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VITA AUCTORIS

James V. Zeitz, S.J. was born in Cleveland on March 21, 1940. He did his schooling in Cleveland and graduated from St. Ignatius High School in 1958. He entered Milford Novitiate in Milford Ohio in the same year. He completed his undergraduate work partially at Xavier University, Cincinnati, partially at University of Detroit by taking courses at Colombiere College, and partially at West Baden College where in 1963 he received his degree as Bachelor of Arts through Loyola University, Chicago. He entered Loyola Graduate School that same year.

At present he is teaching the Classics as well as French at the University of Detroit High School.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to present an edition, translation, and explanation of folios 225v-229 of Vatican Greek Codex #402.

The text is preceded by a general introduction to the section to be edited, an explanation of why this section was chosen, a general description of the whole codex, and finally some paleographical observations. The text itself is edited with critical apparatus and a translation. It is followed by an explanation of the text in the form of notae ad loca, four appendices on theological terms, and a conclusion.

I have chosen this section of this codex because it is, to the best of my knowledge and research, so far unedited, and involves subject matter which falls within my present capabilities, i.e. with regard to available research materials and background knowledge.

This thesis will be predominantly paleographical in scope. The commentary is meant merely to complement the translation.
DESCRIPTION OF VATICAN CODEX #402

Folios 225V-229 (which are here edited) are near the end of codex #402. The catalogue of the Vatican Greek manuscripts, Codices Vaticani Graeci,\(^1\) divides the whole codex into sections, numbered 1-10. It also lists the Greek enumeration of the individual works contained in the codex.

The part here edited consists of section 9 (CVG division, which includes one opusculum, με'), and the first three of eight opuscula included in section 10, i.e. με' - μγ'. These four opuscula form a natural group according to subject matter, since they all treat an aspect of Christology: με', entitled by CVG "de essentia, natura, genere, specie et forma"\(^2\) (sc. in Deo; cf. cod. Inc. Όσια και φύσις και γένος και εἷδος και μορφή ταύτων ἐστιν ἐπὶ θεσό); με' entitled "de assumpta carne sancta Christi;" με' entitled "quomodo anima Christi fuerit separata et divinitas non suffecerit pro anima;" μγ' "de duabus naturis Christi ac de ipsius hypostasi." As a matter of fact the grouping of CVG of με' - νβ' into section 10 seems arbitrary, since the last five of these

---

\(^1\) Codices Vaticani Graeci, II: Codices 330-603, recensuit R. Devresse, (Rome: Bibl. Vat., 1937). This basic work will be abbreviated to CVG in further references.

\(^2\) The titles of these short opuscula are those given in CVG. The format of small letters for listing works is adapted from CVG, which in turn uses small letters, wide-spaced, to quote the Latin translations of inscriptions found in the MS (usually in the upper margin of the MS page). Cf. CVG, introduction.
eight (namely, μη "de factis omnibus a Deo sive per beneplacitum,
sive per dispensationem," μθ "de sensu et phantasia," ν "de
desiderio," να "de anima sensitiva, vegetativa et rationali,"
νβ "de causa et quotupliciter causa") are only indirectly re-
lated to the first three.

After section 10, at the end of the manuscript, there are
three more folios (ff. 232-234) containing a chart for finding the
date of Easter by means of the solar and the lunar cycles, and a
nineteen year cycle with the inscription πασχάλιον τοῦ ἀγίου
Ἰω(άννου) τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ. Finally, after the end of the codex,
is added the Roman Creed found on a bronze plate in 1367-1368
which begins Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἑνα Θεόν πατέρα τῆς πάντων ἀρχῆς καὶ
αἰτίαν, δεσ. καὶ ὁσα ἐβεβαιούμεν καὶ ὁσα ἀνεθεμάτισαν, ἀναθεματίζο-
μεν.

The description of the first part of the codex given in CVG
begins as follows: "Anno 1383 [dated on folio 232], chartaceus,
mm. 217×145 . . . 21 lineae ad paginam." At the end of the
description of the contents (which we will take up below), follow
the observations of the Vatican reader: "Mense Martii 1383, ut
docet subscriptio f.232 . . . absolutus est liber . . . ." Thus
the present codex was composed by this time, and the information
about the date is useful only for establishing a terminus ante
quem. It does not however, establish any terminus post quem for
folios 225V-229, with which we are here concerned. An examination
of the content of the works themselves, along with a comparison
with some of the Apostolic Fathers and the rest of the codex,
1. The first section of the codex is a collection of short works by St. Athanasius, folios 1-100. The first of these (consisting of folios 3-31) is his "de sancta Trinitate dialogus I," (cf. Migne vol. 28, 1116-1157). At the base of the page on folio 31 is written "δεύτερος διάλογος τῆς αὐτῆς ἀπόδειξιν ἐχαν τῷ πρῶτῳ καὶ οτί τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγίου ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς ὡς ἀπὸ στόματος κατὰ τὸν Ἁγίον Κύριλλον." Folios 50-60 are the "dialogus II," which is divided into three sections (M.28, 1157-1184). Folios 60-80 are "dialogus III." At the base of folio 60 is: Διάλογος κατὰ Μακεδονίου τοῦ πνευματομάχου ἐν φ' ἀπόδειξις οτε θεός τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγίου καὶ ὀμοούσιον Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ (M.28, 1201-1249). Folios 80v-84 (numbered η) contain the "contra Macedonios dialogus II (M.28, 1329-1337), with the inscription: Διάλογος κατὰ Ἀπολιναρίου. ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Μακεδονιανὸν τὸν Ἀπολιναρίστῃν διαλέξως, and at the foot of folio 80v: ἀπόδειξις οτι προσελάβετο ο Χριστὸς σάρκα ἐννον τε καὶ ἐμψυχον. Folios 84-86 (η) contain an excerpt from a letter of Gregory Nazianzen to Cledonius (Epistola 101, M.37, 177b4-184b11). Folios 86-93 (θ[9]) contain "de Sancta Trinitate dialogus IV," called in the codex ἄτερος διάλογος πρὸς Ἀπολινάριον. (M.28, 1357-1265). Folios 93-101v (ι) contain "dialogus V," under the inscription: Ἀπολιναρίου ἀνακεφαλαίωσις καὶ πρὸς αὐτὰ ἀντίρρησις Γρηγορίου (M.28, 1265-1285).

2. Section two of the codex contains the following works of

---

3. Migne, Patrologiae Graecae Cursus Completus. (Paris: 1857). Abbreviated throughout this paper to M. along with the volume and page number, whenever the works in the codex correspond to those already edited by Migne. This is the abbreviation used by CVG.
St. Maximus Confessor: folios 101V-128 (ια') contain his "disputatio cum Pyrrho" (M.91, 288-353), described at the foot of 101V: ἀπόδειξις ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάσκει η θεία γραφή λέγειν δύο φύσεις καὶ δύο ἐνεργεῖας ἑκατέραν ἑκατέρας. Folios 128-129V contain ten short treatises on the Wills and Operations with Demonstrations of the Fathers.

3. In section three, various opuscula of Theodorus Abucara are found in folios 129V-178. (ιβ'-λζ'). Of these, the works which have as their subject matter the Trinity and the Incarnation are: "de sancta Trinitate," folios 148V-153; "de incarnatione Domini," folios 154V-161V; "de unione et incarnatione," folios 163V-167.

4. Section four includes folios 178-183V (λζ'), containing "Diadochi episcopi Photicensis visio."

5. This section (λζ'), added to the manuscript later without folio numbers, contains three excerpts "de tentatione s. Maximi," and one from "de tentatione Diadochi.

6,7. These sections consist of short works (folios 184-188V) of which the following are of interest because their subject matter is similar to the subject matter of the section here being edited. Folio 184 contains various excerpts on the divine essence and operation. Folio 184V contains a work of Athanasius which begins ὅταν τὰ πᾶντα ἐνεργῆται and ends καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Folios 184V-185 begin ἐνα Θεόν ἐν τρισὶ and ends καὶ δεδοξάσμα ἐν αὐτοῖς.

8. This final section before the one here being edited consists of folios 189-225 (μγ') and contains questions of St.
Athanasius to the leader of Antioch.

Sections nine and ten have been described above and are here being edited.

CVG (p.106) also gives the following facts on the physical condition of codex #402: it consists of 31 fascicles of four pages each (one has five). Each page is numbered. The original 24th fascicle has seven folios missing; the 25th is completely missing; and the 26th has four folios missing. The present 24th fascicle now consists of the remains of the above three fascicles (24th-26th): viz. folios 183-188, into which is inserted folio 184. The opusolun λή was easily lost, and the marking at folios 233V-234 was a later addition. The inscriptions of the opuscula and works, the numbers, and initial letters are written in red ink.

Concerning the history of the book, the following information appears at the foot of folio 2V: αὕτη ἡ βίβλος π(ατ)ριάρχης Μακαρίου (Constantinopolitaī an. 1376-1379; 1390-1391?)⁴ καὶ γράμματα αὐτοῦ ἀπεχαρίσθη δὲ αὕτη τῷ Ἀγάθωνι καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀνετέθη καὶ ἀφιερώθη τῇ σεβασμίᾳ μονῆ τοῦ πανευφημίου ἀποστόλου καὶ πρωτομάρτυρος Στεφάνου. This information tells us only that the book was bound together at this time and that a certain Agathon presented the book to the patriarch. Further information about Agathon and this monastery (τῇ σεβασμίᾳ μονῆ) of St. Stephan, protomartyr, is beyond the scope of this thesis.

