

Against Apollinarius

by

Gregory of Nyssa

Introduction

When taking into consideration the New Testament accounts of Jesus Christ, one does not discover a developed theological account of his person. Rather, the message or kerugma found there depicts a person who fully shares our human characteristics: Jesus interacts with his friends, enemies and environment yet at the same time he stands apart from them as someone different from the rest of us. This dissimilarity results both from the claims Jesus says with regard to his own person, his relationship with God and most dramatically of all, his miracles. Despite the tantalizing picture handed down to us in the Gospels, we are completely ignorant as to what we would now designate as his awareness or mental experience. In other words, Jesus eludes any attempt to subject his person to psychological investigation.

As the early Church expanded and came into contact with the larger Hellenistic world, it was compelled to translate the message of the Gospels to non-Judaic peoples and to make use of their philosophic heritage. One of the pressing issues confronting Christian apologetics at the time was the personhood of Jesus Christ who was proclaimed as both man and God. The very fact that such a duality could be attributed to a single person was a source of agitation among those educated Greeks being evangelized as well as Christians who were engaged in proclaiming the faith. Several centuries of occasionally heated discussion in the Church were required to resolve the difficulty of two natures in Christ, human and divine. It was not until 451 when the Council of Chalcedon settled the earlier Christological disputes. Briefly put, Chalcedon articulated the unity of these two natures⁽¹⁾ though in abstract terms.

From the vantage point of Chalcedon with its clearly defined teaching on the two natures of Christ we can look backwards, so to speak, upon the teachings of Apollinarius of Laodocia (310-c.390). In many ways he brings to a head the conflicting elements of the great Christological disputes of the fourth century,

controversies which can be confusing even to the trained eye. The question of the full humanity of Jesus Christ, that is, his possession of body and soul, have direct bearing upon the question of human freedom. Although Christ fully assumed the human condition, a number of Christian apologetics subtly viewed his personhood in a Docetist fashion. When the Church Fathers sought to defend themselves against such a teaching, especially when referring to the Incarnation, they developed two frameworks which scholars commonly call Logos-sarx (Word-flesh) and Logos-anthropos (Word-man). The former was developed in reaction to Origen's doctrine on the preexistence of souls. This view failed to account for a human soul in Christ; instead, the Incarnation was perceived as a union of the Logos with human flesh⁽²⁾. On the other hand, the latter framework had as its basic principle the notion that the Logos united himself with a complete humanity, including a soul and a body. In patristic scholarship these two types of Christologies have been termed Alexandrian and Antiochene, respectively. Although such a division runs the risk of oversimplification, it provides us with a rule of thumb and enables us to make our way through this often confused period of Church doctrine. What must be kept in mind is that both the Logos-sarx and Logos-anthropos Christologies affirm that the person of Jesus Christ entered into union with mankind. In other words, Christ was not perceived as a divinely inspired man after the fashion of Arius and his followers.

Apollinarius was one of the most famous personages associated with the Antiochene school and became bishop of Laodicea, a town about fifty miles south of Antioch on the Syrian coast⁽³⁾. He was regarded as a person of immense literary accomplishment who together with his father sought during the pagan revival under the emperor Julian to disguise the Christian scriptures in classic forms. They both composed the Gospels in the form of Platonic dialogues and some of the Old Testament books into heroic verse. The writings of Apollinarius and his father (who had the same name) sometimes took poetic form; they enjoyed immense popularity during this time of persecution and enabled the faithful to maintain their Christian roots during such difficulties. A number of famous persons had attended the lectures of Apollinarius such as Jerome which enjoyed great renown at the time. However, it was about this

period that the Christology of Apollinarius was beginning to be suspect as deviated from the orthodox position of the Church.

Despite the geographical proximity to Antioch, it is more natural to associate Apollinarius with Alexandria (his father came from that city) and its teaching on the sharp division between two natures in Christ which later gave birth to Nestorianism. At a later time Cyril of Alexandria was to take over some basic tenets of Apollinarius' thought, especially his famous mia phusis or one nature of the incarnate Word⁽⁴⁾. Apollinarius enjoyed a close friendship with Athanasius, the famous bishop of Alexandria, and shared many of his views on Trinitarian doctrines. Such a friendship makes it more natural to affiliate Apollinarius with Alexandria rather than with Antioch. In the eyes of Athanasius, his friend from Laodicea steadfastly held fast to the orthodox teaching of Nikaia.

It may be helpful to briefly state the position Athanasius maintained on the person of Christ which serves to give a better picture of Apollinarius' doctrine of the Savior. The bishop of Alexandria is known for his monumental struggles against Arianism, the teaching which claimed that the Son of God was created by the Father from nothing as an instrument for creation and salvation. Christ was not God by nature but a noble creature who received the title of Son of God due to his righteousness which had been foreseen by the Father. Athanasius stressed the unity between Logos and flesh while each retains their own characteristics in a close unity. Such an "indwelling framework"⁽⁵⁾ was the object of reproach and conflict with the Antiochene school who favored the Logos-anthropos Christology. On the other hand, the school of Alexandria, whose most famous son was Origen, seemed to treat the flesh as a thing in which the Word made his home. In their minds it created an unnecessary dualistic approach to the person of Christ and devalued the role of human personhood.

For Athanasius the Logos-sarx framework is the source of all existence and subject of statements about Christ. The human aspect in Christ is ruled by the Logos, a position which has lead scholars to believe that Athanasius did not ascribe to a human soul in the Savior⁽⁶⁾. For him, to "become man" or flesh implies an intimate union between the divine and human to such an extent that it may be said that the Logos is actually man. We will see later how this position maintained by Athanasius in his struggle against Arianism which sought to

denigrate the role of Jesus Christ influenced his friend Apollinarius. The position which Apollinarius has subsequently taken flows from the basic principles of Athanasius' theology. It maintains that God is the only one who can save, an insight which had been hammered out in his controversy with the Arian opposition. For Athanasius, salvation rested upon the incarnation of divinity in all its unchangeable glory; the changeable human mind which is liable to sin could not conceivably be united with the atreptos nature of divinity.

Due to the influence of Athanasius, Apollinarius must have had his position in mind which implied that Christ lacked a human mind or soul; salvation for mankind depends totally upon the immutable power of God through the Incarnation minus any cooperation from the human sphere. For Gregory, perfection is not immutability but a progression towards the good which involves correct moral behavior and alteration. It is this notion of change which enables Gregory to respond to Apollinarius, "Since the human mind is mutable, it is unable to have knowledge of the Only-Begotten God and to speak of its origin" (J.194). However, he accepts the premise of Apollinarius that the human spirit is mutable (treptos)⁽⁷⁾, "The human race and the entire man is not saved by the assumption of mind but by assuming flesh, its natural governing principle. The immutable mind does not require submission to the flesh by any defect of knowledge; rather, it unites the flesh to itself without coercion" (J.195). However, for Apollinarius this mutability belongs to free will's ability to chose between good and evil. If the nous (mind) is mutable by nature, the Logos clearly cannot have assumed a human mind. To this accusation Gregory responds, "just as [Christ] was not defiled by his birth in the flesh, neither is the mind (nous) diminished by assuming mutability (trope," J.195). For him trope implies that the spirit does not consist solely in alternation between good and evil. The human spirit is able to become atreptos and be healed from the inclination towards evil without at the same time ceasing to be a created spirit, for even the human nature of Christ uses trope towards the good.

The writings of Apollinarius confront us with the problem of a dichotomy or more specifically, a trichotomy, soul/spirit-flesh. The bishop of Laodecia maintains that man is an enfleshed mind, a composite of spirit and flesh, pneuma and sarx. As a source for these terms he refers to St. Paul whose apparently trichotomist terms appeal to him. Since both man and the Logos are enfleshed minds

(nous ensarkos), to be made in man's likeness means that the Logos has an enfleshed mind. It was the intent of Apollinarius not to pay too much attention to such terminology; rather, his concern laid in preferring the God enfleshed (theos ensarkos) with an inspired man (anthropos entheos), for this latter phrase implies a created mind enlightened by wisdom⁽⁸⁾. In addition to this, Apollinarius is fond of St. Paul's term, a "heavenly man." Gregory of Nyssa levels an especially strong invective against this position, claiming that the flesh of the divine Logos preexisted in heaven right from the beginning. As Raven has demonstrated⁽⁹⁾, such a view was held by some of his more extreme followers while the fragments assembled by Lietzmann do not reveal this fact.

Apollinarius has taken up the teaching of Athanasius, that God must remain immutable in order to save us. The difficulty he experiences lies in the problem of how God can assume a middle position between his own divinity and humanity. Gregory scoffs at this by presenting the example of a goat-stag (tragelaphos, J.215-16). Here he mocks Apollinarius' position who calls Christ a Man-God: "the combination of names [goat and stag] denotes the participation of one nature in another." For the bishop of Laodicea Christ is not an Arian demiurge standing midway between full divinity and humanity; rather, he is a mixis or mixture of both components. Regardless of the source of his teaching and whether or not it comes from scripture, Apollinarius penned his thoughts out of a formidable literary and scholarly background. He upheld the homoousion, that the Trinity is one as proclaimed by Nikaia. Despite this noble defense of the faith and the admiration of his friend Athanasius, Apollinarius was condemned for heresy by the Council of Constantinople in 381, by the pope in the late 370's, and by a local synod at Antioch.

Despite the close affiliation with Antioch, Apollinarius perceived the humanistic approach of this school as threat to Christ's nature by dividing it into two elements. It thereby rendered him into something akin to a divinely inspired man whose Arian counterpart was the belief that Christ was a lesser god. Apollinarius undertook what was perhaps the most comprehensive attempt to date at theologizing about the personhood of Christ. The salient point of his teaching is the rejection of a human mind in Jesus, something akin to Arianism.

Nevertheless, as J.N.D. Kelly has pointed out⁽¹⁰⁾, Apollinarius was a powerful antagonist against the Arians regarding Trinitarian matters, so it seems unusual

that such a figure would succumb to their Christological principles. We have also observed that the great Athanasius tended to neglect the presence of a human soul in Christ, a feature of the Alexandrian school in general. The sometimes rigid manner of their Logos-sarx framework which makes the Logos the soul in Christ has an innate tendency of treating the Logos as something secondary. Apollinarius had understood that the Father and Son form one identical divine substance, a position taught by his friend Athanasius. However, problems arose when he turned his sharp mind to Christology.

In attempting to conceive Christ's preexistence, Apollinarius is fully orthodox and wields this belief against the Arians who subscribed to the position that Christ had one (human) nature and was a divine though created being⁽¹¹⁾. However, when he treating the Incarnation, Apollinarius slips from the orthodox perception of Christ and says that he has only one true (divine) nature. Apollinarius arrives at such a conclusion by the application of rational investigation⁽¹²⁾ which is intended to bolster faith. If this approach were not taken, Christians would fall into error for "it behooves Christians to be inquisitive and not to imprudently be unmindful of the opinions belonging to either the Greeks or Jews" (J.135).

In accord with Church teaching, Apollinarius believed that Jesus Christ has fully redeemed humanity. He is the only mediator between God and man, a fact which led Apollinarius to maintain that if God were a unity, Christ himself must be a unity. If the divine element were simply united with mankind, we would have two sons, one of God by nature and the other by adoption. In this light the flesh of Christ is not added to divinity but constitutes one nature with the Godhead, a fact which prompted Gregory of Nyssa to write his treatise against the bishop of Laodicea. Hence the Incarnation showed that a physical body was joined with the immutable divine Logos. When John said "the Word became flesh," Apollinarius interpreted this as the Logos taking on flesh without assuming a human mind, the source of evil and unbecoming thoughts. For Apollinarius, the Logos is the sole life of Jesus, the God-man, even down to the physical level. He thereby constitutes one living unity in whom the soul directs and the body follows this direction. No conflict of wills is present in this view of Jesus, a basic tenet of the Antiochene school we have mentioned above and against which Apollinarius rebelled.

Apollinarius maintained that the body does not by itself compose a nature because it is not the source of vivification. On the other hand, the Word cannot be perceived as a separate nature apart from his incarnate state since the Lord dwelt with us in the flesh. The Incarnation represents a self-emptying of the Word in order to assume human flesh; keep in mind, though, that Christ does not empty himself of mind but there does remain the mind of the Savior. Nevertheless, the flesh of Christ did not descend to us from heaven, nor is his flesh on earth consubstantial with God as Gregory of Nyssa wrongly perceived Apollinarius as teaching; rather, his flesh is God inasmuch as it is united with divinity to form one person.

Such a doctrine reminds one of Arius who viewed the Son (who was not divine) as the soul of Christ, whereas Apollinarius denied a rational soul or human mind to Christ so that the Son would not be open to change, a characteristic belonging to the created realm. As a consequence, the flesh of Christ is the very flesh of God which is to be worshipped. While remaining God, the Logos shares the properties belonging to the flesh, and the flesh, while remaining flesh in its union with the Godhead, shares the properties belonging to God. This view offered by Apollinarius safeguards the unity of Word and flesh in Jesus Christ and demonstrated his full divinity. On the other hand, it undermined the humanity of Christ. If the divinity assumed the place of the human mind, how does God touch the rest of mankind? Soul and flesh lacking intellect (man's most essential component) do not constitute man. The teaching of Chalcedon towards which the Church was moving would have been inconceivable for Apollinarius: one person containing two natures. It would follow that Christ lacked a human mind due to its mutability and hence, its tendency to sin, and Apollinarius seems to excuse persons who sin with their minds: he has already demonstrated that even God cannot heal this human mind.

Despite the well-known opposition of Apollinarius to Arius, both men seem to have possessed a similar Christology in that the Logos replaced the human soul in Christ. One sometimes wonder whether or not Apollinarius assumed this view held earlier by Arius and incorporated it into his own teaching⁽¹³⁾. He opposed any reference of human attributes to God, notably mutability, while at the same time shunning those who may separate human components from God, a reason for his stress upon the unity of divinity with human flesh. Apollinarius also came

into conflict with a contemporary of his, Diodore of Tarsus, and both were noted by a tendency to shun allegorical interpretation of scripture. The fragments of Apollinarius handed down to us reveal his concern about the tendency of Antiochene Christology as represented by Diodore to join a man to God. Such a view is more plausible than the one claiming that Apollinarius borrowed some of his insights from the Arians. Indeed, there seems to have been a common thread of presuppositions propagated throughout the area to which Apollinarius had put his own peculiar interpretation upon them.

Together with this notion of a common source to Apollinarius and Arius, we have Muhlenberg's view⁽¹⁴⁾ that Apollinarius desired to contrast Christ as theos ensarkos, the enfleshed God, with the anthropos entheos, the inspired man who mediated knowledge of God. Apollinarius stressed the role of the divine mind as being enfleshed, a notion which appears to have come from his belief that the personhood of Jesus Christ as being fully identified with God could not be compromised with any pagan philosophy. The presence of a human mind in Christ would therefore abolish any distinctive characteristic of Christianity. The presentation of Apollinarius' actual teaching is extremely difficult although the work of H. Lietzmann in 1904 have done much to clarify the issue⁽¹⁵⁾. Although we safely assume from a study of the fragments that Apollinarius conceived of the Logos taking the place of the human mind in Jesus Christ at the Incarnation, the real intent of Apollinarius, there nevertheless remain difficulties as to his exact meaning.

The Treatise Against Apollinarius (also know by its Latin title, Antirrheticus)⁽¹⁶⁾ was composed by Gregory of Nyssa to combat the suspicious teachings of Apollinarius as represented by excerpts from his Apodeixis. Gregory employs the likeness of the lost sheep⁽¹⁷⁾ to illustrate his argument against what he believed was the belief that Christ's flesh preexisted. Prefacing his remarks to this parable with a quote from Apollinarius he says, "The man Christ preexisted not as another Spirit existing apart from him, that is, God; rather, the Lord had the nature of a divine man while remaining a divine Spirit" (J.147). The basic message of this text is that the Spirit is identified with a preexistent man. In other words, the Lord in the nature of the God-man was the divine Spirit. The rebuttal to this position follows in J.148: "[Apollinarius] is convinced that Christ became

manifest through flesh from the Virgin not only according to the eternity of his divinity as we believe, but also according to his flesh which preexisted creation." As we have said above, this was an incorrect interpretation of Apollinarius' teaching as fragment 140 offered by Lietzmann indicates⁽¹⁸⁾.

Following this passage Gregory of Nyssa continues in an invective tone against Apollinarius by employing quotations which pertain to Christ's divine preexistence: "Before Abraham was, I am" [Jn 8.58] and "He existed before me" [Jn 1.15] (cf. J.148.5 & 7). A bit earlier in his treatise Gregory again quotes from Apollinarius⁽¹⁹⁾, "Since Christ as God has a soul and body along with spirit, that is the mind, one may naturally say that he is a man from heaven" (J.143). This passage is an elaboration upon 1Cor 15.45⁽²⁰⁾, "The first man Adam was made a living soul (psuche); the last Adam was made a life-giving spirit (pneuma)"⁽²¹⁾. Apollinarius elaborates upon this verse by saying, "The second man from heaven is spiritual. This signifies that the man united with God lacks an intelligence of his own" (J.145). In these two passages Apollinarius sees a confirmation of his Christology, namely, that the Logos is unable to be complete by uniting his divinity with humanity. "What can be clearer? Opposites cannot be united, that is, perfect God with perfect man" (J.162). Instead, the divine pneuma takes the place of reason, man's pneuma, in the Incarnation. As Apollinarius states, "But the man [Christ] did not come from the earth as commonly assumed; rather, God descended from heaven and united himself to human nature" (J.182). In his view only this kind of Incarnation is able to guarantee the unity of the personhood of Christ as well as mankind's redemption⁽²²⁾. This is possible only because Apollinarius says that Christ has a soul and body along with spirit (cf. J.143) as a man from heaven. At this juncture we see that Apollinarius holds that the divine pneuma or nous is man's most important characteristic: "But he who was crucified was not divine by nature; this did not belong to him although he is spirit" (J.172). Gregory leaves the choice of positions up to the readers of his treatise saying "Let a person carefully judge...whether our opinion which says that the divine glory dwelt in our land out of love for us, as Apollinarius says, the flesh belonging to God was not newly acquired out of his bounty but was consubstantial (sunousiome) and connatural (sumphutos) with him" (J.154).

Gregory of Nyssa uses Eph 1.7 ("in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the richness of his grace") to show that the divine Logos did not have flesh from all eternity. He then proceeds with an exquisite exegesis of the lost sheep (Lk 15.5, Mt 18.12) where Christ is depicted as the good shepherd who becomes one with the sheep he took on himself. This passage plays a crucial role in Gregory's interpretation of our redemption and by implication, the Church, since it is composed of those who have been redeemed by Christ. The essence of his exegesis directed against Apollinarius reads in J.153, "But having imparted himself to us by his own body and soul, Christ opened paradise for the thief by destroying the power of corruption. And the destruction of death renders corruption powerless by God's life-giving power, for his bounty and grace partake of our human nature. Thus he who shares both parts [body and soul] unites through his resurrection that which has been dispersed." This part of his treatise lies at the close of the paragraph just preceding it where Christ "sanctified the entire mass of our human nature by that first fruits" (aparche). This word plays an important role in a short treatise by Gregory⁽²³⁾.

Refer now to J.144 where Prov 9.1 is quoted by Gregory, "'Wisdom built a house for herself' by forming earth into a man from the Virgin through which he became united with humanity." This verse is intended to counter Apollinarius' perception that Christ had human flesh preexisting in heaven as we have seen earlier. Later on (cf. J.223-24) Gregory speaks of the Virgin as being the one through whom the First Fruits (aparche) as New Man (Ho kainos anthropos) must unite a human body and soul to himself to redeem all mankind: "Just as this creative power brings man into existence by a union of body and soul, so does the power of the Most High exercise itself with regard to the Virgin's immaculate body in an immaterial fashion through the vivifying Spirit...He (the New Man, Christ) was formed according to God, not man, since the divine power equally pervaded his entire constitution. As a result, both parts of his constitution partook of divinity and had a harmonious composition of soul and body."

In J.151 Gregory accuses Apollinarius of holding that Christ's humanity preexists and that his Incarnation has no meaning. Here he similarly puts the bishop of Laodicea in the same impious category of Arius and Eunomius⁽²⁴⁾. Against the contention which holds that the Logos had preexistent human flesh, Gregory

says that in the "last days" (ep'eschaton hemeron, implying Heb 1.2), Christ as first fruits (aparche) bound himself with our earthly, human nature. Such a union does not suggest that a completion was conveyed to our human nature through the First Born; rather, it is a completion in both body and soul. However Gregory does not subscribe to such consubstantiality; the fact that Christ "who bears the sheep upon himself impresses no trace of sin nor of going astray" (J.152) signifies that he by nature is separate from humanity⁽²⁵⁾.

R. Hubner says that we should view Eph 1.7 in connection with another verse from scripture, Heb 2.14⁽²⁶⁾. This verse lies in the background of J.153-4 where Gregory speaks of Christ as priest and lamb through his passion and resurrection. He is called "Originator" (archegos) of our life (J.154) through his priestly activity. Although the body and soul are separated at the point of death, the former undergoes corruption while the latter remains incorruptible. As the bishop of Nyssa says, "God resurrected man to union with him after the separation of body and soul and their subsequent union, resulting in total salvation for human nature" (J.154). This passage is intended to counter Apollinarius' claim that the Redeemer maintains a certain homogeneity with those he has redeemed.

At this point I wish to set forth the division of Gregory's Treatise Against Apollinarius as divided into nine sections according to the scheme offered by Muhlenberg⁽²⁷⁾:

- 1) Introduction: correct perception of the faith is the enlargement of the flock (Church). J.131-2.
- 2) Against Apollinarius' claim that in Jesus God had suffered death, Gregory counters with his own teaching that in Jesus, both divinity and humanity are clearly distinguished. J.133-47.
- 3) Against the claim of the eternity of Christ's physical body, Gregory maintains that the Incarnation occurred within space and time. Christ assumed our humanity and raised it up. J.147-62.
- 4) Christ's humanity is essentially human nature. He did not lack reason. J.162-84.

- 5) Against Apollinarius' contention that Christ was an enfleshed mind (nous ensarkos), Gregory teaches the distinction of two natures in the Redeemer. J.185-94.
- 6) Against the doctrine that Christ lacked reason, Gregory shows that all capacity for virtue which Jesus shows to mankind requires reason for it to function. J.194-9.
- 7) Gregory demonstrates against Apollinarius the unity of Christ's divine nature in the Incarnation and teaches that Christ is composed of two different natures, not simply one. J.199-208.
- 8) Gregory shows that a trichotomist understanding of human nature cannot be applied to Christ, that Christ is perfect man and perfect God, and that after the resurrection Christ's humanity is transformed as well as ours. J.208-30.
- 9) Conclusion: the Apollinarist significance of Christ's passion must be avoided. Gregory concludes with a brief passage from Apollinarius. J.230-33.

