

Those who are here have signed this creed: Basil, Mark, George the bishop of Alexandria, Pancratius, Hypatian, and most of the bishops of the west.

I, George, bishop of Alexandria, have issued this creed. My profession is as it is set forth here.

I, Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, have issued this creed. My profession is as it is set forth here. Uranius, bishop of Tyre, Eutychius, bishop of Eleutheropolis, Zoilus, bishop of Larissa in Syria, Seras, bishop of Paraetonium in Libya, Paul, bishop of Emisa, Eustathius, bishop of Epiphania, Irenaeus, bishop of Tripoli in Phoenicia, Eusebius, bishop of Seleucia in Syria, Eutychianus, bishop of Patara in Lyda, Eustathius, bishop of Pinari and Sidymi, Basil, bishop of Kaunia in Lydia, Peter, bishop of Hyppus in Palestine, Stephen, bishop of Ptolemais in Libya, Eudoxius, bishop of . . . Apollonius, bishop of Oxyrynchus, Theoctistus, bishop of Ostradne, Leontius, bishop of < Tripoli

*in > Lydia, Theodosius, bishop of Philadelphia in Lydia, Phoebus, bishop of Polychalandus in Lydia, Magnus, bishop of Themisi in Phrygia, Evagrius, bishop of Mitylene of the islands, Cyrion, bishop of Doliche, Augustus, bishop of Euphrates, Polydeuces, bishop . . . of the second province of Libya, Pancras, bishop of Pelusium, (7) Phillocadus, bishop of Augustus in the province of Phrygia, Serapion, bishop of Antipyrgus in Libya, Eusebius, bishop of Sebaste in Palestine, Heliodorus, bishop of Sozusa in Pentapolis, Ptolemais, bishop of Thmuis in Augustamnica, (8) Abgar, bishop of Cyrus in Euphrasia, Exere-sius, bishop of Gerasa, Arabio, bishop of Adrai, Charisius, bishop of Azotus, Elisha, bishop of Diocletianopolis, Germanus, bishop of Petra, Baruch, bishop of Arabia; forty-three bishops in all.<sup>111</sup> So far the document issued by the above-mentioned Semi-Arians and Arians.*

27,<sup>1</sup> You men of sense who have gone through this and the other creeds, be aware that the effort of both parties is a fraud and nothing orthodox, with even a bit of the godly confession of faith. (2) For the Lord says, "What ye have heard in the ear, that proclaim ye upon the housetops."<sup>112</sup> And as the holy apostle says, "Speak every man truth with his neighbor";<sup>113</sup> but the prophet speaks out to expose their mischief, "He speaketh peace with his neighbor, but in his heart hath he war."<sup>114</sup> (3) In the same way, when these followers of Acacius wanted to cast off the restraint of the true confession after their separation from Basil and his adherents, they issued a spurious, easily refutable, and entirely misleading creed, so that, if they wanted to fool people, they could make a proper confession in the words we have given—(4) but if they chose to reveal the banefulness of their heresy they would have this declaration available, which is midway between the two positions and possible as a confession of each of their creations.

27,<sup>5</sup> But since, in this Acacian faction which was separated from the other two—I have said that the Arian party was divided into three groups. Eudoxius, Germanus, George of Alexandria and Euzoeus of Antioch made one division, (6) and similarly Eleusius, Eustathius, George of Laodicea, Silvanus of Tarsus, Macedonius of Constantinople and many others made another. (7) But again Acacius, as I said, Melitius, Eutychius and certain others formed another group of their own. And the whole thing was pure trickery. (8) What each of them believed, the other believed. But they were divided into schisms among themselves, either from mutual hatred,

since Cyril of Jerusalem was furious with Eutychius and Eutychius with Cyril, but Cyril was in with Basil of Galate, Anianus the newly consecrated bishop of Antioch, and George of Laodicea—(9) but why wear myself out distinguishing between the factions and describing them? I shall go on to the counter-arguments, and the refutation of the guile of each of them. First, though, I must speak of what happened later, for this contributed to the goodness of some, and the wickedness of others.

28,1 For when Melitius was consecrated at Antioch by Acacius' faction—and for Acacius this has been the beginning of his retreat, if only slightly, from his heretical views. By his support of Melitius' election he shows that, of all things, he is in the orthodox camp. As I was saying, when Melitius was consecrated by Acacius' own friends they thought he shared their opinion. But as many report of him, he turned out not to. (2) For at present, since Melitius has been hounded and expelled from his see, those who favor him and his party are gradually and progressively becoming orthodox for God's sake, due to the protracted length of the banishment. (3) For there were more [orthodox] laity than there were laity of the <other\*> party.<sup>115</sup> They profess their faith in the Son admirably through their episcopal elections, and do not reject the homoousion. Indeed they are prepared to confess and not deny it, they say, if there can just be a last council. (4) In fact the most honorable Melitius himself, who was consecrated at Antioch by the Arians around Melitius, gave a sort of first installment of this in church, in his first sermon at Antioch, and in orthodox terms, or so say the majority. I offer his sermon here, as follows:

29,1 *The most wise Ecclesiastes says, "The end of any speaking is better than its beginning."*<sup>117</sup> *How much better and safer is it to cease from a struggle over words than to begin one, especially as the same Ecclesiastes says, "This wisdom of the poor is set at naught, and his words are not heard."*<sup>118</sup> (2) < But > since *"The body is not one member, but many,"*<sup>119</sup> *"All the members care one*

*for another that there be no schism in the body,"*<sup>120</sup> and *"The head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you,"*<sup>121</sup> but *"God hath tempered the body together, giving the more abundant honor to the part which lacks,"*<sup>122</sup> it goes without saying that one cannot avoid being troubled by the troubling of the whole body.

29,3 *But how should one begin to speak to you? Plainly, it is fitting that whoever embarks on speech or action should make peace its beginning and end, and that those who begin with it should also close with it. "For this shall turn to your salvation," says the apostle, "through your prayer and the supply of the Spirit"*<sup>123</sup> *which Jesus gives to those who believe in him. (4) And whether one speaks words of edification, "consolation, comfort of love, or fellowship of the Spirit,"*<sup>124</sup> *he comes in the peace of God—not, indeed, for all without discrimination, but peace "for those who love the Law,"*<sup>125</sup> *as the prophet says. Not the written Law, the "image and shadow of things to come,"*<sup>126</sup> *but the spiritual law which wisely reveals the outcome of the things that were foretold. (5) "For peace," says the scripture, "is multiplied to them that love thee, and they have none occasion of stumbling."*<sup>127</sup>

*Plainly, for those who hate peace, the occasion of stumbling remains, and it behooves those who long to be free from them to hold the love of the Lord before them as a shield. "For he himself is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, the enmity of the flesh, the Law of commandments contained in ordinances."*<sup>128</sup> *(6) Nor is it possible to keep the commandment of the Lord without a prior love of God—for "If ye love me," says Christ, "keep my commandments."*<sup>129</sup> *Nor can the eyes or heart be enlightened unless the commandment enlightens them, for the scripture says, "The commandment of the Lord is clear, and giveth light unto the eyes."*<sup>130</sup> *Nor can one speak any truth unless he has Christ within him as the Speaker, in the words of him who says, "since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me"*<sup>131</sup> *—or rather, not simply "speaking in me," but,*

*"having mercy in me." (7) "Let thy mercy and thy salvation come upon me," says the scripture, "and I shall make answer unto them that rebuke me,"<sup>132</sup> though this cannot be unless one "seek his statutes."<sup>133</sup> For those who are not so disposed, < or > apparently so, there is shame in his rebukes, and they cannot say, "Take from me shame and rebuke."<sup>134</sup> Instead the word of truth is taken out of his mouth, so that there is nothing more for him who prays < than >, "Take not the word of thy truth out of my mouth."<sup>135</sup>*

*30,1 And when is this? When < one > does not continually observe the Law—when one does not journey on open ground. For one's "heart must be broadened"<sup>136</sup> if one is to have room for the Christ who "walks within him,"<sup>137</sup> whose glory, not men but the heavens declare, for "The heavens declare the glory of God"<sup>138</sup>—or rather, the Father himself declares by saying, "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased."<sup>139</sup> (2) But one cannot confess this [Son] "if he haughtily speaketh iniquity"<sup>140</sup> to his neighbor, if he joins the band of the antichrists and adopts<sup>141</sup> their name, abandoning the band and name of the Christians, of whom it is said, "Touch not mine anointed ones."<sup>142</sup> (3) For "Who is a liar," the scripture asks, "save he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This," it says, "is the antichrist. For whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledgeth the Son acknowledged the Father also. That which ye have heard from the beginning," it says, "let this abide in you. And if that abideth in you which ye have heard from the beginning ye also shall abide in the Son and in the Father."<sup>143</sup>*

*30,4 But we shall "abide" when we confess before God and his elect angels—indeed, confess before kings, and not be ashamed, for the scripture says, "I have spoken of thy testimonies before kings and was not ashamed."<sup>144</sup> [We shall abide when we confess] that the Son of God is God of God, One of One, Only-begotten of Ingenerate, the elect Offspring of his Begetter and a Son worthy of him who has no beginning; the ineffable Interpreter of the*

*Ineffable, the Word, and the Wisdom and Power of Him who transcends wisdom and power, beyond anything that the tongue can utter, beyond any thought the mind can initiate. (5) He is the perfect and abiding Offspring of Him who is perfect, and abides the same—not an overflow of the Father or a bit or piece of the Father, but come forth without passion and entire, from him who has lost none of what he had. (6) And because <the> Son is, and is called, the “Word,” he is by no means to be conceived of as the Father’s voice or verbal expression. For he subsists in himself and acts, and by him and in him are all things. Similarly, although he is Wisdom as well, he is not to be conceived of as the Father’s thought, or as a movement and activity of his reason, but as an Offspring who is like the Father and bears the exact impress of the Father. (7) For the Father, God, has sealed him; and he neither inheres in another nor subsists by himself, but <is> an Offspring at work, who has made this universe and preserves it. This is sufficient to free us from the error of the Greeks, the willful worship of the Jews, and the heresy of the sectarians.*

31,1 *But since some pervert the sense of the scriptural expressions, interpret them otherwise than is fitting and understand neither the meaning of the words nor the nature of the facts, they dare to deny the Son’s divinity because they stumble at the mention of creation in Proverbs, “The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works.”<sup>145</sup> (They should follow the Spirit who gives life, and not the letter which kills, for “The Spirit giveth life.”)<sup>146</sup> (2) Let me also, then, venture on a short discussion of this, not because it has <not> been fully discussed by those who have spoken before me—to say this, one would be mad!—and not because you are in need of a teacher, for “Ye yourselves are taught of God,”<sup>147</sup> but so that I may be “manifest in your consciences.”<sup>148</sup> For I am one of those who desire to “impart unto you some spiritual gift.”<sup>149</sup>*

31,3 *Believe me, neither elsewhere in the scripture nor here do the words of scripture contradict each other, even though, to those of unsound faith or weak wits, they may seem to be in conflict. Believe me also, it is not possible to find in this world an example adequate in itself to explain clearly the nature of the Only-begotten. (4) And for this reason the scripture employs many ideas and terms with reference to the Only-begotten, to help us grasp things*

*that are above us with the aid of things familiar to us; to imagine things we do not know by means of things we do; and to advance, gently and by easy stages, from the seen to the unseen.*

31,5 *Believers in Christ, then, should < know > that the Son is like the Father, since he who is "through all," and by whom all things in heaven and earth were made, is the "image" of him who is "above all."*<sup>150</sup> *But [they should know] that he is an image, not as an inanimate object is the image of a living thing or as a process is the image of an art, or a finished product the image of a process, but < as > an offspring is the image of its parent. (6) And [they should know] that the generation of the Only-begotten before the ages may not lawfully be portrayed < along the lines of > bodily human generation. And as < the Son is the \* > Father's < wisdom \* > in the pattern of the wisdom which embraces human thoughts, and though he is certainly not a nonentity and non-existent, the scripture made use of both terms, that of creation and that of generation, of "He created me" and "He begot me." This was not to give the appearance of saying contraries about the same things and at the same time, but to show the real and enduring existence of the Only-begotten through "created," and his special and individual character through "begot." (7) For he says, "I proceeded forth from the Father and am come."*<sup>151</sup> *The very word, "wisdom," however, is enough to exclude any idea of passion.*

32,1 *But whither are we bound with our failure to remember him who said, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"*<sup>152</sup> *(2) We have the Spirit of truth for our teacher, whom the Lord gave us after his assumption into the heavens, that we might "know the things that are freely given to us of God."*<sup>153</sup> *In him "we likewise speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual."*<sup>154</sup> *In him we serve and worship, for his sake we are despised, in him the prophets prophesied, in him by whom we are brought to the Son, the righteous have been guided.*

*But why do we meddle with nature? Am I speaking as with carnal persons, not spiritual? (3) "We cannot speak unto you as unto spiritual but as unto carnal,"*<sup>155</sup> *was said of others. It is to be feared that, from our contention*

over the incomprehensible and dispute about the unsearchable, we may fall into the depths of impiety. "And I said, I will get wisdom, and it was farther from me than that which was before, and its depth was unsearchable; who shall find it out?"<sup>156</sup> Let us be mindful of him who said, (4) "We know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."<sup>157</sup> "If any man think that he knoweth, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know."<sup>158</sup> It is therefore to be feared that, if we attempt to speak of what we cannot, we may no longer be permitted to speak of what we can. We must speak because of faith, not believe because of what is spoken, for scripture says, "I believed, and therefore did I speak."<sup>159</sup>

32,5 Thus when we inquire, and try to contend, about the generation of God although we cannot describe our own, how can we avoid the risk that he who has given us not only "the tongue of instruction," but also the "knowledge of when to say a word,"<sup>160</sup> may condemn us to silence for our rashness of speech. (6) This was accomplished in the case of the blessed Zacharias. As he disbelieved the angel who had announced the child's conception, tested the grace and power of God by human reasonings, and despaired of his ability to father a child in his old age by an aged wife, what did he say? (7) "How shall I know that this will be? For I am old, and my wife well stricken in years."<sup>161</sup> And thus, since he was told, "Thou shalt be dumb and not able to speak,"<sup>162</sup> he could not speak when he left [the temple].

33,1 We therefore cease to wrangle over the questions in dispute and the matters that are beyond us, and hold fast what we have received. Who dare be puffed up over knowledge, when even he who was vouchsafed "revelations," who was caught up "to the third heaven" and "heard unspeakable words," was recalled to his senses by his "thorn in the flesh," so as not to be "puffed up above measure?"<sup>163</sup> (2) The very prophet who said, "I believed, and therefore have I spoken," also said, "I was afflicted"—and not simply "afflicted," but "sore afflicted."<sup>164</sup> The nearer one's apparent approach to

*knowledge, the more should he reckon with his humanity. Hear the prophet say of him, "I said in my astonishment, All men are liars."<sup>165</sup>*

*33,3 Since we have the Teacher of the truth, let us make no further use of the teachings of men. Let us realize <our limitation, believe\* >, and waste no more effort on "modes," or anything else. As we cannot say how the Son was generated or describe the mode of the Father's generation, we <must> consider "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made"<sup>166</sup> as sufficient for teaching.*

*33,4 The Lord grant that with a spirit like Abraham's, who said, "Now I have begun to speak with the Lord, though I am dust and ashes"<sup>167</sup>—and not "exalted as the cedars of Lebanon,"<sup>168</sup> since equable, peaceable wisdom is not attained "by words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which faith teacheth"<sup>169</sup>—we inquire (5) only into what we must do to please our God and Father, and along with him, and together with him, <the Son> in the Holy Spirit, <to whom> be glory, might, honor and power, now, and forever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.*

*34,1 To those <who had been eager> to bring Melitius from Pontus, it seemed that this <had> not <been said> to please or placate most of the Arians, but to annoy them. They then egged the emperor on, plotted against Melitius for not having confessed that the Son is a creature in the fullest sense of the word, and expelled him from his see. (2) He was driven into exile overnight,<sup>170</sup> and is in exile to this day. Even now he resides in his own homeland, a man esteemed and beloved, especially because of the things I am now told that he has accomplished, and which are the cause of the confession his subjects in Antioch now make. They no longer make even a passing mention of the word, "creature," but confess that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are co-essential—three entities, one essence, one Godhead. (3) This is the true faith which we have received from the ancients, the faith of the prophets, Gospels and apostles, which our fathers and bishops confessed when they met at the Council of Nicaea in the presence of the great and most blessed emperor, Constantine. And*

may the most honored Melitius himself make the same confession as his subjects at Antioch and < those > who make it in certain other places! (4)<sup>171</sup> For there are also some, apparently in communion with him and his supporters, who blaspheme the Holy Spirit; and although they speak correctly of the Son, they regard the Spirit as a creature and altogether different from the Father. Later I shall give full information about them, as accurately as I can, in the refutation of the heresy they hold.

35,<sup>1</sup> As I said, I hold Melitius in honor for the good things I have heard of him. And indeed his life is holy in the other respects, he is well conducted, and is beloved in every way by the laity for his way of life which all admire. (2) Some, however—I do not know whether they are inspired by enmity, or jealousy, or a desire to magnify themselves—[some] have said something about him to the effect that the rebellion against him was not over his orthodoxy, but because of canonical matters and the quarrel between him and his priests, and because he received certain persons whom he had previously expelled and condemned.<sup>172</sup> (3) But I have paid no attention to this because, as I indicated above, of the rectifications and the confessions of the faith which, at long last, are being made daily among his companions.

For I must tell the truth in this regard, as far as my weakness in everything allows. (4) Suppose that he overlooked < something > in the rush of the words of his exposition—I cannot say. Or suppose that, in all innocence, a word escaped him—God knows. In one way, two or three remarks in this exposition are questionable—his treating at all, even nominally, of the Son of God in his divine nature as a “creature,” and his saying, “above wisdom,” and perhaps something else.

36,<sup>1</sup> But I shall say a little about their allegations and get finished with this discussion. Tell us, people, why would it disturb you to say that the homoeousion is the homoousion? Confess your faith plainly, to let us know that you belong to us, and are not strangers. Brass can be of an essence *like* gold, tin of an essence *like* silver, lead of an essence *like* iron—but the story you have concocted and turned out will not fool us. (2) For if you want to fool people, you < make > the false excuses that we must not say, “homoousion,” or we will make the Son identical with the Father, or the Spirit identical with the Son and the Father. Here too the argument

you have invented fails. (3) We say, not, “identically essential,”<sup>173</sup> but, “co-essential,” to confess, not that < the Son > is any different from the Father, but that he is God actually begotten of God—not originating from some other source or from nothing, but come forth < from > the Father. He was begotten at no time, without beginning, and inexpressibly, is forever with the Father and never ceases to be, but is begotten, is not the Father’s kinsman, not his progenitor.

36,4 For “homo” means that there are two entities, < but > not different in nature. Thus the true union [of the two essences] revealed by the Holy Spirit, through the expression in the mouths of those who use the expression. And you see that you will have no excuse, and cannot speak against orthodoxy and frighten your followers who accept your false argument, [by claiming] that whoever says, “homooousion,” has professed faith in an identity. (5) No way! [That there are] two will be shown by “homooousion”; that the Offspring is not different from the Father will also be indicated by “homooousion.”

36,6 But because of the word, “essence,” you will be convicted of fabricating the homoeousion; and because of your altered confession of faith you will be condemned for not meaning what you say, but falsifying the teaching of what you mean. For if you mean that the Son is not of the Father at all, but is *like* him instead, you are a long way from the truth. (7) If one chooses to decorate a relief with any materials, no matter which, he cannot make it the same as the relief; indeed, the work is one of fabrication. But a thing begotten of some thing preserves the likeness of genus and the sameness of species which characterize legitimate sonship. (8) Now if you say that the Son is not begotten of the Father himself but must be outside of him, and call him “of like essence” to do him a favor, you have given him nothing, but have been deprived of his favor. (9) “He that honoreth not the Son as the Father honoreth him,” says the holy apostle, “the wrath of God abideth on him.”<sup>174</sup> And again, he who said, “I proceeded forth from the Father and am come,”<sup>175</sup> [said] “I am in the Father and the Father in me”<sup>176</sup> in the same breath as, “Philip, he that hath seen me hath seen the Father.”<sup>177</sup>

37,1 Since I have often discussed these things, I believe that will be enough of the same refutations here. The same ones I applied earlier to the root that put forth their heresy are capable of demolishing these Semi-Arians here—[them], and the ones who split off from them, (2) Acacius' friends and the others who issued a creed at Seleucia in Isauria which is other than the true one. Because I wanted bring it to light, I have also inserted the whole of the creed they issued at the end, after the creed of Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea which was written as representing them all. (3) But lest it appear that when I put this in the second place I did it from forgetfulness—because it did its fearful damage secretly and accepted a gag as though to < restrain its own teachings > with a bridle in the time of hypocrisy—I shall also say a little about it and its authors, the allies of Acacius, Euzoeus, Eutychius and the rest. (4) And the document before us has plainly altered the confession of the truth. But lest it be said that I have slandered these people, let me point out what was discovered and what, as time went by, became evident in this group of theirs.

37,5 One of them is Euzoeus of Caesarea, who is their disciple and Acacius' successor. [That was] after the consecration of Philumen, who was consecrated by Cyril of Jerusalem; and the consecration of the elderly Cyril who was consecrated by Eutychius and his friends; and the consecration of Gelasius who, once more, was consecrated by Cyril of Jerusalem. He was the son of Cyril's sister. After the consecration of these three and their suspension because of the quarrel between them, Euzoeus was consecrated in his turn. (6) Gemellinus was also one of them, and Philip of Scythopolis, and Athanasius of Scythopolis. These not only teach Arianism publicly and not in secret, as though they had never heard of anything better; they do battle for their heresy, what is more, and persecute those who teach the truth. They are no longer willing merely to refute orthodox believers verbally, but subject them to feuds, violence and murder. For they have done harm, not in one city and country but in many. (38,1) < And\* > this Lucius, who has done so much to those who confess the Son of God at Alexandria, is < one of them\* >.

Who, if he has God's good sense, can fail to see < the dreadful things\* > their fraternity < is doing\* > every day? They preach in public that the Son of God is a creature, and that the Holy Spirit is a creature as well, and entirely different from the essence of God. (2) < There is no need for me even to speak of all that\* > Eudoxius and his friends < are doing\* > since George met his shameful end at Alexandria and Eudoxius received the headship, and the perquisites of high office. < He > was one of the group around Hypatius and Eunomius, and to flatter them pretended to be

convinced; < but >, though he kept it a secret, he never ceased to believe in the doctrines of the Anomoeans. (3) And he himself promoted Demophilus, Hypatius and Eunomius, men whom they had once exiled for this criminal exposition [of the creed]. They were disciples of Aetius, who was once exiled to the Taurus. He was made a deacon by George of Alexandria, and the root of the Anomoeans grew up from him. (4) As there is one thorny stem and the same root, but it < bears\* > schisms of different kinds as though on each thorn, so it is with their malice. It has disgorged this filth into the world < by putting forth\* >, differently at different times, the misinterpretations of this heretical sect, which keep getting worse. I shall say this again later about these Anomoeans.

38,5 But I think that for now, this much will do. Since we have scotched and maimed this sect like a horrid serpent let us stomp on it, leave it dead after trampling it, and turn away to hurry on to the rest, likewise calling on God to help us keep our promise.

## V

### **Contra los Pneumatómacos, secta del Cristianismo**

1,1 A sort of monstrous, half-formed people with two natures, as the mythographers < described > the Centaurs, Pans and Sirens, have been born to these Semi-Arians and orthodox believers, and have risen up against us. (2) The Arians of them declare the Son is not fully a creature, but a Son begotten outside of time. But they say with a hint of time that he < has been in existence > from of old<sup>2</sup> until now, and have thus by no means abandoned the formula originally spat out by Arius, which said that "There was a time when He was not" but that He "by whom things were made"<sup>3</sup> was before all time"; and they blaspheme the Holy Spirit < by saying that the Spirit is a creature >. (3) Others hold the truly orthodox view of the Son, that he was forever with the Father and has never ceased to exist, but has been begotten<sup>4</sup> without beginning and not in time. But all of these blaspheme the Holy Spirit, and do not count him in the Godhead with the Father and the Son.

