

Epifanio de Salamina

PANARION

LIBRO II, PARTE II

Prólogo

Here, too, are the contents of the second Section of this same second Volume; in the system of numeration we have indicated, it is the fifth Section. It contains five Sects, as follows:

Paulianists, derived from Paul the Samosatian, who was made bishop of the metropolis of Antioch. He all but insisted that Christ is non-existent, for he portrayed him as an uttered word that has existed only since the time of Mary, and said that what is said about him in the sacred scriptures is predictive—and that he did not preexist, but < came into existence > in Mary's time, through the incarnation.

Manichaeans, also called Acvanites, the disciples of Mani the Persian. They pretendedly speak of Christ but worship the sun and the moon, and invoke stars, powers and daemons. They introduce two first principles, a good one and an evil one, [both of them] eternal. They say that Christ has been manifest [only] in appearance, and that he suffered [only] in appearance. They blaspheme the Old Testament and the God who spoke in it, and declare that not the whole world is God's creation, but [only] part of it

Hieracites, who derive from Hieracas of Leontopolis in Egypt, an expositor of scripture. Although they use the Old and the New Testaments, they deny the resurrection of the flesh. And they entirely forbid marriage, though they accept monks and virgins, and the continent and widows. They say that children who have not reached the age of puberty have no part in the kingdom, since they have not engaged in the struggle.

Melitians, who live in Egypt and are a schism—though not a sect—because they would not pray with persons who had fallen away during the persecution. Now, however, they have become associated with the Arians.

Arians, also called the Arian Nuts, who say that the Son of God is a creature and that the Holy Spirit is the creature of a creature, and maintain that the Savior took only flesh from Mary and not a soul.

Arius was a presbyter of Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria.

This is the summary of the five Sects of the second Section of Volume Two—though counting from the beginning of the series, it is the fifth Section.

I

Contra los Samosatianos, secta del Cristianismo

1,1 Their successor² is Paul, called the Samosatian, who was born after Navatus and Origen. (Origen is at last counted as a heretic because of the deliberate arrogance with which he exalted himself against the truth, through his boastful nonsense and the idea of this that was instigated by the devil. (2) He must be mourned as one who has indeed come to grief “through envy of the devil”³ and fallen from a height; for the saying, “The fascination of evil obscures what is good, and the roving of desire perverteth the innocent mind,”⁴ applies exactly to him.)

1,3 Now this Paul the Samosatian whom it has occurred to me to discuss, whose name I mentioned at the start and whose sect I am < now > describing, was from Samosata, which is off towards Mesopotamia and the Euphrates. (4) He was made bishop of the holy catholic church at Antioch at this time, during the reigns of the emperors Aurelian and Probus.⁵ But he grew proud and was deprived of the truth, and revived the sect of Artemon⁶ who had headed it many years before, but which had been snuffed out.

1,5 Paul claims that God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,⁷ is one God, but that God’s Word and Spirit are always in him, just as a man’s own word is in his heart. (6) The Son of God is not an entity but is within God himself—just what Sabellius, Navatus, Noetus and others have said. Still, Paul does not say the same as they, but something different. (7) The Word came, dwelt in Jesus who was a man, < and after doing his work ascended to the Father again* >. (8) And therefore, Paul says, God is one. The Father

is not a father, the Son is not a son, and the Holy Spirit is not a holy spirit, but there is one God, the Father, and his Son in him like a word in a man. (9) Paul supposedly finds his heresy in the following texts: the words of Moses, "The Lord is thy God, the Lord is one."⁸ (10) But he does not claim, as Noetus did, that the Father suffered. He says, "The Word came, acted alone,⁹ and returned to the Father." And there is a great deal of absurdity in this teaching.

2,1 But let's see whether the deluded man's own words can be proved. For he reminds us that Christ said, "I am in the Father and the Father in me."¹⁰ (2) Now we ourselves say that the divine Word is of the Father, and is with him eternally and begotten of him, but we do not speak of the Father without a subsistent Word. (3) On the contrary, the Father's Word is the only-begotten Son, the divine Word, as he says, "Whosoever shall confess me, him will I confess before my Father."¹¹ And by saying, "me" before "my Father," he showed that the Father is truly subsistent, < and that the Son is truly subsistent also* >.

2,4 These people, with their covert introduction of Judaism, have nothing more to say than the Jews do. They must be termed neo-Jews, and Samosatians, nothing but an alleged [Christianity] in name < and > supposition. (5) By denying the God [begotten] of God, the only-begotten Son and the Word, they have become like those who denied him when he was here—God's murderers, the murderers of the Lord, and the deniers of God. Actually, however, < they are neither Christians nor Jews* >, since they do not have circumcision or keep the Sabbath, but < hold* > Jewish < views* > on everything else.

3,1 Now we too, in fact, maintain that there are not two Gods or God-heads, but one Godhead. For since we say that there are not two Fathers, two Sons or two Holy Spirits, but a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit, < we speak of* > one Godhead < and* > one glory. (2) Paul, however, does not call the Father the only God because he is the source [of the Trinity]. When he < says that he > is the only God, he is doing his best to deny the divinity and reality of the Son and the Holy Spirit. He holds instead that the Father is one God who has begotten no Son, (3) so that there are the two Imperfects, a Father and a Son—the Father who has not begotten

a Son, and the Word of the living God and true Wisdom who is not the fruit¹² [of the Father].

3.4 For they believe that the Word is like the word in a human heart, and the sort of wisdom everyone has in his human soul if God has given him understanding.¹³ They therefore say that God, together with his Word, is one Person, just as a man and his word are one. As I said, they believe no more than the Jews do but are blind to the truth, and deaf to the divine word and the message of eternal life.

3.5 For they do not respect the Gospel's true saying, "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 that was made."¹⁴ (6) For if the Word was in the beginning and the Word was with God, his existence is not just as an utterance but as an entity. And if the Word was *with God*, the One he was with is not the Word—for the One he was with is not a word. For if God [merely] has a word in his heart, and if he does not have a Word he has begotten, how can "was," and "The Word was God," mean anything? (7) A man's word is not a man with a man, for it is neither alive nor subsistent. It is only a movement of a living, subsistent heart,¹⁵ and not an entity. It is spoken, and is at once no longer existent, although it stays said.¹⁶ (8) But < this is not the case with* > God's Word, as the Holy Spirit says by the mouth of the prophet, "Thy word endureth *forever*."¹⁷ And in agreement with this the evangelist says—confessing that God has been made manifest and come, but not including the Father in the incarnation of the Word—(9) "*The Word* was made flesh and dwelt among us."¹⁸ And he didn't say, "The Word-and-Father was made flesh." And he also says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word *was* God"¹⁹—not, The Word was *in* God."

4.1 And lest people ill-advisedly alter the words of life and light to their own disadvantage and harm, and suppose—"From his youth the heart

of man is bent on the pursuit” of one sort of “evil”²⁰ or another. (2) Suppose they begin to argue, “As you say yourself, John didn’t say, ‘The Word was *in* God,’ but ‘The Word was *with* God.’²¹ Therefore the Word is not of the Father’s essence but outside of God.” [If they say this] the truth turns around to set her sons straight and confound the ideas that are unfaithful to her, (3) and the Only-begotten himself says, “I came forth from the Father and am come²²—and again, “I am in the Father and the Father in me.”²³

4,4 But for our understanding of the proof, the One < who speaks > of the Son in the prophets stoops to human weakness—not < by > bearing physical burdens but < by > providing understandable words—and < proves > in terms familiar to us that the Son is truly begotten of him, God of God, very God of very God, not outside of him but of his essence. (5) And so he says in David, “Before the morning star have I begotten thee from the womb,”²⁴ as the Seventy rendered it. And in the words of the other versions—Aquila: “The dew of thy youth is of the womb of the morning”; Symmachus: “As in the dewy dawn is thy youth”; Theodotion: “From the womb, from the dawn of thy youth”; the fifth version: “From the womb, from the dawn is thy dew in thy youth”; the sixth: “From the womb they seek thee, dew of thy vigor.”²⁵ (6) But in the Hebrew it is *merem messaar laktal ieldecheth*,²⁶ which plainly and unambiguously means, “From the womb before the morning star have I begotten thee.” For *merem* is “< from > the womb,” and *messaar* means, “before the earliest dawn,” or in other words, “before the morning star.” *Laktal* is “and before the dew”; *ieldecheth* is “child,” or in other words, “I have begotten thee.” (7) And so you are to learn from the verse that the subsistent divine Word was actually begotten of the Father, without beginning and not in time, before anything existed.

4,8 For by the star he did not mean just the morning star—though indeed there are many stars and the sun and moon, and they were made on the fourth day of creation. (And the sea, the trees and their fruit had been created earlier—and the firmament and earth and heaven, and

the angels, who were created together with these. (9) For if angels had not been created together with heaven and earth, God would not have told Job, "When the stars were brought forth, all the angels praised me aloud."²⁷ (10) And so < he wrote* >, "before the morning star," meaning, "before anything was in existence and had been created." For the Word was always with the Father: "Through him all things were made, and without him was not anything made."²⁸

5,1 But someone might say, "You've shown that the angels were before the stars, but you've said they were created together with heaven and earth. Tell us, how have you proved this? Weren't they, surely, created *before* heaven and earth? For scripture nowhere indicates the time of the angels' creation. (2) And that you have shown that they were before the stars, < is perfectly plain >. For if they weren't, how could they sing God's praises for the creation of the stars?

5,3 I cannot give the answer to any question from my own reasonings, but I can from the text of the scriptures. (4) The word of God makes it perfectly clear that the angels were not created after the stars, and that they were not created before heaven and earth; for the statement that there were no creatures before heaven and earth is plainly a firm one. For "God made the heaven and the earth *in the beginning*,"²⁹ because this is the beginning of < the > creation and < there are > no created things before it.

5,5 And so, as I have indicated, the word in a man cannot be called a man, but a man's word. But if the Word of God is God, it is not a word with no subsistence but a subsistent divine Word, begotten of God without beginning and not in time: (6) for "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of an only-begotten of a Father, full of grace and truth."³⁰ John testified to him and cried out, "This is he of whom I said unto you, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me."³¹ "He came into the world, that through him the world might be saved."³² "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not."³³

5,7 Do you see that the Word is only-begotten? Do you see that he came into the world among men, yet with the full “glory of the only-begotten of a Father?”³⁴ It is not as though the Father is a Word, or that he has appeared as a Father in combination with a Word, like a man appearing with his word, < where > his word cannot even appear in the absence of the word’s speaker.

5,8 Now then, whom should I believe? With whom should I agree? From whose teachings am I to receive life? From the holy, inspired evangelists, who have said that the Word was sent from the Father? Or from these disciples of Paul the Samosatian, who claim that God is combined with the Word and the Word with God, and declare that there is one Person—[the person] of the Father including the Word and the person of the Word including the Father? (9) If there is [only] one Person, how can the one send and the other be sent? For the prophet says, “He shall send forth his Word and melt them; he shall breathe forth his Spirit, and the waters shall flow”³⁵—and again, “I came forth from the Father and am come,”³⁶ and, “I live, and the Father that sent me liveth in me.”³⁷

5,10 Now how can the One who has been sent be sent, and appear in flesh? “No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten God, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.”³⁸ And he says, “the only-begotten God.” The Word is begotten of the Father but the Father was not begotten—hence, “only-begotten God.”

6,1 For the safety of our souls the divine knowledge proclaimed its own truth beforehand, because of its precognition. It knew the Samosatian’s nonsense, the Arians’ heresy, the villainy of the Anomoeans, the fall of the Manichaeans, and the mischief of the rest of the sects. (2) And therefore the divine message makes us certain of every expression. It does not call the Father “only-begotten”; how can One who has never been begotten be “only-begotten?” But it calls the Son “only-begotten,” to avoid the supposition that the Son is a Father, and the comparison of the divine Word with a word in a human heart.

6,3 For if he is called a “Word,” he is so called for this purpose: to keep it from being supposed that he is different from the essence of God the Father. And because of the expressions, “only-begotten, full of grace and

truth,"³⁹ he cannot be a word without subsistence, but must be an entity. (4) And you see how much there is to make our salvation sure. "No man hath seen God at any time" is a statement of the Father's invisibility and Godhead; but < "only-begotten God" >⁴⁰ affirms the manifestation of his Godhead through the flesh.

6,5 But how many other texts, and more, might one select in our support and to counter the Samosatian's stupidity? If the Word was in the Father like the word in a human heart, why did he come here and become visible in his own person? (6) To describe himself to his disciples he says, "He that seen me hath seen the Father."⁴¹ And he didn't say, "I am the Father"; "me" means that < he himself is an entity in the Father* >. (7) And he didn't say, "I am he," but, "I am come in my Father's name, and it is he that beareth witness of me."⁴²

6,8 And again, he says of the Holy Spirit, "< I will pray the Father > and he shall send you another Advocate."⁴³ See how < he says >, "he shall send," "another," < and > "I," to show that the Father is an entity, < the Son is an entity >, and the Holy Spirit is an entity. (9) For besides saying, "He shall glorify me," of the Holy Spirit, he [also] < says >, "He shall receive of mine."⁴⁴ And what is he talking about? The Spirit who proceeds from the Father and receives of "me."

6,10 Moreover, he says, "Two testimonies of men will be established, and I bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me."⁴⁵ (11) But how many other texts of the kind, and more than these, < can one find* >? Look here! He says, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. (12) Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight. All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son save the Father: neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."⁴⁶ "Thou hast revealed them unto babes" and, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father" are said to uproot the strange doctrine which has been invented by these people.

7,1 But see what men's perennial opponent, the devil, has spawned in them, as though by the diabolic inspiration of their speech. (2) For because of the holy Gospels' plain statement of their teaching, the flunkies of the sect of Jews are ashamed of this and, not to seem entirely at odds with the true knowledge of the Gospel, supposedly defend themselves against these charges. (3) They say, "Jesus was a man, and yet God's Word inspired him from on high,⁴⁷ and the man says these things about himself. The Father together with the Son is one God, but the man makes his own person known below, and in this sense there are two persons."⁴⁸

7,4 Now how can a man be God, you stupidest man in the world, with your mind turned away from the heavenly doctrine? How can someone who says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,"⁴⁹ be a mere man,⁵⁰ as you claim? (5) If the man is like the Father, the Father is not different from the man. If, however, the divine Word, who is perfect and has become perfect man, is God begotten of the Father on high, then he is speaking clearly and correctly of himself when he says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." (6) And the Jews say the same of him. "Not only did they seek to kill him," says the scripture, "because he did these things, but because he said he was the Son of God, claiming equality with God."⁵¹ (7) For once more, in saying, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,"⁵² he is claiming that God the Father is his equal. Now a man is not equal to God or like God; but < the One who > is truly begotten of God the Father is God the only-begotten Son.

7,8 For Paul says of him, "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."⁵³ (9) < By* > "He was in the form < of God* >," < Paul gave indication of > his Godhead; but as to the form of

the servant, he made it clear that this was something added to him, and did not say that this had ever been < native > to him.

7,10 Our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Word, often communicates with us even in a human way, and frequently speaks in terms of human experience, (11)⁵⁴ but not when he says, "I came forth from my Father and am come";⁵⁵ this cannot be the utterance of human nature. (12) When, however, he rightly testifies, "If I bear record of myself my record is not true,"⁵⁶ this is meant to show his humanity. When, on the other hand, he testifies of his Godhead, "Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true,"⁵⁷ this is to show that his divine nature is true divine nature, and his human nature true human nature.

8,1 And so there are not two Gods, because there are not two Fathers. And the subsistence of the Word is not eliminated, since there is not one [mere] combination of the Son's Godhead with the Father. For the Son is not of an essence different from the Father, but of the same essence as the Father. He cannot be of an essence different from his Begetter's or of the identical essence; he is *of the same essence* as the Father.⁵⁸

8,2 Nor, again, do we say that he is not the same in essence as the Father; the Son is the same as the Father in Godhead and essence. And he is not of another sort than the Father, nor of a different subsistence; he is truly the Father's Son in essence, subsistence and truth. (3) But the Father is not the Son; and the Son is not the Father, but truly a Son begotten of a Father. Thus there are not two Gods, two Sons, or two Holy Spirits; the Trinity is one Godhead, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and co-essential. (4) For when you say, "of the same essence," < you > do not mean an identification. "Co-essential" does not indicate one [single] thing; neither does it differentiate the true Son's essence from his lawful Father's and, because of the co-essentiality, distinguish his nature [from the Father's].

8,5 For sacred scripture does not proclaim two first principles, but one; it says, "The house of Judah shall join with the house of Israel, and they shall agree upon one first principle" (ἀρχήν)⁵⁹ Therefore whoever preaches two first principles, preaches two Gods; and whoever denies the Word and his subsistence reveals his Judaism. (6) Marcion intimates that

there are two first principles—or rather, three—in opposition to each other. But these neo-Jews, these Samosatians, do away with the subsistence of the Word, showing that they too are murderers of the Lord and deniers of our Lord's salvation.

8,7 Thus there is one first principle and the Son [begotten] of it—its exact image, by nature the replica of his Father, and like him in every way. For he is God of God and the Son of the Father, very God of very God and light of light, one Godhead and one dignity. (8) Thus scripture says, "Let us make man in *our* image and after *our* likeness."⁶⁰ So as not to divide it does not say, "in thine image"; so as not to imply unlikeness and inequality it does not say, "in my image"; it says, "in *our* image." And "let us make" is said to show that the Father is not strange to his creatures, nor the Only-begotten strange to creation. (9) The Father creates with the Son, and the Son, through whom all things were made, is co-creator with the Father. And since the Son is begotten of the Father there is one Son, the perfect Son of a perfect Father; and there is a perfect Father of a perfect Son, who is in the image of his Father's perfection. [He is] "the image of the invisible God"⁶¹—not the model of an image, not the image of an image, not unlike the Father, but the Father's image, showing the exact likeness [to the Father] of his true generation from him who has no beginning and is not in time.

8,10 Thus the Son is the image of the Father. It is the same with emperors. Because the emperor has an image there are not two emperors; there is one emperor, with his image. [And] there is one God. He is not one imperfect thing, made of two parts; the Father is perfect, the Son is perfect, the Holy Spirit is perfect. (11) For < the Son does > not < say >, "I am in the Father,"⁶² as a word is in a man's heart; we know a knowing Father with a Son, and a Son begotten of a Father. (12) The divine message < does > not < declare > that a Word entered a man for a dwelling, appeared in him after his birth, and is on high in God once more, like a word in a human heart. This is the product of demon's madness and bears the marks of all denial of God.

9,1 < I come to a close* > because I believe that these few remarks which I have made about this sect will do. Their power is not formidable, or such that it cannot be overcome by all wise persons. (2) And we have

now uprooted Paul's thorns by preaching the doctrine of the truth, have, as it were, quenched his poison, and pointed out the deadliness of it. Calling for aid on the Father with the Son—on the truly existent God and the truly subsistent Son he has begotten, and on his Holy Spirit, who subsists as a Spirit—(3) and < arming ourselves* > with the salvation of the work of the incarnate Christ, we have broken the van of this assault of the neo-Jews with the sign of our victory over death, I mean the cross. Let us go on to the rest, beloved.

9,4 For there is a viper called the dryinas which is like this heresiarch. It is said that a dryinas is a viper, and that its den is very often near grass or, also, oaks. This is why it is called a dryinas—from its preference for trees, and its camouflaging of itself among the fallen leaves with the color of each leaf. (5) The beast does not have a particularly painful bite, but if it remains [undetected] it causes death. (6) In the same way this man, with his sect, pretends to belong to the faithful by bearing Christ's name while adopting Jewish doctrine. He confesses that Christ is the Word but does not believe that he is; and he is not ashamed to make a parade of himself in many ways.⁶³ (7) But now that we have trampled his seeming doctrine, which is actually imposture, with the sandal of Christ, and have scratched the victims of his bites with the healing scalpel of the Gospel and drawn the poison out of them, we shall go on to describe the rest, beloved, as I said.

II

Contra los Maniqueos, secta del Cristianismo

1,1 The Manichaeans < are > also called Acvanites after a veteran from Mesopotamia named Acvas² who practiced the profession of the pernicious Mani at Eleutheropolis. (2) They began to preach to the world at that time, and brought a great evil on the world after the < sect > of Sabellius.

For they arose in the time of the emperor Aurelian, about the fourth year of his reign³ (3) This sect is widely reported and is talked of in many parts of the world, and as I said, owes its worldwide spread to a man named Mani.

1,4 Mani was from Persia, and was originally named Cubricus. But he changed his name to Mani (Μάνη)⁴ to call himself mad, I suspect by God's providence. (5) And as he thought, he was calling himself "vessel," in Babylonian⁵ if you please; "vessel" (μάνη) translated from Babylonian to Greek, suggests the name. But as the truth shows, he was named for the madness which caused the wretch to propagate his heresy in the world.

1,6 Cubricus was the slave of a widow who had died childless and left him an incalculable wealth of gold, silver, spices and other goods. (7) She herself had inherited the property from a Terbinthus who had also been a slave, whose name had been changed to "Buddha,"⁶ in Assyrian. And Terbinthus himself had been the slave of a Scythianus,⁷ who was a Saracen but had been brought up on the borders of Palestine, that is, in Arabia.

1,8 Scythianus had been taught the language and literature of the Greeks there, and had become proficient in their futile worldly doctrines. (9) But he made continual business trips to India, and did a great deal of trading. And so he acquired worldly goods⁸ and as he traveled through the Thebaid⁹—there are various harbors on the Red Sea, (10) at the different gateways to the Roman realm. One of these is at Aelan—Aelon in sacred

scripture. It was perhaps there that Solomon's ship arrived every three years, bringing gold, elephant's tusks, spices, peacocks and the rest. (11) Another harbor is at Castrum in Clysma, and another is the northernmost, at a place called Bernice. Goods are brought to the Thebaid by way of this port called Bernice, and the various kinds of merchandise from India are either distributed there in the Thebaid or to Alexandria by way of the river Chrysorroes—I mean the Nile, which is called Gihon in the scriptures—and to all of Egypt as far as Pelusium. (12) And this is how merchants from India who reach the other lands by sea make trading voyages to the Roman Empire.

2,1 I have been at pains to convey this in full detail for your information, so that those who care to read this will not go uninformed even of the remote causes of every affair. For whoever embarks on a narrative must start it the best way he can, and introduce it from the very beginning. This is how the truth comes to light too, (2) and even though the speaker has no command of polished speech and elegant language the wise will still be told what they should be by the truthful account.

2,3 To begin with, then, Scythianus was puffed up by his great wealth, and his possessions of spices and other goods from India. (4) And in traveling over the Thebaid to a town called Hypsele, he found a woman there who was extremely depraved though of evident beauty, and made a deep impression on his stupidity. Taking her from the brothel—she was a prostitute—he grew fond of the woman and set her free, and she became his wife.¹⁰ (5) After a long while, because of the extreme luxury in his possession, nothing would do the sinner but that, like an idle person accustomed to evil by the extreme wantonness of his luxury, he must finally think of something new, in keeping with his taste, to offer the world. (6) And out of his own head he made up some such words as these—for he did not take them from the sacred scripture and the utterance of the Holy Spirit, but said, on the basis of wretched human reasoning, (7) “What is the reason for the inequalities¹¹ throughout the visible vault of creation—black and white, flushed and pale, wet and dry, heaven and earth, night and day, soul and body, good and evil, righteous and unrighteous—unless, surely, these

things originate from two roots, or two principles?"¹² (8) But to employ him for further warfare against the human race, the devil spawned the horrid supposition in his mind that non-being does not know being.¹³ This was meant to start a war in the minds of the dupes who believe that there is something more than Him Who Is, and that all things are products of two roots,¹⁴ as it were, or two principles. This [last] is the most impious and unsound idea of all.

2,9 But I shall speak of this another time. Scythianus, whose mind was blind about these things, took his cue from Pythagoras¹⁵ and held such beliefs, and composed four books of his own.¹⁶ He called one the Book of the Mysteries¹⁷ the second the Book of the Summaries,¹⁸ the third the Gospel¹⁹ and the fourth the Treasury.²⁰(10) In them he contrasted and < exhibited* > the personae, in every respect perfectly balanced and evenly matched, < of the > two principles. Pathetically he supposed and imagined that he had made a great discovery about this. And he had indeed discovered a great evil, for himself and the people he misleads.

3,1 Scythianus was busy with this, but had heard how the prophets and the Law spoke prophetically of the creation of the world, of the one, sovereign, everlasting Father who will have no end, and of his Son and the Holy Spirit. (2) Since he lived in greater luxury [than they], made fun of them in his boorish mind, and was egged on by the haughty arrogance within him he chose to travel to Jerusalem,²¹ about the apostles' time, (3) and dispute there, if you please, with the preachers of < God's > sovereignty and the [creation of] God's creatures.

3,4 On his arrival the unfortunate man began to challenge the elders there—who were living by the legislation which God had given to Moses and < confirmed* > by the inspired teaching of every prophet—(5) with,

“How can you say that God is one, if he made night and day, flesh and soul, dry and wet, heaven and earth, darkness and light?”²² (6) They gave him a plain explanation—the truth is no secret—but he was not ashamed to contradict them. And though he could not achieve his aim, he still behaved with stubborn shamelessness.

3.7 But since he met with no success but was worsted instead, he produced an illusion with the magic books he owned. (He was a sorcerer too, and had obtained the horrid, pernicious arts of magic from the heathen wisdom of the Indians and Egyptians.) (8) < For > he went up on a housetop and conjured,²³ but still achieved nothing—instead he fell off the roof and ended his life.²⁴ He had lived in Jerusalem for some years.

3.9 He had had just one disciple with him,²⁵ the Terbinthus we mentioned earlier. He had entrusted his possessions to this disciple, as to a very faithful servant who obeyed him with a good will. (10) When Scythianus died Terbinthus buried him with all kindness but once he had buried him planned not to return to the woman, the former harlot or captive who had been married to Scythianus. Instead he took all the property, the gold, the silver and the rest, (11) and fled to Persia. And to escape detection he changed his name as I have said, and called himself Buddha²⁶ instead of Terbinthus.

3.12 For his evil inheritance he in his turn obtained Scythianus’ four books and his implements of magic and conjuring—for he too was very well educated. (13) In Persia he lodged with an elderly widow and in his turn debated about the two principles with the attendants and priests of the idol of Mithra, with a prophet named Parcus, and with Labdacus, but < accomplished nothing* >. Since he could not even dispute with the promoters of idolatry but was refuted by them and disgraced, (14) he went up on the housetop with the same intention as Scythianus—to work magic, if you please, so that no one could answer his arguments. But he was pulled

down by an angel and fell, and so died from the same magic that he had intended to work.²⁷

3,15 The old woman saw to his burial, and came into possession of his property. Having no children or relatives, she remained alone for a long while. (16) But later she purchased Cubricus, or Mani, to wait on her. And when she died²⁸ she left the evil inheritance to him, like poison left by an asp, for the ruin and destruction of many.

4,1 In his turn Cubricus, who had taken the name Mani, lived in the same place and conducted discussions there. And no one believed him; everyone who heard Mani's teaching was annoyed, and rejected it for its novelty, shocking stories, and empty imposture.²⁹(2) Seeing the defeat of his own mischievous formularies, the feather-brain looked for some way of proving the truth of this dreadful fabrication of his.³⁰

4,3 It was rumored that the son of the king of Persia had fallen victim to some disease and was confined to his bed in the capital city of Persia—Mani did not live there, but in another place, a long way from the capital. (4) Blinded by his own wickedness, and thinking that he might be able to perform cures on the king's son from the books he had acquired of Scythianus' successor, his own master Terbinthus or Buddha, Mani left his place of residence and ventured to introduce himself, claiming that he could be of service.³¹

4,5 But though he administered various drugs to the king's ailing child, his expectation was disappointed. The boy finally died under his ministrations, to the confusion of all empty claims falsely made.³² (6) After this outcome, Mani was imprisoned by royal decree.³³ (7) (The kings of Persia do not execute persons guilty of major crimes at once; they find ways

of inflicting a further sentence of death, by torture, on those who are [already] faced with that threat.)³⁴ And so much for that.

5.1 Thus Mani, or Cubricus, remained < in > confinement, visited by his own disciples. (2) For by now the scum had gathered a band, as it were, already about twenty-two,³⁵ whom he called disciples. (3) He chose three³⁶ of these, one named Thomas,³⁷ and Hermeias, and Addas,³⁸ with the intention < of sending them to Judaea* >.³⁹ For he had heard of the sacred books to be found in Judaea and the world over—I mean < the > Christian books, the Law and Prophets, the Gospels, and the Apostles.

5.4 Giving his disciples money, he sent them to Jerusalem. (5) (But he had done this before his imprisonment, when he found himself unable to sustain his doctrine in discussion with many. (6) Having heard of the name of Christ, and of his disciples, I mean the Christians, he had determined to deceive his dupes with the name of the Christian religion.)

5.7 They went off and purchased the books, for they made no delay. But when, on their return, they found Mani no longer at liberty but in the prison, they entered even that and showed him the books. (8) He took and examined them, and fraudulently combined his own falsehood with the truth wherever he found the form of a word, or a name, which could show a resemblance to this doctrine. In this way he finally provided confirmation for the sham of his sect.

5.9 In the meantime, however, he escaped by importuning his jailer and bribing him heavily,⁴⁰ and he left Persia, and arrived at the Roman realm. (10) But when he reached the border between Mesopotamia and Persia⁴¹ and was still in the desert, he heard of an eminent man named Marcellus⁴² who was famous for piety of the finest sort and lived in the

Mesopotamian city of Caschar.⁴³ Marcellus was a thoroughgoing Christian and remarkable for his righteous works, and supplied the needs of widows, the poor, orphans and the destitute.

5,11 It was Mani's intent to attach himself to Marcellus, to gain control of him and be able not only to rule Mesopotamia through him, but the whole region adjacent to Syria and the Roman Empire. (12) But he sent him a letter⁴⁴ from the boundary of the river Stranga, from a place called Fort Arabio, by Turbo, one of his disciples, and this is what it said. Read it, and have a look at the instrument of the fraud's wickedness!⁴⁵

6,1 *Mani, an apostle of Jesus Christ,⁴⁶ and all the saints and virgins who are with me, to my beloved son, Marcellus: Grace, mercy, peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ. And the Light's right hand preserve you from the present evil age and its mischances, and the snares of the evil one. Amen.*

6,2 *I am overjoyed to hear that your love is very great, but grieved that your faith is not in accord with the right reason. (3) I therefore feel impelled to send you this letter, since I am sent for the correction of the human race, and care for those who have given themselves over to imposture and error. (4) [I write], first for the salvation of your own soul, and then for the salvation of those who are with you, so that you may not have an undiscerning mind, as the guides of the simple teach, who say that good and evil are brought by the same [God], and introduce a single first principle. (5) As I have said, they neither distinguish nor differentiate darkness from light, good from wicked and evil,⁴⁷ and the outer man from the inner, but never cease to confuse and confound the one with the other.*

6,6 *But do you, my son, not combine the two as most men do, absurdly and foolishly in any chance way, and ascribe them both to the God of goodness.⁴⁸ For those "whose end is nigh unto cursing"⁴⁹ trace the beginning, end and*

father of these evils to God. (7) Neither do they believe what is said in the Gospels by our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ himself, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor, assuredly, can an evil tree bring forth good fruit."⁵⁰ (8) And how they dare to say that God is the maker and artificer of Satan and his ills, is amazing to me.

6,9 And would that their vain effort stopped with this, and they did not say that the Only-begotten, the Christ who has descended from the bosom of the Father, was the son of a woman, Mary, born of blood and flesh and women's ill-smelling effluent!⁵¹ (10) And since I have no native eloquence I shall rest content with this, not to abuse your forbearance by writing at length, for a considerable time, in this letter. (11) You shall know the whole when I come to you—if, indeed, you are still tender of your salvation. For I put a noose on no one, in the manner of the senseless [teachers] of the multitude. "Mark what I say,"⁵² most honored son!

7,1 The most distinguished, godfearing and eminent Marcellus was surprised and shocked when he read this letter. For as it happened, the bishop of the town, Archelaus, was in his home with him the day the servant of God received Mani's letter. (2) When Archelaus found what the matter was and had read the letter, he gnashed his teeth like a roaring lion and with godly zeal made as to rush off to where Mani was and arrest him for a foreigner come from the barbarians, from whom he was hastening to destroy the human race.

7,3 But Marcellus in his wisdom begged the bishop to calm down, but told Turbo to terminate his [return] journey to Mani, [who was] at Fort Arabio, where he would be awaiting Turbo. (This fortress is on the border between Persia and Mesopotamia.) (4) Marcellus declined to go to Mani, and not to compel Turbo to do so sent one of his own runners, and wrote Mani the following letter.

7,5 *Greetings from the distinguished personage, Marcellus, to Manichaeus, who is made known by the letter. I have accepted the letter you have written, and of my kindness extended hospitality to Turbo. But I have no way of understanding the sense of your letter unless you come, as you promise in your letter, and explain each point in detail. Farewell.*

8,1 When Mani learned of this he thought that the absence of the detained Turbo boded no good. (To confirm his own notion, Mani often deceived even himself by drawing wrong conclusions). All the same, he took the letter as an occasion for hurrying to Marcellus.

8,2 Now as well as being intelligent the bishop Archelaus had a zeal for the faith. His advice was to have Mani executed at once, if possible—as though he had trapped a leopard or wolf, or some other wild beast—so that the flock would not be harmed by the onslaught of such a predator. (3) But Marcellus asked for the <exercise> of patience, and that there be a restrained discussion between Archelaus and Mani. (4) Archelaus, however, <had> by now learned the whole essence of Mani's opinion, for Turbo had told them—him and Marcellus—all of the sect's nonsense.

8,5 Mani teaches that there are two first principles without beginnings, which are eternal and never cease to be, and are opposed to each other. He names one light and good, but the other, darkness and evil, which makes them God and the devil.⁵⁴ But sometimes he calls them both gods, a good god and an evil god⁵⁵

8,6 All things stem and originate from these two principles. The one principle makes all good things; the other, likewise, the evil things. In the world the substances of these two principles are mixed together,⁵⁶ and

the one principle has made the body, while the soul belongs to the other. (7) The soul in human beings, and the soul in every beast, bird, reptile and bug is the same; and not only this, but Mani claims that the living moisture in plants is a movement of the soul which he says is in human beings.⁵⁷

9,1 But he teaches as much other mythology when he says that whoever eats meat eats a soul, and is liable to the punishment of becoming the same himself⁵⁸—(2) becoming a pig in his own turn if he ate a pig, or a bull, or bird, or any edible creature. Manichaeans therefore do not eat meat. And if one plants a fig tree, an olive, a grapevine, a sycamore, or a persea, his soul at his own death is entangled in the branches of the trees he planted and unable to get by them.⁵⁹ (3) And if one marries a woman, he says, he is embodied again after his departure and becomes a woman himself, so that he may be married. (4) And if someone killed a man his soul is returned to the body of a leper after departing the body, or a mouse or snake⁶⁰ or else will in his own turn become something of the kind that he killed.

9,5 Again, he claimed that since it desires < to draw up > the soul which is dispersed in all things, God's heavenly wisdom⁶¹—(6) (for he and his Manichaean followers say that the soul is a part of God and has been dragged away from him and < is held > as the prisoner⁶² of the archons⁶³ of the opposing principle and root. < And > it has been cast down into bodies in this way, because it is the food of the archons who have seized

it and < eaten it as* > a source of strength for themselves,⁶⁴ and parceled it out among bodies.) (7) And therefore, he says, this wisdom has set these luminaries, the sun, moon and stars⁶⁵ in the sky, and has made a mechanical contrivance through what the Greeks call the twelve signs of the zodiac.⁶⁶

9,8 He affirms that these signs draw the souls of dying men and other living things upwards, because they shine. But they are carried to the ship—Mani says that the sun and moon are ships⁶⁷ And the smaller ship loads for fifteen days, till the full moon. And so it carries them across, and on the fifteenth day stows them in the larger ship, the sun.⁶⁸ (9) And the sun, the larger ship, ferries them over to the aeon of light and the land of the blessed.⁶⁹

9,10 And thus the souls which have been ferried over by the sun and moon < are saved* >. For of those who < have become > acquainted with his vulgar chatter, he says that they have been purified and deemed worthy of this mythical crossing of his. And again, he says that a soul cannot be saved unless it < shares > the same knowledge. And there is much sound and fury in this fabrication.

Now these were Mani's teachings, and Archelaus had been made familiar with < them by Turbo >, and because of his extensive knowledge of God and his advance < information > was fully prepared for the debate. For he had obtained precise knowledge of all of Mani's charlatanry from Turbo. And lo and behold, here came Mani, with his companions!

< Marcellus and Archelaus > came then and there to a public debate in Caschar. They had previously chosen a man named Marsipus, and Claudius, and Aegeus and Cleobulus as judges of their disputation. One was a pagan philosopher, one a professor of medicine, another a professional

teacher of grammar, and the other a sophist. (3) And after many words on both sides, with Mani advancing his fabricated teachings and Archelaus, like the bravest of soldiers, destroying the enemy's weapons by his own strength, and when Mani was finally beaten and the judges had awarded the prize to the truth—(4) that was no surprise. The truth is self-authenticating and cannot be overthrown even if wickedness shamelessly opposes the precept of the truth. For like the shadow of darkness, like the slippery footing of a snake's onset, like the snake's lack of support without feet, falsehood has no ground or foundation.

11.1 And then Mani escaped,⁷⁰ though the people would have stoned him if Marcellus had not come forward and shamed the mob with his venerable presence—otherwise, if he had stayed, the miserable dead man would have died a long time earlier. Mani withdrew and came to a village < in the neighborhood* > of Caschar called Diodoris,⁷¹ (2) where the people's presbyter at the time was a very mild man named Trypho.⁷² Mani lodged with Trypho and confused him in turn with his boasts, for he realized that Trypho, while a good man in other respects and a marvel of piety, was lacking in eloquence. (3) Even here, however, he was not able to mock Christ's servant as he had supposed he could. God's way is to prepare the gifts of the Spirit and supply them to those who hope in him, as the One who never lies has promised, "Take no thought what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of my Father which speaketh in you."⁷³

11.4 And so Mani chose to debate once more, with the presbyter Trypho. Trypho answered him at many points and wrote to Archelaus about this matter, (5) "A man has come here like a fierce wolf and is trying to destroy the fold. I beg you to send me instructions on how to deal with him or in what terms I should reply to his heresy. And if you should see fit to come yourself, you would relieve the minds of Christ's fold, and his sheep." Archelaus sent him two books < for > the ready understanding of Mani, and told him to expect him in person.

11.6 At early morning Mani came into the middle of the village, pretending to challenge Trypho to debate as a colleague. And after Trypho had made his appearance, (7) and with his God-given understanding had

answered Mani's questions point by point to the fraud's discomfiture—[though] somewhat softly where he felt doubtful—Archelaus turned up like a powerful householder protecting his property, confidently attacked the would-be plunderer, and took him to task.

11,8 As soon as Mani saw Archelaus he said, with fawning hypocrisy, "Allow me to debate with Trypho. Since <you are> a bishop, you out-rank me." (9) But together with the repudiation of that remark Archelaus silenced Mani by exposing him as an [even] greater hypocrite, and again put him to shame by answering his arguments, so that he could say nothing further. And the people once more grew angry and tried to lay hands on the offender. He, however, escaped the mob and <returned*> once more to Fort Arabio.

12,1 And then, when the king of Persia learned of Mani's hideout, he sent and arrested him in the fortress. He dragged him ignominiously back to Persia and punished him by ordering that he be flayed with a reed.⁷⁴ (2) They still have his skin in Persia, flayed with a reed and stuffed with straw.⁷⁵ And this is how he died; Manichaeans themselves sleep on reed mattresses for this reason.

12,3 After he had died like that and had left his disciples whom we have mentioned, Addas, Thomas and Hermeias—he had sent them > out before he was punished as we described—(4) Hermeias went > to Egypt. Many <of us*> met him. For the sect is not an ancient one, and the people who had met this Hermeias, Mani's disciple, described him to me. (5) Addas, however, went north⁷⁶ and Thomas to Judaea, and the doctrine has gained in strength to this day by their efforts. (6) Mani, however, said that he was the Paraclete Spirit,⁷⁷ and calls himself an apostle of Christ

on some occasions, and the Paraclete Spirit on others. And there is a great variation of the heresies in his blindness.

13,1 Now at length, beloved, I need to say < something > about the sect and its nonsense; all that precedes, I have described for your information. (2) Now then, the savage Mani begins his teaching, speaking and writing in his work on faith. (3) For he issued various books, one composed of < twenty-two sections* > to match < the > twenty-two letters of the Syriac alphabet.⁷⁸ (4) (Most Persians use the Syrian letters besides < the > Persian, just as, with us, many nations use the Greek letters even though nearly every nation has its own. (5) But others pride themselves on the oldest dialect of Syriac, if you please, and the Palmyrene—it and its letters. But there are twenty-two of them, and the book is thus divided into twenty-two sections.)

13,6 He calls this book the *Mysteries of Manichaeus*, and another one the *Treasury*. And he makes a show of other books he has stitched together, the *Lesser Treasury*, as one is called, and another on astrology. (7) Manichaeans have no shortage of this sort of jugglery; they have astrology for a handy subject of boasting, and phylacteries—I mean amulets—and certain other incantations and spells.

This is how Mani begins his book:

14,1 *There were God and matter, light and darkness, good and evil, all in direct opposition to each other, so that neither side has anything in common with the other.*⁷⁹ And this is the scum's prologue; (2) he begins his mischief there. And broadly speaking, that is the book, which contains certain bad propositions of this sort, the difficulty of which, and the contradiction at the very outset between the words and their aim, must be understood. (3) For even though the rest of his nonsense and fabricated religion is extensive, the whole of his wickedness will be shown by its introduction.

For the words, "There were God and matter," taught nothing less than the futile speculation of the Greeks. (4) But it is easy to detect, understand and refute this valueless sophistical notion. < It is plain* > to anyone with good judgment that the conclusion that there are two contemporaneous

eternals cannot be reached by correct reasoning and well-intended intelligence. And anyone with sense must find this out. (5) If the two [eternals] are contemporaneous they cannot be different, even in name. For anything that is contemporaneous [with one of them] is also co-eternal. But this co-eternal and ever existent thing is God, particularly as he has no cause. For nothing is eternal but God alone.

14,6 But with your barbarous mind and enmity toward the human race you have referred to these principles by different names. You have spoken of one as "light," but the other as "darkness," and again, of the one as "good" and the other as "evil." But you claim that they are in total opposition in every respect, so that neither has anything in common with the other. You separate them, then; for it is plain that they are opposites, as you have said. (7) (If they are partners, however, the partners will be found to be friendly and in agreement, because they live together in fellowship and from their profound affection never leave one another.)⁸⁰

14,8 However, if [Mani's first principles] are separate from each other, each of them is surely bounded. But nothing that is bounded is perfect; it is limited by its boundedness. (9) Besides, a boundary will be needed for the delimitation of both, or both territories will touch at the ends, be in contact with each other through the ends, have something in common, and violate the rule of their opposition.⁸¹ And if you grant that there is a divider between the two, (10) the divider cannot be like them, but neither can it be different from both. (11) For if the divider can be called comparable to one of the two eternals we mentioned [even] in one part of it, then, because of the comparable part, the divider cannot be different from [the eternal]. Instead it will be connected with the one with which it is comparable, there will be a junction at the part that matches, and [the divider] will no longer be bounded where it parts the two substances from each other⁸²

14,12 If, however, it is not like the two and has no share of a part of either, there cannot be two eternals and everlastings; there must, in the last analysis, be three. And there can no longer be two principles, and two primordials opposed to each other. There must be another, third thing, which is opposed to both and unlike both, and which divides the two and, because of its foreignness to them, has nothing in common with either

and no likeness to either.⁸³ And in the end there are no longer two, but these three.⁸⁴

14,13 And besides, another will also be required, a fourth, to mediate and set this boundary. For the two could not set the boundary or partition without another to be the umpire who put the divider between them—a skillful, wise and fair umpire, what is more, with higher rank [than either] so that he can persuade them both to a peaceable reconciliation. (14) Thus there will be one to set the boundary, one to divide, and two to be bounded, and there cannot be only two first principles; there must even be three and four. And in this way one can think of many first principles, ignoring real things and imagining unreal ones.

