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*CAPUT VICESIMUM ALTERUM*

CHAPTER 22

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| Quod etiam in iis, quae ad Nephalium scripsi, apte usus sum exem medici; et quod quasi per concessionem permittere voces contradicentium et eos propriis eorum vocibus ad veritatem adducere, non cladis est, ut putavit iste simul impius et indoctus, sed sine controversia ingentis est victoriae. At ego, hanc vigilantem et prudentem sollicitudinem eximiorum doctorum seetatus, dixi, in illis orationibus, quas ad Nephalium seripsi: « Etiamsi haee sententia: « In duabus naturis indiv nonnullis ex antiquioribus doctoribus Ecclesiae, imo vel ab ipso Cyrillo, attamen 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 a» Nee quisquam dicendo 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 doctoribus v duarum naturarum faetam esse coniunctionem, SYR. | Which I also appropriately used in those things which I wrote to Nephalium, by the example of a physician; and that to allow, as if by concession, the words of those who contradict, and to lead them with their own voices to the truth, is not a defeat, as that man, both impious and unlearned, supposed, but without question is the victory of a great matter. But I, having followed this vigilant and prudent solicitude of the eminent doctors, said in those discourses which I wrote to Nephalium: "Even if this opinion — that in two natures (as indivisible) — is found in some of the older doctors of the Church, indeed even ascribed to Cyril himself, nevertheless the statement 'Christ suffered in the nature of his humanity,' rightly spoken by the orthodox, Cyril forbid when rising up against those who laboured under the sickness of division; nor was any [such allowance] thus left to those who met at Chalcedon. And no one, by saying that some among the ancients had uttered that very opinion, where once the blessed Cyril, taking a middle course and attentive to the disease, established a prohibition attacking that very malady, ..." If, however, none of the earlier doctors thought the union of the two natures to be a blending, |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| plo iduis subsistit Christus post unionem » dieta fuerit a postea reiecta fuit, quemadmodum et pologiae modus, definientibus in duabus naturis individuis Christum cognosci. posset patroeinium eorum suseipere idetur dixisse in duabus naturis individuis subsistere Christum, omnes autem docuerunt id autem, quod | — Christ subsists after the union. What had been said was afterward rejected, as was also the theological mode which defined that Christ is to be known in two individual natures. Their patronage might undertake it, that is to say, to affirm that Christ subsists in two individual natures; but all taught, however, that... |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| — D — νι, 1 9.— l p. 3. ex ea effectum est, unum esse ex duobus, non vero duo, \* — sieut et divus Iulius dixit: IunrUs: « Proelamatur autem in eo hoe qu subsistente'», — quomodo extremae dementiae erimine rei non erunt ii, qui voees eorum indocte proferunt et dieunt: « En patres dixerunt hoe qu autem creatum; ergo in duabus naturis dicimus subsistere unum facta est; duo enim sunt illa, nam unio ex duobus vel ex fit. Ergo addite etiam termiaum unionis, item cum Julio dicentes: « Una natura ex utraque parte subsistente ». Nolite ergo dicere duas naturas Equ duo sunt; at Audivimus enim et sanctum Cyrillum exem similis adduxisse, dicendo: CyYRILLUS: « Proinde iliae duae matrae lam 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 Grammatico in indoeto et impio libelio suo illam etiam addueere et reprehendere. Seribitur autem sic: PATRIARCHAE verba, ex orationtbus an NEPHALIUM: « Neque mihi iterum dieas hae voee duarum naturarum nonnullos ex patribus usos esse; non enim eG usi sunt vestro sensu, etiamsi hoe assertioni eoneedamus. p.4. Tem in ecclesiis grassante, nam ad morbos remedia. Ergo non sanetum.Cyrillum proferri, qui eontra morbum ingruentem remedium invenit; imo, antea dictae. | From this it was inferred that there is one from two, not truly two. Just as the divine Julius said: “But in him is proclaimed that which subsists.” How extreme will be the madness of those who ignorantly utter and say their words: “Behold, the fathers said that which is created; therefore we say that one made thing subsists in