As Muhlenberg correctly says, this outline does not bring out all the fine points of Apollinarius' theology. Gregory has taken a thematic approach to Apodeixis and attempts to see their inner unity that he may counter with an orthodox position.

For Apollinarius, any form of union with Christ which combines the divine Logos with a human soul leads to submerging the human in the divine and therefore to a loss of freedom on our part. Gregory often touches upon this critical notion of freedom in his treatise as in J.141: "This faculty [free choice] belongs to the mind and is not found among infants. How can a person [referring to Apollinarius] who opposes and reduces free will to servility lack a mind?" As Gregory later says in this same section, the freedom to choose is what is most noble in man, and for Christ to lack such a choice, as Apollinarius would have it in his theology, is an offensive interpretation of scripture. Yet it is paradoxical that Apollinarius decided to oppose the Antiochene tendency to stress this freedom of choice. Such a faculty is free yet weak. "How, as [Apollinarius] says,

can flesh be joined to God without coercion and share in pure virtue? For who does not know that the correct action of free choice is virtue? The flesh is a vehicle of free choice led by the impulse of discretion, for free choice would be nothing if it were not for mind and disposition" (J.197-8). Just below this passage (J.199), Gregory defends this faculty in face of Apollinarius' belief that it is swallowed up into Christ's divinity: "Not only is the mind in man but it is more noble than everything else. The free, unconstrained inclination for the good is a perfect witness to the mind" (J.199).

The kind of union espoused by Apollinarius stems from his Platonist view of man's soul as the principle of life which distinguishes it from the inanimate realm. Here all sentient beings, human beings and animals, possess a soul, so there is nothing especially distinctive in this faculty. On the other hand, spirit (pneuma) comes directly from God, the means by which man perceives intelligible realities, and sets him off from the beasts. Because this spirit is divine in origin it has a natural similarity for the Holy Spirit which can easily take the place of a man without distorting his humanity. And when this view is shifted to the incarnate Christ, Apollinarius presents us with a divine man incapable of mutability and therefore of choice. Granted this is an attractive solution for a problem with which we are all familiar. Keeping in mind Apollinarius' Platonic view, he transferred the notion of the spirit's escape from the material realm to our resurrection in Christ. As a result, he could depict Christ as have one (divine) will without peril to either his divinity or humanity. Apollinarius taught that in Christ the human spirit as distinct from soul was substituted by the indwelling Holy Spirit of the Logos.

By denying a rational soul to Christ Apollinarius came to the conclusion that Jesus was devoid of human nature. On the other hand, he bestowed him with an irrational with an irrational soul (animal nature). It seems that the irrational body of Christ lacks the dignity of a nature but has some form of reality. The combination in his person of divinity and this irrational body is a mixture (mixis) resulting in something new unlike either of the constituent parts.

Wolfson⁽²⁸⁾ believes that this belief has its roots in Greek chemistry, especially in Aristotle's conception of predominance reflected in Apollinarius. This means that the union of the irrational soul with the Logos, the latter retains its nature but the irrational soul does not, just its quality. When applied to the personhood of

Jesus Christ, Apollinarius claims that the divine nature of the Logos became incarnate in him while his body retained its irrational soul and therefore suffer. It seems that Gregory of Nyssa misunderstood Apollinarius on these grounds, saying that "the Only-Begotten Son's divinity is mortal and...that his impassible, immutable nature is subject to change and passion" (J.136).

Apollinarius shifted from a trichotomist (J.186-7) anthropology to account for references in scripture to Christ's soul to a dichotomist position in the face of criticism. Here he has the Logos taking the place of the human intellect in Christ while retaining an irrational soul as Wolfson has pointed out just above.

Apollinarius' Apodeixis naturally follows into the former stage of his development where the Logos takes the place of pneuma or nous in Christ's humanity. Both the trichotomist and dichotomist phases of Apollinarius have as their common feature a stress on the Logos as governing principle and the passivity of the flesh, only the former group of writings gives more attention to the Logos as the soul ruler of the flesh. These terms were more popular in nature and did not belong to any particular school of philosophy. Both phases do not lack the so-called communicatio idiomatum or exchange of properties. As Grillmeier has noted⁽²⁹⁾, this is not merely a logical-ontological matter for Apollinarius; rather, it acquires depth only if one pays close attention, as did Apollinarius, to the two kinds of being.

It is clear from the excerpts selected by Gregory of Nyssa in his treatise that Apollinarius takes his anthropology from the authority of St. Paul. The bishop of Laodicea finds the text 1Thes 5.23 especially crucial for his trichotomous position⁽³⁰⁾ even though Paul in other places speaks of a dichotomous soul-body relationship. In Gregory's words, "[Apollinarius] says...that the flesh is not inanimate, for this shows the spirit to be a third entity in addition to soul and body. 'If man consists of these three elements, the Lord is a man. Therefore, the Lord consists of three elements, spirit, soul, and body'" (J.209). R. Norris says that the division into dichotomy and trichotomy may be detected in Apollinarius' special use of St. Paul's pneuma-sarx expression. He points out references in Paul suggesting that these two aspects are not to be taken as implying a split in the constitution of a person⁽³¹⁾. It seems that for Apollinarius, the Pauline division of flesh-spirit points to a person's humanity and enables one to describe

the composition of the Logos after the Incarnation when he assumed human nature.

It seems that in his zeal to defend the orthodox position Gregory of Nyssa had misunderstood Apollinarius on this important point; he failed to see that the bishop of Laodicea was attempting to formulate his Christological and anthropological views. For Apollinarius, spirit in the case of Christ means the Holy Spirit while in a human person it refers to a created spirit. It must be kept in mind that he was assailing the Antiochene tendency to perceive Christ in a dualistic fashion and desired to stress the unity between nature and person. It seems that any reflection upon the teaching of Apollinarius which is based upon unclear textual evidence such as the excerpted sections in Gregory's treatise must be treated with caution. Gregory seems to have overlooked the fact that Apollinarius intended to perceive the flesh assumed by Christ and incorporated into his person was not from eternity but formed a composite whole beginning at the Incarnation.

The insistence Apollinarius places upon the singularity of the divine Logos after the Incarnation does not imply, as Prestige has remarked⁽³²⁾, that he was a Monophysite. Although Gregory of Nyssa (as well as Gregory of Nazianzus) accuse Apollinarius of teaching that Christ's human nature preexisted, Scholars like Raven⁽³³⁾ have shown that this accusation was not justified because a clearer appreciation of Apollinarius' position has evolved from the fragments which have survived. Apollinarius says that "from the beginning" the Incarnation involves two aspects, a human birth and a heavenly descent. Gregory of Nyssa has taken the phrase "from the beginning" as from the beginning of creation, giving rise to a misrepresentation of Apollinarius' theology. Actually the bishop of Laodicea means that the human body in Christ has come to participate in God's uncreatedness; Christ is termed the heavenly Man because he descended from heaven to become man. It seems that if Apollinarius is to be accused of heresy, it lies in his belief that the divine spirit of God the Son was substituted in Christ for a human mind. In other words, when God took human flesh, this is exactly the position of Apollinarius; his battle with the Antiochene school prevented the bishop of Laodicea to allow for any possible duality in the personhood of Christ. If the flesh is dismissed from having a role, it follows that the soul too plays no part in Christ and therefore by extension, to our salvation. In this case the

famous dictum of Gregory of Nazianzus holds true: "that which has not been assumed has not been healed."

In the words of Walter Kasper⁽³⁴⁾, Apollinarianism is essentially a Hellenization of the Christian faith where God and man form one living whole in Jesus Christ. God becomes part of the world and a principle within this world whereas the coming of God's reign in Jesus Christ means that both freedom and salvation for mankind is inverted. That is to say, God and man impose limits upon each other and are mutually exclusive. The Church had been influenced by Apollinarianism when it emphasized Christ's divinity to the detriment of his humanity. In the course of time, devotion to the Virgin Mary and saints took on a more prominent role to act as mediators between us and Christ.

The controversy with Apollinarius centers around the interpretation of Lk 1.35, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you." This verse is employed in J.139 and is used as a rebuttal to Apollinarius' statement, "If the Son of Man is from heaven and Son of God from woman, how can he be both God and man?' I believe that Christ is both man and God...for neither is the divinity earthly nor is humanity divine; rather the power of the Most High comes from above through the Holy Spirit which overshadowed our human nature." As M. Canevet has observed⁽³⁵⁾, it is the notion of power (dunamis) as perceived in Christ's humanity which saves mankind. This commands the vision which Gregory of Nyssa has of the personhood of Jesus Christ. Gregory's chief theme which runs through all his theology is to guard Christ's divine attributes. With this fundamental principle in mind, we can see that for the bishop of Nyssa the notion of becoming is applied not so much to God becoming man but of man becoming God in Christ. This latter principle helps to explain his stress upon the new creation. In a beautiful passage dealing with the Incarnation (J.225-26) based upon Lk 1.35 as stated above, Gregory of Nyssa understands the human nature of Christ in reference to his salvific mission.

* * * * *

The following supplement contains quotations from Against Apollinarius attributed to Apollinarius of Laodicea. The pages refer the critical edition:

-132: Proof of the divine incarnation according to the likeness of man (also cf. 133 & 134).

-134: Only a pious faith is worth practicing, for neither did Eve have the benefit of a faith which has been subject to inquiry. It behooves Christians to be inquisitive and not to imprudently be unmindful of the opinions belonging to either the Greeks or Jews.

-137: The Faithless and heretics claimed that God did not become man and was not subject to human passions. Some heretics appropriate the form of birth from a woman and through sufferings.

-138: To call Christ a divinized man is contrary to apostolic teaching and alien to the synod of bishops. Paul, Photinus, and Marcellus are the authors of this distorted view.

-139: If the Son of man is from heaven and Son of God from woman, how can he be both God and man?

-140: But God took on flesh by the spirit while man took on divinity by the flesh.

-the Word became flesh according to its union with human nature.

-But the flesh is not inanimate, for 'it militates against the Spirit, and its law is at enmity with the law of my mind' [Rom 7.23].

-142: God sent the Lord from heaven.

-143: Since Christ as God has a soul and body along with spirit, that is, mind, one may naturally say that he is a man from heaven.

-145: The second man from heaven is spiritual. This signifies that the man united with God lacks an intelligence of his own.

-146: Paul says that the first Adam has a soul with a body and certainly did not lack such a body; he bestows a name to this unity when he designates the soul as an appropriation of spirit.

-147: The man Christ preexisted not as another Spirit existing apart from him, that is, God; rather, the Lord had the nature of a divine man while remaining a divine Spirit.

-147: The Spirit does not differ from Christ.

-The Lord was divine Spirit in the nature of a divine man.

-155: By them that man by whom God the Father spoke to us had manifested himself, the founder of the ages, the splendor of God's glory, and the stamp of his substance inasmuch as he was God by his own spirit and was not another God, that is, once he cleansed the world from sin through his own flesh.

-158: The prophetic word says that God does not share the same substance as God according to the flesh; rather, he is united to the flesh according to the spirit.

-162: See, Jesus Christ preexisted in his equality with the Father and became like men.

-What can be clearer? Opposites cannot be united, that is, perfect God with perfect man.

-164: But man's body consists of a vile form.

-165: Not a man but as a man, because the noble part is dissimilar to man.

-He humiliated himself according to the flesh, yet God exalted him according to the divine sublimity.

-166: He is glorified as man, but the glory which he possessed before the world was established belongs to God who has eternal existence.

-168: As man he is glorified, rising up from ignominy; as God he possesses glory which existed before the world.

-For the Greeks and Jews are clearly faithless by failing to accept God as born from a woman.

-169: But God had flesh before the ages and was later born of a woman, underwent passions, and by necessity had human nature.

-But the Greeks and Jews will assent to our opinion if we say that a divinized man was born of a woman as in the case of Elias.

-170: Those who do not ascribe to the faith, for example, the birth of God from a woman and his crucifixion by the Jews, are likewise ashamed by such things.

-171-72: God was incarnate from the beginning. He has a visible, palpable body which was born of a woman at the last days. He grew progressively by taking food yet existed before everything and created men along with everything both visible and invisible. He experienced fatigue and felt distress in the face of death.

-172: But he who was crucified was not divine by nature; this did not belong to him, although he is spirit.

-174: If we deny that, we must claim that Christ did not preexist prior to his earthly birth nor existed before all.

-Who is holy from his birth?

-175: Who is wise unless he was taught?

-Who has accomplished the works of God in power?

-176: We distinguish a certain operation according to the flesh which is equal to one according to the spirit.

-He who is equal in power has distinction of operations with regard to the flesh according to which he has vivified not all but those whom he wished.

-177: No one perishes or rises up by reason of his own free will.

-179: But the impious undergo great tribulation.

-It is not recorded that Christ as a man of the earth does not speak this way from his own will as some claim, but as God who descended from heaven.

-180: It is not recorded...(cf. 179).

-182: But the man Christ did not come from the earth as commonly assumed; rather, God descended from heaven and united himself to human nature.

-These words expressing distress do not come from the man whose origin lies in the earth; rather, they come from the God who descended from heaven.

-Christ descended from heaven and united himself to human nature.

-185: But we profess two persons, God and the man which he has assumed. This position is not to be maintained, but to imply that Christ assumed flesh means that he is none other than the incorporeal God. At the same time, Christ resembles us by his life in the flesh.

-Christ is one in the same manner as he is one with us, that is, composed of spirit, soul, and body.

-186: For Christ cannot be made in the likeness of man unless enfleshed according to the human mind.

-187: If the Lord did not have an enfleshed mind, it would consist of wisdom.

-188: The presence of God does not come about through Christ's dwelling with us, but by the birth of a man.

-189: If we believe the Lord to be wisdom, the very one who manifested himself to each person who received grace, we no longer confess the dwelling of God as Christ's presence among us as though wisdom has alienated itself from God.

-190: The enfleshed mind was not the Word but wisdom.

-If mind is not enfleshed it is wisdom.

-If wisdom is not present in the mind, the Lord did not descend, nor did he empty himself.

-Therefore, Christ was a man, for according to Paul, man is an enfleshed mind.

-191: The man has his origin both from earth and from heaven.

-If the mind is with God, then the human mind was in Christ.

-192: If the mind is with God and the human mind was in Christ, then the incarnation did not occur. If this is true with respect to Christ's self-determination and uncoerced mind, any deed brought to completion in the flesh, namely, the abolition of sin, comes from another self-determined movement and the divine mind. Our own self-determined freedom partakes of this abolition inasmuch as it unites itself to Christ.

-The mind is self-determined yet is moved by an external force; the flesh completes its work by the abolition of sin.

- If anything great acquires further addition, it is done by exertion, while no such exertion is present in Christ who lacks a human mind.
- 193: The human race is not saved by the assumption of mind and the whole man but by the taking up of the flesh.
- 194: If the perfect God were united to perfect man, they would be two.
- 195: The human race and the entire man is not saved by the assumption of mind but by assuming flesh, its natural governing principle. The immutable mind does not require submission to the flesh by any defect of knowledge; rather, it unites the flesh to itself without coercion.
- 199: But the divinity attracts the flesh without coercion.
- Pure virtue shares in everything subject to the mind.
- Persons resembling Christ with respect to the mind are not dissimilar to him according to the flesh.
- If God had united himself to man, he is perfect with that which is perfect, for there are two; one is Son of God by nature and the other is son of God by adoption.
- 201: The four names of the Trinity present no danger for us; we should not subject angels as slaves to men.
- 202: If the true God has received God, then there are many gods since this multitude receives God.
- 204: Nothing can be united to God, for example, the flesh which was assumed.
- Nothing can be adored, for example, the flesh of Christ.
- The flesh of the Lord is to be adored inasmuch there is one person and one living being with him.
- 205 & 206: Nothing created is to be adored as belonging to the Lord, for example, his flesh.
- 206: If anyone thinks that a man, rather than all men and angels, is bound with God.

-207: Angels and men are devoid of free will since flesh lacks this capacity. Rather, corruption of our innate free will is not free will, for nature cannot be corrupted by its Maker. Hence, man is not united to God.

-208: The corruption of our innate free will means that we are deprived of it.

-209: Man consists of three parts, spirit, soul, and body.

-If man consists of these three elements, the Lord is a man. Therefore, the Lord consists of three elements, spirit, soul, and body.

-213: But man consists of three parts, spirit, soul, and body.

-But the heavenly man is a vivifying spirit.

-If the heavenly man has every aspect of the earthly man, the Spirit also shares these earthy characteristics and is not of heaven but is a receptacle of the heavenly God.

-214: If man has no mind, he is heavenly; if he is whole, he is no longer heavenly but a receptacle of the heavenly God.

-If man is a receptacle of the heavenly God, it is from the God in heaven above, as Ecclesiastes says.

-If we consist of three parts, Christ, who consists of four parts, is not a man but Man-God.

-216: If something consists of two perfect elements, God neither has what man is, nor does man have what God is.

-217: Man himself cannot save the world, for he is subject to corruption, the common lot of humanity.

-God does not save us unless we are joined to him.

-Having become flesh, that is man, Christ is united with us when as the Gospel says, he became flesh and dwelt with us.

-218: But no one can destroy sin unless he was made a sinless man; neither can he destroy the reign of death in all men unless he died and rose as a man.

-The death of man does not destroy death itself.

-219: Neither the death of a man destroys death nor the resurrection of him who had died. It is clear that the God of all creation had died, because it was impossible for Christ to be restrained by death's bonds.

-We claim that Christ as God the Word did not exist from the beginning.

-227: How can God be man and not lack his identity as God if he had the mind of a man?

-The divine nature became a human mind.

-228: If God existed after the resurrection and was no longer man, how could the Son of Man send his angels? How can we see the Son of Man coming on the clouds? How can he preexist with God and be deified as when he said, 'I and the Father are one?'

-230: But he who held converse with men through the flesh said, 'I and the Father are one.'

-231: The savior has suffered hunger, thirst, labor, grief, and sorrow.

-...not two persons as though one were God and the other man. Therefore, God has suffered and he who is incapable of suffering suffers not under the constraint of an unwilling nature as man but in accord with nature.

-232: The passions must be stirred according to the likeness of men.

-The body existing in heaven is with us until the consummation of the ages.

-233: The Lord is inappropriately divided into what is subject to contradiction, that is, he is incorporeal to corporeal beings and is in the body to those who are incorporeal, for in heaven he consecrates the flesh by spiritually uniting it in himself.

* * * * *

A note about the translation: Within the text are the letters "J" and "M." "J" refers to the critical edition of the Greek text begun under the direction of Werner Jaeger. The Treatise Against Apollinarius was edited by Friedrich Mueller and may be found in Gregorii Nysseni Opera, vol.iii (Leiden 1958), p.131-233. The letter "M" refers to Migne's edition. PG#45.1124-1269 (Paris, 1858).

+

The Text

[M.1124 & J.131] An appropriate way of beginning our treatise is to quote our Lord who bids us to "beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves. By their fruits you will know them" (Mt.7.15-16). If fruit can discern the true sheep from the rapacious one which surreptitiously creeps into the company of the flock disguised in our human form, it can reveal the enemy hidden among us. We must therefore discern the good fruit from the bad in order to expose the [enemy's] deception. As the text says, "By their fruit you shall know them." In my judgment, the good fruit of any teaching augments the Church with persons who have been saved while more pernicious, harmful individuals belong with those headed for destruction. If a person increases his flock through preaching [M.1125], extends to everyone the vine growing on the sides of his house [Ps.127.3], plants cultivated olives around the Lord's table which were once wild, places mystic branches into the sweet, flowing streams of doctrine which increase the flocks and diminishes Laban's possession while Jacob's abounds with [J.132] superior offspring [Gen 30.38], should this person manifest the fruit of his own teaching, (such fruit, as it is said, is growth in the truth), indeed he is a prophet who exercises interpretation by God's spirit. But if anyone plucks the vine's twigs, he uproots

the plant around the divine table, brings it to desolation and withholds spiritual waters so that the sheep cannot conceive [by eating] the patriarch's tender green branches and abound with superior offspring. Instead, the sheep stray from nourishing pastures, that is, from the traditions of the fathers, lodge outside the fold, and are dispersed throughout alien pastures. When the fruit of such a teaching brings about this situation, the form of a wolf now hiding under a sheep's skin will show itself.

Let us now examine the teachings of Apollinarius of Syria, to see whether they increase or decrease the flock, gather the dispersed or scatter those who have been gathered, and whether or not they support or manifest hostility towards the teachings of the fathers. If [Apollinarius] in his enthusiasm has something better in mind, he is indeed a sheep, not a wolf. However, the Lord tells us, "beware of false prophets." This warning is intended to make us watchful for any slanderous, destructive mouth which approaches with the teeth of novel doctrines to lacerate God's holy body, the Church. That our words do not appear hostile, we now present the teaching [of Apollinarius] whose inscription reads, "Proof of the divine incarnation according to the likeness of man." Perhaps a correct understanding of this inscription may dispense the need to disprove the absurdity of [Apollinarius'] teaching.

[J.133] [The inscription to Apollinarius' treatise] reads, "the proof of the divine incarnation according to the likeness of man." We should summon divine scripture to rebuke the coinage of this new expression: "The word became flesh" (Jn.1.14), "his glory has dwelt in our land" (Ps.84.10) and "God has become manifest in the flesh" (1Tim.3.16). Each verse [M.1128] informs us of the divinity whose substance remains unchangeable, immutable amid change and unalterable that [God] might cure in his own immutable nature our inclination towards evil. And so [Apollinarius] states that God did not appear in the flesh, that is, the Word did not become flesh, the very One who was in the likeness of man and who shared the same pattern of our human life by assuming a slave's form. Instead he maintains that the Word impressed itself upon some form of divine flesh. I do not know what [Apollinarius] means here. Either the divinity is mutable and changes into the dense nature of flesh from its simple, uncompounded nature or the divine substance, while remaining itself, appears as another divine incarnation within the confinements of the human and divine

natures. The result is neither man nor God but something which participates in both. Such an incarnation is connatural with our humanity, yet the divinity is certainly more noble than this humanity. But this cannot be God, for the divinity is simple and uncomposite by nature; when simplicity is absent, the divinity is likewise absent. Yet man is not something contrary to this, for he is composed of a body and a rational soul. If we cannot understand these two components, then how can we use the name "man?" When speaking of man's body and soul, we consider each part respectively. The combination of these two elements constitute what we call a man. If the divine [J.134] incarnation yields neither man nor God, something which the author [Apollinarius] has devised in his inscription, we are unable to locate it.

