Against the frauds of the Apollinarists

Leontius of Byzantium (c. AD 485–543)

SermonIndex.net / Church Fathers

English translation

Leontius of Byzantium. Against the forgeries of the Apollinarists[4] [Translated by Bryson Sewell] Some of those who suffer from the illness of the [ideas] of Apollinarius,[5] or those of Eutyches, or those from Dioscorus, in a desire to strengthen their own heresy, ascribed[6] some of Apollinarius' books[7] to Gregory the wonder-worker[8]or Athanasius or Julius,[9] desiring to deceive the more simple, which they have achieved. For, they have been able to win over[10] many of those who belonged to the catholic[11] church because of the credibility of the individuals;[12] and, among many who belong to the true faith, you would find The Faith of Apollinarius, in Part,ascribed to Gregory, and some of his own letters ascribed to Julius, and some other works of his concerning the incarnation or publications[13] ascribed to Athanasius, such as the appended exposition which is in accord with the creed[14] of the 318.[15] Not only are there these works, but also others of this sort. But [the facts] will become clear to you, and to everyone who loves the truth, from the works of Apollinarius himself, which will be given in quotation, and from [those of] his disciples, among them Valentinus, who [writes] as follows:[16]

A chapter of the defense of Valentinus the Apollinarian. "Against[17] those who say that we affirm that the body is of the same substance as God."[18] From the master Apollinarius' letter to Serapion. "I received your affectionate letter,[19] master, and, with regard to the matter about which the letter-bearer was inquiring, we have assisted him as much as we were able. We eagerly received back my master's[20] letter which had been sent to Corinth[21] and condemned the great folly of those who said[22] that the flesh is of the same substance as God." And again from the same letter. "For, the flesh is divine,[23] not by nature, but by its union with the Word,[24] so that it remains in the union, just as He himself[25] says, "It is the Spirit that gives life to the flesh;"[26] for, of course, a body can not become incorporeal, as others foolishly say." [M. 1950]

From the letter to Dionysius, the beginning of which is, "To me, etc." "To me, piety is [the] foundation of friendship,[27] and [there is] no excuse for enmity between those who guard piety. Let no one seek anything novel from me now, nor let him demand that truth be silenced, as if thereby he was creating peace. It is clear

from what we have always written that no one can accuse[28] us of those things which are said against some [people], since we do not say either that the flesh of our savior is from heaven, or that his[29] flesh is of the same substance as God, inasmuch as it is flesh and not divine, and that it is divine inasmuch as it is united to the divine in one person.[30]" And from another letter to him, the beginning of which is, "I am astounded." "I am astounded at learning about some who confess, on the one hand, that the Lord is God in flesh but who, on the other hand, fall into the division[31] that was wickedly introduced by the followers of Paul.[32]"

And again from the same letter. "It is agreed that the body is from the virgin, the divine nature[33] from heaven. The body was formed in [the] womb, the divine nature is uncreated, eternal, [and] remains one in its constitution; the body is body, the divinity, divinity. If it is the custom in Scripture to acknowledge [Him] as completely divine, and as completely human,[34] let us, too, follow the divine words, and not divide what is indivisible." And from the letter to Terentius. "And John, on the one hand, accuses the one who divides[35] Jesus, but these men outright divide [him] by confessing the union with the body; for nothing is joined to itself, nor is [that which is of] the same same-substance [joined] to the same-substance, as these men did not shrink from saying. For this is neither a composition nor a union. For nothing is joined to itself, but that which is joined together is one thing joined to another. And, on the other hand, if the Word is of the same substance as[36] the body, and, on the other hand, the body is of the same substance[37] as the Word, then each of these, of course, is invisible, according to this verse: 'No one saw God, neither is he able to see [God].[38]' For he was not made known in this way, nor was he touched, since he is invisible. Nor is John truthful when he says, 'We have seen and our hands touched [him].[39]'"

And again from the same letter. "If someone says either that the Son is two persons,[40] or that the flesh is of the same substance as God and as our flesh, or that it has descended out of heaven, and that it wasn't assumed by the One who [came down] out of heaven,[41] saying that the divinity is liable to change,[42] let this person be anathema." From '[the] Syllogisms'. "If the Word is of the same substance as the body, nothing was joined with itself by itself, but it was joined with the body and [is] not, therefore, of the same substance as it. If the body is of the same substance as the Word, then it was not seen and touched: for both of these are invisible and intangible, if indeed they are of the same substance. For John says, 'We saw and we touched.[43]' The spirit of the Lord and the body are not, therefore, of the same substance. But the invisible and [the] intangible were joined to the visible and the tangible to form a [M. 1952]unity, and so in this way it has become visible and tangible. He who says that the body is of the same substance as God blasphemes, [since he says that the] incorporeal has a body; for the Son, being of the same substance as the Father, has his own distinctive character[44] even[45] when He is united to the flesh. And it is not because he is of the same

substance as God that he was separated[46] from his own body, but in order that the body should not be thought to be of the same substance [as the Son]."

And again [from] the same [work]. "I, Apollinarius, and those who are with me think as follows concerning the divine incarnation. "The living Word of God took on flesh from Mary, of the same substance as our own flesh, in a union with the divinity, from the first conception in the virgin, and thus became man.[47] For man, according to the Apostle, is both flesh and spirit, and this is [what is meant by] 'the Word became flesh,[48]' the [act of] being united with flesh as a human spirit.[49] A human like us is called 'flesh.' The Lord, as a human, is above us;[50] and therefore [he is] heavenly because of his own spirit, which is heavenly [and] to which the will of the flesh was not opposed. And thus, in Christ, sin was being destroyed, and death caused by sin[51] was destroyed, and we, as sharers in this triumph, are saved by faith, and we, though we are of an earthly father, become [heavenly] by assimilation[52] to the heavenly [one]. Therefore, let him be anathema who denies that the flesh is from Mary, and who says that it is from the uncreated[53] nature, and that it is of the same substance as God. And [let him also be anathema] who says that the divinity is liable to change, and that from it [there are] carnal emotions.[54]

"And I, Jobius the bishop. "I confess that the Lord Jesus Christ, from eternity, the divine Word, without flesh, yet at the end of the ages[55] having joined to himself flesh from [the] holy virgin, is God and human, one and the same, composed of one substance, one undifferentiated[56] person,[57] mediating between God and humans, joining separated creatures to the one who made [them], of the same substance as God according to the divinity he has from his Father's being,[58] and of the same substance as humans according to the flesh, of human nature, that was joined to him, worshiped and glorified with his own flesh, for through it he has become our deliverance[59] from death, and our connection to the immortal. For the flesh was perfectly joined with the Word, never separated from it. It does not belong to[60] a human, or to a slave, or to a created person, but to the divine Word itself, the Creator, of the same substance as God, but not of the same substance as the incorporeal being[61] of the ineffable Father. But those who, contrary to the teaching that we learned from the beginning, say or teach that the flesh, perfectly joined with the Word, and never separated from it, is of the same substance as God, that is, as his incorporeal being,[62] — in accordance with the apostolic command, we shun these people as causing dissensions and scandals in [the] churches, and we consider them [to be] outsiders, on account of their being opposed to the ancient tradition and to the ecclesiastical peace." [M. 1953]

Valentinus the Christian wrote the following against the [doctrines] wickedly and impiously taught by Timothy and those with him, and by their teacher, the most impious Polemius.