two natures; for those two are there, since the union is either from two or is made from two.” Therefore also add the term “union,” likewise saying with Julius: “One nature subsisting from each side.” Do not therefore say two natures… For we have also heard that even Saint Cyril advanced something similar, saying: “Therefore those two mothers are no longer two, but each is fulfilled as one living being.” Thus the Fathers made mention of the union of the two natures, but they say that he who subsists from it is one of the two, not two. But from those things which I wrote concerning Nephalium I have only now made mention of that part; I will bring it forward into the open; for it pleased the Grammarian to add it and to reprehend it in his ignorant and impious little pamphlet. It is written thus: the words of the PATRIARCH, from the orations of NEPHALIUM: “Nor again should you tell me that these expressions ‘two natures’ were used by some of the fathers; for I did not employ them in your sense, even if we concede this assertion.” Since the disease was raging in the churches, for remedies are for illnesses, it is not fitting to produce Cyril as one who found a cure against the advancing disease; indeed, those things were said before. |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| idem esse creatum in unione inereati, ilud autem ineveatum in coniunctione ereati, una natura ex utraque parte idem esse inereatum in Christo, illud pluribus post unionem. idem ea, quae coniuncta sunt id, quod effeetum est, unum est ex duobus. plum hominis nostri pore enim saneti Cyrilli, \* morbo vaniloquiorum Nestorii plerumque vox reieeta est possunt voces aliorum Patrum, si reperiantur, — tanquam coniectura rursus hoc dieo, — adversus plus dico: etiamsi ipsius Cyrilli sint voces idam medieus, exitiali potum prohibeat potest aliquis, in medium progredie..s, dieere ad illum: En mediei patrum nostrorum aquae potum »ermittebant, imo tu ipse,! H.. LIETZMANN, Apollinaris von Laodices, i. I, p. 187. — \* P. Gr.,. | the same — to be created in the indwelling union; but that — to be assumed in the conjunction of the created; one nature from either side the same to be present in Christ; that more pertains to what is after the union. The same: those things which are joined — that which has been effected — the one is from the two. For the greater part of our passage from Saint Cyril, because of the malady of Nestorius’s idle talk the phrase has generally been rejected; the words of other Fathers can be produced, if they are found — I say this again as a conjecture — against which I add: even if Cyril’s own words are the same, someone might forbid them as a destructive draught; coming forward into the open one might say to him: “Behold, the practice of our fathers allowed such a thing; indeed you yourself …” |
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| Original | Translation |
| Neque enim si eximius qu morbo aliquam eivitatem invadenis, aquae LXXVII, 245, qe. anno proxime praecedente, non interdicebas ne aquam biberemus. Iure enim diceret ad illum: Stulte! Ergo non v bum, euius eausa bibentibus aquam damnum acc bona valetudine vis pernieiosae conditioni normam constituere '? » | His autem addit optimus iste et ait: GRAMMATICUS: « Haec revera sunt verba stulti. Etenim, quasi qui prophetieum charisma sortitus est, imo quasi qui omnium cogitationes serutatur, ecce iam loquitur, dicens: « Etiamsi Patres usi sint voce duarum naturarum, non tamen sicut vos eam: adhibuerunt. Il enim sine reprehensione; vos autem dolose ea voce utimini.» Et deinde impudenter decertans, in mendacio extollitur: « etiamsi verbo hoe concedamus»: non enim eoncessit, ut ostendimus, sed invite et valde coactus confessus est \*.» Vehementer qu o bone, eum locum Ambrosii per fictionem mutasti et cetera im PRO naturas subsistere indivise esse naturam Fili inearnatam, haee etiam ausus es impudentissime, sed prorsus r ex eonari ostendere duas naturas subsistentes, et ev » At reprehendit amentiam tuam pro unionem indivise'?», quam etiam ostendit eximius Cyrillus adversari iis, qui dieunt unam esse naturam Filii incarnatam. Iuste ergo, Gr., LXXXIX, 109 et 280. — "Locum non repperi. — \* — \* — \* ^ p. ὃ. | For neither, even if you had been seized by some notable illness, did you forbid that we should drink water. For one would rightly say to him: "Fool! Are you then saying that, on his account, drinking