"A proof of the divine incarnation according to the likeness of man." What does this phrase mean, "according to the likeness of man?" That the divine Incarnation is in accord with human nature. When does this come about? On the last day? And what about the mystery of [Mary's] virginity? The Lord does not assume flesh according to man's likeness as our author would like; rather, the divine power and the Holy Spirit effects this in accord with the Gospel [Lk. 1.26f]. Does the Incarnation occur before the ages? How can being be compared to non-being? Man is situated is at the end of all creation while the Lord is king before the ages. If he existed before all ages, to whose human image was the divine incarnation made? Adam's? He did not yet exist. To the likeness of another man? What is this man fashioned before Adam to whom the divine incarnation is compared? For that [M.1129] is indeed similar to being but dissimilar to non-being. And so two absurdities appear in Apollinarius' doctrine: either some created thing is older than its Maker or the divinity which became incarnate is compared to non-being. The divinity was in the beginning, not Adam. If the divine nature became incarnate according to man's likeness, it is compared to something which lacks being; however, that which is compared to non-being would be composed of nothing at all. But [Apollinarius] says that the Incarnation occurs in a manner different from the human one. And what is that likeness composed of two different natures? If [Apollinarius] denies the divine Incarnation according to man as existing before the ages as well as at the end of time, that is, our Lord's dispensation for mankind when God manifested himself [J.135] in the flesh, the Incarnation is according to the likeness of man

(We cannot maintain this position regarding the mystery of [Mary's] virginity). Both notions as expressed in the inscription to the treatise would be invalid. Because his inscription is ill-conceived and unsatisfactory, I believe that we can adequately clarify this fact by his words, provided we understand them carefully.

It is now time to clarify by close examination the subject of this inscription. I will briefly paraphrase the opening words of [Apollinarius'] treatise, paying attention to their meaning while omitting any point that may be innocuous or not worth exploring. "Only a pious faith is worth practicing, for Eve lacked the benefit of a faith not subject to inquiry. It behooves Christians to be inquisitive and not to be imprudently unmindful of the opinions which belong to the Greeks and Jews." These sentiments are expressed in many places of the treatise's opening words: "Both the faithless and heretics claimed that God neither become man nor was subject to human passions. Some heretics appropriate the form of our faith by claiming that Christ assumed a divinized man through a birth from a woman and through sufferings." [Apollinarius] was indeed familiar with certain heresies which claimed that Christ was a divinized man and may have known their source. For our part, we have travelled widely and have met persons who share teachings in common with ours and who confess their faith when confronted with individuals who disagree and inquire about the Word [of God]. We have not yet heard from [Apollinarius] who makes inflammatory statements about the mystery [of faith], namely, that Christ was [M.1132] a divinized man. Therefore, we ought to correct the [J.136] false opinions of his teachings, introducing in their place notions more amenable to the faith. In this way, one may refrain from devising non-existent teachings and to resist anything insubstantial; however, a person should defend himself with appropriate responses against reprisals. Skilled physicians do not apply their art to non-existing ailments but their knowledge serves to heal persons who are already sick. Let it be known that God did not appear in the flesh but that Christ was a divinized man; then we will find some value in his tract. However, once we discover the extent of his illness, it would be useless to ascribe to all his insubstantial teachings and become involved with such errors.

[Apollinarius], however, did not rashly insert this necessity into his writings; in order to provide a certain system and order to his teaching, he added as already said something which was not uttered. In this way, he appears to combat errors

though a fraudulent refutation that God is mortal. His treatise as a whole claims that the Only-Begotten Son's divinity is mortal and that passion has no place in his humanity; rather, his impassible, immutable nature is subject to change and passion. Hence, [Apollinarius'] treatise has a certain value for persons with an esoteric knowledge of mysteries. However, the sequence of his words is received by persons who are still infants, for even the irreligious Greeks do not ascribe to them. For if the divinity of the Only Begotten [Son] has perished, life, truth, righteousness, goodness, light, and power must have perished along with it. All these diverse interpretations are offered about the Only-Begotten's divinity.

Since [Christ] is simple, undivided, and uncompounded [J.137], he is said to be whole and not composed of parts. It follows that if one part exists [in Christ], all others exist in him, and if one does not exist, all are naturally excluded.

Therefore, if the divinity has perished, all his other characteristics which compose his divinity have also expired. However, not only is Christ power but he is the power and wisdom of God. Because these attributes have passed away with the Son's divinity, the wisdom of God does not belong to the Father; neither does power, life, nor can anything else be named after the good [God]. For all these attributes belong to God, and we believe that everything pertaining to the Father also belongs to the Son; what belongs to the Son does not lack existence because we confess that all things [M.1133] belong equally to the Father and the Son. If power has perished and, Christ is the power of God, has not that power which has been destroyed now restored and become something different? For the Father's power is present in the Son, a teaching our opponents confess. If the one power has been conquered by death and passed into oblivion at the time of [the Son's] passion, what other power does [Apollinarius] manufacture which he summons from death? If he claims that this power has died while another remains immortal, no longer is the power acknowledged as belonging to the Son of the Father. As a consequence, our Lord's words which confess that everything belonging to the Son also belongs to the Father are scorned as no longer true. For [the Son] who possesses all things belonging to the Father certainly has the Father's immortality; immortality has nothing at all in common with death. If the Son's divinity is supposed to be mortal [J.138], they [the followers of Apollinarius] construct the notion that the Father himself lacks immortality. But [Christ] said that he has the Father in himself. And so, anyone

attempting to demonstrate the mortality [of the Son] to whom belongs the Father's eternity is a liar. Since our religion maintains that the power belongs both to Father and Son (We see the Son in the Father and the Father in the Son), then anything passible clearly suffers death while that which is free from passion effects impassibility in what is passible.

But let us move on to the next part of [Apollinarius'] teaching. I will again briefly refer to his words to understand his intention: "To call Christ a divinized man is contrary to apostolic teaching and alien to the synod [of bishops]. Paul, Photinus, and Marcellus are the authors of this distorted view." Next we have an example of athletes violently engaged in a dispute and who resort to murderous words: "How can you say that the man from the earth whom [scripture] claims descended from heaven is called Son of man?" These words serve to confirm what was just said and serve as an introduction to further inappropriate remarks. In order to show that God has died, [Apollinarius] concedes that we cannot attribute an earthly nature to [Christ] since suffering which belongs entirely to death [M.1136] has an affinity with the earth. "The man who descended from heaven is not the man from the earth. Nevertheless, if man has descended from heaven, the Lord did not deny this fact in the Gospels." How is this statement consonant with [Apollinarius'] other remarks? If man is not from the earth but has descended from heaven to us, [J.139] how can it be said that the Son of Man has descended from heaven? [Apollinarius] concedes this, for just as we maintain that fathers exist before their sons on earth, so the heavenly man enters [the earthly] man. Since [Christ] is regarded as the Son of Man, he unhesitatingly accepts a name from his father, but humanly speaking, we maintain that another father exists first in heaven. If one attests to the words, "No one has ascended to heaven except the Son of Man who has descended from heaven" [Jn.3.13] and disassociates them from the earthly man by saying that the Son of Man has come to us from heaven, [Apollinarius] attributes another man in heaven, the Father. [Christ] descended from him to us so that the life of heaven might signify such things as nations, peoples, lands, and so forth. If the one who came from heaven is the Son of Man born from Mary of the seed of David according to the flesh and named Son of Man despite his heavenly birth, he is falsely called Son of God since he lacks fellowship with God with respect to heaven and earth. The following words sum up

[Apollinarius'] teaching: "If the Son of Man is from heaven and Son of God from woman, how can he be both God and man?" I believe that [Christ] is both man and God, a statement complying with faith's correct interpretation and not with [Apollinarius'] inscription. For neither is the divinity earthly nor is humanity divine as he maintains; rather, the power of the Most High comes from above through the Holy Spirit [Lk 1.35] which overshadowed our human nature, that is, this power took on form, the spotless Virgin nourished it in human flesh, and he who was born from her was named Son of the Most High. The divine [J.140] power which has its origin with the Most High thus assumed fellowship with mankind.

"But God," says [Apollinarius], "took on flesh by the spirit while man took on divinity by the flesh." Once again, what is the incarnation of the spirit except union with our flesh? And what is the origin of man except the first man who came from the earth and whose descent does not come from heaven as Moses has taught us? "God took dust from the earth and fashioned man [Gen 2.7]." However, we are instructed about another [M.1137] constitution of man from heaven of whom we have been ignorant. With respect to this statement we have, "The mystery became manifested in the flesh [1Tim 3.16]." This agrees with our teaching and "the Word became flesh according to its union [with human nature]." These words are accurately stated, for [Apollinarius] who says that the Word was united to the flesh asserts no more than the union of two [natures]. "But," he says, "the flesh is not inanimate for 'it militates against the Spirit, and its law is at enmity with the law of my mind [Rom 7.23].'" What an excellent statement! God does not fashion the flesh without a soul. Therefore, let us inquire whether the flesh assumed by the Word of God is animate as the inscription says. We maintain that the soul is animate and the body is in common with the animals. He who attributes to the Word this animated human flesh unites to it another whole man. Nothing can be more appropriate to the human soul than an intellectual nature which enables us to fully share the lot of irrational animals: concupiscence, anger, appetite for food, capacity for growth, satiety, sleep, digestion, [J.141] change, excrement and capacities rooted in the soul which belong both to us and irrational beasts. [Apollinarius] therefore says that he who has assumed man concedes that he has nothing other than a rational soul and testifies to his intellect which is his own human soul. Of this the Apostle says, "The wisdom of the flesh is at enmity with God" [Rom 8.7] (for the

flesh is not subject to God's law). He is speaking here of a person's capacity for free will which belongs to the intellect. For to choose either in a spirit of obedience or inflexibility with respect to the law rests with free choice which cannot be divorced from our intellectual faculty. This faculty belongs to the mind and is not found among infants. How can a person who opposes free will and reduces it to servility lack a mind? For our free will does not choose petty, evil things as demonstrated by persons who lack a mind; rather, those persons who lack a good mind follow its lead. Divinely inspired scripture teaches us about that serpent, the originator and inventor of evil [Gen 3.1]. The serpent certainly does not lack reason, but is more prudent than all the other beasts.

Thus we have added our own words to those of [Apollinarius] to refute the insolence of his teaching. The Apostle [Paul] does not simply oppose the flesh with the spirit by speaking of a choice for evil with respect to a [M.1140] more becoming manner of life; rather, he rebukes the Corinthians for succumbing to passion: "You are carnal" [1Cor 3.3]. When the Apostle had spoken to the Corinthians, did Apollinarius' triple division of man's intellect exist? Or does Paul call such people carnal [J.142] because they behave immoderately due to an inordinate inclination to the flesh? He advises the following: "While there is jealousy and strife among you, are you not of the flesh" [1Cor 3.3]? Jealousy and strife are works of the mind. [Apollinarius'] words abundantly show that man consists of three parts, flesh, soul and mind, a teaching not distant from ours. This three-fold division claims that man is composed of a rational soul and body while the mind is numbered separately, a view which allows for many heretical interpretations. If the rational capacity is counted by itself, another part may be termed irrational by some persons and concupiscible by others. Similarly, any other movements of the soul may be enumerated due to their wide variety instead of employing man's triple division.

But let us move on in order not to unduly prolong our refutation. Man has a triple nature or three parts or whatever else we may wish to designate his composition as stated by several synodal definitions issued against Paul of Samosata. For example, "God sent the Lord [Christ] from heaven." Again, the definition of faith promulgated at Nicaea is related to what was just said: "He who descended from heaven became flesh and was made man." These words prepare us for what [Apollinarius] is about to say, thereby revealing his position on the matter.

As if to accommodate himself to what has been demonstrated he says, [J.143] "Since Christ as God has a soul and body along with spirit, that is the mind, one may reasonably say that he is a man from heaven." What do these words have in common with the preceding ones? Why [M.1141] did this synod issue a promulgation against [Paul of] Samosata? But let us overlook our earlier teachings and see what Nikaia had taught. The faith which claims that [Christ] descended from heaven and took flesh implies that the flesh did not exist before his descent but came into existence later when he became enfleshed and incarnate. All the Churches proclaim this teaching, including ourselves, for it is common inheritance of the Church. Where, then, does [Nikaia] say that Christ possesses the spirit or mind of God with his soul and body as a man from heaven? We cannot discover this intent whether in the words themselves or in the sense of the text. The words [of the synod] differ greatly from those of [Apollinarius] as much as the psalmist's words when he says that the east differs from the west [Ps 102.12]. What does [Apollinarius] have in common with the synod? He says that Christ was incarnate in human flesh while possessing the divine spirit or mind. By claiming Christ to be a divine man, one does not say that he has God in himself as though something were added to another. The synod stated that [Christ] descended from heaven, so let his descent to us remain untainted. We agree with this assumption if we discover a loftier meaning and do not admit that the divinity which is everywhere and embraces everything has descended to a given place; rather, we maintain that [Christ] descended to our lowly human nature. But the synod adds the following words for anyone who wishes to accept this descent: [J.144] "he became incarnate." How should a birth from woman be interpreted favorably? For God is not born from woman as he is in himself; he exists before creation and did not come into being through a fleshly birth. Instead, the Holy Spirit prepared an entry and certainly lacked no material resources to make a fitting dwelling. "[Wisdom] built a house for herself" [Prov 9.1] by forming earth into a man from the Virgin through which he became united with humanity.

Where do these words [of the synod] concur with Apollinarius' claim that Christ as God has spirit or mind together with a soul and body [M.1144] as a man from heaven? If it were possible to apply divine eloquence to visible reality, to interpret dreams in accordance with our desires and to harmonize them with

scripture, then one should go ahead and apply these ideas. If the Apostle advises us to shy away from godless, silly myths [1Tm 4.7], he forbids us to associate with anything which is irreconcilable with [scripture]. But we should combat with our own word the ideas which [Apollinarius] insists upon in order to discredit his teaching. He claims that Paul calls the first Adam a soul with a body [1Cor 15.45] and eloquently uses words which are true. And so, was the first man of whom Paul spoke as a living soul something created and irrational? But history bears witness to a significant work of grace regarding the intellect: God brought all living things to man [J.145] whom he designated as a lord to bestow names and to consider appropriate names for each of them [Gen 2.19]. But disobedience, the inclination toward unlawful things, and shame from wicked deeds, provided an excuse for accusations and activities to demonstrate the faculty of our mind. Why, then, is Paul silent about Adam's intellectual faculty? It is clear that the rest [of our human nature] is joined to it as in the expression, "To you all flesh will come" [Ps 64.3]. Here David speaks of the entire human race by employing the term "flesh." Also, Jacob sojourned in Egypt with seventy-five persons whom history says neither lacked minds nor flesh at that specific time [Gen 46.26-27].

But [Apollinarius] says, "the second man from heaven is spiritual. This signifies that the man united with God lacks an intelligence of his own." We should be able to refute this strange doctrine without much difficulty. [Paul's] words, "as is the man of heaven so are those who are of heaven" [1Cor 15.48], differ considerably with such a notion. Persons who believe their origin lies in heaven call themselves heavenly. As Paul says, they have migrated to the heavenly way of life [Phil 3.20] and resemble the heavenly [Christ]; indeed, no one who has embraced the faith lacks reason. This comparison shows a necessary bond between [Christ] and men by virtue of his human mind: "as is the man of heaven so are those who are of heaven." But we confess that he was either fully invested with a human mind or lacked it completely. Just as we see the attributes of an earthly man [M.1145] at work in his offspring, so the Apostle says [Heb 4.15] in reference to life's necessities that [Christ] was tempted in all things and resembled us [J.146] except by sin [1Cor 15.45]. The mind does not consist of sin yet [Christ] must share every aspect of our human nature. The Apostle correctly speaks of him in our human nature if we confess him to be made like

us. In this way, he who shared this nature might fashion us into what he himself is.

Let us once again recall the words of [Apollinarius]: "Paul says that the first Adam has a soul with a body and certainly did not lack such a body; he bestows a name to this unity when he designates the soul as an appropriation of spirit." Here [Apollinarius] admits to three parts according to an appropriation of the soul as the body and spirit enfolded in [Christ]. However, Paul says, "the last [Adam] became a life-giving spirit" [1Cor 15.45]. Paul shows that the name [Adam] has special meaning with reference to [Christ's] other appellations and is of equal significance. If Adam is called a soul due to his sin, the man [Christ] united with God is called a full spirit since "he did not sin nor was treachery found in his mouth" [Is 53.9]. But [Apollinarius] rejects this. He says that [Christ] was of the earth and was fashioned from it because his soul which had been formed from this earth received life. Does he not call the mind spirit when united to the form belonging to Adam? Does this consist in likeness to God? What emanation came from God unless it were this mind? [Apollinarius] claims that this man is from heaven because the heavenly spirit took on flesh. Where does scripture [J.147] speak of such a thing? Which author of the sacred text says that spirit became incarnate? Neither the Gospel nor the great Apostle [Paul] has taught us such a thing. Instead, the Gospel proclaims "the Word became flesh" [Jn 1.14] and the Spirit descended in the form of a dove [Mt 3.16]. Nothing is said here of the Spirit becoming incarnate with regard to the mystery of our faith. "His glory has dwelt in our land" [Ps 84.10]. "Truth has sprung from the earth" [Ps 84.12]. "God has manifested himself in flesh" [1Tm 3.126]. "Righteousness has looked down from heaven" [Ps 84.12]. These and other examples show that the divinely inspired scripture does not mention the Spirit's incarnation.

"The man Christ preexisted," says [Apollinarius], "not as another Spirit existing apart from him, that is, God; rather, the Lord had the nature of a divine man while remaining a divine Spirit." Such are [M.1148] the words of his inscription. Since a full understanding of his position is not entirely clear due to a certain weakness, I will first reveal the obscurity of his words and proceed to their examination. "The man Christ preexisted." [Apollinarius] maintains that the Word who existed in the beginning and the man who appeared in time existed before

his manifestation. This position is more clearly brought out as follows: "The Spirit does not differ from [Christ]." He adds that the Son's divinity is human from the beginning, a position which becomes clearer by the following: "The Lord was divine Spirit in the nature of a divine man." For him, [Christ] constituted one nature, God and man, and coalesced together. [J.148] [Apollinarius] is convinced that [Christ] became manifest through flesh from the Virgin not only according to the eternity of his divinity as we believe, but also according to his flesh which had preexisted creation.

Shortly thereafter [Apollinarius] attaches his own opinion to the testimony, "Before Abraham was, I am" [Jn 8.58]. And John the Baptist says, "He existed before me" [Jn 1.15]. The Apostle says, "There is one Lord through whom came all things" [Col 1.17]. We omit the words of Zachariah [13.7] which strengthen his distorted view [cf. J.154]. If allow the breadth of thought contained in this strange teaching to pass by unnoticed, I certainly would have refuted its hidden contents. But since [Apollinarius'] impiety cries out with an especially loud voice, I do not know what more our words can accomplish. If flesh existed before the ages and if Abraham existed before the Virgin, then Mary preceded Nachor [Gen 11.22]. As a result, Mary preceded Adam. What am I saying here? That [Mary] seems older than creation and more ancient than the ages. For if [Christ] became incarnate through the Virgin, Jesus is flesh; however, the Apostle testifies that he existed before all creation. Also, [Apollinarius] seems to say that Mary is co-eternal with the Father. Nevertheless, I keep my silence with regard to these inappropriate matters which his novel teaching expounds, for wise persons may freely examine this strange doctrine as long as we do not clarify its unsuitable nature.

[M.1149] Let us skip over the foul odor of these thoughts. Nevertheless, we should observe that if the flesh existed before the ages, the divinity is not rendered void, the Son did not exist in the form of God and he did not assume the form of a servant. However, [J.149] the [divinity] which now appeared while retaining its own nature was not subject to humiliation. Would that the Word [of God] condescend to be present in my words, however, I remain silent with regard to the rest [of Apollinarius' teaching]. If the flesh existed before all creation, then all things have their root in weakness, not in power. "The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak" [Mt 26.41]. If [Apollinarius' teaching] seems

peculiar, who could not but recognize its repercussions and what flows from it? He attributes all the flesh's contingencies to [Christ] who existed in the flesh before the creation of the ages such as labor, grief, tears, thirst, sleep, hunger and other attributes which are even more contrary to his nature.

Since "a child is born for us," as the divine scripture says [Is 9.5], and the shepherds saw the Lord wrapped in swaddling clothes, and as Luke says [2.12], "Jesus advanced in age, wisdom, and grace" until he attained manhood through various stages of growth, what do [the followers of Apollinarius] say about the flesh which existed before the ages? What kind of body did he have then because he had passed through every stage of growth proper to human life? Was that [preexisting] man who was older than all creation a boy, a new-born babe, an adolescent or a fully matured adult? But if they claim a child, how can they say that he failed to attain maturity with the passage of so many stages of life? If they [the followers of Apollinarius] say a perfect man, a notion they feel we should confess, how does an infant's body contain him by human generation? What about the rest of the human body? How can the body's mass circumscribe him? How does the body's mass attain its own measure? Did [Christ] possess a body from the beginning and grow in stages or [J.150] did he join something else to himself through nourishment? But if they say that [Christ] has a beginning, nourishment is useless. If they admit that the Lord does not partakes of food, what about the flesh left behind in heaven? Most likely it seems that [Christ] left a great part of it behind yet kept only what the Virgin's womb could contain. Those who indulge in opinions such as these and who invent other teachings, by necessity end up by maintaining an absurd position.

[M.1152] But let us pass over these matters, for it would not be illogical to inquire about that divine incarnation which occurred before the ages. If they maintain that the flesh always existed along with [Christ], then God is flesh. However, all flesh corresponds to what we can lay hold of, that is, its nature is material and composite, for anything of this sort necessarily corresponds to matter and is subject to natural dissolution. We know that [Christ] partook of human life in a human manner because through flesh, bone and blood like other men, and he shed blood by being pierced with nails and a lance. The Lord therefore said to those who did not believe his appearance, "Handle me and see and know that a spirit does not have flesh and bones as you see that I have" [Lk 24.39].