1,4 I often have discussed this extensively, and have given an authentic proof, at considerable length, in every Sect, that he is to be called, "Lord," with the Father and the Son. For the "Spirit of the Lord filleth the whole world"<sup>5</sup>—the "Spirit of truth,"<sup>6</sup> the Spirit of God. He is called the Spirit of the Lord, who "proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son,"<sup>7</sup> "giveth gifts severally as he will,"<sup>8</sup> "searcheth the deep things of God,"<sup>9</sup> and is with the Father and the Son, baptizing, sealing, and perfecting him whom he has sealed. (5) But to avoid assuming a burden here, I shall offer, for the reader's instruction and the enjoyment of those who have been vouchsafed the Holy Spirit, the things I have already said in opposition to the Spirit's blasphemers in my long work on the faith, which I wrote [in the form of a letter] to Pamphylia. It is as follows:

2,1 *"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ hath appeared, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, godly and righteously in this present world, looking for the blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."*<sup>11</sup> (2) *He "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances, which was against us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it."*<sup>12</sup> *"He hath broken the gates of brass and burst the bars of iron in sunder."*<sup>13</sup> *He made the light of life visible again, stretching forth his hand, showing the way, baring the foundations of heaven and demanding a dwelling place in Paradise once more. He therefore also caused "the righteousness of the Law"*<sup>14</sup> *"to dwell in us,"*<sup>15</sup> (3) *and has given us the Spirit, so that we may know him and the truth about him. That*

is, he has become the beginning and end of our life, our "law of righteousness,"<sup>16</sup> "law of faith,"<sup>17</sup> and "law of the Spirit,"<sup>18</sup> free from the "law of the flesh of sin."<sup>19</sup>

2,4 Therefore "I delight in the law of God after the inward man."<sup>20</sup> But our inward man is Christ, provided that he dwells in us. (5) For it is he who, by dying became our way to life "that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto" the Cause of life, "who died for them, and rose again."<sup>21</sup> "Mindful of the oath which," as David said, "he swore many generations before"<sup>22</sup> "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their transgressions unto them."<sup>23</sup>

2,6 "For it pleased the Father than in him should all fullness dwell, and by him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of the cross."<sup>24</sup> (7) He came, then, "for the dispensation of the fullness of the times," as he promised to Abraham and the other saints, "to gather in one all things in him, things which are in heaven and things which are on earth."<sup>25</sup> (8) There was estrangement and enmity "during the [time of the] forbearance of God,"<sup>26</sup> but he "reconciled them in the body of his flesh, making both one through him. For he came to be our peace"<sup>27</sup> and "as he who broke down the middle wall of partition, who abolished enmity in his flesh, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make the twain one new man in himself."<sup>28</sup> And he commanded that the gentiles be "of the same body, and fellow partakers and fellow heirs of the promise"<sup>29</sup> by saying, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."<sup>30</sup> (9) And so "while I was weak, through the flesh,"<sup>31</sup> a Savior was sent to me "in the likeness of sinful flesh,"<sup>32</sup> and performed this gracious work, to

*“redeem”<sup>33</sup> me from slavery, from corruption, from death. And he became my “righteousness, sanctification and redemption.”<sup>34</sup> (10) Righteousness, by destroying sin through faith in him; sanctification, by setting us free through water and Spirit, and by his word; redemption, by giving his blood, giving himself for me as the atonement of a true lamb, an expiation for the world’s cleansing, for the reconciliation of all in heaven and on earth, and so fulfilling, at the appointed time, the “mystery hidden before the ages and generations.”<sup>35</sup> (11) And he “shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself,”<sup>36</sup> for “In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.”<sup>37</sup>*

*3,1 Christ, the vessel of wisdom and of the Godhead, therefore as mediator “reconciles all things to God in him,”<sup>38</sup> “not imputing their trespasses,”<sup>39</sup> but fulfilling the hidden mysteries by faith in his covenant, which was foretold by the Law and the prophets. He is declared to be the Son of God, but called the Son of David, for he is both God and man, the “mediator between God and men,”<sup>40</sup> the true “house of God,” the “holy priesthood.”<sup>41</sup> He is the giver of the Holy Spirit, who in turn regenerates and renews all things for God; for “The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, even the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father.”<sup>42</sup>*

*3,2 When the rain is absorbed by trees and plants it engenders a body, each in the likeness of its fruit. The oil grows rich in the olive by receiving its essence from it, the sweet wine darkens in the vine, the fig sweetens on the fig tree, and [the rain] will generate new growth according to its kind in every seed. (3) So, I believe, God’s Word was made flesh in Mary and became man in the seed of Abraham, in accordance with the promise, “We have found the Messiah of whom Moses did write.”<sup>43</sup> As Moses said, “Let my word descend as the rain,”<sup>44</sup> (4) and David, “Let him come down as dew on a fleece and*

*like drops watering the earth”;<sup>45</sup> the wool will then increase the progeny of the fleece when it receives the dew. But when the earth receives the rain, since it receives it by the Lord’s command it will increase the fruit for which husbandmen hope, yielding its essence gladly, but in eagerness to receive more from him. (5) So, when the Virgin Mary asked, “How shall I know that this will be to me?”<sup>46</sup> she was told, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that which shall be born of thee shall be holy, and called, Son of the Most High.”<sup>47</sup>*

*3,6 Christ speaks in the angel, and in his fashioning of himself the Lord refashions himself by “taking the form of a servant.”<sup>48</sup> And Mary absorbs the Word for conception as the earth absorbs the rain; but by taking mortal nature God’s Word makes himself a holy fruit. (7) He was [born] of her who absorbed him, like earth and fleece—the fruit of the true hope, awaited by the saints as Elizabeth said, “Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.”<sup>49</sup> This [fruit] the Word received from humankind, and suffered although he was impassible. (8) He is the “living bread which came down from heaven”<sup>50</sup> and gives life. He is the fruit of the true olive, the oil of anointing and compounding which, as a type, Moses described.<sup>51</sup> He is the “true vine”<sup>52</sup> which only the Father tends, who has produced a joyous vintage for us. (9) He is the “living water, after taking which < the > man that thirsteth shall not thirst again, but it is in his belly springing up into everlasting life.”<sup>53</sup>*

*The new husbandmen have taken of this water and given it to the world, while the old husbandmen have withered and perished from unbelief. (10) By his own blood he hallows the gentiles, but by his own Spirit he leads the called to the heavens. “As many as live by the Spirit of God, they live to God.”<sup>54</sup> Those who are not so led are still reckoned as dead, and these are called “natural” or “carnal.”<sup>55</sup> (11) Christ commands us, then, to abandon the works of the flesh which are the strongholds of sin, to put to death the members of death by his grace, and to receive the Holy Spirit which we did not have—*

*the Spirit who gives me life, though I am long dead and, unless I receive him, shall have died. For without his Spirit, all are dead. (12) "If, therefore, his Spirit be in us, he that raised him from the dead shall quicken our mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us."*<sup>56</sup> *In my opinion, however, both dwell in the righteous—Christ, and his Spirit.*

4,1 *If it is believed that Christ, as "God of God," is of the Father, and his Spirit is of Christ or of both—as Christ says, "who proceedeth from the Father,"*<sup>57</sup> *and, "He shall receive of me"*<sup>58</sup> *—and if it is believed that Christ is of the Holy Spirit—the angel's words are, "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit"*<sup>59</sup> *—[then] I know the Mystery that redeems me by faith, by hearing alone, by love for him who has come to me. (2) For God knows himself, Christ proclaims himself, the Holy Spirit reveals himself to the worthy.*

4,2 *A Trinity is proclaimed in the holy scriptures and is believed in with all seriousness, without contention, < by > the hearing of the creeds. From this faith comes salvation by grace—"righteousness is by faith without the works of the Law."*<sup>60</sup> (3) *< For > the scripture says that "the Spirit of Christ" is given to those who are saved "by the hearing of faith."*<sup>61</sup> (4) *And in my opinion, as I am taught by the scriptures, the catholic faith is declared by the voices of its heralds to be as follows:*

*Three Holies, three of equal holiness; three Actuals, three of equal actuality; three Informed, three with the same form; three at work, three at one work; three Subsistents, three of the same subsistence, in co-existence. This is called a holy Trinity, one concord though they are three, one Godhead of the same essence, the same divinity, the same subsistence, like [generated] of like, resulting in the equality of the grace of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*

*To teach the how of this is left to them. (5) "No man knoweth the Father save the Son; neither knoweth any man the Son, save the Father, and he to whom the Son will reveal him."*<sup>62</sup> *But he reveals him through the Holy Spirit. (6) Thus, whether these Persons, who are three, are of him, from him, or with him is properly understood by each Person, just as they reveal themselves as light, fire, wind, and I believe with other visionary likenesses, as the man*

reporting them is worthy. (7) Thus the God who said "Let there be light" at the beginning "and there was" visible "light,"<sup>63</sup> is the same God who has given us the light to see "the true light, which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world"<sup>64</sup>—"Send forth thy light and thy truth,"<sup>65</sup> says David—and the same Lord who said, "In the latter days I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and their sons shall prophesy, and their daughters, and their young men shall see visions."<sup>66</sup> He has therefore shown us three Objects of sacred worship, of a triple subsistence.

3,1 "I say," therefore, "that Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises."<sup>67</sup> But I understand from the sacred scriptures that the Holy Spirit is his fellow minister, for the following reasons. Christ is sent from the Father; the Holy Spirit is sent. Christ speaks in the saints; the Holy Spirit speaks. Christ heals; the Holy Spirit heals. Christ hallows; the Holy Spirit hallows. Christ baptizes in his name; the Holy Spirit baptizes.

3,2 The scriptures say, "Thou shalt send forth thy Spirit, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth,"<sup>68</sup> which is like saying "Thou shalt send forth thy Word and melt them."<sup>69</sup> (3) "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted," says the scripture, "the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."<sup>70</sup> This is like saying "The Lord said, Go into the city, and there it shall be told thee what thou must do."<sup>71</sup> (4) "So they, being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, departed unto Seleucia,"<sup>72</sup> is equivalent to Christ's saying, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves."<sup>73</sup> (5) "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things,"<sup>74</sup> is equivalent to his saying, "I say, yet not I, but the Lord, Let the wife not depart from her husband."<sup>75</sup>

5,6 "Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Spirit to preach the word in Asia, after

they were come to Mysia they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not,"<sup>76</sup> is equivalent to Christ's saying, "Go, baptize all nations,"<sup>77</sup> < or >, "Carry neither scrip, nor staff, nor shoes."<sup>78</sup> (7) "Who said to Paul through the Spirit that he should not go up to Jerusalem"<sup>79</sup>—or Agabus' prophecy, "Thus saith the Holy Spirit, The man that owneth this girdle"<sup>80</sup>—is like Paul's saying, "since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me,"<sup>81</sup> or, "Remember the words of the Lord, that he said, It is better to give than to receive."<sup>82</sup>

5,8 [Paul's], "And now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit"<sup>83</sup> is the equivalent of his, "Paul, a prisoner of Jesus Christ."<sup>84</sup> (9) "Save that the Holy Spirit witnesseth to me in every city,"<sup>85</sup> is equivalent to saying "The Lord testifieth to my soul that I lie not."<sup>86</sup> (10) [To say], "with power according to the Spirit of holiness,"<sup>87</sup> is similar to saying, "Holy is he who rests in the saints."<sup>88</sup> (11) [To say], "And circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit,"<sup>89</sup> is similar to saying, "And ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off the body of the sins by the circumcision of Christ."<sup>90</sup>

5,12 [To say], "If so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you,"<sup>91</sup> is similar to saying, "As ye have received Christ, walk ye in him."<sup>92</sup> And [to say], "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word is in my mouth,"<sup>93</sup> (13) and "having the firstfruits of the Spirit,"<sup>94</sup> is similar to saying, "Christ is the firstfruits."<sup>95</sup> (14) [To say], "But the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us,"<sup>96</sup> is similar to saying "who is on the right hand of God, who also maketh

*intercession for us.”<sup>97</sup> (15) [To say], “that the offering up of the gentiles may be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit,”<sup>98</sup> is similar to saying “Now the Lord sanctify you, that ye may be sincere and without offense at the day of Christ.”<sup>99</sup> (16) [To say], “But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit,”<sup>100</sup> is similar to saying, “When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother’s womb and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me.”<sup>101</sup> (17) [To say], “Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God,”<sup>102</sup> is similar to saying, “Prove your own selves whether Christ be in you.”<sup>103</sup> (18) [To say], “Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you,”<sup>104</sup> is similar to saying, “I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.”<sup>105</sup>*

6,1 Paul says, moreover, that justification and grace come from both [the Son and the Holy Spirit]. [To say], “justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God”<sup>106</sup> is similar to saying, “Being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,”<sup>107</sup> (2) and “No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit”,<sup>108</sup> and no one can receive the Spirit except from the Lord. [To say], “There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all,”<sup>109</sup> “from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord,”<sup>110</sup>(3) and “Grieve not the Holy Spirit, in whom ye are sealed unto the day of redemption,”<sup>111</sup> is similar to saying, “Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?”<sup>112</sup>

6,4 [To say], *"The Spirit speaketh expressly,"*<sup>113</sup> is like saying, *"Thus saith the Lord, the almighty."*<sup>114</sup> (5) To say, *"The Spirit standeth within you,"*<sup>115</sup> < is like saying >, *"If any man open to me, I and the Father will come in and make our abode with him."*<sup>116</sup>

6,6 Isaiah said, *"And the Spirit of the Lord is upon him,"*<sup>117</sup> but Christ said, *"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me,"*<sup>118</sup> *"Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit,"*<sup>119</sup> or, *"The Lord hath sent me, and his Spirit."*<sup>120</sup> (7) And the voice of the seraphim, which cries, *"Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Sabaoth,"* is an obvious example.<sup>121</sup>

6,8 If you hear the words, *"Being by the right hand of God exalted, having received of the Father the promise of the Spirit,"*<sup>122</sup> or *"Wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard,"*<sup>123</sup> or *"The Spirit driveth him into the wilderness,"*<sup>124</sup> or the words of Christ himself, *"Take no thought what ye shall say, for it is the Spirit of my Father that speaketh in you,"*<sup>125</sup> or *"If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God,"*<sup>126</sup> or *"He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness,"*<sup>127</sup> and so on—or *"Father, into thy hands I shall commend my Spirit,"*<sup>128</sup> or *"The child grew and waxed strong in the Spirit,"*<sup>129</sup> or *"Jesus, being full of the Holy Spirit, returned from Jordan,"*<sup>130</sup> or *"Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit,"*<sup>131</sup> or *"That which is born of the Spirit is spirit,"*<sup>132</sup> [any of this] is like saying, *"That which was made, in him was life,"*<sup>133</sup> or *"And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, the Spirit of truth."*<sup>134</sup> *"Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to*

*the Holy Spirit?"*<sup>135</sup> as Peter said to Ananias, and further on, "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."<sup>136</sup> In other words the Holy Spirit, to whom they lied by keeping part of the price of their land, is God of God, and is God, or "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit"<sup>137</sup>—(9) *I cannot give a better argument than this.*

*The Son is God: the scripture says, "Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all God,"*<sup>138</sup> "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved,"<sup>139</sup> "He spake unto them the word of the Lord," and "When he had brought them into his house he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house"<sup>140</sup>—or, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,"<sup>141</sup> or "The grace of our God and Savior hath appeared unto all men, teaching us,"<sup>142</sup> or "that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things,"<sup>143</sup> or "looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ."<sup>144</sup>

6,10 *But the service of the Spirit, and the service of the Word, is the same. [To say], "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God,"*<sup>145</sup> *is similar to saying, "I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry."*<sup>146</sup>

7,1 *As we have shown, the Son and the Holy Spirit work in cooperation with the Father: "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth."*<sup>147</sup> *The Holy Spirit is an object of worship: "They that worship God must worship him in Spirit and in truth."*<sup>148</sup> (2) *But if the Spirit cooperates in the making of these things, a creature cannot make a creature; and the Godhead does not become a creature and is not known as God in some limited or circumscribed sense. For the Godhead*

is boundless, infinite and incomprehensible, and surpasses all that God has made. (3) Nor can a creature be an object of worship: "They worshiped the creature rather than the creator, and were made fools."<sup>149</sup> How can it not be foolish to make a god of a creature and break the first commandment, which says, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord,"<sup>150</sup> "There shall no strange god be in thee."<sup>151</sup>

7.4 However, in the sacred scriptures there are various names for the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Father's names are, "Father Almighty," "Father of all," "Father of Christ." The Son's are, "Word," "Christ," "true Light;" and the Holy Spirit's are, "Paraclete," "Spirit of truth," "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ." (5) Further, our God and Father is regarded as light—indeed, as brighter than light, power, wisdom. But if our God and Father is light, the Son is light of light and thus "dwelleth in light which no man can approach unto."<sup>152</sup> (6) But God is all power, and thus < the Son > is "Lord of powers."<sup>153</sup> God is all wisdom, and the Son is therefore wisdom of wisdom, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom."<sup>154</sup> God is all life, and the Son is thus life of life, for "I am the truth and the life."<sup>155</sup>

7.7 But the Holy Spirit is of both, as spirit of spirit. For "God is spirit,"<sup>156</sup> but God's Spirit<sup>157</sup> is the giver of spiritual gifts, utterly true, enlightener, Paraclete, conveyor of the Father's counsels. (8) For as the Son is "angel of a great counsel,"<sup>158</sup> so is the Holy Spirit. Scripture says, "Now we have received the Spirit of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not with the persuasion of words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit of God, comparing spiritual things with spiritual."<sup>159</sup>

8.1 But someone will say, "Then are we talking about two Sons? Why 'Only-begotten?'" "Nay, but who art thou that reckonest contrary to God?"<sup>160</sup> If God calls the One who is of him, the Son, and the One who is of Both, the Holy Spirit—things which are understood by the saints alone, by faith, which

are light, which give light, which have the power to enlighten, and create a harmony of light with the Father himself (2)—[if this is so], Sir, hear with faith that the Father is the Father of a true Son and is all light, and that < the > Son is the < Son > of a true Father and is light of light, [and] not merely in name, as artifacts or created things are. And the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, a third light, from the Father and the Son.

8,3 But all the other ["sons" and "spirits"] are such by adoption or in name, and are not [sons or spirits] like these, in actuality, power, light or meaning or, as one might say, "I have begotten sons and raised them up,"<sup>161</sup> "I have said, Ye are gods and ye are all children of the Most High,"<sup>162</sup> "Who hath begotten drops of dew,"<sup>163</sup> "of whom [is] the whole family in heaven and earth,"<sup>164</sup> or "I that establish thunder and create spirit."<sup>165</sup> (4) For the true Father has not begun to be a father [at some particular time], like the other fathers or patriarchs; nor does he ever cease to be a father. For if he begins to be a father he was at one time the son of another father, before being the Father of an Only-begotten himself. But fathers are presumed to be children in the likeness of their fathers, and the finding of the true father of this ancient history is an endless process.

8,5 Nor is the true Son new at being a son, like the others, who are children by adoption. For if he is new at being a son, there was a time when the Father was not the Father of an Only-begotten.

8,6 And the Spirit of truth is not created or made, like the other spirits, or called "the angel of the great counsel"<sup>166</sup> in the same sense as the other "angels." (7) Some things have a beginning and an end, but others have rule, (i.e., ἀρχή playing on "beginning") and might of an inconceivable kind. Some create all things for endless ages, in cooperation with the Father; others are created by these, as they will. Some worship the creators; others are fit for worship by all creatures. Some heal created things; others receive healing from the former. (8) Some are judged in accordance with their deserts; others have the power of righteous judgment. And some things are < in > time; others are not in time. Some illumine all; others are illumined by them. Some summon babes to the height; others are summoned by Him who is Mature. Some grant favors to all; others receive favors. And in a word, some hymn

*the Holiness in the heavens of heavens and the other invisible realms; others are hymned, and bestow their gifts on the worthy.*

9.1 *But the scripture speaks of a great many spirits. [It says], “who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire,”<sup>167</sup> and “Praise the Lord, all ye spirits.”<sup>168</sup> (2) The gift of “discernment of spirits”<sup>169</sup> is given to the worthy. Some spirits are heavenly and “rejoice in the truth”;<sup>170</sup> some are of the earth and apt at deceit and error. Some are subterrestrial, children of the abyss and darkness. For the Gospel says, “They besought him that he would not send them away to go out into the abyss,”<sup>171</sup> and he accordingly gave the spirits this command. And he cast out spirits with a word and “suffered them not to speak.”<sup>172</sup>*

9.3 *We are told of “a spirit of judgment and a spirit of burning.”<sup>173</sup> We are also told of a spirit of the world—“We have not received the spirit of the world,”<sup>174</sup> says scripture—and a spirit of man: “What man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him?”<sup>175</sup> [We are told of] “a spirit that passeth away and cometh not again,”<sup>176</sup> “for the spirit hath passed through him and he shall not be,”<sup>177</sup> and “Thou shall take away their spirits and they shall perish.”<sup>178</sup>*

9.4 *And “Spirits of prophets are subject to prophets,”<sup>179</sup> and “Behold, a lying spirit stood before the Lord, and he said unto him, Wherewith shalt thou deceive Ahab? And he said, I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets.”<sup>180</sup>*

9.5 *We are told of a “spirit of compunction,”<sup>181</sup> a “spirit of fear,”<sup>182</sup> a “spirit of divination,”<sup>183</sup> a “spirit of fornication,”<sup>184</sup> a “spirit of tempest,”<sup>185</sup> a “talk-*

ative spirit,"<sup>186</sup> a "spirit of infirmity,"<sup>187</sup> an "unclean spirit,"<sup>188</sup> a "deaf and dumb spirit,"<sup>189</sup> a "spirit with an impediment in its speech,"<sup>190</sup> a "spirit exceeding fierce, which is called Legion,"<sup>191</sup> and the "spiritual forces of wickedness."<sup>192</sup> There is no end to what is said about spirits by the wise.

9.6 But just as most "sons" are sons by adoption or in name but not actual sons, since they have beginnings and ends and < were conceived > in sin, so most spirits are spirits by adoption or in name—even though they are sinful. Only the Holy Spirit, however, is called the "Spirit of truth," "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ" and "Spirit of grace" by the Father and the Son. (7) For he graciously gives good to each in various ways—"to one a spirit of wisdom, to another a spirit of knowledge, to another a spirit of might, to another a spirit of healings, to another a spirit of prophecy, to another a spirit of discernment, to another a spirit of tongues, to another a spirit of interpretations,"<sup>193</sup> and as the scripture says, "One and the selfsame Spirit" [grants] the rest of the gracious gifts, "dividing to every man severally as he will."<sup>194</sup> (8) For as David says, "Thy good Spirit, O God, will guide me,"<sup>195</sup> or "The Spirit doth breathe where he will"—with words like these he has shown us the Holy Spirit's reality—"and thou hearest his voice, but canst not tell whence he cometh or whither he goeth."<sup>196</sup> And the words, "except ye be born of water and the Spirit"<sup>197</sup> are similar to Paul's, "In Christ Jesus I begot you."<sup>198</sup>

9.9 Of the Holy Spirit, the Lord said, "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me,"<sup>199</sup> and "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things

*to come. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you.*"<sup>200</sup>

10,1 *Now if the Spirit proceeds from the Father and, as the Lord says, is to receive "of mine," (2) I will venture to say that, just as "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, nor the Son save the Father,"*<sup>201</sup> *so no one knows the Spirit except the Son from whom he receives and the Father from whom he proceeds. And no one knows the Son and the Father except the Holy Spirit who truly glorifies them, who teaches all things, who testifies of the Son, is from the Father, is of the Son, is the only guide to truth, the expounder of holy laws, instructor in the spiritual law, preceptor of the prophets, teacher of the apostles, enlightener with the doctrines of the Gospels, elector of the saints, true light of true light.*

10,3 *The Son is a real Son, a true Son, a legitimate Son, the unique Son of a unique Father. With him also is the Spirit—< not a Son >, but termed, "Spirit." (4) This is the God who is glorified in the church: Father forever, Son forever, Holy Spirit forever; Sublime < of > Sublime, and the Most High; spiritual, of glory unbounded; the One to whom all that is created and made—in a word, the universe with its measurements and each thing that is contained—is inferior.*

10,5 *The Godhead is chiefly declared to be a unity in the Law of Moses, but is vehemently proclaimed a duality in the prophets, and is revealed as a Trinity in the Gospels, for over the times and generations it accords more closely with the righteous in knowledge and faith. And this knowledge is immortality, and adoption is by faith in it. (6) But as though it were erecting the temple's outer wall in the Law of Moses, it gives the ordinances of the flesh first of all. It expounds the ordinances of the soul second, as though it were putting the sacred objects in place in the remaining prophets. But third it gives the ordinances of the spirit, as though, in the Gospels, arranging the mercy seat and Holy of Holies for its dwelling, but as its holy tabernacle a holy people < who\* > have none but the righteous as their companions.*

10,7 *In this people there dwells one infinite Godhead, one imperishable Godhead, one incomprehensible Godhead, unfathomable, inexpressible, invisible. It alone knows itself; it reveals itself to whom it will. It raises up its witnesses, calls, predestines and glorifies them, lifts them up from hades, hallows them. (8) For its own glory and faith it makes these three one: things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth; spirit, soul and flesh; faith, hope and*

*charity; past, present and future; the ages, the eternal ages, and the ages of ages; Sabbaths of Sabbaths; the circumcision of the flesh, the circumcision of the heart, and "the circumcision of Christ by the putting off of the body of the sins."*<sup>202</sup> (9) *In a word, it purifies all things for itself, things visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities authorities, powers. But in all is the same holy voice crying, "Holy, Holy, Holy," from glory to glory, < to glorify > the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father with the Holy Spirit, to whom be glory and might unto the ages of ages. Amen. And he who so believes will say "So be it! So be it."*

11,1 And these are the things which I have already written, with my extremely limited ability, in explanation of the faith in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and have cited in the preceding paragraphs. But as a testimony to my own salvation I shall continue with the godly citation of texts, and the godly discussion, based on right reason, of the Godhead.

11,2 [It is plain] that the Only-begotten has been shown by many testimonies in the previous discussion to act in concert with the Father, and to do the same things in all respects and grant the same graces, since he is "of the Father," and is not different from the Father's power and Godhead, but is co-essential with the Father. And not only the Son—the Holy Spirit has been shown to act in concert with the Son and the Father, to do the same things, and to give and grant the same graces as he will, since he too is truly "of God," and not different from the Father and the Son, but co-essential with the Father and the Son. This is plain to everyone, and has been and will be entirely proven by such a large number of texts.

However, because of the Holy Spirit's opponents and enemies I shall present the godly conclusions from right reason, and the arguments from texts in the same sacred scripture, that concern only the Holy Spirit, and present them in addition to the other texts, in accordance with the true godly doctrine of the Holy Spirit. (4) For as is the truth, the Holy Spirit too is unique, is worshiped by all, is beloved by all things created and made, and is not to be equated with anything—no angel, no spirit—but is one of a kind. (5) For there are indeed many spirits, but since the Holy Spirit is eternally of the Father, and is not engendered by other beings, which were made from nothing, this Spirit is high above all spirits. As there is one God, and one only-begotten Son of God, so there is < one > Holy Spirit of God, but *of* God and *in* God.

11,6 But the only-begotten Son is incomprehensible, and the Spirit is incomprehensible; however, he is of God, and is not different from the Father and the Son. He is not an identity with the Father and the Son; there is an eternal Trinity of the same essence, not an essence other than the Godhead and not a Godhead other than the essence, but the same Godhead. And of the same Godhead are the Son and the Holy Spirit. (7) And the Spirit is a holy spirit, but the Son is a son. The Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son, “searcheth the deep things of God,”<sup>203</sup> “sheweth”<sup>204</sup> the things of the Son to the world, and hallows the saints through the Trinity. He is third in the enumeration [of the Trinity]—the Trinity is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, for scripture says, “Go baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>205</sup> He is the confirmation of the grace (i.e., of baptism), the seal of the Trinity, not apart from the numeration, not different from its naming, and not other than its gift<sup>206</sup>—but there is one God, one faith, one Lord, one gift, one church, one baptism.