”Since Timothy, who became Polemius’ chief[63] disciple, after raising himself against the Church of Christ from a great madness, teaches, contrary to the truth, the impiety of his teacher Polemius, foolishly instructing his pupil Cataphronius, as he himself writes to his like-minded fellows Paregorius, Uranius, Diodorus, Jobius, saying thus:[64]that the flesh of the Lord is acknowledged as divine in the union with the divine Word, and is confessed [as being] of the same substance as God, [but] in its nature it remains human, and of the same substance as us.[65] And again, quoting[66] Cataphronius, who was instructed by him, he says the following: that it is necessary that in the union [the flesh][67] be acknowledged as the same thing[68] as the Word of God, and that it should be thought to be of the same substance as God, just like the Word.[69] And still [you do something] even more impious than this, Timothy,[70] since you make the flesh, which the Lord Jesus Christ wore from the holy virgin, invisible, just as if, as you say, the flesh, through which we attained our salvation, is of the same substance as [God], just as [the] Word of God is of the same substance as [God]. And we believe that the flesh of the Lord — which he took up from [the] virgin, [and] through which (always being directed by the life-giving divine Word) mediation on our behalf[71] is always preserved[72]— is worshiped together with the Word of God, and is also acknowledged as divine and is glorified.

For in the union with the divine Word, the flesh is acknowledged as divine, but not of its own nature,[73]with the result that it remains in the union, just as the Lord himself says, ”It is the Spirit that gives life to the flesh.[74]” For the body is not in any way able to be of the same substance as the incorporeal God; [yet it is] this very thing which the followers of Timothy and Polemius, and those with them, foolishly and impiously say, employing [their] cunning of every sort[75] in their desire to attach honor to the body, [that is], incorporeity, which is impossible.[76] But it is possible and fitting for the divine-nature[77] that wears it[78] to be glorified with the glory of the incorporeal God, and in this way it[79] is worshiped by all creation as the Creator and the true, flesh-bearing son of God, and not as a God-bearing man.

What, then, is this great ignorance, or rather this faithlessness of yours, O Timothy, both your own and of those with you, and of your[80] teacher Polemius, since you say that the body is of the same substance, [but that it is also] of a different substance than the divine-nature[81] on account of the union, and since you say that it[82] is unchangeable,[83] yet that is has changed?[84] If indeed, as you[85] say, that, as the Word of God, the flesh is of the same substance, you both oppose yourselves and anathematize yourselves. Just as an intoxicated and drunk person doesn’t know what he is doing or what he is saying, so also you don’t know what you are saying or what you are affirming,[86] since this impious teaching, which you have very often taught, confutes you. Learn, therefore, you faithless men, that a union is not [composed] of the same substance.[87]If indeed it is of the same sub-

stance, it is[88]not a union. For nothing is united or attached to itself,[M. 1956] but one thing [is united] with another,[89] i.e.,[90] [the] Word of God having attached itself to flesh. And this is what is said by the divine evangelist,[91] 'The Word became flesh, and dwelled among us,'[92] the [act of] the Word being united with living[93] flesh.

"And so do you not know this, O faithless men, that nature[94] and substance[95] are the same thing in God,[96] [who is] both inexpressible and incorporeal, and of the eternal divinity[97] of the revered[98] trinity?[99] The body which the Lord wore became neither eternal nor incorporeal from the union;[100] on account of this, it is not of the same substance as [his] inexpressible and incorporeal being.[101] The Lord is eternal, and, before [taking on flesh] flesh,[102] he was of the same substance as the Father, and with flesh, the Lord[103] was [still] of the same substance as the Father. The flesh was not of the same substance, for it was a garment and a covering, and he assumed it [as a] covering[104] for the hidden mystery, and he offered [it] on behalf of man,[105] and through it he appeared to man.[106] For in no other way were we able to become spectators of God, except through [the] body. For again, the Lord is of the same substance as us according to the flesh, but not according to the divine-nature.[107] For the divine-nature is not from a woman — by no means! And the flesh is neither from above nor eternal.

Since you[108] say these things faithlessly and impiously against the truth, teaching your own impiety with so great a subtlety of words,[109] being convicted by the truth as evil-doers and deceivers, consider it worthwhile to know that the union glorified the [fleshly] nature.[110] For it did not cause the body [to be] of the same substance as God, as you dare to say in your delusion,[111] you who have fallen from the truth, and who insult the incarnation[112]of the Word, [which occurred] because of God's love for mankind,[113] [the] union with the body, which took place for our salvation, since you say[114] that on account of the union [it] is of the same substance as the impassible[115] divine-nature.[116] This is beyond all impiety, even if you wish to make yourselves wise ten thousand times over, by misinterpreting and slighting the divine Scriptures, and the books of our thrice-blessed Father, and our teacher Apollinarius, since your own documents, which you composed, refute you, [written] to deceive and to snare simpler souls, to your own injury,[117] since you were opposed to the truth. And you know that 'it is hard for you to kick against the goads,'[118]and you used a very roundabout [argument].[119] And just as the Jews committed a transgression, so also you take offence because of the flesh of [our] Savior. And even if you are many, you shall be reckoned as nothing because of your impiety.

If you would remove your meddlesomeness and faithlessness from your soul, you would understand that God appeared in a body, [M. 1957]giving [the] body the opportunity to participate[120] in the divine-nature.[121] For the body that was taken

up from the holy virgin does not itself by itself give salvation, but [salvation comes] from its association[122] with the Spirit, not in order that the body might be disparaged, but that the Spirit might be supremely praised. Do not, then, to the deception of simpler souls, be willing to write into your own blasphemous juxtaposition[123] the juxtapositions of our thrice-blessed father and teacher Apollinarius.[124] For the latter[125] were presented[126] correctly and piously by the holy and God-bearing[127] man, for they[128] are concerned with [the] condition[129] and honor [of each element], but do not denote [their respective] nature.[130] These things which make clear 'the being of the same substance'[131] are the very things which you faithlessly and impiously juxtaposed.[132] For nature[133] and substance[134] are the same thing, as I said before, and all who are confessors of the true faith recognize this.

But you, moved by strife and jealousy and diabolical envy from the very beginning against the holy bishops, and having contended in a most wicked contest against the truth, causing schisms in the Church of Christ - you have turned to such impiety when you say that the body that is subject to change[135] is of the same substance as the impassible[136] divine-nature on account of the union (which is impossible and impious), a body that is of the same substance as man, even saying that it is of the same substance as God. And how "will they look to the one whom they have pierced?"[137] For if the visible body is of the same substance as the invisible divine-nature, as you say, each would, of course, then be invisible, according to what is written, "No one has ever seen God, nor is he able to see [Him]."[138] Our Lord Jesus Christ is invisible according to the divine-nature that He has had eternally from the Father, but is visible according to the flesh which He wore from the virgin. Let both of these be placed together on one person[139] and the truth will not be broken. And so, Christ is neither two persons, nor is His flesh of the same substance as God, but it is ruled by the Word of God.