water does harm, and that the pernicious force of that condition establishes a rule contrary to good health?" Moreover that excellent man adds and says: The GRAMMARIAN: "These truly are the words of a fool. For, as if he had received a prophetic gift, nay as if he searched out the thoughts of all, behold he now speaks, saying: 'Even if the Fathers used the phrase "two natures," yet not as you have applied it. For they used it without reproach; but you deceitfully make use of that word.' And then, contesting shamelessly, he exalts himself in falsehood: 'even if we concede this word' — for he did not concede it, as we have shown, but unwillingly and under great compulsion he confessed." But, good sir, you have violently altered that passage of Ambrose by fiction and the like, imposing that "the nature subsisting in the Son" be the indivisible incarnate nature of the Son; this you also dared most impudently, yet utterly in order to set forth two subsisting natures. And he reproves your madness about the indivisible union, which the distinguished Cyril likewise demonstrates against those who say that the Son incarnate is one nature. Rightly, therefore. "I did not find the passage." |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| ides mor-. idit, sed ex plerumque idem et strenue ostendisti \* id, quod tibi placet ple excogitasti, sieut disputatio ostendit et iterum ostendet. POSITIO HAERETICORUM: « Quomodo non eoneedemus duas Postquam autem e tenebricoso ‘tuo libello sustulisti propositionem, quae immundissimam sententiam ineruditione notat: post unionem "ἢ », — quam sapientissimus Cyrillus ut pollutam reiecit, dicens: CyrILLUS: « Adversatur iterum nihilo minus propositio iis, qui dieunt unam idque ineptum volentes ostendere, ubique eonantur duas naturas subsistentes ostendere ‘ » idicule plicare et seribere: GRAMMATICUS: « Dieit enim eos ubique identer inteiltgit naturas separatas". positio quam abscidisti, quae clamat: PROPOSITIO HAERETICORUM: « Quomodo non concedemus duas naturas subsistere post postquam ea, quae oeulis omnium proponuntur, abscidisti et tenebras sacrilegi furti cireum te eonsiituisti, me in-! De textu graeco loci cfr P. P. Gr., LXXVII, 244. Ibid., 245, — \*-Locum aon repperi. P. Gr, LXXVII, 244 | You spoke harshly, but for the most part you showed the same thing vigorously: that which pleases you you have contrived, as the disputation shows and will show again. POSITION OF THE HERETICS: "How can we not concede two..." But after you lifted from your obscure little booklet a proposition which marks the most filthy opinion by ignorance: after the conjunction "ἢ" — which the most wise Cyril rejected as polluted, saying: CYRIL: "Nevertheless the proposition opposes those who say one, and, wishing to show this absurdly, everywhere strive to show two subsisting natures." To mock and write: GRAMMARIAN: "For he says that they everywhere identically understand separate natures." The position which you cut off, which cries out: PROPOSITION OF THE HERETICS: "How can we not concede that two natures subsist after..." After you cut off those things which are proposed to the eyes of all, and set around you the darkness of sacrilegious theft, you placed yourself, me in—! Concerning the Greek text of the passage, see P. P. Gr., LXXVII, 244. Ibid., 245, — \*I have not found the place. P. Gr., LXXVII, 244 |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| p. 6. p. 7. 4 — sanire dicis, quemadmodum aliquis, in s Si enim ipsam pro eos, qui dieunt, sieut tu dicis, indiv et de illis dixisse eos prorsus supervacaneo asserere Christum «natura humanitatis » passum esse \* eisque interdixisse, medieinae causa, hae formula quae sane et absque malo sensu ab orthodoxis usurpabatur, ita ut dicerent: « Christus carne passus est», sieut Scriptura inspirata dixit'. Tu vero dicis mihi me, tanquam prophetieum charisma sortitum, putare me cogitationes tuas clare percipere, et confirmas a me antea aperte dieta, quae amentia censes, ut Forsitan etiam iusiurandum tibi deferetur ut iuratus suadeas te non mala mente vel dolo dicere Christum in duabus naturis indiv At neque prophetia indigeo, qua abseondita v Dicit enim sacra Seriptura: « Divinatio in labiis regis; in iudicio autem non errabit os eius\*.» Regem autem ex censebitur a recto declinare: ipse protulit iudieium absque errore et dixit eos, qui dieunt indiv unam confitentur esse naturam Filii