

Notations on the Making of Man by Gregory of Nyssa
(two of two)

XVI. A Contemplation [theoria] of the Divine Utterance [rhetos: that which is stated specifically] Which Said-“Let Us Make Man After Our Image and Likeness”; Wherein is Examined [ex + tazo] What is the Definition [logos] of the Image, and How the Passible [em + pathos] and Mortal is Like to the Blessed and Impassible [a + pathos], and How in the Image There are Male and Female, Seeing These are Not in the Prototype [prototupos].

1. Let us now resume [epi + ana + lambano or take upon again] our consideration [noun lacking in Greek text] of the Divine word [phone: voice], “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” How mean [mikros: small] and how unworthy of the majesty of man are the fancies [phantazomai: verb; cf. #15 as imagining] of some heathen [exothern: adverb, outside; cf. 8.4] writers, who magnify humanity, as they supposed, by [pros] their comparison of it to this world! For they say that man is a little world [kosmos; cf. 21.3 as universe], composed [sun + istemi: to stand together; cf. #12 as exist] of the same elements [stoicheion: one of a series; cf. #15 as conjectures; connotes rudimentary knowledge] with the universe. Those who bestow on human nature such praise as this by a high-sounding [kompos: signifies a din, bombast] name, {180} forget that they are dignifying [charizomai: cf. 22.4 as bestowed] man with the attributes [idioma; cf. #9] of the gnat and the mouse: for they too are composed of these four elements, -because assuredly about the animated nature of every existing thing [to empsuchon; having life in the sense of endowed with a psuche] we behold [theoreo; cf. #9] a part, greater or less, of those elements without which it is not natural that any sensitive being should exist. What great thing is there, then, in man's being accounted [nomizo; cf. #16 as regard; connotes a practice or custom] a representation [charakter; cf. #12 as semblance] and likeness of the world, -of the heaven that passes away, of the earth that changes, of all things that they contain, which pass away [sun + para + erchomai; cf. 3.1 as coming without sun] with the departure of that which compasses [peri + echo; cf. 1.1] them round?

2. In what then does the greatness of man consist, according to the doctrine of the Church [kata ton ekklesiastikon logon]? Not in his likeness to [pros] the created world, but in his being in [en & kata or in and according to] the image [eikon; cf. #13] of the nature of the Creator.

3. What therefore, you will perhaps say, is the definition [logos] of the image? How is the incorporeal [a + somatos; cf. 9.1] likened [homoioo; cf. #2 with kata] to body? How is the temporal [pros + kairos; cf. 22.8 as time, without pros] like the eternal [to aidion]? that which is mutable [to alloiomenon: that which is different; cf. 22.1 as variable] by [dia] change [trophe; cf. 27.3] like to the immutable [to an + alloiotos]? That which is subject to passion [em + pathes: a state of emotion or pathos] and corruption to the impassible [a + pathos] and incorruptible? That which constantly dwells [sun + oikeo; cf. 27.2 as wedded] with evil, and grows up [sun + trepho: to nourish together] with it, to that which is absolutely free [a + miges: unmixed, pure] from evil? There is a great difference between that which is conceived [noeo; cf. #8] in [kata] the archetype [archetupos; cf. #10], and a thing which has been made in [kata] its image: for the image is properly so called if it keeps its resemblance [homoiotas; cf. #10] to [pros] the prototype [prototupos; cf. #7. Compare with archetupos; note use of pros & pro(totupos)]; but if the imitation [mimesis; cf. 11.3] be perverted from its subject [pro + keimai: to set before; cf. 24.1 as

presented], the thing is something else, and no longer an image of the subject.

4. How then is man, this mortal, passible [*empathes*], short lived being, the image of that nature which is immortal [*a + keratos: unmixed; connotes being uncontaminated*], pure, and everlasting? The true answer to this question [*logos*], indeed, perhaps only the very Truth knows: but this is what we, tracing out [*ana + ichneuo, as a hound after a scent*] the truth so far as we are capable by conjectures [*stochasma: the thing aimed; cf. 17.2*] and inferences [*hupo + noia: a hidden thought, conjecture*], apprehend [*hupo + lambano; cf. 24.2 as suppose*] concerning the matter. Neither does the word of God lie when it says that man was made in [*kata*] the image of God, nor is the pitiable suffering of man's nature like [*kata + homoioo; cf. 17.2 as compared, without kata*] to the blessedness [*makariotes; cf. 4.1 as bliss*] of the impassible Life: for if any one were to compare [*sug + krino: to compound; cf. 15.2 as associated*] our nature with God, one of two things must needs be allowed in order that the definition [*logos*] of the likeness may be apprehended [*kata + lambano; cf. #10 as comprehend*] in both cases in the same terms, -either that the Deity is passible, or that humanity is impassible: but if neither the Deity [*to theion; cf. #6*] is passible [*empathes*] nor our nature free [*echo: outside; cf. #7*] from passion, what other account remains whereby we may say that the word of God [*theia phone*] speaks truly, which says that man was made in the image of God?

5. We must, then, take up once more [*epi + ana + lambano; cf. #1*] the Holy Scripture itself, if we may perhaps find some guidance [*cheiragogia: leading by the hand*] in the question by means of [*pros*] what is written. After saying, "Let us make man in our image," and for [*epi*] what purposes it was said "Let us make him," it adds this saying: -"and God created man; in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." We have already said in what precedes, that this saying [*logos*] was uttered for [*pros*] the destruction of heretical impiety [*asebeia: profaneness*], in order that being instructed that the Only-begotten God made man in [*kata*] the image of God, we should in no wise distinguish [*dia + krino; cf. 17.2 as separated*] the Godhead [*theotes: divinity*] of the Father and the Son, since Holy Scripture gives to each equally the name of God, -to Him Who made man, and to Him in [*kata*] Whose image he was made.

6. {181} However, let us pass by our argument upon this point: let us turn our inquiry to the question before us, -how it is that while the Deity [*to theion; cf. #12 as divine*] is in bliss [*makarios: happy, blessed*], and humanity is in misery [*eleeinos: pitiable*], the latter is yet in Scripture called "like" the former?

7. We must, then, examine [*ex + tazō*] the words carefully [*meta akribeias: with exactness*] for we find, if we do so, that that which was made "in [*kata*] the image" is one thing, and that which is now manifested in wretchedness [*talaiporia: distress, hardship*] is another. "God created man," it says; "in the image of God created He him." There is an end [*telos: completion; cf. 22.3 as consummation*] of the creation of that which was made "in the image": then it makes a resumption [*epi + ana + lepsis; cf. 18.7 as conception, with hupo*] of the account [*kata*] of creation [*kata + skeue: preparation, equipment; cf. #8*], and says, "male and female created He them." I presume that every one knows [*gnorimos: familiar*] that this is a departure [*echo: outside; cf. 12.11*] from the Prototype [*prototupos; cf. #3*]: for "in Christ Jesus,"

as the apostle says, “there is neither male nor female.” Yet the phrase declares that man is thus divided.

8. Thus the creation [kata + skeue; *cf. #9 as form*] of our nature is in a sense twofold: one made like to [pros] God, one divided according to this distinction [dia + phora; *cf. #9*]: for something like this the passage darkly conveys [ainissomai: to speak in riddles] by its arrangement [sun + taxis; *cf. #9 without sun*], where it first says, “God created man, in the image of God created He him,” and then, adding to what has been said, “male and female created He them,”-a thing which is alien from our conceptions [noeo, verb; *cf. #10 as conceive*] of [peri] God.

9. I think that by these words Holy Scripture conveys [para + didomai: to hand over] to us a great and lofty doctrine [dogma; *cf. 17.2 as opinion*]; and the doctrine is this. While two natures-the Divine and incorporeal nature, and the irrational life of brutes-are separated from each other as extremes [kata to akrotaton], human nature is the mean [mesos, adjective] between them: for in the compound nature [sug + krima: body formed by combination; *cf. 27.5 as composition*] of man we may behold [theoreo; *cf. #13 as contemplated, with epi*] a part of each of the natures I have mentioned,-of the Divine, the rational [logikos; *cf. 8.2*] and intelligent [dia + noetikos; *cf. 18.3 as mental energy*] element, which does not admit the distinction [dia + phora; *cf. #12 as difference*] of [kata] male and female; of the irrational [a + logos; *cf. 17.4*], our bodily form [kata + skeue; *cf. #16 as creation*] and structure [dia + plasis: a fashioning, creation; *implies molding*], divided into male and female: for each of these elements is certainly to be found in all that partakes [meta + echo; *cf. #10 as participant*] of human life. That the intellectual element [to noeron; *cf. 12.7 as principle*], however, precedes [pro + tereo: to be before, in advance; *cf. 29.11 as preserving with sun*] the other, we learn as from one who gives in order [taxis; *cf. 22.5*] an account of the making of man [anthropogonia: origin of man]; and we learn also that his community [koinonia; *cf. 22.4 as fellowship*] and kindred [sug + geneia; *cf. 1.3 as akin*] with [pros] the irrational is for man a provision for reproduction [epi + gennematikos: produced later]. For he says first that “God created man in the image of God” (showing by these words, as the Apostle says, that in such a being there is no male or female): then he adds the peculiar attributes [idioma; *cf. 22.4*] of human nature, “male and female created He them.”

10. What, then, do we learn from [dia] this? Let no one, I pray, be indignant if I bring from far {184} an argument [logos] to bear upon the present subject [noema: perception, thought; *cf. 9.2 as conception*]. God is in His own nature all that which our mind can conceive of [kata ennoian lambein; *ennoia means conception, thought, intention*] good;-rather, transcending [epi + teino: to stretch upon; *cf. 1.1 as augments*] all good that we can conceive [noeo; *cf. #11*] or comprehend [kata + lambano; *cf. 21.2*]. He creates man for no other reason than that He is good; and being such, and having this as His reason for entering [hormao: to push on, set in motion] upon [pros] the creation [demiourgia: workmanship, handicraft; *cf. 29.1*] of our nature, He would not exhibit the power [dunamis] of His goodness in an imperfect form [hemiteles: half-finished], giving our nature some one of the things at His disposal [pros + iemi: to let come to], and grudging it a share [meta + ousia; *cf. 19.3*] in another: but the perfect form [to teleion eidos] of goodness is here to be seen by His both bringing [para + ago; *cf. 24.2*] man into being from nothing, and fully supplying [apergazomai: to finish off, complete] him with all good gifts: but

since the list [kata + logos] of individual good gifts is a long one, it is out of the question to apprehend [dia + lambano; *cf. 24.7 as takes possession*] it numerically. The language [logos] of Scripture therefore expresses it concisely by a comprehensive phrase, in saying that man was made “in the image of God”: for this is the same as to say that He made human nature participant [meta + echo; *cf. 18.1 as share of, with sum*] in all good; for if the Deity is the fulness [pleroma; *cf. #17 as plenitude*] of good, and this is His image, then the image finds its resemblance [homoiotes; *cf. 18.3 as likeness*] to [pros] the Archetype [archetupos; *cf. 3.1*] in being filled with all good.

11. Thus there is in us the principle [idea: outward appearance, kind, sort; *cf. 19.3 as form*] of all excellence [kalon: beauty, adjective], all virtue and wisdom, and every higher thing [pros to kraitton: *towards the better*] that we conceive [noeo; *cf. #13 as consider*]: but pre-eminent among all is the fact that we are free from necessity [anagke: force, constraint] and not in bondage to any natural power [dunasteia], but have decision [gnome: means of knowing, mind; *cf. 10.4 as inclination*] in our own power [autexousios; *cf. #14 as freedom*] as [pros] we please; for virtue is a voluntary thing, subject to no dominion [adespotos]: that which is the result of compulsion and force cannot be virtue.

12. Now as the image bears in all points the semblance [charakter; *cf. #13 as stamp*] of the archetypal excellence [kallos: beauty], if it had not a difference [dia + phora; *also in #12 as distinction*] in some respect, being absolutely without divergence [a + parallaktos: unchanging, precisely similar] it would no longer be a likeness, but will in that case manifestly be absolutely identical [dia panton: through all] with the Prototype. What difference then do we discern [kathorao: to look down, perceive] between the Divine and that which has been made like to the Divine [pros to theion]? We find it in the fact that the former is uncreated [a + ktistos: adverb], while the latter has its being [hupo + istemi: to stand under; *cf. 23.3 as to have existence*] from [dia] creation: and this distinction [dia + phora: *cf. #13 as difference*] of property [idiotes; *cf. 29.4*] brings with it a train [akolouthia; *cf. 22.1 as point*] of other properties; for it is very certainly acknowledged [sun + homologeo; *cf. 26.2, without sun*] that the uncreated nature is also immutable [a + treptos; *cf. 1.4 as unchangeableness*], and always remains the same, while the created nature cannot exist [sun + istemi; *cf. 24.1 as composed*] without change [alloiosis; *cf. 27.3 as alteration*]; for its very passage [para + odos; *cf. 22.5 as entrances*] from non-existence to existence [ek tou me ontos eis to einai] is a certain motion and change of the non-existent transmuted by [kata] the Divine purpose [boulema: counsel] into being.

13. As the Gospel calls the stamp [charakter; *cf. 18.3*] upon the coin “the image [eikon; *cf. #15 as similitudes*] of Caesar,” whereby we learn that in that which was fashioned [morphao] to resemble [pros] Caesar there was resemblance as to outward look [pros + schema; *cf. 31.3 as figure, without pros*], but difference [dia + phora] as to material, so also in [kata] the present saying [logos], when we consider [kata + noeo; *cf. #14, with pro*] the attributes [charakter] contemplated [epi + theoreo; *cf. 11.4 as behold*] both in the Divine and human nature, in which the likeness consists, to be in the place of the features, we find in what underlies them the difference which we behold [kata + orao: to look down] in the uncreated and in the created nature.

14. Now as the former always remains the same [hosautos echei], while that which came into being by [dia] creation had the beginning of its existence from change, and has a kindred connection [sug + geneos] with the like mutation [trope: change; cf. 27.3], {185} for this reason He Who, as the prophetic writing says, “knows all things before they be,” following out [epi + akoloutheo; cf. 14.1 as follows], or rather perceiving beforehand [pro + kata + noeo; cf. #17 as understanding with dia] by His power [dunamis] of foreknowledge [pro + gnostikos] what, in a state of independence [autokrates] and freedom [autexousios], is the tendency [pro + airesis; cf. 8.6 as dispositions] of the motion [kinesis; cf. 22.5] of man's will, -as He saw, I say, what would be, He devised [epi + tikto] for His image the distinction [dia + phora; cf. #18] of male and female, which has no reference to [pros] the Divine Archetype, but, as we have said, is an approximation [pros + oikeoo: to assign to; cf. 28.4, bring in close connection with] to the less rational [a + logoteros] nature.

15. The cause, indeed, of this device [epi + technesis], only those can know who were eye-witnesses of the truth and ministers [huper + retes: an under-rower] of the Word; but we, imagining [phantazomai] the truth, as far as we can, by means of conjectures [stoicheion: one of a series; cf. 27.5 as elements] and similitudes [eikon; cf. 18.6 as image], do not set forth that which occurs to [epi] our mind [nous] authoritatively, but will place it in the form of a theoretical speculation before our kindly hearers.

16. What is it then which we understand [dia + noeomai: to intend] concerning these matters? In saying that “God created man” the text indicates [en + deikomai], by the indefinite character of the term, all mankind [to anthropinon]; for was not Adam here named together with the creation, as the history tells us in what follows? Yet the name given to the man created is not the particular, but the general [katholikos] name: thus we are led by the employment of the general name of our nature to some such view [ti hupo + noein] as this- that in the Divine foreknowledge [pro + gnosis; cf. 13.10] and power [dunamis] all humanity is included in the first creation [kata + skeue; cf. #17]; for it is fitting for God not to regard [nomizo] any of the things made by Him as indeterminate, but that each existing thing should have some limit [peras; cf. 19.3 as end] and measure [metron; cf. 17.2] prescribed [peri + metreo] by the wisdom of its Maker.

17. Now just as any particular man is limited by [kata] his bodily dimensions [peri + ergo], and the peculiar size which is conjoined [sun + partizo: to complete] with the superficies [epi + phaneia; cf. 13.12 with theo, divine appearances] of his body is the measure of his separate existence [hupo + stasis; cf. 17.3], so I think that the entire plenitude [pleroma; cf. 17.4 as fulness] of humanity was included by [para] the God of all, by His power of foreknowledge [pro + knostikos: adjective with dunamis], as it were in one body, and that this is what the text teaches us which says, “God created man, in the image of God created He him.” For the image is not in part of our nature, nor is the grace [charis; cf. 21.4] in any one of the things found [theoreo; cf. 18.1 contemplated] in that nature, but this power extends [dieko; cf. #18] equally to all the race: and a sign of this is that mind [nous; cf. 18.4] is implanted [egkathidruo: to erect, set up] alike in all: for all have the power of understanding [dia + noeo; cf. 21.3] and deliberating [pro + boulomai], and of all else whereby the Divine nature finds its image in that which was made [apo + eikonizo: to represent in a statue] according [kata] to it: the man that was

manifested [sun + ana + deiknumi; cf. 18.9 as holds forth, with hupo] at the first creation [kata + skeue; cf. 18.2 as composition] of the world, and he that shall be after the consummation [sun + teleia] of all, are alike: they equally bear in [epi] themselves the Divine image.

18. For this reason the whole race was spoken [kata + nomizo: to recognize; cf. 20.3 as esteemed, without kata] of as one man, namely, that to God's power nothing is either past or future, but even that which we expect [pros + dokao] is comprehended [peri + krateo: to control, support], equally with what is at present existing [para + iemi; cf. 29.7 as conformable], by the all-sustaining [peri + ektikos: embracing] energy. Our whole nature, then, extending [dieko; cf. #17] from the first to the last, is, so to say, one image of Him Who is; but the distinction [dia + phora; cf. 17.4] of kind in [pros] male and female was added [pros + kata + skeuazo; cf. 17.4 as formed, with eg & minus pros] to His work [plasma; cf. 18.3 as models] last [teleutaios; cf. 8.5] as I suppose, for the reason which follows.