On folio 35V is the sign ση΄ κατὰ λατīναν (in M.28, 1125b15). The occasion of this marking is the sentence Πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἐκπορεύεται, which is quoted by Athanasius in the opusculum "de sancta Trinitate, dialogus I." The same marking, ση΄, is also used frequently in the section here edited (folios 225V-229) to mark phrases or sentences of special importance. For example, 225V.18: ση΄ appears opposite the sentence τοῦ μὲν Πατρὸς ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ προερχόμενον. The codex was rebound with red leather in the 18th century. On the binding can be seen the coats of arms of Pius IX and of the librarian Angelo Cardinal Mai.
PALEOGRAPHICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE WRITING

Besides the information given in CVG about the text of the codex, some general observations of a paleographic nature about the section edited are necessary.

1) General character of the book hand: The whole of the manuscript is written in a minuscule hand. Most of the individual letters have at least one, sometimes two or three variations. A chart follows which gives an approximation of each letter and its variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>α, κ, λ, λ, λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>β, ε, θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Γ, Π, χ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ, Π, Λ, Λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ε, ε, τ, ε, ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>ζ, ζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Η</td>
<td>η, η, η, η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>θ, θ, θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>κ, κ, κ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>λ, λ, λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>μ, μ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Majuscule letters and other markings: The title of each opusculum is written in red at the top of the page on which the opusculum begins. New opuscula start with a majuscule letter in red and are numbered in the margin. Only the first opusculum μεέμε of this section is projected into the margin to show the beginning of a new paragraph. The others start inside the line. The presence of other marginal notations, e.g. η[η] and the words ερως(ηζος) and λυσ(ηζος) opposite μεέμε is noted in the critical apparatus which accompanies the Greek text.

3) Contractions, abbreviations, and cursive forms: Contractions and abbreviations are used in the following cases - a) The divine names, e.g. θεό, πηρ, νυν, χείρ, προς b) άνίων c) ούρων (e.g. 226V.5). These employ the conventional method of placing a vertical line over the contracted word: θεό, θεύ, ξυ, χυ, χφ, Πνευμ, Πνομ, άνίων, plus the other inflections of these. The following abbreviations and symbols are formed: in the case of μεν, or -μεν the contraction, Μεν, frequently appears; the ending μεν is often omitted altogether. Πατε is written Πατη; the combination Πα is frequently γι. αί=εν; γ=ου. Ligatures are found: φες; φ=στ; γ=γι. The following cursive forms are found: η=ιν; η=ις; ορ=εως.

There is little distinction between abbreviated and cursive forms. Cf. alphabet chart above.

4) Accents: the text is fully accented with acute, grave, and circumflex accents. The diacritical mark ("), a diaeresis, appears over all upsilons and iotas. The use of acute and grave accents is nearly in conformity with our present system. The accents are frequently written in a continuous stroke with the
vowel over which they stand, for example Ὕ, ὑ. Accents seem to be included even when symbols or abbreviations are used (for example, the stroke over the abbreviated divine names (→), and the abbreviation for ὠν in -τὸν. Breathings are conventional.

5) The punctuation (commas, raised points, periods—the latter two are difficult to distinguish) observes the following rules:

a) Raised dots (or possibly periods) occur:
   i) in most clauses of contrast if each of two contrasted clauses contains a finite verb or a verb of being.
   ii) at the beginning of subordinate clauses of purpose which come after the main clause.
   iii) at the beginning and end of the second in a series of two subordinate noun clauses.
   iv) before a clause beginning with καὶ when ἔστι could be inserted (i.e. in adjective or predicate complements, whether the complement be a noun or participle).
   v) at the beginning of a dependent clause which begins with the contrastive ἀλλά.

b) Commas occur:
   i) when it is necessary to divide a conditional clause or a circumstantial clause from the conclusion.
   ii) after ἔστι before a noun clause which is an adjective or predicate complement.
   iii) when it is necessary to divide two parallel adjectival clauses (e.g. 226.20 τοιοῦτος ἔστι, οἷος).
iv) when it is necessary to divide two parallel adverbial clauses.

The Greek text follows, along with the translation at the bottom of each page. Critical footnotes for the Greek text, as well as notes on the translation have been put at the bottom of each Greek-English page for convenience.
225V. Περὶ οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως καὶ γένους καὶ εἴδους καὶ μορφῆς ταύτων ἐστιν ἐπὶ θεοῦ κατὰ τοὺς θείους πατέρας. ὑπόστασις δὲ πάλιν καὶ πρόσωπον καὶ χαράκτηρ καὶ ἰδιότης καὶ ἄτομον τὸ αὐτό. καὶ φύσις μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ κοινῶς κατὰ πάντα τῶν ὑποκειμένων λεγόμενον καὶ ἐπίσης ἐαυτοῦ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις μεταξύ διδοῦν

Substance, Nature, Genus, Species, and Form

Substance, nature, genus, species, and form are the same in God according to the divine Fathers. Also hypostasis, person, image, property, and individuality are the same. Nature is that which is predicated commonly of all the constituent elements, and that which communicates something of

1The marginal numbering is according to the MS. The numbers, such as 225, 226, refer to a new folio page; while 225V, 226V, etc. refer to the back of the folio page, i.e. the verso. The lines of the Greek text are divided as they appear in the MS.

The textual apparatus for the Greek text will appear after any footnotes on the English and will be listed according to MS. page and line.

225V.2: marginalia: μοι (44) a sinistra.
καθὸ καὶ μίας φύσεως/πάντες ἀν(θρώποι) λεγονται. ὑπόστασις δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ἰδιαζόντως καὶ/καθ’ ἐαυτὸ ὑφεστῶς καὶ διαιρεσίν χωρὶς διαφορὰς μὴ ἐπιδεχόμεθα/μ(εν)ον. ἡ μ(ὲν) γὰρ φύσις καὶ τὸ εἴδος διαιρεῖται εἰς τὰ ὑποκείμενα ἄτομα. ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις τὸ ἀδιαιρετὸν ἔχει, διὸ καὶ ἄτομον λέγεται/ὡς περ καὶ ὅλον καὶ πρόσωπον καὶ ἰδιότης καὶ χα/ρακτήρ. τούτ(αν) οὔτως ἐχόντ(αν), ἵστεον ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς θεότητος/μίαν φύσιν λέγομεν(εν), μίαν οὐσίαν, καὶ μορφὴν μίαν, καὶ γένος, καὶ εἴδος. ὑποστάσεις δὲ τρεῖς, καὶ πρόσωπα, καὶ χαρακτῆρα, ἄτομα τε καὶ ἰδιότητας. π(ατέ)ρα

itself to the constituent elements. This is why all men are said to be of one nature. Hypostasis is that which exists distinctively and by itself and does not admit of division without destruction. Nature and species can be divided into their constituent elements, but hypostasis has an indivisible quality. For this reason it is called an element as well as a whole, person, property, and image. Since these are our definitions we must now see how, with regard to the divinity, we speak of one nature, one substance, and one form, as well as genus and species, but three hypostases, persons, images,

2Notes on such terms as this will be found in the Notae ad Loca after the translation and text.
Individuals, and properties. And we say the Father is ungenerated, the Son generated, and the Spirit proceeding. And we say the Father is the Father of the Son, and the producer of the Spirit, and that the Son is the Son of the Father. The Holy Spirit we say is Spirit of both the Father and the Son: of the Father in the sense of proceeding from him, and of the Son in the sense that through him (i.e. the Son) he lavishly bestows gifts. In proof that the Spirit is said to be also the Spirit of Christ, the divine apostle says that "If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to
And further, "God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, "Abba, Father.'" For he is sent from the Father but through the Son. This is why Christ can make both the following statements, saying in one place, "I shall ask my Father, and he will send you another Paraclete," and in another place, "If I go away I shall send you another Paraclete to remain with you forever." This is the wonder of the Holy Trinity, and what can be seen in no other being; namely, the existence of three perfect hypostases inseparable from each other, even if they are differentiated by their properties. For the Son is generated from the Father in a
non-dividing manner. And this is not as when we send forth or are sent forth. The divine is not, in the manner of our species, related to hypostases that are divided off and separated from each other; but rather embraces undivided hypostases. Because of this the same one who calls himself "Son" also calls himself the "Word" to show his hypostatic character by "Sonship" and his undividedness by being "Word." So it is that he is also called "the radiant reflection of God's glory, and the express image of his nature." for by the "radi-
καὶ ἑνυπόστατος καὶ ἑνούσιος καὶ τοιούτος οὗτος ὁ π(ατ)-
ηρ. ἐχεί τοῖς καὶ τὸ ἀνούσιον καὶ τὸ ἀδιαίρετον, διὰ τούτο/
καὶ συναιδίος τῷ π(ατ)ρί, καὶ οὐχ ὑστερόχρονος. εἰ οὖν
τριθεῖται/ χωρίζοντες τὸν μιὸν τοῦ π(ατ)ρός εἰς ἀμφίκρημνον
ἐμπίπτουσιν, ὡς φησίν ὁ μακάριος Μάξιμος· ἡ γὰρ συναιδίον
λέγοντες τὸν μιὸν τοῦ/ π(ατ)ρός, χωρίζοντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξ
αὐτοῦ, ἀναγκάζονται λέγειν/ ἐξ αὐτοῦ μὴ γεγεννηθαί, καὶ
ἐμπεσ(εῖν) εἰς τὸ τρεῖς λέγειν θεοῦ/ καὶ τρεῖς ἀρχὰς· ἡ ἐξ