15,1 In the offender's effort not to allow evil, of all things, to touch God—in fact, to ascribe < evil > to God is an absurdity. In the standard form of the church's teaching it is agreed that the Godhead has nothing to do with evil and no admixture of it. (2) For God made nothing evil; he made "all things very good,"⁸⁵ since God is by nature good and of an incomprehensible essence, and contains all things but is himself contained by none. Evil, therefore, did not always exist, nor was evil made by God.

15,3 Since evil does not always exist, then, and was not made by God, it remains to examine the nature of this thing that does not always exist but has a beginning, and that is coming to its end and perishing, and has no permanence—< and > how it began. (4) And in examining this we must first consider the sort of thing that evil is and the sort of thing in which evil arises, and whether it is an object or, as it were, has a body or substance, or whether it can even have a root. (5) And when we think this through we shall find that evil is without substance and has no root, but is limited to the deeds of human activity at work. (6) While we are doing it, evil exists; while we are not doing it, it does not. It is our good judgment that discovers what it means to do evil—to do the thing that does not please God, and can neither contradict God nor resist the Godhead. For when anything can be rooted out and destroyed by men, all the more can it not hold out against God.

16,1 At the same time we must understand that the devil was not made evil by nature at the creation but discovered evil doing for himself later, and not without the knowledge of what he would become. With all creatures

he was created well, with the utmost serviceability because of superior righteousness. (2) For though God in his supreme goodness willed that all persons and creatures be < good >, and though he offered his good gifts to all, he still, by allowing the freedom to choose, permits all creatures to undertake whichever action each chooses by its own will. Thus God cannot be responsible for the evils, though there will be a separation of those who progress to virtue and win the rewards of goodness.

16,3 But though this madman Mani (Μάνις) means to exempt God from evil, he has instead set evil over against God on equal terms. (4) And at the same time, while he is abusing all creation, he is not ashamed to use our human errors as his excuse for interweaving < a mixture of the two* > evenly matched < principles* > with all created being. He has in fact become the champion and defender of the evil he claims to forbid. And when he grants its existence and declares its eternity, and that, together with God, it always is and never ceases to be, he is embracing a sort of fondness for evil and fellowship with it instead of a hatred toward it.

16,5 And Mani's departure from the truth can be detected from his use of certain terms for evil in every subject [he discusses]. For the goodness of God's whole creation is proved by the texts Mani himself cites. (17,1) First of all he has called evil, "matter," and holds matter to be corruption in the same sense [as evil]⁸⁶ And to begin with, if matter is corruption, what can it be the corruption of? If it is the corruption of other things, but matter itself is enduring, then matter would have destroyed everything long ago; and after putting its power into operation for so long without being extirpated, only it would exist.

17,2 But if matter is the corruption of itself, and if it corrupts, assails, consumes and destroys itself, it is on its way to destruction and cannot endure, since it is the source of its own destruction and corruption⁸⁷ (3) How could it have lasted for so long, as the scum claims, but at the same time have nothing at all to do with life, and not in fact < have a share > of life or goodness?

17,4 But since there is also goodness in each of the creatures Mani abuses, his account of evil is altogether mistaken; each of the principles he speaks of has something in common with the other. (5) All that is has

been made for a purpose, but the things that Mani abuses by name contain the opposite of evil. Take snakes, for example and the other < poisonous reptiles >. (6) The sources of deadly poison also contain⁸⁸ an antidote to do away with death and suffering. And the daytime is indeed for human labor, as well as for illumination and vision; but the night, which Mani disparages by name,⁸⁹ is also a rest which God has given to man.⁹⁰ (7) And so it is evident that each thing individually is good, and cannot be termed evil, or given a name synonymous with evil, because of our sins.

18,1 For all things are good and pleasant, and nothing is rejected by the God < who says >, "And behold, all things are very good."⁹¹ And nowhere is there a root of evil. (2) This is why, when God was making the whole world by his goodness, he ascribed goodness to each of his creatures at the outset, and said, "And God saw that it was good"⁹²—testifying to its goodness and confounding the shrewdness of the plotters against mankind, who want to conceal the truth from men with their evil stories. (3) For God made heaven and earth, the light, and the things on the earth, on the first day, "And he saw, and behold it was good,"⁹³ says the scripture. (4) Didn't he know he would make something good, then, since he says, "Behold, it is good," after it was made? And so, in succession, of the waters, the sea, vegetation, trees, the heavenly luminaries, cattle, birds, reptiles and fish. (5) For scripture said, "And God saw, and behold, it was good," in every case—but not because God did not know this beforehand or because he < learned > it after the thing was made, as though he had acquired his knowledge of its goodness by experience. Because of the opinion of the injudicious he declared in advance that all things are good, and that evil has no existence anywhere. (6) Since all things are good, and since their goodness is attested by the absolutely true testimony of the Good, < the > Privation of all that is evil and of all wickedness said, "Behold, it is good", for the refutation of men's whole artificial opinion of evil, and the demolition of the entire notion of those who introduce this mischievous teaching.

18,7 Then, when he came to man, God did not say that man is “good,” and did not say that man is “bad.” And yet man is the most excellent of all earthly creatures, created by God, with his ineffable wisdom, to rule the world—and God would give him dominion over all his creatures as he says, (8) “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air, and over the creeping things of the earth, and cattle and beasts, and over all that is on the earth.”⁹⁴ (9) Since man had been made in God’s image, holy writ was content with such a great dignity, which needed no further addition. (10) For if man possessed the image of Goodness itself at his creation—I mean the image of the Lord God, the artificer, and good artificer, of all creatures, the wellspring of all goodness and the source of the good in all—why would man need the further testimony of “Behold, it is good?” He had received the image of the Good himself.

18,11 But later at the end of the whole account, after the making of all of God’s handiwork, the word of God, in conclusion, bore the same witness for all and said, (12) “And God saw all that he had made, and behold, it was very good,”⁹⁵ adding the word, “very.” This was the sixth day, and the seventh day of rest. The point was to remove the root of [Mani’s] < opinion > of evil, so that never again would anyone find an excuse for daring to believe that evil is eternal. (13) For this same account of evil had been demolished. There was no evil anywhere, for all things were very good, and had been made and witnessed to by a good God.

19,1 “Matter” can mean two things. On the one hand, in the offender’s sense of the word, it is the name of an activity, as I said, and a consuming corruption. But we ordinarily say “matter” of the material < consumed* > by craftsmen in the production of every article—wooden matter, for example, ceramic matter, the matter of gold, the matter of silver. The result of the bodily process which is caused by the decomposition of food⁹⁶ is also called “matter.” All right, let’s have the newly arrived diviner (μάντις), who claims to have been before the ages, tell us < which kind of matter he meant* >. (2) For he even dared to say he was the Paraclete Spirit—though on other occasions he calls himself an apostle of Jesus Christ, as I said. And yet he never took the form of a dove, or put on the Paraclete Spirit who was sent to the apostles from heaven to be their garment of

immortality < and* > the power < of their testimony* >. (3) The Only-begotten promised to send this Spirit, and set the time for it “not many days hence”⁹⁷ but directly after his ascension—as he said, “If I depart, he will come.”⁹⁸ And on their return from the Mount of Olives, “they were filled with the Holy Spirit” at once in the upper room⁹⁹ (4) as the scripture says, “There appeared to them cloven tongues of fire.”¹⁰⁰ And the house was filled as with a violent blast of wind, and the Spirit settled on each of them, and they spoke of God’s wonders in tongues, and all heard them in their own languages. (5) For they came from every people under heaven and yet each of them was comforted by the Spirit—the apostles by the gift, and all the nations by the sound of God’s wondrous teaching.

19,6 For if the Paraclete Spirit the Lord promised his disciples was this scum—this true Maniac, and bearer of the name by his own self-designation—< the > apostles went to their rest cheated of the promise, though the Lord who does not lie had told them, “Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit after these few days.”¹⁰¹

19,7 And it will be found that the fraud is falsely accusing Christ of failure to keep his word. For the apostles’ generation is gone—I mean the generation from Peter until Paul, and until John who even lived until the time of Trajan. And James is gone, the first to exercise the episcopate in Jerusalem. (James was called the Lord’s brother but he was Joseph’s son, born, like the rest of his brothers, of Joseph’s real wife. (8) Because the Lord Jesus Christ, who was born in the flesh of the ever-virgin Mary, was brought up with them, < they > were in the position of brothers to him, and he was called their brother.) And all the saints who shared James’ throne are gone, and Symeon, the son of James’ uncle, with them—Symeon, the son of Cleopas the brother of Joseph.

19,9 I subjoin their successive episcopates one by one, beginning with the episcopate of James—< I mean the successive > bishops who were appointed in Jerusalem during each emperor’s reign until the time of Aurelian and Probus, when this Mani, a Persian, became known, and produced this outlandish teaching.

The list follows:¹⁰²

20,1 James, who was martyred in Jerusalem by beating with a cudgel.
[He lived] until the time of Nero.

Symeon, was crucified under Trajan.

Judah

Zachariah

Tobiah

Benjamin

John, bringing us to the ninth [or] tenth year of Trajan.¹⁰³

Matthias

Philip

Seneca

Justus, bringing us to Hadrian.

Levi

Vaphres

Jose

15. Judah, bringing us to the eleventh year of Antonius.¹⁰⁴ The above
were the circumcised bishops of Jerusalem.

The following were gentiles:

Mark

Cassian

Puplius

Maximus

20. Julian. These all exercised their office up until the tenth year of
Antoninus Pius.

21. Gaian

Symmachus

Gaius, bringing us to the time of Verus, in the eighth year of his reign.

Julian

Capito

Maximus, bringing us to the sixteenth year of Verus.

Antoninus

Valens

Dolichian, bringing us to Commodus.

Narcissus

Dius, bringing us to Severus.

Germanio

Gordius, bringing us to Antoninus.

Narcissus, the same person, bringing us to Alexander the son of Mamaea—not Alexander of Macedon, but a different one.

Alexander, bringing us to the same Alexander.

Mazabanus, bringing us to Gallus and Volusian.

Hymenaeus, bringing us to Aurelian.

20,3 According to some annalists there are 276¹⁰⁵ years altogether from Christ's ascension until the time of Mani, Aurelian and Probus. According to others, there are 246.

And there have been eight other bishops from that time until the present: Bazas, Hermo, Macaris, Maximus, Cyril, Herennis, Cyril once more, and Hilarion, the present occupant of the see, who is accused of consorting with the Arians.

20,4 And the successive emperors whose reigns coincided [with these last eight episcopates] are: The remaining one year of the remaining part of Aurelian's reign; Tacitus, who reigned for six months; < Probus, six years >; Carus, Carinus and Numerian, two years. Diocletian, twenty years. Maximian, Licinius, Constantine, Constantius, Julian, Jovian, Valentinian, Valens, Gratian, < 73 years altogether >. (5) Thus there are 101 years from Mani until the present, that is, till the thirteenth year of Valens, the ninth of Gratian, the first of Valentinian the Younger and the ninety-third of the Diocletian era.¹⁰⁶ (6) < In other words the Holy Spirit waited for 276 years in Mani* >, so that he could be sent to the world as [his] emissary in the fourth year of Aurelian and the episcopate of Hymenaeus at Jerusalem, < and > deprive and cheat his followers of the truth through the working of imposture and delusion by the devil who inhabited him.

21,1 Hence his entire trickery has been fully exposed since, through their accurate discovery of everything, the minds of the wise will surely find his false notion out. (2) And all his other beliefs are sophisms, filled with foolishness—perverse, uncertain and, to all the wise, ridiculous. < Since I intend > to analyze them phrase by phrase, and set down the arguments against them all, I am going to make the refutatory part of my work against him very bulky. (3) Marvelously good replies to him have

already been composed by great men—by Archelaus the bishop, as has been said; and, I have heard, by Origen; and by Eusebius of Caesarea and Eusebius of Emesa, Serapion of Thmuis, Athanasius of Alexandria, George of Laodicea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Titus, and many who have spoken in opposition to him.

21,4 Still, even in my poverty it will do no harm to make a few remarks to the wretched man's shame, in refutation of what I have already called his entirely false notion. (5) And I would prefer not to put his refutation in harsh terms but as gently as possible, except that, impudently, he does not hesitate to blaspheme the Lord of all and deny at the outset that he is the creator—this though he made this whole vault of heaven, earth, and everything in them, and everything in the world. But in imagining another God who does not exist, Mani has abandoned the One who does. (6) He has been deprived of the truth, and has had the experience in the comic proverb, where the crow had food in its mouth and saw the reflection of the food in the water, and wanting to get something else to eat, lost the food it had and still didn't get the food it didn't.

21,7 But who can tolerate the blasphemer? If we have fathers of flesh and blood and cannot bear to hear them criticized, how much more if we hear the Lord God of all blasphemed by the savage Mani?

21,8 When, in the divine goodness, storms are sent by the mercy of God, Mani is not ashamed to say blasphemously that storms do not come from God, but from the effluent of the archons.¹⁰⁷ (22,1) But who could fail to laugh out loud to say the rest, since the tales of Philistion probably carry more conviction than Mani's mimes? (2) He teaches about a mythical porter who supports the whole world,¹⁰⁸ and says that every thirty years the porter's shoulder gets tired, and he shifts the world to the other shoulder, and < this is why > there are earthquakes.¹⁰⁹

22,3 But if this were so, the thing would be a fact of nature, not supernatural. (4) And the Savior's words refute the charlatan, for he said, "Become good like your Father in heaven, for he maketh his sun to rise on the just and on the unjust, and sendeth his rain on the evil and on the good,"¹¹⁰ and, "There shall be earthquakes in divers places, and famines and pestilences."¹¹¹ (5) If earthquakes were natural or normal, < but > perhaps there were frequent quakes in a country and the earth happened to shake many times a night for a whole year, would that be because the porter's shoulders hurt, and he was uncomfortable and made the quake continuous? And who can endure this sort of nonsense?

22,6 But what else < in >credible has he not dared to say? For he claims that souls which have acquired knowledge of his imposture are taken up into the moon, since the essence of the soul is luminous. (7) This is why the moon waxes and wanes, he says; it becomes filled with the souls which have died in the knowledge of his unbelief. (8) Then, he says, they are offloaded from the moon—the smaller ship, < as > he calls it—to the sun. And < the sun > takes them aboard and deposits them in the aeon of the blessed.

22,9 But wickedness is always blind, and unaware of its own shame—how it is refuted by its own words, because it cannot make its lies consistent. (23,1) For one man was formed to begin with, Adam, and had sons and daughters. But in the beginning of the creation, around Adam's hundredth year, Abel was killed at roughly the age of thirty¹¹² (2) After this first victim of murder the first man, Adam, died, at about the age of 930. But the sun, moon and stars had been fixed and established in the sky on the fourth day of creation. (3) Now what should we say, Mister? Should we agree that your stupidity has been exposed? How could 930 years go by without the moon's waning and waxing? (4) With which departed souls was the sun filled and loaded? Well? But Mani did not know that there are wise persons who cannot be convinced by lying words, but [only] by the most authentic proofs.

23,5 But if we do grant that this is so—heaven help us, it can't be! [But if we grant that it is so], and the moon, in growing full, is crammed with the souls of Manicheans, still how can such a proposition be sustained?¹¹³

(6) If no Manichean died after the fifteenth of the month, and it was fore-ordained that Manicheans would die up until the fifteenth, but no more after the fifteenth until the moon's cargo had been unloaded to start loading again at the new moon, their lie would be convincing. As it is, it is unpersuasive. (7) Manicheans die every day, and the heavenly bodies which God has ordained know their course. And once more, the slop¹¹⁴ about the souls in the moon, which he has made up, won't do.

24,1 Again, some of them < concoct another story* > with villainous intent, < and* > say that the Mother of all¹¹⁵ allowed her power to come down from heaven to steal < from > the archons¹¹⁶ and rob them of the power they had taken from on high. (2) For Mani says that the principalities and authorities made war on the living God and seized < his* > great and incomprehensible < essence* > from him, a power which he calls the soul.

24,3 How very absurd of him! Whoever is seized and handled with violence has been bested. If the principalities oppressed the good God and took power from his armor, they must be more powerful than he. (4) And if he gave in to them to begin with, he does not have the ability to take the power, or armor, which they stole from him back from them¹¹⁷—not when he was unable to resist his enemies in the first place.

24,5 To put it another way, suppose that he could win a victory at some time, prevail over his antagonists, and take back the power they had stolen from him. Since the root of evil, its first principle with no beginning, would still be in existence and impossible to destroy altogether, it would win in another war, prevail by the exercise of some power, and again take more power from the good God, as well as his power which he had taken back. (6) And evil will always be ranged against the good God and never controllable, so that it will be forever seizing and being seized.

24,7 But even though these people, whose wits are damaged < and > who are in every way deluded, say that if the good God frees the part of his armor that has been seized from him, he will then do away with the principalities and authorities of the opposing power and destroy them altogether—even if this will happen, and the good God will indeed get rid of them entirely and destroy them,¹¹⁸ the scum’s argument is still all wrong. For he is claiming that the “good” God is not just and does not condemn the sinner, either by consigning him to torments or by putting him to death. (8) For if he makes any attempt to do away with the devil, or opposing power, and destroy him, either he cannot be good in himself, as Mani’s account of him says he is; or, if he is good and still destroys evil, then this Lord who made heaven and earth must be < just >, as in fact he is, since he “rendereth to every man according to his deeds.”¹¹⁹ For with extreme goodness he provides the good man, who has grown weary in well-doing, with good, and metes out justice to the evildoer. (9) And it has been shown in every way that Mani’s talk gradually turns men’s hearts to the opposites [of his teachings].

25,1 But next I appropriately insert Mani’s doctrine word for word as Turbo himself revealed it, one of Mani’s disciples whom I mentioned earlier, taking this from Archelaus’ arguments against Mani in the debate with him. (2) When the bishop Archelaus, and Marcellus, questioned Turbo about Mani’s teaching, Turbo replied in the words I quote from the book. They are as follows:¹²⁰

25,3 *The beginning of Mani’s godless teachings*

If you wish to learn the creed of Mani, hear it from me in a concise form. Mani believes in two gods, unbegotten, self-engendering, eternal, and the opposites of each other. And he teaches that one is good and the other evil, and calls the one Light, and the other, Darkness.¹²¹ The soul in human beings is part of the light, but the body is part of the darkness and the creature of matter.¹²²

25,4 Now < Mani > says that a mixture or confusion of these has come about as follows, likening the two < gods > to the following illustration: Suppose two kings were at war with each other,¹²³ and they had been enemies from the first, and each had his respective territory. But in the battle the darkness sallied forth from its territory and assailed the light. (5) Now when the good Father found the darkness had invaded his land he emitted a power from himself called Mother of life,¹²⁴ and she emitted First Man < and clothed him * > with the five elements.¹²⁵ These are wind, light, water, fire and matter.¹²⁶ (6) Putting these on as battle gear, he went below and did battle with the darkness.¹²⁷ But as they fought against him the archons of the darkness ate part of his armor,¹²⁸ that is, the soul.

25,7 Then First Man was fearfully hard pressed there below by the darkness. And if the Father had not heard his prayer¹²⁹ and sent another power he had emitted, called Living Spirit, and if Living Spirit had not descended and given First Man his right hand and drawn him out of the darkness,¹³⁰ First Man might well have been in danger of capture long ago.

25,8 After this First Man abandoned the soul below. And when Manicheans meet they give each other their right hands¹³¹ for this reason, as a sign that they have been saved from the darkness. For Mani says that all

the sects are in the darkness. Then Living Spirit created the world¹³² and he himself descended clothed with three other powers, brought the archons up and crucified them in the firmament,¹³³ which is their body, the sphere.

*26,1 Then in turn, Living Spirit created the luminaries, which are remnants of the soul¹³⁴ and made them circle the firmament. And he created the earth in its turn, in eight forms.¹³⁵ But beneath it < is * > the Porter, who bears < it on his shoulders * >; and whenever he gets tired of bearing it he shivers, becoming the cause of an earthquake out of its time. (2) This is why the good Father sent his Son from < his > bosom to the heart of the earth and its lowest depths, to give the Porter his due punishment.¹³⁶ For whenever there is an earthquake he is either trembling from fatigue or shifting the earth to his other shoulder.*

26,3 Next, matter too created growing things from herself. And since they were being stolen by certain archons, she called all the chief archons, took power from each,¹³⁷ made this man in the image of that First Man,¹³⁸ and bound the soul in him.¹³⁹ This is the reason for the mixture.

26,4 But when Living Father saw the soul squeezed into the body, in his mercy and compassion he sent his beloved Son for the soul's salvation—for

he sent him [both] for this reason and on account of the Porter.¹⁴⁰ And when the Son arrived he changed his appearance into a man's and appeared to men as a man, though he was not one; and people supposed that he had been begotten [like a man].¹⁴¹ (6) And when he came he created the things that were meant for the salvation of souls¹⁴² and set up a device with twelve water jars which is turned by the sphere and draws up the souls of the dying. And the greater luminary takes these with its rays, cleanses them and transfers them to the moon, and this is how what we call the disk of the moon becomes full—for Mani says that the two luminaries are ships, or ferry-boats.¹⁴³

26,7 Then, if the moon is filled [with souls], it ferries them across to the east wind, and thus gets its load dislodged and is lightened, and begins to wane.¹⁴⁴ And it fills the ferry-boat again, and again discharges its cargo of the souls which are drawn up by the water jars, until it has saved its part of the soul. For Mani says that all soul, and every living and moving thing, is a partaker of the essence of the good Father.

26,8 When the moon has delivered her load of souls to the aeons of the Father, they remain in the pillar of glory, which is called the perfect air.¹⁴⁵ But this air is a pillar of light, since it is full of souls being purified. This is the reason the souls are saved.

27,1 *But this, in turn, is the reason why people die.*¹⁴⁶ *A lovely, beautifully adorned Virgin, very attractive, is attempting to rob the archons who have been brought up by Living Spirit and crucified in the firmament. She appears as a lovely women to the males and as a handsome, desirable youth to the females.*¹⁴⁷ (2) *And when the archons see her with all her adornment they go mad with love; and because they cannot catch her*¹⁴⁸ *they become dreadfully hot, and their minds are ravished with desire*¹⁴⁹ (3) *Now when they run after her the Virgin disappears. Then the chief archon emits the clouds to darken the world in his anger; and if he is extremely vexed he perspires and is out of breath, like a man. And his sweat is the rain.*¹⁵⁰

27,4 *At the same time, if the archon of destruction*¹⁵¹ *is robbed by the Virgin, he sheds pestilence on the whole world to slay human beings.*¹⁵² *For this body of ours may be called a < miniature* > world which answers to < this > great world,*¹⁵³ *and all people have roots below which are fastened to the realms on high.*¹⁵⁴ *Thus, when the archon is robbed by the Virgin, he begins to cut men's roots. (5) And when their roots are cut a pestilence sets in and they die. But if he shakes the heavens by [tugging at] the cord of their root, the result is an earthquake, for the Porter is moved at the same time. This is the reason for death.*

28,1 *And I shall also tell you how the soul is reincarnate in other bodies.¹⁵⁵ First a little of it is purified, and then it is put into the body of a dog or camel, or another animal. But if a soul has committed murder, it is put into the bodies of lepers.¹⁵⁶ If it is found to have reaped grain, it is put into stammerers. (These are the names of the soul: reason, mind, intelligence, thought, understanding.)¹⁵⁷*

28,2 *But reapers, who reap grain, are like the archons who were in the darkness¹⁵⁸ at the beginning, when they ate some of First Man's armor. Thus they must be reembodied in grass, beans, barley, wheat or vegetables¹⁵⁹ so that < they too > may be reaped and cut down. (3) Again, if someone eats bread¹⁶⁰ he must become bread himself and be eaten. If one kills a bird, < he too > will be a bird. If one kills a mouse, he will also be a mouse.¹⁶¹ (4) And again, if one is rich in this world, he must be reembodied in a poor man when he leaves his tabernacle, so that he may go begging and after this go away to eternal punishment.¹⁶²*

28,5 *Since this body is the body of the archons and matter, whoever plants a persea must pass through many bodies until that persea is planted. But if anyone builds a house,¹⁶³ bits of him will be put into all the kinds of bodies there are. Whoever bathes¹⁶⁴ plants his soul in the water. (6) And whoever does not give his alms to the elect will be punished in the hells and reincarnate in the bodies of catechumens until he gives many alms. And for this reason they offer the elect whatever food is their choicest.¹⁶⁵*

28,7 *And when they are about to eat bread they pray first, and tell the bread, "I neither reaped you, nor ground you, nor pounded you, nor put you into an oven; someone else did these things, and brought you to me. I have been eating without guilt." And whenever [an electus] says this for himself, he tells the catechumen, "I have prayed for you," and the catechumen withdraws.*¹⁶⁶ (8) *For as I told you a moment ago that whoever reaps will be reaped, so whoever throws wheat into a thresher will be thrown in himself—or if he kneads dough he will be kneaded, or if he bakes bread he will be baked. And for this reason they are forbidden to do work.*¹⁶⁷

28,9 *And again, < they say that > there are other worlds, since the luminaries set from this world and rise in those.*¹⁶⁸ *And whoever walks on the ground injures the earth*¹⁶⁹—*and whoever moves his hand injures the air, because the air is the soul of men, animals, birds, fish, reptiles and everything in the world. < For > I have told you that this body does not belong to God but to matter, and that it is darkness and must itself be made dark.*¹⁷⁰

29,1 *But as to Paradise, which is a name for the world: Its plants are lusts and other impostures which destroy men's reasonings. But that plant in Paradise through which the good is recognized is Jesus*¹⁷¹*< and > the knowledge of him in the world."*¹⁷² *One who takes [its fruit] can distinguish good from evil. (2) The world itself, however, is not God's but was formed from a part of matter, and all things are therefore destroyed.*¹⁷³

The thing the archons stole from First Man is the very thing that fills the moon, and is cleaned out of the world every day. (3) And if the soul departs without knowing the truth, it is given to the demons to subdue in the hells of fire.¹⁷⁴ And after its punishment it is put into < other > bodies to be subdued, and so it is thrown into the great fire until the consummation.¹⁷⁵

30,1 Now this is what he says about your prophets. There are spirits of impiety or iniquity which belong to the darkness that arose at the beginning, and because the prophets were deceived by these they did not tell < the truth >. For < that > archon has blinded their minds.¹⁷⁶ (2) And anyone who follows their words will die forever, imprisoned in the clod [of earth], because he did not learn the Paraclete's knowledge.¹⁷⁷

30,3 Mani has commanded only his elect, of whom there are no more than seven,¹⁷⁸ "When you finish eating, pray and put on your heads oil which has been exorcized with many names, as a support for this faith." The names have not been revealed to me for only the seven employ them. (4) And again, < he says > that the name of Sabaoth, which is revered and of great importance among you, is human in nature and a father of lust. And so, he says, the foolish worship lust, thinking it is God.

30,5 This is what he says about the creation of Adam. The person who said, "Come, and let us make man in our image and after our likeness"¹⁷⁹—that is, "in accordance with the form which we have seen"—is the archon who told the other archons, "Give me of the light which we have taken and let us make a man in the form of us archons < and > the form we have seen, which is First Man."¹⁸⁰

And so they created the man. (6) But they likewise created Eve and gave her some of their lust for Adam's deception. And the fashioning of the world from the archons' handiwork was done through Adam and Eve.

31,1 God has nothing to do with the world itself and takes no pleasure in it, because it was stolen from him by the archons at the beginning and became a burden to him. This is why he sends emissaries and steals his soul from them (i.e., the archons) every day through these luminaries, the sun and the moon, by which the whole world, and all creation, is taken away. (2) Mani says that the god who spoke with Moses, and with the Jews and their priests, is the archon of darkness; thus Christians, Jews and pagans are one and the same¹⁸¹ since they believe in the same god. (3) For as that god is not the God of truth, he deceives them with his lusts. Therefore all who hope in that god, the god who spoke with Moses and the prophets, must be imprisoned with him, since they have not hoped in the God of truth. For that god spoke with them in accordance with his lusts,

31,4 After all this he finally says, as he himself has written.¹⁸² When the elder¹⁸³ makes his image¹⁸⁴ manifest, the Porter will drop the earth¹⁸⁵ outside. Then the great fire will be let loose and consume the whole world. (5) Next he will drop the clod < that is interposed > between [the world and] the new aeon, so that all the souls of sinners may be imprisoned forever. These things will take place when the image arrives.

31,6 But all the emanations—Jesus, who is in the smaller ship, Mother of Life, the twelve steersmen, the Virgin of Light, the third Elder, who is in

the larger ship, Living Spirit, the wall of the great fire,¹⁸⁶ the wall¹⁸⁷ of the wind, the air, the water, and the living fire within—have their dwellings < on high > near the lesser luminary, until the fire destroys the whole world over a period of years whose length I do not know.¹⁸⁸ (7) And after this there will be a restoration of the two natures, and the archons will occupy their own realms below, while the Father will occupy the realms above, and have received his own back.¹⁸⁹*

31,8 Mani imparted this entire teaching to his three disciples and told each of them to make his way to his own area: Addas was assigned the east, Syria fell to Thomas, but the other, Hermeias, journeyed to Egypt. And they are there to this day for the purpose of establishing the teaching of this religion.

32,1 These are the passages I have quoted from the book by Archelaus that I mentioned. And this is the way Mani introduc<ed> the seed of his tares to the world when he belched out the tares of his teaching. (2) One could offer quantities of answers to however much there is of this mime's slander, as must be plain to everyone. For even if the counter-arguments are not polished, the mere knowledge that this is what they believe will be enough to put them to shame, for their tenets are shaky and have no cogency. (3) For Mani overturns his earlier statements with his later ones, and says things later that are different from what he has said earlier. He sometimes would have it that the world is God's creation, but sometimes that it comes from the archons and that God bears no responsibility for it, but that it is slated to perish. And sometimes he says that the firmament is the archons' hides, but sometimes that they are crucified up above in the celestial sphere—< and > that they chase people, and make clouds, and get excited and wild at the sight of the virgin and the handsomeness of the youth.

33,1 What a disgrace! What could be worse, more disgusting, and more shameful than for the Spirit of truth to change himself into a female, but

sometimes to appear in male form to the archons? It is disgraceful for a man to get drunk and act and look like a woman. But for women to act like men and dress in men's clothes is the most disgraceful of all. (2) And if this spirit is the Spirit of virtue, and divine, why will it not have been insulted rather [than glorified] by its inventor Mani? And how can the archons go wild after having been skinned? Tell me that, Mister! How were they skinned after being crucified? And if they have indeed been crucified, how can they run after the power when it disappears?

33,3 Who can put up with the blasphemer, with his declaration that we draw our nourishment from the archons' sweat, and that the rain pours down on us from their dirty fluids? How can Mani drink himself—since he, along with his disciples, draws his water from the rain? What else can he be but absurd, to be so mastered by bodily needs that he drinks sweat?

33,4 There are various degrees of sin, and the unintentional sinner will not be punished as severely as the one who commits the sin deliberately. (5) Even if this were true—and perish that thought, it's the nut's imagination—[but if it were true], then people who draw and drink sweat and dirty fluids without knowing it <are> excusable, and more entitled to mercy than someone who succumbs to his own frailty and, for no good reason, is moved to draw and drink water, with full knowledge, from the archons' drinks and their other bodily functions.

34,1 And there are many ways in which he has deceived his followers with his lying mouth. Which of his notions is not absurd? The idea that seeds of herbs, produce and pulse are souls! (2) To venture <a> joke, to refute him in terms of his own mythology I may say that if the seeds of lentils, beans, chick-peas and the rest are souls, but the soul of a bull is the same, then, on his premises, people who eat meat have more to their credit than ascetics do. (3) For as his rigmarole goes, he is afraid that if he eats living things—(4) animals and the rest—he will become like them himself. <But> on the contrary! For if fifty, or even a hundred men get together all dine on one bull, as his vain calumny goes <they are all guilty of murder together*>. But in refutation we must still say that the fifty, or the hundred, become guilty [of the murder] of one soul, but someone who eats the grains of seeds will be guilty of ingesting thirty or forty souls at one gulp! And all the things he says are worthless and absurd.

35,1 For to everyone whose mind <is established> in the Lord, the signs of the truth must surely be apparent from the true teaching itself; as a revelation of men's salvation, nothing is more reliable than the Savior. (2) This barbarian who has come to us from Persia and has the mind

of a slave—being a slave physically never bothered him—says that all souls are alike and that the one soul is in all: people, domestic animals, wild beasts, birds, reptiles, creatures that fly and swim, bugs and the seeds of produce, trees and all other visible things. (3) But our Lord didn't tell us this. When he came to save humanity did he also see to the cure of cattle, and < start on* > the healing and resurrection of dead beasts by gathering < their bones* >? He neither described this nor taught this to us, (4) far from it, but he knew the saving of human souls, as he said concisely in the riddle, "I am not come but for the lost sheep,"¹⁹⁰ meaning all humankind.

35,5 And what does scripture say? "He healed all whom they brought unto him, that were lunatick and were taken with diverse diseases."¹⁹¹ They brought him the blind, the deaf, the lame, the palsied, the maimed, and he extended his benefaction and healing to all of them; but scripture nowhere says that they brought him animals.

35,6 Then again, "He came to the parts of Gergestha,"¹⁹² as Mark says—or, "in the coasts of the Gergesenes," as Luke says;¹⁹³ or "of the Gadarenes," as in Matthew,¹⁹⁴ or "of the Gergesenes" as some copies [of Matthew] have it.¹⁹⁵ (The site was in between the three territories.) (7) "And behold two possessed with devils, exceeding fierce, coming out of the tombs, and they cried out, saying, Let us alone, what have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God, that thou hast come before the time to torment us? We know thee who thou art, the holy one of God. And there was an herd of swine there feeding and the devils besought him saying, If thou cast us out of the men, send us into the swine. And they ran violently into the sea and perished in the waters. And they that kept them fled and told it in the city."¹⁹⁶

35,8 And in Matthew we are told of two possessed, but it simply mentions swine and does not give the number. (9) But Mark even reported the exact number of the swine and said, "He came unto the parts of Gergestha, and there met him one possessed of a devil, and he had been bound with iron chains and plucked the chains asunder, and he had his

dwelling among the tombs and cried out, Let us alone, what have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God? Thou hast come before the time to torment us. And Jesus asked him, What is thy name? And he said, Legion, for many devils had entered into him. And they besought him not to be sent out of the country, but to enter into the swine. For there was there an herd of swine feeding, and he gave them leave to enter into the swine. And the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea (for they were about two thousand) and were choked in the sea. And they that fed the swine fled, and told it in the city."¹⁹⁷

35,10 Then did the divine Word who had become man for us ask in ignorance, and not know the demon's name before he asked? No, it is the Godhead's way to make the causes of each event clear from through the lips of persons who are questioned. (11) And here too, to show the frightfulness and the great number of the demons, he asks the question, so that the marvelous deed will be made known out of their own mouths. "And the devils besought him saying, Send us not into the abyss, but give us leave to enter into the swine. And he gave them leave. And the devils went out and entered into the swine, and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters."¹⁹⁸

36,1 What great kindness of God! How he confounds falsehood but shows his servants the truth, through deeds, words and all of his care! For he has shown by a deed that the same soul is not in people, cattle and beasts. (2) If the soul were the same, why did he not refrain from destroying two thousand souls at once when his aim was to purify one person or save one soul, the demoniac's? If it were the same, why did he purify the one man or < save > the one soul, but permit the demons to enter the other bodies, or indeed, the other souls?

36,3 Are the deeds of the light not plain to see? Are these words not "performed in the light?"¹⁹⁹ Is the truth's face not radiant? Are "all things" not "plain to them that understand, and right for them that find knowledge?"²⁰⁰ Who can hear and look into these things without convicting Mani of stitching together things that should not be stitched, to divert men's minds from reality?

36,4 But the offenders in their turn < try to evade the truth* >. I have even heard one argue in this way: after he had heard this argument from

me the oaf turned round and thought he might get somewhere against God's truth. Offering a completely absurd defense < he dared >²⁰¹ to make it out that the truth < agrees > with falsehood, and said, "But he had reserved death for the swine; their souls escaped from their bodies and were saved!"

37,1 The stupidity of the people who can't see, and who blind their minds, and don't even listen to what they themselves say! (2) If he had any idea that the deliverance of souls from the body is salvation, the Savior should have killed the demoniac so that his soul would be saved by its deliverance from a human body. He must have loved the souls in the swine more than the soul of the man! (3) Why didn't he let the man plunge into the sea with the pigs and die too, so as to purify and save all of the souls, the man's and the pigs'?

37,4 But we have seen nothing of the kind. The Savior calls Lazarus from the tomb on the fourth day following his death, raises him and restores him to the world, and not to do him a disservice or cause him harm. The scripture says, *Jesus *loved* Lazarus."²⁰² (5) If flesh is evil, why did Jesus make the man he loved return to the flesh? Why didn't he leave him alone instead, once he had died and been delivered from the body?

37,6 And no one should suppose that Lazarus promptly died again. The holy Gospel makes it clear that Jesus reclined at table and Lazarus reclined with him. Besides, I have found in traditions that Lazarus was thirty years old when he was raised. (7) And he lived another thirty years after < the Lord > raised him and then departed to the Lord. He lay down and fell asleep with a good name, and like us all, < awaits* > the hour of the resurrection when, as he promised, the Only-begotten will restore the body to the soul and the soul to the body and "reward every man according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."²⁰³

38-39, 1²⁰⁴ For if there were no resurrection of bodies, how could there be "gnashing of teeth?"²⁰⁵ And don't anyone make that halfwitted remark again, "Teeth are made for us to chew with; what food will we eat after the resurrection of the dead?" (2) If Jesus ate again after his resurrection, and [took] "a piece of a broiled fish and an honeycomb,"²⁰⁶ and lived with

his disciples for forty days, will there be no food? (3) And as to food, it is plain that "Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of heaven."²⁰⁷ And it is the Lord's own promise that "Ye shall be seated at my Father's table eating and drinking."²⁰⁸ (4) And what this eating and drinking is, is known to him alone, for "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."²⁰⁹

38-39,5 But now that we have reached this stage of describing the differences between souls, < we have explained* >—and on the authority of the truth itself and its perfect Example—that a man's soul is one thing, and a beast's is another. And Christ did not come to save the soul of the beast but the soul of the man, since beasts are not judged. (6) For human beings inherit the kingdom of heaven, and human beings are judged. "These shall go away into everlasting judgment and these to life eternal,"²¹⁰ says the Only-begotten.

40,1 And what do the people accomplish who go hunting for problems? Whenever they find them and do not grasp the interpretation of the text, they distress themselves by thinking of contradictions instead of looking for things that are of use to them—for Matthew says that there were two demoniacs, but Luke mentions one.

40,2 And indeed, < besides this > one evangelist says that the thieves who were crucified with Jesus reviled him; but the other disagrees, and < not > only shows that both did not revile him, but gives the defense of the one. (3) For "He rebuked the other and said, Dost not thou fear God seeing that we are in the same condemnation? But this holy man hath done nothing < amiss >." And he exclaimed besides, "Jesus, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." And the Savior told him, "Verily I say unto thee, today shalt thou be with me in Paradise."²¹¹

40,4 These things make it seem that there is disagreement in the scripture. But it is all smooth. (5) Even if there are two demoniacs in Matthew the same ones are to be found in Luke. Since it is the scripture's way to give the causes of events, Luke mentions not the two, but only the one, for the following reason. (6) There were two men healed of demon possession, but one persevered in the faith while the other came to grief. And so,

because of his perseverance in the faith, he followed Jesus “whithersoever he went,”²¹² as the Gospel says. This is why Luke omitted the one thief and mentioned the one who is in the kingdom of heaven. And nothing can be contrary to the true interpretation.

41,1 But the Gospel now gives another reason, similar to this instance, [for speaking of more than one person] as though of one. The Lord had cleansed ten lepers and the nine had gone away without giving glory to God. But the one had turned back and remained—the one who was also commended by the Lord, as he said, “Ten lepers were cleansed. Why hath not one of them returned to give glory to God save only this stranger?”²¹³ (2) And you see that, because of this man’s perceptiveness and his demonstration of gratitude, the Gospel mentions the one in place of the ten. It is a comparable case, since the same evangelist spoke of the thieves.

41,3 For we are accustomed to speak of singulars in the plural, and plurals in the singular. We say, “We have told you,” and, “We have seen you,” and, “We have come to you,” and there are not two people speaking, but the one who is present. And yet by customary usage the one says this in the plural, in the person of many. (4) Thus the Gospel’s²¹⁴ narrative included [many persons] by its use of the plural, but the other [Gospel] tells us that one was the blasphemer, but that the confessed and attained salvation.

41,5 And you see that all parts of the truth are plain, and there is no contradiction in the scripture. (6) But I suppose I’ve made my statement of the argument lengthy by going over all this scriptural material. Let me wear myself out by the time the argument takes, but confound < the > truth’s < opponents* > and, with the truth’s healing remedies, bring joy to her sons.

42,1 Next, let’s look at the scum’s other teachings. He claims that the two Testaments contradict each other,²¹⁵ and that the god who spoke in the Law is different from the God of the Gospel.²¹⁶ The former god he terms “the archon”; but in the latter case, < where he posits a good

God, he calls him Father, just as the Son* > says that his < Father* > is a good God.

And if he would only tell the truth, and not blaspheme himself by mistake! (2) We ourselves agree with the same proposition, that the good Offspring of a good Father—light of light, God of God, very God of very God—has come to us in order to save us. “He came unto his own” property, not someone else’s, “< and > his own received him not. (3) But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, who were born, not of blood, nor of flesh, but of God.”²¹⁷ (4) And yet, surely no one in the world has been born without flesh and blood; all people are flesh and blood. What were they before they were born in the flesh, or what can we do without flesh? (5) But since the world is God’s creation and we are creatures of flesh and born of fathers and mothers, the Lord came to beget us “of Spirit and of fire.”²¹⁸

For we have been born, and that is true, and no one can deny his first birth, or that he is made of flesh. (6) But our second birth is not of flesh or blood, that is, it is not by the commerce of flesh and blood. In the Spirit we have gained a flesh and soul that are no longer carnal, but are blood, flesh and soul in a spiritual union. (7) In other words, “To them gave he power to become the sons of God”²¹⁹—those who had been converted, and had pleased God with flesh, blood and soul.

