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| | Quod etiam in iis, quae ad Nephalium scripsi, apte usus sum exemplo medici; e& quod quasi per concessionem permittere voces eontradicen-. tium et eos propriis eorum vocibus ad veritatem addueere, non eladis est, ut putavit iste simul impius et indoctus, sed sine controversia ingentis est vietoriae. Vp At ego, hane vigilantem et prudentem sollieitudinem eximiorum doctorum seetatus, dixi, in illis orationibus, quas ad Nephalium seripsi: « Etiamsi haee sententia: « In duabus natu- ) ris individuis subsistit Christus post unionem » dieta fuerit a nonnullis ex antiquioribus doctoribus Ecclesiae, imo vel ab ipso Cyrillo, attamen postea reieeta fuit, quemadmodum et hane sententiam: « Natura humanitatis passus est Christus », bene ab orthodoxis dietam, diei vetuit Cyrillus, adversus eos, qui divisionis morbo laborabant, consurgens; neque sie iis, qui in Chaleedone eonvenerunt, ullus relinquebatur apologiae modus, definientibus in duabus naturis individuis Christum eognosci'.» Nee quisquam posset patroeinium eorum suscipere dieendo nonnullos ex antiquioribus hane ipsam sententiam dixisse, ubi semel sanetus Cyrillus mediei more, attento morbo, prohibitionem ipsum morbum impugnantem statuit. Si vero nullus ex antiquioribus doetoribus videtur dixisse in duabus naturis individuis subsistere Christum, omnes autem doeuerunt duarum naturarum factam esse coniunetionem, id autem, quod!Haee verba Severi graece leguntur P. Gr.,, LXXXVI, 1848. E | What I also, in those things which I wrote to Nephalius, aptly used the example of a physician; and that to permit, as it were by concession, the voices of those who contradict and to lead them by their own words to the truth is not a trick, as that impious and unlearned man thought, but without question it is the victory of a great cause. But I, having followed this vigilant and prudent solicitude of the eminent teachers, said in those orations which I wrote to Nephalius: "Even if this sentence: 'Christ subsists in two individual natures after the union' had been pronounced by some of the earlier doctors of the Church, indeed even by Cyril himself, nevertheless it was afterwards rejected, just as also the sentence: 'Christ suffered the nature of humanity', well spoken by the orthodox, Cyril likewise forbade, rising up against those who labored under the disease of division; nor was any mode of apology left to those who met at Chalcedon, when they defined that 'Christ is to be known in two individual natures'." Nor could anyone take up their defense by saying that some of the earlier men had uttered this very sentence, when once Saint Cyril, in a middle way, having perceived the malady, established a prohibition striking at the malady itself. But if it appears that none of the earlier doctors said that Christ subsists in two individual natures, and yet all declared that a conjunction of two natures was made, and that which... |
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| Ee. P: \* p. 3. ex ea effectum est, unum esse ex duobus, non vero duo, \* — sieut et divus Iulius dixit: 101:108: « Proelamatur autem in eo. hoe quidem esse ereatum in unione inereati, illud autem in-. ereatum in coniunctione ereati, una natura ex utraque parte subsistente'», — quomodo extremae dementiae erimine rei non erunt ii, qui voces eorum indoete proferunt et dieunt: « En patres dixerunt hoe quidem esse inereatum in Christo, illud autem creatum; ergo in duabus naturis dieimus subsistere unum Christum.» Audient enim a nobis: Dixistis ea, ex quibus unio facta est; duo enim sunt illa, nam unio ex duobus vel ex pluribus fit. Ergo addite etiam terminum unionis, item eum Iulio dicentes: « Una natura ex utraque parte subsistente ». Nolite ergo dieere duas naturas post unionem. Equidem ea, quae coniuneta sunt, duo sunt; at id, quod effeetum est, unum esí ex duobus. Áudivimus enim et sanctum Cyrilum exemplum. hominis nostri similis adduxisse, dicendo: CvniLLUs: « Proinde illae duae naturae iam non sunt duo, sed utraque unum animal absolvitur \*.» Patres ergo mentionem unionis duarum naturarum fecerunt, eum vero, qui ex ea subsistit, unum ex duobus esse seiunt, non duos. ` Sed ex iis quoque, quae ad Nephalium seripsi, partem euius modo mentionem feci, in medium proferam; piacuit enim Grammaiieo in indoeto et impio libello suo illam etiam adducere et reprehendere. Scribitur autem sic: PATRIARCHAE verba, ex orationibus Ab. NEPHALIUM: «Neque mihi iterum dieas hae voee duarum naturarum nonnullos ex patribus usos esse; non enim e& usi sunt vestro sensu, etiamsi hoe assertioni eoneedamus. Tempore enim saneti Cyrilli, \* morbo vaniloquiorum Nestorii in ecclesiis grassante, plerumque vox reieeta est; nam ad morbos remedia. Ergo non possunt voces aliorum Patrum, si reperiantur, — tanquam eoniectura rursus hoe dico, — adversus sanetum Cyrillum proferri, qui contra morbum ingruentem remedium invenit; imo, plus dieo: etiamsi ipsius Cyrilli sint, 8 antea dictae. Neque enim si eximius quidam medicus, exitiali morbo aliquam eivitatem invadenis, aquae potum prohibeat, potest aliquis, in medium progredie.:s, dieere ad illum: En mediei patrum nostrorum aquae potum permittebant, imo tu ipse, 'H. LixTZMANN, Apollinaris vom Laodicsa, i. L p. 187, — \* P. € | From that it was brought about that there is one out of two, not two — just as the divine Julius said: "It is proclaimed in him. This indeed is created in the union of the uncreated, that however is uncreated in the conjunction of the created, one nature subsisting from each side" — how will they not be of the very extreme madness of the thing, who foolishly utter and say their words: "Behold, the fathers said, this indeed is uncreated in Christ, that however is created; therefore we say that in two natures one Christ subsists." For they will hear from us: You have said those things from which the union was made; for those are two, since a union is made from two or from several. Therefore also add the term of the union, likewise saying to Julius: "One nature subsisting from each side." Do not therefore say two natures after the union. Indeed those things which are joined are two; but that which has been effected is one out of two. For we also heard that Saint Cyril brought an example similar to our man, saying: "Therefore those two natures are no longer two, but each is resolved into one animal." The Fathers therefore made mention of the union of two natures, and they say that he who subsists from it is one out of two, not two.  But from those things which I also wrote concerning Nephalios I will now bring forward part of that mention; for it pleased Grammaticus, in his unlearned and impious little book, to adduce and to reprehend it. It is written thus: Words of the PATRIARCHS, from the orations of Abbot NEPHALIOS: "Nor say to me again that these expressions 'two natures' were used by some of the fathers; for they were not used in your sense, even if we should concede this to the assertion. For in the time of Saint Cyril, with the disease of Nestor's vain-talk raging in the churches, the expression was for the most part rejected; for remedies are applied to diseases. Therefore the words of other Fathers, if they are found, cannot be alleged against Saint Cyril — this I say again as a conjecture — who found the remedy against the attacking disease; nay, I say more: even if they are of Cyril himself, they were spoken earlier. For just as no outstanding physician, when some deadly pestilence has invaded a certain age, forbids the drinking of water, can anyone, advancing into the public forum, say to him: 'Behold, the middle of our fathers permitted the drinking of water, nay you yourself...' " |