"ance" he discloses his undividedness, and by the "express image" he clarifies his hypostatic character and substantiality. For unlike our word, which does not have a hypostatic character, he is a subsistent Word, and hypostatized and substantive such as is the Father himself. He possesses both substantiality and undividedness, and for this reason he is coeternal with the Father and not temporally later. Therefore the Tritheists, by dividing the Son from the Father, fall into a dilemma, as Blessed Maximus says. For either they say that the Son is coeternally of the Father, but by
dividing him from the Father are forced to say that he was not generated from him, and they fell into saying that there are three Gods and three principles; or they say that he was generated from the Father, but by dividing them are forced into saying that he is not coeternal with the Father, thus making the maker of all time subject to time. But it is still necessary to preserve the unity of God, and the three hypostases must be confessed. First, there is a division; but, according to divine Gregory, it takes place in a 'non-dividing manner. Secondly, he remains intact at the same time as he is divided in himself. For where would the paradox be if he were united and separated as man is to man, and nothing more? At any rate, blessed Maximus interprets it in this way.
Yet we must return to the subject. We were saying that the Son is both really-existent (or: en-hypostatized) and unseparated (undivided). And the Holy Spirit comes forth undivided out of the producer and Father: he is not separated and self-subsistent, yet he is individuated by his property, for he alone is 'proceeding.' Nor can we say he is ungenerated in the way the Father is, or generated in the way the Son is. For his property is unmoveable and immutable. And in this way, then, we say there is one nature and three hypostases in the Divinity. But in the case of the Incarnate Word, we say the opposite: that there are two natures, yet admit and
believe in only one hypostasis. For we know that in Christ these two natures are perfect; namely, the divine and the human. But there is only one hypostasis, the human nature subsisting in the God Word and not receiving a subsistence of its own. Just as if someone pours wax on a golden statue. For the nature of the wax does not take on a subsistence of its own, but subsists on the statue itself. And our nature, now subsisting in the God Word, is said to be en-hypostatized but it is not a hypostasis; so that there is one hypostasis of the God Word even after the Incarnation, manifested in the two natures. For this reason we say that the hypostasis
of Christ is immortal. For the hypostasis was not divided in the time of the holy passion. But even if the soul left the body and the human nature was released, even so there was a single hypostasis of divinity and of flesh and of soul, binding together the divided elements and holding the elements indivisible in the hypostatic union. Thus we say Christ is mortal and immortal: he is mortal in his humanity, but immortal in his divinity. The human nature died when the soul was separated from the body, but the hypostasis was indivisible since the divinity kept the divided elements together in itself when the division took place. Because of this also the
Holy Spirit says through the prophet about the Son that "You are a priest forever after the manner of Melchisedech. For Melchisedech is said to be without mother and without father because he had no genealogy. He had neither beginning nor ending of days," as the Apostle says. So also Christ had neither beginning according to his hypostasis nor experienced end in his passion, but had immortality. If someone says that it is not possible for a nature to exist without being subsistent (hypostatized), we say that the noun "hypostasis"
10 "ὑπόστασις ἔργαν/ ἐν ἡμῖν οὐκ ἐστι, Κύριε." τούτοις ὑπάρχει, καὶ πάλιν λέγομεν λόγῳ τὰ πάντα τὸν Θεόν ὑποστήσατο, τούτοις χαρί/σασθαι. καθ’ ὁ σημαίνομεν καὶ τὰ μέρη τοῦ σώματος ὑφεστάσθαι/ λέγονται μὴ ὄντα: ὑπόστασις ἡ καθ’ εαυτὴν ὑφεστῶσα καὶ ἀδιαίρ/ρετος. κατ’ αὐτὸ τὸ σημαίνομεν καὶ τὸ ἀν(θρώπ)ινον τοῦ Κυρίον καὶ πάντα τὰ/ἐνυπόστατα καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ δηλονότι τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἐχοντα, εἰ τίς/ὑπόστασιν ἑθέλει καλεῖν καθότι ὑπαρξιν ἔχει, οὐχ ἁμαρ/τήθεται.

has two meanings. The first meaning is "subsisting in any way whatsoever and in some way having existence." For example, "there is no operative hypostasis in us, Lord," that is, existence; again we say that God hypostatized all things by a word, that is, conferred existence on them. According to this meaning, even the parts of the body are also said to be subsistent although they are not. A hypostasis which is self-subsistent is also indivisible. According to this meaning, the humanity of the Lord and all things which are enhypostatized and have their very existence in another—if someone wants to term these hypostasēs in as much as they

227V.10 οὐκ ἐστι MS.
have existence, he does not err. The other meaning of hypostasis is: that which is self-subsistent and has individual and undivided wholeness and if divided is subject to destruction. Because of this even the humanity of our Lord, not being divided in the hypostasis, was not subject to the destruction of the body. For his flesh, it says, "did not see corruption." So that if there were a division in the hypostasis, the Lord would then have experienced corruption in his body. But since he remained undivided with respect to the hypostasis, his human nature, on the one hand, was subject

228, supra lin.1: titulum operis seq. (cf. lin.8, infra).
to corruption, that is to say, dissolution and death; yet, on the other hand, the Lord's body remained uncorrupted.

According to this meaning of hypostasis, the Lord's humanity is called an hypostasis in the sense that it does not subsist by itself, but in the God Word it takes on subsistence (hypostasis). For this reason it is said to be enhypostatized. But by itself it is not called hypostasis. Rather the Lord is one hypostasis with his human nature.

228.5 ἃ (σήμανε).

228.8 μὲ (45) ad dexteram, litteris rubris (cf. CVG) prima littera novi opusculi, quod incipit statim post alium in linea sequenti, etiam rubra. Puncta tria ad finem opusculi supr. Titulum novi opusc. litteris, in summo scriptum, etiam litteris rubris. + ante et postea, duo puncta.
Περὶ τῆς προσληψείσες ἁγί(ας) σαρκός τοῦ τουριστοῦ

'Ἡ προσληψεῖσα σάρξ/ τῷ θ(ε)ῷ λόγῳ, κατὰ μ(έ)ν τὴν ὑπόστασιν φύσει θ(ε)ῷ γέγον(εν). οὐ γὰρ ἐσχ(εν) ἡ σάρξ/

υπόστασιν, ἀλλ' ὁ θ(ε)ῷ λόγος ὑπόστασις τῆς σαρκί ἐχρημάτισι· (εν). ἀλλὰ/ καὶ κατὰ φύσιν πάλιν οὐ λέγομ(εν) τὴν σάρκα,

οτί θέσθη ἑθεόθη, ἵνα μὴ υπό/νοιαν δώρ(εν) ὡς καθ' ὀμιλίαν

ἡ σάρξ ἱμώθη τῷ θ(ε)ῷ λόγῳ;/ ὁπερ ὁ ἄθεος Νεστόριος ἔλεγ(εν). ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτω φύσει θεωθήναι τὴν σάρκα/ λέγομ(εν). ἵνα δὲ

†The Flesh Assumed by Christ†

The flesh undertaken by the God Word became God in its nature according to the hypostasis. For the flesh did not have a hypostasis, but the God Word is called a hypostasis incarnate. But even so we do not talk of the flesh 'according to nature,' as being divinized by an agreement, in order not to cause suspicion that the flesh was united by association in the God Word, which is what the godless Nestorius said. Yet in this sense we say the flesh is divinized by
15 nature. But in order that we should not at all suspect that the flesh underwent alienation and alteration, we add the mode of the exchange as the divine Kosmas also says, representing the God Word always uttering: "As man I am substantial, not mere appearance. In this way, by the mode of exchange, the very nature united to me is God." The God Word is said to be man by way of exchange, and similarly the flesh is God in a manner of exchange. This interpretation god-bearing Kosmas took from Damascene. For he says in his treatises that in separating even speculatively the flesh from

228.16 εἰσάει MS. ε supra rasuram.

228.20 Δημοσκήνου . Δ supra rasuram.
the divinity we imply that he is God in his nature. In order not to have it separated in reality we add "by a manner of exchange," in the sense that the divinity in turn gives its natural properties to the flesh because of its undividedness and inseparability. For this reason we even say he is man before time. As the divine apostle says, "The second man is the Lord from heaven." And the Lord himself, "I am the bread that came down from heaven." Thus we say God is also recent, since the natures interchange properties on account of the undividedness; and the separation is only conceptual, not also real.


ερωτ(ησις) ότι πώς διηρέθη ἡ ψυχὴ κ(αί) οὐκ ήρκεσ(εν) ἡ θεότης ἀντὶ ψυχῆς;

Πῶς μῖας ὑποστάσεως οὕσης θεότητος καὶ/ σαρκὸς, τῆς ψυχῆς διαίρεθεισῆς τοῦ σῶματος, ἐνέκρωθη τὸ σῶμα καὶ οὐκ /

ηρκεσ(εν) αὐτῷ ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ἡ θεότης· καίτοι τῆς σαρκὸς τῷ θ(ε)φο λόγῳ/ ἐνυποστάσεις; --

χωρισθείσης τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ σῶματος ἐπὶ τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ λόγ(ου),

Question: How can the soul be separated, and why does the divinity not suffice as a replacement for the soul?

With the Divinity and the flesh one hypostasis, when the soul was separated from the body how did the body die and the divinity not suffice as substitute for the soul, granting that the flesh is really existent (enhypostatized) in the God Word?

When the soul was separated from the body in the case of

228V.7 μ’ (46) scribitur litteris rubris.
228V.8 ἔρωτα i.e. quaestio.
--- Π (πῶς) rubro.
228V.11 λύσις scribitur verticaliter, ab supr. ad infr. in margine sinistra. Opusculum terminat duobus punctis et li.
--- Χ (Χωρισθείσης) rubro.
the God Word, the divinity was not separated from the body, just as it was not from the soul, but it remained united with it, and the hypostasis was not divided. For this reason, we say Christ is immortal by hypostasis, but by his human nature we say he is mortal. For the fall of Adam brought about the death of a man, not of God. Therefore even if the soul was taken from the body, still the divinity remained undivided. For it says, "You were taken away, O Word, from the flesh which you partake in, but not divided from it." Do not wonder, then, how when the divinity was not divided the flesh died and the divinity was not a sufficient substitute for the
soul. For, in order that no pretence be given for saying that Christ did not die, death acceded to the body with the separation of the soul. This took place by the will of the divine nature, even though the divinity could have sufficed in place of the soul to give life to the body, and this pre-eminently so.