42,8 Thus He who came to “his own” is no stranger, but is Lord of all. And this is why he says, “Lo, here am I that speak in the prophets.” And he told the Jews, “Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me”;²²⁰ and, “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad”;²²¹ (9) and, “Thus did your fathers unto the prophets”;²²² and, “Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and say all manner of evil against you falsely. Rejoice and be glad, for great is your reward in heaven. For so persecuted they the prophets before you.”²²³ And in another passage he says, “Jerusalem, that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent, how often would I have gathered thy children?”²²⁴

42,10 Now the words, “how often” show that he had taken care to “gather” Jerusalem through his prophets. For if he says “killing the prophets” in reproof, then he cares for the prophets. But in caring for the prophets he was not caring for strangers, but his own. (11) He says, “And the blood that has been shed shall be required, from the blood of Abel unto that of the righteous Zacharias, which was shed between the temple and the altar.”²²⁵

< And see how he cares for the temple as well; in another passage he says* >, (12) “And he took them all away, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and said, Make not my Father’s house an house of merchandise.”²²⁶ And to Mary and Joseph he said, “Why is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father’s house?”²²⁷ And the Gospel is quick to add, “Make not my Father’s house an house of merchandise,” as it says, “And the disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.”²²⁸ (43,1) And how much there is to say, in < words > such as these of the* > Gospels and Apostles, in refutation and < rebuttal > of Mani’s madness, with his desire to divide and separate the Old Testament from the New, even though the Old Testament testifies to the Savior and the Savior acknowledges the Old Testament.

43,2 And not only that, but the Savior testifies that he is the son of David, as he says,²²⁹ “The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand. If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?”²³⁰ (3) And again in another passage, when the children cried Hosannah to the son of David and “He did not rebuke them”—< and when > the Pharisees say, “Hearest thou not what these say? Bid them be silent,” he replies, “If these were silent, the stones would have cried out.”²³¹ (4) For he is David’s son in the flesh but David’s Lord in the Spirit, and both statements are cogent and accurate. There is no falsity < in > the truth.

43,5 But so as not to lengthen this argument I shall content myself with these texts and go on to the others, for the scum’s full refutation. If the body belongs to one god, Mister, and the soul belongs to another,

what association can the two have? (6) And I am afraid that this modest person's small mind is trying to peer into some pretty deep thoughts. So I shall hold myself in check in order not to give heavy reading to persons who can refute the cheat completely with one item of evidence. (7) Common partnership is not to be found in those who differ, but is the work of one friend or the business of two. Now if the body and the soul are together, this is the work of one God. For there is no distinction, since both work duly together and are in agreement.

43,8 But if, after eating the soul as Mani claims, the archons made this body as a prison for it, how can they lock it up in a body again after it is eaten? Whatever is eaten is consumed, and whatever is consumed also passes into non-existence. But something that passes into non-existence is no more and is not enclosed in any place; there neither is, nor can be, a prison for it if it does not exist.

44,1 But Mani often loses track of his own notion, forgets what he has said, and unknowingly again breaks down what he once built up. He sometimes claims that the soul has been eaten < and has vanished, even though* > he declares that it is shut up in the bodies that presently exist. But sometimes he decides that it has been snatched from on high from the good God's armor by the archons, so that it has not been eaten yet but is being held prisoner.

44,2 But at times he says in disagreement with this that the soul has been taken prisoner and < defeated* >, but tells the same story in a different way, (3) claiming that it has been set out as bait, of its own free will, by the power on high²³²—like a kid thrown into a pit to catch a beast of prey, which is excited and leaps down get the kid, < and thus* > the beast itself is caught.

44,4 Now suppose that the power on high—that is, the good God, or the “light,” as Mani calls it—did send the “kid,” < a bit of > its own power. In the first place, even if he catches the beast, the kid will be eaten up in the meantime. And rather [than helping itself], the power on high will harm itself by offering part of itself as food for the beast, to catch the beast with the part it sees fit to lose. (5) And it will no longer conquer the beast because of its power and supremacy, and the might of its reason and will;

to enable itself to master the beast it employs all sorts of schemes, and plays the knave. (6) And even if the beast is caught, the good God will still have lost the kid that got eaten, from a part of himself—assuming that he can catch the beast at all.

44,7 For if the power on high sent the soul here to catch and bind the principalities and authorities, he has not achieved the goal he planned on. (8) Even though he sent the soul to catch, it has been caught. Although he sent it to trap, it has been trapped. For it came from a pure essence and was subjected, first to the prison of the material body, and then to many enormities of sins. And the fraud's argument, and the offender's teaching, fail in every respect.

45,1 Now then, let's see too about Mother of Life. Mani says that she too was emitted < from the > power < on high >, and that Mother of Life herself < emitted > both First Man < and > the five elements which, as he says, are wind, light, water, fire and matter. (2) Putting these on as battle gear, First Man went below and made war on the darkness. But during their battle with him the archons of darkness ate part of his armor, that is, the soul.

45,3 What low comedy on the scum's part! What < efforts > to prove an unintelligible joke and an absurd story!²³³ Mani is positively attributing powerlessness to God, absolutely ascribing ignorance to God the omniscient! (4) For the God who emitted Mother of Life, as Mani says, is to be blamed either for not knowing what would be produced from Mother of Life, or for not knowing that the events which occurred contrary to his expectation < had* > turned out other than < he thought they would* >. (5) For whoever expects things to happen, but finds that something else has happened later against his wishes, must be charged with ignorance.

45,6 For Mother of Life, whom Mani calls a power, < is born of God* > as his emanation, something it is "a shame even to say."²³⁴ No one of sound mind can suppose that there is anything female in the Godhead. (7) But this female too, says Mani, emitted First Man < and the five elements as a mother bears a child >. And in a word, Mani imagines the First Man < he speaks of >,²³⁵ and Mother of Life, in terms of our experience. For by "man" we mean [the first man] on earth, and by the "mother < of life >"²³⁶ who bore us, the woman God created for Adam.

45,8 But, based on his own thinking, the oaf imagines that there are the same sorts of thing in heaven that there are on earth—though as the sacred scripture everywhere teaches, this cannot be. (9) For scripture says, “There are celestial bodies and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another.”²³⁷ And < the apostle > had not yet given any description of the things above the heavens, but only of these visible things, which are body—I mean < the bodies of > the sun or moon, or the creatures on earth and the bodies of the saints—or so, with all humility, I suppose. (10) I have no way of deciding whether, because of the apostle’s profound capacity for knowledge, there was also to be a discussion < of > the realms above the heavens. But in any case it has been said that < heavenly things > are very < different > from earthly; how much more the things above the heavens? < All right >, Mister, how can they be compared with things on earth?

46,1 And what else can you be doing but < imagining* > First Man < as well* >—who, you say in turn, made wind, light, fire, water and matter for his armor < to fight with the darkness* >? (2) If First Man is from on high, and yet has come here in order to make his armor²³⁸ and emit it to protect and strengthen himself, then the things that are in this world must be more powerful than the one who came down < from > the heavens. (3) For “water” is the water we can see, “light” is visible light, “matter” is ‘what you claim is in decay; “wind” is what sounds in our ears, and “fire” is this fire which we use every day for our needs.

46,4 And if he battles the archons with such things, tell us, what gets the battle started? Who is to be our commanding officer and blow the trumpet? Should we break through the ranks, should we combine to oppose the wings? (5) Who should cast the first spear—going by the raving maniac’s < talk >—at the stuff of the archons and authorities? (6) Does the wind fight, Mister? Does matter, which you say is in decay? Does fire, which the Lord has made for our use? Does light, which gives way to darkness at the successive intervals ordained by God? Does water? How? Explain your vaporings!

46,7 In fact we see that, really, [both] good and evil deeds are done with these elements. Sacrifices are offered to idols by fire, and the fire does not object, or prevent the sin. Daemon-worshippers pour libations of sea water, and no one attempting folly with water has ever been stopped. (8) How many pirates have committed murders with sea water? If anything, water is not opposed to the archons of wickedness, as you call them. Instead, water is their ally, though the water is not responsible; every human being is responsible for his own sin. And how much you talk!

46,9 What good did manufacturing armor and wearing a breastplate made of the elements do your First Man, he who came down to fight and was swamped by the darkness? For you claim that the Man was oppressed there below. (10) But the Father heard his prayer²³⁹ you say, and sent another power he had emitted, called Living Spirit. (11) Raise your mask, Menander, you comedian! That is what you are, but you conceal yourself while you recite the deeds of adulterers and drink. For you say nothing original—you mislead your dupes by introducing the Greeks' works of fiction in place of the truth. (12) Hesiod, with his stories of the theogony, probably had more sense than you, and Orpheus, and Euripides. Even though they told ridiculous stories, it is plain that they are poets and made things up that were not real. But to compound the error, you tell them as though they were.

47,1 You claim that this Living Spirit came below, offered his right hand, and drew your so-called First Man out of the darkness, he being in danger below in the depths—he who had descended to save the soul²⁴⁰ when it had been eaten, and could not save it but fell into danger himself. (2) Though he was sent on a mission of rescue he was endangered, and someone else was needed to be sent to his rescue! (3) How much more endangered must the soul be when the First Man, when he came, was endangered on its account?

But there was a second messenger sent to the rescue, which you say was Living Spirit. (4) Did the Father change his mind, then, and send someone still more powerful to be the savior of First Man? Or was he at first unaware that First Man lacked the power, and did he think that he would save the soul? < But > did he find this out by experience later when First

Man fell into danger, and emit [Living Spirit] and send [him]? (5) What a lot of nonsense, Mani! Your silly statement of your whole teaching is incoherent gibberish.

47,6 He claims in turn that Spirit descended, offered his right hand, and drew the endangered First Man up. Because of this mystery he taught his disciples to offer their right hands when they meet as a sign, as though they have been saved from darkness. (7) For he says that everything, with the sole exception of himself, is in darkness. Well, to make a joke, blind men avoid bad words better than the sighted, and see a great deal by hearing.

48,1 And next, to make other devices and furnishings for us, Mani claims—as though he had been there, though he is imagining things with no existence—that this Living Spirit then made the world. Clothed with three powers himself he too descended, brought the archons up, and crucified them in the firmament, which is their < body >, the sphere. (2) And yet the oaf does not realize how he contradicts himself with his “brought them up,” and how he finds fault with things he commends and makes the things he finds fault with commendable—like a drunkard who goes staggering around and babbling one thing after another.

48,3 For he claims that the archons in the darkness below are made of evil stuff, and that < the realms below* > are the place of corruption. (4) Now if, when Spirit forcibly brought the archons up from this corruption and dark realm to < the > heights—as a punishment, if you please!—if he brought about their departure from evil places and drew them aloft for a punishment, the realms above cannot be good, and made of the stuff of life. They must be made of the stuff of death; and the realms below cannot be a punishment, but must be of a nature somehow good. (5) And because Spirit meant to move the archons as a punishment, as a way of punishing them he took them from pleasant, familiar places to a place of punishment.

48,6 And here is a different argument. If Spirit made the world, why do you say, on the contrary, that the world was not made by God? And if the firmament is the archons’ body, to which cross did Spirit fasten the archons? For you sometimes say that they are fastened in the firmament, but sometimes declare that the firmament itself is their body.²⁴¹ (7) And

your arguments show a great inconsistency, with no correspondence with the truth. < You are defeated* > everywhere you have assailed us—assailed yourself, rather, and those who have adopted your opinion.

49,¹ Then in turn the same man says that after crucifying the archons in the sphere Spirit made the luminaries, which are remnants of the soul. (2) What confused doctrine, and what false and incoherent statements! Any “remnant” is a part of a whole, but the whole is larger than the remnant. (3) If, then, the luminaries are the remnants Mani should show us < something > larger than the luminaries, so that we can see the soul! (4) But if the whole has been eaten and consumed, and the luminaries are its remnants, since they are beneath the crucified archons they will get eaten too, because the archons have the position on top. (5) But if they can no longer remain in possession of the soul and luminaries because of being crucified, then, Mani, your silly account is wrong!

49,⁶ Then in turn the same man teaches that after rebuking the Porter, Matter created all growing things for herself. And when they were stolen by the archons the great archon called all the archons and the chief of them, took one power apiece from them, made a man in First Man's image and imprisoned the soul in him. This is the reason for the combination [of soul and body]. (7) But Living Father is kind and merciful, says Mani, and sent his beloved Son to the soul's rescue when he saw the soul oppressed in the body. For Mani claims that he was sent for this reason, and because of the Porter. (8) And on his arrival the Son changed himself into the likeness of a man and appeared to men as a man, and men supposed that he had been begotten [like a man]. (9) Thus he came and did the creating which was intended for men's salvation, and made a device with twelve water jars, which is turned by the sphere and draws up the souls of the dying. And the greater luminary takes these with its rays, and purifies them, and transfers them to the moon; and this is how what we call the moon's orb becomes full.

50,¹ And do you see how much there is of this charlatan's silly nonsense and drunken forgetfulness? For he consigns his own words to oblivion, whatever he seems to say he revises and reverses, demolishing his own doctrines by describing them in a whole series of different ways. His later teachings destroy his earlier ones and he rebuilds the things he originally demolished, (2) as though to show that they are not his own but that, like the delirious, he is driven by an unclean spirit to tell one story after another.

50,³ For he either means that the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ < came before the creation of the stars, or that the stars were made long

after the creation of the world. But it is obvious* > that the advent came many years after the creation of the luminaries and the thing Mani calls the “device” of the twelve water jars. (4) The stars have been in the sky ever since their creation. Whether they prefer to call them “elements” or “intervals and measurements of the sky,” they have all been put in place since the fourth day of creation, “well,” and not to the harm of God’s subjects. (5) But Christ’s advent < came* > in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar. < For* > he began his preaching < at this point* >, thirty years after his birth, coincidentally with the 5509th year of creation and the thirtieth of his age—[and] until the crucifixion in his thirty-third year.

50,6 Now [if Christ came and made them], why were these in the sky from the beginning, the luminaries and stars? But if he says that Christ came before this to make them, his nonsense is confused. What he calls elements, and the twelve “water jars” as he futilely terms them, and the “device” by which²⁴² he wants to deceive his dupes with nice names, were made before man was on earth.

51,1 For it is plain to anyone with sense, from the scripture itself and its sequence, that all the stars and luminaries were made on the fourth day of creation, before the making of Adam the first man. (2) But Mani says, “He came in the form of a man to make the twelve water jars, and appeared to men < as > a man.” Since he does not even know God’s original provision he thinks he has something to say. Like a blind man serving as his own guide he tells the people he has blinded whatever lies are handy. (3) But when the truth arrives and opens < up > the eyes of the wise, it makes a joke of his nonsense. To which men did Christ “appear” when there weren’t any? How could he “appear in the form of a man if he didn’t take a body?” (4) And if he did things during his advent in the flesh, when he “appeared” to be a man but wasn’t one, the things he did were an appearance. In that case he neither appeared nor came!

51,5 For if he was not real when he came, neither did he come at the beginning. If he was supposed to be a man but was not a man, what impelled God’s Word to appear as a man when he was not one? Unless he was being hounded by money-lenders, and wanted to disguise himself so as to get away from his creditors! (6) But if he indeed appeared and yet wasn’t there, what sort of “truth” was this? There can be no lie in truth, as the Only-begotten says of himself, “I am the truth and the life.”²⁴³ But

life cannot die and the truth cannot be subject to change, or it would jumble the truth up and no longer be truth. (7) And Mani's dramatic piece is a failure for every reason. Neither were the stars created after Christ's advent, nor were there human beings before the creation of the stars. And as I have just shown, the fraud Mani is confounded, both by the latter fact and by the former.

52,1 But on the subject of the moon, he says that its orb is filled with souls. Now how could the moon's orb get full before anyone on earth had died? How could the one soul, the first person to die after the nine hundred and thirtieth year of Adam's life,²⁴⁴ fill the moon's orb? (2) Or why were the 930 years also called "< the > times," if the moon did not wax, wane and run its appointed course, not by being flooded with souls but by God's command because it had the ordinance of his wisdom? (3) But Mani says that all living things are filled with the same soul—thus equating the souls of a man, a mouse, a worm, and the other bodies the origins of which are nasty.

52,4 But now for the rest of his nonsense. [When he says] how the virgin appears to the archons, sometimes in the shape of a man but sometimes in that of a woman, he is probably describing the passions of his own lusts and reflecting his daemon's hermaphrodism. (5) Then he says that when the chief archon is robbed by the so-called virgin he emits his clouds, causes pestilence and begins cutting the roots, and thus the result is death. (6) And yet the oaf has not seen that what he disparagingly calls "death" should rather be called "life," because of deliverance from bodies of the soul. (7) But if the archons have any inkling that the soul's residence in a body is an imprisonment, the chief archon will never do such a thing as to release the soul, which Mani claims he holds captive, from prison. And how much absurdity is there in this tricky teaching?

53,1 But their other complete absurdities, such as their so-called "elect."²⁴⁵ They have been "chosen," all right—by the devil for condemnation, in fulfillment of the words of scripture, "and his choice meats."²⁴⁶ (2) For they are drones who sit around and "work not, but are busybodies,"²⁴⁷

"knowing < neither what they say nor whereof they affirm* >."248 The holy apostle denounces them because of his prophetic knowledge that certain idle, stubbornly evil persons will be making their rounds,249 not by God's teaching but because the devil has made them crack-brained. (3) < For > to give a parody of the occupation of these idlers he says, "If any does not work, neither let him eat!"

53,4 Manicheans instruct their catechumens to feed250 these people generously. They offer their elect all the necessities of life, so that < whoever > gives sustenance to elect souls may appear supposedly pious. (5) But silly as it is to say, after receiving their food the elect all but put a curse on the givers under the pretense of praying for them, by testifying to their wickedness rather than their goodness. For they say: "*I did not sow you. I did not reap you. I did not knead you. I did not put you into the oven. Someone else brought you to me and I eat. I am guiltless.*" (6) And if anything, they have stigmatized as evildoers the persons who feed them—which, indeed, is true. No one who denies that God is the maker of all should take nourishment from God's creatures < except > as an ironical gesture.

53,7 The elect do not cut the cluster themselves but they eat the cluster, which shows them up as out-and-out drunkards rather than persons with a grasp of the truth. (8) For which is the worse? The harvester cut the cluster once, but the eater tormented and cut it many times over, with his teeth and by the crushing of each seed, and there can be no comparison between the one who cut it once and the one who chewed and crushed it. (9) < But they do this* > only to give the appearance of < abstaining from God's creatures* >, < while proving by their* > phony behavior how much evidence of the truth Mani has.

54,1 Then again he speaks impudently of Paradise, which is what he says the world is. The trees in it are < evils* >, he says—for anything we approve of, he denies, to show that he is truly the serpent's dupe. Just as the horrid serpent corrupted the ear of the blameless Eve, so also he corrupts the ears of Mani. (2) For Mani says that what we call trees in

Paradise are the deceits of lusts, which corrupt men's reason. But the tree in Paradise whereby they learn to know the good is Jesus himself, the knowledge in the world. And anyone who takes that fruit can tell good from evil.

54,3 And you see how he perverts everything that is right, although the apostle expressly and emphatically teaches, "I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and innocence that is in Christ."²⁵¹ And see how he pronounced him a fraud and villain, and the deceiver of Eve. (4) And once more, in another passage the same apostle says, "A man ought not to have long hair, forasmuch as he is the glory and image of God."²⁵² And you see how he called hair the glory of God, though it is grown on the body and not in the soul. (5) And afterwards he says, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman sinned by falling into transgression. Notwithstanding, she shall be saved by childbearing, if they continue in the faith."²⁵³ And see how the real truth is proclaimed in the sacred scripture, while Mani makes futile boasts—or rather, makes himself ridiculous in the eyes of persons of sound mind.

54,6 Then again he explains here that the world is not God's but has been made from a part of matter. But because he is not consistent, but goes back and forth plastering over the places he builds up and pulls down, it is plain to everyone that this sort of doctrine is the doctrine of a fool.

55,1 He describes transmigrations of souls from body to body, plainly borrowing this lie from Plato, Zeno the Stoic, or some other victim of delusion. (2) For how can the soul get into one body from another? If bodies came ready-made and received souls in this condition, his pompous fiction would have some plausibility. (3) But since the embryo develops from a tiny drop, how did the soul find such a broad passage into so small a body? For this is how bodies are formed; what Mani says cannot be proved.

55,4 Neither do souls migrate from body to body; no body is formed in any living thing without the intercourse of female with male and male with female. Now, is this the way the soul has come to be, to climax the tramp's theater piece with the union of two bodies? And people who even think such things are very strange.

55,5 But not to alter things that deserve respect, I am content just to give a glimpse of the subject, as though from a distance. I shall pass on from such a degrading idea; all suppositions of this sort are outrageous. (6) For if there is a migration of souls from body to body, and someone who was once a man later < becomes > a dog, why isn't a dog born from a man or an ox? Why isn't a bird? If indeed it should be that some monster is born during the immensely long course of history, this happens for a sign. (7) Even nature knows its own boundaries and does not change a man's nature and make him, contrary to nature, into something else. Nor does it change the nature of any beast; the same kind is born of each kind. (8) And if a different kind of body is never born from a body, how much more does a human soul not migrate into a different body?

55,9 And why is the body changed, does he say? So that, if it did not have the knowledge of the truth while it was in a man, it will be born in a dog or horse and disciplined²⁵⁴ and return to a human body knowing the truth, (10) and be taken up into the moon's orb now that it has come to knowledge. And it is amazing to see that the soul was ignorant when it was born in a man although men have schools, grammarians, sophists, innumerable trades, and speech, hearing, and reason—but rather, it came to knowledge when it was born in a pig! This shows that, if anything, Mani's promise of knowledge is for pigs, because of his imposture and impiety.

56,1 As to Adam's creation, Mani gives a substitute version and interweaves it with error. He says that the person who said, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness,"²⁵⁵ < is the archon, who said it to the other archons* >. And Mani adds to this by saying, "*Come*, let us make man," which is not the text, but, "*Let us* make man in our image and after our likeness."

56,2 But the holy apostle refutes him by saying, < "The man is the image and glory of God."* >²⁵⁶ So does the Lord himself, in the Gospel. The Pharisees told him that it is not good for a man to be by himself, and that Moses said he should give his wife a certificate of divorce and dismiss her. (3) And the Lord said to confute the Pharisees, "Moses wrote because of the hardness of your hearts. But from the beginning it was not so,²⁵⁷ but

he which made them male and female”—and he said, “For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.” (4) And he immediately adds, “What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder,”²⁵⁸ confessing that God, that is, his Father, had made Adam and Eve, and that lawful wedlock has been instituted by him.

56,5 And the holy apostle, the herald of the truth, says in the same vein, “This is a great mystery, but I say it of Christ and the church,”²⁵⁹ using the comparison < to confirm the truth of* > God’s creation of Adam and Eve* >—(6) < and confirm at the same time* > that God created < Eve* > and that Adam said, “This is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh, therefore shall a man leave,”²⁶⁰ < and so forth >. And God shaped his side into a wife for him. (7) And < the apostle says nothing else on the subject >²⁶¹ that is different, but [simply], “It is a great mystery.” And if < the apostle confirms the divine creation* > in the man and the woman and this is treated anagogically in an allegory, why does Mani, speaking blasphemy and ignoring the truth, suppose that God’s creatures are abominable and foreign to God’s truth, and < say that they were made* > by an archon?

56,8 Next, he says, because the soul which had been torn away at the beginning was a source of distress to the power on high it sent someone, one time, and, through these luminaries, stole the remnant of itself—the soul, that is—from the archons. (9) What high hopes we have, and what a great expectation! God the good, living and mighty is powerless to save—never mind his own power which has been dragged away from him—he can’t save the creature he has made and fashioned! He can’t save it except in some other way, or by the banditry of secretly stealing the power that has been torn away from him out of the heavens—or so the tramp says.

57,1 But why am I still tiring myself by spending time on his absurdity in its exact wording? For instance, neither is the wretch ashamed to say blasphemously that the one who spoke in the Law and the Prophets was the archon of darkness. (2) How blessed our hopes are, since Christ came and compelled us to offer gifts to the archon of darkness! For after cleansing the leper < he commands > him to offer the gift which is prescribed in the Law by the very person who spoke in the Law. “Go and offer thy gift

as Moses commanded,"²⁶² says he to the leper he has cleansed. (3) In the case of leprosy the "gift" was a bird for a sacrifice, and fine flour for a burnt offering. (4) If the archon of darkness were < the God of the Law* >, the Word who came from on high—the Son of God who, as Mani says, came to turn humankind from the error of the archons—would not encourage the leper he had healed to become their subject. He would encourage him to escape instead, by teaching him not to do this.

57,5 But he had not come to destroy the Law or < the > Prophets—he had given the Law himself—but to fulfill them, to show us himself that unwavering adherence to the Gospel is the fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets. For the prophets worshiped the same God, and the Law was given by him. Today, however, the worship is not offered to the same God with the same gifts; (6) God gave burdensome commands, as though to slaves, to the men of the Law, since in that way they would be able to obey. But to the men of the Gospel he gave lighter commands as though to free men, of the abundance of his loving kindness. (7) But since the God of the Law and the God of the Gospel are equivalent, and the worship of neither era has been abolished, this same God is one God, ruler of the entire world, worshiped by his servants—but worshiped in each generation as befits his loving kindness.

57,8 And Mani's imposture is altogether refuted, since the Savior orders that the Law's commandments be kept. And [then], after ordering the keeping of the Law's commandments, he breaks the Law's commandments, not by destroying them but by fulfilling them. For in place of the Law's commandments he orders that other sacrifices be offered to God, that is, those of piety, goodness, purity and ascetic discipline.

58,1 But again, Mani claims that in the last days the Elder will come and make his image manifest; and then, when he sees his face, the porter will drop the earth and the eternal fire will consume the earth. (2) Without noticing it the oaf was once again making the earth material, although he had said a while before that it was created by the Spirit of life. For simultaneously with this he supposes that the whole world will be consumed by fire.

58,3 And then, he says, after this, the restoration to unity of the two natures will pass on to the original condition. What a lot of trouble, and after the trouble nothing contributing to improvement! (4) For if everything is to be used up and consumed after it has been created and has

come into being, so that the originals of the two natures, the good and the evil, will remain as they were, this will again be a provocation for the evil nature to come back, start a war and seize some more power, so that another world will once more be generated.

58,5 But if this is not yet the case, then evil is going to learn sense and not be provoked at goodness any more; and [so is] the evil god, who will declare no more wars on the good God. (6) But if indeed he will ever be taught sense he will no longer be evil, since after his alteration he has been changed from his original evil nature. But if indeed the evil god's nature is at all changeable, this is surely because it gets changed from evil to good. And the nature which can be changed to goodness cannot be evil. For evil can be changed to good even today, and while the world is still going on. (7) And if he is to be changed, why is he not changed already? And if the evil god is changed by God's contrivance so that he can no longer do evil, the evil god cannot be responsible for himself. The responsibility must lie with the good God, since he is capable of suppressing the bad god's evil but will not to do before its time a work whose time has been fixed.

58,8 However, if evil is altogether unchangeable it can never stop warring and being warred on, and there can never be a restoration of the two natures. Evil will remain unchanged, and be provoked into doing evil to the good and declaring war on goodness.

58,9 And yet, if evil is always troubled by some desire for the good, it cannot be evil.²⁶³ In its yearning for the good it desires to draw the good to itself, so that, by acquiring power from the nature of the good and its armor, it can feel it is honoring, illuminating, emboldening and strengthening itself. (10) For < the* > notion < of the good* > is surely present in anyone who wants the good, because he expects²⁶⁴ to be benefited* > by good < itself* >. And evil cannot be altogether evil since it is found to be yearning for the good. For anything evil is hostile to the good, just as the good has no desire for evil.

58,11 But if the power is made of both principles jumbled together, and the good God can steal what belongs to him, and can attack the principalities and authorities and flay them—can sometimes destroy and do away with the matter made by the evil god, sometimes make things from it but sometimes do away with it—then < there can be no difference between

good* > and evil. And< the > stream of chatter the offender has inflicted on us < will be found to be > wickedness, and incapable of proof.

59,1 Come on, buddy, speak up! Take up your account of the nature of evil again and tell us—you who arrived in the Emperor Aurelian's time, and yet are describing what was before all ages, though no prophet ever foretold this, and neither the Savior himself nor any of the apostles taught it. Unless you play the fool by writing yourself and palming off some forged books in the names of saints.²⁶⁵ Tell us where you come from, you with your primordial principle of evil!

59,2 If I ask him whether he claims that this principle is changeable or unchangeable, < he talks incoherent nonsense* >. But I have already been told that he describes it [both] as [altogether] changeless, and as changeable at some times but not changeable at others—[that is], not changeable to evil but changeable to good—so that he earns the world's contempt with the two statements. (3) For if evil was changeless over immense ages, and had only this very name and no other name but “evil,” who changed the changeless nature of evil many ages later, into something which was not suitable to it?

59,4 For who made it change, if it had not yet seized power and gone to war, and if it had not yet taken armor to strengthen itself and for food, but had gone for many ages without food or the need of food—[who made] this thing that had never needed food begin to eat, seek what it had never sought, need what it had never needed?

59,5 But if it was changed in nature, what proof can there be of the changelessness of evil that you teach? And even if he reverted to his normal condition when he found nothing more to eat, how could a wicked or evil [god] bear to go on without food for all time to come, once he had become used to eating and having food? (6) For if, when he was not used to eating, he could not bear it, but acquired the new habit of eating and got the soul for his food by stealing it, he will be the more ungovernable when he is used to foods. And once he has become greedy and acquainted with food, nothing could induce him to go on without these things, as your unprovable claim would have it.

60,1 But I shall pass this by, and once more extend the discussion to other parts of his nonsense. Once again, he claims that the archons will be in their own territory then, (i.e., at the restoration) and the Father will

regain his own. (2) Now who is this person so equitable that he can survey the boundary of each territory from either side? Why will [the bad god] heed [him] when he did not heed the truth and the good God at the outset? If it is by force that the good God is to prevail on the lawbreaker to be content with his own and not encroach on the good God's portion, why couldn't he do this in the first place, before the area was stolen at all?

60,3 But why will the two co-exist, each with his respective possessions? If God has any territory, and the other territory is not his, the Almighty cannot be called almighty or God of all. Nor can the evil god be subject to the good God; each one has his own realm.²⁶⁶

60,4 But then, of what can the evil god be the master, when there is still no world, and no animals or people under his sway? And if he is evil at all, and matter and corruption, why hasn't he decayed? If evil has always been corruption, and corrupts other things but not itself, it cannot be in decay—not when it corrupts other things, but is perennial [itself] and does not disappear. (5) But if it remains stable itself, but corrupts other things and not itself, it cannot leave anything unaffected; the corruption of some things must surely corrupt others. But if it is the < only* > thing < left* > in existence, and it will no longer leave anything untouched but only it will remain, the things that are corrupted by it must disappear. (6) However, if it is also bad for itself and the cause of its own decay, its existence cannot continue. I should not say only in the future; it would disappear < as soon as > it was in being, and would in itself already be the cause of its own decay and disappearance.

60,7 But all these are the yarns of the fool's nonsense. Take note of them, you wise sons of God's holy church and the Lord's faith, judge the tramp, and laugh at his drivel! But he will go back to the misconceived occasions of it and resemblances to it in the sacred scriptures—< false ones* > which do not bear that interpretation, but are misunderstood by him in that sense. (8) All right, let's give the exact words of the texts which, as I said, he steals from the sacred scriptures and explains in his own way—though I have often discussed the same ones < already >, and refuted them perfectly well.

61,1 In the first place, because he had found something about the name "Paraclete" in the sacred scriptures and did not know the power of the Holy Spirit, he smuggled himself into them, thinking that this was what they meant. (2) And he claims that what St. Paul said leaves room for

him, since the holy apostle said, "We know in part and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away."²⁶⁷

61,3 But St. Paul never says this of the Paraclete, though he, with those who like him were apostles, was counted worthy of the Holy Spirit himself. He was talking about the two worlds, this world and the world to come, as he told those who want < prior > knowledge of the times, "Let no man affright you by word < or > by letter, as that the day of the Lord is at hand. For except the son of sin be revealed, the man of iniquity,"²⁶⁸ and so on...(a citation is missing here)

61,4 And again, when the disciples had met with the Savior and asked him about the consummation, and he told them, "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you."²⁶⁹

(5) And again he said, "Depart not from Jerusalem, while ye await the promise of the Spirit, which ye have heard."²⁷⁰ This means the Paraclete Spirit, as he said, "If I depart, he shall come and shew you all things."²⁷¹

(6) But < he said* >, "He shall show you all things," because of the gift that was to be vouchsafed them; < for* > the Holy Spirit < would* > dwell in them to give them a clear explanation of all that they could understand in this world.

61,7 And as vessels of the Paraclete Spirit, they prophesied here in this world, as < the scripture says > that Agabus prophesied an impending famine, and that "Prophets came down from Jerusalem,"²⁷² and that "Philip had four daughters which did prophesy."²⁷³

61,8 But when these prophets prophesy, they prophesy in part and know in part but with hope await what is perfect in the ages to come, "when the corruptible is changed to incorruption and the mortal to immortality."²⁷⁴ For < "When this mortal shall have put on immortality, >²⁷⁵ then shall we see face to face." (9) For now these things are shown to us

“darkly,”²⁷⁶ but there “what eye hath not seen here” is prepared. There perfection is revealed, those things that “ear hath not heard” here. There is the greatest gift to the saints, that which “hath not entered into the heart of man”²⁷⁷ here.

61,10 And you see that no further knowledge was held in reserve for Mani. How could Mani know it when < he > fell short of his own goal? He undertook to master Marcellus; he came to Archelaus with the intent of defeating him and could not. (11) Since he has no knowledge of recent events, how can he have it of the greater things? When he was caught and punished, for example, why did he not escape from the king of Persia—except to show all sensible people that he was a complete liar?

62,1 Again, he cites a text in vain to prove the existence of the dyad he believes in and distinguish between the two first principles: the Savior’s words, “A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit; for by its fruit the tree is known.”²⁷⁸ (2) And note his shallow mind, which does not understand the contents of sacred scripture in any depth! If there are trees they have a cultivator; trees are plants and have surely been planted by someone. And nothing which is planted is beginningless but has a beginning. And having a beginning, it will have an end as well. (3) The corrupt tree was not always there, then, but had been planted. And this “good tree” is not a reference to all the goodness on high—for < there is* > goodness unfeigned there, changeless, of ineffable dignity—< and* > the thought is < not about* > the true holy God.

62,4 But let’s see whether Mani is right about the business of trees, and take it from there. If we are talking about the devil, I have already shown often that he was not created evil; God made nothing evil, and this is plain to the wise. (5) For if we are going over the same ground, it will do no harm to give an account of the truth even now. The devil was not wicked in the beginning; he proved to be wicked. Look here, the point about the tree won’t be proved from that angle!

62,6 We see too that Saul was a persecutor, but was later persecuted for the name he once persecuted. We see that Judas was chosen with the twelve apostles but later proved to be < evil >, and is counted as evil. (7) We see that Rahab the harlot was not of Israelite stock, but that she repented later and received God’s mercy. We see that the thief was apprehended in

a crime and hanged on the wood, and yet he confessed and has entered Paradise with the Lord. We see that Nicolaus was a good man and had been chosen—but that he proved to be evil afterwards and was reckoned among the heresiarchs.

62,8 And why give all these examples? What is this evil tree from which no good can come? Plainly,²⁷⁹ it is the acts of human beings. Nothing good can come of fornication, no righteousness of the wickedness of envy,²⁸⁰ nothing commendable of adultery. (9) The tree of sin itself cannot grow through goodness—that is, an evil tree does not bear good fruit, nor < can > the fruit of a good tree < be > evil. (10) The good tree which does not bear evil fruit < is the human heart which is firmly established in God and from which, like good fruit, there spring such good works* > as hospitality, < which is never evil* >. Even if any number of < evils > result from hospitality, charity does not for < this > reason have the force of wickedness. [Nor does] purity for God's sake, continence for the Lord's, righteousness for the Law's.

62,11 These two trees are figurative expressions for righteousness and sin; but in this barbarous Mani's opinion, [one] means God and [the other] means the devil. (12) And yet, it is plain that no one can dare to say that God will ever create evil—perish the thought!—or that the devil does good. (13) All good things are made by God, and nothing evil has been created or made by him. But if certain things are the work of the devil, see here, < in this case too we have found that God fights on the side of the faithful* >, that a wreath is woven by him for the saints, the victors awarded a prize.²⁸¹ (14) And Mani's argument has failed. The evil and good trees refer to good and evil works and not to the Old and the New Testaments, as Mani's argument maintains.

63,1 Moreover, from a desire to furnish occasions of the two first principles, he ferrets out and employs the texts he thinks apply, though they do < not > have this meaning. He says that the Savior told the Jews, "Ye are sons of the devil; he was a murderer because his father was a liar."²⁸² (2) He wants to say blasphemously that the maker of heaven and earth is the father of the devil, although the text cannot possibly refer to this.

63,3 For if the Jews are in any sense sons of the devil, the argument about the devil has failed and Mani is unwittingly contradicting himself. For if their souls are made by the devil it follows that they are distinct [from the others] and cannot originate from Mani's mythical power on high, or be a part of the light or its armor, or the pillar of light, or the Mother of Light. (4) But if < they are > in any sense the devil's children, it follows from Mani's argument that their father Abraham, whose offspring the Jews are, is the devil's son too.

63,5 Well then, why does the Savior say to them in refutation, "Ye are no children of Abraham, but children of your father, the devil. If ye were children of Abraham, ye would do his works. For ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth. This did not Abraham."²⁸³ (6) And you can see that this is colloquial language. The Jews are Abraham's children, and yet separate themselves from the Lord by their works, not their nature or creation—I have previously discussed this.²⁸⁴ How can the portion of Abraham's descendants at one moment be alien to him and belong to the devil, and at the next be God's portion? (7) The Savior means this as an accusation. By his activity and his teaching a man is the slave of the one to whom he submits, as Paul says, "Though ye have many instructors, yet have ye not many fathers. For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel."²⁸⁵ (8) And do you see that he means teaching? And if Mani accepted Abraham, we would say that Abraham was the son of the God of light, but that his children were someone else's!

63,9 But this is the reason. The Jews were imitating the murderer, imitating the betrayal of Judas, had hearkened to the slander of the betrayer, become the children of his denial of God. He himself was a liar, for he "had the bag and stole,"²⁸⁶ and said, "Hail, master," to the Savior, and heard his reproach, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?"²⁸⁷ (10) Since he had become a murderer this Judas imitated Cain who lied to the Lord's face and said "Am I my brother's keeper? I know not where he is."²⁸⁸ And Cain himself had become the < devil's > son, by imitation and by paying

heed to the lying voice that spoke in the serpent and said, “Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.”²⁸⁹

63,11 This is what the Savior says in the Gospel, “Ye are sons of the devil.”²⁹⁰ For he says, “Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?”²⁹¹ “Devil” because he was “a liar and a murderer from the beginning, for his father was a liar.”²⁹²

63,12 And this question has been resolved. The Jews were not the devil’s children, far from it! The Samaritan woman says to the Savior, “Here in this mountain our fathers worshiped; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship”—(13) and later, after much discussion, the Savior told her, “We speak that we do know, *for salvation is of the Jews*.”²⁹³ And the apostle said in his turn, “It is plain that the Lord sprang from *Judah*.”²⁹⁴ And there is a great deal to say about this in refutation of Mani’s imposture.

64,1 Again, he seizes on the following text, “The light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness overcame it not.”²⁹⁵ This means that the darkness pursued the light, he says, since the evil archons pursued the God-head and fought against it.

64,2 But if the light is under attack and pursued by the darkness, the darkness must be stronger than the light—since the light runs away from the darkness and cannot bear to make a stand, since darkness is apparently the stronger. (3) But that is not so. The light does not flee from the darkness, for “The light shineth in the darkness and the darkness overcame it not.”²⁹⁶ But if the darkness did not overcome the light, this is very different from what Mani means. He says not only that the darkness overcame the light, but that it seized armor from it as well. Now how ever could < the > darkness not overcome the light, when Mani declares that it has seized armor? However, if the light is being pursued, why does it willingly go on shining in the darkness?

64,4 But because men’s minds had been blinded by the muddiness of sin, God sent the Law first, giving them light as when a lamp appears, (5) as Peter says in his Epistle, “Taking heed unto the word of prophecy, as unto

a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day star arise, and the day dawn in your hearts.”²⁹⁷ For that is the source of the light which shines in the darkness—the Law which was given “by the hand of a mediator,”²⁹⁸ through God’s faithful servant Moses.

64,6 Because the Law had always been shining like a spark in the law of nature, Enoch, saw it and pleased the Lord; Abel pleased the Lord by its guidance. Noah saw his way by it, and found favor before God; Abraham believed God by it and it was reckoned to him for righteousness. (7) Then the light overpassed the dimensions of a spark, and was added to the luster of “the lamp that shineth in a dark place.” This is the meaning of “The light shineth in the darkness:”²⁹⁹ God’s commandment, and the intent of goodness, which gives light in the hearts of the faithful, within the mind muddied < by > the wicked things men do—idolatry, the denial of God, murders, adultery and the rest.

64,8 But when the great Light came, “the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, he was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not—this light that came unto his own, and his own received him not—but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.”³⁰⁰ (9) And do you see in what sort of darkness this light shines, and what sort of darkness has not overcome it? For the good which is continually sent to the human mind by God, and which gives light in the world, has not been vanquished by sin.

65,1 Once more, Mani similarly seizes on the Savior’s words, “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which sowed good seed < in > his field. And while men slept an enemy came and sowed tares. (2) Then his servants said unto him, Didst thou not sow good seed in the field? He said, Yea. They said, Whence then the tares? He said, An enemy hath done this. His servant said unto him, Wilt thou that we go and root the tares out? (3) But he said unto them, Nay, lest while rooting out the tares ye root out also the wheat. Leave them until the time of harvest, and I shall say to the reapers, Gather up the tares and burn them, but store the wheat in the barn, and make the tares ready to be burned with fire unquenchable.”³⁰¹

65,4 But when his disciples asked him in the house, "Tell us the parable of the tares," he explained and did not conceal it, so as not to provide the cheat with an opening against the truth. (5) The Lord answered them plainly and said, "He that sowed the good seed is God. The field is the world; the tares are the wicked men; the enemy is the devil; the reapers are the angels; the harvest is the consummation of the age; the wheat is the good men. (6) < The consummation will come > when the Lord sendeth his angels and gathereth the sinners out of his kingdom and delivereth them to be burned."³⁰²

65,7 Sons of the truth, see that this man who has become our new version of Jannes and Jambres puts forth his own arguments against himself. He himself denies that the world is God's; yet the Savior has said here that the world is the field, that the householder and owner of the field < is God >—that is, his Father; and that it is he who has sown his good seed. (8) And he did not distinguish souls from bodies or bodies from souls, but said that the enemy had sown the tares, which are the evil men. And he does not call men just bodies < or just souls > but said, "evil men," [meaning both] together. (9) And in turn, he said likewise that the good men are the good seed < which > the householder sowed in his field. And he didn't say their souls, but "good < men >," with body and soul. (10) God thus sows the good in men by his teaching, and the devil secretly sows the evil deeds in men by his mischief.

65,11 But we are not going to find a root of wickedness in this place or that, but works done by ourselves. And God is in no way responsible for the tares which have been sown. Christ makes this clear at once by saying, "while men slept"; he didn't say, "while the householder slept." Whenever we doze off from good works, whenever we neglect righteousness, whenever we do not alert our minds to God's commandment, sins are sown < in us >.