inearnatam, eosque valde dolose et supervacaneo legitimam vocem ab orthodoxis bene usurpatam dicere, scilicet « natura humanitatis» et non Nonne ergo, Doetor, quisquis asserit aliquem ex Patribus, vel ipsum Cyrillum dixisse in natura humanitatis passum esse Christum, velut ad defensionem eorum, qui in duabus naturis confitentur illum subsistere et supervaeaneo dieunt in natura humanitatis illum passum, manifeste deprehenditur sedulae prohibitioni medici repugnans? Ipse enim dixit de iis, qui eontra ipsum di-! Cfr I PETR,, tv, 1. | You call me mad, as one might. For if he himself, concerning those who say, as you say, that they confess one nature of the Son incarnate, had said of them that they utterly and needlessly assert that Christ “suffered in the nature of humanity,” and had forbidden them, for the sake of remedy, those formulas which indeed were used by the orthodox without bad sense, so that they said, “Christ suffered in the flesh,” as the inspired Scripture says. But you tell me that, as if endowed with a prophetic charisma, I suppose I clearly perceive your thoughts, and you affirm that I previously openly declared to you the things which you deem madness, so that perhaps even an oath might be laid before you that, sworn, you might urge that you do not, with evil mind or deceit, say that Christ is in two natures. Nor do I need prophecy, whereby hidden things … For sacred Scripture says: “Divination is in the lips of the king; in judgment his mouth will not err.” And the king is thought not to turn aside from what is right: he brought forth judgment without error and spoke of those who say that they confess one nature of the Son incarnate, and most deceitfully and gratuitously call the legitimate phrase well used by the orthodox, namely “the nature of humanity,” and not … Therefore, Doctor, whoever asserts that some one of the Fathers, or even Cyril himself, said that Christ “suffered in the nature of humanity,” as a defense of those who confess that he subsists in two natures and gratuitously say that “in the nature of humanity” he suffered, is manifestly caught contradicting the careful prohibition of the physician? For he himself said of those who are against him di—! Cf. 1 Peter 4:1. |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| plendenti meridie palpebras suas claudens et voluntate sua in tenebris positus, putabit ceteros quoque non videre solem lucentem. positionem non abscidisses, animadvertisses adversus post unionem in duabus naturis — iduis Christum subsistere, sanetum Cyrillum exsurrexisse pote destituta argumento rerum. iduis subsistere post unionem. ideam, neque investigatione eirea tuas eogitationes. plieationis dogmatum si quis sapientissimum Cyrillum dixerit, non post unionem in duabus naturis iduis subsistere Christum, adversari et repugnare iis, qui potius « earne » ut dieitur in Seriptura divinitus inspirata, Christum esse passum. postquam illam prohibitionem constituit sapiens | Closing his eyelids against the shining midday and, by his own will, placing himself in darkness, he will think that the others also do not see the shining sun. If you had not cut off the argument, you would have noticed that, against the proposition “after the union in two natures — that is, that Christ subsists,” Saint Cyril had arisen, though deprived of the support of the facts. Nor would your reflections be confirmed by an investigation of those matters. If anyone should say, in the exposition of dogmas, that the most wise Cyril taught that Christ does not subsist in two natures after the union, he stands opposed to and contradicts those who rather, as is said in the divinely inspired Scripture, affirm that Christ suffered. After that the wise man established that prohibition. |
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| Original | Translation |