XVII. What We Must Answer to Those Who Raise the Question-“If Procreation is After Sin, How Would Souls Have Come into Being If the First [ex arches] of Mankind Had Remained [dia + meno] Sinless?”

{188} 1. It is better for us however, perhaps, rather to inquire [dia + ereunao], before investigating this point, the solution [luisis: a loosening; cf. 22.6 as change with ana] of the question put forward by our adversaries; for they say that before the sin there is no account of birth, or of travail, or of the desire [horme: impulse; cf. 18.3] that tends to [pros] procreation, but when they were banished from Paradise after their sin, and the woman was condemned by the sentence of travail, Adam thus entered with his consort [eis to gnonai] upon the intercourse of married life, and then took place the beginning [arche; cf. 18.1] of procreation. If, then, marriage did not exist in Paradise, nor travail, nor birth, they say that it follows as a necessary conclusion [ek tou akolouthou] that human souls would not have existed in plurality had not the grace of immortality fallen away to mortality, and marriage preserved our race by means of descendants, introducing the offspring of the departing to take their place, so that in a certain way the sin that entered into the world was profitable for the life of man: for the human race would have remained in the pair of the first-formed [protoplastos], had not the fear of [kata] death impelled [ana + kineo: to stir up, awaken] their nature to provide succession [dia + doche; cf. #3 as succeed].

2. Now here again the true answer [logos], whatever it may be, can be clear to those only who, like [kata] Paul, have been instructed [mueo: to initiate into mysteries] in the mysteries [aporretos: forbidden, secret; cf. 21.4] of Paradise; but our answer is as follows. When the Sadducees once argued against the doctrine [logos] of the resurrection, and brought forward, to establish [sun + stasis] their own opinion [dogma; cf. 12.14], that woman of many marriages, who had been wife to seven brethren, and thereupon inquired whose wife she will be after the resurrection, our Lord answered their argument so as not only to instruct [paideuo: to bring up a child; cf. 30.12] the Sadducees, but also to reveal to all that come after them the mystery [musterion; cf. 25.5] of the resurrection-life: “for in the resurrection,” He says, “they neither marry, nor are given in marriage neither can they die any more, for they are equal to the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.” Now the

resurrection promises us nothing else than the restoration [apo + kata + stasis; *cf. #3*] of the fallen to their ancient state; for the grace we look for is a certain return [epi + ana + odos] to the first life, bringing back [epi + ana + ago] again to Paradise him who was cast out from it. If then the life of those restored [apo + kathistemi: to establish, return] is closely [oikeos: adverb] related to [pros] that of the angels, it is clear that the life before the transgression [para + basis: a going beside] was a kind of angelic life, and hence also our return [epi + ana + odos; *cf. 21.2 as progress with pros*] to [pros] the ancient condition of our life is compared [homoioo; *cf. 16.4 as like with kata*] to the angels. Yet while, as has been said, there is no marriage among [para]{189} them, the armies of the angels are in countless myriads; for so Daniel declared in his visions: so, in the same way, if there had not come upon us as the result of sin a change for the worse [para + trope; *cf. 18.3 as conversion*], and removal [ek + stasis: displacement] from equality with the angels, neither should we have needed marriage that we might multiply but whatever the mode [tropos; *cf. #3 as manner*] of increase in the angelic nature is (unspeakable [arrhetos; *cf. 23.3 as mysterious*] and inconceivable [anepinoetos: without experience of] by human conjectures [stochasma: the thing aimed; *cf. 16.4*], except that it assuredly exists), it would have operated also in the case of men, who were “made a little lower than the angels,” to increase mankind to the measure [metron; *cf. 25.1*] determined by [boule: will, counsel; *cf. 21.1 as counsel*] its Maker.

3. But if any one finds a difficulty in an inquiry as to the manner [tropos; *cf. #4 as mode*] of the generation of souls, had man not needed [dia] the assistance [sun + ergia] of marriage, we shall ask him in turn, what is the mode [tropos] of the angelic existence [hupo + stasis: standing under; *cf. 23.5*], how they exist in countless myriads, being one essence, and at the same time numerically many; for we shall be giving a fit [pros + phoros: adverb] answer to one who raises the question how man would have been without marriage, if we say, “as the angels are without marriage;” for the fact that man was in a like condition with them before the transgression [para + basis] is shown by the restoration [apo + kata + stasis; *cf. #2*] to [eis] that state.

4. Now that we have thus cleared up these matters, let us return to our former point [logos],- how it was that after the making of His image God contrived [epi + technaomai: to invent] for His work the distinction [dia + phora; *cf. 20.1*] of male and female. I say that the preliminary speculation [theorema] we have completed is of service for determining this question; for He Who brought all things into being and fashioned [dia + morphazo] Man as a whole by His own will to [pros] the Divine image, did not wait to see the number of souls made up to its proper fulness [pleroma; *cf. 22.4*] by the gradual additions [pros + theke] of those coming after; but while looking upon [kata + noeo; *cf. 22.4 as perceived*] the nature of man in its entirety and fulness by [dia] the exercise of His foreknowledge [dia tes pro + gnostikes energeias], and bestowing upon [timao: to pay honor] it a lot [lexis: portion] exalted and equal to the angels [isaggelos; *cf. 18.9*], since He saw beforehand [pro + eido] by His all-seeing power the failure of their will to keep a direct course [euthuporeuo] to [pros] what is good, and its consequent declension [apo + pipto] from [dia] the angelic life, in order that the multitude of human souls might not be cut short by its fall from that mode [tropos; *cf. 19.10*] by which the angels were increased and [pros to plethos] multiplied,-for this reason, I say, He formed [eg + kata + skeuazo; *cf. 19.5 as prepare with kata*] for our nature that contrivance [epi + noia: purpose, design; *cf. 24.1 as discussion*] for increase which befits those who had fallen into sin, implanting in

mankind, instead of the angelic majesty of nature, that animal and irrational [a + logos; *cf. 18.3*] mode by which they now succeed [dia + doche; *cf. 22.1 as follows*] one another.

5. Hence also, it seems to me, the great David pitying the misery of man mourns over his nature with such words as these, that, “man being in honor knew it not” (meaning by “honor” the equality [homotimia] with [pros] the angels), therefore, he says, “he is compared [para + sun + blepo; *cf. 18.7 as behold, verb alone*] to the beasts that have no understanding, and made like unto them.” For he truly was made like the beasts, who received in his nature the present mode of transient [rhoodos: with a strong stream]{192} generation, on account of his inclination [rhope: sinking of the scale, crisis] to [pros] material things.

XVIII. That Our Irrational [alogos] Passions Have Their Rise [aphorme: starting point, occasion] from Kindred [sug + geneia] with [pros] Irrational [alogos] Nature.

1. For I think that from this beginning [arche, cf. #3] all our passions issue [sun + didomai: to extend, contribute] as from a spring, and pour their flood over man's life; and an evidence [tekmerion: positive proof; *cf. 25.2*] of my words is the kinship of passions which appears [emphaino: to display] alike [kata to ison] in ourselves and in the brutes [tois alogois or those lacking logos]; for it is not allowable [themis: that laid down by custom] to ascribe the first beginnings of our constitutional liability [dia + theis: disposition, arrangement] to passion to that human nature which was fashioned [morpheo; *cf. 27.5 as produce with meta*] in [kata] the Divine likeness; but as brute life first entered into the world, and man, for the reason already mentioned, took something of their nature (I mean the mode of [kata] generation), he accordingly took at the same time a share of [sum + meta + echo; *cf. 30.32 as partakes, without sum*] the other attributes contemplated [theoreo; *cf. 22.3 as behold*] in that nature; for the likeness of man to [pros] God is not found in [kata] anger, nor is pleasure a mark [charakterizo: to designate; *cf. 23.3 as differentiated*] of the superior [huper + echo] nature; cowardice also, and boldness, and the desire of gain, and the dislike of loss, and all the like, are far removed [porrho] from that stamp [character; *cf. charakterizo*] which indicates Divinity [theoprepeos: befitting God].

2. These attributes, then, human nature took to [pros] itself from the side of the brutes [a + logos; *cf. #3 as irrational*]; for those qualities with which brute life was armed for [pros] self-preservation, when transferred [meta + phero; *cf. 22.4 as transferring*] to [pros] human life, became passions; for the carnivorous animals are preserved by their anger, and those which breed largely by their love of pleasure cowardice preserves the weak, fear that which is easily taken by more powerful animals, and greediness those of great bulk; and to miss anything that tends to pleasure [hedone] is for the brutes a matter of pain. All these and the like affections entered [sun + eis + erchomai; *cf. 29.4 as importation, with epi in place of sun*] man's composition [kata + skeue; *cf. 22.4 as formation*] by reason of the animal mode of generation.

3. I may be allowed to describe [dia + grapho: to mark out by lines; *cf. 12.3 as limits, with peri*] the human image by comparison with [kata] some wonderful piece of modeling [plastikos: fit for molding]. For, as one may see in models [plasma: anything molded; *cf. 22.3 as formed*] those

carved shapes [morphe; *cf. #7*] which the artificers [philo + techneo: to love or practice an art] of such things contrive for [pros] the wonder of beholders, tracing out upon a single head two forms [morphe] of faces; so man seems to me to bear a double likeness [homoiotēs; *cf. 22.6*] to opposite things-being molded in the Divine element [theoeides: like God; *cf. 27.5 as likeness of God*] of his mind [dia + noia; *cf. #5*] to the Divine beauty [kalos; *cf. 21.3 as good*], but bearing, in [kata] the passionate impulses [hormē; *cf. #4*] that arise in him, a likeness [oikeiotes: kindred, relationship; *cf. 1.2 as affinity*] to [pros] the brute nature [ktenodes: like a beast]; while often even his reason [logos] is rendered brutish, and obscures the better element by the worse through its inclination [rhope; *cf. #6 as impulse*] and disposition [dia + thesis; *cf. 21.1*] towards [pros] what is irrational [a + logos; *cf. #6*]; for whenever a man drags down his mental energy [dia + noetikos] to [pros] these affections, and forces [ex + biazō] his reason [ton logismon; *cf. #4 as thought*] to become the servant [huperete] of his passions, there takes place a sort of conversion [para + trope: a turning aside; *cf. 17.2 as worse*] of the good stamp [charakter; *cf. 4.1 as figure*] in him into the irrational image, his whole nature being traced anew [meta + charasso: to remodel] after [pros] that design, as his reason, so to say, cultivates the beginnings [arche; *cf. 23.1*] of his passions, and gradually multiplies them; for once it lends its co-operation [sun + ergeia; *cf. 27.9 as co-operation*] to passion, it produces a plenteous and {193} abundant crop of evils.

4. Thus our love of pleasure took its beginning from [pros] our being made like [homoiosis; *cf. 28.4 as likeness*] to the irrational creation [pros to alogon], and was increased by the transgressions of men, becoming the parent of so many varieties of sins arising from [kata] pleasure as we cannot find among the irrational animals. Thus the rising of anger in us is indeed akin to the impulse [hormē; *cf. 21.2*] of the brutes; but it grows by the alliance [sum + machia: ally. *Literally, a fighting with*; *cf. 14.1*] of thought [ton logismon; *cf. 12.3 as reason*]: for thence come malignity, envy, deceit, conspiracy, hypocrisy; all these are the result of the evil husbandry of the mind [nous; *cf. 20.4 as sense*]; for if the passion were divested [gumnoo: to be stripped naked] of the aid it receives from thought [ek ton logismon], the anger that is left behind is short-lived and not sustained, like a bubble, perishing straightway as soon as it comes into being. Thus the greediness of swine introduces covetousness, and the high spirit of the horse becomes the origin of pride; and all the particular forms that proceed from the want of reason [a + logia] in brute nature become vice by [dia] the evil use of the mind [nous].

5. So, likewise, on the contrary, if reason [logismos; *cf. 26.1 as reasoning*] instead assumes sway over [anti + meta + lambano; *cf. 28.5 as derives, without anti*] such emotions [kinema: motion], each of them is transmuted [anti + methistemi: to move to the other side] to a form [eidōs; *cf. 19.1*] of virtue; for anger produces courage, terror caution, fear obedience, hatred aversion from vice, the power of love the desire [epi + thumia; *cf. 20.3*] for what is truly beautiful; high spirit [to gaugon: exalting] in our character [ethos: custom] raises our thought [phronema: mind, resolution] above the passions, and keeps it from bondage to what is base; yea, the great Apostle, even, praises such a form [eidōs] of mental [no word here in Greek] elevation [eparsis: exultation] when he bids us constantly [sun + exchos: unremittingly] to “think those things that are above;” and so we find that every such motion [kinema], when elevated by loftiness of mind [dia + noia; *cf. #6 as intellect*], is conformed [suschematizo: or has a schema as in 23.3] to [kata] the beauty [kallon; *cf. #7*] of the Divine image.

6. But the other impulse [rhope; *cf. 21.2 as bias*] is greater, as the tendency of sin is heavy and downward; for the ruling element [to hegemonikon; *cf. 12.1 as ruling principle*] of our soul is more inclined to be dragged downwards by the weight of the irrational nature [a + logos; *compare with a + logia in #4*] than is the heavy and earthy element to be exalted by the loftiness of the intellect [dia + noia; *cf. 22.1 as thought*]; hence the misery [athliotes] that encompasses [peri] us often causes the Divine gift to be forgotten [agnoeo: to be ignorant of; *cf. 27.5 as fail to be recognized*], and spreads [epi + plasso: to plaster over; *cf. #9, without epi*] the passions of the flesh, like some ugly mask, over [kata] the beauty of the image [eikon; *cf. #7*].

7. Those, therefore, are in some sense excusable, who do not admit, when they look upon [pros] such cases, that the Divine form [morphe; *cf. #8*] is there; yet we may behold [blepo; *cf. 23.1*] the Divine image [eikon; *cf. 30.30*] in men by the medium of those who have ordered their lives aright [kata + orthoo: to erect, succeed]. For if the man who is subject to passion [empathes; *cf. 30.33 as sensuous*], and carnal, makes it incredible that man was adorned [kosmeo; *cf. 2.2 as decked, with kata*], as it were, with Divine beauty [kallon; *cf. 1.5*], surely the man of lofty virtue and pure from pollution will confirm you in [pros] the better conception [hupo + lepsis: opinion; *cf. 24.1 as opinion*] of human nature.

8. For instance (for it is better to make our argument clear by an illustration), one of those noted for wickedness—some Jechoniah, say, or some other of evil memory—has obliterated the beauty of his nature by the pollution of wickedness; yet in Moses and in men like him the form [morphe] of the {196} image was kept [dia + phulasso: to guard] pure. Now where the beauty of the form has not been obscured, there is made plain the faithfulness of the saying that man is an image [mimema: anything imitated, copy; *cf. 5.2 as imitation*] of God.

9. It may be, however, that some one feels shame at the fact that our life, like that of the brutes, is sustained by food, and for this reason deems man unworthy of being supposed to have been framed [plasso: to shape; *cf. 19.5 as was made*] in [kata] the image of God; but he may expect that freedom [a + teleia: exemption from public burdens; *cf. 16.17 as consummation, with sun*] from this function [leitourgia: public service; *cf. 19.1*] will one day be bestowed upon our nature in the life we look for [pros + dokeo; *cf. 2.1 as manifested*]; for, as the Apostle says, “the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink;” and the Lord declared that “man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God.” Further, as the resurrection holds forth [hupo + deiknumi: to show secretly, mark out; *cf. 20.4 as points out*] to us a life equal with the angels [isaggelos; *cf. 17.4*], and with [para] the angels there is no food, there is sufficient ground for believing that man, who will live in like fashion [kath’ homoioteta] with the angels, will be released from such a function.

XIX. To Those Who Say that the Enjoyment [apo + lausis: fruition, advantage] of the Good Things We Look for Will Again Consist in Meat and Drink, Because It is Written that by These Means Man at First Lived in Paradise.

1. But some one perhaps will say that man will not be returning [epi + ana + erchomai; *cf. 30.34 as may all return*] to the same form [eidos; *cf. 22.4*] of life, if as it seems, we formerly existed

by eating, and shall hereafter be free from that function [leitourgia; cf. 18.9 as *functioning*]. I, however, when I hear the Holy Scripture, do not understand [epi + istemi] only bodily meat, or the pleasure of the flesh; but I recognize [eido; cf. 17.4 with *pro as saw beforehand*] another kind of food also, having a certain analogy [analogia pros; cf. 12.9 as *relation, without pros*] to that of the body, the enjoyment of which extends [dia + baino; cf. 21.3 as *passing beyond*] to the soul alone: “Eat of my bread,” is the bidding of Wisdom to the hungry; and the Lord declares those blessed who hunger for such food as this, and says, “If any man thirst, let him come to Me, and drink”: and “drink of joy,” is the great Isaiah's charge to those who are able to hear his sublimity [megalophuia: noble nature]. There is a prophetic threatening also against those worthy of vengeance, that they shall be punished with famine; but the “famine” is not a lack of bread and water, but a failure of the word:- “not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but a famine of hearing the word of the Lord.”

2. We ought, then, to conceive [ennoeo] that the fruit in Eden was something worthy of God's planting (and Eden is interpreted to mean “delight”), and not to doubt that man was hereby nourished: nor should we at all conceive, concerning [epi] the mode of life [dia + goge] in Paradise, this transitory and perishable nutriment: “of every tree of the garden,” He says, “you may freely eat.”

3. Who will give to him that has a healthful hunger that tree that is in Paradise, which includes [peri + lepeptos] all good, which is named “every tree,” in which this passage bestows on man the right to share [meta + ousia; also in #3 as *participation*]? for in the universal [genikos] and transcendent [huper + keimai] saying every form [idea; cf. 16.11 as *principle*] of good is in harmony with itself [pros eauten sumphuos], and the whole is one. And who will keep me back from that tasting of the tree which is of mixed and doubtful kind? For surely it is clear to all who are at all keen-sighted [dia + oratikos: discerning, perceptive] what that “every” tree is whose fruit is life, and what again that mixed tree is whose end [peras: boundary; cf. 21.2 as *limit*] is death: for He Who presents ungrudgingly the enjoyment of “every” tree, surely by some reason [logos] and forethought [pro + metheia]{197} keeps man from participation [meta + ousia; cf. 22.7] in those which are of doubtful kind.