65,12 Do you see that the reapers get the bundles ready for the eternal fire? Tell me, Mani, do they bind up souls there? Or do they burn bodies without souls, or burn the souls too? Your description of the purification of souls cannot stand up, because they will be consigned to punishment and condemnation. But so much for this. For the wise, the utterances of the truth are plain.

66,1 He seizes on yet another text and cites it without realizing its implications, but with a wrong interpretation of its saving teaching. I mean the

words of the Savior, "The prince of this world cometh, and findeth nothing of his in me";³⁰³ < and again, "The prince of this world shall be cast down >";³⁰⁴ and again, in the apostle, "The god of this world hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine."³⁰⁵

66,2 Let's see < whether > the ruler of this world, of whom the Lord speaks, will be cast down—for Christ adds, "And if I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me."³⁰⁶ Whom does he mean by "the ruler of this world?" And if he means the devil, why does John say of the Savior in his Gospel, "He came unto his own?"³⁰⁷

66,3 For we can see that the two following sayings are contradictory. The apostle says, "The whole world lieth in the evil one,"³⁰⁸ and yet the Savior "was in the world."³⁰⁹ How can both of these allow for each other? And if the whole world lies in the evil one, where is there room in the world for the Savior, so that he can be "in the world?" (4) And if the world's contents are the Son of God's "own,"³¹⁰ what "ruler" exercises control over God's own? But if the contents of the world are not the Son of God's "own," what "ruler of the world" would allow the world's contents to be the Savior's own? And if the world is the Son of God's, why would he allow a "ruler" to hold his own world prisoner?

66,5 But all the words of the sacred scripture are spoken with wisdom, as the Lord himself says, "John came in the way of righteousness, neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold, a man gluttonous and a winebibber, the friend of publicans and sinners. And wisdom is justified of her children."³¹¹ (6) And how was wisdom justified by her children? How but by those who understand wisdom's words, as it also says in the prophet, "Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? For the ways

of the Lord are right, and whoso hath the word of wisdom shall likewise understand these things; but the impious shall faint in them.”³¹²

67,1 < Mani > has indeed fainted in the sacred and heavenly words, and been impious with the impious. For the Savior said shortly before this, “I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven”;³¹³ and here again, he says, “The ruler of this world shall be cast down.”³¹⁴ (2) And if he was speaking of a Satan who had already fallen, why did he need to be cast down again?

But you will surely say, “[He had to be cast] into the abyss.” All right, where was the Lord to be “lifted up?” If he was to be lifted from the abyss, < he needed to go there first. But he spoke while he was on earth, and was to be lifted up from there* >—< for > the comparison of like with like assures equivalence of expression.

67,3 But when was he lifted up on earth? He was speaking of his lifting on the cross, and his ascent to heaven to draw all to himself. (4) And why didn’t he draw them while he was [still] in heaven, but came to earth instead? He had to come and assume the form of men, in order to < exalt > the holy vessel < in himself > first of all—[the holy vessel] he had taken from Mary and formed as his own holy body, the divine Word from on high, come from the bosom of his Father. Then, when he had been exalted in his own body, he could draw the persons who were like him to himself.

67,5 But who is the ruler of this world? When scripture says, “The whole world lieth in the evil one,” it does not mean heaven, earth, the sun, the moon, vegetation, the sea, mountains, the air, clouds, the wind, stars, winged things—it does not mean any part of the creation, perish the thought! “The world” < is* > human < lust* >, the arrogance of the human mind, the insolence of human vanity, the boastfulness of human pride. (6) This, arrogance, was the “ruler of this world” who was cast down. For the Savior says, “Ye receive honor one of another, but I seek not mine own glory.”³¹⁵

67,7 How could arrogance not fall, how could the ruler of the world not be crushed, when Herod kept the Judge and Lord of the quick and dead under guard and judged him? When Pilate sat in judgment on him, a servant struck his jaw, Judas betrayed him, Caiaphas sentenced him, the Jews

spat on him, and soldiers struck his head though he could have crushed heaven and earth with a nod? (8) This was the arrogance, insolence, and vainglory of the men of the world; this was the ruler of the world, who fell to the earth. For all the notables of rank exercise their authority by shouting, insolence, reputation and arrogance, none of which are to be found in the Savior. For “a smoking flax shall he not quench, and a bruised reed shall he not break.”³¹⁶

68,1 And I have a great deal to say about this. But once more, this same Mani says that “The god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest they should shine in the light of the Gospel.”³¹⁷ (2) If there is any “god of this world,” what was the Savior doing, entering someone else’s territory? And if he coveted someone else’s possessions, this is no way for a good or a just person to behave. (3) But if he came to save things which were not his but someone else’s, this is the behavior of a flatterer whose object is to make his neighbor’s slaves more impertinent than they are.

68,4 And if he did come to save the possessions of the god of this world, he was doing the favor for the god of this world himself, by trying to save his vessels. And if the god of this world assents in any way to the rescue of his property by the Savior then, even if he cannot save it himself, he is good, since he is pleased with the rescue of his possessions.

68,5 And then there will be a single mutuality of goodness. For the One who can, saves, while the one who cannot save his own is pleased with those who are saved, and feels that he gains by receiving his own, saved, from the One who can really save them. (6) And if he offers no opposition to the One who wants to save his possessions, he will be thankful too.

68,6 But if he is thankful to him, < the Savior > will first save the owner of the saved—to display his goodness in the rescued owner, and < because > he will not wish to save the less important persons and overlook the essential one, from whom the saved have their origin.

68,7 Or again, from another viewpoint: If he prefers not to save him (i.e., the god of the world) and yet saves < the persons > he < has made >, he is not finishing his task, and is unable to do good in the fullest sense of the word. But if he cannot save him because his is of a nature which is unsaveable, but still saves the persons he made—if anything, the ones he made are worse than he, and incapable of salvation.

68,8 But to put it in still another way: If he had no possessions of his own to save and came to someone else's for show, < to > make a display of his assistance—what a desperate plight, that cannot save anything of its own, and goes to foreign territory to show off the act which it could not show in its own!

68,9 And Mani's argument about the Savior and the ruler of this world has failed already. In fact the "god of this world" cannot be another god different from the real one, or a real other god, perish the thought! God the Lord of all, the maker of the world, is one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and never fails.

69,1 As to the god the apostle says the unbelievers have chosen for their god—I say that there is not just one "god of this world," never think it, there are many. To them unbelievers have submitted and been blinded in mind as the apostle says in another passage, (2) "whose god is their belly and whose glory is in their shame."³¹⁸ And the Lord says in the Gospel, "Ye cannot serve two masters"; and then a good while later, to show who the two masters are, says, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon."³¹⁹

69,3 Very well, "God" is God, and mammon is "the god of this world." For most of the human race is caught by mammon and the belly, these two, and goes blind, not at God's instigation but by their own malice—for out of unbelief everyone desires everything and submits to everything. (4) Thus the apostle says, "The love of money is the root of all evil."³²⁰ And he curses their wicked propensity for god-making for this reason, and to curse the lusts of the belly says, "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats; but God shall destroy both it and them."³²¹

69,5 The god of this world, then, has blinded the minds of the unbelievers. Thus in the Gospel too we find that the scribe first³²² says correctly, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?"³²³ And the Lord said, "Honor thy father and thy mother as it is written." For the commandments of the Law were not foreign to him, and thus the Lord himself teaches that observance of the Law is inheritance of eternal life.

69,6 Then the scribe says, "All these things have I done from my youth." And on hearing this the Lord "rejoiced," to show that the Law's

commandments are not foreign to his Godhead; for by saying that he “rejoiced,” scripture expressed the agreement of the Old Testament with the New Testament.

69,7 But the scribe said, “What lack I yet?”³²⁴ and the Lord told him, “If thou wilt be perfect sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and take up thy cross and follow me, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven. But he went away sorrowing, for he was very rich.”³²⁵ Then the Lord said, “It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.”³²⁶ < The rich > cannot enter because they have been blinded by the god of this world, and have taken mammon for their god and submitted to the “god of this world,” that is, to covetousness. (9) As Christ says, “Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy,”³²⁷ and elsewhere, “which is covetousness.”³²⁸

And to show the effect and consequence of covetousness he says, “They be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.”³²⁹ (10) For since covetousness, the god of this world, had blinded them, neither had “The light of the Gospel shone in their hearts,”³³⁰ for they had gone blind from covetousness. (11) Covetousness also blinded Judas, also killed Ananias and Sapphira, has destroyed many. This is “the god of this world.” By their choice of him for their god men have taken to the honoring of him and despised the Lord, as he says, “He will hold to the one and despise the other; ye cannot serve God and mammon.”³³¹

69,12 And there you see the literal and plain explanation of the matter. There cannot be any other god, not in heaven, not on earth, not anywhere. “There is one Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things,”³³² and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things. The Trinity is forever, one Godhead, neither receiving addition nor admitting of subtraction.

70,1 Let us go on again to something else, beloved, and rend the nets of this beast, enemy and criminal by comparing his heresies with the speech of the truth, for the benefit of those whose aim is to learn the truth and

turn their minds away from the erring teaching of every sect. (2) For once more he seizes on the Law and the Prophets, though he is the enemy of the truth, and of the Holy Spirit who has spoken in the Law and the Prophets. Naturally he has, as always, given his tongue free rein against the God who made all things and spoke in the Law and the Prophets, “the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom all the family in heaven and earth is named.”³³³

70,3 Mani says, “From him (i.e., the God of the Law) comes lust, from him come murders and all the rest. For he ordered [the Jews] to take the Egyptians’ clothing and that sacrifices be offered to him, and the rest of the Law’s provisions—and the murder of the murderer, so that he is still not satisfied with the first murder,³³⁴ but even commands a second supposedly to avenge the first. And he puts lusts into people’s minds by his descriptions < of > women and other things; but he perforce made a few prophecies of Christ, to establish his credibility by these few plausible remarks.”

70,4 And these were the words of the insolent Mani, which he impudently utters against his own Master. Observing them, one must see that there is nothing but delirium in this man. For as someone in delirium who has a sword draws his sword against himself, cuts his own flesh in his fit in the belief that he is fighting against enemies, and does not know it, so Mani is at war with himself because he does not understand the texts he applies against himself. (5) For if lust is from God and he is the cause of lust, why does the God who puts lust in people’s heads write against lust all over the scriptures? It is he who says, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s goods, nor his ox nor his ass nor his maidservant nor his field nor his wife, nor anything that is thy neighbor’s.”³³⁵ If he forbids lust, he cannot be the provider of lust.

71,1 Why, asks Mani, did he order the spoiling of the Egyptians when the Israelites went out of Egypt? Yes, he did—for he is a just judge, as I have often said of him by now. (2) And to show that he himself has no need of sacrifices, he says in the prophet, “Have ye offered unto me sacrifices forty years, O house of Israel? saith the Lord.”³³⁶ (3) To whom were the < sacrifices > offered, then? To him, in proportion with the understanding of the offerers; and God had commanded this, not because he needed the

sacrifices, but to wean them away from polytheism to the recognition of one God. [He commanded it] because they had seen sacrifices offered to the gods of the Egyptians, so that their minds would not be changed because of the polytheism, and they would desert the one and only God. (4) But when God had dissuaded them from polytheism over a long period of time and weaned them away from an opinion of this sort, he began to cut off the things that were not his will, and said, To what purpose bring ye me incense from Saba, and spices from a land afar off?"³³⁷ "Will I eat the flesh of bulls and drink the blood of goats?"³³⁸ "I have not required this at your hands,"³³⁹ "but to do righteousness each man to his neighbor, and truth each man to his brother."³⁴⁰

71,5 And you see that the meaning behind the sacred < oracles > is revealed as time goes on. For example, God himself tells Samuel, "Anoint Saul as king,"³⁴¹ but later he accuses them with the words, "Ye have anointed a king but not by me, and rulers, and I did not command you."³⁴² (6) And since their minds were set on this, God consoles³⁴³ the prophet Samuel by saying, "They have not rejected thee, but me, saith the Lord. But anoint for them Saul, the son of Kish." The Godhead was dealing with them as though with little children, to show patience with the feebleness of the weak and coax the infant out of its weakness. (7) Then, at the very last, he says, "The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart God will not despise,"³⁴⁴ "Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise,"³⁴⁵ and whatever other things can be said about this.

72,1 Next this same Mani says that < the God who gave the Law perforce* > consented to say something about Christ. < And the cheat does not see how he is confuting himself* >. (2) For if he knows the future he is not devoid of foreknowledge—but the one who knows the events of the future is God, and he wrote of them in order that they would take place. And if they were repugnant to him he wrote of them but forbade them, so that we would not consent to them. (3) But since he guarantees that those future events will be realized in Christ, the Spirit who spoke in the

Law and the Prophets, and in the Gospel, is the same. For there is one concord as God says through Moses, "The Lord shall raise up unto you a prophet, from your brethren, < like unto me >"³⁴⁶ (4) and the Lord in his turn says in the Gospel, "Moses wrote of me."³⁴⁷ Moses says, "Every soul that shall not hearken unto that prophet, shall be destroyed,"³⁴⁸ and the Lord, in turn, says, "If ye believe not Moses' writings, how shall ye believe my words?"³⁴⁹ And it is plain on every side that the truth is a shining thing and "has no spot."³⁵⁰

73,1 Again, Mani declares that the testament of the Law is the testament of death, since the apostle has said, "If the testament of death, graven with letters on stones, was given with glory."³⁵¹ (2) And the sacred scripture said not only this, but, "The Law is not made for a righteous man, but for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for perjured persons, and if there be anything that is contrary to sound doctrine."³⁵² (3) Now because the Law is not made for a righteous man, is the righteous man therefore a law-breaker? Of course not! But since the righteous man has already obeyed the Law's commandments, there is no Law against a righteous keeper of the Law; the Law is against the lawless, and condemns law-breakers.

73,4 In this way, then, the testament was a < testament of death >. It said that the murderer should be murdered, the adulterer put to death, the law-breaker stoned. But "It came with glory," for its glory was great. It prevailed over the glory men derive from injustice to one another, and it was typified by the light of a pillar of fire [and] fearful trumpets with their loud blasts, < it was deposited* > in the tent of meeting, and came at that time with great glory.

73,5 For the testament of death had to come first, so that we would "die to sin" first and "live to righteousness"³⁵³—as Christ "hath borne our griefs and carried our infirmities,"³⁵⁴ "bearing all in his body on the

cross,”³⁵⁵ so that first everything pertaining to death and then everything pertaining to life would be fulfilled in him for our sakes.

73,6 And this is why he died first, to confirm the testament of death. Then he rose from the dead, that < we might be “changed > from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.”³⁵⁶ For “He triumphed over principalities and powers”³⁵⁷ on the cross and “condemned sin”³⁵⁸ in death. He buried iniquity by his burial, and broke “death’s sting”³⁵⁹ by tasting death. By his descent into hades he despoiled hades, manfully loosed its prisoners, and won the trophy of the cross against the devil.

73,7 And see how this glory is the same from Moses until the Lord! How much more should the testament of life be glorious, when a stone has been rolled away, rocks are rent, graves are opened, angels shine like lightning, women proclaim the good tidings, peace is bestowed, a Spirit is given the apostles by the Lord, a kingdom of heaven is proclaimed, and a Gospel has enlightened the world? “He that descended is the same as he that ascended far above all heavens,”³⁶⁰ (8) and sits at the Father’s right hand. The testament was not a bringer of death, it was a testament against death. The testament of death came with glory so that the glory that excelled it might be [a testament] against death.

74,1 The next thing this same Mani says is, “The Old and New Testaments cannot be those of one teacher. For the one is growing older day after day, while the other is being renewed day by day. For everything that grows old and ages is nearing disappearance. The former is the testament of one God and one teacher, the latter, of a different God and a different teacher.”³⁶¹

74,2 Now what he says might carry conviction if he were able to show that there are two Old Testaments, on the supposition that there were two testaments given then. And similarly, if he could show two New Testaments, one could take what he has said to heart.³⁶² (3) But if the Old Testament is one God’s and the New Testament is another’s, and the New Testament is the testament of a good God while the Old is that of a bad one, the good God would not have known that he should give a testament

if he had not seen the bad god giving one. And if anything, he would be taking the occasion for his teaching from the bad god. For if he had not seen the bad god giving a testament he would not have imitated him, since he had no experience of affairs. For if he had not seen, he would not have imitated. (4) And, if anything, the Old Testament ought to be the good God's so that, if someone must be called an imitator, it is the bad god rather than the actual God.

74,5 For the Lord says in the Gospel, "What things soever the Son seeth the Father do, the Son likewise doeth."³⁶³ And [he says this] to avoid deferring to a counselor, lest the devil boast that the Savior has done something by his advice—as the devil tells him, "Command that the stones be made bread,"³⁶⁴ but he will not hear of it so as not to be suspected, from his agreement, of taking the advice from the devil.

74,6 And do you see that he says that the two testaments are those of one God? The apostle says, "The first testament was given at Mt. Sinai and gendereth to bondage. For Mt. Sinai is in Arabia. < But the heavenly Jerusalem is free, which is the mother of us all >."³⁶⁵ For if there are two wives, there is still only one husband. thus, even though there are two Testaments, there is one God, the giver of the two. (7) And this is why he did not call two testaments "New," or two testaments "Old," but called one Old and one New. And he says, "A testament is of force after men are dead; therefore the first testament was not dedicated without blood. For Moses took the blood of goats and sprinkled both the book and the people."³⁶⁶ Thus the second testament too was given at the death of the Savior. (8) And above all, both Testaments are in agreement. The one says, "There shall not fail a ruler from Judah, nor a governor from out of his loins, until that come for which it is prepared";³⁶⁷ but the second says, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."³⁶⁸ And there is a great deal to be said about this, but for brevity's sake I shall omit it.

75,1 And again, he compares the Law and the Prophets to trees which are withered and old, supposedly taking this from the text which said,

"The Law and the Prophets were until John."³⁶⁹ (2) And nothing could be sillier. Who does not understand that once < the Law > which the prophets proclaimed was fulfilled, the prophets were finished? If prophets were still coming and announcing a Christ to come from Mary, Christ would not have arrived yet.

75,3 For this matter is something of this kind:³⁷⁰ It is as though a king who intends to visit a country sends riders, advance men and heralds before him, and the nearer the king's arrival the more heralds there are of his coming, preceding him and proclaiming his arrival in the cities. (4) But when the king actually reaches the city, what further need is there for heralds, what for riders, or for the others to proclaim the king's arrival in advance, since the king himself is in the city?

75,5 And thus "The Law and the prophets were until John."³⁷¹ After John had cried aloud in the wilderness and made it known that "This is the lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world,"³⁷² there was no more need for prophets, to come and announce to us Christ's advent from a Virgin. But there was the need of those who had previously proclaimed his coming in the past, for the confirmation of his coming, since it had been proclaimed before.

75,6 It is as though someone had a pedagogue, as the apostle says, "The Law was our pedagogue until the Lord's coming."³⁷³ When the person grows old enough and obtains a teacher, he surely does not get rid of the pedagogue as though he were an enemy. (7) So we too were given guidance in the Law and the Prophets until the coming of our Teacher. But now that we have our teacher we do not despise the pedagogue but, indeed, are grateful to him. He has served as the guide of our childhood, and set us on our way to the more advanced studies.

75,8 Or, it is as though a man planning to make a sea voyage had a big ship, but sailed over the open roadstead beside the shore in a little boat, and the boat took the man to the big ship. The man surely does not sink the boat because he has reached the big ship, but boards his larger, safe ship with thanks to the boat. (9) Or to put it another way, suppose one were exposed in infancy by the mother who bore him, but taken in by a passerby and reared for some time, and recognized his real father

later when he grew up, and his father acknowledged him. Does he despise the man who brought him up because he has recognized his father and is getting his own inheritance? Won't he far sooner thank the man who brought him up, because he did not leave him to die? (10) In the same way, we thank the God who has given us the Law and the Prophets, and we thank him < who > has counted us worthy of his Son's New Testament.

76,1 Once more, Mani says that we are kinds of archons, that we were made by the archons,³⁷⁴ and that we are held in reserve for them, for food. But there is a great deal of ignorance in this sort of talk; (2) we can see that this is not the way things are. Nothing in the world, not even if it is one of < the > more dangerous, fiercer beasts, attacks its own kind, but other kinds. (3) Lions do not eat lions, for example, because they are of the same stamp and the same kind. Even when a severe famine bears hard upon the beasts in the mountains, and they find no < food > for a long while because of snow or some other exigency, they live in their caves and dens, lions with cubs and lionesses, < and do not touch each other* >. And a beast will not attack a beast, or a wolf, a wolf, (4) unless the animal goes mad and in its fury does not know what it is doing. (5) Very well, if a wolf will not eat a wolf because they look alike, how can the archons eat us, if we are of the same < kind >? Won't they treat us gently instead, with the idea of preserving their own kinds? And the tramp's arguments are refuted from every standpoint.

77,1 Then again, he seizes on the text from the Gospel, "All cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given."³⁷⁵ And what the Savior said was not about teaching here, but about eunuchs. (2) However, if "Not all can receive it," is here applied to his teaching by the Savior, then, if they will not receive it, this is intentionally. These people, then, will be termed praiseworthy or blameworthy by their own choice and their acceptance of the teaching cannot be by nature. Otherwise, what good would it do the Savior to give his teaching? (3) So Mani's argument has failed in every respect. The Savior did not make this declaration about teaching, but about eunuchhood, and even if he had said it about teaching, Mani's argument would not hold good.

77,4 Again, Mani says, "I knew my own, 'For my sheep know me and I know my sheep.' "³⁷⁶ But he is a liar in everything. He said this of the

audience at the debate, because he wanted to catch souls by cozening and as it were setting a trap, so that they would see fit to join him because of the flattery. (5) Then, once they had joined him, he could begin to boast, and say that he knew them before they came to him. (6) But the outcome for him was the same as the Greek myth about the soothsayer Apollo, who told other people's fortunes but could not tell his own, and instead failed in his prediction—(7) for he was in love with Daphne, and because of her discretion failed to win her. Mani too prophesied that he knew his own, and actually came for Marcellus, to obtain his submission. But his oracle failed. Neither Marcellus, nor anyone else who was present on that occasion, was convinced by him.

78,1 Next he said that no one was saved in ancient times,³⁷⁷ but [only] from the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar until his own day. (Probus was emperor then, and his predecessor Aurelian, when this Mani was alive.) (2) And in this too he is completely refuted, since the Gospel, and the words of the apostles, speak of those who have already been saved. The Lord likewise says, "There shall be required of this generation all the righteous blood that hath been shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which was shed between the temple and the altar."³⁷⁸ How could Abel be righteous, how could Zacharias, unless salvation were already possible, and because they had already been saved by the Law and the prophets? < Thus the apostle also* > says, "Death reigned from Adam to Moses,"³⁷⁹ to show you that death was checked, though not altogether destroyed, in Moses' time.

78,4 For Moses acknowledged the "Finisher"³⁸⁰ of all things, "Jesus," who, when he gave himself for the human race—the immortal dying, the invulnerable become vulnerable, life enduring suffering in the flesh—would, through death, break the one who had control of death, and the sting of sin, and death. Then at last < the words >, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"³⁸¹ would come true.

78,5 For there, in Moses' time, the death which had reigned until Moses was restrained and checked. And Abel was righteous before that, and Enoch, "who was taken away that he might not see death, and was not

found.”³⁸² (6) But there < was > no written Law yet—only the law which comes into being naturally from our minds, and by tradition, successively from fathers to sons.³⁸³ When, however, the Law was given overtly, it became, as it were, a sword to cut the power of sin in two. But when the Savior arrived, the sting of death was broken. And again, < when this corruptible puts on incorruption and this mortal puts on immortality* >, then death will be swallowed up in victory.

78,7 And see how God saved by many means, but the fullness of salvation has come and will come in Christ Jesus, our Lord, as the Gospel says, “Of his fullness have we all received.”³⁸⁴ (8) And which “fullness?” “The Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.”³⁸⁵ There, it was “given”; here, it has “come.” If the Law, grace and truth come through Jesus of < his > fullness, the Old and the New Testaments < are from the same Testator, who gives them* > in the Law, in grace, and in truth.

79,1 But Mani has also utilized another text and says that “Christ has bought us free from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us.”³⁸⁶ (2) Well then, he should tell us what the sale cost, what price was paid (for us)! Paul didn’t say “bought,” but, “redeemed.” However, Mani understands the purchase, but doesn’t know the price.

But the truth admits of both expressions. (3) Christ has indeed redeemed us and bought us “free from the curse of the Law by being made a curse for us.” And the teacher of the church immediately adds the way in which Christ bought us, and says, “Ye were bought with a price,”³⁸⁷ “the precious blood of Christ, the lamb without blemish and without spot.”³⁸⁸ Now if we were bought with the blood, you are not one of the purchased, Mani, for you deny the blood.

79,4 Tell me, from whom did he buy us? Did he buy us as someone else’s property? If so, was our former owner out of funds and in need of our purchase price, and did he take it and give us to Christ? And if we have been given to Christ, we no longer belong to our former owner.

79,5 If, therefore, our former owner no longer possesses us, however, then he has been deprived of his abundance and has no authority in his own domain. How, then, can he “work in the children of disobedience,”³⁸⁹ as the scripture says? (6) But this utter madman who has opened his mouth without being able to “affirm that whereof he speaks,”³⁹⁰ does not understand how Christ ever bought us, does not understand that we were redeemed, or how Christ became a curse for us. (7) I can see them addressing Christ at the regeneration of his coming and crying out, “In thy name we ate, and in thy name cast out devils.”³⁹¹ And he shall say to them, Depart from me ye cursed, I never knew you.”³⁹² (8) How can they confess him, and he curse them? But what was the curse of the Law? The curse of the Law was the cross, on our sins’ account.

For if someone was taken in a transgression, the Law said, “And ye shall hang him on a tree. The sun shall not set upon him, upon his corpse, but ye shall surely take him down and shall surely bury him before the setting of the sun, for cursed is he that hangeth on the tree.”³⁹³ (9) Thus, since the curse had been pronounced because of the crucifixion he himself, when he came, “bare our sins upon the tree”³⁹⁴ by “giving himself for us.”³⁹⁵ His blood has bought us, his body taken away the curses that were on us—that is, through the penance of the cross, and through his coming, it has done away with the sins. (10) Thus the Law was not a curse, never think it! Neither the Gospel nor the Lord received the curse; but because of his death, the death decreed for sin is destroyed.

80,1 Next he says that the Law “was the ministration of death.”³⁹⁶ < But > I have already said a great deal to show that it was not a minister of death. (2) It did not order murder, but commanded, “Thou shalt do no murder.”³⁹⁷ Its ministry was a ministry of death because it murdered the murderer to prevent murder through the murder of one person, so that many would be afraid because of the one person, keep their wickedness in check and commit no more murders. This was not to minister death,

but to ensure the death of the murderer so that many would no longer become murderers.

80,3 But when the Savior came, since the pedagogue had at last made his charges peaceable for the greater part of the time, the Savior gave the more advanced lessons. In agreement with the Law of "Thou shalt do no murder; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not bear false witness"³⁹⁸ (4) the Savior said, "To him that smiteth thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also,"³⁹⁹ in order to make the ministry a ministry of life with murder eliminated altogether. For if someone receives a blow on the cheek, he offers no provocation to murder. Instead, by his humility he disarms the murderer's hand, and soothes the wickedness in him. And thus all the ancient laws, and the New Testament, are in agreement.

81,1 Then he seizes on something else, as a covert way of introducing two pieces of evidence for the dyad he speaks of—the dyad of the natures which I mentioned before, of two principles with no beginnings, and of two roots. In his desire to say something similar about a distinction between things, he ventures to distinguish them as follows, and is not ashamed to say, (2) "The Old Testament said, The silver is mine and the gold is mine";⁴⁰⁰ but the New Testament says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."⁴⁰¹

81,3 But he does not know that the Old Testament also says, "The poor and the rich have met together: but the Lord is the maker of them both."⁴⁰² And the New Testament agrees, and pronounces a blessing on the poor who are literally poor, and in another passage a blessing on the poor in spirit, so that both pronouncements have force. Thus Peter can point with pride to his literal poverty and say, "Silver and gold have I none, but what I have, I give thee; in the name of Jesus Christ, rise up and walk,"⁴⁰³ (4) so that the blessing of the actually poor means nothing contradictory to the blessing of the poor in spirit. The "poor in spirit" are persons in righteous possession of property, while the "poor" are the humble, of whom Christ said, "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat, thirsty, and ye gave me drink," and so on.⁴⁰⁴

81,5 Next he explains, "These (i.e., the poor in spirit) acted of their abundance";⁴⁰⁵ and you see one and the same Spirit speaking of the poor and the rich in the Old Testament and the same in the New, just as the Savior praises them both. (6) For as he was watching the treasury he saw people putting money into the treasury, and did not refuse the gifts of the rich; but he praised the widow who had put in the two mites for her [actual] poverty, as we have said, in fulfillment of the scripture, "The poor and the rich have met together: but the Lord is the maker of them both."⁴⁰⁶ (81,7) And to show that this is so, and the Spirit of the Old and the New Testaments is the same, see the apostle say of the ancient prophets, "The time would fail me to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephtha, David and the other prophets who wandered about in sheepskins, in goatskins, being tormented, straitened, afflicted, of whom the world was not worthy."⁴⁰⁷ For I have found that Isaiah wore sackcloth, and Elijah too. And do you see how, in the Old and the New Testaments, the poor are called blessed for piety, and the rich are called blessed for righteousness?

82,1 Then once more, the same Mani says, "The Old Testament commands us to keep the Sabbath, and if one did not keep it he was stoned, as one was put < to death > for gathering a bundle of sticks. But the New Testament, that is, the Lord in the Gospel, said, "I work, and my Father worketh."⁴⁰⁸ The disciples plucked ears of grain on the Sabbath, and he healed on the Sabbath. And not only this, but He said besides, "Take up thy bed, and go unto thine house."⁴⁰⁹

82,2 Such ignorance! There is nothing worse than lack of knowledge, for ignorance has made many people blind. When has the Sabbath not been broken for a good cause? When was not only the Sabbath, but every day not a forbidden day for evil?

82,3 Moses' successor Joshua the son of Nun, who counts as a prophet, was God's chosen, and stopped the sun and moon by prayer when he said, "Let the sun be still over Gibeon, and the moon over the valley of Ajalon,"⁴¹⁰ plainly broke the Sabbath for the performance of a good work. (4) When traveling farther than the prescribed six stades was not allowed on the Sabbath, he circled the walls of Jericho for seven days. But the

circumference of Jericho is more than twenty stades; if they circled it for seven days, the Sabbath surely fell on one of the days. (5) But this was God's command, to show his will to work wonders. For there were no machines or catapults, no battering-rams, no siege engines; the enemy's walls sagged and fell solely at the sound of a ram's horn and the prayer of a righteous man. (6) For their punishment was due, since the tally of the Amorites' sins had been completed.

83,1 The Law was a judge of iniquity and rewarded everyone in accordance with his own works. The Amorites were in sin, had fallen into transgression, and had violated the oath they had sworn. I have already said this elsewhere, but to repeat it here will do no harm. (2) This is an example of Mani's frightfulness which comes to mind: "Some 'good' God of the Law! He spoiled the Egyptians, expelled the Amorites, Girgashites and other nations, and gave their land to the children of Israel. If he said, 'Thou shalt not covet,'⁴¹¹ how could he give them other people's property?"

83,3 The ignoramus did not know that they had taken their own land back which had been seized from them, and that retribution was exacted for the pact that was made between them with a true determination and oath. (4) For when Noah was saved from the flood—and his wife, with his three sons and their three brides—he alone divided the whole world as the passage, and nothing foolish or false, states, distributing it by casting lots in Rhinocorura⁴¹² to his three sons Shem, Ham and Japheth.

83,5 For Rhinocorura means Neel, and its inhabitants actually call it that; but in Hebrew it means "lots," since Noah cast the lots for his three sons there. (6) And the allotment from Rhinocorura, Gadiri fell < to Ham >, including Egypt, the Marean Marsh, Ammon, Libya, Marmaris, Pentapolis, Macatas, Macronas, Leptis Magna, Syrtis, and Mauritania, out to the so-called Pillars of Hercules and the interior of Gadiri. (7) These were Ham's possessions to the south. But he also owned the land from Rhinocorura eastwards, Idumaea, Midianitis, Alabastritis, Homeritis, Axiomitis, Bugaea, and Diba, out to Bactria.

83,8 The same allotment marks off the east for Shem. Roughly, Shem's allotment was Palestine, Phoenicia and Coele-Syria, Commagene, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, Paphlagonia, Lazia, Iberia, Caspia, and Carduaea, out to Media in the north. (9) From there this allotment assigns the north

to Japheth. And in the west <Japheth was allotted> the land between Europe and Spain, and Britain, <Thrace, Europe, Rhodope> and the peoples who border on it, the Venetians, Daunians, Iapygians, Calabrians, Latins, Oscans [and] Megarians, out to the inhabitants of Spain and Gaul, and the lands of the Scots and Franks in the north.

84,¹ When the allotments had been so made Noah called his three sons together and bound them with an oath, so that none of them would encroach on his brother's allotment and be covetous of his brother. (2) But, being covetous, Canaan the son of Ham invaded Palestine and held it, and the land was named Canaan because Canaan settled in it after leaving his own allotment, which he thought was hot. (3) And he settled in Shem's land, which is now called Judaea, and fathered the following sons: Amorraeus, Girgashaeus, Pherizaeus, Jebusaeus, Hivaeus, Arucaeus, Chittaeus, Asenaeus, Samaraeus, Sidonius and Philistiaeus. (4) And so, to show that the number of their sins against the oath was reaching completion, the Lord says in the Law, "The sins of the Amorites have not yet been completed."⁴¹³ And therefore [Israel] remained in the mountains and loitered in the wilderness, until the Amorites rendered themselves self-condemned by going to war with the wronged sons of Shem.

84,⁵ For Shem was the father of Arphaxad, Arphaxad of Kenah, Kenah of Selah, Selah of Eber, Eber of Peleg, Peleg of Reu, Reu of Serug, Serug of Nahor, Nahor of Terah, Terah of Abraham, Abraham of Isaac, Isaac of Jacob, Jacob of Judah, Judah of Perez, Perez of Esrom, Esrom of Aram, Aram of Aminadab, Aminadab of Naason. (6) In the time of Naason the head of the tribe of Judah and in the time Joshua the son of Nun, the sons of Shem took their own land with no wrong involved, but a putting to rights. And so the walls of Jericho fell of themselves, for righteousness avenges unrighteousness. (7) They circled the walls on seven days, and the Sabbath was violated so that righteousness would be fulfilled.

85,¹ And not only this, but the sacred lampstand in the tent of the testimony had seven lamps, and the seven lamps were all lit every day. Not one remained unlit on any day; on every day there was the same light. (2) For the Sabbath was not instituted for the stoppage of work but for good work. While no one in the twelve tribes ever worked [on the Sabbath], the altar alone did not stand idle, as the Lord says in the Gospel, "Your priests profane the Sabbath in the temple, and are blameless."⁴¹⁴

(3) But “They profane the Sabbath” means that they break it. But how do they break it but by offering sacrifice to God, so that the altar will not stand idle?

85,4 And not only this. The sun rises and sets, the moon waxes and wanes, winds blow, fruit is produced, mothers give birth, and it all takes place on the Sabbath. (5) And thus when the Lord came he did not practice carpentry or coppersmithing on the Sabbath, or < do > anything else [of the sort], but as God he did the work of God. And he says, “Take up thy bed and walk,”⁴¹⁵ to make his ongoing work known from the man carrying the bed, so that all will recognize Him who has come from heaven to the aid of the sons of men.

85,6 For he did in fact come to abolish the Sabbath, but he could not have abolished it if it had been other than his own. No one destroys someone else’s work unless he is a renter⁴¹⁶ and a nuisance, the kind of person who asks for punishment. (7) But since the Sabbath belonged to him he said, “The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath”; and he said, “Man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man.”⁴¹⁷ (8) Now if God made the Sabbath for man, and valued man more highly than the Sabbath, then < there is one God, who made the law of the Sabbath* > so that everyone would be aware of the rest < God has given us [now*] >, and the repose of the things to come; for the things here are types of the heavenly things. (9) Here things are partial, but there is all perfection. So the Sabbath of the Law was in force until Christ’s arrival. But he abolished that Sabbath and gave us the supreme Sabbath, the Lord himself, our Rest and Sabbath Repose.

85,10 Thus the Old Testament is no different from the New, or the New from the Old. However, if an unschooled, ignorant person sees two ladles draw water from one stream, but supposes because of the difference of the ladles that the kinds of water [in them] are different too, the wise will tell him the truth, “Taste the two ladles, and see that there are two ladles, but one stream.” (11) Thus there is one Lord, one God, one Spirit who has spoken in the Law and Prophets, and in the Gospel. This is why there are not two Old Testaments and not two New Testaments. There are not two testators but one, who makes the Old Testament old and the New Testament new—not by reducing the Old Testament to nothing but

by bringing the Old Testament to a close and adding the inheritance of abundance through the second Testament

86,1 Mani introduces yet another text by saying, "I know that spirit is saved without body."⁴¹⁸ For the apostle teaches this," says he, "with the words, 'It is actually reported that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not found even among the gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already him that hath done this deed, when ye and the Lord are gathered together with my spirit, to deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.'⁴¹⁹ (2) But the destruction of the flesh is its entire reduction to nothing. If the flesh is reduced to nothing by the devil's agency, and the spirit is saved, how can there still be a resurrection of bodies or flesh, and a salvation of spirit?"⁴²⁰

86,3 And in his total ignorance he did not know that "The works of the flesh are fornication, adultery, uncleanness"⁴²¹ and similar things, and < that > Paul is not speaking of the flesh itself, but of the works of the flesh. (4) When fornication is committed, the flesh commits it. But if one practices continence, the flesh is no longer flesh. The flesh has been turned to spirit as the apostle says, "He who joined both at the beginning said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh."⁴²² "Thus he which is joined to an harlot is one body, and he which is joined unto the Lord is one spirit."⁴²³

86,5 Thus if someone commits fornication he has become "flesh"—and not just his flesh itself, but everything about him, his soul and the rest, becomes "flesh." He became flesh by his union with the harlot, and since he is fleshly the whole of him is called flesh. "But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit"—that is, his body, his soul and everything in the man, is one spirit in the Lord.

86,6 And the same apostle says in his legislation on the subject, "God hath set the members in the body, every one of them as it hath pleased him."⁴²⁴ And see how he acknowledges that God is the maker of the body, and the Disposer of our members as he has willed, by his wisdom and goodness.

86,7 Then again, in place of the illustration of our own bodies < he introduces the illustration of the body* > of Christ, < and says >, "As we are the body of Christ and members in particular,"⁴²⁵ and, "the church of God, which is the body of Christ."⁴²⁶ (8) Now if God's church is a body, < but > it is one spirit when it is joined to the Spirit, that is, to the Lord, then a member who sins ceases to be spirit and becomes entirely flesh, in his soul and body, and everything in him.

86,9 Otherwise, how could part of someone be delivered to Satan, and part not delivered? Paul did not say that the man's *flesh* was delivered to Satan, but ordered the delivery of "such an one." But since he says, "such an one," (10) he has delivered a man whole, with his soul and entire manhood. If he has delivered him whole, however, he has declared that he is entirely flesh. But he said that "the spirit" is saved at the day of the Lord, so that the church would not be held responsible for the fault of the man who fell, and the whole church polluted by the transgression of the one. < Thus > what he means is, "Deliver the one who has fallen, that the spirit, that is, the whole church, may be saved."

87,1 But, says Mani, the scripture says, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God";⁴²⁷ and here he thinks he has a point. In fact, however, *fornication* cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven, nor can adultery, uncleanness or idolatry; that is, "flesh and blood" cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.

87,3 If you suppose, however, that the "flesh and blood" [mentioned here] is the actual flesh, what application can be left for, "And as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, who were born, not of the flesh, but of God?"⁴²⁸ Who in the world has been born without flesh? (3) But because their *minds* were changed—not the *natures* of those who are born of flesh and blood mothers and fathers, [but their *minds*][—]and they were born with the second birth, which is

birth from the Lord by Spirit and fire, he gave them the right to become the sons of God.

87,4 Thus, as they were born of flesh and blood here, < so in turn they are born again of spirit* >. And because of their conversion to righteousness their birth is no longer counted as a birth of flesh and blood, although < they live* > in flesh and blood—as he says, “For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh.”⁴²⁹ (5) Thus there can be flesh that does not “war after the flesh.” And this is why he says that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. He < is not speaking > of this flesh which has grown weary [in welldoing], been sanctified, pleased God, but of the “flesh” which is counted as sinful. (6) Otherwise what application can there be of “This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality?”⁴³⁰

87,7 But so that no one will fall into error and despair of the body’s resurrection because of its evil works, the same apostle puts this more clearly and says, “Put to death your members upon earth, which are fornication, adultery, uncleanness,”⁴³¹ and so on. < And see that he means the members that do not rise, the passions of the flesh.* > (8) On the other hand, listen to the angels who appeared to the Galilaeans and said, “This Jesus whom ye have seen taken up from you, shall so come *in like manner as ye have seen him taken up.*”⁴³²

From all that I have said, the sensible can understanding the meaning in all the words of the truth, and in those of this so-called Mani’s falsehood. And even if I have overlooked some text, all his lies are detectable by means of the two or three testimonies which I have mentioned.

We have gone over a long, hard road and many dangerous places, and < have* > with difficulty < crushed the head* > of this amphisbaena and venomous reptile, the cenchritis, which has coils of many illustrations for the deception of those who see it, and conceals beneath it the sting and poisonous source < of the lies of heathen mythology* >. (3) For since Mani is a pagan with the pagans and worships the sun and moon, the stars and daemons, the man < is heathen* >, and his sect teaches heathen religion. < And besides this* > he knows the lore of the magi and is involved with

them, and he praises astrologers and practices their mumbo jumbo. He merely mouths the name of Christ, as the cenchritis too conceals its poison, and deceives people with its tangled coils by hiding in deep woods and matching its background.

88,4 But with the power of God, the cudgel of the truth, the blood of Christ, his body truly born of Mary, the resurrection of the dead, and the confession of the one Divine Unity, we have crushed the head of the dragon upon the waters, put this many-headed sect to flight and smashed its head. Let us close with gratitude to God and hurry on to the other sects, calling on God to be the help of our weakness, so that we may keep the promise we have made in God, and give him perfect thanks.

III

Contra los Hierarcitas, secta del Cristianismo

1,1 After the savage onset of this rotten, poisonous teaching of Mani, the worst of all heresies and like that of a snake, there arose a man named Hieracas, the founder of the Hieracites. (2) He lived at Leontus in Egypt² and had quite a bit of education, for he was proficient in the Greek and other literary studies, and well acquainted with medicine and the other subjects of Greek and Egyptian learning, and perhaps he had dabbled in astrology and magic. (3) For he was very well versed in many subjects and, as his works show, < an extremely scholarly > expositor of scripture.³ He knew Coptic very well—the man was Egyptian—and was also quite clear in Greek, for he was quick in every way.

1,4 He was supposedly Christian but did not persevere in Christ's regime, for he strayed from it, slipped, and came to grief. He could recite the Old and New Testaments accurately from memory and gave expositions of them, but because of his foolishness he privately held whatever doctrines suited his fancy and came into his head.

