

(Photius) Account of a book he had read by Stephen Gobar, which incidentally mentions Hegesippus' opinion about 'liars who speak empty words' (from *Bibliotheca*, 232)

<p>Translated by J. H. Freese, as commissioned by Roger Pearse, from René Henry's French translation in Les Belles Lettres, http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/photius_copyright/photius_07bibliotheca.htm</p>	<p>Photius, <i>Bibliotheca</i>, 232, as hosted by Ruslan Kazarzar. http://khazarzar.skeptik.net/pgm/PG_Migne/Photius%20of%20Constantinople_PG%20101-104/Bibliotheca.pdf</p>
<p>[I <Photius> have r]ead the book of a certain Stephen, a tritheist, surnamed Gobar.</p> <p>The work seems to have involved a lot of work without procuring a profit proportional to the great pain expended; it exhibits in fact more futile vanity than utility.</p> <p>The chapters which the author has written relating to questions of general order which concern the church are up to about 52; some chapters on more limited subjects are mingled in there.</p> <p>These chapters are divided into expositions of two contradictory opinions.</p> <p>And these opinions are not advanced either by logic or from the holy scriptures but uniquely, according to the author, from the citation of various Fathers of whom some advance the point of view of the church and others who reject it.</p>	<p>[313] ... Άνεγνώσθη βιβλίον Στεφάνου [314] τινὸς τριθεΐτου, ὃ ἐπὶ κλην ὁ Γόβαρος.</p> <p>Τὸ δὲ βιβλίον πόνων μὲν ἐδόκει μακρῶν, κέρδος δ' ἔφερε τῆς πολλῆς οὐχ ὁμοιον σπουδῆς· ἢ χρεῖαν ἐπεδείκνυτο περιττήν.</p> <p>Ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὰ μὲν κεφάλαια περὶ ὧν ἡ σπουδή, καὶ ὅσα εἰς κοινὰς καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἀνεφέρετο ζητήσεις, μικροῦ β' καὶ ν' ἦν μερικωτέρων τινῶν οὐ πολλῶν τούτοις παρεμβεβλημένων.</p> <p>Ταῦτα δὲ διτταὶ δόξαι κατεμερίζοντο, καὶ οὐ διτταὶ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντικείμεναι.</p> <p>Τὰς δὲ δόξας οὐ λογισμοὶ τινες οὐδὲ λόγια συνεκρότουν ἱερά, χρήσεις δὲ μόνον, ὡς ὁ γράφων ἐνόμιζε, διαφόρων πατέρων, ἧν αἱ μὲν τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φρόνημα, αἱ δὲ συνεκρότουν τὸ ἀπόβλητον.</p>

<p>The latter point of view is defended by ancient testimonies</p> <p>and ancient authors</p> <p>who had not made an exact study of all the problems,</p> <p>and certain of these citations don't defend the point of view supposed anyway,</p> <p>but only seem to do so, at least to the eyes that collected them.</p> <p>As for the point of view of the church, it is confirmed by the testimonies of authors who have defined the truth with the greatest exactitude.</p> <p>The subjects on which this double and contradictory demonstration is made are the following.</p>	<p>Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ἀπόβλητον παλαιαί τε χρήσεις</p> <p>καὶ παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν,</p> <p>οὐ πάντα πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν ἐξετασάντων,</p> <p>περιέθαλπον,</p> <p>ᾧ ἐνίων μὲν οὐδ' ἔθαλπον,</p> <p>ἐδόκουν δὲ θάλπειν ὅμως τῷ συλλέγοντι ταύταις·</p> <p>τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν αἱ τῶν μάλιστα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξακριβωσάντων ἱερῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐβεβαίουν μαρτυρίαι.</p> <p>Ἔστι δὲ τὰ κεφάλαια, περὶ ᾧ ἢ διὰ τῶν χρήσεων διπλῇ καὶ ἀντικειμένη σπουδάζει κατασκευὴ ταῦτα.</p>
<p>???</p>	<p>Ὅτι τὸ ἰδίωμα καὶ ὁ χαρακτήρ καὶ ἡ μορφή ὑπόστασις ἐστίν,</p> <p>ἀλλ' οὐχὶ συμπλοκὴ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ ιδιώματος,</p> <p>οὐδὲ τὸ αὐθυπόστατον.</p> <p>Τοῦτο μὲν αἱ χρήσεις κατασκευάζουσι πρότερον,</p> <p>εἴτα πάλιν ὕστερον τὸ ἐναντίον ἔτεραι,</p> <p>τουτέστι ὅτι τὸ ἰδίωμα καὶ ἡ μορφή καὶ ὁ χαρακτήρ οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑπόστασις ἀλλὰ τῆς ὑποστάσεως χαρακτήρ.</p> <p>Καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων κεφαλαίων,</p> <p>ἵνα μὴ τὰ αὐτὰ καθ' ἕκαστον λέγειν συναναγκασθείημεν,</p> <p>τὴν ἀντίθεσιν αἱ διάφοροι χρήσεις ἀπολαμβάνουσαι δοκοῦσιν ἐκατέρωθεν συνιστᾶν τὸ προτεινόμενον.</p>
<p>[That] First of all the just will be resurrected</p>	<p>Ὅτι πρότερον οἱ δίκαιοι ἀναστήσονται,</p>

<p>and with them all those alive</p> <p>and they will live a good life for a thousand years,</p> <p>eating and drinking,</p> <p>procreating,</p> <p>and that it is after this time that there will be the universal resurrection.</p>	<p>καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντα τὰ ζῶα,</p> <p>καὶ ἐπὶ χίλια ἔτη τρυφήσουσιν</p> <p>ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες</p> <p>καὶ τεκνοῦντες,</p> <p>καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἡ καθολικὴ ἐπιστήσεται ἀνάστασις·</p>
<p>The contrary opinion</p> <p>is that there is no first resurrection of the just,</p> <p>no[r] more than the good life for a thousand years</p> <p>nor marriages.</p>	<p>καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου,</p> <p>ὅτι τῶν δικαίων προανάστασις οὐκ [315] ἔστιν,</p> <p>οὐδὲ ἡ χιλιονταετὴς τρυφή</p> <p>οὐδὲ ὁ γάμος.</p>
<p>[That] After the resurrection, the just will live in Paradise;</p> <p>and [that] they won't live in Paradise</p> <p>by [but] in the heavens</p> <p>and [because?] the Paradise is neither in heaven</p> <p>nor on earth, but in an intermediate place.</p> <p>Paradis[e] is the New Jerusalem</p> <p>and is [located] in the third heaven;</p> <p>the tree[s?] that grow there</p> <p>are endowed with sensation,</p> <p>intelligence</p> <p>and speech</p> <p>and it is from there that man after his fall was thrown down to earth.</p>	<p>Ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν παραδείσῳ τῶν δικαίων ἔσται ἡ διατριβή,</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἐν παραδείσῳ</p> <p>ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,</p> <p>καὶ ὡς ὁ παράδεισος οὔτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,</p> <p>οὔτε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀλλὰ τούτων μεταξύ.</p> <p>Ὡς ὁ παράδεισος ἡ ἄνω ἐστὶν Ἱερουσαλήμ,</p> <p>καὶ ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ ἐστὶν οὐρανῷ,</p> <p>καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ ξύλα</p> <p>νοερά τέ εἰσι</p> <p>καὶ σύνεσιν ἔχουσι</p> <p>καὶ λόγον,</p> <p>καὶ ὡς ὁ ἄνθρωπος μετὰ τὴν παράβασιν ἐκεῖθεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν κατηνέχθη.</p>
<p>And the opposing thesis</p>	<p>Εἴτα καὶ τὸ ἀντικείμενον,</p>