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| < T. x anno proxime praecedente, non interdicebas ne aquam biberemus. Iure enim diceret ad illum: Stulte! Ergo non vides mor- - bum, euius eausa bibentibus aquam damnum accidit, sed ex bona valetudine vis pernieiosae conditioni normam constituere `? «: His autem addit optimus iste et ait: GRAMMATICUS: « Haec - revera sunt verba stulti. Etenim, quasi qui propheticum charisma sortitus est, imo quasi qui omnium eogitationes serutatur, ecce iam loquitur, dieens: « Etiamsi Patres usi sint voee duarum naturarum, non tamen sieut vos eam. adhibuerunt. 1111 enim sine reprehensione; vos autem dolose ea voce utimini.» Et deinde impudenter decertans, in mendacio plerumque extollitur: « etiamsi verbo hoe concedamus »: non enim eoneessit, ut ostendimus, sed invite et valde coaetus eonfessus est \*.» Vehementer quidem et strenue ostendisti \* id, quod tibi placet, 0 bone, eum loeum Ambrosii per fietionem mutasti et cetera impie exeogitasti, sieut disputatio ostendit et iterum ostendet. Postquam autem e tenebrieoso:tuo libello sustulisti propositionem, quae immundissimam sententiam ineruditione notat: PRoPosrri0 HAERETICORUM: « Quomodo non ceoneedemus duas naturas subsistere indivise post unionem '? », — quam sapientissimus Cyrillus ut pollutam reiecit, dicens: CygiL.LUs: « Adversatur iterum nihilo minus propositio iis, qui dieunt unam esse naturam Filii inearnatam, idque ineptum volentes ostendere, ubique eonantur duas naturas subsistentes ostendere '», — haee etiam ausus es impudentissime, sed prorsus ridicule, explieare et seribere: GRAMMATICUS: €» Dieit enim eos ubique eonari ostendere duas naturas subsistentes, et evidenter (nieiligit naturas separatas". » At reprehendit amentiam tuam propositio, quam abseidisti, quae elamat: PRoPosrTIO HAERETICORUM: « Quomodo non eoneedemus duas naturas subsistere post unionem indivise?^?», quam etiam ostendit eximius Cyrillus adversari iis, qui dieunt unam esse naturam Filii inearnatam. Íuste ergo, postquam ea, quae oeulis omnium proponuntur, abseidisti et tenebras sacrilegi furti eireum te constituisti, me in-! De textu graeco loci efr P. Gr., LXXXIX, 109 et 280. —? Locum non repperi. —? P. Gr., LX XVII, 244. — \* Ibid., 245, — \*.Locum non repperi. — \* P. Gr., LXXVII, 244, | In the year just preceding, you did not forbid that we drink water. For one might rightly say to him: Fool! Do you not then see the disease, that because of it harm comes to those who drink water, yet from good health a power establishes a rule for a pernicious condition?  To these things that excellent man adds and says: GRAMMATICUS: “These are truly the words of a fool. For, as if he had received a prophetic charism, nay as if he kept watch over everyone’s thoughts, behold he now speaks, saying: ‘Even if the Fathers used the phrase “two natures,” they did not use it as you do. For they used it without reproach; but you deceitfully make use of that phrase.’ And then, shamelessly contending, he is frequently puffed up in falsehood: ‘and even if we concede this word’ — for he did not concede it, as we have shown, but unwillingly and very much compelled he confessed.”  You have indeed shown vehemently and strenuously that which pleases you; O good man, you changed that passage of Ambrose by fiction and wickedly contrived other things, as the dispute shows and will show again. But after you, in your dark little pamphlet, removed the proposition which marks the most filthy opinion by ignorance: PROPOSITION OF THE HERETICS: “How do we not concede that two natures subsist undivided after the union?” — which the most wise Cyril rejected as polluted, saying: CYRILLUS: “The proposition nevertheless opposes those who say that the Son has one inborn nature, and, seeking to show this absurdity, everywhere try to show two subsisting natures,” — these things also you dared most shamelessly, but utterly ridiculously, to explain and write: GRAMMATICUS: “For he says that they everywhere try to show two subsisting natures, and plainly (he treats them as) separate natures.”  But your folly is reproved by the proposition which you removed, which cries out: PROPOSITION OF THE HERETICS: “How do we not concede that two natures subsist after the union indivisibly?” which the distinguished Cyril also shows to be opposed to those who say that the Son has one inborn nature. Rightly therefore, after you hid those things which are presented to the eyes of all and set around yourself the darkness of sacrilegious theft, me in- |
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| cebant: « Quomodo non eoncedemus duas naturas subsistere post ` unionem indivise'?»: CyvmrmuLUs: « Valde supervaeaneo ergo dieunt Christum natura humanitatis passum esse, quasi illam a Verbo removeant et proprie seponant, ut.duo intelligantur et non iam unum inearnatum et inhumanatum, illud ex Deo Patre Verbum \*. » Igitur, qui advocatus fit eorum, qui in duabus quidem naturis individuis post unionem Christum subsistere impie eonfitentur, supervaeaneo autem dieunt eum « natura humanitatis » passum, et in medium profert testimonia antiquorum doctorum, quae dieunt Christum « natura humanitatis » passum esse, — quod sanetus Cyrillus decrevit minime dicendum, - eum vellet eohibere morbum eorum, qui impie eonfitentur Christum in duabus naturis subsistere et intelligi, — audiet, et valde reete, ipsum vesaniae morbum medico imposuisse prohibitionem ipsius vocis, quam ante morbum et ipse dicebat et qui ante ipsum fueruni doctores et medici. Itaque ego quoque, ad Nephalium verbum faciens et volens superabundanter devincere contradietorem, concessionis figura usus sum atque dixi: « Demus ¥0 dicere in duabus naturis individuis Christum subsistere, etiam ab antiquioribus, imo et prohibitionem a medico faetam, oportere aegrotantes utantur hae ipsa formula, quia ante morbum tum is, qui eam prohibuit, ea utebatur, tum ceteri quoque doctores et medici? Minime! Audiret enim iste id, quod recte quoad exemplum et imaginem aquae dixi: « Stulte! Ergo non vides morbum, euius eau88 bibentibus aquam damnum aeeidit, sed ex bona valetudine vis morbidam eonditionem ordinare.» Reprehensioni autem obnoxiam non esse, ut Grammaticus iste, divinis rebus minime imbutus et profanus, putavit, comparationem doctorum eum egregiis medieis, qui aegrotantibus obsequuntur, et modo quidem infirmitati indulgent? atque optata quaedam aegrotantibus saepe 3o! P, Gr., LXXVII, 244. 9? 