Therefore, if the divine incarnation, as Apollinarius [J.151] says, does not commence from the Virgin but existed before Abraham and all creation, the disciples' vision consisted of a physical entity with flesh and bones. Thus [Christ's] human composition always existed and his descent had no share in our humble condition; rather, [Christ's] divine nature remained hidden and was manifested at the time of his incarnation. What did Arius and the even more impious Eunomius think about disgracing the Only Begotten's glory, something which Apollinarius had accomplished in his own tract? God, who existed before the ages, consisted of bones, hair, skin, nerves, flesh and fat; he was composed of various other elements, lacked simplicity and was complex. All such characteristics are attributed to "the Word was in the beginning and was with God, and was God" [Jn 1.1]. By sharing our humble nature, he took flesh in the last days out of love for us and united himself to man. Having fully assumed our nature in order to deify humanity by union with his divinity, he sanctified the entire mass of our human nature by that first fruits.

But I think we should quickly pass through each point of sacred scripture which [Apollinarius] has misinterpreted, for it would be superfluous to examine at length [M.1153] every aspect of his teaching. We summon the Apostle as a witness to demonstrate that the [Word] lacked from flesh and blood from all eternity who said that [Christ] redeemed us through his blood and took away our sins through his flesh [Eph 1.7]. In my opinion, anyone who looks elsewhere is not in his right mind. Who does not know that divine mystery when [J.152] the Founder of our salvation pursued the lost sheep as a shepherd [Lk 15.5, Mt 18.12]? We are that sheep who have strayed through sin from the flock of the one hundred rational sheep. [Christ] laid the entire sheep on his own shoulders; not just one sheep had strayed but since all have strayed, he gathers them all together. He does not carry the skin nor leave behind the innards as Apollinarius would like it. Having placed the sheep on his shoulders, it becomes one with him by partaking his divinity. [Christ] therefore placed the sheep on his shoulders because in his desire to seek and save the lost, he had found it. This sheep which had once erred did not walk on its own feet; instead, God bears it. And because what appeared as a sheep, that is man, [God's] footsteps were unknown as scripture says [Ps 76.20]. He who bears the sheep upon himself bears no trace of sin nor going astray; God's footprint is impressed upon him

throughout his life's journey which appears as teachings, cures, raising the dead and other such marvels. Once the pastor took the sheep upon himself, he becomes one with it and speaks with the voice of the sheep to his flock. How does our human weakness hear the divine voice? In a human fashion, that is to say, in the manner of sheep he says to us, "My sheep hear my voice" [Jn 10.16]. And so, the pastor who has taken upon himself the sheep speaks our language and is both sheep and shepherd. He assumed the sheep in his own person, and what he had assumed is a pastor.

Because a good shepherd gives his life for his sheep [Jn 10.27] to abolish death [J.153] by his own death, he becomes the author of our salvation by his human nature as well as priest and lamb by assuming the effects of human passion which is death. Since death is the dissolution of body and soul, he who unites both to himself, I mean body and soul, does not separate them ("For the gifts [M.1156] of God are without repentance," says the Apostle, Rom 11.29). But having imparted himself to us by his own body and soul, [Christ] opened paradise for the thief [Lk 23.43] when he destroyed the power of corruption. And [God's] life-giving power renders the destruction of death, corruption, powerless because his bounty and grace share in our human nature. Thus he who shares both parts [body and soul] unites through his resurrection that which has been dispersed; by his own power he delivers his own body for internment in the heart of the earth [Ps 12.40]. As it is written, he can separate himself from his soul when he says to the Father, "Into your hands I commend my spirit" [Lk 23.46], and when he said to the thief, "Today you will be with me in paradise" [Lk 23.43]. Both statements express the truth.

In another passage we read of the divine way of life which is paradise located in the Father's spacious hand. As the prophet, the Lord's mouthpiece, says with reference to the heavenly Jerusalem, "I have graven you on the palms of my hands; your walls are continually before me" [Is 49.16]. Therefore death is conquered and has lost its domination. That which is composite is divided, and that which is not composite is immune to dissolution. The nature of that which is not composite abides in what is composite, [M.154] and the soul which has been separated from the body no longer suffers separation. As it is said, the sign and effect of this is the body's incorruptibility and the soul's existence in paradise. Such a simple, uncomposite form of life suffers no division; however, that which

is divided is united to that which cannot be divided. As [Paul] says, "God raised him from the dead" [Col 2.12]. Since another power did not restore Lazarus [Jn 11.43] nor anyone else to life, the same applies to the Lord's resurrection. In the case of the Only Begotten, God resurrected man to union with him after the separation of body and soul and their subsequent union, resulting in total salvation for [human] nature. Hence [Christ] is called Originator of our life. For the Only Begotten [Son] who died and rose for us [2Cor 5.19] reconciled the world to himself and purchased us, having redeemed us by his own body and blood by partaking of our human nature. The Apostle says that [Christ] ransomed us through his own blood and blotted out our sins by his own flesh [Eph 1.7]. Such is our understanding of the Apostle's words in contrast to Apollinarius. Let a person carefully judge and weigh [M.1157] which opinion deserves more reverence: whether ours which says that the [divine] glory dwelt in our land out of love for us, or [Apollinarius] who says that the flesh belonging to God was not newly acquired out of his bounty but was consubstantial and connatural.

If the prophet Zachariah has anything further to say which he uttered [J.155] in mystery, I think it is not worth examining whether it pertains to the Lord or to something else. He says, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherds and against the man who is my citizen" [Zach 13.7]. We deem it arrogant to unjustly brandish words as a sword against a person of one's own race. Apollinarius says that he raises a sword against the Lord by the title "shepherd." He does not know that in many places scripture calls pastors and shepherds persons who are endowed with authority. Again, he neglects the Letter to the Hebrews on this point which clearly speaks of the impropriety of such thoughts a cursory reading of the text reveals. Because Hebrews says that in these our last days God spoke through his Son in many and varied ways after he had first spoken to our fathers through the prophets [Heb 1.1], [Apollinarius] clearly says that God appeared to us. However, he interprets the Apostle's words by saying, "By them that man by whom God the Father spoke to us had manifested himself, the founder of the ages, the splendor of [God's] glory, and the stamp of his substance inasmuch as he was God by his own spirit and was not another God, that is, once he cleansed the world from sin through his own flesh."

Apollinarius makes no attempt to alter his words in response to our position. If a man, as his teaching claims, has made the ages and if his flesh is the splendor [of God] and the form of a servant imprints itself upon God's substance, I no longer feel that we should oppose this teaching; rather, we should mourn the stupidity of those persons [J.156] who give allegiance to such novel teachings. [Apollinarius] speaks of man in a merely human way, that is, as someone who spits and makes clay in his hand, who puts his fingers into a deaf person's ears, who touches the diseased and dead, takes sleep and rest from labor, cries, is afflicted by sadness and grief, and who is both hungry and thirsty. Is this the man's [Christ] corporeality and humanity whom [Apollinarius] maintains existed before creation and is God in the nature of composite, solid, and dense flesh? Let all pious ears be blocked in order [M.1160] that flesh's passions which insult the divinity with human attributes may not defile the divine, incorrupt precepts. For who does not know that God appeared to us in the flesh? According to pious tradition he is incorporeal, invisible, uncomposite, both was and is boundless and uncircumscribed, is present everywhere, penetrates all creation and has manifested himself in our human condition. Since every visible body by necessity is circumscribed, any manifestation is subject to limitation and is bound by space, for such limitations cannot share [God's] unbounded nature. But the prophet says, "His greatness has no end" [Ps 144.3]. If the divine nature is flesh as [Apollinarius] claims, and if his manifestation is subject to limitations, how can God's greatness, as the prophet says, have no limit? How can we recognize what is infinite by finite reality and what is uncircumscribed by limitation? Rather, as we [J.157] have said, how can strength come from death? If a man is creator of the ages and remains the same, that is, flesh, as Apollinarius interprets it, man has created everything. But divine scripture speaks of the flesh's weakness which does not partake of strength, fortitude, power or any other lofty notions befitting God which [Apollinarius] attributes to him.

Although [Apollinarius'] position is not entirely irreverent, his treatise continues to utter further blasphemous remarks against the Father. He says that man is the splendor of God's glory and his egotistic notions has remodelled God into the form of an idol with a corporeal nature. And a result, man has embodied God's substance. Just as a ray comes from the sun, light shines from a lamp, and the

figure of a man points to his humanity, so if the Father's glory truly appeared to us and if his flesh is the stamp of his substance, it follows that the Father's nature is fleshly. For the corporeal cannot [M.1161] express the incorporeal, and the visible cannot radiate the invisible; rather, the [divine] glory, splendor, form and substance reveals the invisible [God]. If it has a bodily form, it certainly could not be incorporeal. But the common synod of the Fathers held at Nikaia confessed the doctrine of like substance. No one can say that a similar substance can apply to a different one; rather, one and the same substance is consubstantial to whatever belongs to it. If the Son of God is fleshly, his nature is composed of flesh existing before the ages. [Apollinarius] does not doubt the [Son's] consubstantiality [J.158] with the Father; however, anything consubstantial is composed of the same substance, so he suggests that the Father's nature is human and corporeal which both [Persons] share. As a result, we have two absurd conclusions: either the Father is incorporeal and the Son's divinity is fleshly and composed of a different substance, or if both Father and Son have the same substance and divinity, the Father's divine nature consists of flesh. But Zachariah [cf. J.154] corrects this inaccuracy by saying that the Son is the same as the Father, that is, he is connatural with him and of the same substance. If this teaching is incorrect and not a mere opinion, [Apollinarius] presents us with something further: "The prophetic word clearly says that the [Son] does not share the same substance as God according to the flesh; rather, he is united to the flesh according to the spirit." How can a carnal God be united to flesh before the creation of the world and the ages? The flesh is last in the order of creation. If the divinity was united to the flesh, has not human nature come into existence? But [Apollinarius] knows a flesh other than man's. How, he says, can that man [Christ] who spoke to us of the Father be the same God who created the ages? Who can explain for us the awkwardness of these novel mysteries? Along with other inaccurate doctrines, [Apollinarius] taught that a man existed before man and [M.1164] that the flesh of his creation preceded the ages which was made at the fullness of time.

But let the composer of this tract deceive himself by his own ridiculous teachings. As for ourselves, we recall the apostolic [J.159] teaching as a means to reproach his sacrilegious opinions. For example, "He who was in the form of God" [Phil 2.6]. Here it does not say that [Christ] had the same form as God;

rather, he existed in the form of God. All things belonging to Father are in the Son. The Son fully has in his form the Father's figure, eternity, quantity, immateriality and incorporeality. In addition, he is equal with God. What sort of equality can be maintained with regard to discrepancy or distinction [as pertaining to Father and Son]? How can an equality of different natures be reconciled? If we have a corporeal nature on one hand and an incorporeal nature on the other, how can this difference exist [in one person]? "He emptied himself, taking the form of a slave" [Phil 2.7]. What form of a slave? [Paul] refers to the body. We have received only what the Fathers have handed down to us. Indeed, he who said that [Christ] had the corporeal form of a slave claims that despite his divine form, he has assumed one of a slave. But the words "he emptied himself" clearly show that the appearance revealed to us did not exist from all eternity; rather, he is equal to God in the fullness of divinity, is unapproachable, inaccessible and incomprehensible by our limited human thought. Once death had circumscribed [Christ] in his bodily nature, he emptied himself, as the Apostle says, of his ineffable divine glory and humbled himself to assume our limitations. Although he was great, perfect and incomprehensible, he assumed our human nature. "He was made in the likeness and form of man" [Phil 2.7]. His nature did not have this likeness from the beginning nor was he fashioned in a corporeal manner. For how could a corporeal form make an impression on [J.160] this [divine] form? Nevertheless, [Christ] was made into an [corporeal] form because he assumed the nature of a body.

"He was found as a man." Yes, a man not in everything but as one in harmony with the mystery of his virgin birth. Thus [Christ] manifested himself not because he was subservient to the laws of human nature; rather, he shared our life as God and [M.1165] did not lack a proper human constitution through marriage. He was found not as an inferior man by a defect in his constitution but as man. Thus [Christ] humbled himself and became man without having been altered. If he was [divine] from the beginning, what did his humiliation consist of? Now the Most High humbled himself by a union with our humble nature. When he united himself to the form of a slave and become one with it, he shared the sufferings proper to this condition. Our bodily members are connected to each other as though by nails; as a result, the body suffers as a whole when it is affected. Thus the unity of our human nature appropriates passions as our own. As Isaiah

says, "He bore our infirmities and carried our sorrows" [Is 53.4] and sustained abuse that he may heal us by his affliction. The divinity did not suffer; rather, the man united to the divinity endured these blows. As a result, evil lost its grip over us. Since death entered the world through man's disobedience, the obedience of the second man had driven it out [Rom 5.19]. [J.161] Therefore [Christ] was obedient unto death which healed the disobedience resulting from our sins, for he destroyed death, the result of our disobedience, by his resurrection from the dead.

Destruction of death is man's resurrection. Because of this, [Paul] says, "God has highly exalted him" [Phil 2.9]. This sentence acts like a seal to our earlier remarks. The Most High clearly has not need of exultation; however, the humility [of human nature] raised on high acquired a sublimity which it did not originally have. Human nature united with the Lord becomes one with the divinity whose loftiness exalts it from its humble state. Christ the Lord experienced the humble form of a slave and was exalted. Since Christ was called a man with respect to his humanity, Gabriel announced his humanity to the Virgin [Lk 1.31]. Even though the divine nature cannot be named, one person exists from a union of two natures: God receives a name from his humanity. "The name of Jesus every knee shall bend" [Phil 2.10]. The divinity [M.1168] which is nameless belongs to the man who is above every name in order that just as the lofty [divine nature] is present within humility, so does humility assume lofty characteristics. For just as the divinity is named through humanity, so he who transcends every name is united to the divinity by reason of his humble condition. Just as the lowly status of a slave's form is united to God, so adoration of the divinity attributed to God [J.162] strives for union with the divinity. Thus "at the name of Jesus Christ every knee shall bend in the heaven, on the earth and under the earth, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Amen" [Phil 2.10].

But it seems that [Apollinarius] is ashamed of himself, and his inappropriate words attempt to subvert the Son's earthly resemblance to men: "Behold, Jesus Christ preexisted in his equality with the Father and became like men." Here he seems to repent of his words. Would that this were true, and that he renounce such an erroneous opinion, for we would then dismiss our disapproval directed against him! But it seems that [Apollinarius] stumbles into another impropriety by

uttering prudent remarks: "What can be clearer? Opposites cannot be united, that is, the perfect God with perfect man." This statement clearly is not related with the preceding one, a fact which will become clear to anyone who follows the author's intent. How can [Apollinariou] demonstrate that [Christ] who was not perfect man through whom the perfect God became incarnate, had preexisted as equal with the Father and in the likeness of man? When considering the distance between heaven and earth, we can clearly say that lead is heavier than tin. This difference in weight represents the distance between heaven and earth. And so the imperfect [J.163] humanity shared by God fails to demonstrate that the Son's likeness condescended to assume the earthly nature of men. But I will overlook the impiety and folly of this opinion. By closely following [Apollinarius'] words, I will attempt to refute him wherever possible. He claims that God is not perfect with the perfect man [Christ]. Since he called both natures imperfect, he expressed ambiguity [M.1169] about them. From what we have heard it is impossible to grasp this imperfection whether it pertains to God, man or both together. [Apollinarius] says that God has the glory of God by the Spirit while man bears an inglorious human form in the body. He speaks of God and then of man. It is clear to everyone that the meaning of these two terms differ, for they explain what pertains to God and humanity respectively. For God always remains the source of goodness; he had always existed in the past and will continue to do so in the future. On the other hand, man shares the nature of irrational animals yet is not dominated as they are by their bodies and sense perceptions. Mind, which is man's proper nature, distinguishes him from irrational beasts. No one can define man as composed of a body, bones and senses nor judge human nature as simply the capacity to eat or be subject to change; rather, man is endowed with thought and reason. Thus we are compelled to attribute a nature [J.164] by an appropriate name. When speaking of man, Apollinarius means that he is rational; if this term contains what belongs to the divinity, then the interpretation of what he means by man is not valid. But when speaking of man, [Apollinarius] indeed utters the truth. But the truth of this name demonstrates man as a rational animal, the intention he wishes to convey. Man is necessarily rational and is not a man should he lacks this capacity.

[Apollinarius] says, "But man's body is a vile form." Although such words do not come from scripture, we should examine them and refute his mistaken remarks.

He says that man's body is a vile form. Therefore, the glory of a man or true glory is life according to virtue. Effeminate attributes may be defined by good complexion and corporeal beauty whereas the body's ugliness reveals unbecoming actions. If [M.1172] we confess the glory of men as virtue, then evil is disgraceful. However, Apollinarius claims that God assumed the disgraceful form of a human being. So if disgrace belongs to evil, free will is likewise disgraceful; however, thought is a movement of the mind, so when [Apollinarius] considers the human ignominy assumed by God, he does not divorce man from his rational capacity which God acknowledges by human life. The divine scriptures [J.165] concur with the fact that [Christ] became sin for us [2Cor 5.21] and united man's sinful soul to himself. "The Lord appeared in the form of a slave" [Phil 2.7]. Was this form which the Lord had assumed noble or not? Someone may claim that which was inferior and circumscribed by life's necessities is not honorable. [Apollinarius] says, "Not a man but as a man because the noble part is dissimilar to man." If he does not mean consubstantial, a different substance is implied. The reason for this different substance rests upon the fact that neither a common nature nor name can refer to [Christ's humanity and divinity]. The substance of fire and water are different and are named accordingly, but Peter and Paul are one nature and share a common name because their mutual substance makes both men. If any substance belongs to [Christ] and not to man but refers to appearances according to man, it is truly a different nature. [Apollinarius] says that everything pertaining to [Christ's humanity] is an appearance and deceptive fantasy; his nourishment and sleep lacked reality, all the miracles of healing were insubstantial, the crucifixion did not occur, he was not laid in the tomb and his resurrection from suffering did not transpire. But it seems that all these events were appearances and that scripture's testimony was void. If there was no man, how could [scripture] present us with a record about [Christ]? How could [Apollinarius] say that [Christ], though human, was alien to human substance? He did not say that he was consubstantial with man's proper nature. By separating this essential aspect of man, that is mind, he defines the rest of man as a beast, a fact which certainly is not true. Then [Apollinarius] continues, "He humiliated himself according to the flesh, yet God exalted him according to the divine sublimity." Here we have an even more sacrilegious statement than before. [Apollinarius] says that which was humbled differs from that which was

exalted; [Christ's] flesh was brought low while his own [divine] nature [J.166] was not subject to such a humiliation. However, he believes that his divinity was exalted while his exalted state lacked nothing. How can the divinity be exalted since it transcends all creation and surpasses all sublimity? Rather, it is [Christ's] humble nature which is exalted, a fact which our author does not acknowledge as he had stated earlier.

[M.1173] [Apollinarius] continues to utter inane statements much like a person in his sleep. As a result, he usurps our words and combines with his own teaching good points which come from ours. For that which he discerns as glorified he deems worthy of honor. "He is glorified as man, but the glory which he possessed before the world was established belongs to God who has eternal existence." So far so good. However, if [Apollinarius] maintains this position, his assumptions may unfortunately be taken as conforming to orthodox doctrine. Here he resembles a person who embraces a sane teaching, but upon turning a bend in the road he is once again on the path of error. [Apollinarius] directs many abuses against us besides equating our [faith] to that of the Jews and Greeks. He does this by bringing up previously disgorged vomit; in other words, the vain presumption of his words has devised that Christ's flesh preexisted. He claims that the Son, whose mind was enfleshed, was born of a woman and did not receive his flesh from a virgin; instead, [Christ], who existed before the ages, merely passed through it. God then showed himself as carnal, for as [Apollinarius] himself had said, the [divine] mind assumed flesh.

[Apollinarius] says that the Lord of glory was crucified and that the prophets call him Lord of hosts. He next authenticates his words by employing such verses as "I say to you" [Lk 7.14], "I bid you" [Mk 9.25], "I am working" [Jn 5.17], and other more [J.167] sublime examples. Who is this noble person? How does [Apollinarius] deal with the breast, the swaddling clothes, life which grows and decays, the body's progressive growth, sleep, labor, parental obedience, trouble, grief, desire to eat the Passover supper, request for water, desire for food, chains, blows on the face, stripes from scourging, thorns on the head, the scarlet cloak, violence by [striking with] the reed, bitter wrath, vinegar, nails, spear, the fine garment, burial, tomb and the stone? How can such attributes belong to God? If God became incarnate and appeared through Mary, that is, he who had always existed and manifested his divinity, the divinity suffered such

consequences: he sucked milk, was wrapped in swaddling clothes, took food, became weary, grew, reached maturity, suffered want, slept, grieved, was troubled, was afflicted, tasted food and [M.1176] drink, ran to the fig tree [Mk 11.13], failed to notice the fruit of its leaves and its ripeness, did not know the day and hour, was smitten, bound with chains, was flogged, nailed [to the cross], shed blood, died, was prepared for burial and was placed in a new tomb. While [Apollinarius] attributes all these experiences as connatural to the preexistent divinity, does he not say that [Christ] was nursed unless he sucked milk, did not fully partake of life unless he recovered strength and was fortified with food? How can the God who assumed flesh be ignorant of that day and hour [Mt 24.36]? How can he be ignorant of the season for figs because the Passover says that the fruit is not [J.168] found in the tree for eating? Tell me, who is ignorant? Who is afflicted by sadness? Who is constricted by weakness? Who cried out and was forsaken by God if the Father and Son are one God? And who experienced abandonment when crying out on the cross?

If the divinity suffered, rightly do reverent persons believe that the Son shares the one divinity belonging to the Father. This is the same suffering person who says, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me" [Mt 27.46]? How can the one divine substance be divided in suffering, that is, one part undergoing the act of forsaking while another is forsaken? One suffers death while the other has life; one is killed and the other is immune to killing. Neither view ascribes to one divinity common to Father; hence, some persons take the side of Arius, or others oppose Arius by saying that [Father and Son] have one [divinity] and therefore do not consent to a mere fabrication. However, [Arius] ascribes passions and cries as coming from the humble condition of humanity; although the divine nature is immutable and free from passion, it consents to share in human suffering. [Apollinarius] himself testifies to this by saying, "As man he is glorified, rising up from ignominy; as God he possesses glory which existed before the world." For ignominy indeed belongs to our corporeal condition which is subject to passion, whereas eternal glory is immortal and free from passion.

In order not to falsely accuse [Apollinarius] I refer to his words in the same spirit which we have earlier examined them: "The Greeks and Jews are clearly faithless by failing to accept that God was born from a woman." Why is he now [J.169] silent with regard to the flesh when referring to [Christ's] birth?