12,1 For, as I have often said, the Trinity is forever a Trinity, and never receives an addition. It is sweet to confess this faith, and one never tires of saying it; for the prophet says, “Sweet are thy words unto my throat.”<sup>207</sup> (2) And if the words are sweet, how much sweeter is the holy name, “Trinity,” the fount of all sweetness? This, then, is the enumeration of the Trinity: “Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” (3) The Trinity is not an identity and cannot be separated from its oneness, and yet the Father is perfect in the subsistence of perfection, the Son is perfect, the Holy Spirit is perfect—Father, Son and Holy Spirit (4) Conversely, the Holy Spirit is enumerated among the spiritual gifts: “For there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit, and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord, and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God that worketh all in all.”<sup>208</sup>

12,5 And since such is the case, let us make sure not to be deprived of the truth, but let us confess the truth instead—not to plead for God, but to think of him piously, lest we perish. To say or think that there is any created thing in the Trinity, or anything added to it, is unacceptable; the Trinity was always the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

12,6 The Son is neither the Father's kinsman nor identical with him, and the Spirit is neither identical with nor the kinsman of the Father and the Son. (7) The Son is begotten of the Father and the Spirit proceeds from the Father, though in some ineffable way the Trinity exists in an identity of its glory and is incomprehensibly a Son, and likewise a Holy Spirit, with a Father; nor does the Trinity ever cease from the same eternity. (8) The Father, then, is forever ingenerate, uncreated and incomprehensible. The Son is begotten, but uncreated and incomprehensible. The Holy Spirit is eternally—not generate, not created, not a kinsman, not an ancestor, not an offspring, but a Holy Spirit of the same essence as the Father and the Son, "For God is spirit."<sup>209</sup>

13,1 In every scripture there are testimonies to our salvation, in all its sureness. I shall cite as few as I can of the many [there are], in order, even at this stage, not to leave the exposition without a witness to the Holy Spirit. (2) For example, to declare to all the faithful, for their salvation, the genuineness of his Holy Spirit, the Father says of the Son's human nature, "I shall put my Spirit upon him, and he shall proclaim judgment to the gentiles."<sup>210</sup> (3) Then, by his own testimony, the Only-begotten adds, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me"<sup>211</sup>—a plain acknowledgment, by Christ's testimony, that his human nature is certified and proclaimed to the faithful by the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit is not different from God.

13,4 But again, the Lord says of the Spirit, "It is the Spirit of my Father that speaketh in you."<sup>212</sup> And again, since the Spirit is not different from the Father's divinity, "He breathed in the faces of the disciples and said, Receive ye the Holy Spirit."<sup>213</sup> And again, to show his equality and co-essentiality, and his Father's, with the Holy Spirit, he said, "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I shall pray the Father, and he will give you

another advocate”<sup>214</sup>—since the Lord himself is an advocate, and the Holy Spirit likewise is his fellow advocate.

13,5 And to show that the Spirit is not a servant, but is of the same Godhead [as the Son], the apostles gave intimation of his authority by saying, “And the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them,”<sup>215</sup> and so on. (6) But Paul says plainly of him, “The Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,”<sup>216</sup> and, “Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of the Lord dwelleth in you.”<sup>217</sup> (7) Now if we are called God’s temple because of the Holy Spirit’s indwelling, who would dare to reject the Spirit and separate him from the essence of God—when the apostle plainly says that we become God’s temples because of the Holy Spirit who dwells in the worthy? And how can the Spirit who “searcheth the deep things of God”<sup>218</sup> be different from God?

And don’t tell me, (8) “He *searches*, but he doesn’t *know* yet,” as some dare to blaspheme him to their own destruction. [If this were so] they should say < the > same of the Father, for even of him scripture says, “He *searcheth* the treasures of the belly.”<sup>219</sup> (9) And if you intend to take an impious view [of the Spirit] because knowledge does not follow searching in the Spirit’s case, you must speak impiously of the Father too, and be compelled to express the same wrong notion. No “knowing” is added to “The Father searcheth the treasures of the belly”—there would be no need to say it—since God’s foreknowledge is made plainly evident, < and > fully expressed, by the word, “search.” So please < understand > the one knowledge and foreknowledge in the Spirit, the Son and the Father, since the Holy Trinity is plainly perfect and identical.

14,1 An untold amount could be said about this, and it would be possible to cite a mass of texts from sacred scripture, and drag them out at length and burden the readers. (2) For by speaking at length in every Sect I, despite my weakness, have sufficiently refuted them all by the power of God, and have shown that all sects are strangers to the truth, and that

each of them blasphemes and denies the truth, whether in a minor or in a major matter.

So with these people < who > blaspheme the Lord and the Holy Spirit to no purpose and, as the Lord has said, have no “remission” of sins “here or in the world to come”<sup>220</sup> because of their blasphemy of the Holy Spirit—and who have been trodden underfoot by the truth itself, (3) like a dreadful horned asp with its single horn, since the blasphemous mind is capable of destroying the entire body. And they have been struck by the preaching of the cross and the true confession of the Only-begotten—for, as I said, for a blasphemer of the Holy Spirit “There shall be no forgiveness either in this world or in the world to come”—and have been trodden on and crushed; for they cannot prevail against the truth.

14,4 All the sects are truly “gates of hell,” but “They will not prevail against the rock,”<sup>221</sup> that is, against the truth. For even though some of them choose to say, “We too profess the creed that was issued at Nicaea; show me from it that the Holy Spirit is counted as divine,” they will find themselves confounded even by this. (5) The dispute then was not about the Holy Spirit. The councils make sure of the matter that arises at a particular time. Since Arius was directing the insult at the Son, there was accuracy of language about him, with additional discussion. (6) But observe from the creed itself that there is no way in which the blasphemers of the Spirit, the Pneumatomachi who are strangers to his gift and sanctification, can make their point here either. (7) The creed at once confesses, and does not deny, “We believe in one God, the Father Almighty.” But “We believe” is not left at that. The faith is in God “and in one Lord Jesus Christ.” < And > this is not left at that. The faith is in God “and in the Holy Spirit.” (8) And all this is not left at that. The three “We believes” make it evident that the faith is in one glory, one unity and one co-essentiality—three Perfects but one Godhead, one essence, one glory, one dominion. And here too their argument has failed.

14,9 And how long am I to go on? I believe that what I have said against them will suffice for those who love the truth. I shall therefore pass this sect by too, beseeching God to aid me as usual in the refutation of them all, so that, by his power, I may keep my promise and give him thanks in every way.

## VI

### Contra los Aecianos, secta del Cristianismo

1,1 Again, one Aerius has likewise become a great misfortune for the world, a person with cracked brains and inflated pride. For from first to last, malice has been the cause of every sect that has arisen—[malice], or a spirit of vainglory or pride, or a lustful appetite, or envy of one's neighbors, or temper, or rashness. (2) In a word, blindness is of the devil, though the devil has no power to deceive anyone who does not want him to. Everyone is responsible for his own sinning, as the scripture says, "that they which are approved may be made manifest."<sup>2</sup>

1,3 Aerius is still alive in the flesh and survives, a thoroughgoing Arian. Because he has inquired further into Arian speculations he holds beliefs that are no different, but are like those of Arius, And in his turn he has his tongue sharpened and his mouth battle-ready, to attract a deluded band, and a throng of people whose ears are itching and minds receptive. (4) For he too has invented a monstrous fictitious doctrine with nothing to it—a source of some amusement to the sensible, but he has still deceived and perverted many with it.

1,5 Aerius was the fellow student of Eustathius the son of Sebastius, of Sebaste, in the country called Pontus, or Lesser Armenia. For Eustathius and Aerius were ascetics together. (6) When Eustathius attained the episcopate, however, Aerius wanted this instead, but could not get it. This is the kind of thing that arouses jealousy. Still, Eustathius appeared to be standing by Aerius. (7) He made him a presbyter immediately afterwards, and entrusted him with the hospice, which in Pontus is called an alms-house. For they make arrangements of this kind out of hospitality, and the leaders of the churches there lodge the crippled and infirm, and supply < their needs\* > as best they can.

2,1 But since Aerius' anger had not left him, there were more words between them every day, the jealousy between them increased, and evil reports and slanders of Eustathius were circulated by Aerius. But the bishop Eustathius sent for Aerius and cajoled him, admonished, threatened, rebuked, pleaded with him, and got nowhere. For the thing that had been begun was going on, to very ill effect.

2,2 Aetius finally left the hospice and withdrew from the world, on the pretext < that Eustathius was appropriating the church's funds. From that time on\* > he scrutinized < Eustathius' life\* >, like a man out to get something on an enemy or take a shot at a foe.

(3) And in the end he slandered Eustathius to everyone, and said, "He is no longer the sort of man < you think he is\* >, but has turned to the acquisition of wealth, and all sorts of property." (4) All this was calumny on Aetius' part. Eustathius was in fact in charge of the church's affairs, and he could not do otherwise. And [yet] the things Aetius was saying sounded convincing.

2,5 Since I have introduced Eustathius while speaking against Aetius, one might suppose that I also regard Eustathius as commendable. No few admire his life and conduct, and if his faith were only orthodox too! (6) For he too held Aetius' position from first to last, and not even the hardships of the persecutions set him straight—he was persecuted with Basil, Eleusius and others.<sup>3</sup> (7) But apparently he also went on an embassy with other bishops to the blessed Liberius of Rome, and signed the creed of the Council of Nicaea, and its confession of orthodoxy. (8) Later, however, as though he had regained his memory and awakened from dreams, he never ceased to look to his original principles, the Arian heresy. But this is about Aetius—we must get back to him.

3,1 For the reasons we have given, Aetius originally preened himself on renunciation of the world; but when he left the hospice he took a large body of men and women with him. (2) With his < fellowship > he was driven from the churches, and from cultivated lands and villages, and the other towns. He often lived out in the snow with his numerous band of followers, and lodged in the open air and caves, and took refuge in the woods. (3) But his teaching was more insane than is humanly possible, and he says, "What is a bishop compared with a presbyter? The one is no different from the other. There is one order," he said, "and one honor and one rank. A bishop lays on hands," he said, "but so does a presbyter. The bishop administers baptism, and the presbyter does too. The bishop performs the eucharistic liturgy, the presbyter likewise. A bishop occupies the throne, and the presbyter also occupies one." With this he misled many, < who > regarded him as their leader.

(4) Next he says, "What is the Passover you celebrate? You are giving your allegiance to Jewish fables again. We have no business celebrating the Passover," he says; "Christ was sacrificed for our Passover."<sup>4</sup>

3,5 Then, after this: "Why do you mention the names of the dead after their deaths (i.e., in the liturgy)? < If > the living prays or has given alms, how will this benefit the dead? If the prayer of the people here has benefited the people there, no one should practice piety or perform good works! He should get some friends any way he wants, either by bribery or by asking friends on his death bed, and they should pray that he may not suffer in the next life, or be held to account for his heinous sins.

3,6 "And there can be no set time for fasting," he says. "These are Jewish customs, and 'under a yoke of bondage.'<sup>5</sup> 'The Law is not made for the righteous, but for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers'<sup>6</sup> and the rest. If I choose to fast at all, I shall fast of my own accord, on the day of my choice, because of my liberty." (7) And they therefore make a point of fasting on Sunday instead [of the usual days], and eating on Wednesdays and Fridays. They often fast on Wednesday also, but by their own choice, they say, not by an ordinance.

3,8 And during the days of Passover, while we sleep on the ground, purify ourselves, endure hardships, eat dry bread, pray, watch and fast, performing all the saving < mortifications\* > of the holy Passovers, they buy meat and wine early in the morning, stuff their veins, < and > burst out laughing in mockery of those who keep this holy service of the week of the Passover.

3,9 Indeed, even though they have had the custom of renunciation they have not practiced it. < There is > a great deal of eating of meat and drinking of wine—unless there are a scant few of them who choose < to do > this by their own preference. But most of them indulge lavishly in meat dishes and wine-drinking, as I have often remarked. These are the teachings which Acrius has spat up into the world.

4,1 Thus he shows the world his intent, unbelief, and his mad teachings, again mischievously brought to the world by him. (2) But I shall go on to the arguments against him, make a few points, and then pass him by. < From > his saying that a bishop and a presbyter are the same, it is plain to people with sense that he is simply foolish. How can this be? The

one is an order that generates fathers. For the episcopate produces fathers for the church. But the presbyterate, which cannot produce fathers, produces children through the laver of regeneration, but surely not fathers or teachers. (3) And since he is not ordained for the purpose of ordaining, how could a presbyter consecrate a bishop, or say that he is equal to a bishop? Aerius' quarrel and his jealousy have deceived him.

4.4 For his own and his hearers' deception he alleges that the apostle writes to "presbyters and deacons"<sup>7</sup> and not to bishops, and tells the bishop, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which thou didst receive at the hands of the presbytery;"<sup>8</sup> and again, elsewhere he writes "to bishops and deacons"<sup>9</sup> so that, as Aerius says, bishops and presbyters are the same. (5) And he, as not knowing the true order of events, and not having read the most searching investigations, does not realize that the holy apostle wrote about the problems which arose when the Gospel was new. Where bishops were already consecrated he wrote to *bishops* and deacons, for the apostles could not establish everything at once. (6) There was a need for presbyters and deacons, for the business of the church can be done by these two. But where there was no one worthy of the episcopate, the place remained without a bishop. Where there was a need for one, however, and there were persons worthy of the episcopate, bishops were consecrated.

4.7 But where the congregation was not large they had no presbyters for ordination, and made do solely with the local bishop. However, there can be no bishop without a deacon. And the holy apostle saw to it that the bishop had deacons to assist him; in this way the church got its business done. (8) This is what local churches were like at that time. All did not get each thing at the start, but what was needed was arranged for as time went on.

5.1 For according to the Old Testament, Moses was sent straight to Egypt by God with nothing but a staff. < But > on his entry into Egypt he was also given his brother Aaron to help him. (2) Then, after his brother believed him, the council of elders, and the leaders of the people at that time, were gathered for him. And after this, when his work was established and his following was gathered, he passed through the sea.

5.3 And they were not yet living by the Law, until < the > Lord called him into the mount. But he gave him the tablets, and told him how to

make a tabernacle, and appoint officials, captains of tens, fifties, hundreds and thousands. (4) And do you see how things were expanded? "See," says God, "that thou make all things according to the pattern that was shown thee in Mount Sinai."<sup>10</sup>

5,5 And you see how a seven-branched lampstand was added to the legislation, and long robes, priestly vestments, bells and woolen cloaks, brooches and turbans, miters and jewelry made from various stones; ladles, censers, lavers, altars, bowls, "masmaroth," which are strainers, "midikoth," which means ladles, "machonoth," which are bases—and everything the Law speaks of, cherubim and the rest, the ark of the covenant, carrying poles and rings; the tabernacle, and hides and skins dyed scarlet; curtain rings and the rest; doorkeepers, wooden trumpets and curved trumpets, trumpets made of gold, silver, bronze < and > horn—and everything else the Law said, different kinds of sacrifices, teachings. (6) Because this was not in force from the beginning, were the things not given < permanent status > after they had been ordained? (7) Thus the things the apostle wrote applied until the church expanded, achieved its full growth, and < filled > the world with the knowledge < which > has been most rightly established by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. And Alerius' argument has failed.

5,8 And < by giving indication >, through the holy apostle, of who a bishop is and who a presbyter is, the word of God teaches that they cannot be the same. Paul says to Timothy, who is a bishop, "Rebuke not a presbyter, but entreat him as a father."<sup>11</sup> (9) What was the point of a bishop's not rebuking a presbyter, if he did not have the authority over the presbyter? Once more, it says, "Receive not hastily an accusation against a presbyter, save by two or three witnesses."<sup>12</sup> (10) And he never told any presbyter, "Receive not an accusation against a bishop," or wrote to any presbyter not to rebuke a bishop. And you see that the fall of anyone the devil shakes loose is no light one.

6,1 But let us see and investigate his other teachings. And let us speak first of the Passover, as scripture says, "Christ is sacrificed for our Passover."<sup>13</sup> Let's see whether the man who said that, didn't keep the Passover himself. Scripture says, "He hastened to keep the Feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem."<sup>14</sup>

But what Pentecost was Paul keeping if he hadn't kept the Passover? (2) And who, anywhere in the world, does not agree that Wednesdays and Fridays are designated as fasts in the church? If, indeed, I need to speak of the Ordinance of the Apostles, they plainly decreed there that Wednesdays and Fridays be fasts at all times except Pentecost,<sup>15</sup> and directed that nothing at all be eaten on the six days of the Passover except bread, salt and water;<sup>16</sup> and which day to keep, and that we break our fast on the night before the Lord's Day. (3) But who has better knowledge of these things? The deluded man who has just arrived and is still alive today, or those who were witnesses before us, who have had the tradition in the church before us and received it in this form from their fathers—and their fathers in their turn, who learned it from those before them, just as the church possesses the true faith and the traditions to this day because she has received them from her fathers? And again, so much for his idea of the Passover!

6.4 But then, if the same apostles did not speak of this very subject of Wednesdays and Fridays in the Ordinance, I could prove it in all sorts of other ways. But they wrote about this in specific terms, the church has received it, and there was a world-wide agreement before Aerius and his Aerians. (5) Perhaps Aerius was very aptly named for this reason; he has received an unclean spit of the air, the airish "spirit of wickedness"<sup>17</sup> which, in him, laid siege to the church.

7.1 And then, as to naming the dead, what could be more helpful? What could be more opportune or wonderful than that the living believe that the departed are alive and have not ceased to be but exist, and live with the Lord—(2) and that the most sacred doctrine should declare that<sup>18</sup> there is hope for those who pray for their brethren as though they were off on a journey?

7.3 And even though the prayer we offer for them cannot root out all their faults—[how could it], since we often slip in this world, inadvertently and deliberately—it is still useful as an indication of something more perfect. (4) For we commemorate both righteous and sinners. Though we pray for sinners, for God's mercy,<sup>19</sup> and *for* the righteous, the

fathers, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, evangelists, martyrs and confessors, for bishops and anchorites and the whole band [of saints],<sup>20</sup> (5) we worship our Lord Jesus Christ to distinguish him from the whole of humanity by our honor of him, remembering that the Lord is not on a level with any man—even though each man has < performed > a million righteous deeds and more.

7,6 For how could this be? The one is God; the other, man. The one is in heaven and the other, because of his earthly remains, is on earth—except for those who have risen and entered the bridal chamber as the holy Gospel says, “And many bodies of the saints arose and went in with him into the holy city.”<sup>21</sup>

7,7 But which holy city does he mean? [Both], for the words apply to both, the city here and the city on high. For they plainly entered the earthly Jerusalem with him first. But before the Savior’s ascent into heaven, no one had ascended until the time at which they ascended with him, “For no man hath ascended into heaven but he that came down from heaven, the Son of Man.”<sup>22</sup> Since I am on the subject, I have given the two proof-texts for this. But if anyone asks, “Did they go *into* Jerusalem?” he should learn that on that day, “When the doors were shut, Jesus came to where the disciples were gathered, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.”<sup>23</sup>

8,1 But I shall take up the thread of this topic once more. The church is bound to keep this custom because she has received a tradition from the fathers. (2) And who can violate a mother’s precept or a father’s law? As the words of Solomon < tell us >, “Hear, my son, the words of thy father, and reject not the precepts of thy mother,”<sup>24</sup> showing that the Father—God, that is—and the Only-begotten and the Holy Spirit taught both in writing and in unwritten form. But our mother the church had precepts which she kept inviolate, and which cannot be broken. (3) Now since these precepts have been ordained in the church, and are suitable, and all of them marvelous, this fraud is confounded in his turn.

8,4 But let us pass him by too, as though we had squashed a dung or blister-beetle, or the bug we call a buprestis, < and >, on the foundation

of the church and with God's power, go on once more to the rest, calling on God for aid.

## VII

### **Contra los Anomoeanos, secta del Cristianismo**

1,1 Again, some have been called Anomoeans. These are of recent origin. Their founder was a deacon named Aetius, who was advanced because of his foolishness by George of Alexandria.<sup>2</sup> George was the bishop of the Arians and Melitians at once and, as I have already indicated, was paraded through the city on a camel during the reign of Julian.<sup>3</sup> (2) And first he was surrounded by the Greeks and badly mistreated, and was paraded, as I said, and beaten with cudgels, but was then dragged through almost the whole town, and this is how he died. After his death he was burned, reduced to ashes together with the bones of many domestic and wild animals, and then scattered to the four winds by the pagans, and this was the last of him.<sup>4</sup>

1,3 Should one say of a man who died like that, "Well, he became a martyr by undergoing these sufferings at the hands of the pagans?" Indeed, if his ordeal had been for the truth's sake, and the pagans had done this to him from envy and because of his confession of Christ, he would truly have ranked as a martyr, and no minor one. (4) The confession of Christ, however, was not the reason for his death. It was the great violence he had inflicted on the city and people during his so-called episcopate, if you please, sometimes by robbing people of their patrimony, < sometimes by levying unjust taxes\* >.

1,5 And not to inform on the man—for he did a number of things to the Alexandrians. For example, he expropriated the entire nitre tax; and he thought of a way of controlling the papyrus and reed marshes and the salt marshes, and getting them for himself. (6) He overlooked no shameful way of making money by many methods, even small things. For instance, he thought of limiting the number of biers<sup>5</sup> for the bodies of the dying,

and without his appointed officials no dead man's body, especially not strangers' bodies, could be carried out for burial. This was not for hospitality's sake, but, as I said, to support himself. (7) For if anyone buried a body on his own, he ran a risk. In this way George made a profit on every corpse that was buried. And I pass over the other things the man got for himself through luxuries < and in other dreadful ways\* >, and by cruelty.

1,8 Thus because of all this the Alexandrians who cherished anger against him, the pagans most of all, inflicted this end on him. But my reason for saying how the Alexandrians destroyed him like this as soon as they heard of Constantius' death, is simply because of Aetius, whom George made a deacon.

2,1 They say that even by worldly standards Aetius was uneducated until his manhood.<sup>6</sup> (2) But he stooped to attending the lectures of an Aristotelian philosopher and sophist at Alexandria<sup>7</sup> and learning their dialectic, if you please, for no other purpose than to give a figurative representation of the divine Word. < But > he devoted full time to the project, getting up at dawn and keeping at it till evening, I mean at discussing and defining God via a sort of geometry and in figures of speech, and at teaching and perfecting his doctrine. (3) As an Arian of the deepest dye and a holder of Arius' insane doctrine, he became the more destructive by devoting his time to these things, and sharpening his tongue each day against the Son of God and the Holy Spirit.

2,4 He was accused by certain persons, however, and denounced to Constantius, and was banished to the Taurus.<sup>8</sup> Here he amplified and disclosed all of his wicked doctrine by teaching it openly, < for > after hardening himself by further shamelessness, he disgorged his heresy in full. (5) For he dared to say that the Son is unlike the Father, and not the same as the Father in Godhead.

And not that we rely on the likeness. Beyond the likeness, we know that the Son is the same as the Father, and the Father's equal, in Godhead, and not different at all. (6) Many things can be likened to God, but they are not the same as he, < or > his equals, in Godhead. For example, man is in God's image and likeness, but is not the same as God in the sense of equality. (7) And the kingdom of heaven is *like* a grain of mustard seed—

though < a grain > is not identical with the kingdom and has no part of it—and like leaven, and ten virgins, and a householder in point of likeness, but not identical.

2,8 But as the Son is like the Father—and more than “like” him, because he is the same as the Father and his equal—my concern is not merely to prove his likeness, but < his > sameness and equality as God of God, Son of the Father, and not different from < his > essence, but begotten of him. And the same with the Holy Spirit. (9) But this fine heretic Aetius didn’t even think he should regard the Son as worthy of likeness to the Father. Now I agree that I myself do not really enter upon the demonstration of the faith and the honoring of the Trinity if I rely solely on the likeness. (10) Silver is like tin too, gold is like bronze and lead like iron, and precious stones are imitated by glass; and likeness does not show nature, but resemblance.

3,1 But here I, as to the scripture which confesses the Son to be the “image of the invisible God”<sup>9</sup>—having carefully inquired the meaning of the sacred scripture from the divine Gift who told the Pharisees, “Ye understand neither the scriptures nor the power of God,”<sup>10</sup>—I understand this doctrine in a dual sense, and explain it by taking the answer to the expression’s meaning from a man. (2) We speak of a man’s image, and < there is one image that is like him and > one that is not like him. One image is made like him with paint, but the other is made by the identity of his essence with his begetter’s. As compared with his father the newborn son represents his kind, but in the end he is found to be his likeness < by his > sameness and co-essentiality with him, and his resemblance to him. (3) And we believe in the only-begotten Son of God who is the same as the Father’s Godhead and rank, and his equal because of the true image, and because of the likeness which admits of no variation but is indistinguishable, as becomes a son who is truly and co-essentially begotten of a father. And so with the Holy Spirit, because of his procession from the Father—even though he is not begotten, because the Son is an only-begotten.

3,4 But from his wish to offer further resistance to the confession of the truth, Aetius tries not even to confess the Son’s likeness to the Father. (5) For the other Arians, who took their cue from Lucian and Origen and were companions of a sophist named Asterius<sup>11</sup> who lapsed in the

persecution under Maximian, < did not disclose the whole of their heresy about the Son\* >. (6) For some < said\* > that he is a < creature\* >, and it has been explained in my earlier Sects that each of them declared the Son of God a creature, and taught that the Holy Spirit is the creature of a creature, while some said that even though they declared him a creature, the Son of God is like the Father. (7) But this man exposed the whole of their deception, and of his own impiety, by < displaying > with full clarity the harshness and arrogance of their doctrine of the Lord. And the truth is that the strictness of the argument of this Aetius, who is also called the "Different,"<sup>12</sup> can be used very justly against those who covertly introduce the notion of the Son's creaturehood.