7546., 245. — ° Conicio interpretem graece legisse: cvyyoQobo: vij &o0evelo. | they said: "How shall we not concede that two natures subsist after the indivisible union?": Cyril: "They therefore say most superfluously that Christ suffered by the nature of humanity, as if they were removing that nature from the Word and properly separating it, so that two are understood and not now one incarnate and unincarnate—that Word which is from God the Father." Therefore he who becomes advocate for those who impiously confess that Christ subsists indeed in two individual natures after the union, and moreover say superfluously that he suffered "by the nature of humanity," and brings forward the testimonies of the ancient doctors which say that Christ suffered "by the nature of humanity"—which Saint Cyril decreed should least of all be said—wishes to check the disease of those who impiously confess Christ to subsist and to be understood in two natures—he will hear, and very rightly, that he himself has imposed on the physician of madness the prohibition of that term, which before the illness he himself used and which the doctors and physicians before him used. Therefore I also, making toward that Nephalium word and wishing to overcome the adversary more abundantly, employed the figure of concession and said: "Shall we grant to say that Christ subsists in two individual natures, even according to the ancients, and indeed that a prohibition made by a physician ought to be used by the sick as that same formula, because before the illness both he who forbade it used it and the other teachers and physicians as well?" By no means! For that man would hear what I rightly said by way of the example and image of water: "Fool! Do you not then see the disease, of which those who drink its water suffer harm, but that from good health the force ordains a morbid condition." And that the comparison to physicians is not liable to reproach, as this grammarian, little versed in divine matters and profane, thought, he likened him to excellent physicians who attend the sick, and indeed sometimes indulge the infirmity and often grant certain desired things to the ailing. |
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| ce cl ve eoncedunt, modo autem ad aceuratam sanitatis custodiam eos extollunt, — sieut sanetus Cyrillus feeit quoad Orientales, —. indieavit rerum divinarum peritus Athanasius, qui in apologia pro Dionysio haee scripsit: ATHANASIUS: « Non autem oportet aliquis ea, quae per oeconomiam scribuntur aut fiunt, mala mente accipiat et ad propriam malam voluntatem detorqueat. Nam et medieus saepe ea remed?a, quae aliquibus non videntur eongrua, vulneri nonnullorum, ut ipse novit, adhibet, nullum alium ae sanitatem scopum habens. Sapientis quoque magistri. seopus hie est, ut nempe \* pro ratione mentium eorum, qui instituuntur, doeeat atque loquatur, donee eos ad perfectionis viam traduxerit '. » Hae autem figura concessionis solent doetores uti atque velut in agone superabundanter adversarium devineere. Cum enim lamentabiles Arii auxiliari stulte et blasphemo sensu nomen «Pater» dicerept et vim ei adhiberent ad ostendendum illud esse designationem aetionis, ita ut Pater intelligeretur agens, et Filius propterea effectus et ereatus, non vero potius vera proles, Gregorius Theologus, postquam hoe absurdum et dolosum impietatis conamen, in prima oratione de F'ilio, reprehendit atque resolvit, ostenditque nomen « Pater » signifieativum esse verae et naturalis eognationis gignentis ad genitum, minime vero aetionis, usus est etiam figura concessionis sieque perrexit: GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS: « Sit autem, si placeat, « Pater» nomen aetionis; ne sie quidem nos devineetis, sed hoc ipsum operatus erit Pater eonsubstantiale, etsi alioqui absurda est huiusmodi actionis opinio. Vides quomodo, dum. malitiose decertare vultis, eaptiones vestras effugiamus \*. Cum autem Gregorius hoe 0 et ex abundanti usus sit figura eoneessionis, et concesserit postulationem adversarii, dixeritque: « Sit nomen «Pater» signifieativum: aetionis, si placeat », poteritne aliquis ipsi verbo vim adhibere et temere contendendo asserere Gregoriwm dare Filium esse non prolem sed opus, e ad eladem abscondendam hoe adiungere: QREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS: « etsi alioqui absurda \*est huiusmodi actionis opinio», eumque, qui per eoncessionem dedit, quasi devietum irride-:! P. Gr., XXV, 488. — \* P, Gr., XXXVI, 96. \* p. 10. | they concede these things, but only to raise them toward the careful keeping of soundness, — as Saint Cyril did with respect to the Orientals, —. The expert in divine matters Athanasius indicated this, who wrote these things in the Apology for Dionysius: ATHANASIUS: "It is not, however, fitting that anyone should receive those things which are written or done according to economy with an evil mind and distort them to his own wicked will. For a physician often applies remedies which to some do not seem appropriate to the wound of certain persons, as he himself knows, having no other aim than health. The purpose of a wise teacher is also often this, namely to teach and speak according to the reason of the minds of those who are being instructed, until he has led them on the way of perfection."  Teachers are wont to use this figure of concession and, as if in a contest, to overwhelm the adversary by excess. For when the lamentable Arians foolishly and with blasphemous sense applied the name "Father" and gave force to it to show that it is a designation of action, so that "Father" would be understood as the one acting, and the Son therefore an effect and created thing, and not rather a true offspring, Gregory the Theologian, after he reproved and resolved this absurd and deceitful attempt of impiety in the first Oration on the Son, and showed that the name "Father" is significant of the true and natural begetting of the begetter to the begotten, and by no means of action, also made use of the figure of concession and proceeded thus:  GREGORY NAZIANZENUS: "Let the name 'Father' be, if it pleases you, the name of action; yet not even thus will you deceive us, for the Father will have wrought this very thing consubstantial, although otherwise the opinion that such an action exists is absurd. See how, while you wish to contend maliciously, we escape your snares."  But since Gregory used this figure of concession abundantly, and conceded the opponent's proposition, and said: "Let the name 'Father' signify action, if you please," could anyone apply force to the very word and rashly contend that Gregory declared the Son to be not offspring but a work, and to hide the same add this: GREGORY NAZIANZENUS: "although otherwise the opinion that such an action exists is absurd," and mock him who granted it by concession as if he had erred. |