<p>is that Paradise is not in the third heaven but on earth.</p> <p>[That] The good things prepared for the just the eye has not seen, the ears have not heard, and they are not found in the heart of man. [cf. 1 Cor. 2.9]</p>	<p>ὅτι ὁ παράδεισος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ οὐρανῷ ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.</p> <p>Ὅτι τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα τοῖς δικαίοις ἀγαθὰ οὔτε ὀφθαλμός εἶδεν οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη.</p>
<p>RSV 1 Corinthians 2:9 But, as it is written, "What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him,"</p>	<p>BGT 1 Corinthians 2:9 ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· ἃ ὀφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.</p>
<p>Hegesippus, however, one of the ancients, a contemporary of the apostles, in the third book of his memoirs, in I do not know what context, says that <u>these are empty words and that those who say them are liars</u> <u>since the holy [inspired/illustrious] scriptures [and the Lord]</u> <u>say:</u> <u>Blessed are your eyes because they see and your ears because they hear, and the rest.</u></p>	<p>Ἡγήσιππος μέντοι, ἀρχαῖός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικός, ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι καὶ παθὼν, μάτην μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα λέγει, καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταῦτα φαμένους τῶν τε θειῶν γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος· Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες καὶ τὰ ᾧα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα καὶ ἐξῆς.</p>
<p>[That] Those sinners who are delivered to</p>	<p>Ὅτι οἱ ἐν τῇ κολάσει παραδιδόμενοι τῶν</p>

<p>chastisement are thereby purified of their malice and, after their purification, are free of chastisement.</p> <p>According to the other point of view, [that] those delivered to chastisement are not purified and freed, but only some are,</p> <p>and [that], according to the true point of view of the church, no-one is freed of chastisement.</p> <p>[That] It is to burn and not be consumed that means being destroyed in a destruction that does not destroy itself.</p> <p>Titus, bishop of Bostra, who wrote against the Manichaeans, says in his first book,</p> <p>"How can the destruction be its own destruction?</p> <p>Because it is always some other object that it destroys, not itself.</p> <p>And if it destroys itself, it would not even have any beginning, because it would have destroyed itself instead of existing.</p> <p>An indestructible destruction is impossible to conceive of, at least according to common sense."</p> <p>And it is evident that it's in another sense that this holy author has said that indestructible destruction is impossible,</p> <p>and St. John said it in still another sense.</p> <p>The last-named in fact said that the destruction is indestructible instead of saying it prolongs itself and lasts forever,</p> <p>and the other intended to say that there is no indestructible destruction,</p> <p>i.e. that destruction cannot be a state exempt from suffering,</p> <p>an absence of destruction susceptible to save those whom it encounters.</p>	<p>ἀμαρτωλῶν καθαίρονται τῆς κακίας ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ μετὰ τὴν κάθαρσιν ἀπολύονται τῆς κολάσεως.</p> <p>Εἴτα καὶ ὅτι οὐ πάντες οἱ παραδοθέντες τῇ κολάσει καθαίρονται καὶ ἀπολύονται, ἀλλὰ τινες·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς τῆς ἐκκλησίας φρόνημα, οὐδεὶς ἀπολύεται τῆς κολάσεως.</p> <p>Ὅτι τὸ καίεσθαι καὶ μὴ κατακαίεσθαι φθορὰν ἐστὶν ἄφθαρτον φθείρεσθαι.</p> <p>Τίτος δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Βόστρων, κατὰ Μανιχαίων γράφων, ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ λόγῳ φησί·</p> <p>Πῶς ἂν εἴη φθορὰ ἑαυτῆς ἢ φθορά;</p> <p>Πάντως γὰρ ἕτερόν τι φθείρει, οὐχ ἑαυτήν.</p> <p>Εἰ δὲ ἑαυτὴν ἔφθειρεν, οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἂν ὑπέστη· φθαρῆσεται γὰρ ἑαυτὴν μᾶλλον φθείρουσα ἢ οὔσα·</p> <p>φθορὰν γὰρ ἄφθαρτον ἀδύνατον κατὰ γε τὰς κοινὰς ἐννοίας ἐπι νοηθῆναί ποτε.</p> <p>Καὶ δῆλον ὅτι ὁ μὲν ἱερὸς οὗτος ἀνὴρ καθ' ἑτέραν ἔννοιαν εἶπεν ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὴν φθορὰν ἄφθαρτον,</p> <p>ὁ δὲ θεσπέσιος Ἰωάννης καθ' ἑτέραν·</p> <p>ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὴν φθορὰν ἄφθαρτον εἶπεν ἀντὶ τοῦ διαιωνίζουσαν καὶ διὰ παντὸς γινομένην,</p> <p>ὁ δὲ τὴν φθορὰν ἄφθαρτον μὴ εἶναι,</p> <p>τουτέστι μὴ δύνασθαι τὴν φθορὰν ἀπάθειαν εἶναι</p> <p>καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ σωστικὴν τῶν ὑποκειμένων.</p>
--	--