| — 2 Prov, XVI, 10, ἰδ a = — cebant: « Quomodo non concedemus duas naturas subsistere unionem indivise'1»: CyrILLus: « Valde supervacaneo ergo dieunt Christum natura humanitatis passum esse, quasi illam a Verbo removeant et proprie seduo intelligantur et non iam unum inearnatum et inhumanatum, illud ex Deo Patre Verbum \*. » Igitur, qui advocatus fit eorum, qui in duabus qu eonfitentur, supervacaneo autem dieunt eum « natura humanitatis » passum, et in medium profert testimonia antiquorum doetorum, quae dieunt Christum « natura humanitatis» passum esse, — quod sanctus Cyrillus decrevit minime dicendum, cum vellet eohibere morbum eorum, qui impie confitentur Christum in duabus naturis subsistere et intelligi, — audiet, et valde recte, ipsum vesaniae morbum medico im ipsius vocis, quam ante morbum et ipse dicebat et qui ante ipsum fuerunt doetores et medici. Itaque ego quoque, ad Nephalium verbum faeiens et volens superabundanter devincere contradietorem, concessionis figura usus sum atque dixi: « Demus τὸ dieere in duabus naturis indiv ab ipso antea dietum esse. \* Numqu hae ipsa formula, quia ante morbum tum is, qui eam prohibuit, ea utebatur, tum ceteri quoque doctores et medici? Minime! Audiret enim iste vis morb » 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 qu Gr., LX XVII, 244. = 2 Jb — \*Conicio interpretem graece legisse: συγχωροῦσι τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ. p». 8. | — 2 Prov., XVI, 10, ἰδᾶ = — they said: "How should we not concede that two natures subsist in the indivisible union?" Cyril: "They therefore say very superfluously that Christ suffered according to the nature of humanity, as if they were removing that nature from the Word and understanding it as something proper and separate, and no longer that one incarnate and God‑bearing Word which is from God the Father." Therefore he who becomes the advocate of those who confess in two natures, but nevertheless say superfluously that "the nature of humanity" suffered, and brings forward the testimonies of the ancient doctors which say that Christ suffered "according to the nature of humanity" — which Saint Cyril judged should by no means be said, since he wished to restrain the disease of those who impiously confess Christ to subsist and be understood in two natures — will hear, and very rightly, the very disease of madness in the voice of the man himself, which he used even before the disease and which those before him were doctors and physicians. Accordingly I too, making use of the word Nephalium and wishing more abundantly to overcome the opponent, made use of the figure of concession and said: "Let us grant that τὸ [the saying] that in two natures indivisible had been said by him before." Would that very formula, because before the disease both he who forbade it used it and likewise the other doctors and physicians used it, therefore be excused? Not at all! For one would hear the force of the disease... = 2 Jb — \*I conjecture that the interpreter read in Greek: συγχωροῦσι τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ. p. 8. |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| post ponant, ut. idem naturis individuis post unionem Christum subsistere impie posuisse prohibitionem iduis Christum subsistere, etiam ab antiquioribus, imo et Ponamus autem Cyrillum, cum adversus morbum sectatorum Nestorii pugnaret, hane ipsam formulam prohibuisse, mediei instar, qui vetat exitiali morbo oppressos bibere aquam. id ergo reete diceret quis, post id, quod reete quoad exemplum et imaginem aquae dixi: « Stulte! Ergo non vides morbum, cuius causa bibentibus aquam damnum aeeidit, sed ex bona valetudine idam eonditionem ordinare. idem infirmitati indulgent? atque optata quaedam aegrotantibus saepe! P. id., 245. | Let them suppose, then, that it was impious to assert that Christ subsists in the individual natures after the union; that the prohibition on saying that Christ subsists in the two natures even came from the ancients, nay even. But suppose that Cyril, when he was fighting against the malady of the followers of Nestorius, had forbidden this very formula, like a physician who forbids those stricken by a deadly disease to drink water. Who, then, would rightly say this, after that which I have rightly said concerning the example and image of water: “Fool! Do you not see the disease, on account of which drinking water brings harm to those who drink, and yet would, out of good health, prescribe the same regimen? Would you indulge the same infirmity? And do you often grant certain desired things to the sick?” |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| p. 9. p. 10. ας concedunt, modo autem ad accuratam sanitatis custodiam eos extollunt, — sieut sanetus Cyrillus feeit quoad Orientales, — indieavit rerum divinarum peritus Athanasius, qui in a pro Dionysio haee seripsit: ATHANASIUS: « Non autem o aliquis ea, quae per oeconomiam scribuntur aut fiunt, mala mente aeeipiat et ad propriam malam voluntatem detorqueat. Nam