However many of us, then, are confessors of this unadulterated and true and apostolic faith, let us not receive the profane, foolish blabberings of those around Timothy and Polemius and of those with them, in accord with the Apostle's command.[140] And we keep in mind what was again spoken by him: "After one or two admonitions, avoid the factious man, knowing that such a man is perverted, and he sins as one who is self-condemned."[141] And those around Timothy and Polemius have not only appeared as factious men, but also as sycophants. For our thrice-blessed teacher Apollinarius called those who say that the body of our Lord is of the same substance as the divine-nature blasphemous and crazy. And blessed Athanasius, our most holy bishop, was wont to say that those who dared to say that the body from Mary was of the same substance as the divine-nature were from Hades. Timothy and his teacher Polemius and those with them, were quite unaware that, because the divine Word was one person, and because the flesh came into existence by means [M. 1960] of the divine Word, adoration[142]

is [directed] toward God incarnated, but the adoration is not [directed] toward the flesh. For the Word is not worshipped because of the flesh, but the flesh is worshipped together with the Word, as a robe and covering, as I said before. However many, then, are not in agreement with this rule [of faith],[143] and with this true, apostolic, unadulterated faith, let them be anathema. ”Behold, therefore, the dogs, behold the evil workers, behold the mutilation. For we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God in Christ Jesus, and who do not put their faith in [the] flesh.”[144]

From Timothy an Apollinarian, bishop of Berytus, to Homonius, the bishop and himself an Apollinarian, in which there are testimonies of Apollinarius.

”After our brother Agapius came to us andheard this from [a work] of mine that was composed among us concerning the divine incarnation of the Word, from various books of our thrice-blessed teacher, the bishop Apollinarius, he encouraged us to take a passage from it and to privately expound it to him with our own signature,[145] for your assurance. And so we did this, excerpting the following [passages] from his letter written to Sarapion.You yourself, then, also correctly say, ’We and Christ are not equal.’ To say that His flesh is not of the same substance as us, since it is the flesh of God, needs a little further distinction. For it is better to say that, on the one hand, He took on flesh that was of the same substance as us in nature, but that, on the other hand, He rendered it divine in the union. And you also say this, namely, that in this regard, [His flesh] is not of the same substance as us, since it is the flesh of God, but making a further distinction, one might say that, on the one hand, in nature His flesh is of the same substance as us, but that, on the other hand, in the union it is divine, and through the union it remains distinct. After our aforementioned brother received these things, he went to you and made them known to you. You, our master Homonius, saw these very things and, after writing [a message], you gave him a writing tablet containing the following: ’I, Homonius the bishop, confess that the Word of God received flesh from Mary of the same substance as us. But if anyone should say that the flesh that was united to the Lord is, by any means of reasoning,[146] of the same substance as God, we anathematize [him].’

Although, then, you correctly confessed, on the one hand, the nature of the flesh, saying that it is of the same substance as us, but that, on the other hand, you anathematized its complete union with the incarnate Word, since you wrote that, in no way is it[147] inherently connected with the divine-nature, but you only professed the union, such a union as a holy man might possess with God — not a man who is bound to one life and one hypostasis,[148] but [a man] who is seen in the separation from the divine—nature. And yet, since our blessed bishop [and] teacher Apollinarius said in various books that the flesh of the Lord shares in both the names[149] and distinctive features[150] of the Word, though the flesh remains

in the union, neither undergoing any change nor ceasing from its own nature — and that the Word shares in both the names[151] and distinctive features[152] of the flesh, though it also remains Word and God in the incarnation, neither changing nor having fallen into the nature of the body — consider it worthy to make it clear to us whether [you wrote your message] ignorant of the things[M. 1961]that have been written about the holy and saving incarnation of the Word from our Christ-bearing Father. You anathematized these things, either, on the one hand, understanding [them], and you rejected them as if they were not correctly spoken, and you slandered us in this department[153] as having accepted a heresy; and you anathematized the herald of piety together with piety itself.

For he said, in the work whose beginning is 'Holy:' 'From the beginning Christ is correctly confessed in regard to His body in this way, and it is not possible separately to say that the body is a created thing, wholly inseparable from him whose body it is, but it shares in the name[154] of the uncreated and in the name[155] of God, because it has been joined in a union with God.'"

And after other [things]. "In this way, too, He is of the same substance as God with regard to the invisible Spirit, since the flesh also takes part in the name,[156] since it has been joined to God, who is of the same substance." And again. "He is of the same substance as us since the divine-nature[157] is also included in the body, because He was united with that which is of the same substance as us. The nature[158] of the body is not changed in the union with God, [a union] of the same substance, nor in the fellowship[159] of the name[160] that is of the same substance. In this same way, the nature[161] of the divine-nature[162] has not been changed in the fellowship[163] with the human body and in the designation[164] of the flesh that is of the same substance as us." And again in another work whose beginning is, "Flesh and the one person[165] that governs the flesh," he says the following:

"Therefore, the Lord Jesus Christ is, as God, without sin, and with flesh, the Creator from before time, of the same substance as the only God. The flesh, since it is the flesh of God, is divine, since it is of the same substance as God, a part united with Him, of the same substance as God [and] not separated, for it neither moves separately or independently, just as a human is a self-motivated[166] animal.[167] For, on the one hand, in the fellowship[168] with the flesh, God, who is not, by Himself, human, is human. On the other hand, in the fellowship[169] with God, the flesh, which is not, by itself, divine, is divine. And, in union with flesh God possesses all the things that are in accord with the flesh and, in the union with God, the flesh receives the characteristics of God."[170] Again in another work titled, "Eulogy of Mary, and on the incarnation," he says the following:

"[He][171] sees the body as greater on account of who was united[to it], greater, I say, not only than his own body, but also than the angelic fires, for God was joined

to none of them. For none, none of those bodies gives life to the world.[172] None of the angels is made equal to God, as the One who was composed[173] of body and divinity. He makes himself equal to God when he says, ”Just as the Father has life in himself, thus did he also grant it to the Son to have life in himself.”[174] And after other [things] again. ”And although, on the one hand, you know that the Spirit is working a work[175] in you [M. 1964] as could also be separated [from you], do you consider yourself divine, with the result that your robe, even after it is removed from your body, has the power to heal maladies? That which was inseparably attached to God, [and which] became the same thing asHim because of the real[176] union, for ”The Word,” he says, ”became flesh” — do you suppose that this[177] is neither divine nor God?”[178]

Again in another work, whose beginning is, ”God does not have the pleasure of eating flesh,”he says the following: ”It is not the case that both [elements] are from heaven, but [one] is united with the heavenly [element], and there is one person[179] with [it] that became heavenly accordingly to the union, and He is adored with the adoration of the heavenly God, and as heavenly He saves by the power of the heavenly One.” And from the letter to Dionysius, whose beginning is, ”To me, piety is [the] foundation of friendship,” after a few other things he says the following:[180] ”It is clear from what we have always written that no one can accuse[181] us of those things which are said against some [people], since we do not say either that the flesh of our savior is from heaven, or that His[182] flesh is of the same substance as God, inasmuch as it is flesh and not divine, and that it is divine inasmuch as it is united to the divine[183] in one person.[184]”