<p>But the two interpretations are such that Gobar, the author of the present essay, without understanding the difference of interpretations has juxtaposed them as contradictory propositions.</p> <p>[That] The age to come is the eighth,</p> <p>the opposing proposition being that it isn't the eighth but the ninth.</p> <p>[That] The body of our Saviour Jesus Christ after the resurrection became subtle, spiritual, heavenly, light and impossible to touch;</p> <p>this is why he could even pass through closed doors.</p> <p>His tangible and solid body is another body to the subtle one: it is consistant and of another essence.</p> <p>And the contrary opinion to this, is that our Lord Jesus Christ after his resurrection did not have an intangible or subtle or spiritual body,</p> <p>and that it was by miracle and not in virtue of the nature of his body that he still entered when the doors were shut.</p> <p>[That] The Christ did not abandon his flesh after his resurrection, but with it He is seated at the right hand of the Father.</p> <p>In the opposed thesis, He will come to judge the living and the dead in a divine body, not one of flesh.</p> <p>[That] It is not with his flesh but purely in his divinity that the master will come for the second time.</p> <p>In introducing this data in his chapter, Gobar produces citations by Titus, Bishop of Bostra,</p>	<p>Ἄλλ' οὕτως ἐχούσης ἑκατέρας διανοίας, ὁ πατήρ τῆς παρούσης σπουδῆς Γόβαρος τὴν διάφορον ἔννοιαν οὐ συνιείς ὡς ἀντικειμέναις ἀλλήλαις παρέθηκε τὰς φωνάς.</p> <p>Ὅτι ὁ μέλλον αἴων ὄγδοός ἐστι,</p> <p>καὶ τὸ ἀντικείμενον, ὡς οὐκ ὄγδοος ἀλλ' ἑνάτος.</p> <p>Ὅτι τὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [232.289α] σῶμα λεπτομερές μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν γέγονε καὶ πνευματικὸν καὶ οὐράνιον καὶ κοῦφον καὶ μηδὲ ὑποπίπτον ἀφῆ,</p> <p>καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τῶν θυρῶν εἰσῆλθε κεκλεισμένων.</p> <p>Καὶ ὡς τὸ ἀπτὸν καὶ παχυμερές σῶμα ἕτερόν ἐστι παρὰ τὸ λεπτομερές, καὶ ἀντίτυπον, καὶ οὐσίας διαφόρου.</p> <p>Καὶ τοῦ εἰρημένου τὸ ἀντικείμενον, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν οὔτε ἀνέπαφον οὔτε λεπτομερές οὔτε πνευματικὸν εἶχε σῶμα,</p> <p>κατὰ θαυματουργίαν δὲ καὶ οὐ τῇ τοῦ σώματος φύσει τῶν θυρῶν εἰσῆλθε κεκλεισμένων.</p> <p>Ὅτι ὁ Χριστός οὐκ ἀπέθετο τὴν σάρκα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν δεξιᾷ καθέζεται τοῦ Πατρός·</p> <p>καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ὡς ἐλεύσεται μὲν κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, οὐκέτι δὲ σάρκα ἔχων ἀλλὰ θεοειδέστερον σῶμα.</p> <p>Ὅτι οὐ μετὰ σαρκὸς ἀλλὰ γυμνῇ τῇ θεότητι κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν παρουσίαν ὁ Δεσπότης παραγίνεται.</p> <p>Τοῦτο δὲ θέμενος ὁ Γόβαρος εἰς κεφάλαιον, καὶ χρήσεις παραγαγὼν Τίτου ἐπισκόπου Βόστρων,</p>
--	--

<p>when he could have assembled innumerable numbers who establish that it isn't only in his divinity that the Christ our Master will return;</p> <p>he passes on without mentioning one, thus showing the impiety throughout his soul,</p> <p>and hasn't the honesty to profess the monophysitism by the denial of the flesh.</p> <p>[That] The impassible body, invulnerable and immortal, is of one substance and of a type different to ours</p> <p>and [that] the corruptible and mortal bodies which pass into a state of incorruptibility and immortality undergo a modification in their substance.</p> <p>[That] Every definition preserves the nature of the things it defines.</p> <p>If it is lessened, or elements added to it, the object defined is destroyed.</p> <p>These last two chapters, like those a little earlier, welcome witnesses in one sense only and not in favour of two opposed theses.</p> <p>[That] The Word of God is complete in every way and under all and is complete in the body to which it is hypostatically attached.</p> <p>And in a word, the substance of the divinity, by its nature, by its power and operation, fills everything and passes into every part and mixes itself throughout the universe.</p> <p>[And that] On the contrary, it is not so, but God is separate from the universe in his substance and is in everything through the effect of his own virtues.</p> <p>[That] It is before the creation of the world that God likewise created the angels.</p> <p>He is thus not one of them, but created them on the first day of the creation of the world.</p>	<p>μυρίας ἔχων ἐτέρας συναγαγεῖν αἱ κατασκευάζουσι τὸ μὴ γυμνῇ τῇ θεότητι παραγενέσθαι τὸν Δεσπότην Χριστόν,</p> <p>πάσας παρῆκε καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἐμνήσθη, πανταχοῦ προπηδῶσαν αὐτοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιδεικνὺς τὴν ἀσέβειαν,</p> <p>ἥτις ἐν τῇ ἀπαρνήσει τῆς σαρκὸς μίαν φύσιν δογματίζειν ἀναιδεύεται.</p> <p>Ὅτι τὸ ἀπαθὲς καὶ ἄτρωτον καὶ ἀθάνατον σῶμα ἐτεροοὐσίον ἐστὶ καὶ ἐτερογενὲς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ σώματι·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι τὰ φθαρτὰ καὶ θνητὰ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ ἀθανασίαν μεταβάλλοντα τὴν κατ' οὐσίαν τροπὴν ἐπιδέχεται.</p> <p>Ὅτι ἕκαστος ὁρος μένων ἐντελὴς τὴν τῶν ὀριστῶν διασώζει φύσιν.</p> <p>Εἰ δέ τις τούτου ἀφέλοι τι ἢ προσθήσει, τὸ ὀριστὸν διαλύεται.</p> <p>[315] τοίνυν τὰ δύο κεφάλαια, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ μικρῶ πρόσθεν εἰρημένα, μονομερῶς καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἑκατέρου τῶν ἀντικειμένων τὰς χρήσεις ἐδέξαντο.</p> <p>Ὅτι ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος ὅλος ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ παντὶ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸ πᾶν, καὶ ὅλος ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὃ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἦνωσεν ἑαυτῷ·</p> <p>καὶ ἀπλῶς ἡ τῆς θεότητος οὐσία καὶ φύσει καὶ τῇ δυνάμει καὶ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ πάντα πληροῖ, καὶ δι' ἑκάστου τῶν ὄντων δίδεισι τῇ πρὸς τὸ πᾶν ἀνακράσει.</p> <p>Καὶ ὅτι οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς ἐκτός ἐστι τοῦ παντός κατ' οὐσίαν, ἐν πᾶσι δέ ἐστι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεσιν.</p> <p>Ὅτι πρὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως καὶ Ἀγγέλους ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισε·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς κοσμογενείας ἡμέρᾳ.</p>
---	--