3,8 For whatever is created is unlike its creator, even though it be made like him by grace. And however one tries to decorate this with various sorts of paint, the creator is unlike the creature—unless the representation of him is a copy and likeness which is in imitation only of his appearance. (9) And as his argument would have prevailed against those Arians who regard the Son of God and the Holy Spirit as creatures, so even later, after his excommunication by those same Arians—I mean Eudoxius,<sup>13</sup> Menophilus and the others—he confounded them before the emperor and said, (10) "As they believe, I believe—as they all do! But what is honest in me, they hide, and what I say openly < and > acknowledge, all these say the same, but conceal themselves." And the emperor at that time was not opposed to the Arian fabrication, but considered it orthodox, if you please! But since he declined to confess the Son of God a creature, the emperor was annoyed and, as I have already said, sent < him > into exile.<sup>14</sup>

4,1 That was the origin of the sect, and from the one proposition the man was inspired to a great production of evils, and dealt fearful wounds to his own soul, and his converts'. (2) For he was so deluded—he and his disciples—as to say, "I understand God perfectly in this way, and understand and know him so well that I don't know myself any better than I know God!"

4,3 But I have heard as many things about him, the fearful way in which the devil contrived, through him, to destroy the souls of the people he had caught. (4) Indeed, they take no account of holiness of life,

fasts, God's commandments, or any of God's other ordinances for men's salvation,<sup>15</sup> but only say glibly that they < have > it all through one text. (5) It is as though someone had lightened ship and completely jettisoned the whole cargo, but had kept just one article of the ship's freight, a jar or some other thing, to get himself across the whole sea and ensure his safety with one implement. But if he was wrong, and did not get what he expected from the implement he kept, he would drown afterwards, and thus lose the whole business and his life as well. (6) Thus both Aetius and his Anomoeans cite the Lord's words in the Gospel and repeat the expression without properly grasping the meaning, and they are wrong. (7) For when someone falls in with them and reminds them of the commandments, they claim that, as the text is worded, there is nothing else that God requires of us but simply to know him. This is what Christ meant, they say, by saying, "Grant them, Father, to have life in themselves. And this is life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."<sup>16</sup>

4.8 Indeed, some people have told me what they distinctly heard him say when certain persons were charged with having been caught in a sexual offense, and were found guilty by them. He was not annoyed at this and even made an idle jest and said that something like this is not important; it is a physical need and the way of meeting it. (9) "When we itch by our ear," he said—I myself am embarrassed to repeat what < the > filthy man told them—"we take a feather or straw," he said, "and scratch our ear, and get rid of the itching by our ear. This too happens naturally," he said, "and if someone does it he doesn't commit a sin."

5.1 Aetius made as many such remarks, and all his teachings are lax and wicked, so that what he is may be seen from his works themselves. But the Lord's words have made this abundantly clear to us, (2) as he said, "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"<sup>17</sup> Thus the utter impudence of his stupidity is exposed in the second phrase and the first. (3) [We are shown] how he opened his mouth in impudence against his Master and was not ashamed to blaspheme his Lord, and the wise will

test him by the fruits of his licentiousness and laxity, and not harvest his fruit. There is no cutting of a cluster from thorns, making holiness appear even from false doctrine.

5,4 But this is what I have heard of the events of his life. However, there are many words which, as I said, he dared to say in consequence of the madness of his rebellion against the Lord, and I shall give a few examples, and make the replies to them myself which the Lord gives me in refutation. (5) Here are the nonsense of "Different's" faith, and these are the "likenesses" of the words he quotes from scripture. They do not mean what he thinks, but he takes them that way although they mean something else.

6,1 He says at the very outset, "The Ingenerate cannot be like the Generate. Indeed, they differ in name; the one is 'ingenerate,' the other, 'generate.'" (2) But this is perfectly silly and has simply driven the man insane. If, to avoid losing the true view of Christ, we are to require an engenderer of the Ingenerate, there will no longer be one Father, or < one > father of a Father; we will need an infinite number of fathers' fathers. And there will [no longer] be one God, who is forever, has nothing before him, and endures and abides forever, of whom the only-begotten true Son is begotten and is, and of whom is his Holy Spirit. The gods we need will be many, and the whole will turn out to be imposture, not truth.

6,3 But we must know that, as the fact is, there is one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom is the Holy Spirit who "proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son."<sup>18</sup> (4) And this is the one Godhead—one God, one Lord, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Son is not identical with the Father and neither is the Holy Spirit, but the Father is a father, the Son, a son, and the Holy Spirit, a holy spirit [They are] three Perfects, one Godhead, one God, one Lord, as I have ascribed this praise to God many times, in every Sect.

6,5 Now since God is one, and no one can suppose that there is another God besides the one, the Father is wondrously both ingenerate and uncreated; and God's only-begotten Son, < who > is begotten of him, is not unlike him in any way. He is the same as and perfectly equal to the Father in rank, even though he is generate and the Father ingenerate. (6) For if the Father has begotten any Son of himself, it is impossible that [the Son] not be the Father's equal, and not be like him. Whatever begets, begets its like—and not only its like, but its equal in sameness. (7) A man begets

a man, and God begets God. The man begets through sexual intercourse, but God has begotten an Only-begotten alone, in an ineffable manner. [He has not done this] by overflow, contraction or expansion; the Father, who is spirit, has begotten the Son of himself without beginning and not in time, altogether his like and equal. As the holy Gospel says, "The Jews sought to kill him, because he had not only broken the Sabbath, but said that he was the Son of God, making himself *equal* with God."<sup>19</sup>

6,8 How can the Son not be like the Father and entirely his equal when he has life in himself, and says, "As the Father raiseth the dead, even so the Son raiseth the dead,"<sup>20</sup> and, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father?"<sup>21</sup> (9) He cannot be different when he identifies the Father through himself and says, "He that knoweth me, knoweth the Father,"<sup>22</sup> and, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," meaning that he is not different from the Father. And the Father means the Son < when he says >,<sup>23</sup> "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."<sup>24</sup> (10) If the Son were not like the Father, how could man be made in [*their*] image and likeness? The Father did not say, "Let us make man in *my* image" or in "*your* image," but, "in *our* image." (11) By saying, "our," he indicated the equality with the Father that is in the Son—and not only his likeness, but his sameness in all ways, without any difference.

7,1 But as I have already said, how can he not be the Father's equal and like the Father, he who says, "I am in the Father and the Father in me?"<sup>25</sup> (2) For not only does he say this himself in the Gospel. Isaiah, prophesying in the Holy Spirit, knew that the Son is in the Father and is not other than, or different from the Father, (3) as the verse which implies this says in Hebrew: "phthoou saareim, ouiabo goi sadik, somer emmourteim, iesro samoch, thesaar salom salom, shi bak batoou betou baadonai ada oth, chi baia adonai sor olemeim."<sup>26</sup> (4) In Aquila's version it says, "Open the gates, let the righteous nation enter that keepeth faith, the creation firmly established, the keeping of peace, for in him have they trusted. Trust ye in the Lord forever, for in the Lord is the Lord who established the ages." (5) In the Septuagint's it says, "Open the gates, let < a righteous nation >

enter that preserveth truth, and layeth claim to truth and keepeth peace. For in thee have they trusted forever, O Lord, God the great, the eternal.” (6) The reader should note that in the Septuagint “God” stands in the place of “the Lord,” and “the great” in place of “in the Lord.”

7,7 And how much is there to say about this? I am afraid of prolonging my treatment of these words to a burdensome length. Everything in the sacred scripture is clear, to those who will approach God’s word with pious reason, and not harbor the devil’s work within them and turn their steps to the pits of death—as this unfortunate man and his converts have attacked the truth more vigorously than any who have become blasphemers of God and his faith before them.

7,8 < I have shown > that the Son cannot be unlike the Father, but have said that I do not rely on this either. The Son is not only “like,” but equal, the same in Godhead, the same in eternity and power. And yet we do not say, “tautoousion,” or the expression that some use might be compared with Sabellius. (9) We say that he is the same in Godhead, essence and power, and in all ways the equal of the Father and his Holy Spirit And we say “homoousion” as the holy faith teaches, so that the perfections are clearly indicated by “homo;” for the Son is the perfect Son of a perfect father, and the Holy Spirit is perfect as well.

8,1 These people will be detected by a first, a second, and a third piece of evidence. If it is admitted that a < Son > has been begotten by him at all, it will be admitted that the Son must be like his Begetter. (2) It is plain that Aetius calls him by the name, “Offspring,” but holds and believes him < to be > a creature, though he is called a “Son” by grace—as the surveyor of the realms of the heavens, divider of the indivisible, and measurer of our salvation in Christ, has seen fit to call him. (3) But the argument of all these people who covertly introduce the doctrine of the creaturehood of Christ falls flat, as Aetius’ will. (4) For I shall say to him with perfect justice, “Tell me, Mister, what can you say of the Son of God? Do you call him a creature, or an offspring? If you say he is a creature, stop hiding your outrage with plausible-sounding language by terming him the Father’s Offspring! (5) Nothing that is created, is ‘begotten’; and if it is begotten, it is not created. Never mind even saying ‘begotten!’ You have no business pronouncing the words of the truth even with one expression. Tell us your whole scheme so that we may learn who you are and escape your plot, you fisher for souls, you schemer against those who trust you! (6) Come on, do you worship the Son of God, or don’t you?”

“Yes,” says Aetius, “I worship him.”

"Do you worship him as God, or not?"

"Yes," he says, "I worship him as God."

"Then what kind of a God can be creature, as you say he is, and still be worshiped?"

8,7 For suppose that God, who is fit to be worshiped, made the one creature and consented that he be worshiped, but their creator did not want any of the others worshiped and instead censured the worshipers of a creature, teaching them by Law, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any likeness, and thou shalt not worship it, neither in heaven, nor in earth, nor in the waters."<sup>27</sup> (8) And the apostle says, "They worshiped the creature more than the creator, and were made fools."<sup>28</sup> Why did God forbid the worship of all creatures, < but consent that this one be worshiped? > Is there "respect of persons with God,"<sup>29</sup> then? Never! (9) By the fact that this One is worshiped, God has shown, in every way, that the One who is worshiped is different from the creature and that the creature which is worshiped is different from the Lord, who is fit for worship—the Son of God, begotten of the Father. For because he is begotten of him, he is like him and is his Son. He is therefore fit for the worship of all: "Through him God made all things, and without him was not anything made."<sup>30</sup> (10) For by him, and by the Holy Spirit who "proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son,"<sup>31</sup> God made and established all things. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth."<sup>32</sup>

8,11 When the Only-begotten, as I mentioned above, said, "that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,"<sup>33</sup> he distinguished himself from creation, as the apostle says, "one God, of whom are all things, and we through him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."<sup>34</sup> (12) And you see how he showed that there is one God, the Father, but one Lord, the Son begotten of him. And he didn't say, "one God, and one Lord together with all God's creatures," but, "one Lord, through whom are all things." But if there is one

Lord through whom are all things, he is not one of them all, but the maker of all, the creator of all created things.

9.1 But since he through whom are all things is the Son, begotten of the Father and the Father's offspring, then, as befits the creator of all things, he is unlike them all. (2) Since God the Father, of whom are all things, [is called] "one," and the "Lord Jesus by whom are all things" [is called] "one," the text just mentioned has clearly shown that the Son is of the Father, since it is tied together by the "one" and the "one," and by "of whom" and "by whom." But by saying, "by whom are all things," it has declared wonderfully well that the Son "by whom are all things" cannot be one of the rest, showing that there is a Father, and there is a Son—the only-begotten Lord—of the One who is the Father.

9.3 But the apostle was saying these things by the Holy Spirit's inspiration; he therefore did not need to give any proof of the Spirit. This was not because the Spirit is not glorified with the Father and the Son, or to designate him as one of all the things created through the Son. (4) It was enough that the Spirit was included with the Father and the Son in the Son's sure confession, "Go baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."<sup>35</sup> So when the apostle spoke—or rather, when the Holy Spirit spoke in him—he said nothing about himself. The knowledge of him was clear, and undisputed by the Jews; but it was treasured up [rather than published], so that the Holy Spirit would not be the one to commend himself. (5) But the apostle was inspired by the Holy Spirit and spoke of the Father and the Son, to show that the Holy Trinity is eternal, and never ceases to be.

But don't be surprised if you hear, "one *God*, of whom are all things, and one *Lord*, by whom are all things."<sup>36</sup> (6) By calling the Son, "Lord," the apostle by no means denied his Lordship and Godhead. And by saying, "one God, of whom are all things," he did not deny God's Godhead and Lordship. "Lord" goes together with "God" and "God" with "Lord," and this will make no difference to the tidings which God has truly proclaimed to us through the apostles, for our salvation.

9.7 But by a clumsy construction of God's oracles this Different and his followers have turned the way of the truth < to falsehood >. In the end, through distracting their minds with debate and verbal arguments, they have turned their backs on the truth and been deprived of the heav-

only realms. (8) For—if they are willing to pay attention to “the light of the Gospel”<sup>37</sup>—every word will convict them. Though the Only-begotten surely came in the flesh, he nowhere says, “The Father who created me hath sent me.” Nor did the Father ever say, in the Gospel or the Old Testament, “I have created the Son for you.” [We read], “The Father hath sent me,”<sup>38</sup> “I came forth from the Father and am come,”<sup>39</sup> and, “He who is in the bosom of the Father,”<sup>40</sup> and, “The Word was with God, and the Word was God.”<sup>41</sup> (9) And there is much that we can learn about our salvation, and not be carried away with this devil’s tricky teaching.

9,10 For, consumed with envy at man’s glory, the devil is out to destroy mankind, and has devised various schemes. The first was through ignorance, the second through idolatry, another time it was through vice—but now, at length, it is through the error and imposture of the sects, to turn man away from the heavens by every possible method.

10,1 How much my poor mind will find to say to you, Different! It is quite true that you are “Different”; you have made your way of life and your thinking different from those who have the understanding of God and hold the faith of the truth. (2) You have not become different from other people by your progress in goodness; you have become different from the sons of God’s church by abandoning the way of the truth. By taking as your excuse the Son of God who is like his Father and calling him “different from” the Father, you have become “different” and been awarded this title, since you are no longer like those who are to be saved in God.

10,3 But now then, not to waste my time in investigating him, let me refute him from the things he said himself to certain persons in a dialectical communication. (4) For it seems that he gave some indication of his mistakes in argument in his treatise itself—which contains not one word of faith which is wholly innocent and pure faith, and ordered in the Holy and meek Spirit. (5) First, I set down in full the work which seems to be his, which has come into my possession, to use it against him for the rest of the refutation of his treatise. The work is as follows:

11,1 *During the time of my persecution by the Temporists<sup>42</sup> some of them, among many other things, appropriated a brief treatise concerning the Ingenerate God and the Generate which I had composed with particular effort, corrupted it with insertions and omissions and issued it, after altering the sequence of the argument. It fell into my hands afterwards because one of the virtuous brought it to me, (2) and I have been obliged, like a father, to correct the treatise again and send it to you, all you male and female champions of piety, to show you that the brief discourse accords with the sense of the holy scriptures. With its help you will be able, with brief counter-arguments, to put a stop to the impudence of everyone—these Temporists most of all—who tries to contradict you about the Ingenerate God and the Generate.*

11,3 *For the ready comprehension and the clarity of my arguments I have separated objection from objection and solution from solution in the form of short paragraphs, and have begun with the Ingenerate God,*

12,1 *Whether it is possible for the Ingenerate God to make a generate thing ingenerate:*

2.<sup>43</sup> *If the Ingenerate God transcends every cause, he therefore must also transcend origination. But if he [indeed] transcends every cause he plainly transcends origination also. For he neither received his existence from another nature nor provided himself with existence.*

3. *But if, not from the inadequacy of his nature but because of his transcendence of every cause, he did not provide himself with existence, how can anyone concede that there is no difference of essence between the nature that is provided with existence and the nature that provides it, when such a nature [as the first] does not admit of origination?*

4. *If God remains forever ingenerate and his Offspring forever an Offspring the heresy of the homooousion and the homoeousion will be brought to an end. The essential incomparability [of the two] remains, since either nature remains endlessly in the rank proper to its nature.*

5. *If God is ingenerate in essence, the Generate was not produced by a separation of essence, but God gave it being by virtue of his authority.<sup>44</sup> For no pious reason can allow that the same essence can be both generate and ingenerate.*

6. *If the Ingenerate was generated, what is there to prevent the Generate from having become ingenerate? For on the contrary, every nature is urged < away from > that which is not natural to it toward that which is.*

7. *If God is not wholly ingenerate, there is nothing to prevent his having generated as an essence. But since God is wholly ingenerate, there was no separation of his essence for the purpose of generation, but he brought an Offspring into existence by his authority.*

8. *If the Ingenerate God is wholly generative, the Offspring was not generated as an essence, since God's essence is wholly generative and not generated. But if God's essence has been transformed and is called an Offspring, God's essence is not unalterable, since the transformation brought about the formation of the Son. But if God's essence is both unalterable and above generation, talk of "sonship" will admittedly be a mere verbal ascription.*

9. *If the Offspring was in the Ingenerate God in germ, he was "brought to maturity," after his generation, as we might say, by receiving accretions from without. Therefore the Son is not "mature" because of the causes of his generation, but because of the accretions he received. For things which receive accretions genetically, in the sense of being constituted by them, are characteristically termed "mature" in a distinctive way.*

10. *If the Offspring was full grown in the Ingenerate, it is an Offspring by virtue of properties which were in the Ingenerate,<sup>45</sup> and not by virtue of those with which the Ingenerate generated it. [But this cannot be], for there can be no generacy in ingenerate essence; the < same > thing can < not > both be and not be. An offspring is not ingenerate, and if it were ingenerate it would not be an offspring, for to say that God is not homogeneous is to offer him sheer blasphemy and insult.*

11. *If Almighty God, whose nature is ingenerate, knows that his nature is not generate, but the Son, whose nature is generate, knows that he is what he is, how can the homoousion not be a lie? For the one knows himself to be ingenerate, but the other, generate.*

12. *If ingeneracy does not represent the reality of God but the incomparable name is of human invention, God owes the inventors thanks for their invention of the concept of ingeneracy, since in his essence he does not have the superiority the name implies.*

13. *If ingeneracy is only something external observers observe to be God's, the observers are better than the One observed, for they have given him a name which is better than his nature.*

14. *If ingeneracy is not susceptible of generation, this is what we maintain. But if it is susceptible of generation, the sufferings of generation must be superior to the real nature of God.*

15. *If the Offspring is unchangeable by nature because of its Begetter, then the Ingenerate is an unchangeable essence, not because of its will, but because of its essential rank.*

16. *If "ingeneracy" is indicative of essence, it may properly be contrasted with the essence of the Offspring. But if "ingeneracy" means nothing, all the more must "Offspring" mean nothing.*

*But how < could > nothing be contrasted with nothing? If the expression, "ingenerate," is contrasted with the expression, "generate," but silence succeeds the expression, the hope of Christians may well begin and end [there], since it rests in a particular expression, and not in natures which are such as the meaning of their names imply.*

17. *If the term, "ingenerate," as against the term, "offspring" "contributes nothing toward superiority of essence, the Son, who is [therefore] surpassed only verbally,<sup>46</sup> will know that those who have termed him, "Son," are his betters, and not He who is termed his "God and Father."*

18. *If the ingenerate essence is superior, and innately superior, it is ingenerate essence per se.<sup>47</sup> For it is not superior to generation deliberately, because it so wills, but because this is its nature. Since ingenerate nature per se is God, it allows no reasoning to think of<sup>48</sup> generation in connection with it and resists all examination and reasoning on the part of generate beings.*

19. *If "ingenerate," when applied to God, connotes privation but "ingenerate" must be nothing, what reasoning can take away nothing from a non-existent thing? But if it means something that is, who can separate God from being, that is, i.e., separate him from himself?*

20. *If the “privations” of states are the removals of them, “ingenerate” as applied to God is either the privation of a state, or a state of privation. But if “ingenerate” is the privation of a state, how can something God does not have be counted as one of his attributes? If “ingenerate” is a state, however, a generate essence must be assumed to precede it, so that it may acquire the [new] state and be called, “ingenerate.” If, however, the generate essence partook of an ingenerate essence [to begin with], it has been deprived of its generation<sup>49</sup> by undergoing the loss of a state.*

*Generacy must then be an essence but ingeneracy a state. But if “offspring” implies a coming to be, it is plain that the word means a state, whether the Offspring is made out of some essence, or whether it is what it is called, an “Offspring.”*

21. *If “ingeneracy” is a state and “generacy” is a state, the essences<sup>50</sup> are prior to the states; but even though the states are secondary to the essences, they are more important.*

*Now if ingeneracy is the cause of generacy and means that there is an offspring which implies the cause of its own being, “offspring” denotes an essence, not a state. < On the other hand >, since ingeneracy implies nothing besides itself, how can the ingenerate nature be not an essence, but a state?*

22. *If every essence is ingenerate like Almighty God’s, how can one say that one essence is subject to vicissitudes while another is not? But if the one essence remains above quantity and quality and, in a word, all sorts of change because of its classification as ingenerate, while the other is subject to vicissitudes < and yet > is admitted to have something unchangeable in its essence, we ought to attribute the characteristics of these essences to chance, or, as is at any rate<sup>51</sup> logical, call the active essence ingenerate, but the essence which is changed, generate?<sup>52</sup>*

23. *If the ingenerate nature is the cause of the nature that has come to be, and yet “ingenerate” is nothing, how can nothing be the cause of a thing that has come to be?*

24. *If “ingenerate” is a privation but a privation is the loss of a state, and if a “loss” is completely destroyed or changed to something else, how can*

*the essence of God be named for a changing or vanishing state by the title, "ingenerate?"*

*25. If "ingenerate" denotes privation, which is not an attribute of God, why do we say that God is ingenerate but not generate?*

*26. If, as applied to God, "ingenerate" is a mere name, but the mere expression elevates the being of God over against all generate things, then the human expression is worth more than the being of the Almighty, since it has embellished God the Almighty with incomparable superiority.*

*27. If there is a cause to correspond with everything generate but the ingenerate nature has no cause, "ingenerate" does not denote a cause but means an entity.*

*28. If whatever is made, is made by something, but ingenerate being is made neither by itself nor by something else, "ingenerate" must denote essence.*

*29. If the ingenerate being is implicitly indicated to be the cause of the Offspring's existence and, in contrast with every [other] cause, is invariable, it is incomparable essence in itself<sup>53</sup> and its matchlessness is not implied for any reason external to itself but because, being ingenerate, it is incomparable and matchless in itself.<sup>54</sup>*

*30. If the Almighty surpasses every nature, he surpasses it because of his ingeneracy, and this is the reason for the permanence of generate things. But if "ingenerate" does not denote an essence, how will the nature of generate things be preserved?*

*31. If no invisible thing preexists itself in germ, but each remains in the nature allotted to it, how can the Ingenerate God, who is free from any category, sometimes see his own essence in the Offspring as secondary but sometimes see it in ingeneracy as prior, on the principle of "first and second."*

*32. If God retains an ingenerate nature, there can be no question of his knowing himself as [both] originated and unoriginated. If, on the other hand, we grant that his essence continues to be ingenerate and generate, he does not know his own essence, since his head is in a whirl from origination and non-origination. But if the Generate too partakes of ingenerate nature and yet remains without cessation in his generate nature, he knows himself in the nature in which he continues to remain, but plainly does not know his participation in ingeneracy; for he cannot possibly be aware of himself as both of ingenerate and of generate essence.*

*If, however, the Generate is contemptible because of his proneness to change, then unchangeable essence is a natural rank, since the essence of the Ingenerate admittedly transcends every cause.*

33. *If the Ingenerate transcends all cause, but there are many ingenerates they will [all] be exactly alike in nature. For without being endowed with some quality common [to all], while yet having some quality of its own—[a condition not possible in ingenerate being]—one ingenerate nature would not make, while another was made.*

34. *If every essence is ingenerate, one will not differ from another in self-determination. How, then, can we say that one [such] being is changed and another causes change, when we will not allow God to bring them into being from an essence that has no [prior] existence?*

35. *If every essence is ingenerate, every one is exactly alike. But the doing and suffering of an essence that is exactly like [all the others] must be attributed to chance. However, if there are many ingenerates which are exactly alike, there can be no enumeration of their ways of differing from one another. For there could be no enumerations of their differences, either in general or in some respect, since every difference which implies classification is already excluded from an ingenerate nature.*

36. *If “ingenerate” and “God” are exact parallels and mean the same thing, the Ingenerate begot an Ingenerate. But if “ingenerate” means one thing while “God” means something else, there is nothing strange in God’s begetting God, since one of the two receives being from ingenerate essence. But if, as is the case,<sup>55</sup> that which is before God is nothing, “ingenerate” and “God” do mean the same, for “Offspring” does not admit of ingeneracy. Thus the Offspring does not allow himself to be mentioned in the same breath with his God and Father.*

12,37 *May the true God, who is ingenerate in himself and for this reason is alone addressed as “the only true God” by his messenger, Jesus Christ, who truly came into being before the ages and is truly a generate entity, preserve you, men and women, from impiety, safe and sound from impiety in Christ Jesus our Savior, through whom be all glory to our God and Father, both now and forever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.*

13,1 And this, as I said, is the beginning of my refutation of his corrupt passages, part of which have come into my possession. (For they say that,

in all, he composed 300 other paragraphs like these, filled with impiety.) (2) But I publish the treatise here for scholarship's sake, if you like, as though a snake's body were decaying and rotting, and a good man had gathered up the bones of the carcass of the snake whose treachery might do harm to somebody. Aetius boasts of having put this treachery into writing for "certain persons," and his treatise begins as follows. (3) But < by > God's inspiration let me prepare a preventative antidote because of it, for those who would like to be cured of his poison, by culling out the medicines of the words of the sacred scripture, from the beginning [of the treatise] until its end. I shall place my refutations next to each passage in these paragraphs of syllogistic reasoning, as follows:

14,1 *During my persecution by the Temporists some of them, among many other things, appropriated a brief treatise I had composed with particular effort on the subject of the Ingenerate God and the Generate, corrupted it with insertions and omissions, and issued it after altering the sequence of the argument. It fell into my hands afterwards because one of the virtuous brought it to me, (2) and I have been obliged, like a father, to correct the treatise again and send it to you, all you male and female champions of piety, to show you that the brief discourse accords with the sense of the holy scriptures. With its help you will be able, with brief counter-arguments, to put a stop to the impudence of everyone—these Temporists most of all—who tries to contradict you about the Ingenerate God and the Generate.*

14,3 *For the ready comprehension and the clarity of my arguments I have separated objection from objection and solution from solution in the form of short paragraphs, and have begun with the Ingenerate God.*

15,1 Whether you think they are lengthy, or indeed, brief, I shall give the refutation of the exact words of your pompous dialectic and uselessly laborious syllogisms, without either omitting or repeating the endless number of the passages. (2) And in the first place, you wrote to the "male and female champions" of your connection [in the words I have given] above, and said that certain "Temporists" had appropriated the portion of your treatise that was then in your hands, < and had corrupted > it. But < going by > your expression which we find here,<sup>56</sup> < one > would sooner convict you and your disciples—not to say, your dupes—of bearing this name.