Again in another work whose beginning is, ”We rightly glorify our Lord Jesus Christ,” he says the following near the end: ”*When[185] Christ was living, His body was permeated by God’s spirit,* and [the] spirit in [the] flesh was divine, [that it, it was] heavenly mind, of which we pray to partake, according to the verse, ’We have the mind of Christ.’[186] [The] holy flesh is of like nature[187] to the divine-nature, establishing divinity[188] in[189] those who partake of it, [the] foundation of eternal life, the originator of immortality for men,[190] Creator of an eternal creation, Father of the age to come.” Again in another syllogistic work, composed for John the Evangelist,[191]whose beginning is, ”All things came into being through the Word,” according to the Evangelist, he says the following: ”How is He not the true God, who says, ’I am with you for so much time, and have you not recognized me, Philip?’[192] [thereby] making known His time spent as a man with men in so much time,[193] and showing the man [to be] divine.[194] And so we must not be ashamed to say that such a man is of the same substance as God, who is revealed by the paternal form[195] of [his] divinity, just like the material for the body.”[196]

Again in the next place he says the following. ”The fact of being in equality with God, an equality that is both efficient[197] and renewing, does not make the divine human[198] with respect to the body, [for] it is impossible that, in the equality with God, there be another nature of Christ, [that is], the human [nature], to be subject to the limitations of humanity,[199] as if [the] body were of a human and not of God.” And again in another syllogistic work, whose beginning is, ”That which possesses a different life [possesses] a different action,” he says the following. ”His flesh gives us life because of the divinity[200] that is united with it, for that which gives life is divine. [M. 1965]Therefore, the flesh is divine because it was united with God. And, on the one hand, this saves, and we, on the other hand, are saved by partaking of it as if it were food. That which causes growth,[201] since it is active in what is being nourished, is of the same substance and is not nourished. Similarly, if that which gives life is not made alive in a manner similar to that which is made alive, it is not of the same substance as it. For otherwise it would be a body susceptible to death[202] like our own, in need of being made alive. But it is not a body susceptible to death, but Christ’s body [is a body] of life. The divine,[203] consequently, is not of the same substance as [that which is] human.”

And in the work to Flavius, whose beginning is, ”And still even now Christ is being struck by vile men,” after many other things he says: ”So much more do the specific natures of the elements that were united[204] remain in the mixing of the body with body.[205] For the body is indeed body, and the incorporeal, incorporeal. God is said to have become corporeal in the perfect union, and the body [is said] to have been deified.[206] And to what extent God, on the one hand, who has become corporeal, is human, -- He is both. And to what extent the body, which has been deified,[207] [is divine,] -- again it is both.” And then, a little later, he says the following: ”Already the body has ceased from being formed and from being in the form of a slave. But it is glorified in the natural union with that which is unformed, and in accord with the birth itself from the virgin.And in this regard it has not changed from being formed into that which is uncreated, but it has been united with that which is uncreated. And, being divine[208] according to the union with God, it is uncreated insofar as it is divine.[209] And since [the] body could not arise from the Father[210] (for the Father is not made corporeal), in this regard, it would never be called unbegotten,[211] nor unbegotten in its own nature,[212] as a son or offspring, in the natural union with the begotten son from the beginning.”

And in the work against Diodorus, in the first [book] after the treatise on the Trinity, in chapter 14 he says the following: ”It was a remarkable and wondrous event and happened once, and not a second time: the union of God with flesh. And this your own soul never accepts, nor [the souls] of those who lead you into this impiety andinfidelity of [the] anti-Christ. And you mock the perfect union, and you say, ’The distinctive properties[213] of God, and the distinctive properties[214] of the flesh no longer remain, if there is a union, but that the perfect union of David is

broken,if we confess the perfect union according to the flesh from David.'"[215] And in the 27 chapter he says: "You are, at any rate, vexed by the fact that, by the grace of God, we do not admit that that which is of David's seed took on immortality. And if we are asked for the reason, we say, 'Because of the perfect union.'"

Again in the 61 chapter. "It is not shameful to say, on the one hand, that the nature[216] is the same, but that, on the other hand, the origin[217] is different. For it is vain and superfluous to introduce the virgin birth, if that which was born should not be worthy of the birth, but [be] the same as those who are born from a man and a woman. You are mocking the perfect union as if it were perfect impiety, which the divine Scriptures clearly [M. 1968]introduce, neither making the human part of God destructive[218] [of the divine], nor overthrowing the human part by the divine." And in the second book against the same Diodorus, in chapter 22, he says: "And since you exhort us to answer how that which is from the divine substance[219] is the seed of David, listen: in regard to the incarnation, how is that which is created uncreated? By being united with the uncreated. How is the fruit of David's loins the Creator of [the] Creator? By having been united with the Creator. How is that which is from Abraham before Abraham? By having been united with what was before Abraham."

And in the 36 chapter of the same work. "But let him who spouts this nonsense say how that which has been joined to God in union with [His] person[220] is not divine[221] with Him? How is that which was united with the uncreated in a living union not uncreated with Him? For if the name[222] was not shared, there would in no way be such a mixing. But it would be the most illogical thing of all if, on the one hand, we named that which is incorporeal by the [properties] of the body, saying 'the Word became flesh.'[223] And on the other hand, let us not call the body by the [properties] of the incorporeal, but rather according to the union with it. And if someone wonders how the created is united with the name[224] of the uncreated, another will justly wonder still yet more how the uncreated has been united with the name[225] of the created flesh."

And in the epilogue of the same work he says: "If the Word is called flesh on account of the union, then the flesh [must] be called Word on account of the union. As the Word is [uncreated], so [the flesh], too, is uncreated, not because it wasn't created, but because it appeared as Word from the union." Again in the following [place] he says thus: "As humans are of the same substance as irrational animals in regard to the irrational body, yet are of a different substance[226] insomuch as they are rational, so too the Lord is of the same substance as humans with respect to the flesh, but is of a different substance inasmuch as He is Word and divine.[227]" And in a syllogistic work, whose beginning is, "Whatever two things are joined, they remain as two either in form or concord," he says the following. "A tool,[228] and that which causes movement,[229] by nature complete one operation. What has

one operation also has one substance.[230] Accordingly, there is one substance of the Word and of the tool."

Again in a dialogue, whose beginning is, "You say that Christ is God or man," after the first few things, when his opponent has asked how the body is God and Creator and Master, he answers by saying: "Because the body of God and [the] Creator and [the] Master possesses a unity, which we have not discovered to be of man with God." [M. 1969] Again in a work whose beginning is, "Let us guard the goodness of [the] faith," he says the following near the end. [A quotation should appear here, but it appears to be missing from Mai's printed text. The text immediately following the heading seems to be Leontius' comment upon that missing quotation].