1,5 Hieracas too holds that the flesh never rises, only the soul.⁴ He claims, however, that there is a spiritual resurrection. And he collected

whatever texts he could < find > in the sacred scripture to support his position, and thus heaped them up and wickedly concocted any old cheap fictions for proof of his heresy. (6) But he was awesome in his asceticism, and able to win souls to himself; for example, many Egyptian ascetics were convinced by him. I suppose it was because he took the cue for it from Origen that he denied that the resurrection of the dead is a resurrection of the flesh—or, spat this up out of his own head.

1,7 He does not countenance matrimony, and claims that this is an ordinance of the Old Testament. For he recognizes Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and all the saints alike, Isaiah and Jeremiah too, and regards them as prophets. (8) He says that the contracting of matrimony is permitted in the Old Testament, but that since Christ's coming marriage is no longer accept< able >,⁵ (9) and cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.

For, he asks, what new thing did the Word come to do? What new message did the Only-begotten come to give and set right? If it was about the fear of God, the Law had this. If it was about marriage, the scriptures had proclaimed it. If it was about envy, covetousness and iniquity, all this is in the Old Testament. But Christ came to make only this correction—to preach continence in the world, and choose the pure and the continent for his own; and without continence no < one > can be saved.

2,1 Hieracas collects the warrants for this from all sorts of places—for example, when the scriptures say, “and your consecration, without which no man shall see God.”⁶ (2) And if they ask him, “Why did the apostle say, ‘Marriage is honorable and the bed undefiled, but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge,’ ”⁷ < he replies, “But on the other hand the apostle says, ‘It is good for a man not to touch a woman,’ ”⁸ (3) and adds immediately, < ‘It is good for a man so be.’ ”⁹ And skipping a little he says, “The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, how she may please the Lord, likewise the virgin. But she that is married careth how she may please her husband, and is divided.”¹⁰ (4) Now if there is division, where there is division how can there be union? And if the married woman does not please God but her husband, how can she have her inheritance with

God? (5) < The apostle > doesn't < say >, "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife,"¹¹ in order to commend matrimony after the incarnation, but in order to bear with it, to prevent falls into further ruin. 'For there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake.'¹² And Paul says, 'I will that all men be even as I myself.'¹³ (6) And "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto ten virgins, five foolish and five wise."¹⁴ Wise virgins, foolish virgins, are likened to the kingdom of heaven—but virgins! He didn't say, 'married persons.' " And he heaps up a great deal of material of this kind for his supposed abolition of matrimony, if you please.

2,7 Hieracas does not accept children who die before the age of reason,¹⁵ but excludes them from the hope in which we believe. They cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven, he says, because they have not taken part in the contest. "For if a man strive, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully."¹⁶ If even someone who strives is not crowned unless he strives lawfully, how much more those who have not yet been summoned to the arena?

2,8 Again, of course like Origen as I said, he does not believe that Paradise is an actual place or that the resurrection of the dead is a resurrection of the flesh. He says that there is a resurrection of the dead but that it is a resurrection of souls, and makes up some spiritual mythology. (9) And no one can worship with them without being a virgin, a monk, continent or a widow.

3,1 But Hieracas does not agree with Origen about the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.¹⁷ He believes that the Son is really begotten of the Father and, as to the Holy Spirit, < he asserts > that he is the Spirit of the Father. (2) He, however, as I remarked above in the Sect of the Melchizedekians, claims that the Holy Spirit is Melchizedek himself¹⁸ because "< the apostle > has said, 'He maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.'¹⁹ And who is this? Who but < he that

was made like unto the Son of God, who > remaineth a priest forever?' But it says, 'a *priest* forever,'²⁰ because of the intercession."

3.3 This Spirit met with Abraham then, since he is like the Son. "And this," says Hieracas, "is why the apostle < says >, 'without father, without mother, without descent.'²¹ 'Without mother' " he says, "because he has no mother. 'Without father' because he had no father on earth, but is 'made like unto the Son of God, and remaineth a priest forever.'" And he talked lots of nonsense about the Holy Spirit, and went to a great deal of trouble over him.

3.4 He believes he can draw his clinching proof from the Ascension of Isaiah, supposedly because the so-called Ascension tells us that Isaiah said, "The angel that walked before me showed me, and he showed me and said, 'Who is that on the right hand of God?' And I said, 'Sir, thou knowest.' He said, 'This is the Beloved. (5) And who is the other, who is like him, that hath come from the left?' And I said, 'Thou knowest.' < He said >, 'This is the Holy Spirit, that speaketh in thee and in the prophets.' And," Isaiah says, " 'he was like unto the Beloved.' "²² Hieracas utilizes this as proof of the scriptural saying, "Made like unto the Son of God, he remaineth a priest forever."

3.6 Now how many things, even about this, can my mind think of in opposition to this phony teaching of his ? (7) He died in old age. He wrote both in Greek and in Coptic, expositions he had composed < of > the six days of creation, fabricating some legends and pompous allegories. But he wrote on any number of other scriptural subjects and composed many latter-day psalms. (8) And many of those who believe²³ in his doctrines abstain from meat. Hieracas himself really practiced a great deal of asceticism, but his disciples after him do it hypocritically. He himself abstained from all sorts of foods, and denied himself wine as well. (9) And some say of him that, although he lived past ninety, he practiced calligraphy till the day of his death—he was a calligrapher. For his vision remained unimpaired.

4.1 All right, let's investigate this man's tares too. With which of the sacred scripture's ideas should we join ourselves to scotch this poisonous snake that strikes front and back like a scorpion? For it heaped up material from two Testaments to do harm, not as the sacred words are

but as his false thinking formed obscure notions of things that are clear. (2) Honey is not nasty or bitter, and neither are the nicer foods God has created. But if they are given to a fever patient they seem bitter in his mouth, not because the sweet things have turned bitter, but because the patient's taste has imparted bitterness to the things he is given. (3) In the same way, no one who has fallen away from the truth has been deceived by the truth; he tasted the truth with bitter thoughts and it has been made bitter for him.

4,4 But let's see, what shall we say about the children—the ones who were killed for Christ at once, in Bethlehem of Judaea? Are such as they without part in the kingdom of heaven, or do they have a part? They do, since they are innocent. (5) For if they have no part in it, then the Lord has become an accessory to their murder, for they were killed for him. But if they were killed for him and thus had no opportunity to enter the contest or gain the prize, then the Lord's advent, which was intended < for salvation >, has become harmful to the world instead. For it has become the cause of the untimely departure of the babes, since they were punished and fell victim to the king's menace, so that they could not enter the contest to gain its rewards.

4,6 But let's look at some other considerations. Call Solomon, the blessed and the wisest man of all, to confound this Hieracas! Come here, you most blessed of prophets, who "received of the Lord a profusion of heart and wisdom, as the sand upon the seashore."²⁴ What would you think of the children? (7) And Solomon replies, "Old age is not honorable, nor length of life, nor is the reckoning made by number of years. Wisdom is an hoary head for men, and a spotless life their old age. For in his innocence he was loved by God, and from living among sinners he was translated. He was rapt away, lest wickedness alter his understanding, or guile deceive his soul. For the influence of evil doth weaken things that are good, and the wandering of desire doth undermine an harmless mind."²⁵ (8) And because he is speaking of children he adds at once, "Being perfected in a short time he fulfilled < long years >"²⁶—that is to say, he lived for many years even though he died young. "For his soul was pleasing unto the Lord, therefore he hastened to remove him from the midst

of wickedness.”²⁷ (9) And to Jeremiah the Lord says, “Before thou camnest forth from the womb I sanctified thee.”²⁸

5.1 But let’s look at the Savior himself, the mouth that cannot lie, the one that knows all things. Come here, Lord, and lend your aid to our minds, but confound Hieracas and his rashness! (2) Scripture says, “There came unto him little children, that he might put his hands on them and bless them. But the disciples thrust them away and forbade them. But he said unto them, Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me. For of such is the kingdom of God.”²⁹ (3) And lest it be thought that the kingdom of heaven is composed solely of children and < seems* > not to < extend to* > all ages, he begins with the children, but has granted those who are *like* them to possess the inheritance with them. (4) For if those who are like them can reign, how much more the models for those who are like them? And Hieracas’ fairy story has fallen flat.

5.5 For the Lord is merciful to all. “The Lord keepeth guard over the little ones,”³⁰ and, “Praise the Lord, ye children.”³¹ And the children cried out, “Hosannah in the highest, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.”³² And, “Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected praise.”³³ And there are any number of other texts like them.

6.1 But as to the resurrection of the flesh, Hieracas you would-be sage, how can there not be a resurrection of flesh? The term itself shows the meaning of the expression. We cannot speak of the “rising” of something that has not fallen. (2) But what is it that fell? What was buried? What was destroyed but the body, and not the soul? A soul neither falls nor is buried. And how much is there to be said about this? We cannot speak of the resurrection of a soul; it is the body that is raised.

6.3 And as to the selection the Savior came to make of virgins, the continent, and the pure—to whom is it not plain that there is an election, and that < virginity* > is the pride of the holy catholic and apostolic church? < But the Savior accepts* > persons who are in lawful wedlock as well; for he is out to save “every man in his own order.”³⁴ (4) How can “marriage”

not be “honorable”³⁵ and possess the kingdom of heaven in God, when the Savior was invited to a wedding for the purpose of blessing marriage? If he had refused to go to a wedding he would have been a destroyer of matrimony, and not the One who accepts each one, from pity for his weakness. Marriage is honorable, then, for he himself has so designated it. (5) This is why he went to a wedding—to stop the mouths of those who speak against the truth.

For Jesus performed a first miracle there in Cana of Galilee, by turning the water into wine. (6) As he had dawned from a virgin to show the light that dawned from the virgin to the world, so he performed his first miracle at a wedding in Cana of Galilee—to honor virginity by his conception and the ray of light that dawned through it, but to honor lawful wedlock by his miracles for he performed his first at a wedding, changing the water to unmixed wine.

6,7 Similarly, if marriage was wrong why does the teacher of the gentiles command it, as he says, “Younger widows refuse. For after they wax wanton against Christ, they will marry, having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.”³⁶ (8) What does he say then? “But let them marry, bear children, guide the house.”³⁷ If Paul allows these things, how can you, Hieracas, teach that marriage is to be rejected after Christ’s incarnation?

7,1 And as to your assertion that Melchizedek himself is the Spirit—in that case, the Spirit came and took flesh. It cannot, then, be just the Only-begotten who has been born in the flesh; the Spirit must have been too. But if the Spirit was born in the flesh—well, it was Mary who bore the Savior. Hieracas should say where the mother is who bore the Spirit.

7,2 And in saying, “Made like unto the Son of God he remaineth a priest forever,”³⁸ the scripture cannot be referring to the Holy Spirit. (3) It didn’t say, “like the Son of God,” but, “made like.” Now “made like” refers to something that came to be at a later date. But if the Spirit is “made like” Christ after the time of Abraham, there was a time when there was no Spirit, and this is why he was “made like” the Son of God.

And how can he be “without father?” (4) If the Spirit is self-existent and not of the Godhead’s own essence, it can fairly be shown that he is “without father.” And indeed, the Son is *only-begotten* and has no brother, but is *the*

Son of God. (5) But even if we say that the Spirit is not begotten, since the Son is *only*-begotten, Christ still says that the Spirit “proceeded” from the Father” and “receiveth of the Son.”³⁹ Hence the Spirit who “proceedeth from the Father” and “receiveth of me,” cannot be “without father.”

7,6 Even if he means “‘without mother’ in heaven and ‘without father’ on earth”—for this can also be said of the Savior—why does the apostle explain this at the end by saying, “He whose descent is not counted *from them* received tithes of the patriarch Abraham?”⁴⁰ (7) [The phrase], “from them” is indicative of precise expression; for since his descent was not counted from the children of Israel he must surely have been descended from other nations. But because his father and mother are not recorded in the scriptures, those who misrepresent the truth imagine one thing in place of another. (8) I, though, have found both his mother and his father in traditions; he was descended from the Sidonians and the Canaanites. Thus his fairy story has crumbled. And his ascetic practice is of no avail; to settle for lifeless things coupled with wrong belief is no school of life and the hope of salvation. Scripture says, “Let *all* things be done to the glory of God.”⁴¹

8,1 But here too, I believe enough has been said about them. We have broken the scorpion’s wings and pulled its powers down. For Hieracas is a winged snake and scorpion which has wings of many kinds, and flies, and mimics the church’s virginity but without a clear conscience. (2) For he and people like him are instances of “Having their conscience seared with an hot iron; and forbidding to marry, and to abstain from meats which God hath made to be received. For they are sanctified by the word of the living God and prayer, since all things are good and wholesome, and nothing is abominable with God.”⁴²

8,3 However, they are a complete laughing-stock because of the adoptive wives each of them has acquired, whom they are at pains to have for domestic service. (4) But as I said, we have pulled his wings off too, and broken his head with the wood of life, the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us go on to the rest, calling on God himself to aid us, so that we may reply to the remaining sects, and refute the heresies they palm vainly off on the world.

IV

Contra los Melicianos, secta del Cristianismo

1,1 There is a party of Melitians in Egypt whose founder was Melitius, a bishop in the Thebaid. He belonged to the catholic church and was of the orthodox faith, for his faith did not vary in any way from that of the holy catholic church. (2) Melitius was a contemporary of Hieracas, flourished at the same time as he, and became his successor. He was also a contemporary of St. Peter the bishop of Alexandria. (3) And all of these lived during the persecution in the reigns of Diocletian and Maximian. The affair of Melitius took place as follows.

1,4 He instigated a schism, but in no sense by an alteration of the faith. He was arrested during the persecution, with the holy bishop and martyr, Peter, and the other martyrs, by the officials the emperor had assigned to the task, the governors of Alexandria and Egypt at the time. (Culcianus was prefect of the Thebaid, and Hierocles, prefect of Alexandria.)²

1,5 Melitius too was confined in the prison, he and the martyrs we spoke of, with Peter the archbishop of Alexandria. Indeed, Melitius himself was held to be the first < of the bishops* >³ in Egypt, (6) and second to Peter in the archiepiscopate, in order to assist him; but he was under him and referred ecclesiastical matters to him. (7) For it is the custom for the archbishop in Alexandria to have the ecclesiastical administration of all Egypt and the Thebaid, Mareotis, Libya, Ammon, Marmarica and Pentapolis.

1,8 Now all these had been arrested and were in prison awaiting martyrdom, and had remained in confinement for some time. Others, who had been condemned before them, were martyred, received their reward, and fell asleep; but these, as eminent and more important prisoners, were being kept for later. (2,1) And since some had been martyred, but others had missed martyrdom and committed the enormity of idol worship, those who had even been forced to partake of sacrifices since they had fallen away, and had offered sacrifice and committed the transgression,

approached the confessors and martyrs to obtain the mercy of penance. Some were soldiers, but others were clergy of various ranks, the presbyterate, the diaconate and others.

2,2 There was a disturbance over this among the martyrs and no little trouble. For some said that persons who had once fallen away, denied the faith, and failed to maintain their courage or take part in the contest, should not be allowed penance. Otherwise the ones who were still left would have less regard for the penalty, and would be misled because of the forgiveness so speedily accorded the others, and come to the denial of God and the enormity of paganism. And the thing that was said by the confessors themselves was reasonable. (3) Those who said this were Melitius and Peleus, and more of the other martyrs and confessors with them. And since they had shown their zeal for God they obviously convinced < many >⁴ by saying it.

2,4 They also went on to say, "If penance should be granted them after some time when the persecution is over, when peace has been restored—provided that they truly repent and show the fruit of repentance—it certainly should not mean that each be taken back in his own order. They may be received into the church and its communion after an interval, < but > into the order < of laity >, not as clergy." And this showed respect for the truth and was full of zeal.

3,1 But the most holy Peter, a kindly man and like a father to all, begged and pleaded, "Let us receive them and set them a penance if they repent, so that they will hold by the church, and let us not turn them out of their offices either"—or so I have been told. "Otherwise they < will be > disgraced, and those who, from cowardice and weakness, were once shaken and undermined by the devil, may be perverted entirely because of the delay, and not healed [at all]. As the scripture says, 'Let that which is lame not be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed.'"⁵

3,2 And Peter's argument was on the side of mercy and kindness, and that of Melitius and his supporters on the side of truth and zeal. Then and there the schism started up, in the form of the seemingly godly proposals of both parties;⁶ with some saying one thing, some the other.

3,3 For when Peter the archbishop saw that Melitius' party withstood his kindliness and were carried to extremes by their zeal for God, he

himself hung a curtain in the middle of the prison by spreading out an himation—that is, a cloak or pallium—and proclaimed < through > a deacon, “Let those who are of my opinion come here to me; and let those who are of Melitius’, to Melitius.”

3,4 And the majority of bishops, presbyters and the other orders sided with Melitius; but a very few, bishops and a few others, < went > with Peter the archbishop. And after that the one group prayed by itself and the other by itself, and in the same way each held its other services separately.

3,5 Peter’s martyrdom came and the blessed man was perfected, leaving Alexander as his successor in Alexandria. For he succeeded to the throne after Peter. (6) But Melitius and many others were sentenced to exile, and banished to the mines at Phaeno.

At that time those who were dragged off because of being confessors < went into schism* > with Melitius. Melitius himself, in prison < and > on his journey as he passed through every country and area, ordained clergy—bishops, presbyters and deacons—and founded his own churches. And the first group would not communicate with the second, nor the second with the first. (7) But each put a sign on its own church. Those who held the existing, old churches in succession from Peter, labeled theirs, “Catholic Church”; Melitius’ succession labeled theirs, “Church of the Martyrs.” (8) And so Melitius ordained many clergy in this way at Eleutheropolis, Gaza and Aelia, on his arrival.

3,9 Melitius served further time in the mines. Afterwards, however, the confessors were released from the mines, those of Peter’s party—for there were still many—and those of Melitius’. For they did not communicate or pray with each other even in the mines.

But it was given Melitius to live in the world for a while longer, so that he flourished at the same time as Peter’s successor, Alexander, and was on good terms < with him >. And he was anxious over the state of the church and the faith; for I have frequently said that he held no divergent beliefs.

4,1 For after he had come to Alexandria and spent some time there, holding his own assemblies with his own people, Melitius himself detected Arius. And as it was rumored that Arius, in his expositions, had gone beyond the prescribed bounds of the faith, he brought him to Alexander. (2) Arius was a presbyter at the church in Alexandria which is called Bau-calís. There was one presbyter assigned to a church—for there were many churches, but now there are more—and the church was entrusted to him, even if there was another presbyter with him. When I need to I shall speak of these things in detail, at the proper place.

Since Alexander had zealously detected Arius, he summoned bishops, < called > a council and examined him, inquiring about his faith and demanding < an accounting > from Arius for the corruption of the heresy which had infected him. (3) And Arius denied nothing but indeed, brazenly replied that it was so. And Alexander excommunicated him, and with him there were excommunicated a large number, the virgins and other clergy who had been polluted by him.

4,4 Arius fled and made his way to Palestine. But when he reached Nicomedia and from there wrote letters to Alexander, he did not abandon the insane spirit of his heresy. (5) A little later, however, when Alexander, the holy bishop in Alexandria, had taken pains to arouse the blessed Constantine, Constantine called a council in the city of Nicaea.

4,6 And Arius' sect was anathematized. < But > after < Alexander died, Arius wished to be received back into the church* >. For he first denied his heresy before the blessed emperor Constantine, and pretendedly professed the orthodox formularies under oath. (7) But the emperor said to him, "If you are swearing with full sincerity, may your oath be confirmed, and you guiltless. But if you are swearing guilefully, may < God >, by whom you have sworn, take the vengeance on you!"⁷ And this happened to him not long afterwards, as I shall say later.

4,8 In connivance with Eusebius the bishop of Nicomedia, who held the same beliefs as he, Arius was presented to the same emperor as having supposedly denied and condemned his heresy. And so Constantine directed and permitted Eusebius to receive Arius into the church at Constantinople in the presence of the bishop Alexander, who had the same name as the bishop of Alexandria but was the bishop of Constantinople.

5,1 But now, after the death of the confessor Melitius, Alexander of blessed memory, of Alexandria, renewed his anger against the schism in the church, and decided to offer every kind of harassment and hindrance to those who assembled by themselves and whom Melitius had left behind him, and forcibly prevent them from rebelling against the one church. But they were unwilling and caused trouble and disturbances. (2) And then, because of their oppression and restraint by the blessed Alexander, certain of them, who were the foremost and preeminent for their piety and life, undertook the journey to court with a petition, to request the privilege of

assembling by themselves without hindrance. (3) Those who did so were an important man named Paphnutius, an anchorite who was himself the son of a female confessor < and > had nearly been a confessor himself on a number of occasions; one of their bishops, John, also a highly respected man; and the bishop in Pelusium, Callinicus;⁸ and certain others. (4) But when they went with their petition for the emperor, they were turned away and rebuffed. (5) For when the court officials heard the name, “Melitians,” and did not know what that might be, they would not let them petition the emperor.

6,1 During this affair Paphnutius, John and < the > others had occasion to spend some time in Constantinople and Nicomedia. They became friends at this time with the bishop of Nicomedia, Eusebius, told him their story—they knew he had access to the emperor Constantine—and asked for his introduction to the emperor. (2) But after promising to present them to the emperor and do what they asked, he made this request of them—that they receive Arius, who was falsely feigning repentance,⁹ into communion with them. (3) They promised him, and then Eusebius brought them to the emperor and explained their situation to him; and the emperor granted the Melitians permission to assemble by themselves from then on, without disturbance from anyone.

6,4 If only these Melitians, who had received the absolutely correct form of the truth, had communicated with the lapsees after penance instead of with Arius and his followers! (5) Theirs has been the proverbial fate of fleeing the smoke to fall into the fire. Arius could not have gained a foothold and voice except through this business, which has become an evil alliance for them even now. For the Melitians, who were once simon pure and absolutely correct in their faith, have gotten mixed in among the disciples of Arius. (6) And by now most of them have been defiled by Arius’ heresy, and been turned away from the faith in our time. Even though some have continued to hold the true faith, they hold it, but, because of their communion with Arius and the Arians, are by no means out of the slimy muck.

6,7 But a little later—for as I promised to tell the whole business, I shall repeat it here—Alexander the bishop of Constantinople was compelled to receive Arius, although he prayed, groaned, and knelt before the

altar about the ninth hour of the Sabbath. And Eusebius said, "If you won't receive him willingly yourself he'll enter the church with me against your will tomorrow"—and the Lord's Day was dawning. (8) But as I said, after Alexander had prayed and besought our Lord either to take him away so that he would not be defiled with the blasphemer of the Lord, Arius, or else to work a wonder, as he does in every generation, the holy man's prayer was answered with small delay. (9) That night Arius went to the privy to relieve himself, and, like Judas once, burst. And thus his end came in a foul, unclean place.

7.1 Then, after this, their plots against the church were hatched by Arius' disciples. Alexander of Alexandria died after the council in Nicaea. (2) But Athanasius was not there (i.e., in Alexandria) after Alexander's death; he was a deacon under Alexander at that time, and had been sent to court by him.¹⁰ (3) Although Alexander had given orders that no one but Athanasius be consecrated bishop—as he himself, and the clergy testified, and the whole church—the Melitians seized the opportunity and, since there was no bishop in Alexandria (Alexandria has never had two bishops, like the other cities) they consecrated a man named Theonas as bishop of Egypt in Alexander's place. And three months later he died. (4) Not long after Theonas' death, Athanasius arrived. And a council of orthodox bishops was summoned from all quarters. And thus Athanasius' consecration took place and the throne was given to him, the man who was worthy of it and for whom it had been prepared, in accordance with God's will and the testimony and command of < the > blessed Alexander.

7.5 And then Athanasius began to be distressed and saddened by the church's division, between the Melitians and the catholic church. He pleaded with them, exhorted them, and they would not listen; he pressed and urged them < and they would not obey* >.

Now Athanasius often visited the churches nearby, particularly the ones in Mareotis. (6) And once when the Melitians were holding a service a deacon, together with some laity, came rushing out of the crowd that was with Alexander and broke a lamp—as the story goes—and a fight broke out.¹¹ (7) This was the beginning of the intrigue against Athanasius, for the Melitians brought charges and false accusations against him, and misrepresented the facts, with the Arians lending their assistance to thse plot because of their envy of God's holy faith, and of orthodoxy. (8) And

they communicated with the emperor Constantine. But Eusebius, who, as I said, was the bishop of Nicomedia, was flunky to their whole gang, and the one who plotted the injury to the church and Pope Athanasius.

So the accusers went to the emperor and said that the implement which some, as I told you, said was a torch, was a vessel for the mysteries. (9) And they made certain other accusations. They claimed that a presbyter in Mareotis named Arsenius had been struck, and that his hand had been cut off with a sword, either by Athanasius' people or by Athanasius himself.¹² They even brought a hand to court and displayed it—it was in a box.¹³

8,1 On hearing this, the emperor grew angry. The blessed Constantine had a zeal for God; he had no idea that they were false accusers because of the Arians' anger against orthodoxy, which we have mentioned. And he commanded that a council be convened in Phoenicia, in the city of Tyre.¹⁴ (2) He ordered Eusebius of Caesarea and certain others to sit as judges; if anything, however, they had a certain leaning towards the Arians' vulgar rant. And bishops of the Catholic church of Egypt were summoned, who < were > under Athanasius—eminent, distinguished men with illustrious lives in God. Among them was the blessed Potamon the Great, the bishop of Hieracleopolis and a confessor. And the Melitians were summoned as well, especially Athanasius' accusers.

8,3 The blessed Potamon was a zealot for truth and orthodoxy, a free-spoken man who had never shown partiality. His eye had been put out for the truth during the persecution. When he saw Eusebius sitting on the judge's bench and Athanasius standing, he was overcome with grief and wept, as honest men will, and shouted at Eusebius, (4) "Are you seated, Eusebius, with Athanasius before you in the dock, when he's innocent? Who can put up with things like that? Tell me—weren't you in prison with me during the persecution? I lost an eye for the truth, but you don't appear to be maimed and weren't martyred; you stand here alive without a mark on you. How did you get out of jail, if you didn't promise our persecutors to do the unthinkable—or if you didn't do it?"¹⁵

8,5 On hearing this Eusebius was roused to indignation. He arose and dismissed the court, saying, "If you've come here and answer me like that,

your accusers are telling the truth. If you're playing the tyrant here, you'd much better go on home."

9,¹ Then Eusebius and his fellow judges undertook to send two Pannonian bishops with Arian views, Ursaces and Valens, to Alexandria and Mareotis, where they said these things had happened—the affair of the vessel and the other circumstances of the fight.¹⁶ (2) But although they went they did not bring back anything true but made up one perjury¹⁷ after another, and brought false charges against the blessed Pope Athanasius. (3) And, fabricating them in writing as truth, they took them and referred them to the council of Eusebius and the others. Ursacius and Valens revealed this later by repenting, approaching the blessed Julius, the bishop of Rome, with a petition, and saying in admission of their fault, "We have accused Pope Athanasius falsely; but receive us into communion and penance."¹⁸

(4) And they sent their confirmations of this, written in repentance, to Athanasius himself.¹⁹ At Tyre Pope Athanasius, seeing that the plot he was faced with was in all respects a serious one, fled by night before his trial and confrontation with the false charges, came to Constantine at court, and gave him his side of the story with an explanation.²⁰

(5) Constantine was still aggrieved, however, and remained angry because he thought that the accusers might well be telling the truth and the accused offering a false defense. But in spite of his anger Pope Athanasius sternly told the emperor, "God will judge between you and me, just as surely as you are in agreement with the traducers of my poor self." (6) And then he was condemned to exile because of what the council had written the emperor—for they deposed Athanasius *in absentia*)—and because of which the emperor was displeased, being angry with Athanasius. And he lived in Italy for more than twelve or fourteen years.

10,¹ Later it was widely reported that Arsenius, whom the traducers had originally reported as dead and whose hand was said to be cut off, had been found in Arabia, and that Arsenius had actually made himself known to Athanasius in exile.²¹ And Pope Athanasius sent for him secretly, as I have been told; and when Arsenius had come in person to

the blessed Athanasius himself, < they came > together to Constantine's sons, Constans and Constantius, Athanasius exhibited Arsenius alive and with two hands, and it became clear that his accusers were guilty not only of slander but of grave-robbing, because of the dead hand they used to carry around.²² (2) And this made the whole thing ridiculous, and there was astonishment at such fabrication and so much of it, and no one had any idea of what to say of the accusers, the accused, and all the other things—which will take a great deal of time < if I choose > to tell even part of them.

10,3 But Constantine died, and Pope Athanasius < had become > very much at home, esteemed and welcome < at > Rome and all over Italy, and with the emperor himself and his sons, Constans and Constantius. After the death of Constantine the Great he was sent < to Alexandria* > by the two emperors, although Constantius was at Antioch and gave his consent < through > his representatives and by a letter < to Alexandria* >, as I know from the three emperors' < letters* > to the Alexandrians, and to Pope Athanasius himself.²³ (4) And once again he occupied his throne after his successor Gregory, < who > had been sent by the Arians while Athanasius was in exile.

11,1 But he was again intrigued against, to Constantius by Stephen, and expelled. And after that he was intrigued against once more, by the eunuch Leontius and his supporters. He incurred banishment then, and another recall. For George was sent [to Alexandria] by Constantius, and Athanasius withdrew and went into hiding for a while,²⁴ until George was killed, at which time Julian came to the throne and after Constantius' death reverted to Hellenism. (2) For the Alexandrians had nourished anger at George and they killed him, burned his body, reduced it to ashes, and scattered it to the winds. (3) But after Julian had died in Persia and the blessed Jovian had succeeded to the empire, he wrote to the bishop Athanasius with great honor and a memorable letter; and he sent for him, embraced him, and sent him to his own throne, and the holy church had received its bishop back and was comforted for a short while.

After Jovian's death the blessed Athanasius was once more assailed by the same persecutions, defamations and disturbances. (4) He was not, indeed, driven from the church and his throne; the Alexandrians had

sent an embassy on his behalf, and the entire city had demanded him after Lucius, < who is > bishop now, had been consecrated abroad as the Arian < bishop of Alexandria >. It is likely that at Antioch, and a number of times, he had urged the emperor Valens that he be sent to the throne [of Alexandria], < but that the emperor* >, who was unwilling to expel Athanasius for fear of a disturbance among the people, < had not heeded him* >. (5) Indeed, Lucius was finally sent when Pope Athanasius died, and did much harm to church and city—to the laity, bishops and clergy who had been under Athanasius and had received him in every church, and to Peter, who had been consecrated as Athanasius' successor in Alexandria.

11,6 This is still the situation. Some have been exiled—bishops, presbyters and deacons—others have been subjected to capital punishment in Alexandria, and others sent to the arena; and virgins have been killed, and many others are perishing. (7) God's church is still in this plight because of the affair of the Melitians and Arians, who have used means of this sort to gain their foothold, and < the opportunity > for the same heretical gang, I mean the gang of Arians, to win out. (8) I shall discuss all this in detail in my refutation of Arius.

But I shall pass this subject by as well and go on to the Arian sect itself, calling on God for aid as I approach this fearful, many-headed serpent to battle with it.

V

Contra los Arrianos, secta del Cristianismo

1,1 Arius and the Arians who derive from him came directly after this time of Melitius and St. Peter the bishop of Alexandria. Arius flourished during the episcopate of Peter's successor, the holy bishop Alexander, who deposed him amid much turmoil and with a great council. For Alexander removed him from office and expelled him from the church and the city, as a great evil which had come to the world. (2) They say that Arius was Libyan, but that he had become a presbyter in Alexandria. He

presided over the church called the Church of Baucalis. All the catholic churches in Alexandria < are > under one archbishop, and presbyters have been assigned to each particular church to meet the ecclesiastical needs of the residents whose < homes are* > near each church. These are also called quarters and lanes by the inhabitants of Alexandria.

1,3 Arius was born during the reign of the great and blessed emperor Constantine, the son of Constantius in his old age. Constantius was the son of the emperor Valerian, < who > himself had ruled jointly with Diocletian, Maximian and the others. (4) Everyone knows that Constantine, the father of Constantius, Constans and Crispus, was admirable in the practice of Christianity and the apostolic and prophetic faith of the fathers, which had not been adulterated in the holy churches until the time of Arius himself. But Arius managed to detach a large number [from the church.]

2,1 A spirit of Satan, as scripture says, entered this Arius who was Alexander's presbyter, and incited him to stir up the dust against the church—< just as > no small fire was lit from him, and it caught on nearly the whole Roman realm, especially the east. Even today his sect has not stopped battling against the true faith.

2,2 But at that time Arius was to all appearances a presbyter, and there were many fellow presbyters of his in each church. (There are many churches in Alexandria, including the recently built Caesarium, as it is called, which was originally the Adrianum and later became the Licinian gymnasium or palace. (3) But later, in Constantius' time, it was decided to rebuild it as a church. Gregory the son of Melitian, and Arian, began it, and the blessed Athanasius, the father of orthodoxy, finished it. It was burned in Julian's time, and rebuilt by the blessed bishop Athanasius himself. (4) But as I said there are many others, the one called the Church of Dionysius, and those of Theonas, Pierius, Serapion, Persaea, Dizya, Mendidius, Ammianus, and the church Baucalis and others.)

2,5 A presbyter named Colluthus served in one of these, Carpones in another, Sarmatas in another, and the aforesaid Arius, who was in charge of one of these churches. (6) It is plain that each of these caused some discord among the laity by his expositions, when, at the regular services, he taught the people entrusted to his care. Some were inclined to Arius, but others to Colluthus, others to Carpones, others to Sarmatas. Since each of them expounded the scripture differently in his own church, from their preference and high regard for their own presbyter some people called themselves Colluthians, and others called themselves Arians. (7) And in

fact Colluthus < too > taught some perversions, but his sect did not survive and was scattered immediately. And if only this were also true of Arius' insane faith, or better, unfaith—or better, wicked faith!

3.1 For in his later years he was inspired by vanity to depart from the prescribed path. He was unusually tall, wore a downcast expression and was got up like a guileful serpent, able to steal every innocent heart by his villainous outer show. For he always wore a short cloak and a dalmatic² was pleasant in his speech, and was constantly winning souls round by flattery. (2) For example, what did he do but lure all of seventy virgins away from the church at one time! And the word is that he drew seven presbyters away, and twelve deacons.³ And his plague immediately spread to bishops, for he convinced Secundus of Pentapolis and others to be carried away with him. (3) But all this went on in the church without the knowledge of the blessed Alexander, the bishop, until Melitius, the bishop of Egypt from the Thebaid whom I mentioned, who was regarded as an archbishop himself—the affair of Melitius had not yet reached the point of wicked enmity. (4) Moved by zeal, then—he did not differ in faith, only in his show of would-be righteousness, < because of > which he did the world great harm himself, as I have explained. Well then, Melitius, the archbishop in Egypt but supposed to be under Alexander's jurisdiction, brought this to the attention of the archbishop Alexander. As I have said, Melitius was contemporary with the blessed bishop and martyr Peter.

3.5 When Melitius had given all this information about Arius—how he had departed from the truth, had defiled and ruined many, and had gradually weaned his converts away from the right faith—the bishop sent for Arius himself and asked whether what he had been told about him was true. (6) Arius showed neither hesitancy nor fear but brazenly coughed his whole heresy up from the first—as his letters show and the investigation of him at the time. (7) And so Alexander called the presbytery together, and certain other bishops who were there [at the time], and held an examination and interrogation of Arius. But since he would not obey the truth Alexander expelled him and declared him outcast in the city. But the virgins we spoke of were drawn away from the faith with him, and the clergy we mentioned, and a great throng of others.

4,1 But though Arius stayed in the city for a long time, the confessor and martyr Melitius immediately died. Arius, then, destroyed many by instigating schisms and leading everyone astray. Later though, since he had been discovered and exposed in the city and excommunicated, he fled from Alexandria and made < his > way to Palestine. (2) And on his arrival he approached each bishop with fawning and flattery in the hope of gaining many supporters. And some received him, while others rebuffed him.

4,3 Afterwards this came to the ears of the bishop Alexander, and he wrote encyclical letters to each bishop which are still preserved by the scholarly, about seventy in all. He wrote at once to Eusebius in Caesarea—he was alive—and to Macarius of Jerusalem, Asclepius in Gaza, Longinus in Ascalon, Macrinus in Jamnia, and others; and in Phoenicia to Zeno, a senior bishop in Tyre, and others, along with < the bishops > in Coele Syria. (4) When the letters had been sent reproving those who had received Arius, each bishop replied to the blessed Alexander with his explanation. (5) And some wrote deceitfully, others truthfully, some explaining that they had not received him, others, that they had received him in ignorance, and others that they had done it to win him by hospitality. And this is a long story.

5,1 Later, when Arius found that letters had been sent to the bishops everywhere, and that afterwards he was turned away from every door and none but his sympathizers would take him in any more—(2) (for the elderly senior bishop of Nicomedia, Eusebius, was a sympathizer of his⁴ together with Lucius, his colleague in Nicomedia. And so was Leontius, the eunuch in Antioch who had not yet been entrusted with the episcopate, and certain others. Since all of them belonged to the same noxious brotherhood, Eusebius sheltered him for some time). (3) And so at that time this Arius wrote and addressed letters full of all sorts of foolishness, which contained the whole of his heretical creed, to Eusebius in Nicomedia, this before he had come to him in Nicomedia, putting in them no more than what he really thought. I feel obliged to offer one of them here which has come into my hands, so that the readers can see that I have neither said nor am saying anything slanderous against anyone. Here is the letter:⁵

6,1 *Greetings in the Lord from Arius, unjustly persecuted by Pope Alexander for the all-conquering truth of which you too are a defender, to the most beloved man of God, the faithful and orthodox Master Eusebius.*

6,2 *As my father Ammonius is arriving in Nicomedia it seems to me reasonable and proper to address you through him, at the same time recalling your characteristic love and [kindly] disposition toward the brethren for the sake of God and his Christ. For the bishop is harassing and persecuting us severely, and stirring up every sort of evil against us, (3) so that he has driven us from the city as godless men because we do not agree with his public declaration, "Always God, always a Son. Together with a Father, a Son. The Son co-exists with God without origination, ever begotten, begotten without origination. Not by a thought or a moment of time is God prior to the Son, [but] there is ever a God, ever a Son, the Son from God himself." (4) And as your brother in Caesarea, Eusebius, and Theodotus, Paulinus, Athanasius, Gregory, Aetius and all the bishops in the east say that God is prior to the Son without beginning, they have become anathema—except for the ignorant sectarians Philogonius, Hellanicus and Macarius, some of whom say that the Son is an eructation and others, an uncreated emanation. (5) And to these impieties we cannot even listen, not if the sectarians threaten us with a thousand deaths.*

6,6 *But what is it that we say and believe, and that we have taught and teach ? That the Son is not uncreated or in any respect part of an uncreated being, or made of anything previously existent. He was brought into being by the will and counsel [of God], before all times and before all ages, as unbegotten God in the fullest sense, and unalterable; and before he was begotten, created, determined or established, he did not exist. (7) But we are persecuted because we have said, "The Son has a beginning but God is without beginning." We are also persecuted because we have said, "He is made from nothing." But we have so said in the sense that he is not a part of God or made from any thing previously existent. It is for this reason that we are persecuted; the rest you know.*

I pray for your good health in the Lord, my true fellow Lucianist Eusebius; be mindful of my afflictions.

7,1 *Moreover, I subjoin another letter written in supposed self-defense from Nicomedia by Arius to the most holy Pope Athanasius and sent by him to Alexandria. Once again it is filled, to an incomparably worse degree, with the blasphemous expressions of his venom. This is the letter:⁶*

7,2 Greetings in the Lord from the presbyters and deacons to our blessed Pope and bishop, Alexander.

7,3 Our faith which we have received from our forefathers and learned from you as well, blessed Pope, is as follows. We know that one God, the only ingenerate, the only eternal, who alone is without beginning, only is the true God, alone has immortality, alone is wise, alone good, alone sovereign, alone judge with the governance and care of all, immutable and unalterable, just and good, < the Lord* > of the Law and Prophets and of the New Testament—that this God has begotten an only Son before eternal times, (4) and through him has made the ages and the rest. He has begotten him not in appearance but in truth and brought him into being, immutable and unalterable, by his own will; (5) God's perfect creature but not like any other creature; an offspring but not like any other offspring; (6) and not an emanation, as Valentinus believed the Father's offspring to be; nor as Mani represented the offspring as a co-essential part of the Father; nor like Sabellius, who, dividing the Unity, said "Son-Father"; nor as Hieracas called him a light kindled from a light, or a lamp become two; (7) nor priorly existent and later generated or created anew as a Son. You yourself, blessed Pope, have very often publicly denounced those who give these explanations in the church and assembly. But as we say, He is a Son created by the will of God before the times and ages, who has received his life, being and glory from the Father, the Father subsisting together with him. For by giving him the inheritance of all things the Father did not deprive himself of his possession of ingeneracy in himself, for he is the source of all.

8,1 Thus there are three entities, a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit. And God, who is the cause of all, is the sole and only being without beginning. But the Son, who was begotten of the Father though not in time, and who was created and established before the ages, did not exist before his begetting but was alone brought into being before all things by the Father alone, not in time. (2) Nor is he eternal, or co-eternal and co-uncreated with the Father. Nor does he have a being simultaneous with the Father's, as some speak of things [which are naturally] related to something else, thus introducing two uncreateds. But God is before all as a Unit and the first principle of all things. And thus he is also before Christ, as we have learned from you when you have preached publicly < in > the church.

8,3 Thus, in that the Son has his being from God < who > has provided him with life, glory and all things, God is his first cause. For God is his ruler, as his God and prior to him in existence, because the Son originates from

him. (4) And if “out of the belly,⁷ and “I came forth from the Father and am come,”⁸ are taken by some to mean that he is part of a co-essential God and an emanation, the Father must be composite, divisible and mutable—and in their opinion the incorporeal God has a body and, given their premises, is subject to the consequences of corporeality. We pray for your good health in the Lord, blessed Pope. (5) Arius, Aeithales, Achillas, Carpones, Sarmatas, Arius, presbyters; the deacons Euzoeus, Lucius, Julius, Menas, Helladius, Gaius; the bishops Secundus of Pentapolis, Theonas of Libya, Pistus—the bishop the Arians consecrated for Alexandria.

9.1 Now that matters had been stirred up in this way, Alexander wrote to the emperor Constantine. And the blessed emperor summoned Arius and certain bishops, and interrogated them. (2) But < with the support > of his co-religionists Arius at first denied the charge before the emperor, while inwardly hatching the plot against the church. And after summoning him the blessed Constantine, as though to some degree inspired < by > the Holy Spirit, addressed him saying, “I trust in God that if you are holding something back and denying it, the Lord of all has the power to confound you speedily, especially since it is by him that you have sworn.” Hence Arius was indeed caught holding the same opinions, and was exposed before the emperor.