15,3 For God's holy faith, which was there from the beginning and yet never grows old, is always in existence. Its foundation has been estab-

lished and it has its Master, who is not in time. Hence it is not temporal; it is forever, shares the citizenship of the angels, and adorns the saints in every generation. (4) No, you're the temporist! You have been fed on imposture and become vain in mind, and mix your fodder indiscriminately with the flock's thorny pasturage. For none of the ancients held your views, Aetius—you who write against the "temporal," but are "temporal" yourself, and of no ancient origin. (5) But at the very beginning of your introduction, when you said you had written the little book, you startled the world in the terribly brilliant introduction to your work by saying, "Ingenerate and Generate God"<sup>57</sup>—excuse my making fun of your use of the terms of such a lengthy coinage of new names.

16,1 For what Christian, in possession of God's saving message, would desert this—would be inspired by your mythological fiction to come, leaving the eternal God and his eternal Spirit, hear from you about a "generate God," and make a fool of himself by learning to "worship the creature more than the creator, who is blessed forever. Amen?"<sup>58</sup> (2) We have no created God, no manufactured God, but One who is uncreated and unoriginate, begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time. (3) For even though you play games with "generate" and choose to make "generate" a synonym [for "begotten"], I shall not accept your expression even if you mean no less by it than "begotten of the Father." "Men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles,"<sup>59</sup> and a correct statement is not to be expected from a man who is in error. The Lord silenced the demons too, when they confessed that he was Christ.

But you claim that your dinky little book is in accordance with the sense of the sacred scriptures. (4) Tell me, which sacred scripture ever taught the worship of a created God? As to God's being "ingenerate," we can all see that. (5) But even this is not in the sacred scripture in so many words; we fitly think and say this with piety on the basis of correct and godly reasoning and our understanding of God itself.

16,6 But you say that you arranged your propositions as a short, simple statement in the form of short paragraphs, so that the male and female champions, as you call them—(dupes, actually)—will know how to answer everyone. (7) Therefore, though I am nobody, stupid, and not important but worth far less than many in God's holy church, I < shall take up >

those remarks which you think are weighty and clever, and which you have worked up as a reply to important people—or rather, as your shout against the truth—and, as I said, give the refutation of this incoherent, completely worthless nonsense of yours.

17,1 And this will do as my modest response to your prologue. But [next] I shall insert your propositions, one after another, and beside each statement and proposition put the answers to and refutations of your syllogistic arguments, so that God's servants and true champions, reading this and learning the whole of your absurdity, can laugh at it, saying "The haughtiness of thine heart"<sup>60</sup> has made this for you. (2) "For thou didst say in thine heart, I shall ascend to heaven, and above the stars of heaven will I set my throne. I shall sit on a lofty mountain; upon the lofty mountains of the north will I ascend above the clouds and be like unto the Most High. But now shalt thou descend to hades, to the foundations of the earth," and so on<sup>61</sup>

18,1 And this is the beginning of Aetius' propositions:

1. *Whether it is possible for the Ingenerate God to make a generate thing ingenerate:*

*Refutation.* First, it is impious to begin with to think of impossibility in connection with God, or the only < impossibility > is what is unsuitable to his Godhead—and this, not because he cannot do it, but because evil is unsuitable to the God for whom nothing is impossible. It is impossible for his mighty divine goodness, and for him who is good, because doing evil is impossible [to him].

18,2 And otherwise, if God regards the < making > of the ingenerate generate as a good work, but lacks the power to bring something that was going on well to a good conclusion, this must be a defect of power for God, who wants to do the better thing, but cannot. (3) But if the ingenerate is good, but the generate was well made in its own order, then, since the order of the generate is a good order which stems from a good God, and which God regards as good, God would not make a thing ingenerate which had been well generated. He would be satisfied with its being good in its own way.

18,4 Therefore, since the order of a good thing is not unchanged because it cannot be changed, but because it is good that it be as it is, the

ingenerate God is good. And the things he makes are good in their own order, without taking the name of “ingenerate.”

For God did not make created “gods,” so that one could be equated with the other and remove the opposition between “greater” and “lesser” by the title, [“god”]. (5) If the one is an ingenerate God and the other a generate God, since their natures have nothing in common the generate God cannot by his nature share < in > the rank of the name [of God], except by a kindly intended misuse of the word—and then only if the well endowed God grants this to the lesser God by participation.

18,6 But the lesser God would never call himself by the greater God’s name, but knows that he is entirely ineligible to have the natural rank and title. Someone ought to tell you, “The Word *was* God,”<sup>62</sup> Aetius—not, “The Word *became* God.” If indeed the Word “became” anything, how will he get < the > title of nobility by nature, or how will he be made equal to God’s rank? Or how can the phrase, “was God,” be got rid of? The time implied by “was” does not allow for the slightest distinction [between Gods].

18,7 But let me inform you that the God who has no beginning, the ingenerate God, begot, of himself, a God like himself—and not only like him, but in every way equal to him. (8) And he did not create him. Otherwise, since the creature had been unlike [his creator], he would have made the name “God” inapplicable because of the extent of the difference [between the two]. For the begetter cannot beget an offspring which is unlike him and not his equal, and the begotten cannot be unlike his begetter. (9) Here, then, < pious reason\* > will comprehend the fact of [the Son’s] sameness [as the Father] from the Gospel’s text, “All that the Father hath are mine.”<sup>63</sup> In other words: “The Father is God; I am God. The Father is life; I am life.” And everything else that fits the Father < fits > the Son and the Holy Spirit in one Godhead, with no distinction between the persons of the Trinity. (10) For we are plainly assured of the perfect knowledge that the subsistent Word < has been begotten > of the Father without beginning and not in time, and that the subsistent Holy Spirit < proceeds from > the Father and < receives of > the Son.

19,1 2. *If the Ingenerate God transcends every cause, he therefore must also transcend origination. But if he [indeed] transcends every cause he plainly transcends origination also. For he neither received his existence from another nature nor provided himself with existence.*

19,2 *Refutation*. If the ingenerate God transcends every cause, and yet the One whom he generated was generated unworthily of him and not his equal, yet still retains the Father's transcendent name, the Offspring disgraces his Begetter by having the dignity of a name different from creatures, but not doing honor to his Maker as creatures do. (3) For the things outside of him win glory for their Maker without being their Maker's equals or having his name, but by being made as servants to their Maker's glory, so that the superiority, even to them, of Him < who > is superior to the things that have been made glorious may be observed, proportionately, from the glorious creatures. (4) If, however, the one who is not yet given their name but who has equal rank by co-essentiality with the superior Being from birth, is [still of] a different kind than the superior Being < because of > the difference between them, he will even reduce the Superior Being's rank, since the Offspring's relation to the Superior is changed. (5) The Offspring is therefore not understood by faith to be the like offspring of a like parent and equal offspring of an equal parent, on the analogy of a physical offspring, but as God of God, light of light, and the subsistent Word of the Father. The unchanging glory of the Superior is thus preserved, in that the Superior < is > not his own cause, but generates from himself the equal of his pure and incomprehensible essence—co-essentially generates the real and subsistent divine Offspring. This is not a lifeless image, but replicates the Father's kind—as, to assign equality with the Begetter to the Offspring, the sacred scripture says, “image of the invisible God.”<sup>64</sup>

19,6 And lest it be supposed that there is a difference between image and identity, the Father himself, to provide for the restoration of our life, said, “*Let us make man in our image and after our likeness*”<sup>65</sup> before this last text (i.e., Col 1:15). He did not distinguish himself from the Son, but used a dual and equivocal expression, “*Let us make man*,” to mean two, himself and the Son—or, indeed, I would also say the Holy Spirit. (7) And < by using the words, “in image and in likeness” > of the image's exactitude, and saying besides with two words that [the Son] is not < unlike > [the Father], he said that there is one image. But with “our” he declared that it is the image of two persons, and that the man who is being made, is not being made in the image of the one but in the likeness of the two, and is being made an exact image. This makes it entirely clear that the

superiority of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit remains identical and unvarying.

19,8 For neither the Father, the Son nor the Holy Spirit has taken anything from another nature, or given another nature participation in his nature and rank. Nor did the Only-begotten and the Holy Spirit originate from the Father by an alteration of his nature, nor by division of it nor emanation from it. He has declared to us, plainly and consistently, that, as the ingenerate and uncreated nature was always superior, so a superior Offspring and Holy Spirit were always of him.

20,1 3. *But if, not from the inadequacy of his nature but because of his transcendence of every cause, he did not provide himself with existence, how can anyone concede that there is no difference of essence between the nature that provides existence and the nature that is provided with existence, when such a nature [as the first] does not admit of origination?*

20,2 *Refutation.* You should look up, Aetius, realize your pitiable condition, and put a stop to the worse than impiety of your rash notion, < or > no one will suppose that I have not caught your madness and been overawed by such temerity, but [rather] am giving godly counsel to you and myself. (3) For by supposing that, in the essentials and the things becoming to God, God is unlike and not the equal of the Son he has begotten, and by < seeing fit\* > < to preach > with extreme imposture that < the\* > Son < is “of” him ><sup>66</sup> by some holy act of creation, you are preaching, if anything, that God is like the Son in the most unsuitable ways, which do not become his Godhead.

20,4 In the first place, to think of God with such profoundly stupid irreverence is the fruit of impiety, or rather, of a diseased mind. (5) By saying that < he > is [either] his own cause, or else that he < provided > himself with existence, you, in your search and quest for the origin of God, have entangled yourself in two wicked opinions: that is, either he always provided himself with existence or he exists by chance. And when I contemplate your wicked piece of reasoning I am frightened and shake with fear. (6) Stop it! Let's stop it! It is enough for us and our piety to understand and believe that the everlasting God was always God!

Indeed, you said, as though you had bestowed a great honor on God—though in this too you speak and reason foolishly—that God neither provides himself with existence nor < is his own cause >. On your premises, then, if the preservation of the faith depends upon words and arguments,

< the divine nature would appear\* > to be in a category similar to that of inferior beings and wretched bodies. (7) No creature, from bugs to man, from men to angels, is its own cause or has provided itself with existence. (8) No created thing has provided its own being; each has received the inception of its existence from the only Being who [truly] is. So since you have been < foiled > and beaten by the arguments you thought you could use, stop your unnatural effort to measure yourself against One higher than you! For you will be thwarted in every way since, even though he derives his rank from the Father < by > begetting—or by generation if you will—the Only-begotten is equal to and like the Father. (9) He will be no different from his equality with the Father because of this, just as he will be no different from his likeness because created things cannot provide themselves with being—in the same way that He who is their superior and in all ways perfect did not have his origin from anything before him. (10) For he did not begin to be, either. He was always and is always, even though he remains as he is and does not provide himself with being. We have no need of synonymous expressions, but of the consideration < which\*> genuinely < makes for\* > piety.

20,11 And otherwise, since you have said, “And if, not from the inadequacy of his nature but because of his transcendence of every cause, he did not provide himself with existence,” learn for your own part that the Son’s name cannot come from inadequacy, because he has the special fitness for it of co-essentiality with his Begetter. (12) For as transcendence of every cause is most becoming to the Father, so the same one Godhead is becoming to the only < Son > of the only Father, with the only Holy Spirit—a Godhead which, not because of its inadequacy, but because of its transcendence of each and every thing < that has been made > from nothing, cannot admit of a cause. For there is one Godhead, which is enumerated by one name, “Trinity,” and is proclaimed by candidates for baptism in their one profession of the names of “Father, Son and Holy Spirit,” in the words that truthfully express the equivalence of the naming of a “Father,” a “Son,” and a “Holy Spirit.”

20,13 But again, you said, “how can one concede that there is no difference of essence between the nature that provides existence and the nature that exists, when such a nature [as the first] does not admit of origination?” And you neither understand, nor have understood, how you have deprived yourself of knowledge of God’s truth, because you are not taught the truth by the Holy Spirit, but are trying to penetrate the heavens by the wisdom of this world, which has been made foolish. (14) You will

accordingly hear that [this wisdom] has been brought to naught for you: "The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain."<sup>67</sup>

20,15 For He who begot the subsistent Word begot him equal to himself and not different from his Godhead because of the difference between him and the Offspring, but < in all ways like himself.\* > For it would be entirely inappropriate for us to suppose that the Begetter himself has begotten the Offspring unworthily of himself, unequal to him, and inferior to the Begetter. (16) Scripture has said that all things were made through the Son, the subsistent Word, so as not to count him as a creature, but as the Father's like and equal in < everything >, as befits the name, "Father"—forever < like > Him Who Is, not strange to him but his legitimate Son, as a Son begotten of him with the same essence.

21,1 4. *If God remains forever ingenerate and his Offspring forever an Offspring the heresy of the homoousion and the homoeousion will be brought to an end. The essential incomparability [of the two] remains, since either nature remains endlessly in the rank proper to the nature.*

21,2 *Refutation.* If God remains endlessly and ceaselessly in his ingenerate nature, as you have said, but the nature of God is eternal and in ceaseless possession of its rank, not because of something else but because it is God in his very essence and eternity in its very essence, then, if you call the Offspring "endless," he must surely be co-essential with God. For you have turned round and granted the Son the title on convincing natural grounds. (3) For you will grant, and will be forced to admit, that "endless" means entirely boundless and unlimited. Very well, how can he not be co-essential [with the Father]?

Since you have seen fit to mock the truth and tried to insult it with an heretical name, < you will be > defeated by the very words you have used. (4) For you will either admit that the essence you have blasphemously termed different [from the Father's] < has > an end—or, once you have declared him "endless," you will be obliged to teach the entire unalterability of his rank and the indistinguishability of the rank of the endless [Son from that of the endless Father]. The truth will not allow that the Son has an end for, because the scripture says, "Of his kingdom there shall be no end,"<sup>68</sup> he rules forever with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Whatever has a beginning will also have an end, at the pleasure of Him who provided the thing that had a beginning with being. This is admissible

in all cases, but inadmissible in the case of the Son. (5) For he is forever of the God Who Is and with the God who is, and never ceases to be. Therefore he was, and will be, co-essential with the Father, an only Son of an only Father, and in no way different in essence but is as the ranks of the names imply, of a Godhead which remains identical [with the Father's], which has no amalgamation or beginning, which does not provide itself with being, and which admits of no unlikeness in itself. It is forever and never ceases to be, and is becoming to itself, for it is forever and ceaselessly in the rank of the Father of a Son, and of the Son of a Father, and of a Holy Spirit with a Father and a Son. For the Trinity cannot be compared with itself, since it admits of no distinction in rank.

22,1 5. *If God is ingenerate in essence, the Generate was not produced by a separation of essence, but God gave it being by virtue of his authority. For no pious reason can allow that the same essence is both generate and ingenerate.*

22,2 *Refutation.* You have come forward many times with your “ingenerate and generate,” Mister, and brayed out God’s name, and yet buried your notion of him underneath all sorts of lawlessness. For that name is an object of longing to one who is in doubt about it, and the resolution of his doubts is a consolation to the doubter, < but > if his doubts are not resolved, < he is ashamed\* > even to say it. (3) And since you have no God you are < not > too proud to say this name if only to mouth it, for you have never received it in the fear of him, in faith and hope, and in love for him. (4) Otherwise it would have been enough for you to say this once, and not go beyond the allowable limit for repetition. The Savior’s pronouncement about you is plain, By their fruits ye shall know them”;<sup>69</sup> for you are dressed in a sheep’s fleece, but inside it you are a disguised predator, like a wolf.

22,5 For if you were born of the Holy Spirit and a disciple of the apostles and prophets, you ought to go < looking > all the way from the Genesis of the World to the Times of Esther in the twenty-seven books of the Old Testament, which are counted as twenty-two—and in the four holy Gospels, the holy apostle’s fourteen Epistles, the General Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude and the Acts of the Apostles before their time together with their Acts during it, the Revelation of John, and the Wisdoms, I mean Solomon’s and Sirach’s—and, in a word, in all the sacred scriptures, and realize that you have come to us with a name, “ingenerate,” which scripture never mentions. It is not inappropriate for God but

an orthodox term for him, but it is nowhere to be found in the sacred scripture, since no one < but > a madman would ever conceive of God as being generate.

22,6 But neither did they need to say that only the Father is the “ingenerate God” because his Son is generate, to avoid giving the impression that ingeneracy applies not only to the Father, but also to the Son and the Holy Spirit. Right-mindedness and the Holy Spirit teach all the sons of the truth of themselves not to be unclear about this, but to have the knowledge of God which is requisite, and which in itself belongs to < right > reasoning with regard to piety. (7) But if Anomoeans < say that\* > < “ingenerate” is the proper name for God\* >, since he is ingenerate—and I too agree—< I shall reply that this term is not inappropriate\* >, but that they have no scriptural support for the use of the word. Piety knows of itself, by < correct > reasoning, that this < expression\* > is accurate. For why will there be a difference<sup>70</sup> of essence < between the Ingenerate > and the Generate, if the latter really has the name because of his begetting, in some natural and ineffable sense—in a sense appropriate to God, and to the Son begotten of him without beginning and not in time, in reality and not in some accommodated sense of the word? (8) I therefore deny that his essence is created, or that it is different [from the Father’s] because of being a created thing, but [maintain] that it is really begotten, and not different from its Begetter.

It thus remains not created and not made, but begotten of the very essence of God, and unaffected by time. For his true Begetter was not affected by time, so as to give being to an essence affected by time. For as is the Offspring, so is the Begetter; as is the Begetter, so is the Begotten.

23,1 6. *If the Ingenerate was generated, what is there to prevent the Generate from having become ingenerate? For on the contrary, every nature is urged < away from > that which is not natural to it toward that which is.*

23,2 *Refutation.* If the Ingenerate made < the Generate >, and did not beget him, [then], since the name [of either one] is restricted to the one identity and neither is comparable with the other because of the real opposition of their meaning, the meaning of their relationship is the difference between the one and the other. For neither has anything in common with the other save only by the authority of the superior nature, < which is > the cause of all it has created.

23,3 But since there is another term between “maker” and “made,” and between “creator” and “creature”—a term close to “ingenerate” but a long way from “created”—you cannot confuse all this, Aetius, and deliberately do away with the Son’s share in the perfect name, which reflects the true relation of the eternal, uncreated Son to the Father. (4) < For > an ingenerate, uncreated being can never become a creature, and change back from creaturehood and return to its ingeneracy once more, even though you construct a million Aristotelian syllogisms for us, abandoning the simple, pure heavenly teaching of the Holy Spirit.

24,1 7. *If God is not wholly ingenerate, there is nothing to prevent his having generated as an essence. But since God is wholly ingenerate, there was no separation of his essence for the purpose of generation, but he brought an Offspring into existence by his authority.*

24,2 *Refutation.* God is both wholly ingenerate and wholly uncreated, and so is the Son he has begotten, and so is his Holy Spirit < whom > you belittle, you carnal and natural Aetius who are spiritually discerned! (For the Holy Spirit has his distinctive character [from God] in a way peculiar to himself, and is not like the many things which have been created of him, through him, and because of him.)

24,3 And so [the Son] will have nothing in common with all things, nor can any creature share his rank. For all things are transitory and pass away; and he leaves every logical argument behind him, < defeated\* > by the word of instruction from the sacred scripture, “No man knoweth the Son save the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.”<sup>71</sup> (4) But the Son reveals him through the Holy Spirit—not to those who argue about him, but to those who truly and fully believe in him. For even though you come with a million silly arguments, you pitiable object as I regard you, you can neither “find out his judgments” nor “search out his ways,”<sup>72</sup> as the scripture says.

25,1 8. *If the Ingenerate God is wholly generative, the Offspring was not generated as an essence, since God’s essence is wholly generative and not generated. But if God’s essence has been transformed and called an Offspring God’s essence is not unalterable, since the transformation brought about the formation of the Son. But if God’s essence is both unalterable and above generation, talk of “sonship” will admittedly be a mere verbal ascription.*

25,2 *Refutation*. Not only you, Aetius, but every “heretic” should “be avoided after one admonition,”<sup>73</sup> as the holy and wise commandment directs. For you stand “self-condemned,”<sup>74</sup> inviting your own destruction and not compelled to this by anyone else. (3) Who can pity one who is “evil to himself and good to no one?”<sup>75</sup> But for my part, lest you think in your self-< conceit ><sup>76</sup> that the evils you have propagated in the world are important objections [to the truth], I myself shall go patiently on grubbing up your thorny roots with “the two-edged sword, the word of Christ,”<sup>77</sup> by the sound, full and true confession of faith before God.

25,4 For glory to the merciful < God > who has found what sort you are—you who occupy the place of Judas, who was counted as one of the disciples but cut off from them, not by Christ’s intent but because he had learned the denial of the Lord from Satan. (5) And what need is there to say anything more to you, since you are entirely different from Christians—from prophets, apostles, evangelists, martyrs and all the saints who are prepared to convict you at the day of judgment? For they endured the rack until death, they were scourged, torn, consigned to the beasts, fire, and death by the sword, rather than deny that he is God’s Son and truly begotten of him.

25,6 For the Father is the Begetter of a sole Only-begotten, and of no one else after the One. And he is the Pourer forth of a Holy Spirit and of no other spirit. But he is the creator and the maker of all that he has made and continues to make. (7) Therefore, since many Sons are certainly not begotten and many Spirits do not proceed from him, and since the same Godhead remains forever and is glorified in a Trinity and is never augmented, diminished, or supposed not to exist, the rank is not limited to a mere name in the case of the Offspring. (8) [If it were], he would have many brothers like himself after him—as in the text, “I have begotten sons and exalted them,”<sup>78</sup> and, “who hath begotten the drops of dew,”<sup>79</sup> and, “of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named,”<sup>80</sup> and,

“Have we not all one Father?”<sup>81</sup> and, “my son Jacob,”<sup>82</sup> and, “my firstborn Israel.”<sup>83</sup> (9) These are all “sons” by a mere verbal locution, by analogy, because they have progressed from non-existence to existence, and are not [sons] essentially in the true sense of the word, but are merely < in locution > and by grace. Therefore they have been created by the One who is not called Son by grace or merely in name, but < is > truly the Son. [They are] created by the One, through the One, with him who proceeds from the One and receives of the Other.

26,1 9. *If the Offspring was in the Ingenerate God in germ, he was “brought to maturity,” after his generation, as we might say, by receiving accretions from without. Therefore the Son is not “mature” because of the causes of his generation, but because of the accretions he received. For things which receive accretions genetically, in the sense of being constituted by them, are characteristically termed “mature” in a distinctive way.*

26,2 *Refutation.* If it had not been agreed that the Begetter is incorporeal, your entire performance might be worth staging. You scare no one else by staging it, however, but confuse your own mind [and deprive it] of the true confession of faith. (3) God, who is perfect in himself, begot of himself a perfect Son; he did not, contrary to nature, beget someone else. For the Son is not unsuited to his Begetter, and has no need to acquire anything from without. For, after the essence of God, there is nothing greater than God, which could share with God if he needed acquisition to come to maturity. (4) For He who is forever the incorporeal God has begotten the Incorporeal, by generation, to be with him forever; the Perfect has forever begotten the Perfect—God, who is spirit, begetting the subsistent Word, who is also spirit.

26,5 But what you say is silliness, Aetius, you treader on < the heights >, who get your ideas of God from syllogisms and out of your own logic-chopping head. For to the God who made all things from nothing and can do everything perfect at once, who needs no further benefaction and who governs these things by his decree, you are assigning the name of an essence that is subject to growth, and > a Word in need of extra divinity, and are not even putting him > on a level with his creatures. (6) For he made them perfectly at the beginning, and decreed by a wise ordinance that the things that would spring from them would have no need

to acquire anything. Those are the things in which successive generations have been and will be born—heaven, for example, the earth, water, air, the sun, the moon, the stars, and creatures which have been born from the waters—up to man himself. (7) God did not make heaven imperfect, or the earth in any way imperfect. He made the earth perfect and heaven perfect, though it was “invisible and chaos”<sup>84</sup> because of the order he was to impose on it. But he made water and the original light at the same time, making all things through the true Light, the uncreated and life-giving. (8) But then he made the things that have grown from the earth, and the firmament before that—not half-finished, but he made all things in their perfection. For < he says >, “Let the earth put forth herbage of pasture, sowing seed in its likeness upon the earth, and fruit-bearing trees whose seed is in them in their likeness upon the earth.”<sup>85</sup>

26,9 And you see that the things God had made full grown needed no additional endowment at the moment of their creation; they were “adult,” as it were, and perfect at once, by God’s decree. (10) But the things which were bestowed on man to be his subjects and were with him in germ for him to rule, were not entrusted to him full grown. For man always knew the Benefactor who bestows being on all, but who is over all, and who provides each created thing’s benefactions for the sustenance of those who are of service to him.

26,11 God gave man the earth with the potential for growth, laying it out before him like a floor, as it were, and entrusting it to him as a womb, so that man could borrow the seeds produced by the plants which God had made perfect, and which were sown in the earth with spontaneous wisdom as a tree can do, [and the seeds] of other produce—borrow them from the mature plants in bits as small as a pebble (12) and sow this produce, and await what would be given for their increase < by > the perfect God. The crops man sowed would thus be increased from without, and man would not be unaware of the Provider of the bounty, think himself the creator, and be deprived of the truth.