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| tw n dMiadiic /v bye pepe A vn re et tuas, o Grammatice, voeulas usurpare: «Non enim concessit, sed invite et valde eoaetus confessus cst. Ita. enim valida veritas ut etiam ab adversariis agnosceatur ` »? At. nemo attenderet eum, qui figuram verbi per concessionem prolati assensionem, deditionem et defectionem esse dieeret; inspieeret autem ootius quomodo quaestionem adversariorum prius diluisset et valide solvisset sieque ex abundanti concessionis figura usus esset. uer wer a rena a5 Seito ergo, egregie Grammatiee, me quoque, in duabus orationibus quas ad Nephalium seripsi, postquam omnia effata Patrum ab eo demonstrata in medium protulissem, et ostendis-. sem quomodo dieta essent et potius sententiam impietatis impugnarent, qüippe quae unum ex duobus Christum confiteri doceant, ex abundanti quidem figura concessionis usum esse atque dixisse: Demus có dieere in duabus naturis unum Christum post inexplieabilem unionem ab omnibus antiquioribus doctoribus dietum esse. At sapiens Cyrillus, nestorianae dualitati omnem aditum praeeludens et morbum eohibere studens, illud prohibuit. Et addidi ne sie quidem veniam esse iis, qui prohibitionem eontempserunt et in duabus naturis unum Christum definierunt. Non enim possunt verba ceterorum Patrum, si quae "reperiantur, — rursus per coneessionem dico, — adversus sanetum. Cyrillum proferri, qui grassanti morbo remedium invenit. "n [a Confirmatur recte me dixisse non oporiere, post inania Nestorii verba et eautiones saneti Cyrilli adversus impietatem atque eius prohibitiones voeum, diesmus Dei Verbum hominem assumpsisse, vel Chris. tum voeemus duplieem aut hominem deiferum, vel coniunctionem nominemus inexplieabilem unionem divinae oeconomiae. Heprehensio quoque eompendiosa eorum, qui machinantur uf in duabus substantiis definiatur Christus. Peropportune autem cetera quoque apponemus, quae ab indoeto Grammatico vituperata sunt, et ostendunt simul ignorantiam eius et impietatem et ineruditionem et imperitiam sacra.! Loeum non repperi —?Ofr P. Gr., LXXXIX, 112. | O Grammarian, you would like to appropriate the words: “For he did not concede, but confessed unwillingly and under great compulsion. For the truth is so strong that it is even acknowledged by adversaries”? But no one would heed him who would say that the form of the phrase advanced by concession is assent, surrender and defection; rather one would examine how he had first dissolved the question of his opponents and solved it convincingly, and that he had made abundant use of the figure of concession.  Therefore, excellent Grammarian, I too, in the two orations which I wrote to Nephelius, after I had brought into the open all the sayings of the Fathers demonstrated by him, and had shown how they were expressed and how they rather impugned the opinion of impiety — namely those which teach that Christ is one out of two — I made abundant use of the figure of concession and said: “Let us then say that in two natures one Christ was confessed after the ineffable union, as has been said by all the earlier teachers.”  But the wise Cyril, cutting off every access to Nestorian duality and striving to exhibit the disease, prohibited that. And I added that there is not even pardon for those who contemned the prohibition and defined one Christ in two natures. For the words of the other Fathers, if any are found — I say again by concession — cannot be produced against the holy Cyril, who found a remedy for the prevailing malady.  It is rightly confirmed that I said it was not proper, after the empty words of Nestorius and the warnings of Saint Cyril against impiety and his prohibitions, to say that the Word of God assumed a man, or to call Christ double or a different man, or to name the union a merely inexplicable conjunction of the divine economy.  A concise rebuke too of those who contrive that Christ be defined in two substances. Very fittingly we shall append also the other things which were censured by the unlearned Grammarian, and which at once show his ignorance and impiety and lack of learning and incompetence in sacred matters. |
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| \* p. 15 Ernie unum enim est os doctorum orthodoxorum, quia unus est sanetus Spiritus, qui loquitur in illis: pro ratione morborum variis temporibus erumpentium aptissimis usi sunt auxiliis, mala eonsilia resecantes et eandem quidem, sanam mentem rectamque sententiam semper habentes, prudentioribus autem verbis impetus nunquam intermissos haereticorum cohibentes. Ita et Gregorius Theologus, in epistula ad Cledonium adversus Apollinaristas pugnans, ubi res postulabat, hominem dominicum" de salvatore nostro dicere reeusabat, sie dicens: GREGoRIUS NAZIANZENUS: « Ne deeipiant homines isti, neque decipiantur, mentis expertem aeeipientes dominieum, ut ipsi dicunt, hominem, potius autem Dominum et Deum nostrum. Non enim hominem separamus a divinitate, sed unum eundemque docemus \*.» Athanasius autem rerum divinarum peritus, sie, ut supra diximus, in prima oratione contra Árianos"seripsit: ATEHANASIUS: «Alios quidem deceperunt talia dieendo, hominem autem dominicum non potuerunt decipere. Verbum enim earo faetum est, quod 'Seit eogitationes sapientium quoniam vanae sunt\*.» \* Apparet ergo etiam hie Athanasium reete dixisse: « hominem dominieum », ut Paulus quoque dixit, eum loqueretur de homine nosiro, exteriorem et inieriorem nostrum hominem, minime dissecans ipsum hominem anima et eorpore consianiem, qui in una - hypostasi eomponitur. Nam quia non in duo dividendo unum Christum nominavit «hominem dominieum », clarissimum effeeit dietum per id, quod additum est, ubi signifieavit hominem dominieum esse Dominum et Deum inhumanatum. Etenim postquam dixit: « Hominem autem dominieum non potuerunt deeipere », signifieavit quisnam esset homo dominieus adhue dicendo: ATHANASIUS: « Verbum enim earo faetum est, quod seit eogitationes sapientium quoniam vanae sunt, et quod decipi nequit". » Verumtamen, id etiam probe seientes, ad prudentiorem vigilantiam, quae postea Gregorio Theologo plaeuit, attendimus et nemini concedimus ut hominem dominieum de Salvatore nostro dieat. Ipsum enim Gregorium non fugiebat id, quod dietum fuerat ab Athanasio, euius doetrinas voeavit legem i 0 xugwixóvy üivOoamov.— \* P. Gr., XEXVII, 177. — ° Id est, in Epistula ad episcopos JXgypti ei Libyae, 9. — \* P, Gr., XX'V, 560; efr Psalm. XcoIni, ll, — 5 Ibid, | There is indeed one mouth of the orthodox doctors, for there is one Holy Spirit who speaks in them: according to the variety of illnesses breaking out at different times they used the most fitting remedies, cutting off bad counsels and yet always holding the same sound mind and right judgment, and with more prudent words restraining the never-ceasing attacks of the heretics. Thus Gregory the Theologian, fighting against the Apollinarists in a letter to Cledonius, where the matter required it, refused to call the “man of the Lord” of our Savior, saying thus: GREGORY NAZIANZENUS: “Let these men not deceive, nor be deceived, taking into their thought a mind lacking the lordly, as they say, a man, rather the Lord and our God. For we do not separate the man from the divinity, but we teach one and the same.”  But Athanasius, skilled in divine matters, thus, as we said above, wrote in his first oration against the Arians: ATHANASIUS: “Indeed they deceived others by saying such things, but they could not deceive the man of the Lord. For the Word was made flesh, which… thoughts of the wise because they are vain.”  It therefore also appears here that Athanasius rightly said “the man of the Lord,” as Paul also said, when he spoke of our man, our outer and inner man, by no means dissecting that same man into soul and body, who is composed in one hypostasis. For because he did not name Christ by dividing the one into two, “the man of the Lord,” he made his statement most clear by that which was added, where he signified that the man of the Lord is the Lord and God unassimilated to a human nature. For after he said, “they could not deceive the man of the Lord,” he further indicated who the man of the Lord was by saying: ATHANASIUS: “For the Word was made flesh, which… thoughts of the wise because they are vain, and which cannot be deceived.”  Nevertheless, even knowing this well, we attend, out of more prudent vigilance—which afterward pleased Gregory the Theologian—and we allow no one to call the man of the Lord of our Savior. For Gregory himself was not avoiding that which had been said by Athanasius; he called his doctrines the rule 10 xugwixóny üivOoamov. |