O you truly wretched and low-souled men, who consider the very holy and great worship,[231] shared by all the world, [to be] small! For those who are not wholly ignorant even these things are enough [to demonstrate] that the letters that are published under the name of Julius, except those which Athanasius and the historians mention from among his letters, are the letters of Apollinarius. For Apollinarius' own disciples are older than all who made use of these [letters], non only [older than] the schismatics of Julian (as is reasonable), but also [older than] the orthodox, some of whom, mislead by the title[232] of these [letters], maintained in equal measure both in thinking and saying that these letters were orthodox[233] because of the credibility of the author. And especially, more than all the orthodox, it is reasonable that these men should know the works of their own teacher. But in order that we may recognize his[234] work works (even if some falsely ascribe them to Julius and to Athanasius), not only from his own disciples, but also from the consistency of the works, and from their character, bring forth passages of his works in addition to what his own disciples brought forward, and let us compare his works whole and compete, for the complete assurance of those who, loving truth, read the agreement between[235] both these works and those which bear false headings.

From an old copy of [a work of] Apollinarius that was discovered in the library of Andrew, the bishop, beloved by God,[236] of the Church of the Sidonians. "To the highly honored masters, [the] bishops in Diocaesarea, greetings in [the] Lord.

After we had sent our letter of honor, we were expecting that we would likewise obtain [letters] from Your Charity, O most honored masters, such as [we] always [received] from the blessed bishop Athanasius, who knew us to be in agreement with his teachings and obedient in every regard. But since you didn't write back (reasoning that the length of the letter didn't render our opinion clear to you), behold, we are writing what is manifestly in accord with both our and your shared teacher — I am saying these things concerning the divine incarnation, since, on account of these things, a great tumult was set into motion, not by us, but by others whom I shall pass over in silence. We confess that the Word of God did not come

upon a holy man,[237] [an event which occurred] among the prophets,[238] but that the Word itself became flesh, without having taken on a human mind, which is fickle and made prisoner by foul thoughts, but a divine mind, steadfast and heavenly. And for this reason, our savior didn't possess a body that was lifeless, devoid of feeling, and unintelligent, for neither was His body able to be unintelligent when the Lord became human on our account. Since He was truly [the] Son of God, He also became Son of man. And, since he was the only begotten Son of God, He also became the firstborn among many brothers. And so, the Son of God who was before Abraham was not one, and the [Son] after Abraham another, but [He is the] one, perfect, only begotten of God. And He is perfect by divine perfection, and not by a human [perfection]. We confess that we have fellowship with those who are thusly minded [M. 1972], but with those who think and write otherwise we have no fellowship."

From the same [work], from the Faith, in part. "Since some have greatly troubled us by attempting to overturn our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ by representing Him as God incarnate, a man united with God, for this reason we are making a confession concerning the aforementioned faith, rejecting the faithless confession, and its specious appearance, where it says that God took on a complete man, since a complete man is not, according to the Scriptures, free from sin in the present life, because he is unable to bring his own operations[239] in line with the divine operations, and, for this reason, he is not free from death. But God, united with human flesh, possesses His own operation pure, since his mind is unconquered by spiritual and carnal passions, and since he leads His flesh and His carnal movements[240] divinely and without sin. And not only is He unsubdued by death, but He also destroys death. And there is One with a true and divine perfection. Two persons,[241] and two natures,[242] are not perfect by themselves; for it is not right to say that there are two Sons, or to worship four (God, [the] Son of God, [the] Son of man, and the Holy Spirit), nor to glorify man before the Holy Spirit. And so we, too, anathematize as impious those who place man in the divine doxology together with God and with the Son before the Spirit. We say that each one of us is a complete man being received by God for salvation, each one of us who are being sanctified and are receiving the likeness of the heavenly man, and who are being made divine in the likeness of Him who is truly God by nature, according to [the] flesh of [the] man, our Lord Jesus Christ."

And in the preceding chapter. "We confess [the] one true God as sole ruler, and that [the] one true Son is from the true God, by nature possessing the paternal divinity, that is, being of the same substance as God. And we confess on Holy Spirit, in nature and in truth, which sanctifies and deifies all, being of the substance[243] of God through the Son. And those who say that either the Son or the Holy Spirit is a creation, we anathematize, as well as those who assert that the Son or the Spirit never existed. We confess all created things as subject and created by God

through [the] Son, and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. [And] still we confess that the Son of God became [the] Son of man, not in name but in truth taking up flesh from the virgin Mary, and that He is one [and] perfect, not two perfect [elements] united together, himself [the] Son of God and [the] Son of man, one hypostasis,[244] and one person,[245] and [we confess] that the worship of the Word and the flesh is one. And we anathematize those who say that there are two, and who perform different [types of] adorations [M. 1973], one divine and one human, and those who worship the man from Mary as if he were another in addition to the God from God. We confess the suffering of Christ in the flesh, His resurrection by the power of His divinity, His ascent into Heaven, His coming glorious advent for [the] judgment of the living and the dead, and for [the] eternal life of the sanctified."

From the same Apollinarius, from the work, "For the tradition of renunciation and faith," whose beginning is, "The Devil, after deceiving him, possessed the man who fell from God." "If the same man is completely human and divine, the pious mind, since, on the one hand, it does not worship the man, but does, on the other hand, worship God, will be found to be both worshiping and not worshiping the same person,[246] which is impossible. For while the man will not consider himself worthy of worship, because he won't want to act impiously, God, on the other hand, knows that He is worthy of worship. And it is impossible that the same person knows that he is and is not worthy of worship. Accordingly, then, it is impossible that the same one be both entirely divine and human, but [it is possible] in the unity of the mixed divine and incarnate nature.[247] And so the worshipers look to God inseparable from the flesh, and they do not look to one who, on the one hand, is not worthy of worship, and to another who, in contrast, is worthy of worship. Nor is it in Him[248] that the one doesn't endure [himself] to be worshipped, while the other accepts the worship which leads to [the] salvation of the worshippers. But in reality there is One in accordance with one substance,[249] and in no way are there two in two persons[250] who exist according to their own measures and their own merits."