4. It seems to me that I may take the great David and the wise Solomon as my instructors in the interpretation [exegesis: statement, narrative; cf. *Gregory's Introduction, 2nd paragraph, as exposition*] of this text: for both understand [hegeomai: to lead, guide] the grace of the permitted delight to be one,-that very actual Good [to ontos agathon], which in truth is “every” good;-David, when he says, “Delight in the Lord,” and Solomon, when he names Wisdom herself (which is the Lord) “a tree of life.”

5. Thus the “every” tree of which the passage gives food to him who was made [plasso: to mold; cf. 28.1 as *formed*] in [kata] the likeness of God, is the same with the tree of life; and there is opposed to this tree another tree, the food given by which is the knowledge [gnosis; cf. 20.1] of good and evil:-not that it bears in turn as fruit each of these things of opposite significance [semainomenon], but that it produces a fruit blended and mixed with opposite qualities, the eating of which the Prince [archegos] of Life forbids, and the serpent counsels, that he may prepare [kata + skeuazo; cf. 23.3 as *maintain*] an entrance for death: and he obtained

credence for his counsel, covering over the fruit with a fair appearance and the show of pleasure, that it might be pleasant to the eyes and stimulate the desire [orexis: yearning] to taste.

XX. What Was the Life in Paradise, and What Was the Forbidden Tree?

1. What then is that which includes the knowledge [gnosis; cf. #2] of good and evil blended together [sug + krateo: to keep troops together; cf. 26.2 as is held, with perf], and is decked [epi + antheo: to bloom, manifest itself] with the pleasures of sense? I think I am not aiming wide [para + stochazomai: to miss] of the mark in employing, as a starting-point for my speculation [theoria; cf. 24.1 as examination], the sense [dia + noia; cf. 5.2 as understanding] of “knowable [gnostos].” It is not, I think, “science” [episteme: skill, experience; also in #1 as skill] which the Scripture here means by “knowledge” [gnosis]; but I find a certain distinction [dia + phora], according to Scriptural use [sun + etheia], between “knowledge” and “discernment” [dia + krisis; cf. 25.12 as proofs, without dia]: for to “discern” skillfully [epi + stemonos, adverb] the good from the evil, the Apostle says is a mark of a more perfect condition [teleiotes hexeos: habit, possession] and of “exercised senses,” for which reason also he bids us “prove [dokimazo] all things,” and says that “discernment” [to dia + krinein] belongs to the spiritual man [pneumatikos; cf. 30.1]: but “knowledge” is not always to be understood of skill [episteme] and acquaintance [eidesis] with anything, but of the disposition towards [dia + thesis pros; cf. #2] what is agreeable [to kecharismenon], -as “the Lord knows them that are His”; and He says to Moses, “I knew you above [para] all”; while of those condemned in their wickedness He Who knows all things says, “I never knew you.”

2. The tree, then, from which {200} comes this fruit of mixed knowledge [summiktos gnosis], is among those things which are forbidden; and that fruit is combined of opposite qualities [dia ton enantion], which has the serpent to commend it, it may be for this reason, that the evil is not exposed in its nakedness, itself appearing [phaino; cf. 23.2 as apparent] in its own proper nature-for wickedness would surely fail of its effect were it [a + praktos: ineffectual] not decked [pros + chromazo: to color] with some fair color to entice to the desire [pros epi + thumia; cf. #3] of it him whom it deceives-but now the nature of evil is in a manner mixed, keeping destruction like some snare concealed in its depths, and displaying some phantom [phantasia; cf. 13.5 as imagery] of good in the deceitfulness of its exterior. The beauty of the substance [hule: matter; cf. 29.7 as matter] seems good to those who love money: yet “the love of money is a root of all evil”: and who would plunge into the unsavory mud of wantonness, were it not that he whom this bait hurries into passion thinks pleasure a thing fair and acceptable? So, too, the other sins keep their destruction [dia + phthora: corruption] hidden, and seem at first sight acceptable, and some deceit makes them earnestly sought after [spoudazo; cf. 30.33 as attain] by unwary [an + epi + skeptos] men instead of what is good.

3. Now since the majority of men judge the good to lie in that which gratifies [euphraino: to cheer, delight] the senses, and there is a certain identity of name [homonumia] between that which is, and that which appears to be “good,” -for this reason that desire [epi + thumia; cf. 22.7] which arises towards [pros] what is evil, as though towards [pros] good, is called by Scripture “the knowledge of good and evil;” “knowledge” [gnosis; cf. 22.1], as we have said,

expressing a certain mixed disposition [sun + dia + thesis (cf. 12.1) plus ana + krasis (cf. 27.2 as *commixture, with sun*)]. It speaks of the fruit of the forbidden tree not as a thing absolutely evil (because it is decked [peri + anthizo: adorned with color] with good), nor as a thing purely good (because evil is latent in it), but as compounded [sum + miktos; cf. 9.3 as *compound*] of both, and declares that the tasting of it brings to death those who touch it; almost proclaiming aloud the doctrine [dogma; cf. 23.3 as *arguments*] that the very actual good is in its nature simple [aploos: single; cf. 23.3] and uniform [monoeides], alien from all duplicity or conjunction with its opposite, while evil is many-colored and fairly adorned [kata + schematizo: to dress up or invest with a form; cf. 4.1 as *fashion, without kata*], being esteemed [nomizo] to be one thing and revealed [ana + krino: to examine; cf. 27.2 as *separated, with dia*] by experience [peira: trial, experiment; cf. 25.6] as another, the knowledge of which (that is, its reception by experience) is the beginning and antecedent [hupo + thesis: supposition; cf. *Gregory's Introduction, as force*] of death and destruction.

4. It was because he saw this that the serpent points out [pros + deiknumi; cf. 25.3 as *indicates, with hupo*] the evil fruit of sin, not showing [epi + deiknumi] the evil manifestly in its own nature (for man would not have been deceived by manifest [pros + delos; cf. 22.8 as *clearly, with pro*] evil), but giving to what the woman beheld the glamour [to phainomenon; cf. 7.1 as *appearances*] of a certain beauty [aglaia: splendor, adornment], and conjuring [leggoeteuo: to induce by charms] into its taste the spell of a sensual pleasure, he appeared to her to speak convincingly: “and the woman saw,” it says, “that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes to behold, and fair to see; and she took of the fruit thereof and did eat,” and that eating became the mother of death to men. This, then, is that fruit-bearing of mixed character [karpophoria], where the passage [logos] clearly expresses [hermeneuo: to interpret] the sense [nous; cf. 30.16 as *mind*] in which the tree was called “capable of the knowledge of good and evil,” because, like the evil nature of poisons that are prepared with honey, it appears to be good in so far as it affects [kata + glukaino] the senses with sweetness: but in so far as it destroys him who touches it, it is the worst of all evil. Thus when the evil poison worked its effect against [kata] man's life, then man, {201} that noble thing [pragma; cf. 20.4] and name, the image [apeikonisma: representation] of God's nature, was made, as the prophet says, “like unto vanity.”

5. The image, therefore, properly belongs to [pros] the better part of our attributes [noeo: not translated]; but all in our life that is painful and miserable is far removed from the likeness to [pros] the Divine.

XXI. That the Resurrection is Looked for as a Consequence [akolouthos, adverb], Not So Much from the Declaration of Scripture as from the Very Necessity of Things.

1. Wickedness, however, is not so strong as to prevail over [huper + ischo] the power [dunamis; cf. #2] of good; nor is the folly [a + boulia: lack of counsel] of our nature more powerful and more abiding [monimos: stable] than the wisdom of God: for it is impossible that that which is always mutable [to trepomenon] and variable [to alloiomenon] should be more firm [epi + kratesteron] and more abiding [monimoteron] than that which always remains the same and is firmly fixed [pegnumi: to fix in] in goodness: but it is absolutely

certain that the Divine counsel [boule; cf. 17.2 as *determined*] possesses immutability [a + meta + theton: *unchangeable*], while the changeableness [to trepton; cf. 1.4 as *immutability, with a*] of our nature does not remain settled [pagios: *fixed*] even in evil.

2. Now that which is always in motion, if its progress [pros + odos] be [pros] to good, will never cease moving onwards to what lies before it [phora epi ta prosa], by reason of the infinity [to a + oriston] of the course to be traversed [dia + ex + odeuo]:-for it will not find any limit [peras; cf. #3] of its object such that when it has apprehended [drassomai: *to grasp*] it, it will at last cease [listemi: *to stand*] its motion: but if its bias [rhope: *sinking of the scale, crisis*; cf. 22.4] be in the opposite direction, when it has finished the course [dianuo: *to accomplish*] of wickedness and reached the extreme limit [to akrotaton; cf. 16.9 as *extremes*] of evil, then that which is ever moving, finding no halting point for its impulse [horme; cf. 18.4 as *virtue*] natural to itself when it has run through [dia + trecho; cf. #2 as *run, with ana*] the lengths [dia + stema: *interval*; cf. 23.1 as *interval*] that can be run in wickedness, of necessity turns its motion towards [epi] good: for as evil does not extend to infinity [epi to a + oriston], but is comprehended [kata + lambano; cf. 23.3 as *apprehended*] by necessary limits, it would appear that good once more follows [dia + doche, *noun*; cf. 30.2 as *succession*] in succession [akolouthos, *adverb*; cf. 23.5 as *consequently*] upon the limit of evil; and thus, as we have said, the ever-moving character [to aeikineton] of our nature comes to run [ana + trecho: *to jump up and run*; cf. 22.2 as *revert once more with epi*] its course [poreia] at the last once more back towards [epi] good, being taught the lesson of prudence [sophroniso: *to correct, moderate*] by the memory of its former misfortunes [pro + dustuqueo: *to be unhappy*], to the end that it may never again be [enaluo: *to revel in, dwell upon*] in like case.

3. Our course [dromos], then, will once more lie in what is good [kalos, *beautiful*; cf. 28.1 as *goodness*], by reason of the fact that the nature of evil is bounded [peri + orizo; cf. 22.5 as *pre-determined*] by [dia] necessary limits [peras; cf. 22.4]. For just as those skilled [deinos: *fearful, strange*] in astronomy tell us that the whole universe [kosmos; cf. 26.2 as *world*] is full of light, and that darkness is made to cast its shadow by the interposition of the body formed by the earth; and that this darkness is shut off from the rays of the sun, in the shape of a cone, according to the figure of the sphere-shaped body, and behind it; while the sun, exceeding the earth by a size many times as great as its own, enfolding it round about on all sides with its rays, unites at the limit of the cone the concurrent streams of light; so that if (to suppose the case) any one had the power [dunamis; cf. 22.4] of passing beyond [dia + baino; cf. 19.1 as *extends*] the measure to which the shadow extends, he would certainly find himself in light unbroken [dia + kopto] by darkness;-even so I think that we ought to understand [dia + noeo; cf. 27.6] about ourselves, [dia + ex + erchomai; cf. 22.6 as *reached, without dia & ex*] the limit [horos: *landmark, boundary*; cf. 24.1 as *definition*] of wickedness {204} we shall again have our conversation [bioteuo: *to live, live by*] in light, as the nature of good, when compared with [pros] the measure of wickedness, is incalculably [a + peri + plasios: *infinitely multiplied*] superabundant [peri + ssuouses].

4. Paradise therefore will be restored [palin: *again*], that tree will be restored which is in truth the tree of life;-there will be restored the grace [charis; cf. 22.7] of the image, and the dignity of rule. It does not seem to me that our hope is one for those things which are now subjected

[hupo + zeugnumi: to yoke] by God to man for the necessary uses of life, but one for another kingdom, of a description that belongs to unspeakable mysteries [aporretos: forbidden, secret; cf. 17.2].

XXII. To Those Who Say, “If the Resurrection is a Thing Excellent [kalos] and Good, How is It that It Has Not Happened Already, But is Hoped Far in Some Periods [peri + odos: a going around] of Time?”

1. Let us give our attention, however, to the next point [akolouthia; cf. 25.7 as sequence] of our discussion [ex + tazo: to examine closely; cf. 24.3 as let this discussion be, with para]. It may be that some one, giving his thought [dia + noia cf. #3 as intelligence] wings to soar towards [pros] the sweetness of our hope, deems it a burden and a loss that we are not more speedily placed in that good state [en tois agathois] which is above [huper] man's sense [aisthesis; cf. 14.1] and knowledge [gnosis; cf. #4], and is dissatisfied [deinos: fearful, strange] with the extension [para + tasis: duration; cf. #5 as extent of time] of the time that intervenes between him and the object of his desire [pros to pothoumenon]. Let him cease to vex [stenochoreo: to be crowded together] himself like a child that is discontented at [pros] the brief delay [ana + bole: that which is thrown up, mound] of something that gives him [kata] pleasure; for since all things are governed [oikonomeo: to manage a household; cf. 12.11 as controlled] by reason [logos] and wisdom [sophia; cf. 13.13], we must by no means suppose that anything that happens is done without reason itself and the wisdom that is therein.

2. You will say then, What is this reason [logos], in accordance with [kata] which the change [meta + stasis; cf. 1.4 as shifting] of our painful life to that which we desire [epi to pothoumenon] does not take place at once, but this heavy and corporeal existence of ours waits [ana + meno; cf. #7], extended [para + tithemi] to some determinate time [eis chronous tinas], for the term of the consummation [sum + plerosis] of all things, that then man's life may be set free as it were from the reins, and revert once more [epi + ana + trecho], released and free, to the life of blessedness [ton makarion; cf. 16.6 as bliss] and impassibility [apathon bion]?

3. Well, whether our answer [logos] is near the truth of the matter, the Truth Itself may clearly know; but at all events what occurs to [epi] our intelligence [dia + noia; cf. 30.31 as intellect] is as follows. I take up then once more in my argument [logos] our first text:-God says, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and God created man, in the image of God created He him.” Accordingly, the Image of God, which we behold [theoreo] in universal humanity [en pase te anthropine phusei], had its consummation [telos; cf. #5 as completion] then; but Adam as yet was not; for the thing formed [plasma] from the earth is called Adam, by [kata] etymological nomenclature, as those tell us who are acquainted [epi + istor: noun] with the Hebrew tongue-wherefore also the apostle, who was specially learned in his native tongue, the tongue of the Israelites, calls the man “of the earth,” as though translating [meta + ballo; cf. #6 as undergone] the name Adam into the Greek word.

4. Man, then, was made in [kata] the image of God; that is, the universal [katholos: according to the whole] nature, the thing like God [to theoeikelon chrema]; not part of the whole, but all

the fulness [pleroma; cf. #5 as full number] of the nature was so made by omnipotent wisdom. He saw, Who holds [peri + drasso] all limits [peras: boundary; cf. #6] in His grasp, as the Scripture tells us which says, “in His hand are all the corners of the earth,” He saw, “Who knows all things” even “before they be,” comprehending [em + peri + lambano; cf. 29.3 as included]{205} them in His knowledge [gnosis; cf. 26.2], how great in [kata] number humanity will be in the sum of its individuals. But as He perceived [kata + noeo; cf. #5 as foreknowledge, with *pro*] in our created nature [plasma; cf. 28.1 as formed] the bias towards [rhope pros; cf. 17.5 as inclination, without *pros*] evil, and the fact that after its voluntary fall from equality with [homotimia pros] the angels it would acquire [pros + oikeioo: adapt] a fellowship [koinonia pros; cf. 30.30 as community, without *pros*] with the lower [tapeinonos: humble] nature, He mingled [kata + mignumi], for this reason, with His own image, an element of the irrational [a + logos; cf. 8.4] (for the distinction [dia + phora; cf. 29.1 as difference] of [kata] male and female does not exist in the Divine and blessed nature);-transferring [meta + phero; cf. 5.1 as transfer], I say, to [epi] man the special attribute [idioma; cf. 16.1] of the irrational formation [a + logos & kata + skeue (cf. #5 as creation)], He bestowed [charizomai; cf. 16.1 as dignifying] increase [pleonasma: superfluous addition] upon our race not according [kata] to the lofty character of our creation; for it was not when He made that which was in [kata] His own image that He bestowed on man the power [dunamis; cf. 23.4] of increasing and multiplying; but when He divided it by [kata] sexual distinctions, then He said, “Increase and multiply, and replenish the earth.” For this belongs not to the Divine, but to the irrational element, as the history indicates [para + semaino; cf. 4.1 as inclination, with *epi*] when it narrates that these words were first spoken by [para] God in the case of [epi] the irrational creatures; since we may be sure that, if He had bestowed on man, before imprinting on our nature the distinction of male and female, the power for increase conveyed by this utterance, we should not have needed [pros + deo: to need besides] this form [eidos; cf. 27.3] of generation by which the brutes [ta aloga] are generated.

5. Now seeing that the full number [pleroma; cf. #6 as full complement] of men pre-conceived by [dia] the operation of foreknowledge [pro + kata + noeo] will come into [epi & para + istemi; cf. 23.3 as abide by, without *epi*] life by means of this animal generation, God, Who governs all things in a certain order [taxis] and sequence [heirmos; cf. 23.1 as order],-since the inclination [epi + klisis] of our nature to what was beneath it [pros to tapeinon: humble] (which He Who beholds the future equally [epi + isos] with the present [to en + istemi] saw before it existed) made some such form of generation absolutely necessary for mankind,-therefore also foreknew [pro + kata + noeo; cf. 16.14 as perceiving beforehand] the time coextensive [sum + metros: commensurate; cf. 29.7 as suitable, with *sun*] with the creation [kata + skeue; cf. 23.3 as making with *pro*] of men, so that the extent of time [para + tasis] should be adapted [sun + apartizo: to finish off, complete] for the entrances [para + odos; cf. 16.12 as passage] of the pre-determined [peri + orizo: to limit, confine; cf. 21.3 as bounded] souls, and that the flux [rhoode] and motion [kinesis; cf. 23.1] of time should halt at the moment when humanity is no longer produced by means of [dia] it; and that when the generation of men is completed [teleioo: to fulfill], time should cease [sug + kata + lego] together with its completion [telos; cf. 23.1 as end, with *peri*], and then should take place the restitution [ana + stoicheiosis: resolution of matter into its elements; cf. 23.5 as World-Reformation] of all things, and with the World-Reformation [meta + bole: change, transformation; cf. #6 as change] humanity also should be changed [sun + ameibo] from the corruptible and earthly to [epi] the impassible [a + pathes; cf. 16.3 as passion, with *em*] and eternal [aidios; cf. 23.3 as co-eternal, with *sun*].