9.3 But he made a similar denial again, and many of his defenders petitioned the emperor for him through Eusebius of Nicomedia. But meanwhile the emperor was moved with zeal, and wrote a long circular against Arius and his creed to the whole Roman realm, filled with all sorts of wisdom and truthful sayings. (4) It is still preserved among the scholarly and begins, “The most high Augustus Constantine, to Arius and the Arians. A bad expositor is in very truth the image and representation of the devil.”⁹ (5) Then, after some other remarks and after giving a long refutation of Arius from the sacred scripture, he also indignantly directed a line from Homer against him and quoted it, and I feel that I must quote it here as well. (6) It goes, “Come now, Ares Arius, there is a need for shields. Do this not, we pray; let Aphrodite’s speech restrain thee.”¹⁰

10,¹¹ Arius wished to be received back into the church in Constantinople, and Eusebius pressed for this and had great influence with the emperor, and kept pestering the bishop of Constantinople at that time. The bishop did not wish to be in the same fellowship with Arius or enter into communion with him, and was troubled and groaned, but Eusebius said, "If you won't do it by your own choice he'll come in with me tomorrow at the dawn of the Lord's Day, and what can you do about it?"

10,² That most pious and godfearing bishop, Alexander, bishop of the best of cities—(he and the bishop in Alexandria had the same name)—spent the whole day after he heard that, and the night, in groans and mourning, praying and beseeching God either to take his life so that he would not be polluted by communion with Arius, or to work some wonder. And his prayer was answered. (3) Arius went out that night from the need to relieve himself, went to the privy, sat down in the stalls inside, and suddenly burst and expired. Thus, he was overtaken and surrendered his life in a smelly place, just as he had belched out a dirty heresy,

11,¹ When this was over the emperor felt concerned for the church, because by now many members often differed with one another and there were many schisms. He therefore convened an ecumenical council, and the names of 318 bishops are preserved to this day. And they condemned Arius' creed in the city of Nicaea, and confessed the orthodox and unswerving creed of the fathers, which has been handed down to us from the apostles and prophets. (2) After the bishops had signed this and condemned the insane Arian sect, < peace* > was restored. They passed certain ecclesiastical canons at the council besides, and at the same time decreed with regard to the Passover that there must be one unanimous concord in the celebration of God's holy and most excellent day. For it was variously observed by people; some kept it early, some between [the disputed dates], but others, late. (3) And in a word, there was a great deal of controversy at that time. But through the blessed Constantine God directed the right ordering of these things for the sake of peace.

11,⁴ After Arius had been condemned and these measures taken Alexander died that same year after Achillas had succeeded him, but Theonas was consecrated too, by the Melitians. Then the blessed Athanasius succeeded Achillas after he had been bishop for three months.¹² Athana-

sus was Alexander's deacon at that time, and had been sent by him to court; as Alexander's death approached he had ordered that the episcopate be conferred on Athanasius. (5) But the custom at Alexandria is that the consecrators do not delay after the death of a bishop; < the consecration* > is held at once for the sake of peace, to avoid conflicts among the laity with some for one candidate and some for another. (6) Since Athanasius was not there they were forced to consecrate Achillas. But the throne belonged to the person called by God and designated by the blessed Alexander, and the priesthood was prepared for him.

11,7 Thus Athanasius arrived and was consecrated. He was very much a zealot for the faith and a protector of the church, and by now there were [schismatic] services everywhere, and a splinter group of laity formed by the so-called Melitians, for the reason I gave in my piece on Melitius. In his desire to achieve the unification of the church Athanasius accused, threatened, admonished, and no one would listen. (8) This was the reason for all the intrigues and plots against him, the extremity of his God-given zeal. And so he was subjected to banishments too because of his excommunication by the Arians with the highly unjust secular power. (9) But enough about the blessed Athanasius. His story has been told in full detail in the above description of Melitius.

12,1 Now Arius was infused with the power of the devil, and wagged his tongue against his own Master with shameless impudence—originally from his supposed desire to expound the words of Solomon in his Proverbs, "The Lord created me a beginning of his ways. Before the age he set me up in the beginning, before he made the earth, before he made the depths, before the springs of waters came forth, before the mountains were settled, before all hills he begot me."¹³ (2) This became the introduction of his error; neither < he himself > nor his disciples were ashamed to call the creator of all things, the Word begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time, a creature.

12,3 But then, on the basis of this one passage, he directed his malignant mind into many evil paths, < he himself > and his successors, and they set out to utter ten thousand blasphemies and more against the Son of God and the Holy Spirit. (4) They broke the front, as it were, and concord of the holy, orthodox faith and church, [though] not by their own

power or wisdom. The deluded people who were [truly] inclined to join them were few, but many gradually came in from hypocrisy; and many, besides, were forced into communion with them because they had < no way to resist* >. And no one < of sound faith* > was their agent, but the care< less >ness of the faithful first, and the protection of emperors.

12,5 The beginning < came with > the emperor Constantius, who was a meek and good man in all other respects and who, as the son of the great and perfect Constantine with his piety and unwavering observance of the right faith, was pious himself, and good in many ways. (6) But he was mistaken only in this matter, his failure to follow the faith of his fathers—not by his own fault, but because of those who will give account at the day of judgment, the bishops in appearance, so-called, but corrupters of God's true faith. (7) These must give account, both for the faith and for the persecution of the church, and the many wrongs and murders that have been committed in the churches because of them; and for the vast numbers of laity who still today are suffering affliction under the open sky; and for Constantius of blessed memory himself who, since he did not know the orthodox faith, was led astray by them and in his ignorance deferred to them as priests. For he was not aware of the error of the blindness and heresy in them which was caused by the devil's plot.

13,1 Secondly, their gang of snakes gained further strength through Eudoxius, who wormed his way into the confidence of the most pious and God-loving emperor Valens and, once again, corrupted his ear.¹⁴ The reason they could maintain their position was Valens' baptism by Eudoxius. (2) Otherwise < they would have been refuted > long ago even by women and kids—never mind the more mature, who understand all the exact terms of godliness and right faith, but even by anyone with any partial glimmer of understanding of the truth—and, since they were refuted by the ancients, they would have been harried as blasphemers of the Master, as second killers of the Lord and despisers of the divine protection of our Lord Jesus Christ. (3) But by the emperor's patronage, that is, his protection of them, < they are in the ascendent >, so as to put into effect all the wrongs that have been and are still being done by them at Alexandria, Nicomedia, Mesopotamia and Palestine, under the patronage of the same, current emperor.

14,1 All the rest of their teachings are contrived from this verse in Proverbs, "The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works."¹⁵ And < they gather > every possible agreement and equivalent to this text < from the scriptures >, and everything that could be in accord with it, although neither the text itself nor the other passages say anything of the sort about the divinity of the Son of God. (2) All the same, anything like this—the text in the Apostle, "Receive ye the high priest of your profession, who is faithful to him that made him";¹⁶ and < the one > in John's Gospel, "He it is of whom I said unto you that he that cometh after me *hath come into being*¹⁷ before me";¹⁸ and the one in Acts, "Be it be known unto all you house of Israel that God hath made this Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord and Christ,"¹⁹ and others like these—wherever < they find some text* > of note < they collect it* > as a defense against their foes. (3) For they are indeed foes and conspirators. "Let God arise and let his foes be scattered"²⁰ might well have been written of them and their kind. They appear to be members of our household—there is nothing worse than foes of one's own household, for "A man's foes are all the men of his household."²¹ And this too probably applies to them.

15,1 For they leap up like savage dogs to repel their foes and say, "What do you say of the Son of God?" (For these are their devices for introducing their poison to the simple.)

"And what more can there be after this, after one calls him the Son of God, you folks who are 'wise in your own eyes and prudent in their sight,'²² and give the appearance of knowledgeability? What more can one add to the name of Jesus, other than to say that he is true Son, of the Father and not different from him?"

15,2 Then they scornfully jump right up and say, "How can he be 'of God?'" And if you ask them, "Isn't he the Son?" they confess the sonship in name but deny it in force and meaning and simply want to call him a bastard, not a real son. "For if he is of God," they say, "and if God as it were begot < a Son > from himself, from his actual substance or his

own essence—well then, he swelled, or was cut, or was expanded or contracted in begetting him, or underwent some physical suffering.”²³

And they are simply ridiculous to compare their own characteristics with God’s, and draw a parallel between God and themselves.²⁴ (4) There can be nothing of the kind in God. “God is spirit”²⁵ and has begotten the Only-begotten of himself ineffably, inconceivably and spotlessly.

15,5 “If he is of his essence then,” they say, “why doesn’t he know the day and the hour, as he says, ‘But of that day or that hour knoweth no man, neither the angels, neither the Son, but the Father only?’”²⁶ And if he is ‘of the Father,’ how could he become flesh? How could that nature which cannot be contained put on flesh, if by nature he were of the Father?”

16,1 And they do not know how they are gathering these calculations together to their own shame. For if he took flesh, and suffered and was crucified in it because he was different from the Father’s essence, they should tell us which other spiritual beings donned flesh even though they were creatures. For they cannot help admitting that the Son is superior to all. Even if they call him a creature, they admit that he is superior to all his creatures.

16,2 Indeed, they want to flatter him as though they were doing him a favor—as though they were striking him with one hand but anointing him with the other. For they wish to make this concession to him as though by their own choice, and say, “We call him a creature, but not like any other creature; a product of creation, but not like any other product; and an offspring, but not like any other offspring.”²⁷ This to deprive him of the begetting which by nature is proper to him by saying, “not like any other offspring,” and declare him a true creature by saying, “not like any other creature.”

16,3 Whatever a creature may be, it is a creature. Even though its name is any number of times more exalted it is just the same as all creatures.²⁸ The sun cannot not be a creature just like a rock even though it is brighter than the rest. Nor, because the moon outshines the stars, is it for this reason not one of the creatures. “Behold, all things are thy servants.”²⁹

16,4 But the Only-begotten is truth and his word is true, as he said, "If ye continue in my word ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."³⁰ But if his word is truth and frees the souls whom he sets free, how much more is he himself free—since he is truth, and sets his believing servants free! For all things are his servants, and his Father's, and the Holy Spirit's.

17,1 Then again they say, "How could he come in the flesh, if he was of the Father's essence?" [Is it not true that] angels, who are his servants, have not taken flesh? Archangels? Hosts? All the other spiritual beings? (2) But they say too that the Spirit is even more inferior, and is the creature of a creature, since he is < the product > of the Word. Why did the Spirit not take flesh then, since, on Arius' premises, he can have a face more changeable than the Son's? But since the Son was the Father's wisdom he consented, by his own perfection, to assume our weakness, so that all salvation would come to the world through him. (3) But people who turn good things to bad are ungrateful—ungrateful, unwise, insulters and blasphemers of their own Master.

And whatever else they say, in the last analysis they mean it as a detraction of him. "If he was of the Father's essence, why was he hungry? Scripture says too that God 'shall not hunger or thirst, nor is there any finding out of his counsel.'³¹ But Christ was hungry and thirsty. Why did he tire from his journey and sit down, < when scripture says > that God 'shall not weary'?³² (4) And why did he say, "The Father that hath sent me is greater than I?"³³ The sender is one person, the sent, another."

And it is plain that the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Father. We do not talk like Sabellius, who says that he is the Son-Father. (5) If he had not said, "Another is he that hath sent me,"³⁴ and, "I go unto my God and your God, unto my Father and your Father,"³⁵ < the disciples would have believed that he himself was the Father. < This is why* > he said, < "My God." But he said, "your God," because* > his disciples were begotten < only by grace* >, and not by nature from the essence of God. < This is why > he said, "*your* Father," to them.

17,6 But people who say such things are just cracked. If he is called the Son in name only and is not the Son by nature, he is no different from all the other creatures even if he is of superior rank. Because the emperor outranks his governors and generals, this does not mean that he does not have the same limitations as the rest, and is not their fellow servant of the same creation, since he is mortal, just as his subjects are. (7) And because the sun surpasses the other stars, and the moon does to an extent, this does not mean that they are not heavenly bodies subordinate [to God], and subject to the ordinance of the one creator and maker, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (8) And because angels surpass the visible creatures and, in comparison with the rest, are the greatest of all—for they were created invisible, enjoy the supreme privilege of serving God with continual hymns, are immortal by grace though not by nature, and yet have been vouchsafed a natural immortality by him who in himself is life and immortality—[all] this does not mean that they do not serve with fear and trembling, accountable and answerable to the holy Godhead, and subject to his bidding and command.

18,1 This will help us < understand* > the exact nature of the truth we are after: to say, “Son,” but say it without considering him a son in name only, but say that the Son is a son by nature. With us too, many are called sons without being sons by nature. But our real sons are called “true”; they were actually begotten by us. (2) And if he was only called a son, as indeed all have been called sons of God, he is no different from the rest. And why is he worshiped as God? On Arius’ premises all the other things that have been given the title of sons should be worshiped, since they are termed sons of God. (3) But this is not the truth. The truth at all times knows one only-begotten Son of God whom all things serve and worship, and to whom “every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.”³⁶

18,4 But neither is the Holy Spirit equivalent to the other spirits since the Spirit of God is one, a Spirit that proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son. Arians, though, make him a creature of a creature. For they say, “‘All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made.’³⁷ (5) Therefore,” they say, “the Holy Spirit is a creature too, since ‘all things were made by him.’”

And those who have lost their own souls for no good reason do not know that created beings are one thing, and that < un >created beings—Father, Son and Holy Spirit, one God, Trinity in truth and Unity in oneness—are another. (6) This is the reason that God is one: there are not two Fathers, or two Sons or two Holy Spirits, and the Son is not different from the Father but begotten of him, and the Holy Spirit is not different. But the Son is only-begotten, without beginning < and > not in time. And the Holy Spirit, as the Father himself and the Only-begotten know, is neither begotten nor created, nor alien to the Father and Son; “he anointed Christ with the Holy Spirit.”³⁸ If the Only-begotten is himself anointed with the Spirit, who can bring a charge against the Holy Trinity?

19,1 Then again the insane Arius says, “Why did the Lord say, ‘Why callest thou me good? One is good, God’ ”³⁹ as though himself denying his own goodness?” (2) Because they are soulish and fleshly, are discerned by the Holy Spirit and devoid of him, and lack the gift of the Holy Spirit which gives wisdom to all, they do not know God’s power and goodness, or the dispensation of God’s wisdom.

19,3 “Again,” says Arius, “the sons of Zebedee asked him through their mother if one of them might sit at his right and one at his left in his kingdom, and he told them, ‘Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I shall drink of? And when they said, Yea, he said unto them, Ye shall drink of my cup, but to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but is for them for whom it is prepared of the Father.’⁴⁰ (4) Then the apostle says, ‘God raised him from the dead,’⁴¹ as though he needed someone to raise him. And it says in the Gospel according to Luke, ‘There appeared an angel of the Lord strengthening him when he was in agony, and he sweat; and his sweat was as it were drops of blood,’ when he went out to pray before his betrayal.⁴² (5) And again, on the cross he said, ‘Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.’⁴³ And do you see,” says Arius, “how he is in need of help?”

19,6 But as to his words, “I am in the Father and the Father in me,”⁴⁴ < they cite >, “We two are one, that they also may be one,”⁴⁵ “And do

you see,” he says, “that we too shall be one *as the Father and the Son are one*.”* > Thus he is not speaking of a oneness by nature, but of a oneness of concord.”

19,7 But not only this; they also deny that he has received a human soul, and do so deliberately.⁴⁶ For they confess that he has true flesh from Mary, and everything human *except* for a soul. Thus, when you hear of his hunger, thirst, weariness, journeying, sweat, sleep or anger, and say that he needed these because of his human nature, they will tell you afterwards that flesh does not do these things of itself unless it has a soul. (8) And in fact, this is true. “What can this mean,” they say, “except that his ‘divine nature’ had needs?”—so that, when they say that his “divine nature” had needs, they can declare that he is alien to and different from his Father’s true essence and nature.

19,9 I believe, however, that from one, two, or five of their poorly chosen, refuted and exploded proof texts < I can make the whole of their villainy plain* > to everyone⁴⁷ who has understanding. And since the whole truth is proclaimed, and plainly confirmed, in the faith of orthodoxy, < I trust that* > even if they cite a million other texts besides these contrived expositions, the Arians will stand convicted in the eyes of those people who have godly good sense. For since they mean the same, most of these will be refuted in [the refutation of] these few.

20,1 And I shall start my argument first with the place where Arius began the evil planting of their bitter root, the words of Solomon, The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works.”⁴⁸ (2) And scripture nowhere confirmed, nor did any apostle ever mention this text to apply it to the name of Christ. Thus Solomon is not speaking of the Son of God at all, even if he says, “I, wisdom, have given counsel and knowledge a home, and I have summoned judgment”⁴⁹ (3) How many “wisdoms” are loosely called God’s? But there is one Only-begotten, and he is not given that name catachrestically, but in truth.

For all things are God’s wisdom, and whatever is from God is wisdom. (4) But the unique, supreme Wisdom is something else—that is, the Only-begotten, He who is called wisdom, not loosely but in truth, He who is

always with the Father, “the power of God and the wisdom of God.”⁵⁰ But “The poor man’s wisdom is despised”;⁵¹ and, “since in the wisdom of God the world knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of the Gospel to save them that believe”;⁵² and, “God hath made foolish the wisdom of this world”;⁵³ And, “God gave to Solomon an heart like the sand of the sea, and made him wiser than the sons of Ana”;⁵⁴ and, “God gave wisdom to Bezaleel, and God filled Uri with wisdom.”⁵⁵

20,5 And there is a great deal to say about wisdom, and “Where is the place of understanding, and where can wisdom be found?”⁵⁶ Even though the renowned wisdom says, “I, wisdom, have given counsel and knowledge a home, and I have summoned judgment. By me kings reign, and through me princes are great, rulers write righteousness, and despots possess the earth. (6) I love them that love me, and they that seek me shall find me. Wealth and glory are mine, and the possession of many goods, and righteousness. I walk in the way of righteousness, and I tread in the midst of right paths, to apportion substance to them that love me, and fill their treasures with goods. (7) If I tell you the incidents of each day, I shall remember to recount the happenings from everlasting. The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works. Before the age he established me in the beginning, before he made the earth and before he made the deeps, before fountains of water came forth, before mountains were founded and before all hills he begat me,”⁵⁷ and so on—(8) [even so], since there are some who want to dispute the passage, our opponents will obviously reply by citing the term, “wisdom,” and the sequel to it, “The Lord created me,” together with, “I, wisdom, have given counsel a home.” “See here,” < they will say >, “wisdom gave her own name at the outset and, as she went on in order, indicated herself when she said, ‘The Lord created me.’ (9) See, she says, ‘I, wisdom,’ above; and below she says, ‘If I tell you the happenings of each day, I shall remember to recount the things from everlasting.’ And what does she mean [by the ‘happenings from everlasting’]? ‘The Lord *created* me the beginning of his ways.’”

21,1 I have said that many things which <are> loosely <termed> wisdoms have been given by God from time to time, since God does all things with wisdom. But there is one true wisdom of the Father, the subsistent divine Word. For the word ["wisdom"] itself (i.e., at Prov. 8:22) by no means compels me to speak of the Son of God; <scripture> did not make that clear, nor did any of the apostles mention it, and not the Gospel either. (2) But if it were taken of the Son of God—the word [in itself] is not the same [as "Son"], and does not lend itself to an immediate judgment [as to whether it means "Son" at this point].

For the book is entirely proverbs. And nothing in a proverb has the same meaning [that it usually does]; it is described verbally in one way, but intended allegorically with another meaning. (3) If Solomon says this, however, and some venture to apply it to the Son of God—never! The word is not a reference to his Godhead. (4) But if it can be applied to Christ's human nature—for "Wisdom hath builded her house"⁵⁸—and if it can therefore be piously spoken in the person of Christ's human nature,⁵⁹ as though his human nature were saying, "The Lord created me" of his Godhead—(that is, "the Lord built me in Mary's womb")—"as the beginning of his ways for his works," [then wisdom might indeed mean "Son" here.]⁶⁰ (5) For the beginning of the "ways" of Christ's descent into the world is the body he took from Mary in his "work" of righteousness and salvation.

But some crackbrain who is struck with this frightful plague and has enmity for the Son of God in his heart will be sure to rush forward and say, (6) "He said, 'If I tell you the incidents of each day, I shall remember to recount the happenings from everlasting.'⁶¹ And you see that he says, 'from everlasting.' But according to Matthew God's incarnation came after seventy-two generations; how can 'from everlasting' be said by the human nature?" (22,1) And those who have strayed entirely off the road of the truth do not realize that whatever the sacred scripture wishes to teach, < if > it is beginning an exposition it does not go straight to the oldest data and, as it were, the main point, but begins with the events nearest at hand in order to show last of all what came first. (2) For this is why it said, "If I tell you the incidents of each day," [first], but afterwards," I < shall > also

recount the things from everlasting.”⁶² So God showed Moses the burning bush first, and the vision in the first instance was that of a bush on fire. And an angel spoke to him immediately, but later the Lord spoke to him from the bush.

22,3 But Moses did not ask him straight off about what he had seen, but inquired about things in the distant past. For God said, “Come, I send thee to the children of Israel, and thou shalt say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob,”⁶³—naming Abraham and the others, five or six generations before Moses. And since he had said “the God of your fathers” he had declared something ancient to him. (4) But Moses, with God-given understanding, was not asking about this but about something even more ancient: “If I go unto them and they say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?”⁶⁴ and then he revealed his name: “I am He Who Is.”⁶⁵ (5) And he had begun first with the things nearest in time, but last of all revealed what was furthest in the past.

Luke too begins with things that are later and nearest in time, “And Jesus began to be about thirty years of age, being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph, the son of Eli, the son of Matthan, the son of Nathan, the son of David, the son of Judah, the son of Jacob, the son of Abraham, the son of Nahor, the son of Noah, the son of Lamech, the son of Enoch, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.”⁶⁶ And you see how he spoke of the incarnation first, and then the [things he says] last.

22,6 And so when Matthew, in the fleshly genealogy, wished to remind people of Christ’s human nature, he did not say at once, “The birth of Jesus Christ the son of Abraham.” He said “son of David” first and then “son of Abraham,” indicating the sight most lately seen and the most recent happening and [then] one still further in the past, to show the indispensability of what is still higher above all creation.

23,1 And so, when the blessed John came and found people preoccupied with Christ’s human nature on earth, with the Ebionites gone wrong because of < Mathew’s > tracing of Christ’s earthly genealogy from Abraham and Luke’s carrying of it back to Adam—and the Cerinthians and Merinthians, saying that he was conceived sexually as a mere man, and

the Nazoraeans and many other sects,—(2) John, as though coming along behind them (he was the fourth evangelist) began to recall them from their wandering, as it were, and their preoccupation with Christ's coming below. As though following behind and seeing that some were pointed towards rough, steep paths and had left the straight, true road, he began, as it were, to say to them, "Where are you headed? Where are you going, you who are taking that rough road full of obstacles and leading to a pit? (3) That isn't so! Turn back! The divine Word begotten of the Father on high does not date only from Mary. He is not from the time of Joseph her betrothed. He is not from the time of Shealtiel, Zerubbabel, David, Abraham, Jacob, Noah and Adam. *'In the beginning* was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' "67

23,4 The word, "was," followed by "was" and followed by another "was," admits of no "was not." And you see, first of all, how scripture gave the most recent events at once—how Matthew showed the way with the genealogy and still did not give < all > the precise facts himself, though he surely carried the genealogy into the past. And Mark < described > the events in the world, a voice crying in the wilderness, < and > the Lord who was foretold by the Prophets and Law. And Luke traced him from the most recent times back to the earliest, < But later John, coming fourth, made the crowning touch manifest, and the perfection of the order on high and the eternal Godhead. (5) In the same way Solomon in his proverb < first indicated* > the beginning of the ways—(if, indeed, some may wish to say with piety that, since his Godhead itself had made the flesh and human nature as "the beginning of his ways for his works"⁶⁸ of men's salvation and his own goodness)—his incarnate self, since it says itself of Christ's Godhead, "The Godhead itself founded the house,"⁶⁹ and immediately afterwards, as the topic develops, says, "He founded me in the beginning."

23,6 Was the Son of God really created, and later established, in his divine nature? The clever folks, the observers of heaven, had better tell me the art by which wisdom was created, the tool with which it was established. But if it is allowable even to conceive of it, let us flee from such profound blasphemy, to keep our hands off the divine nature of the Only-begotten, which is always with the Father and has been begotten of him. (7) For < the > Lord was the Word, always with the Father, always wisdom,

always God of God, true and not spurious light, always deriving his being from the Father, and always truth and life.

24,1 And why should I say so much about this? He then says, "He established me in the beginning."⁷⁰ The godly can therefore see that here he means the human soul. (2) For the incarnate human nature says, "The Lord created me,"⁷¹—if, indeed, it should be taken in this way. "He established,"⁷² however, should be taken in the sense that he was established in the soul. But "Before all hills he begot me,"⁷³ is meant to show that his begetting is from on high.

And I have said these things, by no means to insist on them, but as a devout way of understanding the passage as a reference to the human nature. (3) Even though I must speak in this way, no one can ever make me say that this passage refers to Christ. But it if is to be said of Christ, there indeed is its meaning, not obtained by guesswork but in accord with the piety of the thought, so as not to attribute any deficiency to the Son < or > suppose that he has a Godhead which is inferior to the Father's essence. (4) For some of our fathers, and orthodox,⁷⁴—if indeed we must speak in this way of "The Lord created me and established me"⁷⁵—have interpreted this by taking it of the human nature. And < because > this is a pious thought many important fathers have taught it. (5) And if one should not wish to accept the teaching of the orthodox [on this point], he will not be compelled to and it will do no harm to those who are strangers to the faith and pagans.

For neither will < the fact that Christ suffered* > for us entail any deficiency in < the Son >; his Godhead is free [from suffering] and is always with the Father. (6) Christ suffered whatever he suffered, but was not changed in nature; his Godhead retained its impassibility. Thus, when he willed of his own good pleasure to suffer for humanity—since the Godhead, which is impassible in itself, cannot suffer—he took our passible body since he is Wisdom, consented to suffering in it and taking our sufferings upon him in the flesh, accompanied by the Godhead.

For the Godhead does not suffer. (7) How can the One who said, "I am the life,"⁷⁶ die? God remains impassible but shares the sufferings of the flesh so that, even though Godhead does not suffer, the suffering may be counted as the Godhead's and our salvation may be in God. The suffering is in the flesh that we may have, not a passible but an impassible God who counts the suffering as his own, not of necessity but by his own choice.

25,¹ But anyway, neither have these people examined the Hebrew expressions, or found out or < understood > what they mean, and yet they have willfully and rashly risen up as deadly foes, looking for a chance to mutilate the faith—or themselves, rather, for they can't mutilate the truth. And since they have found "The Lord created me," they recklessly dream as though they were having hallucinations, bringing mankind things that are of no use, and disturbing the world. (2) This is not what the Hebrew means, and so Aquila says, "The Lord got me." Men who have sired children always say, "I have gotten a son."

But neither did Aquila render the meaning. "I have gotten a son" implies something new, but in God there can be nothing new. (3) Even if one confesses that the Son has been begotten of the Father and not created, he was begotten without time and without beginning. (4) For there can be no time between the Father and the Son, or there will be some time < previous > to the Son's. For if all things are made through him, so are the times. (5) But if there is a time before Him who is before all—how can there be? But if there is, then we shall need another Son, through whom the time before the Son has been made.

And there are many things which lead into endless perplexity the minds of those people who "are always busy but do nothing good."⁷⁷ (6) In the Hebrew it says, "Adonai" (which means, "the Lord") "kanani," which can be rendered both "hatched"⁷⁸ me" and "got me." In the strictest sense, however, it means, "hatched me." And which hatchling is not begotten from the substance of its begetter? And here, among bodily creatures, the young are produced by the pairings of male and female—from men to cattle, birds and all the rest. (7) And so, since the Only-begotten was in all respects the Father's wisdom and willed to do all things for our correction, so that no one would form a false notion of him and be deprived of the truth, he was not conceived from a man's seed when he made his home

in the human race, when he was truly born of a woman and lay in the Virgin's womb during the period of gestation. Otherwise his birth in the flesh might have required pairing and sexual congress. But he took flesh only from his mother and yet made his human nature complete in his own image—not deficient, but true human nature.

25,8 And his not being of a man's seed did not make him deficient. He to whom all things belong took all things in their perfection: flesh, sinews, veins and everything else; a soul, truly and not in appearance; a mind; and all other human characteristics except for sin, as scripture says, "He was in all points tempted as a man, apart from sin."⁷⁹ (9) Thus, by being born in the flesh here simply of a mother, perfectly man and without defect, he would show those who desire to see the truth and not blind their own minds that on high he has been perfectly begotten of a Father on high, without beginning and not in time; and below has been born of a mother only, without spot or defilement.

26,1 But to explain the phrase, "Adonai kanani," which means, "The Lord hatched me." Whatever begets, begets its like. A man begets a man and God begets God, the man physically and God spiritually. (2) And as is the man who begets, so is the man who is begotten of him. The human begetter, who is subject to suffering, < begets > his own son, and the impassible God begot the Son who was begotten of him without suffering—begot him truly and not in appearance, of himself and not from outside himself, impassible spirit impassibly begetting spirit, impassible God impassibly begetting very God.

26,3 For if he created all things himself—and you admit, Arius, that God has created all things—then he also begot the Son himself. (4) But if you say, "If he begot, he suffered in begetting," we will say to you that if he suffered in begetting he tired from creating. But all that he wills, he has simultaneously perfected in himself; the Godhead will not bring suffering on the Son in the process of creation; nor can the Godhead be conceived of as suffering because of its spotless begetting of the Son. For the Father is unchangeable, the Son is unchangeable, the Holy Spirit is unchangeable, one essence, one Godhead.

26,5 But you are sure to ask me, "Did God beget the Son by willing to or without willing to?" And I am not like you, you troublemaker, to think any such thing of God. "If he begot him without willing to, he begot him unwillingly. And if he begot him willingly, the will came before the Son,

and because of the will there will be at least a moment of time between the Son [and the Father].” (6) But in God there is no time to will and no will to think. God begot the Son neither by willing to nor without willing to, but begot him in his nature which transcends will. For his is the nature of Godhead, which neither needs a will nor does anything without a will, but of itself possesses all things at once and is in want of nothing.

27,1 But Arius ferrets out still more texts, always wandering over everything and fussing with unsound arguments—not as the sacred text is, but as he < conceives of it > in his unhealthy preoccupation with controversies and verbal disputes which are good for nothing except his own ruin and his dupes’. < And > he seizes on the text where the Lord blessed his disciples and said, “Father, grant them to have life in themselves. And this is life eternal, that they know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.”⁸⁰ (2) But I have already dealt with all this in my long work on the faith which, in my mediocrity and feebleness, I have been compelled to write about faith at the urgent request of the brethren, and have called the *Ancoratus*.⁸¹ (3) And as, with God’s help, my poor mind was able to gather the truths of God’s teaching from every scripture—like an anchor for those who wish < to hold onto > the holy apostolic and prophetic faith of our fathers which has been preached in God’s holy church from the beginning until now—I have set it out clearly for our minds to grasp and be certain of, < so that > they will not be shaken by the devil’s devices or damaged by the seas which, by the sects with their bluster, have been raised in the world.

27,4 For the Lord taught his own disciples, “If what ye have heard from the beginning abide in you, and what ye have heard < of me >⁸² abide in you, ye shall abide in me and I in you, and I in the Father and ye in me.”⁸³ (5) Thus the truths of the faith, which we have heard from the Lord since the beginning, abide in God’s holy church, (6) and God’s holy church and orthodox faith thus abide in the Lord; and the Lord, the Only-begotten, abides in the Father, and the Father in the Son, and we in him through the Holy Spirit, provided we become temples to hold his Holy Spirit. (7) As God’s holy apostle said, “Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.”⁸⁴ Thus the Spirit is God of God; and through God’s Holy

Spirit we are called temples, if we give his Spirit a home within us. For, < the > Spirit is the Spirit of Christ who proceeds < from > the Father and receives of the Son, as the Only-begotten himself confesses.

28,1 I have discussed all this in that book of mine about faith—the book which, as I said, I wrote to Pamphylia and Pisidia.⁸⁵ But here, since I have come to the debated expressions one after another, I have had diligently to make the same points over again, as it were, because of Arius, the heresiarch with whom we are dealing, and the Arians who derive from him—to demolish their wicked arguments which turn “sweet to bitter, good to evil, and light to darkness.”⁸⁶ (2) For through the holy Isaiah “Woe” is definitively pronounced by the Lord upon such people, who turn good to evil. And God is in no way responsible for their kind. From pride, prejudice, would-be wisdom or devilish conceit, each of them has been deprived of the truth and, with his unsound teaching, brought an affliction on the world.

28,3 All right, let’s take up this text in order to understand the words the Lord has spoken, as the holy apostle says, “We also have the Spirit of God, that we may know the things that God hath bestowed upon us, which things we likewise speak.”⁸⁷ (4) For the Lord says, “Grant them to have life in themselves. And this is life eternal, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.”⁸⁸

29,1 Now this trouble-maker, Arius, and his followers jump up and say, “His praying to God at all, and saying, ‘Father, grant them to have life in themselves,’ shows that he is not the equal of the Giver of the life. If he were of the Father’s essence he would give the life himself, and not ask the Father to give it to those who receive the gifts he gives in answer to their requests.”

29,2 And the people who have turned their minds against themselves do not realize that the Only-begotten came to be our example and salvation in every way, and took his stand in the world like an athlete in an arena, to destroy all that rebels against the truth—sometimes by idolatry, sometimes by Jewish conceit, sometimes from unbelief, sometimes from the vanity of human prejudice—came to teach men humility, so that no human being will think himself important, but will ascribe everything to the Father of all. (3) And so, although he is life—as he says, “I am the

life”⁸⁹—and although he has the power to give life, he has no wish to confuse what is right. < As > he has come for one sovereignty, one Godhead, one truth, one concord, one Glory, to secure men’s salvation and understanding, he also asks of the Father before his disciples. (4) For which son does not ask his father? And which father does not give to his son? But what kind of son is different from the nature of his father? And thus < the > Son, “the only-begotten of a Father, full of grace and truth,”⁹⁰ needed no filling, < since he was > not in want of truth but full of grace and truth. (5) And he who is full both gives and can give; but his will is to refer all things to the Father.

For the Son glorifies the Father and the Father glorifies the Only-begotten. “I have glorified thee on the earth,”⁹¹ said the Son to the Father, and the Father said to the Son, “I have both glorified thee, and will glorify thee again.”⁹² (6) The Godhead can have no dispute, no envy: “Grant them to have life in themselves.”⁹³ He who is life, wills to receive life from the Father and give it to his disciples although he himself is life, so as not to divide the Divine Unity and thus not put an obstacle in the way of the Jews—so that the Jews would hear him asking of the Father.

30,1 How does the Son ask the Father, then? As though not having and so asking? No, but by declaring the oneness of the Trinity, which provides the gifts perfectly to one who receives them worthily. But to show the Godhead’s oneness, in another passage he gives [gifts], no longer by asking for them but by giving his own on his own authority, for he is Well-spring of Well-spring,⁹⁴ and God of God; < for > “He breathed in their faces and said, ‘Receive ye the Holy Spirit.’”⁹⁵ (2) And in another passage “He lifted up his hands and said,” “Receive ye the Holy Spirit.”⁹⁶

And he has life in himself, to give to whomever he will. “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath the Son life in himself.”⁹⁷ (3) And you see that [it is] from honor of the Father and for the sake of one unity and one glory, and so that the disciples will not suppose that the Only-begotten has come to divert the believers’ minds from the God of the Law and the

prophets—(4) [it is] for this reason that, being God and foreknowing of the malice of men, he addresses these words as to the Father and gives the Father the glory that cannot be taken away. And so Mani will be confounded, who denies the Father; the disciples will learn that the Godhead is the same in the Old and the New Testaments; the Jews will be put to shame because the Only-begotten did not come to teach another God but to reveal his Godhead and that of his heavenly Father. (5) “Grant them to have life in themselves,” [he says], although he himself was proclaiming this life. Why, then, would he ask the Father to give them what he himself was teaching and giving? For he made the life known later on by saying, “This is life, that they may know thee, the only true God.”⁹⁸

31,1 Next, because Christ said, “the *only* true God,”⁹⁹ Arius and his followers jump at the verse as though they have found an argument against the truth. “He said, ‘The only true God.’ You see, then, that only the Father is true.”

31,2 But let’s ask you Arians ourselves, “What do you mean? Is only the Father true? But what is the Son? Isn’t the Son true? If the Son isn’t ‘true,’ ‘Our faith is vain and our preaching is in vain.’¹⁰⁰ (3) And in blasphemy against your own selves you will be found to be likening the Son of < God > to the unspeakable, infamous idols—you to whom the prophets said, as though to persons who are suffering a delusion, < ‘Solomon says, The worship of the unspeakable idols is the beginning of all evil.’^{*} >¹⁰¹ And each of the prophets recalled this text, < like Jeremiah^{*} > who said, < ‘Woe unto them that follow after idols,’^{*} >¹⁰² and, ‘Our fathers made for themselves false gods, and their high places became false.’¹⁰³ (4) The Only-begotten too is condemned in your eyes, and you thus hold a disgusting opinion of ‘him who redeemed you’¹⁰⁴—if, indeed, he did redeem you. For since you deny your Savior who redeemed you, you cannot be of his fold.”

For if God is not true, he should not be worshiped; and if he is created, he is not God. And if he is not to be worshiped, how can he be called God? Stop it, you who < are making a god^{*} > of one more natural object, (5) who are conducting Babylonian < worship^{*} >, who have set up Nebuchadnezz-

zar's image and idol! You who are blowing this renowned trumpet to unite < the worshipers >¹⁰⁵ < against > the Son of God* >; who, with your wrong words, are bringing the peoples to disaster with music, cymbals and psaltery, preparing them to serve an image rather than God and truth. And who else is as true as the Son of God? (6) "For who shall be likened to the Lord among the sons of God?"¹⁰⁶ says the scripture, and, "None other shall be reckoned in comparison with him."¹⁰⁷ And what does he say [next]? To show you that he means the Son, he describes him next and says, "He hath found out every way of understanding, and given it < to Jacob his servant and Israel whom he loveth. > (7) And thereafter he appeared on earth and consorted with men."¹⁰⁸ How can this not have been said truly of him? < And how can the Son not be true God* > when he says, "I am the truth?"¹⁰⁹

32,1 But you will ask me, "Why did the only-begotten true God say, 'that they may know thee, the *only* true God?'" [I reply], "to discourage polytheism, to prevent division of the life-giving knowledge?"¹¹⁰ If the Father is the only true God, then the Son is true and truly begotten of the Father! (2) For it was 'to honor the Father'¹¹¹ and reveal him alone as 'true God,' that the Son made it known that he is 'truly begotten of the Father.'

And how was this to be made known? (3) Just look at the texts here! It says here that the Father is the only "true God," but in the Gospel according to John it says, "He was the true light."¹¹² And which "true light" was this but the Only-begotten? And again, the scriptures say of God, "God is light,"¹¹³ and they didn't say, "God is true light." On the other hand, they said of God's only-begotten Son that the Only-begotten is "true light."

32,4 It said, "true God," of the Father, and not that God is "true light." But of the Son, it said, "God," and didn't add "true" to "The Son is God." And where it said, "God is light," it didn't add, "true light." Then what should we say of the Father? We < shall confess* > that God is "true light," and not make the Godhead defective. (5) And because "true light" is not [said of God] in the scripture, should we < also > sinfully say that God

is not true light? And since scripture says that the Son is God, and that he was God with the true Father—(“The Word was God”;¹¹⁴ and it didn’t say that the Word *became* God, but that he *was* God)—the equivalence [of the Father and the Son] will be shown by the two phrases. From the Father’s being “true God” and the Son’s being “true light” the equality of their rank will be evident; and from the Son’s being “God” and the Father’s being “light” the equivalence of their glory will be made plain. (6) And there will be no difference, nor can anyone contradict the truth, but the Father is true God, and the Only-begotten is true God.

33,1 But I am obliged to speak further here, about the Holy Spirit, or, if I leave anything out, I may give the enemy, who want < to contradict >, a chance to hold their < wicked beliefs* >. For it is the same with the Holy Spirit, as the Lord himself testifies by saying “the Spirit of truth” and “the Spirit of the Father,”¹¹⁵ but the apostle by saying “Spirit of Christ.” (2) Thus, being the Spirit of the Father [and] the Spirit of the Son, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, the Spirit of God, just as God is true God, just as he is true light. For there is one Trinity, one glory, one Godhead, one Lordship. (3) The Father is a father, the Son is a son, the Holy Spirit is a holy spirit. The Trinity is not an identity, not separate from its own unity, not wanting in perfection, not strange to its own identity, but is one Perfection, three Perfects, one Godhead.

33,4 And the sword of the opposition has fallen [from its hand]. Indeed, scripture says, “< Their blows became a weapon > of babes.”¹¹⁶ Even if infants want to take weapons they lack the strength, and cannot do anything with their hands. Even though infants are roused to anger they kill and do harm to themselves rather [than anyone else], since they cannot make an armed attack on others. Similarly these people have sent their imposture to war with themselves, but will bring no evil on the sons of the truth.

34,1 But once more I shall go on to other texts which they have thought of. To begin with, the falsehood they use in order to deceive the simple and innocent is amazing. As the serpent deceived Eve in her innocence, so they, if they wish to win their allegiance, first < approach* > those who do not wish to go by their creed with much flattery, and with liberal expenditure, attention, and both promises and threats, such as “You’re opposing

the imperial decrees and the wrath of the emperor Valens.” (2) And what do they say [next]? “Well, what is it that we’re saying? It’s the faith [itself], only you’re [too] proud [to admit it]!”

All right, let’s see whether this is the faith. They say, “We confess that the Son is begotten of the Father, and do not deny it. (3) But,” they say, “we must also confess that he is a creature and a product of creation.”

But nothing could be more pathetic. Nothing created is like anything begotten, and nothing begotten is like anything created, especially in the case of that one, pure and perfect essence. (4)¹¹⁷ For all things have been created by God, but only God’s Son has been begotten, and only the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and received of the Son. All other things are created beings, and neither proceeded from the Father nor received of the Son, but received *of the Son’s fullness*, as the scripture says, “By the Word of God were all things established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth.”¹¹⁸

34,5 “But we must confess the creaturehood as well,” says Arius, “since scripture said ‘creature’ in a figurative sense, and ‘offspring’ is meant figuratively. For even if we say, ‘offspring,’ we shall not mean an offspring like any other.”

Well then, they are deceiving the innocent by saying, “offspring,” and the offspring isn’t real. (6) “But we also confess Christ’s creaturehood,” they say. “For Christ is also called door, way, pillar, cloud, rock, lamb,¹¹⁹ lamb,¹²⁰ stream, calf, lion, well-spring, wisdom, Word, Son, angel, Christ, Savior, Lord, man, Son of Man, cornerstone, sun, prophet, bread, king, building, husbandman, shepherd, vine, and all sorts of things like these. In the same way,” they say, “we also use ‘creature’ in an accommodated sense of the word. For we are bound to confess it.”

35,1 Such wicked speculation, and such cunning! May the Lord allow no son of the truth to be brought by such dissimulation to accept “creature” as the Son of God’s title for such reasons, and make that confession. Let them tell us what the use of this is, and we will grant them the conclusion of their reasonings. (2) For all those things are ways of speaking and do not impair the Son’s divinity, make him defective in comparison with the Father, or < alter him* > from his essential nature. Even if he should be called “door,” it is because we enter by him; if road, it is because we go

by him; if “pillar,” because he is the support of the truth. Even if “cloud,” this is because he overshadowed the children of Israel, if “fire,” because of the brightness of the fire which gave them light in the wilderness. Even if he should be called “manna,” this is because they denied that he was the bread from heaven; if “bread,” because we are strengthened by him.