<p>[That] The angels and demons are united to bodies.</p> <p>[and that] Neither the one nor the other are united to bodies.</p> <p>[That] The angels and the souls endowed with reason and all the creatures provided with intelligence are by nature and according to nature incorruptible;</p> <p>in the opposing thesis, [that] it is not by nature but by grace that they are immortal. God alone is immortal by nature.</p> <p>[That] The angels who descended from heaven to earth had bodies and organs of generation; they united themselves to women and engendered the giants and taught them the arts, good and bad.</p> <p>The giants themselves in uniting themselves to beasts engendered monstrous men and demons, male and female;</p> <p>these ange[l]s undergo punishment in places where fire and hot water stream from the earth.</p> <p>[and that] The souls of sinners become demons.</p> <p>According to the contrary thesis, the rebel angels remained incorporeal beings;</p> <p>and not themselves but by means of men were they united to women,</p> <p>or even that neither directly nor indirectly did they do this,</p> <p>and [that] the souls of sinners are not changed into demons.</p> <p>[That] The sky is spherical and has a circular movement;</p> <p>[and that] it is not spherical and does not have a circular movement.</p>	<p>Ὅτι οἱ Ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ δαίμονες σώμασιν ἦνωνται,</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐδέτεροι αὐτῶν σώμασιν ἦνωνται.</p> <p>Ὅτι οἱ Ἄγγελοι καὶ αἱ λογικαὶ ψυχαὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ νοερά κτίσματα φύσει καὶ κατὰ φύσιν εἰσὶν ἄφθαρτα·</p> <p>καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ὅτι οὐ φύσει ἀλλὰ χάριτί εἰσιν ἀθάνατοι, φύσει δὲ μόνος ὁ Θεός.</p> <p>Ὅτι οἱ Ἄγγελοι κατελθόντες ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰς τὴν γῆν σάρκα τε ἔσχον καὶ παιδοποιὰ μόρια, καὶ ταῖς γυναῖξιν ὁμιλήσαντες τοὺς γίγαντας ἐγέννησαν, καὶ ἐδίδαξαν αὐτοὺς τέχνας τε καὶ κακοτεχνίας·</p> <p>οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἀλόγοις μιγέντες ἐγέννησαν τερατώδεις ἀνθρώπους καὶ δαιμόνια ἄρρενά τε καὶ θήλεα·</p> <p>κολάζονται δὲ οἱ Ἄγγελοι ἐκεῖνοι ἔνθα τῆς γῆς πῦρ ἀναδίδοται καὶ θερμὰ ὕδατα·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν δαιμόνια γίνονται·</p> <p>καὶ τοῦναντίον ὅτι ἄσαρκοι ὄντες οἱ ἀποστατήσαντες ἄγγελοι</p> <p>οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν ἀλλὰ διὰ μέσων ἀνθρώπων ἐμίγησαν ταῖς γυναῖξι,</p> <p>μᾶλλον δὲ οὔτε δι' ἑαυτῶν οὔτε διὰ μέσων ἀνθρώπων·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐ μεταβάλλουσιν αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαὶ εἰς δαιμόνια.</p> <p>Ὅτι ὁ οὐρανὸς σφαιρικός ἐστὶ καὶ κύκλῳ κινεῖται·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὔτε σφαιρικός ἐστὶν οὔτε κύκλῳ κινεῖται.</p>
--	---

<p>[That] In the verse,</p> <p>"The Spirit of God was moving over the waters,"</p> <p>the Holy Spirit is referred to;</p> <p>[and that] it does not refer to the Holy Spirit</p> <p>but to one of the four elements.</p> <p>[That] The day of the Lord is both the eighth day and the first;</p> <p>and [that] is not so.</p> <p>[That] The souls of men are bodies endowed with intelligence and are fashioned according to the exterior appearance of the body.</p> <p>According to the opposite opinion, the soul is incorporeal and doesn't take on corporeal form.</p> <p>[That] Souls existed before the creation of the world, and [that (they)] descended from the heavens into bodies like those of Moses, and the prophets, of Socrates, of Plato, of John the Baptist and the apostles, and that of the Lord himself.</p> <p>According to the opposite opinion, [that] souls did not exist in heaven before bodies, but are born at the moment of the generation of the body;</p> <p>however, the body comes into existence first,</p> <p>and then the soul;</p> <p>or even, [that] souls do not come into existence before or after the body, but, better still, body and soul come into existence together.</p> <p>[That] The body of Adam was fashioned with some earth by God;</p> <p>[and that] it was not from earth, but from water and spirit.</p>	<p>"Ὅτι τὸ εἰρημένον·</p> <p>Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος</p> <p>τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἦν·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἦν</p> <p>ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐν τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων.</p> <p>"Ὅτι ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα ἡ αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ὀγδόη καὶ πρώτη</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐχί.</p> <p>"Ὅτι σώματά εἰσι νοερὰ αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαί, καὶ διατετυπωμέναι κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἔξωθεν τοῦ σώματος σχῆμα·</p> <p>καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ὅτι ἀσώματός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ σωματικοῖς οὐχ ὑπόκειται τύποις.</p> <p>"Ὅτι αἱ ψυχαί πρὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ὑπέστησαν καταβολῆς, καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰς τὰ σώματα κατέβησαν, ὥσπερ Μωσῆς καὶ οἱ Προφῆται καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ Πλάτων καὶ ὁ Βαπτιστὴς Ἰωάννης καὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων αἱ ψυχαί, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ γε ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου.</p> <p>Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ὅτι πρὸ τῶν σωμάτων οὐκ ἦσαν αἱ ψυχαί ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τοῦ σώματος γενέσει ὑπέστησαν,</p> <p>προϋπάρχει μέντοι τὸ σῶμα,</p> <p>εἴτα ἡ ψυχὴ·</p> <p>ἢ μᾶλλον, ὅτι οὔτε προϋπάρχουσιν οὔτε μεθ'ὑπάρχουσιν ἀλλὰ συνυπάρχουσιν ἀλλήλοις.</p> <p>"Ὅτι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀδάμ ἀπὸ γῆς ἐπλασεν ὁ Θεός·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἀπὸ γῆς ἀλλ' ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος.</p>
---	--