6. And this it seems to me the Divine apostle considered [kata + noeo; cf. 23.3 as *conceive*] when he declared in his epistle to the Corinthians the sudden stoppage [aiphnidios or unforeseen & stasis] of time, and the change [ana + lysis: dissolving, removing; cf. 22.4 as *dissolution, without ana*] of the things that are now moving on back to [eis] the opposite end where he says, “Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump.” For when, as I suppose, the full complement [pleroma; cf. 29.1 as *fulness*] of human nature has reached [erchomai: to come, return] the limit [eis peras; cf. 16.16] of the pre-determined measure [kata to pro + gignosko; cf. 23.3 as *known, as verb alone*], because there is no longer anything to be made up in the way of increase [epi + auxesis] to the number of souls, he teaches us that the change [enallage] in existing things will take place in an instant [akares: too short to be cut] of time, giving to that limit [peras] of time which has no parts or extension [a + dia + statatos] the names of “a moment,” and “the twinkling of an eye”; so that it will no more be possible for one who reaches [epi + baino kata] the verge [akme: point, edge]{208} of time (which is the last and extreme point, from the fact that nothing is lacking [hupo + leipo] to the attainment [meros; cf. 29.5 as *partide*] of its extremity [akrotes]) to obtain by [dia] death this change [meta + bole; cf. 27.3] which takes place at a fixed period [peri + odike], but only when the trumpet of the resurrection sounds, which awakens [aphupnizo] the dead, and transforms [alloioo: to change] those who are left [kata + leipo; cf. 22.6 as *lacking without kata*] in life, after [kata] the likeness [homoiotes; cf. 30.30 as *semblance*] of those who have undergone [meta + ballo: to turn about] the resurrection change [alloioo], at once to [pros] incorruptibility [a + phtharsia]; so that the weight of the flesh is no longer heavy [epi to kato britho, to weigh down], nor does its burden hold them down [para + kata + echo] to earth, but they rise aloft through the air-for, “we shall be caught up,” he tells us, “in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.”

7. Let him therefore wait [ana + meno; cf. 27.2 as *remained, with para*] for that time which is necessarily made co-extensive [sum + para + teino; cf. 1.1 as *augments, with epi*] with the development [auxesis: increase] of humanity. For even Abraham and the patriarchs, while they had the desire [epi + thumia; also in #7, with ex + luo] to see the promised good things, and ceased not to seek [epi + zeteo; cf. 30.1] the heavenly country, as the apostle says, are yet even now in the condition [en to] of hoping for that grace [charis; cf. 30.32], “God having provided some better thing for us,” according to the words of Paul, “that they without us should not be made perfect.” If they, then, bear the delay [ana + bole: that which is thrown up, mound; also in #7] who by [dia] faith only and by hope saw the good things “afar off” and “embraced them,” as the apostle bears witness [martureo; cf. 25.2 as *vouch for*], placing their certainty [to a + sphales: not liable to fall] of the enjoyment [apolausis] of the things for which they hoped in the fact that they “judged Him faithful Who has promised,” what ought most of us to do, who have not, it may be, a hold upon [pros] the better hope from the character [ek ton bebiomenon or bebaion, to make firm] of our lives? Even the prophet's soul fainted with [ex + luo or to set free & dia epi + thumia] desire, and in his psalm he confesses this passionate love [to erotikon touto pathos; cf. 16.3 (*pathos*) as *empathes*], saying that his “soul has a desire and longing to be in the courts of the Lord,” even if he must needs be rejected [para + ripteo: to throw aside] to a place amongst the lowest, as it is a greater and more desirable thing to be last there than to be first among the ungodly tents of this life; nevertheless he was patient of the delay [ana + bole; cf. #1], deeming, indeed, the life [dia + goge; cf. 25.8 as *state*] there blessed [makarizo], and accounting a brief participation [meta + ousia] in it more desirable than

“thousands” of time-for he says, “one day in Your courts is better than thousands” -yet he did not repine at the necessary dispensation [oikonomia peri; cf. 25.3, *without peri*] concerning existing things, and thought it sufficient bliss [eis makarismos] for man to have those good things even by way of [dia] hope; wherefore he says at the end of the Psalm, “O Lord of hosts, blessed is the man who hopes in You.”

8. Neither, then, should we be troubled [stenochoreo: to be narrow] at [peri] the brief delay of what we hope for, but give diligence [spoude: haste] that we may not be cast out from the object of our hopes; for just as though, if one were to tell some inexperienced person [a + peiros] beforehand, “the gathering of the crops will take place in the season of summer, and the stores will be filled, and the table abundantly supplied with food at the time of plenty,” it would be a foolish man who should seek to hurry on the coming {209} of the fruit-time, when he ought to be sowing seeds and preparing the crops for himself by diligent care; for the fruit-time will surely come, whether he wishes or not, at the appointed time; and it will be looked on differently by him who has secured for himself beforehand abundance of crops, and by him who is found by the fruit-time destitute of all preparation. Even so I think it is one's duty, as the proclamation [kerugma; Greek text has theios, divine] is clearly [pro + delos; cf. 13.10 *as evident*] made to all that the time [kairos; cf. 25.3] of change will come, not to trouble [polupragmoneo: to be busy about many things; cf. 23.2 *as meddling*] himself about times (for He said that “it is not for us to know the times and the seasons”), nor to pursue calculations by which he will be sure to sap the hope [peri] of the resurrection in the soul; but to make his confidence in the things expected [pros + dakao] as a prop to lean on, and to purchase [pro + emporeuomai: to acquire in advance] for himself, by [dia] good conversation [politeia: citizenship; cf. 28.1 *as society*], the grace that is to come.

XXIII. That He Who Confesses the Beginning [arche] of the World's [kosmos] Existence Must Necessarily Also Agree as [peri] to Its End [telos].

1. But if some one, beholding [blepo; cf. #3 *as seen*] the present course [phora: a carrying; cf. 29.1 *as difference, with dia*] of the world, by which intervals [dia + stema; cf. 21.2 *as lengths*] of time are marked [theoreo: verb in Greek text; cf. #3 *as known*], going on in a certain order [heirmos; cf. 15.3 *as order*], should say that it is not possible that the predicted stoppage of these moving things should take place, such a man clearly also does not believe that in the beginning [arche; cf. 28.4 *as principle*] the heaven and the earth were made by [para] God; for he who admits a beginning, of motion [kinesis; cf. 28.8] surely does not doubt as to its also having an end [peri & telos; cf. 28.3 *as (no) conclusion*]; and he who does not allow its end, does not admit [para + dechomai] its beginning either; but as it is by believing that “we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God,” as the apostle says, “so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear,” we must use the same faith as to the word [peri & rhema: the subject of speech; cf. 3.2] of God when He foretells [pro + agoreo] the necessary stoppage [stasis; cf. #5 *as existence, with hupo*] of existing things.

2. The question of the “how” must, however, be put beyond the reach of our meddling [polupragmoneo: to be busy about many things; cf. 22.8 *as to trouble*]; for even in the case mentioned it was “by faith” that we admitted that the thing seen [blepo; cf. 25.1 *as having regard*]

was framed [kata + rtizo] from things not yet apparent [phaino; cf. 27.3 as appearing with em], omitting the search into things beyond our reach [para + trecho; cf. 27.1 as return, with ana]. And yet our reason [logos] suggests [hupo + tithemi; cf. #4 as assume] difficulties on many points, offering no small occasions for doubt as to [pros] the things which we believe.

3. For in that case too, argumentative men might by plausible reasoning [eu + logos kata akolouthon; cf. 24.1 as consistent, with kata] upset our faith, so that [pros] we should not think [nomizo; cf. 27.6] that statement [logos] true which Holy Scripture delivers [presbeuo: to be the eldest, take first place; cf. 24.1 as declares] concerning [peri] the material creation, when it asserts [dia + bebaioo: to make firm] that all existing things have their beginning [genesis] of being from God. For those who abide by [para + istemi; cf. 25.2 as delivers] the contrary view maintain [kata + skeuazo: to equip; cf. 26.1] that matter is co-eternal [sun + aidios; cf. 28.4 as eternal, without sun] with God, and employ in support of their own doctrine some such arguments [pros to dogma; cf. #4 as doctrine] as these. If God is in His nature simple [aploos: single; cf. 23.3] and immaterial [apoiios: without quality or attribute], without quantity, or size, or combination, and removed [allotrios: adverb] from [kata] the idea of circumscription [peri + graphe: sketch, outline] by way of figure [kata to schema; cf. 4.1 as form], while all matter is apprehended [kata + lambano; cf. #4 as supposes, with sug] in extension measured by intervals [en dia + stematike para + tasei], and does not escape [dia + pheugo] the apprehension [kata + lepsis; cf. 24.1 as opinion, with hupo] of our senses, but becomes known [gignosko (cf. 25.2) & theoreo (cf. 24.1 as contemplative, with sun)] to us in color, and figure, and bulk, and size, and resistance, and the other attributes belonging to it, none of which it is possible to conceive [kata + noeo] in the Divine {212} nature, -what method [machane] is there for the production of matter from the immaterial [aulos], or of the nature that has dimensions [dia + stematikos] from that which is unextended [a + dia + statos]? For if these things are believed to have their existence [hupo + istemi; also in #3] from that source, they clearly come into existence after being in Him in some mysterious way [kata & arrhetos with logos; cf. 2.1]; but if material existence was in Him, how can He be immaterial while including matter in Himself? And similarly with all the other marks by which the material nature is differentiated [charakterizo]; if quantity [posotes] exists in God, how is God without quantity [a + posos]? If the compound nature [to sun + theton] exists in Him, how is He simple, without parts and without combination [a + sun + thetos]? So that the argument [logos] forces us to think either that He is material, because matter has its existence [hupo + istemi; cf. 24.1 as had existence] from Him as a source [dia to ekeithen]; or, if one avoids this, it is necessary to suppose that matter was imported [epi + eis + erchomia] by Him ab extra for the making [pros & kata + skeue; cf. 28.5 as substratum] of the universe.

4. If, then, it was external [exo; cf. #5 as beyond] to God, something else surely existed besides [para] God, conceived [sun + epi + noeo: to include in the idea of; cf. 24.1 as conceived, without sun], in respect of eternity [kata ton tes aiidotetos logon], together with Him Who exists ungenerately [a + gennetos; also in #4]; so that the argument [logos] supposes [sug + kata + lambano: to apprehend together; cf. 24.1 as grasped, without sug] two eternal [an + archos: without beginning] and unbegotten [a + gennetos] existences, having their being concurrently with each other -that of Him Who operates [en + ergo] as an artificer [technikos: skilled craftsman; cf. 30.29 as artificial], and that of the thing which admits this skilled operation [ten epi + stemonikos: related to knowledge & en + ergeia; cf. 10.2 as operation]; and if any one under pressure of this argument should assume [hupo + tithemi] a material substratum [hupo +

keisthai ten hulen] for the Creator [demiourgos; *cf. 5.1 as maker*] of all things, what a support will the Manichaeans find for his special doctrine [sun + egoria: advocacy of another's cause, defense & dogma], who opposes [anti + arexago: to compare, contrast] by virtue of ungenerateness [kata to ageneton] a material existence [aitia: cause; *cf. 30.29*] to a Good Being [te agathe phusei]. Yet we do believe that all things are of [ek] God, as we hear the Scripture say so; and as to the question how they were in God, a question beyond our reason [logos], we do not seek to pry into [peri + ergazomai] it, believing that all things are within the capacity [chorma: space, room] of God's power [dunamis; *cf. #5*]-both to give existence [huphistemi: to place under] to what is not, and to implant [epi + ballo; *cf. 27.3 as imposed*] qualities at [pros] His pleasure [doke] in what is.

5. Consequently [akolouthos; *cf. 8.5 as orderly course*], as we suppose the power [dunamis; *also in #5*] of the Divine will to be a sufficient cause to the things that are, for their coming into existence [hupo + stasis; *cf. 24.2*] out of nothing, so too we shall not repose [para + lambano] our belief on anything beyond [exo] probability [eikos] in referring the World-Reformation [ana + stoicheiosis: restoration; *cf. 25.11 as regeneration*] to [eis] the same power [dunamis; *cf. 25.1*]. Moreover, it might perhaps be possible, by some skill in the use of words [heuresilogia], to persuade those who raise frivolous objections on the subject of matter not to think that they can make an unanswerable attack on our statement [logos].

XXIV. An Argument [anit + rresis] Against [pros] Those Who Say that Matter is Co-Eternal [sun + aidios] with God.

1. For after all that opinion [hupo + lepsis; *cf. 28.2 as theories*] on [peri] the subject of matter does not turn out to be beyond [exo] what appears consistent [kata to akolouthon; *cf. #2 as follow*], which declares [presbeuo: to be the eldest, take the first place; *cf. 23.3 as delivers*] that it has its existence [hupo + istemi; *cf. 3.1 as existing*] from Him Who is intelligible [noetos; *also in #1 as intellectual*] and immaterial [aulos; *cf. 14.2*]. For we shall find all matter to be composed [sun + istemi; *cf. 27.5*] of certain qualities, of which if it is divested [gumnazo: to train naked, wear out; *cf. 12.9 as deprived*] it can, in [kata] itself, be by no means grasped [kata + lambano; *cf. 11.4 as comprehended*] by idea [logos]. Moreover in idea each kind of quality is separated from the substratum [hupo + keimai; *also in #1*]; but idea is an intellectual [noetos; *cf. #2 as intelligible*] and not a corporeal method of examination [theoria; *also in #1 as notice*]. If, for instance, some animal or tree is presented [pro + keimai; *cf. 28.1 as present subject*] to our notice [theoria; *cf. 30.4 as consideration*], or any other of the things that have material existence [sun + stasis; *cf. 24.7*], we perceive [kata + noeo; *cf. 25.2 as survey*] in [kata] our mental discussion [epi + noia; *cf. 30.9 as thought*] of it many things concerning the substratum, the idea of each of which is clearly [amiktos: unmixed] distinguished from the object we contemplate [sun + theoreo; *cf. 24.1, without sun*]{213}: for the idea of color is one, of weight another; so again that of quantity and of such and such a peculiar quality of touch: for "softness," and "two cubits long," and the rest of the attributes we spoke of, are not connected [sum + phero] in idea either with one another or with the body: each of them has conceived [epi + noeo; *cf. 8.8 as devised*] concerning it its own explanatory definition [ho heremeneutikos horos; *cf. 27.2 as limits, horos alone*] according to [kata] its being, having nothing in common [epi + koinonos] with any other of the qualities that are contemplated [theoreo; *cf. 27.9 as behold*] in the substratum [hupo + keimai; *cf. #2*].

2. If, then, color is a thing intelligible [noetos; *also cf. #2 as intellect*], and resistance also is intelligible, and so with quantity and the rest of the like properties, while if each of these should be withdrawn from the substratum [hupo + keimai; *cf. 27.5 as furnish*], the whole idea [logos] of the body is dissolved [sun + dia + luo; *cf. 25.1 as dissolution, without sun*]; it would seem to follow [akolouthon; *cf. 25.2 as logical*] that we may suppose [hupo + lambano; *cf. 29.3*] the concurrence [sun + drome] of those things, the absence [apo + ousia; *cf. 28.1 as communion, with meta*] of which we found to be a cause of the dissolution [lusis] of the body, to produce [apo + tikto] the material nature: for as that is not a body which has not color, and figure, and resistance, and extension [dia + stasis], and weight, and the other properties, while each of these in its proper existence [kata to idiazon] is found to be not the body but something else besides [para] the body, so, conversely [to anti + strophon], whenever the specified attributes concur [sun + drao] they produce bodily existence [hupo + stasis; *cf. 12.9*]. Yet if the perception [kata + noesis] of these properties is a matter of intellect [noetos; *cf. 8.5 as intellectual*], and the Divinity is also intellectual in nature, there is no incongruity [apeikos] in supposing that these intellectual occasions for [tas noeras aphormas pros] the genesis of bodies have their existence [huphistemi; *cf. #3*] from the incorporeal nature, the intellectual nature [noete phusis] on the one hand giving being [huphistoses] to the intellectual potentialities [tas noetas dunameis], and the mutual concurrence [sun + drome; *cf. 27.2 as concourse*] of these bringing [para + ago; *cf. 7.1 is brought*] to [eis] its genesis the material nature.

3. Let this discussion, however, be [para + ex + tazo; *cf. 12.13 as discussed*] by way of digression [para + ergon]: we must direct [epanakteon: one must raise, return] our discourse [logos] once more to the faith by which we accept the statement that the universe [to pan] took being [huphistemi; *cf. 23.4 as give existence*] from nothing, and do not doubt, when we are taught by [para] Scripture, that it will again be transformed [meta + stooicheioo] into some other state [kata + stasis; *cf. 28.2*].

XXV. How One Even of Those Who are Without [exothen] May Be Brought to Believe the Scripture When Teaching of the Resurrection.

1. Some one, perhaps, having regard [blepo; *cf. #3, with apo*] to the dissolution [dia + luo; *cf. 24.2 as dissolved, with sun*] of bodies, and judging the Deity by the measure [pros to metron; *cf. 28.5*] of his own power [dunamis; *cf. #7*], asserts that the idea of the resurrection is impossible, saying that it cannot be that both those things which are now in motion should become stationary, and those things which are now without motion should rise again.