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*Praestantiora enim ubi nobis demonstrantur, non devineimur*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| non oportet perpetuo et una sententia pro iis, quae sibi prius placuerint vel amplexus fuerit decertare, sed si praestantius quid et magis profieuum visum fuerit,?llud libenter suseipere. Praestantiora enim ubi nobis demonstrantur, non devineimur sed docemur, praesertim in iis, quae conducunt ad unitatem ecclesiae et ad spem et ad veritatem 11061 nostrae.» \* At iste Grammaticus moabita vel ammonita et alienus a legibus Israel, eui ne ingredi quidem lieet in synagogam Domini, declarationem doetorum ad praestantiora et accuratam advérsus haereses eustodiam spiritualis eoneordiae, quae unam eandemque mentem ecclesiae servat, bellum intestinum vocat, atque ex amenti ignorantia ea quoque, quae in orationibus, quas ad Nephalium seripsi, habentur, stulte reprehendere audet. Sic autem se habent: PATRIARCHAE, EX oraíiiomibus AD NEPHALIUM: «Rursus post abseissionem Nestorii, reprehensioni subiacet dieere Christum esse duplieem, quia iste dixit: NEsToRIUS: « Dupliees apud Christum naturas distinguo: duplices enim sunt seeundum naturam, sed seeundum dignitatem singulares'.» Ideo ergo et ` Cyrillus in epistula sua ad Nestorium apparet dieens: CYRILLUS: « Voces autem in evangelio de Salvatore nostro prolaías neque duabus hypostasibus, neque duabus personis dispertimus; non enim duplex est unus et solus Christus, quamvis ex duabus rebus in unitatem indivisibilem coaluisse intelligatur, quemadmodum etiam homo ex anima et eorpore constitutus intelligiiur, non tamen duplex est, sed potius unus ex utroque\*.» Et iterum, in libris adversus blasphemias Nestorii, in tomo seeundo, dieit: CvxrtLUs: « Non enim quia Verbum, quod ex Deo est, eum earnem assumpsit, prodiit homo nobis similis, ideo et duplex appellandus est'.» Attamen videtur Gregorius Nazianze11118, in oratione de nativitate Christi, hac voce irreprehensibiliter usus, dieendo: GREGoRIUs NAZIANZENUs: « Missus quidem est, sed ut homo; duplex enim est" », postquam paulo ante dixerat: « Progressus autem \* Deus cum assumptione, unus ex duobus inter se contrariis?. » 80! Edit. HaxTzL, t. II, p. 773. — ° Loors, Nestoriana, p. 354. — ° P. Gr., LXXVIT, 116. — \* P. Gr, LXXVI, 84. —\* 7. Gr, XXXVIT, 328. — ° Ibid., | It is not fitting to contend forever and with one opinion for those things which formerly pleased or were embraced, but if something more excellent and more profitable seems to have been shown, to accept that willingly. For when more excellent things are demonstrated to us, we are not to guess but to be taught, especially in those things which conduce to the unity of the Church and to our hope and to our truth.  But that Grammarian, a Moabite or Ammonite and alien to the laws of Israel, to whom it is not even permitted to enter the synagogue of the Lord, calls the doctors’ declaration toward the more excellent and accurate guarding against heresies of the spiritual concord which preserves the one identical mind of the Church an intestine war, and out of mad ignorance even dares to foolishly reproach those things which are contained in the orations that I wrote to Nephalius. Thus they stand: PATRIARCHS, FROM THE ORATIONS TO NEPHALIUS: “Again, after the deposition of Nestorius, the assertion that Christ is double is subjected to blame, because he said: NESTORIUS: ‘I distinguish double natures in Christ: for they are double according to nature, but single according to dignity.’” Therefore also Cyril in his letter to Nestorius appears saying: CYRIL: “Moreover, in the words in the Gospel about our Savior we neither divide them into two hypostases, nor into two persons; for Christ, one and only, is not double, although he is understood to have been united from two things into an indivisible unity, just as a man is also understood to be constituted from soul and body; yet he is not double, but rather one out of both.” And again, in the books against the blasphemies of Nestorius, in the second volume, he says: CYRIL: “For not because the Word, which is from God, took upon him flesh, did a man similar to us come forth; therefore he is to be called double.” Yet Gregory Nazianzen seems to have used the phrase without reproach in the oration on the nativity of Christ, saying: GREGORY NAZIANZEN: “He was indeed sent, but as a man; for he is double,” after he had said a little before: “And God, in the advance with the assumption, one of two things contrary to each other.” |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| 325. Totus loeus ut excerptus ex orationibus Severi ad Nephalium graece non servatue est, \* p. 20, \* p. 21. | 325. The whole passage, as excerpted from Severus' Orations to Nephalion, has not been preserved in Greek, \* p. 20, \* p. 21. |
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*Contra haee Grammatieus, ae si dixerimus nos ante morbum*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| Contra haee Grammatieus, ae si dixerimus nos ante morbum Nestorii nullum ex Patribus et deiferis doctoribus duplieem dixisse Christum, insania impietatis atque ignorantia insaniens, sieut daemoniaeus, qui in sacris evangeliis dieitur catenas et vineula dirupisse et ad monumenta cueurrisse', frustra currit et audet producere testimonia, in quibus Patres Christum dixerunt duplieem. At promptum est ad illum dicere: O bone, si vigilares, aperte agnosceres tibi adesse id ipsum a nobis iam seriptum, cirea quod frustra laboras atque desudas! Cum enim Gregorium in medium produximus, in illo omnes doetores, qui eadem sentiunt, produximus. Ex duabus naturis confitentur ésse Christum, et ideo irreprehensibiliter, minime vero sieut Nestorius, duplieem voeaverunt illum, sieut et hominem nostri similem unam personam ex duobus confitentes, et unam naturam 8tque hypostasim, absque ulla reprehensione illum etiam duplicem vocant, propter duplicem eirea illum contemplationem, sieut Gregorius, in oratione de baptismo, signifieavit haec seribendo: GREGoRIUS NAZIANZENUS: « Cum ergo simus duplices, ex anima dieo et corpore, et una quidem natura invisibilis, altera autem visibilis, duplex quoque est purifieatio, per aquam dico et spiritum, una quidem visibiliter et eorporaliter accepta, altera autem incorporaliter et invisibiliter eoneurrente °, » Ita etiam sanetus Iohannes, episeopus eonstantinopolitanus, \* jin oratione cui titulus « De obseuritate Veteris Testamenti », euius initium est: « Gaudet quidem bubuleus », dixit: lomANNES CONSTANTINOPOLITANUS: « Duplex enim est hoc animal, homo ex duabus substantiis compositus, una sensibili, altera intelligibili, ex anima 0100 et corpore, et in eaelo et in terra eognationem habet. Etenim per intelligibilem substantiam supernis virtutibus participat, per sensibilem vero terrenis rebus coniungitur, eum sit aretum quoddam vineulum utriusque ereaturae'".» Er PosT PAUCA: « Propterea, ex duabus substantiis eompegit nos Deus \*. » 1$ Ostende ergo, o optime, synodum ehalcedonensem ex duabus naturis definivisse esse unum Christum, ut discamus illam, sieut illos sanetos Patres, xó « duplex » irreprehensibiliter sensisse 35! Ofr MaRC., v, 2 et seq. — ° P. Gr., XXXVI, 368. — ° P. Gr., LXI, 182. — \* Ibié., 185. | Against these things the Grammaticus, and if we should say that before the sickness of Nestorius none of the Fathers and diverse doctors called Christ double, raving with the madness of impiety and ignorance, like a demoniac who in the sacred Gospels is said to have broken chains and fetters and to have run to the tombs, runs in vain and dares to produce testimonies in which the Fathers called Christ double. But ready is the reply to him: O good man, if you were watchful, you would plainly acknowledge that the very thing has already been written by us, concerning which you labor and sweat in vain! For when we brought Gregory forward into the midst, in him we brought forward all the doctors who think the same. From two natures it is confessed that Christ is, and therefore irreproachably — by no means, as Nestorius, did they call him "double." Likewise, confessing one person out of two and one nature and hypostasis similar to ours, without any reproach they also call him double, on account of the twofold contemplation concerning him, as Gregory, in the Oration on Baptism, signified by writing these things:  GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS: "When therefore we are doubled, I mean from soul and body, and indeed one nature is invisible, the other visible, likewise also is the purification twofold, I mean by water and spirit, one indeed received visibly and corporally, the other however occurring incorporeally and invisibly."  Thus also Saint John, bishop of Constantinople, in the oration entitled "On the Obscurity of the Old Testament", whose beginning is: "The ox indeed rejoices", said:  IOHANNES CONSTANTINOPOLITANUS: "For this animal is double; man is composed of two substances, one sensible, the other intelligible, indeed of soul and body, and he has knowledge both in heaven and on earth. For through the intelligible substance he partakes of heavenly powers, through the sensible he is joined to earthly things; it is as if a certain little bond of both natures were appointed to him." And after a few words: "Therefore God composed us of two substances."  Show therefore, O most excellent one, that the Chalcedonian synod defined that there is one Christ from two natures, so that we may learn that it, like those holy Fathers, understood "double" irreproachably. |

# Page 22

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| et dixisse, velut ad contemplationem solummodo differentiae substantiae eorum, quae in unum coniuncta sunt. Si vero Christum ex duobus dici exclusit, maluit autem illum in duabus naturis non separatis neque divisis definire, omnibus evidens est illam synodum scire et intelligere Christum duplicem sieut Nestorius, qui dixit, in oratione cui inseribitur: « Expositio fidei ' », sie: NESTORIUS: « In utraque ergo natura unum Filium et TIudieem omnium nostrum exspeetamus, visibilem simul eundem et invisibilem, sed visibilem quatenus, cum substantiam nostram visibilem assumpsit, inseparabilem semper eam habere voluit, invisibilem vero in substantia divina, in qua nullus ex hominibus illum vidit, sed nec videre potest ˆ, iuxta verbum divi Apostoli\*. » Eum autem adducit sanetus Cyrillus, in primo tomo adversus blasphemias eius `, haee quoque scribentem: \*NESTORIUS: « Unicitatem filiationis servemus in natura divina et humana \*. » RURSUSQUE, IN TOMO SECUNDO `: « Sed Filius est duplex, non dignitate sed natura, » Quid ergo, o Grammatiee, putas te vitaturum econsensionem Nestorii dieendo te in utraque substantia confiteri Christum? Eeee enim et ipse Nestoríus, ut vides, formulam «in duabus naturis » interpretatus est uf « in duabus substantiis ». Si vero ad significationem genericam eonfugias, seeundum quam seimus substantiam comprehendere multas hypostases, ad hane absurditatem et impietatem tua amentia detruderis, ut dieas substantiam sanctae Trinitatis incarnatam esse in substantia et toto genere humanitatis: quod ratio multum serutata? demonstravit. Te autem docebunt allatae sententiae Gregorii Theologi et saneti Iohannis de constitutione hominis nostri similis quoad unam ex duobus eompositam hypotasim, substantias illas ex quibus unus iste coaleseit, non ut genera significare, quia non generum est compositio, sed unius animae et unius corporis, ex quibus unum animal subsistit, habetque cognationem ad ea, quae ex qualibet parte similis generis sunt et similis substantiae. Dixit enim: IOHANNES CONSTANTINOPOLITANUS: « Duplex est hoe animal, ho- | and to have said, as if only for the contemplation of the difference of their substance, which are joined into one. But if he excluded calling Christ out of two, and yet preferred to define him as in two natures not separated nor divided, it is evident to all that that synod knew and understood Christ as twofold, as Nestorius, who said in the discourse which will be inserted: "Expositio fidei", thus: NESTORIUS: "In utraque ergo natura unum Filium et iudicem omnium nostrum exspectamus, visibilem simul eundem et invisibilem, sed visibilem quatenus, cum substantiam nostram visibilem assumpsit, inseparabilem semper eam habere voluit, invisibilem vero in substantia divina, in qua nullus ex hominibus illum vidit, sed nec videre potest, iuxta verbum divi Apostoli."  This same passage is adduced by Saint Cyril, in the first tome against his blasphemies, writing this also: NESTORIUS: "Unicitatem filiationis servemus in natura divina et humana." And again, in the second tome: "Sed Filius est duplex, non dignitate sed natura."  What then, O Grammarian, do you suppose you will avoid the assent of Nestorius by saying that you confess Christ in both substances? For behold even Nestorius himself, as you see, interpreted the formula "in duabus naturis" as "in duabus substantiis." If, however, you flee to the generic signification, according to which one seems to comprehend many hypostases under 'substance', you will by your madness thrust yourself into that absurdity and impiety, so as to say that the substance of the Holy Trinity was incarnate in a substance and in the whole genus of humanity: which, after much scrutiny, reason has demonstrated. Moreover the brought-forward opinions of Gregory the Theologian and Saint John will teach you, concerning the constitution of our man, that the hypostasis composed of one of the two, those substances out of which that one coalesced do not signify genera, for the composition is not of genera, but of one soul and one body, from which one animal subsists, and it has relation to those things which from any part are like in kind and like in substance. For IOHANNES CONSTANTINOPOLITANUS said: "Duplex est hoc animal, ho- |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| \* Cfr supra, huius versionis t. T, p. 120, — \*T TIM., vi, 16. — ° Locum non repperi, sed efr Loors, p. 330, e. — \* P. Gr., LXXVI, 36. — 5Loors, p. 328. — \* P. Gr., LXXVI, 84. — \* Loors, p. 281, — \* Conicio interpretem legisse in graeco: 6 Aóyoc toÀvxooyuovóv. "m | Cf. above, of this version t. T, p. 120, — T TIM., vi, 16. — I did not find the passage, but cf. Loofs, p. 330, etc. — P. Gr., LXXVI, 36. — Loofs, p. 328. — P. Gr., LXXVI, 84. — Loofs, p. 281, — I conjecture that the interpreter read in Greek: ὁ Aóyoc toÀvxooyuovóv. |