26,13 For even though Noah planted a vineyard, scripture does not call him planter; he “was made an husbandman.”<sup>86</sup> There is a difference between God who bestows the original gifts on things that are to be, and man who has received being from God, to whom God’s husbandry is

entrusted. The one is meant to tend the gifts needed for growth to maturity, but the other to provide the maturity, by his gift of his creatures and of things that grow to maturity. (14) And so with beasts and birds; so with domestic animals, reptiles and sea creatures. In the beginning they were all made full grown by the God who commanded it, but by the will of his wisdom they now need a gift [from him in order to grow]. This is intended for the mental benefit of man who rules on earth, so that < he > will recognize as God and Lord the God above all, the Provider of the seed-bearing plants and the gift of their growth.

26,15 For this reason God has left the heavenly bodies, which are not sown by human hands and which neither beget nor are begotten, in a full grown state. For they—the sun, moon and stars, for example—did not spur the human mind on to treachery and the pride of vainglory. (16) Not even the moon alters its appearance because it is born, wanes or waxes, but to mark and usher in the seasons, which God has regulated by the luminaries. (17) If God made corporeal things full grown at the outset when he chose, although they cause other things to decay, and they themselves decay, why should he beget the One he has begotten of himself—One [begotten] of one, the true God who is forever with the true God by generation—in need of any benefaction?

26,18 All right, Aetius, stop bringing me your worthless Aristotelian syllogisms! I have had enough of them and am not to be cheated of our Lord's true teaching, which says, "I came forth from the Father and am come."<sup>87</sup> The saying is not meant loosely, but gives indication of the essence of God's perfection and dignity.

27,1 10. *If the Offspring was full grown in the Ingenerate, it is an Offspring by virtue of properties which were in the Ingenerate, and not by virtue of those by which the Ingenerate generated it. [But this cannot be], for there can be no generacy in ingenerate essence; the same thing can < not > both be and not be. An offspring is not ingenerate, and if it were ingenerate it would not be an offspring, for to say that God is not homogeneous is to offer him sheer blasphemy and insult.*

27,2 *Refutation.* In his desire to understand God through logical terminology of human devising Aetius introduces opposition, and < falsely ><sup>88</sup> tries, with words, to mutilate the sure hope of the plain faith. He contrasts

unlike with unlike, and sets expression against expression to force them to mean the impossible, the unlikeness < of the Son > to the Father.

For he himself will be out-argued by the very arguments he has taught the world. (3) He says, "If the Offspring were full grown in the Ingenerate, it must be an Offspring by virtue of the properties within the Ingenerate, and not by virtue of those with which the Ingenerate generated it. [But this cannot be], for there can be no generacy in an ingenerate essence. The < same > thing can< not > both be and not be. An offspring is not ingenerate, and if it were ingenerate it could not be an offspring, for to say that God is not homogeneous is to offer him insult and blasphemy." This means that the ground gained by the words is exposed to attack on all sides, for the Son *cannot be* unlike the Father, or unequal to his perfect Godhead.

27,4 For if he will insist on saying this, but turns < the > words he uses against each other and keeps saying that "ingenerate" and "generate" are opposites, he should learn from this < to contrast > the created and the uncreated. For the one cannot share the rank of the other, which is fit< ness > for any sort of worship. (5) If a thing that is unlike [God] is fit for any worship, since it is the equal of something [else that is] unlike [God] there will no longer be any sense in distinguishing the one thing from all of them. The unlike < being > cannot be compared, in the position of its rank, with the One, even though this one thing out of all the unlike things has greater glory; the unlikeness of < all > of them to the One has nothing in common with the One. (6) And the end result will be that the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth, and further things inferior to these, will be objects of worship—but no longer the One, with the One Spirit, that is, one Trinity, one Godhead, one Worship.

27,7 And so, if we must draw this inference for this reason, it will truly be the correct one. For the one Word is not like all the words, nor is the one Son the same as everything that is called a son by analogy; for he is not one of them all, but the one through whom they all were made. (8) The thing which Aetius himself at the outset termed impossible, and an insult to God and sheer blasphemy—because, as he said, there is < no > non-homogeneity in God—is not part of the difference [between the Son and the Father], but part of [the Son's] equality with the Father. And since the Godhead is not divided but is eternal perfection there are three Perfects, one Godhead. (9) But, if anything, the doctrine of unlikeness was confirmed for us as a proof of the true faith, so that we will neither hold with, nor believe those who, by a rash preconception, have

been unworthily < carried away ><sup>89</sup> with the opinion of the pagans, who everyone knows worship the whole creation—which is unlike the Father who is worshiped in the Son, and the Son who is worshiped in the Father with the Holy Spirit, to whom be glory forever. Amen.

28,1 11. *If Almighty God, whose nature is ingenerate, knows that his nature is not generate, but the Son, whose nature is generate, knows that he is what he is, how can the homoousion not be a lie? For the one knows himself to be ingenerate, but the other, to be generate.*

28,2 *Refutation.* As a discriminator and surveyor who deals with the nature of God, Aetius, a human being who wants to know things that are beyond human nature, has said and declared that he knows—as a conclusion, not from scripture but from the arguments of the notions of mortals—that “Almighty God, who is of an ingenerate nature, knows that he is not of a generate nature.” (3) But never yet, from the very beginning of his treatise, does he say even by implication that the Only-begotten is a Son, as the original Arians did. (4) From the impudent remarks he keeps making, sons of the truth, observe at every point that he would like the Son to be entirely different from the Father, and to have no part at all in the divine nature. For there is no point < in his saying > that < God > knows he is ingenerate, and that he knows that he is not of a generate nature, and it is said < merely > < so as not > to call the Son a Son, even in name.

28,5 But his argument will be demolished. The Father is ingenerate and, because his nature is appropriate to him, has generated the Only-begotten eternally, < and is a Father\* > by his generation of the Only-begotten as his one and only [Son], and his issuance of the Spirit. [The Holy Spirit is] an only Spirit who < co-exists >, in addition to the Only-begotten, with the only Begetter; and who co-exists with the Son who is begotten without beginning. The Father is spirit and begets spirit; he is not a body which can be divided physically, and which decays, grows, and can be cut. (6) Therefore, in the cases of all other things that beget and are begotten, they may have need of each other for many reasons,<sup>90</sup> but here the rank of the One who is with the One, is not like all the others.

28,7 Therefore the Begotten himself, who has been uniquely begotten of him who has awesomely begotten him—just as he has been generated by the Ingenerate—is fit for his Begetter. He < therefore > begets no further sons himself—I mean, not of his essence—so that, because < the

Son > begets no one else of his essence and the Father is not begotten, the full glory of their rank may be preserved in both ways, in the single unity of the rank of Godhead: a perfect Father, a perfect Son, and a perfect Holy Spirit. (8) And thus the sacred scripture knows that the homooousion is no lie, and neither is the pious reason that has devoutly learned to glorify and worship the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit by receiving the grace [for this] from God.

29,1 12. *If ingeneracy does not represent the reality of God but the incomparable name is of human invention, God owes the inventors thanks for their invention of the concept of ingeneracy, since in his essence he does not have the superiority the name implies.*

29,2 *Refutation.* I too, as I say to address Aetius, < confess the doctrine of > ingeneracy, and do not deny it even though it is not in sacred scripture; it is an orthodox idea. But in saying “ingenerate” I acknowledge that the Father is indeed ingenerate and do not deny that the Son is generate, although I do say that he is not created. Nor, if I declare that the Son is generate, can I deny that he has his being from God the Father. For the Father begot him by an act of generation, and did not create him.

29,3 For as you purposely pervert yourself—it can’t be anything else—by thinking all crosswise about the “Generate and Ingenerate,” you yourself must hear the words, “The thoughts of man are inclined to evil continually from his youth,”<sup>91</sup> with regard to human arguments, contradictory syllogisms and worthless human thought. (4) < But > I shall say for my part that, far sooner, it is inappropriate for the uncreated God to create creatures, and for the unmade God to make them. For if, as Aetius says, it is not proper that the ingenerate God beget, then it is inadmissible that the uncreated God create, and that the God who has not been made, make the things which are to be. (5) But since created things, and the greater part of their existing visible substance, are there to see, but do not befit the uncreated God < in the sense of > being his creatures, it will be desirable, in the end, that there be one uncreated God, and another who is created and, correspondingly, able to create. Otherwise the Incomparable will be cited for the change of created things, and, instead of what Aetius thinks of as suitable, will be regarded as unsuitable. (6) However, since the created God with the < power > to create is not self-generating but was created, another God will be required to be his creator, and another will therefore be invented. And there will be much idle talk about abysmal

error, for our intellects will no longer be sound, but will be instances of the saying, "The servants of God were made fools, and from knowledge, every man was made foolish."<sup>92</sup>

29,7 For no one "liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."<sup>93</sup> Nor will one learn to know anything but God, who has revealed his true faith to us < and said >, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him"<sup>94</sup>—and his Begotten, who has revealed his Father to us and said, "I came forth from the Father, and am come."<sup>95</sup> (8) And God did not get his incomparability from a human name, nor will the rank of the true, subsistent divine Word, begotten of the Father without beginning < and > co-essentially, be impaired because of God's incomparability. For neither of them is indebted to human inventions for the names. (9) The Godhead receives no new rank, and no addition. The Godhead itself, of its fullness, provides for all—a fullness ever the same and never lessened, but ever bearing in its own essence the rank of its name, power and essence.

30,1 13. *If ingeneracy is only something external observers observe to be God's, the observers are better than the One observed, for they have given him a name which is better than his nature.*

30,2 *Refutation.* True it is that no one is better than God—say I to Aetius, the inventor of all this. How can anyone be better than God, when all things have received their being from God? (3) But since God is the cause of his creatures, rational and non-rational, visible and invisible, he himself is better than all, even if his rational creatures are of a mind right as to orthodoxy, so as to give partial, [not full], honor to That which is better than they. (If everything put together, and innumerable more, which has been thought to apply to God's praise, could compass the fullness of his glory, the Better < Being > would always be beyond the conception of its inferiors—even if they reach out with all their might, and beyond their might, towards the ascription of praise to their Better. For he is "better," not [merely] in word, but in power, name and word.)

30,4 But the praise of the Better by the inferiors will not distinguish between Incomparable and Incomparable. It knows the superiority through ingeneracy that is inherent in the Father, and the superiority that has been begotten of him. (5) Therefore the right mind God has granted men confesses < the > homouousion. [It confesses this] to avoid inventing

the unlikeness of the Son to the Father, and so dividing the superior, pure Perfection of Him through whom it knows [the Son] to have been truly begotten in an incomparable manner by his Begetter who, because of his superiority, is beyond any conception.

31,1 14. *If ingeneracy is not susceptible of generation, this is what we maintain. But if it is susceptible of generation, the sufferings of generation must be superior to the real nature of God.*

31,2 *Refutation.* To speak of any sufferings in God at all is the height of impiety. The Godhead is entirely immune to suffering, and very far above anything that occurs in our conflicting notions, < and > Aetius' argument will be completely defeated. For whatever takes place in us accompanied by suffering, exists in God without suffering. (3) For in us, willing is partly suffering—I do not mean the will to be godly, but the will to do something beyond our nature, because we cannot do what our will would like—say a man's will to fly, soar in the air, view the veins of the abyss, know the depths of the earth, and things of this sort.

But whatever in me involves suffering, is in existence without suffering in God. (4) For this reason God can do all he wills; for his nature does not conflict with his will, while our nature conflicts with as many desires as we have to reach out towards the impossible.

31,5 And because I have said that God does what he will, let no one by any means say that he does the unsuitable. Not at all! God wills those things that he does, proportionately to his rank, with his will not in conflict with his capability, or his capability contrary to his will. But < God does not do the unsuitable\* >, not because he cannot, but because he will not.

31,6 And otherwise. But come to think of it, after this freedom from suffering that exists in God, and after < the nature > in us and in other creatures that is subject to suffering, we must admit that there is, in fact, still another "suffering"; and after the second kind, a third kind can also be distinguished. (7) We beget and are begotten with suffering, since our nature, and that of the other creatures which are begotten and beget, can be divided and drained, can expand and contract, can be burdened and lightened, and all the other things which are subject to suffering for such a reason.

But none of these were in God in his begetting of the Son. (8) If there were one such thing in God—in accordance with < the > doctrine which serves < them > as an excuse for repudiating the "Offspring"—I must reply to them, as the representative of the other side, that there is a second suffering, suffering in creating, and that we suffer in begetting and being begotten. (9) God, however, whom you conceive of as a creator and not

a begetter and whom, as an argument against us, you accuse of suffering in begetting, in order to deny the legitimacy of the Son but consign suffering in creation to oblivion—(but this is not a form of suffering in God, heaven forbid! < God is entirely impassible\* >. (10) We neither attribute suffering to God by the confession that he is the creator of all, nor, again, do we conceive of < another kind of > suffering in connection with him by confessing that he has begotten the true Son, truly without beginning and not in time.)

We therefore know that his nature is incomprehensible and not subject to suffering. (11) Hence we confess him both as impassible begetter and as impassible creator. For he begot the Only-begotten without suffering, sent the Holy Spirit forth from himself without being divided, and created what has been and is being created without being afflicted by ills or suffering. And he does what he will, in keeping with his Godhead, without reflecting first in order to determine by consideration whether the thing to be done ought to be done or willing to do a thing and, because of suffering, lacking the power to gratify will with performance. (12) He possesses at once will, deed, the begetting of the Only-begotten, and the creation of all things, for the divine nature and rank is far beyond the conception of Aetius' logic, and the logic of all humanity. God is superior to all invention, and gives way to no suffering but is far beyond all sufferings and any conception.

32,1 15. *If the Offspring is unchangeable by nature because of its Begetter, then the Ingenerate is an unchangeable essence, not because of his will, but because of its essential rank.*

32,2 *Refutation.* How long has this man been coming to me with the same thing to say, and never going beyond its content? From beginning to end he has described exactly the same things, and nothing else, about the same things. He has revealed no mysteries to me, (3) and has not taught me God as he professes to; nor faith, working with which the apostles, with a sound confession of the truth, raised the dead, cleansed lepers and < performed > all the other acts of good concord, by which they gave examples of the real working [of miracles]. Instead he expounds useless, boastful syllogisms which do not go beyond their repetition, but are just that and nothing else. Please, then, none of you readers blame me if I attack the same points myself, since I am obliged to reply to his repetition.

32,4 For the Offspring is unchangeable as it befits Godhead to be, and the Begetter is unchangeable as, correspondingly, it befits his unchangeable nature that he be. The Begetter continues forever to have the Son he has begotten, and allows his creatures no expectation of knowing the Father without the Son, and of ever knowing the Begotten without the

Father, and his perfect Spirit who proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son. (5) And this befits the rank of God's essence—not to need any additional rank but to have it eternally in its proper identity.

33,1 16. *If "ingeneracy" is indicative of essence, it may properly be contrasted with the essence of the Offspring. But if "ingeneracy" means nothing, all the more must "Offspring" mean nothing.*

*But how < could > nothing be contrasted with nothing? If the expression, "ingenerate," is contrasted with the expression, "generate" but silence succeeds the expression, the hope of Christians may well begin and end [there] since it rests in a particular expression, not in natures which are such as the meaning of their names implies.*

33,2 *Refutation.* After learning to stupefy the minds of the simple, why do these people love to anticipate the points against themselves! Aetius, who has his hope merely in an expression and not in truth, has impudently come forward to pin it on me, although it does not embarrass him to confess that the Son of God and God the Father < differ > in a mere word. And yet I, of all people, confess that the Father is real, the Son is real, and the Holy Spirit is real; for nothing else can be compared with the Trinity.

33,3 And therefore the homoousion is truly the stay of my confession, and not as an expression that can be canceled by use and disuse, like Aetius' opinion of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. (4) There is actually a true Father, and actually a true Son and Holy Spirit, however many worthless syllogisms Aetius sows broadcast. As the sacred scripture says of such people, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise,"<sup>96</sup> and, "The Lord knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are vain,"<sup>97</sup> and so on.

34,1 17. *If the term, "ingenerate," as against the term, "offspring" contributes nothing toward superiority of essence, the Son, who is [therefore] surpassed only verbally, will know that those who have termed him "Son" are his betters, not He who is termed his "God and Father."*

34,2 *Refutation.* No matter how much play-acting Aetius does for me, no pious reason can allow that those who have received being from Him Who Is are better < than the Son >. For he himself agrees that they have been made through him. (3) For those who have been vouchsafed his kindness, < and > are privileged to be called Christians because they truly know him and have been taught, not by flesh and blood but by the Father,

and who are therefore rightly called blessed—like him (i.e., Peter) who recognized the Son of God, with the addition of “living”<sup>98</sup> [to “God”]—have not learned to call him “Offspring,” as a verbal expression, but as a “true Son begotten of a true Father.” Nor are they spiritually discerned, < as > He who is spirit and only-begotten < discerns > the soulish Aetius as incapable of receiving the things of the Spirit.

34,4 < For\* > even though he says, “I go unto my Father and your Father, unto my God and your God,”<sup>99</sup> < the Son remains above the beings which have been created through him\* >. (5) Neither of these names can be equated with names of other sorts; the truth abides forever, and each order which is needed in the Son of God truly teaches it clearly. (6) For “my Father and your Father” cannot apply to them in the fleshly sense; how can God, who did not assume flesh, be the Father of flesh? And “my God and your God” cannot apply to the Son’s divine nature and the disciples’ adoption as sons. (7) With < the words >, “my God and your God,” he who tells the truth in all things for our < salvation > was mysteriously assuring the disciples of his human nature. When he said, “my God and your God,” he < meant God’s natural > relationship to him by the “my”—and at the same time his relationship to us “which, in my kindness,” < he says >, “I allowed you to make your own by my coming,” as the scripture says, “He gave them power to become sons of God.”<sup>100</sup>

34,8 Thus he himself took the form of a servant when he came among them, and partook of something recent in latter days (i.e., Christ’s human nature), though what was ancient (i.e., Christ’s divine nature) remained as it was and did not change in order to be mixed [with anything new]. The sons of men were changed to incorruption by participation in God, but not united with him in co-essentiality; and he who took the form of a servant indicated his recency by the word, “took,” but did not undergo a change, as is shown by “being in the form of God.”<sup>101</sup> (9) Since these things are so, and are wisely confessed, with full knowledge, by those whom God has taught, neither “my God and your God” nor “my Father and your Father” will express any difference from the rightful common possession of the pure divine essence, < or > from the transcendence of the Father’s union with the Son, and the Son’s, and likewise the Holy Spirit’s, with the Father.

35,1 18. *If the ingenerate essence is superior, and innately superior, it is ingenerate essence per se. For it is not superior to generation deliberately because it so wills, but because this is its nature. Since ingenerate nature per se is God, it allows no reasoning to think of generation in connection with it, and resists all examination and reasoning on the part of generate beings.*

35,2 *Refutation.* Aetius has involved me with the same bothers and, as I said, got me to repeat myself even frequently, because of his repetition, from beginning to end, of the same remarks about the same things. (3) The faith which saves every faithful person has never consisted of the speculation of human reasoning; human ideas are fallible, and cannot attain to the boundlessness of the essence of God. (4) Indeed, the whole of our salvation, the life-giving mystery of Christ, is “to the Jews a stumbling block, to Greeks foolishness. But to us who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men.”<sup>102</sup>

35,5 Well then, wouldn't one class Aetius with the Jews because of the stumbling block of his syllogisms, but < regard > him as Greek because, in his own would-be wisdom, he considers God's truth foolishness? (6) For though the creator and artificer of all < is > one and is greater than all creation and handiwork, this does not mean that, because he is greater than his creatures, he does not make and create his creatures; he is not envious of his own goodness. For he is possessed of absolute goodness in his own right, and this is greater than all. He is not the victim of emotions, and it was not from envy or jealousy that he made what is out of what is not.

35,7 For he did not intend the things which he made, but which are inferior to his incomparable Godhead, to his own disadvantage, < making\* > his creatures < to his own harm\* >. He made them for his glory to manifest his own generous Godhead, for he is absolute goodness and self-existence<sup>103</sup> and imparts being to all the beings he has created from non-being because he wills them—each creature in proportion—to share the gift of each thing. (8) To the luminaries he has granted light, to the sky the beauties of orderly arrangement, and portions of excellence to the earth and the rest, in accordance with his will. And on the angels themselves, and on other holy hosts, he has bestowed the gift of immortality; and on man he has bestowed the dignity of his image, and the gracious gift of life, knowledge

and rationality. (9) And it was not only after hesitation, as one might say, that this came to him, by consent, or after a wait or a change of mind or on reflection, but of his absolute goodness. For his nature, in his absolute goodness, is to have, to make, and to complete all things in a way that is becoming to himself.

35,10 Thus, as God procured nothing unbecoming his goodness < in > this, but glory and the knowledge of an awesome bounty, so there is no additional glory for his Godhead when he becomes known and perceived by his creatures. (11) The Godhead is never in need of an addition of glory. < It is > absolute glory, absolute excellence, absolute wonder and absolute praise, because the Father begot a Son though he himself was not begotten, < and the Son was begotten > to be with the Father as an eternal Well-spring of an everlasting Well-spring—stemming from him as Well-spring of Well-spring, God of God and light of light, with no beginning, not in time, but truly having a Father, while at the same time the Father truly has a Son not unbecoming to his Father, and without prejudice to the Father's incomparability. (12) For he is not a physical contraction but a subsistent Word, a Son of a Father, spirit of spirit and God of God. He excludes every speculation of logic, but is for the salvation of the faithful and of all that are made, through him and by him, by the Father, and who believe and know, and do not regard the power of God as foolishness—and do not regard the wisdom of God as foolishness, since it transcends all examination and all reasoning, particularly mortal men's, as Aetius himself has unwillingly admitted.

36,1 19. *If "ingenerate," when applied to God, connotes privation but "ingenerate" must be nothing, what reasoning can take away nothing from a non-existent thing? But if it means something that is, who can separate God from being, that is, separate him from himself?*

36,2 *Refutation.* Aetius tells me the things the pagan controversialists say about "privation" as though he were discussing this with reference to the knowledge of God and < for a profitable purpose >, but without knowing, to start with, the cases in which "privation" is understood by the pagans. (3) Dialectic does not agree that "privation" can be spoken of with regard to everything, but only with regard to those things which possess something by nature. For, [Aetius to the] contrary, one speaks of "privation" < in the cases of > things which admit of the cessation the things they have by nature; one does not say it of things which do not.

36,4 Thus one cannot say "blind" of a stone. A person who is sighted by nature and then loses his sight, is called blind. But surely if a bird, a

man, or < any > beast whose nature is to see—when it is deprived of sight, it is called “blind” in the sense of a privation. (5) Similarly we cannot say “even-tempered” of < a stone >, or “harmless” or “ungrudging;” this is not a stone’s nature. But of a man, or a beast with an irritable nature, one would speak of privation when it is not angry—but never in the case of things which cannot be angry.

36,6 I must apply this to God too, as though I were directing the argument at Aetius and cross-examining him. “Tell me, Aetius, do you know that God cannot be compared with all the things that are not of the same essence as his? Or would you even dare to count him as one of them all? (7) And if you would count him < with > all the things that are not of his essence, but which he has made from nothing through the Son who is begotten of his essence—[with all things, that is], with the sole exception of him (i.e., the Son) and the Holy Spirit, who is of the essence of the incomparable Father and his only-begotten Son—[if that is what you think of him], your confession of faith must be absurd in the extreme. (8) How can He by whom all things have been made from nothing, still be one of all things? This is impossible, and not even you would say it.

“But since he cannot possibly be like, or the same as, the beings which were made by him from nothing, he cannot possibly suffer like the beings which are unlike him—for whose emergence from non-being he is responsible, and all of whose qualities result from the privation of their opposites. (9) For some of them are sighted, not of themselves—for they do not have being of themselves, but by the generous grace of its Giver—and suffering may < be caused > in these by the privation of things which they had by the gift of the Giver. He, [meanwhile], is impassible and has his being from no one, and cannot be deprived, < like > the creatures which are made from nothing.

36,10 “Thus, if neither the Son, the Father nor the Holy Spirit is the same as they, but the Son is different from them and is not called by the same name, but has a special, incomparable name because < he is > absolute good and the Son of Absolute Good—[if all this is so], what can he have to do with privation < when\* > there are < no\* > opposites in < his nature\* >?” (11) There is no need for Aetius’ argument to tell me about privation, for it is not by the privation which is characteristic of creatures that the ingenerate God and his generate Son have their superior rank, but because of its natural and special appropriateness in itself to their being and Godhead.

So with God’s freedom from anger. This is not because he is < not > angry, but because he is absolute freedom from anger. And the reason he

is “ingenerate” is his absolute < in >generacy, even if the Son is generated from the Ingenerate. For talk of privation in the sense intended by the person suggesting [it] has no relevance to Him who is not comparable to the other beings. (12) For neither can the others be equated with the Generate, nor does the Ingenerate impart co-essentiality [with himself] to creatures. This is not because impossibility is an attribute of the Mighty [God], but because, due to the unique nature of the one God, and his only-begotten Son with the Holy Spirit, impossibilities do not apply to the Mighty [God].