I think that the person who has not determined entirely to be contentious no longer thinks that he can contradict these things with good reason, but that, straight away, (so as to speak freely[251]) he is obedient to the truth, and he agrees with all the decrees, that some of the letters, which are falsely ascribed to Julius, Gregorius, and Athanasius, belong to Apollinarius, or indeed concerning works on the incarnation. We need not wonder, if even [from among] the associates of Valentius, and those of Timothy, who are disciples of Apollinarius, some of them confess the 'same substance,'[252] while others deny it, and [if] both groups from the teacher contend against one another. For indeed even Gregory the theologian[253]expounds some even more impious blasphemies of his[254] in the letter to Nectarius, as if they were from his[255] works. "For," he says, "he affirms that the flesh that was taken up by the only begotten Son in accordance with the dispensation[256] is not

required for the transformation of our own nature,[257] but that that fleshly nature[258] was in the Son from the beginning." And after saying a few more things, he adds: "And this is not yet terrible, but the most difficult thing of all, that he makes the only begotten God himself, the judge of all, the originator of life [and] the destroyer of death, mortal, and that he received His suffering with His own divinity, and in that death of his body, which lasted for three days, His divinity was killed with the body, and in this way He arose again from the Father's side from death. It would take a long time to go through everything else he adds to such eccentricities."[259]

It is no wonder, therefore, if by means of his lesser impiety, saying that the body became of the same substance as the divine-nature,[260] [M. 1976] he advanced to greater impieties, adding ignorance to ignorance and impiety to impiety. And Timothy appears rather to be a member with those who boldly speak the forbidden impiety and wickedness.[261] For through this he was able to receive his commendatory letters from the great Athanasius to the Westerners, as if he were zealous against the impiety of Arius, and from them [he received] a letter to carry to the bishop. Yet his fabrication did not go unnoticed forever. For a second time after Athanasius' death, after he had again been sent to Rome, he received[262] both his own destruction, and that of the one who sent him, Apollinarius. [End] [4] Adversus fraudes Apollinaristarum, the title by which it is generally known. The title given in Migne is Adversus eos qui nobis proferunt quaedam Apollinarii, falso inscripta nomine sanctorum patrum: "Against those who are bringing forward certain things by Apollinarius, falsely inscribed with the name of the holy fathers."

[5] Literally, "the things of/pertaining to Apollinarius." Note: all names are given in their Latinized form. [6] Possibly, "appended." [7] Possibly, "sermons," or "words." The Greek is λόγους. [8] The Latin transliteration of the Greek for "wonder-worker," "Thaumaturgus," is sometimes used, i.e. Gregory Thaumaturgus. [9] Probably Pope Julius I. [10] Possibly, "seize" or even "destroy." [11] i.e. the universal Church teaching correct doctrines. [12] i.e., you can trust what is written because of the reliability associated with these particular individuals, the problem then being that false works are being attributed to these individuals whereby others are being lead astray, assuming the works to be genuine. [13] ἔκθεσις. [14] ἔκθεσις. [15] A reference to the traditional number of bishops in attendance at the council of Nicaea in 325 A.D. [16] i.e. clear which works are falsely ascribed to credible figures, etc. A more literal translation would be: "But, from the works of Apollinarius himself, which will be quoted, and from his disciples, to whom, among others, also belongs Valentinus, who is [here] appended, it will become clear to you and to everyone who loves the truth."

[17] Possibly, "to." [18] Migne adds the note, "Here we have omitted two passages from St. Athanasius' letter to Epictetus." [19] Literally, "letter of love/affection."

[20] ”my master’s” seems to be an indirect way of saying ”your.” [21] Possibly, ”we received back my master’s letter which eagerly had been sent to Corinth...,” though with respect to the normal Greek adverbial syntax, the first translation is to be preferred. [22] Possibly, ”say,” but the Greek uses the aorist participle. [23] Possibly, ”is made divine,” or ”becomes divine.” The Greek has no verb. [24] Λόγος. [25] I understand this to refer to the Word, considering the immediate context. [26] John 6:63. [27] Possibly, ”affection.” [28] Literally, ”bring against us.” [29] Possibly, ”the.” [30] πρόσωπον. [31] διαίρεσις. The Latin translator in the Migne text renders this word by error, a sense not found in LSJ nor G.W.Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, (1969), which do not suggest either ”error” or ”sect” as a meaning. But perhaps ’error’ ought to still be considered.

[32] Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch (3 century). Paul was understood to advance the idea that Jesus was only a man until his baptism, thereby denying the Trinity; hence the confusion of Apollinarius. [33] θεότης. [34] The meaning is not entirely clear. One might also render this by ”acknowledge as completely God, and completely human.” The Greek is τὸ ὅλον θεολογεῖν and ἀνθρωπολογεῖν τὸ ὅλον. The idea seems to be that one cannot divide the ’elements’ of Jesus, but must acknowledge both the divine and the human as complete. [35] Or, ”dissolves,” ”breaks,” maybe even ”destroys.” The biblical reference is to 1 John 4:3. [36] ὁμοούσιος. [37] ὁμοούσιος. [38] John 1:18. [39] 1 John 1:1. The Apollinarian is here arguing from the fact that God is invisible. If the flesh of Jesus is of the same substance as his Godhood, he argues, then it too must be invisible. But since Jesus was actually visible, touched and handled, then clearly his flesh was of a different substance (ousia) to his Godhood / divine nature / divinity.

[40] πρόσωπα (pl.). [41] Or, ”by the one from heaven.” [42] παθητήν. This could also be rendered by ”liable to suffering and death.” [43] 1 John 1:1. [44] τὸ ἴδιον ἔχει. [45] Or, ”also.” [46] Or, ”divided.” [47] ἄνθρωπος. [48] John 1:14. [49] Τὸ ἑνωθῆναι πρὸς σάρκα ὡς τὸ ἀνθρώπειον πνεῦμα. [50] Or, ”over us.” The meaning is not entirely clear. It does not, however, seem to mean, ”on our behalf,” which would require the genitive with ὑπέρ rather than the accusative. The accusative here might signify a gradation of quality. I.e. ”better than us, higher in nature”. [51] ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος. [52] Or, ”likeness.” [53] i.e. divine. [54] i.e. emotions and desires that created humans experience and suffer. [55] This doesn’t refer to the actual end of the world, but refers to the stage of the world now that Christ has entered into it as a human.

[56] Or, ”undivided,” ”indivisible.” [57] Or possibly, ”nature.” The Greek is πρόσωπον. [58] οὐσία. [59] Or, ”deliverance.” [60] Literally, ”it is not of a human, not of a slave, not of a created person, but of the divine Word itself.” [61] ἀσώματος οὐσία. [62] ἀσώματος οὐσία. [63] Literally, ”first.” [64] The sentence is an awkward fragment in the Greek; the same fragmented structure

is retained in the English. [65] It is unclear whether these units of text are to be taken as direct quotes, in which case quotation marks would be appropriate, or as paraphrases. [66] Πρόσωπον. The phrase ἐκ προσώπου + a name to introduce a quotation or paraphrase, i.e, 'from the person of," to mean, "quoting so-and-so," is a non-classical idiom but is common in later Greek. It is used both of man and of God. [67] The text is difficult. The issue was also recognized by Turrianus, who composed the Latin translation printed in Migne. Turrianus dealt with it in the same way as here. The problem is that there is a word, ταυτὸν [the same] whose antecedent is unclear, because of the difference in gender. σάρξ [flesh] must be understood to be the antecedent, yet σάρξ is a feminine word, which should have generated τὴν αὐτὴν, which is how both Turrianus and myself think that the text must be understood.