<p>[That] The breath that God breathed in the face of Adam was a temporal breath and not the eternal Spirit;</p> <p>[and that] it was not temporal but an immortal soul.</p> <p>[That] It was neither a temporal breath nor a soul but a spirit, since man is composed of three elements: spirit, soul and body.</p> <p>And [that] the breath breathed (into Adam) was none of the three elements just mentioned</p> <p>but the Holy Spirit,</p> <p>and it is neither soul nor spirit but the breath that created the soul.</p> <p>[That] Earth, water and the other elements are transformed to give fruit and planys; nourishment is transformed to give flesh, nerves and the other elements of the body.</p> <p>According to the opposed thesis, [that the] earth is not transformed into plants and fruit nor nourishment into our body.</p> <p>[That] After death, the soul does not leave either the body or the tomb;</p> <p>on the contrary, [that] it does not stay with the body nor in the tomb.</p> <p>On this question Gobar, who disposed of witnesses in abundance, only produced that of Severian of Gabala and that of Irenaeus.</p> <p>[That] All that is created is corruptible and mortal and it is by the will of God that it remains indissoluble and incorruptible.</p> <p>According to the opposed thesis, that which is corruptible by nature cannot be made incorruptible by the will of God,</p> <p>because to speak thus is self-contradictory</p>	<p>Ὅτι ἡ πνοή, ἣν ἐνεφύσησεν ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Ἀδάμ, πρόσκαιρος ἦν καὶ οὐχ ὡς τὸ πνεῦμα αἰώνιον·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐ πρόσκαιρος ἦν ἀλλὰ ψυχὴ [232.290α] ἀθάνατος.</p> <p>Ὅτι οὐ πρόσκαιρος ἦν οὔτε ψυχὴ, ἀλλὰ νοῦς, ὡς ἐκ τριῶν συγκεῖσθαι μερῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, νοῦ τε καὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος.</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲν τῶν εἰρημένων ἦν ἡ ἐμφυσηθεῖσα πνοή,</p> <p>ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,</p> <p>καὶ οὐκ αὐτὸ ψυχὴ οὐδὲ νοῦς χρηματίσαν, ἀλλὰ δεδημιουργηκὸς τὴν ψυχὴν.</p> <p>Ὅτι ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ στοιχεῖα μεταβάλλει εἰς τοὺς καρπούς καὶ τὰ φυτά, καὶ ἡ τροφή εἰς σάρκα καὶ νεῦρα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μέρη τοῦ σώματος·</p> <p>καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ὅτι οὐ μεταβάλλει ἡ γῆ εἰς τὰ φυτά καὶ τοὺς καρπούς, οὔτε ἡ τροφή εἰς τὸ ἡμέτερον σῶμα.</p> <p>Ὅτι μετὰ θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ οὔτε τοῦ σώματος οὔτε τοῦ τάφου χωρίζεται·</p> <p>καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ὅτι οὐ παραμένει τῷ σώματι ἡ ψυχὴ οὔτε τῷ τάφῳ.</p> <p>Ἐνταῦθα δὲ μυρίων εὐπορῶν ὁ Γόβαρος χρήσεων Σεβηριανοῦ μόνον τοῦ Γαβάλων καὶ Εἰρηναίου παρέθηκε χρήσεις.</p> <p>Ὅτι πᾶν γενητὸν φθαρτὸν ἐστὶ καὶ θνητὸν, βουλήσει δὲ Θεοῦ διαμένει ἄλυστον καὶ ἄφθαρτον·</p> <p>καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, ὅτι τὸ φύσει φθαρτὸν οὐ δύναται ἄφθαρτον εἶναι βουλήσει Θεοῦ·</p> <p>ἐναντία γὰρ δοξάζει ἑαυτῷ ὁ τοῦτο λέγων,</p>
---	---

<p>and attributes the impossible to the creator.</p> <p>For this proposition the author has produced a citation borrowed from Justin Martyr;</p> <p>the latter had undertaken to combat the opinions of the pagans and refutes Plato who said,</p> <p>"Since you were born, you are neither immortal nor quite indestructible and yet, you won't suffer dissolution and you won't undergo a mortal destiny because you have obtained a stronger link which is my will."</p> <p>And the martyr refutes the Platonic sophism and shows that Plato propounds a self-contradictory creator and doesn't include any logical reasoning;</p> <p>because by necessity, whether indeed that which is created is corruptible according to the definition above, or that in fact he lies in saying that everything that is born is corruptible.</p> <p>And Gobar hijacks the argument destined to confound the pagan in such a way that it serves the refute the position of the church.</p> <p>The chapters in question are elaborated by the author by means of pairs of contradictory citations as usual; he then returns to chapters from a single point of view.</p> <p>He first says ---- and this is the thirty-eighth chapter of the whole work ---- what the teaching was concerning the incarnation of our Lord according to St. Eustathius, who occupied the episcopal chair of Antioch,</p> <p>then what was the teaching of the very holy Cyril, the Bishop of Alexandria,</p> <p>and how the doctors of the church understood the verse,</p> <p>"Of the day and the hour, no-one is told, not the</p>	<p>[316] καὶ ἀδύνατα χαρίζεται τῷ δημιουργῷ.</p> <p>Ταύτης δὲ τῆς δόξης χρῆσιν μὲν παρέθηκεν ἐκ τοῦ μάρτυρος Ἰουστίνου·</p> <p>τῷ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν μὲν δόξαν συνενήνεκτο μάχη, καὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἔλεγχος κατεσκευάζετο εἰρηκότος·</p> <p>Ἐπεὶ περ ἐγένεσθε, ἀθάνατοι μὲν οὐκ ἔστε οὐδὲ ἄλυτοι πάνπαν, οὔτε γε μὴν λυθήσεσθε οὐδὲ τεύξεσθε θανάτου μοίρης, τῆς ἐμῆς βουλήσεως ἰσχυροτέρου δεσμοῦ λαχόντες.</p> <p>Καὶ ὁ μὲν μάρτυς, τὸ πλατωνικὸν διελέγχων σόφισμα, ἐπιδείκνυσιν τὸν Πλάτωνα τὸν τε δημιουργὸν εἰσάγοντα τάναντία λέγοντα ἑαυτῷ, καὶ εἰρμὸν ἀκολουθίας οὐδένα τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἀρμόζοντα·</p> <p>ἢ γὰρ ἀνάγκη πᾶσα τὸ γενητὸν φθαρτὸν εἶναι κατὰ τὸν πρότερον ὅρον, ἢ ψεύδεσθαι λέγοντα πᾶν τὸ γενόμενον φθαρτὸν εἶναι.</p> <p>Ὁ δὲ Γόβαρος τὸν ἑλληνικὸν ἔλεγχον εἰς ἀνατροπὴν ἐκβιάζεται χρῆσθαι τοῦ φρονήματος τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ.</p> <p>Τὰ τοίνυν εἰρημένα κεφάλαια διπλαῖς καὶ ἀντικειμέναις χρήσεσιν, ὡς ἐνόμιζε, κατασκευάζων, ἐπὶ τὰ μονομερῆ πάλιν μεταβαίνει.</p> <p>Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν φησιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τῆς ὅλης συντάξεως ἡ' καὶ λ' κεφάλαιον, ὅπως ἐδόξασε περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐνανθρωπήσεως ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Εὐστάθιος, ὁ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἀρχιερωσύνης προεδρεύσας,</p> <p>ἐφεξῆς δὲ ὅπως ὁ ἁγιώτατος Κύριλλος, ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἀρχιερεύς·</p> <p>καὶ ὅπως ἐνόησαν οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλοι τό·</p> <p>Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς</p>
---	--