37,1 20. *If the “privations” of states are the removals of them, “ingenerate” as applied to God is either the privation of a state, or a state of privation. But if “ingenerate” is the privation of a state, how can something God does not have be counted as one of his attributes? If “ingenerate” is a state, however, a generate essence must be assumed to precede it, so that it may acquire [a new] state and be called “ingenerate.” If, however, the generate essence partook of an ingenerate essence [to begin with], it has been deprived of its generation by sustaining the loss of a state.*

*Generacy must then be an essence but ingeneracy a state. But if “offspring” implies a coming to be it is plain that the word means a state, whether the Offspring is made out of some essence, or whether it is what it is called, an “Offspring.”*

37,2 *Refutation.* By already fighting fiercely, on the subject of privation, on the side of those who are strange to the faith, Aetius too has armed himself against the faith with the same weapons as they. But he says nothing that is based on the faith, and has not remembered what was said to those who say foolish things of their own invention and do not hold the Head of the faith—as the word says in refutation of them, “I said in my astonishment, All men are liars,”<sup>104</sup> after “I am deeply humbled.”<sup>105</sup>

37,3 Now, however, he again spends his time on the same things, and cites the rubbish of the terms, “privation” and “state,” and the reasonings of shaky human speculation. And though he is spiritually discerned he takes no trouble to restrain the special onslaught of an < idea which stems > from human villainy, because of which he < undertakes > to say what he pleases about God. (4) Moreover, he once more obliges me to dwell on the same things myself although I have discussed the topic of

privation at length, and to spend my time in refutations of him. And the previous refutation should be enough since, being equally weighty and the same as his syllogistic argument, it can be used against each one.

37,5 But we must not leave a hard-mouthed horse unbridled, whether it is galloping toward a ditch or has already been checked in its career. Nor may we give way to a man who is saying the same things against the faith, and not reply to him. So I shall speak again < to the question of > (6) “If the privations of states are the removals of them, ‘ingeneracy,’ as applied to God is either the privation of a state or a state of privation” and, “If it is the privation of a state, how can something God does not have be counted as one of his attributes?”

37,7 And if < you pretend > to think of God in this way or that way, Aetius, and guess at “states” with regard to God, you will be deprived of your mind. No matter how many ideas about God enter your head to be stored away there—except just to believe him, marvel at him, and glorify him with all your heart!—you will be exposed as unable to out-argue God, his Son or his Holy Spirit, so that God will convict you, and you will be made a liar, as the scripture says. (8) There are states, wants and shaky ideas in us, since that is our nature and essence. But we can also speak of the nature and essence of God; and because we hear of God’s nature and ours, and God’s essence and ours, this does not mean that we are to compare the incomparable God with our nature. (9) And so with all that you say about God, Aetius. The Godhead is *per se* transcendent, incomparable, perfect in itself, with no need of anything; for it is absolute perception and absolute will.

37,10 Thus God has not been deprived of his < own > essence by incomparably begetting an incomparable only-begotten Son, nor < has he deprived the Offspring >, whom he has begotten of him as the only Offspring of an only Father, of his rank—nor the Holy Spirit. For the Offspring has no equality of nature, rank, or anything else with other beings. (11) God has not deprived himself of his incomparable Godhead in state or essence. Nor, as I said, has his Offspring been deprived of his Father’s rank and his equality with the Father, (12) since it, like his Holy Spirit, cannot be compared with anything at all.

In fact, it is a perfect Trinity: the Father perfect, the Son perfect, the Holy Spirit perfect. It is not an identity and does not differ from itself or have any subordination. (13) Otherwise what had been distinguished would remove the Offspring’s incomparability, and what had been altered would cause a deprivation of [its] being, for it would either be called [an Offspring] in appearance and not in truth, or else it would be named by

a mere word in passing, and not really exist. At any rate, this is the way your idea is meant, Aetius, for it tries to exclude him from the definition of faith, (14) "He that cometh unto God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him."<sup>106</sup> And this cannot apply to the Father alone, "for he that hath not the Son hath not the Father;"<sup>107</sup> and if one speaks of the Son, he cannot do so "without the Holy Spirit."<sup>108</sup>

37,<sup>15</sup> For the Father is truly "true God,"<sup>109</sup> as the Son, who knows the Father, testifies. And the Son, who is known and witnessed to by the Father, is "true light."<sup>110</sup> And the Spirit, who is not different [from God] but proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son, is the "Spirit of truth."<sup>111</sup> (16) But these truths put an end to all the syllogistic story-telling of your words, Aetius, and I cannot be told to become a disciple of your master Aristotle, and abandon < the teaching > of the fishermen who, though "< un > learned and ignorant men,"<sup>112</sup> were enlightened in the Spirit of God, and by God's power were heralds of the truth as it was vouchsafed them. For the kingdom of heaven is not in syllogistic speech and boastful talk, but in power and truth. (17) Indeed I have heard enough, from the beginning, of your argument about the privation of states and accidents, and that generate essence does and doesn't assume ingeneracy, and that it sustains the loss of a state with a state, and the involvement of generate essence with a state which is, however, ingenerate; and the passing mention of an "offspring," though this means "only in the state [of being an offspring]" and, because it has been remodeled from some essence or other, indicate < s > a state, even though, as you have said, it is called an offspring. (18) For your sick fancy says < the > same things on the same subjects, and never utters the last of its repetitions.

38,<sup>1</sup> 21. *If "ingeneracy" is a state and "generacy" is a state, the essences are prior to the states; but even though the states are secondary to the essences, they are more important.*

*Now if ingeneracy is the cause of generacy and means that there is an offspring which implies the cause of its own being, "offspring" denotes an essence, not a state. < On the other hand >, since ingeneracy implies nothing besides itself, how can the ingenerate nature be not an essence, but a state?*

38,2 *Refutation*. As you see, friends of the truth, Aetius is once more attempting to form an argument that distinguishes states in God, and states after God. And he puts some of them first, and others second. (3) But it is not right to assume firsts of God, or speak of seconds. God has all things at once and needs no additions. This is why pious reason does not allow the Offspring to be conceived of as born at some time. (4) < Nothing new\* > co-exists with God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—that is, with the Trinity that *Is*. And so the God Who *Is*, is called the Father Who *Is*, and the Son Who *Is* is with Him Who *Is*, begotten without beginning and not in time. As the scripture says, “With thee *is* the well of life,” and, “in thy light shall we see light”;<sup>113</sup> and “he who *is* in the bosom of the Father”;<sup>114</sup> and “In the beginning *was* the Word, and the Word *was* God.”<sup>115</sup> And it says likewise of the Holy Spirit, “My Spirit *is* in the midst of you.”<sup>116</sup> (5) And you see that there is nothing new in the Trinity. Therefore there is neither essence before state, nor state before essence.

38,6 And even if you make us say “state” of God, Aetius, we do not mean the precarious states, subject to change, which are in all the things that have non-essential states; and we do not mean anything in God that is more honorable [than He], or of later origin [than He]. We mean everything that, for his glory, is suitable to his rank; one glory and one honor to the one Godhead, “that they may honor the Son as they honor the Father,”<sup>117</sup> (7) and not blaspheme the Holy Spirit—because of the threat that does not forgive their sin either here or in the world to come. Nothing different [from this] can fitly be understood, worshiped or glorified in connection with the Trinity. We speak of, and truly glorify a Father in the Father, a Son in the Son, and a < Holy Spirit > in the Holy Spirit, just as the true faith fitly < requires > that we accord worshipful reverence to the one Trinity, and know its rank. (8) And the Ingenerate does not need the Generate to contribute to its essence, making the Generate the cause of its essence < because > Generate denotes < an essence >. And the essence of the Begotten neither is, nor is called, a state of the Unbegotten.

38,9 For the Trinity is in need of nothing and receives no increment. Though the Trinity was always itself and no creature, this does not mean that it was by random chance, or for the honor of an additional title or an increase in dignity, that the Father thought of creating heaven, earth

and all things visible and invisible through the Son, and stablishing the whole host of those very creatures of his by his Spirit—to gain the additional tribute of being called Creator and Artificer from the creation of the creatures and the making of creation, < and > of being perceived as Father besides, by the Son through whom and by whom the creatures had been made, and by the Holy Spirit in whom what was stablished had been stablished. (10) For God did not make his handiwork because he was changed from state to state and altered in his nature and essence, < or > as though by reflection and a changeable < mind >. He had eternal creativity and perfection in himself and needs no increment of glory. (11) And as no creature may conceive of an additional state in God and suppose that this is required by God's dignity, essence and glory, so Aetius, who wants to out-argue God about "ingenerate," "generate," and his argument about God's state and essence, will be stopped short. For it is agreed that all created things genuinely exist, and have not been contrived as an addition of glory to a God who needs none—just as we may not say that the Only-begotten and his Holy Spirit are the same as God's creatures, for this is not acceptable.

38,12 But since Aetius, with his chatter about high things and his impudent reaching towards the heavens, has come to me with syllogisms but draws his analogies from the creatures below, it will be found that he himself < has accomplished\* > nothing < worthwhile\* > with his logical arguments. For the wisdom of men passes away, and men's syllogisms are buried [with them]; "His spirit shall come forth and turn him to his dust."<sup>118</sup> (13) For all human argumentations are transitory and humankind will pass away, together with the artful reasoning about the faith of Aetius < and persons like himself >. But as the scripture says, the faith, hope and the love which he has despised<sup>119</sup> abide.

39,1 22. *If every essence is ingenerate like Almighty God's, how can one say that one essence is subject to vicissitudes while another is not? But if the one essence remains above quantity and quality and, in a word, all sorts of change because of its classification as ingenerate, while the other is subject to vicissitudes < and yet > is admitted to have something unchangeable in its essence, we ought to attribute the characteristics of these essences to chance,*

*or, as is at any rate logical, call the active essence ingenerate but the essence which is changed, generate.*

39,2 *Refutation.* I deny that every being is unbegotten,<sup>120</sup> or that every being is begotten of God. The God who has begotten the Son who has been begotten of him, and who has sent his Holy Spirit forth from himself, did not beget all beings. He begot One, who is therefore only-begotten; and he sent one Spirit forth from himself, who is therefore a *Holy* Spirit. But he created all beings through the One, and stablished them in the One, and some of them beget after their creation and are begotten, while some have been created, but neither beget nor are begotten.

39,3 But the uncreated being of the Trinity is far different from the beings that have been created, and not begotten, by the Trinity. (4) And so the Trinity is impassible and changeless, but all things after the Trinity < are > subject to suffering—unless the Impassible should grant impassibility by virtue of immortality, granting this as a generous gift to whom it will. They, however, do not have impassibility by virtue of an incorporeal nature, but by the generosity of the good and impassible God.

39,5 For not even the Only-begotten procures suffering in the flesh for his Godhead—although it is believed, by a true confession that stems from the true faith, that he suffered in the flesh although he was the impassible divine Word. But in his impassibility he remained the same, with no change or alteration of nature. (6) Therefore, since he was wisdom and impassible God, and knew that by suffering he would save those who are subject to the pain of death, he did not send “a messenger or an angel,”<sup>121</sup> or < anyone > further like the prophets before him, but came himself as Lord, assumed passibility and truly suffered, though his divine nature remained impassible.

39,7 For the incarnation did not weaken the power of his Godhead. We find him in his Godhead doing the works of God, and not prevented by flesh. He rebukes the wind, storm and sea, calls Lazarus by his sovereign authority, and does innumerable other things and more. (8) But he also allowed the flesh such things as were suitable—allowed the devil to tempt him, for example, men to strike him, the authorities to arrest him—so that the Impassible would suffer in his passible nature, but remain impassible in his proper Godhead. (9) For he is not different from the impassible God, but does all things willingly in accordance with his

awesome mystery—just as the Father contains all things, who is God with the Only-begotten himself and his Holy Spirit, one forever perfect Trinity and one impassible Godhead. He is one God and one sovereignty, for the same God contains all.

39,<sup>10</sup> And his containing of all things does not make him passible, although the things he contains are subject to suffering. For God is within all and without all, not mingled with any. (11) And though God is everywhere, is without all things and contains all things, and all things are moved within him, they will not bring suffering on the impassible God—just as, < though > he has begotten the Only-begotten, or < because > the Only-begotten has been begotten, or though God's Holy Spirit has been sent forth, this will not bring suffering on the Holy Trinity. (12) For neither is the Holy Spirit passible, even though he descended to the Jordan in the form of a dove. Nor is the Only-begotten passible, even though he was baptized and touched by John; nor the Father, even though he cried from heaven in a voice audible to men, "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him."<sup>122</sup> (13) The Son, then, is immutable. And the Father is unbegotten, while the Son is begotten < but > impassible. And the Holy Spirit, who came forth, is also < impassible >. But all other things are creatures. The Holy Trinity, < however >, retains its quantity and uncreated name, with no change in the Supreme Being and no liability to suffering on the part of the Begotten, for neither does the Begetter suffer.

For the Offspring is not corporeal, but spirit [begotten] of spirit and Son of Father. (14) And the Spirit is likewise "of him," Spirit of the Father, Spirit of Christ, not created, not begotten, not their kinsman, not their ancestor, not their scion. For the incomparable being of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit surpasses all conception and all understanding, to speak not only of men, but of angels. (15) Neither the Only-begotten, nor his Father, nor his Holy Spirit underwent any change because the Only-begotten suffered in the flesh despite his impassibility, his Holy Spirit < descended > in the form of a dove, and the Father impassibly uttered a cry from heaven in the hearing of men. (16) Just so the angels when they were created, and the heavens, the earth and all things, underwent no change and suffering at the hands of their maker. The whole is an awesome mystery as the scripture says, "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God!"<sup>123</sup>

40,1 23. *If the ingenerate nature is the cause of the nature that has come to be, and yet “ingenerate” is nothing, how can nothing be the cause of a thing that has come to be?*

40,2 *Refutation.* The ingenerate nature has a < causal > relationship in a different sense—not in the sense in which it is causally related to all things—to its only-begotten Offspring and the Holy Spirit who proceeds from it. But it is not causally related to them in the way in which that which exists is causally related to that which does not. For the Begotten is not begotten of nothing, and neither the Begetter nor the Holy Spirit who proceeds from him are non-existents—on the contrary, the Existent is the cause of the rest. (3) Therefore the holy Trinity co-exists in its own eternal glory, forever in an existence proportionate to each name for its rank. For the things which have been made from nothing, have been made by the Trinity, and not by anything external to it.

Therefore not even the Father is the cause of created things by himself, but the Father, Son and Holy Spirit made all things. (4) If the Son were different [from the Father], as though he < had been made > from nothing by a cause, he would have come forth along with everything else, and would himself have been the same < as they >. And God would have not been the cause by generation of the Son who had been brought forth, but would have been his cause by creation. And it could not be admissible that the one be called an offspring and the others creatures, but all should be called offspring along with him, or he should be called a creature like all the rest. And nothing would be exceptional (5) since, in that they were created from nothing, the One would be equivalent to all. I should say that not just angels would be equal to their maker and only-begotten creator, but men and cattle, and everything else that is infinitely inferior to his nature and rank.

40,6 < However >, He Who Is < forever > co-exists with Him Who Is Truly Begotten of him, though not in time—not [made] from nothing, but [begotten] of him. (7) And his Holy Spirit, which is in being, does not differ from his essence, and is not provided to God as though for his assistance, which is what Aetius says.

41,1 24. *If “ingenerate” is a privation but a privation is the loss of a state, and if a “loss” is completely destroyed or changed to something else, how can the essence of God be named after a changing or vanishing state by the title of “ingenerate?”*

41,2 *Refutation.* If the opinion of God which is to be derived from your syllogisms has been provided for God's glory only in your time—as your words above suggest—I too shall direct the same sort of remarks

to you with God's permission, and address you myself. For since none of the ancient apostles or prophets in the Old and New Testaments held this opinion, you are asserting your superiority to God himself, and your unshakeability. (3) According to what you say, only in your time did the Godhead acquire this syllogistic subtlety of yours for its creed—this speaking about the privation of the ingenerate and generate, about the complete loss of a state and its change, and the naming of God with a word for the divine essence.

41,4 Since God is the creator of all things after his Only-begotten and Holy Spirit, there cannot be any privation of things which are not his attributes. Nor has the affirmation of attributes been acquired, so that his later creations add something better to God, and his purity can be conceived of through its ability to be deprived of that in favor of this as well as through its changelessness. (5) The Godhead, however, is forever the same, and though it is wholly glory, and wholly incomprehensible by all its creatures, it is glorified by all, in accordance with the capacity of those who exert themselves in its praise. By the angels it is glorified in the tongue of angels, which the apostle declares to be preferable to men's. < But by men > it is glorified in the tongue of men, which is of an inferior capacity; < by the other creatures\* >, in accordance with their still more inferior ability. (6) And God's glory has by no means been lessened or changed because God < is glorified > in each creature proportionately to < its ability >. It is unchangeable in itself, while all creation, in addition to its endless exertion of itself in praise, suffers deprivation; but the Supreme Being forever surpasses all understanding, and is neither changed, altered nor improved by the things everyone says are permitted to it. For the same Godhead is superior, incomparable and glorified.

42,4 If you worship the Father only in name, you have given him the honor deceitfully. And if you worship the Son while recognizing that he is unlike the Father, you have introduced confusion into the worship by honoring unlike equally with unlike. (5) If, however, you deny the Son worship from the prejudice of your unbelief, you will be reproved by all for failing to recognize Him who is rightly worshiped by all, and who is equal [to the Father]. "For all the angels of God shall worship him,"<sup>124</sup> and Mary and all his disciples worshiped him when he had risen gloriously in the flesh. (6) For they knew that he does not have the title of "born" or "created" < but > is begotten of the Father; and they worship him as the

real God [begotten of] the real God, and worship the Holy Spirit, who is of him.

42,7 For they know that he differs in essence from creatures; he is not born or created, but begotten of the Father. And so, Aetius, after laboring over everything, spending a great deal of time, and introducing strange terms, < in the end you too\* > will worship him.<sup>125</sup> (8) “For we must all stand before the judgment seat,”<sup>126</sup> and “every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord”—Jesus Christ, who is not different from God but “to the glory of God the Father,”<sup>127</sup> as scripture says and as we believe.

43,1 26. *If, as applied to God, “ingenerate” is a mere name, but the mere expression elevates the being of God over against all generate things, then the human expression is worth more than the being of the Almighty, since it is has embellished God the Almighty with incomparable superiority.*

43,2 *Refutation.* “Ingeneracy” is not a mere name when applied to God, and does not have any relationship of essence with created things. Thus “created things” is not a mere name either. But since another name in between “ingenerate” and “created” is needed, and this name is “Son”—< generate > and yet not created—which name shall we make the exception (i.e., exceptional in being a “mere” name, though the other two names represent reality)?

43,3 And if we grant that, [as Aetius says], created things are related [to the Son], then, since neither of the things we are mentioning (i.e., “creatures” and “Son”) is spoken of with a mere name, (4) mere naming is not allowable in the case of the Generate and Son, just as mere naming is not allowable in the case of the Ingenerate and Creator, and in the case of created things. Aetius’ senseless quibble will therefore show confusion in his reasoning, since, because created < nature > exists in reality and not < by > the mere naming of it, created beings cannot be equated with the name of “Son.” For the Son himself does not permit the naming of “Son” to be the naming of a mere name.

43,5 But since the non-existent is not real, and the Son is not called “only-begotten” as a mere name, he is united with the Father’s glory and is not to be mixed in with the category of creatures. (6) For the God-head has no need of elevation, as though it did not exist. Nor does it need exaltation, even though, by some ignorant people, it is not exalted. And

the being of the Godhead is not constituted by anyone's verbal locution. (7) No expression, of men or other creatures, can boast of winning glory as though for a God who needs it, or of embellishing God almighty, the God whom we worship, the God who is the master, creator and artificer of the expression. (8) For it does not suppose that it surpasses him in glory and is the beautifier of its own creator. Otherwise it would regard itself as worshipful, and certainly not worship Him who is to be worshiped. And your treatise, Aetius, starts a useless argument against all this to no purpose.

44,1 27. *If there is a cause to correspond with everything generate but the ingenerate nature has no cause, "ingenerate" does not denote a cause but means an entity.*

44,2 *Refutation.* Everything generate indeed has a cause, and I do not admit this as though I have learned it from you. The faith of the truth foresees, confesses at the outset, and teaches that God has no cause at all, and that he is uncompounded and entirely unequalled.

44,3 I myself, therefore, do not worship anything that is inferior to the essence of God himself, since it is proper to accord divine honor only to the Absolute—to the ingenerate Father, the Son [begotten] of him, and the Holy Spirit [who proceeds] from the Father and through the Only-begotten, since nothing in the Trinity is created and falls within the province of causation. (4) For nothing in the Trinity is made from nothing, like other things, which fall within the province of causation and have causes.

And so, since the Trinity is without such a cause, it has inerrantly taught that it alone can be worshiped; for it alone is without a cause. (5) But all other things must be categorized as caused. For they are things which have been made and created, while the Father is uncreated, and he has a Son who is begotten of him but not created, and a Holy Spirit who proceeds from him and yet is not his handiwork.

44,6 Since this is the case the Son, who is worshiped, has not inherited<sup>128</sup> the suffering of his cause even though, in the Father, he has a Begetter. And neither has the Holy Spirit. And other things, the creatures, cannot be the cause of any inheritance without suffering [themselves], since they are created by the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. (7) But the Only-begotten—and his Holy Spirit—can plainly be the cause of inheritance

without suffering [themselves], for the Son is not a creature but an offspring and, since he has been begotten, will not inherit the causation of suffering. Neither will the Holy Spirit, since he proceeds from the Father. (8) For neither can the Father be classed as one who suffers in causing things because he has begotten [the Son], has sent the Holy Spirit forth from himself, and has created all the rest after the Son and the Spirit—though surely, all other things suffer in creating and begetting. (9) Therefore the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are uncaused; but the Trinity is the cause of all things, for it creates and fashions them jointly, meanwhile knowing that nothing within it is created or fashioned.

45,1 28. *If whatever is made, is made by something, but ingenerate being is made neither by itself nor by something else, “ingenerate” must denote essence.*

45,2 *Refutation.* To appear to be the inventor of a dialectical argument Aetius has come at me with this too, as though he were telling me something new and unheard of. There is simply no need for him to prove this particular thing. It is not in dispute, < its\* > perennial < obviousness is not in contradiction\* > to the truth, and it is confessed in the catholic church. (3) For “< If > whatever is made, is made by something else, but ingenerate being is made neither by itself nor by something else, ‘ingenerate’ must denote an essence.” (4) What is more cogent than this? For Aetius has turned round and selected the term, “essence,” which < is > regularly < rejected > by the Anomoeans themselves and the Arians, since he is plainly compelled by the truth to acknowledge it.

45,5 Ingeneracy, then, is an essence, and has generated the Only-begotten without defilement and without suffering, not in time and without beginning, not from non-existence but from itself. It has also sent the Holy Spirit forth, from itself and not from non-being. Therefore the holy Trinity is plainly declared co-essential by the orthodox teaching in the catholic church. But no created thing can be so termed, since neither by nature nor in divine majesty is it like the Only-begotten and the Holy Spirit. (6) Such things are created from nothing and cannot be worshiped, but the Trinity is eternal—the Father a perfect Father, the Son a perfect Son begotten of the Father, and the Spirit a perfect Spirit, proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son. (7) And everything in the sacred scripture and the holy faith is crystal clear to us, and nothing is tortuous, contradictory or knotty.

46,1 29. *If the ingenerate being is implicitly indicated to be the cause of the Offspring’s existence and, in contrast with every [other] cause, is invariable, it is incomparable essence in itself [and] its matchlessness is not implied*

*for any reason external to itself but because, being ingenerate, it is incomparable and matchless in itself.*

46,2 *Refutation.* Aetius attacks the same points many times, as I myself have said many times, and merely burdens me and nothing more. In the present instance I have had to add to my burden and repeat the same points to the same people, since Aetius has seen fit to do this. (3) For if the ingenerate being that begot is implied by the being of < the > offspring, the Begetter will not differ in rank from the Begotten < because of > begetting him. For he begot him of himself as an essence—spirit of spirit, and not body of body. Therefore the Begetter is implied to be incomparably well suited to the Begotten, and the Begotten to the Begetter. (4) For the Godhead needs no increment, or it would be called Father at one time but not at another. And neither can the Son be found < released\* > from the heavenly bond (i.e., of the Trinity) by not being a Son at one time, but being a Son now. Thus God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is of the same essence and not of different essences.<sup>129</sup> (5) For God is neither a kinsman nor a late arrival, but < a co-essential\* Trinity >, with the name, “Father,” ineffably well suited to the Son who is co-essential with him; and his Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father through the Son and < receives > what is the Son’s, suitable to the Father and the Son.

46,6 Incomparability with all the creatures which are inferior to the Trinity and which have been created by the Trinity itself, is therefore characteristic of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. But the Trinity is not incomparable with itself, for it is uncreated, ingenerate and matchless. (7) Hence nothing can be equated with the Father, and nothing which has been made from non-existence and not begotten [by him] can be worshiped together with him. For he never said, “Sit thou on my right hand,”<sup>130</sup> to a creature. Nor, surely, did the Unbegotten say of any creature, “He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father,”<sup>131</sup> “I am in the Father and the Father in me,”<sup>132</sup> and, “No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and the Son save the Father, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.”<sup>133</sup> (8) But he reveals him through the Holy Spirit, who knows, teaches and

proclaims what is the Son's in the world "and searcheth all things, even the deep things of God."<sup>134</sup>

46,9 This is why Christ said, "He that honoreth not the Son as he honoreth the Father, the wrath of God abideth on him."<sup>135</sup> And he didn't say, "He that honoreth not angels as he honoreth the Father,"—or, in turn, "He that honoreth the Son as well (as the Father)"—but, "He that honoreth not the Son as he honoreth the Father." And to show that the incomparability and matchlessness of the Trinity is in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, he likewise said, "It shall not be forgiven him that blasphemeth the Spirit, neither here nor in the world to come."<sup>136</sup>

47,1 30. *If the Almighty surpasses every nature, he surpasses it because of his ingeneracy, and this is the very reason for the permanence of generate things. But if "ingenerate" does not denote an essence, how will the nature of the generate things be preserved?*

47,2 *Refutation.* It is fitting to state and confess, and so hold fast to the doctrine that the Almighty, from whom the only-begotten divine Word and his Holy Spirit have inexpressibly come forth to us, surpasses all nature. (3) And therefore we surely do not acknowledge a creature as God, or we would be made fools of. But we glorify the Trinity which surpasses every nature, the Son with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, because of its ingeneracy and uncreatedness. (4) For since the Only-begotten and the Holy Spirit are not of another nature but are God of God and light of light, the Only-begotten too will be called, "Almighty," together with the Almighty Father, as the sacred scripture plainly says. (5) For the Only-Begotten's rank is not different from the Father's, as the holy apostle expressly testifies in the Holy Spirit when he says of the children of Israel, "of whom are the worship and the covenant and whose are the fathers, of whom according to the flesh is Christ, God above all, blessed for evermore, Amen."<sup>137</sup>

47,6 Therefore the Only-begotten is also fit for worship and is God, the Holy Spirit is the divine Spirit, and there is no other God after the holy Trinity. (7) Instead the Father is almighty and so is his only-begotten Child, Jesus Christ, who is fit for the Father's rank and is called the Father of the world to come.<sup>138</sup> And he is also fit for his Holy Spirit, and the Trinity is forever manifest and known in its uncreatedness. (8) Because of this

Trinity there is causation in all created things, and this is indicative of the perfect and incomparable essence—Father in Son, Son in Father with the Holy Spirit—which has eternal permanence in itself. For created things owe their preservation to this Trinity.