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| \* p. 24. mo ex duabus substantiis compositus.» Nam nomine generico «substantia » pro indieatione partieulari utebantur, et quandoque unam hypostasim determinatam solent Patres vocare unam substantiam: idque fusis verbis supra ostendimus. \* Haee autem ex abundanti diximus ut ostenderemus eos, qui dieunt Christum in duabus naturis vel substantiis subsistere, ilum voeare duplieem, sieut Nestorius Christum ita vocavit, non autem sjeut doetores orthodoxi Nestorio antiquiores, qui ` ex duabus naturis eonfessi sunt Filium immutabiliter inearnatum et perfecte inhumanatum, quia post reiectionem a saneto Cyrillo factam, in perpetuum et omnimodo recusamus duplicem dieere Christum, sieut et nomen «adhaesio» bene a Patribus dietum, item reiecit ut impetus sententiae Nestorii prorsus cohiberet. Universe enim lud reieeit et de illo quoque similiter et sine limitatione seripsit: CvRiLLUS: « Non enim quia, eum carnem assumpsit, Verbum quod ex Deo Patre est prodiit homo, hane.ob eausam appellabitur et duplex.» At strenuus Grammatieus, qui in verba divina illotis pedibus irruit, quasi aliquid diffieile inventu faeiens, 10808 Gelasii, qui fuit episcopus Caesareae, in medium profert, duplieem appellantes nobis Christum. Numquid ergo, quia idem Gelasius hominem deiferum vocat Christum, seribendo in oratione eontra Arianos 810: GELAsIUS: « Itaque ille vir deifer, quem mortis passionem ultro sufferre decebat propter auxilium hominum, coronam quidem gloriae\*, ut ait verbum Scripturae, gloriam potentiae assumpsit, assecutus est autem gloriam, quam antea non habebat\*», ambigemus de universali prohibitione sapientis Cyrilli, qui decrevit nullo modo Christum hominem deiferum nominatum iri, tibique impio et subtili interpreti praestolabimur, ut dilueides nobis quonam quidem \* sensu Gelasius, quonam autem rursus Nestorius Christum deiferum voeaverint, et quomodo Cyrillus in perieulum non veniat ne eontemptor patris sui fiat atque adversus antiquiores doctores bellum intestinum et certamen gerat? At quivis religiosus a te velut ab immundo et amenti faeiem suam avertet et verbis ineptiarum tuarum aures suas claudet atque ut legem retinebit reieetionem facíam ab 35! P, Gr., LXXVI, 84, — ° Cfr I PzrR.,, v, 4. — ° Locum non repperi. Z | "composed of two substances." For by the generic name "substance" they were accustomed to use it for the designation of the particular, and sometimes the Fathers are wont to call one determined hypostasis "one substance": and this we showed above in more extended words. These things, however, we have said at greater length to show those who say that Christ subsists in two natures or substances, to call him double, as Nestorius so called Christ, not however as the orthodox doctors earlier than Nestorius, who, having confessed the Son from two natures, hold him immutably incarnate and perfectly unaltered; because, after the rejection made by Saint Cyril, we for ever and in every way reject calling Christ double, as also the name "adhesion," well spoken by the Fathers, was likewise rejected so that it might wholly restrain the impulse of Nestorius's opinion. For he rejected that whole thing and wrote likewise and without limitation about that also: Cyril: "For not because, when he assumed the flesh, the Word which is from God the Father became man, shall this therefore be called and double." But the vigorous Grammaticus, who tramples on the divine words with soiled feet, as if doing something difficult to discover, brings forward Gelasius, who was bishop of Caesarea, to the fore, calling Christ double to us. Therefore shall we, because the same Gelasius calls Christ a deified man, writing in an oration against the Arians—Gelasius: "Therefore that god-bearing man, whom it was fitting should freely suffer the passion of death for the help of men, indeed assumed the crown of glory, as the word of Scripture says, he assumed the glory of power, and he attained the glory which he had not before"—doubt about the universal prohibition of the wise Cyril, who decreed that in no way should Christ be called a deified man, and shall we wait upon you, an impious and subtle interpreter, that you may explain to us in what sense Gelasius, and in what sense again Nestorius, called Christ deified, and how Cyril will not come into danger of being a contemner of his own father and wage internal war and strife against the earlier doctors? But every religious person will turn his face from you as from something unclean and mad and will close his ears to the words of your follies, and in order to keep the rule I make a rejection. |
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*Nos ergo reieetiones a sancto Cyrillo faetas velut saeram*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| eximio Cyrillo, quae im quinto apostolieorum eius capitulorum universe et clare clamat: OvRIuLUsS: « Si quis dieere audet hominem deiferum Christum, et non potius eum esse Deum seeundum: veritatem, utpote Filium unum et seeundum naturam, quatenus Verbum earo faetum est et communieavit perinde ae nos sanguini et carni,.anathema sit'.» Nos ergo reieetiones a sancto Cyrillo faetas velut saeram quamdam anehoram retinemus et Christum neque hominem deiferum, neque duplicem nominamus, neque quidquam aliud huiusmodi. Nam et ipsa saneta et oecumeniea synodus ephesina, diligenter eonsentiens iis quae antea a doctoribus dieta sunt, et ad eundem sensum saneti Cyrilli verba recurrere animadvertens, accuratas horum ipsorum verborum reiectiones recepit, ut integritas et pietas doctrinae servaretur, minimeque per introduetionem horum verborum vis ei inferretur a sectatoribus Nestorii Quapropter et ea, quae adversus impium Nestorium seripta sunt a Cyrillo, confirmavit synodus, signavit et coronis orthodoxiae eoronavit, ita ut etiam spiritus apostolieorum doetorum. praecedentium exsultarent, simulque sententiam dicerent. Quod eum duplicem speciem cognitionis et contemplationis et verborum de Christo, — est enim una Deo digna, altera autem humana, — aut etiam temporum contrapositionem vel differentiam substantialem, ex ignorantia deducant impii ad seetionem unius hypostasis et naturae | Verbi inearnatae, Verbum, quod ad ipsos attinet, àupvíc atque 0:06 comoc efüeiunt, eb merito seeundum impietatem suam vocantur diphysitae et diprosopitae. Àt videamus quemnam locum ex ipsis seriptis Spiritu sapientis Cyrilli Grammatieus nobis proferat ad constitutionem erroris Sui cum ne unum quidem ex seriptis Doctoris ex toto legerit, — nam quómodo eomparatus esset qui in tam indoctis sententiis impietatis natat! — sed ex excerptis alienis? alas graeuli \* malae doctrinae collegerit. Etenim ex illo studiosorum Nestorii ± P. Gr., LXXVII, 120. — \* 10 est, «5 sliig colleetis, — ° Ailudit ad mnoiissimam fabulam aesopieam, sicut etis) in opere suo Philalethes (edit, BANDA, p. 77 textus ot p. 99 versionis). | to the illustrious Cyril, which in the fifth of his chapters on the apostles universally and clearly proclaims: “If anyone dare say that Christ is a mere man, and not rather that he is God according to the truth, namely the only Son according to nature, since the Word became flesh and communicated likewise to us blood and flesh, let him be anathema.”  