<p>angels nor the Son but only the Father,"</p> <p>and how Severus understood it.</p> <p>After these subjects treated in a single sense, he returns to producing citations in two senses, and makes a forty-second chapter where it is said that our Lord Jesus Christ was nourished with milk by Mary, the mother of God, and that he was not so nourished.</p> <p>[That] The verse,</p> <p>"The least in the kingdom of Heaven is greater than John the Baptist," was spoken by the Saviour of himself;</p> <p>[and that] it was not of himself that he said this, but of John the Evangelist.</p> <p>[That] Our Lord Jesus the Christ was crucified aged thirty.</p> <p>[and that] He was not thirty, but thirty-three;</p> <p>and [that] not thirty-three but forty;</p> <p>[and that] no[t] thirty-three or forty but much older,</p> <p>so that he wasn't far short of fifty.</p> <p>[That] At the moment when the Lord transmitted the mystery of the New Covenant to his disciples, he was eating the passover;</p> <p>and [that] he was not eating the passover at that moment.</p> <p>[That] The brass serpent that Moses made in the desert was a "type" of the Master;</p> <p>and [that] it was not his "type" but an "anti-type."</p> <p>[That] He that cut off the ear of the High Priest</p>	<p>οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι, οὐδὲ ὁ Υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ,</p> <p>καὶ ὅπως τοῦτο Σεβήρος ἐνόησε.</p> <p>Ταῦτα μονομερῶς διελθὼν τὰ κεφάλαια μεταβαίνει πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν διπλὴν προκομιδὴν τῶν χρήσεων, καὶ ποιεῖται κεφάλαιον β' καὶ μ' ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐγαλακτοτροφήθη ἐκ τῆς Θεοτόκου Μαρίας, καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἐγαλακτοτροφήθη.</p> <p>Ὅτι τό·</p> <p>Ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων ἐστὶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Σωτὴρ·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ</p> <p>ἀλλὰ περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ.</p> <p>Ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός λ' ἐνιαυτῶν ὑπάρχων ἐσταυρώθη·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐ λ' ἀλλὰ γ' καὶ λ'·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐ γ' καὶ λ' ἀλλὰ μ'·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὔτε λ' ἐτῶν οὔτε μ' μόνον,</p> <p>ἀλλὰ καὶ πλέον, οὐ πόλυ τῶν ν' ἀφεστηκώς.</p> <p>Ὅτι ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ παρέδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὁ Κύριος τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης μυστήριον,</p> <p>τὸ νομικὸν ἔφαγε πάσχα·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔφαγε τήνικαῦτα τὸ νομικὸν πάσχα.</p> <p>Ὅτι ὁ χαλκοῦς ὄφεις, ὃν ὑψωσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὁ Μωσῆς, τύπος ἦν τοῦ Δεσπότης·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐχὶ τύπος ἀλλὰ ἀντίτυπος.</p> <p>Ὅτι ὁ τὸ ὠτίον ἀποκόψας τοῦ δούλου τοῦ</p>
--	--

<p>was Thomas;</p> <p>[and that] it wasn't Thomas but Peter.</p> <p>[That] At the moment of the Passion, the divinity was separated from the body of Christ;</p> <p>[and that] the divinity was not separated from either body or soul.</p> <p>[That] In exchange for the man who was possessed, the Lord [Saviour] gave his own blood to the enemy as a ransom since the enemy extorted it;</p> <p>in the opposing thesis, it was not the enemy but to God his [and] father that the Christ [he] made this offering.</p> <p>[That] The Christ was resurrected in most great and marvellous glory that he only manifested in his Transfiguration on the mountain,</p> <p>and [that] after the resurrection he did not change his body to give himself the glory due to him, but made visible what he had been [already] before his death.</p> <p>Thus says Cyril; the opposing opinion is that of Dionysius of Alexandria.</p> <p>[That] It was on the twelfth day of the first month that Mary annointed the Lord with myrrh in the house of Simon the leper;</p> <p>it was the thirteenth day when the Lord gave the mystic supper to the disciples;</p> <p>the fourteenth when the passion of the Saviour took place,</p> <p>the fifteenth when he rose from the dead</p> <p>and the sixteenth when he rose into heaven;</p> <p>or, indeed, it was not so</p> <p>but it was the fourteenth day when he ate the</p>	<p>ἀχιερώς Θωμᾶς ἦν·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐχὶ Θωμᾶς ἦν ἀλλὰ Πέτρος.</p> <p>Ὅτι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ πάθους ἡ θεότης ἐχωρίσθη τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὔτε τῆς ψυχῆς οὔτε τοῦ σώματος ἡ θεότης ἐχωρίσθη.</p> <p>Ὅτι λύτρον ἀντὶ τοῦ κατεχομένου ἀνθρώπου τῷ ἐχθρῷ τὸ οἰκεῖον ὁ Σωτὴρ ἔδωκεν αἷμα, τοῦ ἐχθροῦ τοῦτο αἰρησαμένου·</p> <p>καὶ τὸ ἀντικείμενον, ὡς οὐχὶ τῷ ἐχθρῷ ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ προσήνεγκε τοῦτο.</p> <p>Ὅτι κρεῖσσον καὶ θαυμασιώτερον τῆς ἐν τῷ ὄρει μεταμορφώσεως ἀνέστη ὁ Χριστός·</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι οὐ μετεστοιχείωσεν ἀναστὰς τὸ σῶμα πρὸς δόξαν τὴν αὐτῷ κεχρεωστημένην, ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτον ἔδειξεν οἷον ἦν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ θανάτου.</p> <p>Καὶ τοῦτο μὲν λέγει Κύριλλος, τὸ δὲ ἀντίθετον ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας Διονύσιος.</p> <p>Ὅτι ἐν τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τοῦ πρώτου μηνὸς ἤλειψε τὸν Κύριον ἡ Μαρία μύρω ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ,</p> <p>ἐν δὲ τῇ γ' τὸ μυστικὸν δεῖπνον ὁ Κύριος παραδίδωσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς,</p> <p>ἐν δὲ τῇ ιδ' τὸ σωτήριον ὑπέστη πάθος,</p> <p>ἐν δὲ τῇ ιε' ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη</p> <p>καὶ τῇ ι' ἀνελήφθη·</p> <p>ἢ οὐχ [232.291α] οὕτως,</p> <p>ἀλλὰ τῇ μὲν ιδ' τὸ μυστικὸν ἔφαγε δεῖπνον,</p>
--	---