Indeed, that which was born from the flesh is flesh [M.1177] as the Lord says [Jn 3.6]. Since [Apollinarius] wishes the flesh born from a woman to be divine and intends to add that God did not appear in the flesh he says, "But God had flesh before the ages and was later born of a woman, underwent passions and by necessity had human nature." Although he says this, [Apollinarius] does not refer to [Christ's] humanity; rather, as man he was subject to passion while not partaking of human nature. How could he be man while lacking an earthly origin? Scripture says that the human race sprung from Adam and the first man came from earth by God's power [Gen 2.7]. Luke claimed that [Christ] was reputed to be Joseph's son and cites his genealogy, "he was from Adam" [Lk 3.38], a statement claiming that [Christ] is the origin of all our fathers. Hence, if [Christ] does not spring from the human race, he is not man but something other than a man. Since neither the man [Christ] did not share our human nature nor did the incorporeal God assume flesh, let [Apollinarius'] disciples and followers of his error now state their position with regard to God's incarnation: "But the Greeks and Jews will assent to our opinion if we say that a divinized man was born of a woman as in the case of Elias." And who among the Greeks will admit to the truth of Elias' miracles [2Kg 2.11]? Fire manifested itself in two forms: chariot and horses descended from heaven, a movement contrary to their nature. Elias was lifted up into the flaming chariot and saved from being burned by this fire while he was assumed along with the horses and chariot. If anyone accepts this as he should, he will [J.170] imply a figure of the mystery, that is, a prophecy of the Lord's incarnation prefigured in this narrative. As fire tends upwards and the divine power downward, Elias, who was infused by heavenly fire, partakes of its natural movement and is raised up on high. Thus the immaterial and incorporeal essence, the power of the Most High, assumed a servant's form through the Virgin and raised it up to his own sublimity, having transformed it into a divine, immortal form. Anyone finding this difficult to accept could not believe in Elias' miracles, and the person who had earlier learned that the truth had overshadowed [Elias] would stubbornly refuse to accept this truth. [Apollinarius] now rails abusive words against us which we should reject and concocts the following myth [M.1180]: "Those who do not ascribe to the form of faith, namely, the birth of God from a woman and his crucifixion by the Jews, are likewise ashamed by such things." Who does not know that the invectives

directed against his adversaries are ineffective? There are two pits, one for Apollinarius and the other for Arius. Both are equally ruinous, but Arius seems to be the lesser of the two evils. Both men denigrate the uncompounded nature of the Only-Begotten [Son] by saying that he has a humble condition; however, Arius attributes the angels' incorporeal nature to the Lord [J.171]. He likewise professes that the [divine] uncreated nature is inferior and resembles created beings. This absurd position maintains that [Christ] is merely a man, has the same nature as the angels and his nature is corporeal. Arius says that the incorporeal nature surpasses corporeal bodies, an impiety less absurd than Apollinarius' position. What person who explains the mystery [of Christ's birth] from the Virgin is unfaithful to the form of our faith? Would that [Apollinarius] make public his derisive attitude towards our faith and offer his opinion! For our part, we say that the God whose essence is immaterial, invisible, and incorporeal, disposed himself to assume flesh out of love for mankind at the consummation of the world when evil had reached its peak. He united himself to human nature in order to destroy sin just as if the sun had dwelt in a gloomy cave and then banished darkness by its light. [Christ] assumed our uncleanness yet was not defiled; rather, he purified this filth in his own person. "For the light shined in the darkness and the darkness has not overcome it" [Jn 1.5]. Here we have an example of the art of healing. Once an annoying illness has been cured, it is banished and is not transformed into the art of healing. Such is our position. But [Apollinarius] says, "God was incarnate from the beginning. He had a visible, palpable body which was born of a woman at the last days. He grew progressively by taking food yet existed before everything [J.172] and created men along with both visible and invisible reality. He experienced fatigue and felt distress in the face of death." I do not know how a wise person, when contemplating the heavens, earth, and all creation's marvels, can maintain that his Creator experienced no labor [M.1181], yet say that he engaged in labor as, for example, his journey from Juda to Galilee [Jn 4.6]. The same person who asked the Samaritan woman for a drink turned the rock into a pool of water for the Israelites. For forty years [Ex 16.35] he did not weary to provide heavenly nourishment for such a multitude; he ran to the fig tree hoping to eat its fruit yet found none [Mt 21.19]. Let the prudent hearer judge from these examples which position belongs to the form of faith or does not.

"But," says [Apollinarius], "he who was crucified was not divine by nature nor did he have any share in it even though he is spirit." Such a false accusation becomes an apology which is an outright denial. If Apollinarius believes that the mind is spirit, he claims that one half Christian's [human constitution] cannot be united with God; rather, the whole man must be united to the divine power. Therefore, he wishes to attribute names to various aspects of man, such as mind, spirit or heart. Scripture says that three parts form man's governing part: "A pure heart create in me, God" [Ps 51.12], "The man of understanding will acquire skill" [Prov 1.5], and "No one knows a man's thoughts except the spirit of the man which is in him" [2Cor 2.11]. We say that the overshadowing of the Most High's power and descent of the Holy Spirit both have spirit, mind and heart. In this way we will not be open to [Apollinarius'] charge that the man [Christ] lacked spirit [J.173] or mind; however, we are obliged to consider his words in the face of such rebukes, for he who calls the spirit mind says that Christ lacks a human mind and does not possess a spirit. But what is [Apollinarius'] accusation? He wrongly charges us of saying that man has a nature greater than himself, that is, the indwelling of the divinity. If this is his accusation, we and the Apostle [Phil 2.6] are not only repelled but reject it. In accordance with [Paul] we believe that God's form which existed in the form of a slave belongs to the realm of appearance. Therefore, he [Christ] who conversed with men according to the flesh has something more noble which our author [Apollinarius] claims is offensive to the faith. But the Apostle says, "the fullness of divinity dwelt in him bodily" [Col 2.9]. When [Paul] said "in him" he does not mean half a person but the totality. If the divinity dwelt in a human body, this body is not lifeless; furthermore, [M.1184] the intellect is part of the human soul. If this is separated, the remainder is a mere beast as we have often said; we would lack the noble part and be subject to the Apostle's condemnation. The great John said "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us" [Jn 1.14]. He [John] did not speak of our [human nature], but used the plural form ["us"] to signify that which belongs to human nature. He first separated the Word from the flesh and then united [J.174] it to this flesh. For the Word remained himself and "was with God" [Jn 1.1]. Whatever God was, the Word was also "for he was God" [Jn 1.11]. But when he came to his own and shined in the darkness [Jn 1.5], the Word became flesh. Therefore let all abuse directed against us cease that saintly persons may not be inflated with pride.

I now interject some of [Apollinarius'] words which deny the mystery [of the Incarnation] and lie beyond his comprehension. One such attack directed against us is as follows: "If we deny that, we must claim that [Christ] did not preexist prior to his earthly birth, did not exist before all creatures, nor was he equal with God." However, we confess that [Christ] preexisted before his earthly birth, provided we do not deny the flesh as constituting his earthly existence. We reject the position that the flesh was united with God. No Christian should coin a novel term derived from a combination of ignoble elements and the divine majesty. This would result in attributing falsehood to God's divinity. Neither would Eunomius fear to usurp the term "Lord" here. He denied [Christ's] true divinity, saying that it was not connatural to him in the same way persons who are members of the same body of Christ believe in him; they are not one with the Lord in nature but share his nature and are called accordingly [Eph 3.6]. He [Apollinarius] who attacks our confession of faith does not acknowledge our unassailable religious devotion and sets forth his belief concerning the divine flesh as follows: "Who is holy from his birth?" Here he demonstrates his ignorance of the prophet Jeremiah, [J.175] "Before I formed you I sanctified you in the womb" [Jer 1.5]. Scripture testifies not only to [Christ's] sanctity at his birth but to his sanctity before birth. But he [M.1185] who leapt in his mother's womb and rejoiced at the voice of the greeting of the mother of the Lord [Lk 1.41] was holy from his birth. As the angel attests, "He will be filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb" [Lk 1.15]. Next [Apollinarius] adds, "Who is wise unless he had been taught?" But we have the wisdom of God, Christ, whom we believe was not taught by anyone.

We have no doubt that our flesh which has been united to divine wisdom is good by reason of participation. We trust in the Gospel's words, "Jesus advanced in stature, wisdom, and in grace" [Lk 2.52]. Just as our bodies grow step-by-step by the intake of food and advance to maturity, so do our souls advance by training toward the fulfillment of wisdom. [Apollinarius] says, "Who has accomplished the works of God in power?" How does such a ridiculous statement denigrate the inexpressible greatness of God? For men sanctified by God's power accomplish feats in accord with this power as when Elias caused the rain to cease, rained down fire upon adversaries, multiplied flour and oil in an earthen jar, restored life to a dead boy by his breath and performed other

miracles narrated by scripture [cf. 1Kg 17.14 & 2Kg 1.10]. Nothing lies beyond the man's capacity when united to the authority of God, for he can accomplish miracles with this power because the exercise such transcendent authority has been entrusted to us. What we all have received in truth we hold as true.

[J.176] When [Apollinarius] makes an unintelligible distinction, we cannot skillfully refute it. What does he wish to say by the following remarks? "We distinguish an operation according to the flesh which is equal to one according to the spirit." He then adds the Gospel's statement, "My father is working still, and I am working" [Jn 5.17]. If a person favors unreasonable thoughts, let him agree with [Apollinarius] who utters similar words: "He who is equal in power has a distinction of operations with regard to the flesh according to which he has vivified not everyone but only those whom he wished." We have chosen the simple, unelaborated sense of divine scripture since we are familiar with [M.1188] its content. When we hear the Lord speaking let us pay attention: "The Father raises the dead and gives them life, and the Son gives life to whom he will" [Jn 5.21]. We do not believe these words to be a rejection of the life-giving will, but since we have heard and believed that everything belonging to the Father also belongs to the Son, we clearly see the Father's will as one in the Son in everything. If the Father's will is in the Son, the Father, as the Apostle says, "wishes everyone to be saved and to come to the recognition of the truth" [1Tim 2.4]. He who shares everything with the Father also has the Father's other graces along with his salvific will.

If the perfect will is not destroyed, it is clear that the Father wishes everyone to be saved and brought to life; his will which loves mankind is not diminished as Apollinarius claims because [the Son] wishes some, not all, [J.177] to be saved. For the divine will does not save some persons and cause others to perish (otherwise that will is the cause of perdition); rather, some persons are saved and others perish as a result of their own free will. [Apollinarius] continues by saying, "No one perishes or rises by his own free will." We have in response the Gospel's words, "No one can take my life from me; I have power to lay it down and power to take it up again" [Jn 10.18]. Is this life rational or irrational? I think we should examine how an irrational soul is united to God. If it is irrational, Christ is a beast, not a man, and if rational, what else can it be except the mind? Mind certainly does not lack reason but the beginning and movement of thought

as well as the foundation of reason. Therefore when speaking of a rational intellect, [Apollinarius] admits its capacity for thought. If thought is the movement and product of the mind, how does the absence of mind effect activity if the Lord's soul did not have a mind? If the Lord has a soul which he freely takes up and lays down, it is not beastly and irrational but human; indeed it follows that he assumed a human, rational mind.

[M.1189] With regard to these matters [Christ] speaks of a grain of wheat [Jn 12.24] which must die and later sprout seeds. I will continue since this matter pertains to us and strengthens our argument. What is the seed which has died and rises with its own seeds in an ear of corn? I believe that this divine teaching points to the mystery of the Passion fulfilled in [Christ's] humanity. This text shows that we [J.178] must die, be buried and rise with him. It is easy to imitate something connatural while to resemble something difficult lies beyond our capacity. If the flesh is subject to death, we who live in the flesh should find it easier to imitate [Christ's] death by our own death. If the divinity is mortal, how can we die with it since we are composed of flesh? Flesh is put to death with flesh and rises with it. But if the divinity is subject to suffering as Apollinarius wishes it to be, we must seek other forms of divinity which are subject to death and a resurrection with respect to divinity. For just as Christ died and rose, so do we, says the Apostle [1Thes 4.14]. What does our nature consist of, the divine power or blood and flesh as scripture says? [Christ] shared our nature of flesh and blood since he was made this way for us and became like us. He died for us with a nature like ours and imitated us by becoming a member of the human race. On the other hand, [Apollinarius'] uses our own arguments in an unbecoming manner to demonstrates the divinity's mortality. What is mortal, corruptible and common to the human race? Does not flesh dissolve into the earth while the mind remains with the soul and because of its essence, does not share the body's fate? One such proof [for the soul] is the wealthy man who remains under the earth and beseeches Abraham on behalf of his own kin [Lk 16.24]. No one would act so absurdly as to shun concern for one's kin in distress. If our mind suffers no passion and change after death, how can Apollinarius claim that God underwent a three-fold death in the flesh? How has he undergone death or [J.179] dissolution? Is it not commonly known that death means the soul's separation from the body? How can the soul and mind be

separated and how can each experience death? If our soul is incapable of dying, then those persons who divide Christ into many parts are inquisitive about the manner of his death.

[M.1192] "But the impious undergo great tribulation." Here [Apollinarius] slanders us and calls us unfaithful pagans due to our unquestioning loyalty to the Gospel's words, "If it is possible, let this chalice pass away from me; but may your will be done, not mine" [Mt 26.39]. To this [Apollinarius] adds, "It is not recorded that [Christ] does not speak from his own will as a man of the earth as some claim but as God who descended from heaven." Who would ever ascribe to such a position? I do not say that such words should be condemned as heretical; in my opinion, not even the father of impiety and lies can find a more loathsome blasphemy! Does the author of this statement actually realize what he is saying? [Apollinarius] reviles the very will of the God who descended from heaven and who does not wish to carry out [his Father's] will. Hence the will of Son and Father are at enmity. How can both persons share a common will? How can such a division of wills reveal their [common divine] nature? The Lord says that the will must be in accord with the nature: "A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit" [Mt 7.18]. The fruit may be called free will so that what is good belongs to goodness and what is bad belongs to evil. If the fruit of the will between Father and Son [J.180] differs, their nature must also differ. Why does Arius show hostility in this matter? Why do not such persons accede to Eunomius who divides the nature of Father and Son along with the will? He introduces a foreign substance to the divinity, thereby rending it inferior instead of wonderful.

Let us again quote [Apollinarius]: "It is not recorded that [Christ] as a man of the earth does not speak in this way from his own will as some claim, but as God who descended from heaven." What will is he speaking about? The Lord clearly wishes to be one with the Father when he says "Not my will but yours be done." Is not the contradiction clear here? The Passion and the betrayer with an armed band are at hand, hence this prayer. Does [M.1193] man or God pray in this situation? If God, he appears just as weak as man. Therefore, how does God who has no need of good apart from himself pray for help from heaven? How does God reproach his own will? Does he wish good or evil? If good, then why does he not bring it about? If evil, how can evil be united with the divinity? But

[Apollinarius] does not pay attention to my earlier remarks and distorts them. If the Only-Begotten [Son] of God says "Not my will, but your be done," his words are eternally directed against himself and are of no [J.181] value. [Christ] clearly does not wish to do his own will, something he expressly desires. Therefore, how is his prayer subject to grief? I desire one thing [says Christ], that my wish is not realized. Nevertheless, he is disposed to the contrary and is indifferent with regard to the effect of his prayer. For whatever he intends, the result is opposite to what he did not desire in prayer. Is [Christ's] will accomplished in prayer? Since his prayer consists in doing what he does not wish, he is in total disagreement with everything he undergoes, having resisted his will and overcome it. The one encouragement we obtain from the truth of this mystery is that such weakness results from human nature's reluctance to undergo suffering. As the Lord says, "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak" [Mt 26.41]. Suffering comes from the divine dispensation, will and power. Since we see [in Christ] both the human and divine will, he who made our suffering his own speaks from the weakness of human nature. [Christ] then speaks of the lofty will befitting God which exercises domination over human [nature] while simultaneously wishing [M.1196] salvation for mankind. When he says, "not my [will]," he reveals his human [nature]. But when he adds "your [will]," he shows the unity of his divinity with the Father. Here both [Father and Son] are of one will due to their common [divine] nature, for he speaks like this to show the will of the Father and the Son. This [will] consists in wishing all men to be saved and to come to recognize the truth [1Tim 2.4]; it could not be not otherwise [J.182] unless [Christ] experienced death which had shackled life. The Lord uttered words characteristic of human nature's reluctance to suffer, thereby showing that he truly assumed our [human will] and confirmed his [human] nature through fellowship with [our] sufferings.

"But," says Apollinarius, "the man [Christ] did not come from the earth as commonly assumed; rather, God descended from heaven and united himself to [human nature]." These faulty, obscure words reveal their author's mind although we have not yet fully uncovered the muddled sense of his text. "The words expressing distress do not come from the man whose origin lies in the earth; rather, they come from the God who descended from heaven." Such words clearly indicate that the Godhead underwent suffering. Then [Apollinarius]

reveals his confused mind by an absurd form of logic: "[Christ] descended from heaven" and immediately adds "he united himself to [human nature]." This statement will become clear when we realize their meaning as follows: [Christ] did not speak as man, but God spoke through a man whom he united to himself as a manifestation. What, then, is the origin of that man? The earth? [Apollinarius] does not say. The human race does not originate in heaven. It remains for us to say that this appearance is insubstantial and false, for whatever lacks origin does not even exist. But [Apollinarius] adds that the man [Christ] had descended from heaven, Mary existed on earth, [her son was born] in a cave and laid in a crib. How can we profess that a heavenly man united himself to what is earthly? Scripture confesses the virgin, birth, flesh, [J.183] swaddling cloths, the breast, crib and [Christ's] human condition. [Apollinarius] rejects all these facts and fashions another man who has no affinity with our human nature.

But once [Apollinarius] has woven such derogatory notions into his words, he falsifies [M.1197] [true] teaching in order to assail us more vehemently with his blasphemous remarks. I believe that we should disregard him and pass judgment on his words which distort the apostolic faith. According to Paul [2Cor 5.16], we who knew Christ according to the flesh do not now know him in this fashion; in other words, he always existed before the dispensation on man's behalf as well as later when God assumed flesh. [Apollinarius] further remarks that the Jews blasphemed against [Christ] who said that he came eating and drinking [Mt 11.19], observations which belong to a man. Who is that man condemned by the Jews for eating and drinking? Does he partake of food and drink or not? If the answer is no, he is an appearance only; if the answer is yes, he belongs to the earth: heaven is not nourished by the earth. What an incredible contradiction we have here! [Apollinarius] is brought low due to a conflict of opinion! Now [Apollinarius] says that the noble part of human nature appeared in the flesh and manifested the evil part which has disfigured this noble aspect. For our mind is that sublime element which he says does not participate in the flesh, the means God used to manifest himself. It is clear that [Apollinarius] has put much effort into conceiving this doctrine, and we shall briefly examine his position, provided that our attempts be taken seriously. The very magnitude of harmful remarks crammed into his writings [J.184] challenges

us to say that [God's] union with the flesh and the assumption of a man cannot be justified. If I am speaking in an unrefined manner, I do so in order not to conceal the truth but because his teaching is at odds with our accustomed manner of speaking. It is difficult to interpret the difference between [Christ's] union with flesh and his assumption of man because union may be understood in various ways such as number, form, nature, purposes, teachings, properties of both evil or virtue and other considerations. For this reason we must explain the union with flesh, whether it pertains to [Christ] or to something else. We lack knowledge of how [Christ] assumed our humanity, the kind of union, its origin and how it came about. Since divine scripture fails to offer salt [to understand] this mystery, we are reduced to allow the faithful to trample underfoot the tasteless salt of pagan wisdom. What does the Gospel tell us of [Christ's] union with the flesh? What statement from the Apostles teaches us of humanity's [M.1200] assumption? What law, prophet, divinely inspired word, or teaching of which synod can convey this [mystery] to us? These two words [assumption and union] signify something in particular, for they lay claim to a special reality of which we were in doubt. We ascribe to neither term nor to both that we may uncover a difference, for both basically mean the same. Union indeed has one connotation and assumption another: each denotes a relation to the other, for assumption means union and unity is achieved by assumption.

[J.185] He says that "we profess two persons, God and the man which he had assumed." He claims "this is not so; to imply that [Christ] assumed flesh means that he is none other than the incorporeal [God]. At the same time, [Christ] resembles us by his life in the flesh." [Apollinarius] presents us with numerous accounts of such ridiculous notions. The God who became enfleshed cannot have a simple nature, for no one in the flesh can look upon such simplicity; however, that which is not simple cannot be uncomposite. But [Apollinarius] says, "[Christ] is one in the same manner he is one with us, that is, composed of spirit, soul, and body." Here we have learned a new form of number, one is divided into three different kinds. However, let us have nothing to do with [Apollinarius'] teaching on the spirit. We have learned that human nature has a division on a more material level and confess man to be composed of an intelligent soul and a body. We believe that one [person] is composed of two [substances], a position derived from the Apostle who observes two men in each

one of us. He wisely says, "though our outer nature is wasting away," that is the body, "our inner nature is being renewed every day" [2Cor 4.16]. Here he hints at the existence of the soul. If Apollinarius asserts three men and [the Apostle] two, the invisible and the visible, he would strengthen his own teaching against us with this example by naming one that which is two, a position which Paul refutes with his two-fold division of man. Since his teaching rests on the example of human nature, we refute it along with his disturbing teaching [about Christ]. [Apollinarius] further says, "Man is one as composed of spirit, soul and body." I believe that he first ascribes to this position from an assumed, [J.186] created body and a soul with an origin [M.1201], whether from rational humanity or from an irrational source; that is, if the man [Christ] is considered as a beast, a rational attribute is added which [Apollinarius] says differs from the spirit, the same mind within us which he calls God in [Christ]. If he first describes the formation of the heavenly man after the likeness of the earthly man, we are obliged to express our distress over the consequence of such falsehood, for his unconventional teaching claims that the earthly race of men is composed of a rational soul and body. However, the heavenly race has a soul without reason, but the human body and God are united by reason of a soul which Apollinarius believes has appeared on earth. Because [Christ] became manifest and entered our existence only by birth through the Virgin and did not share our human nature, it is both absurd and inconsistent to call a body that which is not a body and a human soul that which is not a soul. If anyone does not recognize the intellect, he fails to admit that man exists.