Therefore we receive the rejections made by Saint Cyril as a kind of sacred anchorage and we do not call Christ either a different man, or twofold, or anything else of that kind. For the holy and ecumenical Synod of Ephesus itself, carefully agreeing to those things which had previously been said by the doctors, and observing that the words of holy Cyril recur to the same sense, accepted exact rejections of those same words, so that the integrity and piety of the doctrine might be preserved, and so that by the introduction of those words no force might be imposed upon it by the followers of Nestorius. Wherefore the synod confirmed those things which had been written by Cyril against the impious Nestorius, sealed them and crowned them with the crowns of orthodoxy, so that even the spirit of the apostolic learned predecessors might exult and at the same time pronounce judgment.  Because the impious, from ignorance, infer a twofold mode of knowledge and contemplation and of words about Christ — for one is fitting to God, the other to man — or even a contrast of times or a substantial difference, they lead to a separation of the Person and nature of the incarnate Word; the Word, as regards them, is cleft and diminished, and deservedly according to their impiety they are called dyophysites and diprosopites.  But let us see what passage from those writings of the wise Cyril the Grammarian produces for the establishment of his error, since he has not read even one of the doctor's writings at all — for how shall he be judged who swims in such unlearned opinions of impiety! — but has collected from others' excerpts? Alas, what a load of evil doctrine he has gathered. Indeed, from that of the followers of Nestorius... |
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| libro, qui sanetum Cyrillum tanquam impiis ipsorum doctrinis eonsentientem ealumniatur `, — contra quem Philalethen seripsi, — eapitulum ducentesimum tricesimum septimum subtraxit ` optimus iste, — forsan autem et ab alio illud desumpsit, — et in lamentabili suo libello sibimet contradieendo apposuit partem eius. Istud autem eapitulum integrum reperitur in libro nono operis de adoratione in spiritu, sieque se habet: CvgiurLus: «Non igitur aequabit divinitatis excellentiam humanitas, multum enim: abest\*. Itaque nobis similis faetus et intellectus dicebat: « Pater meus maior me est », quamvis seeundum naturam divinitatis aequalis sit et excellentia \* genitoris sui minime inferior. Celsitudo vero eolumnae decemeubitalis; perfectus enim est Christus in omnibus sublimitatibus divinitatis: porro wf perfectionis signum assumitur in divina Seriptura numerus qui ad decem pertingit. Aureum autem caput habet columna, rursusque eorpus aureum: sublimis enim naturae habitatione ditatur id, quod ex Virgine est, templum; symbolum autem divinitatis est aurum, quod supremam habet sublimitatem, aurum dico seeundum talem materiam. Ex argento autem et ex duobus est basis: splendidus enim et clarus est Christus in terra, iuxta verbum: « Deus Dominus et illuxit nobis ` », et velut duplex est cognitio eius: eoneipitur enim simul Deus et homo. Hoc enim puto esse ió duplieem et ex argento habere basim \*. » E quibus postquam partem, ut dixi, posuit Grammatieus, et id quidem perverse, neque servando dispositionem et ordinem sermonis Doctoris, sieut auditione ad ipsum pervenit, quin illam aeeurato studio proeessus et cohaerentiae operum emendaret, gaudet et laetatur, atque prae voluptate accedit ad scribendum haee: GRAMMATICUS: « Vides: docet duplicem esse Christo cognitionem, quatenus intelligitur Deus et homo. Attamen nos contemnunt, magnoque impietatis risu rident et diphysitas 8 voeant isti impugnatores oeconomiae Christi. Porro illos fugit nobis suavius esse eum Cyrillo saepe reponi. » Et quis adversus eos, qui tam absurde gaudent in iis, quae!Iste liber tum graece, tum syriaee servatur, sed ineditus manet. Cfr SANDA, op. cit., p. 4. — ° Ad verbum vertit, sed male intellexit interpres formulam graecam: zo0ÀAoU ye xoi Oei. — ° 108., xiv, 28. — \* Psalm. oxvi, 27. — 5 P. Gr., LXVIII, 636. — ° Loeum non repperi. | in the book which calumniates Saint Cyril as consenting to their impious doctrines — against whom Philalethes wrote — he removed chapter two hundred and thirty-seven, that excellent man — perhaps he took it from another — and in his lamentable little book, contradicting himself, he appended part of it. That chapter in full is found in the ninth book of the work On Worship in Spirit, and it runs thus:  Cyril: «Humanity will therefore not equal the excellence of divinity; far from it. Thus, having become like us and in his understanding, he said: “My Father is greater than I,” although according to the nature of divinity he is equal and in no respect inferior in excellence to his Father. The loftiness, however, is that of the tenfold column; for Christ is perfect in all the sublimities of divinity: moreover, as a sign of perfection the number which reaches ten is assumed in divine Scripture. The column has a golden head and likewise a golden body: for that which is from the Virgin, the temple, is enriched by the habitation of a sublime nature; and gold is the symbol of divinity, which has the highest sublimity — I mean gold according to such a material. The base, however, is of silver and of two [parts]: for Christ is splendid and clear on earth, according to the word, “The Lord God hath shined upon us,” and his knowledge is as it were twofold: for he is conceived both God and man. For I think this is to be twofold and to have a base of silver.»  After the Grammaticus, as I said, had set down a part of these — and indeed perversely, not preserving the disposition and order of the Doctor’s discourse as it came to the hearer, nor correcting it by careful study for the sequence and coherence of the works — he rejoices and exults, and, overcome by delight, proceeds to write these things:  GRAMMATICUS: «You see: he teaches that the knowledge of Christ is twofold, insofar as he is understood as God and as man. Yet they despise us, and with a great laugh of impiety they mock and call “dyophysites” those attackers of the economy of Christ. Moreover, it seems pleasanter to them that he be often referred to Cyril.»  And who is against those who so absurdly rejoice in these things? This book is preserved both in Greek and in Syriac, but remains unpublished. |