35,3 Even if “angel,” this is because he is an angel of a great counsel. The word, “angel,” is a synonym. Rahab received the “angels,” and yet the men who had been sent there were not angels, but *the persons who brought the report*¹²¹ of the place. And so, because he reported the Father’s will to men, the Only-begotten is an “angel of a great counsel,” who reports the great counsel in the world.

35,4 Even if he should be called “stone,” the “stone” is not inanimate; this is a way of speaking, because he has become a stumbling block to the Jews, but a foundation of salvation to us. And he is called “corner-stone” because he unites the Old and the New Testaments, circumcision and uncircumcision, as one body. (5) But he is called “lamb” because of his harmlessness, and because the sin of humankind has been done away by his offering to the Father as a lamb for the slaughter; for the Impassible came to suffer for our salvation. And whatever else in these usages is an aid to human salvation is applied to him by the sacred scripture in some accommodated sense.

36,1 Now what good can “creature” do, or what use is it to our salvation and to the glory and perfect divinity of the incarnate divine Word? How does calling him “creature” help us? What can a creature do for creatures? How does a creature benefit creatures? (2) Why did God create < a Son > and allow < him > to be worshiped as God, when he says, “Thou shalt not make to thyself any likeness, neither on earth nor in heaven, and thou shalt not worship it?”¹²² Why did he create a Son for himself and order that he be worshiped, particularly when the apostle says, “And they served the creature rather than the creator, and were made fools.”¹²³ It is foolish to treat a creature as God and break the first commandment, which says, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.”¹²⁴ (3) And thus God’s holy church worships, not a creature but a begotten Son, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, with the Holy Spirit.

36,4 "Oh, yes!" says Arius. "Unless I say he is a creature, I attribute diminution to the Father. For the creature does not diminish the creator, but by the nature of things the begotten shrinks its begetter, or broadens or lessens or cuts it, or does it some such injury."¹²⁵

36,5 It is most foolish of those who think such things to imagine Godhead in their likeness—and of those who attribute their frailties to God, since God is wholly impassible, both in begetting and in creating. We are creatures, and as we suffer when we beget, we tire when we create. And if the Father suffers in begetting, then he also tires in creating.

36,6 But how can one speak of suffering in connection with God, and of his tiring if he creates? He does not tire, never think it! The scripture says, "He shall not weary."¹²⁶ "God is spirit"¹²⁷ and begot the Son spiritual<ly>, without beginning and not in time, "God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made."¹²⁸

37,1 But I shall pass this text by too, and once more devote my attention to others which they repeat and bandy about in wrong senses, and which I have mentioned earlier. For again, they confusedly misinterpret this one: "Receive your high priest, who is faithful to him that *made* him."¹²⁹ (2) In the first place they reject this Epistle, I mean the Epistle to the Hebrews, remove it bodily from the Apostle and say that it is not his. But because of their malady they < turn > the text to their advantage, as I said, take it in a wrong sense, and covertly introduce the Son's creaturehood, supposedly by means of the words, "faithful to him that *made* him."¹³⁰

37,3 But someone with sense might ask them when our Lord adopted the title of "high priest," and they will be at a loss because they have no answer. (4) Christ never adopted these names before his incarnation—stone, sheep led to the slaughter, man and Son of Man, eagle, lamb and all the rest that are applied to him after his coming in the flesh. Thus he is called "high priest" because of the declaration the Law made of him, "A prophet shall the Lord raise unto you, of your brethren."¹³¹ (5) The text thus plainly explains "prophet," "high priest," and "of them" [as titles given] *after* his sojourn on earth, and it can be seen at a glance how, once again,

God's unconquerable power and foreknowledge foretold and certified all this by its wondrous light, to the "stopping of every mouth"¹³² that rebels against the truth. (6) For he says in the same passage, "Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men to offer gifts and sacrifices, being able to bear with [their infirmities]. For he hath need < to offer > for his own sins. But he that had no sin offered himself to the Father."¹³³ (7) And "of men" is said because of the earthly sojourn, but "not of men" < and > "that hath no sin" are said because of the divinity. And of his divinity he says, "though he were a son"; but of his humanity, "He learned by the things he suffered."¹³⁴

38,¹ And you see that all of Christ's titles are simple and have nothing complicated in them. "High priest faithful to him that *made him*" here describes neither the making of his body here nor of his human nature, nor is it speaking of creation at all, but of the bestowal of his rank after his incarnation, like the text, "He gave him a name which is above every name."¹³⁵ (2) And this was not done of old in the divine nature, but < in > his current advent, since the human nature he took from Mary received the name above every name, the title "Son of God" in addition to the title of "Divine Word." (3) And again, for this reason he has said here, through the apostle himself, "We see Jesus, who for a little was made lower than the angels crowned with glory and honor,"¹³⁶ so that the Master and Maker of the angels would appear lower than they; so that he who inspires the angels with dread and fear and, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, made the angels from nothing, would be called "lower," and it would be plainly evident that he is not speaking of his Godhead here, but of his flesh.

38,⁴ For the suffering of death was not counted as the Word's before he took flesh, but after his incarnation, with the same Word being passible and impassible—impassible in Godhead but suffering in his manhood, just as both titles apply to the one [person]—"Son of Man" to the same person, and "Son of God" to the same. For Christ is called the "Son" in both alike.

39,¹ What did God "make" him, then? From all that has been said the trouble-makers should learn that nothing in this text is relevant to the

Godhead but to the human nature. And “made him,” does not refer to the making or creating of him, but to his rank after the advent.

39,2 If someone asks a king about his son, and says, “What is he to you?” the king will tell him, “He is my son.”

“Is he your legitimate or your illegitimate son?” The king will say, “He is my legitimate son.”

“Then what did you make him?”

“I made him king.” Plainly, the son’s rank is no different from his father’s. (3) And because he has said, “I made him king,” this surely does not mean that the king is saying, “I created him.” In saying, “I made him,” he has certainly not denied the begetting of him—which he had acknowledged—but has made that plain; “I made him,” however, was a statement of his rank. Thus, by those who wish < to obtain > salvation, the Son is unambiguously believed to be the Son of the Father, and is worshiped.

39,4 But “was made high priest” is said because he offered himself in his body to the Father for mankind, himself the priest, himself the victim; as high priest for all creation he offered himself spiritually and gloriously in his body itself and “sat down at the Father’s right hand,”¹³⁷ after “being made an high priest forever”¹³⁸ and “passing through the heavens”¹³⁹ once and for all. The same holy apostle testifies to this of him in the lines that follow. (5) And once again their ostensible discussion of sacred scripture, which they use as their excuse, has proved a failure, for scripture is life-giving; nothing in it offers an obstacle to the faithful or makes for the downfall of blasphemy against the Word.

40,1 Then they have mentioned another passage, when John was standing in the wilderness, saw him coming and said, “This is he of whom I said unto you, a man cometh after me that *was made*¹⁴⁰ before me, for he was before me.”¹⁴¹ (2) And first, as though they were half drowsy, they misunderstand the expressions themselves and say, “How could this apply to the human nature, when he was not conceived in Mary’s womb before the conception of John? Instead, as the evangelist says ‘In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent to a city of Galilee, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph. And he came in unto her and said, Hail,

thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee,¹⁴² and the rest that follows. (3) When the virgin was troubled at his greeting he said to her, 'Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bear a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. And behold, thy cousin Elizabeth hath conceived a son in her old age, and this is the sixth month with her that is called barren.'¹⁴³ And you see," they say, "that John was already there six months before the annunciation to Mary. (4) How can 'He was made'¹⁴⁴ before me' apply to Christ's human nature?"

Can any innocent soul whose mind is not clear and firmly made up, hear that without being upset? (5) For <truly>,¹⁴⁵ for those who bring their troubles on themselves, the sacred scriptures' cogent, innocent, life-giving teachings appear to do more harm than [good] although the texts are always illumined in the Holy Spirit. (6) What has been omitted to make the text convincing? See here, it says "This"—to indicate something visible and show it to the onlookers—"This is he of whom I said unto you that he cometh after me." And who is coming but a "man?" But no one with sense would suppose that our Lord is a *mere* man—only the sects we have already indicated, the Cerinthians, Merinthians and Ebionites.

40,7 But together with knowing him as "man" it is surely true that the true believers know him with certainty as Lord as John testifies, "That which we have heard from the beginning,"¹⁴⁶ meaning him who is from the beginning—the invisible divine Word, of whom we have heard in the sacred scriptures, who is proclaimed in the prophets, who is hymned in heaven. (8) Thus the intent of < the line >, "We have heard with our ears from the beginning and have seen with our eyes," is for the word, "hear," coming first, to confess that he is God from the beginning, but for the word "see" to show that he is the man of whom John the Baptist said, "After me cometh a man."¹⁴⁷ And "our hands have handled" is meant to show that he is God from on high and indicate that he is visible man, born of Mary and raised whole from the dead without losing the sacred vessel and perfect human nature he had taken; it is meant instead, from the handling of his side and the nail-prints, to give unshakeable testimony to all three. (9) So please understand here too that "This is he of whom

I said unto you that a man cometh after me"¹⁴⁸ is meant to show the human nature, and "He was before me" to show the Godhead "because he was before me." For "He was in the world," says the holy Gospel, "and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not."¹⁴⁹

41,1 But if he was in the world before the creation and begetting of John he had arrived in the world before him—not meaning creation or making, but in the sense in which people use the same word to say, "I arrived¹⁵⁰ in Jerusalem, arrived in Babylon, arrived in Ethiopia, arrived in Alexandria"—not meaning creation here, but presence and arrival. (2) What does "I arrived in Babylon" or some other place mean but, "I came [there]?" "He arrived [here] before me" shows the continual presence on earth of the Word, and "He was before me" shows that the Godhead is eternal. "Coming after me" does, however, indicate his conception after John's.

And so "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness"¹⁵¹ means a cry to draw people's attention. (3) When people call they give a loud shout first without any words, to call from a distance to the people who need to hear something from them. And once the people hear the shout [which is] only [a shout], and pay attention and get ready to hear, then finally the shouter pronounces whatever words he wanted to say. (4) And thus John was a voice in the wilderness to draw people's attention. For John himself was not the Word; the Word on whose account the preparatory shout was heard came after him. And this is why he says, "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord."¹⁵² (5) The voice prepares the ways, but the Lord sets foot on the ways which have been prepared. And a voice speaks < to > the ear; but when the ear is receptive, the word is implanted in the ears of its receivers. Thus Arius and his followers will never perceive God's truth although it enlightens the hearts of the faithful at all times to prevent their turning away from the salvation which is to be found in the Word, the true, uncreated and unoriginate Son of God.

42,1 But again, as I go ahead and come to each topic in turn, I shall not omit any point I have previously proposed for solution but take up the thread again.¹⁵³ Once more the Arians offer another excuse, St. Peter's words in Acts, "Be it known unto you, all ye house of Israel, that God hath

made this Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord and Christ.”¹⁵⁴ (2) And again they say, “Here we find ‘made’ in scripture”; and they do not see that the phrase, “this Jesus”—for the phrase is self-explanatory—means the Lord’s human nature. < The meaning* > is clear from “this Jesus *whom ye crucified*.” This is < plainly* > the flesh which they crucified, for < it is clear that > they crucified flesh. (3) And thus the Lord says in the Gospel, “But now ye seek to kill me, a *man* that hath told you the truth which I have heard of my Father,”¹⁵⁵ < declaring himself man* > but not separating his Godhead from his manhood. (4) For neither was Christ’s Godhead separate from his manhood when he was about to suffer, nor when he suffered was the human nature abandoned by the Word. But no more had the impassible Word previously suffered; he suffered < only > in the suffering flesh. For the same name truly applies to both natures and is given to the divine nature and to the human. The human nature of the Word himself is Christ, and yet Christ is the Lord in the human nature itself. (5) But the suffering is in the flesh, as Peter said, “Christ suffered for us *in flesh*”—to show the divine nature’s impassibility—and again, “dying *in the flesh*, brought to life in the Spirit.”¹⁵⁶

Thus Peter said “this *Jesus* whom ye crucified” to show that the sacred human nature was not abandoned by the impassible and uncreated Word, but was united with the uncreated Word on high. (6) And this is why he said, “God hath *made* Lord and Christ”¹⁵⁷ the thing that was conceived by Mary, the thing that had been united with Godhead. For Mary is not divine by nature, and for this reason he adds “made.” And so, when Mary asked him, “How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?” the angel Gabriel said, “The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that which shall be born shall be called holy, the Son of God.”¹⁵⁸

42,7 But when he said, “that which shall be *born*,” he showed unquestionably that the divine Word is indubitably a *Son*, not created, not made. (8) And as to the human nature which was born of Mary, he showed, by adding “that which is born < shall > also < be called holy, the Son of God >,” that God had made < even the thing that was born > Christ and Lord. And as everything about the other passages has been fully dealt with

and presents no difficulty, here too everything about his human nature had been dealt with, and for those who are attending to their salvation there is no bypath. (9) For the Word is a living Word from a living Father—the Father's Son, not his creature. But everything in the human nature has been dealt with, so that no one may suppose that he is an apparition, or that his flesh is co-essential with his Godhead on high, but everyone [will realize] that the human nature is united in one impassibility, especially after his resurrection from the dead. For scripture says, "He dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him."¹⁵⁹ (10) There is one Lord, one Christ, one King, seated at the Father's right hand; that which is physical and spiritual is one union, one spiritual Godhead, both natures radiant and glorious. (11) But since I feel that the passage has been sufficiently expounded I shall pass it by; and let me take up the discussion by < going on* > to < warn > my hearers against the other parts of their < foolishness > which they have invented for the overthrow of their hearers.¹⁶⁰

43.1 For again, they say, "If he is of the Father's essence why does he not know the hour and the day, but by his own admission acknowledges to the disciples that he does not know the things the Father knows and says, 'Of that day and of that hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven or the Son, but the Father only.'¹⁶¹ (2) If the Father knows," they say, "and he doesn't know, how can the Father's and the Son's Godhead be the same, when the Son doesn't know what the Father does?"

43.3 But not knowing their human frailty, they seize, to their own harm, on everything that the Only-begotten, in his divine wisdom, teaches mystically for the assurance of the truest knowledge—as horrid serpents, when caught by a crafty hunter, take the bait to their own destruction. They do not know that falsehood will never stand, while the truth always keeps its own sons straight and confounds falsehood. (4) Those who harbor this evil suspicion of Christ from the first must tell us which is by nature greater and more important to know—God the Lord of all and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or the day which is brought to its dawning by the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the hour when it dawns. But if they are asked that question, the truth itself will surely oblige them to say that the Father is greater, as indeed he is.

43,5 Now if the Son says, “Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and no man knoweth the Son save the Father,”¹⁶² when he knows the greater thing, the Father, how can he not know the lesser thing? But these words are divine and spoken by the Holy Spirit, and are unknowable by those who have not received the gift and grace of the Holy Spirit. (6) For such are the Arians with their wavering spirit and feeble intellect, and they slip into hurtful deviations even in their minor ones.

44,1 For the Lord’s own words will step out to meet them, “Be ye ready, < let > your loins < be > girded about and let there be lamps in your hands, and be ye as good servants, awaiting their Master. For like a thief in the night, so will the day come.”¹⁶³ And the holy apostle says, “Ye are not children of the night but of the day, lest the day should come upon you as a thief.”¹⁶⁴ (2) If, then, the children of the day are not hidden by the darkness, but are ready because “Their Master cometh in a day they know not and at an hour they await not,”¹⁶⁵ then, because of his brilliant being and his Godhead, will not < He who > gives them being be different from his servants, the sons of the day? Or, like those who do not know the day and are unprepared, will he be caught in ignorance and subject to deficiency? (3) Who but the < in > sane could suppose these things of the Lord, that he will be like his subjects and disciples—or like those who, from their unpreparedness and ignorance, are inferior to these? That is just silly.

44,4 Now if these things are not possible, but the explanation, when compared with it, turns out to contradict the saying, we need to see what explanation we can find that will leave both saying and explanation uncontradicted and prevent our deviating from the truth. For the Lord cannot lie, and can give no expositions for our salvation in vain.

44,5 Thus the Father knows [the day], the Son knows, and the Holy Spirit knows. For nothing in the Father is different from the Son, nor is anything in the Son different from the Spirit. In every Sect, when I needed to, I have shown with authentic proofs that the Trinity is one Godhead and has no internal differences but is all perfection—three Perfects, one glory and one sovereignty.

45,1 But you will ask me, “Why did he say this, then?” And I have already given an explanation of this elsewhere.¹⁶⁶ But nothing need keep

me from adding to the same things and telling the same truths; “To me it is not burdensome, but it will be a safeguard”¹⁶⁷ for the readers and refutatory for the opposition. The reason for this is as follows. (2) Christ has made incidental mention, in the same sentence, of three ranks: the Father, himself, and the angels in heaven. And he has attributed knowing to the Father, implying not only acquaintance and knowledge but everything that is always indubitably controlled, brought about and made by the Father and the Son. (3) Indeed the Father knows the day—knows it, has fashioned and made it, and < at the same time > judged, as he said in the Gospel according to John, “The Father judgeth no man, but hath given all judgment to the Son”¹⁶⁸—in *giving* judgment he has judged; in judging, then, he knew [the day]; knowing, he is aware of when it will come. (4) For “He that believeth not on the Son is judged already”¹⁶⁹—not in the sense that the judgment is past, but that what will happen then is already made plain, just as any particular thing follows from this [or that cause]. For scripture is aware of more than one sort of “knowledge”; and in my frequent returns to the main point I have never ceased to clarify and explain each subject with the similes and examples which have already been discussed.

46,1 So let’s take < up > the discussion again < too >, from the beginning, and speak about these things. What do you mean, people? Did or didn’t Adam know Eve his wife even before their disobedience and transgression? And you can’t contradict the truth. (2) Even though you prefer not to deal fairly with the sense of this, you will be exposed, for scripture says, “They were naked and were not ashamed.”¹⁷⁰ For if they were naked and not blind¹⁷¹ they saw and knew each other. For neither can you deny this and not admit that they could see; “Eve *saw* that the tree was good for food and goodly to look upon.”¹⁷² Thus they saw and knew.

And by knowing and seeing they recognized each other. (3) But it was much later when scripture said, “And Adam *knew* Eve his wife” It speaks of the first knowledge and sight in the sense of knowledge gained by seeing and intellection, but in the case of the second acquaintance and knowledge it is describing knowledge by experience. (4) Thus the sacred

scripture says the same of David in his old age, “And David was old and could not keep warm. And his servants said, Let a virgin be sought for the king. And there was found Abishag the Shunamite.”¹⁷³ And it says, “And she warmed him, and he slept by her side, and David knew her not.”¹⁷⁴ (5) How could he not know her when she was close to his body and slept beside him? But here scripture is describing, not knowledge by intellection but knowledge by experience.

46,6 Indeed it is the same with Jacob. When he was herding with Leah and Rachel for seven years he knew them. But when the scripture speaks of their lawful conjugal intercourse it says, “He *knew* Leah his wife.”¹⁷⁵ The first knowing was by intellection and sight, but the second acquaintance and knowing was by experience and activity.

46,7 And likewise in the sacred scripture “The Lord knoweth them that are his”¹⁷⁶ doesn’t mean that he doesn’t know those who aren’t his, but refers to the activity of the Lord’s assistance. And [so with] “Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. I never knew you.”¹⁷⁷ Did he have no intellectual knowledge of them? But because they were not worthy of him he withholds his personal knowledge from them. And elsewhere he says, (8) “You have I known of all nations.”¹⁷⁸ [If we take this literally], all the nations, and the entire human population, have been left out of his knowledge. On the contrary, aren’t the hairs of each one’s head known < by > him—of those who serve, and those who disobey him? And “God knoweth the ways on the right hand.”¹⁷⁹ Doesn’t he know the ways on the left? And how much of this sort can be said of the different kinds of knowledge!

47,1 And so with God’s only-begotten Son. Since < he says >, “The Father hath given judgment to the Son,”¹⁸⁰ he attributed the knowledge of personal acquaintance and experience to the Father. For “No one knoweth the day save the Father”¹⁸¹ is meant in two ways. He knows when it comes—indeed, the day and hour come by his authority—and he knows it < by

acting >. For there has already been activity on his part, the delegation of the judgment to the Only-begotten.

47,2 And thus the same knowledge is in the only-begotten Son of God, since he is God and no different from the Father. For he himself knows the day, he brings it himself, carries it on, brings it to an end, and judges, and without him it cannot come. (3) But he does not know it through activity yet, that is, he has not yet judged. The impious are still impious, the unrighteous covet, fornicators, adulterers and idolaters commit iniquity, the devil is at work, sects arise, and imposture does its work until God's only-begotten Son brings the day itself, and gives each his just due. And < then* > he will know it < through activity* >, that is, [know] it through deed and power. (4) And in the Father knowledge is complete in two ways, but in the Son it is there by intellection and is not unknown, but has not yet been completed by activity, that is, he has not yet judged.

47,5 But knowledge has been withheld from the holy angels in two ways—< in that they do not yet know [the day] > intellectually, and < also > that they do not yet know it through activity, that is, through the fulfillment of their function. For they have not yet been directed to go out, gather the impious in bundles like tares and prepare them for burning. (6) And you see, beloved and servants of God, that all these people who welcome shocking notions because of some preconception of their own, have gone to war in vain, and directed against themselves their various attempts to blaspheme the Son of God as lesser and inferior.

48,1 But now that we have also explained this sufficiently let us once again, by the power of God, devote our attention to their other arguments. Although these great heretics who are game for anything do not have beliefs like the Manichaeans or like many other sects, still, even though they hold that Christ's fleshliness is real, they hold even this inadequately and not in the fullest sense. (2) They confess that the Savior truly had flesh; but when they learn from the Gospel itself that he tired from his journey, was hungry and thirsty, and went to sleep and got up, they put all this together and apply it to his Godhead as though they wanted to separate his Godhead from the Father's essence for reasons like the following.¹⁸² (3) For they say, "If he is of the Father, but the Father does not tire or thirst or hunger as the sacred scripture says, "He shall not weary not hunger nor thirst nor sleep, and of his counsel there is no finding

out”¹⁸³—(4) if these things are characteristic of the Son, they say, “then he is different from the Father’s essence and nature.” And they themselves will admit that before the incarnation these things did not apply to the Only-begotten. However, when they are forced to admit this and come to the things he did in his human nature, and hear that naturally he did these things because he had taken a body, yielding to them for his legitimate needs like a mule yielding to a chariot because he had taken flesh in reality and not appearance, then they claim that this was not due to his flesh alone.

49,1 For in fact [flesh] cannot of itself thirst or grow tired. But those who have left the road and turned off on paths that lead in the opposite direction do not know that the Son of God did not simply take flesh at his coming, but also took a soul, a mind and everything human except for sin, and was < truly begotten >, though not of a man’s seed, but of the holy virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit. (2) < But if* > they will not admit < themselves* > that he has taken a soul, < they will be made fools of* > by this argument against them, which is the simplest of all the replies to their nonsense.¹⁸⁴ (3) The true God—< who > says of himself, “I am the truth”—himself acknowledges that “My soul is troubled,”¹⁸⁵ “My soul is exceeding sorrowful,”¹⁸⁶ and “I have power to lay down my soul and to take it”¹⁸⁷—[this last] to show that, as God, he has this power, < but that by his incarnation he has truly become man* >. (4) For no [mere] man could say this; no one has the power to lay his soul down and take it. But when Christ speaks of a soul he shows that he has become man in reality, not appearance.

49,5 And again, [he says], “I am the good shepherd who layeth down his soul for the sheep.”¹⁸⁸ And to show the reality of these things he said to his Father on the cross, “Into thy hands I commend my spirit”;¹⁸⁹ and when the soldiers came, the scripture says, “They found that he had already given up the ghost.”¹⁹⁰ (6) And again, “Crying with a loud voice” he said, “Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou

forsaken me?"¹⁹¹—I have also explained this way of speaking earlier—and, as the Gospel says, "gave up the ghost." (7) For when the truth says, "He gave up the ghost," "into thy hands," "My soul is troubled," and all the rest, who would be < so > foolish as to believe such a bunch of half blind dreamers and ignore the actual credible statements of the divine Word?

50,1 And then, like pirates mutilating sound bodies, hunting out of each scripture things which have been said well and rightly, they appeal to some expression which the scripture often uses figuratively. And they like to cite in a literal sense something that has been said figuratively, but interpret a literal and unequivocal statement as an allegory of something else. (2) They jump right up and cite some words from the holy Isaiah which were spoken in the person of the Father, "Behold, my servant shall understand, my beloved in whom I am well pleased, whom my soul loveth,"¹⁹² as though this is the Father speaking; for so indeed he is. (3) "Well, now," they say, "has the Father taken a soul too?" But if we say, "Of course not! What can this be but a figurative expression?" they reply, "Then what was said by the Son is figurative too." (4) And they think they can get an occasion against the truth in this way, but it won't be given them. The truth stands unadorned on its own feet, undefeated and with no need for decoration.

50,5 For let's see what both of these mean. If the Father became corporeal, assumed flesh and said these words, he really took a soul. But if the Father did not assume flesh and still said, "my soul," this is a figure of speech referring to God, to safeguard the [Son's] legitimacy and show the legitimacy of the Father's relationship to the Son. (6) But one cannot say the same of the Son in this respect. The Father did not take flesh, while the Son assumed flesh. The Father did not become man, but the Son did.

50,7 Something similar may be said of the Father. As he says, "My soul hath loved him,"¹⁹³ in this passage, so he says, "I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine heart,"¹⁹⁴ "My heart is far from them."¹⁹⁵ (8) If we take what is said of the soul figuratively because "My soul hath loved" is a figure of speech, then what is said of the heart is also figurative. And clearly, this must be evident to any sensible person. (9) Therefore, if the Father speaks figuratively of a soul and a heart, which he did not take—

for he did not assume flesh—things of this sort are applied to the Father in a figurative sense. But the same is not to be supposed of the Son; for the Son took flesh, and the entire human constitution.

51,1 This will serve as a reply to anyone who speaks figuratively of the Son with regard to < the > humanity, since there is no < allegorical > expression even* > in a part of a word, because Christ truly took human nature. (2) For if what is said of the Son's soul is allegory and we must take the language about it figuratively, then the same has been said of his heart. And finally we will admit that everything about him is appearance and not truth. (3) < Therefore >, according to Arius' contentious argument, the Word cannot have received a heart either when he came—or a liver, flesh, entrails, bones, or anything like that. In the last analysis all of these are allegories and meant figuratively—or else he just received a blob for a body, without any insides. (4) In that case, how could he eat and drink? Forget it! For if the Father speaks of a soul and a heart but in his case the meaning is allegorical and the expression figurative, then < the Arians should also take the heart* > figuratively in the Son's case, since they deny that the Son has taken a soul.

51,5 But if, when pressed, they cannot deny Christ's heart because they admit that the Lord received the whole bodily frame, therefore, given their < admission > that there are two different "hearts," the one admitted to be real and the other allegorical, in the case of Christ's "soul" the word is accurate, and not allegorical or figurative. (6) However, since Christ's human nature is complete in every respect—in body, soul, mind, heart, and everything human except sin—he naturally could do what men do, and yet be entirely complete in Godhead, with impassibility.¹⁹⁶ (7) His Godhead cannot be less glorious than the Father's perfection, but he will be made complete by his human nature and his thirst, hunger, drinking, eating, sleeping, discouragement, while his Godhead is impassible. And again their argument about this has failed, since Christ became flesh while being God.

52,1 But if they say, "If he was of the Father why did he become flesh?" our reply would be, "What do you say about the angels?" For it is plain to everyone that Arians admit the angels were made by the Son. (2) Indeed, they also blaspheme the Holy Spirit by venturing to say that he was created by the Son, although he is uncreate, proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son. (3) Hence, if they dare to say this of the Holy Spirit,

how much more will they be unable to deny in the case of the angels, who are created beings, that they have received their existence from the Only-begotten?

If, then, the angels he created were created spiritual but are his creation in spite of that, and, as his workmanship, are infinitely far below his essence and yet they have not taken flesh—what do you say about that? (4) Are they greater than the Son even though created by him? Or the Holy Spirit too? Why didn't he come to flesh, put on flesh and become man—either the Holy Spirit of God or one of the holy angels? (5) The Son surely did not assume flesh because of an inferiority to the Father. In that case the angels would surely have assumed flesh, or even the Spirit. But since the Son, who is the Father's wisdom, power and Word, had made all things himself with the Father and the Holy Spirit, he assumed flesh (6) to show that the reason for Adam's transgression or disobedience was not that Adam was a creature or that God had made sin, but Adam's own choice, so that [the Son] could carry his righteous judgment through as Isaiah said, "A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he shall carry the judgment through to victory, and in his name shall the gentiles hope"—¹⁹⁷ as David said of him, "Thou shalt be victorious when thou art judged."¹⁹⁸

52,7 For he was judged in order to silence his opponents by judging justly; for no one will be able to oppose his righteous judgment. For he wore the body and kept it undefiled. For it was certainly not at the instance of the creator, who is not responsible for Adam's sin, that that which was in man, that is, in Adam, from the beginning came to the point of becoming sin with the result that Adam sinned. The creator allowed Adam freedom of choice and each person is responsible for his own sin. (8) And thus, < although he was > not responsible [for sin], the divine Word, the creator, who with his Father and the Holy Spirit created man, the immortal and undefiled Word, became man of his own good pleasure, by some ineffable mystery of wisdom. And in his extreme loving kindness, under no compulsion but of his own free will, he assumed all his creature's characteristics for his creature's sake to "condemn sin in the flesh,"¹⁹⁹ annul the curse on the cross, utterly destroy destruction in the grave, and by descending to hades with soul and Godhead make void the covenant with hades and

break “the sting of death.”²⁰⁰ (9) But the ungrateful turn good things completely to bad and no longer thank the kind, perfect, good Son of a good Father for the things for which < one should > thank him. Instead they show ingratitude by attributing frailties to his Godhead, things they are not able to prove, since the truth is evident to everyone.

53,1 And now that these have been expounded I shall go on in turn to other arguments in succession. For they quote the text in the Gospel, “The Father who sent me is greater than I,”²⁰¹ with a bad interpretation. In the first place it says, “The Father who *sent* me,” not, “the Father who *created* me.” (2) For all the sacred scriptures show his true sonship to the Father. They say, “The Father begot me,”²⁰² “I came forth from the Father and am come,”²⁰³ “I am in the Father and the Father in me,”²⁰⁴ and, “the Father who sent me.”²⁰⁵ And nowhere have they said, “the Father who created me,” or, “the Father who made me.”

53,3 And why do they keep heaping up things that are not so? “The Father who sent me is greater than I”—what could be more proper? More cogent? More necessary? More fitting? Who but his true Son, the One begotten of him, is the proper person to glorify the Father? (4) For the Father glorifies the Son and the Son glorifies the Father. And the Son glorifies the Father both to be an example²⁰⁶ to us, and < for the sake > of his glorification of the Father as one union and glory [with himself], teaching us that his honor is the Father’s honor, as he has said, “He that honoreth not the Son as he honoreth the Father, the wrath of God abideth upon him.”²⁰⁷

53,5 But in what way do Arians think that he is “greater?” In bulk? Time? Height? Age? Worth? Which of these is in God, for us to conceive of? Time does not apply to the Godhead, so that < the > Son who is begotten of the Father but not in time, might be considered inferior. Nor does the Godhead allow for advancement, or the Son might achieve the Father’s greatness by advancing to it. (6) For if the Son of God is called the Son of God as the result of advancement, then he [once] had many equals and advanced by being called higher in rank, but was [once] lower than someone who

outranked him. (7) But the scripture says, “Who shall be likened unto the Lord among the sons of God?”²⁰⁸ since all things are termed sons colloquially, but he alone is Son by nature, not grace—for “He hath found out every path of understanding, and none shall be declared his equal.”²⁰⁹

But what do Arians say? “The Father surpasses the Son in elevation.” (8) Where is the Godhead located? Or is it bounded by space so that “bigger” might be shown by circumference? < Forget it* >, “God is spirit!”²¹⁰ And their heretical invention is a complete failure. Let us pass this by too, beloved, and go on to the rest of their arguments.

54.1 For they say that the sender is not like the sent, but that sender and sent differ in power because the one sends, while the other is sent. And if the meaning of the truth were what they say, the whole subject of our knowledge could not be traced to one unity of truth, power and Godhead. (2) For if two were meeting or two were sending, the Son would no longer be a son, but a brother—who had another brother, no longer a father.²¹¹ But if they were related by identity or adoption, or if one were to send himself, or if the two sent together or arrived together, they would show that there are two Godheads and not one unity. (3) But here there is a Sender and a Sent, showing that there is one Source²¹² of all good things, the Father; but next after the Source comes One who—to correspond with his name of Son and Word, and not with any other—is one Source springing from a Source, the Son come forth, ever with the Father but begotten < without beginning and not in time as the scripture says* >, “For with thee is the source of life.”²¹³ (4) And to show the same of the Holy Spirit < it adds >, “In thy light shall we see light,” showing that the Father is light, the Son is the Father’s light, and the Holy Spirit is light and a Source springing from a Source, [that is], from the Father and the Only-begotten—the Holy Spirit. “For out of his belly shall flow rivers of water springing up unto eternal life; but,” says the Gospel, “he said this of the Holy Spirit.”²¹⁴

54.5 And again, to teach his disciples his co-essentiality with the Father, he says, “If any man open to me, I and my Father will come in

and make our abode with him.”²¹⁵ And [here] he no longer said, “I shall be sent by my Father,” but, “I and my Father will < make our abode > with him,” with the Son knocking and the Father entering with him, so that it is everlasting, and neither is the Father separated from the Son nor the Son separated from his Father. (6) And so he says in another passage, “I am the way, and by me shall they go in unto the Father.”²¹⁶ And lest it be thought that < he > is less than the Father because they go in to the Father by him, he says, “No man can come unto me unless my heavenly Father draw him.”²¹⁷ (7) Thus the Father brings him to the Son and the Son brings him to the Father, but brings him in the Holy Spirit. The Trinity is forever eternal, one unity of Godhead, three Perfects, one Godhead. And the Arians’ argument has failed.

55,1 But again, they say, “Why did Christ tell his disciples, ‘I go unto my Father and your Father, and unto my God and your God’?”²¹⁸ If he acknowledges him as his God, how can he be his equal or legitimately begotten of him as Son?”—showing that they are entirely ignorant of God, and in no way “illuminated by the light of the Gospel.”²¹⁹

55,2 Always, and in every generation, one who has examined and investigated will know the meaning of the truth of the perfect knowledge of our Savior and of his equality with the Father. But these people itch from being wrapped up in Jewish thinking, and are annoyed with the Son of God just as the Jews said, “For no evil deed do we stone thee, but that thou, being a man, callest thyself Son of God, making thyself equal with God.”²²⁰ (3) They are annoyed too because they have gotten into the same state as the Jews²²¹ and Pharisees, and will not call the Son equal to the Sire who begot him.

55,4 For observe the accuracy of the scriptures! The sacred scripture never used this expression before the incarnation. The Father says “Let us make man”²²² to the Son, calling the Son his fellow creator and showing that he is his own Son and equal. (5) And the Son never said, “my God and your God,” < before the incarnation, but* >, “And Adam heard the

voice of God walking in the garden,²²³ and < “God said to Noah >, Make to thyself an ark of acacia wood,”²²⁴ and, “The Lord rained from the Lord,”²²⁵ and “The Lord said unto Moses, I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob”;²²⁶ and David says, “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand.”²²⁷ And the Lord never said, “my God and your God.”

55,6 But when he had taken our body, “appeared on earth and consorted with men,”²²⁸ and become one of us, then he said “my God and your God, and my Father and your Father” to his disciples, whom it was his duty to be like in all respects except sin: “my Father” by nature in the Godhead, and “your Father” by grace because of me, in the adoption. “My God” because I have taken your flesh, and “your God” by nature and in truth. (7) And thus everything is crystal clear, and nothing in the sacred scripture is contradictory or has any taint of death, as the Arians pretend in concocting their wicked arguments. But again, I think this has been sufficiently explained, and shall next go on to the rest.

56,1 For again, they say that the Holy Spirit is the creature of a creature because of, “By the Son all things were made,”²²⁹ as the scripture says—stupidly seizing on certain lines, not reading the text as it is worded but, with wrong suppositions and apart from the text misinterpreting, in terms of their wrong supposition, something that has been correctly said. (2) For the divine Gospel did not say this of the Holy Spirit. It said of all created things that anything which is created was made through the Word and by the Word. If you read further, the line, “All things were made through him, and without him was not one thing made,” includes the words, “that was made,” to make it clear that all [created] things were made by him, and not a single thing without him.

56,3 Then again it says, “In him was life.”²³⁰ For here too the sequence of St. John’s [expressions] must be made complete as he goes on with his confessions that non-existent things < have been made >²³¹ in existent ones. For “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,

and the Word was God.”²³² (4) Since [he says] “was,” and was,” and “In him was life,”²³³ and “that *was* the true light,”²³⁴ and “He *was* in the world”²³⁵ and all < the rest* >, the blessed John, by the Holy Spirit’s inspiration, is making it plain with this “was” that “All *that was made*, was made through him.”²³⁶ But the Maker of all the things that were made is prior to them all.

56,5 However, the scripture says that all things were made through him but did not say what the things that were made were. For there was never any supposition of wickedness, so that no one could suppose things that were not true and blaspheme God’s changeless and unalterable Holy Spirit. (6) It is on their account that the Lord says, “If any man say a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him. But if any man say aught against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven him, neither here nor in the world to come.”²³⁷ For the whole of their argument is ridiculous.

56,7 One might, however, answer them in terms of their blasphemous supposition and say, “You hotshot sophists and word-twisters who want to count God’s Holy Spirit as a creature on account of, ‘All things were made through him,’ because of ‘all things,’ although the Holy Spirit is never counted in with ‘all things!’ (8) You should suppose, then, in terms of your blasphemous supposition—if, indeed, there is anyone else who is worse than you—that the Father too was made through the Son.” For the line which says that all things were made through him is comprehensive. (9) But if it is blasphemous to think any such thing of the Father, and foolish, the like applies to those who suspect it of the Holy Spirit, who belongs with the Father and the Son.

56,10 For if he were were a thing that is made he would not be reckoned in with the uncreated Father and the uncreated Son. But because he is uncreated he is so reckoned; the scripture said, “Go baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”²³⁸ And how can the Spirit be created when it is testified of him that “He proceeded from the Father”²³⁹ and “received of me,”²⁴⁰ and through him man’s full

salvation, and everything required for the human nature, was made complete. (11) For scripture says of the Lord, "God anointed him with the Holy Spirit."²⁴¹ But the Father would not have anointed Christ's human nature, which had been united in one Godhead with the divine Word, with a creature. However, since the Trinity is one, three Perfects, one Godhead, this needed to be done for the Son in the dispensation of the incarnation, so that the Trinity, completely glorified in all things, would be observed to be < one >. I have cited no [mere] one or two texts against all the sects in my discussions of the Spirit, to prove that he is the Spirit of God, glorified with the Father and the Son, uncreated, changeless and perfect. And, in its turn, the argument against themselves that the trouble-makers < have invented > about him has proved a failure.

57,1 But again, let's devote our attention to their other arguments. For they say in turn, though they do not have a sound understanding of the text, that the Savior himself said, "Why callest thou me good? There is one good, God,"²⁴² and thereby separated himself from the essence and subsistence of the Father.

But this whole thing is foolish. (2) If they do not think that the One who has done so much for us is good, who else is < good? But what > could be worse than this, that the One who gave his life for the sheep; who went willingly to the passion although he was the impassible God; who secured the forgiveness of sins for us; who worked cures in all Israel; who, of his own goodness, brought such a numerous people, in goodness, to the Father—that the Promoter of goodness and Lord of peace, the Father's good word begotten on high of the good Father, the Giver of food to all flesh, the Author of all goodness for men and all his creatures, is not considered good by the Arians!

57,3 And since they have managed to forget it, they do not know that he threw the questioner's word back at him in order to humble the overweening insolence in him. A scribal type was boasting that he had exactly fulfilled the requirements of the Law. And to parade his own righteousness and goodness he said, "Good Master, what [more could] I do to inherit eternal life?" (4) And since he thought of himself as < endowed > with such great righteousness, the Lord, wishing to ascribe all goodness to God so that no fleshly being would indulge in vanity, said, "Why callest thou me good? None is good save God." By saying such a thing when he was

what he was and as great as he was, he intended to humble the arrogance of the speaker with his supposed righteousness, and expose what was in his heart, for with his lips he called him a good teacher, but he did not abide by his good teaching.

57,5 And that he is good he teaches us himself by saying, "Many good works have I done among you; for which of them do ye stone me?"²⁴³ To whom is this not clear and plain as day, particularly as many of his creatures are, and are called good, as the sacred scripture says? (6) See here, the sacred text tells of many good things. It says, "Saul, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, was a good man, and from the shoulders and upward higher than all the people."²⁴⁴

And "Samuel" was "good with the Lord and men"²⁴⁵ And "The last word was better than the beginning."²⁴⁶ And, "Open thy good treasure, the heavenly."²⁴⁷ (7) But since these are creatures, and are shown by himself and his creatures to be good, how can it not be indisputably good to confess that the author of their being is good? But < not > to prolong the discussion of this—I have spoken extensively of it everywhere—I shall once again go on to the next, and give the explanation of each expression.

58,1 But these people who will try anything cite some other texts to sow the suspicion that there are defects in their Redeemer—if, indeed, they have been redeemed. For when the mother of the sons of Zebedee approached Jesus and begged that the one son should sit on his right and the other on his left when he came in his kingdom, he told them, "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I shall drink of? And they said, Yea. We are able. And he said to them, Ye shall drink of my cup, but to sit on my right hand or on my left is not mine to give, but is for them for whom it is prepared of my Father."²⁴⁸ (2) "Do you see," they say, "how he has no authority independent of the Father's, who has the authority to give it to anyone he chooses?"

And who in his right mind would think such a thing? If the Son does not have authority, who does? "For," he says, "the Father giveth life to the dead, and thus he hath granted the Son to give life to whom he will";²⁴⁹

and, "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father."²⁵⁰ (3) Who could have any further doubt? But his sacred, wise saying is meant to show that nothing is awarded from respect of persons, but in accord with merit. For to grant is the Lord's prerogative, but he grants to each according to his deserts. Each who has done something right receives < from the Lord > in accordance with his labor; and not mere giving is his sole prerogative, but giving to one who has made himself worthy.

58,4 For I venture to say that giving [as such] is not the Lord's prerogative although he has the power, but he does not wish [simply] to give. Nor is it the Holy Spirit's although the Holy Spirit has the power to give, as the scripture says, "To one is given wisdom by the Spirit, to another divers kinds of tongues by the same Spirit, to another the interpretation of tongues, to another power, to another teaching, but it is one Spirit that divideth to every man as he will."²⁵¹ And it didn't say, "as he is directed," but, "as he will." (5) And "The Son giveth life to whom he will,"²⁵² and "The Father calleth whom he will to the Son."²⁵³ And again, neither the Father and the Son, nor the Holy Spirit, calls, gives, provides or awards from respect of persons, but as each person renders himself worthy; this is the meaning of, "It is not mine to give, but if you toil it will be prepared for you by my Father." But < I shall give* > at the End, for "I am the life."²⁵⁴ And I shall go right on to the others.