Since the tripartite division of man is impossible due to his two-fold composition, does it follow that God is tripartite? On one hand we have man with a two-fold nature and on the other, God divided into three parts. [Apollinarius] says, "For [Christ] cannot be made in the likeness of man unless he is enfleshed with a human mind." I am unable to say whether or not that man [Christ] had a mind in whom God had reconciled the world to himself because he who ascribes to these beliefs was not in his right mind when composing them. Should I remain silent, [Apollinarius'] writings will certainly proclaim his view. How can something other than man be in the likeness of man and not share our human nature? If our human constitution has a rational soul and a body--for neither can this body nor soul which he had fashioned belong to him--how can

[Christ] [J.187] resemble man while sharing our human nature? But [Apollinarius] says that [Christ] is not a man but something resembling man with an enfleshed mind. These views persuade me that [Apollinarius] was not in his right mind when he composed them. How can [Christ] resemble human nature while not partaking of it? What is that enfleshed mind which is both connatural to the flesh and incapable of being separated from it while always remaining in existence? Can something like this actually exist? Flesh can only beget itself if flesh is its origin. As the Lord says, "What is born from flesh is flesh" [Jn 3.6]. But [Apollinarius] says that the mind became enfleshed at a later time. What kind of flesh does he who is enfleshed assume? Real flesh? Flesh which lacks existence? But this flesh has the same existence. Therefore one cannot speak of him who is enfleshed, for this does not say that he did not exist.

[M.1204] But let us examine the repercussions of the argument which claims that Only-Begotten God had an enfleshed mind. "If the Lord did not have an enfleshed mind, it would consist of wisdom." What a fallacious proposition! He maintains that another [Lord] exists who is composed of either one of these substances, enfleshed mind or wisdom. For [Apollinarius] this must be the constitution of [Christ]; if this is not the case because the mind is not enfleshed, [Christ] is undoubtedly wisdom, for mind cannot be enfleshed. What about a stone, a beetle or anything else which we may observe? [Apollinarius] will indeed attribute some other entity composed from these two properties, that is, either the enfleshed mind or wisdom. However, both mind and wisdom have nothing to do with these. Both the proposition and fraud attributed to their author perish along with his argument. Hence these two elements are identical: if one exists the other does not, or on the contrary, [J.188] if one does not exist, the other does exist. However, neither one or both of his propositions are thwarted. Let us examine the absurdity which follows from such a proposition. If [Apollinarius] asserts that the mind is not enfleshed, it would be wisdom; the contradiction is evident because if [Christ] is wisdom, the mind is not enfleshed. But everyone who admits wisdom to be Christ accepts the faith. According to the proposition of wisdom, we confess that [Christ] cannot have an enfleshed mind. Hence, with regard to the first and second proposition as well as the present one, our author formulates anything he wishes to show that the Lord is not an enfleshed mind. Such is his proposition and his assumption.

The conclusion [Apollinarius] realizes is worthy of both his propositions. What are his words? "The presence of God is not through Christ's dwelling but through a man's birth." Arrogant persons may denounce such remarks as these. However, we resist the temptation to be derisive, judging it more expedient both to weep over his misleading words and to challenge his conceited assumption. Who would not deride the incoherence of his syllogistic procedure? I will now quote his argument: "If the Lord did not have an enfleshed mind, wisdom, which is found in all men, would illumine the mind of man. If this is true, then the presence of Christ did not consist in God's dwelling with us but in a man's birth." No reverent person would deny that the Lord is wisdom. [M.1205] As the convincing evidence of the holy Fathers and Apostles testify, he transcends every mind. [J.189] Paul cries out, "God made [Christ] our wisdom" [1Cor 1.30]. Also, "The grace of salvation has appeared for us, training us to renounce impiety and worldly passions, and to live sober, upright, and godly lives in this world while awaiting our blessed hope" [Tit 2.11-13]. The Apostle has taught us that the Only-Begotten Son who is above, through and in all things, does not have an enfleshed mind. Neither do the saints hand on to us any novel teaching derived from divinely inspired scripture which describes [Christ] as having a monstrous nature. We pay special attention to the intent of this unorthodox writer who rejects with callous sophistry the Lord's wisdom, the very means by which we believe he enlightens every mind. In its place he introduces an absurd new teaching which gives a name to the mind of the enfleshed Only-Begotten [Son] while refraining to call him wisdom. "If the Lord is believed to be wisdom, the very one who manifested himself to each person who received grace, we no longer confess the abiding of God as Christ's presence among us as wisdom which had become alienated from God." Who cannot but pity the insanity of such a man? If he says that we believe [Christ] as wisdom, God's dwelling with us does not come from Christ "who was made for us wisdom by God" [1Cor 1.30] but from the birth of a man. And what if he were wisdom? Have you not heard the prophet crying out, "the virgin will conceive in her womb and will give birth to a son" [Is 7.14] and, "a child is born for us" [Is 9.5]? Finally, a strong, powerful son has the ruling authority laid upon his shoulder; this occurred not only in the past, but he is also the father of the age to come [vs. 6].

But let us reject this fantasy which claims [J.190] that an enfleshed mind is neither illuminating wisdom nor [Christ's] appearance by his birth into our human existence. He offers yet another argument: "The enfleshed mind was not the Word but wisdom." How can a wise person distinguish mind from wisdom and say that the two are different? Anyone who can accurately distinguish between two different realities says that life is opposed to death and death to life, evil to virtue and so forth. With this example of [M.1208] opposing realities in mind, how can wisdom be distinguished from mind since two entities cannot be one and the same thing? [Apollinarius] says, "If mind is not enfleshed, it is wisdom." This is as if one were to say that anyone not enjoying good health is ill. What is the argument here? "If wisdom is not present in the mind, the Lord did not descend to us nor did he empty himself." Observe the inevitable result of his argument! How can [Apollinarius] maintain that the Lord did not descend to reveal himself because he was wisdom? If his descent repudiates that wisdom comes from the Lord, then he who confesses this descent must deny [the Lord] as wisdom. However, Apollinarius acknowledges [Christ's] descent and that which has descended he does not believe to be wisdom. Such are the arguments opposed to the truth he offers concerning our [Lord's] birth. Then [Apollinarius] adds an unintelligible argument based upon a false assumption: "[Christ] was a man, for according to Paul, man is an enfleshed mind." I beseech my readers not to think that we are ridiculing this statement fabricated by Apollinarius, for his words enable us to comprehend [J.191] his argument. Does Paul say that the mind is enfleshed? Does [Apollinarius] have Paul imply something else? The Apostle who called himself a slave of Jesus Christ says nothing of the sort in all his writings. If his epistles do not bear this out, what is the origin of this strange, concocted doctrine? [Apollinarius] further adds, "That man [Christ] was both from the earth and from heaven." Again I refer to Gabriel's announcement to Mary upon whom we believe the Holy Spirit had descended. She was overshadowed by the power of the Most High; from her Jesus was born who bore the authority upon his shoulders, that is, he bore his own authority. This authority is indeed God the Word who was in the beginning and is the beginning [NB: arce means both authority and beginning] as the Word says in scripture, "I am the beginning" [Apoc 1.8]. Let it be known that either the Virgin did not exist on the earth or that the heavenly man was not made. Neither should one fear less educated persons who offend the divinity by accepting

[Christ's] humanity while not confessing his divinity, for his humanity is born from woman while virginity points to a birth transcending man. Such is the case with the man [Christ] who was born; the power by which he came to birth does not come from man but from the power of the Most High through the Holy Spirit. Therefore, [Christ] is truly [M.1209] man and God; to the eye he is man, and to the mind, God. [Apollinarius] does not arrive at the conclusion that the divinity present in visible reality cannot be defined by the mind.

But let us move on to the argument which follows: "If the mind is with God, then the human mind was in Christ." Such is his contention which we now reprove. Which saint [J.192] defined the divine mind? Which part of scripture has taught us that God consists of this mind, claims that the man Christ lacked a mind and that God became a mind devoid of reason? We are compelled to correct such abuse. However, I fear that we are not sufficiently derisive to our readers in our presentation of [Apollinarius'] unacceptable teaching which we have treated with contempt. In order to bring his idea to a completion, we only need to state its conclusion, and this I pass over as mere rubbish: "If the mind is with God and the human mind was in Christ, then the incarnation did not complete its work in him. If the incarnation was not accomplished by [Christ's] self-determination and uncoerced mind, any deed completed in the flesh such as sin's abolition comes from another self-determined movement and the divine mind. Our own self-determined freedom partakes of sin's abolition when united to Christ." Can you see the inevitable result of such a statement? I think that we could use an enchanter and a diviner here who discerns the mysteries of dreams to interpret such novelties. "The mind is self-determined yet is moved by an external force; the flesh completes its work by the abolition [of sin]." But I prefer that children ridicule such notions as these while we continue with the rest of the tract. "If anything great acquires further addition it is done with effort, while Christ who lacks a human mind requires no such effort." How can we reconcile this with divinely inspired scripture? What is the origin of Beseleel's skill [Ex 31.1] and [J.193] Solomon's knowledge? How does Amos, the pruner of sycamore trees, obtain the gift of prophecy from pasturing goats [Amos 7.14]? Similarly, none of these persons has descended from heaven nor did any of them exist in the beginning as an equal to God. [M.1212] But let us quickly pass over this argument in silence which brings to a conclusion [Apollinarius'] earlier remarks:

"The human race is not saved by the assumption [analepsis] of mind and the whole man but by the taking up [proslepsis] of the flesh." Such is the conclusion of his argument. Here the cold terms of grammar interpret the difference between "assumption" and "taking up." And so, these parts of the text are called propositions which offer a brief systematization of discrepancies for school boys. We do not hesitate to interpret as identical that which was both assumed and taken up. David says, "With glory you have taken me up [proslambano]" [Ps 72.24]. And again, "He chose David his servant and took him up [analambano] from the flocks of his father's sheep" [Ps 77.70]. Therefore, "taken up with glory" and "taken from the flocks of his father" mean the same. Both words refer to one reality so that anyone not wishing to apply the word "assumption" to the Only-Begotten may say that he was "taken up" in accord with the mystery of the incarnation. Nevertheless, the meaning of each term can never be explained. But in my desire to escape submersion in the filth of [Apollinarius'] absurd words, I omit his monumental folly. I consider his position as meaningless, a conclusion reached from reading his text. Whoever wishes to vigorously inveigh against heresy cannot refute [J.194] such nonsense from his own reasoning.

[Apollinarius] states his falsehood with a weak defense which reveals his impiety as follows: "If the perfect God were united to perfect man, they would be two." The imperfect united with what is perfect cannot be considered as two regarding [Christ]. Can you not see that this distinguished gentleman is unable to count children upon the fingers of his hands? In numbering the small as one with the great, he calls one less and the other greater. He says both are the same when taken together. Every number is an aggregate of individual units denoting a total sum. If anything we can count is added to something else which can be counted with it, this sum is larger than the smaller number, for the number one is insignificant by itself because magnitude is lacking. When considering two things of equal size, we speak of two similar elements, but when we count the less with the great [M.1213] we also speak of two. However, one is inferior and the other is complete. A person proficient in arithmetic says that if the nature of each is complete, they are two. But if the inferior and the great form a unit, I do not know how they can be joined and how unity can result from opposing, irreconcilable elements. When two complete entities are united as in the similar case of two inferior entities, they form a likeness. But when we have a unity of

opposites as in the case of the inferior with the complete, I will leave the means of explaining this dilemma to the inventor of such novel arithmetic.

The human mind's mutability cannot know the Only-Begotten God and speak of its origin. Therefore, [Apollinarius] maintains [J.195] that God did not assume flesh. Our author does not deny the flesh's mutability extending from youth to old age as though these various stages have put on other clothing. How could the immutable [God] be cared for by his mother, advance to childhood and adolescence, thereby arriving at maturity and the fullness human growth? If [Apollinarius] spurns the mind because it is mutable, the flesh should not be attributed to [Christ]; thus the entire Gospel will be seen as false, and our faith along with its proclamation would be worthless. If he believes that [Christ] appeared in mutable flesh, he should also recognize the mind; rather, just as [Christ] did not suffer defilement through his birth in the flesh, neither is the mind altered by assuming mutability. I refer once more to this matter using [Apollinarius'] own words: "The human race and the entire man is not saved by the assumption of mind but by assuming flesh, its natural governing principle. The immutable mind does not require submission to the flesh by any defect in knowledge; rather, it unites the flesh to itself without coercion." Everybody knows that an inferior being differs in nature from a superior one and that the nature of anything which has come into existence to rule also requires a governing principle. Thus irrational animals are subject to man's dominion. Man does not have a newly acquired rule over these beasts, but it is something proper to him. If, as Apollinarius believes, it is natural for the flesh [M.1216] to be ruled and the divinity to govern by reason of its nature, how can he say that one nature can be divided into two right from the beginning? For [J.196] one nature is clearly subject and another, reason, is superior. A created nature requires administration while another nature performs the act of governing. If another nature is composed of contrary elements, I mean flesh and divinity, how can these two be one? How can the Word form the divine, heavenly flesh? The preexistent Word himself who was made flesh in these last days did not assume our form but always existed in his divine state. [Apollinarius] claimed that the immutable [Christ] required flesh and guidance and that our flesh is subject to sin due to its mutability. But if the body is celestial and divine, as he says with regard to the Word, neither does he follow through by ascribing to him mutability

nor a need for direction. It is God's teaching, not ours, which says that ill persons require a doctor, not the healthy [Mt 9.12]. There is no sickness of sin in heaven but we are the ones suffering sin's effects who are weakened by our consent to evil. We who have been changed into sin have great need of immutability since after we have turned away from the way of salvation, we need the good. If our author attributed this condition to our Lord's flesh, namely, that although he was immutable, he disposed himself to be led and to require guidance, then [Apollinarius] has only spoken of our own human constitution. If the flesh constrains the divinity, whatever he claims it to be, this flesh does not require something else for guidance (for it is free from change and inclination towards evil). In vain then, he contrives terms for the Lord's flesh [J.197]. If the flesh is divine, it is clearly immutable; if mutable, it is not divine.

[M.1217] Who can follow this confused, inconsistent tale which wanders all over the place like a dreamy fantasy manifesting itself under various forms? At one time [Apollinarius] says that the Word's divine flesh is co-eternal; at another time that it is acquired and assumed, and still again, that it is alien to our human nature which is subject to passion and death and in need of guidance due to its mutability and subjection to passions' whims. And so, [Apollinarius] attributes irrationality to the divine flesh that the divinity may heal it just as God both guides and protects the irrational behavior of men. He therefore claims that destitution of mind is more blessed, provided that God assumes this condition. Why does he disprove of Solomon who says, "The intelligent [man] will gain direction" [Prov 1.5]? I do not think that the mystery of this proverb refers to direction, only that evil throws our human nature into confusion and results in shipwreck. For this reason we require guidance from the true Pilot's command to reach the harbor of the divine will. If man is saved by not being rational, how will the intelligent man possess sovereignty? To which nature is the divinity more inclined, rather, to which nature is reason properly subjected in order to possess the divine nature? Flesh is crass, dense and has an affinity with the earth while mind is invisible and lacks shape. Who does not know which is more in harmony with God, the crass and earthly or the invisible and formless? How, as [Apollinarius] says, can flesh be united to God without coercion and share in pure virtue? [J.198] For who does not know that the proper activity of free choice is virtue? The flesh is an instrument of free choice led by the impulse of

discretion to whatever it desires, for free choice is nothing other than mind and disposition. If [Apollinarius] says that man partakes of pure virtue which lacks mind, what freely acknowledges virtue? Perhaps our author is thinking about something subject to constraint, not something free from such restriction. When the mind is not disposed towards the good and the body is not engaged in evil deeds, we have necessity, not free choice, for a desirable end. However, when a person makes a rational judgment for the good, it is necessarily superior, and his life naturally tends towards the good. How can our author say the [Christ] has freedom of choice while lacking the capacity to make free choice and while his very own reason cannot chose the good? Sinlessness [M.1220] would not result from choice nor be worthy of special praise; we do not laud those persons who are bound by chains and hindered from evil since they forsake evil deeds by constraint, not by choice.

"But the divinity attracts the flesh without coercion." Here [Apollinarius] clearly speaks of unconstrained free will. But how does [Christ] apply himself to virtue when he lacks free will? Choice, the act of willing, to opt for the good and to avoid being misled are efforts of the mind yet transcend the reach of a person who lacks a mind. If the flesh is united to God without coercion, our author testifies that it neither lacks free will, acts irrationally, nor lacks guidance towards a worthwhile goal. However, no one has ever said that the flesh lacked reason, for how can reason be present in a nature which lacks reason? Not only is the mind in man by [J.199] what [Apollinarius] says, but it is his most noble attribute. The free, unconstrained inclination for the good is perfect testimony for the mind. Also his ensuing words show that the mind is inclined towards the good: "Pure virtue shares in everything subject to the mind." If virtue's purity is in the mind, how does he exclude the mind from [Christ's] in which he also acknowledges purity? A choice must be made here; either mind can share in virtue or the flesh lacks mind when freely united to virtue.

The preceding words were both incoherent and inconsistent, so it would not be worth our effort to carefully examine what now follows a similar vain: "Persons resembling Christ with respect to the mind also resemble him with respect to the flesh." Such revolting words present an erroneous teaching to their admirers. But let us quote once more from [Apollinarius] himself: "If God had united himself to man, he is perfect with that which is perfect, for they are two: one is

Son of God by nature and the other is [son of God] by adoption." I simply wish to learn that if the adopted son is perfect and endowed with mind, what does [Apollinarius] call the man which, he says, lacks reason and mind? The Only-Begotten God is complete and perfect because this appellation of the true Son can be verified by his nature. But what is an addition to a half-complete man called? If Apollinarius says that the adopted son is perfect man, [M.1221] the half-complete man, insofar as he is man, is clearly a half-God and aptly named because the term adoption results from division. If we wish to clearly say that the perfect man is adopted, then this [J.200] half or deficient third part is in accord with those persons who wish to chop the man [Christ] into little pieces. But if it is improper for God to have an adopted son, the same may be equally said with respect to the perfect and imperfect man. The result of this is an absurd mutilation. If the perfection of human nature is applied to the divinity, we would have something disgraceful along with a conception not worthy of God. How much more disgraceful would his mutilated nature appear! If [Christ] does not have a mind, flesh comes from the Father but does not belong to his essence. Similarly, the person of the Son both taken as a whole and in his various aspects differs according to the law of nature; neither can our mind nor body be associated with the [divine] transcendent nature by reason of their essence. When confronted with a myth about the divinity which fabricates a heavenly form of flesh, a perceptive person would deny that such flesh is consubstantial with God and the Father. If the flesh is alien to the Father's substance, how can the Son be alien from his Father? He who has his origin from another person does not have another essence but differs only with regard to him who begets. But the Father is not flesh, and he who comes from the Father is not flesh, for what is born from spirit is spirit and is not flesh [Jn 3.6]. If the flesh is not from the Father, the Son is not from the Father. What is that flesh called? We will apply to human flesh whatever name for that heavenly flesh the author [Apollinarius] has concocted, and so both our human nature and [Christ's] will have the same name. [J.201] The Son does not have his origin from the earth nor is the Son heavenly [according to Apollinarius]; an adopted son has his origins from the earth just as [Apollinarius' heavenly son]. Hence, we have two sons. One son [according to Apollinarius] is composed of flesh and divinity who comes from the earth. Since all creation is nothing when compared to the divine nature, we confess that the Father equally transcends heaven and earth.

Something remains which has charity as its goal, namely, to consider what is more befitting of God. This does not consist in determining [Christ's] name but in bestowing a name of great value and power resembling the ocean. If a person were to swallow a drop of salt water which [M.1224] conveys the quality of the sea, in similar fashion the true, Only-Begotten Son who is inaccessible light, wisdom, power, every exalted name and conception, manifests himself to men through the flesh. But the flesh's own nature is transformed into the incorruptible sea. As the Apostle says, "What is mortal is swallowed up by life" [2Cor 5.4]. Every corporeal manifestation is transformed into the divine, immortal nature. Neither weight, form, color, solidity, softness, quantity nor anything visible remains; the humble nature of the flesh is taken up to be united with the divinity and to assume its properties.

Apollinarius' fabrication directed against us asserts, "The four names of the Trinity present no danger; we should not subject angels as slaves to men." Those who serve the man [Christ] subject themselves to the Lord; they are not ashamed to worship him who made his home in the world through the flesh. "When he brings the first-born into the [J.202] world, it is said, 'Let all God's angels worship him'" [Heb 1.6]. Only one entry into this world is possible, human birth, for no other way exists. Scripture also calls birth through the flesh our entrance into the world. If all the angels worship [Christ's] entry into the world--and his entry is through the flesh--we have not reduced the Lord to a slave's condition; rather, the angels acknowledge his transcendent lordship. Thus let [Apollinarius] who brings forth such vain ideas be silent. His arguments compel us to make earth into heaven, thereby reducing to servitude the God-bearing angels along with the God-bearing man.

To these considerations [Apollinarius] adds, "If the true God has received God, there are many gods since this multitude receives God." What is our response? "God was in Christ reconciling [M.1225] the world to himself" [2Cor 5.19] to which the great Paul was a honorable witness. If our author thinks that we proclaim a multitude of gods due to our confession that God reconciled in Christ the world to himself by becoming united with men, we offer the following defense: if there were many virgins who were also mothers, and if the revelation [of Christ's birth] came by Gabriel to many persons, the descent of the Holy Spirit and the divine power has descended upon them all. If the prophets

proclaimed grace to many persons, children were born for us, sons were given for us, virgins were conceived in the womb and all who were born received the name Emmanuel. If everyone treaded upon waves and an ineffable power fell upon those thousands [J.203] in the desert, they have multiplied bread and the disciples distributed it. If all were dead for four days, they experienced the resurrection. If everyone were lambs of God, they offered themselves as a Paschal sacrifice for us, nailed sin to the cross, loosened the bonds of death, ascended into heaven before the disciples and sat at the Father's right hand. If the entire world came to be judged in righteousness and confessed the name of every celestial power both upon earth and beneath it, we would attribute many gods if such evidence were available. But if there is one Lord Jesus who brings everything into existence--"from him, through him and in him are all things" [Rom 11.36]--and if the enumeration of names befitting God refer to him alone, what danger is there in forming many gods when we claim that God has appeared through flesh and was endowed with a human soul? Was [Christ] who became manifest a man ignorant of the Gospel teaching and the salvation he offered to the Jews? "Now you seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth" [Jn 8.40]. Can you not see in [Christ's] words an occasion to kill him when he said "Now you seek to kill me?" It is not the truth they wish to kill but the man by whom truth speaks. It was not man uttering the truth but God who was clearly speaking while man mediated [God's] message to men using his own voice. [Christ] is mediator between God and men since human nature cannot experience a pure union with God and have kinship with him. Therefore, the heavenly power approaches him by means of [Christ's] human voice. But let us leave these considerations behind us and turn our attention to the following: [M.1228 & J.204] "Nothing," says [Apollinarius], "can be united to God such as the flesh which was assumed." Oh, what a judicious statement! Nothing can be united to God such as flesh, goodness, eternity, incorruptibility, omnipotence, nor any thought befitting God; all these secondary characteristics are judged as inferior to the flesh when it is united with God. However, [Apollinarius] confesses that he who assumed flesh made known his coming upon earth.