2. Let such an one, however, take as the first and greatest evidence [tekmerion; *cf. 28.9*] of the truth touching [kata] the resurrection the credibility of the herald who proclaims it [keyrugma]. Now the faith of what is said derives its certainty [to asphales: safe from falling] from the result [ek + basis: a going out] of the other predictions [prorresis; *also in #2*]: for as the Divine Scripture delivers [para + istemi; *cf. 11.1 as present*] statements [logos] many and various, it is possible by examining [theaomai: to behold] how the rest of the utterances stand in the matter of falsehood and truth to survey [kata + noeo; *cf. 29.4 as perceive*] also, in the light of them, the doctrine [dogma; *cf. 28.2*] concerning the resurrection. For if in the other matters

the statements are found to be false and to have failed [dia + sphallo] of true fulfilment, neither is this out of the region of falsehood; but if all the others have experience to vouch for [martureo; cf. 22.7 as bears witness] their truth, it would seem logical [akolouthon; cf. 24.1 as appears consistent] to esteem as true, on their account, the prediction [prorresis] concerning the resurrection also. Let us therefore {216} recall [epi + mimnesko] one or two of the predictions that have been made [pro + kata + aggello], and compare the result with what was foretold [pro + ereo: to prescribe beforehand], so that we may know [gignosko; cf. 29.10] by means of them whether the idea [logos] has a truthful aspect [pros ten aletheian].

3. Who knows not how the people of Israel flourished of old, raised up against all the powers of the world; what were the palaces in the city of Jerusalem, what the walls, the towers, the majestic structure of the Temple? things that seemed worthy of admiration even to the disciples of the Lord, so that they asked the Lord to take notice of them, in their disposition to marvel, as the Gospel history shows us, saying, "What works, and what buildings!" But He indicates [hupo + deiknumi; cf. #13 as received, with epi] to those who wondered at its present state the future desolation of the place and the disappearance of that beauty, saying that after a little while nothing of what they saw should be left. And, again, at the time of His Passion, the women followed, bewailing the unjust sentence against Him, -for they could not yet see [apo + blepo] into the dispensation [oikonomia; cf. 30.19 as regulation] of what was being done: -but He bids them be silent as to what is befalling Him, for it does not demand their tears, but to reserve their wailing and lamentation for the true time [kairos; cf. 27.5] for tears, when the city should be compassed by besiegers, and their sufferings reach so great a strait that they should deem him happy who had not been born: and herein He foretold also the horrid deed of her who devoured her child, when He said that in those days the womb should be accounted blest that never bare. Where then are those palaces? where is the Temple? where are the walls? where are the defenses of the towers? where is the power of the Israelites? were not they scattered in different quarters over almost the whole world? And in their overthrow the palaces also were brought to ruin.

4. Now it seems to me that the Lord foretold [pro + menuo: to denounce beforehand] these things and others like them not for the sake of the matters themselves -for what great advantage to the hearers, at any rate, was the prediction [prorresis; cf. #13] of what was about to happen? they would have known by experience, even if they had not previously learnt what would come; -but in order that by these means faith on their part might follow [eis akolouthian; cf. #9 as sequence] concerning more important matters: for the testimony [marturia] of facts in the former cases is also a proof [apo + deixis] of truth in the latter.

5. For just as though, if a husbandman were explaining the virtue of seeds, it were to happen that some person inexperienced in husbandry should disbelieve him, it would be sufficient as proof of his statement for the agriculturist to show him the virtue existing in one seed of those in the bushel and make it a pledge of the rest -for he who should see the single grain of wheat or barley, or whatever might chance to be the contents of the bushel, grow into an ear after being cast into the ground, would by the means of the one cease also to disbelieve concerning the others -so the truthfulness which confessedly [sun + omologeo] belongs to the other statements seems to me to be sufficient also for evidence {217} of the mystery

[musterion; cf. 17.2] of [kata] the resurrection.

6. Still more, however, is this the case with the experience [peira; cf. 27.8 as experimentally] of actual resurrection which we have learnt not so much by words as by actual facts: for as the marvel of [thauma kata] resurrection was great and passing belief, He begins gradually by inferior instances of His miraculous power, and accustoms our faith, as it were, for the reception of the greater.

7. For as a mother who nurses her babe with due care for a time supplies milk by her breast to its mouth while still tender and soft; and when it begins to grow and to have teeth she gives it bread, not hard or such as it cannot chew, so that the tender and unpracticed gums may not be chafed by rough food; but softening it with her own teeth, she makes it suitable and convenient for the powers of the eater; and then as its power increases by growth she gradually leads on the babe, accustomed to tender food, to more solid nourishment; so the Lord, nourishing and fostering with miracles the weakness of the human mind [mikropsuchia: literally, small soul], like some babe not fully grown, makes first of all a prelude [pro + oimiazō] of the power [dunamis; cf. 26.2] of the resurrection in the case of a desperate disease, which prelude, though it was great in its achievement, yet was not such a thing that the statement of it would be disbelieved: for by “rebuking the fever.” which was fiercely consuming Simon's wife's mother, He produced so great a removal of the evil as to enable her who was already expected to be near death, to “minister” to those present.

8. Next He makes a slight addition [pros + tithemi; cf. 12.1 as ascribes] to the power, and when the nobleman's son lies in acknowledged danger of death (for so the history tells us, that he was about to die, as his father cried, “come down, ere my child die”), He again brings about the resurrection of one who was believed about to die; accomplishing the miracle with a greater act of power in that He did not even approach the place, but sent life from afar off by the force of His command.

9. Once more in what follows [di' akolouthias; also in #9] He ascends [epi + ana + baino; verb in #10, with huper] to higher wonders. For having set out on His way to the ruler of the synagogue's daughter, he voluntarily made a halt in His way, while making public the secret cure of the woman with an issue of blood, that in this time death might overcome the sick. When, then, the soul had just been parted from the body, and those who were wailing over the sorrow were making a tumult with their mournful cries, He raises the damsel to life again, as if from sleep, by His word of command, leading on human weakness, by a sort of path [hodos; cf. #28.5 as return, with epi & ana] and sequence [akolouthia; cf. 28.4 as consequence], to greater things.

10. Still in addition [huper + baino; cf. 26.2 as surpass] to these acts He exceeds them in wonder, and by a more exalted act of power prepares for men the way of faith in the resurrection. The Scripture tells us of a city called Nain in Judaea: a widow there had an only child, no longer a child in the sense of being among boys, but already passing from childhood to man's estate: the narrative calls him “a young man.” The story conveys much in few words:

the very recital is a real lamentation: the dead man's mother, it says, "was a widow." See you the weight of her misfortune, how the text briefly sets out {220} the tragedy of her suffering? For what does the phrase mean? That she had no more hope of bearing sons, to cure the loss she had just sustained in him who had departed; for the woman was a widow: she had not in her power to look to another instead of to him who was gone; for he was her only child; and how great a grief is here expressed any one may easily see who is not an utter stranger to natural feeling. Him alone she had known in travail him alone she had nursed at her breast; he alone made her table cheerful, he alone was the cause of brightness in her home, in play, in work, in learning, in gaiety, at processions, at sports, at gatherings of youth; he alone was all that is sweet and precious in a mother's eyes. Now at the age of marriage, he was the stock of her race, the shoot of its succession, the staff of her old age. Moreover, even the additional detail of his time of life is another lament: for he who speaks of him as "a young man" tells of the flower of his faded beauty, speaks of him as just covering his face with down, not yet with a full thick beard, but still bright with the beauty of his cheeks. What then, think you, were his mother's sorrows for him? How would her heart be consumed as it were with a flame; how bitterly would she prolong her lament over him, embracing the corpse as it lay before her, lengthening out her mourning for him as far as possible, so as not to hasten the funeral of the dead, but to have her fill of sorrow! Nor does the narrative pass this by: for Jesus "when He saw her," it says, "had compassion"; "and He came and touched the bier; and they that bare him stood still;" and He said to the dead, "Young man, I say to you, arise " "and He delivered him to his mother" alive. Observe that no short time had intervened since the dead man had entered upon that state, he was all but laid in the tomb; the miracle wrought by the Lord is greater, though the command is the same.

11. His miraculous power proceeds to [pros + erchomai pros] a still more exalted act, that its display may more closely approach that miracle of the resurrection which men doubt. One of the Lord's companions and friends is ill (Lazarus is the sick man's name); and the Lord deprecates any visiting of His friend, though far away from the sick man, that in the absence of the Life, death might find room and power to do his own work by the agency of disease. The Lord informs His disciples in Galilee of what has befallen Lazarus, and also of his own setting out to him to raise him up when laid low. They, however, were exceedingly afraid on account of the fury of the Jews, thinking it a difficult and dangerous matter to turn again towards Judea, in the midst of those who sought to slay Him: and thus, lingering and delaying, they return slowly from Galilee: but they do return, for His command prevailed, and the disciples were led by the Lord to be initiated at Bethany in the preliminary mysteries of the general resurrection. Four days had already passed since {221} the event; all due rites had been performed for the departed; the body was hidden in the tomb: it was probably already swollen and beginning to dissolve into corruption, as the body moldered in the dank earth and necessarily decayed: the thing was one to turn from, as the dissolved body under the constraint of nature changed to offensiveness. At this point the doubted fact of the general resurrection is brought to proof by a more manifest miracle; for one is not raised from severe sickness, nor brought back to life when at the last breath-nor is a child just dead brought to life, nor a young man about to be conveyed to the tomb released from his bier; but a man past the prime of life, a corpse, decaying, swollen, yea already in a state of dissolution, so that even his own kinsfolk could not suffer that the Lord should draw near the tomb by reason of the offensiveness of the decayed body there enclosed, brought into

life by a single call, confirms the proclamation of the resurrection, that is to say, that expectation of it as universal, which we learn by a particular experience to entertain. For as in the regeneration [ana + stoicheiosis; cf. 27.5 as *World Reformation*] of the universe the Apostle tells us that “the Lord Himself will descend with a shout, with the voice of the archangel,” and by a trumpet sound raise up the dead to incorruption-so now too he who is in the tomb, at the voice of command, shakes off death as if it were a sleep, and ridding himself from the corruption that had come upon his condition of a corpse, leaps forth from the tomb whole and sound, not even hindered in his egress by the bonds of the grave-cloths round his feet and hands.

12. Are these things too small to produce faith in the resurrection of the dead? Or do you seek that your judgment on this point should be confirmed by yet other proofs [krisis: judgment; cf. 13.13 as *interpretation*]? In truth the Lord seems to me not to have spoken in vain to them of Capernaum, when He said to Himself, as in the person of men, “You will surely say to me this proverb, “Physician, heal thyself.” For it behooved Him, when He had accustomed men to the miracle of the resurrection in other bodies, to confirm His word [logos] in His own humanity [kath’ eauton anthropo]. You saw the thing proclaimed working in others-those who were about to die, the child which had just ceased to live, the young man at the edge of the grave, the putrefying corpse, all alike restored by one command to life. Do you seek for those who have come to death by wounds and bloodshed? Does any feebleness of life-giving power hinder the grace in them? Behold Him Whose hands were pierced with nails: behold Him Whose side was transfixed with a spear; pass your fingers through the print of the nails thrust your hand into the spear-wound; you can surely guess how far within it is likely the point would reach, if you reckon the passage inwards by the breadth of the external scar; for the wound that gives admission to a man's hand, shows to what depth within the iron entered. If He then has been raised, well {224} may we utter the Apostle's exclamation, “How say some that there is no resurrection of the dead?”

13. Since, then, every prediction [prorrisis; cf. 25.2] of the Lord is shown to be true by the testimony of events, while we not only have learnt this by His words, but also received [epi + deiknumi; cf. 24.4 as *showing*] the proof of the promise in deed, from those very persons who returned to life by resurrection, what occasion is left to those who disbelieve? Shall we not bid farewell to those who pervert our simple faith by “philosophy and vain deceit,” and hold fast to our confession in its purity, learning briefly through the prophet the mode of the grace, by his words, “You shall take away their breath and they shall fail, and turn to their dust. You shall send forth Your Spirit and they shall be created, and You shall renew the face of the earth;” at which time also he says that the Lord rejoices in His works, sinners having perished from the earth: for how shall any one be called by the name of sin, when sin itself exists no longer?

cf. 29.1 as foreknowledge], could be a hindrance to concourse [sun + drome] of kindred things [ton oikeion] when they

XXVI. That the Resurrection is Not Beyond [exo: outside] Probability.

1. There are, however, some who, owing to the feebleness [a + tonia: slackness, fragility] of

human reasoning [logismos; cf. *Gregory's Introduction*], judging the Divine power by [para] the compass of our own, maintain [kata + skeuazo; cf. 27.9 as framed] that what is beyond our capacity is not possible even to God. They point to the disappearance of the dead of old time, and to the remains of those who have been reduced to ashes by fire; and further, besides these, they bring forward in idea the carnivorous beasts, and the fish that receives in its own body the flesh of the shipwrecked sailor, while this again in turn becomes food for men, and passes by digestion into the bulk of him who eats it: and they rehearse many such trivialities, unworthy of God's great power and authority, for the overthrow of the doctrine, arguing as though God were not able to restore [apo + kata + istemi] to man his own, by return through the same ways.

2. But we briefly cut short their long circuits of logical folly by acknowledging [homologeo; cf. 30.5 as acknowledged] that dissolution of the body into its component parts does take place, and not only does earth, according to the Divine word [logos], return to earth, but air and moisture also revert to the kindred element, and there takes place a return [meta + choreo: to go to another place; cf. 28.5 as to pass] of each of our components to that nature to which it is allied [pros to sug + genes; cf. 27.2 as own]; and although the human body be dispersed among carnivorous birds, or among the most savage beasts by becoming their food, and although it pass beneath the teeth of fish, and although it be changed by fire into vapor and dust, wheresoever one may in argument [logos] suppose the man to be removed, he surely remains in the world [kosmos]; and the world, the voice of inspiration [theopneustos] tells us, is held [peri + krato; cf. 1.1 as holding with dia] by the hand of God. If you, then, are not ignorant of any of the things in your hand, do you deem the knowledge [gnosis; cf. 27.2 as recognition, with epi] of God to be feebler than your own power [dunamis; cf. 27.2], that it should fail to discover the most minute of the things that are within [hupo] the compass [akribeia: exactness; cf. 28.2 as completely, with dia] of the Divine span [spithame: the space one can span with the thumb and little finger]?

XXVII. That It is Possible, When the Human Body is Dissolved into the Elements [stoicheion: one of a series] of the Universe [to pan], that Each Should Have His Own Body Restored [apo + sozo: to preserve from] from the Common Source.

1. Yet it may be that you think, having regard to [pros ta stoicheia] the elements of the universe, that it is a hard thing when the air in us has been resolved into its kindred element, and the warmth, and moisture, and the earthy nature have likewise been mingled with their own kind, that from the common source there should return [ana + trecho; cf. 11.3 as recourse] to the individual [to oikeion; cf. #2 as kindred things] what belongs to itself [epi to idion].

2. Do you not then judge [logizomai; cf. 29.7 as suppose] by [dia] human examples [hupo + deigma; cf. 28.1 as standards] that even this does not surpass [huper + baino; cf. 25.10 as in addition] the limits [horos; cf. 21.3] of the Divine power [dunamis; also in #2]? You have seen surely somewhere among the habitations of men a common herd of some kind of animals collected from every quarter: yet when it is again divided among its owners, acquaintance with their homes and the marks put upon the cattle serve to restore to each his own. If you conceive [en + noeo peri; cf. 27.6 as understand, with dia] yourself also something like to this, you wilt not be far from [hamartano: to miss the mark; cf. 30.30 as (not) far] the right way [prepo: to be clearly

seen]: for as the soul is disposed [dia + keimai; *cf. 14.1 as disposition*] to cling to [schesis: state, condition; *also in #2*] and long [storge: love, affection] for the body that has been wedded [sun + oikeo pros] to it, there also attaches to it in secret [lelethos: something connived at, by insinuation] a certain close relationship [sun + ana + krasis; *cf. 13.5 as union*], [schesis] and power of recognition [epi + gnosis], in virtue of their commixture as though some marks [semeion; *cf. #3*] had been imprinted [epi + keimai] by [para] nature, by the aid of which the community [koinotes] remains unconfused [a + suychutos], separated [dia + krino; *cf. 29.5 as distinguished*] by the distinctive signs [idiazo: to be alone]. Now as the soul attracts [helko] again to [epi] itself that which is its own [sug + genes; *cf. 24.2 as allied*] and properly belongs to it, what labor, I pray you, that is involved for the Divine power [dunamis; *cf. 29.1 as foreknowledge*], could be a hindrance to concourse of kindred things when they are urged [epeigo: to press hard] to [pros] their own place by the unspeakable attraction [holke] of nature, whatever it may be? For that some signs of our compound nature remain [epi + dia + meno; *cf. #2: same verb with para*] in the soul even after dissolution [dia + lysis] is shown by the dialogue in Hades, where the bodies had been conveyed to the tomb, but some bodily token [gnorisma: that which is known; *cf. #3 as identity*] still remained [para + meno; *cf. #5*] in the souls by which both Lazarus was recognized and the rich man was not unknown.