<p>mystic supper,</p> <p>the fifteenth when he was crucified,</p> <p>the sixteenth when he was resurrected.</p> <p>Or [that] it was not so either, but [that] it was the thirteenth day, the Sunday, when the resurrection of the Lord took place,</p> <p>and he ascended (into Heaven) forty days later.</p> <p>[That] It was on the fifth evening at the moment when the Lord gave the mystic supper to his disciples that the sacrifice of his body began.</p> <p>So far, therefore, it is the doctrines of the church and questions of a general kind that the author discusses in almost all his chapters,</p> <p>and most of the time he offers two opposing opinions with some contradictory witnesses</p> <p>and, in some cases, he can only establish a view by witnesses favourable only to a single thesis.</p> <p>From here on, he deals with some special questions, eighteen in number.</p> <p>For example, the opinion of Severus on the holy conductors of the churches and of the arrangements where he reflects on the words of Cyril and John in their message to Thomas, Bishop of Germanica;</p> <p>[and that] he does not approve of what St. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, said on the restoration of man,</p> <p>nor Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis and martyr,</p> <p>nor Irenaeus, the holy Bishop of Lyons [Lugdunum],</p> <p>when they say that the kingdom of Heaven consists of the coming of certain material foods.</p>	<p>τῇ δὲ ιε' ἐσταυρώθη,</p> <p>ἀνέστη δὲ τῇ ι'·</p> <p>ἢ ὅτι οὐδὲ τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ὅτι τριήμερος μὲν καὶ ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ γέγονεν ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνάστασις,</p> <p>καὶ μετὰ μ' ἡμέρας ἀνελήφθη.</p> <p>Ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσπέρας τῆς ε', ὅτε τὸ μυστικὸν δεῖπνον ὁ Κύριος παρεδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς, τότε τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἐτέθυτο.</p> <p>Μέχρι μὲν οὖν τούτων περὶ τῶν κοινῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας δογμάτων τε καὶ ζητημάτων μικροῦ διὰ πάντων τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐποιεῖτο τὸν λόγον,</p> <p>τὰ πλεῖστα μὲν δι' ἀντικειμένων χρήσεων ἑκάτερον μέρος τῆς ἀντιθέσεως ἐπικουρῶν,</p> <p>ὀλίγα δὲ καὶ μονομερέσι μαρτυρίαις ἐπιβεβαιῶν.</p> <p>Ἐντεῦθεν δὲ περὶ τινων [317] ἰδικῶν κεφαλαίων τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὀκτωκαίδεκα διαλαμβάνει,</p> <p>οἷον τίνας εἶχεν ὑπολήψεις Σεβῆρος περὶ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁσίων μυσταγωγῶν, καὶ ὅπως διετέθη πρὸς τὰ εἰρημένα παρὰ Κυρίλλου καὶ Ἰωάννου ἐν τῇ πρὸς Θωμᾶν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Γερμανικείας,</p> <p>καὶ ὅτι τῷ ἐν ἀγίοις Γρηγορίῳ, τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Νύσσης, τὰ εἰρημένα περὶ ἀποκαταστάσεως οὐκ ἀποδέχεται,</p> <p>οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Παπίαν τὸν Ἱεραπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον καὶ μάρτυρα,</p> <p>οὐδὲ Εἰρηναῖον τὸν ὅσιον ἐπίσκοπον Λουγδούνων,</p> <p>ἐν οἷς λέγουσιν αἰσθητῶν τινῶν βρωμάτων ἀπόλαυσιν εἶναι τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν.</p>
--	--

<p>[That] St. Basil does not follow St. Dionysius of Alexandria on many points, above all those where the Arian heresy found an opportunity.</p> <p>The author says in defense (of Arius) that this was not from an impious intention,</p> <p>but in combatting Sabellius; that he had been carried away in his remarks against the opposite heresy.</p> <p>More still, concerning the (Holy) Spirit, he held improper opinions.</p> <p>But the great Athanasius himself defends Dionysius;</p> <p>"As for Arius,"</p> <p>he says,</p> <p>"Dionysius never shared the opinions (of Arius), nor ignored the truth;</p> <p>in fact he was never condemned for heresy by other bishops and never included the ideas (of Arius) in his teaching."</p> <p>Theodoret also uses the same language on the subject of the said Dionysius.</p> <p>The author also cites some witnesses on the attitude of Theophilus and his synod in regard to St. John Chrysostom</p> <p>and the opinions of Atticus and Cyril on the subject of the same very holy John of Constantinople</p> <p>and the reticence of the very prudent Isidore of Pelusium with regard to Theophilus and Cyril, the bishops of Alexandria, concerning St. John Chrysostom;</p> <p>he blames the first for their hostility towards Chrysostom, while he praises and admires him.</p>	<p>Ὅτι Βασίλειος ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Διονύσιον Ἀλεξανδρείας οὐκ ἐν πολλοῖς ἀποδέχεται, μάλιστα δὲ ἐν οἷς τὸ Ἀρειανῶν ἔθνος ἐπερείδεται.</p> <p>Ἀπολογεῖται δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ὡς οὐκ ἀσεβεῖ γνῶμη,</p> <p>μάχη δὲ τῇ πρὸς Σαβέλλιον εἰς τὴν ἀντίθετον κατὰ τοὺς λόγους περιτραπῆναι δυσφημίαν.</p> <p>Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος οὐκ εὐαγεῖς αὐτὸν ἀφεῖναι φωνάς.</p> <p>Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ μέγας Ἀθανάσιος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνδρὸς Διονυσίου ὑπεραπολογεῖται·</p> <p>Τὰ γὰρ Ἀρείου,</p> <p>φησί,</p> <p>Διονύσιος οὔτε ἐφρόνησέ ποτε, οὔτε ἡγνόησε τὴν ἀλήθειαν·</p> <p>οὔτε γὰρ ὑφ' ἐτέρων ἐπισκόπων ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ κατεγνώσθη οὔτε τὰς ἀρειανικὰς φωνὰς ἐφθέγγετο ὡς δογματίζων.</p> <p>Ἀλλὰ καὶ Θεοδώρητος τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ εἰρημένου Διονυσίου λογισμοὺς ἀποδίδωσιν.</p> <p>Ἔτι μὴν παρατίθῃσι μαρτυρίας καὶ ὅπως μὲν διετέθη Θεόφιλος καὶ ἡ σὺν αὐτῷ σύνοδος πρὸς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωάννην τὸν Χρυσόστομον·</p> <p>καὶ ποίας ἔσχε δόξας Ἀττικὸς καὶ Κύριλλος περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγιωτάτου Ἰωάννου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως·</p> <p>καὶ οἷας ἔσχεν ὑπολήψεις ὁ εὐλαβέστατος Ἰσίδωρος ὁ τοῦ Πηλουσίου περὶ Θεοφίλου καὶ Κυρίλλου τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἱεραρχῶν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου,</p> <p>ὡς τοὺς μὲν ἔνεκα τῆς πρὸς τὸν Χρυσόστομον ἀπεχθείας ἐκάκιζε, τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ γνέει τε καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν.</p>
---	---