229.supra lineam 1. Titulum opusculi quod incipit ad lineam 2, litteris rubris. + ante et post.

229.1 μέ (47) scribitur rubro.

229.2 In fine operis, duo puncta, linea horizontalis. Novum opusculum incipitur—i (majisc.) rubro.
The Two Natures of Christ and His Hypostasis

We must realize in what sense we say that in Christ there is one hypostasis but two natures and that these two natures are such that in our thought they are of a discrete quantity. For in thought we separate the natures of Christ, but in reality we do not divide the two from each other. But we say in the case of the Godhead that there is one nature, but three hypostases, and these three hypostases we divide from each other in our thought, but not in reality, just as we do...
the natures in the case of Christ. For this reason we also say speculatively that the three hypostases are of a discrete quantity, as in the case of the natures of Christ, but in reality of a continuity, since in reality they do not admit a division. And our soul constitutes with the flesh quite a different nature, and conceptually in conjunction with preserving divisible elements is said to be of a discrete quantity, while in reality parts not completely separated are conceived of as belonging to a continuum. For if the soul is separated from the body because of sin, the flesh once separated is not saved, but in fact dissolves and is corrupted.
σώζεται ἡ σάρξ/ χαριζομένης αὕτης, μὲν ὅτι καὶ διαφθείρεται.

ἐνομένης πάλιν/ ἀδιαιρέτως συνάπτεται, ἐπιθετικά μόνη

20 χαριζομένης καὶ οὐχὶ πράγματι.

Again united; it is indivisibly intact and is separated only conceptually, not really.
NOTAE AD LOCA

Notes on 225 verso (Notes follow the numeration of the Greek text).

3: χαρακτήρ: Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1959, subsequently referred to as Sophocles, Greek Lexicon), lists the following meanings: "the transliteration character; then, mark, sign, figure; stamp; face (equals πρόσωπον)." Liddell, Scott, Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940; This is the new edition and will be referred to subsequently as LSJ), gives (sub.v.II.4) "type or character of a thing or person, rarely of an individual nature." The Latin translation of Patrologiae Graecae is, generally, proprietas (which also translates ἴδιόνης). It is here translated "image," which is the translation it is given in Hebrews 1.3 by the Confraternity edition of the New Testament (New Jersey; St. Anthony Guild Press, 1941). Kleist-Lilly (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1954) in the same locus (Heb.1.3), however, translates it "express image."

4 ἐπίσης: Late and modern Greek form for 'ἐπ' ἴσης. LSJ, sub.v.

5 ἴδιαγόντως: A late form. Patristic Greek Lexicon (Ed. by GWH Lampe. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. This work, which will subsequently be referred to as PGL, covers non-classical or

6: ὑπόστασις See appendix A.

15: πνεῦμα ἐκπορευτών "proceeding." Cf. PGL. See also John Damascene (M.94,779A) De haeresibus liber, epilogus, "...Πατὴρ ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ ἀγέννητος· Υἱὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, γεννητὸς καὶ οὐκ ἀγέννητος" ἐκ Πατρὸς γάρ. Πνεῦμα ἄγιον οὐ γεννητὸν, ἀλλ' ἐκπορευτόν, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γάρ..." (N.B. Latin translation is procedens). Note the similarities in this passage from Damascene with the text of our MS. This appears to be a common, formulaic way of talking about the three persons. See also Greg. Mammæ, Contra Ephesos, M.160, 141C. Gregory quotes, in the same passage, Damascene's explanation of "proceeding": ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐστι δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευουμένη. He also quotes the Seventh Synod (Act.3, In litteris Tarasii): Πιστεύω καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένου...

18: σημείωσις. Note that this same sign (meaning 'note') was also used at f. 35V of this codex to draw attention to the fact that Athanasius' quote was "against the Latins" (κατὰ Λατίνων). Here it undoubtedly is drawing attention to the phrase ἐκ αὐτοῦ προ-

20: Rm. 8.9
21: Gal. 4.6 (Cf. also Rm. 8.16, Mk. 14.36)

Notes on 226:


4: ἐὰν ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω, πέμψω ὑμῖν ἄλλον παράκλητον, ἵνα μένῃ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Cf. quote supra; also Jn. 16.7 "ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἀπέλθω ὁ παράκλητος ὑμῶν ἐλεύσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ, πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς." The two quotes are amalgamated. The only changes introduced by the MS are παρακαλέσω for ἐρωτήσω and μένῃ for ἤ. "Paraclete" is the Knox translation (The Holy Bible. London: MacMillan and Co. Ltd., 1960) for παράκλητον. Kleist-Lilly has "advocate."

6: παράδογγον: properly, it means: "contrary to received opinion, incredible (cf. LSJ), opposed to ἑνδογγόν." 

8: ἀδιαίρετως γεννᾶται: "generated in a non-dividing manner."

This usage demonstrates a delicate care to avoid Nestorianism. Cf. 228v.16 for other usages of ἀδιαίρετως.

13: τὸ ἑνωπόστατον: "really existent" --Damascene (LSJ), or: "endowed with existence (hypostasis)" --Sophocles, Greek Lexicon.

See Appendix B for a range of meanings. The term here could be
translated "inner reality," although "hypostatic character" has been employed instead, as an interpretation of "inner reality."

The idea is clearly that Christ, as Son of the Father, shows us as adopted sons what the Father is (his existence or, therefore, reality). Cf. also note on 228V.11 (ἐνυπόστασης as verb). Note that τὸ ἐνυπόστατον—that which Christ as Son manifests—is coupled with τὸ ὀδιαίρετον ("the undividedness"), that which Christ as Λόγος shows us.

15: ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τοῦ ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ

17: Note parallel: by the radiance (ἀπαύγασμα) He shows the undividedness (τὸ ὀδιαίρετον), just as above (line 14) He shows forth the undividedness by being Word (Λόγος). By image (χαρακτήρ) he shows the "inner reality" (τὸ ἐνυπόστατον), just as he shows the inner reality by being Son (διὰ τῆς υἱότητος). (N.B. We have here used the Kleist-Lilly translation i.e. "express image of his glory." Elsewhere we use the Confraternity ed. translation of χαρακτήρ, "image."). Also, for the purpose of this demonstration, τὸ ἐνυπόστατον has been rendered "inner reality."

18: ἐνυόσιος: This, as well as ἐνυπόστατος, shows the careful orthodox distinction of one nature, substance, etc. of the Trinity, shared by three persons, hypostases, etc.
Notes on 226 verso:

1: ση (nota). Following the hypothesis that the sign is a gloss drawing attention to controversial issues, it might here refer to χαρίζοντες τόν Υἱόν τοῦ Πατρός, to which it is placed opposite.

--- τριθείας: Cf. Tixeront, History of Dogmas. (St. Louis: Herder, 1916.) Vol. III, 187. This three volume work will subsequently be referred to as Tix. with the volume and page number. The reference here is to Tixeront's discussion of Tritheism. This is some indication that our document should be placed after 550 A.D. since this heresy did not arise until this time.

--- εἰ οὖν... ἐμπίπτουσιν. The condition does not seem to have a conclusion (N.B. ἀναγκάζονται, the only verb possible, is not the conclusion. But this does not give an easy sense to the passage: "if they, dividing the Son, fall into a dilemma...they are forced to say that Christ was not generated from him...") The sense is rather that they fall into a dilemma by their manner of dividing the Son from the Father.

Note the series of mounting conditions of the first horn of the dilemma: coeternal, of the Father, then, either generated or, if not generated, three gods. The dilemma, then, arises at the point of saying how the Son will be of the Father. The other horn of the dilemma now arises if we agree to the fact that Christ must be generated, but do not agree that generation can take place ab
aeterno, without any temporal posteriority resulting.


3: συναντίον λέγοντες τὸν οὖν τοῦ πατρὸς... Either 1) "coeternally of the Father," or 2) "coeternally with the Father" (taking the with from the adjective), or 3) "coeternal with the Father" (genitive of comparison), or 4) "the Son of the Father is coeternal." There may possibly be more than one of these meanings in the Greek. The wording makes considerable difference, at least for later developments of theological terminology. "Coeternal with the Father" would place this document within the tradition that talked of Christ as somehow being coexistent with the Father so that God really would not undergo change in the Incarnation. We have translated the genitive case as "of the Father." Cf. also the footnote on the dilemma above.

9: διαφεύγει μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀδιαφεύγει τοις... This brings out the nearly contradictory nature of the language used to describe this mystery.

16: μὴ διαφοροῦμενον...καὶ τὴν ἰδιότητι διαφοροῦμενον... This paradoxical way of speaking is orthodox: "not divided (in the sense of separated), but divided (in the sense of distinct) in his
Notes on 227:

1-5: The grammatical construction of the Greek is difficult here, but the idea is clear. We know 1) two perfect natures 2) one hypostasis. Then, in a genitive absolute, we are given two results of the mystery--two natures in one hypostasis: 1) the human nature subsists in the God Word, 2) the human nature does not receive the hypostasis.

6: ὑπόστασις: here is "substance." Elsewhere it is "person" (especially when used of Christ). This brings out the equivocal sense the term had throughout early Christianity, and explains why so many schisms and heresies arose around its meaning. We have translated ὑπόστασις as "substance" here; elsewhere we transliterate hypostasis.

10: μίαν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου...δυσὶ γνωριζομένης φύσει. Cf. the Chalcedon definition of faith: "ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν ἐν δύο φύσειν ἁμώμοιοι, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαίρετως, ἀχρίστως γνωρίζομεν. #148 (Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum. Freiburg: Herder and Co., 1932). Note that Christ is not talked of here as hypostasis, although he is one in two natures. The use of hypostasis to describe this oneness is a later doctrinal development.