3. There is therefore nothing beyond [exo: outside; *cf. #8*] probability in believing that in the bodies that rise again there will be a return from the common stock to the individual [pros to idion], especially for any one who examines [kata + ex + tasso; *cf. 7.1 as promoted, with pro*] our nature with careful attention [philoponos: loving labor]. For neither does our being consist altogether in flux [rhusis] and change [meta + bole; *cf. 13.1*]-for surely that which had by nature no stability [stasis; *cf. 28.2 as state, with kata*] would be absolutely incomprehensible [a + leptos: hard to catch; *cf. 8.5 as subtle, without a*]-but according to the more accurate statement [logos] some one of our constituent parts is stationary while the rest goes [pro + iemi] through a process of alteration [alloiosis; *cf. #4 as change*]: for the body is on the one hand altered by way of growth and diminution, changing, like garments, the vesture of its successive statures, while the form [eidos; *cf. #4*], on the other hand, remains in itself [istemi] unaltered through every change [trope], not varying [ex + istemi] from the marks [semeion; *cf. 25.9 as signs*] once imposed [epi + ballo; *cf. 9.1 as adding*] upon it by [para] nature, but appearing [em + phaino; *cf. 29.2 as visible, without em*] with its own tokens of identity [gnorisma; *cf. #4*] in all the changes [trope; *cf. 16.3*] which the body undergoes [kata to soma].

4. We must except, however, from this statement the change [alloiosis; *cf. #5 as alteration*] which happens to the form [eidos; *cf. #5*] as the result of disease: for the deformity [a + morphia] of sickness takes possession [dia + lambano; *cf. 16.10 as apprehend*] of the form like some strange mask, and when this is removed {228} [peri + aireo; *cf. 1.2 as dividing with dia*] by the word [logos], as in the case of Naaman the Syrian, or of those whose story is recorded in the Gospel, the form that had been hidden by disease is once more by means of health restored to sight again with its own marks of identity [gnorisma; *cf. #2 as token*].

5. Now to the element of our soul which is in the likeness of God [theoeides; *cf. 18.3 as divine element*] it is not that which is subject to flux [to rheon] and change [to meth + istamenon] by way of alteration [alloiosis; *cf. 14.2*], but this stable [to monimon] and unalterable element

[husautos echon] in [kata] our composition [sug + krima; *cf. #9 as composite body*] that is allied [pros + phuo: to confirm; *cf. 7.1 as aid, with sum*] and since various differences of combination [krasis] produce [meta + morpheo; *cf. 5.1 as form, without meta*] varieties of forms [kata to eidos; *cf. 29.4*] (and combination is nothing else than the mixture of the elements [stoicheion; *cf. 16.1*]-by elements we mean those which furnish [hupo + keimai; *cf. 30.2 as subserve*] the substratum [kata + skeue; *cf. 28.1 as making*] for the making of the universe, of which the human body also is composed [sun + istemi; *cf. 29.3 as came into existence*]), while the form necessarily remains [para + meno; *cf. 28.1 as abides*] in the soul as in the impression of a seal, those things which have received from the seal the impression of its stamp do not fail to be recognized [agnoeo; *cf. 18.6 as to be forgotten*] by the soul, but at the time [kairos; *cf. 13.3 as proper times, with eu*] of the World-Reformation [ana + stoicheiosis; *cf. 22.5 as restitution*], it receives back to [pros] itself all those things which correspond [en + armozo: to fit, adapt] to the stamp of the form: and surely all those things would so correspond which in the beginning [kat' archas; *cf. 28.4 as principle*] were stamped by the form; thus it is not beyond probability that what properly belongs to the individual should once more return [epanaluo] to it from the common source.

6. It is said also that quicksilver, if poured out from the vessel that contains it down a dusty slope, forms small globules and scatters itself over the ground, mingling with none of those bodies with which it meets: but if one should collect at one place the substance dispersed in many directions, it flows back to its kindred substance, if not hindered by anything intervening from mixing with its own kind. Something of the same sort, I think [nomizo; *cf. 28.2*], we ought to understand [dia + noeo; *cf. 16.17*] also of the composite nature of man [peri to anthropinon su + krima; *cf. #9 as composite body (sug + krima)*], that if only the power [endosimos: signal, beginning] were given it of [para] God, the proper [katallellos: co-related] parts would spontaneously unite [epi + ana + kirnaomai: to combine again] with those belonging [tois oikeiois] to them, without any obstruction on their account arising to Him Who reforms [ana + stoicheoo] their nature.

7. Furthermore, in the case of plants that grow from the ground, we do not observe any labor on the part of nature spent on the wheat or millet or any other seed of grain or pulse, in changing it into stalk or spike or ears; for the proper nourishment passes spontaneously, without trouble, from the common source to the individuality of each of the seeds. If, then, while the moisture supplied to all the plants is common, each of those plants which is nourished by it draws the due supply for its own growth, what new thing is it if in the doctrine [logos] of the resurrection also, as in the case of the seeds, it happens [sum + baino; *cf. 1.3 as combine*] that there is an attraction [holke; *cf. 27.2*] on the part of each of those who rise, of what belongs to himself [tou oikeiou]?

8. So that we may learn [gnorizo; *cf. 29.4 as recognized*] on all hands, that the preaching of the resurrection contains nothing beyond [exo: outside; *cf. 28.1*] those facts which are known to us experimentally [peira].

9. And yet we have said nothing of the most notable point [to gnorimotaton] concerning ourselves; I mean the first beginning [aphorme: starting point, occasion; *cf. 28.4 as occasions*] of our existence [sustasis]. Who knows not the miracle of nature, what the maternal womb

receives-what it produces? You {229} see how that which is implanted in the womb to be the beginning of the formation of the body is in a manner simple and homogeneous: but what language [logos] can express [ek + diegeomai] the variety of the composite body [sug + krima] that is framed [kata + skeuazo; cf. 28.2 as were created]? And who, if he did not learn [manthano; cf. 29.10, with kata] such a thing in nature generally, would think that to be possible which does take place-that that small thing of no account is the beginning of a thing so great? Great, I say, not only with regard to [kata] the bodily formation [dia + plasis; cf. 29.10 as formation], but to what is more marvelous than this, I mean the soul itself, and the attributes we behold [theoreo; cf. 29.6 as see] in it.

XXVIII. To Those Who Say that Souls Existed Before [pro + phistimi] Bodies, or that Bodies Were Formed [dia + plasso] Before Souls; Wherein There is Also a Refutation [ana + trope] of the Fables [muthopoiios] Concerning [kata] Transmigration of Souls [metempsuchosis].

1. For it is perhaps not beyond [exo; cf. #5 as bounds] our present subject [pro + keimai; cf. 16.5 as subject] to discuss [diexetasis: legal inquiry] the question which has been raised [amphi + ballo: to put round oneself; cf. #8 as to be rejected, with apo] in the churches touching [peri] soul and body. Some of those before our time who have dealt with the question [logos] of “principles” [peri ton archon] think it right to say that souls have a previous existence [pro + phistimi] as a people in a society [politeia: citizenship; cf. #3 as state] of their own, and that among them also there are standards [hupo + deigma; cf. 10.5 as illustration] of vice and of virtue, and that the soul there, which abides [para + meno; cf. 10.2] in goodness [kalos; cf. 18.3 as beauty], remains without experience of conjunction with [sum + plope pros] the body; but if it does depart from its communion [meta + ousia; cf. 30.2 as participation] with good, it falls down to [pros] this lower life, and so comes to be in a body. Others, on the contrary, marking the order [pros + echo; cf. 29.9 as take heed] of the making [kata + skeue; cf. 29.6 as formation] of man as stated by [kata] Moses, say, that the soul second to the body in order of [kata] time, since God first took dust from the earth and formed [plasso; also cf. #1, with pro & dia] man, and then animated [psucho: to breathe] the being thus formed by [dia] His breath [emphuseisis]: and by this argument [logos] they prove that the flesh is more noble than the soul; that which was previously formed [pro + dia + plasso] than that which was afterwards infused into it [epi + eis + krino: to introduce as an addition from outside; cf. 29.3]: for they say that the soul was made for the body, that the thing formed [to plasma; cf. 30.30 as formation] might not be without breath and motion; and that everything that is made for something else is surely less precious than that for which it is made, as the Gospel tells us that “the soul is more than meat and the body than raiment,” because the latter things exist for the sake of the former-for the soul was not made for meat nor our bodies for raiment, but when the former things were already in being the latter were provided for their needs.

2. Since then the doctrine [logos] involved in both these theories [hupo + lepsis; cf. 28.8] is open to criticism-the doctrine alike of those who ascribe to souls a fabulous [mutholego; cf. #3 as hold] pre-existence in a special state [kata + stasis; cf. 28.6], and of those who think [nomizo; cf. 1.4 as accounted] they were created [kata + skeuazo; cf. 28.7 as maintains] at a later time than the bodies, it is perhaps necessary to leave none of the statements contained in the doctrines [dogma; cf. #3] without examination [an + extazo]: yet to engage and wrestle with

the doctrines on each side completely [dia + akribeia: exactness; cf. 4.1 as perfectly], and to reveal all the absurdities [a + tomia] involved in the theories [tas egkeimenas], would need a large expenditure both of argument and of time; we shall, however, briefly survey [epi + skopeo; cf. 12.4 as studied]{232} as best we can each of the views mentioned, and then resume our subject.

3. Those who stand by the former doctrine [logos], and assert [dogmatizo; cf. 15.1 as will be positing] that the state [politeia; cf. #4] of souls is prior to their life in the flesh, do not seem to me to be clear from the fabulous doctrines [dogma; cf. #4] of the heathen [Hellenikos: Greek; cf. #8] which they hold [mutholego; cf. #2 as fabulous] on the subject of successive incorporation [meta + en + somatosis]: for if one should search carefully, he will find that their doctrine is of necessity brought down [kata + suro] to this. They tell us that one of their sages said that he, being one and the same person, was born a man, and afterwards assumed the form of a woman, and flew about with the birds, and grew as a bush, and obtained the life of an aquatic creature;-and he who said these things of himself did not, so far as I can judge [kata emen krisin], go far from the truth: for such doctrines as this of saying that one soul passed through so many changes are really fitting for the chatter of frogs or jackdaws, or the stupidity of fishes, or the insensibility of trees.

4. And of such absurdity [a + topia] the cause is this-the supposition [oiomai: verb] of the pre-existence [to prouphestanai] of souls for the first principle [arche; also in #4 as beginning] of such doctrine [dogma; cf. #6] leads on the argument [logos] by consequence [dia & akolouthia; cf. #5 as inference] to [epi] the next [pros + eches] and adjacent stage [para + keimai; cf. 1.2 as adjacent to], until it astonishes [terateuomai: to talk marvels] us by reaching [dia + ex + iemi: to go out through; cf. 29.3 as proceeds, with pro] this point. For if the soul, being severed [apo + spao: to drag away] from the more exalted state [politeia: citizenship; cf. #5] by some wickedness after having once, as they say, tasted corporeal life, again becomes a man, and if the life in the flesh is, as may be presumed, acknowledged to be, in comparison with [para] the eternal [aidios; cf. 22.5] and incorporeal life, more subject to passion [em + pathesteros], it naturally follows that that which comes to be in a life such as to contain more occasions [aphorme; cf. 29.3 as first start] of sin, is both placed in a region of greater wickedness and rendered more subject to passion than before (now passion in the human soul is a conformity to the likeness of the irrational [pros to a + logon homoiosis; cf. 5.1, for homoiosis]); and that being brought into close connection with [pros + oikeo: to adapt; cf. 16.14 as approximation] this, it descends [meta + rhreo: to flow differently] to [eis] the brute nature: and that when it has once set out on its way through wickedness, it does not cease its advance towards evil [epi] even when found in an irrational condition: for a halt [stasis; cf. #6 as original state, with kata] in evil is the beginning [arche] of the impulse towards virtue [horme kat' areten; cf. 30.9 as impulse, horme], and in irrational creatures virtue does not exist. Thus it will of necessity be continually changed for [pros] the worse, always proceeding to [pros] what is more degraded and always finding out [ex + eurisko] what is worse than the nature in which it is: and just as the sensible [to aistheton] nature is lower than the rational [to logikon; cf. 29.6 as rationality], so too there is a descent [meta + ptosis] from this to [epi] the insensible.

5. Now so far in its course their doctrine [logos], even if it does overstep the bounds [exo]:

outside] of truth, at all events derives [meta + lambano] one absurdity [to a + topon] from another by [dia] a kind of logical sequence [akolouthia]: but from this point onwards their teaching takes the form of incoherent fable [a + sun + artetos & muthopoieo]. Strict inference points to [hupo + deiknumi (cf. 18.9 as holds forth) & akolouthia (cf. #5 as consequence)] the complete [pan + telos; cf. #7 as (not) conclusion] destruction [dia + phthora; cf. 20.2] of the soul; for that which has once fallen from the exalted state [politeia; cf. 8.6 as godly life] will be unable to halt at any measure [metron; cf. 16.16] of wickedness, but will pass by means of its relation with the passions [dia tes pros ta pathe scheseos] from rational to irrational, and from the latter state will be transferred to [meta + baino pros; cf. 13.2 as pass] the insensibility of plants; and on the insensible there borders, {233} so to say, the inanimate [to a + psuchon; cf. #6]; and on this again follows the non-existent [to anuparkton: unreal, nothingness], so that absolutely by this train of reasoning [dia & akolouthia; cf. #6, by consequence] they will have the soul to pass [meta + choreo] into nothing [pros to me]: thus a return once more to [epi + ana + hodos pros; cf. #6 as process, with pros] the better state is impossible for it: and yet they make the soul return [epi + ana + ago] from a bush to [epi] the man: they therefore prove that the life in a bush is more precious than an incorporeal state [dia + goge; cf. 19.2 as mode of life].

6. It has been shown that the process [pros + hodos; cf. #6 as return towards, with epi & en] of deterioration [pros to cheiron] which takes place in the soul will probably be extended downwards [hupo + baino (cf. 1.3) as combine, with sum] pros to katoteron]; and lower than the insensible we find the inanimate [a + psuchon; cf. #5], to which, by consequence [dia & akolouthia; cf. 29.3 as due course], the principle [arche; cf. 29.3 as beginning] of their doctrine [dogma; cf. #7] brings the soul: but as they will not have this, they either exclude [eg + kata + kleio] the soul from insensibility, or, if they are to bring it back to [epi + ana + ago epi] human life, they must, as has been said, declare the life of a tree to be preferable to the original state [kata + stasis; cf. 8.5 as existence]-if, that is, the fall towards vice [pros kakian] took place from the one, and the return towards [epi + en + hodos (cf. 30.30 as method) pros] virtue takes place from the other.

7. Thus this doctrine [dogma; cf. #8] of theirs, which maintains [kata + skeuazo; cf. #7 as demonstrated, with pro] that souls have a life by themselves before [pros] their life in the flesh, and that they are by reason of [dia] wickedness bound [sun + deo] to their bodies, is shown to have neither beginning [a + kephalos] nor conclusion [a + telos; cf. 29.2 as imperfect]: and as for those who assert that the soul is of later creation than the body, their absurdity [a + topia] was already demonstrated [pro + kata + skeuazo; cf. 29.5 as maintain, without pro] above.

8. The doctrine [dogma; cf. 30.31] of both, then, is equally to be rejected [apo + ballo; cf. 29.3 as was laid, with kata]; but I think that we ought to direct [eu + thuno: to set straight] our own doctrine in the way of truth between these theories [hupo + lepsis; cf. 1.4 as conception]: and this doctrine is that we are not to suppose, according to the error [a + pate: deception] of the heathen [Hellenikos: Greek; cf. #3] that the souls that revolve [sum + peri + poleo] with the motion [kinesis; cf. 30.7] of the universe weighed down by some wickedness, fall [kata + pipto] to [epi] earth by inability to keep up [sum + para + theo] with the swiftness of the motion of the spheres [polos: sphere which revolves on the globe's axis].

XXIX. An Establishment [kata + skeue] of the Doctrine [*not in Greek text*] that the Cause of the Existence [huparxis: coming into existence, emergence] of Soul and Body is One and the Same.

1. Nor again are we in our doctrine [logos] to begin by making up man [pro + dia + plasso; cf. 13.5 as molded, without pro] like a clay figure, and to say that the soul came into being for the sake of this; for surely in that case the intellectual nature [he noera phusis; cf. 1.1 as growth, only phusis] would be shown [apo + deiknumi; cf. #7 as shows, with dia] to be less precious than the clay figure. But as man is one, the being consisting of [sun + estekotos & dia] soul and body, we are to suppose [hupo + tithemi; cf. #1 as to place, with pro] that the beginning of his existence [arche (cf. #3) tes sus + tasis (cf. #3)] is one, common to both parts, so that he should not be found to be antecedent [pro + genesteros] and posterior [neoteros] to [en] himself, if the bodily element were first in point of time, and the other were a later addition; but we are to say that in the power of God's foreknowledge [dunamis (cf. #2) & prognostikos] (according to the doctrine [logos] laid down a little earlier in our discourse), all the fulness [pleroma; cf. 16.10] of human nature had pre-existence [pro + phistemi] (and [eis] to this the prophetic writing bears witness, which says that God "knows all things before they come into being"), and in the creation [demiourgia; cf. 30.7 as construction] of individuals not to place [pro + tithemi; cf. 30.7 as should be supplied, with hupo] the one element before the other, neither the soul before the body, nor the contrary, that man may not be at strife [stasiazo: to rebel] against [pros] himself, by being divided [merizo; cf. 11.1 as distributes, with epi] by the {236} difference [dia + phora; cf. 8.1] in point of [kata] time.

2. For as our nature is conceived [noeo; cf. #4 as perceive, with kata] as twofold, according to the apostolic teaching, made up of the visible [phaino] man and the hidden man [krupto], if the one came first [prouparcho] and the other supervened [epi + gignomai], the power [dunamis; cf. #3] of Him that made [demiourgeo; cf. 30.30 as molds] us will be shown to be in some way imperfect [a + telos; cf. 28.7 as nor conclusion], as not being completely sufficient [ex + arkeo: to be quite enough] for the whole task at once, but dividing the work, and busying [askoleo] itself with [peri] each of the halves in turn.