<p>[That] Severus, who undertook to criticise St. Isidore without good reason, imagines as his subject an accusation of Origenism,</p> <p>and yet, conquered by the truth, spontaneously admits his error.</p> <p>The author reports some suspicions that Hippolytus and Epiphanius encouraged concerning Nicholas, one of the seven deacons, whom they condemn energetically.</p> <p>On the other hand the divine Ignatius [the God-bearer]</p> <p>and Clement, (the author of) the Stromateis,</p> <p>and Eusebius Pamphilus</p> <p>and Theodoret of Cyr</p> <p>condemn the heresy of the Nicolaitans but deny that N[i]cholas was connected with it.</p> <p>[That] Hippolytus and Irenaeus claim that the Letter to the Hebrews is not by Paul,</p> <p>but Clement and Eusebius and a numerous company of the other [God-bearing] fathers count this letter among the others</p> <p>and say that Clement named above translated it from Hebrew.</p> <p>[That] Origen and Theognostus received the approbation of the great Athanasius of Alexandria in many of their works;</p> <p>Titus of Bostra and Gregory the Theologian in their letters call him the friend of virtue while (Gregory of) Nyssa speaks of him in favourable terms.</p> <p>St. Dionysius [the Alexandrian], writing to this personage,</p> <p>then after his death to Theotechnus Bishop of Caesarea,</p>	<p>Ὅτι Σεβήρος τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Ἰσίδωρον μέμψασθαι μὲν ὀρμηθεὶς, οὐκ ἔχων δὲ ὄθεν, φήμην αὐτῷ περιπλάττει ὠριγενιασμοῦ,</p> <p>εἰ καὶ ταύτην αὐτὸς πάλιν ἀποσκευάζεται δι' ἑαυτοῦ, ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας νικώμενος.</p> <p>Ἔτι δὲ ποίας ὑπολήψεις ἔσχεν Ἰππόλυτος καὶ Ἐπιφάνιος περὶ Νικολάου τοῦ ἐνὸς τῶν ζ' διακόνων, καὶ ὅτι ἰσχυρῶς αὐτοῦ καταγινώσκουσιν.</p> <p>Ἰγνάτιος μέντοι ὁ Θεοφόρος</p> <p>καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Στρωματεὺς</p> <p>καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου</p> <p>καὶ Θεοδώρητος ὁ Κύρου</p> <p>τὴν μὲν Νικολαϊτῶν καταγινώσκουσιν αἵρεσιν, τὸν δὲ Νικόλαν μὴ τοιοῦτον εἶναι ἀποφαίνονται.</p> <p>Ὅτι Ἰππόλυτος καὶ Εἰρηναῖος τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου οὐκ ἐκείνου εἶναι φασί,</p> <p>Κλήμης μέντοι καὶ Εὐσέβιος καὶ πολλὸς ἄλλος τῶν Θεοφόρων πατέρων ὁμιλος ταῖς ἄλλαις συναριθμοῦσι ταύτην ἐπιστολαῖς,</p> <p>καὶ φασιν αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος μεταφράσαι τὸν εἰρημένον Κλήμεντα.</p> <p>Ὅτι Ὀριγένην καὶ Θεόγνωστον ὃ τε μέγας Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐν πολλοῖς ἀπεδέχετο λόγοις</p> <p>καὶ Τίτος ὁ Βόστρων, καὶ ὁ Θεολόγος Γρηγόριος ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς φιλόκαλον αὐτὸν λέγει, καὶ ὁ Νύσσης δὲ εὐφήμως εἰς μνήμην ἄγει.</p> <p>Ἀλλὰ καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον γράφων,</p> <p>ἔτι δὲ καὶ μετὰ θάνατον ἐκείνου πρὸς Θεότεκνον τὸν τῆς Καισαρείας ἐπίσκοπον γράφων,</p>
---	--

<p>praises Origen.</p> <p>And Alexander, Bishop of the Holy Towns and martyr, in a letter to the same Origen treats him in a very friendly manner.</p> <p>[That] Theophilus and Epiphanius reject Origen with vigour.</p> <p>The author reports the suspicions of most holy Hippolytus in regard to the heresy of the Montanists as well as those of Gregory of Nyssa.</p> <p>Such are the chapters concerning questions of detail.</p> <p>He then returns again to more general ideas</p> <p>and presents some citations which attest that the soul of someone dead derives great advantage from prayers, offerings and alms given in its name;</p> <p>and the opposed opinion, that it is not so.</p> <p>These are all the chapters that we have found assembled in the work of Gobar.</p>	<p>δι' ἐπαίνων τὸν Ὀριγένην ἄγει</p> <p>καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἱεραπόλεων ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς, πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν Ὀριγένην γράφων, λίαν οἰκιοῦται τὸν ἄνδρα τοῖς λόγοις.</p> <p>Ὅτι Θεόφιλος μὲν καὶ Ἐπιφάνιος λίαν ἐκτρέπονται τὸν Ὀριγένην.</p> <p>Τίνας ὑπολήψεις εἶχεν ὁ ἀγιώτατος Ἰππόλυτος περὶ τῆς τῶν Μοντανιστῶν αἵρέσεως, καὶ τίνας ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις τῆς Νύσσης Γρηγόριος.</p> <p>Τὰ μὲν οὖν μερικώτερα τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐν τούτοις.</p> <p>Πάλιν δὲ ἐπὶ τι κοινότερον μεταβαίνει,</p> <p>καὶ παρατίθησι χρήσεις ὅτι παντὸς τεθνεῶτος ψυχὴ ὠφελεῖται μέγιστα διὰ τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἐπιτελουμένων εὐχῶν καὶ προσφορῶν καὶ ἐλεημοσυνῶν,</p> <p>καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου, ὅτι οὐχ οὕτω.</p> <p>Τὸν μὲν οὖν Γόβαρον μέχρι τούτων τῶν κεφαλαίων τὸν πόνον εὕρομεν ἀναδεξάμενον.</p>
---	---