16: καθ' ὑπόστασιν: "in the hypostatic union." More properly we would translate "in the hypostasis," or "hypostatically,"
but hypostatic union is a commonly accepted way of talking about Christ's person as a union of God and man.

Notes on 227 verso:

1: σὺ εἰ ἵστατι... Cf. Heb. 5.6 (which omits εἰ) Note that this has been quoted by the author of Hebrews from Ps. 109.4.

2: ὁ γὰρ Μελχισεδέκ...equals verse 1 from Heb. 7. This is a loose quotation. Our present text of St. Paul has ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἁρχὴν ἡμέραν, μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων.

7: δύο ἔχει τὰ σημαινόμενα: Since this passage can be compared with many other discussions of hypostasis (e.g. John Damascus's) we will treat the two meanings in the appendix on hypostasis.

Opposite line 7 is the marking ὑ (i.e. σημαινε), which may signalize the two meanings of hypostasis as being of special interest. This does not fit the pattern into which the uses of this sign up until this point have fallen. See above, 225V.18, 226.8, 226V.1.

10: ὑπάρξε: "existence" in a broad sense. In the context we know that the mere possession of existence as the definition of hypostasis makes it possible to say that "even the parts of the body are subsistent, although they are not."

13: ὑπόστασις η καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὑφεστάσα καὶ ἀδιαίρετος.
meaning of this is clear, although it is hard to see how it fits into the context. Is the writer here contrasting the indivisible nature of hypostasis taken in this sense to the type of subsistence which the parts of the body have in the first meaning of hypostasis (which is what he had been discussing)? If so, there is no contrastive particle. At any rate he must be setting up a condition for the following sentence (which contains the particle γάρ). Thus the idea would be that after admitting that the parts of the body may be said to subsist according to this meaning, they must be shown incapable of subsisting according to the fuller meaning of hypostasis. But the author has not made the contrast as clearly as we have made it here. After stating that the parts of the body exist in some sense, according to the first meaning of hypostasis, there is a break. The next phrase (ὑπόστασις ἡ καθ' ἐσωτήρ ύπερστῶσα καὶ ἀδιαίρετος) seems to be the start of a parenthetical explanation of the theory of enhypostasis: i.e. things which by themselves do not qualify as hypostasis in the full sense can be thought of as hypostasis in another. (κατὰ γάρ τοῦτο τὸ σημαίνομενον καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐνυπόστατα...εἰ τις ὑπόστασιν ἐθέλει καλεῖν...οὐκ ἀμαρτήσεται.)

This idea is parallel to the Thomist distinction of substantial and accidental existence. For example, I can call whiteness a subsistent, but in the real order it subsists only in so far as there is a white object.

In summary, the first meaning allows hypostasis in some sense to be predicated independently of things which are not self-subsist
division. That is, "en-hypostatized" things dependent on the same hypostasis are not multiple in their hypostatic existence.

Notes on 228:

9: σῶρε...κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν φύσει Θεός γέγονεν. "The flesh became God in its nature according to the hypostasis." This is, again, paradoxical at first glance. How could we say that Christ is human and divine if the flesh is divine? However, the dative case of φύσει following κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν makes it clear that the author is talking about the flesh as it subsisted. It really cannot be called "natural" flesh once it is part of the hypostatic union because, as in the second meaning of hypostasis above, it has its reality in Christ, as the author proceeds to explain.

11: We (presupposedly, we Christians who have not fallen into the error of Nestorius) do not say that 1) the flesh is κατὰ φύσιν, because by an agreement (θέσει) it was divinized. Furthermore we do not want to "give suspicion" [(insula ὑπόνοιαν δῆμεν) The word for suspicion, ὑπόνοια, could also be translated "conjecture, guess" (LSJ)], about 2) how the flesh was united by association (καθ’ ὁμιλίαν) in the God Word, which is what Nestorius said.

On the other hand, we say 1) φύσει θεοθήνα: τὴν σάρκα 2) we add the manner of interchange (exchange) -- ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἀντιδοσεως, or in the Latin tradition, communicatio idiomatum.

In order to see how completely and directly the author of the MS is refuting Nestorius, it will be useful to have a précis
of Nestorian doctrine. According to Cayré (Manual of Patrology, vol.I. Rome: Desclee and Co., 1936), pp. 17, 18, the following points are important in Nestorian Christology:

1) Christ is one person, two natures. "The unity is the result of a union instead of existing 'in spite of' the union (i.e. in spite of the plurality supposed by any union), thanks to the previous existing person of the Word who assumes the human nature." The πρόσωπον of Christ is not identical with the πρόσωπον of the Word, and there is no strict communicatio idiomatum.

2) The union is not καθ' ὑπόστασιν. It is a συνάφεια or even at times a ἕνωσις, but it takes place in a special πρόσωπον, the πρόσωπον τῆς ἕνωσεως. This πρόσωπον is not physical, but a moral or juridical personality, which is in reality a simple and even accidental property.

How much or little, then, does the MS say about Nestorianism? The author of the MS is evidently refuting Nestorius only in general terms: in the first point (cf. lines 11, 12 MS) that the flesh is not according to nature, but divinized by an agreement, there is a vague correspondence with what Nestorius says about the two prior πρόσωπα and their union. Cf. Tixeront, vol.III, 27 (History of Dogmas), quoted from the Book of Heraclites: "The natures subsist in their prosopons and in their natures, and in the prosopon of the union..." The use of prosopons prior to the prosopon hēnosia may be what causes our author to attribute to Nestorius "flesh according to nature," i.e. flesh according to the prior prosopon.

Furthermore, the "suspicion aroused by Nestorius," (cf. lines
14,15) probably refers to Nestorius' use of the prosopon henosis as was mentioned above. Nestorius' denial of communicatio idiomatum (cf. above, and Tixeront, op.cit. p.31) also makes clear why our author not takes up the question.

11: θέσει θεωθη: This phrase has already been discussed with regard to Nestorianism. GPL: "opposed to φύσει, by decree, at will, arbitrarily; always means not essentially." Cf. H.A. Wolfson, Philosophy of the Church Fathers (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), p.599, where he talks of the confusion caused by saying our Lord had a body θέσει (since θέσει can mean 'by a mere convention of speech'.)

13: φύσει θεωθνα: This terms, too, has already been discussed in relation to Nestorius. We wish to point out the delicate difference between the terms used: "the flesh does not exist κατὰ φύσιν," rather it is divine κατὰ θεωθνα. It can only be said to exist κατὰ ὑπόστασιν. However it divinized naturally or 'in its nature.'

14: ἐκστασίς: LSJ: "displacement, change." PGL: "1. separation. Metaphorically: alienation." Thus separation or alienation in the sense of changing from one realtionship (between Christ and the human nature before and after the Incarnation) to another as, perhaps, Nestorius claimed. (Cf. Tixeront, op.cit. p. 27 ff.)
15: τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἀντιδοσίας: We will treat this under Appendix D, ἀντιδοσία.

16: θεῖος Κοσμᾶς, and the quote: "ὡς ἀνθρώπος... ἤ ἐνθεοίσα μοι." This is probably Cosmas of Jerusalem, 8th century. See Migne, volume 98 for works attributed to him, e.g. In Natalia Domini, In Theophania, In Transfigurationem, Odae. There are only two others named Cosmas among the writers in Patrologia Graeca: Cosmas Indicopleustes, who lived in the sixth century, i.e. before John Damascene. The statement in our manuscript that "Cosmas took this idea from Damascene" rules him out. There is also a Cosmas Vestitor, 10th century (M.106) whose Sermo in SS Joachim et Annam is extant. But he is too late to be a likely writer of the ideas here quoted. The tone of the discussion shows it was carried on when the great theological controversies were still a living reality. Thus we would place this document as close to the 7th century as possible. Cosmas of Jerusalem best fits this requirement, besides being a near contemporary of John Damascene.

Notes on 228 verso:

4: προσιώνιον: Cf. note on 226V, 3. There are orthodox and heterodox ways of talking of Christ as "before time." Sophocles, Greek Lexicon, lists references to Athanasius (II, 732A), Basil (IV, 253A), Greg. Naz. (III, 332C, II, 424B) Note that the numbers here refer to the number of successive volumes in Migne containing the works by one author. Presented here are two of the main loci (since this matter is essential to the discussion of the
Incarnation and the communicatio idiomatum:

Greg. Naz. III, 332D (Latin column of PG): Atqui evangelicum quoddam dictum perperam acceptum ad hujusmodi absurditatis testimonium prætendit, quod ita habet: Nemo ascendit in caelum, nisi qui descendit de caelo, Filius hominis; tanquam prius etiam, quam ipse descendisset, filius hominis esset, ac descendens carnem suam secum adducerit illam, quam in coelis habebat, quamdam ante saecula existentem, essentiaeque suae insitam. (italics are here added)

In this passage, Gregory is castigating those who give προσαίωνιον the wrong sense.

Cyril, expositio symbolorum (M.77, 1336D): ...Περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ταῦτα λέγοντες, ἂ ξυντόμως ὁ Πέτρος ὁμολογήσας, ἐκρίθη μακάριος. Ἄλλῃ ἐπειδῆ τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων Υἱὸν ἀπεφήνατο, ὥστε πᾶς πάλιν τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων Μονογενῆ δεικνύον ἄνθρωπον γεγενημένον ταῖς ἀντιδόσεσι ταῦταὶ τῆς σωτηρίου οἰκονομίας, τὴν ἐνωσιν ἐφίστῳς ταῖς, καὶ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δεικνύντες, θεόν τε οὕτω μονογενῆ, καὶ ἄνθρωπον δι’ ἄνθρωπους γεγενημένον...

Note especially the link between this notion and the communicatio idiomatum.