59,1 They say, "Why do you say that he is of the Father's perfect God-head? See here, the apostle says of him that 'God hath raised him from the dead.'²⁵⁵ If he needs God's help to raise him from the dead, then there is one person who raises him by his power; but the other person, the one who is raised by the power of the One who is able to do this, is inferior."

59,2 And how long must I tire myself out with the silly ideas of the people who give themselves headaches? Who raised Lazarus? Who raised the widow's son at Nain? Who said, "Qumi talitha, Get up, child," to the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue? On whose name did the apostles call, and the dead were raised?

I suppose the apostles < said this to show* > that all this had been done at the Father's good pleasure, by the will of the Son and with the consent

of the Holy Spirit, because the apostles were in a dispute with Jews who thought that they were preaching apostasy from the God of the Law, and because they had received²⁵⁶ from the Holy Spirit the knowledge that sects would set Christ in opposition to the will of the Father. (4) But this is not said to show any defect or weakness, or any difference between the divine Word's essence and the Father's. There are no differences. See, in the first instance, how the angel describes him when he asks Mary and the others, "Why seek ye the living among the dead?"²⁵⁷ You see, he who was alive had risen in his Godhead and flesh; he was not with the dead. And what does the angel say to them? "He is risen. He is not here."²⁵⁸ He didn't say, "God has raised him and is he not here?" but to show the power of the Savior he said that he had risen even living.

59,5 And again, he himself told his disciples before his passion, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be delivered to be crucified, and the third day he shall rise again."²⁵⁹ (6) And he didn't say, "< God > will raise him." But he was plainly showing beforehand the control [over resurrection] of his power by saying, "I have power to lay my soul down, and power to take it."²⁶⁰ (7) But since he had the power, why couldn't he raise himself? When the apostle wrote, "God raised him from the dead,"²⁶¹ he said it to show that nothing in the economy of salvation has taken place without the Father's will. For the apostle himself says in another passage, "Even though he died from weakness, he lives by power."²⁶²

59,8 If I could only pick the brains of these people who know all about the scripture, [and find] which weakness the Only-begotten had—[the Only-begotten] by whom the heaven has been spread out; by whom the sun was lit; (9) by whom the stars shone; by whom all things have been made from nothing. Which weakness does the apostle mean? Isn't it the weakness the Word assumed when he came in our flesh, putting it on so as to bear our weakness? As the prophet's oracle about him says, "He took our weaknesses and bare our illnesses."²⁶³ He who is life and the impassible God died because of our weakness in the flesh which we had made

weaker [yet], but he lives by power. "For the Word is living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword."²⁶⁴ (10) Thus he died from weakness and lives by the power of his Godhead; but he lives in our flesh in which he accepted the passion. And it was because of this dispensation that the apostle said, "God raised him from the dead,"²⁶⁵ to give token of the Father's good pleasure.

60,1 They cite still another text from the Gospel according to Luke, one which is marvelous, choice, and in every way most useful. Which text? When the Lord, by his own will, was about to enter upon the passion, taking the disciples into the mount at that time he "went apart from them about a stone's cast, and went and prayed and said, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me that I drink it not. Nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt."²⁶⁶

60,2 And first, once more these people pretend and say, "Do you see how he speaks coaxingly and shows a will that is distinguished from the Father's by saying, 'Not what I will, but what thou wilt?' How can it be the same essence," they ask, "when there is one will in him, but another in the Father?"

And they are ignorant of the entire meaning of this. For this is why the apostle said, "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God!"²⁶⁷ (3) And how could Christ be speaking of a will of his own beside the Father's will when he himself tells his disciples, "My soul is troubled, and what shall I say, 'Father, save me from this hour?'"²⁶⁸ as though he were speaking in advance about the text [in question], and using the words, "What shall I say, 'Father, save me from this hour?'" in a way that was equivocal? He means, "Should I say [such a thing as] this? For *for this cause* came I unto this hour."²⁶⁹ (4) He came, not unwillingly but willingly. For earlier he says, "I have a cup to drink, and how eager I am to drink it! And I have a baptism to be baptized with, and what will I if I were already baptized!"²⁷⁰ If he is willing and eager, then, and says that he has come for this purpose, how can he be showing that he has one will, and the Father has another? (5) And, being kindly and willing to

spare Abraham's seed, since he would be betrayed by Israel he was putting in a word for the people.

However, it was the Father's will that his provision be executed in this way by the children of Israel, although they were accessory to their own betrayal of the Son and not compelled to it by God; and the Son's will was not different from the Father's. (6) But it was essential that he show this even here to ascribe the whole of the divine unity to the Father, leaving no division between the one unity and human nature.

61,1 And Arius adds next that "‘being in agony while he prayed,’" < as > we find in the Gospel according to Luke, and "‘He sweat, and his sweat was as it were drops of blood falling to the ground. And there appeared an angel of the Lord strengthening him.’" ²⁷¹ (2) Those nit-pickers jump up at once as though they had found an opening against an enemy, and add, "Do you see that he even needed the strength of angels? An angel strengthened him, for he was in agony."

And they have no idea that if he did not have all these things, including "Not my will, but thine," the human nature of Christ would have been an illusion; and if Christ had not been in agony and sweat had not poured from his body, there would be some sense in the theory of the unreality of the human nature that Manichaeans and Marcionites yap about, < since Christ would be an apparition > and not absolutely real. (3) But < he did > all these things to make our salvation sure < because > he assumed everything < that is ours >, and as concessions said certain things, in truth, not deceit, that reflected human frailty. < For example >, [he said] "not my will," to show the reality of his flesh, confound those who say he has no human mind, and frustrate the people who deny that he has flesh.

61,4 For every divine word, standing firm amid the sons of darkness, confounds the darkness but enlightens the sons of the truth. See how much helpful material there is in this saying. No sweat comes from bodiless beings. In this way he showed that his flesh was real and not an apparition. < And > without a soul and a mind there can be no agony of a flesh that is united to the Godhead. By experiencing agony he showed that he had soul, body and mind at once, which is why he could show agony. (5) And again, by saying, "not my will, but thine," he revealed a mind truly human though without sin.

For his Godhead is always in the Father, the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Holy Spirit, perfectly possessing all things, and the Son's

intent is no different from the Father's nor the Father's from the Son's, or the Holy Spirit's from the Father's and the Son's. (6) If the Son desires what the Father does not will, he will indeed be a mere man as you say and, from inferiority, < subject > to the will of the Father. But this is not the case, never think it! By speaking of things that are reflective of human frailty he shows the reality of his incarnation and the perfection of his human nature, so that he will be our salvation in every way and we will not perceive one thing in place of another and be deprived of the truth.

62,1 But as to his being seen to be strengthened by angels, what could be more proper than this? What more necessary? See, we have found the application of the passage in the great Song written by Moses, "Let my utterance be awaited as the rain,"²⁷² and shortly afterwards, "Let all the sons of God worship him, and all the angels of God strengthen him"²⁷³—(2) not so that the angels may give him strength. He did not need the strengthening of the angels. They "strengthen" him in the sense of giving him the due acknowledgment of his strength. (3) Indeed, for all our weakness we too have often blessed God, often strengthened God—not because God needs our blessing, but we acknowledge the power of his blessing. And we say, giving the full particulars, "Thine is the power, thine the might, thine the honor, thine the glory, thine the blessing, thine the strength, thine the power." (4) Not that we provide God with strength by saying "Thine is the might, thine the power, thine the blessing," not that we have given God power, have blessed God. But by corroboration and confirmation we have confessed the power (δύναμιν) of God and ascribed the strength (ἰσχύν) to God.

62,5 Thus the angel too was amazed at that time, and astonished at the abundance of his Master's loving kindness because, although he was God, and was worshiped in heaven with the Father, and served by his own angels, he submitted to such a < depth* > [of humiliation] as to come willingly by his own desire and assume flesh—(6) and not only this, but < also > submitted to suffering, even to consignment to the cross, for his own creation, the human race, "tasting death, even the death of the cross,"²⁷⁴ so that humankind could win the trophy against death through

him, “destroy him that had the power of death, even the devil,”²⁷⁵ and “triumph over every rule and authority.”²⁷⁶

62,7 And so, in amazement and awe, to glorify and praise his Master as he stood in such an arena and with such remarkable deeds, the angel said to him, “Thine is the worship, thine the might, thine the power, thine the strength,” in fulfillment of the words that Moses had written, “Let all God’s angels give him strength.”²⁷⁷

62,8 And you see, servants of Christ and sons of God’s holy church and orthodox faith, that there is nothing obscure or knotty in the sacred scripture; everything has been written marvelously and marvelously fulfilled for our salvation. However, in their hostility to God’s only-begotten Son and the Holy Spirit, Arians, like enemies, think up all sorts of plans and subtleties. (9) But far be it from us to rely on human subtleties. We must keep our minds sound to glorify our Master and not conceive of any defect in him. For if the One who came to save all things has any defect, how can creation be saved from its own defects?

63,1 Again, in their search for some text or other against the Savior, this new crop of Jews who are springing up again—for they are votaries of the Jewish opinion and no different from Jews except merely in name—they seize, like adversaries, on something else “to entangle him in his talk,”²⁷⁸ as the Gospel has said. (2) “On the cross,” they say, he said, ‘Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’” And “You see him piteously begging and wailing,” they say, “and saying, ‘Why hast thou forsaken me?’”²⁷⁹ (3) And those whose minds are torpid from the poison of Arius’ madness, and who have no knowledge of God, do not know that all the human frailties in the Lord are to be confessed [as residing] in his true human nature.

63,4 In the first place, they do not realize that they are jumping from one thing to another in their thinking about him and have no fixed position. How can they, when they are not sound in mind? For they will sometimes call the Savior himself Lord, Christ, before all ages, Master of angels and archangels, through whom all things were made—principalities and authorities, angels and archangels, the heavens and all things, the earth, all humanity and everything on earth, the sea and all that is in it. (5) How

foolish of them to say such glorious things of him and not realize that < He who > in his Godhead < is > before the ages cannot say such a thing as, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"²⁸⁰ here in the person of his Godhead—He by whom heaven and earth were made, and angels and archangels, and in a word, all things visible and invisible.

63,6 When was the Son forsaken by the Father, and when was the Son not in the Father and the Father not in the Son? For he came to earth as the Son and the divine Word, and yet he touched heaven, and all his enemies were filled with his glory. And he was in Mary and was made man, and yet filled all things by his power. (7) How could such a person, and One of such greatness, say piteously, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" in his divine nature, though it was he himself who said, "I shall come again and shall not leave you desolate, but I shall come unto you."²⁸¹ And he says again in another passage, "Verily I say unto you, All ye shall be offended because of me this night, and ye shall all leave me alone, and yet I am not alone, but the Father who begot me is with me."²⁸² 8) And again, "I go, and I shall send unto you the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who proceedeth from the Father and receiveth of me."²⁸³ And again, in another passage, he says, "I knock, and if any man open to me, we shall come unto him, I and my Father, and make our abode with him."²⁸⁴ This is as much as to say that he is not forsaken by the Father, but that the Father is always with the Son, just as the Holy Spirit is always with the Father and the Son.

64,1 "Well then," they say, "what did he mean when he said, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'" But who cannot see that the words are uttered in the person of his human nature, reflecting human frailty? (2) His human nature [said this], though not by itself. (He never spoke from a separate divine nature and a separate human nature, as though < he were > sometimes the one and sometimes the other. He spoke with his manhood united with his Godhead as one holiness and therefore possessed of perfect knowledge in it.) Appropriately for the manhood which had been united with God and joined to one divine nature, but which now saw its Godhead, with its soul, impelled to leave its holy body, it < pronounced the words > in the person of the Lord-man, that is, in the person

of his human nature. (3) For the divine nature was about to accomplish all that the mystery of the passion involved and descend to the underworld with his soul, to secure the salvation there of all who had previously fallen asleep, I mean the holy patriarchs. Thus, when it was so impelled, Christ's voice said, in the person of the human nature [speaking] to his divine nature itself, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"²⁸⁵

65,4 But this had to be, in order to fulfill, through him, the prophecies the sacred scriptures had made of him through his own prophets. And it was in fulfillment of the words against Hades which are said to Hades, seemingly by the man, so that though the archon Hades and Death intended to subdue a man he would unknowingly < seize > the < holy > Godhead < concealed > in the soul, and Hades himself would be subdued and death destroyed, fulfilling the saying, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hades, neither shalt thou suffer thine holy one so see corruption."²⁸⁶

65,5 For neither did the holy divine Word abandon the soul, nor was his soul abandoned in Hades. Unceasingly, the holy Trinity provides for all aspects of so great a mystery—the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, with the Son < become > fleshly but the Father incorporeal, and the Son, although unchangeable, incarnate by his own good pleasure and < made > flesh by the will of the incorporeal Holy Spirit. But all these provisions were made by the holy Trinity for the salvation of humankind.

66,1²⁸⁷ And so, in turn, he says in another passage, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" and here he says, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee."²⁸⁸ For < his > body needed to spend the three days in the grave in order to fulfill the sayings, "And I was free among the dead"²⁸⁹ and "They cast me, the beloved, out like a loathed carcass."²⁹⁰ This was also in fulfillment of "Thou shalt not suffer thine holy one to see corruption,"²⁹¹ (to show his holiness through his body), and < "Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hades" >, (to show that his soul was not left in Hades either). (2) For the divine Word was in it throughout his sojourn in Hades, in fulfillment of the apostle's saying, "It was impossible for him to be holden of Hades."²⁹²

66,3 And why does scripture say, “impossible,” except that Death and Hades was eager to detain a soul but that, because of his Godhead, it was impossible for his soul to be detained? But if his soul could not be detained because of his Godhead, how could, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”²⁹³ be said in the person of his Godhead? (4) This saying was given in the person of the manhood, in terms of human frailty, to teach us that Christ was incarnate truly, and not in seeming or appearance.

66,5 But what arose from the earth, other than the body that had fallen asleep? “He is risen,” says the scripture, “he is not here.”²⁹⁴ And what was it that had arisen except a body? It was a body, then, that was in the grave, but the soul had departed with the divine Word. (6) And again, Christ accomplished his perfect resurrection all together, in the same Godhead, the same soul, the same holy body, and then united his whole self in one spiritual union—one union of Godhead, one provision, one fullness. In the ninety-second Psalm it says, “The Lord hath reigned, he hath put on comeliness,”²⁹⁵ meaning the divine Word’s entry from the heavens into the world having put on comeliness, that is, with the flesh that was born of a Virgin.

66,6 For since he seemed of little account to his unbelieving beholders comeliness was ascribed to him to show his power which, through the seeming weakness of the flesh, overcame the arbiter < of death. For he arose* > after abolishing < the curse* > of sin—that is, death—and after, in a comely fashion, accomplishing the entire provision for our salvation, after doing away with corruption and the curse, annulling the writ against us and the covenant with Hades, and making all the provisions for the salvation of humankind. (7) For directly after it says, “The Lord hath reigned, he hath put on comeliness,” the scripture makes a further addition and repeats it, saying, “The Lord hath put on, and hath been girded about, with strength.”²⁹⁶ This is to show that his first garment came from Mary, but that his further clothing the second time came from the resurrection of the dead; (8) for as the sacred scripture has said, he is “the firstborn from the dead.”²⁹⁷ This is why he adds a further assurance by this second donning of a garment and says, “The Lord hath put on, and hath been girded about, with strength.”

67,¹ For as a person with his waist belted tightens his garment about his loins, making his appearance trimmer and bringing the garment close to his own skin, so Christ “girded on comeliness” for the first time because of his sojourn here in the flesh. But the second time he “put on strength,” as the scripture says, by rising from the dead. His manhood is no longer subject to suffering, no longer subject to scourging, can no longer be crucified, as the apostle said of him, “He is risen, he dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him.”²⁹⁸ (2) This is why it says, “He was girded”—[that is], by uniting his flesh with one Godhead, a single oneness, < one > spirit, the divine and the bodily one as a spiritual whole, indissoluble. Thus, then, he entered where doors were barred, < proving > his grossness ethereal and his passibility impassible, for he had suffered in the flesh while retaining his impassibility. (3) [Even so] after entering he displayed bones and flesh, the mark of the lance and the marks of the nails, was felt by Thomas and seen by the disciples. But he entered where doors were barred to show that, for us men, he had made one spiritual unity of the whole of his saving work.

67,⁴ And why do I tire myself with so much talk? To say “the same things” often “is not grievous to me, but” for my readers < “it is safe.”²⁹⁹ Therefore* >, since I have often thought of < the same thing* > for your safety I have put it down as a way of getting through the savage attack of Arius’ thoughts, words and suppositions.

68,¹ And now that I have likewise discussed this expression sufficiently, let me go on to the rest in order, by fully explaining most of their foolishness that comes to my mind, to show, from a few texts or even more, that for one who has the Holy Spirit and has received a sober mind from the Lord, nothing crooked can be suspected anywhere in the sacred scripture, and no sort of frailty in the Father, the Son or the Holy Spirit. (2) Everything has been said, in truth, in the sacred scripture, with entire perfection and with provision for every need and for what is required in every passage, by the Lord himself and his holy apostles and prophets whom he has sent.

68,³ For indeed, the Lord made a prophesy of this when he said, “Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani” in Hebrew. The Lord, come to the cross, was duly finishing the saying by saying what had been prophesied of him, “Eli, Eli,” in Hebrew as it had already been written; and [then], in adding the companion phrase he said, “lema sabachthani,” no longer in Hebrew but in

Aramaic, so as to begin as it had been written of him but in going on change the rest of the line to another language. (4) This too he was doing to make a good provision. By saying, "Eli, Eli," he meant to acknowledge that the words had been spoken of him by the prophet. But by saying the rest no longer in Hebrew but in Aramaic, he meant to humble < the pride > of those who boast of Hebrew, and to declare that other languages too are fit for the fulfillment of the oracles about him. (5) For he was now to extend the knowledge of himself to all nations, not just the Hebrews, as this whole series [of expressions] in the twenty-first Psalm³⁰⁰ indicates when, in the person of his human nature, it records all the frailty of his humanity.

68,6 But, come [to the cross], he was completely fulfilling the description himself, just as < every point > in the whole of the psalm, one after another, corresponds with the humanity of Christ which it is describing. It says, "And they parted my garments,"³⁰¹ and, "They pierced my hands and my feet, they stared and looked upon me."³⁰² And as many other such things are said, which cannot possibly apply to his Godhead, but are said in the flesh—although the Godhead, impassibly and in truth, has made provision of them all.

69,1 But they leap up again, like mad dogs in the grip of some frenzy which, because of their frenzy, do not know their master and attack him first. When we tell them truly that the Lord in the Gospel said of his disciples, "Those whom thou hast given me, Father, I have kept in the world,"³⁰³ (2) and again, "Make them to be one in me, as I and thou are one,"³⁰⁴ they reply, "Can't you see that in the words, 'I am in the Father and the Father in me, and we two are one?'"³⁰⁵ he is not speaking of equality but of concord? (3) How could the disciples be in him by equality? But they could be in him by concord."

And God's truth refutes them completely at once, since the disciples could not do this, and it could not be said of them, if the Word had not come and shared their flesh, and united them in him for adoption as sons. (4) Thus everywhere in the Song of Songs, he calls his holy church "neighbor," addresses her with his holy voice of arousal and admonition, and

says, "Rise up and come, my neighbor, my fair one, my dove!"³⁰⁶ (5) And do you see how he calls her "neighbor?" But the church could not be called Christ's "neighbor" if he had not come from above and drawn near to her, through the flesh with frailties like hers which he had taken, so as to gather those who had obediently drawn near him and call the humanity which had become near to him his holy and spotless bride.

69,6 And this is why the Word, our Lord the Only-begotten, here prays the Father that his disciples may be in him, so that, when the disciples have been sanctified, he may join the kinship with him through the flesh which has become theirs by the Father's good pleasure, into a oneness of good will and adoption and, in the Father's Firstborn, they may have "enrollment with the firstborn in heaven."³⁰⁷ (7) And lest anyone suppose that the Son has been changed from his Father's glory by donning the flesh, to confirm their faith and knowledge of his truth, so that < no one > becomes suspicious of his servants and is deprived of his hope, he says, "that as I and thou are one, so these may be one. (8) For I and thou are one"³⁰⁸—since < he is > God of God, and co-essential [with the Father] in Godhead.

69,9 And "We are one," is not indicative of a unit. He did not say, "I am one," but, "I and thou." And "We are one" is said to confound Sabellius and his school, since Sabellius thinks that the Son and the Father are an identity and the Father and the Holy Spirit likewise. For that is why he said, "We are one," and did not say, "I am one." There are two Perfects, a Father and a Son, but one because of equality, by their < one > Godhead, one power and one likeness. (10) In the Godhead the Father and Son are one, in the manhood the Son and the disciples are one, brought to one union of adoption by his deigning to call the disciples to the ineffability of his lovingkindness. And once again there has been a refutation of those who in vain think wrongly of their Master.

70,1 But let me pass this text by too and examine the rest. Since they spend their time on syllogisms and nonsensical reasonings and, although they are men, try to out-argue God, the sophists, when they discover one text or another, jump right up. The prophet reproved them by saying, "Will someone trip God because you can trip me?"³⁰⁹

70,2 Well, what do the great guys have to say now? The same talking point which I explained earlier they [now] direct at me in the form of a query, "Did God beget the Son by willing it or without willing it?"³¹⁰ I have shown that to God there is no future, (3) but that in him all things are complete at once. He does not will a thing first before doing it; nor does he do it without willing it or will a thing in preparation for it, and his preparation does not require will. (4) Thus with him his Offspring is always begotten with no beginning in time. It is always with the Father as an Offspring begotten, and never ceases to be such. Since I have repeated the argument here, I again make the statement that the Father did not beget the Son either by willing it or without willing it, but in his nature which transcends will. For the Son is < the offspring > of a nature beyond will and above all conception and supposition.

71,1 But these latter day disciples of Aristotle, as I said, invent another argument similar to this one. For they have imitated Aristotle's poison and abandoned the harmlessness and meekness of the Holy Spirit, as the Lord says, "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest for your souls."³¹¹ (2) But these people have abandoned meekness and gone in for cleverness instead, taking up Aristotle and the other secular dialecticians. Contentious as they are, they go after the fruits of dialecticians but know no fruit of righteousness and have not been privileged to have the gift of the Holy Spirit within them.

71,3 Now here is what they say to us, when we tell them that the Son Who Is was with the Father Who Is—since the Father said to Moses, "Thou shalt say unto them, He Who Is hath sent me,"³¹² and again, the Gospel says of the Son that "In the beginning *was* the Word, and the Word *was with* God, and the Word *was* God."³¹³ If we tell them that He Who Is was with Him Who Is, they ask us, "Well now, was that which is begotten, or that which isn't? If he 'was,' why was he begotten? But if he was begotten, how come he 'was?'"

71,4 And < this > is the product of the same foolishness which is pre-occupied with philosophical questions, has its head in the clouds, "meddles with things in the heavens, and does no good."³¹⁴

For we shall ask them, "What gave you this idea of thinking these things?" (5) But if they tell us, "Our mind requires us to examine them," we for our part shall say, "All right, you people, tell us, are you reasoning about your own affairs, or about God's?"

Then they say, "We're reasoning about God's on our own initiative, as rational beings."

"Well, isn't God different from your condition, nature and essence?"

"Yes," they reply.

"Well, if God's nature is different from yours, then in the first place your nature can't comprehend things about God that are incomprehensible. And in the second, it is an impiety to model God on yourselves, in terms of your own essence."

71,6 For in our own case, something that does not exist is begotten [and then it exists]. For at one time we did not exist, but we were begotten by our fathers, who at one time did not exist either; and so it must be understood from the beginning, back to Adam. But Adam was made from the earth, and at one time earth did not exist. But the earth was made from nothing, since it did not always exist.

But God was always a Father.³¹⁵ And whatever he was by nature, so he has begotten the Son. (7) He begot him as an everlasting [Son]—not as a brother to him but begotten of him, his like in nature—Lord of Lord, God of God, very God of very God. And whatever one concludes of the Father, so he must conclude of the Son; whatever he believes of the Son he must < also > hold of the Father. (8) For [the Son] says, "He that believeth not on the Son as he believeth on the Father, and honoreth < not > the Son as he honoreth the Father, the wrath of God abideth on him,"³¹⁶ as we find in the Gospel.

And their idea of logic has failed in its turn. (9) For God, who is incomprehensible, has begotten incomprehensible God, before the ages and before time. And there is no interval between Son and Father; in perceiving a Father you simultaneously perceive a Son, and in naming a Son you simultaneously indicate a Father. For Son is perceived from the Father and Father is known from a Son. (10) How can there be Son if he has no Father? And how can there be a Father if he did not beget the Only-begotten? When can the Father not be called "Father," or the Son not be called "Son"—so that people can perceive a Father who was without a

son and later, as though he had managed an improvement, begot a son so that, after the begetting, the Father could be called Father, with the perfect God who needs no improvement improving in Godhead?

72,1 Since they want to reject this curative drug and health-giving antidote, the foundation of the faith of God's holy church, they make one more pretense and say, "Why the term, 'essence?' Why is the Son called "co-essential" with the Father? Which scripture has spoken of co-essentiality? Which apostle said anything about an 'essence' of God?"

But they do not know that "being" (ὕπόστασις) and "essence" mean the same thing. (2) Christ is Lord in his "being," and "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his being."³¹⁷ Thus he is [the Father's] essence—not an extraneous addition (περιουσία) to it but this existent thing itself (αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ ὄν), as Moses said when he spoke to the children of Israel, "He Who *Is* hath sent me."³¹⁸ "He Who *Is*" is that which is, but that which is is the existent essence. (3) On the other hand, "co-essential" does not mean "one" but by the "co" indicates two perfect entities. Yet the two do not differ from each other, nor are they different from their oneness. But if we have employed an < unscriptural > expression from motives of piety, to pin the truth down—(there can be no refutation whatever of heresy without the confession of the homoousion. (4) As a snake hates the smell of pitch, the exhalation of hartshorn, the odor of lignite and the incense of storax, so do Arius and Sabellius hate the statement of the true confession of the homoousion.) [But even if we have employed such an expression] we shall tell them all the same, (5) "Even though the expression is not in the sacred scriptures—indeed, it is plainly implied in the Law and by the Apostles and the Prophets, for 'By two or three witnesses shall every word be established'³¹⁹—it is still permissible for us to employ a useful expression for piety's sake, to safeguard the holy faith."

72,6 "But what do you mean, you people? Tell us, folks, what are you saying about the Father? Is the Father uncreated?" Of course they'll say yes. Who is so < silly > as to doubt this? What sort of nut would suppose that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is not uncreated? You yourselves must surely admit that he is unbegotten, uncreated, and

unoriginate. For he has no Father before him nor any limit to his years, nor any “beginning of days,”³²⁰ as the scripture says.

72,7 “Thus, if he has no beginning of time or end of time, it is agreed and unquestionable that he is uncreated—but nowhere does scripture say this of him.³²¹ But even if it is not scriptural we are obliged, for piety’s sake, reverently to think and say this of him. (8) In the same way, even if it were not scriptural we would be compelled to speak of “homooousion” in our own language as an abbreviation—even though this might seem beyond us, and the discussion of God might appear to be beyond our powers. (9) But may the Lord himself pardon—not wishing to defend the Godhead which has no need of our support, but we must speak with piety and think with piety, or we perish.

73,1 “Well then, disciples of Arius, give us an answer! We all agree in saying that the Father is unbegotten and uncreated, and the expression is plainly a wonderful one. Where is it in scripture then? Show us the place! The Law has not said it, nor the prophets, nor a Gospel, nor the apostles. Thus if we may use an unscriptural expression with piety, and it is allowable when said for the glory of God, who can accuse us even if the homooousion were not in the scriptures, (2) since we have found a word with which we can confess the certainty of our salvation?” But there are texts [which, confirm the homooousion when] used with the help of pious reasoning, the ones I have listed above³²² and many others. I shall also pass this expression by, however, and with God’s help tear open their other expressions and devices to which they have given voice for the entrapment of the innocent.

74,1 The same people say further, along with all the texts which, by bad guesswork, they debase from the Gospel and the Apostle: “As the apostle says next, and as it is found in the Epistle to the Corinthians, in the chapter on resurrection, (2) “Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered the kingdom to God and his Father, when he shall have put down all rule and authority and power. For he must reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. Now when he saith that all things are in subjection under him, it is

manifest that he is excepted that hath put all things in subjection under him. (3) Now when all things are put in subjection under him, then shall the Son himself be subject to him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all.’”³²³

74,4 They seize on this passage, and with their customary hostility toward the Only-begotten take his ineffable, glorious Godhead away and say—foolishly, as I have often remarked—“You see that he says, ‘Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered the kingdom to God and his Father, when he shall have put down < every rule and > all authority and power. For he must reign, until he hath put all his enemies under his feet.’ (5) But ‘must,’ ‘until,’ and, ‘when he shall deliver the kingdom,’ are the setting of a time.” And they blasphemously say that these are indications of the cessation and deposition of the one who is reigning < for he remains* > [in power only] until he delivers the kingdom to God and his Father.

74,6 And they do not know the sense of the truth to begin with. Because of the partaking of our flesh and blood by the Only-begotten his human frailties are dwelt on and mentioned in connection with his human nature, in addition to his glory—but not without his ever perfect and glorious Godhead which needs no enhancement of its glory but possesses glorification in itself and is perfection itself. (7) He himself gives an account of the two natures by saying of the more recent one, “Glorify thou me, Father, with the glory that I had with thee before the world was.”³²⁴ But when the Father proclaims the glory of the two natures, he says spiritually of the first, “I have glorified it,” to show its infinity; but he says, “And I will glorify it again,”³²⁵ of the newer nature because of the incarnation.

75,1 Now for the clarification, even here, of the things the apostle said when he set the truth about Christ down in two ways < and wrote “Son” because of his divine nature* >, and “until he shall deliver the kingdom unto God and his Father” because of his human nature’s beginning in time. For the divinity of the Only-begotten was always with the Father—that is, the only-begotten divine Word who has proceeded from the Father without beginning and not in time. (2) Otherwise where is the fulfillment of the angel’s words, “The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee?”³²⁶ For he said, “Thou

shalt bear a son and shalt call his name Jesus"³²⁷ to Mary, to show that the divine Word had descended from on high, had taken flesh in this virgin's womb and perfectly become man. (3) < And > so as not to separate his human perfection from his divine perfection he and told her with the addition of the word, "also," "Therefore *also* that which shall be born of thee shall be called holy, the Son of God."³²⁸

Then < he says >, "God will give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob unto the ages, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."³²⁹ (4) Now what should those who do not know the life-giving scripture say, given that each of these is the opposite of the other—"He must reign *until [some time]*" and "He shall reign over the house of Jacob *unto the ages*," (and he did not say merely, "unto the age," but, "unto the ages.")? And again, "when he shall have delivered the kingdom unto God and his Father," standing in contrast with "and of his kingdom there shall be no end." And yet both have said such things of the Lord and Christ < and > both are entirely trustworthy—the angel Gabriel is a holy being and the holy apostle inspired—(5) can the scripture, which is always truthful in all things, contradict itself? Never think it!

But as I said at the outset, because of the implications of the manhood Christ possesses all its natural accompaniments. (6) For if he ever hands his rule over to anyone, then he is not ruling now. But if he is not yet ruling, why is it that he is worshiped continually by the angels and arch-angels, before and during his advent in the flesh, as the scripture says of him, "When he bringeth the first begotten into the world, it saith, angels of God worship him."³³⁰ And again, "He sat down at the right hand of the Father."³³¹ And again, "Unto him every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth."³³²

75,7 Thus he who is worshiped < by > all, always rules. What shall we say then, since the Son who rules always—from the beginning, now and forever—has not yet handed the rule over to the Father? (8) Is the Father excluded from his rule? Never think it! The Son is ruling together with the Father, and the Father with the Son and the Holy Spirit.

But what are they saying? “When he delivereth the kingdom to God and his Father does he himself cease to rule?” Never think it! (9) Where is the application of, “Of his kingdom there shall be no end.”³³³ [He shall deliver the kingdom” is said] to show that nothing which has been found or is to be found in the Son opposes or differs from the unity of the Father, and from < the > one will of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. (10) For even here we see that “When he shall have delivered the kingdom to God and his Father, when he shall have put down all rule and authority and power”³³⁴ is said of the Son in the sense of the Son himself delivering the kingdom, and putting down all rule and so on. And “He must reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet”³³⁵ is said of the Son doing all things, possessing all sovereignty and authority, and with the kingdom delivering his subjects to the Father.

76,1 Then next he again switches to another person, that of the Father in turn, subjecting all things to the Son, and says, “He hath put all things in subjection under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.”³³⁶ But he is no longer speaking only in the person of the Father or only in the person of the Son, but right in between the persons of the Father and the Son, and he says, “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.”

76,2 “But when *he* saith that all things have been put under him,” < and so on >. If I could only ask them in whose person that “He saith” is said! For the profundity of God’s mysteries judges the fleshly spiritually. “The fleshly man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, for they are foolishness unto him.”³³⁷ (3) For here, if the Father is speaking to the Son, the action is defective; the Son made things subject to the Father. But if “when he saith < that > all things are put in subjection under him” is said in the person of the Son, the thought is unsatisfactory because it assumes futurity in God, either in the Father or in the Son.

76,4 But who is it that is saying that all things have been made subject? For it has not said, “when *they* say”; if it had said, “when they say,” it could apply either to the angels or to the subjects. (5) But since it has previously shown the Son subjecting all things and handing them over to the Father, and the Father subjecting all things to the Son, careful exegetes are left

with the person of the Holy Spirit. And therefore, after the person of the Father and the person of the Son, the scripture has unequivocally given an intimation of the person of the Holy Spirit who always declares and teaches the truths about the Father and the Son—to keep the full knowledge of the Trinity, and of the additional glory of [Christ's] human nature, from being defectively stated. (6) Then he says, “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.” But one who is destroyed has been curbed and can no longer do what he does, or even exist; he has been destroyed.

77,1 Well, what have those who have no knowledge of the scriptures to say about this? “If this is what the text said, we must suppose that the Son will cease to rule.”

But [if we say this] we shall commit an impiety and < venture > to rank him with God's subjects, particularly after he ceases to do what he has been doing. (2) Perish the thought! No one who believes and truly hopes in Christ will think of saying or hearing anything unbecoming his glory, as the Arians futilely think that they can. The sacred scripture teaches everything < by saying >, “When he saith, All things are put in subjection under him, it is manifest that he is excepted who hath put all things in subjection under him. But when all things are put in subjection under him, then shall also the Son himself be subject unto him that hath put all things under him.”³³⁸

77,3 This means that the statement that was originally made by the angel, linked [with it] by the similarity of the expression, fittingly and with perfect clarity reveals the statement's whole meaning. The angel said a similar thing, mentioning the Son to begin with and then with an addition which referred to the human nature, showing the union [of the natures]: “Therefore that which is born of thee shall *also* be called holy, the Son of God.”³³⁹ (4) For this and similar reasons, “because that which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God,” “the Son himself will be subject to him that hath put all things under him” so that Christ's flesh will no longer be fleshly in power but united in [one union with the Godhead], and reign with the Father and Holy Spirit, “of whose kingdom there shall be no end.”³⁴⁰

77,5 And it is since he has risen that “that God may be all in all”³⁴¹ has had its inception, for his flesh has been spiritually united with his one

Godhead. But since he says, "Do this in remembrance of me until the coming of the Son of Man,"³⁴² and "Ye shall see him in like manner as ye have seen him taken up—" ³⁴³ then finally, when all things have been fulfilled and nothing left unfulfilled of those things < that are to be > brought back³⁴⁴ to his Godhead, the prophecy, "that God may be all in all" < will come true* >.

77,6 < But > the text says, < "God," >³⁴⁵ so that there may be no distinction [between the manhood and the Godhead]. For there is no distinction, to make polytheism impossible, for there is one glory. For the Son is not now out of the Father's control, like a warlord, or under his control like a slave with no freedom of action: [he is] < the One > begotten of the Father, of the same nature and the same Godhead. Nor will he be subject to the Father then from defect or inferiority, or by compulsion or cessation [of rule], (7) but as a true only-begotten Son who rules with the Father forever, and who both elevates the whole creation to a single oneness and honorable reward and teaches this to his holy church, "so that God may be all in all."³⁴⁶ For there is one Godhead, one sovereignty and one glory of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, with the Father fittingly honored by the Son as a true son, and by the Holy Spirit as not different from the Father and the Son. (8) And let this exclude even the words of those who blaspheme God's Son and Holy Spirit, and the thoughts of their enmity to the Son and the Holy Spirit. And once more we have detected their evil devices and thwarted them.

78,1 Once more they select certain expressions from the Gospel and say, "Why can 'The Son do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do?' "³⁴⁷ And they do not understand what is said at the beginning [of the scripture]; although it was surely the Father, he did not create something first, and the Son manufacture something afterwards. (2) Which heaven did the Father make all by himself, for the Son to take the example of the first heaven as his model, and manufacture something like it?

But none of the inventors of evil can prove this. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,"³⁴⁸ but he says at the same time, in the

beginning at the creation, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."³⁴⁹ And he didn't say, "Come here and I'll show you how to do it." (3) And then it says, "And God made the man,"³⁵⁰ and it didn't say, "God made him and showed the Son how to make the man." The Son was no ignoramus, that he needed to learn a trade first and then put it into practice.

78,4 But when our Lord had come in his turn, put on flesh, become man and lived in our midst, he conversed with the Jews who thought that he was abolishing the Father's commandments and, desiring to elevate their minds, so that they would not attend to his manhood alone, said, "The Son doeth naught but that which he seeth the Father do." His intent was to show that the work of the Son is the work of the Father, and that the Father is pleased with the Son's execution of all his work.

78,5 And they will also be harried like this < about > each of the other texts in its turn, when they blunder into them like beasts and are confounded by the lightning flash of the Word, the truth. "Flash thy lightning and scatter them, send forth thine arrows and confound them."³⁵¹ (79,1) For we have to deal with the following text, which they select next and quote from the Gospel, "For the Father loveth the Son and showeth him all that he doeth, and greater works than these shall he show him, that ye may marvel";³⁵² and again, "The Father raiseth the dead and giveth them life. Likewise also doth the Son give life to whom he will";³⁵³ and further, "The Father judgeth no man but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all may honor the Son as they honor the Father."³⁵⁴ (2) But take note, Arius, at the end of my debate with you, of the conclusion to which the discourse has come. Christ did not say, "that some may say yes and some say no," but, "that *all* may honor the Son as they honor the Father." Stop dishonoring the Son, then, so as not to dishonor the Father! If you choose to ascribe an inferiority in the Son or suppose some defect in him, does the supposition not extend to the Father as well? For it is part of your impudence that you think < meanly > of the Son, and do not honor him as you honor the Father.

79.3 Why, indeed, does the Father also give him [this]? Tell me what he says, wonder man! "That the Son may give life to whom he will"—he didn't say, "to whom he is told." There were two particular reasons why the Son needed to receive all this from the Father, though not to be less than the Father. (4) First, it was to direct our minds upward to a single oneness of Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and not to lower the human reason to divisions and a multiplicity of gods, but to raise it to a single oneness. But second, it was for the transformation of the glory of Christ's human nature and its union with his Godhead.

79.5 For since he came to gladden his disciples with the promise he gave, "There be some standing here that will not taste death till they have seen the Son of Man coming in his glory,"³⁵⁵ "and on the eighth day,"³⁵⁶ as the Gospel says—(6) or, as the other says, "after six days."³⁵⁷ For the evangelists do not say some things in place of others but, although there is one exact truth, it is constantly safeguarded so that people will have no excuse to stumble at the essentials, since "The mind of man is continually bent on evil from his youth."³⁵⁸ (7) This is the reason why one evangelist said, "on the eighth day." Part of the day on which the Savior said this was left over, and the evangelist counted from that day and hour—if the day was declining, about the ninth hour or the tenth. And again, since the thing was done at about the third or fourth hour of the eighth day, this day was called the eighth. (8) But the other evangelist provides a safeguard and says, "after six days." He did not count on the day when the Savior said the word to the disciples, or the day on which he did the work, but the six full days in between.

80.1 But since I have come to the discussion of the saying, I shall give the explanation. "He took Peter and James and John and brought them into the mount, and was transfigured, and his countenance shone as the sun"—his countenance in the flesh united with his Godhead—and "his raiment shone white as snow."³⁵⁹ Plainly, this means the flesh taken from Mary, which was of our stock. (2) And it was changed to glory, the added glory of the Godhead, the honor, perfection and heavenly glory which his flesh did not have at the beginning, but which it < was > receiving here in its union with the divine Word.

80,3 In this way understand the words we quoted earlier, “He hath given all judgment to the Son”³⁶⁰—because he has given him authority “to give life to whom he will”—³⁶¹ as proof, first of all, of the unity of the divine nature, and of its one will which ascribes the whole of goodness to the Father and to one First Principle and Godhead. For there are three perfect entities but one Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; and in its turn the human nature [of Christ] which, along with the divine nature, receives the gift, authority and perfection of rank which is granted it by the Father and the Son, and which < has been united > in a single spiritual oneness of Godhead.

81,1 And we have barely managed to get past this stormy place and through this whole attack by savage beasts—the wild heaving of the billows and the fearful foaming of the seas. Because, in my inadequacy, I received the power and the grace from God, I have burned my opponents’ spears and shields thanks to the right reasoning in my mind, have broken the bows of the opposition, < and have been victorious* > over this serpent, the many-headed ugliness of the hydra, (2) so that I can sing < the > song of triumph in God, “Let us sing to the Lord, for he is gloriously magnified; horse and rider hath he hurled into the sea.”³⁶²

I have broken the dragon’s head above “the water that goes softly,” of which these present day fellow heirs with the Jews would have no part. The prophet had them in mind when he said, (3) “Because ye refuse the water of Siloam that goeth softly, and prefer to have the king Rezin and Tabeel the son of Remaliah, behold, the Lord bringeth upon you the mighty water of the river, the king of Assyria,”³⁶³ and so on. (4) But we have received help in the Lord, the “saliva spat on the ground” by his true flesh, and with the spittle have received “the clay” smeared “on our eyes,”³⁶⁴ so that we who were once in ignorance now know the truth, and have gone and washed in “Siloam,” which means “the Sent.”³⁶⁵ That is, [we have washed] in his human nature and perfect Godhead, and since we now see we no longer deny the Lord, even though the partisans of Arius and successors of the Jews cast us out of the synagogue. (5) For like the Jews, the Arians have agreed that whoever confesses the Lord must “be cast out of the

synagogue,"³⁶⁶ showing that one who has recovered his sight is a reproach to those who cannot see. For if their synagogue were not all blind, they would not eject someone whose eyes had been opened.

81,6 Let us thank the Lord, then, that we have recovered our sight and confess the Lord and, if we perform the work of the commandments, have healed our hurts; and that we have trod upon the serpent and broken the head of the dragon by the power of God, to whom be glory, honor and might, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father with the Holy Spirit, unto the ages of ages. Amen.

81,7 But leaving this hydra we have slain, with its seven heads and many segments, let us go on to the rest as usual, beloved, calling on God, our constant help, to take the same care of us and of any who desire to read this work, for the cure of those who have been bitten, and the correction of those who have already joined the ranks of the evil.