We therefore pass over [Apollinarius' words] in silence since they are harmless, insubstantial fables. When he said that nothing attributed to God can be united to the Lord [Jesus] as the flesh which he had assumed, he has realized that

nothing can be united with [God] nor be adored. He concludes with another flourish of his pen, "Nothing can be adored, for example, the flesh of Christ." We remain silent with regard to this absurd folly which is obvious even to children. Such children who sit and play in the market place would reason as follows: if nothing can be adored such as the flesh, then the flesh of Christ is worthy of more reverence than the Father's majesty and all-powerful authority which governs everything. And if any part of our human nature can speak of the divine power, we have left behind worship of Father, Son and Holy Spirit as alone worthy of adoration and prefer the flesh to which we ascribe all power. Indeed [Apollinarius'] words above are similar to what now follows: "The flesh of the Lord is to be adored inasmuch as there is one person and [J.205] one living being with him." He mentions two elements, the Lord and the flesh of the Lord, which compose one living being. Now the inscription to his tract clearly reveals the divine incarnation in man's likeness. Since the soul joined to the body is a unity formed from different elements of which human life consists and the distinguishing mark of our human constitution is this union of soul and body, our author [M.1229] is quick to say in his inscription concerning the divine power's manifestation that the divinity appears in the flesh according to the likeness of man. [Apollinarius] clearly says that there is one person and one living being or the flesh and the Lord, as if Paul claimed that what is manifest is present in what is hidden on account of the body's affinity with the soul. What action can we take against such claims? How can anyone accuse us of insensitivity and of fabricating false ideas? Let us consider the following statement: "Nothing created is to be adorned as belonging to the Lord, for example, his flesh."

Who can decide which irreverence is worse, that of Apollinarius or of Eunomius? Which one has exerted himself more vigorously against the truth? It seems that both are successful in presenting their equally sacrilegious opinions. One maintains that the Only-Begotten God is created and does not deny any difference between his mind and corporeal nature. This view professes that right from the beginning [Christ] was fashioned from two natures, flesh and divinity, and he is one living being in the likeness of human nature. [J.206] Both ascribe worship to a created being; however, [Eunomius] declares that [Christ's] nature is intellectual and incorporeal. [Christ's] nature is corporeal, and we should adore it instead of other creatures just as irreverent adoration is attributed to

other creatures which the followers of Eunomius confess. Therefore, let us attribute victory against Eunomius, and let it be known that he has been adorned with the crown of impiety. Inasmuch as the body is deemed inferior the soul, when referring to those who worship the flesh among creatures, [Apollinarius] says that the worship of an intelligent creature is an especially flagrant breach of impiety. Also, if he claims that other creatures are to be worshiped, the flesh, by comparison, is worthy of a higher degree of worship. [Apollinarius] says, "Nothing created is to be worshiped, for example, the flesh of the Lord." All creatures are nothing before the divine power whether they be incorporeal or corporeal. But creation is composed of both great and small elements, and the incorporeal nature is more worthy of honor than anything which is sensible and corporeal. Just as Eunomius and Apollinarius attribute worship to a created being, both are equally worthy of disrespect. However, he who prefers the intellectual nature over the flesh is guilty of a greater impiety. Let the followers of such misunderstanding pay attention to our words directed against their teacher and the charge brought against him.

[M.1232] Let us see how the following shackles, that is, Apollinarius' teaching, present us with an indissoluble syllogistic chain of thought: "If anyone thinks that a man, rather than all men and angels, is bound with God..." We feel compelled [J.207] to examine the meaning of this statement. For the purpose of clarification, I cannot say which is better: to ask whether or not a stone has a soul or wood has understanding. Instead, we simply have a confirmation of his impiety. Nevertheless, the context of these words should attest to such nonsense as follows: "Angels and men lack free will because flesh does not have this capacity. Rather, corruption of our innate free will is not free will, for nature cannot be corrupted by its Maker and so, man is not united to God." What an argument we have here! How indissoluble are the webs of such syllogisms! The free will of men and angels which makes union with God possible is destroyed, and the corruption of our innate free will is not free will. What does this ventriloquist mean here? What are these voices and vain teachings emanating from the earth? If men and angels lack free will, human nature is united to God. Is it not a man who says, "Do you not seek to kill me, a man who has spoken the truth to you" [Jn 8.40]? Was he who manifested the divine power not united with the divine nature when he showed the works he

freely wished to accomplish? If this was not the case, the witness of the Gospels are false. [Apollinarius] asserts that Paul, the prophets and all who proclaimed the wonders of the Lord were false, along with those who recounted [Christ's] deeds. If God had truly manifested himself in the flesh and the flesh which became united to the divine nature was one with it, then according to [Apollinarius'] fable, free will perished while human nature and the angels were reduced [J.208] to slavery. As a result, they both forfeited the grace of free will. What an absurd novelty we have here! [Apollinarius] continues, "The corruption of our innate free will means that we are deprived of it." [M.1233] Is not a slave counted among animals because he does not freely have control over his destiny but is subject to another person? For the author [Apollinarius] defines a living being by free will yet ordains that a person devoid of it is not a living being. Therefore Canaan was dead when he became subjected to his brothers through impudence [Gen 9.25]; the slave of Abraham was dead [Gen 24.2] as well as the boy Gehazi belonging to Elisha [2Kg 5.27] and in later times Onesimus [Philem 10] was considered dead along with all the governing authorities [Rom 13.1]. What can I say about them? All are subject to authority which hinders free will. But those transcendent authorities whom Paul decrees to be subject are indeed dead; even if they are endowed with souls, they perish and are no longer alive. Apollinarius propagates his fable for the purpose of uniting to the God over all things flesh without a soul, whether it happens to be soulless or lacking a mind. His fable has both points equally in mind. But to be dead means to have no soul. A beast is alive without reason, a fact which [Apollinarius] does not deny as ridiculous after he had removed free will from [Christ's] flesh. Irrational beasts naturally do not have power over themselves but are subject to man's domination.

But let us omit these considerations and move on by briefly paraphrasing the [J.209] content of [Apollinarius'] thought: "Man consists of three parts, spirit, soul and body" as the Apostle says in his [first] letter to the Thessalonians [5.23]. [Apollinarius] quotes from the song of the three young men, "Bless [the Lord], spirits and souls of the just" [Dan 3.86] and adds, "In spirit serve the Lord" [Rom 1.9]. He continues with words from the Gospel which teaches us to worship God in spirit [Jn 4.23]. [Apollinarius] also says that the flesh is at enmity with the spirit. By claiming the flesh to be animate he shows that the spirit is a third entity

in addition to soul and body. "If man consists of these three elements, the Lord is a man. Therefore, the Lord consists of three elements, spirit, soul and body." We will now briefly treat each of these three points to show that the divine scriptures do not affirm his position. First, let us begin with the Apostle Paul who did not [M.1236] divide man into three parts. According to our text of First Thessalonians [5.23], Paul prayed to the Lord to sanctify us in body, soul, and spirit. The teaching about the excellence of free choice is not in this passage alone but is in the letter to the Corinthians [1Cor 3.1, 15.44]. Paul knew that man is both carnal and spiritual as well as having animal life. He calls "flesh" our passionate, material life, while the spirit consists of what is not weighed down by corporeal enticements and has mind raised on high. Paul accurately terms "animal" that which is neither of these [J.210] yet shares in their existence. He also claims that neither the fleshly man is destitute of mind, the soul's functions, nor of the spirit which is alien by reason of its union with soul and body; similarly, neither does the animal man lack mind nor flesh; rather, Paul presents us with numerous names for the function of free will. "He who judges everything is judged by no one" [1Cor 2.15]; if man is composed of flesh and soul he is also called spiritual. A person maddened by the flesh's passion to violate his father's bed [1Cor 5.1] possesses neither soul nor mind. Similarly, the person standing midway between praiseworthy or despicable behavior partakes of both; he has own mind and is clothed with flesh. But as it is said, persons devoted to life's pleasures may be termed carnal and fond of disputes. Those who are capable of discernment are not susceptible of judgment by other person and are called spiritual by reason of their ethical way of life. Paul continues to speak of our natural human tendency which is inferior to the spiritual just as the spiritual is superior to the carnal. Since he wishes the animal part to be perfect through virtue not only by a sublime manner of life but to have God in mind while performing our bodily functions, no aspect of our human nature is unmindful of God ("Whether you eat, drink or do anything, do all to the glory of God" [1Cor 10.31]). Hence our bodily actions do not fail to glorify God).

Paul bestows a powerful blessing to the more lofty-minded Thessalonians: "God will sanctify you wholly, and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound" [1Thes 5.23] [J.211]. In other words, everything pertaining to the body, soul and spirit is intent upon sanctification. His words are our own. If Apollinarius

says [M.1237] that the mind, body and soul are separately blessed, and if he distinguishes the capacity of these blessings, how can the body which is subject to death be kept whole? How can any part be whole when it is worn out by abstinence, shrivelled up and unhealthy through harsh servitude? How can anyone maintain that poor Lazarus, teeming with wounds and consumed with puss, was not deprived of a blessing [Lk 16.10]? But in a marvelous way to experience a body covered with wounds was an ample blessing for Paul. For the spirit assists the body to maintain its soundness by make it refrain from being drawn down into compulsive behavior and disgraceful thoughts. And so, the flesh is not pulled down nor excited by the mind with bodily passions. The hymn of the three youths [Dan 3.86] show that the souls of the just together bless God while on the other hand, Apollinarius claims that the spirit existing apart from the soul cannot bless him. What praise can the soul alone offer to God without the mind's activity? As it has been often said, the soul devoid of mind is a beast deprived of the mind's rational function. What about the mind which is separate from our soul as [Apollinarius] claims? Let us concede that spirits have the capacity to praise God as when he says that spirits have minds. If another soul is believed to be separated from the mind, how can what is devoid of mind praise God? What hymn can please God when it lacks mind? What need does the soul have for mind [J.212] if praise as a hymn to God does not require the mind's assistance? But we do not learn these things from the interpretation of scripture. Instead, souls are like angels unfettered by the chains of the body as the Lord says [Lk 20.36], words which shows the dignity of souls united with angels. Angels are spirits. As the prophets says, "He makes angels his spirits" [Ps 103.4] with whom the three youths and souls of the just are deemed worthy to sing a hymn [to God].

The Savior said that we must worship God in spirit [Jn 4.23]. He does not denote the mind by the term "spirit;" rather, he means that we should not maintain any corporeal [M.1240] opinions regarding God. The Samaritan woman told the Lord that God should be worshiped on the mountain [Jn 4.20], a particular location, a statement based upon human opinion. In response to this error the text says that God is spirit, that is, incorporeal, and those persons who adore him cannot draw near to the incorporeal God in a corporeal fashion; rather, they should fulfil their worship in spirit and in truth. This text admonishes

us about a two-fold ignorance: truth is accommodated to corporeal matters from figure and spirit from opinion. Because of this Paul assents to the truth; we should worship the Lord in spirit [Rom 1.9], neither in figure nor in the body. For him the flesh is not subject to God's law, and he directs an especially severe reproach against the error of such a teaching. Our free will enables us to engage in combat, make our [enemies] captive and to prevent us from being reduced to slavery. [J.213] If the mind does not exist, neither does free choice. Therefore Apollinarius says that the flesh is endowed with soul and free choice and admits that it is not destitute of mind. But regarding the flesh alone, he says that it contains the perfection of humanity. In this way the rest of man cannot be devoid of faculties belonging to his nature.

"But man consists of three parts." This can be taken as true, provided we are not compelled to ascribe to it. He continues, "But the Lord as man is said to consist of three parts: spirit, soul and body." We find no fault with this statement. It is correct to assume that each aspect of our human nature pertains to that man [Christ]. "But the heavenly man"--and [Apollinarius] speaks here of the Lord--"is a vivifying spirit." We concur with this statement if it is understood correctly. For he who is united with the heavenly and earthly man has undergone a union for the better; he is no longer earthly but heavenly. The same must be said of the life-giving Spirit; he who performs good acts in us is the same life-giving Spirit. But let us see how our author makes use of such ideas. "If the heavenly man has every aspect of we who are of the earth, the Spirit also shares these earthly characteristics and is not of heaven but a receptacle of the heavenly God." [M.1241] Much in these obscure words comes across as weak and difficult to understand; nevertheless, [Apollinarius'] intention is easy to uncover. "If man [J.214] has no mind, he is heavenly; if he is whole, he is no longer heavenly but a receptacle of the heavenly God." What further offensive remarks do these words contain? Does he wish to restrict the divinity's perfection that the flesh deprived of mind can be united to the divinity? Or does he reckon that once we have consented to believe in the heavenly God he is not present in us as supposed but is in a different place with another name? Apollinarius says, "If man is a receptacle of the heavenly God, God is in heaven above, according to Ecclesiastes [Eccl 5.2, code B]." He who receives God in himself is rightly called

heavenly, not earthly. If our author wishes to speak coherently, he clearly adds to his own words a correct teaching confirmed by his adversaries' wisdom.

But let us examine the text which now follows: "If we consist of three parts, [Christ] who consists of four parts is not a man but Man-God." The reader should not deride such a foolish, irrational statement; rather, let him deplore the mutilation of free will which is subject to so ridiculous an opinion. If the ever-vigilant power of God saves our human nature in its entirety, then God the Word is called Man-God. Just as fables indulge in making animals from different natures such as forms and names, for example, horse-deer, goat-stags and so forth, so the invention of this new fable reduces the divinity [J.215] to a ridiculous legend. The Apostle explicitly cries out that "Through a man came resurrection from the dead" [1Cor 15.21]. We do not have here a half man nor even something less than half a man; rather, Paul shows that [Christ's] nature does not suffer by the name [of man]. The minotaur created by imagination produces a disrespectful representation and perverts the mystery [of faith]. It gives rise to many occasions for deriding this faith by the introduction of unnatural elements. A person who ridicules our teaching rejects this absurd composition, whether the author's [M.1244] view or ours is more persuasive. No matter which position is taken, a name cannot express the composition produced from two natures. He who says that the flesh is from heaven no longer perceives it as flesh. However, flesh is governed by a life-giving nature and contains within itself a vivifying power which Apollinarius rightly calls man while he who has assumed flesh and manifested himself through it indeed has another nature. The name of the assumed flesh shows how much it differs in nature from the person who has assumed it. Therefore, how can the absurdity of a coined name impede the manifestation of God in the flesh? Apollinarius calls [Christ] a Man-God, a name he has cleverly devised. Mythology does not refer to a goat-stag when a goat is joined to a whole stag as a half goat; or on the contrary, this can happen in reference to a mixture of the animals when part of a stag is added to a whole goat. However, the combination of names denotes the participation of one nature [J.216] in another. Our author says that if man and God are united, whether fully by nature or in part, the resulting synthesis cannot but be absurd. If the Greeks learn such teachings from [Apollinarius] and then ridicule our mystery [of faith], we will indeed have occasion for sacrilege. The

prophet invokes a curse against such persons, "Woe to those through whom my name is blasphemed among the gentiles" [Is 52.5]!

Let us closely examine the words which now follow. "If something consists of two perfect elements, God neither has what man is, nor does man have what God is." If this definition claims that union [between divinity and humanity] results from both deficiency and perfection, do not [Apollinarius' followers] likewise have the audacity to say that man does not share God's nature and visa versa? In every way the divinity differs from the humanity, and no one can ever insinuate that the human nature is inferior to the divine nature. The [divinity] does not lack existence nor does [the humanity] exist imperfectly; each nature needs to be considered by itself and named with its own properties. When we hear of God, this name should convey a proper understanding of him; similarly, when we hear about man, we get an idea of his entire nature [M.1245]. Hence, the significance of these two names suffers no confusion so that one name can be understood by the other. Neither does the divinity signify the humanity nor visa versa; the name of each nature has its own connotation, and a name cannot be altered to represent the other. Both imperfection and perfection suggest different things, for we speak of perfection [J.217] by reason of its own proper nature and of imperfection by reason of its opposite nature. Neither name can depict man nor God; rather, to whatever object or designation a name may be applied, we clearly perceive fullness or deficiency. How can Apollinarius claim that if man is imperfect God is imperfect? This would result in a mutilation of our nature with respect to the divinity.

Let us now consider [Apollinarius'] following words: "Man himself cannot save the world, for he is subject to corruption, the common lot of humanity." I respond by saying that if human nature is good in itself, then the mystery [of the incarnation] is irrelevant. Since man is helpless before death, God did not offer salvation. Therefore, the light shines in the darkness through the flesh that [Christ] might destroy darkness through the same flesh. [Apollinarius] says, "God does not save us unless we are joined to him." The author of these words seems to have sound understanding and directs the soul to a clear judgment. According to him, combination signifies union of disparate natures. "Having become flesh, that is, man, [Christ] is united with us when, as the Gospel says, he became flesh and dwelt with us." These words are not contradictory unless

immediately sown with darnel. We take the position of truth because [Christ] dwelt with us when he became flesh, that is, he became flesh by dwelling with us. If the flesh came from him who dwelt with us, the Word never had flesh before Gabriel [J.218] announced [Christ's birth] to the Virgin. [Apollinarius] falsely claimed that the humanity descended to us from above and existed as man before the creation of human nature by which the divinity was mixed with humanity. "But no one can destroy sin unless he was made a sinless man; neither [M.1248] can he destroy the reign of death in all men unless he died and rose as a man." Would that [Apollinarius] always speak the truth proclaimed by the Church!

Again [Apollinarius] reverts to his customary teaching and reproaches the Church's position because man is subject to passion and rebukes us with the following: "The death of man does not destroy death itself." Why does he say this? Because he shows that the Only-Begotten's divinity had died by his suffering on the cross together with his power and truth. As a result, in the period of three days [between Christ's death and resurrection] he had neither life, power, justice, light, truth nor divinity. Neither does [Apollinarius] say that one divinity had died and another was assumed since in many places he appears to have opposed Arius on this point. To confirm his argument, he maintains that the one divinity of the Trinity which had died was not something alien. I cannot see how anyone can doubt that the divinity is not subject to death, for the only death to which man is subject is the dissolution of his human constitution. Once our body has been dissolved, the soul does not perish along with the body; rather, that which is composed perishes while that which is uncomposed remains indissoluble. If death does not affect the soul, those persons who are ignorant of what they are talking about claim that the divinity is subject to death. I omit the rest of [Apollinarius'] position on this matter, for in the following words he ascribes [J.219] to the death of the divinity of the Only-Begotten: "Neither the death of a man destroys death nor the resurrection of him who had died. It is clear that God had died because Christ could not be restrained by death's bonds." I firmly believe that we should avoid this absurdity without further examination since any reasonable person can perceive this impiety and accurately destroy the notion of this bizarre God who endured death in his own nature. We should equally disregard his plausible words because his position

radically differs from ours. [Apollinarius] tends to disinfect his lies and slanderously attach them to our position. He says, "We claim that Christ as God the Word did not exist from the beginning." But in the last days we affirm that the power of God, along with his wisdom, light, life and anything else belonging to Christ, became manifest through the flesh. To claim that there was a time when all these attributes [M.1249] manifesting Christ the Lord did not exist is in our estimation an intolerable sacrilege because [Christ's name] is denied. [Apollinarius] says that Christ did not exist from the beginning (Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God [1Cor 1.24] whose name implies everything honorable and befitting God), and that we are unable to comprehend such a great name. Just as when the rational nature of man is denied along with any other aspect of his nature, the name [man] is destroyed along with his other attributes. If Christ is the power, wisdom, stamp and effulgence [J.220] of God, [Apollinarius] rejects him together with the rest of our perceptions about him, for he claims that Christ did not exist from the beginning.

With the divine scriptures as our guide we contemplate Christ together with the Father's eternity. God is always the Only Begotten God. He does not participate in divinity nor does he progress from a more humble condition to divinity. Thus the power, wisdom and every name befitting God is co-eternal with his divinity; anything which had never existed from the beginning can never approach the glory of the divine nature. On the other hand, we say that the name of Christ is contemplated from eternity with respect to his stature of only begotten [Son]. The manifestation of his name has brought us to this conclusion. Confession of this name includes the teaching on the Holy Trinity when we believe that this title appropriately manifests the individual Persons composing it. We do not presume to speak from our own opinion, so we offer the following prophetic words: "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever. Your royal scepter is a scepter of equity. You love righteousness and hate wickedness, therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows" [Ps 44.7-8]. The term "throne" designates [God's] rule over all things. The rod of equity signifies righteous judgment. The oil of gladness, the power of the Holy Spirit by whom God is anointed as God, is the Only-Begotten by the Father since he has loved righteousness and hated injustice. If a time ever existed with no love of righteousness and no hatred of injustice, it would follow that a time existed

without anointing because [Christ] loved righteousness and hated injustice. If it was clear that he always loved justice (for he had never despised himself since he is justice itself), he is considered as anointed. Therefore [J.221] Christ is just, not unjust, and never lacked being anointed. Christ, who had never been without anointing, always existed. Everyone [M.1252] whose heart has not been covered with the veil of the Jews believes that the Father anoints and the Holy Spirit is the anointing.

How can [Apollinarius] claim that we disavow Christ's eternal existence? Such a declaration is false because we confess the eternity of Christ and have always understood the teaching which [Apollinarius] has devised with regard to [Christ's] flesh. But we know that Christ existed before the ages and is the same Lord after his passion. As Peter says to the Jews, "God has made both Lord and Christ this Jesus whom you have crucified" [Acts 2.36]. We do not confess two Christs and Lords in our contemplation of one Christ; since God is naturally the Only-Begotten God, Lord of all, King of creation and Maker and Castigator of those who have lapsed, not only has he patiently guided our fallen nature from sin and did not reject us from fellowship with him, but he has also restored us to life. He is life itself. Once evil has come to fruition at the end of human life, [Christ] united himself to our humble nature and offered us a remedy; he assumed a human form and became man. As he says to his disciples, "I am in you and you in me" [Jn 14.20], that is, he is the very same person whom he made and united to himself. [Christ] was eternally exalted and elevated man's humility, for he who transcends every lofty thing needs no [J.222] exaltation.