4: ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος. Cf. 1 Cor. 15.47: (ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ).

5: ἔγω εἰμί ὁ ἄρτος... Jn. 6.41

11: ἐνυποστάσεως: How it was possible that the divinity did not suffice as a substitute was clarified by Leontius of Byzantium
as Tixeront explains (op. cit. p.148): "A nature without a hypostasis is an abstraction. Whence it would seem that, since the human nature of Jesus Christ exists it is an hypostasis. This would be a wrong conclusion, Leontius goes on to say (M.86, 1277D). Between ὑπόστασις and ἀνυπόσταστος there is a middle, viz., ἐνυπόστατος, to exist, not in oneself, but in another as a part in the whole; and this is what happens in the case of Christ's humanity..." Henceforward this becomes traditional orthodox theology. Cf. John Damascene, M.94, 615C, 1017, and Appendix B on ἐνυπόστατος.


16: διηρήθη: and the following line ἀνηρέθη...οὐ διηρήθης. We have been translating ὄδιαίρετος 'undivided.' Here the aorist passive verb form of this word, διηρήθης, must signify divide in the sense of "soul divided from body." Christ's human soul may be divided or separated from the body (e.g. when the body was in the grave), but the Divine Word remained undivided since it was "taken away from" (ἀνηρέθη) but not "divided" (διηρήθη). This second use of the verb seems to have a different sense here. It here refers to the division of essential parts which brings about an essential division or dissolution of a nature or person. Thus the soul divided from the body is a temporary division, but there can be no essential division within the Divine Word.
Notes on 229

4: ἐπινοεῖς: Cf. its usage in John Damascene (M.94, 828D)

"Εν γὰρ ἐκαστὸν αὐτῶν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ ἐτερον, οὐχ ἂττον ἢ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν
tουτέστιν ὅτε κατά πάντα ἐν εἰσιν ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱός, καὶ τὸ ἀγιον
Πνεῦμα, πλὴν τῆς ἁγεννησίας, καὶ τῆς γεννησίας, καὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσ-
εως ἐπινοεῖς ὑπὲ τὸ διηρθμένον. See Tixeront's comment (op. cit.
p.472): "The author (i.e. Damascene) goes even so far as to say
that we can distinguish the three Persons only through the operation
of our minds (ἐπινοεῖς) and some have regarded this expression as
smacking of Sabellianism. In matter of fact, for St. John, that
word (borrowed from the Doctrina Patrum, cf. Cap. 26, edit. Die-
kamp, p.188-90), far from excluding a real distinction between the
three Divine Persons, rather presupposes it."

4: διαμισμένου ποσών: This is a peculiar way of talking
about the distinction with continuity preserved in the hypostatic
union. Cf. Damascene, M.94, 1001, for a like comparison (Damascene,
at this point, is talking about the number of the natures): "The
number is not of such a nature as to cause division or unity, but
it signifies the quantity (ποσότης) of the things which are con-
tained in the number, whether they are united or divided."

Cf. H.A. Wolfson (op. cit., p.40). Quoting Leontius of
Byzantium, he shows that Leontius is adapting Aristotle's types of
unity. Things can be "one individual object of the kind called by
Aristotle one in continuity." (πανταχοῦ δὲ τὸ ἐν ἦ τῷ ποσῷ ἦ τῷ
εἴδει ἀδιαιρέτου. Metaph. 1016b23).

διαμισμένου presents a translation problem. In the active
tenses it means "define, determine to be, draw a distinction."

However, LSJ lists sub IV, "Pass., to be discontinuous, opp. to συνάπτω, Arist. Categ. 4b.28 διωρισμένος, opp. συνεχής, 1b.20.

Perhaps it means "of a discrete whole" here, or possibly, "of a defined, determined whole." The idea would be that there is a continuity because there is one quantity; yet the two natures must be contained within this whole.

13: It is difficult to make sense of this passage. Perhaps the text is corrupt. The difficulties are: 1) ὁντα (?) If this is what was intended and this is a participle, there is really nothing for it to modify. One would expect that it would modify ἡ ψυχή. The idea, conjecturely, is that our soul is, in conjunction with the flesh, of quite a different nature (ἄλλης καί ἄλλης: The ἄλλης can be repeated as adverb for emphasis. LSJ: II.4 ἄλλος ἄλλος τρόπος quite another sort.) 2) μετὰ τοῦ σώζεσθαι διαίρομεν- 

ον: "in conjunction with preserving divisible elements." What this must mean is that our body can be thought of as able to be divided into discrete segments: this would be in contrast to Christ's body (the particle ὅɛ points of this contrast, cf. line 12), perhaps because Christ's body, as part of the hypostatic union can never exist apart from its existence in the hypostasis. 3) σωτικ-

ως: LSJ: "able to save, maintain, uphold." Sophocles (Greek Lexicon): "in a saving manner" (Pseud. Dion. 261C). Our translation is "completely separate." This sets up a contrast to the previous clause (in practice, opposed to in thought). 4) διὰ τὴν παράβασιν LSJ sub παράβασις gives "a going aside, slight alteration, deviation.
tion, transgression. παράβασις in St. Paul is sin, cause of death; it is likely that this is what is meant here. "For if the soul is separated from the body because of sin, the flesh..."
APPENDIX A: ὑπόστασις


Usages in this text: 225V.2,6,9,13; 226.7,11,12,16; 226V.20, 21; 227.3,6,9,10,11,12,15,16,20; 227V.5,7,9,14,16,17,20; 228.1,2, 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,102; 228V.8,13,14; 229.3,9,92,11.

The difficulties which arise from the use of this word are basically caused by the fact that ὑπόστασις, meaning substance, may also mean person. If we analyze the similarity in meaning of nature used in the case of human nature and substance used to describe the same reality, man, we can see where a difficulty would arise. For in the person Christ, there were two natures. The words in Greek for nature were variously φύσις, οὐσία (in certain cases), and ὑπόστασις. The latter might mean substantial nature and thus might be thought apt to describe Christ's human nature (although, see Francis Ferrier, What is the Incarnation) or for his divine

1 Cf. The Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. X, sub Person: "In scholastic philosophy, nature, essence, and substance are closely related terms. Both essence and substance imply a static point of view... while nature implies a dynamic point of view... But applied to the same substantial being, the terms substance, essence, and nature in reality stand only for different aspects of the same thing... Substance denotes the thing as requiring no support... nature denotes the substance or essence considered as source of activities.

2 Vol. 24: Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism, pp. 87, 88: "... if personality is defined as an autonomous self or subject, there is nothing self-contradictory in the thought of one and the
nature. However, the same word could best be used for the person, Christ. For example, see the comment of the Catholic Encyclopedia, sub person: "Eventually in the West, it was recognized that the true equivalent of ὑπόστασις was not substantia but subsistentia..."

Note that subsistentia is the formulaic word for describing the human person (ibid.)

Eventually there had to be a choice of which words could be used to describe which realities in Christology. First of all, with respect to οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, Tixeront points out:

these two words continued for many years, until about the years 362-370, to be used almost indiscriminately one for the other...From an abstract point of view, hypostasis reproduced exactly the substantia of the Latins. Οὐσία was a Platonic expression; hypostasis came from the Stoics; but the meaning of both was essentially the same.¹

The formula eventually arrived at was one hypostasis, two substantial natures. For example, at Ephesus, Anathema #3 (Denzinger #115): εἰς τις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς Χριστοῦ διαίρετι τὰς ὑποστάσεις μετὰ τὴν ἐνωσίν (Latin version: si quis dividat substantias). Anathema #4 (Denz. #116): εἰς τις προσώποις οὐσίν ἦ γοῦν ὑποστάσεις, κτλ...ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

The use of hypostasis and prosopon as synonyms shows the development these words had gone through.

The discussion of these terms in the manuscript shows famil-

¹Tixeront, op. cit. vol. II, p.36.
arity with and acceptance of the final orthodox terminology. The
text begins by lining up the terms which can be used for the
Trinity on the one hand, and for the persons in the Trinity on the
other. Then it takes up the main subject matter of the first part,
amely, the one hypostasis and two natures of Christ. We will
first distinguish the usages of hypostasis in the manuscript.
They are basically two. Then we will set or establish the content
of the manuscript in the tradition by considering the usage of the
term ὑπόστασις by other Fathers.
A. The usages of hypostasis:

In the first group of meanings, ὑπόστασις has the meaning
of individual, which we may define as "that which exists distinctively
and by itself and does not admit of division without destruction." In line 2, ὑπόστασις is equated with "person, image
(χαρακτήρ), and individuality," and in line 9, it is called a
"whole."

Two further senses of the word are distinguished, starting
at 227V.7: First, simply signifying "existence"(ὑπάρξις). In lines
9 and 10 we are given a quote, perhaps of a sermon or poem, in
which hypostasis is used in this first sense: ὑπόστασις ἐργῶν ἐν
ὑμῖν οὐκ ἐστι, Κύριε... The meaning here is "reality" or "actual
existence," because the author informs us that in this sense God
can be said to "hypostatize" all things, that is, "confer exist-
ence" on them. See Appendix B for further discussion of this
section of the manuscript.

A second meaning follows in the manuscript (although it is
synonymous with the first group of meanings, above), which is the
fuller or primary sense: "self-subsistence, a certain wholeness, unable to be subjected to even temporary dissolution." The example of our Lord's humanity as hypostasis clarifies the special character of this second meaning. The author of the manuscript states that our Lord did not see corruption, although he was subject to dissolution in the sense of separation from the body. This dissolution, which describes what happened while our Lord's body was in the tomb, evidently presented problems in terminology. If the hypostasis of Christ is to remain intact, there must be no dissolution; yet death is a type of dissolution. The resolution of the difficulty seems to be contained in 227V.19, 20: τὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνθρωπινὸν μή διαίρεσθέν..., i.e. "the humanity was not divided."