3. But just as we say that in wheat, or in any other grain, the whole form of the plant is potentially included [em + peri + lambano; cf. 15.3 as surrounding, without em]-the leaves, the stalk, the joints, the grain, the beard-and do not say in our account [logos] of its nature that any of these things has pre-existence [prouparcho], or comes into being before the others, but that the power [dunamis; also in #3] abiding in the seed is manifested [phaneroo; also in #3] in a certain natural order [taxis; cf. Gregory's Introduction, as sequence], not by any means that another nature is infused into it [epi + eis + krino: to be introduced from the outside; cf. #5 as is secreted, with apo]-in the same way [kata ton auton logon] we suppose [hupo + lambano; cf. 16.4 as apprehend] the human germ to possess the potentiality [dunamis; cf. #4 as power] of its nature, sown with it at the first start [aphorme; also in #3 as stepping-stone] of its existence [sus + tasis; cf. 30.13 as subsistence], and that it is unfolded [ex + aploo: to stretch out] and manifested [phaneroo; cf. 10.1] by [dia] a natural sequence [akolouthia; also in #3 as course] as it proceeds [pro + iemi] to [pros] its perfect state [teleiosis; also in #3 as perfection], not employing [pros + lambano; cf. 11.1 as receives, with ana] anything external to itself as a stepping-stone [aphorme; also in #3, as occasion] to [eis] perfection [teleiosis; cf. #6], but itself advancing [pro + ago; cf. 30.2 as importing with epi & eis]

its own self in due course [dia & akolouthia; cf. 28.4, *by consequence*] to the perfect state [eis te teleion]; so that it is not true to say either that the soul exists before the body, or that the body exists without the soul, but that there is one beginning [arche; cf. 30.4 *as first beginnings*] of both, which according to the heavenly view [kata ton hupseloton logon] was laid [kata + ballo; cf. 2.2 *as gives*] as their foundation in the original will of God; according to the other, came into existence [sun + istemi; cf. 12.11 *as holds together*] on the occasion [aphorme; cf. #5] of generation.

4. For as we cannot discern [en + orao; cf. 16.13 *as behold, with kata*] the articulation of the limbs in that which is implanted for the conception of the body before it begins to take form [sullepsis: a gathering], so neither is it possible to perceive [kata + noeo; cf. #5 *as to obtain an idea*] in the same the properties [idiotes; cf. #11] of the soul before they advance to operation [pro + erchomai (cf. #4 *as importation, with epi & eis*) eis energeian]; and just as no one would doubt that the thing so implanted is fashioned [schmatizo] into the different varieties of limbs and interior organs, not by the importation [epi + eis + erchomai; cf. 30.31 *as arises*] of any other power [dunamis; cf. #5 *as potentiality*] from without, but by the power which resides [egkeimai] in it transforming [meta + istemi; cf. 3.1 *as existing with hupo*] it to [pros] this manifestation of energy, -so also we may by like reasoning [analogos; cf. #6, *similar to*] equally suppose [hupo + noeo; cf. #5 *as to obtain an idea, with kata*] in the case of [peri] the soul that even if it is not visibly [en to phainomeno] recognized [gnorizo; cf. 27.8 *as may learn*] by [dia] any manifestations of activity [energeia; cf. #6 *as energies*] it none the less is there; for even the form of the future man [eidōs mellontos anthropou] is there potentially [en te dunamei], but is concealed [ana + phaino; cf. 2.1 *as should appear before*] because it is not possible that it should be made visible before the necessary sequence of events [akolouthia; cf. 30.30 *as sequence*] allows it; so also the soul is there, even though it is not visible [phaino; also in #4 *as will be manifested*], and will be manifested [phaino; cf. 30.29 *as appearing with ek*] by means of its own proper [dia tes oikeias] and natural operation [kata phusin energeias], as it advances concurrently [sum + proiemi; cf. 8.5 *as advanced, without sum*] with the bodily growth.

5. For since it is not from a dead body that the potentiality [dunamis; cf. 30.3 *as faculty*] for conception is secreted [apo + krino: to distinguish; cf. #5, *with dia*], but from one which is animate [em + psuchos; cf. 30.29] and alive, we hence affirm that it is reasonable [eu + logos; cf. 23.3 *as plausible reasoning*] that we should not suppose that what is sent forth [pro + iemi; cf. #7 *as conformable, with para*] from a living body to be the occasion [aphorme] of life is itself dead and inanimate [a + psuchos; cf. 30.29 *as animate, with em*]; for in the flesh that which is inanimate is surely dead; and the condition of death arises by the withdrawal [kata steresin: deprivation] of the soul. Would not one therefore in this case be asserting that withdrawal is antecedent to possession-if, that is, he should maintain [kata + skeuazo; cf. #5, *as formation*] that the inanimate state which is the condition of death is antecedent to the soul? {237} And if any one should seek for a still clearer evidence [tekmerion; cf. #5] of the life of that particle [meros: part; cf. 12.9 *as something with kata*] which becomes the beginning of the living creature in its formation [kata + skeuazo; cf. #7 *as preparing for*], it is possible to obtain an idea [kata + noeo; cf. #10 *as considers*] on this point from other signs [semeion; cf. 12.1] also, by which what is animate is distinguished [dia + krino; cf. 16.5] from what is dead. For in the case of men we consider it an evidence [tekmerion; cf. 12.8] of life that one is warm and operative and in motion, but the chill and motionless state in the case of bodies is nothing else than deadness.

6. Since then we see [theoreo; cf. 30.5 as *behold*] that of which we are speaking to be warm and operative, we thereby draw the further inferences [sun + tekmerioo] it is not inanimate; but as, in respect of [kata] its corporeal part, we do not say that it is flesh, and bones, and hair, and all that we observe [kathorao; cf. 13.10 as *behold*] in the human being, but that potentially [en dunamei] it is each of these things, yet does not visibly appear [kata to oromenon phainesthai] to be so; so also of the part which belongs to the soul [epi tou psuchikou], the elements of rationality [to logikon; cf. 28.4 as *rational*], and desire [to epi + thumetikon], and anger, and all the powers of [kata] the soul are not yet visible; yet we assert that they have their place in it, and that the energies [energeia; cf. #7 as *activity*] of the soul also grow [sun + auxo; cf. #8 as *increasing with aun*] with the subject in a manner similar to [analogos; cf. 12.10 as *proportionally*] the formation [kata + skeue; cf. #8] and perfection [teleiosis; cf. 38] of the body.

7. For just as a man when perfectly developed [teleiotheis] has a specially marked activity [dia + phainomeen energeia] of the soul, so at the beginning of his existence [sus + stasis; cf. 3.1 as *formation*] he shows [dia + deiknumi; cf. 2.1 as *should be manifested, with ana*] in himself that co-operation [sun + ergeia; cf. 18.3] of the soul which is suitable [sun + metros; cf. 22.5 as *co-extensive, with sum*] and conformable [para + iemi] to his existing need, in its preparing for [kata + skeuazo] itself its proper dwelling-place by means of [dia] the implanted matter [hule; cf. 30.4 as *material*]; for we do not suppose [logizomai; cf. 13.12 as *to calculate*] it possible that the soul is adapted to [en + harmozo; cf. #7 as *agree, without en*] a strange building, just as it is not possible that the seal impressed on wax should be fitted to an engraving that does not agree [harmozo; cf. 30.6 as *connecting*] with it.

8. For as the body proceeds [pro + iemi; cf. 30.12 as *be provided, with sum & peri*] from a very small original to [ek brachutatou pros] the perfect state [to teleion], so also the operation [energeia; cf. #9] of the soul, growing in correspondence with the subject [to hupo + keimeno], gains and increases with it. For at its first formation [kata + skeue; cf. 30.1 as *frame*] there comes first of all its power of growth and nutriment alone, as though it were some root buried in the ground; for the limited nature of the recipient does not admit of more; then, as the plant comes forth to the light and shows its shoot to the sun, the gift of sensibility blossoms in addition, but when at last it is ripened and has grown up to its proper height, the power of reason begins to shine forth like a fruit, not appearing in its whole vigor all at once, but by care [epi + meleia] increasing [aun + auxo; cf. #6 as *grow, with sun*] with the perfection [teleiosis; cf. 30.29 as *perfecting*] of the instrument [organos], bearing always as much fruit as the powers of the subject allow.

9. If, however, you seek to trace the operation [energeia; cf. #10] of the soul in the formation [plasis: molding] of the body, “take heed [pros + echo; cf. 28.1 as *marking the order*] with regard to yourself,” as Moses says, and you will read, as in a book, the history of the works of the soul; for nature itself expounds [diegeomai; cf. 27.9 as *express, with ek*] to you, more clearly than any discourse, the varied occupations [ascholia: lack of leisure] of the soul in the body, alike in general and in particular acts of construction [dia + skeue; cf. 30.1 as *structure*].

10. But I deem it superfluous to declare [diexeimi: to go out through] at length in words [logos] what is to be found in [kata] ourselves, as though we were expounding some wonder that lay beyond our boundaries:-who that looks [blepo; cf. 1.2 as beholds, with epi]{240} on himself needs words to teach him his own [ta oikeian phusin] nature? For it is possible for one who considers [kata + noeo; cf. 30.1] the mode [tropos; cf. 30.33] of his own life, and learns [kata + manthano; cf. 30.1, without kata] how closely concerned [epi + tedeios: adverb] the body is in every vital operation [energeia], to know [gignosko; cf. 10.6 as recognizes, with epi] in what the vegetative principle [to phusikon] of the soul was occupied [kata + skoleomai] on the occasion of [para] the first formation [dia + plasis; cf. 30.29 as process] of that which was beginning its existence; so that hereby also it is clear to those who have given any attention [an + epi + skopos: neglected; cf. 30.2 as regards, without an & epi] to the matter, that the thing which was implanted by separation from the living body for [pros] the production of the living being was not a thing dead or inanimate in the laboratory [ergasterion] of nature.

11. Moreover we plant in the ground the kernels of fruits, and portions torn from roots, not deprived by death of the vital power [zotikes dunameos] which naturally resides [egkeimai: to lie in, be wrapped] in them, but preserving [sun + tereo; cf. 30.6 as is kept] in themselves, hidden indeed, yet surely living, the property [idiotes; cf. 1.1] of their prototype [prototopos]; the earth that surrounds them does not implant such a power from without, infusing it from itself (for surely then even dead wood would proceed to growth), but it makes that manifest which resides in them, nourishing it by its own moisture, perfecting the plant into root, and bark, and pith, and shoots of branches, which could not happen were not a natural power [phusikes dunameos] implanted with it, which drawing to itself from its surroundings its kindred and proper nourishment, becomes a bush, or a tree, or an ear of grain, or some plant of the class of shrubs.

XXX. A Brief Examination [theoria] of the Construction [kata + skeue] of Our Bodies from a Medical Point of View.

1. Now the exact structure [akribe dia + skeue; cf. 29.9 as construction] of our body each man teaches himself by his experiences of sight and light and perception, having his own nature to instruct him [didaskalos: teacher]; any one too may learn [manthano; cf. 8.3] everything accurately who takes up the researches which those skilled in such matters have worked out [philoponeo: to be fond of work] in books. And of these writers some learnt by dissection the position of our individual organs; others also considered [kata + noeo; cf. #2] and expounded the reason for the existence of all the parts of the body; so that the knowledge [gnosis; cf. 10.4] of the human frame [kata + skeue; cf. #3 as structure] which hence results is sufficient for students. But if any one further seeks [epi + zeteo; cf. 22.7] that the Church should be his teacher on all these points, so that he may not need for anything the voice of those without (for this is the wont [nomos: custom, law] of the spiritual [pneumatikos; cf. 8.6 as spiritual man] sheep, as the Lord says, that they hear not a strange voice), we shall briefly take in hand the account [logos] of these matters also.

2. We note [noeo; cf. #2 as consider, with kata] concerning our bodily nature three things, for the

sake of which our particular parts were formed [kata + skeuazo; *cf. 1.2 as framed*]. Life is the cause of some, good life of others, others again are adapted with a view to the succession of descendants. All things in us which are of such a kind that without them it is not possible that human life should exist, we consider [kata + noeo; *cf. #3 as mark*] as being in three parts; in the brain, the heart, and the liver. Again, all that are a sort of additional blessings, nature's liberality, whereby she bestows on man the gift of living well, {241} are the organs of sense; for such things do not constitute our life, since even where some of them are wanting man is often none the less in a condition [sun + istasis] of life; but without these forms of activity it is impossible to enjoy participation [meta + ousia; *cf. 16.10 as share*] in the pleasures of life. The third aim regards [skopos pros; *cf. #4 as purpose*] the future, and the succession [dia + doche; *cf. 17.1 as succeed*] of life. There are also certain other organs besides these, which help, in common with all the others, to subserve [hupo + keimai; *cf. #4 as substratum*] the continuance [pros & dia + mone; *cf. 1.1*] of life, importing [epi + eis + ago; *cf. 2.2 as introduced, without epi*] by their own means the proper supplies, as the stomach and the lungs, the latter fanning by respiration the fire at the heart, the former introducing the nourishment for the internal organs.

3. Our structure [kata + skeue; *cf. #7 as formation*], then, being thus divided, we have carefully to mark [kata + noeo; *cf. #7*] that our faculty [dunamis; *cf. #6 as powers*] for life is not supported [diexago: to order, arrange] in any one way by some single organ, but nature, while distributing [epi + nemo] the means for our existence [pros ten sustasin] among several parts, makes the contribution [sun + eis + phora] of each individual necessary for the whole; just as the things which nature contrives [epi + technomai; *cf. 5.1*] for the security and beauty [kallos; *cf. 5.1*] of life are also numerous, and differ much among [pros] themselves.

4. We ought, however, I think, first to discuss briefly the first beginnings [arche; *cf. #11 as principle*] of the things which contribute [sun + teleo; *cf. #4 as assistance*] to the constitution [pros ten sustasin] of our life. As for the material [hule; *cf. 20.2 as substance*] of the whole body which serves as a common substratum [hupo + keimai; *cf. 24.1*] for the particular members, it may for the present be left without remark; for a discussion as to natural substance [phusiologia] in general will not be of any assistance [sun + teleo; *cf. 1.5 as were finished*] to our purpose [skopos; *cf. #30 as aim*] with regard to [pros] the consideration [theoria] of the parts.

5. As it is then acknowledged [homologeio; *cf. 16.12, with sun*] by all that there is in us a share of all that we behold [theoreo; *cf. 24 as considered*] as elements [stoicheiodos: adverb, elemental; *cf. 3.1 as elemental*] in the universe [kosmos; *cf. Gregory's Introduction as world*]-of heat and cold, and of the other pair of qualities of moisture and dryness-we must discuss them severally.

6. We see [horao] then that the powers [dunamis; *also cf. #6 as force*] which control life are three, of which the first by its heat produces general warmth, the second by its moisture keeps damp that which is warmed, so that the living being is kept in an intermediate condition [epi tou mesou sun + tereo (*cf. 1.1 as preserving*)] by the equal balance of the forces exerted by the quality of each of the opposing natures (the moist element not being dried up by excess of heat, nor the hot element quenched by the prevalence of moisture); and the third power by its own agency holds together [sun + echo; *cf. 12.9 as sustained*] the separate members in a

certain agreement [sum + bole] and harmony [harmonia], connecting [harmozo; cf. 1.3 as *attached*] them by the ties which it itself furnishes, and sending into [epi + pempo] them all that self-moving [autokinetos] and determining [pro + airetikos] force [dunamis; cf. #9 as *power*], on the failure of which the member becomes relaxed and deadened, being left destitute [amoiro: to have no share] of the determining spirit [tou pro + airetikou pneumatos].

7. Or rather, before dealing with these, it is right that we should mark [kata + noeo; cf. 6.1 as *conceive*] the skilled workmanship [technikon] of nature in the actual construction [demiourgia; cf. 6.10 as *creation*] of the body. For as that which is hard and resistant does not admit [kata + dechomai; cf. 13.2 as *succeeds, with dial*] the action of the senses (as we may see in the instance of our own bones, and in that of plants in the ground, where we remark indeed a certain form of life in that they grow and receive nourishment, yet the resistant character of their substance [anti + tupia tou hupo + keimenou] does not allow them sensation), for this reason it was necessary that some wax-like formation [kata + skeue; cf. 2.2 as *instincts*], so to say, should be supplied [hupo + tithemi; cf. #33 as *indicates*] for the action [energeia; cf. #10 as *energy*] of the senses, with the faculty of being impressed with the stamp of things capable of striking them [anti + leptikois tupois], neither becoming confused by excess of moisture (for the impress [to tupoumenon]{244} would not remain [hupo + meno; cf. 10.2 as *abides, with para*] in moist substance), nor resisting by extraordinary solidity (for that which is unyielding would not receive any mark from the impressions), but being in a state between softness and hardness, in order that the living being might not be destitute [a + moiro: to have no share in] of the fairest [kallistos] of all the operations of [kata] nature-I mean the motion [kinesis; cf. #24 as *force*] of sense.

8. Now as a soft and yielding substance, if it had no assistance from the hard parts, would certainly have, like molluscs, neither motion nor articulation, nature accordingly mingles in the body the hardness of the bones, and uniting these by close connection one to another, and knitting their joints together by means of the sinews, thus plants around them the flesh which receives sensations, furnished with a somewhat harder and more highly-strung surface than it would otherwise have had.

9. While resting, then, the whole weight of the body on this substance of the bones, as on some columns that carry a mass of building, she did not implant the bone undivided through the whole structure: for in that case man would have remained without motion or activity, if he had been so constructed, just like a tree that stands on one spot without either the alternate motion of legs to advance its motion or the service of hands to minister to the conveniences of life: but now we see that she contrived that the instrument should be rendered capable of walking and working by this device, after she had implanted in the body, by the determining spirit [pro + airetikon pneuma; *pneuma also in #9*] which extends through the nerves, the impulse and power for motion. And hence is produced the service of the hands, so varied and multiform, and answering to every thought [epi + noia; cf. 12.1 as *opinions*]. Hence are produced, as though by some mechanical contrivance, the turnings of the neck, and the bending and raising of the head, and the action of the chin, and the separation of the eyelids, that takes place with a thought, and the movements of the other joints, by the tightening or relaxation of certain nerves. And the power [dunamis; cf. #23 as

force] that extends [*diexiemi*] through these exhibits a sort of independent impulse [*horme*], working with the spirit of its will [*pro + airtikon pneuma; pneuma in #11*] by a sort of natural management, [*kata tina phuseos oikonomian*] in each particular part; but the root of all, and the principle of the motions of the nerves, is found in the nervous tissue that surrounds the brain.