Christ is both Lord and Word, and that which he united he assumed into his divinity. The Lord is not reconstituted as Lord but is Lord in the form of a slave. The statement, "There is one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom all things exist" [1Cor 8.6] may also apply to Christ who was clothed before the ages with the glory of the Spirit (for his anointing symbolizes this). After the passion Christ is adorned with the man whom he united to himself by anointing. "Glorify me," as if he were to say, "Anoint me with the glory which I had with you before the world was created" [Jn 17.5]. But the glory which existed before the world, all creation, all the ages and which glorified the Only-Begotten God, is, in our opinion, the glory of the Spirit. Our faith teaches [M.1253] that the Holy Trinity alone exists before the ages. "He who existed before the ages" [Ps 54.20], as prophecy says of the

Father. Of the Only-Begotten the Apostle says "by him the ages were made" [Heb 1.2]. And the Only-Begotten God's glory which existed before the ages became manifested in the Holy Spirit. Therefore, what belongs to Christ from the Father before the creation of the world also belongs to man who is united to Christ at the end of the ages. Scripture says, "Jesus of Nazareth whom God has anointed with the Holy Spirit" [Acts 10.38]. That we may not expose ourselves to the slanderous claim that Christ was not always the Only-Begotten God, we say that he always existed both before and after his dispensation for mankind. Man existed neither before him nor after him but at the time of this dispensation. Neither did man exist before [Christ's birth from] the virgin nor after his return to heaven, for the flesh retained its own characteristics. "If we knew Christ according to the flesh we know him now [J.223] no longer" [2Cor 5.16]. The flesh does not remain immutable because God appeared in the flesh; rather, since man is mutable and God is immutable, the divinity is immune from mutability nor does it change for better or for worse (for divinity is free from such alteration). But human nature in Christ can change for the better, that is, from corruption to incorruptibility, from mortality to immortality, from temporal to eternal existence and from bodily appearance to an existence which no form can express.

Because [Apollinarius] has us say that man suffers, not God, let us now offer our response. We confess the divinity to be present in [humanity] which is prone to suffering while that which is impassible cannot suffer. Let us attempt to clarify our position and offer our [M.1256] own view. Human nature subsists by union of the intellectual soul with the body. However, both have their existence from a certain material substance. Man's material existence has its origin in the divine power; if anyone supposes his existence does not spring from this creative power, matter is sterile and does not come to life through [God's] creative activity. Just as this creative power brings man into existence by a union of body and soul, so does the power of the Most High exercise itself with regard to the Virgin's immaculate body in an immaterial fashion through the Spirit's vivifying where incorruptibility assumes matter in the virgin's body to create a fetus. And so, the New Man is formed who first and alone received [J.224] this means of existence. He was formed according to God, not man, since the divine power

equally pervaded his entire constitution. As a result, both parts of his constitution partook of divinity with a harmonious composition of soul and body.

When the man [Christ] was born, the divinity of him who was begotten did not cease because it existed before all time; nevertheless, once begotten, he appeared as man with respect to human birth. Similarly, he who lives forever did not fail to rise; he rose to life through the divine power. The divinity did not rise (for it did not die), but fallen human nature in the person of Christ experienced resurrection. If the divinity lacks neither birth nor resurrection, [Christ] clearly did not suffer according to his divinity; instead, the divinity existed in him who underwent pain in union with [the humanity which] suffered since he had appropriated this suffering to himself. The divine nature, as it is said, appropriately consists of soul and body which were united because "the gifts of God are without repentance" [Rom 11.29]. Both soul and body are not separated but remain united. Nothing can sever man's affiliation with God except sin; his life is without blemish when union with God cannot be sundered.

Since both soul and body do not have sin, the divine nature is certainly present [M.1257] in them. But when death separates the soul from the body, this composite whole [J.225] is divided while the uncomposite suffers no such fate; rather, the [divine nature] fully remains present in each part. A sure sign of God's presence in the body is the flesh's incorruptibility after death, for God is incorruptibility itself. The body is not separate from the soul, hence the thief had entered paradise by means of his soul [cf. Lk 23.39-43]. Since the mystery of the divine power is fulfilled in the two components of our human nature, [God's] vivifying energy take effect in a manner connatural to each part: through the flesh to the body and through the soul to the soul (I mean the rational part, not the irrational; for the irrational part belongs to the animal, not to the human). Hence right from the beginning the divinity is united to both body and soul. It works through the resurrection in him [Christ] who fell asleep, and so the very same Christ who had died [Rom 6.4] has risen from the dead. He who is king before all the ages came to birth when the angels announced that great joy had come to all the people at the savior's nativity. Scripture appropriately says, "he who is Christ the Lord" [Lk 2.11] and according to Gabriel, the Holy Spirit will come to the Virgin and the power of the Most High will overshadow her. It is therefore reasonable to say that the One who is born is Christ and Lord: Lord

through the power of the Most High and Christ through the anointing of the Spirit. He who is eternal was not anointed at that time; instead, scripture says of him, "You are my son; today I have begotten you" [Ps 2.7]. The word "today" signifies the present located between two dimensions of time, past and future.

How is the Creator of the ages begotten and anointed in time? The divinity is not subject to death but is risen; not subject to death because what is composite is not dissolved; risen because he who exists [J.226] allows himself to undergo dissolution in accord with the law of human nature. And so, the property of each nature remains, and Christ cures the nature of the body through the body and the nature of the soul through the soul. Again, he united in himself that which has been separated and raises it up in his exalted state. Just as a reed is divided into two and these ends are then united, the entire cut part of the reed is by necessary brought together to form a whole because the union of one extremity joined with another forms a whole. In a similar way with respect to [Christ], the soul is united to the body [M.1260] through the resurrection (for nothing bodily can hinder the mystery of [God's] dispensation in the resurrection). Inasmuch as human nature is one, it is united through death to the soul and body by our hope in the resurrection since what has been sundered is brought to unity. Paul expresses the same sentiment: "Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" [1Cor 15.20], and "just as all have died in Adam, so all are restored to life in Christ" [1Cor 15.22]. The example of a reed shows that sin has severed our human nature whose origin lies in Adam and that death has separated our soul from the body. Human nature revitalizes itself from the part which is according to Christ while the severed part is restored in the resurrection of a man according to Christ. Because we have died with him who died for us, I do not say that death is common and necessary for our human nature, for this would involve a lack of free will; since we must freely undergo death with him who has died, we should regard death as a free act because our imitation of [J.227] this free choice is done without coercion. Since everyone undergoes death whether they will it or not, no one has ever said that a person assumes death freely. However, in a different manner we freely die with him who has died, "having been buried with him through baptism into death" [Rom 6.4]. By imitating his death we might also imitate his resurrection.

But let us now continue. "How can God be man and not lack his identity as God if he had the mind of a man?" Does [Apollinarius] really understand the content of his words? He is correct in attributing immutability to the divinity, for it is always one and the same and does not derive its nature from another source; rather, it can be present in something different from itself while not changing into this substance. What does Apollinarius mean by saying that man has [an immutable] mind? Does he maintain [Christ's] majesty is present within his immutable nature even though it had changed from a sublime to a humble state and thereby enclosed itself in human nature? The human [M.1261] mind is equally present in the divinity if, as Apollinarius says, "the divine nature became a human mind." Similarly, if human nature takes our mind or God in place of mind, both mind and God are of equal majesty as, for example, the mind is in the divinity and the divinity is circumscribed by mind. When measuring corn or some other seed into an empty vessel, the measure of both grains is identical. Wheat, too, when emptied of its seeds and is ready for weighing, yields another measure. If [J.228] the divinity occupies the mind's place, no one can say that it is more excellent than the mind because it is equivalent to both mind and human nature. According to Apollinarius, the same human mind is in the divinity and does not change from one state into another; if the mind is inferior to the divinity, it changes to an inferior condition. But who does not know that the divine nature transcending all creation is both inaccessible and incomprehensible? How can one maintain that God is both mutable and has changed into a created being or mind? If Apollinarius does not know that the divinity is mutable while taking the place of the human mind, neither can the mind torn asunder be joined with man in an unalterable union. However, since [the Word] which became flesh is not subject to change, how much more should [this Word] remain immutable while united to the mind! If [Apollinarius] charges that mutability is in the mind, the [divine] dispensation for the flesh indeed is not free from the accusation of mutability.

[Apollinarius] says (I now omit the middle of his text), "If God existed after the resurrection and was no longer man, how could the Son of Man send his angels? How can we see the Son of Man coming on the clouds [Mt 24.30]? How can he preexist with God and be deified as when he said, 'I and the Father are one'" [Jn 10.30]? These words clearly demonstrate that the body cannot

encompass the divinity; rather, hair, fingernails, form, shape, bulk, [M.1264] and other corporeal parts clearly manifest aspects of the human body along with what is invisible to our eyes. I believe [J.229] that anything cast to the ground and despised is unworthy of God as in the case of [Apollinarius'] ignominious preaching. Let me now briefly mention [Apollinarius'] principle teachings to prevent scripture from contributing to his fable. Since he claims that scripture has the Son of Man sending his angels at the end of the world, he also believes that [Christ] has a human form. He also does not recall the Gospel where the Lord in his own words often appoints the man [Christ] as God over all his works [Mt 21.33, Rom 9.5]. It was a man as a master who cultivated vines on tilled land; after the death of his servants he sent his only-begotten son whom the farmers cast out of the vineyard and killed [Mt 21.35]. Who is that man who sent his only-begotten son? Who was that son slain outside the vineyard? Why does not scripture describe in human terms the one who made a wedding feast for his son [Mt 22.2]? We must say that if [Christ] assisted persons who in their weakness despised him who shared their similar [human] nature and who could not believe in his divinity, he strengthened their superficial minds in faith with fearful words. [Scripture] says that the Son of Man will send his angels for judgment, and a fearful expectation of their arrival may heal mens' infidelities. "But you will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with much strength and majesty" [Mt 24.30]. This passage applies to those persons we mentioned above, either to the man who planted the vineyard, the one who made a wedding feast for his son or in accord with the sense we previously attributed [to scripture].

Because scripture [J.230] has nothing in common with the base opinions of Apollinarius by rejecting a corporeal understanding [of Christ], it clearly demonstrates that at his coming at the end of the ages creation will see the Lord in the "glory of his Father" [Mt 16.27]. These words imply one or two things: either the Father is to be understood in a human manner that the Son may appear in human fashion in the Father's glory, or that the magnificence of the Father's glory be contemplated in a manner untainted by form and appearance; [Christ], the same one proclaimed as seen in the Father's glory, cannot be made to fit human our human form. The glory of man is one thing and the glory of God is another. [Apollinarius] says, "But [M.1265] he who held converse with men

through the flesh said "I and the Father are one" [Jn 10.30]. Oh what a demented mind we have here which maintains that [Christ] will appear in a human form at the end of the ages! The words, "I and the Father are one," were uttered in the body. Does this reasoning actually say that the Father has a fleshly existence? If [Christ] says that he is one with the Father not according to the Spirit but according to man as Apollinarius maintains, we end up by saying that the Father himself is the Son who appeared as man. But we must understand the divinity is alien to any form of corporeal existence. Thus the Son's unity with his Father is not according to human form but according to the fellowship of the divine nature and power. This is abundantly clear by the words spoken to Philip, "He who sees me sees the Father" [Jn 14.9]. He who perfectly perceives the majesty of the Son as in a mirror beholds the archetype.

I quickly pass over what now follows due to the text's incoherence and unintelligibility in order [J.231] not to appear one fond of vain ideas which [Apollinarius] fails to clearly articulate to an attentive reader. I simply have no idea what profit he obtains from referring to the verse, "No one can steal from his hand" [Jn 10.28] the sheep handed over to him by the Father because "Christ draws the sheep to himself by the Father's divinity," and "If Christ is united to the Father before the resurrection, how can he not be united to God?" [Apollinarius] maliciously wishes to employ a fable concocted from his own devices to show [Christ's] humanity both as separated and united to God. If he says that Christ is united to the Father, how can he not be united with God? And so, another man according to Christ is united to God in him. I am compelled to refute [Apollinarius'] deceptive teaching by employing his own words and will now examine his inconsistency. "The Savior has suffered hunger, thirst, labor, grief, and sorrow." Who is this Savior? It is God, as [Apollinarius] says in the preceding text, "not two persons as though one were God and the other man. Therefore God has suffered," the same one whom [Apollinarius] said underwent suffering, "and he who is incapable of suffering suffers not under the constraint of an unwilling nature as man but in accord with nature." What benefit are such vain musings? Cannot [Apollinarius] perceive the difference in natures and what follows from them? Truth considers the significance of each nature, that is, [M.1268] an eye ailment produces bad vision. I repeat, the person with poor vision experiences bad sight. Are not these two statements the same?

When [J.232] [Apollinarius] speaks of necessity he means consequence, and that which has resulted from consequence implies necessity. Why does our wise author ascribe the passions of our human nature to the Savior not by the necessity of nature but by the consequence of nature? [Apollinarius] says, "The passions must be stirred according to the likeness of men." Who does not clearly speak of such necessity? Is it not scripture? The Gospels explicitly mention this term [necessity]. "Scandals must come" [Mt 18.7 & 24.6], for they are necessary. Do not both words imply the same meaning? [Christ] says that scandals must come and speaks of their necessity, and their necessity means that they must occur. For my part, let me disregard such profuse idle talk resulting from vain reasoning.

At the end of his treatise [Apollinarius] says, "The body existing in heaven is with us until the consummation of the ages." Who is with us? Clearly the author does not know that he is dividing that which is indivisible. If the body is in heaven, [Apollinarius] says that the Lord is with us; here we have a clear division and separation made by such a distinction. He claims that [Christ's] body remains in heaven and is with us, but this body is in heaven while our bodies are not in heaven. Therefore he believes that a body other than the one in heaven is with us which differs from our own earthly body. Such are the sublime teachings of Apollinarius. However, we maintain that [Christ] was assumed. He who was taken remains with us, for no division exists here; just as he remains in each of us and [J.233] is in our midst, so he pervades the bounds of creation and is equally manifest in every part of the cosmos. If he who is incorporeal is present to us in an incorporeal manner, neither is he corporeally present in the heavens. "The Lord is inappropriately divided into what is subject to contradiction, that is, he is incorporeal to corporeal beings and is in the body to those who are incorporeal. In heaven he consecrates the flesh [M.1269] by spiritually uniting it in himself." Just as the soul at its last gasp experiences great distress in breathing, so [Apollinarius] piles at the end of his treatise a jumble of thoughts which, I believe, we can leave unexamined. Here he summons assistance from Greek mythology to fabricate his own tales. Anyone with an inordinate love for various forms of heresy is free to read these texts. However, we do not have such leisure for a careful analysis of his text which is clear in itself and rebukes the absurdity of his position.

+ the end +

1. "The Christological dogma of the Council of Chalcedon constitutes in the language and in the context of the problem at that time, an extremely precise version of what, according to the New Testament, we encounter in Jesus' history and what befell him: namely in Jesus Christ, God himself has entered into a human history, and meets us there in a fully and completely human way." Walter Kasper *Jesus the Christ* (London, 1976), p.238.
2. "The Logos-sarx framework took as its premiss the Platonic conception of man as a body animated by a soul or spirit which was essentially alien from it." J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (New York 1978), p.281. We should keep in mind that the biblical concept of "flesh" (sarx) implies the whole man while the Greek conception took flesh as a distinct entity as opposed to soul and mind.
3. "An Antiochene by adoption though of Alexandrian parentage." D.S. Wallace-Hadrill *Christian Antioch* (Cambridge, 1982), p.132.
4. "...a fully divine and unreduced consciousness, unconditioned by its association with the flesh and operating the flesh like a mechanical instrument, satisfied both his definition of human nature. Cyril did not fall into that mistake." "Cyril sums up his Christology in the formula which he adopted, as he thought, from Athanasius, but in reality from Apollinarius, 'one personality of God the Word, and it made flesh.' The Greek word here translated 'personality' is physis." G.L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics* (London 1940), pp.160 & 167.
5. Aloys Grillmeier says that this unity is the basic trend of his Christology: "The nucleus around which all his other statements are to be arranged, as for example when he speaks of 'putting on human nature' or of 'entering into the flesh' or of clothing." *Christ in Christian Tradition* (London 1975), p.327.
6. For a discussion of this problem, refer to *Christ in Christian Tradition*, pp.308-28.
7. On this notion of mutability/immutability, refer to Jean Danielou's remarks: "On voit que la notion de trope est une clef de l'oeuvre de Gregoire...L'intuition fondamentale de Gregoire est d'avoir donne de cette notion de trope une evaluation positive, en y voyant le caractere constitutif de l'etre cree a la fois

dans ce qui le distingue radicalement de l'incree et dans ce qui lui confere sa consistance propre en relation d'origine et de fin avec l'etre incree." L'etre et le Temps chez Gregoire de Nysse (Leiden 1970), pp.114-15.

8. For a fuller discussion of this, refer to an article by Reinhard Hubner, "Gotteserkenntis durch die Inkarnation Gottes" in Kleronomia, vol.4, 1972, pp.131-61.

9. C.E. Raven, Apollinarianism (Cambridge 1923).

10. Cf. p.289-90, Early Christian Doctrines.

11. It should be noted that both Arius and Apollinarius denied that Jesus Christ had an irrational soul; however, they later attributed this to Christ while denying only a rational soul.

12. H. Wolfson gives an example of the syllogistic reasoning employed by Apollinarius:

"None is a savior but who is God;

Jesus is a savior;

Therefore Jesus is God.

And so Apollinarius came to describe Jesus as having only 'one nature,' a divine nature." H. Wolfson, Religious Philosophy: A Group of Essays (Cambridge, Ma. 1961), p.149.

13. Grillmeier speaks of a common origin to Apollinarian and Arian thought which may have produced the Alexandrian Logos-sarx framework. He mentions the possible influence of Eusebius of Caesarea and the Synod of Antioch of 268. This synod opposed the "diversive Christology" of Paul of Samosata. At this time Apollinarius attempted to support his Christology as related by Gregory of Nyssa in his treatise, J.143. Cf. Christ in Christian Tradition, p.330.

14. Ekkehard Muhlenberg, Apollinaris von Laodicea (Gottingen 1969).

15. Frances Young remarks (From Nicaea to Chalcedon, London 1983, p.183) that the reconstruction of Apollinarius' works is further complicated due to his followers having published these works under false names. In addition, there exist two pseudo-Athanasian works which Lietzmann attributes to his followers.

In addition, there are many fragments preserved in works directed against Apollinarius such as Gregory of Nyssa's quotations from the Apodeixis. It is difficult to decide whether these are direct quotes or have been altered to fit the orthodox position.

16. As for the dating of this treatise, J. Danielou situates it in the winter of 382-3 ('La chronologie des oeuvres de Gregoire de Nysse,' *Studia Patristica* 7, Berlin 1966, p.164) and G. May situates it in the year 387, 'Gregor von Nyssa in der Kirchenpolitik seiner Zeit,' *Jahrbuch der Osterreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 15, 1966, p.124-6.

17. Compare the exegesis on this parable in *Against Apollinarius* (J.151-52) with two others in the works by Gregory: *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (J.304-05) and *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (J.61).

18. *Apollinaris*, p.140.

19. For a list of quotes used by Gregory of Nyssa from the Apodeixis, refer to the end of the Introduction.

20. Cf. J.144 & 145 for a reference to this passage by St. Paul: "He claims that Paul calls the first Adam a soul with a body and eloquently uses words which are true. And so, was the first man of whom Paul spoke as a living soul something created and irrational?...Why is Paul silent about Adam's intellectual faculty? It is clear that the rest of our human nature is joined to it as in the expression, 'To you all flesh must come.' Here David speaks of the entire human race by employing the term 'flesh.'"

21. Reinhard Hubner says of this important passage for Apollinarius' theology, "Apollinarius sieht in diesen Versen eine Bestatigung seiner christologischen These, das der Logos nicht eine vollstandigen, aus Leib und vernunftbegabter Seele bestehenden Menschen angenommen habe, sondern Mensch geworden sei in der Einigung mit dem beseelten, aber vernunftlosen menschlichen Fleisch, wobei der Logos, das gottliche Pneuma, die Stelle der Vernunft, des menschlichen Pneumas." *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa* (Leiden 1974), pp.130-1.

22. "But no one can destroy sin unless he was made a sinless man; neither can he destroy the reign of death in all men unless he died and rose as a man"

(J.218). As a rebuttal, Gregory says later on, "If death does not affect the soul, those persons who are ignorant of what they are talking about claim that the divinity is subject to death."

23. "However, from the entirety of human nature to which the divinity is mixed, the man constituted according to Christ is a kind of first fruits (aparche) of the common dough. It is through this [divinized] man that all mankind is joined to the divinity." (P.G.#44.1313B) A Treatise on First Corinthians 15.28 (Brookline 1984), p.18.

24. "What did Arius and the even more impious Eunomius think about disgracing the glory of the Only Begotten, something which Apollinarius had furnished in his own tract" (J.151)?

25. Cf. Contra Eunomium, J.384.20-389.4 for a similar commentary on the lost sheep.

26. "Since therefore as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he [Christ] also took part of the same nature, that through death he might destroy him who has the power of death, that is the devil." Cf. Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa, p.133.

27. Apollinaris von Laodicea, p.71-2. The remaining pages of this chapter examine in detail the surviving fragments which have come down to us of Apollinarius' Apodeixis and examines Gregory of Nyssa's interpretation of them.

28. Religious Philosophy, p.154-5.

29. Christ in Christian Tradition, p.336.

30. The full verse runs, "And may the God of peace sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." R.A. Norris remarks about this problem of dichotomy vs. trichotomy, "Apollinarios uses both terminologies to express or interpret a relatively self-consistent, unified, anthropological conception, which underlies both forms of speech, and which, at the same time, provides him with a scheme for his Christological doctrine." Manhood and Christ (Oxford 1963), p.88.

31.

32. With reference to a piece of iron in the fire Prestige remarks, "It is true that the fire penetrates the iron and makes it act like fire, but still, he explains, the iron retains its own character too. So with the body of Christ; though it renders divine activities for those who are able to touch it, yet it is not changed. Just as man possesses soul and body in unity, so, and far more so, does Christ possess deity together with His body and retains the two permanent and unconfused." *Fathers and Heretics*, p.107.

33. "He is repeatedly at pains to explain that such phrases can only be used, if at all, on account of the completeness of the union; and from the whole tenor of his theology it is obvious that a 'heavenly flesh' would vitiate all the deeper aspects of his thought." *Apollinarius of Laodicea*, p.212.

34. *Jesus The Christ*, p.211. Kasper remarks that Apollinarianism has filtered down to our own age as a "subliminal heresy". The Germanic tribes knew Christianity in the form of Arianism. When coming across the Church at large, they developed an anti-Arian Christology which so stressed Christ's divinity that his humanity was forgotten. Thus Christ was perceived as purely divine and had little or no share with our human lot.

35. *Gregoire de Nysse et L'Hermeneutique Biblique* (Paris 1983), p.159.