That is, not divided in itself, no corporeal breakdown. Yet Christ was "taken away" from His body (228V.17): ἀνθρώπης γὰρ, φησίν, ἀλλ' οὐ διαιρέθης, λόγε, ής μετέσχες σαρκός. The accepted terminology, then, is that "taking away" does not involve the dissolution of the wholeness of our Lord's hypostasis; and, on the other hand, "taking away" sufficiently explains what happened when our Lord's body was in the tomb.

In another group of meanings, ὑπόστασις can be translated "substance." This is the pre-theological meaning used by Aristotle. The main example of this is at 227.6: "the nature of the wax does not take on its ὑπόστασις (or substance).

B. Some uses of hypostasis--after Church Fathers: Cyril: "Jesus Christ is one sole person... The union is καθ' ὑπόστασιν, not in the sense that it produces an hypostasis that did not exist before.
but in the sense that it associates a humanity to the pre-existing hypostasis of the Word.¹ This view becomes part of the tradition. Damascene follows this usage: "An hypostasis is a particular being subsisting apart by itself; it is a substance with its accidents, enjoying an existence of its own that is independent and separated from the other hypostasis actually and as a matter of fact."²

Note that Damascene also distinguishes two senses: Ποτέ μὲν τὴν ἀπλῶς ὑπάρξειν. Καθὸ σημαίνομενον τούτον ἑστίν οὐσία καὶ ὑποστασίς οὕτως τίνες τῶν ἄγιων πατέρων εἶπον τὰς φύσεις, ἤγον τὰς ὑποστάσεις. Ποτὲ δὲ τὴν καθ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἰδιοσύστατον ὑπάρξειν. καθ' ὁ σημαίνομενον τὸ ἄτομον δηλοῖ...³

The first of the two senses according to Damascene is the same as the one given in the manuscript (at 227V.9,10). Migne in a footnote on this phrase (Ποτέ μὲν τὴν ἀπλῶς ὑπάρξειν) says:

interdum significat simplicem existentiam. Id est non nudam speciem, sed ipsammet rei veritatem. Ammonius philosophus varias enumerans receptiones τῆς οὐσίας, ea interdum rem omnem quae existat designari docet, atque idcirco accidentia etiam οὐσίας appellari, διὰ τὸ ὑποστάσας, eo quod subsistant. At Damascenus Leontium hic sequitur cujus hoc fragmentum legitur in collectaneis mss. contra Severianos, cap. 27: ἡ ὑποστάσις κατὰ δύο σημαίνομενον φέρεται...⁴

¹Quoted by Tixeront, op.cit. Vol.III, p.147.
³Migne, 94.612B (Dialectica).
⁴Ibid.
APPENDIX B: ἐνυπόστατος, τὸ ἐνυπόστατον, ἐνυπόστασα.

The reason for treating ἐνυπόστατος in a separate appendix is that this was a separate, independent theory, which became more sophisticated as time went on. Tixeront says, for example, speaking of Cyril of Alexandria: "...this is the way Cyril presents the idea of ἐνυπόστασις, which was developed later on by Leontius of Byzantium."¹ We have already seen the need the early Fathers felt for special terminology when talking about our Lord's humanity.

Usages in the manuscript:

1) τὸ ἐνυπόστατον: This has been translated "hypostatic character" (but see note at 226.13—another possible translation is "inner reality"). It is also used in approximately this same sense at 226.18, where it is opposed to τὸ ἐνυπόστατον.

2) ἐνυπόστατος or ἐνυπόστασα, the purely adjectival form, is used to describe the Word as possessing τὸ ἐνυπόστατον (226.20) and the Son at 226V.14. At 227.8; 228.7, it is used to explain how our human nature exists within the Divine Word; and at 227V.13 to describe not only the humanity of Christ, but all things which have their very existence in another. (See note at 227V.13)

Cyril has already been mentioned as one expositer of a special theory regarding τὸ ἐνυπόστατον. Leontius of Byzantium is next to develop further implications. After defining hypostasis as that

¹Tixeront, op.cit. vol. III, p.67. Cyril explains that even though Christ's body is homogenous and consubstantial with our bodies, we must deem it...the own body of the Word. (M.77, 372)
which has a physically independent existence, he says that a nature without a hypostasis is an abstraction. Yet there is a middle state, enhypostatos, to exist not in oneself, but in another.¹ This is parallel to the Aristotelian definition of accident; and, as a matter of fact, Leontius uses the existence of accidents as an analogy to the type of existence which enhypostatos describes, with the qualification that in this case the enhypostatized nature is subsistent.²

John Damascene for the most part gives the explanation of Leontius, with some further subtleties:

An hypostasis is a particular being subsisting apart by itself; it is a substance with its accidents...There is neither a nature that is ἐνυπόστατος, nor an hypostasis that is ἐνοοῦσιος. Every nature, then, is either ἐνυπόστατος or ἐνοοῦσιος; or rather, every nature is ἐνυπόστατος just as every hypostasis is ἐνοοῦσιος, since logically nature is never identical with hypostasis, and in reality but seldom.³

It has already been pointed out how the term hypostasis underwent refinement so that it came to have a technical meaning somewhat different from its original meaning, substance. Now the same transformation takes place with regard to the term ἐνυπόστατος. It acquires a technical sense, one which depends on doctrinal definitions. We have translated τὸ ἐνυπόστατον "hypostatic character," but have transliterated enhypostatized to retain the technical sense of this term wherever the technical sense is involved.

¹ Tixeront, op.cit. p. 148
² Ibid. p.149
³ Ibid. p.481
Liddell, Scott, Jones lists the following meanings: I. original II. natural form or constitution of a person or thing as the result of growth. III. the regular order of nature; κατὰ φύσιν naturally φύσει by nature. IV. In philosophy: 1. nature as an originating power. cf. Arist. Metaph. 1014b16; Plotinus 4.4.44. 2. elementary substance; cf. Plato Laws 891c, Arist. fr. 52. 3. concrete, the creature, 'nature,' V. as a concrete term, creature. VI. kind, sort, species. VII. sex.

Obviously, a full discussion of the meaning of the word φύσις would have to start with its use by the Pre-Socratics, then continue through Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, etc. However, the concern here is not with all the connotations it had when it was used by the Fathers. Important for the understanding of its usage here are φύσις meaning the species, man, and φύσις meaning the divine nature of Christ. In our manuscript, the main issues which involve the use of the word φύσις with regard to Christ are: How can a nature exist and not be a hypostasis? How is the human nature of Christ related to the divine in ἀντίδοσις? How is there analogously a continuity between the two unmixed natures? (See the final opusculum "On the Two Natures of Christ."

1Cf. below; also the quotes from Damascene at the end of Appendix A on the two senses of hypostasis: Ποτὲ μὲν τὴν ὑπαρξιν, καθο σημαίνομεν, ταύτων εστίν οὕσιν καὶ ὑποστάσις, οθεν τίνες των ἄγιων πατέρων εἰπον τὰς φύσεις, ἦγουν τὰς ὑποστάσεις. And see the passage quoted from Tixeront (vol. III, 481) at the end of Appendix Ε.
First, we list general usages as they appear in the manuscript:

225V.4: ϕύσις is defined as "that which is predicated commonly of all the constituent elements (τῶν ὑποκείμενων) and that which communicates of itself to these constituent elements." Ibid. line 8: ϕύσις is divided into constituent elements (τὰ ὑποκείμενα).

227V.6: The discussion of whether a nature can exist without a hypostasis (ἀνυπόστατος).

A second group of meanings concerns specifically human nature and how it is incarnated in Christ: 226V.21: How can there be two natures, one hypostasis. Cf. also 229, the title of the opusculum "On the Two Natures of Christ" and 229.3 ff. passim. Other places discuss the theological problems brought about by the fact of the human nature of Christ e.g. how it is enhypostatized in the Divine Word (cf. 227.8), how it died on the cross, or how Christ died in his human nature (227.19).

Finally, ϕύσις is used in adverbial expressions. Cf. LSJ: III quoted above. See the text, 228.9, and nota ad locum. (This note refers to a locus where ϕύσις and κατὰ ϕύσιν are used almost synonymously)

We have already mentioned with reference to Nestorianism (note to 228.11) the difficulties arising with regard to Christ's perfect human nature. Our manuscript maintains the orthodox position; and, in fact, takes great care to use such terms as ϕύσις and κατὰ ϕύσιν strictly—even at times paradoxically.

With regard to the other particular problems surrounding the word ϕύσις which are treated in the manuscript, we will not attempt here any treatment of what they were in the Patristic tradition.
or how the discussion of them in this manuscript matches the tradition. Most problems arise in connection with other terms, which are treated in the other appendices and the notes. How the human nature is enhypostatized in the Divine Word is treated in Appendix B on ἐνυπόστασις; what happened to the human nature when Christ died on the cross, in Appendix A on ὑπόστασις; how the two natures interchange properties, in Appendix D on ἀντίδοσις.
Liddell, Scott, Jones: "giving in return, exchange" (cf. Arist. EN, 1133a6). The Patristic Greek Lexicon gives "exchange" as the later meaning of the word.

In our manuscript, this basic meaning remains constant throughout. Therefore, we will not list the various places in which it occurs. However, in order to better understand the doctrine or theory itself and what it meant in the Patristic tradition, we will briefly indicate its use in passages from several of the Fathers, then compare this with its use in our manuscript.

A. ἀντιδοσις in the Patristic tradition:

The three main contributors we will consider are Cyril of Alexander, Leontius of Byzantium, and St. John Damascene. Various expressions involving the term are: τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως, ἀντιδοσις ἰδιώματων, περιχώρησις (which describes a different aspect of the same reality), and in Latin communicatio idiomatum. Our manuscript uses τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως, which we have translated "in the mode of the exchange."