10. We consider, then, that we need not spend more time in inquiring [*polu + pragmoneo: to be meddling*] in which of the vital members such a thing resides, when the energy [*energeia; cf. #32 as operation*] of motion is shown to be here. But that the brain contributes to life in a special degree is shown clearly by the result of the opposite conditions: for if the tissue surrounding it receives any wound or lesion, death immediately follows the injury, nature being unable to endure the hurt even for a moment; just as, when a foundation is withdrawn, the whole building collapses with the part; and that member, from an injury to which the destruction of the whole living being clearly follows, may properly be acknowledged to contain the cause of life.

11. But as furthermore in those who have ceased to live, when the heat that is implanted in our nature is quenched, that which has become dead grows cold, {245} we hence recognize the vital cause also in heat: for we must of necessity acknowledge that the living being subsists by the presence of that, which failing, the condition of death supervenes. And of such a force we understand the heart to be as it were the fountain-head and principle [*arche; cf. 1.2 as beginning*], as from it pipe-like passages, growing one from another in many ramifications, diffuse in the whole body the warm and fiery spirit [*pneuma; cf. #12*].

12. And since some nourishment must needs also be provided by nature [*sum + peri + iemi para tes phuseos*] for the element of heat—for it is not possible that the fire should last by itself, without being nourished by its proper food—therefore the channels of the blood, issuing from the liver as from a fountainhead, accompany the warm spirit [*pneuma; cf. #15 as breath*] everywhere in its way throughout the body, that the one may not by isolation from the other become a disease and destroy the constitution. Let this instruct [*paideuo: to bring up a child; cf. 13.12 as instructed, with pro*] those who go beyond the bounds of fairness [*atakteo: to be undisciplined*], as they learn from nature that covetousness is a disease that breeds destruction.

13. But since the Divinity [*to theion; cf. 6.1 as deity*] alone is free from needs [*a + pros + dees*], while human poverty requires external aid for its own subsistence [*sus + tasis; cf. #29.1 as constitution*], nature therefore, in addition to those three powers [*dunamis; cf. #23 as force*] by which we said that the whole body is regulated, brings in imported matter from without, introducing by different entrances that which is suitable to those powers.

14. For to the fount of the blood, which is the liver, she furnishes its supply by food: for that which from time to time is imported in this way prepares the springs of blood to issue from the liver, as the snow on the mountain by its own moisture increases the springs in the low ground, forcing its own fluid deep down to the veins below.

15. The breath [pneuma; *cf. 8.5 as spirit*] in the heart is supplied by means of the neighboring organ, which is called the lungs, and is a receptacle for air, drawing the breath from without through the windpipe inserted in it, which extends to the mouth. The heart being placed in the midst of this organ (and itself also moving incessantly in imitation of the action of the ever-moving fire), draws to itself, somewhat as the bellows do in the forges, a supply from the adjacent air, filling its recesses by dilatation, and while it fans its own fiery element, breathes upon the adjoining tubes; and this it does not cease to do, drawing the external air into its own recesses by dilatation, and by compression infusing the air from itself into the tubes.

16. And this seems to me to be the cause of this spontaneous respiration of ours; for often the mind [nous] is occupied [a + scholos: lack of leisure] in discourse with others, or is entirely quiescent when the body is relaxed in sleep, but the respiration of air does not cease, though the will gives no co-operation to this end. Now I suppose, since the heart is surrounded by the lungs, and in the back part of its own structure is attached to them, moving that organ by its own dilatations and compressions, that the inhaling and exhaling of the air is brought about by the lungs: for as they are a lightly built and porous body, and have all their recesses {248} opening at the base of the windpipe, when they contract and are compressed they necessarily force out by pressure the air that is left in their cavities; and, when they expand and open, draw the air, by their distention, into the void by suction.

17. This then is the cause of this involuntary respiration-the impossibility that the fiery element should remain at rest: for as the operation of motion is proper to heat, and we understand that the principle of heat is to be found in the heart, the continual motion going on in this organ produces the incessant inspiration and exhalation of the air through the lungs: wherefore also when the fiery element is unnaturally augmented, the breathing of those fevered subjects becomes more rapid, as though the heart were endeavoring to quench the flame implanted in it by more violent breathing.

18. But since our nature is poor and in need of supplies for its own maintenance from all quarters, it not only lacks air of its own, and the breath which excites heat, which it imports from without for the preservation of the living being, but the nourishment it finds to fill out the proportions of the body is an importation. Accordingly, it supplies the deficiency by food and drink, implanting in the body a certain faculty for appropriating that which it requires, and rejecting that which is superfluous, and for this purpose too the fire of the heart gives nature no small assistance.

19. For since, according to the account we have given, the heart which kindles by its warm breath the individual parts, is the most important of the vital organs, our Maker [plastēs: molder] caused it to be operative [energōs; cf. 15.3] with its efficacious power [to drastiko tes dunneōs] at all points, that no part of it might be left ineffectual or unprofitable for the regulation [pros & oikonomia; cf. #23 as economy] of the whole organism. Behind, therefore, it enters the lungs, and, by its continuous motion, drawing that organ to itself, it expands the

passages to inhale the air, and compressing them again it brings about the expiation of the imprisoned air; while in front, attached to the space at the upper extremity of the stomach, it warms it and makes it respond by motion to its own activity, rousing it, not to inhale air, but to receive its appropriate food: for the entrances for breath and food are near one another, extending lengthwise one alongside the other, and are terminated in their upper extremity by the same boundary, so that their mouths are contiguous and the passages come to an end together in one mouth, from which the entrance of food is effected through the one, and that of the breath through the other.

20. Internally, however, the closeness of the connection of the passages is not maintained throughout; for the heart intervening between the base of the two, infuses in the one the powers for respiration, and in the other for nutriment. Now the fiery element is naturally inclined to seek for the material which serves as fuel, and this necessarily happens with regard to the receptacle of nourishment; for the more it becomes penetrated by fire through the neighboring warmth, the more it draws to itself what nourishes the heat. And this sort of impulse [horme; *cf. 13.1*] we call appetite [orexis; *cf. 19.5 as desire*].

21. {249} But if the organ which contains the food should obtain sufficient material, not even so does the activity of the fire become quiescent: but it produces a sort of melting of the material just as in a foundry, and, dissolving the solids, pours them out and transfers them, as it were from a funnel, to the neighboring passages: then separating the coarser from the pure substance, it passes the fine part through certain channels to the entrance of the liver, and expels the sedimentary matter of the food to the wider passages of the bowels, and by turning it over in their manifold windings retains the food for a time in the intestines, lest if it were easily got rid of by a straight passage it might at once excite the animal again to appetite, and man, like the race of irrational animals, might never cease from this sort of occupation.

22. As we saw, however, that the liver has especial need of the co-operation of heat for the conversion of the fluids into blood, while this organ is in position distant from the heart (for it would, I imagine, have been impossible that, being one principle or root of the vital power, it should not be hampered by vicinity with another such principle) in order that the system may suffer no injury by the distance at which the heat-giving substance is placed, a muscular passage (and this, by those skilled in such matters, is called the artery) receives the heated air from the heart and conveys it to the liver, making its opening there somewhere beside the point at which the fluids enter, and, as it warms the moist substance by its heat, blends with the liquid something akin to fire, and makes the blood appear red with the fiery tint it produces.

23. Issuing from there again, certain twin channels, each enclosing its own current like a pipe, disperse air and blood (that the liquid substance may have free course when accompanied and lightened by the motion of the heated substance) in divers directions over the whole body, breaking at every part into countless branching channels; while as the two principles of the vital powers mingle together (that alike which disperses heat, and that which supplies moisture to all parts of the body), they make, as it were, a sort of compulsory

contribution from the substance with which they deal [ek ton oikeion] to the supreme force [dunamis; *cf. #29 as power*] in the vital economy [oikonomia; *cf. 22.7 as dispensation*].

24. Now this force [kinesis; *cf. 1.1 as motion*] is that which is considered [theoreo; *cf. #27 as contemplate, with en*] as residing in the cerebral membranes and the brain, from which it comes that every movement of a joint, every contraction of the muscles, every spontaneous influence that is exerted upon the individual members, renders our earthen statue active and mobile as though by some mechanism. For the most pure form of heat and the most subtle form of liquid, being united by their respective forces through a process of mixture and combination, nourish and sustain by their moisture the brain, and hence in turn, being rarefied to the most pure condition, the exhalation that proceeds from that organ anoints the membrane which encloses the brain, which, reaching from above downwards like a pipe, extending through the successive vertebrae, is (itself and the marrow which is contained in it) conterminous with the base of the spine, itself giving like a charioteer the impulse and power to all the meeting-points of bones and joints, and to the branches of the muscles, for the motion or rest of the particular parts.

25. {252} For this cause too it seems to me that it has been granted a more secure defense, being distinguished, in the head, by a double shelter of bones round about, and in the vertebrae of the neck by the bulwarks formed by the projections of the spine as well as by the diversified interlacings of the very form of those vertebrae, by which it is kept in freedom from all harm, enjoying safety by the defense that surrounds it.

26. So too one might suppose of the heart, that it is itself like some safe house fitted with the most solid defenses, fortified by the enclosing walls of the bones round about; for in rear there is the spine, strengthened on either side by the shoulder-blades, and on each flank the enfolding position of the ribs makes that which is in the midst between them difficult to injure; while in front the breast-bone and the juncture of the collar-bone serve as a defense, that its safety may be guarded at all points from external causes of danger.

27. As we see in husbandry, when the rain fall from the clouds or the overflow from the river channels causes the land beneath it to be saturated with moisture (let us suppose for our argument a garden, nourishing within its own compass countless varieties of trees, and all the forms of plants that grow from the ground, and whereof we contemplate [en + theoreo; *cf. 1.4, without en*] the figure, quality, and individuality in great variety of detail); then, as these are nourished by the liquid element while they are in one spot, the power which supplies moisture to each individual among them is one in nature; but the individuality of the plants so nourished changes the liquid element into different qualities; for the same substance becomes bitter in wormwood, and is changed into a deadly juice in hemlock, and becomes different in different other plants, in saffron, in balsam, in the poppy: for in one it becomes hot, in another cold, in another it obtains the middle quality: and in laurel and mastick it is scented, and in the fig and the pear it is sweetened, and by passing through the vine it is turned into the grape and into wine; while the juice of the apple, the redness of the rose, the radiance of the lily, the blue of the violet, the purple of the hyacinthine dye, and all that we behold in the earth, arise from one and the same moisture, and are separated into so many

varieties in respect of figure and aspect and quality; the same sort of wonder is wrought in the animated soil of our being by Nature, or rather by [para] Nature's Lord [despotes]. Bones, cartilages, veins, arteries, nerves, ligatures, flesh, skin, fat, hair, glands, nails, eyes, nostrils, ears,-all such things as these, and countless others in addition, while separated from one another by various peculiarities, are nourished by the one form of nourishment in ways proper to their own nature, in the sense that the nourishment, when it is brought into close relation with any of the subjects, is also changed according to that to which it approaches, and becomes adapted and allied to the special nature of the part. For if it should be in the neighborhood of the eye, it {253} with the visual part and is appropriately distributed by the difference of the coats round the eye, among the single parts; or, if it flow to the auditory parts, it is mingled with the auscultatory nature, or if it is in the lip, it becomes lip; and it grows solid in bone, and grows soft in marrow, and is made tense with the sinew, and extended with the surface, and passes into the nails, and is fined down for the growth of the hair, by correspondent exhalations, producing hair that is somewhat curly or wavy if it makes its way through winding passages, while, if the course of the exhalations that go to form the hair lies straight, it renders the hair stiff and straight.

28. Our argument [logos], however, has wandered far from its purpose, going deep into the works of nature, and endeavoring to describe how and from what materials our particular organs are formed, those, I mean, intended for life and for good life [pros to eu zen], and any other class which we included with these in our first division.

29. For our purpose [to pro + keimenon; cf. 1.4 as contraries, with anti] was to show that the seminal cause [aitia; cf. 12.2 as character] of our constitution [sus + tasis; cf. 29.1 as existence] is neither a soul without body, nor a body without soul, but that, from animated [em + psuchos; cf. 29.5] and living bodies, it is generated at the first as a living and animate being, and that our humanity takes it and cherishes it like a nursling with the resources [oikeios, adjective: of the household; cf. 8.5 as properties] she herself possesses, and it thus grows on both sides and makes its growth manifest correspondingly in either part:-for it at once displays, by [dia] this artificial [technikos; cf. 13.4 as artificer] and scientific process [epi + stemonike dia + plasis (cf. 16.9 as structure)] of formation, the power [dunamis; cf. Gregory's Introduction] of soul that is interwoven in it, appearing [ek + phaino; cf. #30 as expressed, with pro] at first somewhat obscurely, but afterwards increasing in radiance concurrently [sun + ana + lampo] with the perfecting [teleiosis; cf. #33 as perfection] of the work.

30. And as we may see with stone-carvers-for the artist's purpose is to produce in stone the figure of some animal; and with this in his mind, he first severs the stone from its kindred matter, and then, by chipping away the superfluous parts of it, advances somehow by the intermediate step of his first outline to the imitation which he has in his purpose, so that even an unskilled observer may, by what he sees, conjecture [kata + stokazomai: to aim at] the aim [skopos; cf. Gregory's Introduction, as scope] of his art; again, by working at it, he brings it more nearly to the semblance [homoiotetes; cf. 3.1 as likeness] of the object he has in view; lastly, producing in the material the perfect and finished figure, he brings his art [techne; cf. 1.1 as skill] to its conclusion, and that which a little before was a shapeless stone is a lion, or a man, or whatsoever it may be that the artist has made, not by the change of the material into the

figure [pros to eidos; *cf. #30 as form*], but by the figure being wrought upon the material. If one supposes the like in the case of the soul he is not far [hamartano: to miss the mark; *cf. 27.2 as will not be far from*] from probability; for we say that Nature, the all-contriving [techniteuo], takes from its kindred [homogenos] matter the part that comes from the man, and molds [demiourgeo]; *cf. 3.2 as to make her statue* [andrias: image of a man] within herself. And as the form [eidos; *cf. #30*] follows upon [epi + koloutho]; *cf. 12.10 as comes to follow, with anti*] the gradual working of the stone, at first somewhat indistinct, but more perfect [teleioteron] after the completion of the work, so too in the molding of its instrument the form [eidos] of the soul is expressed [pro + phaino]; *cf. 1.1 as is seen, without pro*] in the substratum [kata ten analogian tou hupokeimenou], incompletely in that which is still incomplete, perfect in that which is perfect; indeed it would have been perfect from the beginning had our nature not been maimed [kolobo: to curtail, shorten] by [dia] evil. Thus our community [koinonia; *cf. 10.5*] in that generation {256} which is subject to passion [pros ten empathe] and of animal nature, brings it about that the Divine image [eikon; *cf. Gregory's Introduction*] does not at once shine forth at our formation [plasma; *cf. 9.1*], but brings man to perfection [epi to teleion]; *cf. #31 as perfect state*] by a certain method [hodos: way; *cf. 1.3 as concurrence, with sun*] and sequence [akolouthia]; *cf. 8.5 as order*], through those attributes of the soul which are material, and belong rather to the animal creation.

31. Some such doctrine [dogma; *cf. 8.4*] as this the great apostle also teaches us in his Epistle to the Corinthians, when he says, "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things"; not that the soul which arises [epi + eis + erchomai]; *cf. 12.13 as were introduced*] in the man is different from that which we know [noeo] to be in [para] the boy, and the childish intellect [dia + noia]; *cf. #32 as intelligence*] fails while the manly intellect takes its being in us; but that the same soul displays its imperfect condition [to ateles] in the one, its perfect state [to teleion]; *cf. 8.5 as perfection*] in the other.

32. For we say that those things are alive which spring up and grow, and no one would deny that all things that participate [meta + ousia]; *cf. 16.10 as share*] in life and natural motion are animate, yet at the same time one cannot say that such life partakes [meta + echo]; *cf. #33 as shares*] of a perfect soul, -for though a certain animate operation [energeia]; *cf. #33*] exists in plants, it does not attain to the motions of sense; and on the other hand, though a certain further animate power exists in the brutes, neither does this attain perfection, since it does not contain in itself the grace [charis]; *cf. Gregory's Introduction as debt*] of reason [logos] and intelligence [dia + noia]; *cf. Gregory's Introduction as wit*].

33. And even so we say that the true and perfect soul is the human soul, recognized by every operation [energeia]; *cf. Gregory's Introduction*]; and anything else that shares [meta + echo]; *cf. 1.1 as has a share*] in life we call animate [empsuchos]; *cf. 4.1 as living*] by a sort of customary [sun + etheia]; *cf. 4.1 as ordinary use*] misuse [kata + chresis] of language, because in these cases the soul does not exist in a perfect condition, but only certain parts of the operation of the soul, which in man also (according to Moses' mystical account [kata ten mustiken] of man's origin) we learn to have accrued when he made himself like this sensuous world [pros to empathe]; *cf. 16.4 as passible*] oikeoteta]. Thus Paul, advising those who were able to hear him to lay hold on

perfection [teleiosis; *cf. 29.3 as perfect state*], indicates [hupo + tithemi; *cf. 23.2 as suggests*] also the mode [tropos; *cf. 11.2*] in which they may attain [spoudazo; *cf. 20.2 as sought after*] that object, telling them that they must “put off the old man,” and put on the man “which is renewed after the image of Him that created him.”

34. Now may we all return [epi + ana + erchomai; *cf. 12.14 as let us return*] to that Divine grace [epi ten theoeide charin] in which God at the first [kat' archas; *cf. 27.5 as in the beginning*] created man, when He said, “Let us make man in our image and likeness”; to Whom be glory and might for ever and ever [eis tous aionas ton aionon]. Amen.