48,1 31. *If no invisible thing preexists itself in germ, but each remains in the nature allotted to it, how can the Ingenerate God, who is free from any category, sometimes see his own essence in the Offspring as secondary but sometimes see it in ingeneracy as prior, on the principle of “first and second?”*

48,2 *Refutation.* Aetius should give me warning of his questions in advance and put them clearly—especially this expression < he introduces >, (i.e., “in germ”) which is reprehensible and in no way akin to his illustrations, since neither of the beings he has named can be equated with the other. For he has come to me with the names of many invisible beings.<sup>139</sup>

48,3 There are the spiritual invisible beasts, I mean the Seraphim and Cherubim, as well as angels, which are “spirits,”<sup>140</sup> and certain others of which it is true that nothing about them is “in germ.”

48,4 For no one would say that invisible things are bodies, for they neither beget nor are begotten. Plainly, they were created in accordance with the will of the everlasting Godhead. Each creature has been assigned whatever virtue He Who Is has allotted it in the excellence of his generous lovingkindness, and each has received its allotted portion and abides by it. (5) And God is independent of all cause, contains all things, and does not have his Son—or his Holy Spirit—with hesitation, or regretfully after a lapse of time.

He has a Son in a way that befits the eternal possession of a Son begotten—and only-begotten—with the Father always within him; and he also has the Holy Spirit who is of the Father and receives of the Son, and has him everlastingly.

48,6 For the abundance of the everlasting Godhead does not depend on a lack of glory or the addition of glory. But while no creature is everlasting, when did the Trinity see itself with its abundance lessened, and see this at one time, but at another time see itself with an increase of essence, as though it needed it—and at still another time see itself with a further increase of glory or abundance after the creation of its creatures? (7) And in sum, < the nonsense\* > of those who choose to bring forward and advance the speculations of human reasoning against the truth and

make them public, will do no harm. The rank of God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, surpasses all the understanding of angels and greater beings, let alone man's.

For human reasonings of are of no value, and men's thoughts are mortal because they skewer themselves on syllogisms and disputations. (8) Thus others have been condemned by their own arguments, and < have drawn inferences > from some quibbling speculation, some, about the origin of evil, others about the devil's origin or why he was made, others about God's purpose in creating man such that he would sin, others about God's reason for accusing man later after making him like that. (9) [All this] to learn, after ringing the changes on all their arguments, that they are mortal, and to ascribe majesty and knowledge to the < God who is glorified\* > in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, that is, to the one Trinity—(10) after asking and receiving the knowledge of the true faith from him—and not to try to overstep their bounds. Instead they will learn to desist from blind reasoning, and not talk cleverly with their wagging tongues and foolish arguments, but be circumspect at the wise command of the holy and divine scripture which says “not to think more highly than they ought to think, but to think soberly.”<sup>141</sup>

49,1 32. *If God retains an ingenerate nature, there can be no question of his knowing himself as [both] originated and unoriginated. If, on the other hand, we grant that his essence continues to be ingenerate and generate, he does not know his own essence, since his head is in a whirl from origination and non-origination. But if the Generate too partakes of ingenerate nature and yet remains without cessation in his generate nature, he knows himself in the nature in which he continues to remain, but plainly does not know his participation in ingeneracy; for he cannot possibly be aware of himself as both of ingenerate and generate essence.*

*If, however, the Generate is contemptible because of its proneness to change, then unchangeable essence is a natural rank, since the essence of the Ingenerate admittedly transcends every cause.*

49,2 *Refutation.* There is no doubt that God retains an ingenerate nature since he has created and made all things from nothing—the Father < who > begot from himself a Son who is co-essential with him and fit for his eternity, and [produced] the Holy Spirit who came forth from him with the suitability for co-essentiality with him. (3) And although the Trinity created all things, visible and invisible, from nothing, this does not mean that that which corresponds with God's rank, the eternity of

Him Who Is, is denied by the recent origin of the name of the creatures. (4) But the supreme essence on high is denied to the creatures, since it is not co-essential with them, but called them out of non-being into being.

Thus the Son, who has not been begotten of non-being but of Him Who Is, may properly be contemplated together [with God], for [God's] essence neither stretched nor shrank [in begetting him]. The Father, who is spirit, truly begot his Son as spirit, and produced the Holy Spirit from himself—and is neither unknowing of himself, nor aware of a shrinkage, a broadening or a division of his essence. (5) It makes no sense that God should not know all these [latter] things < of himself >, just as it is unaccountable that < the Son and the Spirit\* >—that is, the Holy Spirit < that searches the depths of God\* >—should not know the Godhead.

And the Ingenerate does not fail to share co-essentiality with his Offspring, nor the Generate to be eternal with the Father. (6) For the Father knows the Son and the Son knows the Father, since the Trinity remains endlessly uncreated and the Only-begotten is endless, for he is begotten of Him Who forever Is, and in his own perfect nature, himself truly Is. (7) He therefore knows himself. And neither is the Son ignorant of the ingenerate essence of the Father, nor the Ingenerate of the essence of the Son, for the only-begotten divine Word is worthy of credence when he says, “No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and the Son save the Father.”<sup>142</sup>

49,8 Therefore never mind the pronouncement of this great Aetius, “He cannot possibly have knowledge of himself both as of ingenerate and as of generate essence.” (9) The Only-begotten has already delivered his verdict in the form that follows, by saying that he and no one else knows the Father—(though at the same time he allows for the inclusion of the Holy Spirit, as he says elsewhere, ‘The Spirit of the Father shall teach you.’<sup>143</sup> But if the Spirit is the Spirit of the Father, he is not ignorant of the Father either.) (10) But by saying, “No man knoweth the Father save the Son,”<sup>144</sup> < the Son showed in the same breath\* > that he always knows the Father—showing his own matchlessness, and the Father's and the Holy Spirit's matchlessness, in comparison with all other beings, which are not eternal but have been made.

49,11 But if he has already < said > that he always knows the Father, it is no use for Aetius to come tiptoeing in with his worthless teachings. For it is clear to everyone that he plainly thinks in human terms, and

is condemned as fleshly and soulish by Him who knows himself, the Father and his Holy Spirit. (12) The Godhead, then, is exempt from all causation—not only the Father, but the Son and the Holy Spirit as well, since all are agreed that the Godhead of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit transcends every cause.

50,1 33. *If the Ingenerate transcends all cause but there are many ingenerates, they will [all] be exactly alike in nature. For without being endowed with some quality common [to all] while yet having some quality of its own—[a condition not possible in ingenerate being]—one ingenerate nature would not make, while another was made.*

50,2 *Refutation.* Of course the Unbegotten transcends all cause, since the Ingenerate is one and is an object of worship, but the object of worship is different from the worshipers. (3) But the Trinity is an object of worship because it is a unity and a Trinity enumerated in one name, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. And it includes nothing different from itself, but the Father has fittingly begotten, and not created, a Son. (4) For the Offspring is forever of the Begetter—as is the Holy Spirit who has come forth from him—since the Offspring is the < Son > of Him Who Is. The Trinity, then, exists in one uncreated unity, while all that has been created from nothing is caused by the Trinity itself. (5) The one Trinity is therefore one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, containing nothing different from itself: uncreated, unbegotten, unfashioned, a Trinity which is not made but makes, which includes the name of no creature but creates, which is one and not many. (6) And although they are many, all things are caused by it but are not enumerated with it.

Thus no share of the incomparable essence is allotted to any other nature. (7) There is therefore no created nature in the essence of God; God's essence is creative of all that cannot participate by co-essentiality in the incomparable—in the one essence of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. To one who has received the knowledge of the truth it is plain that the divine nature reveals this to him, < since > it alone is worshiped and not created things, just as it alone, and not created things, baptizes in its own name.

51,1 34. *If every essence is ingenerate, one will not differ from another in self-determination. How, then, can we say that one [such] being is changed and another causes change, when we will not allow God to bring them into being from an essence that has no [prior] existence!*

51,2 *Refutation.* Every opponent of the truth has gathered an amazing number of trivial sayings and expected to fall upon people, get them upset, remove them from the way of life, and ruin them. Aetius expects

to overawe the simple here although he is not really saying anything with this proposition. For he says what he says unnecessarily, and has employed the term, <“ingenerate”>, at this time, from his usual habit of trotting it out for no good reason.

51,3 The ingeneracy of every essence is not acknowledged even by the wise themselves, or every essence would be regarded as God. (4) But since not all essences are treated as God, but one rather than all—the one Godhead in Trinity—how can this fine fellow still suppose that an awe of him will overcome the sons of the truth? (5) One essence will differ from another because the Trinity creates them; but all things are created by the Trinity and it alone is self-determined, while all that it has made is determined by it. The latter sort of essence is changeable but the Trinity's essence is changeless, though it is constantly changing the things that are changed by it, and is able to bring their essences and subsistences out of nothing. (6) For it is fitting that God should transform as he wills the ordering of < the > things he has made, and has brought into being out of non-being and nothing.

52,1 35. *If every essence is ingenerate, every one is exactly alike. But the doing and suffering of an essence that is exactly like [all the others] must be attributed to chance. However, if there are many ingenerates which are exactly alike, there can be no enumeration of their ways of differing from one another. For there could be no enumerations of their differences, either in general or in some respect, since every difference which implies classification is already excluded from ingenerate nature.*

52,2 *Refutation.* Not every essence is ingenerate. It is foolish to think < this >, and whether Aetius intends it as a declaration or as a query, both the argument and its statement belong to pagan ignorance. But plainly, Aetius intends it as a query. (3) Then let him ask the pagans this, and let them agree with him that this follows from their argument; for they give the title, “matter,” to something that is contemporaneous with God. And if Aetius agrees, let him get caught with them! The truth is that there is one Maker, which consists of one essence of a perfect Trinity, < which is >, and yet is not enumerated as an identity. But all other things are born and created, and not ingenerate.

52,4 But the Godhead is uncreated, with the Father begetting, the Son begotten, and the Holy Spirit sent forth from the Father himself and receiving of the Son, while all [other] things are created. Indistinguishability in power is properly confined to the Trinity. And all Godhead is ascribed to the Father because of the rightness and certainty of belief in one God, and the refutability of belief in many. But the rightness of the Son is fittingly reckoned in proportion to that of the Father and the Holy Spirit.

52,5 This being so, the device of the query will fail of its treacherous purpose from the start. There are not many indistinguishables; there is one Trinity in unity, and one Godhead in Trinity. (6) But all other things are separate, and their doing and suffering is not by chance. Nor can the holy Trinity suffer in doing a thing; the whole—I mean the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—is impassible and worshipful. (7) For God made all things through a Son, but he did not make the Son—(the Son is not one of all the creatures, for he assists the Father and is worshiped together with him)—nor did he make the Holy Spirit. (The Holy Spirit is not one of the totality of God’s creatures; he strengthens the power of all, and he is worshiped.) (8) But all things are subject to the providence of the One, and each one endures, acts, suffers and < does\* > everything else < in accordance with the will of the One\* >.

Thus the one Trinity is indistinguishable from itself but the other things, < which > it has made, are different from it. (9) It alone is eternal, uncreated and unbegotten—though the Son is begotten independently of time and without beginning, but ever existent and never ceasing to be. (10) Thus for safety’s sake the word of God has taught that the Father is the head—and yet not the beginning—of the Son,<sup>145</sup> because of their co-essentiality. The Holy Spirit also, who has been sent forth from the Father, is with the Father forever and has had no beginning in time.

53,1 36. *If “ingenerate” and “God” are exact parallels and mean the same thing, the Ingenerate begot an Ingenerate. But if “ingenerate” means one thing while “God” means something else, there is nothing strange in God’s begetting God, since one of the two receives being from ingenerate essence. But if, as is the case, that which is before God is nothing, “ingenerate” and “God” do mean the same, for “Offspring” does not admit of ingeneracy. Thus the Offspring does not permit himself to be mentioned in the same breath with his God and Father.*

53,2 *Refutation.* How does Aetius want me to grasp the meaning of the questions which are raised by his arguments? And if he says through arguments and syllogisms, my speculation will fail just like his. (3) For no one can ever out-argue God, nor, as the scripture says, “shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?”<sup>146</sup> But by pious reasoning and the right confirmation of it one must return, by means of the holy scripture, to the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

53,4 Now since an unalterable pronouncement teaches us that those who worship a creature have been made fools, how can it not be < foolish > to take a creature for God and worship and honor it, when faith by its nature denies worship to the creature and the creature to worship. (5) Indeed, there will be no advantage in Christianity if it is in no way different from those who give divine honor to the creature. Such faith will be idolatry rather than piety.

53,6 For they too worship the sun, the moon and the heavenly bodies, heaven and earth, and the other created things. And the superiority of [certain] created things arouses no awe, and even if one creature is outweighed by the other the special character [of one creature] will not set it apart from the honor that is common to them all because of their common name (i.e., "creature"). There is One who has made both [of the creatures being compared], and has allotted each, not a difference of name but a difference of essence.

53,7 For in the case of all created things the creature's name is "servitor," not "free." And if the servitor in any part [of creation] is worshiped, the worship [of it] will be no different from [the worship of] any other part, even if it is inferior. For it is the same as the most exalted part, by its kinship with the creature which has been made to be, after non-being, by Him Who Is.

53,8 "Ingenerate" is therefore a fit name for God, and "God" for the ingenerate. Thus we do not call the Offspring a product or artifact, but an offspring begotten essentially and without spot of the Father, co-essential with the Father and fit to be worshiped with him. And neither do we call the Holy Spirit, who is of him, different; he too is fit to be worshiped. (9) But the word, "God," is not uttered in the same breath with any other being, a creature, since the creature has been made different from ingeneracy because it has been allotted being after non-being. The Trinity, however, is eternal, and "God" and "Ingenerate" are not different things.

53,10 But your admission, Aetius, that the Son has been begotten of the Father, is deceptive and not sincere. Whatever is begotten is not created, and whatever is created is not begotten. But if a begotten thing is created, it is created in a different way, as, for example, men beget men but do not create them, since they themselves have been created by God on high. Thus the things they beget have been begotten by them, but all things have been created by God.

53,11 Now since God is uncreated but has begotten—not created—a Son, he begets nothing different from his own essence. How can his

Offspring be created, then, when the Father is uncreated? If he calls the Offspring a creature, it cannot be called an Offspring.

And there is a great deal to say against such an absurd speculation. (12) But it does not become even God to be without a Son at one time, and be called "Father" later, after [begetting] a Son. Nor is it becoming to the Son that there be a time before him; if there is, the time will be greater than his greatness. (13) But the perpetual possession of unfailingness and eternity, in the identity of their qualities, is becoming to the Father. And nothing was before God, this is plain. It can be shown, then, that "God" and "Ingenerate" are the same, as Aetius has said; and in somehow implicating these with each other Aetius accuses himself rather than proving his point. (14) For if "God" is used together with God, as it is, "ingenerate" is also an acceptable term for the "Begotten Son"; ingeneracy is implicit in God. (15) The divine Word is mentioned in the same breath with the Father because of his Godhead, uncreatedness, and joint honor with the Father, even though this is of no help to Aetius; for all creatures worship the Son, and "every tongue confesses that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father,"<sup>147</sup> to whom be glory, the Father in the Son with the Spirit, unto the ages of ages. Amen.

54,1 *Aetius' closing valediction*

37. *May the true God, who is ingenerate in himself<sup>148</sup> and for this reason is alone addressed as "the only true God" by his messenger, Jesus Christ, who truly came into being before the ages and is truly a generate entity, preserve you, men and women, safe and sound, from impiety in Christ Jesus our Savior, through whom be all glory to our God and Father, both now and forever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.*

54,2 *Refutation.* Even at the close of Aetius' letter to his gang whom he addressed as "male and female champions," he did not desist from this sort of verbal wickedness. In his valediction too he gave proof of the strangeness of his doctrine. (3) For he says, "The true self-begotten God preserve you safe and sound," and without realizing that with one word he has destroyed all the implications of his inquiry. He spoke of the "Ingenerate God" in the propositions above, but by introducing a "self-begotten God" to us here he has made no allowance for < God's uncausedness\* >

and the fact that he did not make himself. For every < evil > notion forgets itself, the better to be detected.

54,4 Next he says, “he who for this reason is alone addressed as ‘the only true God.’” But going by what Aetius says and thinks, he is either keeping the Son from being “God,” and misrepresenting the name < because he wants > to be called a Christian, or else he believes that the Son is God but not a true one. And [in that case] he will have one true God, and one who is not true. (5) And because Aetius finds one Person below another in a descending order and assigns the Holy Spirit a still lower and inferior rank—or again, will hold that the Spirit is a lesser “God” or not count him as one of the Trinity—the pathetic object will be an entire stranger to Christians. May he be denounced in the end as a complete pagan and Sadducee, a stranger—as he is—to the Holy Spirit, and comparable to the pagans in his lot. (6) For he claims that there is one greater and one lesser God, one true God and one not true. The pagans confess that one God is supreme but call the others lesser. But the sacred scripture plainly confounds him. It says that the Father is “the true God”,<sup>149</sup> and likewise says “God” of the Son<sup>150</sup>—and it says, “God is light,”<sup>151</sup> of the Father, and “He was the true light”<sup>152</sup> of the Son. And of the Holy Spirit it says, “the Spirit of truth.”<sup>153</sup> Thus the Trinity is truly proclaimed to us in “wisdom and the depth of its riches.”<sup>154</sup>

54,7 Next after this he even says, “by his messenger, Jesus Christ.” He was not ashamed to regard the Only-begotten as unworthy of the name of God, but employed the mere verbal title, just as, in the above propositions, he accorded the Son the honor of the divine name only verbally.

54,8 However, he says, “who truly came into being and is of a nature truly generate,” but says, “He will keep you from impiety.” Any loose woman attributes her behavior to others from the start. Not seeing how great his impiety has been, he believes himself pious, as madmen suppose themselves sane but the others crazy.

54,9 But here < in writing >, “in Christ Jesus,” he did not dare to acknowledge him as “our Lord,” but deceptively called him “our Savior.” (10) And he says, “through whom be all glory to < our God and > Father, now and

forever and unto the ages of ages. Amen.” Even “*all* glory” is meant to strip the Son of honor and glory. May none of the pious, who have received the gift of the true faith from the Holy Spirit, ever acquiesce in this!

54,11 But now that I have discussed all these things that Aetius has said in thirty-six syllogistic propositions with a certain skill in debate and the inferential guesswork of human trickery, (12) I urge you to read them<sup>155</sup> attentively, and you will know his earth-bound nonsense at once, Christian people, servants of Christ and sons of the truth, which has nothing to do with the teaching of the Holy Spirit. (13) Aetius did not dare to mention the word of God even in one paragraph, or any text of the Old or the New Testament—not from the Law, the Prophets, the Gospels or the Apostles. He did not dare quote a line of the patriarchs’, of the Savior himself; never one of the Father’s, not one oracle of the Holy Spirit delivered through apostles or prophets. He thus stands fully self-exposed, to the friends of the truth, as an entire stranger to God and his faith.

54,14 I believe that I have opposed his propositions, as best I can even in untrained speech, but that I have confronted him with proof from the sacred scriptures, and from pious reason itself. (15) And since I have discussed the faith clearly enough in my refutations of him I feel that this will do, so as not to create any further difficulty in reading by making additions.

54,16 But once more, < I shall mention and indicate\* > a few of the ideas < he introduced\* > in his vanity, after his foreign creed and his hatred of Christ and his Holy Spirit, and take up, and briefly state and discuss, all the < foolishness\* > his mouth, and his disciples’ mouths, dared to utter in his arrogant pride and inordinate blasphemy.

54,17 For with their idea of knowing God not by faith but by actual knowledge, he and his disciples were the most deluded of all. I mentioned somewhere above that they say they do not simply know God with the knowledge of faith, but as one might know anything which is visible and tangible. As one might pick up a rock or club, or a tool made of some other material, so this good chap says, “I know God as well as I know myself, and do not know myself as well as I know God.”

54,18 But in the end, talking and hearing nonsense is a deception to many, but a joke to the wise. For what person who has contracted insanity and gone mad can fail to drive others mad, particularly his followers and subjects? (19) Suppose someone demanded of him and his pupils,

“Don’t tell me that you know the incomparable, incomprehensible God, whose form cannot be perceived, but who is known to his servants by faith! Describe the foundations of the earth to me, the storehouses of the abyss, the veins of the sea, the location of hades, the dimensions of the air, the form and thickness of the heavens! Tell me what the top of the heavens is, the bottom of the underworld, what is to the right, what is to the left of creation! Tell me how you yourself were made, and the number and dimensions of the innumerable things on earth!” (20) Then after hearing this, as some of their dupes have told me, his disciples resort to quibbling excuses and finally say deceitfully, “All these things are physical, and we cannot know them. But we know clearly what sort of God made them, how he is, what he is like, and who he is.”

54,21 But who can hear this without at once laughing at them? It is sheer foolishness to say that one knows, and has accurately described, the incomparable, ineffable Artificer. And if only Aetius would say that he knows and has described him by faith, and he and they would not venture to say that they know him by a sort of direct knowledge! But the things the incomparable God himself has made, and which, because of their innumerable < kinds\* >, can < only\* > be wondered at by those who see them, he says that he and his followers do not know. (22) And most of all, the sacred scriptures everywhere plainly declare that God is invisible, incomprehensible and beyond our understanding, but that it is known only by faith “that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that love him.”<sup>156</sup>

54,23 But when anyone with an orthodox view of God’s glory, faith, love and incomprehensibility tells them, “We know that God is incomprehensible, we know that God is invisible, ineffable, but we know that, in his invisibility and incomprehensibility, he actually is,” this exponent of the new dialectic dares < to reply\* > with light mockery, as though to tell a story, (24) “What are you and your faith like? Like a deaf, dumb and blind virgin who’s been violated. Everyone who knows her can see that she has, but if they ask who her seducer is, she can’t hear to know they’re asking. And she hasn’t seen her seducer because she’s blind, and can’t say who he is because she’s dumb.”

54,25 Now the reverse is true of him and his story, for as the scripture says, “His travail shall return on his own head, and he shall fall into the pit which he hath made,”<sup>157</sup> and the like. (26) Aetius himself is like a man

who was born blind but can speak—indeed, speaks at length—and can hear, and knows the names of white and black, hyacinth, light green, red and the various other colors, and light and dark, and has been told their names. But he surely has no knowledge of their appearance and cannot possibly describe it, because he was born blind to begin with, and does not know the variation and appearance of the qualities of the colors. (27) The reality which answers to the distinction between each of their names is experienced by visual perceptions, but never by verbal explanation to one who does not know their appearance to start with, or by handling and touch. (28) So when people who are blind from birth talk about them and know enough to contrast black with white, and green with hyacinth, purple, scarlet and the other colors, but we ask them the quality of their appearance and the color of each quality, they cannot say, and cannot learn it from us. They can only convince each other by talking, but they deceive their hearers as though they know all about the distinction, even though they are describing < the indescribable\* > in words and are ignorant because of their inability to comprehend it.

54,29 Even so Aetius himself, who jokes about the seduction of the deaf, dumb and blind virgin, has come to me to talk about God. In fact, going by his blasphemy, it is he who has been spoiled, and his ignorance is like blindness from birth, (30) because he talks about God but by describing < the indescribable > in words, and ends even by making his disciples shameless.

For there is nothing that they do not dare. When they are under cross-examination by someone and are hard pressed, they blaspheme the names of prophets and apostles and leave at once, turning away with the words, “The apostle said this as a man,” but sometimes, “Why quote the Old Testament to me?” (31) But this is no surprise in view of the Savior’s words, “If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more them of his household.”<sup>158</sup> If they deny the Lord himself and his true glory, how much more his prophets and apostles?

54,32 But his disciples have been inspired to still further madness, as has their successor, a person miscalled Eunomius (i.e., “law-abiding”), who is still alive to be a great evil, < and introduces\* > another piece of impudence. For he rebaptizes persons already baptized—not only people who come to him from the orthodox and the sects, but even from the Arians. (33) He, however, rebaptizes them in the name of God the Uncreated, and

in the name of the Created Son, and in the name of the Sanctifying Spirit created by the Created Son. (34) And to make it clear that it is no longer faith which their whole workshop of jugglery, theater and farce proclaims, but practically clowns' work, some maintain that he baptizes his candidates for rebaptism upside down, with their feet on top and their heads below. (35) And while they are in this position he obliges them to swear an oath that they will not abandon the sect he has cooked up. (36) But they say that when this same Aetius had been recalled from exile after Constantius' death by Julian on his accession to the throne, and when he was still a deacon in his sect, he was raised to the episcopate by a bishop of his sect.

54,37 This is < the > information I have < about > Aetius and his disciples, to whom some have given the name of Anomoean because he has come to an opinion still more frightful than the heresy of Arius. (38) With God's help I have gone through his doctrines in detail as best I can, as though I had stamped on the serpent called the many-footed millipede, or wood-louse, with the foot of the truth, and crushed it with the true confession of the Only-begotten. Giving our accustomed thanks to God, beloved, and summoning his power to the aid of our weakness, let us go on to the remaining sects (39) to the best of my ability and understanding, and call, as I said, on our Master himself, to come to my aid in the exposure of the sects and the refutation of them, so that, by his power, I may be able to keep the promise which, despite my unimportance and mediocrity, I have made.