[68] ταυτὸν. [69] i.e. is thought to be of the same substance as God. [70] Leontius is directly addressing Timothy as if he were responding to him in person, not just to his text. [71] Μεσιτεία ἡμῖν. This could also be rendered as, "our mediation," but this seems to obscure the meaning. [72] The meaning seems to be Christ's (i.e. the Word in flesh) petitioning the Father on behalf of his followers. [73] Literally, "but not in its nature," i.e. the flesh is not divine by itself, but becomes divine only by union with the Word. [74] John 6:63. [75] Πολυτροπώτατα φιλοτεχνοῦντες. [76] Τὴν ἀδύνατον ἀσωματίαν. The phrase needs expanding to make sense in English. One could render it more literally, "to attach honor to the body, the impossible incorporeity," but this is a little awkward. The meaning is that incorporeity, i.e. bodilessness, cannot be attached to a body, which is by its very nature corporeal.

[77] Θεότης. [78] i.e. the body. [79] Or maybe, "He." [80] Plural. [81] Θεότης [82] Neuter, presumably referring back to the 'body,' as the only other neuter noun in this passage. [83] ἀμετάβλητον. [84] αὐτὸ μεταβληθὲν λέγοντες. [85] Plural. [86] Literally, "about what things you are giving your affirmation." [87] i.e. that any union is necessarily composed of different parts; there must be two distinguishable elements being united. Otherwise, if there is only one element, even if it is joined to itself, there is no union. [88] Or possibly, [there is no]. [89] ἕτερον ἑτέρῳ. [90] Literally, "which is [the Word] of God having..." taking the Greek ὅ ἐστι as introducing a concrete example of the abstract concept just expressed, hence my translation "i.e." [91] Literally, "the thing said, the [thing] of the divine evangelist." The Latin translator has understood the text in the same way. [92] John 1:14. [93] Or, "animated." The Greek is ἔμψυχος.

[94] φύσις. [95] οὐσία, possibly also rendered by 'being.' [96] ἐπὶ θεοῦ. [97] θεότης. [98] σεβάσμιος. [99] τρίας. [100] i.e. being joined to the divine-nature (θεότης) does not render the body's nature divine. [101] οὐσία. [102] i.e. before assuming flesh in human form. [103] Literally, "the same was...." [104] Or, "veil." προκάλλυμα. [105] προσήνεγκεν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου [106] ἀνθρώποις.

[107] θεότης. [108] Plural. [109] Μετὰ τοσαύτης τεχνολογίας. [110] τὴν φύσιν. [111] φανταζόμενοι. [112] Literally, ”you who insult the descent of the Word,” ἐνυβρίζοντες τὴν...συγκατάβασιν τοῦ Λόγου. [113] Τὴν ἐκ φιλανθρωπίας θεοῦ συγκατάβασιν τοῦ Λόγου. [114] Literally, ”saying,” λέγοντες. [115] i.e. not subject to suffering. [116] θεότης. [117] Literally, ”against your own head.” [118] Acts 9:5; 24:16. [119] περιδρομή. [120] Μετάληψις. Literally, ”giving the participation of the body to the participation of the divine-nature.” [121] Θεότης. [122] Συνουσία. [123] Παράθεσις. [124] This seems to mean, ”Your own ideas and works are blasphemous, but you are including among them some of Apollinarius, hence tampering with Apollinarius’ ideas and presenting them in a corrupt fashion,” or, ”You are taking the framework Apollinarius uses to discuss the relationship of Christ’s body and divinity, but turn it blasphemous by the introduction of ideas and changes not from Apollinarius, since his own juxtapositions deal in the realm of ’condition and honor,’ but your juxtapositions make claims about ’nature.’

[125] i.e. the statements on the relationship between the human and divine elements in Christ, as specified by Apollinarius. [126] Παρετέθησαν. [127] Θεοφόρος. [128] Referring again to Apollinarius’ ideas and works, as in footnote 6. [129] Σχέσις. [130] Φύσις. [131] Τὸ ὁμοούσιον. [132] Παρεθήκατε. [133] Φύσις. [134] Οὐσία. [135] Παθητόν. [136] ἀπαθής. [137] John 19:37. [138] 1 Timothy 6:16. [139] Πρόσωπον. [140] 2 Tim 2:16. [141] Titus 3:10. [142] Προσκύνησις. [143] Κανών. [144] Philippians 3:2. [145] Or, ”signed statement.” [146] Καθ᾽οἷον δήποτε λόγον. [147] The flesh. [148] ὑπόστασις, i.e. ”one substantive reality”. [149] ὀνόματα. [150] ἰδιώματα. [151] ὀνόματα. [152] ἰδιώματα. [153] Κατὰ τόπον. [154] ἐπωνυμία. [155] Κλῆσις. [156] ὄνομα. [157] Θεότης. [158] Φύσις. [159] Κοινωνία. [160] ὄνομα. [161] Φύσις. [162] Θεότης. [163] Κοινωνία. [164] ὀνομασία. Possibly, ”naming.” [165] Πρόσωπον. [166] Αὐτενέργητον. [167] Possibly, ”a self-motivated animal like a human.” [168] Κοινωνία. [169] Κοινωνία. [170] Τὰ θεοῦ ἴδια. [171] No subject is stated in the text. The Latin introduces ’Mary’ as the subject, but this seems rather unlikely to be correct. First of all, why would Mary see ’the body’ greater than herself? Christ’s body? But this makes little sense. Secondly, there is a masculine/neuter reflexive possessive pronoun, ”greater, I say, not only than HIS/ITS [ἑαυτου] body, but also than angelic fires....” This particular reflexive pronoun reflects the gender of the antecedent, and cannot be feminine, which would require ἑαυτῆς if ’Mary’ were the subject. So, the antecedent (the subject of the first verb, ”[ ] sees,”) must be either masculine or neuter, and the neuter here makes little sense. It seems best, then, to supply ”He” for the first subject, only capitalized because it stands first in the sentence, and ”his,” not capitalized, for the possessive pronoun.

[172] This is a difficult sentence. The Greek is οὐδὲν ζωοποιὸν κόσμου, τῶν σωμάτων ἐκείνων οὐδέν. My translation takes κόσμου as the object of ζωοποιὸν,

on the model of a related word that clearly take a genitive object as, for example, ὁ θεὸς ἔχει δύναμιν ζωοποιητικὸν τῶν νεκρῶν, ”God has the power to give life to the dead. (See entry in Lampe, p. 598). [173] ὡς ὁ κεκραμένος.... [174] John 5:26. [175] ἐνέργεια. [176] Οὐσιώδης. [177] This ’this’ probably refers to the body. [178] i.e. (1) ”In contrast to you, who rely on the work of the Spirit, Jesus is inseparably joined with God. (2) Jesus became flesh while still being inseparably joined to God, hence retaining His divinity while in the flesh. And the flesh was really a part of Him, so it must, too, be divine, and hence His body, being flesh, is also divine.” [179] Πρόσωπον. [180] This is the second instance of this passage in this work. See column 1949, A.