The doctrine of the communicatio idiomatum is known at least before the fifth century Apologists. And Bindley traces its origin back to Scripture: "Since the Logos Incarnate is the subject, as we have seem of all that is said of Jesus Christ in the

in the Bible, it is right also to speak of the words or actions in either nature as the words or actions of God..."

According to Tixeront, Apollinaris "inferred legitimately this principle."\(^1\) Gregory Nazianzen used it; for "Origen had already outlined...this doctrine; the Greek Fathers of the fourth century take it up or sanction it by the use they make of it."\(^2\)

In the fifth century, Cyril of Alexandria is the first to define clearly that ἄντίδοσις is a special mode, perhaps because he had to combat the Nestorian idea that the humanity of our Lord, if it was to be truly a human nature, would be a degradation to the Divine Word. Furthermore, he was forced to clarify his terms, and ἄντίδοσις, as a special mode, was at least a clear idea, even if it did not solve all difficulties for Nestorius. Bindley comments on Cyril's second letter: "Nestorius would not allow that this method of speech could be used without inconsistency, as indeed Cyril was already aware when he resorted to such paraphrases as ἀπαθώς ἔπαθεν."\(^3\)

Two important texts of Cyril on ἄντίδοσις are the following:

\[\text{καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ συναμφότερον, καὶ θεὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπος λεγεται...Καὶ ὅταν ἐξ ἐνος τῶν μερῶν καὶ Υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ θεὸς ὄνομάζεται, δέχεται τὰ τῆς συνυφεστηκυίας φύσεως ἰδιώματα, ἣτοι τῆς σαρκός θεοῦ παθητὸς ὄνομαζόμενος, καὶ Κύριος τῆς δόξης ἐσταυρωμένος, οὐ καθὸ θεὸς, ἀλλὰ καθὸ καὶ ἀνθρώπος ὁ αὐτὸς. Καὶ ὅταν ἀνθρώπος καὶ οὐς ἀνθρώπου ὄνομάζεται, δέχεται τὰ τῆς θείας ουσίας ἰδιώματα καὶ σώματα παιδίον}\]

\(^2\)ibid. 123.
\(^3\)Bindley, op.cit.p. 105.
The first selection goes through the consequences of the fact of ἀντίδοσις. The second makes clear that a 'certain mode' is needed to explain how ἀντίδοσις is possible. Elsewhere Cyril stresses the fact that this doctrine is concerned with the divinity or humanity taken concretely, i.e. in the Incarnated person of Christ. Or, he says it takes the divinity and humanity in the union. "For the divinity itself did not suffer..." Note also the use at the end of the first selection of περιχώρησις as a synonym for ἀντίδοσις.

Leontius of Byzantium further elaborates the doctrine of ἀντίδοσις in combating the heresy of two ἐνέργειαι (which would imply two persons in Christ). Leontius states that, contrary to this idea, there is a ἐνωσις καθ ἐνέργειαν, and that this is a valid way of speaking because of the ἀντίδοσις ἰδιώματων.

1 Migne, PG. 77, 1172C. 2 Ibid. 77, 196AB (ep. XL.117).

3 Tixeront, op. cit. p.68. See also M. 77, 777A-D.

4 Ibid. p.151. "Since each nature retains its ἰδιώματα, he says, it is quite proper that it should also retain its ἐνέργεια, which are merely its real properties or faculties in action. Leontius there rejects the διαίρεσις καθ ἐνέργειαν,..."
St John Damascene treats the principle in a way which sums up previous discussion, sets forth the rules, and justifies the use more fully and clearly than had been done before: "Καὶ οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἀντιδόσεως, ἐκατέρας φύσεως ἀντιδοῦσις τῇ ἑτέρᾳ τὰ ἱδια διὰ τὴν ὑποστάσεως ταυτότητα, καὶ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα περιχωρήσιν. κατὰ τοῦτο δυνάμεθα εἰπεῖν περὶ Χριστοῦ. "Οὗτος ο θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὕφη, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανεστράθη...")

And on περιχωρήσις, "εἰ καὶ ἤνωται, ἀλλ' ἀσυγχύτως ἤνωται" (i.e. the two natures) καὶ εἰ ἐν ἄλληλαις περιχωροῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλας τροπήν τε, καὶ μεταβολὴν οὐ προσέρχεται."

It is interesting that the formulation of the principle ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἀντιδόσεως is the same as that in our manuscript (See 228.15 ff.) Furthermore, our author attributes the principle to Cosmas (cf. nota ad locum, 228.16) who, he says took it from Damascene.

B. ἀντιδόσις in the manuscript:

The reasons which the manuscript gives for the principle are 1) to ensure the validity of the human nature "lest we suspect that the flesh underwent alienation;" 2) to show that it is our human nature which the Word assumed; 3) to explain how there is no separation in reality (πράγματι) although the two natures are in

---

1Mt.94, 1000A (Fid. Orth.) Note that the first part of this explanation, up to εἰς ἄλληλα αὐτῶν περιχωρησάν, is really a quote from Cyril, now become part of traditional doctrine. Note also that the section from Cyril which John is quoting (viz. M.77,1172C) is listed in PG under "dubious works of Cyril. The Most Holy Trinity." The last part of the passage is also to be found in Baruch III, 38.

2Mt.94, 1001A.
some sense distinct. (i.e. ἐπινοεῖ; 4) to explain the Scriptural references to Christ as the "second man" and the "bread from heaven," and to His humanity as in some sense "before time" (προσώπου). See nota ad 228V.4.

What is the relationship between the tradition and our manuscript? First, we have to take into consideration the fact that our author is only writing a precis of the principle, whereas the other Fathers we have quoted were applying it to particular situations. For example, Leontius spoke of the exchange of properties; and Cyril of Alexandria was stressing the fact that there are two natures and that the actions of each are to be attributed to the other in the Incarnate Word. Our author seems to be using freely a terminology that is well established. For example, 228V.2: ὁς ἀντιδοῦσης τῆς θεότητος τῆς σαρκός τὰ οἶκεῖα κατὰ φύσιν διὰ τὸ ἀντικρίσετον καὶ ἀναφέρετον. This echoes the wording of the selection quoted from Cyril (ἐκατέρας φύσεως ἀντιδοῦσης τῆς ἑτέρας τὰ ἰδία) and Damascene (ἐκατέρας φύσεως ἀντιδοῦσης τῆς ἑτέρας τὰ ἰδία). Consequently our manuscript would be dated much later than Cyril and some time after Damascene.

Furthermore, our author applies the doctrine of ἀντιδοτισ to explain how Christ is said to be "before all time." This was an old problem, taken up, for example, by Athanasius:

He came down from heaven and made Himself like unto us. This is why He is called the heavenly man, and also the firstborn of every creature and among his brethren. But on taking a body like ours, the Word lost none of his attributes.¹

¹Tixeront, op. cit. vol II, p.11. Athanasius is quoted by Tixeront.
Tixeront's comment on this passage of Athanasius is that at his point of doctrinal history the terminology was not sufficiently developed to enable the theologians to understand accurately this doctrine. The understanding referred to came, it seems, through the clarification of principles like ἀναρίθμος. Thus, our author is writing at a later date and is speaking about long-standing problems, applying to them new terminology.

1Tixeront, op.cit.,vol.II,p.26
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The section of Vatican Manuscript #402, folios 225V-229 still eludes exact dating or placement in a specific mainstream of manuscripts. Although the date of the codex' completion is 1283, this does not rule out the possibility that the composition of these opuscula was earlier and that their inclusion in the codex Vatican #402 is due to recopying of an earlier original. Furthermore, the fact that these works are at the end of the codex makes it more probable that they were a sort of appendix to the rest of the codex.

The internal evidence for a date after John Damascene (who is mentioned at 228.20, cod.) and before the tenth century has been presented. The argument used to establish the terminus post quem was based on the generality that an author later than the tenth century would not be likely to refer to Damascene as a near contemporary. Added to this was the suggestion that an author writing, for example, in the thirteenth century would not be silent about doctrinal developments of the tenth to twelfth centuries. But the shortness of the document does not allow us to consider the internal evidence as sufficient for any conclusive judgement about a terminus post quem.

An alternate aid to establishing a date is to determine the genre of the manuscript. Here, only a few suggestions will be made first to point out that the types of writings were not so

\(^1\text{See nota, 228.16 above.}\)
varied, second to show that the type of treatise along with
the subject matter contained in it can give a fairly accurate
date to the composition of the work.

The shortness of the opuscula and the fact that they discuss
a theological problem already limits the genre to "florilegia." This type covers any short or long discussions which were written
in the East concerning the three principle theological controvers­
ies: The Trinity, The Incarnation, and The Procession of the Holy
Spirit. R. Devreese in the second half of his Introduction à
l'Etude des Manuscrits Grecs\(^1\) in a survey of existing florilegia
mentions two types which will be of interest for comparison to
our manuscript: "Dogmatic florilegia whose source of inspiration
is the third to seventh councils," and "dogmatic florilegia of
Trinitarian writings."\(^2\)

It may now be possible to identify the genre of our manuscript
by noting its resemblance to the above types. First, the section
of the manuscript which discusses Nestorianism and the orthodox
answer to it suggests the florilegia which drew their inspiration
from the third to seventh councils. Another possibility, however,
is the florilegia drawing their inspiration from the Trinity
controversy. Taking into account, for example, the summary at the
beginning of the manuscript of Trinitarian terminology, we can
see this as a likely explanation.

Even a brief glance at the genres which seem similar to the


\(^{2}\) These two types are part of the four divisions in Chapter XII
and have been selected as most similar to our manuscript.
one used by our author, together with the internal evidence which was considered above (Cf. Nota ad 228.16.) would indicate a date in the ninth or tenth centuries.
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