et medieus saepe ea remedia, quae aliquibus non v eongrua, vulneri nonnullorum, ut ipse novit, adhibet, nullum alium ae sanitatem scopum habens. Sapientis quoque magistri scopus hie est, ut nempe \* pro ratione mentium eorum, qui instituuntur, doceat atque loquatur, donee eos ad perfectionis viam traduxerit '. » Hae autem figura concessionis solent doctores uti atque velut in agone superabundanter adversarium devineere. Cum enim lamentabiles Arii auxiliarii stulte et blasphemo sensu nomen «Pater» dieerept et vim ei adhiberent ad ostendendum illud esse designationem actionis, ita ut Pater intelligeretur agens, et Filius propterea effectus et ereatus, non vero Gregorius Theologus, resolvit, ostenditque nomen « Pater » significativum esse verae et naturalis cognationis gignentis ad genitum, minime vero actionis, usus est etiam figura concessionis sieque perrexit: GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS: « Sit autem, si aetionis; ne sie qu erit Pater consubstantiale, etsi alioqui absurda est huiusmodi actionis opinio. V Cum autem Gregorius hoe "ined et ex abundanti usus sit figura concessionis, et concesserit opus, et ad eladem abscondendam hoe adiungere: GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS: « etsi alioqui absurda \*est huiusmodi actionis ορ]- nio» | p. 9. p. 10. They concede, but only exalt them for the careful preservation of health — as Saint Cyril did with regard to the Orientals — so declared Athanasius, expert in divine matters, who wrote this in his work on Dionysius: ATHANASIUS: “Let no one, however, receive in a bad spirit those things which are written or done according to economy and pervert them to his own evil will. For the physician often applies remedies which are not suitable to some, to the wounds of certain persons, as he himself knows, having no other aim than health. Moreover the aim of the wise teacher is this, namely to teach and speak according to the capacity of the minds of those who are being instructed, until he has led them onto the road of perfection.” These figures of concession doctors are accustomed to use, and, as it were, to overwhelm the adversary abundantly in debate. For when the lamentable auxiliaries of Arius foolishly and with blasphemous sense seized on the name “Father” and forced it into service to show that it was a designation of action — so that the Father would be understood as the agent, and the Son therefore as the effect and the created — Gregory the Theologian did not accept this; he resolved and showed that the name “Father” is significant of the true and natural relationship of the begetter to the begotten, and by no means of action. He also made use of the figure of concession and proceeded thus: GREGORY NAZIANZENUS: “Let it be, then, if [you will], of action; nor will he be Father consubstantial, although otherwise the opinion of such an action is absurd.” When Gregory sometimes, and even abundantly, used the figure of concession, and conceded the point, and in order to veil the same added this: GREGORY NAZIANZENUS: “although otherwise the opinion of such an action is absurd …” |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| pologia portet identur potius vera proles postquam hoe absurdum et dolosum impietatis eonamen, in prima oratione de Filio, reprehendit atque placeat, « Pater» nomen idem nos devineetis, sed hoe ipsum operatus ides quomodo, dum malitiose decertare vultis, eaptiones vestras effugiamus \*. postulationem adversarii, dixeritque: « Sit nomen «Pater» significativum aetionis, si placeat », poteritne aliquis ipsi verbo vim adhibere et temere contendendo asserere Gregorium dare Filium esse non prolem sed ide- P. Gr., XXV, 488. — \* P. Gr, XXXVI, 96. | The apologist will rather maintain that the true offspring—since in his first Oration On the Son he reproves and rejects this absurd and deceitful epithet of impiety—calls the same name "Father" of God; but as to how this very thing operates, while you maliciously wish to contend, let us evade your traps. If, in answer to the opponent’s demand, he should say, "Let the name 'Father' be significant of origin, if you please," can anyone attach force to the word itself and, by rash contention, assert that Gregory intends the Son to be not a progeny but an idea— |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| , eumque, qui per concessionem dedit, quasi devictum irr αι ο re et tuas, o