[181] Literally, ”bring against us.” [182] Possibly, ”the.” [183] Θεότης. [184] πρόσωπον. [185] The grammar and meaning is difficult.One might also render this by ”Christ was living with a body permeated by God’s spirit.” The Greek is: ζῶν δὲ Χριστὸς σῶμα θεόπνουν....” [186] 1 Corinthians 2:16. [187] Θεότητι συμφυής. See Lampe, p. 1292, sections b and c. [188]θεότης. [189] Possibly, ”for those....” [190] The dative here is translated as a dative of advantage. It could also be a dative ofpossession, which would render, ”of man’s immortality.” [191] This should probably be understood as ”in praise of....” [192] John 14:9. [193] Τὴν ὡς ἀνθρώπου συνδιατριβὴν μετὰ ἀνθρώπων. [194] Or possibly, ”God.” [195] Εἶδος. [196] The Greek is rendered as accurately as possible, but the meaning is obscure. [197] Ποιητική. [198] Possibly, ”the human divine.” [199] Literally, ”to be limited with the limitation of a human.” [200] Θεότης. [201] Or, ”is nourishing.”

[202] Literally, ’a body of death.’ [203] Τὸ θεῖον. [204] Τὸ τῆς φύσεως τῶν ἐνωθέντων. [205] ”The body with the body,” according to the Greek text. But note that the Latin has ”the incorporeal with the corporeal.” [206] Τεθεωμένον. [207] Τεθεωμένον. [208] Θεός. [209] Θεός. [210] ἐπειδὴ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο σῶμα.... [211] ἀγέννητον. [212] Φύσις. [213] Τὰ ἴδια τοῦ θεοῦ. [214] Τὰ ἴδια τῆς σαρκός. [215] i.e. that no such union can be perfect by definition. [216] Φύσις. [217] Γένεσις. [218] ἀναιρετικόν. [219] Οὐσία. [220] Πρόσωπον. [221] Possibly, ”God.” [222] ἐπωνυμία. [223] John 1:14. [224] Προσηγορία.. [225] Προσηγορία. [226] ἑτεροούσιοι. [227] Possibly, ”God.” [228] ὄργανον. [229] Τὸ κινοῦν. [230] Οὐσία. [231] Σέβασμα. [232] ἐπιγραφή. [233] ὀρθῶς [234] Apollinarius. [235] Literally, ”read the unity in....” [236] Or, ”who loves God.” [237] Οὐκ εἰς ἄνθρωπον ἅγιον επιδεδημηκέναι. This might also be rendered, ”did not dwell in a holy man.” [238] Literally, ”which thing was among/in the prophets.”

[239] ἐνέργεια. [240] Κινήσεις. [241] Πρόσωπα. [242] φύσεις. [243] Οὐσία. [244] ὑπόστασις. i.e. ”One substantive reality.” [245] Πρόσωπον. [246] Τὸν αὐτόν. [247] Φύσις. [248] Or, ”it.” [249] Οὐσία. [250] Πρόσωπα. [251] Literally, ”so as to speak without constraint.” [252] Τὸ ὁμοούσιον. [253] Gregory Nazianzen. [254] Apollinarius. [255] Apollinarius. [256]κατὰ οἰκονομίαν, Lampe p.941, right

column, c6 [257] Φύσις. [258] Φύσις. [259] Quoted from Gregory Nazianzen, ep. CCII, to Nectarius, [260] Θεότης. [261] Literally, ”the forbidden things of impiety and wickedness.” [262] Lit, ”he receives.” This text was commissioned by Roger Pearse, 2013. This file and all material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely. Greek text is rendered using unicode.

Introduction

Leontius of Byzantium Against the forgeries of the Apollinarists
(CPG 6817)

Introduction
Leontius Byzantinus was a 6 century Chalcedonian theologian, known to us as the author of a small collection of four christological treatises (CPG 6813-7).[1] He composed Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos lib. III, issued separately and then collected with a prologue by the author. These excited opposition from Severian Monophysite writers, to whom he responded with the Epilysis, and with the Triginta Capita contra Severum. Only a little is known about his life. He is mentioned in the Vita Sabae by Cyril of Scythopolis. Leontius was a monk of the New Laura, and head of the Palestinian Origenists. Leontius accompanied Sabas on his journey to Constantinople in 531, where he proved effective in defending the definition of Chalcedon against the Monophysites. He seems to have made known his Origenism, which led Sabas to condemn him. But he perhaps stayed in the capital for a number of years, and a Leontius is mentioned in the Acts as taking part in the anti-Monophysite synod of 536, although this may be Leontius of Jerusalem. Returning to Palestine between 537-540, he tried to advance the views of the Origenist party, but was forced to return to Constantinople where he died, soon after the anti-Origenist edict of 543 was issued.

He also seems to be the author of the work translated here Adversus fraudes Apollinistarum, a florilegium of passages from the works of the condemned heretic Apollinarius / Apollinaris of Laodicea and his disciples. The works of the latter could not circulate under their own name, but passages from them were being brought forward for controversial purposes by monophysite writers, under the impression that they were in fact by such luminaries as Pope Julius I and Gregory Nazianzen. The purpose of the collection was to permit identification of these spurious items. This text has reached us in a single 10 century manuscript, Vaticanus graecus 2195, where it appears on folios 165-184. The manuscript also contains copies of other works by Leontius (which exist in several other copies) and other works. The work was first printed in a Latin translation in 1603 by Henricus Can-

isius S.J., in volume 4 of his Lectiones Antiquae, f.106 f. Canisius states, however, that the translation was actually made by Turrianus, or Francesco Torres S.J. (1584).

The Greek text was first printed by Angelo Mai in Spicilegium Romanum volume 10, part 2, p.128-151, from the Vatican ms., which he states had once belonged to Cardinal Salvati, and then to the Colonna family, before being purchased by the Vatican when he was in charge of the library there. Mai's Greek text, accompanied by the Latin translation of Turrianus, were reprinted in the Patrologia Graeca series, vol. 86, cols.1948-1976. This translation has been made from the Greek text in that edition. The column numbers from this edition are given inline as [M.----]. After the translation was completed, we became aware of an unpublished critical edition of the works of Leontius Byzantinus, produced in 1978 by Brian Daley as a DPhil. thesis.[2] An edition and translation of all the works of Leontius Byzantinus by Brian Daley is forthcoming from Oxford University Press.[3] Roger Pearse July 2013 [1]More details of his life and works may be found in Angelo Di Berardino, Patrology: The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon (451) toJohn of Damascus (d.750), tr. A. Walford, James Clarke & co (2006), p.285-288. A critical edition and translation of all the works of Leontius of Byzantium has been made by Brian Daley and is forthcoming from Oxford University Press.

[2] B. E. Daley, Leontius of Byzantium: A Critical Edition of his Works, with Prolegomena (Diss. Oxford, 1978). Unfortunately this has not been accessible. [3]Private email from Brian Daley. This text was written by Roger Pearse, 2013. This file and all material on this page is in the public domain - copy freely. Greek text is rendered using unicode.

Source. English translation: an older public-domain translation as collected in the Writings-Database (HistoricalChristianFaith), mostly from the Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers and similar nineteenth-century editions. SermonIndex has only divided it into chapters and short sections; the wording is the translator's own. Square brackets, Greek or Latin words and footnote-free text are as the source file prints them, and a transcription error may remain. No Greek or Latin text is shown beside it yet, and no modern English version has been made.