Grammatice, voeulas usurpare: «Non enim eoneessit, sed invite et valde coactus confessus cst. Ita. enim val eum, qui figuram verbi per concessionem prolati assensionem, de5 ditionem et defectionem esse diceret; inspieeret autem quomodo quaestionem adversariorum prius diluisset et val solvisset sicque ex abundanti concessionis figura usus esset. Scito ergo, egregie Grammatice, me quoque, in duabus orationibus quas ad Nephalium seripsi, 40 Patrum ab eo demonstrata in medium protulissem, et ostendissem quomodo dieta essent et doceant, ex abundanti qu 15 At sapiens Cyrillus, nestorianae dualitati omnem aditum praeeludens et morbum cohibere studens, illud prohibuit. Et add 20 definierunt. Non enim reperiantur, — rursus per eoneessionem dico, — adversus sanctum Cyrilum proferri, qui grassanti morbo remedium invenit \*. CAPUT VICESIMUM TERTIUM \* p. 11, Confirmatur reete me dixisse non o tum vocemus du nominemus inexpiieabilem unionem divinae ceconomiae. Reprehensio quoqne eompendiosa eorum, qui machinantur ut in duabus substantiis 30 definiatur Christus. Perop! | , and him who gave it by concession, as though conquered, to appropriate even your words, O Grammarian: "For he did not concede, but unwilling and very much forced he confessed." For that would indeed hold for him who would say that the figure of the word, by the concession of one who had uttered assent, was surrender and defection; he might, however, consider how he would first have dissolved the question of his adversaries and then have resolved it, and thus would have used the figure of concession out of abundance. Know therefore, excellent Grammarian, that I too, in the two addresses which I wrote to Nephalius, had brought forward into the open what the Fathers had demonstrated through him, and had shown how they were spoken and taught, from the abundant... But the wise Cyril, shutting off every approach to Nestorian duality and striving to check the malady, forbade that. And they added: they defined. For they will not be found—again, I say, by concession—to be urged against Saint Cyril, who found a remedy for the raging disease. CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE It is rightly confirmed that I said: let us not then call it two, nor name the inexpiable union of the divine economy. Likewise a brief reprimand of those who contrive that Christ be defined in two substances. Enough! |

## Footnotes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Original | Translation |
| ida veritas ut etiam ab adversariis agnoscatur'»? At nemo attenderet potius ide postquam omnia effata potius sententiam impietatis impugnarent, quippe quae unum ex duobus Christum confiteri idem figura concessionis usum esse atque dixisse: Demus τὸ dieere in duabus naturis unum Christum post mexplicabilem unionem ab omnibus antiquioribus doctoribus dietum esse. idi ne sie quidem veniam esse iis, qui prohibitionem contempserunt et in duabus naturis unum Christum possunt verba ceterorum Petrum, si quae poriere, post inania Nestorii ver25 ba et cautiones sancti Cyrilli adversus impietatem atque eius prohibitiones voeum, dicamus Dei Verbum hominem assumpsisse, vel Chris. plieem aut hominem deiferum, vel coniunctionem portune autem cetera quoque apponemus, quae ab indoeto Grammatico vituperata sunt, et ostendunt simul ignorantiam eius et impietatem et ineruditionem et imperitiam saera. P. Gr, LXXXIX, 135. | Is the truth such that it is acknowledged even by adversaries? But no one would rather heed that, since after they had said everything they instead attacked the sentence of impiety, for those things — that to confess Christ as one of two — had been used in the same figure of concession and had been spoken. Let us grant τὸ dieere that “one Christ in two natures after the inexplicable union” has been declared by all the earlier doctors. Even so there would be no pardon for those who scorned the prohibition and, in speaking of “one Christ in two natures,” used the words of others; if anything arose, after the empty words of Nestorius and the warnings of Saint Cyril against impiety and his prohibitions, let us say that the Word of God assumed a man, or Christ a mere man, or a human person, or a conjunction — and we will properly add other things as well, which have been censured by the unlearned Grammaticus, and which at the same time show his ignorance and impiety and lack of learning and incompetence. |